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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We're going to get started. Good afternoon, everyone.

Welcome to a public meeting of the Subcommittee of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. It is the Subcommittee considering a Petition by the Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire, which does business as Eversource Energy, seeking a Certificate of Site and Facility. We are doing a public hearing today, and there will be a number of things that will happen. We'll go over the agenda in a few minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. WEATHERSBY: Patricia Weathersby, public member.

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

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

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

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

[No verbal response]

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

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

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

On December 7th, the Subcommittee met to consider the status of the Application, and determined that it contained sufficient information to satisfy the
application requirements of each state agency having
jurisdiction under state or federal law to regulate any
aspect of the construction or operation of the proposed
facility. The Subcommittee also made an independent
determination that the application contained sufficient
information to carry out the purposes of RSA 162-H.

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

Today, we're here for a public -- what
is referred to in the statute as a "joint public
hearing", and the "joint" aspect of that refers to if
there are other state agencies that have
permitting/hearing requirements. There may be none.
It's not surprising, it's not unusual that there
aren't. So, the only people you have here today are
the SEC Subcommittee.
Under RSA 162-H:10, the Subcommittee is required to hold at least one public hearing in each county in which the proposed project is to be located. This is the first such hearing, and the Belknap County version, of what will take place in four other locations. The public hearings must be held within 90 days after acceptance of the application.

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

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

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

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

I believe the next item of business is to turn it over to the Applicant for their
MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Thank you very much. My name is Bill Quinlan. I'm the President of Eversource New Hampshire. I want to thank everyone for being here tonight and showing an interest in the Project that we're proposing. I'm going to give a quick overview of the Project that we've applied for a certificate, as well as highlight kind of some of the issues that have been raised during its history, as well as some of the impacts in New Hampshire.

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

So, what's going on in the energy markets today? This is a topic I hear about regularly, from businesses and residences across the State of New Hampshire, and you could translate that anywhere across New England. In essence, what you've got is a situation where energy prices are higher than they should be and they're more volatile than they should
be. They're subject to very wide swings. And, there's a lot of reasons for that.

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

As a result, what's happened is, this transformation here, between the year 2000 and 2015, you'll see this is a depiction of the generation mix in New England. So, what are the power plants that are used to generate electricity? And, you look at 2000,
very good fuel diversity, a nice mix of nuclear power plants, coal plants, oil plants, hydro plants, natural gas. The plants that have retired, and many of them are in this area, are coal, nuclear, and oil. You know, a good example of it is Vermont Yankee, which is kind of a recent addition.

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

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

Here's an illustration of what I mean by impact on prices. So, as demand rises, and supply comes down, the surplus that we had diminishes. So, we end up with a scarcity. As a result, you know, prices begin to ramp up. This is a depiction of what's referred to as "capacity". These are incentive payouts that are made to generators, and the commitments are made years in advance to ensure that those plants
remain in operation when we need them. So, these are markets that have cleared out into the future, three years in advance, all the way out to 2019. And, you know, the takeaway is for a decade the capacity market for all of New England has been about a billion dollars. Because of the phenomena that I identified earlier, where plants are retiring and supply is growing, but not quickly enough to meet demand, that billion dollar market will become a $3 billion market, a $4 billion market, in three years from now, a $3 billion market. All of that translates into higher electric rates across New England. And, it's really due to the simple theory behind supply-and-demand, you have a scarcity situation. So, we have visibility three years out that prices are going to go higher still than they are today.

Here's what's happening on the energy side. So, your electric price is really made up of two elements, one the capacity that I just referred to, the other is the cost of energy. In essence, for any given hour, customers across New England demand a certain amount of electricity to keep the lights on. And, the way that price is determined in the market is the Independent System Operator dispatches generating units
until the supply is sufficient to meet the demand of customers. And, they do it from the lowest cost generation asset, to the one that just meets the customer demand. When you have balanced the customer demand, that last generating unit sets the price for all of the generation across New England. Okay?

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

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

I'm going to transition to what's referred to as the "Clean State RFP". So, this is what
New England is doing about that supply challenge. The three southern New England states, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, in recognition of this challenge, have gone out and solicited projects to essentially increase the supply of electricity, clean energy, into New England. It's for two primary purposes: One, to address that supply situation I was referring to, and replace some of those plants that are retiring; and, two, help the region meet its environmental goals. Those are the two principal purposes of this solicitation.

Northern Pass, this Project was bid into that three-state request for proposals in late January. The Project we bid into that three-state RFP is identical to the Project that we have submitted to the SEC for consideration. It's the same route, and the same project cost, with the same, in essence, benefits. Our view is that our proposal is a very strong one. It's a large volume. It's clean energy. So, it's exactly the type of power those states are looking for. And, from a price perspective, we expect it to be very competitive.

The question I get often is "what's the relationship between our Project, Northern Pass, and
our partner, Hydro-Quebec?" Okay? So, Northern Pass Transmission, NPT, the Applicant in this case, is a subsidiary of Eversource, the Company. Okay? It's a direct subsidiary. Our partner is Hydro-Quebec. Hydro-Quebec is the owner and operator of hydro facilities in Canada. They basically control the supply of that hydroelectric power.

It's a fairly simple relationship.

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

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

That's the high-level summary of the relationship between Northern Pass Transmission and Hydro-Quebec. I know there have been a lot of questions as to those relationships. But it's all
spelled out in that Transmission Service Agreement. And, that agreement has been submitted and approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Okay?

So, for the last 18 months or so, as I've been involved in Northern Pass, we've been taking a very hard look at this Project and listening to a lot of stakeholders across the State of New Hampshire. And, they range from businesses and residential customers, who are struggling with those energy costs, to landowners, to environmental organizations, elected officials. And, really, what we've been trying to identify is "what is the project that, in our view, is balanced?" Meaning, it works technologically, it gets the power from that source, which is the Hydro-Quebec generation plants, down to Deerfield, New Hampshire. It clearly has to do that in a reliable way. It has to be affordable. Meaning, it can't be so expensive that no one will pay for it. And, it has to be sitable, which is where the SEC and the Department of Energy come in. And, we have to have a project that meets the requirements for being sited, both at a state and a federal level. That's what we've been working towards for the last year and a half.

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

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

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

[Video presentation provided on the Northern Pass Project.]

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. I thought that would be a useful -- oh, excuse me -- a useful illustration of the progression this Project has taken, really to address one of the issues we've heard consistently here in New Hampshire. If you think about
that progression you just saw, from a project
perspective, it's a very different project. It's
longer. It's been reduced in size by 15 percent. It's
going to cost about a half a billion dollars more than
originally envisioned. Sixty (60) miles of it will be
underground. And, a big portion of it is moved off to
the western side of -- the eastern side of the Coos
County. So, these are significant changes in this
Project.

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

The other question I get frequently is
"what's in this for New Hampshire?" You know, the
original perspective around the Project was that "this
was all about getting power into southern New England."
So, what we prepared, as part of the ForwardNH
announcement, was a summary of the benefits to New Hampshire. I'm not going to read it in its entirety, but it's broken out at the top between "environmental" and the "economic benefits". If you look at the economic benefits over the foreseeable future, approximately 3.8 billion. And, it ranges from the impact on energy costs, when we evaluate the market effects that I was referring to earlier, it's about an $80 million a year savings to New Hampshire customers. We made a very significant commitment to the establishment of a fund that will be invested locally, a $200 million ForwardNH Fund; $30 million a year in property taxes; some very strong commitments about job creation in the state. When you look at the economic benefits, they're quite significant, almost $4 billion. Beyond that, are the environmental benefits. You know, we're talking about a clean source of electricity. If you look at displacing the power plants that we anticipate displacing, it's approximately 3 million tons a year in reduced carbon dioxide emissions. There are no projects that you could envision that are going to have that kind of environmental impact.

And, just as an aside, you know, 2015 is
the first year in a long time our carbon emissions went in the wrong direction, meaning they went up, by 7 percent year-over-year. Why was that? It's because some of the power plants that have retired are nuclear plants, which are not carbon-emitting, and they're being replaced by natural gas plants. So, if we, as a region, we, as a state, are serious about achieving our environmental goals, we do need power plants like this, and investments like this, which are non-carbon-emitting, are clean, and help us move that in the right direction.

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

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

Before I allow any of them to ask
questions, for the benefit of those who have just
arrived, or just a reminder for those who have been
here, if you have a question that you want to be asked,
there's the green form. If you have -- if you want to
speak, when we open it up for speakers, we have the
yellow sheet. And, if you just want to submit a
written comment, it's the blue form.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Who
from the Subcommittee has questions for Mr. Quinlan or
his people?
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There are no substantive questions from members of the Subcommittee?

[No verbal response]

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

[Documents handed to Chairman Honigberg.]

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: So, there are technologies that have been under development for decades, which are local or distributed. You know, one example is solar technology or fuel cell technology. These have been technologies that have been in development now, you see them being adopted to varying degrees. And, they
certainly serve a purpose. You know, they're generally renewable, and they certainly bring a benefit by being local.

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

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. Solar -- storage technology, again, it's been under development for
decades. You know, I think just now you're starting to see the first true commercial applications of it. Some utilities across the country are making investments in storage, either on a pilot or a small scale. There are no large-scale dependencies on storage. And, it's for two reasons: First, we have to, you know, prove it out that it works technically, and it provides the benefit that we hope to deliver; and the second is, again, price. It is cost-prohibitive to rely on storage on a large scale, in essence, to meet the demands of customers.

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, with -- for Eversource customers, and this is certainly true for
the work we're doing today, but it's also true for the
Project itself, from the outset we've made a commitment
to New Hampshire that New Hampshire customers will not
pay for any aspect of Northern Pass. And, that remains
the case. And, that's certainly true for any costs
we've incurred to date. The costs we've incurred to
this point are really borne between our Company and its
shareholders, as well as our partner, Hydro-Quebec.

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

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

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

MR. BOWES: Thank you. This is Ken
Bowes, Vice President of Engineering for Eversource.
It's really down to the electrical safety codes that are in place.

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

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: So, in essence, and the video depicted this, the far northern portion of the route, which is basically from Pittsburg, at the Canadian border, down to the Coos Loop, which is about
40 miles, that is the new portion of the route. That's where we're either going underground, which will be for eight (8) miles of that distance, or through the working forest, which will be 24 miles of that distance. And, then, there's eight (8) miles of new right-of-way. Okay?

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Following up on
that, there's a question related to jobs and construction. There's a series of questions buried in here, not all of which I can read as clearly as some of the others, but I'm going to do my best to get this person's questions out there.

MR. QUINLAN: Sure.

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

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, there's a wide range of jobs. So, it's a $1.6 billion infrastructure project. So, that's a large undertaking. The range of jobs spans the gamut. It really starts from the electrical workers, the highly skilled craftsmen who will actually build the electrical line and do the electrical work, whether it's in a substation environment or the line itself. It is other physical
workers, who may have a role in, you know, creating an
access road, clearing a right-of-way, delivering
equipment. So, those might be truck drivers, loggers,
gravel suppliers. You know, the gamut of physical work
necessary to undertake a $1.6 billion infrastructure
project.

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

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

So, one of the commitments we've made is
a "New Hampshire first" commitment. So, to the extent
possible, every one of those disciplines we will look
to New Hampshire residents and businesses and contractors first. And, we're doing an extensive outreach today up and down the route to identify who are the local companies who can play a role. And, we've been very impressed by what's available here in the state. So, the vast majority of this investment is going to be done locally.

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

MR. QUINLAN: So, the short answer is "no". In fact, we actually scaled down the size of the Project, in what was originally going to be a 1,200-megawatt line, using a more conventional cable, has been reduced to 1,090. Why did we do that? It was to be in a position where we can commit to 60 miles of underground construction. We were not comfortable with the state of technology in doing that with a 1,200-megawatt cable. So, we actually changed the cable technology, from a conventional cable to a state-of-the-art cable. We think that technology is --
works at 1,090. It's not been used at 1,200 megawatts. So, we've actually scaled back the size of this Project so that we could address one of New Hampshire's big needs.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Related is another question that got submitted, which is that "Hydro-Quebec already transmits some of its power into
the New England grid. Why can't they just transmit
more along their current lines?" And, I guess I'd like
you to speak, if you can, about what other sources of
hydro are coming into New England and along what
transmission lines.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: Can you repeat that question please?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "In addition to the
new transmission lines" --

MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

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

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

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

You know, five years ago, customers were paying hundreds of millions of dollars a year in what's referred to as "congestion costs". That's because, if you had generation in Maine, and you couldn't get it to New Hampshire, it doesn't really do you any good. And,
the price differential between Maine and New Hampshire was referred to as "congestion". And, that was a 100 million -- several hundred million dollar a year price tag for New England customers. Over the last ten years, and we've done a lot of this, we've built out the grid, so that that power can move seamlessly around New England, in essence, eliminating congestion. Those were investments we've been making over the last decade to allow that power flow.

There were a couple projects here in New Hampshire, which will illustrate this point, one of which is pending before the SEC, so, I won't speak about it, but that's the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project. The other is the Seacoast Reliability Project. It's, in essence, a project along the lines of what I just referred to. It's one that is -- will allow power to flow into the Seacoast area in an affordable way. The Seacoast is growing. There's a lot of business development. Customer demands are going up. And, our ability to get the lowest cost power into that region reliably is tapped out. So, we have a project, which will open up the grid to allow power flowing into the Seacoast, so that area can continue to grow.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I have a more technical engineering question here. It is the question asker's understanding that "a natural gas pipeline from Canada to Portland was built and buried through the North Country of New Hampshire. What are the logistical and engineering differences between burying a pipeline and burying your transmission lines?"

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

MR. BOWES: Yes. I'll start out, and then I'll also defer to Sam on some of this. Very familiar with constructing electric transmission, including underground. And, the process is normally not done on rights-of-way, it's normally done in the public way, in city streets and state highways. So, that's one difference between constructing gas pipelines. They're typically in a right-of-way either by themselves or, in some cases, collocated with overhead transmission lines.

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

MR. JOHNSON: Sam Johnson, Burns &
McDonnell Engineering. Basically, the construction of an underground trench for an electric line is really similar to that of a gas transmission line, with the exception of location. Gas transmission lines are typically built in rural areas or away from urban centers where possible. And, they are, by default, also located next to transmission lines, again, to minimize impacts from additional clearing and other things. The one thing that will be noted is that, because they are building a ditch, effectively, through the countryside, there are significant wetland impacts that occur, as well as significant amounts of directional drilling that needs to be done to get across watercourses, etcetera. But, effectively, the construction is relatively similar in its scope.

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

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

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

MR. QUINLAN: Sam, do you have that answer readily available?
MR. JOHNSON: I can find it.

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

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

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

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

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

[Audience interruption.]

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

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

MR. BOWES: I think the essence of the question gets to "why don't we build along the I-93 corridor?" I think that's the underlying question that
people are trying to get to. And, there's several reasons that make that a nonviable option. The first is public safety; the second is the environmental impacts of building along I-93; the third is the constructability; and the last is, ultimately, the project costs.

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

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

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

Franconia Notch is environmentally, culturally, and legally not an option. It's nonviable. If you think about -- in fact, I would say, without hesitation, Franconia Notch is the most environmentally and culturally sensitive place in this state. And, I
would say that, if you think about it, it's a notch, a very confined area. And, in that notch, just off the top of my head, you have Echo Lake, you have Profile Lake, you have Canon Mountain State Park, you have the Old Man historic site. You have several geologic formations, including Boise Rock and The Basin. You have a very fragile stone face up above, as the Old Man would testify, if he was around. And, you have the Pemigewasset headwaters, you have The Flume. In that confined space, you cannot do this level of construction without enormous impacts.

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

Now, that agreement bars any further construction in the Notch, period. And, to the extent
that, even when DOT last did an overlay of pavement there, they weren't allowed to put in temporary pavement for detours.

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

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

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: Could you introduce
yourself please.

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

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

And, that study has four major components. It surveys the professional literature, which is extensive on this topic. But, then, most importantly, it undertakes three New Hampshire-specific studies. The first of those is a set of case studies, this is a study of 58 sales of properties that either abut or are, in fact, crossed by a high-voltage transmission line right-of-way in New Hampshire. Then, there are 13 what we call "subdivision studies", which
are studies which look at the sale of lots. And, these would be raw land, unimproved lots in subdivisions, where some of the lots are either crossed by or abut a transmission line easement, and other lots do not. It's quite a -- it's a very revealing environment, in which to see if -- what the effect of the transmission line might be, because it's not confused with the kind of house that's built on the lot.

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

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

There's an exception to that. There will be -- the studies have identified a unique set of attributes of a property, essentially what they amount to is properties that are very heavily impacted by a
transmission line corridor, where the Project may, in fact, increase the likelihood that those properties will sustain some kind of a value impact.

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

MR. QUINLAN: Thank you, Jim.

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

MR. QUINLAN: So, on the first topic of,
you know, "why hasn't solar grown as quickly in New Hampshire as it has in some other states, like Massachusetts?" You know, and I would say New Hampshire has taken a measured approach to encouraging solar development. There is a subsidy that's provided to solar developers, it's referred to as "net metering", that is really a key to making a solar installation economic. Some states have had a very high adoption, because they, in essence, don't have a limit as to the extent of that subsidy. So, Massachusetts, for example, has seen a proliferation of solar development, because they're allowing that net metering subsidy to be able to a large number of developers.

New Hampshire, on the other hand, has taken a bit more measured approach. While we allow net metering, we do provide a subsidy. The Legislature, in its wisdom, several years ago, in essence, put a cap on the net metering subsidy that it was going to allow, while this technology was in its infancy. We are approaching that cap. And, some utilities, like ours, have now just recently hit the cap. So, the growth has been a bit more modest. And, I think it was due to the way the legislation was structured.
Now, the real issue becomes, you know, how much of a subsidy do you want to provide to solar? And, are other customers, who don't have solar panels, willing to pick up that subsidy? So, for every dollar of subsidy that's paid out as a result of net metering, either a business or another residential customer, who doesn't have a solar panel, have to pay that. And, the question is, what's the right balance between promoting an exciting technology, one that clearly has part of our energy mix, and the subsidy, how far do you go?

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

So, I know there is discussion right now within the New Hampshire Legislature to relax that cap, so that this industry continues to grow in a measured, affordable way, without putting too large a burden on other customers. So, you know, I think the subsidy structure in New Hampshire, my own estimation, is about
right. It's not inhibiting the growth, it's allowing it to be done in a measured way.

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

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

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. There are installers and developers statewide who could better answer that. You know, our obligation, as a utility, in essence, is to allow for the interconnection of those installations to our grid. Because, back to the earlier point, there
needs to be a reliable backup for instances where the Sun is not shining.

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, just an interesting point on this. You know, I talked earlier about Hydro-Quebec, and the fact that, you know, they have a large generation fleet, hydroelectric fleet.

One of the things that has to happen for this Project to work is they need to build another transmission line, from northern Quebec down to the U.S. Border, to interconnect with Northern Pass. That's something that Hydro-Quebec is pursuing. They will be paying for it. It will be an all-overhead project, similar to the ones that you've seen.

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

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

And, then, finally, I'll say, as far as
location, you know, the changes we've made to move the line from the western part of Coos County, to the eastern part of Coos County, were driven, in essence, to address the aesthetic issue. So, we're trying to demonstrate a real sensitivity to that question. And, we know it's top-of-mind for many in New Hampshire, and we're working really hard to address it.

Ken.

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

MR. QUINLAN: So, back to Mr. Bowes' earlier answer. The National Electric Safety Code dictates the height of the tower, one of the key drivers of that is the voltage of the line. The higher the voltage, the taller the structure.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The second question on this sheet, I'm going to read as close to the way it's written as I can, and you may need to do some interpretation.

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

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

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

Now, the existing right-of-way that we're talking about, much of the part of the North Country is at 115 kV AC. That is considerably lower.
voltage than the 320 kV DC. And, the real issue we went to the higher voltage for the DC line is the amount of capacity needed, the amount of transport for over a thousand megawatts. That is not capable on a 115 kV line, which would then have the same structure, dimensions, and heighth.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There are probably different answers for different people. I'll give mine, and I'll ask some of the other members of the
Subcommittee to weigh in.

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

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

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

Others want to weigh in? Please?

[Laughter.]

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

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

MS. WEATHERSBY: I would echo that. I look at this primarily as a listening session. I'm here to learn more about the Project, but mostly to hear about your concerns. And, from that, I develop my own list of questions. I have a number of them that I
may ask tonight, or they may get answered as we go along. And, if they're not answered tonight, they certainly will be answered at the time we have the full hearings.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. BOWES: So, this Application is for a single line. So, it is -- there's a single point of
failure along that line. So, there is not, by itself, redundancy built in. But, in the design itself, there are many things that are taken into consideration, including, you know, impacts from external factors, such as trees off the right-of-way and within the right-of-way, so that that will be managed over the life of the Project. The design itself is to a higher class of construction than normally. It's called "Class B construction", which means that it is built to withstand more extreme conditions, as we are starting to experience more and more as the climate changes. So, both wind and ice loading are at a higher level than the traditional construction techniques.

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

So, those are some of the things that are done to enhance the design and operation of the line to make it the most reliable that it can be.
MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Muntz.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Reliability north of the border is the subject of this sheet. The sheet says, and I guess I'll ask you to comment on the first part before following up with the question, it says here that "When Northern Pass was introduced, there was a chart on either the Northern Pass or the Hydro-Quebec
website that showed that Hydro-Quebec might not be able to guarantee electricity during the three winter months." This says that "that chart has disappeared from the website." Is that -- can you comment on that or verify that at all?

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think then you may have answered the question as it followed up on the premise, which is that "if there is extremely high demand due to extreme weather in Quebec, will there be
a problem with their transmission of the full 1,090
commitment?"

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

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

MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How is it legal to
drill under land that you do not own or have a
right-of-way across?" And, there's a reference to the
"Washburn Family Trust in Pittsburg and Clarksville".
MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, that's a particular area in northern Coos County, where we've made a commitment to, in essence, have underground construction under the public right-of-way. We think we, as a utility, are entitled to use the public way for that purpose. Our belief is based upon centuries, over 100 years of legal precedent here in the State of New Hampshire, standing for the premise that running utilities, such as this, to transmit electricity is an appropriate use of the public way.

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

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

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

[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. The next phase of this proceeding is an opportunity for you all to speak. I'm told we have 15 of these yellow sheets, which means we won't have to impose draconian limits.

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, it's true that Hydro-Quebec is, in essence, a crown corporation; so they're owned by the Canadian Government. But for purposes of siting the Northern Pass line in the U.S., it's entirely governed by U.S. law. Here at the state level, it's the law that gives jurisdiction to the Site Evaluation Committee for the New Hampshire siting. There's also a federal permit that we have to seek and receive. The lead agency there is the Department of Energy, and that's under U.S. Federal law. And then, even the
contractual agreement between Hydro-Quebec and Northern Pass, whereby they pay for the line, is governed by U.S. law. That's governed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. So, for all U.S. aspects, the siting of the line, the use of the line, the reimbursement of costs, that's all governed by U.S. laws jurisdictional to the United States.

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

When you come up to speak, there's a couple of ground rules that will really be helpful for us and for the stenographers. First, if you could spell your last name, your first and last name if there's some ambiguity about your first name. If you have something written that you're going to be reading
from, two things about that: The first is read slowly and evenly, or the stenographers, either their machine or their hands will blow up. And if you could give a copy to the stenographers, they will rely on that to make sure that they've got your comments correctly recorded. Does everyone understand that? Good.

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

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

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

MS. VOSE: I'm sorry. It's V-O-S-E.

Our town is the only town in Belknap County where this project will be located.

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

Since October 2010, when the Northern Pass Project was first revealed to the public, the people of New Hampshire have repeatedly rejected the overhead option for the Northern Pass transmission
line. They have shown up at hearings. They have
called and written letters and e-mails to their
representatives at the state and federal level. They
have filed their opinion with both the Department of
Energy and now the state Site Evaluation Committee.
They have participated in the process with an
unwavering message. As currently proposed, the
Northern Pass demands too high a price from the people
and the communities being asked to host the line. They
have also offered a reasonable compromise since day one
of this journey. If the project is to be sited in New
Hampshire, then it should be buried in its entirety,
that disruption, convenience or financial burden be
borne by the Applicant for this participant-funded
merchant project. The Committee has the opportunity to
solve what may appear to be an intractable problem by
requiring the Project to be burden in its entirety. By
imposing this solution on the Applicant, the Committee
will, amongst many other benefits, protect the scenic
landscape that is the backbone of our tourist economy
and the property values of properties adjacent to the
transmission line, while allowing for the short-term
and permanent job creation and tax revenue for the
local taxing jurisdictions, promised by the Project's
sponsors.

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

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

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

MR. HAUSMANN: Hausmann is spelled H-A-U-S-M-A-N-N. I've worked for Eversource for 14 years as an account executive. And during that time I've worked with the largest accounts in mostly the western side of the state up to the Laconia, down to Hinsdale, Newport, Claremont, Peterborough. So that's
my territory where I work with the large accounts. And what I do is I consult on energy-efficiency projects. I respond to power quality issues, assist in construction, give advice, and many, many other topics. But I can honestly say that with all these accounts, the No. 1 concern that surfaces is the high cost of energy, also, the need for stable energy prices, because of what we've seen with volatile prices in the last couple years. For these large accounts, electricity is a big part of their budget, including -- let's talk about one account -- well, I have three ski areas. And during the winter, during the volatile prices, their energy costs go up to easily $200,000 a month. I work with other accounts that annually they're $3 million a year. In New Hampshire, I know the electric rates in the industrial sector are nearly double the national average. Commercial business electric rates are 40 percent higher. These are critical issues for the future well-being of our state's business and industry.

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

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

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

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

To me, the aesthetics of the line, whether it's buried or not, are relatively unimportant. The environment is more than scenery. R.S.A. 162 says that this Committee is supposed to consider all environmental, economical and technical issues in an
integrated fashion. That means you have to look at
more than just the transmission line. You have to look
at both ends of it. This is a two-headed viper. You
don't just look at the body of the snake. You look at
the whole snake and see what's going on at both ends.

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

Now, I've spent weeks and hundreds of
miles canoeing in the James Bay Lowlands. I know the
area. It's an unforgiving environment. The Crees who
live there have little choice. They don't have
supermarkets. They live off the land. Their food
comes from the land. And mercury has insidious effects
on the brains particularly of children. And one small mistake in the winter, they have no choice. We're playing Hunger Games with their kids in order to generate the power that's coming down from Hydro-Quebec.

I testified before this Committee decades ago for the existing Hydro-Quebec interconnect, and we have the same problem with Northern Pass that we had then. This is a two-way line. What Northern Pass doesn't include in any of their propaganda is the fact that we have to ship back as much power to Quebec as they are shipping south. Quebec's power peaks in the winter when they use it for home heating, and it costs their consumers about a third of what we pay for electricity in New Hampshire. We peak in the summer. Good deal for both utilities, not such good a deal for the environment. You won't find that in any of Northern Pass's propaganda. It's buried on Page 26 of a 172-page annual report for Northern Utilities -- excuse me -- yeah, Northeast Utilities in 2009, where they call it a hydro -- they don't even call it Northern Pass. But it's clearly that project because there is only one interconnect. At the end of the line we have to produce that power from fossil fuels and
nuclear power. We don't have enough renewables to produce that amount. So we are polluting just as much or more for the supposedly clean power that we're importing. The ISO says this power is not necessary. It's unreliable. We saw what happened in the 1998 ice storm. And essentially, if we approve this kind of project rather than going to the kind of clean power that is truly available, we are telling our kids and Canada's kids in the future, well, sorry, but may the odds be always in your favor. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

I want to take the chance to go on record here with my overwhelming support for this project. And at the top of my list of many positive attributes associated with this project is linking the Northeast with an abundant supply of clean, renewable
energy created by water. In my opinion, this is a monumental step not only for New Hampshire but for New England to continue to cut ties with dangerous, inefficient energy production models like Vermont Yankee and other antiquated fossil fuel plants. I feel this is an opportunity to continue, enhance and add to a network of right-of-way systems that foster and support biodiversity in the state. We live in one of the most forested states in the United States, to the tune of 89 percent tree cover, that a century ago this state was thriving with farms, fields and brush land. The right-of-way now offers a last refuge for a rich array of plant, animal and reptilian life. Amongst them are rare species sometimes not found anywhere else but the right-of-way, like the New England cottontail, Karner blue butterfly, frosted elfin butterflies, brown thrashers, yellow-breasted chats, Blanding, box and wood turtles.

In terms of jobs, this will not just create jobs with linemen and construction personnel. Eversource will be working in conjunction with many organizations, Fish and Game, to support these relationships with animals that call the right-of-way home.
In my opinion, this is an opportunity not only for the state but for the region to say yes to renewable energy, to move progressively away again from the dependence on foreign subsidiaries, inefficient and inevitably dangerous methods of energy production. This is also an opportunity for this region to grow, for the towns to grow, for business to grow and for families to grow. Ultimately, this will lay the groundwork for our children and their children's children to appreciate a new dependence on renewable energy. Thank you.

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Slow down a little.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Trying to make the
The high cost of electricity to New Hampshire's families and businesses has been well documented. We have the fifth highest electricity costs in the United States. The recent and potential retirement of 8,000 megawatts of coal, nuclear and oil-fired electricity generation, has left New England short of baseload power options and over-reliant on natural gas-fired generation, with half of our annual electricity produced by natural gas plants. This over-reliance is exacerbated by the fact that New England has insufficient pipeline capacity to meet the demand of natural gas generators, especially in cold winter months. With an electricity market that hasn't induced any natural gas generators to subscribe to firm capacity from any of the proposed pipeline projects, and the fact that natural gas generation sets the wholesale market rate 80 percent of the time, electric ratepayers are increasingly held hostage to the volatility of natural gas markets. Yes, it is true that wholesale electricity prices have softened over the past twelve months. The policymakers should not be lured into a false sense of security. New England experienced a similar softening of wholesale prices in
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2012, which was then followed by 55 percent and
13 percent increases in wholesale electricity prices
the following two years, sending shock waves to the
budgets of both businesses and households. These high
and volatile energy prices are crimping our economy and
putting future job growth at significant risk.

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

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

Northern Pass is far from perfect, and
its merits and flaws are certainly open to debate.
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What isn't debatable is the fact that New England's electricity grid is seeing its baseload power options decrease while its electricity rates experience extreme price volatility as a result of our over-reliance on natural gas for electricity generation. A perfect solution to our region's energy woes that will please everyone does not exist. Can a state that has seen 35 percent of its manufacturing jobs, and a region which has lost half a million manufacturing jobs in the past 25 years, really afford to make the perfect project the enemy of this very good project? That's it.

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

MR. BROWN: I tried, I tried.

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

MR. KIMBALL: My name is Kenneth Kimball. And having just learned that I have four minutes, I've tried to reduce my testimony here to much shorter. So if I trip up here a few minutes, that's the reason.
I'm here to represent Appalachian Mountain Club, which is one of the oldest conservation and recreational organizations in the United States, has 100,000 members, with 12,000 who live here in the state.

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

There's also numerous competing projects already bid into the New England Clean Energy RFP that was mentioned earlier, as well as Northern Pass. One of these competing bids in this three-state PPA even includes Hydro-Quebec Power, and that bid has full...
burial using 21st century technology, like two other projects recently permitted in New York and Vermont. Full burial technology is affordable, available, being applied elsewhere in the region, is must less threatened by solar flares, such as the 1988 ice storms and in 1998, or the terrorist bombings of Hydro-Quebec towers in 2004, which brought Hydro-Quebec's overland thousand-mile umbilical power cord to its knees.

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

First, these hearings we believe are
premature. The Applicant hurried up and tried to submit its revised, required application on Friday. Some of those files you cannot even still open on the SEC web site today, which talks about fair process; and yet, here tonight we're supposed to talk about these things intelligently. Northern Pass will surely claim that materials were submitted before the start of these hearings, whose legal purpose is to receive comments from the public on a complete application. Am I and many others in this room tonight, with less than 24 hours to review the materials, supposed to substantively comment on them? The SEC has not even yet determined whether the Application materials submitted on Friday are complete. It would be polite to call this a travesty. Paralleling this, Northern Pass's lawyer -- I would note a former PUC commissioner and SEC member, no less -- filed for partial waivers of some of the new requirements imposed by the new rules. AMC will request that the SEC hold another series of public meetings once those materials are truly complete and available to the public. We will also ask that you restart the time line for the review process to catch up with these materials. We also question whether the Applicant's request for waivers of the new SEC rules
are fair. They had plenty of time to prepare, and they
spent most of that time engaged in trying to fight the
new rules as they were being developed.

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Zero.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: He can have my time
that I had for making a comment.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. EATON: Good evening. My name's Tiler Eaton. I'm from Nottingham, New Hampshire. I'm a journeyman lineman, and I am here in full support of Northern Pass as the way it is laid out right now. I believe Eversource has compromised greatly with the amount of underground, and I think, as you heard Mr. Quinlan say earlier, this amount of underground will be the longest stretch of this type in the country. So I believe we need this. We need to bring jobs to New Hampshire, and we especially need to bring jobs to the North Country. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next speaker is Manfred Hoertdoerfer, followed by Suzanne Steele and Jennifer Tuthill. And yes, you are going to have to spell your name.

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

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

Now, knowing a little bit about construction, being an engineer, civil engineer, I would always anticipate that this is a very special project. It's huge. It has significant structures and facilities. It requires special equipment and
specially trained people to make all these
installations. The way I see it, no such missionary
here in this state and not the trained people. So most
of that work will be done by companies from somewhere
out west, wherever these big companies are that do that
work. And they bring their trained people with them.
So how many jobs are really left, except for a few
laborers and a few truck drivers here at the end? And
then, low and behold, as part -- and I give the
Commission credit in the revised requirements for the
submission because that's what I looked at first and
said, well, they're supposed to tell you who their
contractors are and suppliers, and it was not submitted
in the original submittal. It's not in the
supplemental that was submitted on the 26th. And the
companies come: Quanta Services from Houston, Texas;
Par Electric from Kansas City; Longfellow Drilling from
Iowa; M.J. Electric from Michigan; Underground
Construction from California; Crux Surface, Inc. from
Spokane, Washington. Does that tell you something? It
tells me happening here. It's also primarily, and I
say this for that reason, a reflection of the big
statements that get made by Northern Pass here all the
time, general statements with nothing behind it. This
is their story. It's propaganda. And I say the same
goes for some studies that are mentioned for effect on
our business of -- and the White Mountains. They just
say it is so. Or on the real estate, just the fact
that loss -- no loss in value, only increases they
could find in a so-called study. Well, bullshit, right.
But that's fine.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How much more do
you have?

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

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

MR. HOERTDOERFER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- because there
are a number of other people who want to speak, and I
don't want to make people sit and wait their turn.

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

MS. STEELE: Suzanne Steele.


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

Some of the reasons I am not in favor of this project: First of all, New Hampshire is known for its natural beauty of countryside, lakes and mountains. And this beauty is an integral part for generating hundreds of thousands of dollars in our economy through tourism. This tourism provides a living for the population in our state as well. This project, if it goes through, would forever scar our great state, potentially impacting that revenue. Hundreds of miles of our Granite State would be permanently altered, thus
changing the many vistas that are currently free from a hundred-plus foot towers.

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

I moved to Deerfield in '93 because of the beauty of its area, as well as history of our town. Coincidentally, we are celebrating our 250th anniversary this year, a community steeped in history. We have a number of important centers in our town, several very near the new proposed expanded lines. I am not sure our forefathers envisioned 150-foot towers within view from our town hall. This would threaten our historic places. During the open forum in Deerfield with Eversource, it was asked a number of times how much larger the Deerfield terminal would be
and how much more electromagnetic power would be
surging from this building. Neither Bill Quinlan nor
any other spokesman answered any of these questions.
As a Deerfield resident, that raised a red flag for me.

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

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

One of the biggest reasons why I don't
support Northern Pass is that this electricity is not
going to be used by our residents. New Hampshire is
currently a net exporter of electricity. It's going to
be used by southern New England, just like the existing
Northeast Utilities transmission line that runs through
our state. We are just being used up by Hydro-Quebec
and Eversource to help them earn more money by scarring our beautiful state. Please do not allow this to happen. Thank you for your time.

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

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

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

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (inaudible)

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

MR. FINN: Good evening. Brendan Finn, F-I-N-N. Thanks very much for the opportunity to speak with you tonight. I am a Manchester resident, so I've come up here amongst these, I assume mostly residents...
of the Lakes Region to offer a couple comments.

My wife and I moved to New Hampshire this year after I got out of the Marine Corps. And we moved here not because of Manchester's beauty, as lovely as it is, but because of -- some people are from Manchester here it sounds like -- but because of the beauty of the Lakes Region, the North Country and the Seacoast. And we've loved it up here, every minute since we moved up here. The beauty of those sections of the state are a big reason why. The one thing that's really surprised me is how much we pay in electricity costs relative to what we used to when we lived in Maryland and North Carolina and Virginia and everywhere else the Marine Corps took us. And I looked into it, and I found out the big reason why is because this is the only region of the country that doesn't have a supply of natural gas. So we could ship it in. Of course, there are those concerns with continuing our reliance on fossil fuels. So that puts us in a bit of a bind. I also looked into the state's energy policy and found out that the previous governor, Governor Lynch, set a goal to establish 25 percent of the state's source of energy as renewables by the year 2025. It's very ambitious, and I think that this
project would help us get there. So on the one hand we've got conserving what makes New Hampshire New Hampshire, on the other hand we have got reducing rates for consumers and meeting our long-term energy goals. How do we tip the scale there so we can make the decision?

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Next speaker is Daniel Heyduk, to be followed by Donna
Keeley and Susan Seitz. Did we lose Mr. Heyduk?

(No verbal response)

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

MS. KEELEY: Hi. Thank you. My name is Donna Keeley. I live in Pittsfield, New Hampshire. I am a 29-year-plus -- and I count every minute and every day -- proud employee of Eversource, formerly PSNH. During this time I've worked my way up through the company, starting my career in customer service, then as a business account executive, and now in community relations, working directly with New Hampshire communities throughout the Lakes Region and the Conway area. I've heard firsthand from our customers what matters to them, and their top issues have long been having access to reliable energy and lowering costs.

To give you an idea of how much of an issue this is, as we all know, New Hampshire has the seventh highest electricity rates in the country. Working in the energy industry, I understand New Hampshire's energy market. And I think we all need to be part of the solution when it comes to supplying our needs for energy. Our state and country rely on highways and power lines and other infrastructure to
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keep our economy going. Building infrastructure projects like Northern Pass is about the bigger picture. It's about providing for our society as a whole, not just ourselves.

I am a long-time New Hampshire resident who's active in my community. I am a Rotarian. I previously served on my town's board of selectmen and planning board and conservation commission. I am also a nature lover, sometimes to a fault. I am a former, long-time member of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forest and current member of Bear Paw Land Trust. I understand people's love of our land, and I believe in preserving New Hampshire's natural beauty. I also understand the need for balance when it comes to responsible growth, economic development, the environment and natural resources. I am proud to work for a company that currently, for the past several decades, has supported New Hampshire communities, promoted economic development, helped customers understand the energy market, and supported community efforts and many, many local nonprofits. I believe there must be a balance with the needs of our region, the economy and our history that will serve the greater good, not just me. I support Northern Pass because it
has tried to achieve this balance with this project and
the many benefits that it's offering our state. Thank
you.

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

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

We are here tonight to discuss an
incomplete application by a company who's under
investigation by the Federal Energy Regulatory
Commission. This scares me. This application was
turned in on Friday and it's still not complete. But
it is also incomplete because it ends at the Deerfield
substation. This power can't stay in Deerfield. We
don't need it. It needs to leave Deerfield. And how
that's going to happen should be part of this proposal.
I live in Deerfield at the end of the line. Not only
will we have towers, no matter if this is buried or if
this is above ground, we'll have a huge substation and
more power lines leaving our town in the other
direction. Applications to fill in wetlands have
already been applied for, and we're being told it has
nothing to do with Northern Pass - it's just a
coincidence. Sitting here listening to you talk, I'm
concerned. We have been told by you at all meetings in the past that we might, and it was stated very clearly "might," get a 5 percent decrease on our electric bills. This means every three months I can buy a frozen pizza and make it at my house. I cannot see how a 5 percent "possible" electric savings is going to bring business to New Hampshire. Maybe I'm wrong, but it's not going to change anything I do. Now I'm being told by you tonight that we will be paying electric rates at the highest transmission charge, depending on what is online. So tell me again, how does this benefit me and not just Eversource?

You plan on -- you also mentioned tonight that you plan on protecting the line by looking at the trees along the route. Does this mean any tree on any property that might now or sometime in the future fall down on your line be cut? If that's the case, that means your power lines are a whole lot further than you had your power or whatever it is, the corridor. It's a whole lot wider than you're stating. And it also means that I'm going to see it from my house over a mile away, and I live down a hill. These towers will be big enough that I can see them from my yard if you cut more trees down. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jane Difley, to be followed by Ryan Barber and Eileen Schulze.

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

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

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

    We believe that the Application before
you should be rejected. A hundred and thirty miles
would host towers well above mature trees. Nearly all
of the adverse impacts of above-ground towers on
aesthetics, on historic sites, on natural resources, on
private property values could be avoided if the entire
line were buried along an appropriate transportation
corridor. Northern Pass acknowledges that such burial
is technically feasible, but says it's too expensive to
bury the entire line without providing any evidence to
defend this claim. Eversource seeks to subsidize its
project through adverse impacts to land owned by others
and landscapes cherished by all. It is a subsidy
rejected by thousands who commented to the Federal
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Government. It is a subsidy rejected by most of the 31 communities directly affected. It is a subsidy rejected by a large majority of the intervention petitions presented to the Site Evaluation Committee. It is a subsidy the Site Evaluation Committee should reject. The public interest is served by protecting landscapes, not needlessly scarring them. We believe natural landscapes are among New Hampshire's most significant assets. We believe that there is no need, nor any compelling reason to allow a private transmission line to degrade these assets. We have not objected to the idea of bringing hydropower from Quebec through New Hampshire to consumers to the south of us. We believe that the Site Evaluation Committee should consider the full burial projects proposed in other states when determining whether the Northern Pass proposal represents an unreasonable adverse impact on aesthetics and natural resources. Thank you.

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

MR. BARBER: Hi, I'm Ryan Barber. I'm a graduate of Plymouth State University. I live in Rumney, New Hampshire. I'm also an apprentice with the Electrical Training Alliance, sponsored by the
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

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

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

MS. SCHULZE: Thank you. Eileen Schulze from Northfield, spelled E-I-L-E-E-N, S-C-H-U-L-Z-E. I will summarize some comments that I submitted in
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writing back in 2013, attempted to read at a comment
meeting earlier at Grappone Center. I was cut short
and not allowed to complete it, so I will just
summarize some of my wording here. And I want to thank
those here that oppose Northern Pass. I agree with the
comments and details they have given at all of the
different meetings I've attended.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Senator Forrester,
to be followed by Jason Lauze. And last call for Daniel Heyduk.

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

I guess there's a lot's been said, and I agree with a lot of what I've heard. And I would say this: I'm just so disappointed that we're here, now five or six years later. And it appears to me that PSNH-Eversource is tone deaf. You're not hearing. It concerns me that there is no benefit for the state of New Hampshire. You're talking about a project that's going to the southern states, southern New England states. It's not going to benefit New Hampshire. And I know PSNH-Eversource is better than this. I was a Main Street manager in Meredith and in Plymouth. I worked with local communities. I know what's important to communities. And I know back then when I did that, PSNH, at the time, was very involved. You heard it earlier. Contributed greatly to communities. I know
of all the good things they have done. So this really
disappoints me. I just -- I don't understand it.
Because it's about New Hampshire. It's about what's
good for New Hampshire. And this is not good for New
Hampshire. All the communities that I represent that
run through my district oppose this; 31 communities
oppose this project. Now you've heard people say that
if you bury it underground, that's the compromise that
we're willing to give. And I wish and I hope that the
Site Evaluation Committee, when you look at this and
you weigh the pros and cons and advantages to New
Hampshire, that you will, I guess, reject this
application as it's submitted to you.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jason Lauze.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't you give
us the correct pronunciation and spell it for the
stenographers.
MR. LAUZE: It's Lauze, L-A-U-Z-E. So you were very close, which is basically as good as it gets with this last name. Nobody ever actually pronounces it right.

So at the Whitefield meeting, amongst others, you know, I had a lot of thoughts, and I wrote a lot of them down. And the more I listen to people, the less I actually want to read the things I've written down. Right now my current role work-wise is training director for the Northeastern Apprenticeship and Training Program. So we have 675 apprentices or so, and we span from, you know, Maine to Maryland. So, basically the entire apprenticeship program for all the area concerned is what we deal with. You know, a lot of people like to stand up here and like to talk about, you know, temporary jobs, and they like to talk about how, you know, we're going to just run this program through and nobody's actually going to have jobs. We create jobs. We create permanent jobs every day. But a job of this scope creates, you know, numerous jobs, permanent jobs. And they're not permanent jobs so much as they are careers, because you take, you know, a program of this scope or a job of this scope -- and we provide hundreds of jobs throughout the program -- and
it's not like when the Northern Pass ends all those jobs go away. They don't. They move somewhere else or they move to another program.

Regardless, the other thing beyond that that I always hear at all of these meetings refers to tourism and, you know, how a project as unsightly as this is going to make, you know, monumental issues with tourism in New Hampshire. This is the first meeting that I can actually stand up here and say, you know, I'm a resident of this county because I bought a property knowing full well that the Northern Pass -- or hoping fully that the Northern Pass is coming to this area. I didn't do so thinking, you know, maybe I should wait until Northern Pass comes and maybe I can get a better deal because everybody's going to be scared of the Northern Pass. I bought a property in an area that is tourism-based. I bought a property that is -- you know, that I'm looking at as a rental property, amongst other things. I'm looking at it as a place to enjoy with my family. And I bought it midstream with Northern Pass because I don't feel like any of the things that these people talk about, you know, any of these things that they think are going to be detrimental to New Hampshire, I don't feel like
those are legitimate. I'm looking at it from my standpoint, you know, not only as a resident and taxpayer and a person raising a family in the state, and not only do I feel like it's good and viable from that standpoint, but also on the flip side of things I look at it as, you know, the training director for an apprenticeship, and look at it as, you know, a lot of people will be put to work. You know, a lot of these guys that I'm pushing to Connecticut and to Philadelphia and those areas, a lot of those guys that are New Hampshire residents will go to work tomorrow here if this thing starts.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How much more do
you have?

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

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

MR. LAUZE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is Mr. Heyduk here?

(No verbal response)

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

Mr. Kimball for round two.

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

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

The second is a little fact checking. This has been described as the "longest project in North America." If you look at the Champlain-Hudson
Project, which I believe has finished its permitting both with the U.S. Department of Energy and the State of New York, it actually has considerably more burial proposed. And that is also a 1,000 megawatt line. And that burial I'm talking about is terrestrial, not the aquatic component. There's a lot of it that has to move out of the Hudson River because of PCBs. So there's actually far more burial in that project than what's being proposed here.

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

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

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

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hoertdoerfer.

MR. HOERTDOERFER: Thank you for letting me continue.

The other issue I wanted to talk about is the buried line in the state highway. When I first
looked at the submittal, I was surprised how few
details were provided for the typical installation of
this system in the roadway. And in the presentation
hearing in Laconia on January 14th, and it's in your
file, I made some comments about this. And looking at
it as an engineer, I was worried about, well, if you
dig up the road, and everybody knows, then you have a
trench and it gets filled eventually, and then you
patch it in and then it settles and then it gets
uneven. And I made some suggestions on how that should
be restored in the best way for the public, for the
people, so we don't have something that you see when
you go through downtown Manchester on Elm Street. And
this is my typical approach from engineer. There's a
problem. You look for solution to get it under control
to minimize shortcomings and defects and make sure the
end product somehow is adequate. Since -- and if you
find my suggested recommendations for -- and we
suggested requirements for more information in that
sheet that I submitted at the time.

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

(Court Reporter interrupts.)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hoertdoerfer,
she didn't get what you said.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How much --

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sir --

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How much do you have, sir?

MR. HOERTDOERFER: Couple minutes.

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

MR. HOERTDOERFER: Okay. So now I wondered: What is Northern Pass doing trying to put in a submittal where when they get turned down by DOT for
installation of the underground in the state highway
the project is dead because then there is nowhere to
go? Well, surprise, surprise. In a supplemental
submittal of last Friday, there is an alternate No. 1,
an alternate plan which shows just for that alternate
to bring back the original power line through the White
Mountains as an alternate in case, I assume, the DOT
turns them down. Are they arrogant or stupid? Or
what's going on?

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

(No verbal response)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We're
going to close the public hearing in just a moment. I
will tell you, for those who have not been to their
e-mail or been on the Internet this afternoon, there
was an order issued this afternoon on the motions that
were filed regarding this hearing and the four
subsequent hearings. As you can see, we are here
holding a hearing. However, the order provides for two
additional public hearings to be held at a time to be
scheduled, that are being scheduled because of the
supplemental filing. We'll determine locations as
necessary. I will not go beyond some speculation that there's likely to be one north of the Notch and one south of the Notch to accommodate as many people as possible to discuss whatever supplemental information the Company filed last week.

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

(Off-the-record discussion)

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

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