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SPEAKER: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Martin Honigberg. I'm the Chair of the Site Evaluation Committee. I'm also chairing this subcommittee. In my day job, I chair the Public Utilities Commission.

Welcome to a public hearing of a subcommittee of the Site Evaluation Committee which is reviewing the joint application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire which does business as Eversource Energy, and they're seeking a Certificate of Site and Facility. I'm going to ask the folks at the table to introduce themselves. Starting to my left. Down at the end.

MS. WEATHERSBY: Patricia Weathersby.
Public Member.

MS. WHITAKER: Rachel Whitaker, Alternate Public Member.

MR. WAY: Christopher Way. New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development.

MS. BAILEY: Kathryn Bailey from the Public
Utilities Commission.

MR. OLDENBERG: William Oldenberg from New Hampshire Department of Transportation.

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

MR. WAGNER: Tom Wagner, Forest Supervisor, White Mountain National Forest.

MR. MILLS: Brian Mills for the Department of Energy.

MR. HONIGBERG: As indicated by the last two gentlemen who introduced themselves, this is a concurrent hearing with the federal agencies. I'm going to ask the Department of Energy through Brian Mills and the U.S. Forest Service by Tom Wagner to say what they would like to say before I go further.

MR. MILLS: Thank you. As I said, I work for the Department of Energy in the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability. I will be the Hearings Officer for the Department of Energy. The reason we are here is Northern Pass LLC, or Northern Pass, is proposing to construct an international transmission line.
Northern Pass has asked the Department of Energy for a Presidential permit. A Presidential permit is needed before any transmission line can be built across the US international border. The Department of Energy determined that an Environmental Impact Statement would be the appropriate level of analysis for this Presidential Permit. This is a public hearing on the Northern Pass Transmission Line Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or simply the Draft EIS.

Once we begin the hearing, we'll hear from you in the order you have signed up. If you wish to speak but have not signed up, you can sign up at the registration table.

For those of you who may not be familiar with the process we go through in preparing an Environmental Impact Statement, an EIS, and where we are for this particular project, I'll cover the steps.

The first step in the EIS process, starting the public participation, begins by DOE issuing a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS. For this
project, DOE issued a Notice of Intent on February 11th, 2011, and an Amended Notice of Intent on September 6th, 2013. The Notice of Intent began a process we call scoping, which requests the public to tell us their issues and concerns related to the proposed project. We use this input to help us prepare a draft EIS. If you commented during the scoping period, we used your scoping comments to determine which alternatives and issues we needed to address.

The next step in the process is to prepare a draft EIS. The draft EIS analyzes the foreseeable environmental impacts that might result from granting the permit. The Draft EIS also identifies steps that might be needed to mitigate impacts. For this project, we issued a Draft EIS in July, 2015. After we issue a draft EIS, we ask the public to comment on it during a Public Comment Period. EPA opens the comment period by publishing a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. The EPA Notices for this Draft EIS was in the Federal Register July 31, 2015.
The comment period gives you opportunity to tell us any changes you would like to see in the Final EIS, what you think is wrong about the document and how you think we should fix it. We are also looking for issues you think we missed or didn't cover as well as we should.

If you ask questions as part of your comment, we, the federal agencies, will not be able to answer your questions today but we will do so in the final EIS. It's also very helpful for your comments to cite specific sections from the document itself. None of this is required, but it will help us to understand your comments.

Posters with an abbreviated Draft EIS Table of contents are in the foyer. During the hearing, the Hearings Officer may ask questions to allow you to clarify points you are making. Whether you choose to speak or not, you're invited to submit written comments. Instructions to do so are provided on another poster or are available at the registration table. All comments, whether written or oral, are treated the same and have equal weight.
For this Draft EIS, we will continue to accept comments until April 4, 2016. To the extent we can, we will also consider your comments submitted after that date. After the close of the comment period, we will write the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The final EIS will contain a Comment Response Document that addresses comments received on the Draft EIS.

When completed, EPA will issue a Notice of Availability of the Final EIS in the Federal Register, and, again, we will post the document on the EIS website and send it out to the mailing list.

I hope that very general process outline is helpful to you. I'd also like to mention a couple other things about the Draft EIS and this project. The US Army Corps of Engineers, the US Environmental Protection Agency, the US Forest Service and the New Hampshire Office of Energy Planning are all cooperating agencies in the preparation for the draft EIS. DOE in evaluating the application requesting issuance
of a Presidential permit for the proposed Northern Pass Transmission Line border crossing. While DOE has authority to issue a Presidential permit for the border crossing, DOE does not grant rights of way, issue easements, issue building permits, regulate utilities, or site transmission lines in the State of New Hampshire. The US Forest Service has siting authority for the White Mountain National Forest, and the State of New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee has authority to site transmission lines in the State of New Hampshire. This hearing is a joint hearing with the State of New Hampshire SEC on the EIS and the Northern Pass Transmission Line Project. Comments on the Draft EIS expressed at any of our hearings, including the joint hearings, or provided to us by email or letter will all be considered equally.

MR. HONIGBERG: Thank you, Mr. Mills. Mr. Wagner?

MR. WAGNER: Yes. I would only add that, as Brian already outlined, Northern Pass has
applied for a Special Use Permit to cross the White Mountain National Forest to operate and maintain a transmission line. I'm the responsible official to make the decision on whether to grant that special use permit, and I'm here tonight to listen to your input on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and any additional information you think we need to make a decision as far as the siting on White Mountain National Forest.

MR. HONIGBERG: I'd like to tell you what the order of events is going to be. I have opening remarks that I need to make to open the record in this proceeding. After I'm done, the Applicant will make a presentation regarding their project. Following that, we will ask the questions that you submit to the Applicant, and questions should be submitted on one of the green sheets of paper. We will try to group them so that questions on the same topic are together. That won't happen, for sure. We will double back without question, and we will get through all the questions as quickly as we can.
The Committee may have questions for the Applicant as well, but the Committee may also choose not to ask questions. Please understand that we've had this application since November. There's been supplemental information on file, but we have had the opportunity to review what the application says. We will also have many other opportunities to interact with the companies, including at a final hearing on the merits of their application. So we may or may not have questions tonight.

Following the question period, we'll open the flow for public comments. If you would like to make a comment orally, we'd like to you to fill out one of the yellow sheets. Now, we will call people generally in the order in which they've signed in. I think Mr. Mills indicated there was an opportunity to sign up online in advance. We have a list of names of people who did that. That's likely to be the first group that we call. Then we'll call people largely as they've signed in. There are a couple of exceptions for people who have particular needs.
If you just want to submit a written comment, many of you know you can do that electronically. People have been sending us emails regularly, but we also have the opportunity for you to fill out one of these blue sheets, and all of these comments get scanned and posted on our website. So with that, I'm going to more formally open the hearing and read what, unfortunately, I need to read.

On October 19th, 2015, Northern Pass Transmission LLC and Public Service Company of New Hampshire doing business as Eversource submitted an application to New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee for Certificate of Site and Facility to construct 192-mile transmission line. The line is proposed to have a capacity rating of up to 1090 megawatts and is proposed to run from the Canadian border in Pittsburg to Deerfield, New Hampshire.

On November 2nd, pursuant to RSA 162-H, I appointed a subcommittee of the Site Evaluation Committee to hear and consider the application. Some of the members of the Site Evaluation Committee:

- [Member 1]
- [Member 2]
- [Member 3]
Committee who are agency heads, New Hampshire state government designated senior officials within their agencies to serve on this subcommittee, and many of the people you see up at the front of the table come from the various agencies that are on the SEC.

On December 7th, 2015, the subcommittee met and reviewed the application and determined at that time that the application 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. Following that meeting, the subcommittee issued a procedural order setting forth deadlines with interventions and scheduling public information sessions in Franklin, Londonderry, Laconia, Whitefield, and Lincoln. Those public information sessions took
place in January.

Regarding interventions, the subcommittee has received over 150 motions to intervene. Orders on the intervention motion petitions will be issued soon. Many of the people in this room I know have filed petitions to intervene.

On February 3rd, 2016, the subcommittee issued an order and notice scheduling public hearings in Meredith, Holderness and Deerfield for March 1st, 14th and 16th, respectively. Also on that day, the subcommittee issued an order and notice scheduling public hearings in Colebrook and Concord for March 7th and March 10th respectively. The hearing this evening and the hearing in Concord will be held at the same time as the public hearings with the US Department of Energy and the United States Forest Service.

Notice of the public hearings was served on the public by publication in the New Hampshire Union Leader on February 10th, 2016. I've already outlined the order of events tonight. I want to emphasize that the company will go
first, there will be opportunities for questions from the subcommittee and the public, and the subcommittee may choose not to ask any questions at this time. Then the public's questions will be asked and then there will be public comment.

If you want to submit a comment or a question, please get it on one of the yellow forms to make a public comment, the blue forms for written comment and green forms for questions.

One other person I want to introduce tonight is the other person who at this time as formal status in this proceeding and that's the public counsel representative from the Attorney General's office, that's Peter Roth. Peter, could you stand up please and identify yourself?

MR. ROTH: Good evening, everybody. I'm Peter Roth. I'm a Senior Assistant Attorney General.

MR. HONIGBERG: He's a Senior Assistant Attorney General at the New Hampshire Attorney General's office, and by statute the Attorney General represents the public's interest in Site
Evaluation Committee applications for
Certificates of Site Facility.

MR. ROTH: Thank you, Mike.

MR. HONIGBERG: I believe that's all the
business I need to do. I'll also mention that
our lawyer, Mike Iacopino, is with us tonight,
as is our administrator Pam Monroe. If you have
questions or concerns about what's going on this
evening, you should look for Pam or Mike to see
if you can get those resolved. I think without
further ado, I'll turn the microphone over to
the Applicant, Mr. Quinlan.

MR. QUINLAN: Thank you. Good evening,
everyone. I'm Bill Quinlan. I'm the President
of Eversource New Hampshire. I want to thank
you all for being here tonight. I'm joined
tonight by Ken Bowes who is our Vice President
of Engineering, Jim Muntz who is the President
of our Transmission Business, Lee Carbonneau who
is our environmental expert with Normandeau
Associates, and Sam Johnson who is the technical
expert with Burns & McDonnell, an engineering
firm. I want to thank Chairman Honigberg and
Mr. Mills for the opportunity to make a short presentation about our project.

So I'm going to give a short overview of the project. I'm really going to hit three topics. The first is going to be what's going on in the energy markets here in New England; in particular, New Hampshire. I think folks generally are aware that we pay among the highest prices for electricity in the United States. I'm going to explain why that is. What this project could do about it.

Secondly, I'm going to cover the environmental benefits of the Northern Pass Project, and, thirdly, the balance that we're trying to strike to ensure that this process delivers substantial benefits to New Hampshire and to New England.

This is really a depiction of the wholesale market for electricity here in New England. Think of it as a bucket, if you will. On the right-hand side in any given hour, customers across New England have a certain demand for electricity. Okay? In essence, what happens
and what determines the price for that power is you gradually dispatch generation units starting with the lowest cost units first until there's sufficient supply to meet the demands of the customers. When you've got sufficient supply to meet the demands of customers, that establishes the -- I'm going to do this without a microphone. (Microphone adjustments).

Back to the energy markets here in New England. Again, what I'm trying to depict here is how are energy costs set for all of New England, and it's really based upon customer demand and then the supply necessary to meet that demand. So, again, the customer demand changes hour to hour. The generation units necessary to meet that demand change hour to hour. When supply and demand are matched, that establishes the clearing price for all of those generation assets in the queue. Okay?

That price is common across all of New England. So New Hampshire is part of the New England market, and there is, in essence, one cost for generation for all of the states in New
England. It's a common cost. So what happens when you retire a low cost unit. So take a nuclear unit towards the bottom of this bid stack. Vermont Yankee recently retired. When you take out of that bid stack a plant like Vermont Yankee, you have to dispatch a higher cost generation unit to meet the demands of the customers; therefore, the cost of electricity across all of New England goes up.

If you take a low cost asset, for example, like Northern Pass, you see it there in the large scale hydro, you insert it in the bid stack, you displace a higher cost generation so the cost of electricity all across New England goes down. That's fundamentally how the markets work in New England, and the effect of retirements or additions to the generation next.

Here's a depiction of what's going on in New England. It's a phenomena that's happening as we speak. These are plants that have either retired or announced their retirement or are at risk of retirement based upon the Independent System Operator's view, and what you see there
are large number of baseload generation assets, nuclear, coal and oil plants that are essentially retiring. And more to come. The items in red are the ones that are forecast to retire in the foreseeable future. When you look across this snapshot of the retirements, that's about 25 percent of the generation for all of New England that would have retired over this short period of time.

Here's what's replacing that generation. These are all the new generation units that have been added across New England over the last 20 years, and what you see is the dominance of natural gas so the dark blue is the percentage of gas plants that have come on over the last 20 years to replace the units that are retiring. In essence, 85 percent of the new generation for the last 20 years has been natural gas. You do see some incremental nuclear generation that has come online as a result of up rates of utilities, some solar, fairly modest, wind and oil, relatively modest, but dominance in natural gas, to the point where today across New England
we rely upon natural gas for about 50 percent of the energy generated in the region, which is a very large dependence.

Here's what has happened over time, and it's a result of the dependence on natural gas. So what you're seeing here in blue, that's the price of natural gas from 2003 to 2015 here in New England, and you'll see volatility, and it tends to be a volatile fuel. So, for example, when the hurricanes hit the Gulf of Mexico in 2006, natural gas prices spiked across the country. More recently, with the onset of fracking technology, you see a boom so very low cost gas prices, and then you see peaks over the last three winters. I'm going to come back to those three peaks.

The other thing you see is the price of power which is in yellow. Okay? Very closely correlated. That's because we've become so heavily dependent on natural gas that there's a tight correlation between the price of that fuel and the price of electricity here in New England.
So the rest of the country from here over, from 2008 or 9 over, price of natural gas and therefore the price of electricity is essentially flat. It's because there is ample pipeline capacity to get their natural gas through the generation units. What you have going on in New England, however, are these spikes, every winter. Both gas and therefore electricity prices are spiking. Why is that? In New England, there's a very heavy demand for natural gas to heat homes during the winter, and the pipeline capacity necessary to meet that demand and the demand for generation is insufficient.

So for each of the last three winters we've seen very dramatic spikes in the price of electricity in New England. Just for frame of reference when you calculate what does that mean to New England economy? That's a three billion dollar spike, this is a five billion dollar spike, three billion dollar spike. We are literally adding billions of dollars a year in increased costs because of infrastructure.
inadequacies and dependence on natural gas.

What does the future hold. This is a depiction of the other element in your energy cost which is capacity market so your power price that you pass is a combination of energy costs and capacity costs. Capacity is nothing more than payments made to competitive generators to be there in the future. For the last decade, that's been about a one billion dollar market. Because of the retirements that have occurred and the scarcity now of generation and our dependence on gas, when you look out over the future, those prices are going to go up significantly. We know these numbers, 3 billion, 4 billion, and 3 billion, those are in markets that have already cleared forward. So we have visibility of what these market prices will be three years out. And you see a dramatic increase in the cost of electricity and it's for that same phenomena. We're becoming very heavily dependent on one fuel source and there's a scarcity during the winter months. So this will now cripple the economy. In essence, what
you've got is a combination of the energy cost and capacity costs are creating the highest energy cost in America, right here in New England, at a time where the rest of the country is experiencing record low energy costs because of the availability of natural gas. So that's the problem we are trying to solve. It's one of the issues we're trying to resolve.

Here is one of the approaches that's taking place. So if you look across the three southern New England states in recognition of those high energy prices as well as furtherance on meeting our environmental goals, those three states, Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, have gone out for competitor proposals to bring in supplies that are not gas-fired into the region. Northern Pass, the project we're here tonight to talk about, is one of those projects. We have bid the identical project that we've put in front of the SEC and the Department of Energy in that three-state request for proposals.

So identical projects, same route, same design, same cost. Our partner Hydro-Quebec
will essentially provide the power supply to the transmission line.

What we have depicted down below is really to answer a question we get commonly, what's the relationship between our company, Northern Pass Transmission, and Hydro-Quebec. It's a fairly simple contractual relationship, transmission service agreement, whereby we build, finance and own the line, provide a transmission path to Hydro-Quebec who owns the hydropower and that allows them to get their power into Deerfield, New Hampshire, and for that they pay us back in essence for the investment that we've made.

So that's the relationship between the parties. We believe we have a great project that meets the needs of these three southern New England states and will deliver very substantial benefits to the State of New Hampshire in doing so.

Here is a depiction of the balance that we have been working to strike here in New Hampshire. We recognize that there are legitimate issues that have been raised here in
the state around, for example, view impacts. We also recognize that we need to have a project that works technically. It has to get the power from the Canadian border down to Deerfield, New Hampshire, and it's got to be a project that is economically viable, meaning someone will pay for it. That's the balance we've been working to strike here in New Hampshire. That's the project we have put in front of the Site Evaluation Committee. I'm going to show a brief video that's going to walk you through the progression of time from when this project was first introduced in 2010 to our most recent presentment of the project, and you'll see the steps that we've taken to address those issues that have been raised here in New Hampshire. And then we'll circle back and I'm going to summarize the benefits that we think we're going to be able to deliver to New Hampshire as a result of the project so, Andrea, could you cue the video, please? Thank you.

(Video shown)

MR. QUINLAN: So, again, the purpose of
that was really to show the steps we've taken to strike a balance here in New Hampshire and have a project that New Hampshire can support. You think about that progression, we are now at a fundamentally different project than the one that was introduced in 2010. It's longer, uses a different cable and converter technology, A third of it is now underground. Here in Coos County a large percentage of it is in the Wagner Forest which is a working forest, as you all know, and we've added about half a billion dollars in project costs to make these changes. That's all based upon feedback that we've received across the State of New Hampshire.

I'm going to share some of the other benefits to the State of New Hampshire and having the project located here. Just on the top line, I mentioned earlier, the effect that inserting Northern Pass into that bid stack would have. So on an annual basis, our experts have calculated that's approximately 800 million dollars savings to customers across New England. 80 million of that will land here in New
Hampshire. In addition to that 80 million dollars a year in energy cost savings, we anticipate having a Power Purchase Agreement with our partners Hydro-Quebec to deliver additional economic benefits to New Hampshire customers. Importantly, here in Coos County we announced last fall establishment of a Forward New Hampshire fund. It's a 200 million dollar fund. The purpose is to make investments and initiatives in towns hosting the line. Our committee here is that many of these dollars are going to retire right here in Coos County. If you go on down the line, there's clearly substantial jobs that will be created by this project. Our commitment is to a New Hampshire first approach to this project, which means that in every instance possible, we are going to source the project from local labor. So the goods, the services, the physical labor necessary to build the project will come from New Hampshire to the extent possible.

Property tax issues, very big issue for municipalities. Our current estimate is about
30 million dollars a year property tax benefits across New Hampshire. When you total all of that, economically, almost four billion dollars in benefits across the State of New Hampshire, which is a large number for a project this size.

We go to the environmental benefits, beyond the pure economics, there's not another project like this that could have the impact on carbon reductions. Wind and solar, those are intermittent resources, which means they don't operate all the time. This looks like a very large baseload source of clean energy which means it operates around the clock 7 days a week.

When you run the numbers, it's about a three million ton reduction a year in carbon dioxide emissions. This is really important right now. When you look at New England's goals, New Hampshire's goals for cleaning up our environment, for the last ten years we've been going in the right direction which means carbon emissions have been going down. 2015, for the first time in the last decade, emissions went
up. Now, why was that? Because we're retiring nuclear plants which are not carbon emitting, and we're replacing them with gas plants. So for New England, New Hampshire and this country, to achieve its carbon emission reduction goals you're going to need project just like Northern Pass to do it.

I'll touch upon this last one because there's a question I get often is what's going to be the impact on small scale renewable. If you bring in a large amount of hydropower, is there rule for solar, is there room for biomass plants, wind plants. One of the things that's unique here in Coos County is our ability to take advantage of this project and take the time to upgrade the Coos transmission loop. So the Coos transmission loop is a transmission loop that basically serves the North Country today. It is a transmission infrastructure that is basically at its capacity. So for many hours on many days, there are small scale renewable generators on that loop, whether it's Burgess Biomass plant or the Granite Wind Reliable plant.
that can't run. There's not sufficient
transmission capacity to get their energy to
market. One of things we're going to do as part
of Northern Pass and the commitment we've made
is to upgrade the loop. That's been something
that's been talked about here for a decades.
We're going to do it as part of this project.
So not only are we going to unlock those
existing generators to run more, we're going to
create the opportunity for more small scale
renewables right here in Coos County. We've not
quantified these environmental benefits, but if
you think about it, those are very significant
benefits and the vast majority of them will
reside right here in the North Country. So with
that I thank you for your attention and I look
forward to your questions.

MR. HONIGBERG: Thank you, Mr. Quinlan. Do
members of the subcommittee have questions for
Mr. Quinlan or his team?

MS. WEATHERSBY: I have one.

MR. HONIGBERG: Yes. Ms. Weathersby.

MS. WEATHERSBY: One quick question I
thought of while you were doing the presentation. There's presently a plan to build two hydroelectric transmission lines through the State of Vermont. If that project is built, what effect will that have on the New England energy market, and how does it affect the need for this project?

MR. QUINLAN: So for those who didn't hear the question, the question was about a project that has been discussed in State of Vermont which would essentially do the same thing. It would be a similar project in the sense that it would take hydropower from Canada and deliver it to a point in Vermont so it, generally, would have the same impact if that were built.

Now, curiously, I mentioned the three-state RFP. The sponsors of that project did not bid into the three-state RFP. Why is that? You know, what we're hearing in the industry is that there are a couple of things that that project has not been able to demonstrate. So to be a successful bidder you need to demonstrate you've got a reliable committed source of hydropower so
you have to have clean energy to bring into New England. We have a very strong partnership and a contractual arrangement with Hydro-Quebec to do that. That project apparently didn't have the necessary supply of electricity.

Secondly, the hydro generation assets are northern Quebec, and essentially you need to get to the US border so that can interconnect with your project. We have a project or Hydro-Quebec has a project designed to bring a transmission line down from their generation source to connect with us at the US border. That project is being sited in Canada parallel with our siting here. They don't have a project being sited to connect to Vermont. So they also don't have that transmission path to get it down into the region.

There's a question there on cost. You know, that project has been suggested to cost $1.2 billion. That's what you read about it on the project sponsor's website, for example. There's a real question as to whether that project could be built for that amount. When we
look at that project and some of the other experts we know who look at that project, they say it's a dramatically understated number. So why they didn't bid into the three-state RFP, it was the optimal opportunity to import the project to consider. They elected to take a pass. It may be a combination of those three things.

MR. HONIGBERG: Do other members of the Committee have questions for the Applicant? All right. Seeing none, we'll begin with questions submitted by the audience. I will say that some of what has been submitted with green forms is in the nature of a statement for a series of challenges to aspects of the SEC process. We're going to take those and treat them as comments and not deal with them through the company.

The first question technically directed to Northern Pass is about a report titled Cost/Benefit and Local Economic Impact Analysis of the Proposed Northern Pass Transmission Proposal. That is the subject of a motion for confidential treatment that is pending before
the Site Evaluation Committee so such a report exists, and the Board will issue on it in the future.

There are a number of questions regarding state employees and former state employees. I'm going to read the first question as it's written. How many, and please identify any members of the SEC that were or I guess are employed by the State of New Hampshire and what agencies. That's not a question for you, Mr. Quinlan. That's a question for us. Each of us introduced ourselves at the beginning of this hearing. Starting with Mr. Way, Ms. Bailey, myself, Mr. Oldenburg and Mr. Wright are all state employees and we all introduced ourselves at the beginning.

I believe what this person may have been actually is actually the subject of another question which is how many lawyers and experts working for this project were employed by agencies of the State of New Hampshire. To the extent you can provide where they worked, that is a followup on this sheet.
MR. QUINLAN: I'm aware of a few. Mr. Varney is not a lawyer but is working for the company, was with the Department of Environmental Services, DES. Mr. Hodgdon who is an attorney formerly with the Attorney General's office, representing the Department of Transportation. And Tom Getz, Tom Getz is a lawyer who is with the McLane firm. He was formerly with the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission. Those are the three that come immediately to mind.

MR. HONIGBERG: And to complete Mr. Getz's background, when he was on the Public Utilities Commission he also served on the Site Evaluation Committee, correct?

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. I believe that's correct. Yes.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Varney is another one, I think. First one he mentioned, right? Yes. You probably were the Chair of the Site Evaluation Committee.

MR. VARNEY: I was the Chair, yes.

MR. HONIGBERG: Please describe agreements
between Northern Pass, Hydro-Quebec, Eversource, Bayroot LLC, and Wagner Land Management.

MR. QUINLAN: I don't believe there are agreements as between Hydro-Quebec and Bayroot. There is a lease agreement that I'm aware of between Northern Pass Transmission LLC and Bayroot which in essence is a long-term lease for the portion of the right-of-way depicted in the video, the 24-mile working forest is property that's under management by Bayroot and in essence Northern Pass is leasing a right-of-way through that property for 24 miles. That was when we made the move up the line to the east to get it out of the less populated area, get it to the less populated area of the state.

MR. HONIGBERG: All right. I think we have a series of questions about burial and the above ground/below ground question. At what point after the proposed transmission line crosses the US/Canadian border does it first go underground. How many towers are above ground from the border to the first point it goes underground?
MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to refer this question to Sam Johnson from Burns & O'Donnell. Sam is an engineer and also a project manager.

MR. JOHNSON: Good evening. The underground portion of the project in the most northern section of the project starts in Pittsburg and goes under Route 3 and comes up in Clarksville. There are 20 structures from the border over to where this part goes underground, covering a distance of approximately 2.1 miles.

MR. HONIGBERG: If it is less costly to bury direct current transmission lines, I think that's the first premise, if that's not true then correct it, why not convert the power to AC in Deerfield instead of Franklin.

MR. QUINLAN: So the premise of the question which is that it's less costly to bury direct current transmission is not correct. When we look at the incremental cost of burial versus overhead construction, it's approximately 5 to 10 million dollars per mile of additional cost depending on the site and the terrain.

We've now confirmed that range based upon actual
cost estimates. So one of the things that we've
done as far as our project is gone out and
competitively bid for construction services. We
actually have awarded contracts to build the
line, and we now know with pretty good accuracy
what the incremental cost of underground
construction is, and it's generally in that five
to ten million dollar per mile range that the
company believes is true.

MR. HONIGBERG: Why is the conversion
station sited in Franklin instead of Deerfield?

MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to refer that
question to Ken Bowes. Ken is our Vice
President of Engineering at Eversource.

MR. BOWES: Thank you, Bill. The simple
answer is Franklin was willing to accept the
converter station. There's a large land area
that's required for that, and they welcomed us
to come to their town. Could have been sited to
the north or to the south, but that was the main
reason was because they were willing, the town,
to accept the facility.

MR. HONIGBERG: Are there any plans to
deliver power to Maine or Vermont from Franklin?

MR. QUINLAN: No. The line is in essence a direct delivery to a substance in Deerfield, New Hampshire, at which point all of the power flowing over this line will then enter the regional grid.

MR. HONIGBERG: I'm going to do my best to read this one. At one point underground construction of Northern Pass showed six 8-inch conduits. Is this still your plan. There's more. Why don't you start with that one?

MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to refer that to Mr. Bowes and Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: As the video depicted, when the technology was changed from the 1200 megawatt to the 1090 megawatt, we changed the type of cable used. Instead of carrying or requiring two conductors for each phase and a return, now it can be accomplished with the single conductor for each phase so it is true that the conductors have changed from a total of 6 to a total of 2 for the underground portion because of the changes in technology.
MR. HONIGBERG: As worded, it says could you ever expand to include additional transmission burial. I think there's potentially two questions there. Can you expand this transmission line is the first. And second is, can you bury more. Two separate questions, obviously.

MR. BOWES: So the capacity of the cable can not be expanded once it's installed. The length of the cable can technically be extended.

MR. HONIGBERG: Do you believe that if you had initially proposed to bury the entire project when you announced it back in 2010 that the project would have been approved by now? I'm going to do my best to read them as you give them to me.

MR. QUINLAN: That's obviously speculation. The reality is, our view is that an all-underground project is not economic, and therefore, would not be built.

MR. HONIGBERG: Excuse me. It's his turn to speak.

MR. QUINLAN: I'll also add that ironically
in certain of the areas where we've chosen to go underground with the underground construction they're the subject of pending lawsuits so I don't know what the view would be if this were an all-underground construction. Some folks may be happy with that, some folks may be less happy.

MR. HONIGBERG: The next two questions relate to the various opposition base. Here's the first one. Despite your efforts over the past five years portraying Northern Pass as environmentally friendly, not one New Hampshire environmental group supports the plan, even the revised burial plan, partial burial plan. Some of the groups that have been working in opposition to you include the Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests, the Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation Law Foundation, the Sierra Club, New Hampshire Audubon, the Nature Conservancy and the Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust.

On a national level, the National Trust for Historic Preservation designated scenic
landscapes of New Hampshire a national treasure and has petitioned to intervene as well. What do you say in response to that, and I will note that the questioner asks you not to describe your outreach efforts or claim that you are, quote, working with, close quote, these groups.

Now, you can answer however you like, but I will be fair to the question asker.

MR. QUINLAN: So the point underlying that question is the notion that large scale hydro is somehow not clean energy. And if you look, for example, at the Environmental Protection Agency's recently released clean power plan, you'll find a very heavy dependence on large scale hydropower to meet this country's clean energy goals. If you go back to New Hampshire's Climate Action Plan several years ago, there's a very heavy reliance on large scale imported hydropower from Canada in recognition of the fact that this is a clean energy source. You look at the Request for Proposals that three southern New England states just issued for clean energy, this is exactly the type of
project they're looking for. So the notion that large scale imported hydropower is somehow not clean is wrong. I think public policy suggests that it's wrong, and I shared with you the carbon dioxide emissions that are offset by this project.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Have you ever gone to HydroQuebec and took a look for yourself?

MR. HONIGBERG: Be quiet. We're in an elementary school but you're adults. So you'll behave like adults, and if you can't, you'll be asked to leave. If you cannot behave like an adult, you'll be asked to leave.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: He's not acting like an adult himself.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Quinlan, you may continue.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes, my final point was that if you look at the three million tons per year of carbon dioxide emissions that are offset by this project, it's very hard to argue that it's not a clean source of energy, one that's needed to meet New Hampshire and the region's clean
energy goals.

MR. HONIGBERG: Following up with opposition, 31 towns have voted in one way or another against the Northern Pass project, and you continue to push forward, and there's a number of questions that are like this. But why are you -- no. Let me just put it that way. Why do you think the towns have taken the positions that they've taken in opposition to the project?

MR. QUINLAN: One of the areas that we are working very closely with are the municipalities along this route, and while I'll say that there are quite a number that have over time taken a position against Northern Pass, I think in many instances we're having a very good and constructive dialogue and that is beginning to change. Mr. Bowes has mentioned the city of Franklin, for example. They are a very strong supporter of this project. They recognize what it can do for the economy of Franklin. From a tax perspective and job perspective, I think it could really make a difference to a city like
Franklin. I know there are other towns and cities across New Hampshire who have intervened in support of the project. Our commitment is to continue to work with these towns to make the project as good as it can be to address as many of their issues as we can.

MR. HONIGBERG: There are some questions about property values. You've stated that you are willing to bury parts of the project. Are you willing to bury more of the project particularly on property that you currently own.

MR. QUINLAN: So the project we've submitted to the Site Evaluation Committee for consideration strikes the balance that I was referring to. We've worked very diligently to understand the issues across New Hampshire. It's led to some very dramatic changes in the project design and size and benefits, as well as the commitment to have underground construction for 60 miles. That's a project that we think strikes the right balance and we look forward to the SEC's review of that.

MR. HONIGBERG: Would you be willing to
compensate property owners for their diminished values. I think I'm going to ask you to answer that question directly, but also then I know you have someone who can provide some information about property values generally.

MR. QUINLAN: So one of the things we've done over the last several years is to outreach the property owners up and down the route to understand where the issues are, to address questions or concerns that they have. That dialogue continues. We do have an expert on property values, Dr. Chalmers, who can perhaps speak to the preface of the question which is that there is a negative impact on property value, and then you can turn it back to me. Dr. Chalmers?

JAMES CHALMERS: Thank you, Bill. My name is Jim Chalmers. My expertise is in real estate economics and appraisal. Over the past 40 years I've specialized in analyzing the effects of projects of broad variety of types on property values. I've looked at nuclear generating stations and landfills, at Superfund sites,
airports, highways, pipelines, and at many
transmission lines around the country. Any of
these studies of the effects of the project on
property values, lot of different ways to
approach it. Fundamentally, it comes down to
looking at market data on the sales of actual
properties that are adjacent to the type of
project in question and then looking at the
sales of properties that are otherwise, that are
in all other respects similar but are a distance
from the project in question. So you have a
project, a home that's presumably affected, a
home that's presumably unaffected, they're
similar. One's close to the project that you're
studying, and you investigate that and do
research on it and see whether there's any
effect on the project.

In the context of Northern Pass, we've
prepared a research report that has four pieces.
The first piece is a literature review. The
professional literature on this topic is
extensive, well done, and provides a foundation
from which to start, but most of it is not, none
of it is New Hampshire specific. For that reason we initiated three New Hampshire specific initiatives. The first was to study 58 transactions, these are actual market sales of properties that either abutted or were crossed by transmission line easement in New Hampshire. The second New Hampshire specific initiative looked at the sale of lots, raw land, in subdivisions where some of the lots were abutting or crossed by right-of-way. Other lots weren't. And that provides really a very clear context in which you can ask the question, were the lots that abutted or were crossed, did they sell at a different price or a different rate than the lots that weren't. And the third New Hampshire specific component was an analysis of Multiple Listings data that has some ratio that gives you some insight as to whether the market is resisting certain properties, and we looked at those ratios for properties different distances from transmission lines in New Hampshire, and those, all of those initiatives as well as the literature basically come to the
same conclusion. They're very consistent, one with the other. And when they're applied to the Northern Pass project the implication is that there will not be due to the project, there's just no evidence that there will be any widespread or consistent measurable effect on property values.

MR. HONIGBERG: You may disagree, but it's his turn to talk. Thank you.

JAMES CHALMERS: This is an empirical question, and that's what the empirical data showed. It did, there were exceptions, however. There were properties where we found that had a unique set of attributes, and for those properties I think the probability of their inuring some effect of the project will go up, but the number of properties is very small. It's a handful. It's 10 or 12 properties along the entire line, and those will be localized property specific effects, and they won't rise to the level of having any effect on local or regional real estate markets.

MR. HONIGBERG: Don't move, Mr. Chalmers.
The next question specifically asks you about your research and talks about the three types of initiatives that you looked at, and the question is, in your opinion, which of the three types is the best reflection of what is actually, what actually happens in New Hampshire and the effect of a project like this one on property values.

JAMES CHALMERS: Well, I think it's, you know, it's the collective evidence of the three. If one of them were out of sync with the other two, then you have to sort of weigh the relevant merits, but I think by far the most important implication is the results of all three are consistent, one with the other, and it's the collective implication of the three that I think matters.

MR. HONIGBERG: Thank you. I'm going to read this one as its written. What compensation does the landowner get if towers and wires are installed on his or her land.

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

MR. HONIGBERG: What compensation does the
land owner get if towers and wires are installed on his or her land.

MR. QUINLAN: So in many instances where we are, where it's a new portion of the line, for example, there was a question earlier about the Bayroot property which is land owned by Bayroot. We entered into a lease agreement, in that case a long-term lease agreement. So that property owner will be compensated for our use of their land. If it's in a right-of-way where we have a current set of property rights, current easement, which is the vast majority of this line, there's no additional compensation. So if you think about from Dummer down to Deerfield with the exception of the area in and around White Mountain National Forest, it's an existing transmission corridor with an existing transmission line. There will, however, be a lease between Northern Pass and Eversource New Hampshire whereby Northern Pass will pay Eversource New Hampshire for use of those property rights in that right-of-way that already exists, and those costs will float back
to customers and be a credit against their electric bill.

MR. HONIGBERG: All right. The next question asks how many local North Country Eversource workers are here in support of this project. This question asks those people to show hands. I'm not going to require that. People are uncomfortable doing that. If there are local Eversource workers who are here in support of that project and they would like to show themselves by raising their hands, that's fine. Many of them, some of them may have signed up to speak. I don't know. It's really entirely up to you if you want to do that.

MR. HONIGBERG: Next question. Many Eversource employees have testified or spoken in favor of project. Are they being paid to do so?

MR. QUINLAN: No.

MR. HONIGBERG: Many IBEW members have testified or spoken up in support of the project. Do you know if they are paid to attend and speak in favor?

MR. QUINLAN: I don't know the answer to
MR. HONIGBERG: This may be a question for one of the lawyers. Please clarify the term, quote, abutter, close quote, in this context.

MR. QUINLAN: We're not going to ask for a legal interpretation. I'm going to turn this over to Sam Johnson. When I mentioned Sam's role is the project engineer, he's also leading our outreach to abutters and that's the property owners who are along the route. What's the definition you use?

MR. JOHNSON: We define rebutter as a landowner who has property that is either adjacent to the project or on land that we cross. So some it's right next to it and some it's land we actually cross and also includes all of the owners and businesses along the underground route for the 60 miles that we have.

MR. HONIGBERG: New topic. Actually a number of individual questions on topics at this point. How will this project affect wildlife?

MR. QUINLAN: Wildlife. So, you know, I think if you asked the environmentalist, I'm
going to turn this over to Lee Carbonneau for a technical response. They say it's, it could have some very positive effects. One of the things that we're learning along the transmission corridors throughout New England is that the habitat created by transmission corridor, its early succession habitat that doesn't really exist any longer in New Hampshire. It's critically important to many endangered species. So it's brushy, shrubby areas that have largely been overgrown through the New Hampshire and the rest of New England. There are many endangered species who need that type of habitat to survive. Transmission corridors have proven to be kind of the optimal early successional habitat. Lee, is there anything you'd like to add to this? Again, Lee is an environmental expert with Normandeau Associates.

MS. CARBONNEAU: Lee Carbonneau, Normandeau Associates. So there are, as Bill says there are going to be some positive impacts for species that are adapted to these early
successional cover types that will result from transmission line right-of-way management, and we already have a number of those in existing transmission corridor. There will be a more negative effect on some wildlife species that are adapted to forest habitats in locations where the forest would be converted to an open right-of-way. So it's a mixed bag. We have some endangered species in the right-of-way already, and in some cases, those will find enhanced habitat. We have some that will be affected more adversely by the project. In particular, we have, for example, Karner blue butterflies in the Concord pine barrens area. So the project during construction may have a direct effect on Karner blue butterflies. However, in the long run the habitat that is created and maintained within the right-of-way is actually beneficiary to Karner blue butterflies so it's a mix.

For the most part, the negative impacts to wildlife are temporary and they would occur during construction, and in general the
long-term effects on wildlife are quite minimal or positive for the most part.

MR. QUINLAN: I'll add just one last element to this. As part of this project, we have committed to a very large relationship with the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation whereby we are in essence providing $3 million of funds that they are then leveraging up to approximately ten million dollars to be invested here in New Hampshire on important conservation initiatives, really designed to improve the habitat for fish and wildlife, and that's a program that's already under way. 2016 will be year 2 so we're already starting to deliver a very positive effect on wildlife in this state.

MR. HONIGBERG: Can you say anything about the northern area of marsh hawk population in Stewartstown?

MR. QUINLAN: Which population?

MR. HONIGBERG: The northern area? That's the question. I'm reading the question.

MR. QUINLAN: One more time.

MR. HONIGBERG: Has the northern area for
marsh hawk population in Stewartstown been
included in any of your work?

MS. CARBONNEAU: We did evaluate some of
the habitats in the North Country and elsewhere,
some of the open lands where marsh hawks or
northern harriers are most likely to be present.
We were, we got information from New Hampshire
Audubon and National Heritage Bureau about where
those species might be found, where those birds
would be found. We did conduct some preliminary
surveys to see if we had appropriate habitats.
We did not find any harriers actually nesting in
our project area, but we do have some mitigation
land that we think was traditionally harrier
habitat. It might be just a little bit too
grown up now, sort of shrubby instead of very
open, but we included that in our mitigation
package, and we don't expect this project will
have any adverse impacts on harriers.

MR. HONIGBERG: Next question is about
sound. How much noise does a transmission line
like this make? This question asker says he has
a video from Quebec of a hum and crackle that
can be heard and that it's normal for overheard transmission lines.

MR. BOWES: So both AC portion and the DC portion of the line do have some audible noise. It's generally very low. It tends to be higher during certain periods of atmospheric conditions such as humid weather, but in general the levels are quite low for both DC portion and for the AC portion of the line. There is a detailed sound study as part of the application, and it takes almost an entire appendix and goes into a lot of detail around not only the transmission lines but also the transition stations and the substations.

MR. HONIGBERG: There are couple of questions on this sheet that are very specific to particular landowners' issues, but I'm going to turn them into more general questions. During construction how long will roads be closed and unavailable to traffic during construction period?

MR. QUINLAN: I'll refer this to Mr. Johnson.
MR. JOHNSON: So I'm assuming that the question is regarding underground construction in its entirety. The goal is to not close roads at all. We are going to work very diligently with the Department of Transportation and municipalities that will be affected to ensure that at least one lane of a two-lane road will remain open. We're hoping to do most of the construction in the shoulders of the road so that we're not impacting travel lanes as much as possible. We realize that there will be some impacts. However, in typical construction, say in front of a landowner's driveway, we expect that impact to be approximately one to two weeks, and at all times that driveway will be accessible. We will have a plating system that will allow the vehicle to enter and exit the driveway at all times.

MR. HONIGBERG: If someone owns a piece of property that is next to or near the line, how can they determine how close the line will actually be to their property line?

MR. JOHNSON: Again, if you go to the...
websites, either the Northern Pass website or the SEC website, we have published a series of maps that have the locale of property lines vis-a-vis the actual easements or the new constructions where it's going to be and you can distinguish where your property would be based on those maps.

MR. QUINLAN: As well, I'll just say, you know, for abutting landowners and other landowners near the line, we are going to continue our outreach up and down this route so to the extent you have questions that you can't answer through the website, certainly get in touch with the Northern Pass team and we'll get the engineers to work with you on answering the questions.

MR. HONIGBERG: There's a couple of questions that generally relate to cost/benefit. Can you review again how you are going to lower electric rates for New Hampshire's ratepayers?

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So at the outset I explained the effect that putting Northern Pass into service has on wholesale electric rates
across New England. It basically displaces higher cost generation, and, therefore, lowers the clearing price across New England. That's the effect on the wholesale energy markets. When our experts evaluate Northern Pass and put it into that bid stack that I showed, the annual cost savings to New England customers is approximately 800 billion dollars a year. New Hampshire's approximately 9 percent of New England's total load so 9 percent of those savings land here in New Hampshire, that's approximately 80 million dollars a year in annual energy cost savings. We refer to that as the market suppression effect. It's basically lowering the wholesale price of electricity.

Separate and apart from this, we are planning to enter an Power Purchase Agreement with our partner Hydro-Quebec to reserve ten percent of the power flowing over this line for New Hampshire customers, and our anticipation is that's going to be beneficially priced which means it's going to provide additional energy cost servings for New Hampshire customers. So
there's really two effects that will result in lower energy bills for our customers.

MR. HONIGBERG: Circling back to burial. I'm going to read it as it's written. With the profit potential of the Northern Pass being so high, the payback period being so short, why does the Northern Pass insist on resisting a full burial?

MR. QUINLAN: As I indicated earlier, we've been working really hard on the project that strikes that balance. That does what it needs to do technically, that is not priced beyond the point where you pay for, meaning it becomes uneconomic, and protects what critical interests we can here in the State of New Hampshire. That's the project that we have put in front of this Site Evaluation Committee. I also indicated that's the project that we submitted to the three-state RFP. We think it's a very competitive project. In essence, it strikes the balance.

MR. HONIGBERG: Two related questions. Why has Northern Pass refused to meet with upper
Coos County elected officials to consider their concerns and rights, and why has the Applicant not contacted or met with county officials or the county commissioners who are the elected Selectmen of Dixville and Millsfield?

MR. QUINLAN: So for the last year and a half, we've spent, I personally have spent days here in the North Country meeting with elected officials and other interested stakeholders including members of the legislature, county commissioners, individuals from the towns of Millsfield and Dixville so I don't agree that we've ever refused a meeting. In fact, we're open to any meeting from any stakeholder here in New Hampshire, and that's been our policy for the last 18 months which is how long we've been involved in the project.

MR. HONIGBERG: All right. New topic. How may current existing PSNH towers will be relocated?

MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to refer that to Mr. Johnson.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Johnson, there's a
series of questions here so why don't you start with that one because, well, I'll tell you what they are so maybe you'll be able to look at multiple pieces of information at the same time. What is the span of heights of the relocated towers. Then there's a question about is this information in the SEC application. And if it is not, where can the information be found.

MR. JOHNSON: So the answer is that there are 282 115-kV structures that will be relocated. They range approximately 41 feet to 115 feet, the most common being the 92 and a half and that's in Coos County. If you'd like statistics for the whole project?

MR. HONIGBERG: Could you repeat that, the Coos County numbers, please?

MR. JOHNSON: 282 with the average range of heights ranging between 41 and 115 and the most common being 92 and a half.

MR. HONIGBERG: Are you able to quickly give the information for the entire project?

MR. JOHNSON: I'm adding it up right now. Let's just say it's approximately 600 structures
for the entire project. All of these structures are in the application. If you look at the mile sheets, project maps that were submitted, each of these structure heights of the new project and the relocated project are all listed there.

MR. HONIGBERG: All right. We're going to move on. Have you sought or obtained any permits from the State of Vermont for any of the subdivisions or municipalities? If so, what permits have you obtained and what permits are you seeking? If not, why not.

MR. QUINLAN: So we have not sought nor received any permits from the State of Vermont. None are required.

MR. HONIGBERG: You have stated previously that you cannot use any part of the I-93 corridor for any part of buried component of this project. Is this because New Hampshire Department of Transportation has told you the corridor is not available to you or is it because of some other reason, and if so, what is that reason?

MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to refer that
question to Mr. Bowes.

MR. BOWES: I'll start out with the analysis that the company has performed. We don't believe that the I-93 corridor is a viable route, four main reasons. The ability to construct it on a limited access highway creates public safety issues. Second item is environmental impacts, construction through undisturbed soil which I will come back to at the end. The third item is the constructability of that project. While it's much easier to construct inside a state highway, for example, Route 3, on Route 93 there are many other complications to that constructability, the exit and on ramps, the elevation of the highway, and as, again, I mentioned some of the constructability issues that take us off the roadway into the undisturbed soil area. All of those things lead to a much higher cost so ultimately the project cost becomes a tipping point where it's no longer a viable project.

Now, as far as the New Hampshire DOT is concerned, we've had a series of meetings with
the DOT both before we submitted the
application, during the application process to
make sure we had the permits that were necessary
for the project in the sense the project has
been announced. In each one of those meetings,
we have confirmed the New Hampshire DOT's
understanding of their rules for this project.
That we must come up with a viable alternative
to using I-93 before we can ask for that use.
In every case, we have a viability alternative
to using I-93. So if we were for some reason to
go on I-93, you could not be in the median, we
could not be in the travel lanes, we could not
be in the breakdown lane and we could not be in
the shoulder which pushes us to the far
right-hand side of the highway into the
undisturbed area of that highway right-of-way.
That would make, the first four statements I
made, public safety, environmental impacts, the
constructability, and ultimately the cost would
make that a nonviable project for us to pursue.

MR. HONIGBERG: Following up on something
that was said earlier, a question's been
submitted asking you to clarify something. The question writer says that a couple of weeks ago in a meeting Northern Pass's engineers stated that the buried portion of the transmission line would be located under paved portions of roads. This question asker understood you to just say a little while ago that the construction would be, quote, mostly in the shoulder of the road. Can you please clarify the situation?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe the words I used in that meeting were disturbed areas of the road. Disturbed areas by definition means the shoulder and also the paved area. Our prior goal is to locate our underground line within the disturbed area of the shoulder of the road so that would minimize the impacts due to the paved areas. There will be some places where we cannot avoid the paved areas and that thus will in some in some areas be in the paved areas.

MR. HONIGBERG: All right. The final question on green sheets here is directed to our friends from the Department of Energy regarding the Environmental Impact Statement. So it will
be submitted to them to comment and I will read it. Will the Final EIS include additional contrast/dominance ratings for simulation of the use prepared by Northern Pass or the SEC/DOE or for additional views simulated by others. That is the last question.

So what we're going to do is we're going to take a 10 or 15 minute break to give people a chance to stretch their legs. We have, I believe, upwards of 50 people who are signed up to speak. So what we're going to do is we're going to ask people to limit their comments to three minutes. If what you have extends well beyond three minutes, we're going to offer you a couple of choices; to submit what you have in writing or to come back and after all have had a chance to speak. We're not going to be draconian. It's not like we're going to cut the microphone off in three minutes. If you go a little bit over, that's okay, but we do, we would like you to limit yourself to three minutes. So we'll come back in 15 minutes.

(Recess taken)
MR. HONIGBERG: All right, folks. We are at the public comment portion of evening. As I said before the break, we'd like you to, if possible, to keep your comments to three minutes. If you need a little bit more time, we can do that, but if you need a lot more time, we're probably going to ask you to either submit in writing or wait until the end to finish your remarks. I'm going to do my best to pronounce your names as well as I can. I have been living with a somewhat difficult-to-pronounce name for my entire life so I am empathetic.

When you come up, please spell your name for the stenographer. If you have something you want to read, please read it slowly and clearly as best you can. That's the only way the stenographer is going to get it right. She does a great job, but she's only human, and if you go too fast, her machine may explode. If you do have something in writing, if you could please give her a copy when you're done, that way she has the best chance to understand if you used some obscure words or said something that she
couldn't get.

If you hear something that someone else has said with which you agree, you don't, we'd ask you please not to repeat it. If you say I agree with what so-and-so said about such-and-such, that will get you through this very large pile of yellow sheets and names on this list as quickly as we can.

So with that, we have two elected officials that I'm aware of and we'll call on them first. The first is the Chair of the Colebrook Board of Selectmen, Raymond Gorman. You'll be followed by Representative Larry Rappaport and then Mr. Samuel Bird.

SPEAKER: Good evening. Raymond Gorman. Chairman of the Board here in Colebrook, Selectman. First of all, I'm coming to make a statement here about we really appreciate seeing this meeting here tonight, and I think if you look at the number of people that are here, you compare it to the population in this area, this might be one of your most well-attended meetings. And it's important, I think it's
been, I was at the original meeting in 2010, and it's important to please include Colebrook in this area in your meetings.

And next is going to be a question for folks over here, and maybe you can help answer. We see tonight with your Power Point that you're talking about 30 million dollars in property tax. Okay? And why I'm coming to this is the town of Colebrook right now is involved with a lawsuit with New Hampshire Electric Co-op that we have spent tens of thousands of dollars on. We spent 40 to $50,000 in the last four to five years disagreeing with them about the evaluation of their power lines and poles. We feel we've got at least two more years with this lawsuit. There's several other towns. So my question to you folks are, do you have any lawsuits with any other communities over the values of the transmission lines, and how do you see this 30 million over the next five to ten years, will we sue, will those towns be collecting the same percentage after five years and ten years as you projected at the first year of this to be taxed.
MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Gorman, the time for questions for the company has passed this evening. We had dozens of written questions submitted for the company to answer. If you want to have a question submitted to them at the next public hearing in Concord on Thursday, you can submit that, or when we're in Deerfield or Plymouth on the other occasions, but right now, we're for public comment.

MR. GORMAN: All right. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: Please stop, please stop. We don't have all night, folks. Representative Rappaport followed by Samuel Bird and Dolly McPhaul.

SPEAKER: Thank you. My name is Larry Rappaport. Boy, it's been a long time. I started this in 2007, and Mr. Quinlan, I have been asking to meet with you for two years now through your associate Donna Gamache who was in my committee. I'm a State Representative. And so far nothing's happened.

(Applause)
MR. HONIGBERG: Samuel Bird followed by Dolly McPhaul and Mark Armstrong.

SPEAKER: I'd like to thank the committee for coming to Colebrook, and I have to say this right at the beginning, of course I know he's here, Charlie Jordan said it best. This is like being trapped in the movie Groundhog Day. Now, I know this is the procedure, but the same thing over and over again, year after year, EIS, DOE hearings, SEC hearings, and absolutely nothing has changed. All the few pros on Northern Pass are the same. All the many cons on Northern Pass are the same. But the Groundhog Day meetings, hearings and steps in this so-called process go on and on, but you're not going to wear us out, and to make things even more ridiculous, we are here again to comment even though Northern Pass has not completed its application and still doesn't even have a route to build the project. You are going to hear nothing here that you haven't heard many times before. I've already heard so many things that I've heard before. And after millions and
millions of words about this, it's many possible, no matter how many speakers there are or how articulate for anyone to say something different or shed a new thought on this saga. If you are among the very few that support this exploitation or if you are among many that are against this project without burial, you will hear nothing new. It's all been said.

Many of you committee members must have sat through years of listening to this. I see Brian Mills so many times and others I recognize also, and I know it's your job, but this can't be the best part of it. Please, everyone, let's end this movie, but please know, however, like I said before, you ain't going to wear us out. But wait, a brand new idea did just come to me, and I don't think anybody has said this before. How about this. Why don't you bury Northern Pass. All the other companies do. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Dolly McPhaul, M C P H A U L, Sugar Hill, and I'm here tonight to give a little different perspective. Maybe it is
something new. I spent one year attending the
ICC rulemaking sessions. I only missed one
meeting at which the SEC members were present.
The final meeting to ratify the new rules. I
couldn't bear to be there and watch the
Eversource rules be ratified. In my mind,
Eversource is the parent company of the SEC.

Here are a few examples. Pay attention.
They're pretty outrageous. When the project is
no longer in use, what happens to the towers.
Nothing. If you are a company with wind
turbines, you have to remove all structures and
restore the site. That sentence is missing from
transmission towers. Think about that. No
requirements from the SEC for Eversource to
remove the obscene Northern Pass towers. 78
miles of hideous towers.

Next, there was a bill passed that said the
SEC must consider cumulative impacts when making
its decision. Makes perfect sense to have to
consider everything in sight. Oh, oh, wait.
Transmission towers were removed from that.
Just think. Apparently 85 to 155 foot towers
through 78 miles of New Hampshire are invisible. Isn't that great? We don't have to look at those. Even when they're dead.

Third, how far should transmission towers and lines be set back from homes, day care centers and hospitals. We fought for those for two reasons: EMFs and falling tower zones. What happened. No setbacks necessary. According to the SEC, the many studies that indicate the connection between cancer, especially childhood leukemia, and transmission lines I guess don't matter with Eversource or the SEC. What are mere human lives compared with more, and I stress the word more, of the all mighty dollar for Eversource or a high paying job with Eversource for an SEC member. The SEC committee needs to go talk to Rod McAllister or Lynn Placey about where their priorities should be.

As far as towers falling, we were told the odds against that happening were so minimal that there was no need to be considered, even after being shown a picture of the towers on a home and being told that 1000 steel towers collapsed
in the Canadian ice storm. What happened? No setbacks. Guess we weren't Eversource.

Four, another outrageous acceptance of the completed application that is not complete. They do not have control of their route, and then this circus of meetings. Meetings that are not legitimate. We can't know the facts because they're not out there. We are called to a meeting that does not have all the facts. Oh, we've been told that they will have two more meetings some time somewhere for us to hear these facts. Undoubtedly, they will be in the least accessible at the worst convenient time for people so as few will come out as possible. The people obviously do not count.

And finally, for those of you who vote to accept this rape and pillage of our beautiful countryside, I feel every one of you that accepts this project should be investigated. Your acceptance of this application will in no way stop our fight against this obscene, unnecessary, for-Eversource-profits-only project.
I am proposing a new group of SEC members be chosen from outside New England with no relationship to Eversource, and certainly not members of the Eversource, SEC, PUC revolving door. The first letter I ever wrote to the papers was aimed at Eversource or PSNH or Northeast Utilities or Northern Pass, whatever they were calling themselves, and it was entitled How Dare You. I have since added the SEC to the mix, and my comments are still the same. How dare you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: My name is Mark Armstrong and I'm the forester with Wagner Forest Management in Errol, New Hampshire. Perform logging operations in Coos County. This is my personal opinion. We might all agree that these are not the best economic times, but our concept of hard times is nothing compared to our grandparents endured during the Great Depression. We might ask how the people in that era dealt with that economic crisis. It was Franklin Delano Roosevelt's great public works projects
providing the springboard for the nation's recovery. The CCC employed thousands of young men building woods through the wilderness, roads that are still in use today. The TVA and the Bureau of Reclamation built big hydroelectric projects that continue to provide cheap electricity to southeastern and west states.

Here's what the iconic American folk singer Woody Guthrie had to say about these enormous hydroelectrical projects. Quote, and on up the river is Grand Coulee Dam, the mightiest thing ever built by a man to run these great factories and water land. Roll on, Columbia, roll on. Woody Guthrie was a starving Oakie, right out of the dust bowl. Now, this iconic American folk singer wrote a couple dozen songs about these big hydro projects, and it's interesting to know if that you did a word search on this entire body of lyrical work, graces like snail darter, endangered species or viewshed don't come up.

And the hundreds of thousands of hungry refugees from the poverty of the dustbowl didn't pass up these temporary construction jobs.
Maybe they and President Roosevelt realized that sometimes you need a brief but intense spark to ignite something bigger and longer lasting.

When you go camping and carefully build your fire lay with the tinder and the kindling and the tiny twigs with some bigger sticks on top and you get ready to strike the match, nobody ever says oh, don't bother with that temporary thing. That's only going to last about five seconds. The Northern Pass construction may well be what we need to rekindle the economy. One enormous benefit of this project will be the upgrade of the Coos loop. This really is very significant for all of Northern New England because it will allow the biomass boiler to run at full capacity. With the slowdown of the pulpwood sector, we desperately need this market for low-grade wood. We need to build this project for the good of New Hampshire, for the good of New England, for the new generation of Americans who will need this low cost electrical energy to build a flourishing economy for the future. Thank you.
(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: Steve Ellis followed by Scott Rineer and Bill Abbott, and Mr. Ellis, I apologize. I didn't realize you are the Chair of the Selectboard in Pittsburg.

SPEAKER: Thank you. My name is Steve Ellis, and I am the Chairman of the Selectboard for the town of Pittsburg. I'm also a retired Senior Vice President and National Director of Sales for a major insurance company.

As you know, Northern Pass plans to enter the US over Halls Stream in Pittsburg and erect 20 towers before it is buried under the Connecticut River. Pittsburg is a community that survives on tourism, where people can escape to enjoy our abundant wildlife and scenic vistas. There are many unique things about our town. We have the largest geographic township in New England. We're considered the snowmobile capital of New England, having over 200 miles of groomed trails and hosting vintage snowmobile races. We are part of the Ride the Wilds trail which covers over 1000 miles for ATVs. We have
many fishing habitats, including lakes, ponds, streams, bogs and the Connecticut River. We have a trophy fishing area on the Connecticut River that attracts anglers from all over the world, and we have miles of beautiful hiking trails.

Without any consideration for our natural resources, Northern Pass plans to ruin our pristine vistas. In February of 1998, the State of New Hampshire recognized the importance of keeping Pittsburg and the Great North Woods from being developed. They established an easement of 146,000 acres of the Connecticut Lake Headwaters and established the Connecticut Lake Headwaters Citizen Committee to monitor compliance with the terms and conditions of the easement.

We wish Northern Pass also recognized this importance by leaving our landscape untouched, by simply burying the lines. It is only two miles from the entrance into the United States to the Connecticut River where a directional bore will bury the line under the Connecticut
River. If not buried, the towers erected up to that point will be seen for miles as you enter our town on Route 3.

The biggest insult to our town, however, is the disturbing our historic land where the towers will be erected; namely, the Indian Stream Republic territory. In 1783 the Treaty of Paris established the border between the US and Canada. It was not clear and in 1832 this border dispute caused double taxation for the inhabitants of which is now a section of Pittsburg. They had enough and revolted and created their own sovereign nation with their own Constitution and Congress and named it the Indian Stream Republic. For over 175 years, this land has remained untouched. But now Northern Pass wants to change that.

In conclusion, I ask you not to let Northern Pass destroy our beautiful vistas which will have an adverse effect on our economy. Do not let them destroy Indian Stream Republic territory which has been preserved for over 175 years. This is sacred land to our town and
citizens. The solution is very simple. Bury the lines, so both Northern Pass objectives and ours can be achieved. Thank you for your attention.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: My name is Scott Rineer. I'm a resident of Errol, New Hampshire. I've been a resident of Northern New Hampshire for over 25 years living in towns close to the proposed Northern Pass project. I also work in the timber industry, an industry that is vital to this region and one of the leading industries in our state for many years.

I support the Northern Pass project and for many good reasons. Northern Pass doesn't just promise to spend money in this area. They have already begun to do so. This project will support local businesses, it will provide jobs, and it will provide a much needed upgrade to the Coos loop. In recent months the timber industry has been hard hit, losing markets for low-grade wood that are vital to keeping our loggers and sawmills in business. The current limitations
to the Coos loop are the reason for the new biomass plant in Berlin to be running at half throttle. An upgrade would allow for up to 100 megawatts of additional power to enter the New England grid. This is not new development. Rather existing power facilities such as biomass, the biomass plant in Berlin and the wind farms at Dixville, Millsfield and Berlin to operate to full capacity. The timber industry as well as local renewable industry producers need this upgrade badly, and Northern Pass agreed to do it.

The Northern Pass project will provide the economic stimulus our state and this region is so desperately seeking. They will do this by supporting local businesses and helping our traditional industries such as timber and tourism prosper in the future. Thank you. And I also have ten additional letters written by business owners here in Coos County to submit for the record as well as my letter.

MR. HONIGBERG: Give the letters to Ms. Monroe, and you'd give your written statement to
the stenographer. Will Abbott followed by Alexander Ritchie and Clifford Lane, Jr.

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Will Abbott, and I'm here today representing the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests where I serve as Vice Presidents for Policy & Reservation Stewardship. I have comments this evening for the Department of Energy and Draft EIS. I also have comments on here for the SEC on the proposed Northern Pass application, comments to supplement those made by our President/Forester Jane Difley last week in Meredith. I'm going to offer my comments to the DEIS now and respectfully request the opportunity to present an additional three minutes of comments on the SEC issues once all others have had a chance to speak.

Concerning the Draft EIS, the Forest Society sees one major flaw that must be corrected in the Final EIS. We believe that the DEIS fails to satisfy the legal requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act because it fails to study more than one international
border crossing. NEPA regulations require federal agencies to, and I quote, according to the regulations, identify and assess reasonable alternatives to propose actions that will avoid or minimize adverse effects of these actions upon quality of the human environment. An Environmental Impact Statement is the tool provided by NEPA to study a range of alternatives. The EIS is designed to inform the federal permitting agency as to what the least damaging environmental alternative is for the project. NEPA does not require that the agency choose the least damaging alternative, only that it study a range of alternatives to inform the agency's decision.

The DEIS before us today, the draft form, does not study a range of alternatives for the international border crossing. It only studies one crossing alternative, the one presented by the Applicant, and the Applicant's proposal is the one presented by its customer, Hydro-Quebec. We strongly urge the DOE to prepare a Final EIS that studies at least one additional alternative
to the Applicant's preferred border crossing. This would correct the flaw, and would better inform the DOE's Presidential permit decision.

Given that the Northern Pass changed the size of the facility and the cable technology proposed for this project last summer after the final original EIS work was completed, this is another compelling reason to revisit the issue of options for crossing the international border in the Final EIS.

As just one example, if the Final EIS studies an alternative border crossing at Derby Line, Vermont, it could then consider a completely buried facility from Derby Line to either Hartford or Boston or even Deerfield, New Hampshire. This would get electricity to the southern New England markets that Mr. Quinlan explained earlier is a primary objective of Northern Pass.

Consider that a buried route along I-91 and I-93, would avoid Coos County completely, and all of the adverse impacts of the current proposal on Coos County. Consider that a buried
transmission line down I-91 and I-93 between Derby Line and Exit 40 off Bethlehem, New Hampshire, is ten miles shorter than the current serpentine route through Coos County. Consider that a completely buried line from Derby Line to Deerfield would avoid nearly all of the adverse impacts of the 132 miles of overhead lines currently proposed. Consider that an alternative border crossing at Derby Line would provide an alternative to the Coos County route that may be rendered moot by a property rights lawsuit that we have raised in Coos County Superior Court concerning our land in Clarksville, something which I will discuss later.

The point here is that the Draft EIS does not consider any border crossing except the Applicant's proposed crossing at Hall's Stream. In so doing, the EIS draft fails to meet the primary statutory objective of NEPA and fails to fully inform the DOE on the decision ahead of it concerning the Presidential permit. This is precisely --
MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Abbott, how much more do you have?

SPEAKER: One sentence. This is precisely why NEPA requires a range of alternatives to be studied in the first place. The Final EIS should study more than one border crossing, and we strongly encourage you to consider studying this additional crossing at Derby Line, Vermont. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: So Mr. Abbott, we'll circle back to you at the end. Thank you. Alexandra Richie followed by Clifford Lane, Jr., and Dr. Kenneth Kimball.

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Alex Richie, and I am here on behalf of Cate Street Capital. Cate Street Capital is the developer of a 75 megawatt biomass facility in Berlin, known as Burgess Biopower. We oversaw its development, construction and now we manage its operations. We have seen firsthand the positive impact that a large scale project can have on a region. Having been a part of the North Country
and throughout our efforts at Burgess BioPower for over 8 years now we feel we have an obligation and responsibility to the region, its livelihood and its success. As a result, Cate Street Capital is an intervenor in the Northern Pass docket, and I am here to testify that we do support the approval of Northern Pass's application by the New Hampshire SEC. Given the many measures the developer has taken in order to minimize the significant adverse impact, we believe that this project and the region can both succeed in harmony.

More so, we are here to support the approval of the Northern Pass Project as we believe it is critically important to the region's overall energy forecast. Almost 50 percent of New England's generation is currently being produced from natural gas, as Mr. Quinlan spoke to earlier this evening. Additionally, approximately 8,000 megawatts of capacity is scheduled to be retired from now to 2020. We are in imminent need of significant diversification of New England's overall energy
supply, and we believe that the Northern Pass project is needed to help bridge both of these fronts.

Further, Northern Pass will bring a large and much needed investment to the North Country's tax base. This investment will help lessen the burden on existing taxpayers and provide new revenues for local and county services. Having developed the Burgess BioPower project facility, we have seen the meaningful impact that an anchor tenant, if you will, can have on a community. The property tax agreement that Burgess BioPower and the city of Berlin was able to negotiate has allowed the city to strategically plan for its future as a community over the long-term, knowing that this tax base will be available.

As part of the Northern Pass's proposal the project has proposed an upgrade to a portion of the Coos County loop which Burgess BioPower uses to transmit its power to the grid. This portion of electric infrastructure is critical to those of us that operate energy generators in the
region, and, unfortunately, this transmission line is currently limited and the ability to transmit power is restricted on many days, sometimes significantly. Very often, Burgess BioPower and other New Hampshire electric generators face significant curtailment because of these ongoing issues, which has had and will continue to have a significant economic impact on anyone affected.

We do believe that the proposal put forth by Northern Pass to upgrade a significant portion of the loop is meaningful and is a much needed near-term solution to this problem.

In closing, let's be honest. There's no perfect project. I saw that firsthand 7 years ago. There is no pleasing everyone 100 percent of the time, but I have to compliment Eversource and their Northern Pass team on the painstaking effort they put into the development of this project. They listened, they engaged with surrounding communities, they explored alternatives. They worked with neighbors to not only try and find a way to bring this critically
important product to New Hampshire, but to do so
in a responsible and collaborative way. So I
thank you for your consideration of our comments
and I encourage the Committee's support for the
Northern Pass. Thank you.

SPEAKER: My name is Clifford Lane, Jr. My
name is Butch Lane. Everybody knows me, my son
John and I own JML Trucking & Excavating in
Errol. I am here to support the Northern Pass
project. The project will provide much needed
upgrades to the Coos loop. Right now and in the
near future there is a surplus of biomass
available. Mills in Maine are closing down, ton
of biomass at a very cheap price. This is a
great chance for the biomass plant in Berlin to
run at full strength. I've worked around there
for the last month or so, and I've seen nothing
but trucks. Three months ago they couldn't get
enough, wondering, and now they're turning
trucks away. What a great place. They will
keep people in the woods going. Keep everybody
going. We need jobs for the woods industry,
believe me. The woods industry is failing fast,
and the government's moving in from both sides. That will only be possible when Northern Pass comes through with these upgrades because we need this Coos loop open. We have one windmill farm that can't even operate. We have another one that our tax dollars have built, $130 million up there, and that's running at half capacity. We've got to start getting some of these places going.

The construction project will probably be one of the largest that New England's ever had. With this poor winter season we have just experienced, we cannot just survive on tourism, and I think a lot of the motels and restaurant owners and people around here with rentals are seeing that. This type of project will put a lot of quick money into the local economy. Motels and restaurants, parts stores, gravel pits, small contractors and such and myself. These people, contractors, I was in it for 30 years, make big and they spend fast. Puts quick money into the area.

This will also help many local young men
who have gone for training at linemen school hoping to get a chance on the lines. As I look around this room, there's not a lot of young people. Young people are leaving the North Country fast. We've got to put them back to work.

So in closing, I sincerely hope this agreement, the agreement can be done with Northern Pass and we can put people back to work. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Thank you. Kevin Kimball. I'm Director of Research for the Appalachian Mountain Club. Tonight, I will make my comments focused to the DEIS. First on the alternative analysis, at Section 1.1, the Draft EIS states it was prepared to meet among several key objectives describe and evaluate the range of reasonable alternatives to proposed action in the US including the no action alternative number 3. The DEIS examined alternative routes and burial operations in New Hampshire only. However, DOE acknowledges that its role is not to select the final route in New Hampshire.
Rather, DOE's jurisdiction for Presidential permit is the international border crossing.

MR. HONIGBERG: I'm sorry, Mr. Kimball. Just a second. Whoever is speaking over there, you know, we can hear you. So please stop. He deserves your respect and your full and undivided attention.

MR. KIMBALL: Thank you. To date, DOE has refused to look at any alternative international crossing site other than the single one proposed by the Applicant. DOE should consider alternative international boarding crossing locations. A much more direct and shorter route with far less environmental impacts or costs for this energy would be to cross in Vermont and follow the buried route along I-91 south to the intended markets Mass., Connecticut and Rhode Island. This logical alternative route goes directly to the Vermont Yankee nuclear power plant in Vernon, Vermont, which is now being decommissioned, and its bridge switch yard is now without power. The Applicant claims the need for Northern Pass is to fill the gap caused
by the Vermont nuclear power plant going off line. The Governor of Vermont publicly stated back in 2014 that Vermont stands ready to consider this Vermont alternative. Variation on this approach is burial along I-89 to I-91 to I-93 as Mr. Abbott just spoke to. Both of these alternatives should be studied and included in the Final EIS.

Second, on the use of New Hampshire's interstates. The Applicant's filing for both the New Hampshire SEC and the US DOE, the interstates in New Hampshire cannot effectively be used for power line right-of-ways, has never been publicly verified. The Applicant has never asked the three parties that signed the MOU, the Franconia Notch I-93 on those possibilities. Its preference has been to cram more than 1100 more cheap transmission towers which will be 2 to 3 times tree height in Applicant's right-of-way to increase short-term profits at the long-term expense of the New Hampshire landscape. Neither DOE nor the SEC should accept without full documentation that can be
publicly reviewed that burial and interstate right-of-ways for electric power transmission is legally or fiscally impossible.

My final comment goes to the visual impact analysis in the DEIS. The DEIS correctly ranks the North Country study region as having high to very high scenic intrinsic visual quality in contrast to convoluted visual assessments submitted to SEC by the Applicant. The DEIS appropriately acknowledges that overhead lines above and below ground conversion stations would impact the visual landscape whereas complete burial would not. However, one component of the Draft EIS visual component is problematic. When it gets around to trying to understand the visitor's perception and expectations, it can't find readily available data so it resorts to the US National Census Data which is based on the population per square mile. It's obvious that if you have a national landscape, there will be few people there, whereas if you have urban landscape, there will be a lot of people, and that greatly skews that model when it is
actually implemented. The Final EIS needs to go back and actually ask, what is the visitor's expectation of this area. That includes not only the residents but the second homeowners and the tourists that come here. I think as you'll see from many of the people sitting behind me here today, their expectations are a little bit different than just simply using census data which really skews the results and this need to be corrected in the Final EIS. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Trevor Lewis. I live and work here in Coos County, and I'm here tonight to voice my support for Northern Pass. While some people oppose this project for reasons ranging from aesthetic concerns to the importation of a foreign energy source, I can understand and respect those views. In saying that, I do believe there's room for conservative responsible change and growth for this county and state. As a forester, I consider myself first and foremost a
conservationist, and with that, I feel there's a balance that can be found between economic growth with the development and the protection and preservation of our environment. Northern Pass has heard the concern of those individuals that oppose this project as is evident from the changes that have been made from the initial proposal. I see that as a fair and balanced compromise for both parties, and looking forward in the future to grow economically while making our community a stronger and more vibrant place for the future. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Kevin McKinnon. I'm a representative of the Headwater Subcommittee of the Connecticut River Joint Commissions. We are charged with the preservation and protection of the resources of the Connecticut River Valley. Slicing out a 32-mile wide scar starting out at Hall Stream is a far cry from protecting and preserving our national resources. 31 towns have voted no to Northern Pass at their town meetings. Shouldn't this be enough? If, indeed, Northern Pass was serious about minimal
impacts and utilizing existing corridors, they would have come south on US Route 3, cutting the mileage in half, minimizing the impacts both ecological and aesthetic. This would eliminate the horrific scarring of the countryside, alleviate many concerns in terms of the environment and aesthetics and bolster the State of New Hampshire's economy.

As you are traveling north on US Route 3, you will climb a large hill prior to the town of Lancaster. At the top is a scenic pullover with a spectacular view of the gateway to the headwaters region we are in. This spectacular view will be despoiled by over 80 towers set in a broad swath of cleared land across the countryside. This image is completely at odds with the picture we set for our tourism industry.

As our Chairman stated, the headquarters committee has consistently opposed Northern Pass project. Some reasons that have been cited at many of our meetings are the effect of scenic beauty, loss of work and forest land, impacts to
wetlands, reduction of property values, negative effect on tourism, and the lack of any long-term benefits of the region.

Member Tom Caron wrote, other regions of New Hampshire do not rely so heavily upon their natural resources and tourism in industry than do the Great North Woods and White Mountain regions of the state. While other regions to the south have large industrial and manufacturing sectors of their economies, the Great North Woods and White Mountain regions do not. All of our eggs are unfortunately in one basket, tourism.

The fact that the transmission line as proposed is buried along its journey through the White Mountain regions for 52 miles and similarly buried for only an 8 mile segment along 145 in Clarksville in the Great North Woods region is curious. If it can be buried going through ecologically and tourism sensitive White Mountain National Forest, why not be buried in just as beautiful and sensitive a part of New Hampshire the Great North Woods? A
better option is to bury the entire Northern Pass project.

In the wetlands application under ENV-WT 302.04 #4, Northern Pass states, Work was not performed outside of the proposed right-of-way. The impacts are not known but are stated as the proposed transmission line will have little to no permanent direct impacts. This is a tremendously leap of assumptions. Number 17. Relocation of TS 1 and TS 5 to areas where it is outside wetlands would be much preferred. Burying the lines will eliminate these structures all together. Section 6, Table 3. Summary of wetlands, rivers, streams and vernal pool impacts. Half the impacted wetlands are in the North Country. This is not a good example of avoiding/minimizing wetland impacts.

Table 4, Communities. Northern white cedar, balsam fir swamp. Purchasing wetlands and then proposing to develop the property is not responsible, environmentally sensitive aesthetically pleasing, and most importantly, does not take into consideration minimizing
wetland impacts.

6.1.1.1. Route selection. Northern Pass states, identifying the shortest route feasible, end quote. The shortest route is traveling south in the US Route 3 corridor. Northern Pass has played connect the lots trying to develop an alternate route that they would own.

This region is our home for us and our future generations to come. We refuse to have it maligned due to so-called progress, corporate greed or the supposed needs of southern neighbors. New Hampshire is and has been an exporter of electrical power. There is no demonstrated need for us to have this transmission line. We, the Headwaters Committee of the Connecticut River Joint Commission, stand opposed to this Northern Pass project as presented. Perhaps if a different approach had been used rather than trying to shove the project down people's throats, there may have been a different outcome. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Bob
Baker, and I am an almost retired lawyer. I'm living in Columbia, New Hampshire. I moved here about 19 years ago or at least I acquired my home 19 years ago. Because of the majestic environment and Great North Woods. The beauty and the serenity of this area is enchanting, but it would not be the same if the Northern Pass project is permitted and built as currently designed. I say that I'm almost retired because I still have a few active cases. They involve the Northern Pass, and those clients are moving to intervene in this proceeding and they will tell their stories in the future assuming that the interventions are permitted.

I speak tonight on my own power as a resident of Coos. I find this project to be ugly, unnecessary, commercial intrusion into a region. It will damage, if not destroy, the most significant assets that we all possess. Those assets are our hearts, our souls which are bound to this beautiful place. The very ethos of people is at stake. If this project is built with its above ground structures and...
transmission lines and strings of insulators hanging over our land, we will not feel the same about ourselves. We will never feel the same way about who we are. I beg you to stop this madness. It's been going on far too long. It's not wanted in Coos County by our communities. Don't the voices of the people count for something? Do they matter at all? I ask you to seriously consider that question. Do they matter at all.

But it's not just impacting our New Hampshire towns here in Coos County. Part of our region, part of our souls, part of our communities is across the river in Canaan, Vermont. The towers that Northern Pass plans to build in Pittsburg will be erected on foundations of concrete poured high above the Connecticut River 200 yards from the Canaan, Vermont border. It will be visible. Highly visible from the Beecher Falls section of Canaan, Vermont, and in many other viewpoints in Canaan, Vermont. Northern Pass will build a road through forested mountain sides all the way
from Halls Stream on the Canadian border to the
Connecticut River in order to pour those
foundations. The wetlands will be invaded there
and the water will run off. Where will it run?
Into Vermont. That's the downhill side of that
hill.

I have some questions for the DOE, not that
you're going to answer them tonight, but I'm
going to ask you this. Why hasn't Canaan in the
State of Vermont been involved in the Section
106 process? Why hasn't the Vermont Division
for Historic Preservation been contacted? Why
hasn't Northern Pass filled out required
applications in Vermont for the Section 106
process with the historic and cultural resource
people in Vermont. Mr. Quinlan said tonight
they don't have to. Are you sure? Why doesn't
someone pick up the phone and call Vermont and
ask the Historic Resources division if they
think an application might be needed.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Baker. How much more
do you have?

MR. BAKER: I have just a few more
observations, and I can summarize them. I'll turn in my handwritten sheet because these are questions for the SEC.

Since the only way you can reach the Hall Stream road area is by the roads in Vermont, I would question, and I don't have the answer, I'm not an expert in Vermont law, but I would question whether or not the Department of Transportation in Vermont needs to be contacted for necessary permits to enter into a commercial project that would use their highways, and I don't know the answer to that, but I think it should be done. Also I think that the wetlands resources or the Department of Environmental Protection in Vermont may be interested in having an application done for this project because of water flow off that hill into Vermont, there's obviously going to be disturbed water courses in wetlands in New Hampshire that will have an impact on the water system in Vermont. So I would ask that that be done because in order for the application to be complete, the Applicant must show required
application permits that they have obtained or
at least started the process. At least my
understanding. So I look forward to having this
process continue, and I thank you very much for
your attention.

SPEAKER: Hello. I'm Rob Beland. I've got
land on both sides of the power line. I've got
gas line going by my house. The gas company
told me that, I told them why don't you put the
gas line underneath the power line and run it
through that way, and they says they can't
because it's got to be so far away from the
power line so they brought it close to my house.
24-inch main. So I had to live with that. I
asked them to put it on the other side of the
power line, and they said it cost too much, put
it on the other side of the power line so now
they're thinking about putting the transmission,
there's one there, they want to put another
transmission line there. You know, there's one
115 kV line going through there, something
happens, Berlin says that, you know, they've
unloaded, they've got to rehab that whole line.
You know, they're not getting enough power through there, so let's heat that baby up a little bit more. If it's that bad, it should have been done 15 years ago. Eversource knew about it. They didn't do it since Northern Pass. Eversource didn't say well, we'll just throw that in. They knew about it. People in Berlin are hurting. Eversource knew they were hurting. You know, it's not a new thing. You know? I believe that, I think it's really, really, you ought to think about this because them gas lines with the 24-inch mains that goes a long ways to that right-of-way. When they put that gas line in, they didn't plan on having another line going through there. You know? It's just, you know, it's a bomb waiting to blow up. And I say bury it and be done with it. You know what I mean? All we're doing now is dragging our feet and having meetings and dragging our feet. Just bury it. You know?

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Nancy Martland. Good evening.
I'm going to be addressing my remarks strictly to the SEC because I think this is the only chance I'm going to have to actually speak to you face to face, and I've had a chance to speak to the DOE. My name is Nancy Martland. I live in Sugar Hill, New Hampshire, and I'm here this evening partly because I'm be out of town when my town has its hearing but also partly because I live in a town that now has a buried line, and I don't think it's right that some towns are spared overhead lines and some towns are not. I understand that this is a statutory regulatory permitting process. However, I hope that your decision will rest on more than dotting the regulatory i's and crossing the t's more than a process operated mainly so far as I can see by lawyers for lawyers. As Bob Baker said, do we matter? We're here. Do we matter? The highly controversial nature of this project requires that you who hold our futures in your hands exercise extreme care as you weigh the issues involved in this case. If I were in your shoes, I think I might be wondering why
people like me are fighting Northern Pass so hard. So maybe I can help with that a little.

I cannot impress upon you strongly enough that we know that the decision that you make on Northern Pass is one we will have to live with for the rest of our lives. Long after you've returned to your homes and moved on, we will still be here as will our children and their children living with your decision. Allowing this project to deface our land when there is a perfectly reasonable low impact alternative would be a travesty and that is why we fight.

It's impossible to grasp the notion of a beach by looking at individual grains of sand, and it's impossible to understand the full scope and impact of Northern Pass by looking only at its details. Fair judgment and your own rules require you to comprehend the beach, not just the grains of sand. For example, the big picture is essential to your required findings of impact on aesthetics and historic properties which must include an examination of effects on the landscape as a whole. So I'd like to talk
to you in the time I have left about the concept of cultural landscapes, and I believe Ms. Monroe gave you some materials that I have taken from the National Park Service. I'm going to speak on it briefly, but you can look into it more fully in the material.

Cultural landscapes are a class of historic properties eligible for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. According to the National Park Service guidelines, and I quote, cultural landscapes and range from thousands of acres of rural tracts of land to a small homestead with a front yard of less than one acre. Like historic buildings and districts, these special places reveal aspects of our country's origins and development with their form and features and the ways they were used. Cultural landscapes also reveal much about our involving relationship with the natural world, and I believe on the bus tour today, you got a glimpse of a number areas that qualify as cultural landscapes.

Our landscape is so important that the
National Trust for Historic Preservation has designated the scenic landscapes of New Hampshire as a national treasure. The trust notes regarding Northern Pass, and I'm quoting again, if the transmission line is built, it should not be at the expense of the character and spirit of the Granite State's special places. We live in an age of technology and innovation. By making use of this technology, surely a solution can be found that puts place before power lines, end quote.

MR. HONIGBERG: Ms. Martland, how much more do you have?

MS. MARTLAND: I can skip to my final. I have another paragraph. Can I do that?

MR. HONIGBERG: Go for it.

MS. MARTLAND: Cultural landscapes are distinct from other types of historic properties, this is really important, such as buildings or historic districts. They're of great value but cannot alone define the qualities of the North Country. What we have here can not be reduced simply to discrete
building or sites. It involves the landscape that is majestic and intimate and has drawn people here from all over the world for close to 200 years. Our landscape defines us here in the North Country. It is scenic, it is historic, and it is culturally significant.

Please be certain that you consider the integrity of the New Hampshire's landscape in this context as you weigh the information regarding aesthetics and historic properties that will come before you as a result of this decision. I believe that our cultural landscape should be protected from the disfigurement that overhead power lines would inflict upon them. Of course, as everyone in this room knows, damage could be avoided almost completely if Northern Pass elected to bury all of its lines rather than just segments. Thank you. Sorry I went over.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: My name is Steve Adams. I'm the President of PAR Electric Contractors, a Quanta Services Company. I want to thank both the
Department of Energy and the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee for coming here today. I'm speaking in support of the project. We are the selected general contractor for Northern Pass. Quanta Services operates two construction companies in New Hampshire. PAR Electrical Contractors in Bow, New Hampshire, and JCR Utility Construction in Raymond, New Hampshire. We currently employ 200 people in New Hampshire with the company dating back to over 30 years. These employees live and work in New Hampshire and raise their family here. With Northern Pass, we plan on increasing the number of employees, permanent and temporary.

An important aspect of Northern Pass is the Eversource's New Hampshire First commitment. It requires the general contractor to provide work and job opportunities for New Hampshire citizens and business. This local requirement includes several Eversource transmission projects in New Hampshire, including Northern Pass. While there are certain aspects of this project that would require specialty workers, there has been
considerable effort to work with locals and local contractors to give them the best advantage. Over 70 New Hampshire companies and subcontractors have been met with to date.

Given Quanta's experience working with large electrical transmission projects around the country, I want to provide some information on the economic benefits that these types of projects will be bringing to New Hampshire. While many people can see the jobs and economic benefits that flow to electric linemen, sometimes it's difficult to appreciate the benefits and how they flow down to the rest of the community. I think the best example is a similar transmission construction project that was just completed called the Maine Power Reliability Project. So-called MPRP. It was just completed in 2015. It was a five-year project that totaled $1.4 billion. 390 contractors were hired to build the project with 270 of those contractors coming from Maine. At the height of construction of the project, it created 2700 jobs for the state and supplied
$436 million to the Maine economy. There are similar examples of these projects across the country with widespread economic benefits provided by these projects, but I would encourage the committee to consider that MPRP impacts due to the location and the schedule.

Several of the other contractors have spoke about the various items used as far as wood and gravel, but the economic flow down goes much deeper when you get into lodging, landscaping and waste management, salvage, aggregate hauling, equipment hauling, transportation. Let's not forget all the way down to retail stores, restaurants, motels, campgrounds, all the necessary services that will be required to keep a large workforce moving, and the company will continue to operate and reach out to New Hampshire companies. We encourage all companies to reach out to us if they haven't heard from us. Quanta looks forward to continuing its work with local contractors and others as we prepare for this project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments. I encourage the
Department of Energy and the New Hampshire Site Committee to approve this. I also have a letter for the Department of Energy.

MR. HONIGBERG: You can submit it to the DOE down at the end or give it Ms. Monroe.

SPEAKER: Good evening. I want to thank your for the opportunity to be here. I'd like to give this young lady my correct spelling. It will be easier. Bruce Beaurivage. I'd like to from a contractor's point of view. Specifically, an electric contractor's point of view, which I am. Seventeen years I spent with Public Service. I helped wire and build, construct Deerfield's substation where this electric is ultimately going to enter the New England grid in the late '70s. That's from the point of view, from electrician's point of view and jobs, this is a very unique type of electrical work. It's limited to linemen and it does provide jobs, but I don't want anybody to be misled here about the apprenticeship program and how it work in the State of New Hampshire for a licensed electrician.
The utilities have their own training facilities and their own requirements for hours worked and for education. It is not recognized totally by the New Hampshire State Fire Marshal's office in licensing of electricians in the State of New Hampshire. The State of New Hampshire requires an apprentice to do 2000 hours of work a year for four years, 8,000 hours, and 600 hours in school. It's up to the Licensing Board of the State of New Hampshire electricians to decide how much credit will be given to an apprentice in the program for the utility to build the power line, and he would still have to attend 600 hours of school before he can even take the test to become a journeyman electrician in the State of New Hampshire.

So building a power line does not allow the 10,000 current electricians licensed in the State of New Hampshire to do residential, commercial or industrial work in the State of New Hampshire. I'll make it quick because I know we don't have much left here.

Basically, as far as reliability point of
view, with my background in electricity for the years that I've been involved and among other things, this is very simple. That bury it is a lot more reliability as we all watched back in the ice storm of 1997 when the towers toddled in Canada and they had to milk the cows by hand because they had no power for a month in some of the provinces of Quebec. So from reliability point of view, I realize it's more money, but it makes a lot more sense to go underground. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: My name is Harry Brown, and I'm currently the President of New Hampshire Off Highway Vehicle Association, but I'm not representing them tonight. I'm speaking on behalf of my wife and myself. We live in Stewartstown and have not taken a position pro or con on the project, but we feel the majority of the testimony given thus far seems to be on balance. We want to also take this opportunity to express our concern over the behavior of some of our North Country neighbors that have
exhibited at previous hearings. They have
hissed, they booed and they shouted out
derogatory remarks to individuals that expressed
neutral or supporting views of this project.
This behavior is and will remain unacceptable to
us and is just another form of bullying.
Respecting the process is as important as having
the supporting, opposing or neutral views.

The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests campaign has stated that the
above ground transmission lines will have a
negative impact on tourism and recreation. In
our opinion, this has no factual base from any
studies, and it's pure hype. A scare tactic.

Coos County economy relies heavily on OHRV
and snowmobiling and will not be affected by the
Northern Pass Transmission lines. We're
presently allowed many miles of trails under
power lines throughout New Hampshire, the rest
of the United States and throughout Canada.
This is without any negative effects to the
participants concerning these types of
recreational pursuits. Quite the opposite. It
allows them access to trails that would not otherwise be available. The State of New Hampshire clearly recognizes that the sport is greater than a half million dollar a year industry, especially in Coos County, and it has lived a new life for many current and new business owners and economic stimulus when many could not see any light through the tunnel previously. We want to recognize without land owners giving us permissions to utilize their problems for our trails there would be no Ride the Wilds or snowmobiling in Coos County or throughout the state. Northern Pass is one of those landowners allowing the sports on the land that affects ten measured trails. Without them being good neighbors, this would virtually shut down the entire northern Coos County.

Yes, we voted at the Stewartstown meeting on March 3rd, 2011, to oppose the 1200 megawatt high voltage direct current transmission line as presently proposed. This was almost five years ago. Since the project has been downsized to the 1090 megawatts and is being buried in
Stewartstown except for on the land that Northern Pass owns. Susan and I are retirees and are living on entitlements such as Social Security. If the latest route is accepted, this will afford us nearly 50 percent in tax relief. Many of my fellow citizens in Stewartstown are economically challenged. This will provide significant relief for taxpayers. Just think. Northern Pass will pay huge property taxes and annuities without any buildings so we don't have to provide fire, EMS or police, and oh, by the way, no kids. No bigger schools. These are examples of the positive side of project.

Finally, neither Susan nor I are OHRV enthusiasts. Actually, through the OHRV initiative, we just wanted to help our neighbors to be able to raise their standard of living. We're also concerned that in the end result, all the conservation groups that oppose Northern Pass will cash in like they always do in projects like this and that will not help our economic initiative in Coos County. Quite the contrary. They will do whatever they can to
curtail OHRVing and snowmobiling. We hope that the SEC will deliberate fully on all the facts. Thank you.

SPEAKER: For the record, Jason Balint. I've just got a couple statements, and I have a story to tell Bill. You guys stopped up to my camp today on Diamond Pond Road. I saw many of you out there. Appreciate you stopping by. Hopefully, it made a difference when you could see the view from that portion of the road that approaches Coleman State Park.

A comment about the logging. Maybe the pictures were wrong that I saw that you guys were out there, but the swath of land that I saw cut that those towers were on wouldn't have enough wood to fill a pickup truck. So the pictures were wrong, or maybe I'm wrong. So now my story.

My wife and I bought property which is located on Diamond Pond Road in Colebrook about one half a mile from where the proposed transmission line would be going aerial and about one mile from the entrance of Coleman
State Park. We had dreams of building a camp in this area that as of now has some of the most beautiful views in the North Country. Someday we hoped to hand the keys over to our daughter Ayla so she could also have a chance to enjoy what we have come to love. But as of now, the tools have been put down and the building has stopped and our dreams and aspirations are being replaced with anger and disgust. The view from where the deck would be is exposed to about two miles of transmission towers and lines if the project were approved and it ripped through the valley near Heath Road and on the side of Sugar Hill. Who would have ever thought that six years since the original proposal that Northern Pass would still be insisting to install aerial transmission towers over 90 feet tall so close to a New Hampshire State Park and tourist attraction. My immediate neighbors along with everyone at Diamond Pond Road share the same level of disgust, frustration and anger.

A couple statements: There were roughly 143 petitions for intervention recently
submitted to the Site Committee. The Northern Pass was quick to submit their response and objections to many of these petitions. In the document entitled 2015-06 that was submitted to the SEC, Northern Pass states that any property owner not within 100 feet of the affected area do not qualify for any sort of intervention. The 100 foot rule would be shorter than the height of the proposed towers.

My wife and I attended the first SEC meeting in Meredith last week. While we were there, a real estate expert who was apparently on the Northern Pass payroll stated that transmission lines such as those proposed by Northern Pass would have no adverse effects on property values. The reaction by two realtors in the room and many others would lead one to believe that this is a fictitious statement. My question would be, and it was asked earlier and not answered, Will Northern Pass be prepared to sign off on and except all monetary damages that will occur from the loss of our property values if the project were to go through as currently
proposed.

The Northern Pass speaks of job creation for New Hampshire which is false and misleading. This is nothing more than short-term highs and a stimulus package for the benefit of the Northern Pass and its associated unions which most likely have millions of dollars investigated in lobbying. Wouldn't total burial of the transmission line create more jobs.

I question why we're all here in the first place. To intelligently and thoroughly evaluate a proposed route for the transmission line, there must be one. To my knowledge, the project is blocked in two locations north of where the project is proposed to go aerial in the area of Bear Rock Road and the Washburn Family Trust. Are we here to have a discussion about the maybe route?

I leave you with these thoughts. In fact, beg you, the Site Evaluation Committee, come to our homes and properties and see the impacts that this project would have on our homes, towns and our state in general, from our point of view.
and not that of Northern Pass. We cannot allow our beautiful landscapes to be subject to the kind of project that has been proposed by an organization that has little to no regard for the State of New Hampshire or its residents and, in particular, those in the North Country. If the Northern Pass truly valued what we as residents and many state officials have voiced over and over for six years, they would have mentioned entirely burying this line. It's not that they can't. It's that they don't want to. This project is clearly more about profit and less about power. Please consider what is ours and do not allow a for profit organization to capitalize on what we have worked so hard to preserve for generations to come. From what I can see, the only supporters of the Northern Pass are those who will profit from it.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Tara Bamford. The Planning Director at North Country Council. North Country Council is the state designated regional planning commission for the Northern Pass
corridor from the Canadian border all the way to the Plymouth/Bridgewater line. In the interest of time, I'm just going to focus on one point. My role of planner is to look for the solution that pleases the highest number of residents of our region. Just a kick look at the summary of the November supplement, if you take another look at alternatives 4 and 6, you'll see that burial of the line increases all of the benefits that the Applicant has listed for the project. You'll see that burial reduces all of the negative impacts, not just the scenic impacts, but loss of property values, loss of property tax income for towns, archeological impacts, wetland impacts, CO2 uptake that's lost. Prime farmland that's lost. They're all lessened by burial. All of the benefits, again, that the Applicant missed are increased with burials. Both the short-term and long-term economic benefits are higher than alternatives four and six where it's buried throughout our region. The number of jobs, which we're hearing on both sides of the conversation, the number of jobs in
both the short-term of construction and long-term with maintenance are higher with burial. Energy costs would be reduced by the same amount so that benefit doesn't change. Only the cost of construction to the Applicant is higher with burial. Not by orders of magnitude, not by an unreasonable amount. By 33 percent in the case of alternative 6 A. Thank you for listening. I know it's a long hearing. 

(Appause)

SPEAKER: Good evening. Stephen Tracy. I'd like to make a couple comments about the presentation tonight with the words clean and carbon. In Canada it's nowhere near clean, and it really increases the carbon issue. Flat lands up there flooded make rotten smelling swamps that flood out an entire nation of indigenous people and changed their lives forever like what would happen here. Did you enjoy your warm heating bill this winter. When you have a bug reflecting the sun, absorbing the sun, it raises the temperature of the earth where it used to be white snow, trying to
reflect it back up. Now to what I was going to say.

In history when my native ancestors were discovered, Turtle Island was considered a paradise even though millions of people have lived here for a very long time. In a comparatively short-term since then has been destruction.

Our Mother is very ill. Her temperature is rising. She's panting with strong winds. Droughts in California, floods in the southern midwest. The radioactive waste from the Manhattan Project buried near St. Louis is now spewing out of the flooded farmlands of the midwest. Where does your food come from? Our Mother is trying to heal herself but we need to stop hurting her. Projects like Tar Sands pipeline, fracking and injecting chemo-like poisons causing seizure-like earthquakes, and the Northern Pass and many others are not helping her.

Like a nursing mother on crack, like when we use GMOs and poisonous insecticide, what we
put into our Mother she gives back to us. We keep getting mind-bending propaganda telling us that we need fracking, we need pipelines, we need towers. But we really don't. We could turn off a couple of lights in here and wouldn't be blinded and we wouldn't be using so much.

If as much time, money and effort was put into solar and wind power as is put into the propaganda, we and our Mother and our children's futures will be better off. In history, before the Europeans came, if an important decision had to be made, our elders would gather and discuss the situation with the admonition, conduct your actions in respect for the next 7 generations. Nowadays, an overpaid Board meets with the admonition, how will this decision affect our stockholders, oh, and our jobs and pay three months from now. Greed, not love of our Mother, determines everything now.

If you let this Northern Pass towers or buried happen, you will be continuing the path of destruction of our Mother in killing our children by handing them a nonlife sustaining
earth. The blood of their suffering and deaths will be on your hands. Don't kill our Mother. Don't kill our future.

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Brad Thompson. I live at 599 Noyes Road just off Bear Rock Road in Stewartstown. My wife Daryl and I built our retirement home in 2008 and 9. Prior to that we had a camp in Clarksville since '75. The last five and a half years of fighting Northern Pass has been an ongoing battle and certainly not what we envisioned with retirement. We have a direct view from our front deck of the transition point area number 4 which is where it comes out of the ground on Bear Rock and East Road. From there, the 90-foot tall towers pop out of the ground and head out away from us. Twelve hundred feet of our property borders on Bear Rock Road where the buried cables are proposed. For the record, my wife and I are adamantly against this project and will not rest until complete burial along state right-of-ways have occurred.

I have two points I'd like to make. At
meetings that you, the Site Evaluation Committee, held prior to December 18th, 2015, you had to ask the question, do you, Northern Pass Transmission and Eversource, have a complete defined route that you own or have right-of-way over or have leased for the 190-plus miles of DC and then AC current to travel. If the answer for Northern Pass was yes, then you, the Site Evaluation Committee, were grossly misled.

In the summer of 2015, Northern Pass realized that they had a serious problem. Their planned overhead loop from Clarksville and Stewartstown was in serious trouble. There existed local folks who would not sell their land that Northern Pass desperately needed in order to fulfill the requirement by SEC. Out of desperation, Northern Pass resorted to Plan B. They announced they would go underground along Old County Road, Creampoke Road, Northhill Road and State Highway Bear Rock Road to satisfy the Site Evaluation Committee requirements of having a clearly defined route.
The new route when announced was justified by Northern Pass as, we hear what the people of the North Country are saying and we've reacted. Northern Pass really had no choice. Plan B was their only choice. Northern Pass does not have the permission to use the roads in Stewartstown. They blatantly misled you when they said they did in their application. For this reason, the Site Evaluation Committee needs to seriously consider delaying these hearings until a completed route is defined. We, the abutters, on four town roads own to the centerline of those roads subject to the easements of the public in the roads over the land. The general rule is that the abutting landowner owns to the centerline of the road unless there's clear language to the contrary or if the town of Stewartstown or the State of New Hampshire took a fee interest to the roads. The town of Stewartstown has publicly stated that they do not hold fee title interest in those roads, and the property owners have legal property rights to the roads.
Northern Pass should have addressed this issue with property owners prior to claiming they had an approved route. They did not. I, with some professional help, found four New Hampshire Supreme Court cases that strongly support this position of land ownership, and I'm listing them on the sheet that I passed in to the stenographer. In all four cases, the court upheld for the landowner. He owns the dirt under the right-of-way.

At a meeting that I requested in early 2015, I met with Jim Wagoner and Sara who are associated with Northern Pass. I asked Jim how he could justify digging up my dirt. His response was the transporting electricity along these town rights-of-ways is part of the definition of a right-of-way. I do understand that inherent to the right-of-way in addition to the, in addition to the road being built on it, are overhead or underground electric, telephone, cable TV, and gas lines. However, I will argue that these lines are intended to serve the homes and properties that the town roads serve. The
intention of the right-of-way is not to allow a for profit, stock held corporation to transport a product, electricity, from where it's manufactured, Quebec, Canada, to its ultimate marketplace, southern New England.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Thompson, how much more do you have?

MR. THOMPSON: Half a page.

MR. HONIGBERG: How many pages have you gone through so far?

MR. THOMPSON: Three.

MR. HONIGBERG: Finish up, please.

MR. THOMPSON: Along the whole 6.1 miles of proposed buried electric line in Stewartstown, Eversource has zero customers. We are all serviced by, New Hampshire Electric Co-op services all of the properties. Eversource and Northern Pass have no need or right to be overhead, on or be under the right-of-way and certainly no right to dig up our land without permission.

My second point is quick. If burial is allowed, Northern Pass to begin construction by
digging up our land would be a clear case of
taking our land by eminent domain. Our State of
New Hampshire legislature has sent the very
clear message that taking our land by a for
profit, stock held corporation is illegal.

In closing, my wife and I feel no
compassion for a for profit business to deeply
scar our beloved North Country. Mr. Quinlan, I
say to you, it's time to pull the plug and bury
it. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Luke Wotton. All right. I'm
here. I see you're already smirking. You may
have recognized me from before, but I'm against
the project in a whole, buried or overhead,
because it's just really nasty. Like that guy
before, he's not here anymore, but it's really
gross what Hydro-Quebec has been doing up in
Hydro-Quebec, all of those dams, and it's beyond
me. And then let's talk about you're going to
upgrade the Coos loop. Now, I have a question
for you, and I called the SEC, whatever you guys
are over there, and you guys kind of blew me
off, but my question was if you upgrade the loop
but you don't upgrade the export of the loop,
you're just going to upgrade it so there's more
power flowing there but then that power is not
going to be even being used so you're going to
go back to it's going to have too much power in
it so you have to upgrade the exportation of
this power, correct? Correct. So I don't know.
You guys just need to grow up and like listen to
the folks that are like right in front of you
like saying go away, go away. And goddamn it,
I'm going to take live free or die, and I'm
going to fucking live by that. I'm going to
live free.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Wotton, Mr. Wotton.
Would you please clean up your language?

MR. WOTTON: You've been warned.

SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for
allowing me to leave the meeting earlier and
moderate a school meeting and then come back.
For the record, my name is Richard Rick Samson.
I live at 804 Piper Hill Road, Stewartstown, New
Hampshire, and I am the Coos County Commissioner
for District 3 which begins in Groveton and runs to Pittsburg and Errol to the Maine border to the Connecticut River separating New Hampshire and Vermont.

I have just a couple of thoughts that I'd like to mention before I read my testimony, and one question my constituents have asked me is why was this meeting and tour scheduled for the night before town meeting in New Hampshire. Who decided the site visit tour and why did it not include the real visual impacts of our most scenic area. The Coos loop has been mentioned here several times tonight, and the Coos loop upgrade will not benefit the public, but will benefit Bayroot LLC, Wagner, Eversource, and Hydro-Quebec, and the reason would be for Wagner's plan to put wind towers on their property. Eversource is challenging utilities all over the state of the assessments that are being put on them, and they're asking for abatements on utility structures. So the promise of tax benefits to communities, I believe, is false.
The towns of Pittsburg, Clarksville, Stewartstown, Columbia, Stratford and Groveton have all voted at their town meetings in the past several years to oppose the proposed Northern Pass project. It is also in the Stark 2016 town warrant, article 16, to oppose any further overhead development of alternating current or direct current high voltage transmission lines within the borders of the town of Stark.

In Stark, all such future electric transmission lines must be placed underground within power line rights of ways or within yet to be established power line corridors and installed in a manner approved by the State of New Hampshire Public Utility Commission and/or the Department of Transportation.

At this time there are no, there are no, no transmission lines in Pittsburg, Clarksville or Stewartstown. The only thing there is transbution lines. As Northern Pass shown disregard and disrespect for upper Coos County by a lack of communication with local elected
officials? No Northern Pass officials or representatives have contacted the Coos County Commissioners which serve as the Selectboard for the unincorporated places. According to RSA 162-H: 16 IV (b) requires the committee to consider the views of municipal governing bodies on the project's impact on the ordinary growth of the region and economic impacts as well.

Would the Site Evaluation Committee require Northern Pass to identify who Northern Pass feels are the stakeholders? The residents, landowners and business owners in my district that are negatively affected most by this proposed project have not been given due consideration or input. Northern Pass's refusal to meet with the above-mentioned parties and opponents to honestly and openly discuss this proposed project shows a lack of concern for the residents of upper Coos County.

I would respectfully request the Site Evaluation Committee require Northern Pass to have open, honest and sincere discussions with any elected and affected local officials and
affected opponents. If Northern Pass is to be built, let us do what is right and honest for all the residents of our state and benefit our state and not corporate greed. Enough false information has been generated by proponents of this ill-conceived proposed project.

The Site Evaluation Committee required that the Coos Wind Park have their financing in place and a decommissioning fund set up before approval. The Coos Wind Park is now 75 percent owned by Brookfield Power of Toronto, Canada. The total decommissioning fund is $875,000 for 33 high elevation wind turbines. The fund will not begin to decommission the 33 turbines.

If permitted, will Northern Pass remain owned by Northern Pass or will it eventually be sold to Hydro-Quebec as was the case with the Wind Park?

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Samson, just how much more do you have? Excellent.

MR. SAMSON: Is it the responsibility and obligation of the Site Evaluation Committee to protect not only the Applicant but also to
protect the residents and our state? We the people are the caretakers of New Hampshire and included is the Site Evaluation Committee.

My closing comment would be, I respectfully request that Mr. Quinlan meet with the Coos County Commissioners and representatives to discuss Dixville and Millsfield which you intended to go through. The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion or to allow very lively debate within that spectrum. And is that what is being done here? I ask. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Good evening, Mr. Chair and members of the committee. My name is Ted Tichy. I live in Milan, New Hampshire. I'm here tonight representing the North Country Forestry, Incorporated, and the local forest industry. We currently run two log and pulpwood concentration yards in New Hampshire. One is in North Stratford and one is in Woodsville, New Hampshire. We currently employ 6 employees in
New Hampshire and contract with many logging contractors which are suppliers in this state.

We would like to purchase the forest products that the right-of-way cutting of the Northern Pass Project will produce. The wood that is harvested will provide many jobs, not only for the loggers, truckers and wood buyers, but for the entire forest products industry as well as supporting businesses; i.e., equipment suppliers, fuel suppliers, grocery stores. The list goes on and on.

One thing above all others that would help out New Hampshire families and business would be a guaranteed rate cut. The electric rates in New Hampshire are killing our economy and our industry. This winter has been very mild. Fuel prices are the lowest they've been in years, and my wife told me the electric rates just went up again this month. There's one big reason that we have fewer sawmills in this state. Just ask the mills that we have left what their biggest operating expenses are.

The reason I say guaranteed is that
promises don't keep. We still, we were promised
Seabrook would lower are rates. They did not.
We'll still paying for that one. I am sure
Eversource has a long-term agreement with
Hydro-Quebec. Why not make a long-term contract
with the ratepayers for a lower rate for ten
years. We can make processing of wood products
an industry once again in New Hampshire if our
rates were reasonable. You folks on the
committee can make this happen, and being one of
later speakers I have a few observations that I
have the benefit of doing. You know, if the
people are really concerned with the
environmental impacts, they would not be calling
for the burial of this pipeline. The impact
would be far greater on all lands, not just the
wetlands. Having to dig a pipeline, a power
line through a wetland, instead of going over it
with lines in the air is a much, much greater
impact on everything.

My wife and I have ridden our horses on the
VELCO line over in Vermont many, many times.
The trails over there provide spectacular views
that would otherwise not be available to the
general public. They allow the Vermont Horse
Council to use these trails, and we're members
of that. So it is a very good recreational
activity and a very good tourist industry over
there using those pipelines. Thank you very
much for your time.

SPEAKER: My name is Carl Martland. I have
previously submitted detailed comments to DOE
concerning the Draft EIS, and in particular the
visual impact analysis. I just wanted to hit
the highlights of those just so other people
might hear them. One, the literature review is
one of three parts of the visual analysis. The
visual literature review and the Draft EIS is in
my opinion of limited use at best and misleading
and erroneous at worse. I documented this the
same as I would review an article for a
professional journal.

Second, the summary that is often cited by
Northern Pass is very misleading. They say that
the average visual impact increased from, I
think it's 1.61 to 1.79. An increase of 10
percent. That's like someone saying that a river was flooding, the flood level was up only 10 percent, but the area flooded had increased by one and a half or two times which is the case with the visual impact.

Third, the photo simulations and key observation point analysis is outstanding, and everybody should look at that, but the problem is that the results interpretation are dispersed throughout the document. There are 15 points, and I will get into that a little later. So my comments, main comments, today are addressed to the Site Evaluation Committee concerning the unreasonably adverse impacts of the proposed towers on the scenic byways, and I know we traveled today on the byways. You'll see more tomorrow. I hope you'll stop in Stark. Walk the byway a little bit and go up toward Christine Lake and Georgia farm lands, and you'll see many more of what my wife calls the cultural landscapes of the North Country.

So I'm here as the Chair of the North Country Scenic Byways Council. We have
submitted comments previously, and the main point of these comments is that the towers will obstruct the views for people using the byways, going off the byways on local roads to see the kinds of sites that we saw today and you will see tomorrow. Coleman State Park is a wonderful spot. You go another two miles down the road, you would have seen it. On the way down and on the way back, you would have noticed that view where we stopped, and then you would have gone under the lines and then you would have gone out on the lake and gone fishing and seen the towers over the hills. The photo simulations in the EIS differ from the ones you saw today because they also had visual experts interpret the views. They call it contrast/dominance rating. I'm not sure what is, but it goes from zero which is no towers to 45 if there's one right here. Every place the towers cross the road there's a tower within a hundred feet or so of the road. The visual impact is severe, which the experts call, not me, the experts call unreasonably adverse. Every tower that is
within 750 feet according to the EIS would have an unreasonably adverse impact. Every tower that is within 750 to 1800 feet we would have an adverse impact, and depending on the situation, it would be unreasonably adverse. We're in the North Country. You've heard about the scenic landscape. You've seen it. That is the location where it would be unreasonably adverse.

There are locations up to two miles. We saw some today where it was a mile away. The impact there might be strong or it might be moderate. We've heard in previous sessions, we saw a picture. We couldn't see those pictures because the lights prevented you, but it was like those we saw today. A mile away. That impact, according to the EIS methodology, could be moderate. What does moderate mean?

Well, it might be considered adverse by a casual observer. So moderate is probably not what you were thinking.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Martland, how much more do you have?

MR. MARTLAND: I've got a picture and one
paragraph. Basically saying the North Country Byways Council knows that these impacts would be eliminated if the lines were buried. The picture is this. Even in the back of the room you can probably see the red, these are the 15 key observation points. Red means it was severe. This color means it was moderate. Every point in the group has in that picture and I have a longer statement that I will leave with you. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: My name is Jon Wilkinson. It's actually spelled kind of funny. It's actually spelled J-O-N. I was supposed to be Jennifer 57 years ago. Didn't happen. It's all my fault. My last name is spelled W I L K I N S O N. I'm a resident of Lancaster. I'm spoken many times at these hearings over the past five years so I'm going to make mine real brief. Normally, I prepared something to say. I don't have anything prepared to say. Just want to touch on a couple of quick points. We've heard a lot about feasibility. I'd like to talk about
sensibility, and that's talking to you guys, the Site Evaluation Committee. Quickly, too, I want to welcome you here to the North Country and hope you can see what is so near and dear to all of us that live here and all of the people that come here.

As far as the sensibility, one of the things I'd really like you to look at and one of you kind of actually highlighted it is when you have the time, please look at the first section of the Northern Pass proposal, how it enters into the United States, and what it does. How it goes underground, above ground, underground, above ground, and kind of question yourself, I think, about what is the reason. I know the reason. It has to do with accessibility. But just looking at the direction of it, too, chicaning around, heading way to the east when it had already entered into Route 3 which it is what, a north/south corridor. It should really, really be accessed. That said, the other thing I'd like to do is, I believe it was one of you on the committee, had asked the question about
comparing the project over Vermont to this one.
All I want to tell you is I urge you to try to
get more information beyond the source of
Northern Pass because like any salesman, they
want to sell you their car even though other
dealerships have cars for sale that are maybe
just as good and maybe even better. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Good evening, folks. My name is
Landon Placey. My wife and I own an antique
shop in the area, and we deal with tourists, and
we haven't heard anything from any of them
saying that they're opposed to power towers or
windmills or solar panels that we already have
in the area, and in fact, some of them use
windmills as a place to go in the summertime on
their tours, but the number one complaint that I
get from the tourists is that we should have
some cell towers up there because in the area
I'm in and that's Stewartstown that we don't
have any cell service. Now, I think everybody
wants cell service, and if we didn't have any
power or didn't have any affordable power,
everybody would want power towers, but seeing as
we have power now they think well, don't make any difference how much it costs, but some folks it does. We need affordable power and we need the jobs. Because I've seen a change in how many tourists that come into the area now so the jobs would certainly help that. I hope you folks on the Site Evaluation Committee will vote in favor of this plan, and the only time I hear the opposition to the plan is at these meetings. It's the same people over and over again. On the outside, the everyday people in the area, aren't opposed to this plan. Well, that's my say and thank you very much for hearing me out.

(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: Every speaker up here deserves your respect. Every single speaker, whether you agree or disagree. Thank you.

SPEAKER: My is Allen Bouthillier. I was born and brought up here in Colebrook. I'm the owner of AB Excavating in Lancaster, New Hampshire. I employ approximately 30 employees. We do excavating and logging, and we provide other types of construction services. We've
also been involved in developing the wind energy projects in this region. I'd like to say that I was initially opposed to this project. Like many other examples of misinformation that swirl around this project, I was told that this project would hurt the local logging industry. However, I took the time to research this project and the benefits involved, and I changed my mind. I am now in full support of the project. This is exactly what the county needs, major investment that will support local jobs and the economy and bring critical support for our tax base.

A critical piece of the past project is its proposed upgrade to portions of the Coos loop. Rebuilding the Coos loop will bring long-term help to landowners and logging alike. With the closing of the paper mills, biomass becomes more important to setting the price of wood for loggers and landowners alike. The proposed upgrade for the Coos loop will mean that existing renewable energy plants will be able to run more often and produce more wood industry
based jobs and produce more local energy.

    By increasing the amount of electricity
that can be exported out of the county to the
New England grid, the current biomass plants can
run at full capacity, increasing demand for
chips.

    Finally, I think it is important for this
committee to understand how critical the route
agreements are that Northern Pass has developed
with large timberland owners. These large
industrial timberlands are the backbone of our
economy and revenues from projects like Northern
Pass help to ensure they were remain viable and
in private ownership.

    Keeping these properties viable for private
ownership ensures they stay open to access by
ATVs, snowmobiling and other recreational uses.
In Coos, much of the industrial timber land that
we have had historical free access to recreate
on has been bought by federal and state agencies
and environmental groups. Once land comes under
the control of some of these groups, access is
usually limited. It is hard to hunt a
40,000-acre piece of land which no longer has
access to wheeled vehicles or camp on over
night. There is a push right now in Coos County
to expand the Conti Refuge which if that happens
you'll see restrictions put on that property and
those acres will no longer be available for
historical use and access.

Northern Pass will not harm our economy.
In fact, this project will be a huge benefit to
our economy in many ways. Local construction
jobs, massive new tax revenues for towns and the
county, and critical support for our existing
economy include forestry, recreation and
tourism. It is important that this committee
look beyond the vocal minority and do what is
best for the majority of people in Coos County
and the State of New Hampshire. Please support
the project. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Hello, my name is Randy Perkins.
I'm an employee of Eversource Energy and I've
been with the company for 30 years. My current
job is an account executive in which I provide
services to the largest companies and businesses
within the service territory covering all of northern New Hampshire. Serving these large companies, I consult on energy efficiency projects to cost-effectively lower their electric bills, respond to power quality issues, assist in construction, and offer advice on energy and many other topics.

The number one concern from my customers are the high energy costs and the need to stabilize energy prices and avoiding the volatile energy prices we've been seeing in recent years. In New Hampshire, electric rates for the industrial and commercial sector are nearly double the national average. Commercial business electric rates in New Hampshire are 40 percent than the national average. These are critical issues for the future well-being of our state's businesses and industry.

Electricity is a large part of the budget for business and industry including those in our New Hampshire tourist industry. For instance, ski areas use the bulk of their energy in the winter months making snow, although this year
hasn't been quite so good, but they still make a lot of snow and they use a lot of electricity. Most of my ski areas see their electric bills soar from about December to February to 100 and $250,000 per month. It is important to remember that Northern Pass will reduce yearly energy costs by approximately 80 million dollars which is roughly 5 percent off their electric bills. That may not seem like much to some of you, but keep in mind that 5 percent could represent between 5000 and $12,500 each month for the ski industry which is very important to the New Hampshire economy.

It's for these reasons that I support the Northern Pass Project. I believe it can help reduce energy prices for the state's businesses and industry that I serve every day. It's important to keeping New Hampshire businesses in New Hampshire so they don't relocate elsewhere and at the same time introducing more green power into our state and region. Thank you.

MR. HONIGBERG: I'm told that the next one has left. All right. Ms. Menard, do you want
to speak right away? I can see you came from Deerfield so you may want to speak before the break. We'll take the break after Ms. Menard.

SPEAKER: Jeanne Menard. Thank you for your consideration. I actually will not want to miss a single word of any of the comments here tonight. These are very special proceeding taking place here. So members of the SEC, DOE, and counsel for the public, Deerfield is in a very unique situation regarding the Northern Pass project. We're the substation at its terminus. Since the project's announcement in 2010, we have been concerned not only about the increased incoming electricity but also the distribution of it. Residents and Deerfield have wanted details regarding the right-of-way, not just as it pertains to the Northern Pass project, but the reconfiguration of our substation, the poles and the lines, as to how this would affect future projects that may impact our community. What is the buildout plan for this right-of-way and for the many right-of-ways in our town. We cannot consider
Northern Pass Transmission Project as an isolated project. What is the ten-year plan, what is Eversource's ten-year plan, 20-year plan, 30-year plan. As a company, Eversource must have such a plan, and we are asking that there be a conversation about that, and this needs to be revealed to our Selectboard, our planning board and the residents of our town so that when we're evaluating the Northern Pass project, we can also evaluate the capacity for what may come in our future.

Northern Pass has only answered questions about their proposed route. We have had no information from the Applicant regarding any of the alternative routes, several of which site a converter station in Deerfield. Back in 2013, Eversource bought a 38-acre parcel of land near 35 North Road in Deerfield. Why did they buy it? For the last three years, at every opportunity, I have asked for possible reasons for this purchase. As I've already mentioned, several alternatives for the Northern Pass project listed in the DOE, Draft EIS, happened
to identify this same site as possible for converter station. The fact that neither Northern Pass nor Eversource will answer this question about the purchase is alarming in itself, but the possibility of a converter station in Deerfield, within a half a mile of our town center, is also alarming. The last attempt for me to get an answer to this question was a month ago, and I did receive an email back saying they're working on it. Will the answer or reason impact the orderly development of Deerfield.

Who paid for this parcel? Ratepayers? There has been line reconductoring referred to as upgrades in Deerfield since this project's announcement. Who is paying for this? Northern Pass or New Hampshire ratepayers? Should these Eversource distribution costs be factored into the cost of the project, especially in the cost/benefit analysis. For several years Northern Pass has proclaimed the project stops in Deerfield. Why then did Northern Pass do wetlands study on an outgoing...
line to Scobie Pond in Londonderry.

Ask any resident within a mile of the existing substation what life in their neighborhood has been like the last few years. Construction noise, lights, steady traffic. The relationship between the Hydro-Quebec's project and Eversource's upgrades is extremely murky. I'm asking the SEC for some oversight to look back and ensure that this Northern Pass project isn't pushing ahead of the local process.

MR. HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard, how much more do you have?

MS. MENARD: Two short paragraphs.

MR. HONIGBERG: Okay.

MS. MENARD: Since Eversource is a coapplicant to this project, it is my hope that the SEC process will solicit and require honest answers to questions that reflect our concerns about the long-term plans of Eversource for Deerfield. In Whitefield, Mr. Quinlan referred to Deerfield as robust. I am sure that not everyone would agree with Deerfield being characterized in this way, excepting maybe
during the Deerfield Fair.

So for southern New Hampshire, we are quiet, rural and extremely community oriented. The threat of loss of our landscape weighs very heavy on us and every town along the right of way. Undisturbed soil, undisturbed view. Undisturbed soil, undisturbed view. Thank you very much.

MR. HONIGBERG: With that, we're going to take a break and return as close to 5 minutes after nine as we can.

(Recess taken)

SPEAKER: Martin Kaufman. I don't know about you, but I'm exhausted. K A U F M A N. First name Martin. You folks on the tour didn't make it up to where I was waiting for you on Heath Road, Bear Rock Road, Paul Hill. So I hope you get up there because what I'm about to read is really related to that area and a group of us, 43 of us, have signed a petition and submitted it to you, the Site Evaluation Committee, asking to intervene. This is not the intervention argument, but we call ourselves the
Dixville Notch/Harvey Swell location, and we identify ourselves as a neighborhood. All of our 43 signatories will be able to, are able to see the Balsams Resort at Dixville Notch to their south and would be able to see the proposed Northern Pass Project of towers along the hills to the north. At least 10 of the 43 are abutters, some within the width of Heath Road and some, myself included, have easements traversing the 120-foot wide, what I prefer to as a dead zone on the proposed HVDC line. We submitted our application to be intervenors, and within literally hours after we requested the committee to accept our petition to intervene, lawyers from Northern Pass petitioned the SEC to reject or diminish our request based on various arguments.

Some of us spoke with Governor Maggie Hassan in Errol a while back where we asked the following question. Since money is power, and the combined wealth of Hydro-Quebec owned by the provincial government of the Quebec and Eversource is probably greater than the wealth
of the State of New Hampshire, can our elected
officials really say no to this project, even if
they wanted to. Governor Hassan answered that
she had a great deal of confidence in this Site
Evaluation Committee and would pay attention to
their recommendation. Now, I like Maggie Hassan
because she always makes me feel like she cares,
but she is a politician. So I balance what I
feel against what I think, and what I think is
that Northern Pass lawyers are sharks in an
ocean in which we're swimming and we really are
looking to the Site Evaluation Committee for
protection. By now, everybody knows or should
know that the North Country is working towards
becoming a vacation/hospitality industry area,
and we welcome efforts like the Balsams Resort
renewal project and recoil with anger and
disgust at environmentally unfriendly projects
like Northern Pass.

Northern Pass claims that burying the line
is too expensive. $5 million a mile, they say,
and going online, I found that that figure is
repeatedly mentioned. While online, I also did
the following.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Kaufman, how much more do you have?

MR. KAUFMANN: Oh, not much. We'll survive. So I went online and what I looked at was the real estate value around Sunday River and a comparable distance and view of Sunday River as we see the Balsams if that project succeeds that which we all hope it will, and what the land is going for up there is 40 or $50,000 an acre. Sounds like a lot but for a house it comes down to about 10, $20,000. The land that you folks didn't see today on the hill, Paul Hill, Holden Hill, looks out at the ski area of the Balsams. That land is very comparable to what I saw online around Sunday River. Now, they're going to put towers on that hill. The towers traverse that hill and it's going to parallel Heath Road, the road you folks didn't get to today. If you just take a small percentage of that hill and turn it into real estate property instead of having towers, it comes out like, I did the math, it's simple.
You can do it, you know? Eight or $10 million for just --

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Kaufman, please bring your remarks to a close.

MR. KAUFMAN: So it's more than the cost, the value then increases more than the cost of burying the line. So they may have this notion that they can't afford it, but they don't look at it in a small direct way like this.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Kaufman, if you want to, you have more you want to say, I'll call you up again after Mr. Abbott is done.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm going to give this to this wonderful woman would does this magical thing.

MR. HONIGBERG: All right. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Donald Bilodeau. I'm an abutter in Clarksville. There are 25 towers going through Clarksville for a total of 2.4 miles. Next to Wiswell Road there are two lattice towers on the south side next to each other, transition towers, and they have one tower, lattice tower again, on the north side of
Wiswell Road. It appears to me as though these towers are going to be in a wetland. The remaining 22 monopoles may also cross some of the other wetlands that I have hunted and seen while hunting in that area. I don't know exactly the proposed route is actually where it is, but I don't know. The SEC today did not even stop at Route 45. At least 8 towers plus will be seen from this scenic byway from the cemetery just south of Wiswell Road where the rest area is located as well by the cemetery on the west side of this road. It would seem to me the additional cost to bury these 2.4 miles for 25 towers in wetlands and ruining the beautiful views would be worth it. Bury the entire, still better, bury the entire line in this beautiful state and connect all the dots. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: Just so people know, there were two buses out today. As we drove along parts of the route, one of the buses got stuck so that's why some of the things that were planned ended up not happening.
SPEAKER: Pam Frizzell. I'm from Pittsburg and Colebrook. So this whole power line project is kind of like I don't like cake. I don't care if you like frosting on it, I don't care if it's chocolate, I don't care if it's white, I don't like cake. I don't like the power line. Bury it, don't bury it, lie to us, don't lie to us, we don't want it. We don't want cake. We don't want your power line.

We hear about the current high cost of electricity. Who sets those rates? Who is responsible for our current high cost of electricity. It's these folks. The Balsams, we've heard people refer to how wonderful that is. We'll see how that pans out at the end the night after their testimony. I agree with the woman from Sugar Hill. She spoke very well. Years ago we heard almost the same arguments for the gas pipeline and what has that economically put impact been. It hasn't been positive.

Another woman questioned earlier what the taxes will be. We know what they'll be. They'll try and negotiate the hell out of them,
it will be down. Talk about reduced emissions in New England. What about the environmental impact in Canada. Does anybody even care? The jobs, New Hampshire First? Have you checked out the unemployment rate? It's pretty low. Where are you going to get the workers. Would any of you buy a property that abutted this proposed power line. We hear you talking about I-93 you can't go to the lanes or on to the side because of the environmental impact. What about the environmental impact up here? Is that different? Is 93 more special? And I think it's interesting earlier that Harry Brown referred to bullying and in appropriate actions at previous meeting. Apparently, he doesn't apply the same standings to his postings on line that he does to the people that attend these meetings.

I'm asking you to oppose the Northern Pass. Period. We don't want it buried, we don't want it overhead. We want it to go away. We want these people to go away. We want never to have this conversation again. Thank you.
SPEAKER: Julie Moran. Thank you. I want to thank Senator Shaheen for calling you up here. Shame on you for not coming up here in the first place. This is the first place that the SEC should have had hearings because we are the most affected. I'll read my testimony. So time to be real. Since well before the initial announcement of Northern Pass and throughout its permitting process the New Hampshire officials, regulators, governors, legislators have allowed the rape of our citizens and our land by the Northern Pass. It's time to take the process and the people seriously and stop the proposed rape of our pristine state and its people by a foreign country and its private business. There's absolutely enough evidence for the governor, the legislature, and with DOE and SEC, to stop this assault that will continue to assault us every second of every minute of every hour and every day of every year for the rest of our lives. We will have to live with this.

It's shameful enough that a foreign country
has mated with our own energy company to assault us, but for the past five years our governing bodies have failed us causing great exacerbation of our poverty, loss of our business, property values, house sales, and time and energy that you call us to come to these meetings year after year after year to fight this again. I don't even like the color orange. Please hear us. Please hear us.

The last governors have both failed to protect us from this impending assault. Our senators and legislators have tried, but they haven't stopped the assault. We've asked for burial. We've asked for you to go away. All we get is more meetings to say the same exact thing or we're balanced. But it's not true. It's not balanced.

The SEC and DOE are basically the only ones left that can save us from this assault. The process has included far too many back door sessions, incomplete applications, the site tour that was hastily put together on a snowy day when visibility was low on a road that is not
even open in the winter. I'm sorry you got stuck, but we could have told you you would be stuck if you asked us.

This whole process has put our lives on hold, waiting for the rape to occur. That's the reality. And I'm sorry I have to use that word. I didn't write that, but I apologize now. We can't continue to live like this, and please don't continue to put us through it. Our complaints have been laughed at and scorned. Would you laugh at the rape of your sons and daughters? Of course not. If that's the case, then the SEC and DOE must stop the towers here and now. Whoever has the power to stop this, and doesn't stop it, is going to have blood on their hands every second every minute of every day. Ours. It's got to be stopped. Therefore, I hope you will make the right decision and deny Northern Pass its plan to dissect New Hampshire with its towers so that you'll have clean hands and a healthy heart for the rest of your lives. Please, tell Northern Pass to bury the line completely. Thank you.
SPEAKER: Let me introduce myself. I'm Harley Mason. I'm from the town of Milan, and I own and operate Mason Enterprises which is an excavating and trucking company. We build roads, subdivisions, complete site work for homes and businesses. We also process and sell gravel. We support the Northern Pass as this is a project much needed in Coos County creating around 300 jobs and bringing in millions of dollars for the workers, all the small businesses and giving the economy a big boost.

We were involved with the Portland natural gas pipeline which came through Coos County in 2000, 2001, as we supplied gravel, sand and trucks. This project put many people to work and brought thousands of dollars to the small towns of Coos County which was great.

Next came the windmills on Dixville Peaks, Kelsey, Owls Head, Blue Mountain. A total of 33 towers were installed. Our construction crew doubled in size and we worked 12 to 14 hours a day. Seven days a week we trucked gravel, stone
and burial sand up into the mountain. We produced and delivered a total of 54,000 yards of material to the top of those mountains. This project had a couple hundred people working, again, bringing millions of dollars into the area for local businesses. This was a great project for Coos County, great project for the workers and our economy.

The Northern Pass is a much larger project which will take 2 to 3 years to complete with around 300 workers. We are very lucky to have this great project and should be overwhelmed to have the work and large amounts of money that will be put into our community. We are ready to challenge this project. We the workers and the contractors of Coos County have the knowledge and ability to start and complete the Northern Pass. We have the ability and knowledge to do it in a professional and safe manner. We will do this project and do it successfully as a team. I encourage the SEC to approve this project. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is David
Van Houten. I have lived in Bethlehem since 1972. We have a small farm consisting of a house and outbuilding situated in a field with adjacent wood lot. The view is a field, trees and sky in all directions. The place has a bucolic character. This pleasant setting defines the quality of our daily lives and also contributes a great deal to the real estate value of the property. It also represents no small investment on our part.

The Applicant proposes to erect tall poles bearing power lines approximately 1500 feet to the west of our house. There is a distinct possibility that the structures will arise above the tree line and be visible from the homestead. The result would be a transformation of a rural landscape into one that gives a more industrial impression. We have no doubt that it would lower the market value of our property. The Applicant has not contacted us to inform us of this change to our place, either to seek our opinion, work with us to mitigate the impacts in their plans, or offer compensation for lost
value. They propose this development in order to make money, and if it goes through it will cost us tens of thousands of dollars, and they can't even be bothered to call us to talk it over. I hope you don't wonder why we are angry.

The Applicant proposes to site the project on an easement conveyed to PSNH in 1947 and 1953 which cut through our property identified as Lot 40 on Bethlehem tax map 404. There is no mention of Northern Pass, Hydro-Quebec or the right of PSNH to assign their easement privileges to a third party. We conclude that the Northern Pass proposal falls outside the terms of the original deeds and suggest that the Applicant withdraw any route across our land from consideration.

I see from the long list of petitions to intervene that this is a common concern for New Hampshire landowners. I am compelled to point out that the Site Evaluation Committee should not have judged this application to be complete until there was further clarity concerning the Applicant's legal right to the land. Rule
301.03(c)(6). A dispute between a landowner and the Applicant is a legal matter and would have to be resolved by the courts. I request that this proceeding be suspended until this issue has been decided.

In following the site evaluation record of decision on appeals of a similar nature, I notice that such appeals have been pretty much brushed aside, and I suppose this one will be treated in a similar manner. Surprise me. Is there anybody who isn't opposed to Northern Pass?

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Robert Martin. M A R T I N. I'm an elected official. In addition to that, I'm the emergency coordinator for Coos County. I spoke at the meeting at the DOE EIS meeting last time and I submitted a paper which was in their database. I suggest very strongly that you take a look at that because I raised some points relative to what I consider to be potential serious issues and emissions from the towers that would affect radio communications here. On that point I'm
not in agreement with the gentleman from the Northern Pass. Nor was the FCC when they fined the power transmission line in California for repeated interference with communications. Similar events took place in Texas. So it's a potential serious issue. A lot of the people here have spoken on some of the points that I wanted to raise so let me make very brief comments about a few point here.

I feel Mr. Quinlan is a bit disingenuous when says he has spoken to folks up here. I know he hasn't spoken to my town, Pittsburg, and Stewartstown and he hasn't spoken to any of the towns down below, and that's unfortunate because we have a few points to make for sure.

With regard to the comments about the real estate, you can't look at the real estate and do a comparative on it. It's like doing a comparative on an island in the middle of the ocean. There's nothing to compare it with. We don't have sales up here. How can you do comparisons on it. I know of at least ten pieces of property that have been on the market
for years because of Northern Pass. Signs are up and nobody will buy them. They could probably dump it and lose a lot of money, but to do a comparative on property that doesn't even enter into the lists that the gentleman is using as a comparative is ridiculous.

We have a serious problem with evaluation of the property to the point that you cannot sell property anywhere around this area here. People just won't buy it. So you can't say that there's no impact when you don't have a sale because people can't sell them, and that I think is an important point.

I'm a little bit concerned about Northern Pass with another issue. That is a bidirectional line. Power doesn't only go down from Canada. It can go back to Canada. Somebody commented about a thousand towers in Canada. The actual number from the Canadian reports was 3101 towers. 526 or 36 structures were damaged in that ice storm. Canada was in very serious problems. They were not exporting, and to think that they don't have any serious
needs of power down from Canada we could have serious impact in terms of getting it, and we may in fact be sending power back up to Canada and that would be unfortunate.

The other comment is about the cheap electricity. During that storm and in other periods of time when there have been shortages in the wintertime Canada has been charging us 50, 60, 70 cents a kilowatt hour. No cheapness there. That's 3 or 4 times what we're paying, five times what we're paying here. That's not a good thing. So some of those arguments are a little bit flaky as far as I'm concerned.

The other issue I'm very concerned about is this whole thing about taxes. How much money we're going to be getting from taxes. And we've got to be careful. Power companies and the gas companies with the power lines and everything else come in with the all these things about tax savings. First thing their accounting department is going to do is to apply accelerated depreciation on those assets, and they're going to drop the value significantly.
This is a 40-year project. Five or ten years 
out in the project, we're going to have that 
stuff devalued to a point where it's not going 
to have any significant tax advantage at all, 
and I want to be very careful about that. I 
don't like the canons about how much money we're 
going to be saving on our taxes and all that. I 
think that's not reasonable to expect.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Martin, how much more 
do you have?

MR. MARTIN: Well, I think if you could 
probably close it up if you give me a chance. I 
know it's getting late. I'm sorry. Thank you 
for listening to me and I appreciate your 
efforts. That's it.

SPEAKER: Bill Schomburg. I imagine the 
SEC is here tonight so that the record might 
show that this permitting agency has at least 
listened to the people of New Hampshire 
regarding the Northern Pass project. Has the 
Site Evaluation Committee read the master plans 
of the 31 towns presently under attack by 
Northern Pass? Has the site Evaluation
Committee found anything in our master plans
that justify the Northern Pass or do our master
plans created by New Hampshire citizens
contradict the economic master plans of
Hydro-Quebec and Eversource. New Hampshire RSA
674:1 states that the master plan will, quote,
guide the development of the municipality and
that it shall contain a set of statements which
articulate the desires of the citizens affected
by the master plan, not only for their locality
but for the region and the whole state. It
shall contain a set of guiding principles and
priorities. That's the end of the quote.

The master plan is the resource document
helping to determine whether proposals of change
are consistent with the views of the
townspeople. It serves as a guide for the
community to use in shaping its future. If the
Site Evaluation Committee is really trying to
capture the beliefs of our citizens, read these
master plans and then act on them for the people
who created them, not for Northern Pass.

That was my prepared couple of paragraphs.
During this procedure, I became aware once again of what Ray Burton said two months after this scheme was hatched, and I trust Ray Burton. He said Northern Pass should fold its tents and get out of town, and I think he said it correctly. And I also know that Governor at that time John Lynch who was a part of this scheme, he did say, quote, if the people of New Hampshire don't want this, it will not happen. Thank you.

SPEAKER: I'd like to thank you, both committees, for coming tonight and I'd like to read a statement I have.

MR. HONIGBERG: Before you do, can you pronounce your last name and spell it for the record, please?

MR. HONIGBERG: Yes. My name is Bruce Brekke. My wife and I are property owners in Whitefield. Our concern is the effects that the proposed overhead towers will have on property values and the tourist industry in the State of New Hampshire, the North Country, the town of Whitefield and specifically our property value in way of life. Recently, and new to us, the
word viewshed has appeared in print and in much
of the documentation referencing the Northern
Pass. Interestingly, Wikipedia comments
regarding the viewshed as, quote, in urban
planning, for example, viewsheds tend to be
areas of particular scenic or historic value
that are deemed worthy of preservation against
development or other change, end quote.

My wife and I spend most of the days of the
year at home and many hours of those days
enjoying our backyard. Northeast facing view
both inside and outside. We can see it when
it's storming in Lancaster at Mt. Prospect or
when it's sunny in Jefferson near Mt. Waumbek.
Our viewshed has become our lifestyle. We
praise it and we thank God for it every day.
Our land abuts the existing right-of-way in
Whitefield where three of the 40-foot wooden
structures are visible only during winter months
when the trees are bare. The view from the rear
of our house is stunning. We have clear sight
of the Mountainview Grand Hotel even though it's
over four miles away. The panorama includes Mt.
Waumbek, Mt. Cabot, Mt. Prospect, Mt. Pleasant and Dalton Mountain, with the Pliny range and Kilkenny range and the Percy Peaks beyond, to the north. Now, and for the last four years our lifestyle has been threatened. Four of these steel towers as high as a hundred feet are planned to be placed along the 3000 foot of our property that abuts the existing right-of-way visible from our rear house windows and back yard. Another 19 towers would be very visible looking northeast into Whitefield. The proposed Northern Pass towers would dominate the view and if built as proposed according to the information provided by the DOE Northern Pass Section 106 documents, we would see 25 of them, and we would see the value of our property permanently diminished never to recover until the trees go to the heights that we will never see.

Our ability to sell our property has been diminished by the current Northern Pass proposal. Approval of this proposal will certainly decrease our property value. Although
we realize that there's a need for additional electric energy in Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut, installing the lines underground is a viable and sensible compromise which will address the interest of all parties and leave New Hampshire's views intact. After the initial impact of construction and underground lines, the scenery will revert back to its former beauty over time as nature takes hold and heals the scars. Unfortunately, even nature can't do anything about ugly overhead towers.

When I look past my property at the mountains in the sky, I do not think of the value of my house and land. I take in the natural beauty what is there. That is why many people have stayed here in New Hampshire, settled here, and more importantly, visit here. We cannot ruin what we have. This magnificent country for any reason, especially a reason that is not necessary. The Northern Pass representatives say that they are listening to the people, but they are not. We want the
entire project underground, not just part of it.

Now, listening to the comments tonight, for the most part, it looks like Northern Pass, yes or no, is not the question. The issue is towers, and the issue is an issue because of Northern Pass's stubborn refusal to spend the money to completely bury the lines. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Good evening. Thank you for allowing me to speak tonight. My name is Les Otten. I own a renewable energy company and I've been doing business in New Hampshire since 2008, wood pellet industry. I've long supported replacing fossil fuels with renewable energy. In fact, that's what my company has been doing and we're a leader in the state. We deliver efficient wood pellet boilers and heating systems so residents and businesses can stop burning oil and propane. I'm also for jobs and growing the North Country economy. I spent the last two and a half years creating a plan for the Balsams Resort that you've heard about tonight that could lift the entire region, if successful. The fulfillment of that plan is my
first responsibility.

I also believe that climate change is real. It's our responsibility to mitigate the most potentially damaging activity that man has inflicted on our planet, but this is again also about jobs and the economy. In Dixville, in particular, was where manufacturing, power and tourism thrived for decades. Power has been a central component of the North Country's history. People resist change and they fear the unknown. Many times in my life, I have resisted change and feared it as well so I understand.

We have currently a Hydro-Quebec line that is taller than the proposed Northern Pass line which was built in 1986. That line runs directly through major tourism areas without negative impacts. And 33 wind towers were built on the mountain ridges above Dixville, and depending on your perspective and where you are at night, you can see blinking red lights on over 100 spaces on the hilltops over the State of New Hampshire. To some of us, those represent progress. They represent clean
energy, and we like to see them. So often
vision is in the eye of the beholder.

From a lifetime of developing resorts in
New Hampshire, California and Maine, I've never
seen tourism negatively affected by low cost
renewable energy and the systems derived and
built to create them. Views are important. The
North Country is also facing serious social and
economic issues. The highest unemployment
rating is in the North Country of New Hampshire.
It's caused our young workers to leave. Our
high school graduates can't find professions.
We've invested significant dollars in our
community only to watch these great assets leave
because there are no jobs. We have a drug
addiction epidemic in all of the northeast and
especially in the rural communities in New
Hampshire that many of us don't recognize, but
it's there.

Northern Pass while not loved, clearly, has
created a Forward New Hampshire fund that has
invested $2 million in the project at the
Balsams without strings. We're discussing a
potential increased investment with them as the Pass progresses. This will help us fulfill our commitment of restoring the Balsams Resort and revitalizing the North Country's economy. When we reopen with Phase 1, and at its completion, we will employ 1700 people. 600 people will be used over the next ten years in construction.

We will also save significantly in our annual energy cost. Those costs are something that a businessman really needs to pay attention to. The price that we're currently paying for power is the highest in the nature and in the continental United States. The possibility of keeping those costs in line and of stopping pollution of our land, our water, our air with hydrocarbons that are being put there from fossil fuels is an important part of our future and may well be the key to preserving our lakes, trees, our ground that we grow our food with.

Northern Pass is helping the North Country in a very significant way. Approving the project will bring more investment to our region. The fund for the future is real. It's
$200 million that's going to be spent in the North Country. That is a significant investment and commitment.

In closing, let me say that let there be no doubt that I favor the rebirth of the North Country, and I favor Northern Pass and the opportunities it will create. I hope these opportunities will endure for the next century. I thank you for your time.

MR. HONIGBERG: Every speaker up here this evening deserves your respect, and you will not make any more disparaging comments about any speaker here this evening. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Jeff Stevens, and I am a construction manager working on the Balsams renovation. I live in Dixville and have built large resort projects all over the world. Infrastructure is a necessary component of all development projects, and the Balsams project is no exception. In fact, there are many good aspects to the Balsams project and the Northern Pass including the fact that they will use clean renewable hydroelectric power and
will help Coos County to grow rather than shrink.

Exactly 30 years ago I helped to build the Pontook Hydroelectric Project in Dummer, and that has been a boon to Coos County and New Hampshire in terms of its economic, environmental and recreational opportunities with minimized visual impact from the infrastructure and transmission lines. I look forward to doing the same with the Balsams redevelopment. Thank you.

MR. HONIGBERG: Andy Pearson. I have been connected to the Balsams property for the majority of my life and have worked at the resort for upwards of 27 years. During this time, I've worked for different owners and several management companies, each of whom brought varying degrees of change, both to the resort's operation as well as the staff and guests. The biggest change and the one with the most impact still to this day was the decision in the fall of 2011 by our then owner, Tillotson Corporation, to close the resort.
Now I'd like to speak briefly about opportunities. Specifically, the opportunities that I've witnessed as countless students all from surrounding communities have experienced working at the resort during their high school and often college years. For decades our local youth have had the privilege of having a wide range of employment options allowing them to acquire skill sets, work alongside others from different parts of the world and recreate at the resort throughout the seasons. This unique opportunity was in their backyard, and for many had the enormous positive impact on their lives. On more than one occasion I received a copy of college papers written bring past employees of the resort on their experience and the importance of that experience during that time in their life.

We are now coming to the end of our fifth winter season at the Balsams and the Balsams remains closed. To my point, that represents five graduating classes or half a decade of kids who did not get to experience those types of
opportunities. This is a real concern of mine. I have a 13-year-old who wonders what her future will look like over the next 8 or 9 years. We're very close to realizing the tremendous opportunities that the rebirth of the resort will bring area wide, the opportunity to share in Forward New Hampshire fund to allow especially our local kids the chance to participate in and experience the many attributes and skills that will come with such employment options is a future that I've looked forward to.

There is a quote that used to hang in most offices at the resort, it came about from talking to employees about their feelings working at the Balsams, not management. It read, the Balsams is your highest priority. By serving its interests first and for the long-term, you and its guests, staff and community will all benefit the most.

SPEAKER: Monique Petrofsky. Thank for the opportunity to speak. I actually have a statement that my son wrote, and he represents
the future of the area. He currently lives in Washington, D.C., has bought land here and has dreams and hopes of returning here, and I have to say that my daughters worked at the Balsams, but my son was not able to get a job there because they were hiring foreign workers. So I just don't know how I feel about that. I think everybody deserves a job, but I don't think it's always the local kids anymore.

So this is an open letter that he wrote for Governor Hassan. Governor Hassan, we should not have to put our faith in the courts to uphold the public's will, not to mention our property rights. It is clear that the public stands against this project. The vast majority of those communities most affected by the project have taken a stand against it, but I fear our political system continues to fail us. Bills that would have offered common sense solutions have been tabled. The project continues to inch forward. It's time for you to take a stand against Northern Pass. Forcefully speak out against any version of it that does not bury it
entirely under public roadways, and with landowners permission, which you will get if it is buried. You can help shepherd a bill through the House that will protect our property rights and our landscape. This will go a long way towards reaffirming the belief that New Hampshire is still a place where government works for the people, a place worth fighting for. I, for one, have dreams of bringing my business back to the area. As my mother, who I am, I'm his mother, his grandparents, and he forgot to mention his great grandparents, were born in this area. If I do this, it will be for one reason: that the North Country is one of the most beautiful places on earth, and if Northern Pass goes through above ground, I fear I will never come back.

So this is a young man who I'm very proud of, who went away, got an education and wants to return to the area. And he would bring, he would offer a lot, and, respectfully, going away from my son's statement, I would like to add to my son's statement that I myself have been away
for 30 years. I was active duty, just retired. I worked all over the world in different areas. I worked in hardship areas, I've worked in very challenging areas, unsafe areas, to protect our nature's health. I spent most of the last 20 years working in West Africa, East Africa, throughout southeast Asia, and this is where I'm retired to. This is my home. This is where I wanted to come back to, but I have to say that if it goes above ground, I really don't believe that Northern Pass can afford to bury it. If it goes above ground, I really would start thinking where else have I lived in the country that I would like to retire to and not have to look at really awful power lines, and I think the power of the North Country is its beauty. It sounds simplistic, but it's its beauty. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Hello. My name is June Coulombe, and I live in Clarksville, New Hampshire, and I understand that they really want this power line to go through. A lot of the loggers are desperate for work, but guess what, guys. Don't
put your hopes up on logging. You remember when
the mill closed down in Berlin, New Hampshire,
and a bunch of guys lost their jobs? Well, the
government is thinking of putting a moratorium
on all wood cutting because of the environmental
impacts of clearcutting and all the flooding
down, you know, lower parts of the states
because of the environment being changed. Not
because just global warming but El Nino and all
kinds of other calamities. So there's a good
possibility that they're going to stop everybody
from cutting wood so don't get your hopes up on
that. Find some other line of work. Maybe you
can get hired replanting trees. So that is a
possibility for jobs.

And I'm sick and tired of seeing old growth
trees get cut down. 2 or 300-year-old beautiful
maples that they cut recently in the town of
Stewartstown and other places for clearing for
the power line. I asked last year at the
Whitefield meeting at the resort that they don't
cut any more trees out of old growth and beauty
for scenic purposes, and it's like, go ahead and
cut all the trees because they did just the total of opposite of what I asked, and that's Eversource that cannot be trusted. It will tell you one thing and do the other. So if you're going to deal with these people, get it all on paper and have lawyers because I have proven time and time again they cannot be trusted. That's why I want to put an application in to be on the site committee and as an intervenor, I would like to intervene. I know it's late, too late maybe, but they should give an extension of time because they did for everything else. So why not give people in towns that don't have an intervenor a chance to intervene, and my husband recently passed away so I'm a little up tight right now and I can't speak well, and I think that this project, you know, made him weak. He was worried about, you know, his property and stuff, and it just killed him. He just couldn't take anymore. Five years of this. Come on.

I think maybe Donald Trump said the wrong border that he should be closing off if he becomes president. Maybe he should close the
border of New Hampshire and Canada on this line of the line. If they have no respect for us in New Hampshire, and they can't talk to us in a decent manner, they won't, you know, allow us to speak to them at meetings. They cut us short. They don't listen to our ideas, our feelings, how can we work with them. How can they be trusted.

I mean, I used to like Canada. My grandparents came from Canada. They were good farm families, but the government doesn't listen to its people either. Look what they did to the natives that lost all their native lands, just to put in these dams that they dammed up all the rivers and, you know, the people had no place to go. So they became very displaced. That's what causes friction.

Geez, folks, you think I'm going to stay in New Hampshire if those power lines go up? No, sir. I'm going where the grass is green and the trees are tall. And one more thing. I have to say that you should try to work with the people. If you can't do that, pack up and go home.
because the border is going to be closed and I'll make sure of it. I'm make sure that the right people get into politics and I'm not taking about Donald Trump either. There's other people that are environmentalists and they will become president. I'm assured of that. I'm not saying names at this time, but I'll make sure that they get into office, and I'll make sure that they put Canada on its side of the line because there's ways and means of doing these things if you will not cooperate with us. We're sick and tired of it.

So I mean, either I'm going to be an intervenor or I'm going to become your worse nightmare, and, believe me, I can do it. So have a good day.

SPEAKER: David Chappell. I want to thank you for coming. I would not be able to, if I were you, I would not be able to live with myself if I made a decision without seeing the whole route so I would take the time tomorrow to do that. How about Boy Scouts are in here that have learned leave no trace. Not many. I
suggest also you look at Boy Scout handbook and see what it is because Boy Scouts are taught to leave no trace, and if this was true with these towers, imagine what it would do to our young people that are taught that.

I live in Clarksville, I'm David Chappell. In my town, at least 17 pieces of property were bought by affiliates of Northern Pass, and three of those properties were over $10 million which would lay the line all the way through the town of Clarksville was spent on all of these properties. Seems like they came in, just bought and bought and bought and they bought the route, couldn't go through so they backed up and bought by the cemetery and route 145. There were some people there that balked. Don was one and couple of other, three other of his neighbors that wouldn't sell to them so they just backed and bought another piece.

When Northern Pass first came in, they came to our town halls to meet with the Selectmen, and when people got wind of it, our Town Hall in Clarksville was packed with people. I went to
the Pittsburg meeting and the Town Office was packed with people. But Northern Pass would have got along a lot better if they hadn't come in and be so underhanded. They tried to put things over on people that woke up quick, and all it takes is one and boy, it doesn't take long to spread the word.

I'm fifth generation in my family. I live on the Pittsburg side of the hill which is about a mile from where the Northern Pass bought a piece of property next to the cemetery, and I have a good, pretty close to a quarter of that cemetery is my family that had lived here previously. When I talk to, one of the Northern Pass meetings and I talked to them and I said how much area, how big a swath do you have to have to lay the line, and he said 30 feet. And at that time, 150 feet to have the towers. Now, it's five times the width that has to be disturbed. A 30-foot swath is not a lot, like a road, but I had a good friend who told me that he went up where the windmills are up by the Balsams and he said there was a disgrace to the
roads up there that they built where he used to hunt. He says it used to be old wild land and they built these roads and cleaned the property right up off.

Also, the towns, I believe they said was 20 towns in the area that voted for Northern Pass not to go through their towns and that would be another consideration. I know Mr. Samson was the one that brought that up, and I want to thank you for your time and hopefully really do think a lot of thought in your decision you make and know that you have to live with it over the years. What you do can hurt people in the area. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Mullen, first name Thomas. I want to, first thing I want to do is apologize to the people from Coos County. I'm an interloper from down south, down around Campton, where there was an announced not so long ago that the Northern Pass was going to go underground. Now, I have a very clear picture of why Northern Pass decided to go underground down through southern Grafton County. One of
them is the gentleman sitting at the table over there, Tom Wagner, who has the White Mountain National Forest, and I don't know what went on there, but I have a pretty good idea that Tom Wagner wasn't about to let the Northern Pass go overhead through the White Mountain National Forest.

Secondly, there are a lot of people who own property in and around the area where I live. North Woodstock, Campton, Thornton, Plymouth, Ashland. They had deeds that go way back, and in those deeds, it's quite specific what they were deeding those right-of-ways for, and in many, many cases those right-of-ways were deeded in order to electrify the North Country for the people that lived up here, not to enrich the pockets of Public Service Company of New Hampshire. So if you think for a moment that going underground through my neck of the woods was done out of the goodness of Eversource's hearts, forget it. That's not what happened. And Mr. Muntz knows this is true, and Mr. Quinlan knows this is true and they will not
argue this because they know of what I speak.

Couple of other things. The Northern Pass project is absolutely in terms of how it's designed is defying the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in terms of putting lines too close together and rights-of-way that are too narrow. FERC has weighed in on these types of lines and has said that they are the wrong thing to do, and the problems that come from storms and related events cause huge blackouts in areas where these towers are so tall that when they fall, they fall on other towers and knock out the whole grid, number one.

I happen to think that it would be in all of our interests to support the Northern Pass project. I don't think at this stage that there's any reason why if they go underground we should not support them. It's a solution to our nightmare. It stands to end the difficulties that we're all going through with our businesses and with our property values. So I challenge the SEC and the Department of Energy to require this project to go underground and will tell you
that the cost of undergrounding this project works out to about 1/1000th of the income stream that flows in to Eversource on an annualized basis. 1/1000th of the income stream represents what their costs would be of going overhead, and I'll bet that that's probably not anybody in this room that wouldn't pay some sort of a surcharge on their electric bill to see this thing go underground. I would, and I know many businesses that would. And it's time that as a community we step up and have this dialogue, have it with the Northern Pass people and let's get this thing out of the public clamor that's been going on. It's a terrible process that we've been going through, and it damages everybody's values. Thank you very much.

MR. HONIGBERG: Is there anyone else who has submitted a yellow sheet that hasn't been called? After Cindy-Lou Amey, we'll circle back to Will Abbott.

SPEAKER: Good evening. For the record, my name is John Amey. I'm from Pittsburg, and before I start my written comments which will
only take two minutes, we haven't heard anything
from Brian Mills since I got here. I'm so happy
to see Brian Mills back. I suspect we might see
you back next spring the way things are going.
It's so nice to see you.

I would like to welcome the representatives
of the Site Evaluation Committee to the North
Country. Thank you for coming all the way to
Pittsburg today to better understand our
concerns with this application of Northern Pass,
and I hope that you will return so you can see
the rest of what you missed today. You did see
the signs down near the ground, but you didn't
see the viewshed.

I'm a direct descendant of the Indian
Stream Republic when Pittsburg was its own
country from 1832 to 1840. I have friends and
relatives here tonight that share this honor.
All of Pittsburg is a historical town, the
largest in our country, and much of which was
part of Canada before it declared its
independence from Canada and New Hampshire. The
epicenter of the former Republic is where I live
and where my family has lived since that time.

For those that may be unaware of the geography of our town, there are two primary routes as well as two secondary roads entering our town. All four of these roads are directly affected by this proposal from Northern Pass. In fact, three routes will have transition towers besides roadways as the project moves from above to underground.

It is important to note that I and the people I represent believe that the residents of our town as well as the thousands of people who vacation here deserve no less than the residents nearby and vacationers that travel each year to the White Mountain National Forest. Our economy in Pittsburg is very dependent on the millions of dollars that our visitors bring here. While we are promised significant tax revenues, those will be a mere pittance when compared to our history and our recreation industry. It is for these reasons and others that we, the residents of Pittsburg, and the descendants of the Indian Stream Republic respectfully ask you, the Site
Evaluation Committee, to deny approval of this application as presented until such time that we are granted the same concern that has been granted to the White Mountain National Forest.

Furthermore, we request that the complete analysis be made public regarding burial of the entire project in the State of New Hampshire transportation corridors. In closing, thank you in advance for addressing our concerns.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Thank you for visiting with us again, Mr. Mills. You must really like it, but you're getting to see it before the towers are built. What will you think of it when they are built.

I'm Cindy-Lou Amey. Wanted to thank you for hearing the questions and comments coming to you and at you from both sides of this very divisive issue. There's a particular concern troubling me. While well educated, I know that I'm not an expert in the field of energy. In our state, it is the office of the Site Evaluation Committee that will weigh in on this
application submitted by Northern Pass LLC. As yours is the body charged with proving or
disapproving this application, I wish to inform myself as to the process. Therefore, I spent
considerable time on the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee website. There, I discovered that you are have quite onerous
responsibility. Under the section Title XII, the terms public safety and welfare is in bold print. While reading this material it became obvious that your committee must rely on the Applicant and a host of experts to provide you with unbiased, detailed technical information which you must sift through and analyze in order to come up with a fair and equitable response to your application. This is to be done all the while ensuring that you have kept faith with delivering on your obligation to ensure that the public is kept safe and their welfare secured. What failsafe mechanisms are in place to guard against your lack of expertise in ascertaining the truthfulness of the information presented to you. I mean no disrespect in asking that
question. It's just that when entities as large as Eversource and Hydro-Quebec put together a business plan such as Northern Pass which promises shareholders an unusually robust return on their investment, how can you be certain that they haven't skewed the information provided to us in order to help you feel confident that a finding in favor of their application is a sound decision. Sound decisions can only be made from sound information. My concern is that you will not even be able to recognize whether or not you're being manipulated.

I respectfully submit that we depend upon you to sincerely fulfill the duties of the position you hold in this process. It is my hope that after all is said and done, you are able to find that this project, if it must be built in New Hampshire, is required to be built along state byways with an equitable payment schedule to the State of New Hampshire which cannot be set aside.

I really appreciate that you've come this far, and I hope tomorrow's tour brings you
further good information. Thank you.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Abbott.

SPEAKER: I'm not sure what I bargained for when I agreed to do this earlier, but I thought it was important to share with the subcommittee a couple of concerns the Forest Society has with two parcels of land that we own in Coos County that are directly impacted by Northern Pass.

Our 2000-acre Washburn Family Forest in Clarksville has 6 miles of frontage on the Connecticut River. You didn't get a chance to see it today because the skies weren't clear, but this is part of a truly exceptional scenic gateway as you've heard many others talk about into the town of Pittsburg. It would truly be a shame to allow this gateway to be scarred.

Furthermore, Northern Pass proposes to build its power line below part of our land and you actually drove over the green steel bridge today as part of the tower, and you drove over land that is part of the Washburn Family Forest where Northern Pass proposes to build the power line 50 to 70 feet below the surface of the
land. Now, it so happens that the state holds a transportation easement over this land by virtue of road layout approved jointly by the selectmen of Pittsburg, Stewartstown and Clarksville in 1931.

We believe Northern Pass does not have the legal right to build the project through our land as they propose. Without our permission, this would constitute an unconstitutional taking. We are, therefore, defending our property rights in the only legal setting where the New Hampshire Constitution provides for such relief. In the Coos County Superior Court. If the court rules in our favor, Northern Pass can't dig in our dirt. If Northern Pass can't dig in our dirt, it's likely that the entire corridor currently proposed for Coos County will be in some jeopardy. When we suggested that the SEC under its rules, that this issue rendered the application incomplete, you chose to decide otherwise, but the legal dispute is real. No case with such a set of facts has been decided before by a New Hampshire court. The Forest
Society continues to believe that it's inappropriate and a waste of resources for all of us to be investing so much time and money into this matter while the court is considering our case.

Finally, I'd like to bring your attention to the concerns we as a landowner have with the proposed use of the PSNH right-of-way through more than a mile of our Kaufmann Forest in Stark. In this 150-foot wide right-of-way held by PSNH and the Portland Natural Gas Pipeline Company, there is presently a 115 kilovolt overhead transmission line on wooden poles well below tree line and a 24-inch natural gas pipeline buried four feet below the ground. Northern Pass proposes to remove the existing above ground transmission facility and replace it with an entirely new set of steel structures well above tree line to post a new enhanced AC transmission line. Northern Pass also proposes to erect a second set of structures within the 150 foot right-of-way to host the new HVDC line, also well above the tree line. Many of
the individual towers for both facilities will be above 150 feet in height. As Mr. Beland of Stark noted earlier this morning, there's a very practical question as to how many transmission facilities can be safely located within this 150-foot right-of-way. There's a question about whether a consequence of what Northern Pass proposes represents an unreasonable adverse impact on aesthetics, and there's a question about just how safe it is to colocate all three of these facilities in the existing right-of-way.

If Northern Pass is built in Stark as proposed, the natural landscapes of the town of Stark will change dramatically. If Northern Pass as proposed in Stark were built, will private property be harmed if any of these new towers fall outside of the right-of-way or if they fall on each other or fall in a way that disrupts the gas pipeline. We thank that what Northern Pass proposes for our land in Stark is not only an unreasonable adverse impact on aesthetics, but also an unreasonable adverse
impact on public safety.

As the SEC subcommittee contemplates the Northern Pass application, we ask that you consider these questions about property rights, aesthetics, public safety, and natural resources much more comprehensively. New Hampshire only has one chance to get the decision on this application right. To make a well-informed decision on the Northern Pass application, the SEC needs to set a very high bar for the substance of its review. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: All right. Thank you, Mr. Abbott. That's probably the last word. I have no other cards and no one else is signed up to speak. Ms. Monroe or Mr. Iacopino, is there anybody else we need to do before we adjourn? This meeting is adjourned. Thank you all very much.

(Hearing ended at 10:23 a.m.)
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