1 STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE 2 Docket No. 2015-066 3 Joint Application for Northern Pass Transmission, LLC and Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy for a Certificate of Site 4 and Facility 5 6 PUBLIC HEARING CONDUCTED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE 7 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY 8 Grappone Conference Center 70 Constitution Avenue 9 Concord, New Hampshire March 10, 2016 10 5:00 - 10:30 p.m. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

1	MR. HONIGBERG: Good evening, ladies and
2	gentlemen. Welcome to a Public Hearing of the
3	New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee.
4	Specifically, this is a subcommittee forum to
5	consider the Joint Application of Northern Pass
6	Transmission LLC and Public Service Company of
7	New Hampshire which does business as Eversource
8	Energy, seeking a Certificate of Site &
9	Facility.
10	Before we go any further, I'm going to ask
11	the people up here to introduce themselves.
12	Starting to my left.
13	SPEAKER: William Oldenburg from the
14	Department of Transportation.
15	SPEAKER: Christopher Way from the
16	Department of Resources & Economic Development.
17	SPEAKER: Craig Wright with the Department
18	of Environmental Services.
19	SPEAKER: Martin Honigberg with the Public
20	Utilities Commission.
21	SPEAKER: Kathryn Bailey with the Public
22	Utilities Commission.
23	SPEAKER: Rachel Whitaker. Alternate

1 Public Member. 2 SPEAKER: Patricia Weathersby, Public 3 Member. 4 Tom Wagner, Forest Supervisor, SPEAKER: White Mountain National Forest. 5 Brian Mills with the Department 6 SPEAKER: 7 of Energy. 8 MR. HONIGBERG: This is actually two 9 hearings in one. A Site Evaluation Committee 10 hearing is going on concurrently with 11 proceedings by the Department of Energy. As you 12 heard, a member of the Department of Energy staff is here as well as someone from the Forest 13 14 Before I go any further, I will ask 15 them to make their remarks and I will ask them 16 and everyone else who reads something tonight to 17 read slowly and clearly so the stenographer can 18 get it. 19 MR. MILLS: Hi. I'm Brian Mills with the 20 Department of Energy. Thank you for taking your 21 time to attend this hearing. I work for the 22 Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy 23 Reliability. I'll 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 U.S. international border. The Department of Energy determined that an Environmental Impact Statement would be the appropriate level of analysis for this Presidential permit. a public hearing on the Northern Pass Transmission Line Draft Environmental Impact Statement or simply the Draft EIS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Once we begin the hearing, we will hear from you in the order you have signed up. If you wish to speak but have not signed up, you can get signed 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, and where we are for this particular project, I'll cover the steps.

The first step in the EIS process, starting public participation, begins by DOE issuing a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS. For this project, DOE issued our Notice of Intent on February 11th, 2011, and an Amended Notice of Intent on September 6th, 2013. The Notice of Intent began an 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 environment 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 the Draft EIS in July 2015. After we issue a Draft EIS, we asked the public to comment on it during a public comment period.

The EPA or the Environmental Protection

Agency opens the comment period by publishing a notice of availability in the Federal Register. The EPA notice for this Draft EIS was in the Federal Register, July 31st, 2015.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The comment period gives you the opportunity to tell us any changes you'd 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 If you ask questions as part of your comment, we will not be able to answer your questions today, but we will do so in the final Environmental Impact Statement. It's also very helpful for your comments to site specific sections or page numbers 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 hall. 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 are

invited to submit written comments.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Instructions to do so are provided on another poster in the hallway. 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 the 4th, 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 Environmental Impact statement will contain a Comment Response Document that addresses comments received on the Draft EIS.

When completed the Environmental Protection Agency 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 outline process is helpful to you. I would also like to mention a couple other things about the Draft EIS and this project. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S.

Forest Service and the New Hampshire Office of

Energy Planning are all cooperating agencies in
the preparation of the Draft Environmental

Impact Statement. DOE is 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 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 Draft 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 be

considered equally. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. WAGNER: Good evening. Brian has covered the process so I won't repeat the process. It's the similar process for us in the Forest Service to listen to your comments here and your comments in other venues and written comments, but let me just quickly cover our role in the siting process within the State of New Hampshire.

Good evening. I'm Tom Wagner, Forest Supervisor on the White Mountain National Service. The Forest Service is the cooperating agency working with DOE to ensure the Final EIS meets the needs of all involved agencies with jurisdiction. Northern Pass has applied to the Forest Service for a special use permit authorizing Northern Pass to construct, operate and maintain an electric power transmission line crossing portions of the White Mountain National As the forest supervisor, I am the Forest. agency official responsible for deciding whether to issue such a permit. My decision will consider whether the project is appropriate

based on the White Mountain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan and the laws guiding the management of your federal public lands. My decision will be documented in a Record of Decision which would come out after the Final EIS. Thank you.

MR. HONIGBERG: Thank you. Before talking more about the process we're going to follow tonight, there is an introduction that I need to read, unfortunately, but I'm going to introduce a couple of other people who are here. Sitting to my far left is the attorney who represents the Site Evaluation Committee, his name is Mike Iacopino. Also somewhere either in this room or out in the hallway is Pam Monroe. Behind me is Pam Monroe who is the administrator for the Site Evaluation Committee. She is the SEC's only employee.

Also here this evening is a representative of the New Hampshire Attorney General's Office who has appointed Peter Roth to serve as public counsel. Peter, if you could stand up and wave.

On October 19th of 2015, Northern Pass

Transmission LLC and Public Service Company of
New Hampshire which does business as Eversource
Energy submitted an application to the Site
Evaluation Committee for a Certificate of Site
and Facility to construct a 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 down to Deerfield, New Hampshire.

On November 2rd, pursuant to statute, I as the Chair of the SEC appointed a subcommittee to consider the application. Some of the state officials who serve on the SEC pursuant to their statutory authority designated members of their staffs to serve on this subcommittee.

On December 7th the subcommittee met to review the status of the application. At that time, the subcommittee determined that the application contained sufficient information to satisfy the application requirements of each 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 Chapter 162-H.

On December 22nd, the subcommittee issued a procedural order setting forth deadlines for motions to intervene and scheduling public information sessions in Franklin, Londonderry, Laconia, Whitefield and Lincoln. All of those meetings were held in January as scheduled.

The subcommittee has received over 150 motions to intervene in this docket. Many of the people who would like to intervene are here this evening. An order will be issued on the motions to intervene in the near future.

On February 3rd, the subcommittee issued an order and notice scheduling public hearings in Meredith, Holderness and Deerfield for March 1st, 14th and 16th respectively. Also on February 3rd, a second notice was issued scheduling public hearings in Colebrook which took place on Monday, and Concord which is being held right now. As we indicated earlier, the

hearing in Colebrook and this hearing are being done concurrently with hearings by the U.S.

Department of Energy and the Forest Service.

The subcommittee is required to hold at least one public hearing in each county in which the project is to be located and public hearings must be held within 90 days after acceptance of the application for a certificate. In addition to the five required hearings, one in each county, we will be holding two additional hearings for people to comment on supplemental information that the Applicants filed in late February.

As was required by statute, notice of this hearing was served upon the public by publication in the New Hampshire Union Leader on February 10th, 2016.

This evening we will proceed as follows.

We will first hear a presentation by the

Applicant. Following that presentation, the

subcommittee or other agencies represented here
this evening will have an opportunity to pose
questions to the Applicant. Often the

subcommittee does not have questions for the Applicant at this stage of the proceedings. We have had an opportunity to review the filings of the Applicant and other parties. We will have further opportunities to question the Applicant and ultimately probably later this year there will be a hearing on the merits at which all of the company's representatives will be under oath and other parties will be there to present their cases to us. That said, we may also ask questions.

Thereafter, the public will be permitted to pose questions to the Applicant. If you have a question for the Applicant, we ask that you write your question down and give it to someone representing the committee, either Attorney Iacopino or Administrator Monroe, using one of the green forms. As noted by the federal agencies, they will not be accepting and answering questions. Our subcommittee may or may not answer questions that are directed to us. The substantive questions this evening should be directed to the Applicant.

We will try to organize the questions by subject matter and present them to the Applicant in an organized fashion. Once all of the questions have been asked, we will take public statements or comment on the application. If you would like to make an oral comment, we ask you to fill out one of the yellow forms which can be gotten in the back, handed in. If you would just like to submit a written comment, you can do that on one of the blue forms. All the written comments will be posted on the SEC's

website.

At the time when we start taking oral public statements we'll make some judgment as to how many people have signed up to speak and how long it's likely to speak and whether to impose reasonable time limits. I will tell you that what we've done in the first two events in Meredith and Colebrook we were asking people to limit their comments to four minutes at Meredith, and three minutes in Colebrook. What that means for three minutes for those who were there, is that once you got to four and a half

minutes, I asked you how much longer you had to go, and if you said you could wrap up quickly, you could wrap up quickly. If you need more time than that, we're going to ask you to stop talking then and wait until everyone else has had a chance to speak before you continue and we've had people do that, and that's just fine. But we're going to ask everyone here to be reasonable regarding how long they intend to speak. I believe that is all the process I need to alert you to.

We will ask everyone to be polite and respectful. Everyone who speaks here this evening deserves your full attention and respect. If you feel you are unable to give full attention and respect to the people who are speaking, we're going to ask you to leave. Now, with that I will turn the microphone over to the Applicant. I believe Mr. Quinlan will be speaking first.

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Thank you. My name is Bill Quinlan. I'm the President of Eversource New Hampshire. I want to thank everyone for

being here tonight. Also I want to thank SEC Chairman Honigberg and Mr. Mills from the Department of Energy for the opportunity to make just a short presentation, and I'm going to cover in the presentation a couple of important One, the role this project can play in areas. helping to lower and stabilize energy costs for New England and New Hampshire. Two, the important role that this project as a clean source of energy can play in helping us meet our environmental goals. Three, and particularly important in New Hampshire, is the balance we've attempted to strike to make this project more acceptable to the State of New Hampshire, and fourth and finally, the benefits that we anticipate delivering to the State of New Hampshire through this project, and you'll see they're quite unique and substantial.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So first, to understand what's going on in the energy market, we've come up with a simple depiction. This is a bucket and it's intended to reflect the power pool for the 6-state New England region. I think many of you know that

all six states of New England are interconnected electrically. This is one grid. We all participate in one market. So on any given day on any given hour we all essentially pay the same price for electricity, regardless of where it's generated, and the way that price is set is based upon matching customer demand with supply. So every hour of every day, the Independent System Operator looks at that customer demand and dispatches generation units until there's sufficient supply to meet that demand.

At that point, you've got the supply that you need, those are dispatched from the lowest cost plant to the plant just sufficient to meet that customer demand, and once you've got everything you need, it sets the clearing price for every unit in that stack. That's preferred to as the bid stack. Okay? So it's a simple supply/demand balance. That last unit sets the clearing price. And you'll see there are a number of different types of units as you go from lower cost to higher cost. You know, renewables, nuclear, large scale hydro,

relatively low cost. For most hours of most days, natural gas generated power plants set the market clearing price, and I'll explain to you why, and then you get to some of the higher cost unit.

So what's happening today. What's happening today is plants that we've relied on for quite a long time have been retiring across New England. Here's a depiction of the last five years and the five-year projection and you'll see many power plants, large baseload power plants, coal-fired, oil-fired, nuclear plants that have retired or are at risk of retiring. So essentially, when you retire those units, you have to dispatch a higher cost unit to meet customer demand and therefore prices go up. Okay?

The role that a Northern Pass could play if you go back to that bid stack, is as a relatively low cost unit, if you insert a large amount of hydropower into that bid stack, the market clearing price comes down. Okay?

So here's the situation we're facing.

23

Retirements have already occurred, some are about to occur. You know, Vermont Yankee is a good example relatively nearby where a large baseload, noncarbon emitting power plant retired and essentially created upward pressure on price as well as upward pressure and emissions. Okay? So what's replacing that fleet. And here's the dependence I was referring to on natural gas. Over the last 20 years as coal, oil and nuclear plants have retired, virtually all the new generating capacity in New England is fueled by There's a lot of reasons for that. natural gas. It's a domestic supply, it's relatively low cost, it's relatively clean, and there's a lot of good reasons why we in the country and we as a region are becoming more dependent on natural This is a very significant change in our dependency. In 2000, we were 15 percent dependent on natural gas. Today we are 50 Five years from now we've expected to percent. be 70 percent. So we're becoming very dependent on a single fuel source, and we don't have that fuel diversity that we've had a region

historically. So big move towards natural gas.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Here's an example of what has happened as a result of that dependency. So if you look at this, this on an annual basis, what is the price of power in New England. Broken out between winter in blue and summer in yellow. Okay? So you see in 2008, they are about even. expect that New England because our peak loads are in the summer that prices would be a little higher in the summer and that was actually true in 2008. And then in 2009, hydraulic fracking has become commercially feasible so the price of gas came way down. As a result, all of those market clearing prices came down.

This is the phenomena I really want you to focus on. 2013 through 2015. The spread between the winter price and the summer price has widened dramatically. Why is that. Because we've become so dependent on natural gas that in the winter, when folks are using natural gas to heat their homes and their businesses, there's not enough fuel to power a generation fleet. So we're dispatching higher and higher cost assets.

These are dramatic differences. Seasonal differences in the price of electricity. If we had ubiquitous gas supplied to the region you would anticipate prices to be in that 20 to \$40 a megawatt hour year-round. That's what most of the country is seeing. When you have price spikes up to \$140 a megawatt hour period, that's a 6-month period, that's a dramatic impact on the New Hampshire and New England economy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Just to illustrate that, these are across New England, three or four billion dollar increases during those winter periods. So the difference between that yellow and blue, that's probably two and a half billion dollars. Difference between this yellow and blue, almost five billion dollars. The difference between these two, 3 to 4 billion dollars. That's the additional cost that businesses and residential customers across New England are paying as a result of our dependence on natural gas for generating fuel and power as well as the scarcity that we see in the winter. Okay? So that's what's happened over the last three

years. That's one of the problems that in Northern Pass can help us address.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

You project out for the next three years. This is an illustration that the problem is going to, in essence, worsen as you look out over the next three years. So this is a graph of the capacity. These are payments made to the generation fleet to ensure that they're available to generate those powers. These markets clear three years in advance so we know the value of these markets. For the last decade, for New England, the total cost of capacity market value, the capacity market has been about a billion dollars. When we look into 2017 and beyond, it's a tripling and a quadrupling of the capacity markets. just to ensure we have sufficient generation capacity to keep the lights on before we even generate electricity.

It's an indicator to those who follow these markets that this problem is going to continue to get worse unless and until we bring in large new supplies of power that are not gas

dependent. If you are following this closely, you'll know that a couple years ago the Governors of the six New England states recognized this issue. They saw this coming. They see where capacity markets are going, and they came to an agreement among the six New England states to say we really need to bring more gas pipeline capacity into the region to support the generation fleet that we've got, but we also need to provide some fuel diversity through new large power supplies that are not reliant on natural gas.

That's where Northern Pass comes into the equation. Northern Pass is ideal from this perspective. It looks like a large baseload power plant delivering power right into the New Hampshire grid in Deerfield, and it's clean. It's not dependent on natural gas. So that's what Northern Pass can do to address the region and New Hampshire's energy challenges is to take out that volatility and stabilize prices for businesses and residential customers.

For the last year and a half we've been

working to develop a balanced approach to this project that meets the needs of New Hampshire. We've been working to build support here in New Hampshire. It's the result of a lot of listening that we've done over that 18-month period. We've listened to all types of stakeholders; environmental organizations, businesses, residential customers, elected officials, municipalities, wide range of stakeholders in an effort to develop a balanced project that worked for New Hampshire, and by balance what I mean it fundamentally has to work as a matter of physics. It's got to get power from where it's being generated in Canada to Deerfield, New Hampshire, and it's got to do that reliably. It's got to be affordable or economically viable meaning we can't design and engineer a project that is so expensive that no one will pay for it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And then here in the State of New
Hampshire, and with the Department of Energy at
federal level, we need a project that meets the
siting criteria so we need a balance and in

striking this balance we've been keenly focused on input from stakeholders here in the state of New Hampshire as well as the Department of Energy. The plan we announced last August is referred to as the Forward NH Plan. I'm going to outline that for you in a moment. That is the balance that we have struck. We worked very hard to achieve this, and we think we've got it right and that's the project we've put in front of the SEC and Department of Energy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I think it's important to understand how this project has evolved since its inception in 2010 in an effort to meet New Hampshire So if you started in 2010 when feedback. initially announced, this was the proposal. So you think about this. The hydroelectric dams are way up here in Canada. There's a line being built to the US border and then you cross into the United States at Pittsburg, New Hampshire. In the original plan and it's outlined in red, you went from that border crossing on a fairly direct route over the western part of the state, and that's outlined in red, that's 40 miles of

new right-of-way through some of the more populated areas in the North Country. Okay?

You then at that intersection with the blue picked up an existing right-of-way and followed it all the way to Deerfield through the White Mountain National Forest. The original concept was that this was all going to be overhead construction. It was going to be 40 miles of new right-of-way in the north, there was going to be all overhead construction. That's the least cost alternative. It was going to be a 1200 megawatt project and it was going to cost about 1.1 billion.

Many of you understand the feedback we received in the North Country in this initial proposal that led to these changes that were announced in 2013 and they were largely focused in the North Country. So if you think about that 40 miles from the crossing down to the existing right-of-way, 8 miles are now underground. They're depicted in yellow. What do these 8 miles allow us to do? They allowed us to move the entire route to the eastern part

of the state into a less populated area. have 8 miles of underground construction in yellow, you have overhead construction in red. When we got to the eastern part of the state, we were able to acquire a lease or an easement through the Wagner forest so 24 of those 40 miles of new right-of-way and it's this large segment in red, are in a working forest, referred to as the Wagner Forest. There's virtually no inhabitants in the area. from any population center. It's a forest that is timber harvested routinely. So we were able to move that line to the east away from the population center. Still a 1200 megawatt project at that point. These changes added about \$300 million to the project cost. So it went from \$1.1 billion project to a 1.4 billion project.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2015, this is the announcement I was referring to. It was referred to as our Forward NH Plan. These were changes that we made, submitted to that were quite substantial, and, again, based entirely on feedback we received

from New Hampshire. At the time, universally, the feedback we were receiving was you need to address the White Mountain National Forest.

Regardless of where I was in the State of New Hampshire, regardless of stakeholder, these conversations almost universally started with the White Mountain National Forest. That led us to these changes. So quite substantial and from a design perspective, we agreed to an additional 52 miles of underground construction so this yellow segment is all underground and public highways and rights of way under existing roadways.

So what does that do? Now the White

Mountain National Forest, the Appalachian Trail,

Franconia Notch, the line will not be visible

from those key advantage points which was

important for us to do. We eliminated quite a

number of structures and importantly, we also

changed the cable technology. We went from a

1200 megawatt cable to a cable that we felt

comfortable with that amount of underground

construction. So we actually had to reduce the

size of the project to make these design commitments. So the cable technology, converter technology all changed based on feedback from New Hampshire.

Here's what it now looks like. So the line has gotten longer. Now 192 miles. You'll see the area in the yellow now through the White Mountain National Forest is underground. Project cost has gone up again. So it went from \$1.4 billion to \$1.6 billion. Project size, we had to reduce it from 1200 megawatts to 1090 megawatts. Again, based on feedback from New Hampshire.

Here's a table that summarizes that evolution, and if you look, we fundamentally have a different project today. I mean, it still essentially does the same thing which is to take a large amount of clean energy from Canada and deliver it to Deerfield, New Hampshire, but many of the key features of the project have been changed substantially based upon feedback from New Hampshire. It's a longer project, almost a third of it is underground.

It's smaller, and it uses entirely different technology. When you look at this from a cost perspective, the cost has gone up by about a half a billion dollars, and that was, again, in an effort to strike the balance that I referred to at the outset. So that's the balance we've struck. Beyond the balanced project, as part of our Forward NH Plan it's important for us to demonstrate clear and direct New Hampshire benefits.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The top line messages, those are almost \$4 billion as a result of this project. So a very significant economic benefit to the state. It's comprised of several things. But \$800 million in lower energy costs. Those benefits flow to businesses and residential customers across the State of New Hampshire. 800 million. committed to establish quite a large fund to promote community investment. That's a \$200 million fund. Again, targeted towards the host communities, these communities along the route where this line will run. About \$600 million in Ouite a number of jobs. And other taxes.

drivers of economic benefits.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

I think the job portion is key. We got a lot of feedback about these being temporary positions. You're going to bring in a lot of out-of-state labor to construct this project. So we, working with our partners, have made a very firm commitment to a New Hampshire First approach to building this project. So if you think about this, it's a \$1.6 billion infrastructure project that's very complex and requires a lot of different skills and construction trades and support services.

Under our Forward New Hampshire, New Hampshire First commitment, we are going to source all of that locally to the extent possible, and we've gotten that commitment from every one of our major contractors so we are going to put many in the State of New Hampshire to work as a result of this project. And the second and third order benefits to communities along this route from hotels to restaurants and

16 17 18 19 20 21 22 recreation are quite significant and that drives 23 about \$2 billion in gross domestic.

21

22

23

Separate and apart from the economics of it are the environmental benefits. I mentioned that we're retiring a lot of our historic Some of these are actually nuclear plants that don't emit carbon. So Vermont Yankee, Millstone, Connecticut Yankee, Pilgrim. These are all baseload large noncarbon emitting plants that either have retired or will retire. Just replacing them with natural gas is not going to allow the region in New Hampshire to meet its environmental goals. We have some very aggressive goals to reduce carbon. We're not going to get there by replacing that with natural gas so we need projects like Northern Pass which are large baseload projects, bring in a clean source of electricity and they're noncarbon emitting. To the extent you could match those with wind power and solar power all the better. It helps us as a society meet environmental goals.

So that's the high level overview of the project. Those are the benefits we anticipate delivering to the State of New Hampshire, the

balance that we've attempted to strike. So with that, I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

MR. HONIGBERG: Do members of the subcommittee have questions for Mr. Quinlan and his team? All right. We're going to turn to the public's questions. There are a variety of questions on a variety of topics. We will jump around quite a bit. The first question is a process question largely directed to the SEC and we will answer this question, and the question is will the SEC be doing site visits in Deerfield on Wednesday the 16th prior to the Rockingham County meeting. The answer to that is yes. An order will probably be issued tomorrow regarding that.

There's a series of questions, Mr. Quinlan, regarding who is paying for the review of the Applicant and the other permits that you need to obtain to get this project built. Can you outline what cost you money and what didn't in terms of the filings that you've had to make either with the federal government or the State

of New Hampshire?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. OUINLAN: Yes. So the cost for this project thus far are all being paid for by Eversource and its shareholders as well as our partner Hydro-Quebec. So it's a joint obligation that the two of us had. Importantly, on this question of cost, and who's paying for this project, one of the commitments we've made at the outset and we've remained firmly committed to it is New Hampshire customers have not and will not pay for any of this project cost, either the development or the construction, and we've been able to honor that commitment through the Forward NH Plan that we've proposed. So, importantly, New Hampshire customers won't bear any of these costs, either during this phase or the future.

MR. HONIGBERG: Talk filing fees.

MR. QUINLAN: Filing fees are paid for, again, by Eversource and our partner

Hydro-Quebec. For example, the cost of preparing the filing, making the filing, the fees associated with the filing that have to be

1	paid to the SEC, paid for by our shareholders as
2	well as our partner Hydro-Quebec.
	well as our partner hydro-quebec.
3	MR. HONIGBERG: Do you recall what the
4	filing fee for the SEC was? It was more than
5	\$500,000, but I don't remember the specific
6	amount. \$626,000.
7	MR. QUINLAN: It's a voluminous filing.
8	MR. HONIGBERG: 17 boxes as I recall.
9	Actually, I think that was one copy was that
10	many. Other State permits also had filing fees
11	associated with this, do they not?
12	MR. QUINLAN: They do. I know we have
13	filings that are made with the New Hampshire
14	Public Utility Commission. I believe there's a
15	filing fee associated with that. I think that's
16	true with the Department of Environmental
17	Services as well.
18	MR. HONIGBERG: I'll correct one of those.
19	Actually your filings with the PUC don't have a
20	filing fee.
21	MR. QUINLAN: Oh, they don't.
22	MR. HONIGBERG: No. I think the Department
23	of Environmental Services does, but the filings

1 that require PUC approvals I don't believe have filing fees associated with them. 2 3 Had you filed this two years ago or three years ago, would there have been a SEC filing 4 5 fee. The answer to that is no. 6 MR. OUINLAN: Okay. You have to answer. 7 MR. HONIGBERG: There's a series of 8 questions about who's paying for this review. 9 MR. OUINLAN: Yes. So the short answer is 10 we are paying for the review. Any and all costs 11 associated with the preparation or the filing 12 are borne by the Applicant, and, therefore, we 13 are the Applicant. We and our partners are 14 paying for it. 15 MR. HONIGBERG: At the last meeting, there 16 was a question regarding former members of the 17 SEC who are now working on this project for the 18 Applicant. Would you please identify those 19 people for this crowd? 20 MR. OUINLAN: Okay. So we have Bob Varney 21 who is with Normandeau Associates, formerly of 22 DES. 23 MR. HONIGBERG: When he was the

1 Commissioner of DES, he would have chaired the 2 Site Evaluation Committee. MR. OUINLAN: Tom Getz from the McLane law 3 4 firm, formerly of the New Hampshire PUC, and I believe he was also Chair of the SEC at the 5 time. 6 7 MR. HONIGBERG: I actually think he was 8 Vice Chair at that time. MR. QUINLAN: Vice Chair. 9 10 MR. HONIGBERG: At the same time that the 11 statute was put in requiring filing fees, the Chair of the SEC was switched from the 12 Department of Environmental Services to the 13 Public Utilities Commission, and the Vice Chair 14 15 switched from PUC to DES. 16 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Any others? I believe 17 just those two. 18 The question asked, the MR. HONIGBERG: 19 question asker wants to know if there is a 20 conflict of interest in any of Mr. Varney or 21 Mr. Getz's participation in this, and I quess I 22 would broaden the question to ask if Mr. Varney 23 and Mr. Getz are in compliance with New

1 Hampshire statutes regarding their activities 2 post state employment. 3 MR. VARNEY: Yes. 4 MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Varney and Mr. Getz are 5 both signifying yes so I suspect they're aware 6 of the requirements and are compliant with them. 7 MR. HONIGBERG: The next question asks 8 other than you and the people who are here to be 9 part of your presentation and support your 10 presentation, are any of your employees, 11 Eversource's employees, being paid to attend 12 this meeting? 13 MR. QUINLAN: No. 14 MR. HONIGBERG: Are you or any other 15 Eversource employee or contractor going to 16 receive a bonus of any kind if the project goes 17 through, and, if so, how much? 18 So you know, Northern Pass is MR. OUINLAN: a strategically important project for us. 19 20 not have a specific bonus that's tied to this 21 project going forward, and I don't believe 22 anyone from the Eversource management team has 23 any bonus or incentive that's specifically tied

1 to success on Northern Pass. Now, it is 2 strategically important, and when we make it a 3 reality, we are successful in doing so, that will be certainly a positive in any executive 4 5 review. It's an indirect answer to your 6 question, but I do not have a specific incentive 7 or bonus tied to Northern Pass being placed in 8 service. 9 MR. HONIGBERG: Do you know if anyone else 10 does? 11 MR. QUINLAN: I'm not aware that anyone 12 else does. 13 MR. HONIGBERG: What is your estimate for 14 the time it will take to bury the proposed 15 section that will be buried under this proposal? 16 I'm going to refer that MR. OUINLAN: 17 question to Sam Johnson. Sam is with Burns & 18 McDonnell. He's a project engineer and project 19 manager. 20 Thank you, Bill. Limitations MR. JOHNSON: 21 from the Department of Transportation for 22 construction are from the period of April to 23 November. We anticipate that the entire

installation will take place over two full seasons of construction.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HONIGBERG: More construction questions. Should the project be approved, how will specific types of features like horse pastures, fenced-in areas, be dealt with at the time when construction is going on near them.

MR. JOHNSON: Sure. So as some of you are aware, we have engaged a general contractor who will be managing the entire construction One of the items or duties of their process. contract is that they must reach out to everyone on the route to inform them of the construction process. This would include soliciting feedback regarding such exact things as horses, orchards, hay fields and things like that where there is potential for a construction to impact those operations. All considerations will be made during this process to ensure that there is limited impact to these people and to ensure things like gates remained closed once a vehicle has entered or exited the property.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Louder, please?

1 Perhaps you could cover the MR. OUINLAN: 2 steps we take on disturbed areas. 3 MR. HONIGBERG: Make sure you're close enough to the microphone so that as you move you 4 5 don't fade in and out. Is that better from the back? 6 MR. JOHNSON: 7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Little louder, please? 8 MR. JOHNSON: Sure. Okay. One other 9 aspect of this is that if we do disturb areas 10 and inevitably there will be roads constructed 11 for access, et cetera, that these roads will be 12 restored to their original condition, or the ground around it will be restored to its 13 14 original condition either by hydroseeding or 15 working with landowners to replant the areas 16 back to where they were in their original 17 conditions. 18 Thank you. MR. QUINLAN: 19 MR. HONIGBERG: Is it true that burial and 20 having underground power lines requires less 21 maintenance than overhead power lines in the 22 Going to refer this question to Jim long-term? 23 Jim is our president of transmission. Muntz.

MR. MUNTZ: Well, there's a tradeoff between overhead and underground. Underground is less susceptible to damage certainly, but when you do have an issue of underground, you're usually into a substantially longer and more expensive repair.

MR. HONIGBERG: New topic. It has been suggested that Northern Pass has not communicated with towns. Can you explain what communications you have had with towns along the route?

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So even predating my arrival on this project, I know the Northern Pass team has done extensive outreach with municipalities across the route and I know that outreach continues today. We periodically meet with each and every town along the route, and in some instances it's in an informal Town Hall setting. In other instances, it's with key leaders in those impacted towns, depending on their preference. So that's been a focus area for us. Certainly was prior to my arrival as we developed the Forward NH Plan that municipal

input has helped to shape the plan that we put to the SEC. Municipal feedback has been helpful in making that balance, striking that balance. We continue to work at a municipal level now on fine-tuning the route. Are there areas where we can place a structure at a different location or lower a structure or change a structure design so that it reduces the view impacts. So these are local decisions that have benefited greatly from municipal feedback so that outreach will continue and it's not just municipalities, it's abutting landowners along the route.

MR. HONIGBERG: This is a different topic but falls on something you just said. How many lines can actually be hung on one tower which might call on you to describe different types of towers that you'll have along the route.

MR. JOHNSON: So there are two primary types of towers that will be involved in this program. A DC structure which will have two conductors and two shield wires so two thicker wires and two very thin wires to basically stop lightning. The AC portion of the project will

1	have three conductors and two shield wires,
2	again, three larger conductors and two small
3	ones, again as protection from lightning.
4	MR. HONIGBERG: How many lines can go on
5	each type of tower?
6	MR. JOHNSON: As currently designed, our DC
7	portion of the project can only handle one
8	circuit which would be the two major conductors.
9	The AC portion of the project is also the same
10	to be designed as one circuit and so therefore
11	only three conductors.
12	MR. HONIGBERG: The next questions are on
13	the same general topic. How many structures
14	will be relocated as part of the construction of
15	this project.
16	MR. JOHNSON: In total for the entire
17	project, 635 structures will be relocated. In
18	Merrimack County, that number is 286.
19	MR. HONIGBERG: Is it correct that there
20	are roughly 900 new structures being put in
21	place?
22	MR. JOHNSON: Actually, the number is a
23	little bit higher than that. It's 1198.

MR. HONIGBERG: All right. There was an assumption in the next question that had 900 there. So added to existing structures, with the new structures, what's the total number of structures that this project entails building or moving?

MR. JOHNSON: Just north of 1800 structures.

MR. HONIGBERG: After the transmission lines enter Deerfield, actually it's when they exit Deerfield, what is the height of the towers that will go from Deerfield to Scobie Pond.

MR. JOHNSON: The new construction associated with the project actually ends at the Deerfield substation. There are ten structures that have to be adjusted in that corridor that goes down from Deerfield to Scobie Pond as part of the system uprights and that means that any time you build a new project you also have to assess the impacts of injecting that much energy into the system, and are there trickle down effects where you would have to increase or change the configuration of the lines in that

general area.

In this particular case, there are ten structures that have been identified in this corridor and of those ten structures, the average height will increase by about five feet. Those ten structures are spread throughout that entire corridor, and I believe the majority of them are in Deerfield itself.

MR. QUINLAN: Sam, you might want to share the numbers of structures in that existing corridor so it's ten out of?

MR. JOHNSON: Out of just close to 600. There are two circuits that go down in that corridor, just about over 300 each.

MR. HONIGBERG: This is following on what you just said. I'm just going to read it as it is, and if there are things in it that need to be corrected, go ahead.

The application shows work being done beyond Deerfield to transmit to Scobie Pond and other locations. Who will pay the cost of the necessary reconductoring and transmission lines to those locations?

1	MR. JOHNSON: Again, that is a cost that
2	will be borne by Northern Pass.
3	MR. HONIGBERG: More about towers. Do you
4	know how tall the tallest transmission tower
5	currently in use in New Hampshire is?
6	MR. JOHNSON: Off the top of my head, I do
7	not know. There are many, many miles of
8	corridor in New Hampshire, and I'm basically
9	familiar with the Northern Pass corridors.
10	MR. QUINLAN: Somewhere over 200 feet.
11	MR. HONIGBERG: What's the range of heights
12	of the existing transmission lines in the state
13	to your knowledge.
14	MR. JOHNSON: So the existing 115
15	structures that are within the project's
16	corridor range from 40 and just shy of 100 feet.
17	MR. HONIGBERG: And how tall will the
18	Northern Pass Transmission towers be?
19	MR. JOHNSON: On the DC side, they will
20	range from 60 to 130 feet, and on the AC side,
21	they will range from 40 to 155 feet.
22	MR. QUINLAN: Just back on the question of
23	the tallest existing structure in New Hampshire,

1 we'll get a precise number. 2 MR. HONIGBERG: The person actually wants 3 to know where that tower is. Do you know? I'm assuming that that would 4 MR. JOHNSON: 5 be in the Newington area where there is a large river crossing, but that, again, is conjecture 6 7 on my part so we will look that up. 8 MR. HONIGBERG: The next couple of 9 questions are about benefits of the project. 10 Mr. Quinlan, some of this I think you covered in 11 your presentation, but you're going to be asked 12 to redo some of this. 13 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. How will the towers that 14 MR. HONIGBERG: 15 you're building benefit the residents of New 16 Hampshire when New Hampshire already generates 17 more power than it uses. 18 So I did touch upon this in MR. OUINLAN: 19 the outset which is we are part of one power 20 pool, one integrated grid, one market. 21 almost doesn't matter where the physical 22 generation assets are located. They all feed 23 one grid and the electrons flow ubiquitously

around a 6-state region. The benefits of this project will certainly benefit all of New England, but in particular they'll benefit New Hampshire by lowering energy costs, by delivering the environmental benefits that are referred to, and then delivering all of those unique benefits that are specific to the host state whether it's jobs, taxes, the commitments we've made to the Forward NH fund, those benefits are unique to New Hampshire as a result of hosting the line.

MR. HONIGBERG: How will customers of other utilities, the Co-op, Unitil or Liberty, how will they benefit from the construction of Northern Pass?

MR. QUINLAN: So again, those customers are part of that very same power pool so to the extent the energy prices are reduced and stabilized for all of New England, the customers from those utilities, Unitil, Liberty and Co-op, will see a reduction and greater stability in their energy cost. They will also see the same environmental benefits that customers of

1 Eversource will see. Again, carbon doesn't know 2 boundaries, doesn't know state boundaries, 3 doesn't know utility boundaries. That's a side benefit that customers of those utilities will 4 receive their share. 5 MR. HONIGBERG: What are the tax benefits 6 7 to the New Hampshire towns from this project? MR. QUINLAN: So our current estimate based 8 9 upon the \$1.6 billion price is about \$30 million 10 a year in annual tax benefits. The majority of 11 that is municipal taxes. There are some state 12 and county taxes as well, but approximately \$30 13 million a year to the municipalities hosting the 14 line. 15 MR. HONINBERG: For how many years will 16 that \$30 million benefit be in place? 17 So the depreciable life of a MR. OUINLAN: 18 transmission investment is a long one. 19 tend to be 40-year depreciation schedules so 20 they go down, but they go down very gradually, 21 like two and a half percent a year. 22 assuming there are no other capital investments 23 made. To the extent we are investing additional

1 capital in the line, that would increase the 2 So start at about \$30 million a year and taxes. 3 you depreciate it basically on a straight line over a 40-year period, other than additions will 4 5 which tend to extend that life. 6 MR. HONIGBERG: I think the next question 7 is one that I can answer. There's a study, a 8 cost/benefit local economic impact analysis that 9 is part of the application, correct? 10 MR. QUINLAN: Correct. 11 MR. HONIGBERG: And you filed a motion for 12 confidential treatment of that report. Is that 13 right? 14 MR. QUINLAN: That's right. 15 MR. HONIGBERG: That motion is pending and 16 at some point will be ruled on so that answers 17 the question on that page. 18 Back on the tax benefits, I'm going to read 19 it as it's written. Will you attempt to abate 20 your property taxes? 21 No. So the projection I just MR. OUINLAN: 22 gave which is \$30 million at the outset and then 23 straight line depreciation is an industry

1 accepted tax methodology. It's one we're very 2 comfortable with. Assuming municipalities tax 3 us on that basis, we're very comfortable with In fact, we have in our discussions with 4 it. 5 the municipalities offered to formally commit to that in writing. 6 7 MR. HONIGBERG: Are you in compliance with 8 your Memorandum of Understanding with the New 9 Hampshire Department of Historical Resources 10 regarding this application? 11 MR. QUINLAN: To the best of my knowledge, 12 we are, yes. 13 Can you describe that MR. HONIGBERG: 14 Memorandum of Understanding and what it required 15 you to do? 16 MR. OUINN: Yes. So I'm going to introduce 17 Cherilyn Widell. Cherilyn is a historic 18 resources expert. Cherilyn? 19 MS. WIDELL: Good evening. My name is 20 Cherilyn Widell. I'm a historic preservation expert, and my company is Widell Preservation 21 22 The question is regarding a Services. 23 Memorandum of Understanding which has been

signed between Northern Pass and the Division of Historic Resources, and it commits to the Division of Historic Resources to complete above ground inventory forms and necessary archeology for as a bridge between the identification stage currently being done and the completion of an agreement document under the Section 106 process, and Northern Pass is completely in compliance with that process.

MR. QUINLAN: Just one point of clarification. Those commitments are Applicant commitments, not DHR, and we're in compliance with those.

MR. HONIGBERG: Your presentation included claims that there will be regional price reductions, and the question is, and I'm going to read it as it's written, if the project were to increase prices, should the SEC deny the application?

MR. QUINLAN: So energy benefits are an important reason for this project. We feel very strongly that this project will increase power supply into the region as a new source into the

1 We have an Expert Report who has 2 determined the numbers I shared with you which 3 is about an \$800 million a year energy cost 4 savings from across New England. Our view is 5 that this will certainly save customers on their 6 energy costs, particularly New Hampshire 7 customers who are not being asked to bear any of 8 the cost of the project. Energy benefits are 9 one part of the review process by the SEC and 10 looking at the total benefit package so it would 11 also be looked at, if somehow it were to create 12 upward pressure on cost, but I don't believe 13 that's possible here in New Hampshire since New 14 Hampshire is not going to bear any of the cost. 15 MR. HONIGBERG: When you say that 16 Eversource is paying costs, one of the questions 17 on the sheet I'm looking at says doesn't that 18 mean your customers and ratepayers are going to 19 be paying? 20 MR. OUINLAN: No. 21 MR. HONIGBERG: Why don't you explain a 22 little bit about that process works. 23 MR. OUINLAN: So the investments in this

project are being paid by Northern Pass which is a subsidiary of Eversource, but we are paying to build the line. We cover our costs through a contract we have with Hydro-Quebec, our partner. We are essentially receiving payments from them to use our lines so they can deliver their clean hydropower into New England. That's how we recover the cost. New Hampshire ratepayers will not bear any of those costs. It's all pursuant to the agreement between Northern Pass Transmission and Hydro-Quebec and that agreement has been submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for review and they've approved it. So the cost recovery will not implicate New Hampshire customers in any way. How many customers does MR. HONIGBERG: Eversource have in New Hampshire? In New Hampshire, just over MR. QUINLAN: 500,000. MR. HONIGBERG: What is the significance of the effect on tourism in your view to this So please explain how you believe this process? project will affect tourism, if it will, and if

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

it were to have a negative effect on tourism, is that something that should cause the SEC to reject your application.

MR. QUINLAN: So certainly the effect on tourism is one of the factors the SEC can weigh in looking at the totality of the project. I am not a tourism expert, but I did hear just recently that our last hearing from some tourism experts, one from the ATV and snowmobiling community, who spoke quite eloquently and convincingly about the benefits that this project can deliver to that peak tourism sector, ATV and snowmobiling, through creating new rights-of-ways, creating new trails, and as many of you know that's a critical area of the tourism future in New Hampshire.

There was another expert who's currently developing, redeveloping the Balsams project, and I think he shared his views on the impacts on tourism. He doesn't see any negative impacts, and to the extent we can work with him to make his project a reality, it will be a substantial increase in tourism in that

critically important area of the North Country. So, again, I'm not a tourism expert, but we're hearing from some of the experts that the impacts on tourism are not significant in a negative way and will be quite positive.

MR. HONIGBERG: Following up on the issue of aesthetics, general question, can you explain how you conducted your visual impact assessment, and there's a specific question within that. So in explaining that, how did you select the key observation points generally. How did you select them specifically in the Concord area.

MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to refer that question to Terry DeWan. Terry is our visual simulation expert.

MR. DEWAN: My name is Terry DeWan. I'm a scenic assessment consultant from Yarmouth,
Maine. We've been working on this project now for over two years. When we were on the tour with the SEC the last two days, we visited a number of the KOPs or the key observation points. As we described in the field, we looked at places where the general public has a right

to, people go to these key observation points because they are known for their scenic values. We, in identifying key observation points, we considered a number of factors, not the least of which is whether or not these are considered to be a scenic resource. Scenic resources are identified and defined in our visual impact assessment.

The methodology that we've used is a fairly standard one that's been prescribed by the SEC rules that starts out with a thorough investigation as to where scenic resources are, within a defined area, area of potential effect. We initially did a three-mile distance outside of the line. As you know, the recent revised rules call for us to go out ten miles. We've done that, we've done viewshed analyses, computer-based analyses. We did a substantial amount of field investigation. We looked at a number of factors relative to each of these sites we've identified. We've been to and identified over 600 sites within our study area. The final results of the work has been

1 identified and presented in the visual impact 2 assessment which you have on file already. 3 MR. HONIGBERG: Do you know how many key observation points there are in Concord? 4 5 was a specific question about the stretch in Concord. 6 7 We can find that in a moment. MR. QUINLAN: While you're looking for 8 MR. HONIGNBERG: 9 that --10 Mr. Chairman, may I introduce MR. QUINLAN: 11 Mitch Nichols who is our tourism expert? 12 speculating on tourism impact and I didn't see Mr. Nichols here. 13 14 MR. HONIGBERG: Why don't we circle back to 15 the tourism questions while you're looking for 16 the answer regarding Concord. 17 MR. NICHOLS: Very good. Good evening. МУ 18 name is Mitch Nichols from Nichols Tourism 19 We have spent the last year Group. 20 investigating the Northern Pass project, and 21 we're very familiar with New Hampshire industry. 22 We work across the country with destinations and 23 states in strategic planning and development of

the tourism industry. We looked at five various elements and study areas investigating that question related to impacts to the tourism industry. In combination, all five of those areas develop a very similar finding that the Northern Pass project would not have an impact on the regional demand for visitation within the State of New Hampshire. That there are broader more powerful factors that influence that visitor demand decision to choose New Hampshire, and we do not feel that the project will vary or impact that overall visitor demand into the state.

MR. QUINLAN: Thank you.

MR. DEWAN: This is a very large document. So in the city of Concord we evaluated a total of 48 scenic resources. Of those we did photo simulations in our initial go-around. It was delivered back in October at Turtle Pond. That was a key observation point. Since then we have also done evaluations at Suffolk River and Oak Hill's trail. We've done others as part of the additional supplemental information we

1	presented.
2	MR. HONIGBERG: We have a number of
3	questions about burial, and more are coming, I
4	see. Under the current proposal, how many miles
5	will be buried and how many will not be buried.
6	MR. QUINLAN: Roughly 60 miles will be
7	buried. 132 will not be buried.
8	MR. HONIGBERG: What would it cost to bury
9	the balance of the line?
10	MR. QUINLAN: Approximately one billion
11	dollars of incremental costs.
12	MR. HONIGBERG: Can you tell us the per
13	mile cost of burying the HVDC cable?
14	MR. MUNTZ: Our costs as we've confirmed
15	with competitively bid contractors and cable
16	suppliers are between five and \$10 million
17	incrementally for each mile of additional HVDC
18	burial.
19	MR. HONIGBERG: It sounds like some people
20	didn't hear that answer so could you make sure
21	you're close enough to the microphone so you're
22	projecting to the entire room?
23	MR. MUNTZ: Our costs for burial of the

1 HVDC are about 5 to \$10 million incrementally, 2 and that is based on actual bids from cable 3 suppliers and contractors that do that work. 4 Do you have the cost broken MR. HONIGBERG: 5 out for the various components of construction? Digging, trenching, refilling? 6 7 MR. MUNTZ: Yes, we do. 8 MR. HONIGBERG: Could you break out roughly 9 the per mile cost of the various components of 10 construction? 11 MR. JOHNSON: I'm doing the math in my 12 I apologize. I'm doing the math in my head. 13 The cable itself is going to range about head. three million dollars a mile with the remainder 14 15 being the trenching and the trenchless crossing 16 cost. 17 There are two components of the underground 18 installation. There is the trenching where 19 you're going along the road edge, and then 20 there's the trenchless part where you have to go 21 underneath rivers and/or environmentally 22 sensitive areas. Those areas tend to be very 23 expensive in relation to the actual trenching

1 activities so it, on average, is the cost that 2 we're presenting to you. 3 MR. HONIGBERG: Can you estimate the cost of burying the line from Franklin to Deerfield? 4 5 MR. MUNTZ: Probably be about \$250 million. 6 MR. OUINLAN: That's incremental costs, 7 correct? Incremental costs, correct. 8 MR. MUNTZ: MR. JOHNSON: 9 I'll just add to that that 10 that component of the project is AC underground 11 which is more expensive than the DC because 12 there's a third phase that's involved or third 13 conductor. So there are three underground lines 14 and not two, I'm sorry, underground cables and 15 not two in this case. 16 Have you, I'm going to read MR. HONIGBERG: 17 it as it's written and it's a little hard to 18 read so I may stumble on some of these words. 19 Have you tried to reach out to the communities 20 affected suggesting that perhaps some limited 21 sections could possibly be buried and then 22 develop an actual cost estimate for those 23 sections to compare to the overhead cost.

1 So, again, we've had MR. OUINLAN: 2 extensive discussions with municipalities four 3 years or more up and down the route. Oftentimes the question of the possibility of additional 4 5 underground construction is one that we are 6 asked and we provide answers to. I'm not aware 7 of any municipality who has asked for a specific 8 cost estimate for the burial associated with 9 that municipality. Sam, you've been involved in 10 some of that? Am I correct? 11 MR. JOHNSON: That's correct. 12 inquiries to date have been general in nature 13 and not specific to a particular town or route 14 as proposed by municipalities. 15 MR. HONIGBERG: There are a number of 16 questions, the essence of which is please 17 explain your statement that it is not 18 economically viable to bury the entire line or 19 greater portions of the line than are in the 20 current proposal. 21 MR. MUNTZ: Well, as Bill has said 22 repeatedly, we've tried to strike a balance here 23 where we actually have a viable project that the

supplies and the customers will find to be economic. We've had this discussion with Hydro-Quebec who needs to sell power into this market and recover enough money to pay for the line and to recover their costs, and, obviously, we consulted with them and we've put in a proposal to the Site Evaluation Committee. We looked at all the interests and all the feedback that we got in New Hampshire, it worked out and we feel that 60 miles of underground addresses some of the key points in New Hampshire that we have achieved the economic goal balancing point for all the parties.

MR. HONIGBERG: The next couple of questions have some assumptions in them that may or may not be correct. You're going to need to explain however you need to answer this question.

Would you consider replacing the lattice structures, all of the lattice structures with monopoles or would you consider increasing the number of monopoles and placing them closer together so as to lower the height of the poles

and thereby lower the volume of noise about the project?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. OUINLAN: So these are the type of local design techniques that we are exploring up and down the route. For those of you who are not familiar with the difference between a lattice structure and a monopole, a lattice structure tends to be a more imposing structure. It has four legs. It looks like an erector set. A monopole is a single pole that looks more like a tall conventional telephone pole. We have already determined several hundred locations where we are going to bear the incremental cost of using monopoles in some of the areas that have been identified as scenically important. We're also working on pole location and height in an effort to minimize visual impacts.

As to the specific questions, these are discussions we are now engaged in up and down the route with municipalities and with landowners to strike a further balance at a lower level to the best of our ability to address these concerns through the design and

1 engineering and construction of the project. 2 That will continue right on through the balance 3 of the project. MR. HONIGBERG: Why aren't you using the 4 5 I-93 corridor through Concord; and the followup on that, why are you not considering burying the 6 7 line on that corridor through Concord? So I'm going to refer this to 8 MR. QUINLAN: 9 Mark Hodgdon. Please introduce yourself? 10 My name is Mark MR. HODGDON: Sure.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Hodgdon. I'm a private attorney in Concord.

Before going into private practice, I was in the Attorney General's Office for 24 years where I represented the Department of Transportation.

I-93 was looked at along with other routes when we started looking at underground burial. The first thing you have to understand is I-93 is not a preferred option from DOT's point of view. It is the most important road in the state. It carries tens of thousands of cars a day depending on where you are. It can be in the 20 to 30 range or as much as 50 down on the border. But in the areas we're talking about

it's tens of thousands of cars a day at high speed. DOT does not want you using that corridor unless you have, in their policy terms, an extreme hardship, and one of the criteria for an extreme hardship is you have to have no other viable alternatives. The roads being proposed are viable alternatives.

In addition, if you look at I-93, DOT will not, even if you met the hardship criteria, DOT will not allow you to be in what we call the disturbed areas, meaning the road or the shoulder, and they also won't allow you to be in the median, and you can't impact traffic by entering and exiting the main line of the road. So you have to build, essentially, a parallel access road at the outside limits of the right-of-way where they're going to require you to locate the facility.

The impacts out there are enormous, both wetlands wise, tree removal wise, vegetation wise, and probably well water wise, and it would be unsightly. So even if we could meet the criteria, which we don't, it would not be an

appropriate alternative.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Furthermore, you have, not down in this particular area, I know your question was about Concord, but for the White Mountain region, it is not even remotely viable to go through Franconia Notch. Franconia Notch is an extremely narrow area with probably the highest concentration of environmental and cultural sites in the state in that small area. Just off the top of my head, they have Echo Lake, Profile Lake, you have numerous wetlands, you have the Pemigewassett headwaters. You have several small water courses. In addition, you have Franconia State Park, you have the historic Old Man site, you have enormous and very sensitive geological formations in the basin and Boise Rock and an extremely fragile rock face which unfortunately used to house the Old Man, but no longer does. That's a testament to how fragile it is, and that area is so sensitive it's governed by Federal Court consent degree which bars any further construction along the Franconia Notch Parkway, and that consent decree

1 was after 20 years of litigation and required 2 congressional approval to do it. So Franconia Notch area is simply off limits. You can't do 3 4 the construction in there and not have massive 5 impacts, and that accounts for the 24 miles 6 around the White Mountain region. 7 MR. HONIGBERG: Related to burial, but 8 specifically about employment, would burial 9 require a larger workforce? 10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. 11 MR. HONIGBERG: The followup assumes that 12 not many New Hampshire residents are certified 13 to work on these types of lines. Wouldn't it 14 increase the number of New Hampshire jobs if you 15 were to go ahead with burial? 16 MR. QUINLAN: First as to the premise of 17 the foundation of that question --18 That is the premise of the MR. HONIGBERG: 19 question. 20 I think it's false. MR. OUINLAN: T think 21 there are many aspects of this project that will 22 be sourced locally. It's true that some of the 23 electrical work may require some skilled

craftsmen from outside of the state, but there are plenty of those skilled craftsmen here in the State of New Hampshire. We have a very good and solid contingent of electrical workers who are expert in this craft and they're going to do the vast majority of this work.

If you go beyond the pure electrical work, we expect to source much of this construction locally. Whether it's gravel suppliers, excavation crews, forestry folks who are going to clear rights of way. Our anticipation is we're going to put many hundreds of folks to work here in New Hampshire, and that's the majority of this work is going to be done locally.

Mr. Muntz mentioned the contracts we have executed for our general contractor. All of our contractors are now committed the maximum extent possible to use the local labor and services to build this project, and we're very happy about that commitment, and we think it's going to create some real opportunities for the citizens in this state.

1 If the total project costs MR. HONIGBERG: 2 increase with burial and you were to go ahead with burial and increase costs, would that 3 translate into increased taxes collected, lower 4 taxes collected or would it have no effect on 5 taxes collected? 6 7 I'm going to introduce Lisa MR. QUINLAN: 8 Shapiro. Lisa's an economist. 9 MS. SHAPIRO: My name is Lisa Shapiro. I'm an economist and I worked on the tax estimates 10 for the project. So the way taxes work in New 11 12 Hampshire, as you all know, is the higher the value of your property, the more taxes you pay. 13 14 So if the project costs more, the tax bill will 15 be higher, but if the project costs so much more 16 that there's no project there's no taxes. 17 MR. HONIGBERG: All right. We have some 18 new topics. In past winters, Hydro-Quebec has 19 stopped exporting power to the US because they 20 needed to meet Canadian demand. How can we be 21 sure that the power will in fact come when we 22 need it. 23 MR. OUINLAN: So two things. One of the

things that's unique about this project is
Hydro-Quebec is actually making a firm delivery
commitment to New England which doesn't exist
today. Right now, Hydro-Quebec with the two
lines that interconnect their grid with the New
England grid, they have very few commitments to
deliver energy to New England. They essentially
do it when the market is favorable. They have
the ability to move it to New York, go to
Ontario, wherever the prices are best. That's
today's situation.

Under this project, and their proposal to the New England, they're actually making a firm delivery commitment which is a binding contractual obligation to deliver power to New England during peak periods during the months of the year when we need it the most. So they now have a firm contractual obligation. The reliability of these lines is very, very high. Reliability of their generation fleet is very, very high. So our full expectation and I think history proves this out, they've been a very reliable partner in New England. They've been

delivering hydro power to New England markets for decades quite reliably, and now they'll have a firm contractual obligation to get it to us when we need it most.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HONIGBERG: If the project does not go through, is there a chance that over the next 20 years there will be brownouts or blackouts in the region?

MR. QUINLAN: So technically this is not what's referred to as a reliability project today, meaning today it's not a project that's necessary to keep the lights on, but I showed you some graphics which reflected the retirements of the New England generation fleet and our increasing dependence on natural gas. Over the last couple of winters we've had instances where there just wasn't enough gas to run the fleet, and we were very, very close to situations where we would have to do what we refer to as curtail load. In essence, brownout And not only were prices high and customers. volatile but supply was very, very tight. you project that out into the future, and we

don't bring in new baseload supply, we'll continue to retire the coal plants and nuclear plants in this region, you could envision instances where we have to make that very difficult decision which is to curtail load, essentially shut off customers, generally during the worth possible time of the year which is the coldest days of the winter. The challenge with becoming so dependent on one fuel supply, natural gas, is you're dependent on one fuel supply, and if you look at the history of natural gas, it's quite a volatile fuel in quantity and price.

So fuel diversity to me is a very important thing. This would be a very diverse fuel source, very reliability fuel source and would be there when we needed it. So technically today, no, it's not a reliability project, but our supply/demand balance is becoming very tight, and the surplus that we once enjoyed as a region is largely evaporated.

MR. HONIGBERG: Will Northern Pass in addition to paying local property taxes be

paying state taxes as well? State property tax, business profit tax, et cetera?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. OUINLAN: And I'll refer this to Ms. Shapiro.

MS. SHAPIRO: Hi, the statewide utility property taxes, utilities pay directly to the state and then that money goes into the education trust fund and that's used for distribution to communities. In the first year, I'd estimate that's about \$10 million, and then with the depreciation schedule, that would gradually go down. At the state level, the property tax rate is fixed at \$6.60 per thousand so it doesn't change each year like what you see at the local level.

The project will also be subject to business profits tax and business enterprise taxes, and the business profits tax in the first year will likely be over \$10 million and, again, that would go down over time as the assets depreciate and the earnings decline with the depreciation of the assets.

MR. OUINLAN: Thank you. MR. HONIGBERG: Will the construction use best environmental methods available.

MR. HONIGBERG: So I'm going to refer this to Lee Carbonneau. Lee Carbonneau is an environmental expert with Normandeau Associates.

MS. CARBONNEAU: Thanks, Bill. Lee
Carbonneau. The project has committed to using
what we call best management practices. That's
a common root word. There are many different
best management practice manuals available.
There's some that have been put out by the
state. There are other practices that some of
the construction companies and engineering firms
have also developed.

In addition to that, there have been a number of commitments that the project has made above and beyond the typical best management programs that will be employed to help minimize and avoid impacts to particularly sensitive species of wildlife or rare plants and these are been included in our mitigation report. They include a variety of things like seasonal restrictions on working in certain sensitive

areas during particular breeding seasons, using protective fencing in areas where we definitely don't want any mechanical equipment to stray off a path and into a sensitive area, using mats along sensitive plant locations so that they are more easily restored, and having environmental monitors out in the field during construction to make sure that the commitments are obeyed, that the permit conditions are adhered to and that all of the other best management practices are used and maintained and done according to all of the plans and commitments.

MR. HONIGBERG: Don't put the microphone down. Do your considerations of the environment include consideration of the carbon impact of the flooding of the lands up in Quebec that occurred to generate the power that will come down through these lines?

MS. CARBONNEAU: The carbon issue is not part of our state and federal permit applications that we're doing for the siting of the project in New Hampshire. So although the project is aware of carbon issues associated

1 with the project up in Canada which someone else 2 can speak to more generally than I can, it is 3 not part and parcel of the application materials. 4 5 MR. QUINLAN: So one of the expert reports 6 that you referred to earlier prepared by London 7 Economics which is pending consideration of a protective order, they evaluate the emissions 8 9 impact. They determine there's about three 10 million tons a year in carbon reduction across 11 the region. So that analysis is embedded in 12 that Expert Report. MR. HONIGBERG: In construction, will you 13 14 be using nonreflective wires along the towers? 15 MR. MUNTZ: I believe that is the type of 16 wire that we will be using. 17 MR. HONIGBERG: Are buildings in the fall 18 zone of the towers that are being proposed? 19 MR. JOHNSON: So I think what the question 20 is is if a structure were to fail and fall 21 outside of the right-of-way, would it 22 potentially have an opportunity to impact a residence or a business of some sort. 23 In

general, when towers fail they don't fall outside of the zone. They're specifically, over the right-of-way they're specifically designed so that does not happen. It's to do with the way that the wire's tension and structures themselves so if one were to fall it would either crumble in place or fall along the way the lines are built. There are always worst case scenarios, I'll say, but those are extremely rare, and to my knowledge, I have never encountered one of these situations.

MR. HONIGBERG: Along some portions of the route, towers are in the same right-of-way as gas pipelines. If a tower were to fall on top of a gas pipeline, would that be a problem?

MR. JOHNSON: Again, there are strict codes that govern the installation of electric lines within or coexisting with high pressure gas pipelines, the Natural Energy Safety Code, and, again, there are rules about how far away those must be, and we are adhering to those standards.

MR. HONIGBERG: The next one is really directed to the Department of Energy's EIS. I'm

just to read it and this will be considered as a comment for DOE. Will the Department of Energy issue the Final EIS and Record of Decision before the Section 106 historic review process is complete. If yes, how will the project complete its historic review process before permits are finalized or before beginning construction.

The next question is probably also directed at DOE, but if the company wants to answer this, how will the project impact greenhouse gas emissions in New Hampshire. You may have answered that question a moment ago.

MR. QUINLAN: I did. So it's a regional number. It's approximately \$300 million tons per year in carbon dioxide emissions that will be reduced. Just for frame of reference, that's the equivalent of removing approximately 600,000 cars from the highways. Again, a regional number.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry, Bill. Three million, not 300 million.

MR. QUINLAN: I'm sorry. Three million per

1 year.

MR. HONIGBERG: If there's a contractual disagreement between Hydro-Quebec and Northern Pass or Eversource, will the ratepayers of New Hampshire be liable for damages or other costs of litigation?

MR. QUINLAN: No. No. Again, ratepayers of New Hampshire are not a party or in any way implicated in any of the contractual arrangements between Hydro-Quebec And Northern Pass Transmission. These are contracts that exist between a limited liability company, Northern Pass Transmission, under Eversource, a wholly owned subsidiary totally insulated from our regulated businesses like Eversource, New Hampshire. Formerly, Public Service of New Hampshire.

MR. HONIGBERG: I'm going to read the question that's on this sheet as it's written that does not have a town associated with it. So the question may not make quite as much sense without that, and you'll understand why when I read it.

Per the town selectmen, Northern Pass has not done any presentations. The Town Manager states, quote, Northern Pass is not coming here, close quote. Can you explain why?

MR. QUINLAN: No. Without identification of the town, I can't answer the question. I will say, however, that we have been in continuous contact with each and every municipality hosting this line so to the extent there's any municipality that's interested in such a meeting, we'd be happy to participate.

MR. HONIGBERG: Are there benefits to a landowner that has the right-of-way already on his or her property? Monetary benefits in addition to what that property may have received when the right-of-way was originally granted?

MR. QUINLAN: So an existing landowner, existing right-of-way. There's no incremental benefit through use of the property directly to that landowner. Lease payments or payment to acquire the already existing line. However, those customers and those adjoining landowners will benefit similar to all other New Hampshire

customers from lower energy costs, job opportunities, reduced emissions. Those are universal benefits that inure to each and every citizen in the State of New Hampshire. There's nothing new or specific for the use of a right-of-way.

MR. HONIGBERG: If a property is a historic property that has the right-of-way on it, is that treated differently from other pieces of property along the route?

MR. QUINLAN: I'll refer this to Cherilyn Widell.

MS. WIDELL: Historic properties which are properties defined by the Park Service as those that are on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places are afforded protection under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and also need to be taken into consideration for the SEC application. So the effects of the project on historic properties are considered as part of the application and as part of the Section 106 process.

MR. HONIGBERG: If a property owner can prove that the project has lowered the property value, will that person be entitled to any payment from you for any part of this project?

MR. QUINLAN: In addition to the outreach we've done with municipalities along the route, we've also conducted extensive outreach to landowners along the route, and we're working with those landowners on a case by case basis, either to do what we can to mitigate any adverse consequences or to address specific questions or concerns that they may have, and it's really a case by case determination that we engage in with the landowners. It's something we've been focused on for quite some time now, and it's going to continue right on through the permitting and construction phase.

MR. HONIGBERG: That answers part of the question that's on this sheet, but the other part on the sheet I'm looking at right now has to do with existing rights-of-way. Are existing rights-of-way going to be widened along the route. Obviously, we're in Concord, and this

person is in Concord and wants to know about

Concord rights-of-way, but will right-of-ways

have to be widened and will the towers be

higher? I think we already know that the towers

will be higher.

MR. QUINLAN: Towers will generally be higher but the rights-of-way will not be wider. One of the things our engineers are working on is a design that will in essence allow us to colocate the existing transmission line with the new line in the same right-of-way. Therefore, the rights-of-way will not have to be wider.

MR. HONIGBERG: What percentage of the time will the line be at full capacity and are there times when it won't be used at all?

MR. MUNTZ: The commitment that HQ has made is to flow the line a minimum of 67 percent of capacity. Basically, what's known in the industry as 7 days a week, 16 hours a day during the peak period. As a reference point, existing line that HQ has into the US has run at over 90 percent capacity over the last five years and that includes all outages, weather, maintenance

1 outages, what have you, so we expect that 67 2 percent at a minimum. MR. OUINLAN: That's a minimum. 3 It's during the peak periods. 4 So the price pressures 5 that I was alluding to earlier occur during these peak hours, and that's why their 6 7 commitment to deliver during those periods is so 8 important. 9 MR. HONIGBERG: You've made a proposal in 10 response to the New England Clean Energy RFP. 11 If you are not selected is your project still 12 viable and will you proceed? MR. MUNTZ: Yes. We believe that the 13 14 project is viable as proposed to the SEC with 15 Hydro-Quebec funding the project. We also 16 believe the project is viable as proposed into 17 the RFP where Hydro-Quebec has made other 18 significant commitments about the timing and 19 extent of delivery and in exchange for that has 20 asked for assistance in paying for it. 21 MR. HONIGBERG: You may have answered this. 22 How much electricity is estimated to flow 23 through the line in a given year?

1 About as a minimum, 7.2 MR. MUNTZ: 2 kilowatt hours each year is 7.2 million 3 megawatts. 4 MR. QUINLAN: 7.2 million megawatt hours. That's the minimum commitment. 5 6 MR. HONIGBERG: If you were to bury the 7 line and incur the additional one billion in 8 cost, and you amortize that cost over 40 years, 9 what would the annual cost increment be? 10 MR. MUNTZ: When we look at the cost to 11 this line right now, the first year revenue 12 requirements, if you will, for customers are 13 about and for Hydro-Quebec will be about \$240 million and that would decrease over the life of 14 15 the line down to about \$50 million which is sort 16 of our ongoing O&M costs. If we were to add 17 another billion dollars to it, that would add 18 \$145 million to the first year cost. 19 MR. HONIGBERG: I think I'm going to ask 20 all the questions on this at once. What is 21 Northern Pass's and Eversource's expected return 22 on its investment for the current proposal. 23 What would the return be on the investment if

1 the line were completely buried. And what 2 portion of the projected New England energy costs would come to Northern Pass/Eversource? 3 MR. QUINLAN: Jim, why don't you answer the 4 5 first two. 6 MR. MUNTZ: Could you please repeat the 7 question. 8 Sure. This is the first MR. HONIGBERG: two questions. What is Northern 9 Pass/Eversource's expected return on its 10 11 investment for the current proposed line and 12 what would its return on investment be if the 13 line were completely buried. 14 MR. MUNTZ: Okay. Basically this is a 15 \$1.65 billion investment, 40-year anticipated The return is linked to the New England 16 life. 17 transmission, regional transmission rate of return that's approved by FERC. We would expect 18 19 to make about \$90 million in the first year and 20 that, again, declines over the life of the line. 21 If we were to add another billion dollars 22 to that and there was someone willing to pay for 23 that, we would actually make more money if the

line was buried. The problem we run into is the line is not economical, and there aren't folks willing to pay for it either to deliver their power in the case of HQ or receive the benefits of that power in the three states that have indicated interest. They would pay for it. At some point the cost of the line becomes prohibitive.

MR. HONIGBERG: I'm going to read this one just as it's writing, Mr. Quinlan. What portion of the projected New England energy costs, parens, three billion plus, close parens, would come to Northern Pass/Eversource?

MR. QUINLAN: So the short answer is none of it. Our return on this investment is through the mechanism Mr. Muntz just described. We invest capital to build the line. Our earnings and our return come from the use of the line and the repayment and it's subject to approval by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and purely based on the capital investment. Has nothing to do with what's going on in the markets. Those costs and those benefits flow to

1 Ours is a capital investment with customers. 2 return on the investment. MR. MUNTZ: Return on investment is 11.17. 3 4 MR. OUINLAN: Just over 11 percent. Return 5 on equity portion of the investment. 6 MR. HONIGBERG: How are you establishing 7 the right to build this project in all of the 8 various places that you're proposing to build 9 it? So if you could go through the different 10 types of relationships you have to the land that's being used, I think that's what this 11 12 question is getting at. In particular, this 13 questioner also wants to know what the situation 14 is in Bear Brook State Park so if you could hit 15 Bear Brook State Park as part of this answer, 16 that would be helpful. 17 MR. QUINLAN: So for the vast majority of 18 this line, we have an existing right-of-way with 19 an existing transmission line. In that existing 20 right-of-way, we have the property rights 21 necessary to construct and own this line. 22 In areas that we are using the public way, 23 meaning we're going to build under an existing

state roadway, we have requested approval from the Department of Transportation for use of those corridors.

In the far northern portion of the state, those 40 miles that I was referring to, there's one 24-mile segment that we have leased, the Wagner Forest. So we have a lease that allows us to construct and own the line in that leased area. And then we acquired parcels, generally we bought them, in some cases we've leased them, to essentially bring us over, so it's a combination of lease arrangements, purchase arrangements, that far northern part, use of the state highway is where we're going to the Department of Transportation and then our existing corridor.

Bear Brook State Park. Sam?

MR. JOHNSON: In Bear Brook State Park, we have an existing easement that goes through the park. We will be maintaining our construction within that easement.

MR. HONIGBERG: What is the current status of the Seabrook power plant? Didn't PSNH used

1 to own that and lose it in the bankruptcy?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. OUINLAN: No. So it's true that Seabrook was partially owned by Public Service of New Hampshire, I think with a minority ownership interest, but it was owned by utilities across New England. I think in early 2001, many of those utilities under industry deregulation were required to sell their generation equipment. In New Hampshire we were required to, PSNH was required to sell its ownership interest in Seabrook and we did so it's currently owned by NextEra which is a Florida-based company and to the best of my knowledge, it's operational. It's been running since 2001 when we sold it.

MR. HONIGBERG: Does New Hampshire get some of its power from the Seabrook plant today?

MR. QUINLAN: I'm not certain what the contractual arrangements are that NextEra has for its output. Again, we are one grid of one power pool. It really doesn't matter where those plants are located. For example, they could have a contractual obligation to deliver

that power to Maine or to Massachusetts or to
New Hampshire. I'm not aware of any New
Hampshire commitments that NextEra has. They
certainly don't have any with Eversource or the
75 percent of the load here in New Hampshire.
I'm not aware of their relationships with Unitil
or Co-op or Liberty, but their power, just like
power from every other generator across New
England, flows into the grid and then
electrically serves load in the region.

MR. HONIGBERG: That was the last question. There are two more green sheets, one of which has a comment regarding the visibility of the proposed project in Stark. The other is a, really, request to the SEC that it review the Draft EIS and also use the Final EIS to inform its decision regarding the environmental impacts of the proposal.

So with that, we will close the question portion of the evening, and we're going to take a 15-minute break so the stenographer's fingers can cool off, and we'll be back at 715.

(Recess taken)

MR. HONIGBERG: The first thing we're going to do is Mr. Quinlan has asked for the opportunity to clarify something that was said in response to one of the questions. I don't even know what the question or answer was, but they need to clarify something so Mr. Quinlan?

MR. QUINLAN: I'd like to provide some information on the tallest transmission tower in New Hampshire. It's actually 340 feet tall. It's in the Seacoast area in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and it is part of a river crossing. And also to provide clarity on the using the low reflective conductor, we are not using the low reflective conductor on this project.

MR. HONIGBERG: We're now ready to start with the public comments. We have over 50 people who have signed up to speak. It is really in everybody's best interest for you to be concise and if at all possible limit yourself to 3 minutes. If you're not able to do that, we will ask you to stop and come back at the end in a second round with those who need more time.

If someone before you said what you would

have said, or essentially what you would have said, please don't just repeat what someone else has done. Please say I agree with what an earlier speaker said regarding X, Y or Z and everyone behind you will be ecstatic.

There are some people who signed up online through the Department of Energy's process. We have a bunch of yellow sheets. We have a handful of elected officials. We're going to call the elected officials first. I hope we got them all. Is Senator Lou D'allesandro back from his earlier meetings? No. Not yet. All right. So we'll put Senator D'allesandro aside, and we'll start with Senator Andrew Hosmer followed by Representative Howard Moffett and then Les Otten, a Dixville selectman.

SPEAKER: Good evening and thank you. I'm

State Senator Andrew Hosmer. I represent

District 7 which is 8 towns and two cities. One

of those cities being the city of Franklin which

is where the converter station is proposed to be

built. Franklin is a city that's struggled over

the past few decades with the closure of mills

and the depreciation of its tax base. It's also a place that's quite beautiful. Its citizens are proud and hard working, and I know that the ones that I speak with are hopeful that the future will hold economic opportunity for them as well as for future generations.

The Northern Pass project will be transformational for the city of Franklin. The project will provide a \$400 million investment in the city's tax base, approximately \$6 million a year in new tax revenues and more than 500 jobs coming to that city during the construction phase. The benefits to the city will both be short-term and long-term, and the residents of the city are eager to see this project move forward.

I have followed this project for many
years. No one will dispute the fact that
Northern Pass got off to a bad start and was
poorly designed and presented. However, the
project has continued to reach out to
communities, has listened to concerns from
residents and has made changes that address many

of the concerns raised. Because of this, the project deserves your support.

I recognize that these types of projects have impacts, and many residents have very legitimate concerns. The Site Evaluation Committee can play a positive role in helping address those concerns and encouraging Northern Pass and abutting landowners to continue to discuss opportunities to reduce the impact of the project.

In conclusion, New Hampshire must pursue long-term energy strategies that balance the interest of its citizens, lowers the cost of energy and helps create a vibrant economy. This project allows the citizens of Franklin to look into the future and know that the city they love has a future filled with opportunity.

Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

MR. HONIGBERG: Senator Hosmer, if you have something in writing if you could give it to the stenographer, that way she'll get your remarks exactly as you intended to deliver them. That's

a ground rule for all of you, if you are going to be reading something, if you could read it just the way Senator Hosmer read his statement, that would be great, and if you could provide a copy to the stenographer, that would be very helpful. Also if you could spell your last name if there's any ambiguity in your last name that would be helpful as well.

So next up we have representative Howard Moffett, followed by Dixville Selectman Les

SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. I thank you especially for the time and attention that you've given to this docket. My name is Howard Moffett. I represent Canterbury and Loudon.

I'm also among the 68 state legislators who have filed jointly a Petition to Intervene in this docket. Little before 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon, I was passing through Franconia Notch on my way to the Colebrook Elementary School.

As I went by Profile Lake, I looked up to the left to the spot where the Old Man used to be.

I always do that when I go through the notch.

The cloud cover was low but not too low. I could see where he used to be. Keeping watch over the Pemigewassett River Valley, and it reminded me of something that Daniel Webster once said. He said men hang out their signs indicative of their respective trades.

Shoemakers hang out a gigantic shoe, jewelers a monster watch, and the dentist hangs out a gold

monster watch, and the dentist hangs out a gold tooth, but up in the mountains of New Hampshire, God Almighty has hung out a sign to show that there He makes men. We lost the Old Man in 2003, but he still serves as the symbol of the Granite State, and I'd like to think that he still watches.

So what would he think of Northern Pass, which now proposes to hang out its own signs, two signs, up there. Two chains of steel towers, 100 feet high, strung with wires from Pittsburg to Bethlehem and from Bristol to Deerfield to show that there, high above some of New Hampshire's most valued landscapes, Northern Pass wants to transmit high voltage electric

power made somewhere else for the benefit of consumers in Massachusetts and Connecticut and for the profit of Eversource shareholders. I believe I know what he would think.

The first thing to be said about Northern
Pass is what you heard earlier from Mr. Quinlan.
It's not a reliability project. It's an
economic project. It's not needed to keep the
lights on. So I want to suggest that it
behooves you to weigh very carefully the
benefits, the alleged benefits of the project
against the cost, because I think if you do
that, you will find that compared to some of the
alternatives, the benefits of the project end up
being rather modest compared to the costs
because unless the line is buried, the cost to
the public, the costs to the state of New
Hampshire are going to be incalculable.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go a little over three minutes and I'm happy to come back at the end.

MR. HONIGBERG: You're already over three minutes.

SPEAKER: Why don't I come back at the end.

MR. HONIGBERG: Thank you, Representative

Moffett.

(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: Next up is Dixville Selectman Les Otten.

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Les
Otten. I'm the developer of the Balsams Resort
in Dixville, New Hampshire, and a Selectman of
that unincorporated town. Thank you for the
opportunity to speak tonight. Our business has
received a two million dollar investment from
what will become the Forward NH Fund established
to help lift one of the poorest economies in the
northeast. This investment was made with no
strings attached. Northern Pass may make a more
substantial investment in our project in the
near future as their process continues.

Our North Country community is suffering from decades-long job losses. Drugs have invaded our schools and communities and there has been a dramatic and continuing decline in our wood products industry. On a positive note,

our communities have already embraced renewable power now for decades with hydrogeneration stations on the Androscoggin River and 33 wind towers sited along our ridgelines. These dams release water on schedules that have enhanced the recreation rafting industry. Seven of these wind towers are located on our property and do not negatively impact the viability of the \$143 million investment my company is attempting to make in its first phase of development adding an estimated 1700 long-term jobs and 600 construction jobs.

I've been involved with resorts from
California to Maine, including three resorts in
New Hampshire, none of which have been
negatively affected by transmission lines to my
knowledge. Our resort will benefit from the
reduced power cost we expect as bulk power
buying becomes possible from the proposed DC
power line. My staff has estimated that that
will save our company over \$200,000 a year. We
are attempting to build a green farm to table
renewable reliant resort which will be favored

globally as a vacation destination.

It's long past the time for us to acknowledge there is no silver bullet for solving the effects of fossil fuels in our environment. Northern Pass is one positive step that will reduce our dependence on the sources of power generation that are harming our environment.

Since 2008, I have been investing in clean renewable energy in New Hampshire. My company Maine Energy Systems has been the leading installer of clean renewable central heating pellet boilers and has been delivering fuel produced in Maine, New Hampshire and Canada to New Hampshire residents.

Finally, my father was born in 1886. He was 63 when I was born. If my son lives as long as his grandfather, he will live until 2079. In that 193-year time span we will have consumed the vast majority of all the fossil fuels created on our planet in a 6 to 7 billion year history. Releasing that CO2 into the atmosphere is understood to have devastating effects on the

ecosystem of our planet. It is also shameful for us not to make every reasonable effort to move to renewable resources like the hydropower we are discussing. I support renewable energy locally and globally, and I therefore support Northern Pass. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: Next up, Robert Werner to be followed by Gail Matson. Those are the only other elected officials that I'm aware of who are here. If you are an elected official and would like to move up in the queue, if you could come up and tell Mr. Iacopino, that would be the best way to do that. Mr. Werner.

SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Rob Werner. I represent Ward 5 here in Concord and also chair the Concord Energy and Environment Subcommittee. Many of us know in this community that we had a subcommittee of Concord City Council work very diligently for many hours and many days and the recommendation was to bury the lines of the Northern Pass project within Concord.

It was stated earlier by Mr. Quinlan that we needed to address the impact of this project on the White Mountain National Forest. Time to take a step back and to address the impacts of this project on the city of Concord which is highly significant. Some of the towers have been described as much as 120 feet, 125 feet high. Very large impact in terms of sight lines.

The lines on the projects are really quite contrary to our vision of a city in terms of how we generally look at power lines, whether it be downtown Concord or, whether it be in other areas of the city, whether it be new developments where it would require lines to be buried. So what we have before us is actually a scar on our city that we highly recommend to look at other options that have less impacts, not only in the city of Concord but on our wildlife, on our forests and our other impacts of our culture and life here in New Hampshire. And Councilor Matson, my colleague who chaired the subcommittee, will talk in a bit more detail

about some of these impacts.

(Applause)

_

_

MR. HONIGBERG: Councilor Matson to be followed by Beth Campbell who is representing Representative Kathy Rogers tonight.

SPEAKER: My name is Gail Matson. I'm the Ward 8 City Councilor. Also the chair for the subcommittee for Northern Pass here.

Our subcommittee gathered information from Eversource and other stakeholders to determine the impact of the proposed project in Concord. The report submitted to Council, they voted unanimously to file a Petition to Intervene and recommend burial of the lines in our city. We request for burial of the lines is based upon the project's current proposed aerial path and subsequent impacts to character, property values and as well as visual and audio impacts due to the close proximity to residences.

Concord has spent nearly two million to bury utility lines in the downtown area of Concord and is considering burial of the lines on South Main Street. Currently, our city

regulations require that new subdivisions bury title lines. The proposed route of the Northern Pass passes through 31 communities using the two 2010 census, slightly more than 117,000 people live in those communities. Concord's population is 42,695 which is slightly more than 36 percent of the entire affected population.

There are 8.1 miles of overhead lines proposed for Concord; approximately, 6 percent of the total overhead route, and per the Northern Pass, the most common height of the existing structures in the right-of-way in Concord are 43 feet. The height of structures being relocated for the project will increase from 43 to 88 feet. The October 14th Northern Pass project map indicates that there are 120 structures over 90 feet in Concord. Sixty of those 120 will be between 100 and 125 feet. For perspective, the Capitol dome is 150 feet.

Northern Pass claims the average scenic impact is 1.79 on a scale of 0 to 5 which is low to very low. However, for the southern section which includes Concord, the impact rises from

1.92 to 2.92 with additional 6 square miles of the viewshed rating high or very high. The view from roads will increase from low to moderate to moderate to high. In the DOE draft

Environmental Impact Statement in July 2015, sites two areas in Concord with strong aesthetic visual impacts. Loudon Road increases from moderate to severe. And Turtle Town Pond increases from moderate to strong. Clearly, the visual impact to Concord will be significant.

In our subcommittee meetings, Brian Bosse of Eversource has told us that the cost of aerial installation was approximately three million per mile and the cost of underground installation was between 8 to 13 million per mile which is quite a range. The subcommittee councilors asked on varying occasions for cost estimate breakdowns due to a variety of soil conditions and this information was never provided.

Citizens of Concord have been clear and consistent in their position on the Northern Pass. Aerial installation will have lasting

negative effects on individuals and the city as a whole with respect to quality of life and economic development. Therefore, we request burial of lines throughout the city of Concord. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HONIGBERG: Next up is Beth Campbell for Representative Rogers to be followed by George Dzjuna, a Franklin City Councilor, and then Ellen Schaefer.

Good evening. Speaking for SPEAKER: Katherine Rogers: Good evening. My name is Katherine Rogers. I am a New Hampshire representative who lives here in Concord. I am speaking out in favor of this project because of my constituents. As a state legislator, I work to balance sometimes competing interests of issues like this. Two areas in which we all agree is that a number of older power plants retiring and going off line requires this conversation, and if we don't embrace projects like this, we will not make any progress in lowering electric rates which remain among the highest in the country.

My constituents tell me their electric bills are way too high. Many of the people I represent are low income families who struggle with their monthly payments. They need help. I also have heard from businesses who tell me their utility costs are too expensive. They need relief, too. We can't forget about these folks.

Eversource has repeatedly explained this project is estimated to lower residential electric rates by 5 percent. Businesses are in line to save substantially more. That is on top of the \$80 million in property tax revenue for the communities along the route. Those are real savings for the people who live in our communities, and I can't ignore that type of savings.

In addition, as a representative of a working class neighborhood, I have heard from many people who celebrate the fact that this proposal means well over 1,000 jobs with training opportunities available to actually participate in the economic benefits of Northern

Pass in direct ways. Some of my constituents are members of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and they are clear and unanimous in their unwavering support for this project and the jobs that will be created by allowing it to proceed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This project has become demonized by many in this debate, and I feel like we have lost sight of why we are talking about Northern Pass. Are there 77 new towers going up to sustain the Yes. There are also 122 poles that are being relocated to lessen the impact on visibility so there is positive response based on resident feedback, and I keep coming this reality. Every inch of this line through this area is in a utility right-of-way which was designed many decades ago to be the acceptable pathway for power lines. Perhaps there are ways to keep lowering the heights, but if we want new energy resources, we have to be willing to connect them. I'm not saying I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically endorse every detail of this project, but I know major progress when I

see it and I know a proposal that resolves constituent concerns when I see it and this does both.

What I see is a plan that will lower electric rates, provide new jobs and it will produce clean energy that can actually take a bite out of our carbon footprint. These are good things. I fear that absolutes in this debate, that all in or nothing sentiment, jeopardizes the many benefits a project like this can bring to New Hampshire. I urge the members of the Site Evaluation Committee to find the common ground to move this project forward so our state can enjoy the benefits it would bring. Thank you.

MR. HONIGBERG: George Dzujna.

SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Chairman and Panel. My last name is Dzujna. I'm a City Councilor in Franklin, and I concur with what Senator Hosmer has said. He hit the nail on the head so I'm not going to go on about all the benefits. I guess the biggest thing that I just wanted to, statement I wanted to make is back in

January when we had the meeting in Franklin, somebody said oh, I don't blame Franklin for taking the money and running, but that's not what it's about. It's not taking the money and running. It's taking the money and doing something with our city. We're in the process of revitalization and I know, being a City Councilor for the last four years, I know some of the challenges that we had with our budget from the challenges from the state downshifting to us, and where else can we find some money to do the projects that we're doing for our revitalization and for our mill districts. And thank you very much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: Ellen Schaffer, followed by Taras Kucman and Jane Difley.

SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Ellen
Schaffer, and I'm a resident of Concord. I am
speaking tonight as a citizen of New Hampshire
and more specifically of Concord. I do not want
the Northern Pass at all, but because our
neighbors in the south need more electricity,

I'm willing to support a compromise as long as it is not at the expense of destroying the beauty and tranquility of our beautiful state and its capital city. This is what will happen if the line goes above ground or through the right-of-way. The destruction of so many trees and the humming of the lines will ruin the surrounding areas, especially in Concord which has the most new towers of any area.

Seventy-seven new towers are scheduled to be built in Concord, destroying farmland. Turtle

built in Concord, destroying farmland, Turtle Pond, and passing way too close to homes. For this reason, it must be buried along roads and not in the right-of-way.

When I heard Bill Quinlan's comment that he wasn't hearing much opposition from people in central and southern New Hampshire, I contacted my neighbor, Sue Woodard, and who had a sign saying Stop Northern Pass in her yard, and we started the following Petition which states: We support burying the Northern Pass Transmission lines through the entire state but especially through Concord where they will be in close

proximity to many homes. We have gathered 1102 signature on this Petition and I have to say we only had maybe 2 or 3 dozen people in Concord that would not sign it in all the people we spoke to. So I would like to have this entered into the record. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: My name is Taras Kucman. I'd like to thank the DOE and I'd like to thank the SEC for allowing me to speak this evening. I'm wearing orange, and it comes as no surprise that I am opposed to the project as it is stated. I'm a 20-year resident of Concord and I live on the right-of-way. I've been a resident and engineer and I've been a US Army engineer in the past. I was commissioned back in 1983. And I'm glad that the Corps of Engineers is represented this evening also. My point is that what's rarely brought up is the national security risk of what's being proposed here this evening.

Right now it's a very simple right-of-way.

It's got two sources of energy on an east and on the western boundary. They're 115,000 volt

lines. They're separated by about 150 feet, and they're about 55-foot towers so if they fall down in either direction, it makes no risk or impacts nobody.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

However, if this project proceeds as it is planned, they will crowd that right-of-way, simply 250 feet wide, the western boundary service will be moved 40 feet closer to the residences, and the towers are going from 55 feet to 85 feet, and then the artery, the 345 kV will go right down the middle and that's where the rub is.

To put it in context, I'd just like to say that we recall the blackout of 2003. You may recall that the blackout went clearly from Massachusetts up through Minnesota and way into What caused that. Ontario. That was a simple It was heat in the summer, August. event. Closed plants put additional plants on other Wires sagged, shorted out the ground, wires. blacking out power supplies. Further blackouts. The rolling blackout lasted three hours. So that by 4 o'clock everything was blacked out but the blackout stopped. Luckily, it was not a big deal.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Kaufman, it actually works better if you speak to the microphone.

People in the back will hear you better if you speak to the microphone.

Okay. Will do. MR. KUCMAN: The repairs were made and within a week everybody even out in Ontario had power back. But now I would ask that you consider in that context we had Y2K. In that context we had 9/11 and then we had this blackout. There was a lot of fear and anxiety as to what was going on. So now I would ask you to consider that in today's environment, what if someone were compelled to create a spectacular event like blowing the outside towers inward towards the Hydro-Quebec line and take the Hydro-Quebec line and then blow it so that it falls in either direction. I quarantee you as someone that's been qualified in building bridges or blowing them up, knocking down poles is not a problem. Anybody hell-bent on doing that could do it.

1 I would ask that DHS consider what the 2 impact of such a catastrophe would be, not in 3 August but on a coldest evening in February. 4 Eversource and Northern Pass may go ahead and 5 say that hey, this has never happened. 6 are much greater targets, say, in Gary, Indiana, 7 or in Toronto. I don't know if you've driven 8 through the QEW in Toronto or if you've ever 9 been to Gary, Indiana, but having towers like 10 that come through New Hampshire would probably 11 be the biggest dream that Bill Quinlan and Tom 12 May could ever have. I just do not understand 13 how they can rely on '20s and '30s technology so 14 use that as a justification for increasing the 15 return on their investment. There's no excuse 16 for it. Automobiles replaced --17 MR. HONIGBERT: Mr. Kucman, how much more 18 do you have? 19 MR. KUCMAN: Half a minute. Automobiles 20 replaced horse drawn carriages, cassettes 21 replaced 8-tracks. Buried transmission lines 22 will replace monopoles and towers. 23 competitors have figured it out. Why haven't

you.

In closing, while TSA continues to grope women and children looking for explosives and box cutters that are not there, and the FBI is still struggling with constitutional ramifications of breaking into terrorists' Facebook accounts, terrorists are looking to astonish us again within the next spectacular event. It takes no imagination to conclude that the casualties from such an event as I have described would make 9/11 look like a fireworks celebration gone wrong.

Regardless, I still believe in the premise that the key to adult learning is repetition, and in that spirit I say to you again, bury the Northern Pass completely. Aside from that, I have no strong opinion. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Thank you for holding these meeting this evening. I appreciate it. My name is Jane Difley, and I'm here this evening representing the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests where I serve as the President/Forester. Last week at the hearing in

Meredith, I summarized the Forest Society four concerns with the Northern Pass project as proposed. In Colebrook, Will Abbott reviewed concerns we have about the project's impacts on two of our largest forest reservations. Tonight I would like to address a basic concern before the SEC. That is, how you determine whether this project serves the public interest.

The Forest Society protects land because of the public benefits such conservation provides. We hold conserved lands in the public trust. It is our duty to defend these conserved lands from interests that would adversely affect the conservation values inherent in these lands. Similarly, the state holds land in public trust and has similar stewardship obligations for state parks, state forests and state wildlife conservation areas.

Eversource is a private company with a fiduciary obligation to its shareholders.

There's nothing inherently wrong with this, but the interests they bring to this table are very different from the interests of those who

steward the public trust. When Mr. Quinlan says that he believes that the Northern Pass project as proposed is balanced, he is using a scale where money is the primary counterweight. What Eversource has proposed is a project that its customer, Hydro-Quebec, says that it is willing to pay to build.

The scale that the SEC must use to assess whether the project serves the public interest is very different. The counterweight on your scale is the public interest in protecting public lands, water resources, private lands conserved for public benefit and the scenic landscapes that New Hampshire advertises around the globe to visitors to support our tourism economy. In a nutshell, the resources held in this public trust should not and cannot be for sale, nor be made available for long-term lease.

The State's wetland resources are a critical piece of water resources held in public trust. The State's wetland protection law, RSA 482-A, requires an Applicant for a wetland permit to demonstrate that it has studied

alternatives that would avoid any adverse impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Only then can the Applicant look to minimize or mitigate impacts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The Northern Pass application asks the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services to issue wetland permits for disturbance of an astounding 142 acres of wetland from Pittsburg In the 27,000 pages of the to Deerfield. application, we see no evidence that the Applicant has actually studied any alternative that would avoid any of the wetland impacts. Rather it appears to suggest that they simply need to write a large check to the state's wetland mitigation fund for the 142 acres of damage proposed without considering any alternative that would significantly avoid these impacts. Our preliminary analysis suggests that there are reasonable alternatives that would allow Northern Pass to be built in a way that substantially reduces the wetland impacts. The point is that Northern Pass should be required to present information documenting that

they have actually considered alternatives that would avoid the wetland impacts in the current application. The statute requires it so the public interest requires it.

As you begin your review of the Northern Pass application, we ask that you consider the public interest finding that you are charged to make in a manner that fully values the public trust and the resources that it is intended to protect. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the Committee for this opportunity. I do know my statement is closer to four minutes so I'll just say that from the outset.

 ${\tt MR.\ HONIGBERG:}\ {\tt We\ won't\ cut\ the\ mike\ off.}$

SPEAKER: Thank you. Appreciate that. I'm Susan Arnold, the Vice President for Conservation for the Appalachian Mountain Club.

The AMC is the oldest conservation and recreation organization in the country with more than 100,000 members and supporters from Maine to Washington, DC, including more than 12,000 here in New Hampshire. In our 140-year history,

AMC has helped to protect this region's open spaces, including from poorly sited energy projects such as Northern Pass which is requesting to use high impact old technologies to maximize profits at the expense of New Hampshire's iconic landscape. Yes, parts of this proposed project use an existing right-of-way where current tower structures are less than tree height. This project will congest that right-of-way with over 1100 new towers that are more than 2 to 3 times tree height and cut a new swath for 40 miles through northern New Hampshire. This is not state of the art, and this is the unnecessary impact that has brought out so many people in opposition to this project as proposed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I will reference but not repeat here AMC's comments provided earlier in other meetings by Dr. Kimball in Meredith in Chris Thayer in Waterville. The first point is that the choice before the SEC and the DOE is far from Northern Pass or nothing. It is whether you will allow the use of yesterday's technologies with their

high environmental impacts at the expense of New Hampshire's landscape. You know that other competing projects are completely buried, using 21st century technology and that different energy alternatives exist. Both the SEC application and the DEIS fail to acknowledge or appropriately examine competing or other reasonable alternatives to meet regional energy needs. The need for Northern Pass and its impacts must be reviewed within a broader framework.

Along with Northern Pass, other competitive projects have been bid into the newest New England Clean Energy RFP. These projects include solar, battery storage, offshore wind and more, and, ironically, one of these RFP projects, the Vermont Green Power Line, even has Hydro-Quebec power as part of its bid and it is a totally buried transmission proposal. Much of the future energy need Mr. Quinlan discussed in his opening presentation will be met with or without Northern Pass, but New Hampshire's landscape will be permanently scarred if

Northern Pass is approved as proposed.

Mentioned but downplayed in Mr. Quinlan's presentation and distributed energy and energy efficiency. These alternatives are clearly ways to help meet future energy need without the negative environmental impacts and increased foreign trade deficit of Northern Pass, and in fact, they would create more New Hampshire jobs than Northern Pass. Energy efficiency and distributed generation are emphasized in New Hampshire's 2014 update of our ten-year energy strategy, but it's not even sited in the DEIS or the SEC application. Why not. It should be.

Paradigm shifts for meeting energy needs are happening at an accelerating rate. On Tuesday night, the town of Lancaster voted for solar arrays to reduce the town's total energy cost by 25 percent. Ironically, Franklin's plan to build a much larger solar project can't proceed until more people are allowed to net meter though it would halve that city's electric bill. Big utilities like Eversource are blocking efforts to increase net metering.

Eversource and its ilk are themselves the primary barrier to getting more distributed generation online faster.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Northern Pass's presentation discussed the New England region's Forward Capacity market and argues that prices will be going up in the short-term because of the scarcity situation, but Moody's most recent analysis this last month states this market is expected to be further depressed, i.e., prices lowered, because of the amount and variety of resources that will be From demand side commitments from available. big energy users to the nation's first offshore wind farm off Block Island to two large fuel cell facilities, and, finally, the first long-term forecast for solar growth that shows small scale New England solar reducing demand by 390 megawatts in 2020. That's 50 percent of the tower going off line because of the Pilgrim nuclear power retirement. The DEIS's analysis of these alternatives is absent or much out of date and needs to be included and updated in the FEIS, and these are factors the SEC should

consider when it determines the overall public benefit or lack thereof of Northern Pass as proposed. Thank you for your time and your consideration.

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Tom Colgan. I work for Wagner Forest Management, a company based in Lyme, New Hampshire, with an office in Errol, New Hampshire. Wagner Forest Management owns and operates 100,000 acres or more of working forest in Coos County, much of which was depicted upon an earlier slide this evening that Mr. Quinlan showed of where the proposed route of the project would go through the Northern Pass.

We employ many local residents who harvest a sustainable supply of raw materials used in wood businesses based in northern New Hampshire. I'm here tonight in support of the Northern Pass project. Twenty-four miles of the proposed route will be over our land. When we were first approached by the Northern Pass folks about a right-of-way over our land, we spent an enormous amount of time talking to them, working with

them, using our firsthand local knowledge of the property to ensure that it was going to cross our land in the most environmentally friendly way possible. That location you see on the map is where we wanted it as much as and more so than where Northern Pass wanted it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

You've heard and will continue to hear many people espousing the importance of and necessity to bury the entire line through the entire 192 section miles of the proposed project. 24-mile section is proposed to be above ground, and that's exactly where we want it. working forest, you want to be able to see the obstacles that might be in your way. I can see a power line above the ground. I can't see one buried. With all the skidders, the harvesters, trucks, bulldozers, the excavators that work every day, that's the last thing I want to do is be worried about any issues that occur with the equipment that we use. And for the comments that it's an incalculable, I think, quote of disturbance of the aesthetics of the property, it's a perfectly compatible use with a working

forest. It's compatible with all the recreational uses that go on on our land, and it's a privilege that we offer the local public.

Our company believes that climate change is real, and we do more than just believe the talk about it. We walk the talk. We have been a developer of a wind project and we still manage a wind project in Maine. We're been an investor in Granite Reliable project in northern New Hampshire. We used to be a part-owner of the largest wood pellet business based in Jaffrey, New Hampshire, New England Wood Pellets.

So we walk the talk. And when I look at this project, it will bring renewable energy. Baseload hydropower. We also have solar panels on our property, on our office, that we put up with our own money, and I can tell you if I had to live with only the power it generated every day I would be cold and dark, and my computer would not work. It's as simple as that. It's a laudable cause, but it's not always the answer. It's part of the big choices that one should have.

1 In closing, I'd like to say in this day and 2 age when nearly every societal issue comes up it 3 seems to be so partisan and polarizing, I'm grateful that the state legislature years ago 4 5 set up the SEC to be a thoughtful arbiter of large projects like Northern Pass. 6 There's 7 always going to be impacts, there's always going to be many different opinions on what it should 8 9 be, but I want to thank you for making the 10 personal and professional commitment shepherding 11 this process to a decision that is in the best 12 interests of the people and the policies of the 13 state.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, my name is Dick
Swett, and I want to thank you for holding these
hearings and also for your attention this
evening. As an architect and renewable energy
developer from way long before the talk of polar
ice caps melting or global climate change were
even mentioned, and as a former member of
Congress who served on the Public Works and
Infrastructure Committee and on the Science and

Technology Committee and as a member of the New Hampshire Clean Tech Council, I have always been interested in the intersection of design aesthetics, power production, environmental protection and economic profitability.

My work today continues to combine these four components in what I hope are balanced and practical, yet beautiful, solutions. The Northern Pass is a challenging project to consider when these requirements are applied to it. Yet I believe that there is a way to balance all and do that in harmony. This project will be a long enduring source of power for many years to come, and for that reason we should take the long view and make sure that it over time does nothing to diminish the aesthetics of our beautiful state. That long timeline also enables us to recoup its profits and to spread out the costs over time as well.

For these reasons I rise to contribute my voice to these who would like to see the line buried for the entire distance through the North Country. The economics have been proven,

feasible in our neighboring states of Vermont and Maine. Burying the line would lead our wilderness a pristine wilderness without the imposition of horrendously ugly towers cutting across the landscape and would minimize the environmental impact. Over time, perhaps a little longer than has originally been planned, revenue would be recouped and profits would not diminish to unacceptable levels.

At the same time, I believe that the developers should show a commitment to New Hampshire's ability to self-generate power, renewable power in the North Country, and provide a way to help it get to market in the southern tier of the state. I know there is talk of Northern Pass providing economic support for the upgrade of the Coos loop which would enable the green power produced in the North Country to make its way south. I encourage the commitment of support to be realized and for the sake of our local economy and our commitment to our natural habitat. It is a small price to pay that will enable our great State of New

Hampshire to self-generate power using its own resources. This will make us less reliant on energy from over our border. It will enable us to produce a greater economic churn from every dollar spent on energy that is spent within our state borders, in some cases generating economic activity over six times its original value.

The New Hampshire Clean Tech Market report dated in February of 2015 states on page 15 that, quote, if New Hampshire could achieve the kind of relatively more efficient relationship between total energy expenditures and the economic activity as Massachusetts, which happens to be one of the leaders in New England and in the nation in clean tech, then New Hampshire citizens and businesses would have spent \$2 billion less on energy in 2012 for the same level of economic output, and where would that \$2 billion have gone? Mostly back into the state's economy in other areas, boosting producers of other goods and services and incentivizing job creation, end quote.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Swett. How much more

do you have?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Fifteen seconds. Northern Pass MR. SWETT: can help make this happen through support of that upgrade of the Coos loop. In conclusion, let me say that the beauty of our natural environment is central to our economic well-being as we share it with all who come to visit our beautiful state. We need to protect our environment and at the same time allow for utilization of our natural resources for the generation of power that creates more than light in the night. It creates employment for the many more people, far more people than will be employed by Northern Pass long after it's been built. The balancing of these points will allow profits to be realized by all parties concerned, the economy will be strengthened, and the future of our state will remain bright. I encourage the burial of the Northern Pass line and the upgrade of the Coos loop for these reasons. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: I'm Fred Brownson from Wentworth,

New Hampshire. I'm here to speak to the question of the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement and the SEC evaluation on local, region and national security. Five points to be made.

First, the failure of a grid for more than 3 or 4 days extending into weeks or months would be a catastrophic impact on the people, tens of millions of people, who are served by the grid.

Number two, a rather tightly veiled secret for decades with penetrations from time to time from retired utility executives and retired government officials is the vulnerability of our electric grids to attack from those who would do harm to us, whether they be rogue nations like Korea and the iso call fate to more mature nations like Iran, China, Russia. They all have the capability to take down our grid. The amateur hacker could probably do it one day, but the vulnerability is there.

Number 3, as to New England, that vulnerability becomes greater the more power we import from a foreign nation with a massive

transmission and transformer infrastructure that is vulnerable to attack in an area that our government cannot defend.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Fourth, the very existence of increasing dependence upon Canadian power and the economic stake that the utilities have in that creates a major barrier to the ultimate solution to security which is microgrids. And, finally, the EIS and I suspect the SEC evaluation have failed completely to address these issues. Fortunately for us, and this is my written submission this evening, Ted Koppel, who was at the top of the ABC news network for years, a terrific investigative reporter, released last year a book that made it to the New York Times bestseller list titled Lights Out. Ted examines these issues in great depth and pulls the veil of secrecy back off of this subject in a way that had not been previously been accomplished.

I thank you for the opportunity to say these words this evening, and I hope you will take this Koppel book and where is the DOE?

I've already sent one to the head of the SEC,

and, hopefully, they'll pay some attention to it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

SPEAKER: Thank you, especially for the correct pronunciation of my last name. is Greg Rahe, and I've worked for Eversource New Hampshire for 14 years. As an account executive I worked with Eversource's large commercial industrial customers in the greater Seacoast The Seacoast is growing at twice the rate area. of the rest of the state and is expected to represent approximately 25 percent of New Hampshire's electrical by 2020. The growth is due in part to business expansion. Several of the largest industrial customers on the Seacoast are multi-national concerns with corporate offices located in Europe and Asia. When deciding where to expand, Seacoast businesses are often competing against their counterparts in other US locations or abroad. The talent pool companies can draw from is abundant which strengthens the argument to expand here. However, many of these customers have stated that the high cost of utilities, especially

electricity, is a prime concern. They tell that electric rates for their businesses in New Hampshire are nearly double the national average for manufacturing and almost 40 percent higher for the commercial segment. These are energy intensive businesses that consume a lot of electricity, and any opportunity for them to reduce their variable costs is very beneficial.

To give you some perspective, a large business on the Seacoast consumes three million kilowatt hours a month. That's 6000 times more than the average home. To equate those figures to cost, that business would pay \$255,000 a month for energy, not including transmission and distribution charges. A five percent reduction in energy cost would save the business upwards of \$108,000 annually. Those are funds that they could use to hire additional staff, expand their product line and give back to the communities.

I support Northern Pass because it's a renewable energy source which will reduce energy prices, help mitigate the price volatility we've witnessed over the last several winters and help

business and industry thrive and expand in New Hampshire. Thank you.

MR. HONIGBERG: For those paying a babysitter at home, we're about a third of the way through the pile.

SPEAKER: Committee members, my name is Susan Percy. I'm going to make this very easy for you. You have a great job in front of you. Hard work. I encourage you to either deny the project as it's presented or insist that the line be buried. My testimony is included. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm Frederick Fitts, a property owner in Whitefield, and I teach courses in environmental history. My ancestors showed up in New Hampshire in the 1600s and now responsibility for the land is on our watch just as it was earlier on theirs. So I speak with some reference for tradition. The decisions that you make here will have a huge impact on the legacy that you bestow to our state. Think well on it. Nothing is lost by taking time to reflect on the degradation of a transformed

landscape. When you walk out of here tonight, when you meet to make siting decisions, you will see and feel the power provided by electricity. We use it, we need it, we appreciate its advantages as it lights our world, and you may also turn out those lights at times, perhaps when you read your child a bedtime story. I'd recommend The Lorax by Dr. Seuss.

All across this state, thousands of citizens are dependent on the power this company provides, but what my neighbors and I in the North Country resist is the transformed power of the landscape you have the power to prevent. The issue here is not about jobs, not about individual rights to the land or corporate rights to provide services, nor about individual preferences.

The one issue in front of you is your responsibility to our common birthright. An environment preserved from selfish and greedy assault and scarred by corporate muscle. The lands around our community, the vistas we see are not the provenance of the powerful and the

wealthy and the greedy. The scar that enormous towers represent stands as emblematic of a willingness to give privilege to profit over preservation. To prioritize speedy development over assured safety and to declare that all progress is good progress.

So I rise here and ask that you embrace the precautionary principle and oppose a project whose electromagnetic health risks are yet unknown, and I rise here to ask that you reject the project whose negative transformation to the environment is known and would be visible to every community as long as steel shall stand against sky.

I am asking you to stand against these towers. Bury them if this project is, in your judgment, essential, but deny the right to degrade our state. You will leave a legacy to your children and to my children and to the children of power company executives. You will decide if enormous towers that can be buried are worth degrading our communities. I am asking that you not allow this company's proposed scar

to be tattooed onto our common landscape. Thank you.

(Applause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

My name is Bill Felling. SPEAKER: here tonight to urge you to look very closely at the entire path of construction that Hydro-Quebec and its partner Eversource plan to wreak on our state, the great state of New Hampshire. New Hampshire is famous for mountains, forests and natural beauty. Over the years its citizens have been careful stewards of land across the state to ensure a quality of life unparalleled now and for future Whole swaths of forests have been generations. preserved from development through easements, pastures are protected, entire mountain ranges cover the state with extraordinary majesty. Lakes, rivers and streams are enjoyed by people and wildlife existing together.

The Northern Pass project as proposed threatens what New Hampshire residents have prized, all for the sake of greed. Billions of dollars are projected to be realized by private

companies at our expense. Our citizens will not have long-term jobs. Our electric rates will not go down. We the residents of New Hampshire cannot win anything.

I'm here to speak for the members of Percy Summer Club whose properties are located on the western shore of Christine Lake in Stark.

According to the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Christine Lake is the closest thing to a wilderness lake in the state. The lake is open to the public, is a trout fishery and hosts nesting loons. Ospreys and bald eagles are often seen.

Almost 30 years ago, members of the Percy
Summer Club worked with the state of New
Hampshire and the Forest Society to ensure that
the water and viewshed of Christine Lake would
be permanently protected, preserving the unique
area for feature generations. Easements on
Percy's Summer Club land combined with state
management of the Nash Stream tract and longtime
club member John Kauffmann's donation of the
nearly 2000-acre Kauffmann Forest surrounding

the lake have made that vision a reality.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Until today, that is, when Northern Pass proposes to erect a series of towers over 100 feet in height, using the existing PSNH right-of-way which runs along the ridge on the entire southern shore of the lake. Unlike the current towers in the right-of-way, these new towers will be visible from the lake itself as well as from the surrounding trails and Whether swimming, fishing, boating mountains. or hiking, the transmission towers will become a permanent part of the experience of Christine The right-of-way runs directly through Lake. the Kauffmann Forest making a mockery of John's lifelong efforts to secure the viewshed.

When the right-of-way was originally granted to Public Service New Hampshire, there was in fact a public service involved, the need to provide reliable electricity to the residents of Coos County. While no one is busy taking sunset photos of the existing power lines, we all understand their purpose and the fact that they serve a legitimate local need. Not so with

Northern Pass. While it can be argued that this project will benefit energy markets in southern New England, that should not be a license to permanently mar the precious landscape of northern New Hampshire. Especially when Northern Pass has already acknowledged that the technology exists to bury this new and intrusive power line. They are, after all, proposing to do exactly that in some few sections. Clearly, the transition from PSNH to Eversource has removed public service from more than their name.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I urge you to deny this project as presented. The SEC through our RSA 162-H:16 must find that this project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water quality, the natural environment and the public health and safety. There is nothing reasonable in any portion of the proposal by Northern Pass. is nothing natural about the proposal running from Canada to New Hampshire. This project

There simply does not meet the tests of the Site

Evaluation Committee, and, importantly, the citizens of New Hampshire. Do the right thing for the residents. Deny this application.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Good evening. Thank you. МУ name is Bob Clay. I'm a businessman, former senator, and I'm here tonight speaking on behalf of the Small Business and Small Industry Association in New Hampshire. One of our biggest issues facing small businesses is the cost of electricity. New Hampshire pays on the average 50 percent more for electricity than other regions of the country, mainly due to our lack of an adequate supply. This is a make or break issue for my members, many of whom are the Mom and Pop's operations that still drive a big piece of New Hampshire economy. When I look at a project like Northern Pass offering clean hydropower from Canada, with most of it constructed underground or in existing right-of-ways and driving down energy costs to consumers and businesses, to me it's a

no-brainer. New Hampshire should be doing everything it can to move the project forward.

As I look around the room and as I've looked at other places that I've testified, I see the loudest opponents of the project are group likes New England Power Generators, the Appalachian Mountain Club, the Forest Society, groups that seem to make the most noise but certainly don't represent my interests, the interests of my members or majority of the New Hampshire people who support this project.

The power generators have an interest in providing power at the highest price possible because that's what their supporters and their company is expected to do. Groups like AMC and the Forest Society, which neither provide many jobs where I come from in the southern tier, still consider that under no circumstances should this project go through unless its lines are buried because of the views. I'd like to remind everybody that the North Country valiantly fought that the views were worth anything. In the statewide property tax they

demanded that they not be included in the assessment because they had no real value. So today to listen that suddenly their view has a value is surprising to me and maybe it's time that we revalued them for the statewide property tax. We all know that burial of the lines is meant to do nothing more than stop the project. It's not economically feasible and it will shut it down. But I can tell if we don't provide more power, then we won't have any more jobs.

I also partner in a business that provides an awful lot of commercial and industrial space. When we lost Seabrook nuclear power plant in 1999, we lost a lot of companies that were going to move in. Right now we're starting to lose businesses who provide jobs because they can no longer afford the cost of electricity. If we don't allow the hydropower to come in, and we continue to make gas the major source, we will soon be a state with no jobs, not even the service industry jobs. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Okay. It's Welch, W E L C H.

First name Don. In the spirit of town meeting here in New Hampshire, I was going to call the vote, but I get this isn't the meeting for that so I'll move on with my remarks. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

I'm a resident of Bow. I'm a native of New Hampshire. I'm also very fortunate to serve as the President of Globe Manufacturing Company in Pittsfield, 20 minutes from here. Global is a 127-year-old family business, been in New Hampshire since the early 1900s and we employ about 300 folks here in New Hampshire. We also have smaller plants in Maine and Oklahoma.

We're fortunate to have a wonderful, wonderful workforce in Pittsfield, but we're in a very competitive business. As I said, we're selling fire suits so from small municipalities that we are very proud of like in the North Country to very large cities like Washington, DC, Atlanta, Dallas, you name them, and it's a competitive business. Costs are important to us. We're the largest employer in the Pittsfield area. As you probably know,

Pittsfield is a region with a long and very proud history of manufacturing, but it's seen that manufacturing base crumble dramatically in the past few decades. We're the largest employer as I mentioned by far and we have great benefits and very good pay to our employees.

We're an important cog in the local economy.

As a manufacturer, rely on power for almost everything that we do. Electricity. When we start up the machines in the morning to cut the high tech fabrics that go into the garments we make, they're powered by electricity. The sewing machines that join the panels are powered by electricity. Even our customer service people who are communicating with our customers are doing it our computer terminals and need electricity.

So one of our basic needs is low cost reliability power. It's simple, right? I can't run my operation without those things. As we all know, electric costs in New Hampshire are among the highest in the country. As I compare my costs in New Hampshire to my plant in

Oklahoma, my costs are about double what they are in Oklahoma. So we have other issues in New Hampshire. It's not just about electric power, and I understand that. Labor costs are lower in other markets. Housing costs are lower, medical costs are lower, but electricity is a big part of it as the gentleman before me noted, and I hear this from other manufacturers so I'm not necessarily a small business or manufacturing business, I communicate with other manufacturing companies. They struggle with many of the same issues about as I want to grow and make my business better, do I do it in New Hampshire or do I look to other places in the country.

The challenge is, you know, we in this room think ah, people aren't going to leave. We have options, and, you know, I'm not threatening, but businesses have to make those choices.

The bottom line is we've got to find ways to lower electricity costs. If we want to continue to see businesses grow and thrive in New Hampshire, which I think is important to our economy, then we need to address the energy

crisis. I think the Northern Pass project will bring reliable, lower cost energy to New Hampshire which will begin to address our region's economic competitiveness. believe Northern Pass is the end-all solution. I understand we need other energy development I'm in support of all those, whether it's natural gas pipelines, solar energy development, wind farms, and I fully support energy conservation. I know businesses, many, myself included, are doing a lot of work in that area because it makes economic sense, but I believe in the future we're going to need the additional power that Northern Pass will generate. I think it's a wonderful opportunity, and I don't want to see us let it slip by.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

One other point. The scenic vistas. As a New Hampshire native, as I mentioned, I spent a lot of time in the North Country since I was a little boy camping, hiking, snowmobiling, in the winter skiing, I enjoy the North Country and I enjoy our whole state so I appreciate your concerns about scenic vistas, but I also have to

1 balance those with the economics. I think the 2 Northern Pass folks have done a good job 3 addressing the key scenic vista areas, and I recognize that others have concerns about this, 4 but most of the lines near as I can tell are in 5 6 existing right-of-ways, under roadways, et 7 cetera, so I think we just need to be able to 8 look forward without increasing the costs that 9 we're all going to pay. 10 MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Welch, can you bring it 11 to a close, please? 12 MR. WELCH: Yes. In closing, as a 13 long-term manufacturer and large employer in the 14 state, I want to voice my support for the 15 project. Manufacturing companies in the region 16 need lower cost, reliable power. I think 17 approval for the Northern Pass project is 18 important to move us toward this goal. 19 you very much. 20 (Applause) 21 Hi, my name is Lance Clute. 22 the Vice President of Operations for PAR 23 Electrical Contractors, and we were recently

selected as the general contractor for the Northern Pass project.

MR. HONIGBERG: Can you spell your last name for the record, please?

MR. CLUTE: C L U T E. First and foremost, I want to thank the Site Evaluation Committee and the DOE for allowing me the opportunity to speak in support of the project.

I personally been involved with our operations here in New Hampshire and throughout New England for the past six years. Over that time frame we have constructed and maintained a large portion of the transmission lines that bring power to really everyone here in the room. We also have played a major role in restoring power during recent storm events. An example, we provided thousands of workers for Hurricanes Irene, Sandy and the October snowstorm.

We have an office located in Bow, and we currently employ approximately 200 people in New Hampshire. These employees live, work and raise families here in the State of New Hampshire, and you can be sure that all of them are looking

forward to working on the Northern Pass project staying here in New Hampshire. Some of these current employees are part of a program that Eversource and us started last year. The goal is to find New Hampshire residents that want to join the apprenticeship program. We hire these candidates, put them into the program, and approximately three and a half years later they become fully qualified line workers. We plan on continuing this program throughout Northern Pass and into the future. What that does is allows these men and women to be able to stay and work in New Hampshire even long after the Northern Pass project is finished and completed.

Based on my experience on past projects,
Northern Pass will add thousands of jobs to the
New Hampshire economy, and only a small portion
of those jobs will be those line workers. The
larger portion and the greatest portion will be
from local road builders, excavation companies,
lumber mills, loggers, landscapers, waste
management companies, aggregate hauling,
equipment maintenance, trucking and I could go

1 on and on.

22

23

2 I also wanted to give you an order of magnitude of some of the legal spend that we 3 occur from the project. With our experience in 4 5 the past projects, I put together an estimate of these spends for the local now. We expect to 6 7 spend \$7 million on gravel. Upwards of \$10 8 million on concrete. \$27 million on conduit and 9 other items for the construction of the duct 10 banks and substations. Our lodging and means 11 from all of the people working in this project 12 we would expect to be \$20,000,000 and above. 13 Fuel costs alone for our equipment, not including the folks that drive to and from work, 14 15 will add up around \$10 million. And believe it or not we will spend over a million dollars on 16 17 ice, water and Porta-Potties. Keep in mind 18 these are just a few of the direct spends that 19 we will bring to the project. There are far nor 20 indirect, some of the trickle down spends that 21 will have a large impact on the economy.

In closing, I would like to urge the committee to approve the application. The

State's workforce, economy and well-being is best served by building Northern Pass. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Applause)

MR. HONIGBERG: I will note for the record that many years ago, more than ten years ago, I did legal work for one of Mr. Rubin's enterprises.

MR. RUBIN: Thank you, members of the This is amazing testimony to civil Committee. society in America that an issue that has been tense and divisive for this long can result in the civilized comments on both sides here, but it's no secret that American faith and confidence in our governing institutions has reached a historic low, and there is basis for this, and here, there is a lack of confidence in this process, the SEC and the DOE process here. People feel that this process is slanted in favor of the Applicant, and there is basis for that, and I'll just give you two examples for the basis for the sensation that this is a slanted process which has a known outcome or

predictable outcome.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Number one, the Applicant has testified this evening that they have requested use, quote unquote, requested use for a portion of the land on which the project is to be built. They don't control that then. They've testified as such this evening. I'm a real estate developer and if I had gone before a Planning Board with a project and I were to build a shopping mall as I have in the past and I would say I requested use of the land in your town over which you have oversight to build this project, the project would never have even received a hearing. that's problem number one. They don't control the land, and, therefore, you should delay this entire process until the Applicant proves to you that they own or control the land.

Item number 2, that is a very substantial basis for the perception this is a slanted process. You hear claims that this will save money. And there are numbers associated with these claims as to the amount of money that will be saved, and yet we also hear that there is no

22

23

business relationship with numbers attached. The Power Purchase Agreement has either not been disclosed or does not exist. However, these numbers that are a basis for the projected savings must by definition be predicated on the at least assumptions as to the power purchase price and the prevailing price of electricity otherwise without the project. Let's see those numbers. Again, a basis for the lack of public confidence in this process. And there's reasonable basis for not trusting the Applicant. This applicant projected to us that their Merrimack station, their Bow power plant conversion with the scrubber was going to a big savings, and the cost would be X. The cost turned out to be 2X, and the ratepayers got stuck with that added cost. So, again, there's a basis for lack of confidence in the process.

So an idea, a solution idea. Obviously, people would much more readily accept this project if it were entirely buried. The incremental cost for that burial could be paid for, this is just an idea, creative idea, the

Applicant could voluntary go to FERC and say we will take a market rate of return, a risk appropriate market rate of return on the project, and that would compensate for all or a good deal of the incremental cost of burying the power line. What would be a market rate for the appropriate risk associated with this? Because it's a guaranteed return? 6 or 7 percent. Not 11.07. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Lynn Woodard, W O O D A R D. I live in Concord, New Hampshire. I am in opposition to the Northern Pass proposed plan to construct overhead transmission towers and distribution lines through the city of Concord for the following reasons, and these reasons are part of the statutory requirement that you review and consider. Aesthetics, safety, and economics, and I'll be brief on these three subjects.

First, aesthetics. If this project with its proposed overhead lines is allowed to go forward, it will establish a visual blight on

the city of Concord for the next 40 years or the foreseeable future. New Hampshire's capital city will no longer be known as the fair city it is. It will be known as the city with the ugly 125-foot towers in multiple lines. Due to the level of the topography of the Heights area, these towers will be visible for an extended distance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now, safety. Relocation of existing distribution towers from the center of the right-of-way to its western boundary will place private homes within the fall zone of these It will place Concord citizens in towers. direct danger should they fail due to weather conditions or other factors. For an excellent example, you have to look no further than the 1993 ice storm that raced up the New England's east coast into Canada. There is a picture taken from the May 1998 issue of the National Geographic which I have here and I've included it in my letter to you. You can readily see how the 4 to 6 inches of ice totally collapsed the giant steel towers. A future storm of this type

could cause power failures resulting in death and destruction, and I'm not kidding because we have a lot of homes that are very close to the right-of-way line now that these things are going to be relocated to the western edge. This is a health and safety issue that must be addressed and certainly you're here to hear this and hopefully you'll take into consideration.

Economics. Construction of the proposed towers and lines will diminish not only property values of adjacent property owners but also the 22 percent of property owners who will be within the direct view of these towers. It will further inhibit residential development and recruitment of business and industry to this area of the city. No one wants to pay good money to view massive towers and electric lines.

For example, I refer you to the February 22nd, 2016, issue of Concord Monitor where the Concord City Manager was speaking concerning the redevelopment of downtown Main Street and basically said, the short distribution towers on South Main Street should be buried. These short

1 distribution lines, these are only 20 to 30 feet 2 high, okay? And it would have a greater 3 potential for development if the city would take these wires underground. 4 5 Now, keep in mind the distribution poles on South Main Street, like I said, are only 20 to 6 7 30 feet tall. The proposed Northern Pass towers will be five to six times this height at about 8 9 125 feet or higher and have multiple 10 transmission and distribution lines. 11 MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Woodard, how much more 12 do you have? 13 I'm concluding right now. MR. WOODARD: 14 Thank you. I would like to conclude by saying 15 the proposed overhead towers and wires will create aesthetic, safety and economic problems 16 17 for the city of Concord if allowed to be 18 constructed. It is, therefore, recommended if this project is to go forward these lines must 19 20 be buried through the entire 8 miles of the City 21 Thank you for your consideration. of Concord. 22 (Applause). 23 SPEAKER: My name is Joe Casey. I'm the

1 international representative for the IBEW, 2 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Lifelong resident of the State of New Hampshire. 3 And you know I, too, love the beauty and 4 5 everything about everything that New Hampshire has, and that's why I've decided to spend my 6 7 life here and raise my family here. But there's also the issue, and I come from a blue collar 8 9 family, and people have to make a living to work 10 and reside in this state, and I look at, I have 11 a 21-year-old daughter that's a senior at UNH, 12 and the other day on the front page of our 13 newspaper were a couple of friends that she went 14 to high school with that had been arrested in a 15 heroin sting in our town, and these were good 16 kids. These were good kids, good, they were at 17 my house all the time. I asked my daughter what 18 happened, what's going on with them. And she 19 told me that they've given up. In passing, she 20 said that they've given up and walked off. 21 There is not a heck of a lot of 22 opportunity, I can tell you that right now, and

we also have to look at our children and the

23

opportunities that we're providing for them. There's no debate that we have a flight of kids that are leaving the state to find employment We at the IBEW, we put people to elsewhere. We put people to work in the construction work. industry. Construction projects have to be approved. I've been working on construction projects my whole life trying to get approval so that we can put our people to work, and in the State of New Hampshire, I can tell you right now, I'm not very successful. It's very difficult to site something or get something approved here in the State of New Hampshire.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And we have to take a look, we take people in that have a high school degree or a GED equivalent and we train them and give them a trade in the electrical industry that they can use for the rest of their lives, and I've seen, the best part of about my job is in the apprenticeship training program when you can see a kid that comes in with no other place to go, and he's able to make a career out of the electrical industry, whether it be the line

industry or where I represent, the electricians.

We need to have projects, we need to move forward. You know, these projects will create an atmosphere for lower electrical rates here so other industries can come in and people can go to work. We have to be able to take care of our families, take care of the needs of our people so that we can enjoy the beautiful State of New Hampshire.

And I ask you, you know, this has been six years. Ten years ago I sat on a committee to upgrade the Coos loop. We're still waiting for that to happen. Six years ago we started this endeavor. We need to put people to work. I have 240 IBEW linemen and electricians that are New Hampshire residents that are currently working elsewhere.

This whole country, this electrical system needs to be upgraded. There's going to be plenty of opportunity for these people to make a living for the rest of their lives. Let's put people back to work. Let's get our people in the state back to work, and let's create new

opportunities for our children. Thank you.

(Applause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HONIGBERG: We're going to do three more speakers before we take a break.

SPEAKER: Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to say a few words. My name is Phil Bilodeau. When I first sat down this evening and the chairman began to speak and then Mr. Quinlan spoke about from Canada to Deerfield, my heart's pounding. It was pounding every time Deerfield was mentioned. I'm going to reduce this conversation right now from global energy and jobs and all that, and I'm going to bring it to a personal note. project ends in Phil and Joan Bilodeau's backyard at 140 Nottingham Road. We filed intervenor status. We were disappointed that the Applicant challenged that so we filed a letter and objections to the objection and I don't know. I quess I can't say anymore. I'm too emotionally involved. But I am disappointed and I'll say disappointed in Mr. Quinlan this evening to say that you reached out to all the

abutters that may have been in some situation or some hardship, and I want to honestly say to this crowd and for the record to say that Public Service has never reached out to Phil and Joan Bilodeau. Thank you.

(Applause).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

SPEAKER: Good evening, Members of the Committee. My name is John Dumais, and I'm President of the New Hampshire Grocers Association. I'm not here to tell you how you should decide this particular proposal. fact, our associate has not taken a position on this project. However, we are concerned about electricity. I am here tonight to appeal to the Site Evaluation Committee to redouble your efforts to find a balance between environmental concerns over new energy projects and the clear economic benefits they would bring to our entire state and its business community. If you say no to this project, please be prepared to say yes to something that will meaningfully start to lower electric rates.

The food industry is a profession that

1 lives with narrow profit margins. The grocery 2 store business is not easy one. One of their 3 biggest expenses is electricity, and we have 4 minimal ways to reduce the operating expense on 5 I'm sure your own power bills our own. skyrockets in the summer when the temperature 6 7 rises and you have to increase your air conditioner uses. Imagine having to pay to keep 8 9 freezers and coolers operating all year long, 10 and that doesn't include the power required for 11 the rest of the store's functions. 12 runs into many millions of dollars statewide. 13 These expenses can threaten operations of 14 grocery stores which is partly why several of 15 the big chain stores have closed stores and 16 scaled back their operations in the state in 17 previous years, and if they are having a hard 18 time doing this, the challenges have multiplied 19 for the several smaller independent operators. 20 When any operating expense, especially 21

When any operating expense, especially electricity, is too high, the added cost has to be passed on to the consumers as higher costs for their groceries. This is a significant

22

23

financial burden to lower income households in our state. It is also a major concern for the New Hampshire grocers' out-of-state consumers who are about 45 percent of all of our annual sales. That's 45 percent come from out of state. They come here regularly to shop, seeking lower prices. When higher electricity costs come that trend may not continue.

Needless to say, in a competitive business such of ours, we are always looking for ways to save money. We are glad the region's leaders are starting to do the same. The New Hampshire Grocers Association applauds the six New England governors for working on a collaborative attempt to identify and fund new and cheaper energy resources for residents. Our current rates are the highest anywhere in the United States and relief seems far away. This process will take years before a new project is up and running. We hope you recognize that this, that as every month passes, more grocers' profits are being diverted to pay for higher electrical costs without any expectation of seeing lower rates.

23

Our message to you is simple. Please do something to provide some relief as soon as possible. Utility regulators have clearly stated our region needs to develop new energy resources totaling more than 6000 megawatts by 2020 to make up for the plants that are shutting Even if Northern Pass is approved, that would provide only a thousand megawatts. aren't even close to filling the gap. The New Hampshire Grocers Association understands there are sharp divisions between those who want cheaper power from the Northern Pass versus those who worry about the impacts of the power lines in the North Country, thus opposing the plant. We respect the views of both and hope a compromise can be found to move the project forward in a meaningful consensus. who say no to every new energy option, we respectfully ask, what is your alternative. Wе know that the demand for power is too great simply to conserve our way to cheaper rates and lower demand. We need new resources and we need them now. Thank you very much.

1

(Applause)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HONIGBERG: We're going to take a ten-minute break. When we come back the first three speakers will be Brian Sullivan, David Gustafson and Dr. Deborah Warner.

(Recess taken)

SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Commission. My name is David Gustafson. permanent residency is in Hanover, Connecticut, and I drove the two and a half hours up here for this hearing as my chance to put my two cents in, I guess. As a property owner on Spooner Hill overlooking Lake Francis in Pittsburg for 40 years, I have to tell you that we go up to Pittsburg for the view, for the woods, because we love it. It's a five and a half hour drive each way, and we do it as often as we can.

From everything I've heard here night, the biggest difference between the views from the White Mountains and the views from Pittsburg are It would seem that the tourists are much more affluent in the White Mountains than the snowmobiles, hunters and ATVers up in

Pittsburg, and I guess also that I know that there's no permit required from the Forest Service to run towers in Pittsburg as in the White Mountains. I don't know if there's more, obviously, there's more observation points from the White Mountains and scenic resources other, I can only think of Mt. Magalloway in Pittsburg, but I can tell that you the view from the roller coaster of Route 145 in Clarksville where you can see to the Mt. Washington and the Presidential Range are going to have a lot less people pulled over on the side of the road to take fall foliage pictures if all they can see are towers.

My wife and I have actually discussed what we're going to do if the signs go from the Great North Woods to the Great North Towers because we really don't want to end up continuing to making that trip when we could stay in Connecticut to see towers. I have to ask, Mr. Quinlan, and the other members here, and not quite the same comparison but if Verizon announced that they were going to put cell towers across the street

from your homes, would it be comforting to know that they were going to put monopoles 20 feet shorter than lattice poles 150 feet tall? The result would be the same.

As the ultimate, probably the ultimate flatlander in the room, from the North Country, I know that the North Country needs the work, but I would hope that you would decide to put all these people to work burying the line rather than putting up the towers. Thanks.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Hello. Can you hear me all right? I'm Dr. Deborah Warner. I have our own Vanna White here to help us out. Thank you.

I'm Dr. Deborah Warner from Littleton, and I have a handout for you. On page 2 I'd like to start there with a study that I did in 2012 as this whole project was developing, and the chart as you see and is being held by Jean shows the results of a study conducted in 2012 that surveys studies more than a 100 attendees at public events in Coos County, New Hampshire, which is where I'm from, right on the border on

land right there. The spontaneous answers to the question, what do you like about the North Country. I heard they love the North Country. As you can see in here -- show it to them. top line there is two thirds of people asked, what do you like about the North Country, spontaneously said, it's the mountains and the forests that they like, and, in fact, as I listened to them, they also said well, I like the people here, I have a family here, I have relations and such. Half of them talked about the people. Two thirds talked about the mountains and forests. They talked about nature activities, about 30 percent. Quiet and daily quality of life and so on. You can see the items on this grid.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But as I listened to them I could hear that they weren't just talking about gosh, you know, Exit 43 or Exit 29, it's convenient because there's a store right there. They're talking about the mountains and the forests, and I'm a psychologist so I listen to how people talk, and the way they talked about these things were not

talking about inanimate objects. They were talking about the mountains and the forests like

they are family members. Their loved ones.

So when Northern Pass came on the scene and said we're going to strike these things and we're going to slash the woods, that's what we heard. They're going to scar the landscape. They might as well have said they're going to take our children and do medical experiments on them. It's that profound a feeling inside the people in the North Country who live there.

And people live there. There's an economic cost to living in the North Country, and if I might indulge with going to page 1, I will go over here. This is a quick lesson in economics. There's the external market where goods and services are made here, and they're sent away and money comes back. You have a destination market where people come here and they enjoy our beautiful lands which we're happy to share with them and they leave their money here with us. The local market, we buy from each other. And money we have just goes, changes hands among

ourselves, and there's the drain market where outside business comes in, uses our resource and the money goes somewhere else.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Northern Pass fits into the drain market category of economics. They're coming in from afar, they're not local, they are taking our resources, and in our case, it's the mountains and forests' value that they are taking. Mr. Clay, I might correct, we actually are taxed on the view. It has economic value. You have a regular property tax based on the market value of your house and then on top of that you have a view tax. Many, many people pay that, and many, many places are going under because the view is in jeopardy with Northern Pass. We have the Owl's Nest Golf Course and huge development in Campton that went under just because of this coming in, and no one would invest anymore and they were thriving before that.

There are many, many people as you just heard the gentleman speak from Connecticut who have retirement homes, who come here to live who buy the view and they buy it for the next

generation, and that's what they want. And they're not the big spenders necessarily, but they are coming and we do appreciate their business, and we appreciate their love of the area that we're very, very happy to share with them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HONIGBERG: Dr. Warner, how much more do you have?

DR. WARNER: I'm probably summing up. Now that you mention it. Thank you very much. I do have one point to make. I do dispute something that Mr. Quinlan has stated supposedly as fact that they have reached out to every municipality along the way. My husband served on the Littleton Selectboard for four out of the past five years, and we never heard anything of it. I haven't seen any Town Hall meetings. meetings that we have heard of and been to are the large meetings that are required by this Board that happened at some of the larger places, the venues like Mountain View Grand.

I would prevail upon the Board to please ask Mr. Quinlan to provide you with an entire

list of the these contacts and the notices given for these meetings, and I certainly would hope it would go onto the notification list because I'd like to see that.

I recommend burial. It is done in other states and we should have that as well. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Susan Seitz from
Deerfield, New Hampshire, and I'm asking a favor
of you. Don't worry. No one will know if you
do this or you don't. On Wednesday, when you
take your bus tour of Deerfield, please put
yourself in our shoes. As you pass the
Deerfield Community Church, imagine how you
would feel if that's the church you had attended
all your life, and suddenly there's 130-foot
tower towering behind your church.

And then consider how lucky you were when you got your mother into the elderly housing complex next to the church until your mother calls you up crying because she can't sleep because of the noise from the line.

It's Old Home Days. Many small towns in New Hampshire hold these. You're at the gazebo, but behind our historic town hall, a friend calls your name and you turn to look, and you see the towers engulfing the historic district. And please consider the Bilodeaus. Nobody has talked to them. The project ends in their backyard. And nobody cares.

Please consider the human aspects of this project and not use New Hampshire as a thruway for power to the New England grid. Thank you.

(Applause)

Averill. I'm a resident of Canterbury, New
Hampshire. People today are moving towards
supporting local farms, businesses, permaculture
and community projects because they see value in
it. All involved have an vested interest in
their business a well as the well-being of their
community and natural environment. We are tired
of being told half-truths and lies by large
corporations with no interest in the local
communities so they can make higher profits. We

do not appreciate being told this project has to happen with scare tactics about the future when most or even all of the electricity from these lines will not go to New Hampshire residents but we will be left with the scar on the land and the towers in the sky.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Eversource has investors and shareholders to please and show profit. Community members have each other to work together and show value in the community, not the almighty dollar. Eversource will have you believe large scale utilities are the only option for the future. Evolving solar, wind and geothermal energies are allowing individuals to provide power for themselves and their communities. It is local, responsible and everyone in the community knows how things are working. More and more people are looking to move away from the grid and as the technology for homeowners continues to advance and become available, there will be even more options. I'm strongly opposed to the Northern Pass project. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. My name is Pentti Aalto. I live in Pembroke, New Hampshire, couple hundred yards from where the line will go through.

I guess what I'd like to do first is recognize that there have been major improvements in this project in the last years. I remember one of the early meetings in this room. Since then, quite a bit has changed and I thank and recognize the efforts of the company in moving things forward. Key word I guess comes out of is balance and I guess that's where some of my issues come out.

We seem to have chosen a rather expensive path to do this work. Clearly, the power could tend to reduce the price in New England. On the other hand, some of the other paths that have been chosen by other companies seem to have been a lot cheaper and lot more easily achieved. DC line under water seemed to go in much more quickly in a few months instead of six years. Operations in Maine seem to be doing the same

type of thing.

The concern I have is that ultimately the cost of this will be borne by business and people in New England if the unthinkable happens and the price of energy drops. Ten years ago, it would have been very difficult to think of price of natural gas delivered to Boston at \$2.10 on the 11th of March of this year, tomorrow. That reflects a locational price for electricity in New Hampshire of about 1 and a half cents a kilowatt hour as the primary cost.

If we get much more development of renewables that somehow could get into that market here, some of these investments that we make today may be in difficulty and that leads to the question of who are the counter parties to buy this power. Something as expensive as this has to have someone willing to sign a long-term contract to buy power. If that's a competitive entity, that's on their heads. If it's a regulated utility that buys the power for the default service customers, then quite likely those customers are going to end up paying that

bill even if they choose to leave that service at some point as we've recently seen with the divestiture process where we as customers probably will end up paying a half a billion dollars.

MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Aalto, how much more do

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

MR. AALTO: Just about done. If we do build this facility, perhaps we could try to make it as flexible as possible. By that I mean, as the renewables develop, maybe we need to make sure that power can go both ways over this wire as a way of getting maximum benefit for our own investments in renewables making use of the storage capability in Canada. Thank you. (Applause)

SPEAKER: Good evening. Jean Menard from Deerfield. To the women and men of blue in this room, the work that you do to keep the lights on is appreciated. My comment tonight is not intended on pitting small business against big business. A 2015 New Hampshire economic development study by the Regional Planning

Commission announced that New Hampshire ranks number two in the nation for being small business friendly. I am a small business owner. A driving argument for the Northern Pass project has been to meet the need of low cost power for businesses. I would like to respectfully request that the SEC be open to further rigorous discussion of the factors and criteria that quantifies the number two high ranking of small business in New Hampshire to ensure that this project does not undermine a very healthy small business environment. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Members of the Committee, representatives of the Department of Energy, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is Melissa Birchard, and I represent Conservation Law Foundation.

Conservation Law Foundation is a regional membership-based organization that uses the law, science and the markets to develop innovative, pragmatic solutions to some of New England's greatest challenges. Consistent with its

mission to promote thriving resilient communities, CLF is dedicated to advancing solutions that strengthen New England's and New Hampshire's environmental and economic vitality.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CLF and its members are concerned that the Northern Pass transmission line as currently proposed has far too many negative impacts on the State of New Hampshire, its landscapes, its communities, and an energy future that is built on efficiency and clean local renewables. the Department of Energy, CLF has advocated for a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement that would assess regional need and the various projects proposed or under development that could serve the same or similar goals that this project purports to serve. CLF continues to believe that there are sound alternatives to the project as proposed and that the National Environmental Policy Act and the Site Evaluation Committee's review process necessitate the rigorous and objective consideration of such alternatives.

Conservation Law Foundation is particularly

concerned that New Hampshire needs to focus its energy and resources on the development of local renewable technologies. We are disappointed that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement has given energy efficiency and renewable power such short shrift, and we are also dismayed that utilities like Eversource here in New Hampshire seek to undermine lesser-impacting energy alternatives like rooftop solar while claiming that large cross-border high voltage transmission lines are an inevitability that we must accept.

As for the Draft Environmental Impact
Statement, although it is excessively narrow in
its consideration of alternatives to the
project, it does consider a range of feasible
aerial options. Conservation Law Foundation is
concerned that absent such burial, the proposed
project remains fatally flawed by the inequity
that it imposes on the State of New Hampshire.

While the project Applicants suggest that climate change, unit retirements and overreliance on natural gas necessitate the

1 project as proposed, that is not the case.

Thank you very much.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

There are alternatives to this project as proposed, and, importantly, there are alternatives with lesser impacts on the State of New Hampshire and on the region of New England.

(Applause)

Thank you all for letting me SPEAKER: giving me the opportunity to speak tonight. Мγ name is Ammy Heiser. I'm from Pembroke. the Chairman of the Conservation Commission in Pembroke, and I was authorized by the Board of Selectmen to, they authorized me to act as the intervenor for the town of Pembroke. of Selectman are a pretty conservative group and so I was quite surprised that they gave, authorized me to speak and have Pembroke be an intervenor to the Northern Pass. Twice we went to town meeting and the town overwhelmingly voted in preference of burial of the lines, and the first time was at the March meeting in 2011 and then March meeting 2014, and I will give you the wording of that article, and I just wanted

to make sure I went on record that the town has been opposed.

This impacts the town. It basically divides our town right in half. 6.2 miles of transmission wires through our town and a lot of them, the 54 new ones in our town, a lot of them are going to be 130 feet in height. I just, for all the reasons that people have so eloquently discussed why they're opposed to this project, my hat's off to all of them and I hope you will consider burying this project. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Thank for the opportunity to speak this evening. My name is Lee Lajoie. I live in Concord on Mountain Road. Native of Concord, by the way. I am an abutter to the Northern Pass project as the existing right-of-way cuts across the back of my property so I do have skin in the game.

I purchased my home in 1990, and one of the things that actually made the property attractive to me was the fact that the

right-of-way was there. I knew that no one would be building behind me, and I have direct access to a snowmobile trail. In the intervening 26 years, I've yet to purchase a snowmobile, but I still have hope.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As I expected, the presence of the right-of-way has prevented further development directly behind my home, despite numerous houses and developments being constructed in my neighborhood. The City of Concord has never met a development they didn't like. I've attended a number of these public hearings and one of the common themes I have heard is that the Northern Pass will decimate the value of adjacent properties. In addition to the original purchase, I've refinanced my property 2 or 3 times, and I can tell that you not one of the appraisers mentioned the transmission lines, not one of the comparison properties evaluated had rights-of-way, and my property value is in line with simpler properties in the city of Concord. So my personal experience does not correlate with the opinions expressed by others, although

based on testimony by one of our city councilors earlier, I guess I can expect a giant refund of all those taxes I paid over the years. I guess I'm not going to hold my breath for that.

I'm an engineer by training. I am an admitted and unabashed geek. My wife used to give me a hard time because I came back from Switzerland with pictures of transmission lines climbing over the top of the Alps, and from Hawaii with photos of lines climbing up and over the top of extinct volcanos. To my knowledge, neither place has had a collapse of their tourism industries, another common theme I have heard in these forums.

I also confess to liking creature comforts. When it gets hot in the summer, I like to have air conditioning. When I go home at night, I like to flip the switch and have the lights come on. I play hockey at the rink in Laconia and I'm well familiar with the need for electricity to keep the ice frozen.

For these and many other reasons, I fully support having adequate supply of electricity in

the region based on a variety of fuel sources, and with the changing landscape of the power supply in New England, I understand the need for additional sources such as the Northern Pass.

I've also heard numerous times that New
Hampshire is an exporter of electricity. Well,
I'm not an economist, but I fail to say how this
argument makes a case against Northern Pass. If
the state is an exporter of a commodity, in my
mind that means you have jobs in the state
producing that commodity which is good, and are
getting money from someone out of state which is
also good, and there is nothing more New
Hampshire than trying to get money from people
out of state.

In closing, I do not envy the task you have in front of you. I wish you all the wisdom of Salomon in balancing the various positive and negative aspects of the project, and I hope you're able to put aside emotions and carefully weigh the facts while making your decision. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and you pronounced my name correctly. My name is Elizabeth LaRocca, and I'm a native of New Hampshire and I've worked at PSNH, now Eversource, for 35 years. I work in community relations, but I also held positions in accounting and in regulatory affairs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In 1988 I traveled with other New England utility representatives and various state officials to Quebec, and we toured the hydroelectric complex in James Bay. Northern Utilities had just negotiated two separate energy agreements with Hydro-Quebec. Hopes were high that this power would be as economical as the power New Brunswick had been selling to the region since 1971. The first HQ agreement was signed in '83 and involved 52 miles of new line in Vermont, 7 miles in New Hampshire, and a new converter station in Monroe, New Hampshire. The line went operational in '86, and allowed Northern to buy hydropower for 11 years.

Second Hydro-Quebec agreement signed in 1985. That one extended that transmission line

133 miles through the center of New Hampshire into Massachusetts, expanding the line capacity from 690 megawatts to 2000. The purchase power agreement covered a ten-year period from 1990 to 2000. The line stands today in communities like Hopkinton, Dunbarton and Bedford which are all considered very scenic and desirable places to live.

Given the undisputed success of these energy agreements, why the controversy today. What has changed? Well, part of the answer lies in the deregulation of the power generation sector which began about 20 years ago in New England and elsewhere in the United States. Most of the power plants serving the region of New England today are owned by merchant generators who participate in the competitive marketplace overseen by ISO New England but governed by the economic principles of supply and demand.

To those who doubt that Northern Pass will lower electricity prices for New Englanders, I point to the New England Power Generators

Association's fierce opposition to the project. It seems that they object to their most expensive generators being displaced by lower cost hydropower since this will lower the wholesale market clearing price paid to all the market participants. Although this will also lower electric costs for consumers, the generators appear to be steadfast in their opposition to lower profits and united in their effort to keep the New England energy marketplace one of the most lucrative in the United States. Thank you for your time and attention.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Mary Lee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to this committee and to the USDOE. I've been here before since 2011. Here I am again. I am still convinced that the best action for me, for my property in Northfield and for the State of New Hampshire is no build. As currently proposed, the Northern Pass plans to keep the originally proposed steel H-frame towers and the steel monopoles.

20

21

22

23

- 2. The aesthetics of my conservation land and other properties along the 192 miles would be permanently blighted by the proposed aboveground structures that are to be taller than the surrounding treetops and built of steel rather than the wooden poles. Once the steel structures are put up, there is irreparable damage to our landscape. The placement would be wrong, the dimensions would be disproportionate to our rural beauty.
- I and my neighbors live near the right-of-way easement that Northern Pass will alter. I and we are used to the small scale and the camouflaged wood poles that are currently in In my neighborhood we can walk out or we place. can stay indoors and see the wood poles. Especially in the winter. Right now. would be no camouflage for steel structures that are taller and built as a tower. My neighbor is further away from my property and sees in a long perspective view from her windows more of the stretch of transmission poles and lines than I do. The discussion regarding the 100 foot or

100 feet distance to the proposal in order to be considered as an intervenor during the review of Northern Pass should consider the eyesore to those whose viewshed is greater distance than just outside my yard. So, in other words my neighbors see more of the line out of their windows than I do when I look directly out my dining room table, picture window or over my sink. So they have a right to be here as intervenors even if they're within what is called the list of nonabutters.

Number 4, since 2011 I have attended hearings before the New Hampshire legislature and the US Department of Energy. Thousands of New Hampshire citizens have voiced concern about the suitability of Northern Pass. Visitors to New Hampshire have come here to enjoy our natural beauty and have remarked that our state is, quote, still beautiful. I hope you will decide to protect and cherish the environment, and I want to make an addendum to this remark because Mr. Quinlan is here and you mentioned outreach by the Northern Pass to landowners.

And I'm hoping you didn't say out of reach, you. Said outreach by Northern Pass to those of us who are landowners and I have made the outreach to Northern Pass mainly because I didn't believe that it should be built and I don't believe it should be built today so I still have many opportunities to outreach to you all to find out what exactly going is to be coming up the pick if it's approved. Just to correct the record. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: My name is Ruth Niven. I live in Franklin, New Hampshire. I went to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee website. There I found the Executive Summary for the Northern Pass Transmission Project, and under potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures, I'm going to quote: Northern Pass will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics. The project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect from the project will be minimal on the project's

avoidant and minimization efforts. The project will not have a significant effect on aquatic resources. The project will also not have significant effects on wildlife or wildlife habitat. There will be no unreasonable adverse effects on public health and safety. Any potential effect on land use will be minimal.

There is no basis in the published literature or in the New Hampshire research to expect that the project would have a discernible effect on property values or marketing times in local or regional real estate markets. The Northern Pass would not have a measurable effect on the New Hampshire tourism industry.

I was amazed to find that this 192-mile project would be so low impacted on the State of New Hampshire. I also don't believe it. And I really would like you all to consider the source of this Executive Summary Statement and try to discern the reason why it would be to the benefit of Hydro-Quebec and Eversource to minimize the impact on the State of New Hampshire of the Northern Pass project as

I do not believe there would be such proposed. opposition to this project if there wasn't an impact. You've all heard testimony, this is affecting people's lives and their businesses and their homes and their recreation, and you Despite the fact that at the end of know what? the summary it says, in a manner that's respectful to the voices of the New Hampshire residents. Northern Pass has taken very thoughtful steps to reduce the project's potential impact. Well, you know what? has not been enough of an effort. This project as proposed should not be allowed. If the Northern Pass project must be constructed, it should be buried. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
Members of the Committee for investing your time
in this process. My name is Edward Craxton. I
and my wife are residents of the town of Dalton,
New Hampshire, where we retired from Louisville,
Kentucky. There were no mountains in
Louisville, Kentucky. It is my understanding

1 that a major part of your role is to determine if the issuance of a certificate to Northern 2 3 Pass will serve the objective outlined in RSA-162-H:16 which include giving due 4 consideration to the views of municipal 5 governing bodies and to ensure that the site and 6 7 facility will not have unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and 8 9 water quality, natural environment and public 10 health and safety. Regarding the views of towns 11 and governing bodies, Dalton, like Pembroke, 12 which was previously mentioned tonight, is one 13 of around 30 towns in New Hampshire which has 14 registered a vote against Northern Pass. 15 such a vote is not binding, it clearly indicates 16 the will of the people with regard to this 17 The will of Dalton, our Selectboard, project. 18 and many other towns have said a resounding no 19 to Northern Pass and its proposed overhead 20 transmission lines. I'd like to comment on the unreasonable 21

I'd like to comment on the unreasonable adverse effects on aesthetics and natural environment. As we all know, the natural

22

23

landscapes are significant assets to New Hampshire, attracting hundreds of thousands of tourists to this part of our state every year. Over the past few years I have intentionally engaged many tourists in conversation while riding up the ski lifts together or encountering them on mountain trails. The vast majority of them had not heard of the Northern Pass project, and as I described the proposed route of these overhead transmission lines, to a person they were incredulous. Why would you scar this beautiful country in that way. That's one illustration of an unreasonable adverse effect on the aesthetics and natural environment of the area, not to mention the adverse effect on the economy of the area when those tourists seek more pristine destinations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Regarding public health and safety, some of my neighbors in Dalton live in a community of 45 homes. That neighborhood, according to the maps that Northern Pass provided to us, would be within 75 feet of the proposed new overhead transmission lines. This is within the fall

zone. This same neighborhood is one in which many children reside. I and the town are concerned for the public health and safety of the families living in such close proximity to proposed power lines.

In the July 20, 2015 Public Health and Safety Technical Report for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, it notes the following, and I quote. Under normal operating conditions, public safety hazards associated with high voltage transmission lines include electric shocks. These can occur by working and recreating under or near transmission lines. Electrical shocks can occur from touching transmission towers or other large metallic objects near power lines.

It goes on for a few more paragraphs like that, and then continuing the quote, another potential public safety hazard associated with transmission lines is arc flashes. Arc flashes occur when electricity from a high voltage line travels between conductors through the air. The gap distance varies according to the voltage.

1 These occur in normal conditions, but can also be caused by smoke from fires. Arc flashes can 2 3 produce intense heat and light. If individuals get too close to energized power lines without 4 5 touching them, an arc of electricity can form 6 between the power line and the person and result 7 in serious burns. MR. HONIGBERG: Mr. Craxton, how much more 8 9 do you have? 10 MR. CRAXTON: Two more paragraphs. 11 MR. HONIGBERG: How long are the paragraphs 12 you've been reading? 13 MR. CRAXTON: I'll just be 30 seconds. In 14 addition, while studies over the past 20 or more 15 years on exposure to EMF, electromagnetic 16 fields, from overhead power lines and 17 demonstrated health effects have been 18 inconclusive, some studies do show a weak 19 association between such exposure and childhood 20 These above-referenced conditions leukemia. 21 created by overhead high voltage transmission 22 lines are unacceptable in a community where

adults and children live and play.

23

conclusion, for these and many other reasons I will not take time to enumerate, I ask that the SEC disapprove of this project. However, in the spirit of common ground and compromise, at the least, I ask the SEC to require that the entire transmission project be buried along an appropriate transportation corridor. If developers of high voltage transmission line facilities in New York, Vermont and Maine can totally bury their facilities, we can, too. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Laura Bonk. I live in Concord, New Hampshire, and I'm here to speak for the southern half of the state in this project.

The proposed high voltage transmission line, Northern Pass, will pass through a few thousand feet of Bear Brook State Park in Allenstown, New Hampshire. This proposed project will create an unreasonable adverse effect on the aesthetics and the natural environment of Bear Brook State Park.

Furthermore, the proposed Northern Pass will

violate the original transfer deed from the federal government. For these reasons, I am opposed to this project as currently presented.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Bear Brook State Park is the largest developed State Park in New Hampshire. It is currently more than 10,000 acres and lies within both Merrimack and Rockingham Counties. park contains pond beaches, 40 miles of trails, a 101-site campground, group picnic areas and a The Civilian Conservation Corps museum complex. within the State Park is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Furthermore, this large state park lies within 15 miles of Manchester, New Hampshire, the state's largest It provides nearby recreational access to city. our large population centers, and it's a very busy place as families can easily access this State Park. I encourage you to visit it on a warm summer weekend.

The proposed towers will be significantly above the current tree line. They will be visible from numerous places within the park including both Catamount and Hall Hills, popular

day hikes. The view of these towers will undoubtedly disturb the visitor's experience to this natural environment. The proposed towers negatively impact the enjoyment of this state resource. Bear Brook State Park is of no less importance than the White Mountain National Forest. It provides much of the same amenities for our citizens and is much closer to our population centers.

In 1943, in the middle of World War II, the State of New Hampshire accepted the Bear Brook land from the federal government with the following conditions in the original deed. Provided always that this deed is made upon the express condition that the State of New Hampshire shall use this property exclusively for public park, recreational and conservation purposes.

The proposed Northern Pass project is not a recreational or conservation project. It is a project to benefit the shareholders of Eversource Energy. As such, it violates the original deed in which the State of New

Hampshire accepted these lands. Thus, it should not proceed as currently proposed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This Saturday, March 2nd at 10 a.m. please meet me in the snowmobile parking lot, Bear Brook State Park, Deerfield Road in Allenstown.

I'll be very happy to walk you through the park and show you the impact of this proposed project on our state's treasured natural resource.

Please be prepared for mud. Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Martin SPEAKER: Kimbell. I have had a business in the State of New Hampshire for 30 years now. For 24 years my power has come from -- excuse me. In Ashland. Bridgewater Power has been a-wood fired generating plant for the entire time I've been there for 24 years plus. New Hampshire's number one economic resource is recreation. business is involved in recreation. started a second business in recreation in Campton, and I have been living in Campton, New Hampshire, for the last 24 years. For 14 years I've been living on Route 3, and Eversource came to visit me and put forth a proposed project on

what the impact on Route 3 would be having buried this transmission line. Well, that's my front yard. I was living on Route 175 and that was my backyard. I didn't want it in my backyard and now I don't want it in my front yard.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

When they proposed this project, I asked them, I said, so what is it going to look like? Is it going be on my property? Is it going to be on my neighbor's property or is it going to be right in the middle of the road, under the road, under the river. I have 75 feet of frontage on Route 3. Not a whole lot. But I own 1500 feet of river up to the thread of the river. Now, this river that flows along my property and goes underneath Route 3 is only about 10 feet higher than the thread of the I don't see any room for what they brook. propose is a three foot by three foot concrete conduit going underneath the highway or side by side to the highway or underneath the bridge.

In the springtime we have ice falls that come down through these rivers, all up and down

the White Mountains of New Hampshire, and the highest recorded ice fall since I've been there has been over 14 feet and run right into the bridge and flooded out my property. What a transmission line would look like buried in New Hampshire going underneath the Pemigewassett River in the White Mountains and all of these smaller brooks/rivers throughout our area is in question.

So I asked the Eversource team if there was a transmission line buried that we could observe and observe how they were constructed with bridges in the area. They said that that didn't exist here in the United States. That we could take a trip to Europe where lots and lots of transmission lines are buried successfully. I said, if you guys would like to buy us all plane tickets and go to Germany or Austria or Liechtenstein or otherwise, we're be glad to take a trip and view those transmission lines underground.

If they would construct one here in New Hampshire, we could take a field trip and look

at such a construction. My concern personally is not in my front yard. With transmission lines overhead we hear of the snap, crackle, pop and arcing electromagnetic forces. What is it underground? What is the impact of that buzz going to be on my property and my value.

Lastly, I would just like to say that since my energy at my shop does come from a wood-fire generated plant, it has been said that a number of wood-fired generated plants in the State of New Hampshire would belly up if Northern Pass were to come through the state. I would not want to see the jobs for the people I know in Ashland, New Hampshire, be taken away due to another energy source coming through the state that was only passing through us to power yet another energy grid south of here. That would be all I have to say. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
Members of the Committee. My name is Walter
Palmer. I'm from Franconia, New Hampshire. I
wasn't planning on getting up and making a

comment here tonight, but I feel like somebody has to get up and say this. I'm reacting to a statement made by Mr. Quinlan earlier this Mr. Quinlan stated several times that, quote, New Hampshire resident are not being asked to bear any of the costs of this project. This is one of the most outrageous and incredibly insensitive statements I've heard so far in this proceeding. New Hampshire residents are asking to bear the brunt of the cost of this project in terms of major visual impacts, loss of property values, damage to the tourism economy, crushed dreams and ruined lifestyles. That's why we're all here protesting this project and have been doing so for the last five years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Northern Pass brings out so-called experts who assert that the visual impacts, property value impacts, tourism impacts somehow all will negligible with this project. But New Hampshire residents know that this is ridiculous. We've already heard many testimonies here tonight of people here in New Hampshire who are already

experiencing negative economic and other impacts just from the threat of Northern Pass. How much more so once Northern Pass, if Northern Pass were to be built.

Your experts are like performing magicians. They pull a little bit of misdirection based on dubious studies, and, presto, somehow serious impacts of the project seem to magically disappear, but we all know it's just a trick. You can't make the very real and serious negative impacts of this project just disappear by waving your hands at them. If you really are so eager to make the impacts disappear, why not try listening to the will of the residents of New Hampshire and propose to bury the transmission line along interstate corridors or not build it at all.

Mr. Quinlan, I'm afraid your statement that New Hampshire resident are not being asked to bear any cost of the project reveals how little you think of New Hampshire residents and the real cost of this project. Northern Pass would externalize all of the serious visual property

values and economic costs so you don't even recognize these costs exist. To us, these costs mean everything. To our way of life, quality of life, to our lifestyle.

So please, Mr. Quinlan, I ask you that you be good enough not to make that statement at future meetings like this. You are asking us to bear onerous and massive costs, and you would do well to acknowledge that. The only way New Hampshire residents will not bear any cost to this project is if the project is not permitted and not built as proposed. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: I'm Lawrence Phillips. I'm from Canterbury. My family has operated a business in New Hampshire for 37 years. It's constantly a challenge controlling cost and increasing profit to stay in business. A lot of the costs of doing business are not controllable. It's the cost of doing business. But a lot of those costs are controllable where you have to make a decision, whether to do the ethical thing for a customer or not. You're not required by any

kind of a law or anything like that. And we always make the ethical decision, even though it costs us money in the business to make an ethical decision, and we do that, and what I'm asking is for Eversource to make the ethical decision and to bury the line. Even though it would cost more, it's the ethical decision because it affects so many people in New Hampshire. Thank you very much for your attention.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Applause)

Hi. My name is Craig Pullen. SPEAKER: Му wife and I own a 140-acre farm, equestrian facility, bed and breakfast in Canterbury, New Hampshire. It's a historic farm. We rely on tourism. We have allowed trees to grow on our property to hide the existing 40-60 feet towers that are on our property right now, less than a quarter mile from our buildings. Eversource's proposing up to 130-foot towers on our property. There's no hiding these. They're towers. We've allowed these trees to grow at the expense of our hay fields. They're shading them out.

1 We also have a snowmobile corridor that 2 goes through our property, a major corridor. We've diverted that corridor off the 3 right-of-way. That's the last thing people want 4 to see on a snowmobile ride is transmission 5 lines. 6 7 Just recently we traveled south, my wife and I, on the eastern seaboard, and we got an 8 9 eyeful of transmission lines. Coming home back 10 to New Hampshire I was wowed by the beauty of 11 New Hampshire. We have a gem of a state here. 12 We need to protect New Hampshire, protect small 13 business, protect tourism, protect people's life investments here. I had a hard time swallowing 14 15 some of these answers tonight. I wish you would 16 consider please say no to this project. Protect 17 New Hampshire. Thank you. 18 (Applause) 19 SPEAKER: Erica Druke. If it's okay, I'd 20 like to ask my questions because it was 21 submitted too late to be answered. 22 MR. HONIGBERG: You can state the

questions, but I'm not promising anybody's going

to answer them.

SPEAKER: Right. So if Northern Pass was approved, would Hydro-Quebec open any more additional big hydro dams to increase supply based on increased demand over time? How many dams are there now? How many dams are planned in the future and over what time frame? Who are all the current and future customers for Hydro-Quebec/Eversource. Now I'll start my comments.

Big hydro is not technically clean due to the permanent damage it does to the environment. Who pays for the external cost due to the environmental damage. US citizens and humanity in general. Not Northern Pass. It costs a huge amount to build dams in terms of resources and concrete and CO2 emissions. Pristine forest and valleys are flooded in Canada, destroying wildlife and displacing people and as well as recreational and economic opportunities. The rivers are no longer reaching the ocean or only as a trickle of its former self. This has negative impacts on the sensitive ecosystem of

I'm

the oceans worldwide. It contributes to the warming of water temperatures of the ocean and advances climate change and global warming. The cost of big hydro is too much to bear when there are better alternatives such as solar power and wind that can be developed in New Hampshire. Wind and solar would allow New Hampshire to be self-reliant and live free of foreign power New Hampshire should invest in itself, sources. not be a passive consumer of private, foreign, for-profit enterprises. Rivers are like gold in Canada. Canada is known for having the most fresh water in the world. Canada doesn't have a problem destroying their own pristine land to be to create big hydro dams so why the hell would they care about New Hampshire's scenery. Why can't New Hampshire generate its own sources of power that are truly clean and don't cause global damage. Don't approve Northern Pass. If is it approved, bury all lines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Applause)

Good evening. Brian Tilton.

SPEAKER:

1 opposed to Northern Pass. No secret to many of 2 you on the panel and for those in the back. Ι 3 wear the orange shirt. I attended a round of SEC sessions previous to this round, and in that 4 round and this is for the DOE's benefit to 5 understand, not a single person that spoke in 6 7 favor of the project was a disinterested party. Everybody had some sort of financial gain. 8 9 tonight, we've heard from everybody that's in 10 favor of the project, except for maybe one or 11 two people, again, stand to have a direct 12 financial benefit if the project were to be 13 built as proposed. So I do want to add to both 14 the DOE and SEC in response to the claims about 15 supermarkets leaving the state, in full 16 disclosure I do work for a supermarket chain in 17 New Hampshire, Market Basket. I'm not speaking 18 on their behalf. I'm not speaking in any way to represent them. I'm just speaking as myself. 19 20 Companies like Market Basket are actually 21 expanding in this state despite the claims that 22 were made earlier about higher electricity

driving them out. The reason why our

competitors have been driven out is because of their business model. Inefficiencies and extremely high cost. We excel in selling a product that's 15 percent cheaper on average than our retail competitors and our employees are paid quite well. So as one of those proud employees, I can say that is certainly the case.

Any of the claims that have been made about the financial benefits to New Hampshire ratepayers, how much cost savings that we'll have, again, without a Power Purchase Agreement in place, all those numbers you see on those screens are meaningless. They don't mean a darn thing because without a signed Power Purchase Agreement, there is nothing, absolutely nothing, to base those numbers on. So until that is in place, I think you guys are just completely wasting your time. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER: Howard Moffett. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to take another
couple of minutes to talk about one issue that I
didn't get chance to talk about, and it's one

1 that seems to have been relevant to a number of 2 people who have spoken tonight. It's the 3 question of whether and to what extent Northern Pass is actually going to reduce electric rates 4 5 in New Hampshire and New England. I think there's a case to be made that it will have or 6 7 could have a modest effect in terms of reducing electric rates, but I think it's going to be 8 9 very important for the committee if they want to 10 get a handle on this to really look carefully at 11 these claims. Mr. Quinlan has told you that 12 Northern Pass hydropower would displace higher 13 cost generation in the ISO New England bid stack 14 resulting in \$800 million in annual savings for 15 New England, and that New Hampshire's share of 16 those savings would be ten percent or \$80 17 million based on our 9 percent share of New 18 England's electric load. He calls this the 19 market suppression effect. 20

What he didn't tell you or at least he hasn't emphasized is that Hydro-Quebec plans to sell Northern Pass power at prevailing market rates, meaning it will charge as much as the

21

22

market will bear. So yes, Northern Pass could in theory displace the most expensive thousand megawatts of the 16 to 20,000 megawatts that New England uses in an average winter day, but that doesn't mean that electric rates paid by New Hampshire ratepayers would be cut by five percent. Not even close.

The effect of Northern Pass on the average ratepayer's monthly electric bill will be much, much smaller than some of the figures you've heard tonight. I heard a figure of five percent, and, frankly, I don't know where that could come from if Hydro-Quebec is going to be charging prevailing market rates. Mr. Quinlan also mentioned a beneficially priced Power Purchase Agreement, Mr. Tilton referred to it earlier, for ten percent of Northern Pass's power, but as you've heard before, Eversource has been talking about that for several years, but we have yet to see the contract.

You don't have to take my word for this.

Okay? I'm not an expert on electric rates, but
you have available to you some people that are

experts on electric rates, and I would suggest that if you want to get a sense of how to weigh the potential effects of the Northern Pass project would have on reducing electric rates, you might want to look carefully at another project that is coming before your committee, that's the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Project, the Northeast Energy Direct Project. Because members of the PUC staff in an investigative study that they did last year in IR 15124, coming out of that study they have, they've concluded that the Northeast Energy Direct Project would actually reduce electric rates in New England by somewhere between 7 and 11 That's not 7 to 11 cents. It's 7 to percent. 11 percent. And I don't think there's any other project on the drawing boards anywhere that comes close to that. Certainly not the Spectra AIM project, and I don't think Northern Pass is going to come close to it either. My point is, if you really care, if you really think that this project is going to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

benefit New Hampshire ratepayers by

significantly reducing electric rates, I would ask you, I would urge you do your homework. Take advantage of the expertise you have in the PUC and find out because I don't think it makes That's all I'll say. No, it's not all sense. I'll say. I'm going to say a couple more It's the cost to the public that really make this project unacceptable unless it's buried. You can't quantify those costs. Because if Northern Pass is hung from hundred-foot towers, the damage to the state's most treasured natural landscapes would be in incalculable. You've heard countless people testify about that tonight. New Hampshire's sense of itself would be in irretrievably compromised, and as for the state's symbol and welcome sign, you would be asking us to trade the Old Man for 130 miles of overhead transmission lines. Thank you. (Applause) MR. HONIGBERG: I believe I have called everyone who signed up to speak. Did I miss All right. I will ask the anyone?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Administrator and Counsel if there's anything else we need to do? PAM MONROE: No. Seems like there is nothing MR. HONIGBERG: so we will adjourn this hearing. Thank you all for your participation. (Hearing ended at 10:24 p.m.)

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

Reporter and Licensed Court Reporter, duly authorized

I, Cynthia Foster, Registered Professional

to practice Shorthand Court Reporting in the State of New Hampshire, hereby certify that I reported in machine shorthand the above-entitled Public Hearing conducted in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Energy, held on March 10, 2016, in the matter indicated on the title sheet, and that the foregoing is a true, complete, and accurate transcript of public comments as appears from my stenographic notes so taken to the best of my ability and transcribed by me.

I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of this cause of action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand and affix my Certified Shorthand Reporter seal this 28th day of March, 2016.

CYNTHIA FOSTER, LCR, RPR