

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

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

March 14, 2016 - 5:03 p.m.
Plymouth State University
Welcome Center at the Ice Arena
129 NH Route 175A
Holderness, New Hampshire

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

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

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

COURT REPORTER: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 052

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	I N D E X	
		PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	INTRODUCTION BY CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG	7
4	PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANTS (by Mr. Quinlan)	12
5	QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE	26
6	Commissioner Bailey	26
7	Ms. Weathersby	27
8	QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION TO QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	29
9	COMMENCEMENT OF PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION	91
10	PUBLIC COMMENTS BY:	
11	Chairman Shelagh Connelly	93
12	Rep. Herb Richardson	94
13	Chairman Neil Irvine	97
14	County Cmsr. Martha Richards	101
15	Rep. Edmond Gionet	104
16	Selectman Eric Meth	106
17	Rep. Bill Baber	110
18	Rep. Susan Ford	113
19	Rep. Rebecca Brown	115
20	Mayor Ken Merrifield	119
21	County Cmsr. Rick Samson	120
22	Rep. John Burt	125
23	Rebecca More	127
24	Cheryl Jensen	129

	I N D E X (continued)	
1		
2	PUBLIC COMMENTS BY:	PAGE NO.
3	Elizabeth Terp	135
4	David Van Houten	136
5	Rep. Suzanne Smith	139
6	Patricia Kellogg	142
7	Walter Palmer	143
8	Jeff Guerra	146
9	Tiler Eaton	148
10	Robert Krey	150
11	Barbara Meyer	153
12	Barbara Robinson	156
13	Peter Grote	159
14	Sen. Jeanie Forrester	163
15	Frederick Von Karls	166
16	Susan Moore	168
17	Richard Hunnewell (by Ms. Hunnewell)	170
18	Eli Badger	174
19	Linda McDermott	175
20	David Sakura	179
21	Susan Arnold	181
22	Mike Stirling	185
23	Mike Novello	187
24	Margaret Mumford	189

	I N D E X (continued)	
	PUBLIC COMMENT BY:	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	Heather Townsend	192
4	Jon Wilkinson	194
5	Alan McLain	197
6	James Mason	198
7	Harley Mason	200
8	Allen Bouthillier	202
9	Pat Hopp (by Mr. Page)	204
10	Manfred Hoertdoerfer	206, 240
11	Virginia Jeffryes	209
12	James Page	213
13	Henry Ahern	216
14	Rep. Stephen Darrow	217
15	Jane Difley	221
16	Nancy Martland (By Mr. Phillips)	221
17	Peter Powell	225
18	Kelly Wieser	229
19	Mark Monahan	233
20	Ryan Barber	234
21	Jeanne Menard	237
22	Matt Denhart	238
23	Thomas Mullen	244
24		

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good evening,
3 ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to a public hearing of
4 the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. This is
5 the Subcommittee hearing, the Joint Application of
6 Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service
7 Company of New Hampshire, which does business as
8 Eversource Energy, for a Certificate of Site and
9 Facility. The docket number is 2015-06.

10 Before turning to our agenda this
11 evening, I'm going to ask the Subcommittee members to
12 identify themselves, starting to my far left.

13 MR. OLDENBURG: William Oldenburg, from
14 the Department of Transportation.

15 MR. WAY: Christopher Way, from the
16 Department of Resources and Economic Development.

17 DIRECTOR WRIGHT: Craig Wright, with the
18 Department of Environmental Services.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Martin Honigberg.
20 I'm Chair of the Public Utilities Commission.

21 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Kate Bailey,
22 Public Utilities Commission.

23 MS. WHITAKER: Rachel Whitaker,
24 alternate public member.

1 MS. WEATHERSBY: Patricia Weathersby,
2 public member.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Also with us is our
4 Administrator, Pam Monroe, our Attorney Michael
5 Iacopino, and there's one other person I'd like to
6 introduce, from the Attorney General's Office, Peter
7 Roth, who serves as Public Counsel in this proceeding.

8 On October 19th of 2015 Northern Pass
9 Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New
10 Hampshire, which does business as Eversource Energy,
11 submitted an Application to the New Hampshire Site
12 Evaluation Committee for a Certificate of Site and
13 Facility to construct a 192-mile transmission line.
14 The transmission line is proposed to have a capacity
15 rating of 1,090 megawatts, is proposed to run from the
16 Canadian border in Pittsburg to Deerfield.

17 On November 2nd, pursuant to RSA
18 164-H -- I'm sorry, 162-H, I, as the Chair of the
19 Committee, appointed a Subcommittee to serve on this
20 matter. Many of the state officials who serve on the
21 SEC, in turn, exercised their authority under RSA 162-H
22 to designate senior members of their agencies to serve
23 on the Subcommittee.

24 On December 7th, the Subcommittee met

1 and reviewed the status of the Application. At that
2 time, the Subcommittee determined that the Application
3 contained sufficient information to satisfy the
4 application requirements of each state agency having
5 jurisdiction under state or federal law to regulate any
6 aspect of the construction or operation of the proposed
7 facility.

8 Off the record for a minute.

9 *[Brief off-the-record discussion*
10 *ensued.]*

11 *[Audience interruption.]*

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You will all be
13 respectful this evening of everyone who speaks. And,
14 if you feel you can't be respectful, you will be asked
15 to leave. Is that clear?

16 FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you very
18 much. At the meeting on December 7th, the Subcommittee
19 also made an independent determination that the
20 Application contains sufficient information to carry
21 out the purposes of RSA 162-H.

22 On December 22nd, the Subcommittee
23 issued a Procedural Order setting forth deadlines for
24 motions to intervene, and scheduling public information

1 sessions in Franklin, Londonderry, Laconia, Whitefield,
2 and Lincoln. Those public information sessions took
3 place during January. The Subcommittee has received
4 over 150 motions to intervene. An order will be issued
5 shortly regarding the intervention petitions.

6 On February 3rd, the Subcommittee issued
7 and Order and Notice scheduling public hearings in
8 Meredith, Holderness, and Deerfield for March 1, 14,
9 and 16, respectively. Also, on February 3rd, the
10 Subcommittee scheduled public hearings in Colebrook and
11 Concord for March 7th and 10th, respectively. The
12 Colebrook and Concord hearings, which have already
13 taken place, were held contemporaneously with public
14 hearings for the Department of Energy and other federal
15 agencies with oversight over this Project. The hearing
16 in Meredith took place as well. The hearing in
17 Deerfield will -- I'm sorry, the hearing in Concord
18 took place, and the hearing in Deerfield will take
19 place this Wednesday. We are required to hold at least
20 one public hearing in each county in which the project
21 is to be located, and those public hearings must be
22 held within 90 days after acceptance of the
23 Application.

24 In addition to the required hearings,

{SEC 2015-06} [Joint Public Hearing/Holderness] {03-14-16}

1 two additional hearings will be scheduled to deal with
2 the supplemental information that was filed in late
3 February.

4 Notice of this joint -- I'm sorry, this
5 public hearing was served on the public by publication
6 in the New Hampshire Union Leader on February 10, 2016.

7 We will proceed this evening as follows:
8 First, we will hear a presentation by the Applicant.
9 Following that presentation, the Subcommittee members
10 and Subcommittee staff will have an opportunity to pose
11 questions to the Applicant. Sometimes the Subcommittee
12 has questions for the Applicant; sometimes the
13 Subcommittee does not. The Subcommittee has had the
14 opportunity to review the filings of the Applicant and
15 other parties, and we will have other opportunities to
16 question the Applicant and other parties under oath
17 later in this process.

18 After the Subcommittee has had an
19 opportunity to ask questions of the Applicant, the
20 public will be permitted to pose questions to the
21 Applicant. If you have a question for the Applicant,
22 we ask you to please write down your question on one of
23 the green sheets, and hand it to one of the people who
24 are working here this evening to process paperwork. If

1 you have questions for the Subcommittee at this time,
2 we may or may not answer them. It depends on what the
3 nature of the question is. For the most part, we will
4 treat questions directed to the Committee as public
5 comments, as the federal agencies do in their review
6 process. We will try to organize the questions by
7 subject matter and present them to the Applicant in an
8 organized fashion, with no promise that we will be able
9 to do that effectively.

10 Once we have asked all of the questions
11 that the public has, we will then take public
12 statements or comments on the Application. Please make
13 your comments as succinct as possible, and try not to
14 be repetitive. I'll go through some more guidelines
15 with respect to your public comment a little bit later.
16 But you can expect to be asked to limit your comments
17 to approximately three minutes, with the understanding
18 that you may need a little bit more time than that. If
19 you need substantially more than three minutes, we'll
20 probably ask you to make your initial comments, and
21 then come back at the end to finish whatever it is that
22 you could like to say.

23 If you would like to speak, we're going
24 to ask you to fill out one of the yellow sheets, and

1 get it to one of the people working this evening. Many
2 of you have already done so.

3 If you would like to submit a written
4 comment, there are blue forms for the written comments.
5 All of the blue forms get scanned and are posted on the
6 SEC's website.

7 I believe that is all the housekeeping
8 we need to deal with at this time. And, I think we are
9 ready to hand it over to the Applicant for their
10 presentation. And, I believe Mr. Quinlan will be
11 starting that for the Applicant.

12 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. Thank you. So, my
13 name is Bill Quinlan. I'm the President of Eversource
14 New Hampshire. I'm joined by Lee Carbonneau, who's with
15 Normandeau Associates, she is an environmental expert;
16 Sam Johnson, he's with Burns & McDonnell, he's a
17 technical expert; Ken Bowes, who is our Vice President
18 of Engineering; and Jim Muntz, who's the President of
19 our Transmission business.

20 It's great to be here tonight. And, I'm
21 going to give you a quick overview of the Project, and,
22 probably most importantly, answer any questions that
23 you've got.

24 So, Northern Pass, you know, obviously,

1 you've heard a lot about the Project. What is the
2 issue that we're trying to solve? We're trying to
3 solve a terribly important issue, both for New England
4 and New Hampshire, which is that our electric prices
5 are among the highest in the country. And, it's a
6 result of retirements at power plants that have
7 occurred over the last several years, and are going to
8 continue out in the future. But, sitting here today,
9 we're about 50 percent higher, from an energy
10 perspective, than we should be, which puts us at a
11 competitive disadvantage. We also have very aggressive
12 environmental goals as a region, and Northern Pass is a
13 great opportunity to not only lower our energy costs,
14 but also begin to address our environmental goals.

15 So, I've been involved in the Project a
16 little over a year. And, you know, what became
17 apparent to me, when I first got involved with this
18 Project, is that we needed to pursue an application
19 that struck an appropriate balance. And, these are the
20 three factors that I and the team have been seeking to
21 balance over the last year or so. We've been working
22 to strike a balance based upon feedback from New
23 Hampshire.

24 So, if you look at these three

1 variables, you know, first and foremost, the Project
2 needs to do what it's intended to do, which is to take
3 a large volume of affordable, clean hydropower from
4 where it's generated in Canada and deliver it to the
5 New England grid. So, it's got to work
6 technologically. It's got to be sitable, which means
7 it's got to be a project that addresses, to the extent
8 it can, the view and scenic impacts of the State of New
9 Hampshire. And, then, third, it's got to be
10 affordable. I mean, it's got to be a project that is
11 not so costly that it becomes prohibitive and no one is
12 going to pay for it. These are the three factors that
13 we've been seeking to balance, and we believe we've
14 done so.

15 Late last year, in the August/September
16 timeframe, we announced our ForwardNH Plan, which
17 included some very significant changes to our Project.
18 And, it was really a plan designed to balance these
19 three critically important factors.

20 So, these are the -- this is the Project
21 that we have now moved into siting, which is the result
22 of the outreach we have done across New Hampshire to
23 strike that balance. Now, over to the right, I'll give
24 you a high-level overview of the currently proposed

1 route. So, the hydropower is generated in northern
2 Quebec. Okay? Our partner, Hydro-Quebec, is siting a
3 60-mile transmission line, outlined here in red, which
4 is an overhead line, to essentially get the
5 hypothetical to the U.S. border.

6 At that point, Northern Pass will pick
7 it up at the border, and ultimately deliver it to
8 Deerfield, New Hampshire. So, just for frame of
9 reference, these areas in red are overhead
10 construction, yellow are areas we've determined to
11 place underground, and blue are areas where we're
12 following an existing right-of-way with an existing
13 transmission line. Okay?

14 So, it comes overhead, it crosses the
15 border, it then goes southeast. And, the reason we
16 went in that direction is we wanted to pick up this
17 area referred to as "Wagner Forest". Where we have a
18 24-mile leased right-of-way, which is a working forest.
19 It's an area that's routinely forested. And, our goal
20 was to get to that forested area so that we are away
21 from the population centers on the western side of
22 northern Coos County.

23 So, we cross into the United States,
24 eight (8) miles here, in yellow, it's underground. It

1 essentially gets us to Wagner Forest. And, then, we
2 have a 24-mile overhead construction through that
3 working forest. Okay?

4 At that point, when we exit Wagner
5 Forest, we pick up our existing transmission
6 right-of-way, which is outlined in blue, and we follow
7 that all the way to Bethlehem. So, there is an
8 existing transmission line and an existing
9 right-of-way, and, essentially, these two lines will
10 run parallel. And, that's something we attempted to do
11 from the outset, is to use existing transmission
12 corridors.

13 When we announced the ForwardNH Plan,
14 even though there is an existing right-of-way right
15 through the White Mountain National Forest, with an
16 existing line that's overhead, based upon the feedback
17 from New Hampshire, we determined that we would go with
18 52 miles of underground construction, so as not to have
19 any further impact on the White Mountain National
20 Forest. So, the Grafton County, for the most part, is
21 now all underground construction.

22 So, what did we avoid? We, obviously,
23 avoided the White Mountain National Forest, we avoided
24 Franconia Notch, and we avoided the Appalachian Trail.

1 We selected that area specifically based upon the
2 feedback we have received from stakeholders across New
3 Hampshire.

4 So, that brings you all the way down to
5 Bridgewater. We pick back up our existing overhead
6 transmission corridor. We bring it down to Franklin,
7 and we convert it to alternating current, and then we
8 follow our existing transmission corridor down to
9 Deerfield.

10 So, to the extent possible, we've used
11 existing corridors, we've used this working forest to
12 put a large block of the Project out in an area that is
13 not populated at all. And, then, we placed 60 miles of
14 it underground.

15 So, if you look at the evolution of this
16 project, from 2000 [2010?] to what we proposed last
17 year, it's changed quite dramatically. Not only has it
18 grown in length, because we had to go east to pick up
19 the forest, so, it's gone from 180 to 192 miles, almost
20 a third of it now is underground. We changed the cable
21 technology. So, to have 60 miles of underground
22 construction, we actually had to change the cable
23 technology. We are now using state-of-the-art
24 underground cable. That required us also to reduce the

1 size of the Project. We did not feel comfortable
2 technologically with a 1,200 megawatt HVDC Light cable.
3 So, we've scaled down the size of the Project from
4 1,200 megawatts to 1,090, and the price tag overall has
5 gone up by a half a billion dollars. So, it's a
6 fundamentally different project than the one that was
7 initially introduced in 2010. And, that was all done
8 based upon feedback from New Hampshire, in an effort to
9 strike the balance that I was referring to earlier.
10 Very significant changes to the Project.

11 Now, one of the things I've heard about
12 for the last year and a half is, you know, "You're
13 using outdated technology. Everyone else, over the
14 last ten years, has been building transmission lines
15 underground." Which is completely wrong. So, what
16 I've shown here are the large 345 kilovolt transmission
17 lines that have been built across New England over the
18 last 10 or 15 years. There has been ten of them. And,
19 I've broken them down between overhead construction and
20 underground construction. You'll see there's almost
21 600 miles of new transmission across New England, none
22 of it in New Hampshire, by the way. It's mostly in
23 Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont. But
24 almost 600 miles of new construction, over 90 percent

1 of it is overhead construction. The only exceptions to
2 that are down in Fairfield County, with Lines Number 1
3 and 2, where you're approaching, in essence, the New
4 York border. It's heavily congested. There's just no
5 place to put an overhead transmission line, and in
6 Boston. Okay?

7 So, the notion that "other projects are
8 going underground and we are using an outdated approach
9 to this project" is wrong.

10 The other line that I've added here is
11 the existing Hydro-Quebec line. There is an existing
12 line in service today, it's been in service for
13 decades. It's larger and taller than the line that
14 we're talking about today. Essentially does the same
15 thing that Northern Pass is proposing to do. And, it's
16 outlined here in red. It's a 180-mile line that brings
17 hypothetical from Quebec to Massachusetts. Okay? It
18 cuts through Vermont and it cuts through New Hampshire.
19 Some of the towers on that line, for frame of
20 reference, are over 200 feet tall. Okay?

21 So, I just wanted to share some facts
22 about existing transmission lines, because I think
23 there's a lot of misinformation as to what others are
24 building and what is currently in service today. The

1 vast majority of transmission infrastructure in this
2 country has been built overhead, with the single
3 exception being in large cities, where there's
4 physically not an open area to put in a transmission
5 corridor. Okay?

6 When we put 60 miles underground for
7 Northern Pass, that will be the longest HVDC
8 underground construction in North America.

9 And, another area that I felt it would
10 be worth sharing is the result of a recent competitive
11 solicitation by the southern New England states. So,
12 in recognition of the high energy costs, and in an
13 effort to meet environmental goals, the three southern
14 New England states have gotten together and recently
15 solicited proposals to bring clean energy into the
16 region. Okay?

17 And, there were a lot of projects that
18 were on the drawing board that we anticipated being
19 submitted into the competitive solicitation, but the
20 reality is very few are mature enough to bid. So,
21 you've got Northern Pass, which is the Project we're
22 here talking about today. It's the only large-scale
23 hydro project that was bid into the solicitation.

24 The projects that we've been hearing

1 about for the last couple of years, such as the New
2 England Clean Power Link, you may have heard about the
3 TDI project in Vermont, that was almost a mirror of
4 Northern Pass, except it was underground and
5 underwater; they selected not to bid.

6 Similar projects in Maine, which would
7 have essentially done the same thing, bringing large
8 amounts of clean energy into the load centers, also
9 chose not to bid.

10 Now, why is that? You know, I don't
11 know. But, you know, some of the rationale that I've
12 heard in the market is either those projects are too
13 costly, they don't have a power supply, they don't have
14 an interconnection with Canada to bring power to the
15 border, or a combination of the three. So, they are
16 truly conceptual projects that aren't mature enough to
17 have even bid into the solicitation, which is, you
18 know, a unique opportunity for projects such as these
19 to go to market. Okay?

20 The only other projects that did bid are
21 relatively small, and for very different purposes.

22 This is a project that we're involved in, "we" being
23 Eversource, which is to bring wind into western
24 Massachusetts. So, it's wind, backed by hydro. You

1 know, there's the Vermont Green Line, which has wind,
2 again, backed by hydro. And, then, you have these
3 three wind projects in Maine, which essentially move
4 hydropower from northern Maine down to southern Maine.
5 But no large-scale projects that will actually get to
6 the issue we're trying to solve, which is to bring a
7 large amount of baseload hydropower into the region to
8 lower our energy costs.

9 Every one of these other projects is
10 requiring a power purchase agreement, which is a
11 long-term commitment on behalf of those three southern
12 New England states to pay for the energy coming over
13 the line. The only project that doesn't require a
14 power purchase agreement is Northern Pass.

15 So, these bids are in the process of
16 being evaluated by those three states, and the results
17 will become known later this year. But I just felt it
18 was important to share with the Committee and others,
19 you know, the true facts as to what's going on in the
20 market.

21 Beyond the Project itself, when we
22 rolled out ForwardNH, this is an illustration of the
23 other benefits that this Project delivers to New
24 Hampshire. A question that we've gotten repeatedly for

1 the last year is "What are the benefits for New
2 Hampshire? Isn't this all about getting power to
3 southern New England?" And, the actual opposite is
4 true. The vast majority of the benefits rest with New
5 Hampshire.

6 So, when we talk about lower energy
7 costs, we certainly get our share. Our share is about
8 \$80 million a year. That's of an \$800 million a year
9 in New England savings. So, we're about 10 percent of
10 the load, our customers will get 10 percent of the
11 savings. We announced the ForwardNH Fund to drive some
12 community betterment projects here in the state.
13 Obviously, the taxes will rest here in New Hampshire.
14 And, importantly, from a jobs perspective, when we made
15 our announcement, we also announced a "New Hampshire
16 first" approach for sourcing a lot of work on this
17 Project. Which means that, to the extent possible,
18 we're going to use local labor and local contractors to
19 build this Project.

20 When you add up the economic benefits to
21 the State of New Hampshire, they're quite significant,
22 almost \$4 billion of economic benefits. In addition to
23 the environmental benefits, I'm not going to hit them
24 all, but, you know, if you think about what I said at

1 the outset, which is the region's clean energy goals,
2 there's no project that is going to have the impact
3 environmentally that Northern Pass will have in a
4 positive way. So, it will offset 3 million tons of
5 carbon dioxide a year, which is a very dramatic
6 reduction in greenhouse gases. Okay? If you think
7 about it, over the last five years, we've been making
8 steady progress as a region in meeting our clean energy
9 goals. In 2015, for the first year, that progress
10 reversed itself. So, carbon dioxide emissions last
11 year actually went up 7 percent. And, it's a result of
12 some of our nuclear fleet retiring and being replaced
13 with natural gas. So, after several years of steady
14 progress, an uptick in carbon last year. And, our
15 goals are very, very aggressive as a region, and this
16 Project gets us a long way towards it.

17 The only other one I'll mention here is
18 the last one, which is our grid upgrades. One of the
19 things we have been able to commit to as part of this
20 project, when we looked at the design of this, what can
21 we do to bolster and foster small-scale renewable
22 generation? One of the questions I repeatedly get is,
23 "you're bringing in a large amount of hydro, are you
24 going to squeeze out all of the small-scale renewables?"

1 The biomass plants, the small wind plants, the small
2 hydro plants, are they going to be able to compete with
3 the Northern Pass?" And, the short answer is "yes,
4 they can." They can certainly compete economically.
5 And, we're actually going to do something with this
6 Project to enhance their viability. So, there's a
7 portion of the transmission loop in Coos County that
8 for years has been very constrained, meaning it's not
9 big enough to get all of that small-scale renewables to
10 market. There's almost 400 megawatts of small-scale
11 renewable power in northern New Hampshire. And, on any
12 given day, as much as 100 megawatts has to sit on the
13 sidelines, because it can't get to market.

14 So, one of the things we can do, as part
15 of this Project, and we've committed to do it, is to
16 upgrade that transmission infrastructure, to increase
17 the carry capacity of it, so that small-scale
18 renewables can get unlocked and actually get to market.
19 Which should make it a much more attractive proposition
20 for those small plants, and will complement what we're
21 trying to do here with Northern Pass, which is to meet
22 our environmental goals.

23 So, that's Northern Pass in a nutshell,
24 the ForwardNH Plan, both the changes we've made to the

1 Project, to address New Hampshire feedback, as well as
2 the economic and environmental benefits. I've tried to
3 summarize them, so folks can get a sense of what this
4 Project is all about.

5 And, with that, I look forward to your
6 questions.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do members of the
8 Subcommittee have questions for Mr. Quinlan or his team
9 at this time? Commissioner Bailey.

10 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Mr. Quinlan, can
11 you tell me where the \$800 million of savings for New
12 England comes from?

13 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, the 800 million
14 is a number calculated by one of our experts. It's
15 captured in a report by London Economics. And, what
16 they looked at is "what is the effect on the wholesale
17 energy markets on an annual basis, when you take the
18 power that Northern Pass can deliver and put it into
19 the market?" So, it basically suppresses the wholesale
20 market costs for electricity in New England by about
21 800 million a year. New Hampshire's share of that 800
22 million, because we're about 10 percent of the load, is
23 80 million a year. When I sometimes say, you know,
24 "New Hampshire's benefit is 800 million", it's for a

1 ten-year period. So, it's 80 million a year for ten
2 years. It happens to be the same as the annual number
3 for all of New England.

4 So, it's really that market suppression
5 effect. In essence, for those of you who don't follow
6 the markets, you're taking a low-cost supply, and
7 you're displacing higher-cost generation assets that
8 would be required to meet customer demand. So, when
9 you do that, the overall market price comes down. And,
10 that's what leads to the 80 million a year for New
11 Hampshire and 800 million a year for New England.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are there other
13 questions from the Subcommittee? Yes, Ms. Weathersby.

14 MS. WEATHERSBY: I had not been aware
15 until tonight of the existing Hydro-Quebec lines that
16 come through the state. Is it possible to use some or
17 all of that corridor? And, if not, what are the
18 obstacles?

19 MR. QUINLAN: And, so, the short answer,
20 it was an option that was given a lot of study, and we
21 determined it's not technically feasible. And, I'm
22 going to turn that over to our Engineering team to
23 explain why that is. Sam Johnson, from Burns &
24 McDonnell, will explain.

1 MR. JOHNSON: So, one of the options we
2 did look at was utilizing that corridor, since it's
3 already there. There are two primary issues. One is
4 that that corridor is maxed, as far as the amount of
5 infrastructure that can go into the existing corridor.
6 There's no more room in that corridor, *per se*. And,
7 secondly, in large tracts where this -- where that line
8 goes, there's no room for expansion, meaning that we
9 could not get easements on either side, either due to
10 restrictions from the current landowners or that it's
11 already in conserved areas.

12 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. I'm going to ask
13 Mr. Muntz to also provide some further input on that as
14 well.

15 MR. MUNTZ: There's also a concern with
16 the overall ISO-New England grid system. Basically,
17 the ISO-New England grid is based around the single
18 biggest element, which is about a 1,200 megawatt
19 nuclear power plant. And, the whole grid is sized and
20 designed for the loss of that element. So, when you
21 start having one right-of-way with the current line
22 that generally runs around 1,400 megawatts, and you add
23 another one, you have the potential to lose about, you
24 know, 2,000 -- I mean, 2,400 possibly megawatts on the

1 grid at once in ISO-New England. The build-out of the
2 grid would be required to accommodate that type of, you
3 know, one single right-of-way would be prohibitively
4 expensive.

5 The other thing I'll mention, the
6 existing line currently runs at about 90 percent
7 capacity. It's all-in. You know, holidays, weekends,
8 outages, storms, it runs at about 90 percent capacity
9 over the last five years. So, it's pretty well fully
10 utilized.

11 MR. QUINLAN: And, just to make sure
12 that one point was clear. When you have two
13 transmission lines together, whether they're
14 underground or overhead, in close proximity, and
15 they're two of this size, you would actually change the
16 design basis for the entire New England grid. It would
17 change the design basis, from the loss of a nuclear
18 plant to the loss of those two lines, which is a --
19 it's a huge deal, from an engineering perspective. But
20 the alternative was pretty closely studied.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Other questions?

22 *[No verbal response]*

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Seeing
24 none, I'm going to turn to the green sheets. There are

1 a couple of questions specifically directed to SEC
2 members. And, I'm going to ask the SEC members to
3 identify their hometowns, because people would like to
4 know what towns we live in. Mr. Oldenburg.

5 MR. OLDENBURG: I live in Bow.

6 MR. WAY: I live in Bradford, New
7 Hampshire.

8 DIRECTOR WRIGHT: Loudon, New Hampshire.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I live in Concord.

10 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I also live in
11 Bow.

12 MS. WHITAKER: I'm from up in Stark.

13 MS. WEATHERSBY: I live in Rye. I also
14 have a family property in Hart's Location.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are any of our
16 properties or homes affected by the proposed line?
17 Does anyone? I believe that I will not be able to see
18 the line from my home. But, I think, if I walk about
19 50 yards, I'll be able to see it from my -- I live in
20 East Concord, and the line does go through East
21 Concord, a ways from where I live, but I believe I'll
22 be able to see it a short distance from my own home.

23 There are a number of process questions.
24 I'm going to start with this one.

1 "Do you know, Mr. Quinlan, or does
2 anyone on your team know, the process for
3 Hydro-Quebec's participation in a U.S. project and how
4 it is that it's essentially a foreign government is
5 able to do business here in the United States?"

6 MR. QUINLAN: So, Hydro-Quebec is a
7 decades-long participant in the New England power
8 market. They have a market status. They have applied
9 for it and received it, just like many other foreign
10 utilities. So, every day they are selling power into
11 the New England market. So, they're an active
12 participant, actually quite a large player in that
13 market.

14 This Project requires the issuance of a
15 Presidential Permit, because we're crossing an
16 International border, and that is the subject of the
17 review by the Department of Energy.

18 So, from a market perspective, they have
19 got all the approvals they currently need. And, you
20 know, the physical interconnection would be approved by
21 the Department of Energy.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. There
23 are other process questions that we'll get to a little
24 bit later. There's a series of environmental

1 questions.

2 The first one references Section H,
3 Number 4 of the Application. And, there's what
4 purports to be a quote written here. It says "Many
5 self-imposed seasonal restrictions and survey
6 requirements have been developed by the Project to
7 minimize impacts to wildlife at critical life stages."
8 And, the specific question is, "Does this include
9 tree-cutting restrictions during migratory bird nesting
10 season?"

11 MR. QUINLAN: So, Lee Carbonneau, she's
12 our environmental expert, from Normandeau Associates.
13 Lee.

14 MS. CARBONNEAU: The seasonal
15 tree-clearing restrictions will vary from place to
16 place a little bit. To the extent that the U.S. Fish &
17 Wildlife Service concludes that we have to do seasonal
18 restrictions to comply with any particular rule or
19 regulation, including Migratory Bird Treaty Act, then
20 that will be implemented.

21 For the most part, a lot of the seasonal
22 tree-clearing, to the extent that we can, a lot of it
23 is going to happen in the winter, the best we can, for
24 a number of reasons. But that would be one of them.

1 That's not always the only concern with seasonal
2 tree-clearing. The Project does go through some deer
3 wintering areas, where winter tree-clearing might not
4 be the preferred season.

5 These things will be evaluated in the
6 overall project schedule, and the work will proceed in
7 a way that is as minimally impacting as possible.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next question
9 refers specifically to horizontal directional drilling,
10 and asks "What the reporting protocol is for
11 inadvertent returns of drilling mud to surface waters
12 during horizontal directional drilling? And, in the
13 event that it happens, will water quality then be
14 monitored?"

15 MR. JOHNSON: The answer is "yes" and
16 "yes". And, I'll expand on the first one. Basically,
17 what happens is, we need to come to an agreement with
18 the appropriate agency for any potential inadvertent
19 returns, and that's basically what's called a
20 "frack-out". That's when the drilling mud hits a
21 fissure in the rock, for example, and somehow the mud
22 works its way up into a wetland watercourse -- a
23 wetland or stream watercourse.

24 In this instance, there will be -- the

1 drilling crews themselves have equipment on standby
2 that is able to minimize the impact. And, then,
3 depending on the agreement with the agency and the
4 volume of the discharge, there will be long-term
5 monitoring that will be part of the process.

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Does the reduction
7 in carbon emissions include the loss of carbon sink
8 capacity that occurs with the development of large
9 hydro, i.e., the flooding of forest lands?"

10 MS. CARBONNEAU: The reduction in
11 carbon, my understanding, is something that has been
12 evaluated pretty carefully. My understanding is that
13 the Application does include some modification of the
14 amount of carbon reduction based on what has occurred
15 up in the Canada provinces. The source of the
16 hydropower is largely from reservoirs that have been in
17 place for some time. So, the amount of emissions from
18 those has been greatly reduced from when they were
19 originally established, and, in general, are quite
20 minimal, compared to the carbon reductions that this
21 Project will foresee, based on the closing of power
22 plants that we know are coming.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: To what extent will
24 the construction and operation of the line disrupt

1 migration routes, nesting sites, mating and breeding
2 habitats of species?

3 MS. CARBONNEAU: We have done a fair
4 amount of evaluations of different wildlife habitats.
5 So, we've looked at where threatened/endangered
6 species, Forest Service sensitive species, special
7 concern species, and general wildlife habitats as well.
8 As much of the line is going to be in existing
9 rights-of-way that are already managed or are going to
10 be underground, in those locations, we don't expect
11 that there will be substantial changes to wildlife
12 habitat. Either from -- there will be some temporary
13 changes in those locations from the construction of
14 the -- the construction activity. So, there will be
15 some displacement during construction. That's a
16 short-term impact. We expect that things will return
17 to their current status, once we get into the normal
18 phase of the management activities that occur there.

19 In the northern portion of the Project
20 where there will be a new right-of-way, there will be
21 some habitat changes. And, those effects will be
22 either -- they can be direct or indirect, they can be
23 short-term or long-term, and they can be beneficial or
24 detrimental. So, we have a range of different things

1 that will happen. Some of the species that are deep
2 forest species will lose some habitat, because the
3 trees there will be permanently removed, then it will
4 be maintained as early successional cover. Compared to
5 the amount of forest that's available in the North
6 Country, this is a fairly minimal amount of loss of
7 forest habitat. So, we're not expecting population
8 changes. There will be -- most of the species that we
9 see in the forested areas do not seem to have any issue
10 crossing the right-of-way. We've done tracking
11 surveys, we've done bird surveys. Most of the animals
12 will be able to cross the right-of-way, which will be
13 about 120 feet wide in the North Country.

14 Some of the species that like early
15 successional habitats will actually benefit from the
16 new right-of-way. Where it -- certainly, where it
17 extends out of existing open lands, there will be
18 additional habitat for some of our rarer bird species
19 up north, and as well as some good forging habitat for
20 some of our large game species. So, it will be a mix.
21 We don't anticipate serious loss of wildlife habitat
22 that's long term.

23 We do have a few endangered species
24 issues, particularly in Concord Pine Barrens area,

1 we're working with Fish & Game and Fish & Wildlife to
2 come up with solutions that, in the long run, will be
3 beneficial to those species that are temporarily
4 impacted.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please discuss the
6 state of the research and science regarding exposure to
7 electromagnetic radiation, specifically with respect to
8 early childhood Leukemia?

9 MR. QUINLAN: Let me introduce Dr.
10 Bailey.

11 DR. BAILEY: Good afternoon. I'm Dr.
12 William Bailey. I'm a technical consultant for the
13 project. For the last 35 years, I've been involved in
14 research and teaching in the field of
15 bioelectromagnetics. So, this is a study of how
16 electric and magnetic fields interact with the
17 environment and with people.

18 I trained at Dartmouth College, here in
19 New Hampshire, the University of Chicago, the City
20 University of New York, and Rockefeller University.
21 Based on my background and experience, I've been called
22 as an advisor to many state, federal, and international
23 agencies, including the World Health Organization.

24 On the topic of electric and magnetic

1 fields in this Project, we investigated the fields both
2 with the direct current portion of the line, and also
3 the AC current portion of the line.

4 The question regarding childhood
5 Leukemia and EMF pertains specifically to alternating
6 current electric and magnetic fields, associated with
7 appliances and power lines that we commonly encounter,
8 not with the DC type of fields.

9 The question arose in 1979, when some
10 scientists observed a statistical association between
11 the presence of distribution lines outside people's
12 houses in Denver, Colorado, and the likelihood that
13 children in the area had Leukemia and other forms of
14 cancer.

15 Subsequently, there have been dozens of
16 studies that have investigated this question over the
17 years, with increasing power to resolve the questions
18 that have come up at the beginning. This statistical
19 association has not been confirmed by experimental
20 studies, in which animals have been exposed for their
21 entire lives to levels of magnetic fields that might be
22 even 10,000 times or 50,000 times what you might find
23 in our homes.

24 The most recent studies that have come

1 out on this topic are three studies that are described
2 in our report. One is from the UK, one is from France,
3 and one is from Scandinavia. And, in each of these
4 studies, they did not find a relationship between
5 overhead power lines and childhood cancer. That is, if
6 you compare the birth addresses of children with and
7 without cancer, they are no closer to the power lines,
8 their addresses, than children without cancer.

9 So, much research has been done on this
10 topic, probably more than for any other environmental
11 exposure that we commonly encounter, and certainly for
12 most chemicals in our environment.

13 And, the current conclusion of the World
14 Health Organization is "that the evidence does not
15 confirm the existence of any health consequences of
16 exposure to low-level electromagnetic fields."

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How will you
18 protect groundwater, byways, brooks, rivers, *etcetera*,
19 from contamination from chemicals, herbicides,
20 pesticides, or petroleum agent leaks, or just
21 deforestation during the process of building and
22 operating the line?"

23 MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Bowes.

24 MR. BOWES: Thank you, Bill. I would

1 break it down into two variables. One is the
2 construction activity and one is the ongoing operations
3 and maintenance.

4 For the construction phase, obviously,
5 we'll have environmental inspectors as part of the
6 overall management plan of this Project. Included in
7 that will be spill kits on vehicles, as well as rigor
8 around the environmental management systems that we
9 use.

10 For the ongoing portions of the
11 operations and maintenance of the line, then there will
12 be some inspections that take place, you know, either
13 vehicle-based or aerial-based. So, there is, you know,
14 a very remote chance of spills as well. And, our
15 environmental management systems would deal with those
16 spills, if they were to occur.

17 As far as the vegetation management
18 practices, in New Hampshire, we do use a cutting or
19 clearing-only policy at this point. Other utilities in
20 the state do use pesticides. At this point, Eversource
21 does not.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: National security.
23 The question is: "What's the relevance of national
24 security for our consideration and your consideration

1 of building this? Do you perceive this to be an
2 attractive target for those who might want to disrupt
3 the entire New England grid by concentrating such a
4 highly visual row of overhead lines on huge towers?"

5 MR. BOWES: So, as with all of the high-
6 voltage electric transmission system in New England, it
7 is a critical infrastructure. We anticipate that this
8 line will also be part of that. It has not been
9 classified as that to date, and that really falls under
10 classifications for the North American Electrical
11 Reliability Corporation. That said, just prudence
12 would dictate that we will have security systems in
13 place for this asset, as with all assets we have our on
14 system.

15 And, is there a second part of that
16 question I may not have covered?

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It was all one big
18 question, really.

19 MR. BOWES: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: About "isn't this
21 just a really big target?"

22 MR. BOWES: So, as Mr. Muntz explained
23 before as well is, is this will add another path for
24 about a thousand megawatts of power into New England.

1 It will further diversify the supply we have today.
2 So, in essence, it will become a more redundant system
3 than New England has at the present time.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next question
5 is an environmental question about the source of the
6 energy from a large hydro project in Canada that
7 involved flooding of lands that people used to live on.
8 And, the statement in the question regarding the
9 environmental effects of that flooding being "greater
10 than the supposed benefits of hypothetical generally".
11 And, for those of you who can see me, you can tell I'm
12 not reading many of the words that are part of this
13 question. But that is the gist of this question. The
14 environmental effects of the large hydro project that
15 is the source of this electricity, how do you account
16 for that, how should we account for that, in
17 considering this Project?

18 MR. QUINLAN: So, I'm going to refer
19 that question to Mr. Varney. Mr. Varney, could you
20 introduce yourself please.

21 MR. VARNEY: Thank you. Is that on?

22 MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

23 MR. VARNEY: Thank you. Bob Varney,
24 Normandeau Associates. As some of you may know,

1 Hydro-Quebec has a number of large hydro facilities
2 that generate electricity. The vast majority of those
3 impoundments are already in place. Of course, we have
4 many impoundments here in New Hampshire, with hydro
5 facilities and with dams for flood storage, that do not
6 create energy as a generation source. Those facilities
7 generally are -- each one is unique based on the
8 characteristics of that hydro facility, that site, that
9 impoundment. And, in general, there is a reduction in
10 emissions from each of those facilities over time. So,
11 the newer the facility, the higher the emissions; the
12 longer it's in place, the lower, in general, very
13 broad, general terms.

14 My understanding is that almost all of
15 the facilities, all but perhaps one, are already in
16 place in their system, which provides and generates
17 electricity throughout their system to multiple
18 locations.

19 As far as the carbon emission
20 calculations, those have been factored into the report,
21 which indicated 3 million metric tons reduction, and a
22 significant decrease in carbon emissions throughout New
23 England that's associated with displacement of other
24 sources. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: A specific question
2 about downtown Plymouth. "What is the plan for how the
3 Project will affect Route 3 in downtown Plymouth? And,
4 have you reached an agreement with the Town about how
5 you're going to proceed?"

6 MR. QUINLAN: So, currently, the plan is
7 for underground construction through Plymouth. It's
8 part of the 52 miles that we announced in August of
9 last year, in essence, to bypass the White Mountain
10 National Forest. So, at a macro level, we're planning
11 for underground construction. We have a currently
12 proposed route. But I am aware that there are
13 discussions underway with individuals in Plymouth to
14 look at alternative routes. You know, is there a more
15 attractive, less impactful route for the Town of
16 Plymouth. And, these are the types of discussions that
17 are taking place with many towns along the route as we
18 further refine the Project.

19 So, the short answer is, we haven't yet
20 reached any agreement with the Town of Plymouth. But
21 we are certainly aware that there are preferences as to
22 which streets to use, and we're open to those options
23 at this point.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Kind of a series of

1 questions about economics. "At what" -- and use of the
2 line generally. "At what capacity will the new line be
3 used typically?"

4 MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Muntz.

5 MR. MUNTZ: Yes. Typically, we would
6 expect the line to flow at minimum of 67 percent
7 capacity. Generally, that's based on seven days a
8 week, 16 hours a day, which is the peak demand periods
9 for electricity. That's a minimum. As I said, the
10 Phase II line is used at 90 percent capacity, which
11 means it flows pretty much around the clock.

12 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, as part of the
13 three-state RFP that I referred to earlier,
14 Hydro-Quebec has committed to deliver power during
15 those peak periods that Mr. Muntz was referring to.
16 Those are the hours that New England needs the power
17 most, and Hydro-Quebec has made a firm commitment to
18 deliver it during those hours. Whether they deliver it
19 in other hours, I think it's going to be a function of
20 market conditions.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "If the government
22 of Quebec decides that it needs this power, would that
23 supersede the agreement that you have with them
24 regarding transmission?"

1 MR. MUNTZ: No. The agreement would
2 remain in effect, and the appropriate penalty clauses
3 would apply.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are those penalties
5 monetary or can you force them to deliver?

6 MR. MUNTZ: The penalty, it's a
7 combination. They have an opportunity to make up the
8 total volume of power during the course of the calendar
9 year. They also have -- we have the opportunity to
10 monetize that, should they not be able to deliver.
11 And, I think it's important to note that this is not
12 about a, you know, one-day or a two-day, you know,
13 storm or an event like that that would cause them not
14 to deliver. That, generally, they can make that up
15 within the month.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Will the line ever
17 be used to send power north, from New England to
18 Quebec?"

19 MR. BOWES: It has the capability to do
20 that. In the last few years, the Phase II Hydro-Quebec
21 line was used once in that direction. It was December
22 of 2014, where they had some 700 kV problems around
23 Montreal. And, New England actually delivered power
24 for a few hours to support the Canadian system.

1 In general, it's not used in that
2 direction. Probably only under an emergency situation
3 would that occur, just because of the pure economics of
4 it.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Is there any way
6 for the Hydro-Quebec power to offset New Hampshire
7 electrical rates so much that New Hampshire would move
8 from one of the top five most expensive electric rate
9 states to one of the top five most affordable electric
10 rate states?"

11 MR. QUINLAN: So, New England is
12 dramatically more expensive right now than the rest of
13 the country. Much of the rest of the United States is,
14 as a result of the prevalence of natural gas, running
15 at 50 percent of our rates or lower. You know, for New
16 England to actually get those types of levels, we need
17 a lot more than Northern Pass to do that. We,
18 obviously, would have to bring in additional natural
19 gas infrastructure to take advantage of the low and
20 abundant supply of that fuel source. And, we need to
21 diversify our supply mix with large sources of
22 affordable baseload power, like Northern Pass.

23 So, for us to get to a level where we're
24 competitive with the rest of the country, and if, you

1 know, if the aspiration was to be in the top five, you
2 know, we have to dramatically change the energy
3 infrastructure in this region.

4 But Northern Pass is a big step in the
5 right direction. You know, right now, we are the
6 highest in the country, and we're going higher. And,
7 not only are we high, we're very volatile. Which means
8 we're having very significant price swings in the wrong
9 direction during the winter months, which is a critical
10 period for many of our business and homeowners.

11 So, it's a step in the right direction,
12 but much more than Northern Pass will be necessary to
13 become truly competitive with the rest of the country.

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Is the ForwardNH
15 Fund currently active?"

16 MR. QUINLAN: Technically, it is not.
17 So, the ForwardNH Fund is a corporate commitment we
18 introduced last year, when we rolled out our new
19 project route. Technically, it doesn't become
20 effective until Northern Pass goes into service. The
21 funding source for the ForwardNH Fund is the Northern
22 Pass Project.

23 Now, I say "technically", because
24 recently we did announce an advance commitment from the

1 ForwardNH Fund. It was made, in essence, by Eversource
2 and its shareholders. And, it was really an
3 opportunity to help to make the Balsams redevelopment
4 project in the North Country a reality. For those of
5 you who followed that project, it is a transformational
6 project for that portion of the state, which is, you
7 know, somewhat depressed and could use, you know,
8 economic development.

9 The Northern Pass Project, which
10 essentially funds the ForwardNH Fund, was in a position
11 to make a commitment to allow a critical phase of that
12 Balsams redevelopment to go forward. So, it's an
13 advance from the Fund. It's essentially being borne by
14 our shareholders. The reason we selected that project
15 is it's exactly the type of initiative that the
16 \$200 million ForwardNH Fund is intended to target.
17 It's in the North Country, it's for the betterment of
18 communities who are hosting the line. It would have a
19 very positive effect on tourism and economic
20 development in the region. So, it's the quintessential
21 initiative for a fund like the ForwardNH Fund, and we
22 took the opportunity to make the commitment.

23 So, it's not technically in effect, the
24 Fund. But, in essence, we've made an initial

1 commitment.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How will the Fund
3 be administered? If there's an advisory board, who
4 will be on it? And, how will those people be
5 appointed?"

6 MR. QUINLAN: So, ultimately, when we
7 move forward into construction of Northern Pass and we
8 actually place the Project in service, our anticipation
9 is we'll have an advisory board made up of key leaders
10 from across the State of New Hampshire. So, from the
11 business sector and the environmental community,
12 obviously, representation from the North Country. And,
13 essentially, they will may make the determinations as
14 to which initiatives to fund. We're not at the point
15 where we are selecting advisory board members today.
16 If you think about it, this Project wouldn't go into
17 service until 2019. So, we've got quite a bit of time
18 before we actually stand the fund up fully. But, you
19 know, we're already getting inquiries from potential
20 advisory board members, as well as communities for
21 further investments. So, it's an opportunity to make a
22 real difference here in the State of New Hampshire.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Are there specific
24 programs of New Hampshire Fish & Game that are

1 specifically being supported? And, if so, what are
2 they?"

3 MR. QUINLAN: Not to my knowledge, no.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Will you, Mr.
5 Quinlan, get a performance raise or bonus if this
6 project goes through?"

7 *[Audience interruption.]*

8 MR. QUINLAN: I have no specific bonus
9 or incentive tied to the Northern Pass Project.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You will be
11 respectful of everyone who is speaking this evening.
12 If you can't live with that rule, you're going to have
13 to leave.

14 Please describe the need for this
15 Project. As worded, the question is "Why do you keep
16 saying that there is a need for the Northern Pass
17 Project?" So, why don't you reiterate your view of why
18 this Project is needed.

19 MR. QUINLAN: You know, I tried to
20 outline this at the outset, but it's pretty simple.
21 You know, we, as a region, we, as a state, need new
22 baseload energy supplies to stabilize and lower our
23 energy costs. We're not at all competitive with the
24 rest of the country currently, and we're going in the

1 wrong direction. So, first and foremost, it's an
2 opportunity to lower our energy costs for businesses
3 and residential customers across the State of New
4 Hampshire. Secondly, if we have any hope or
5 expectation of meeting our environmental goals as a
6 society, projects like Northern Pass have to be a
7 reality.

8 So, those are the two principal needs:
9 One, lower energy costs; two, environmental objectives.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: But it is correct
11 that this is not a "reliability project", as that
12 phrase is used in the industry, correct?

13 MR. QUINLAN: So, as a technical matter,
14 it's not, today, required to keep the lights on. So,
15 it's not technically a "reliability project". Meaning,
16 the System Operator has said "if you don't" -- has not
17 said "if you don't build Northern Pass, the lights are
18 going to go out." They haven't drawn that conclusion.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This question
20 references a 2014 agreement between Northern Pass and
21 Hydro-Quebec that has a missing appendix that is
22 referenced in the agreement called -- that references
23 the "AC line upgrade cost". Is that, in fact, a
24 missing appendix? And, if so, "when would that

1 appendix be available for review?"

2 MR. QUINLAN: I am not familiar with any
3 missing appendix. But let me ask the team. Perhaps
4 we'll get clarification at the break and see if there's
5 a missing appendix. I'm not aware of any missing
6 appendix.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please -- there are
8 a few questions about the Coos Loop. I think it would
9 be helpful for you to describe the Coos Loop in some
10 level of detail, because there are a number of
11 questions about it. The specific question on this
12 sheet is "Will the Coos Loop benefit Bayroot, LLC,
13 Northern Pass, and Eversource?" But more general
14 questions relate to the Coos Loop.

15 MR. QUINLAN: So, the Coos Loop is an
16 existing transmission loop, it is literally a loop, a
17 circle in Coos County. It's the transmission supply to
18 the entire North Country. Today, there are almost
19 400 megawatts of small-scale renewable generation that
20 feed into the Loop; hydro plants, biomass plants, wind
21 plants. Because the load, meaning customer demand, in
22 the North Country is not significant, a large
23 percentage of that power needs to get to market. So,
24 it has to get out of that circle, out of that loop,

1 into more southern portions of New Hampshire.

2 The upgrade that we're talking about is,
3 in essence, to give those generation plants a path to
4 get their product to market, so they can operate more
5 frequently. And, today, on any given day, one or
6 several of those power plants won't be able to run,
7 because there's not a transmission path to get the
8 load, to get where customers need the power.

9 So, as part of the Northern Pass
10 Project, because we're, in essence, in the same
11 rights-of-way, we're going to take the opportunity to
12 upgrade the Loop. We're going to replace the wire with
13 bigger wire, so it's got greater carrying capacity.

14 This is a project that apparently has
15 been talked about in New Hampshire for a decade, and it
16 hasn't become a reality. The reason it hasn't become a
17 reality is, typically, the way those transmission
18 upgrades would be paid for would be by generators. If
19 a generator wants to connect to that Loop, they would
20 pay for the associated transmission upgrades. And, in
21 the past decade, that has been cost-prohibitive to do
22 so. It's more than a \$50 million upgrade. It would be
23 somewhere between 50 and 100 million in total,
24 depending on the final design. So, it's quite a

1 substantial upgrade to the Loop. It's designed to
2 increase its carrying capacity so that generation could
3 get to market.

4 And, I don't believe Bayroot operates
5 any current generation on that loop, is that correct?

6 MR. MUNTZ: I believe they're part owner
7 of Granite Reliable.

8 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. I stand corrected.
9 So, Bayroot apparently is a part owner of the Granite
10 Reliable wind farm, which is a 100-megawatt wind farm
11 in the Dixville Notch area. So, to the extent their
12 plants could operate more, they potentially would be a
13 beneficiary, as would the Burgess Biomass plant, which
14 is a plant I hear about regularly, because it's, in
15 essence, not running as much as it should be, for
16 exactly the reason I articulated.

17 Now, as far as Eversource New Hampshire,
18 we do own some small-scale hydro that feeds into the
19 Loop. We, the Company, wouldn't benefit from increased
20 generation from that, those hydro facilities, our
21 customers would. So, to the extent our hydro plants
22 would run more, it would reduce the energy costs for
23 our customers. So, corporately, we see no benefit in
24 increased generation from our facilities.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You referenced "50
2 to \$100 million in cost". "Are those costs included in
3 the \$1.6 billion construction cost on the entire
4 project?"

5 MR. QUINLAN: The known costs are. So,
6 the ones we today currently know we have to make are in
7 the existing cost estimate. There is some potential
8 for incremental cost upgrades, once the ISO-New England
9 gives us the final results of its study of what it's
10 going to take us to unlock the loop, if you will.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who will pay for
12 any additional costs that ISO identifies in that study?

13 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. It will be paid for
14 in a similar fashion, which is through our Transmission
15 Support Agreement with Hydro-Quebec, importantly, not
16 New Hampshire customers. So, as part of the ForwardNH
17 Plan and the Northern Pass route announcement, one of
18 the things we've been able to preserve is our
19 commitment that New Hampshire customers will not pay
20 for any of this transmission project, and they won't be
21 paying for the Loop upgrades.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next question
23 is about work that is being done beyond the Deerfield
24 Substation. The question is: "What percentage of the

1 improvement work beyond the Deerfield Substation will
2 ratepayers of New Hampshire be paying for?"

3 MR. QUINLAN: Those upgrades, which are
4 fairly modest, I believe there's ten structures in an
5 existing transmission line between Deerfield and Scobie
6 Pond, which is in the Town of Londonderry, correct?
7 So, it's ten out of how many, Sam?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Over 600.

9 MR. QUINLAN: So, there's 600 existing
10 transmission structures, ten of them having to be
11 increased by five feet, to increase, in essence, the
12 capacity of that line, once Northern Pass goes into
13 service. The cost of those upgrades will be paid for
14 through the Northern Pass Project. So, customers will
15 not pay any of those associated costs either.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: A question about
17 renewables: "Which New England states have legal
18 mandates to increase the use of renewables? And, in
19 which states does hydropower meet that definition?
20 And, which states does large hydropower meet that
21 definition?"

22 MR. QUINLAN: So, I think all New
23 England states at this point have renewable standards,
24 and they vary state-to-state. You know, I think all of

1 them count small-scale hydro, which tends to be
2 run-of-river hydro, generally domestic, small-scale
3 hydro against their renewable standards.

4 As far as large-scale hydro, I'm aware
5 that Connecticut recently determined that large-scale
6 hydro will count for its renewable goals. And, I
7 mentioned earlier the three states of Connecticut,
8 Massachusetts, and Rhode Island have gone out for a
9 Clean Energy Request for Proposal, specifically
10 targeting large-scale hydro, as well as wind and other
11 renewables.

12 Now, those won't count for renewable
13 energy credits in the classic sense, but they will be
14 counted as "clean energy". So, in a similar fashion,
15 New Hampshire, when it adopted its Climate Action Plan
16 some years ago, recognized that large-scale hydro
17 imported from Canada was important in reaching our
18 clean energy goals.

19 Today, New Hampshire doesn't count
20 large-scale hydro technically from a renewable
21 portfolio standards perspective, but we recognize that
22 it's clean energy. And, I would say, as a country, we
23 are beginning to move strongly in that direction. So,
24 the Obama Administration, who announced their Clean

1 Energy Plan recently, put very heavy emphasis on
2 importing large-scale hydro from Canada as a way of
3 meeting the country's clean energy goals.

4 So, as a technical matter, I think it's
5 just Connecticut that today counts large-scale hydro.
6 Other New England states count it as clean energy, but
7 not for Renewable Portfolio Standards, but I think the
8 momentum is clearly in that direction.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You may have
10 answered this question before, and, if so, I apologize.
11 "What percentage of the power that comes down the line
12 will go to New Hampshire?"

13 MR. QUINLAN: Well, all of it will, as a
14 matter of physics. You know, all 100 percent of the
15 power will be delivered to Deerfield, New Hampshire.
16 Okay?

17 Contractually, we have an opportunity to
18 enter into a power purchase agreement with Hydro-Quebec
19 for 10 percent of the power, which is sized to equal
20 our load share for all of New England. So, -- and, we
21 think we can do that in a very cost-effective way for
22 our customers. So, we anticipate having a power
23 purchase agreement with Hydro-Quebec for 10 percent of
24 the power.

1 The other 90 percent of the power
2 flowing over this line is uncommitted. So, if New
3 Hampshire wants more than 10 percent, we can certainly
4 pursue that. But, at this point, we anticipate
5 reserving at least 10 percent for our customers, with
6 the potential for more.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I have a series of
8 questions about burial. What is the cost difference
9 between burying 60 miles and burying the entire line?

10 MR. QUINLAN: \$1 billion.
11 Approximately, \$1 billion.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's not exactly
13 \$1 billion?

14 MR. QUINLAN: It's not exactly, but it's
15 pretty close. And, just to add to that. You know,
16 we've built a lot of transmission as a company, as has
17 Hydro-Quebec. And, we do know the cost differentials
18 for these types of constructions. As part of the Clean
19 Energy RFP, we went to some of the largest constructors
20 in North America to get binding bids for the cost of
21 overhead portions of the route and underground portions
22 of the route. And, they confirmed all of our analyses.
23 So, it means, with their numbers, on a per unit basis,
24 for that additional 132 miles of underground

1 construction, it's approximately a billion dollars.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This question asks:
3 "Are you aware that TransÉnergie, a subsidiary of
4 Hydro-Quebec, said to the Federal Energy Regulatory
5 Commission that undergrounding high-voltage lines was
6 cost comparable with overhead lines?"

7 MR. QUINLAN: I'm not aware of that, no.
8 And, as I mentioned earlier, the Canada portion of this
9 line, approximately 60 miles, was all overhead
10 construction, in essence, because it's
11 cost-prohibitive, in their view, to go underground.

12 So, I would be surprised if that were
13 true. But I'm not aware of that statement.

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There are a series
15 of questions about why you haven't tried to bury the
16 route along the interstate highway. That question is
17 specifically here: "Have you asked the Department
18 of" -- it says the "Department of Energy" here, "if you
19 can use I-93?" I assume that means the "Department of
20 Transportation". "Have you talked to DOT about burying
21 the line in the interstates?" So, those next three,
22 they're all essentially the same question, about burial
23 along I-93.

24 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Mr. Bowes.

1 MR. BOWES: So, our analysis is that the
2 interstate highway system is not a viable path for a
3 transmission line. It's really based on four factors.
4 It's the public safety aspects of building on a limited
5 access highway; it's the environmental impacts of
6 basically going in the undisturbed portion of the
7 highway right-of-way, the constructability of it with,
8 in this case, for this particular route, I-93, there's
9 obviously ledge, there will be a lot of tree-clearing
10 to be done, as well as wetlands impacts, the
11 constructability to deal with the on-ramps, off-ramps,
12 various raised structures, and just the environmental
13 impacts, would make it -- the constructability very
14 challenging; and, ultimately, the last item is it
15 becomes cost-prohibitive to bury the line for the
16 entire way.

17 I think there was another question
18 around "have we had discussions with the DOT?" The
19 answer is "yes". Before the Application was provided,
20 during the permit application process, we were actually
21 looking to see what permits we need. And, since the
22 Application has been filed, and now we're onto monthly
23 meetings with the DOT, to talk about various aspects of
24 underground construction.

1 Our analysis was that the interstate
2 highway system was not a viable alternative. And, that
3 has been also confirmed with the DOT. It's a matter of
4 "do you have a viable alternative to that?" And, in
5 this case, we do. And, we're actually proposing that,
6 as part of this project, to go on state roads that are
7 not limited access highways.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Please talk about
9 the line that is proposed to come down underwater/
10 underground through Vermont. Why is this not an
11 alternative for this line, underwater and underground?"
12 And, then, there's a more general question about "who
13 makes decisions such as this? Is it the states? Is it
14 a federal agency? Is it Congress?"

15 MR. QUINLAN: So, the project that's the
16 foundation of that question is one of the projects I
17 referred to earlier that did not bid into the three-
18 state request for proposals. It's the New England
19 Clean Power Link, which was intended to use Lake
20 Champlain underwater, and then some underground
21 construction. Why didn't they bid? It's, you know,
22 speculation, but, you know, they have suggested
23 publicly that's a \$1.2 billion project. When we look
24 at it, based upon what we're hearing in the market, we

1 think they're dramatically understating the price of
2 that project. So, it could be that they're not in a
3 position to make a firm commitment as to the cost of
4 the project.

5 Also, to compete in this RFP, you need a
6 secure power supply. We have one with our partner,
7 Hydro-Quebec. We've made a firm delivery commitment
8 through the Northern Pass line. We're not aware that
9 they have a similar commitment from a supplier in
10 Canada.

11 You also need a transmission path north
12 of the border to get it from the generation to the
13 border. And, Hydro-Quebec, in parallel with the siting
14 process here in the U.S., is siting that
15 interconnecting line to bring it to Pittsburg, New
16 Hampshire. And, we're not aware of an interconnection
17 being sited tied to the New England Power Link.

18 So, we think it's a combination of those
19 three. You know, the cost-prohibitive nature, the lack
20 of a confirmed power supply, and the fact that they
21 have no interconnection, but that's somewhat
22 speculative. They chose not to bid.

23 Now, who's responsible for making the
24 decision? Ultimately, for purposes of that

1 solicitation, it will be the three southern New England
2 states. But, for our project, it's the SEC, here in
3 New Hampshire, as well as the Department of Energy at
4 the federal level.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Can you circle
6 back --

7 MR. QUINLAN: Sure.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- and provide a
9 little bit more information about why your proposal
10 doesn't use the technologies that that proposal uses to
11 go under Lake Champlain, and then down underground.
12 Why aren't -- I think the analogue would be, why aren't
13 you using the Connecticut river, and then going
14 underground?

15 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, I'm going to
16 turn it over to the engineers for a moment. But we are
17 using the same technology. The HVDC Light cable
18 technology that was contemplated for that project is
19 the technology we are using for our Project.

20 As far as the Connecticut River?

21 MR. BOWES: As far as the
22 constructability, we have done projects in open water,
23 such as Lake Champlain and such as Long Island Sound,
24 and it does present some unique challenges. But both

1 Lake Champlain and Long Island Sound, there is a path
2 to go through. And, the cable is laid on the bottom
3 of the floor, whether it's the ocean floor or whether
4 it's the lake floor, and then it's jetted in. That
5 technology would not be possible inside the Connecticut
6 River. And, there would be significant environmental
7 impacts by trying to do that type of trenching inside
8 of that river bed.

9 Now, as far as the overland portion of
10 it goes, it is actually very similar to Northern Pass.
11 It uses a combination of state and local roads to do
12 the underground, in disturbed soil, generally inside
13 the roadway. TDI does not propose to use the
14 interstate highway system in Vermont, nor was it a
15 alternative studied by the regulator, the siting
16 regulator in Vermont, nor the DOE.

17 MR. QUINLAN: And, just so we're clear,
18 is the "jetting" technology that Mr. Bowes is referring
19 to, is high-pressure water, referred to as "jet plow",
20 on the ocean floor, you basically use that technology
21 to open up a temporary trench in the sediment, you lay
22 the cable, and the sediment settles back over it. That
23 technology would not work in the Connecticut River.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Once built, which

1 is more expensive to maintain, an overhead line or a
2 buried line? And, how much is the difference?

3 MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Bowes.

4 MR. BOWES: So, we've studied both
5 overhead and underground AC transmission lines. And,
6 the life cycle cost, again, dominated by the initial
7 cost of installation, the underground lines for a life
8 cycle are more expensive. Strictly, the O&M costs, for
9 an underground line versus an overhead, they're
10 probably lower. But what's the overall life cycle
11 cost, it ultimately is higher for an underground line.

12 MR. QUINLAN: Another factor in that
13 determination, if you have a fault, meaning an
14 interruption in your overhead transmission line versus
15 your underground transmission, it's a much longer
16 restoration for an underground system. For an
17 overhead, it's generally visible, easily located. You
18 can get a crew -- crews out there to do the
19 restoration. Underground, you have to locate the
20 fault, you have to excavate, and it's quite a lengthy
21 process, particularly for this type of construction.
22 So, the restoration time, which also has a maintenance
23 cost, is quite a bit higher in underground
24 construction.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Will the project
2 have a negative effect on tourism in New Hampshire?
3 And, if so, by how much per year?

4 MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to introduce
5 another expert, Mitch Nichols. Mitch, if you could
6 just introduce yourself please.

7 MR. NICHOLS: Sure. Thank you. Good
8 evening. My name is Mitch Nichols. I'm President of
9 Nichols Tourism Group. Over the last 20 years, we've
10 worked with states, cities, counties, national parks,
11 state parks, around the country, in assisting them in
12 developing their tourism industry and developing
13 strategic plans to maximize the potential of the
14 visitor industry.

15 We've studied New Hampshire's tourism
16 industry and the relationship to Northern Pass. We've
17 looked at that relationship in five varying approaches.
18 And, in all cases, it points to the same fundamental
19 conclusion: Northern Pass will not have any impacts to
20 the regional travel demands for visitors to the State
21 of New Hampshire. And, that's the fundamental --

22 *[Audience interruption.]*

23 MR. NICHOLS: -- conclusion.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Excuse me. Excuse

1 me, ma'am. If you're having trouble breathing, why
2 don't you step out for a few minutes and get a glass of
3 water.

4 Everyone here has an obligation this
5 evening. Everyone here has an obligation to be
6 respectful of the people who are speaking. If you are
7 unable to do that, you will be asked to leave. Is
8 everyone clear on that?

9 *[Audience interruption.]*

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is everyone clear
11 on that? There is no question being asked right now,
12 except for the one that the audience --

13 *[Audience interruption.]*

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Excuse me, sir.
15 Thank you. You are done. Thank you very much.

16 You may continue.

17 MR. NICHOLS: I will just point to one
18 specific example, I think it was brought up, the Maine
19 Power Reliability Program. That project has been
20 underway for the past five years in the State of Maine,
21 another large overhead transmission project. We looked
22 at trends, in terms of the tourism businesses and
23 operations that were evolving during that period of
24 time. What we found was not only was there not a

1 reduction in tourism businesses, but the tourism
2 business expansion in counties in which the
3 transmission lines occurred expanded at rates three
4 times the level of counties in which there was no
5 transmission development that was experienced.

6 And, what we found is there's a variety
7 of fundamental travel factors. They range in diversity
8 of travel products and experiences a destination can
9 offer, the ease of access to the destination, the price
10 and value opportunities that is provided to the visitor
11 dollar, the range of economic underlying factors,
12 weather conditions. These are the factors that drive
13 the fundamental business and tourism demands and
14 experiences, not the presence or lack of presence of
15 power lines.

16 And, I might just, one final anecdotal
17 example. I was assisting Estes Park in Colorado just a
18 couple weeks ago, the entry to Rocky National Park.
19 There's very large transmission lines as you enter into
20 Estes Park on their main arterial pathway. There's
21 also a tremendous transmission plant that's located
22 just a quarter mile away from the main Visitor Center
23 in Estes Park. And, in that case, just in the last
24 year, Rocky Mountain National Park expanded their

1 attraction and visitor demand. They grew from the
2 fifth most visited national park in the nation to the
3 third. Visitors are coming to those kinds of
4 experiences because of the collective destination
5 appeal of the region, of the state, of a city. And,
6 again, it's that collection of significant factors,
7 products, marketing, ease of access, those are the
8 factors that drive visitor demand.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You would agree,
10 though, would you not, that the plural of anecdote is
11 not data, correct?

12 MR. NICHOLS: That's why we undertook
13 both survey work in the five areas that I noted in
14 terms of our analysis, we looked at actual tourism
15 expansion during periods of past power line
16 transmission development, both in the State of New
17 Hampshire, in the 1980s, and in the Maine example, with
18 the Maine Power Reliability Project. In both of those
19 instances, businesses -- tourism-related businesses
20 expanded at rates of growth faster than what occurred
21 in counties and areas outside of those in which
22 transmission lines were developed. We undertook one of
23 the most extensive surveys of prospective visitors into
24 New Hampshire, from key feeder markets to New

1 Hampshire, and we asked specifically about the --

2 *[Extended audience interruption.]*

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Since she may have
4 just vacated a seat, if there's someone in the overflow
5 area, the seat just emptied.

6 MR. NICHOLS: Just the survey I was
7 mentioning, it was an extensive survey that we
8 undertook, in terms of key feeder markets to the State
9 of New Hampshire. And, through that, we developed a
10 very strong understanding of the key factors that were
11 influencing visitation to the state. And, it was
12 consistent with the points that we raised earlier.

13 These are also consistent with the
14 points that were supplied in your Draft Environmental
15 Impact Statement. They reached the same conclusion
16 about these key factors driving fundamental visitor
17 demand.

18 One last point I'd bring up, as far as
19 research, one of my associates is Dr. Daniel
20 Fesenmaier. He's with the University of Florida, and
21 runs the National Laboratory of Tourism and eCommerce.
22 He's on the Journal of Travel Research Editorial Board,
23 and he's one of the most published academics in the
24 world. We undertook a worldwide literature search in

1 relation to power lines and their impact to tourism.
2 There was no peer-reviewed studies that identified or
3 documented that relationship. And, again, that was
4 also a fact that was noted in the Draft EIS.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Quinlan,
6 earlier you were asked about the existing Hydro-Quebec
7 line and why it's not being considered for this.
8 Please address the question asked on this sheet, about
9 "whether, in fact, the reason you're not considering
10 the existing line is that it would produce less revenue
11 for Eversource?"

12 MR. QUINLAN: No. That's not the
13 reason. I think we explained earlier the reasons for
14 not using that line. In fact, I think there might be a
15 flawed premise underlying that question as well. You
16 know, the revenue to Eversource is based upon the cost
17 of the line. That existing transmission corridor is
18 about the same length. It's 180 miles. It would
19 probably be a similar cost if the construction was
20 similar. So, I don't think it would have a material
21 difference to the revenue to Eversource.

22 But, more importantly, the reason we
23 elected not to explore that alternative are the
24 technical and other factors that Mr. Muntz referred to

1 earlier.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next question
3 is very specific to a property owner along Route 3 that
4 has buried water lines next to his or her property. I
5 guess the general question here is, "how will you work
6 with existing underground facilities in the area where
7 your line will be underground? And, who will be
8 responsible if an existing line is damaged?"

9 MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Johnson.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. So, the very first
11 process, and we're actually just about to kick it off,
12 is to do all the investigative work from a survey and
13 geotechnical perspective along the entire underground
14 route. This will include coordination with any local
15 utilities for water, cable, existing electrical
16 utilities, and other things, as well as landowner
17 outreach to find out where wells and any water lines
18 are that may not be put together as far as a regulated
19 utility. So, that process is just about to be kicked
20 off, and we will be reaching out to everyone on the
21 underground route, as well as to the municipalities, to
22 start that mapping process.

23 As far as our design, obviously, we will
24 avoid those utilities wherever practicable. And, where

1 it is not practicable, which is almost never, we will
2 rebuild your facilities such that they remain the same
3 as they were before.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next question
5 is specific to the right-of-way in Bethlehem, from the
6 Whitefield/Bethlehem town line to Route 302. "Will you
7 have to cut additional trees to put up new transmission
8 lines? If so, how much cutting will you do? And, will
9 you be removing or moving the current lines and poles?"

10 MR. JOHNSON: In the Bethlehem
11 right-of-way, there will be some selective clearing.
12 There will be no rebuilds of the existing facilities.
13 That there's enough room already to put our lines
14 adjacent to those facilities.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If the transmission
16 line is damaged, what corporate entity or what entities
17 would be financially responsible for the cost of
18 repairs?"

19 MR. MUNTZ: Eversource will be owning
20 and maintaining the line.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who pays for
22 repairs? Shareholders or ratepayers?

23 MR. MUNTZ: Basically, whoever's paying
24 for the line. So, Hydro-Quebec would pay for the

1 operation and maintenance cost and reimburse
2 Eversource. More than likely, Eversource New
3 Hampshire.

4 MR. QUINLAN: Just so we're clear, New
5 Hampshire ratepayers will not pay for any costs of
6 owning, operating or maintaining this line.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Is there an
8 estimate of how many", what are referred to on this
9 sheet, as "danger or hazard trees per mile do you have
10 to cut down during construction?"

11 MR. JOHNSON: So, we've done some
12 preliminary analysis of that. As far as the existing
13 right-of-way, Eversource already maintains that
14 right-of-way, and has managed the danger trees. They
15 do come up once in a while. I'm aware of a couple in
16 the southern part of our right-of-way that recently
17 have been attended to. But, for the most part, there
18 are not a significant number of danger trees that will
19 be removed as part of our process.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "The slide
21 presentation stated an environmental benefit to New
22 Hampshire fish and wildlife. Can you specify what you
23 mean by that?"

24 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. What that was

1 referring to is a commitment we've made as a
2 corporation to the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation.
3 It's a national organization that's involved in
4 preservation and conservation efforts across the
5 country. We are partnered with them on a New
6 Hampshire-specific set of initiatives to pursue
7 important conservation initiatives in the State of New
8 Hampshire. So, we've made a \$3 million corporate
9 commitment. They, in essence, go out and solicit
10 matching funds. So, in total, it's about a \$10 million
11 fund, where they, in essence, go out and solicit grant
12 applications to deal with important conservation work
13 targeted here in New Hampshire. And, it's all for the
14 betterment of fish and wildlife. We are not involved
15 in the selection process. It's a program that they
16 administer. We are, in essence, a funding source.
17 And, again, it was intended to provide additional
18 benefits to the State of New Hampshire as part of our
19 ForwardNH Fund.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Earlier in response
21 to an environmental question, "it was stated that
22 "private environmental inspectors will be on site
23 during the construction phase". To what extent will
24 there be state or federal oversight during the

1 construction? And, to what extent will there be state
2 or federal enforcement if best management construction
3 practices are not adhered to?"

4 MS. CARBONNEAU: Well, that's actually
5 up to the agencies. They, obviously, operate their
6 inspection and enforcement operations at their
7 discretion. We would expect that there will be some
8 permit conditions that may require certain activities
9 from different parties. I know that the Project is
10 committed to having environmental monitors. If the
11 state and federal agencies would like to have their
12 own, they're certainly welcome to do that. And, as is
13 typical, we would certainly have worked with them in
14 the past on such issues, often monitoring reports are
15 required. They are certainly welcome to come out and
16 look at the activity at any time that they so desire.
17 The application fees that we pay to the state help fund
18 all of their review and project implementation
19 practices.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This question asker
21 would like you to repeat "what the current total
22 projected cost is? What the increase would be with
23 full burial?" And, also asks for "the money you are
24 stating as a cost includes gifts to North Country

1 nonprofits?"

2 MR. QUINLAN: So, the total current
3 projected capital cost is a little over \$1.6 billion.
4 The incremental cost of a full underground route would
5 be approximately \$2.6 billion. And, that's the capital
6 cost of the Project. Any of the initiatives that we're
7 talking about, such as the ForwardNH Fund or the
8 National Fish & Wildlife Fund, are separate and apart
9 from the capital cost of the Project. Those are
10 ongoing expenses.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "If Northern Pass
12 "walks away", either because it decided not to move
13 forward with the project, or because the SEC does not
14 issue a certificate of site and facility, will Northern
15 Pass owe any penalties or damages?"

16 MR. QUINLAN: No. We have a currently
17 active proposal into the three-state request for
18 proposal, but it's conditioned upon receiving the
19 necessary state and federal permits. If those permits
20 were not granted, we would have no damages in that
21 solicitation. Obviously, we and our partner have made
22 a certain amount of investment to bring the Project
23 along to its current point, and that will be borne by
24 shareholders.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How employees does
2 Eversource New Hampshire have? And, if the Project is
3 not approved, would there be any effect on New
4 Hampshire employees?"

5 MR. QUINLAN: So, Eversource New
6 Hampshire has approximately 1,500 employees here in the
7 State of New Hampshire. That's about -- it's out of
8 roughly eight or 9,000 for the entire Eversource
9 footprint, which includes Connecticut and
10 Massachusetts. Short answer is there will be no impact
11 on those employees if this project didn't move forward.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Will ratepayers,
13 taxpayers, or the State of New Hampshire generally, be
14 underwriting this project in any way -- in any way,
15 directly or by contract?"

16 MR. QUINLAN: No.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How is the
18 \$80 million you estimated as the benefit, how will that
19 be received? Is it through lower rates? And, if it is
20 through lower rates, how will that effect existing
21 suppliers/generators of electricity?"

22 MR. QUINLAN: So, again, that
23 \$80 million is New Hampshire's share of lower wholesale
24 markets. In essence, that assumes that there are

1 certain higher-cost, generally, carbon-emitting
2 generating plants that wouldn't run. They would be
3 displaced, because there would be a lower-cost
4 alternative for the region. So, to the extent there's
5 an existing generator, that would have cleared without
6 Northern Pass, it may not clear in the future, because
7 it would be a higher-cost asset.

8 Could you repeat the first part of that
9 question, Chairman?

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think you --
11 actually, it's "how would the benefit be received?"
12 Would be through lower rates, right?

13 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, the benefit, in
14 essence, is through a lower wholesale price for energy
15 and the associated capacity in the wholesale markets.
16 Those wholesale markets ultimately are reflected in the
17 retail rates that businesses and residences would pay.
18 In essence, utilities across New England access those
19 wholesale markets to buy electricity on behalf of
20 customers, and then they deliver that electricity. So,
21 lower wholesale markets, it's a lower supply cost,
22 lower retail rates for businesses and residences.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "What percentage of
24 the usage is residential versus non-residential?"

1 MR. QUINLAN: So, that's a --

2 MR. BOWES: Across New England, it's
3 probably about 50 to 60 percent residential, 30 percent
4 commercial, and probably less than 10 percent
5 industrial.

6 MR. QUINLAN: And, those rough numbers
7 are similar for Eversource New Hampshire as well. It's
8 predominantly residential, 60 or 70 percent
9 residential.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm going to read
11 this as it's written, but I think you and I may need to
12 figure out exactly what the question is. But "what is
13 the process to become a public service provider or to
14 obtain that status in New Hampshire?" I'm thinking
15 that question really is asking "what is the process for
16 becoming a public utility?"

17 MR. QUINLAN: A utility, yes. So, to
18 become a public utility in the State of New Hampshire,
19 you would file an application with the Public Utility
20 Commission, and make the necessary technical,
21 managerial, and financial showing. And, then, the
22 Public Utility Commission would determine whether you
23 would qualify as a public utility.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Does being a

1 public utility give a company eminent domain powers to
2 take land or expand current easements?"

3 MR. QUINLAN: It does in circumstances
4 referred to earlier, where the project is a
5 "reliability project". So, it's a project necessary
6 to, in essence, keep the lights on. Northern Pass, as
7 indicated earlier, is not a reliability project. So,
8 under New Hampshire law, public utilities would not
9 have the right to use eminent domain to build a
10 project, such as Northern Pass, because it's not
11 technically a reliability project.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Another question
13 about burial. "If I-93 is not an option for burial,
14 have you considered using Route 3A, from Plymouth to
15 Franklin, to burying the line along that route?"

16 MR. JOHNSON: We did look at various
17 options around the state. And, again, as Bill alluded
18 to earlier in his presentation, it's striking a
19 balance, as far as the amount of underground that could
20 go. We focused primarily on the White Mountain
21 National Forest, as that is what most people in New
22 Hampshire have talked about as far as preserving the
23 environment. And, that would lead us to a natural
24 conclusion of ending our route where it is in

1 Bridgeport -- Bridgewater, sorry.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: A similar question.
3 "Why not bury the route in the existing right-of-way in
4 Sugar Hill and Franconia?"

5 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, the reason we've
6 selected the public highways is that, generally, you're
7 dealing with a already disturbed area of the land. If
8 we were to bury it in our existing right-of-way, which,
9 in essence, slices through the White Mountain National
10 Forest, the environmental impacts of burial would be
11 quite significant. So, when we made the determination
12 to look for an underground alternative, to minimize the
13 environmental impacts, we selected the public way, as
14 opposed to the existing right-of-way through the forest
15 and mountains.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This is a safety
17 question related to FERC recommendations. "Is it true
18 that in a number of places where you'll be going
19 overhead that multiple lines will be closer together
20 than FERC recommends?"

21 MR. BOWES: I'm not aware of any FERC
22 regulations on the separation of transmission lines.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is there any body
24 out there that recommends spacing of lines, and are you

1 in compliance with those recommendations?

2 MR. BOWES: So, the answer to that is
3 "yes". I was going to get to that. So, the NERC,
4 another acronym, similar to FERC, which is the North
5 American Electric Reliability Corporation, does have
6 planning criteria through both the region and
7 ultimately through ISO-New England about how many lines
8 and spacing of lines. And, there are also safety codes
9 that would apply for the physical dimensions. So, one
10 is around how many transmission lines you can have in a
11 corridor, based on that reliability, which would be
12 ISO-New England. And, then, the issue on the corridor,
13 "what's the physical separation?" And, that is
14 governed by the National Electric Safety Code. So,
15 there are two other non-FERC regulations that would
16 apply.

17 MR. QUINLAN: And, we're in compliance
18 with both?

19 MR. BOWES: And, we are in compliance
20 with both regulations, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are you concerned
22 at all about having multiple lines in such a small
23 space from a safety perspective?

24 MR. BOWES: I am not. In this case,

1 there's only two or three transmission lines in the
2 same corridor, in some cases a distribution line as
3 well. That is very common throughout Eversource
4 operating areas.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm going to read
6 this one as it's written: "If the project does not go
7 through, will Eversource still get paid?"

8 MR. QUINLAN: No.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're not going to
10 take any more questions, folks, after this group that
11 we've just been handed. We have a lot of people who
12 want to speak. And, we have a handful of process
13 questions to get through, apparently, some more
14 substantive questions, but I'm sure a lot of people
15 want to speak. And, our stenographer is going to need
16 a break very soon.

17 There's a process question related to
18 how this space was chosen. I don't personally know the
19 answer to that. But, if this space is not workable, we
20 apologize. I know there are people who are in an
21 overflow room. And, that's not our preference. We
22 certainly didn't want that to happen. But we never
23 know how many people are going to show up at one of
24 these things.

1 There's a couple of questions about
2 intervention. "Will there be other opportunities to
3 intervene?"

4 There will certainly be other
5 opportunities for public participation. As I noted at
6 the outset, there are going to be at least two
7 additional public hearings, in all likelihood, one
8 north of the Notch and one south of the Notch, for
9 people to discuss the supplemental information that was
10 filed. It is always possible that someone could seek
11 late -- seek intervention beyond the deadline. Would
12 need to make an appropriate showing if that was
13 something that should be granted.

14 There's a question -- a substantive
15 question about intervention. There will be an order
16 being issued relatively soon regarding intervention.

17 There's one gentleman who has asked a
18 series of process questions, about how would things
19 happen at the SEC. I'm going to ask him to deal
20 separately with the Administrator, Ms. Monroe, or with
21 counsel, to get a number of those process questions
22 answered.

23 Turning to the last few sheets. You
24 know what I'm going to do, because the stenographer

1 needs a break, and I have just been handed these
2 questions, we're going to take a 15-minute break. And,
3 when we come back from the 15-minute break, we'll ask
4 these last few questions of the Company, and we'll
5 start the public comment period.

6 So, we'll come back at five minutes
7 after 7:00.

8 (Recess taken at 6:50 p.m. and the
9 public hearing resumed at 7:08 p.m.)

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We have
11 three more green sheets. Some of which have a couple
12 of different questions on them. We're going to try to
13 do those quickly. We have over 70 people who have
14 signed up to speak. In the "respect your neighbors"
15 department, I'm going to have to make a few requests.
16 I really would like you, if at all possible, to keep
17 your remarks to three minutes or less. I would really
18 like you to consider whether what you would say has
19 already been said by somebody else. If you heard it
20 already, please, just say that you pass or you agree
21 with what so-and-so said earlier. There are a couple
22 of other ground rules that we'll get to when we start
23 calling people up. And, we're going to try and keep
24 people moving as quickly as possible.

1 So, the last few green sheets.

2 Mr. Quinlan, can you clarify what seems, to this
3 question asker, to be a possible contradiction between
4 the improvement to the Coos Loop, which would allow
5 more small power producers to get their power into the
6 grid, versus the lower price, wholesale price that the
7 project will produce for all of us. And, won't the
8 latter undercut the viability of the former?

9 MR. QUINLAN: The short answer is, no,
10 it will not. If you look at how generation is
11 dispatched in New England in any given hour, it's from
12 lowest cost to highest cost, until you have sufficient
13 supply to meet customer demand. Small-scale
14 renewables, whether it's wind, hydro, biomass, bids in
15 very low from an energy perspective, because the
16 economics around those facilities generally are driven
17 by the additional revenue they receive through
18 renewable energy credits. So, they tend to bid very
19 low, and always clear in the energy markets.

20 So, Northern Pass would come in perhaps
21 a bit higher in cost than those small-scale renewables,
22 and likely what it will displace is what's referred to
23 as the "marginal cost", meaning that last piece of
24 generation necessary to meet customer demand, which

1 tends to be, on 80 percent of the hours across the
2 year, a natural gas plant. In some hours, during the
3 winter, for example, it might be a coal plant or an oil
4 plant. But it's not going to be a small-scale
5 renewable, it's not going to be a nuclear plant. Those
6 are lower-cost assets, because of the way the bid stack
7 is designed.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next question
9 has to do with permits for burial under land the
10 Company does not own. I'll read most of this question
11 as written. "The White Mountain National Forest
12 requires Northern Pass to apply for a Special Use
13 Permit to bury the line through the White Mountain
14 National Forest." Do you -- is that a correct
15 statement, first of all?

16 MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, that's because
18 that's federal land, owned by the federal government,
19 correct?

20 MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Why does the same
22 logic not apply to private landowners who own their
23 land? Why do you not need to get their permission
24 before going under their property?"

1 MR. QUINLAN: So, my understanding,
2 under New Hampshire law, for land that is, in essence,
3 below the public way, the Department of Transportation
4 has the authority to grant use or access rights to
5 those lands. So, once a public way has been
6 established, it's DOT that has the authority to allow
7 further use.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The question on
9 this sheet asserts that a "3.5 mile burial project in
10 Chino Hills took approximately two years or was
11 estimated to take approximately two years to complete.
12 What is your estimate of how long it will take to bury
13 60 miles of this line here in New Hampshire?"

14 MR. QUINLAN: Our estimate for the
15 construction of Northern Pass is approximately two
16 years. So, assuming our permits are issued in late
17 2016 or early 2017, our expectation would be we could
18 place those facilities in service in 2019, two years in
19 total. And, that will be both for the aboveground and
20 underground construction.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We're
22 now ready to start with the speakers. Here are some
23 additional rules for you to follow. The first is, when
24 you come up, if you could spell your name, if there's

1 any ambiguity about how your name is spelled, and
2 sometimes even if there isn't any ambiguity, if you
3 could spell your name for the record, so the
4 stenographer has it.

5 Second, if you have something you're
6 going to be reading, please read clearly, and at a
7 slower pace than you sometimes might feel you want to
8 speak to get a lot of information out there. Because
9 the only way that the record is going to be clear is if
10 the stenographer can understand you and follow what
11 you're saying. If you have something prepared that you
12 have read from, please give a copy to the stenographer,
13 who will be right in front of you, who is wearing a
14 green shirt and a tie. And, that will be helpful to
15 all.

16 What I'm going to do is, when I call a
17 speaker, I'm going to call three people. I'm going to
18 say "A, being followed by B, and C." If you are the
19 second or the third name, please get ready. And, if
20 you are in the overflow area, and you hear your name as
21 one of the next couple of speakers, please come up, so
22 that there's no delay, so we can get people in and out
23 of here as quickly as we can.

24 All right. Everybody clear on that?

1 We're going to start with various elected officials,
2 local and state, who are here with us this evening.
3 So, we'll start with Shelagh Connelly, who is the Chair
4 of the Holderness Selectboard. For those who did not
5 know, we are not in Plymouth, we are in Holderness as
6 we sit here. To be followed by Representative
7 Richardson, and Neil Irvine, who is Chair of the New
8 Hampton Selectboard.

9 MS. CONNELLY: Good evening. For the
10 record, my name is Shelagh, S-h-e-l-a-g-h, Connelly,
11 C-o-n-n-e-l-l-y. I am the Chair of our Selectboard
12 here in Holderness. Thank you all for coming out to
13 our lovely little hamlet. We're happy to have you
14 here.

15 Our town has been actively involved in
16 following this whole project. And, in 2012, and again
17 in 2014, at our Town Meeting in March, we affirmed our
18 objection to the Northern Pass Project, and recommend
19 that state-owned transportation rights-of-way should be
20 used to locate underground energy transmission
21 corridors. And, this is something that was voted on
22 both times unanimously, with no opposition.

23 So, I just wanted to have that for the
24 record. Here you are in Holderness, and that has been

1 the vote of our people. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Representative
3 Richardson, to be followed by Neil Irvine, and Martha
4 Richards.

5 REP. RICHARSON: Thank you, Mr.
6 Chairman. My name is Herb Richardson, H-e-r-b,
7 R-i-c-h-a-r-d-s-o-n. I'm the State Representative from
8 Coos District 4, the Towns of Lancaster, Dalton, and
9 the unincorporated place of Kilkenny. And, I am the
10 Vice Chairman of the Science, Technology and Energy
11 Committee, in Concord.

12 I am pleased to be here today in support
13 of the Northern Pass Project and ForwardNH Fund. I
14 believe that I speak for the silent majority of the
15 citizens of my district that want to grow our economy,
16 want opportunities for themselves and their families,
17 and want to see the North Country thrive again.

18 Unfortunately, those who speak up in
19 support of this project find themselves a target of
20 harassment and bullying from the opponent of this
21 project. This is something I have seen affect not only
22 myself, but others as well. This is something I have
23 learned firsthand, a few years ago, and again a couple
24 of years when I spoke against legislation on mandatory

1 burial that project opponents were pushing in the New
2 Hampshire Legislature. I was threatened, as many
3 others were, on this subject. Yes, but the New
4 Hampshire House ITL'ed that bill. Yes, threatened
5 personally, I was. But I can tell you, I'm still here
6 today. And, I will not be silent.

7 I fought burial in Coos County down the
8 state right-of-ways. No one could or would show me
9 these right-of-ways. I learned that abandoned rails
10 have been deeded back to the landowners. What's left?
11 Route 3, creating a disaster for what -- that would
12 only cripple the economy of the North Country,
13 affecting transportation in a negative way for a couple
14 of years.

15 I pass along the story only to encourage
16 you to disregard the threats you will receive.
17 Disregard the antics, the stunts, and the bullying that
18 I have enjoyed. Do your job to do the best of your
19 ability, look for the opportunities to make this a
20 better project, and do your best to mitigate the
21 impacts and make a decision based on facts.

22 I believe this project will bring major
23 benefits and opportunities to Coos County. In addition
24 to lower electric rates, which New Hampshire is one of

1 the highest in the country, this project will only --
2 will provide jobs and economic opportunity for
3 residents and businesses of my district.

4 I support the project's decision to
5 provide \$200 million in funding for economic
6 development and other initiatives. Imagine the
7 possibilities. Imagine the projects, like broadband,
8 that could bring -- that could be completed and the
9 problems that could be solved with these funds.

10 I support the project's decision that
11 Northern Pass was providing \$2 million in early funding
12 for the Balsams redevelopment. This is another perfect
13 example of how beneficial this fund could be. This is
14 great news for Coos County, and will help bring the
15 project to completion. And, hopefully, in my lifetime,
16 attend the ribbon-cutting.

17 I would also like to add that I do not
18 dismiss the concerns of my constituents. These types
19 of projects do have impacts. Over the past several
20 years, I have tried to use my position to facilitate
21 solutions to concerns raised. And, I encourage the SEC
22 to do the same and continue to look for ways to
23 migrate -- mitigate the impact of this project.

24 Ultimately, I believe the SEC can and

1 will play a positive role in approving a project that
2 our state can be proud of. Thank you for your time and
3 your consideration.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Neil Irvine, from
5 the New Hampton Selectboard, followed by Martha
6 Richards and Representative Edmond Gionet.

7 MR. IRVINE: Neil Irvine, N-e-i-l,
8 I-r-v-i-n-e. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee,
9 thank you for the opportunity to address you this
10 evening. As Chairman of the Board of Selectman, it is
11 my privilege to speak on behalf of the residents of New
12 Hampton, and to continue to give voice to our
13 opposition to the Northern Pass Project as currently
14 proposed.

15 Our observations, comments and
16 objections submitted in writing to the Committee
17 September 10th, 2015, remain unchanged. Our position
18 that Alternative 4a, which brings maximum benefit to
19 the affected communities, in jobs, tax revenues, and
20 protection of the scenic viewsheds, that form the
21 backbone of the tourist economy is consistent with our
22 previous statement that as a "participant funded
23 merchant project" any disruption, inconvenience or
24 financial impact be borne in its entirety by the

1 Applicant.

2 The project sponsors have spent untold
3 resources trying to convince the affected communities
4 that the project will be a benefit to their
5 communities. I would like to speak to just three of
6 those perceived benefits.

7 Jobs. The Applicant would have us
8 believe that one of the benefits of the project will be
9 massive job growth. What they have not shared with the
10 public is that the number is a theoretical number based
11 on a concept referred to as "Regional Economic
12 Modeling". The model says that while the construction
13 crews are in your town, the additional business at
14 Dunkin Donuts or a local pizza shop, *etcetera*, will
15 cause the owners of these businesses to hire additional
16 staff. Once the crews move on to another town, another
17 project, and the business activity returns to its
18 normal levels, will the business owners keep those new
19 hires or will they return to pre-construction staffing
20 levels? A promise of temporary jobs for a permanent
21 scar is no benefit at all.

22 Taxes. New Hampton, like many other
23 municipalities, has spent years fighting abatement
24 filings from the utility companies, including

1 PSNH/Eversource. To date, we have spent \$27,000 for
2 the privilege of prevailing before the BTLA regarding
3 assessed value of utility assets. Project sponsors
4 tell us that, if we accept their methodology of asset
5 valuation, which is "original cost, less the
6 depreciation and adjustments to zero", they would not
7 file an abatement request. However, that very
8 methodology was deemed not credible as an indication of
9 market value by the BTLA in its July 2nd, 2015
10 decision. Northern Pass would have us leave over
11 \$15 million on the table to avoid an abatement fight.
12 Taxes assessed on a discredited methodology are no
13 benefit at all.

14 Lower electricity pricing. We've heard
15 a lot of that tonight. Representatives from Northern
16 Pass, PSNH, and now Eversource have spent five years
17 throwing around big numbers in savings for New
18 Hampshire electricity consumers, ranging from
19 25 million back in 2010, to the latest iteration of
20 \$80 million, but have struggled to answer the simple
21 question "how much will the savings be to the
22 individual ratepayer?" The math really isn't that
23 difficult. Using data from the Applicant's original
24 FERC filing, as well as the U.S. Energy Information

1 Administration, we can calculate an estimated saving
2 for the average residential customer of between
3 16/100ths of a cent and 5/10ths of a cent per
4 kilowatt-hour. And, that's just on the energy cost
5 portion of the bill. A benefit measured in hundredths
6 or even tenths of a cent is no benefit at all.

7 One hundred and fifty-three (153) years
8 ago, President Lincoln concluded his Gettysburg Address
9 by describing our government as being "of, by, and for
10 the People". Six generations later, you have been
11 afforded an opportunity to demonstrate that, at a time
12 when the trust of government and their agencies is at
13 an all-time low, that you have heard the people of New
14 Hampshire, and the consistent message that the only
15 viable option for the siting of this project in New
16 Hampshire is complete burial along the entire route.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please wrap up.

18 MR. IRVINE: Last sentence. Tonight, I
19 have been asked by the residents, property and business
20 owners of New Hampton to present you with copies of a
21 petition having 739 signatures calling for the full
22 burial of the project, if approved. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Martha Richards,
24 from the County Commission, to be followed by Edmond

1 Gionet, and Eric Meth.

2 MS. RICHARDS: The 2000 Day Plus
3 Campaign. Good evening. I am Martha Richards, from
4 Holderness, wearing two hats tonight. First, as a
5 private citizen, on an ROW now on the winners list, who
6 proudly stands with the opposition fighting this
7 damnable project for six years. And, second, as one of
8 the three Grafton County Commissioners, who are all in
9 full agreement of opposition to the Northern Pass
10 Project as currently proposed. We are also intervenors
11 on this project.

12 So, I finally stand before you, this
13 august group we have conjured up for six years. I do
14 see you really are mere mortals like us, but hold more
15 power. You do have the power to make some
16 life-changing decisions for thousands of us throughout
17 New Hampshire about whether or not Northern Pass gets
18 built. I assume you are aware of the perception you
19 are in collusion with the Northern Pass officials. It
20 will be up to you to ask the very tough questions
21 eventually about an application fraught with
22 questionable statements about this no-need, private
23 (for greed) project.

24 An application that divides up the state

1 into winners and losers, burial or aboveground,
2 depending apparently on who squawked more over these
3 past years. There has been silence from you in all of
4 these meetings, but Chair Honigberg offers the excuse
5 as wanting to give the audience more time to
6 interrogate the Applicant. I appreciate that. But we
7 have received too many hollow, deceitful, and
8 superficial answers to our hundreds of queries already.
9 We need to hear from you to frankly see if you've even
10 been listening to us, let alone thoroughly read
11 Northern Pass's Application and will follow through
12 this process with intense questioning to bring you to a
13 decision.

14 As a County Commissioner, I have been
15 very forthright in my complete opposition to this
16 project. Initially, like our late Ray Burton said,
17 "pack up your tents and go home". But, now,
18 reluctantly, I will accept this private project only if
19 totally buried all the way. Hydro-Quebec has already
20 decimated thousands of pristine acres with their
21 flooding of the indigenous peoples' lands, erected huge
22 dams wreaking imbalance with Mother Nature, all the
23 while methane gases from decomposing trees spilling
24 into our atmosphere. This is not a green project.

1 Now, backed up with their money,
2 Northern Pass wants to continue this raping of our
3 state's beauty and further disrupt our fragile economy
4 with "fugly" [sic] towers in the "losers'" regions.
5 You don't want to believe there will be and are real
6 estate losses. You think we and the tourists will get
7 used to seeing towers. No, we won't.

8 Having our main streets in Woodstock,
9 Franconia, and Plymouth ripped up for months, adversely
10 affecting businesses, while I-93 is a mere one mile
11 away or less makes no sense. It is baffling why, when
12 there is a logical transportation corridor as I-93 for
13 use, that Northern Pass is so averse to using it? If
14 all the impacts you have been told about could be
15 avoided by burial down I-93, why not bury it? For
16 once, let's see if New Hampshire can be progressive and
17 environmentally sensitive, as well as deriving some
18 income from the use of I-93.

19 Now, it's your turn to fulfill your duty
20 as a member of the SEC. Ask the hard questions that
21 are expected from you. I hope you let the citizens of
22 New Hampshire for once see a government entity work
23 effectively to determine if this project is really
24 something that will or will not benefit New Hampshire,

1 not just line too many corporate pockets with obscene
2 profits who don't give a damn about people's lives and
3 livelihoods being permanently ruined in an already
4 fragile region.

5 We know, though, over this many next
6 months, as someone quipped, we will see voodoo
7 procedures and red tape morph into your decision. A
8 decision you will have to live with, but will hopefully
9 have been arrived at with great thought, deliberation,
10 and sensitivity.

11 Northern Pass will continue to see the
12 strength of the orange movement, as we defend the
13 beauty and the economy of our state against a private
14 project, unless it is buried all the way. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Edmond Gionet, to
16 be followed by Eric Meth, and Bill Baber.

17 REP. GIONET: Good evening, Mr.
18 Chairman, members of the Committee. For the record, my
19 name is Edmond Gionet. I'm a native of Lincoln, and
20 District 5 of the state, that encompasses the Town of
21 Livermore, Waterville Valley, Woodstock, and my
22 hometown of Lincoln. I am here to express support for
23 the Northern Pass.

24 I did not automatically support the

1 project, and I didn't just listen to the rhetoric from
2 the supporters or the opponents. I did my homework.
3 And, I saw immediately that, as an elected official, it
4 would be irresponsible to immediately oppose this
5 project. And, when is it the last time that the state
6 has seen an investment in the state of over \$1 billion?
7 That kind of investment is exactly what the state
8 needs, and it's especially critical in my region. Yet,
9 I was concerned about negative impacts that naturally
10 come with this type of project. So, I spent time
11 asking questions. I placed my phone calls, and
12 attended most meetings by Eversource.

13 I believe I was one of the few elected
14 officials that recognized the role that the state plays
15 in ensuring that this project is built without
16 "unreasonable adverse effects". I knew that you, the
17 members of the Site Evaluation Committee, play a
18 critical role in how this project ends, what it looks
19 like and the benefits that New Hampshire receives.

20 It was obvious to me that the visual
21 impacts had been exaggerated, and even exaggerated by
22 those who have supported wind structures that are
23 roughly three times the height of the Northern Pass
24 towers. I agree that Northern Pass has to respect the

1 state and its natural resources. I also want to be
2 certain that we don't make it so difficult to site this
3 project that it doesn't go forward.

4 We have a great need for low-cost
5 energy, and communities are in dire need of tax
6 benefits, not to mention the jobs and the ForwardNH
7 Fund. I am not one of those who wants to throw out the
8 good in search of the perfect.

9 Please review this project with the
10 appropriate balance, and with a keen eye on the facts,
11 and not just emotion. Thank you for your time and for
12 listening to all of us.

13 Respectfully submitted. And, I will
14 spell my name, Edmond, E-d-m-o-n-d, the last name,
15 Gionet, G-i-o-n-e-t. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Eric Meth, to be
17 followed by Bill Baber, and Susan Ford.

18 MR. METH: Thank you for the opportunity
19 to speak before the Site Evaluation Committee, I thank
20 the members. My name is Eric Meth, E-r-i-c, last name
21 is M, as in "Mary", e-t-h. I'm a selectperson, one of
22 the selectpersons from the Town of Franconia. I
23 represent the concerns of the citizens and residents of
24 Franconia.

1 Our town has many concerns about the
2 scale of the Northern Pass proposal and the effect it
3 will have on our infrastructure, our waterways, our
4 real estate values, and our tourist -- tourism-driven
5 economy. The issues I discuss represent just a
6 cross-section of these concerns, and it's by no means
7 complete.

8 For at least the last decade, hundreds
9 of residents have been personally involved in planning
10 for the future development of Franconia. To that end,
11 we have replaced water mains and other utilities in
12 their homes and to businesses. We have replaced
13 sidewalks. And, in fact, many of our electric lines
14 and fiber optic cables are underground to preserve our
15 scenic views.

16 Since this proactive planning has
17 included a design charrette with Plan NH, a prestigious
18 grant organization with professionals working with our
19 citizens to design a future plan for our Main Street.
20 We've worked out a Master Plan, with the result, a
21 formation of a Community Design Committee. This has
22 resulted in the Colonel Oliver [Nelson] Planning Board
23 Award from the North Country Council. And, my point is
24 is that this, a lot of effort and a lot of thought has

1 gone into the development going forward for Franconia.

2 And, it seems ironic that Eversource has
3 placed a plan that -- it does not work with or
4 cooperate with the Town of Franconia whatsoever. At
5 the time they met with the Selectboard in the Fall of
6 2015, they weren't even aware that we had an
7 infrastructure buried five feet below the road surface,
8 the very road surface they propose to tear up and
9 modify with a large trench.

10 Excuse me. As for the construction
11 period itself, we have serious concerns. We are a
12 four-season vacation area with hundreds of second
13 homes. These property owners come to ski, to hike, to
14 bike, to swim, to boat, and just enjoy the peaceful and
15 quiet side of the Notch. These people support the
16 businesses on Main Street, where the project is due to
17 come down, and are the only reason many of our stores
18 are able to exist. Our fear is that a prolonged,
19 massive construction project right through the center
20 of town will discourage their visits to the village.
21 They will not want to navigate through this massive
22 construction project. And, we fear that this will be
23 the life -- the lifeblood of our village is our
24 businesses, and they will not survive this impact.

1 The other concern is the impact it has
2 on our geography. Like a lot of other towns, Franconia
3 grew up at the confluence of several creeks and rivers.
4 Sometimes, like a couple of weeks ago, we had a
5 devastating overflow, with erosion and flooding along
6 these creeks. We only fear what will happen once this
7 line goes through, when these normal disasters happen
8 exposing the line that's going to be buried, and are we
9 prepared for that type of disaster?

10 If this project is approved, what
11 happens when a 1,000-megawatt, 320 kilovolt cable is
12 buried four feet below the surface of our road, capped
13 with a cement slab and settled just over our utilities?
14 We fear what will happen, and the answers that have
15 been given to us.

16 The other end -- the other anticipated
17 effect of the cable generating such great heat is the
18 changes in the road surface and shoulders, especially
19 during our cold winters of often 20, 30, and even
20 40 degrees below zero. No one has studied these
21 problems. We've talked about EMF, but we don't believe
22 that the problem either has been addressed. Again, --

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How much more do
24 you have?

1 MR. METH: I'm wrapping it up right now.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

3 MR. METH: Thank you very much. And,
4 perhaps Eversource should build some real-life model to
5 illustrate that we are -- that our fears are without
6 merit.

7 And, I'll wrap it up right here, one
8 last point. We personally have a problem with the best
9 practices. And, as pointed out in the letter that was
10 submitted to the Committee, December 2nd, by the Public
11 for the Counsel, we think that the "best practices" is
12 really code for cover and for the specificity. And, we
13 would like to see a little bit more of that going
14 forward. Thank you very much for your time.

15 *[Audience interruption.]*

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Representative Bill
17 Baber, to be followed by Susan Ford, and Rebecca Brown.

18 REP. BABER: Thank you. Sorry, I'm
19 getting over a cold. So, bear with me. Bill Baber,
20 and it's B-a-b-e-r. I'm from Dover. I'm the ranking
21 member of the Science, Technology, and Energy
22 Committee. And, I was one of the authors of the
23 legislation which you currently have the opportunity to
24 be serving under. And, so, I thank you for your

1 service. I know that this is no small contribution on
2 your behalf.

3 I'm not going to speak from my prepared
4 remarks. I just want to make three simple points.
5 And, the first, I think, is one that everyone in this
6 room can agree with. This part of New Hampshire, in
7 fact, most of New Hampshire is a special place. It's
8 kind of a magical place, and it's a place that there
9 are few left in the Northeast that can rival it. And,
10 that's important to me. And, I think it's important to
11 everyone that's a resident of this state. And, we
12 understand that this is not something that's given.
13 It's something that has to be protected, it has to be
14 cherished, and we have to make trade-offs to ensure
15 that happens.

16 One of the reasons it's such a tourist
17 destination is we are so close to metropolitan areas.
18 That's good and it's bad. That means that, in this
19 case, we're also a conduit to serve the needs of those
20 large dense areas to our south.

21 The second point I want to make is we
22 need to remind ourselves that this project is not for
23 the civic government of the state, this is simply a
24 business project. It's a project to make money for the

1 corporation of Eversource and for the Province of
2 Quebec, and get back to the core owners of the funding
3 sources for this. And, while they're investing in this
4 mountainous project, it's not a significant amount of
5 the money that's going to be involved in the lifespan
6 of the project. If we look at some of the other
7 projects around the state, and other we have not far
8 from us, pipelines that were built during World War 2
9 that are -- actually, I think it may have just closed
10 last week, but were in service until last week.
11 Electric service lines can have similar lifespans, they
12 endure.

13 And, at current market rates, and that
14 is what Eversource is saying that they are going to
15 enter the market, they're going to sell at market
16 rates, you can expect that Hydro-Quebec will be earning
17 about half a billion dollars a year from the revenue
18 stream that's coming from this single project.

19 So, I think that it seems not
20 unreasonable, in looking at the balance of the task
21 that you have before you, to find that a small
22 additional amount of that significant long-term revenue
23 stream to be invested for the best welfare and the
24 future of this state, and for our grandchildren's sake,

1 that we preserve much of what we see today.

2 And, I just remind you that your charge
3 is to find the best balance for the needs of the state,
4 and it's not to maximize the profits for the companies
5 involved. Thank you for your time.

6 *[Audience interruption.]*

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Susan Ford, to be
8 followed by Rebecca Brown, and Ken Merrifield.

9 REP. FORD: Thank you. For the record,
10 my name is Susan Ford. And, I am a New Hampshire House
11 Representative from Grafton District 3. I would have
12 preferred to speak at the Concord hearing, but we were
13 all quite busy last Thursday evening.

14 My concern is about the towers planned
15 for Concord. If the proposed Northern Pass plan goes
16 forward, it means there will be 77 towers, ranging from
17 85 to 100 feet, in our capital city. I am so concerned
18 about this that I did invite the CEO of Eversource to
19 visit New Hampshire and see where these towers were
20 going, and to show him what were some scenic views --
21 the scenic views in New Hampshire look like. I lived
22 in Connecticut, and worked in Berlin, the corporate
23 home of Eversource. I can predict what the headline in
24 the Hartford Courant would be if 77 towers were

1 proposed for Hartford. I suspect the same would occur
2 in Boston. I have read articles in the Courant that
3 object to a cell tower marring the landscape. I've
4 lived in both states. The Connecticut residents don't
5 know what a scenic view is unless they have visited
6 northern New Hampshire.

7 I know that there are tours planned to
8 take a look at where these towers are going. Please
9 don't assume that, because you work and maybe even live
10 in Concord, you know about the Concord towers. Please
11 go on tour and examine the locations and the landscape.
12 While you're on the bus, please stop at McKenna's
13 Purchase, an apartment complex on the east side, and
14 have a conversation with the residents. The City of
15 Concord will have the most visual assault in the state
16 due to these towers.

17 Concord was designated as the Capital
18 City in 1808. Our State House is the oldest State
19 House in the country in continuous use. We have a
20 grand and glorious history in Concord and New
21 Hampshire. Please don't let them defile our capital
22 city with 77 towers.

23 I'm also amazed that we're still having
24 any conversation about burial versus towers. If this

1 project was a reliability project that was proposed 25
2 years ago, New Hampshire residents might just have to
3 live with the towers. After all, it was in the 1940s
4 that the right-of-ways were granted. Rural New
5 Hampshire needed electricity, and this was the only way
6 to get it.

7 Today, there is new technology that
8 eliminates scarring our landscapes. Why we would not
9 use this new technology is beyond me. After all, if I
10 have a heart attack tomorrow, I want my medical team to
11 use the most up-to-date knowledge and technology
12 possible, not 25 years before. Just because I choose
13 to live in a rural area does not mean that I am adverse
14 to technology. Why would anyone allow towers to litter
15 the landscape into the next century, when for sure this
16 will be an old outdated project.

17 Require the transmission lines to be
18 buried and we'll all go home. Bury all of it.

19 *[Audience interruption.]*

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Rebecca Brown, to
21 be followed by Ken Merrifield, and Rick Samson.

22 REP. BROWN: Thank you. Good evening.
23 I'm Rebecca Brown. This evening I am wearing two hats
24 has. I'm representing the Ammonoosuc Conservation

1 Trust, which is the regional land conservancy serving
2 the North Country. We conserve land for the vitality
3 and wellbeing of the region.

4 I'm also representing the Towns of
5 Franconia, Sugar Hill, Lisbon, Lyman, and Monroe as a
6 state legislator.

7 And, I'd like to address you, first and
8 foremost, as an elected public official, someone who,
9 like you, is entrusted with working in the public
10 interest, and who must earn and maintain the public
11 trust.

12 The process by which this particular
13 project is examined is going to set the groundwork for
14 many more like it over the next few years. Your work
15 will set the tone for how the public believes the
16 process works, or does not work, in their behalf.

17 Many others this evening have spoken or
18 will speak to the fact that these overhead transmission
19 lines represent an outmoded form of infrastructure that
20 will scar our landscape far beyond their useful life.

21 Others will speak to the idea that a
22 truly green, renewable locally produced energy is the
23 key to New Hampshire's energy future.

24 And, others will speak to the fact that

1 this project represents the last gasp of a failing
2 company and is at heart a corporate welfare project,
3 not a project conceived in the public interest at all.

4 I want to ask you, in your deliberations
5 over what the public interest is in this case, to think
6 of what it means to be New Hampshire. Please listen
7 carefully, I am quoting: "When we look around us, what
8 do we experience as part of life in New Hampshire?
9 What is good, what is bad, and what can we do about it?
10 What makes New Hampshire special and unique? What
11 gives our people a sense of place? How have our
12 citizens, through their attitudes, approaches to
13 problem-solving, and responses to community needs shape
14 our institutions, government, and infrastructure? Will
15 our small-town rural heritage and small-scale city life
16 still be available in the future? Will our natural
17 environment be able to provide for our recreation and
18 products for manufacturing? These are among the types
19 of questions that the Commission needs to ask itself
20 and the people of New Hampshire."

21 The commission in question was the
22 Governor's Commission on New Hampshire in the 21st
23 Century. And, those words were written by Governor
24 Judd Gregg 25 years ago. It was in his introduction to

1 their report, which is called "New Hampshire, My
2 Responsibility". The Governor had two goals for that
3 Commission. Again, I quote: "First, identify those
4 characteristics which would make New Hampshire a unique
5 and special place. Second, develop approaches and
6 initiatives that will help assure the protection and
7 promotion of those characteristics."

8 The Northern Pass Project represents the
9 opposite of what Governor Gregg called for. It goes
10 against the character of our landscape. It goes
11 against the small, democratic, direct involvement of
12 citizens in creating public policy.

13 It has, however, energized hundreds of
14 people in creative problem-solving about how to stop
15 it. Many of them are my constituents. These are
16 people who care deeply about the future of our state,
17 about what is unique and special.

18 We do not want to look like New Jersey
19 with mountains, or like the landscape between the
20 Canadian border and Montreal, crisscrossed with
21 transmission lines and every manner of tower.

22 I am personally, as many of my
23 constituents, and the Land Trust are still opposed to
24 this project going forward, period. But, if it is to

1 cross our state on the way to supplying energy to those
2 way down below, it must all be buried. Thank you.

3 *[Audience interruption.]*

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mayor Ken
5 Merrifield, to be followed by County Commissioner Rick
6 Samson, and Representative John Burt.

7 MR. MERRIFIELD: Good evening. Ken
8 Merrifield, K-e-n, M-e-r-r-i-f-i-e-l-d. And, I am the
9 Mayor of Franklin, New Hampshire. And, I come to you
10 this evening on behalf of my community, certainly, but
11 also on behalf of a unanimous Franklin City Council,
12 who supports this Project as submitted to you. And,
13 the benefits to my community are numerous and profound.

14 But I would like to take a second to
15 share conversations that I have had with manufacturers
16 throughout central New Hampshire. Who tell me that
17 they have a couple of tremendous burdens as they try to
18 compete with other manufacturers throughout the
19 country. One of which was on display a little earlier
20 this evening, that being climate control in New
21 England, which some of their competitors do not have to
22 face. The other is very high electricity prices, as
23 you've heard several times this evening. And, so, as
24 manufacturers in New Hampshire, and throughout New

1 England, are trying to compete and trying to save jobs
2 here in our state, they find themselves increasingly
3 burdened by high electricity prices.

4 And, I hope that you will be able to
5 bring balance to the discussion. You'll hear very
6 heartfelt concerns this evening, you've heard some
7 already. I hope that you'll be able to balance those
8 with the economic needs of the state as well, which I
9 believe is part of your charge under the statute.

10 So, thank you very much for this
11 opportunity for the public to speak. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: County Commissioner
13 Rick Samson, to be followed by Representative John
14 Burt, and Rebecca More.

15 Before you start, I just remind people,
16 if you have a written statement, to please give it to
17 the stenographer. Representative Brown I think may
18 have escaped before doing that.

19 MR. SAMSON: Good evening, Mr. Chairman.
20 For the record, my name is Rick Samson, S-a-m-s-o-n, as
21 in "Samson and Delilah". I am the Coos County
22 Commissioner for District 3, which is the upper portion
23 of Coos County. I represent eleven towns and eight
24 unincorporated places in District 3, six of the eleven

1 towns and two of the unincorporated places will be
2 directly negatively affected by Northern Pass.

3 I did not intend to speak here this
4 evening, as I spoke in Colebrook, and you have that
5 testimony, Mr. Chairman. But I do have several
6 questions that I would like to give the Committee to
7 consider upon hearing the Northern Pass presentation
8 tonight. And, some of the comments that were made that
9 Bayroot owns 25 percent of the Coos wind farm,
10 Brookfield Power, from Toronto, Canada, owns the other
11 75 percent. They have a agreement with the Vermont
12 Central Public Service and Green Mountain Power to
13 procure 80 percent of all power generating at that wind
14 park.

15 When the three paper mills in Berlin and
16 the two in Groveton were running, they used more
17 electricity than all other commercial and residential
18 users in Coos County. And, therefore, I question
19 Northern Pass and Eversource's figures on the Coos Loop
20 and the availability of power. The Coos Loop does not
21 extend out of Coos County. It has no effect on upper
22 Coos County. There are no transmission lines in
23 northern Coos County. This will be an entirely new
24 project.

1 I would like to know if the SEC would
2 request an independent analyst to find the real facts
3 concerning cost of burial of the entire route of
4 Northern Pass. Vermont has a DC line right now almost
5 identical, and it only operates at approximately
6 50 percent of capacity. And, I'm wondering if that has
7 been taken into consideration by the Site Evaluation
8 Committee?

9 Another question that I have that I
10 would like the Site Evaluation Committee to look at is
11 why has Eversource not had any discussions with either
12 the Coos County Commissioners or serious discussions
13 with the selectboards of Pittsburg, Clarksville,
14 Stewartstown, and the Town of Dalton or Northumberland?

15 As noticed, most of the proponents here
16 this evening will be receiving monetary benefits from
17 this project. And, I would appreciate you keeping that
18 in consideration when you're looking at their
19 testimony.

20 One of the notes I would like to make is
21 that the cost of generating, transmitting, and
22 distributing electricity -- distributing electricity in
23 New Hampshire has always been the purview of Public
24 Service Company of New Hampshire. But the costs of

1 installing, maintaining those poles is no different in
2 New Hampshire than it is in North Carolina, Montana or
3 Wyoming. And, I would like to know why the costs in
4 New Hampshire are so much higher?

5 Another question would be, does
6 Eversource currently have any AC or DC transmission
7 lines on the same right-of-ways?

8 With my testimony this evening, and the
9 state requirements and the state RSAs that define who
10 the selectmen for the unincorporated places are, those
11 duties and responsibilities are required to be the
12 duties and responsibilities of the County
13 Commissioners, according to New Hampshire RSA 28:7-a.

14 I would like to ask, and you will be
15 getting a written request, to strike the testimony of
16 Les Otten, that testified in the Concord hearing as a
17 selectman from the Town of Dixville, which he is not.
18 The only responsibilities of the residents of the
19 unincorporated places are with the election of election
20 officials. To assume any other duties,
21 responsibilities, or titles are not governed by the
22 state RSAs, laws or regulations.

23 As a District 3 Commissioner, I
24 represent the best interest of my district. And, I

1 would like to know if the Site Evaluation Committee has
2 given appropriate time, attention, and consideration to
3 my constituents that they deserve. Northern Pass, thus
4 far, has refused to identify who they consider the
5 stakeholders in this proposed project. Will the Site
6 Evaluation Committee require Northern Pass to identify
7 the stakeholders and ask why the local elected
8 officials have and are not considered as stakeholders?

9 I would respectfully request that any
10 members of the Site Evaluation Committee be required to
11 notice how much, if any, time they have ever spent in
12 upper Coos County. Can they consciously make such an
13 important decision concerning the future of Coos
14 County, knowing very little or nothing about the county
15 and the economic condition of our county?

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Samson, how
17 much more do you have?

18 MR. SAMSON: One minute, one paragraph.
19 As a member of this Committee, --

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please wrap up.

21 MR. SAMSON: -- it is your obligation,
22 duty and responsibility to the residents of our state
23 to consider the negative impacts that this proposed
24 project will have on our entire state. Your decision

1 is not temporary, but permanent, and will affect our
2 state forever. Thank you.

3 *[Audience interruption.]*

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Representative John
5 Burt, to be followed by Rebecca More, and Cheryl
6 Jensen.

7 REP. BURT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
8 thank you, Board, for allowing me to speak tonight. My
9 name is Representative John Burt, and I represent
10 Goffstown, Weare, and Deering. And, my name is John
11 Burt again, J-o-h-n, and it's B-u-r-t.

12 Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman with
13 the green shirt and tie is going to have very tired
14 hands tonight. As I watch him, I don't know how he
15 keeps up.

16 Mr. Chairman, I used to have a business
17 in Barnet, Vermont. I operated it for 18 years. Every
18 day, when I came out of my office, which was an old
19 barn, that I converted it into an office, I saw the
20 power line over in Monroe. I support Northern Pass,
21 because I support that power line over there. I
22 thought it looked pretty cool, to be honest, when I
23 looked at it. All my friends and neighbors over in
24 Monroe, they didn't have an issue with that power line.

1 As a matter of fact, their property values did not hurt
2 one bit.

3 I am a resident of Goffstown, and in
4 Goffstown, it does not hurt property value. That same
5 power line from Monroe, New Hampshire, runs right
6 through Goffstown. As a matter of fact, Market Basket
7 built their parking lot under, in Bedford, New
8 Hampshire, they built their parking lot under the power
9 lines, and the store is just off to the side. And,
10 again, they pay a lot of property taxes, because it
11 does not hurt property value.

12 What I'd like to talk about is a little
13 bit of the wind and power, the wind power and the solar
14 power. It is high cost to me and my constituents and
15 to my neighbors. Hydro-Quebec is low-cost energy. We
16 need it, Mr. Chairman.

17 As a state representative, I get a lot
18 of calls and e-mails from businesses. Several of the
19 businesses, well, almost all the businesses say one of
20 their major factors of not coming to New Hampshire is
21 the high cost of power. Hydro-Quebec will help with
22 that. The businesses that want to come here are not.
23 They're going to North Carolina and the southern
24 states, because the power cost is less.

1 Mr. Chairman, I hope you look at this
2 favorably, because we need the Hydro-Quebec power,
3 which is renewable, cheap, and a good energy source to
4 come down here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Rebecca More, to be
6 followed by Cheryl Jensen, and Elizabeth Terp.

7 MS. MORE: Good evening. My name is
8 Rebecca More, M-o-r-e, one "o". I'm speaking on behalf
9 of the Weeks Lancaster Trust, in Lancaster, New
10 Hampshire, regarding the proposal of the Northern Pass
11 to lay two, I repeat, two new aboveground lines through
12 New Hampshire's historic and cultural landscapes.

13 Many here in New Hampshire know how
14 devastated the White Mountains region looked before the
15 Weeks Act of 1911. The reclamation of forest lands and
16 habitats has been slow and incremental. The Weeks Act
17 was a collaborative, grass-roots effort, based on
18 accurate data and supported by many people.

19 Sadly, Weeks State Park, given to the
20 state in 1941 by my grandfather, Sinclair Weeks, and
21 his sister, directly overlooks the proposed
22 transmission line. They gave the Mount Prospect site
23 to the state as a reminder of the purpose and the
24 benefits of the Weeks Act, as well as for recreation by

1 all. Thousands of visitors come from around the world
2 to enjoy it's extraordinary panoramic views -- if you
3 haven't been, I advise you to go there -- from Mount
4 Monadnock, near Colebrook, to Moosilauke, near Benton.

5 However, the documents submitted by
6 Northern Pass regarding the visual impact of this
7 proposal on Weeks State Park are inaccurate,
8 inconsistent, and misleading. Just one example will
9 suffice: The submitted materials state that eight
10 towers would be visible from the Park. When, in fact,
11 the number is approximately 219.

12 I hope that the SEC, acting on behalf of
13 the people of New Hampshire, will submit these
14 materials to the critical review by independent
15 experts. If the Weeks State Park materials are
16 inaccurate, inconsistent, and misleading, then
17 undoubtedly those submitted for other areas are as
18 well.

19 Thank you very much.

20 *[Audience interruption.]*

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Cheryl Jensen, to
22 be followed Elizabeth Terp, and David Van Houten.

23 And, Ms. Jensen, just for one day I wish
24 I had your penmanship.

1 MS. JENSEN: Wish what?

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I wish I had your
3 penmanship.

4 MS. JENSEN: That's Ms. Weir, in the
5 first grade, at Nottingham Elementary School.

6 *[Laughter.]*

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I did not have Ms.
8 Weir.

9 MS. JENSEN: Okay. My name is Cheryl,
10 C-h-e-r-y-l, Jensen, J-e-n-s-e-n. I am Co-Chair of the
11 Bethlehem Conservation Commission. I timed my remarks
12 at three to four minutes, but that was at one o'clock
13 this afternoon and I was much fresher, so...

14 As proposed in Bethlehem, this project
15 would include almost five miles of overhead
16 transmission lines along the current Eversource
17 right-of-way, through wetlands from the Bethlehem town
18 line to Route 302, as well as Transition Station Number
19 5 across from Miller Pond, also called "Baker Brook
20 Pond", where the lines will then be buried. It will
21 impact two important water bodies: The Ammonoosuc
22 River and Baker Brook Pond.

23 The Ammonoosuc River is a New Hampshire
24 Designated River, with special protection from the New

1 Hampshire River Management and Protection Program under
2 RSA 380 -- 483. And, I'd like to mention that the
3 Ammonoosuc Local River [River Local?] Advisory
4 Committee opposes this project and has submitted a
5 letter to the SEC.

6 Baker Brook Pond is the largest open
7 water pond in Bethlehem at almost 18 acres, and it's
8 subject to the Comprehensive Shoreland Protection Act.
9 This Transition Station Number 5 is going to be
10 directly across from Baker Brook Pond.

11 We commissioned two certified wetland
12 scientists to look at the impact of this project on the
13 wetlands in the current right-of-way. And, we
14 submitted the report to the DES and to the SEC. The
15 report is titled "Assessment of the Transmission Line
16 Proposal on Natural Resources within the Northern Half
17 of Bethlehem, New Hampshire". Not a very sexy title,
18 but it's interesting reading. I know you will read
19 that report and the letter we submitted, which
20 thoroughly outlines our concerns, but I do want to call
21 your attention to a few other things.

22 First, we believe that the environmental
23 impact of this project, as bad as it is, is being
24 underestimated in several different ways, and not just

1 in Bethlehem. First, all the temporary impacts that
2 are associated with this I believe are not accounted
3 for. Just one example is the area at Baker Brook Pond,
4 where I believe you stopped very briefly when you
5 visited the Rocks last Monday. The land there drops
6 away very quickly into a wetland. I talked to
7 Eversource engineers at one of the public hearings, and
8 they said that that area would have to be developed
9 with "fill".

10 The Northern Pass Stormwater Management
11 Study for that area reads, I'll give you just one
12 sentence, "Filling these soils likely requires a permit
13 from the New Hampshire Department of Environmental
14 Services and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Yet, no
15 application that I can find has been submitted for like
16 dredging or filling that area. So, how can we be
17 looking at the full impact?

18 Another way it's being underestimated is
19 that the temporary impacts from -- for staging and
20 laydown areas, as well as access roads, are not
21 included in the applications that have been submitted
22 to DES thus far. The fact that these impacts are not
23 being accounted for is documented in two places. One
24 is the letter to the SEC from Peter Roth, Counsel for

1 the Public, the other is in the prefiled testimony of
2 John Kayser, who is the Construction Project Manager.

3 Briefly, from excerpts in Mr. Roth's
4 letter, "The prefiled testimony of Mr. Kayser indicates
5 laydown areas can be up to fifty acres...Yet the
6 testimony does not describe how many laydown areas are
7 needed or where they where they will be located. The
8 prefiled testimony...states that the information is not
9 known at this time...Thus, for an unknown portion of
10 the land that will be impacted by construction, which
11 could be significant, given the potential size of each
12 laydown site, the Applicant is silent."

13 And, finally, we think the impacts being
14 underestimated in Bethlehem, because Northern Pass was
15 constrained to mapping in the right-of-way because of
16 property rights. And, although the Applicant purports
17 to have a relatively small impact of 0.39 acres, this
18 does not take into account the connectivity of the
19 wetlands, streams, and rivers.

20 In the existing right-of-way, Northern
21 Pass identified 55 wetlands, all of which are part of
22 larger systems that extend far beyond that narrow
23 right-of-way. Disrupting the wetlands within the
24 right-of-way will have negative impacts far beyond

1 those boundaries.

2 And, in our report, we identify five
3 "Wetland Concern Areas", all of which involve potential
4 adverse impacts to the Ammonoosuc, because of impacts
5 to streams which from flow either directly or
6 indirectly into it.

7 Please keep these points in mind when
8 you're looking at and considering the impact.

9 Bethlehem hopes that you won't allow the destruction of
10 valuable wetlands and adverse impacts to the Ammonoosuc
11 River and Baker Brook Pond, merely so that corporations
12 based in Connecticut and Quebec can make money at the
13 expense of our environment. It seems that you can
14 achieve balance that people have been talking about
15 tonight by just burying the project.

16 Thank you very much.

17 *[Audience interruption.]*

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Elizabeth Terp, to
19 be followed by David Van Houten, and Suzanne Smith.

20 Ms. Terp, before you start, I need to
21 make a couple of announcements.

22 First, for those who want to come to the
23 status conference that's scheduled I think next week,
24 there's still no location set for that. So, please

1 check the website regularly, look for an order
2 specifying where that will take place. It will be in
3 Concord, but it probably won't be at the Public
4 Utilities Commission, because our facility, while
5 large, is probably not big enough to accommodate the
6 crowd.

7 Second, with respect to questions about
8 process and participation in a proceeding like that,
9 Public Counsel, Peter Roth, has been referenced a few
10 times tonight. Peter, can you stand up again?

11 Peter reminded me that he's also
12 available to speak to people who have questions about
13 the process and how things are going and what the
14 process will look like.

15 And, the third thing I want to talk
16 about is that, I know people are trying to be brief,
17 and I really appreciate that. What I'm going to do is,
18 when people get to three and a half minutes, I'm going
19 to raise my hand. So, if you do happen to look up and
20 see that I have my hand raised, that means you've gone
21 past three and a half minutes. And, if you could
22 either bring yourself to a close or to stop and come
23 back at the end, we'll all appreciate it and we'll get
24 through more speakers that way. So, thank you for your

1 patience.

2 Ms. Terp, you may proceed.

3 MS. TERP: All right. And, I'll be
4 brief. Elizabeth Terp, E-l-i-z-a-b-e-t-h, T-e-r-p.
5 I'm from Thornton. And, my concern is the plan to
6 mitigate the Northern Pass carbon footprint.

7 Hydro-Quebec power is not clean energy.
8 It comes at great cost to the environment, the
9 indigenous people of Quebec, the fishing and tourist
10 industries, and the diversity of wildlife. It leaves a
11 significant carbon footprint. Hydro-Quebec has avoided
12 mitigating their destruction of Quebec through
13 Environment Canada, which considers their reservoirs a
14 "land-use change". Hydro-Quebec can make no such claim
15 in New Hampshire.

16 My concern is with the carbon footprint
17 by the Northern Pass Project, and the absence of a
18 comprehensive mitigation plan to offset 500 miles of
19 access roads, widening the existing road, blasting to
20 prepare for pilings, cement for pilings, and heavy
21 equipment used to create 35-foot pilings to carry the
22 new lines. Here is a picture of the overhead
23 transmission line foundation to consider. These are
24 filled with cement. And, cement is -- for every ton of

1 cement, you have one ton of carbon dioxide emitted.

2 The following questions need to be
3 addressed before the Northern Pass Application can be
4 accepted: What is the Northern Pass Mitigation Plan?
5 And, what Carbon Footprint Monitoring System is being
6 used to assure that compliance is documented? For
7 example, the Carbon Disclosure Project is a
8 London-based global non-profit. And, how much will the
9 mitigation of the Northern Pass carbon Footprint cost?
10 And, how is the Northern Pass paying the bill?

11 Burying the line is certainly going to
12 lower that carbon footprint. So, please bury the line.
13 See that the line is buried.

14 Thank you for your consideration.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: David Van Houten,
16 to be followed by Representative Suzanne Smith, and
17 Patricia Kellogg.

18 MR. VAN HOUTEN: Good evening. Thanks
19 again for those of you who serve on the Site Evaluation
20 Committee to come and hear our opinion of this dreadful
21 proposal.

22 My name is David Van Houten, V-a-n,
23 H-o-u-t-e-n. I live in Bethlehem. And, you will
24 remember, from my comments in Colebrook last Monday,

1 that I disagree with the Applicant's contention that
2 they have the right to build this project on my land.
3 I am not alone in this.

4 The Applicant claims that this project
5 is about energy. In fact, energy is a secondary issue.
6 The primary objective of this proposal is for
7 Hydro-Quebec and Eversource to make a lot of money.
8 This has guided their every move since day one.

9 The route that was first proposed cost
10 the least to build and made the most money for the
11 Applicant. The proposal now before us costs a little
12 more, and would yield slightly lower profits, but is
13 still very lucrative. The Committee will not have
14 failed to notice that this proposal is still rejected
15 by the people of New Hampshire by a three-to-one
16 margin. You've also heard that some of the opponents
17 might be willing to settle for a route that was
18 completely buried along major corridors in ground that
19 has already been disturbed. Coincidentally, this would
20 line up with statements in the U.S. Department of
21 Energy's Draft Environmental Impact Statement that the
22 least environmental impact and the greatest economic
23 benefit to New Hampshire would come from this approach.
24 The Applicant claims that it cannot afford such a

1 project. According to the Montreal Gazette,
2 Hydro-Quebec profits in 2015 were \$3.1 billion. That
3 represents a lot of buying power when considering a
4 project that will generate income for decades.

5 An alternative that must be considered
6 is burial of the line from Derby Line, Vermont, down
7 I-91 to Hartford or on 91 to I-93. These are already
8 developed corridors that are large enough to absorb a
9 project of this magnitude. Instead, I see Route 112
10 and 116, which are not big enough, and Route 3 barely
11 qualifies as a major corridor. The idea to bury this
12 in Franconia village and Main Street, in Plymouth,
13 close by homes, schools, and businesses, is simply
14 ridiculous.

15 I have also not seen much discussion
16 about the wisdom of building a project on our land that
17 will funnel money out of the country. This money would
18 be much better invested in American workers
19 implementing energy efficiency and conservation
20 measures, and ramping up solar energy capacity here in
21 New England. Are the electrical workers who come to
22 these meetings looking for jobs going to follow the
23 money to Canada? It won't be here anymore.

24 Will Eversource sell this project to

1 Hydro-Quebec when it is all done? What would be the
2 implications of that?

3 How do we know that the electricity
4 coming down from Quebec is this supposedly clean
5 hydropower? There is nothing to stop Hydro-Quebec from
6 building a thousand megawatt coal plant just north of
7 the border to feed this line.

8 Over the last week or so, the property
9 owners and the citizens of New Hampshire have stated in
10 no uncertain terms that we oppose this project. You
11 have heard of the "line in the sand"; we have drawn a
12 line in the mud: No towers.

13 I hope you will decide that the no-build
14 alternate is the best. And, if you can't bring
15 yourself to do that, please stipulate that the entire
16 project be buried in a sensible fashion.

17 Thank you for your time.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Representative
19 Suzanne Smith, to be followed by Patricia Kellogg, and
20 Walter Palmer.

21 REP. SMITH: Good evening. For the
22 record, I am Suzanne Smith, S-u-z-a-n-n-e, S-m-i-t-h.
23 I represent the Towns of Plymouth, Hebron, and
24 Holderness in the New Hampshire Legislature. And,

1 welcome to my district.

2 Since the Northern Pass was introduced
3 five years, I have attended numerous public forums,
4 hearings, meetings, and, today, a site tour. I
5 listened to the comments of my constituents, residents
6 of the North Country, Concord, and the Lakes Region at
7 many of these meetings. One phrase that I frequently
8 hear is "our natural beauty", the "natural beauty of
9 New Hampshire". Whether it's the lakes, the mountains,
10 or the farmland, we live in a beautiful state. And, we
11 need to protect the natural scenic beauty of New
12 Hampshire.

13 When this project was first proposed
14 entirely above-ground, signs went up in downtown
15 Plymouth. The local cafe, the hair dresser on Main
16 Street, the dentist, and even my own cabin: "Stop
17 Northern Pass". These signs have not come down, I
18 checked today, along the transmission lines -- although
19 the transmission lines in Plymouth are proposed to be
20 buried. Burying some of the lines is a good first
21 step, but it is only a beginning.

22 Northern Pass has worked long and hard
23 to push this project ahead. But they have not garnered
24 much more support than when they began in 2010. In

1 fact, as more people become aware of the ramifications
2 of Northern Pass, they may have lost support.

3 In New York and Vermont, large
4 transmission projects, which will be underground or
5 underwater, have been approved easily. In Maine,
6 negotiations for burial of long distance HVDC lines in
7 the Maine Turnpike corridor are moving ahead.

8 I had a wonderful time on the site visit
9 today, and I learned a lot. And, you, the SEC, have a
10 daunting task ahead of you. And, I'm relying on you to
11 ask the tough questions. Does this project work? And,
12 if so, how?

13 I took a few notes, and here are a few
14 questions I had. Route 3, in Plymouth, Main Street.
15 Hmm. Going to dig it up? How long will businesses be
16 impacted by this? Having sat on Route 3, how feasible
17 is it when ledge is on one side of the road, railroad
18 tracks running close by on the other side, and wetlands
19 on the other side also, all very much in close
20 proximity to Route 3? And, what about homes close to
21 the road? I saw some that looked to be maybe 50 feet
22 at the most from the side of the road. Ledges on one
23 side, houses on the other, blasting of ledges, damaging
24 homes. All these are questions I have.

1 Why is the project taking the most
2 challenging route? For example, back to Route 3, that
3 weaves in and out from Woodstock, down through
4 Plymouth, and into Bridgewater. Route 93 is pretty
5 much a straight shot. Why not bury in the interstate?
6 I think more work could be done on that. And, why,
7 again, with the most challenging route, if the project
8 crossed the border at Derby Line, followed the
9 Interstate-91 in Vermont, and cross to New Hampshire
10 below the White Mountains, the White Mountain National
11 Forest would be avoided, and Pondicherry section of the
12 Silvio O. Conte Wildlife Refuge would also be avoided.

13 If burial had been the first, rather
14 than the last, option, the line would probably be built
15 by now. New Hampshire is worth the effort.

16 And, thank you.

17 *[Audience interruption.]*

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Patricia Kellogg,
19 to be followed by Walter Palmer, and Jeff Guerra.

20 If there are people who are still
21 sitting downstairs, there are seats coming available
22 upstairs pretty much every 30 seconds or so.

23 MS. KELLOGG: Patricia Kellogg,
24 P-a-t-r-i-c-i-a, K-e-l-l-o-g-g, of Littleton, New

1 Hampshire. And, I just have a picture that's done to
2 scale that I would like to show the Site Evaluation
3 Committee. And, I have an assistant.

4 *[Large photograph presented for view by*
5 *the Site Evaluation Committee and*
6 *audience members.]*

7 MS. KELLOGG: Just say "no". This is to
8 scale. Just say "no".

9 *[Audience interruption.]*

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Walter Palmer, to
11 be followed by Jeff Guerra, and Tiler Eaton.

12 MR. PALMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13 My name is Walter Palmer, P-a-l-m-e-r. And, I'm from
14 Franconia, New Hampshire. Most of my prepared remarks
15 have already been covered by others. So, in the
16 interest of brevity, I will skip over most of them.

17 But there is something that I still
18 would like to bring to the attention of the Committee.
19 And, that is, in 2011, New Hampshire's Legislature had
20 enacted Senate Bill 361, which was a bill created to
21 create a commission to study the feasibility of
22 establishing energy infrastructure corridors within
23 existing transportation rights-of-way. These corridors
24 would be for the expressed purpose of siting projects

1 just like Northern Pass.

2 Senate Bill 361's commission included
3 DOT staff, and worked very closely with the New
4 Hampshire Department of Transportation. The final
5 Senate Bill 361 Commission Report, published on
6 November 30th, 2012, stated that DOT, Department of
7 Transportation now, had identified four high corridors
8 as preferred energy infrastructure corridors. These
9 four corridors included, and I quote, "I-93, between
10 the Massachusetts border and the Vermont border".
11 Other identified corridors included the "I-89 corridor"
12 and the "I-95 interstate corridor".

13 The Senate Bill 361 Commission Report is
14 available on the Internet. And, I will give you the
15 reference, the citation for that.

16 So, in 2012, the DOT themselves
17 identified the Interstate I-93 corridor, including the
18 portion, I might add, through Franconia Notch, as a
19 preferred corridor for the siting of projects, such as
20 Northern Pass. I-93 and Franconia Notch are not off
21 limits to Northern Pass, despite their repeated efforts
22 to try to convince us that they are.

23 In fact, the opposite is true. I-93 has
24 been specifically identified, through a coordinated

1 statewide study, to be a preferred energy
2 infrastructure corridor for projects just like Northern
3 Pass. And, I might add that Northern Pass are
4 certainly fully aware of this fact.

5 It's clear that Northern Pass does not
6 want to build along the interstate corridors, because
7 it's more expensive to do so. However, the fact that
8 they don't want to do it does not make it inviable, as
9 they have repeatedly try to claim it is.

10 Construction of Northern Pass within
11 interstate corridors is highly viable, completely
12 viable, would eliminate most of the impacts of the
13 project. Would still provide all the benefits that you
14 saw in Mr. Quinlan's table about the benefits of the
15 project, and would, in fact, provide more jobs than the
16 current proposal.

17 I'll just conclude by emphasizing that
18 burial of Northern Pass along interstate corridors is,
19 in fact completely viable. And, just because Northern
20 Pass doesn't want to do it, that doesn't mean that it
21 can't be done. It is, in fact, the optimal solution
22 for siting Northern Pass in New Hampshire.

23 And, if SEC is true to its mandate to
24 consider environmental impacts, visual impacts, and

1 overall benefits to the people of New Hampshire, it
2 will certainly deny a permit to Northern Pass for its
3 current proposal, and instead stipulate that Northern
4 Pass must site its transmission lines -- its
5 transmission line along interstate corridors.

6 Thank you.

7 *[Audience interruption.]*

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jeff Guerra, to be
9 followed by Tiler Eaton, and Robert Krey.

10 MR. GUERRA: Good evening. My name is
11 Jeff Guerra. I'm a resident of -- spelled G-u-e-r-r-a.
12 I'm a resident of Manchester, New Hampshire. And, I
13 want to thank the Site Evaluation Committee for
14 allowing me the opportunity to speak in support of the
15 Northern Pass Project.

16 I'm a Project Manager for PAR Electrical
17 Contractors. We were recently added to the Northern
18 Pass Project Team, and will serve as a general
19 contractor if the project is approved. Our office is
20 in Bow, and we have a sister company in Raymond. We
21 currently employ over 200 people in the state between
22 our two companies.

23 For an industry that traditionally
24 requires these men and women to travel for work, you

1 can be sure that all of them are looking forward to
2 working on the Northern Pass Project. Especially so
3 for the 240 plus qualified electrical workers currently
4 working away from their homes and families that reside
5 in the State of New Hampshire.

6 I have personally been involved with our
7 operations in New Hampshire for the past two years,
8 and, more importantly, our apprenticeship program. As
9 part of the Eversource Jobs Initiative Program, we have
10 partnered with Eversource to train and employ young New
11 Hampshire residents. We started this program last
12 year, and it has been a success from its initiation.
13 After approximately three and a half years, these
14 apprentices become fully qualified journeymen. If
15 approved, we plan to continue this program throughout
16 the Northern Pass Project, which will give many more
17 young New Hampshire residents the opportunity for a
18 lifelong career in a highly specialized industry.

19 The New Hampshire First Initiative will
20 be implemented on this project as well. It gives New
21 Hampshire residents and contractors a first priority to
22 work on the project. Based on our experience on past
23 projects, Northern Pass will add thousands of jobs to
24 the New Hampshire economy. Only a small portion of

1 these jobs will be for the actual line workers who
2 build the lines. The greatest portions of jobs will be
3 in the form of local road builders, excavation
4 companies, lumber mills, loggers, landscapers, waste
5 management firms, aggregate hauling, equipment
6 maintenance, trucking, and I could go on.

7 Over the upcoming months, PAR Electrical
8 Contractors will be holding a series of informational
9 sessions for local contractors to attend. We will be
10 working with the Chambers of Commerce and issue press
11 releases once the dates are firmed. At these sessions,
12 we will discuss how all the local contractors can get
13 involved with the project.

14 In closing, I would like to urge the
15 Committee to approve this Application. Not only will
16 it bring the 240 traveling workers back home and reduce
17 our electric bills, it will bring much needed jobs and
18 economic stimulus to the State of New Hampshire.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Tiler Eaton, to be
21 followed by Robert Krey, and Barbara Meyer.

22 MR. EATON: Good evening. My name is
23 Tiler Eaton, T-i-l-e-r, E-a-t-o-n. I'm a lineman. I
24 live in Nottingham, New Hampshire. I'm in favor of

1 Northern Pass. And, like many here tonight, I have
2 also attended several hearings regarding this project.

3 I have done some research on many of the
4 other projects that have been mentioned at several
5 hearings as well. According to the New England Clean
6 Energy RFP website, there are 24 bidders at this time,
7 and two of the projects that would be built underground
8 that I keep hearing of, Champlain Hudson and Maine
9 Power Express, have not submitted a proposal.

10 Some of the projects that have are the
11 Vermont Green Line, which is 13 miles of underground in
12 Vermont, 6 miles of underground in New York, and
13 40 miles of sea cable.

14 The Maine Clean Power connection, 66
15 miles of overhead transmission.

16 The Maine Renewable Energy Interconnect,
17 149 miles of overhead transmission.

18 NextEra project, which has two, the
19 Evergreen Express, 114 miles of overhead transmission;
20 and the CMP Express, 72 miles of overhead transmission.

21 The Northern Pass is 192 miles, in which
22 60 miles will be underground.

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Robert Krey, to be

1 followed by Barbara Meyer, and Barbara Robinson.

2 MR. KREY: Thank you. My name is Robert
3 Krey, K-r-e-y. I've been an employee at Eversource for
4 20 years. My father served as a Tuftonboro Planning
5 Board member and on the Lakes Region Planning
6 Commission. And, so, discussions of public concern
7 were dinner talk back in the 1970s. And, this issue is
8 not simple, I can say. New Hampshire residents and
9 businesses both need new generation to offset power
10 plant closings, but you all know that. I thought a lot
11 about what's best for the customers we serve at
12 Eversource, understanding some people's negative views
13 of overhead power lines. And, as an aging pond hockey
14 player, I admire efforts to preserve New Hampshire's
15 vistas. It simply appears that Northern Pass now is
16 the best proposal available to provide clean power
17 here.

18 I asked myself, who has a plan now
19 that's better? That provides renewable power, no
20 up-front construction costs to New Hampshire customers,
21 and provides reliable hydropower available when wind
22 turbines and solar plants are fast asleep.

23 The time is here when officials will
24 need to choose some kind of large-scale power source

1 simply as a replacement just to keep the lights on. In
2 my work as an account executive, I assist large power
3 users. I'm in charge of ensuring customers to get the
4 best value-for-money in their electricity purchase;
5 analyzing customer usage, and advising them on best
6 practices.

7 New Hampshire power prices are a drag
8 not just on job creation, but also on job retention
9 here in New Hampshire. Whether it's a supermarket
10 chain paying \$6 million a year for electricity, believe
11 it, or a school district paying one and a half million,
12 high power prices discourage hiring, and school
13 improvements as well.

14 Please consider what a manufacturing
15 president told me after I announced a power price
16 increase would work out to \$50,000 per year for his
17 business. After he turned red, then purple, he
18 replied, "That just cost me two employees, Bob."

19 It's important to remember, as a
20 delivery utility, Eversource sets prices based on what
21 it costs us to buy power for you, our customers. Now,
22 there's just not enough reliable supply to keep prices
23 stable and affordable all year around.

24 Schools, supermarkets, and manufacturers

1 need relief from current prices. Like spokes of a
2 wheel, our economy works best when all sectors
3 function. If people want to continue the increase in
4 New Hampshire government spending they have voted for
5 continuously since the 1990s, a business-friendly
6 economy is the only way to afford it.

7 With only three states having higher
8 electricity prices, is it time now for New Hampshire to
9 choose at least one solution that may turn out better
10 financially for us than just building another natural
11 gas-fueled generator?

12 Like a balanced economy, a balanced fuel
13 mix, as you all know, helps us by smoothing the
14 volatility in electric prices. In many cases,
15 power-intensive businesses are now located in New
16 England for one reason: Because they're already here,
17 and relocation is costly and disruptive.

18 Family-owned businesses create much of
19 the wealth that government takes to function. If you
20 burden those businesses too much with high costs, you
21 reduce government revenue available for the schools and
22 public services. As you all know, too many New
23 Hampshire towns already know this effect.

24 With the planned closure of many nuclear

1 and coal power plants, we're painted into the current
2 situation of high-priced power. I salute our company
3 and private property owners who have collaborated to
4 make way for a new energy source that the public needs.
5 The state now has a great opportunity for clean,
6 affordable power.

7 Shouldn't people support the most
8 economic route construction? Why shouldn't affordable
9 power be a high priority in New Hampshire, like it is
10 in many other states?

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please wrap up,
12 Mr. Krey.

13 MR. KREY: Solar and wind can't rise to
14 the job at hand in this case. Clean hydropower, coming
15 overhead from Canada, will help all New Hampshire power
16 customers.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Barbara Meyer, to
19 be followed by Barbara Robinson, and Peter Grote.

20 MS. MEYER: Barbara Meyer, from Easton.
21 Meyer is M-e-y-e-r. People have been talking about
22 "winners" and "losers" in the Northern Pass Project. I
23 live among the "winners", where cables are proposed to
24 be buried along Route 116 through Franconia and Easton.

1 And, I'd like to explain tonight why my neighbors and I
2 don't feel like "winners" at all.

3 First, there is the fact that, in our
4 area, our homes are sited fairly close to the road
5 where these lines would go in. I estimate that maybe
6 about a third of our homes are within 50 feet of the
7 road. Some are on stacked stone foundations. Some
8 have wells in the front yard, at say around 30 feet
9 from the excavation, which will include blasting and
10 drilling, especially for the 10-by-10-by-30-foot
11 vaults. Eversource has said they'll be taking videos
12 of wells and foundations in anticipation of damage
13 claims. Damage claims? And, we're winners in this?

14 We're also concerned that, although
15 Eversource has said they'll try to bury the lines under
16 the pavement, they will sometimes use adjacent land.
17 That means that, in some of our front yards, they will
18 be removing vegetation permanently. And, again, no
19 winning here.

20 Next, consider what's happening to our
21 property values. Many folks have an 80/20 split,
22 mortgage financing to equity in their homes. But the
23 banks don't share your pain when something like this
24 hits your overall property value. So, an overall loss

1 of ten percent in the value of your home wipes out
2 50 percent of your equity. Half of your investment is
3 gone overnight, because you opened a letter from
4 Eversource that says the Northern Pass is going at the
5 end of your driveway. Now, that's winning like Charlie
6 Sheen!

7 Then, you go to an info session and you
8 learn that huge property tax payments are being used to
9 entice local governments to approve the route.
10 Millions of dollars are going here, going there, to one
11 group or another, that can push the project along.
12 Yet, you, the people who are actually affected, are
13 completely ignored, ignored while you're the ones
14 suffering the impact of the project. You bear the
15 risks of excavation, blasting, dust and debris through
16 the years of construction. Forever after, you'll bear
17 the loss of vegetation, and the hassles of repairs.
18 Most galling of all, though, you'll watch the value of
19 your home equity eroded, while no one even contemplates
20 compensation to you. Somehow that feeling of being
21 crushed by political expediency, I don't think that's
22 what winning feels like.

23 When even the winners hate your plan,
24 it's time for a new plan. Opt for Alternative 4a and

1 bury this whole line using existing industrial
2 corridors like I-93. The I-93 route is shorter. It
3 has less environmental impact. Fewer historical sites
4 would need to be evaluated. Problems from construction
5 damage, to EMF worries, to dig-in risks, are all
6 reduced on 93 compared with running this through a
7 residential community. Traffic flow on 93 would even
8 keep the lines safer from people who might
9 intentionally want to disrupt the grid. And, most
10 significantly, using 93 preserves property values.

11 Don't tear a new industrial corridor
12 through residential neighborhoods in the North Country.
13 Bury this project down 93 instead.

14 Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Barbara Robinson,
16 to be followed by Peter Grote, and Senator Jeanie
17 Forrester.

18 MS. ROBINSON: My name is Barbara
19 Robinson. I'm a resident of Ellsworth, New Hampshire.
20 I'm also the Executive Director of North Country
21 Council. North Country Council is a state-designated
22 regional planning commission for the proposed route of
23 the Northern Pass transmission line from the Canadian
24 border to the Plymouth-Bridgewater line. We are

1 responsible, under state law, to prepare a coordinated
2 plan for the development of the region to encourage the
3 most appropriate use of land. Accordingly, New
4 Hampshire RSA 162-H:16 requires the SEC to take the
5 views of the regional planning commission into account
6 in determining whether issuance of the certificate
7 would interfere with the orderly development of the
8 region.

9 Our current regional plan was adopted in
10 2014. The plan was developed after two years spent
11 asking residents of the region what their highest
12 priority need was, and what qualities of the region
13 were most important to them. We asked in many
14 different ways, in many different settings. Through
15 this process, we were able to generate a
16 consensus-based regional plan aimed at addressing the
17 region's highest priority need: Livable wage jobs with
18 benefits, that are built on, or at least compatible
19 with, stewardship of the region's scenic natural
20 environment and recreational opportunities. The plan
21 emphasizes taking care of what we have and building on
22 our strengths, such as our scenic natural environment,
23 to increase prosperity, while reducing the cost of
24 living through such means as local energy production.

1 The regional plan contains the following
2 strategy statement: "Protect the region's iconic and
3 popular viewsheds from undue adverse impacts associated
4 with incompatible land use, such as large transmission
5 lines, like Northern Pass, through such means as
6 legislative restriction and participation in EIS and
7 permit reviews."

8 Alternatives 4 and 6, which provide for
9 burial of -- in the roadway corridors throughout our
10 region, would be consistent with the region's plan's
11 emphasize on the natural scenic environment as the
12 foundation for the orderly development of the region.

13 A second consideration relative to the
14 orderly development of the region criterion is the
15 impact of local energy production. Relative to
16 reducing the cost of living in the North Country, the
17 plan contains the follow strategy statement: "Increase
18 the region's production and use of renewable energy
19 consistent with protection of other important natural
20 and scenic resources." This means that to establish
21 that the Northern Pass proposal will not interfere with
22 the orderly development of the region, in addition to
23 burial of the line. The SEC must also be convinced the
24 project won't provide a financial disincentive to the

1 development of additional local energy generation
2 facilities.

3 We urge the SEC to seriously consider
4 the 2014 regional plan for the North Country when
5 considering interference with the orderly development
6 of the region. I will provide this paper that gets
7 into more details for you.

8 Only the cost of construction to the
9 Applicant is higher with burial, but not by orders of
10 magnitude, not by an unreasonable amount, by
11 33 percent, in the case of Alternative 6A, for example.

12 Thank you for consideration of our
13 comments, and the unusual high stakes associated with
14 scene impacts of our region.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Peter Grote, to be
16 followed by Senator Jeanie Forrester, and Frederick Von
17 Karls.

18 MR. GROTE: Good evening. My name is
19 Peter Grote, G-r-o-t-e. I'm a resident of Franconia.
20 I thank the Committee for hosting this public hearing
21 and allowing us to address members.

22 I first would like to respond to
23 Mr. Quinlan's comment, if I heard it correctly, and
24 please correct me if I'm wrong, I heard Mr. Quinlan say

1 that the reason for avoiding I-93 was "because it can't
2 be disturbed". That disturbs me. For over a million
3 years, the Appalachian Mountain System has survived ice
4 sheets, glaciers, earthquakes, floods, and landscapes
5 [landslides?], and, in recent times, even the
6 construction of twenty different interstate highways,
7 including Interstate I-93.

8 Geologic history indicates that a river
9 once flowed through Franconia Notch, the river that
10 disturbed -- that deposited disturbed gravel, not
11 ledges. I think, Mr. Quinlan, you need to send of your
12 experts back to do some homework.

13 I have three questions. Will Plymouth
14 taxpayers have to pay for the cost of maintaining,
15 repairing, and updated their existing utility
16 infrastructures, in addition to the Applicant's new,
17 untested, thermally dynamic DC lines for the next 70
18 years?

19 Now, "70 years" may be a contradiction
20 to what we've heard, but at one of our meetings, and I
21 believe it was in Whitefield earlier in the year,
22 representatives of Northern Pass were asked the life of
23 the towers, and the answer was "60 or 70 years". If
24 the life of the towers is 60 or 70 years, we, the

1 skeptical public, can also assume that the whole line
2 will have a life of 70 years, not 40 years.

3 The second question: What are the
4 cumulative, long-term, quantitative and qualitative
5 impacts on all the other New Hampshire Main Streets,
6 not just Plymouth, North Woodstock, and Franconia, all
7 the other Main Streets, residences, businesses, farms,
8 wildlife habitats and viewsheds along the proposed
9 192-mile project?

10 It can be argued that the Applicant's
11 proposed route, consisting of 1,838 towers and buried
12 lines under New Hampshire State Route 3, 116, 112, and
13 Route 18, as well as other roads, could impose greater
14 long-term impacts than an alternative route throughout
15 the Interstate Highway System, as has been proposed and
16 suggested many times tonight.

17 During recent public hearings in
18 Whitefield, Lincoln, Colebrook, and Concord, Applicants
19 made the following comments: It would be technically
20 impossible to bury the entire line. The lifespan, as I
21 mentioned, of the towers was stated to be "60 or 70
22 years". This presumes that the line consisting of
23 towers and/or underground cables could be 60 or 70
24 years. Finally, again, as we heard tonight,

1 Hydro-Quebec, not New Hampshire ratepayers, will be
2 paying for the construction of the line. And, that the
3 cost of burying would add a billion dollars.

4 While the Applicants are still
5 withholding from the public a report titled
6 "Cost/Benefit and Local Economic Impact Analysis",
7 Hydro-Quebec, on a regular basis, discloses detailed
8 financial results and projections.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Grote, please
10 bring your comment to a close.

11 MR. GROTE: Okay. I'll conclude.
12 Basically, the simple model of cash flow suggests that
13 burying the entire line could cost perhaps 1 percent of
14 the potential cumulative profit resulting from the
15 project.

16 To conclude, the Applicants have told
17 members of the Committee repeatedly "It's not
18 economically viable to bury the entire line." Many of
19 the participants here tonight believe this hypothesis
20 is not credible.

21 Thank you very much.

22 *[Audience interruption.]*

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Senator Jeanie
24 Forrester, to be followed by Frederick Von Karls, and

1 Susan Moore.

2 SEN. FORRESTER: Good evening. For the
3 record, my name is Jeanie Forrester, J-e-a-n-i-e,
4 F-o-r-r-e-s-t-e-r. I'm the Senator for District 2,
5 representing 27 communities. And, I'm here this
6 evening to testify in opposition to this project.

7 I was happy to hear earlier the
8 gentleman, Mr. Palmer, mention the "361 Commission".
9 I'm the prime sponsor of the bill, and chaired that
10 Commission. So, it was nice to know somebody actually
11 read the report. So, thank you, Mr. Palmer, wherever
12 you are.

13 I did want to talk about that, but I'll
14 be brief, since he took most of my lines. In 2012, a
15 commission to study the feasibility of establishing an
16 energy infrastructure corridor within existing
17 transportation rights-of-way was created. On that
18 Commission were members of the House and the Senate,
19 the Office of Energy & Planning, the Department of
20 Administrative Services, the Department of
21 Transportation, the Department of Environmental
22 Services, and the Department of Resources and Economic
23 Development, along with the Chair of the Public
24 Utilities Commission and the Department of Revenue

1 Administration.

2 And, I tell you that, because I think
3 it's important to know how that Commission was made up.
4 And, for any of you that are interested, I'd be happy
5 to give you a copy of that report.

6 And, I reread the report myself. And, I
7 would like to just read a few things, and then I'll be
8 done.

9 As an elected official, my priority, my
10 responsibility is to my constituents. I have heard
11 loud and clear their concerns about what could
12 potentially happen to New Hampshire's beautiful vistas
13 and landscapes with uncontrolled predatory development.
14 It is exactly why the 361 Commission was created, to
15 look at the feasibility of creating underground energy
16 corridors.

17 Now, I'll go to the findings very
18 quickly. And, basically, it says, and I'm just taking
19 excerpts, not reading the whole thing: "Some current
20 transmission proposals would use New Hampshire
21 essentially as a through-path to link generation
22 capacity located outside New Hampshire, with demand
23 load centers also located outside New Hampshire." So,
24 essentially, an extension cord through New Hampshire.

1 And, you heard that the DOT did identify
2 the corridors that could be used. And, then, I'll read
3 you this one last thing: "As specified in RSA 162-H,
4 the SEC, before issuing its approval for a proposed
5 energy facility, must consider available alternatives
6 and fully review the environmental impact of the site
7 or route, and must also find that the site and facility
8 will not unduly interfere with the orderly development
9 of the region, with due consideration having been given
10 to the views of municipal and regional planning
11 commissions and municipal governing bodies, and that
12 the site and facility will not have an unreasonable
13 adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and
14 water quality, the natural environment, and public
15 health and safety."

16 And, supporting this, this finding, were
17 members of the Department of Revenue Administration,
18 the Department of Environmental Services, the
19 Department of Transportation, the PUC, DRED, and OEP.

20 So, I think the results of the 361
21 Commission is clear. It is possible to put this
22 site -- this project underground, and this
23 Commission -- or, the Site Evaluation Committee should
24 seriously look at that as the alternative, as the way

1 to put this project through, if you're going to do it.

2 So, thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Frederick Von
4 Karls, followed by Susan Moore, and Richard Hunnewell.

5 And, before you start, Mr. Von Karls, I
6 have some good news and some bad news. The good news
7 is that somebody asked to have their card pulled. The
8 bad news is that we are roughly one-third into the pile
9 of cards. Okay? So, we're going to take three more
10 speakers, and then we're going to take a break, so
11 Mr. Patnaude's hands don't explode.

12 Mr. Von Karls, you may proceed.

13 MR. VON KARLS: My name is Doctor
14 Frederick, F-r-e-d-e-r-i-c-k, Von Karls, spelled V, as
15 in "Victor" -o-n, K-a-r-l-s.

16 And, I'm going to start by reading a
17 letter I sent and addressed to Mr. Peter Roth, who is I
18 believe, I was told at a Plymouth meeting earlier by
19 Mr. Roth that he is a representative, an attorney who
20 represents the interests of the people of the State of
21 New Hampshire, who also has the ability to hire
22 consultants around issues that pertain directly to
23 Northern Pass and this project. So, this is the letter
24 I wrote to Mr. Roth, and -- Roth, I'm sorry, I keep

1 saying that improperly, Mr. Roth.

2 "Dear Mr. Roth: After meeting you at
3 the Loon Mountain Northern Pass meeting, I had an idea
4 that may prove crucial to a final and accurate
5 rendition of the outcome data concerning the estimated
6 versus the ultimate true tax benefit value to
7 communities in New Hampshire regarding the immediate,
8 ongoing and long-term effects of the Northern Pass
9 Project.

10 I propose that you consider hiring an
11 independent consultant -- notice that word, very
12 important here -- independent consultant who would
13 gather the following data. Number (1) Validate the
14 current Eversource estimates regarding the proposed
15 total tax dollar benefit of their proposal. Number (2)
16 Research the dollar impact of view and construction
17 degradation to affected properties adjacent to the
18 proposed construction per owner and town. Number (3)
19 Assess tax revenue losses in each town along the route
20 due to assessments that may need to be lowered on
21 properties, as well as the probable losses of income
22 due to tourist avoidance of visiting impacted areas or
23 deciding not to visit affected or adjacent areas.

24 I believe the residents of the State of

1 New Hampshire deserve a fair and accurate cost/benefit
2 analysis that compares the Eversource estimates of tax
3 revenue benefits against all possible tax and tourist
4 revenue losses that could be incurred because of real
5 estate devaluation and lessened tourist trade visits
6 because of unlike -- [unsightly and] degradation to
7 scenic areas and towns both during construction and as
8 a result of this project."

9 I'd like to add further that I believe
10 this state is a national treasure. I firmly believe
11 that, and I'd like everyone who's a resident of this
12 state hopefully to feel the same way. And, that all of
13 us, everybody here, Mr. Chairman, the SEC members, the
14 Eversource people who are with us here today, that we
15 all could work toward making sure that this state stays
16 a national treasure. Because I think it's an
17 incredible resource, and we all need to be proud of it
18 and maintain it.

19 *[Audience interruption.]*

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Susan Moore, to be
21 followed by Richard Hunnewell.

22 MS. MOORE: My name is Susan Moore,
23 M-o-o-r-e. I am speaking as Chair of the Northern
24 Grafton County Democrats, and I am a Franconia

1 resident.

2 We are on record in opposition to the
3 original proposal for Northern Pass. We are pleased
4 that Eversource has recognized how important it is to
5 bury some of their lines, and that they have put forth
6 revised plans. This is a great beginning, but it still
7 leaves most of the lines above ground.

8 Coos County and a good portion of
9 Grafton County will still have aboveground lines. This
10 is not a good situation for our neighbors.

11 Now that Eversource has stated that
12 lines can be buried along roadways, through the White
13 Mountain National Forest, we request that lines be
14 buried throughout the entire route. We also request
15 that this burial of lines be done in such a way that it
16 will cause the least disruption to the communities the
17 lines pass through. Eversource uses the -- use of the
18 I-93 corridor for the Northern Pass Project would
19 mitigate much of our concern.

20 Thank you.

21 *[Audience interruption.]*

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hunnewell, to
23 be followed our break.

24 MS. HUNNEWELL: My husband has taken

1 ill, and I would like to read his speech for him. Is
2 that all right?

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Absolutely.

4 MS. HUNNEWELL: Thank you. This evening,
5 I would like to leave you with two points. One is an
6 ingredient missing in the transcription of the hearings
7 the SEC has not attended, and, second, about legacy.
8 My husband, I should tell you, is an art historian.

9 Firstly, to guard the natural beauty
10 with which New Hampshire has been so generously endowed
11 is the principal reason most of us are wearing orange,
12 and have come out time and time again to these hearings
13 during the last five years. Legions of New Hampshire
14 citizens have spoken passionately and eloquently in
15 opposition to Northern Pass. They have enumerated the
16 multiple negative impacts, as well as marshaled
17 prodigious amounts of painstaking research that has
18 pointed out facts and supplied compelling documentation
19 which refute the contentions and promises in Northern
20 Pass's glossy propaganda.

21 What I would like to emphasize this
22 evening, however, is that a crucial ingredient of these
23 statements have not been captured in the reams of
24 transcription. For the first time, you, as members of

1 the SEC, have the opportunity to see us give our
2 statements. Yes, to experience us as people, not as
3 pieces of paper transcripts.

4 My hope is that you will take away from
5 this evening not only our statements to the opposition
6 to surface transmission lines, but also the following:
7 The intensity in our faces, the sincerity in our eyes,
8 the passion in our voices, and the commitment and
9 resolution in our -- in our demeanor to continue our
10 protest of Northern Pass and surface transmission
11 lines.

12 Secondly, I am wearing my orange in an
13 attempt to contribute in a small way to those
14 courageous souls in the past and present who have
15 worked to doggedly to honor, protect, and preserve our
16 landscape and its resources. We must continually
17 remind ourselves that New Hampshire people and other
18 state visitors have extolled and celebrated New
19 Hampshire's natural beauty for over 200 years.

20 In the 19 -- in the 1820s and '30s, the
21 English born artist and poet, Thomas Cole, traveled to
22 the White Mountains and recorded his responses to the
23 majestic grandeur of New Hampshire in paintings and
24 poetry. In 1911, Congressman John Weeks sponsored the

1 Weeks Act, which created the White Mountain National
2 Forest. These persons of vision understood the crucial
3 importance of the preservation of our natural
4 environment and the future.

5 As members of the SEC, you have a
6 momentous decision to make. A decision which not only
7 will impact New Hampshire now, but will also resound
8 into the future. If the entire length of Northern Pass
9 is not buried, then the surface lines will become a
10 permanent disfiguration assault on our landscapes.

11 My hope and prayer is that you will take
12 the high road and make the decision which will continue
13 the history of honoring, protecting, and preserving the
14 New Hampshire landscape, and thus safeguarding our
15 birthright and assure our legacy for future
16 generations, your birthright and legacy as well.

17 Thank you very much.

18 *[Audience interruption.]*

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ma'am, could you
20 identify yourself for the record please.

21 MS. HUNNEWELL: I'm Anne Hunnewell.

22 MR. PATNAUDE: Anne Hunnewell.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you. Please,
24 we hope your husband is feeling better.

1 MS. HUNNEWELL: That goes for me, too.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We will be taking
3 about a ten-minute break. When we come back, the first
4 speakers will be Neil Irvine, to read a statement on
5 behalf of John Hughes, Eli Badger, and Linda McDermott.

6 *(Recess taken at 9:01 p.m. and the*
7 *public hearing resumed at 9:12 p.m.)*

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Irvine, are you
9 ready to read Mr. Hughes's statement into the record?

10 *[Short pause.]*

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is Mr. Irvine still
12 here?

13 *[No verbal response]*

14 MR. SAKURA: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I
15 didn't hear your call. My name David Sakura,
16 S-a-k-u-r-a.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Sakura, are you
18 speaking for Mr. Hughes?

19 MR. SAKURA: No. I thought you called
20 me?

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No. I haven't
22 called you. I'm sorry, no. I see your name, you're in
23 here somewhere, but you're not up yet.

24 MR. SAKURA: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The person I'm
2 looking for is Neil Irvine, to speak on behalf of John
3 Hughes?

4 *[No verbal response]*

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Well,
6 we'll put that aside. Eli Badger, to be followed by
7 Linda McDermott, and Scott Grey.

8 MR. BADGER: Good evening, ladies and
9 gentlemen. I am Eli Badger, E-l-i, B-a-d-g-e-r. I'm
10 with the Ashland Water and Sewer Commission. And, 11,
11 approximately 11 of the towers are going to go, if this
12 happens, are going to go through our well field and our
13 lagoon area. So, we are a little bit more concerned if
14 this happens.

15 Part of what I have to say is, when I
16 was reading all -- as much of the documentation as I
17 could over the last several days, is that Ashland Water
18 and Sewer was lumped into -- lumped along with the
19 Planning Board and the Town of Ashland's Board of
20 Selectmen. And, we feel that we have different issues
21 than either the Planning Board does or the Selectboard
22 does. The Commission is responsible for the health and
23 safety of our drinking water and our septic systems.

24 Three of the wells -- excuse me, three

1 of the towers are going to be within 80 feet of our
2 septage receiving area, our lagoons. Our lagoons are
3 clay-lined, and we have a large concern that -- what
4 will happen if they are disturbed. We are within
5 250 feet of the Pemigewasset River.

6 Our concerns have not been addressed.
7 And, we hope the SEC will ask about them, as explained
8 in our letter. That's all I have.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Linda McDermott, to
10 be followed by Scott Grey, and Anne Hunnewell, again,
11 although I'm not sure she wants to speak separately.

12 But, anyway, Ms. McDermott.

13 MS. McDERMOTT: Thank you.

14 M-c-D-e-r-m-o-t-t. I'm from Franconia. My husband and
15 I fell in love with Franconia when we honeymooned there
16 23 years ago at the historic Franconia Inn. We loved
17 the laid-back culture and peacefulness of the town and
18 the serene scenic views of the surrounding mountains.
19 Our retirement dream came true recently when we
20 purchased a home in Franconia to enjoy nature with our
21 family, today and into our future. We felt safe with
22 our purchase, because Franconia wasn't on the proposed
23 route on the website, "What's happening in your town."
24 But the route changed and underground lines are now

1 being proposed for the town.

2 While that's preferable to ugly
3 stress-inducing towers, I feel it would be an
4 unnecessary disruption to this small town, with
5 historic homes close to the road, with fragile
6 foundations, and roadside wells and ponds. Small
7 businesses on Main Street depend on tourists that will
8 have to close during construction, a financial
9 hardship.

10 Environmentally, an extensive network of
11 wetlands and streams meander along the scenic treeline
12 winding and rolling Route 116, where bear, moose, deer,
13 beavers, and other wildlife nest and feed.

14 There are less populated, less
15 environmentally sensitive, and straighter interstate
16 routes available. I imagine a straighter route, A to
17 B, would be less expensive.

18 I don't like the idea of Northern Pass
19 at all. But, if it has to be, the entire Northern Pass
20 should be buried. There cannot be human equality for
21 the people of New Hampshire when there is a lack of
22 environmental equality.

23 With all the millions Hydro-Quebec has
24 spent, buying a property, donating to causes, investing

1 millions in the Balsams, an ambitious and risky
2 development, which is probably better suited to private
3 investment, could those millions have been earmarked to
4 bury the Northern Pass in the first place?

5 I'm getting a little shaky. And, yay,
6 tourism. People are exhilarated by the scene: Hikers,
7 deer, campers, and fishing people and more. We don't
8 want transmission lines zapping out our endorphins.
9 New Hampshire beauty can't be compared to other states.
10 Bury it, because New Hampshire is revered for its
11 special natural resources, and is one of a few
12 remaining places in this area to seek refuge from
13 stressful city life. Those unobstructed views all the
14 way to Canada is worth it. New Hampshire is defined by
15 its land.

16 A corporation is not a person, I get
17 that. But people run Hydro-Quebec and Eversource, and
18 their lives will be enriched from profits for many
19 years to come. But the lives of the people directly
20 impacted by the Northern Pass will not be enriched.
21 Below the Notch, many will lose their homes,
22 businesses, yards, and views. Above the Notch, the
23 same, except there's a huge bond that the people in the
24 North Country have with the land. Their lives are

1 enriched by the land. Those massive, ugly towers with
2 humming lines will scar the landscape forever, and rip
3 the heart out of New Hampshire, but more so, rip the
4 heart and soul from these people. It will be like
5 taking a child away. They have nurtured, cultivated,
6 they have loved their land for generations. They have
7 fished, hunted, farmed, and eating -- and they eat off
8 the land. They have used the land to educate their
9 children. They want this land for future generations.

10 I'm also almost done. Hydro-Quebec and
11 Eversource have an environmental and moral
12 responsibility to bury all the lines. If that's not
13 good enough, with technology advances today, and the
14 rapidly changing sources of energy, it's incumbent upon
15 Hydro-Quebec and Eversource to bury all the lines.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Scott Grey, to be
18 followed by Anne Hunnewell, if she's still here, and
19 then David Sakura.

20 *[Short pause.]*

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Scott Grey here?

22 *[No verbal response]*

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Sakura, to be
24 followed by Susan Arnold, and Mike Stirling. Welcome.

1 MR. SAKURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 My wife has my dinner ready for me. So, don't worry.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm not.

4 MR. SAKURA: During the public
5 information meeting held by Eversource -- first of all,
6 let me spell my name again for the recorder. It's
7 spelled S-a-k-u-r-a, David, first name.

8 During the public information meeting
9 held by Eversource last summer in Lincoln, I believe it
10 was Mr. Quinlan who estimated that the average
11 homeowner would expect to see an approximate 5 percent
12 reduction in his or her electrical bill due to the
13 added capacity and the lower cost of energy -- to the
14 lower cost of energy. As a homeowner, the 5 percent
15 reduction translates into just \$40 per year, which is
16 about the cost of four large pepperoni pizzas.

17 This amount of money is an insult, when
18 compared to the overall economic and ecological damage
19 Northern Pass will have on our beautiful state. And,
20 I, for one, will not be bribed by Eversource or NPT
21 with a few gold coins. So, I strongly urge the SEC to
22 either reject the Application or to approve the full
23 burial option.

24 I'd also like to make a personal appeal

1 to the members of the SEC. In a statement made by
2 Chief Seattle, as he surrendered his tribe to the
3 Federal officials in the State of Washington in the
4 late 1880s, he said "We do not inherit the earth from
5 our ancestors; but we only borrow it from our
6 children."

7 And, let me emphasize that statement
8 again. "We do not inherit the earth from our
9 ancestors; we only borrow it from our children." We
10 all agree New Hampshire is a beautiful state, with its
11 forests, streams, and mountains. And, this is the
12 reason why we choose to live here.

13 As members of the SEC, you have the
14 power, granted by the people of New Hampshire, to
15 approve or reject the NPT Application. So, if you
16 grant approval, what will you tell your children and
17 their children's children, why you would allow NPT to
18 deface their land, the children's land?

19 I strongly urge the SEC members to
20 consider your own legacy to your children, your
21 grandchildren, and your great grandchildren, when it
22 comes to the NPT Application.

23 Thank you very much.

24 *[Audience interruption.]*

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Susan Arnold, to be
2 followed by Mike Stirling, and Mike Novello.

3 MS. ARNOLD: Mr. Chairman, members of
4 the Committee, I think my testimony is a little over
5 three minutes, but I will be fast.

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, we have it in
7 writing. So, you could probably forego reading it,
8 understanding that it will be part of the record.

9 MS. ARNOLD: Correct. I'm going to say
10 it, though.

11 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

12 MS. ARNOLD: I'm Susan Arnold, Vice
13 President for Conservation at the Appalachian Mountain
14 Club. AMC is the oldest conservation and recreation
15 organization in the country, with more than 100,000
16 members and supporters, from Maine to Washington, D.C.,
17 including more than 12,000 here in New Hampshire. For
18 140 years, AMC has helped to protect this region's open
19 spaces, including from poorly sited energy projects,
20 such as Northern Pass, which wants to use high-impact,
21 old technologies to maximize profits at the expense of
22 New Hampshire's iconic landscape. And, just because
23 they are used elsewhere, as was pointed out by
24 Mr. Quinlan, it doesn't make it right here. It is this

1 unnecessary impact that has brought out so many people
2 in opposition to this project as proposed.

3 I have three points I would like to
4 make. AMC appreciates the SEC's intention to hold
5 additional public meetings and site visits. Our
6 observations from these sites, that is including
7 today's, is that the stop locations and vantage points
8 are those principally selected by the Applicants'
9 visual consultant for his photosimulations, and they
10 often reflect a bias towards minimizing visual impacts,
11 whereas other more egregious locations are downplayed
12 or ignored.

13 For example, from last week's visit in
14 Stark, the Route 110 photo location simulation by
15 Mr. Dewan is shown in the top picture, this is on the
16 back of the handout. Yet, where the line would cross
17 Route 110, a scenic byway, there is a much more serious
18 visual impact, but this view, which is the lower
19 picture, was not photo-simulated by the Applicants'
20 consultant. We urge the SEC to consider site visits to
21 locations suggested by parties other than the Joint
22 Applicants, to provide sufficient advance notice, to
23 conduct them during seasons when the most people would
24 see and experience the impacts.

1 The SEC rules require the use of best
2 practical measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate
3 project impacts. This is my second point. With the
4 proposed 60 miles of burial, Northern Pass has about
5 one-third of the "avoid and minimize" right. Bury the
6 rest and this commitment is met, similar to how other
7 lines are now proceeding in the region and elsewhere.

8 But the mitigation portion, the
9 so-called "ForwardNH Plan", is a façade. Started with
10 hearings last fall, and ramping up even now, the
11 Applicant has promoted its ForwardNH Plan as the
12 panacea to provide direct benefits to New Hampshire.
13 In reality, it's largely a self-serving business slush
14 fund. "No strings" attached, Les Otten is the best and
15 latest example. Unsaid is that Mr. Otten needs
16 BayRoot's lands for his Balsams project, BayRoot wants
17 the land on -- the line on their lands for multiple
18 business reasons, Mr. Otten needs investment money, and
19 Northern Pass is desperate for public support. The
20 strings are very much attached.

21 Mitigation plans and funds should be
22 transparent, and directly address the project's actual
23 impacts. The ForwardNH Plan is designed by the
24 Applicants for the promotion of the project through the

1 calculated dispersal of funding to bolster its own
2 business interests. Until such time the public has
3 sufficient information to accurately scrutinize the
4 claims for this plan, the ForwardNH Plan should not be
5 considered in the Application review process.

6 We strongly object to all the waiver
7 requests submitted by the Joint Applicants, but
8 especially the request on decommissioning. To avoid
9 providing a required decommissioning plan in its
10 Application, the Joint Applicants are arguing that this
11 transmission line may never be removed, underscoring
12 the permanence of the scar this project will inflict on
13 New Hampshire's landscape if approved as proposed.

14 One of the Joint Applicants has a recent
15 history, and this is PSNH, of not removing
16 decommissioned transmission poles. When this line was
17 updated through Woodstock, Lincoln, and Easton, 215
18 chemically treated poles -- I will close in three more
19 sentences -- were dumped in the right-of-way near the
20 Reel Brook Trail, a feeder trail to the Appalachian
21 National Scenic Trail in the White Mountain National
22 Forest. Despite numerous complaints from the Town of
23 Easton, these poles were not removed until this
24 Application was put forward. This callous disregard

1 for the impact of dumping, in the White Mountain
2 National Forest and in the vicinity of the AT,
3 underscores why this request for a waiver from the
4 decommissioning requirements must be denied. The
5 revised SEC rules were designed to make decommissioning
6 promises a reality, and not leave New Hampshire with
7 the Hobson's choice of a permanently scarred landscape
8 or a taxpayer-funded bailout.

9 Thank you for your time.

10 *[Audience interruption.]*

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mike Stirling, to
12 be followed by Mike Novello, and Lew Mello.

13 MR. STIRLING: My name is Mike Stirling,
14 and it's spelled S-t-i-r-l-i-n-g. I represent Chapman
15 Development. I am the General manager for a project we
16 have in Groveton, New Hampshire, that is the site of
17 the former Wausau Paper Mill and Groveton Paper Mill.

18 Groveton, right now, is a dying
19 community. Over eight years ago, we lost a mill that
20 employed 750, to, at one time, 1,200 people, in a town
21 of 2,200 people. These jobs have not returned. This
22 is an aging community. Every year, young families move
23 out of this community, with their kids, seeking
24 employment, because they can't find it there locally.

1 This trend has depleted the tax base, raised taxes,
2 significantly per capita, and decreased property values
3 as supply exceeds demand.

4 The community needs this assistance that
5 the project can provide. And, I testify to you tonight
6 that this project can reunite families in this area.
7 The project can bring revenue and work to businesses,
8 revitalization to the area, and hope to these families
9 and communities. And, this support is vital.

10 The economic support from the ForwardNH
11 Fund is critical for the economic development in
12 Groveton. We, right now, have three businesses that
13 are ready to move onto the Groveton site, bring new
14 jobs to the area and new business activity to the area.
15 What we are looking for are the outside funding sources
16 to make those businesses viable in their new situation.
17 The quicker this support can be extended, the faster
18 the recovery can begin.

19 We look forward to the support that this
20 project can provide to Groveton and to the surrounding
21 areas. We are grateful for this opportunity. This
22 area depends on the support and the opportunity that
23 this project provides. Thank you for your time.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mike Novello, to be

1 followed by Lew Mello, and Margaret Mumford.

2 MR. NOVELLO: Hello. I'm Mike Novello.
3 That's N-o-v-e-l-l-o. I'm from Lyme. I work for
4 Wagner Forest Management Company. We support the
5 project. For my job, I focus on renewable energy
6 solutions. I could not be prouder of the job that I
7 do, because I feel very strongly that climate change is
8 the biggest single problem that faces us today, and our
9 response to this man-made disaster will define the
10 legacy we leave to the next generations.

11 I read last week in Popular Science
12 that, according to NOAA's latest "State of the Climate
13 Report", this past winter was the warmest on record in
14 the U.S., two and a half degrees Celsius above the 20th
15 century average, or about what the scientists are
16 telling us to expect as an approximate average case
17 scenario for expected global warming situations. So,
18 this past winter is what we can expect going forward.
19 And, if New Hampshire doesn't get -- if we don't get
20 serious about this challenge, I worry that we're going
21 to have a lot more winters where the use of snowsuits
22 is to prevent people from getting muddy, instead of the
23 kids staying warm in the snow.

24 I'm well-versed in the local energy

1 markets. And, one of the really clear trends over the
2 last several years is that the only new projects coming
3 on line are wind and natural gas. Natural gas is
4 definitely better than the coal -- the coal plants that
5 are being retired. But it still involves burning a
6 fossil fuel and releasing pollutants into the
7 atmosphere. Hydro projects like Northern Pass, will
8 not be burning anything, so they won't be releasing any
9 pollutants, carbon dioxide or otherwise. It remains
10 still one of the most cost-effective baseload power
11 sources that we have right now that are clean.

12 I'm looking forward -- I'm also looking
13 forward to the upgrades to the Coos Loop that we've
14 heard about a little bit today. As you know, this
15 section of the grid is host to a lot of New Hampshire's
16 renewable resources, both existing and planned, like
17 wind, water, and biomass. However, our ability to
18 sustainably use our own generation potential and our
19 resources to keep money and energy within the state is
20 severely limited by the aging infrastructure up there.
21 Upgrading these lines will unleash the power of New
22 Hampshire's ingenuity and the ability of our
23 sustainable developers that -- and deal with the
24 problems that we've been talking about for about for

1 the last decade. With Northern Pass, we will finally
2 have the means of turning a lot of this talk into
3 action.

4 I have been part of countless SEC
5 hearings, drafts, and proceedings. I recognize just
6 about everyone up here. And, I know that yours is a
7 thankless task. And, I just want to say thank you for
8 your dedication to a fair process.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Lew Mello, to be
11 followed by Margaret Mumford, and Heather Townsend.

12 Is Mr. Mello here?

13 *[No verbal response]*

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No. Margaret
15 Mumford.

16 MS. MUMFORD: My name is Margaret
17 Mumford, M-a-r-g-a-r-e-t, M-u-m-f-o-r-d. I've been a
18 resident of Plymouth for 42 years, and I'm a sixth
19 generation descendent of early European settlers in
20 both Plymouth and Bridgewater. I remain a landowner in
21 both Plymouth and Bridgewater. I wish to voice concern
22 over the inequity of impacts of the underground and
23 overhead sections of this most recently proposed route.
24 Overhead versus underground determinations seem to have

1 been made based on weakest link of opposition.

2 Concerning the overhead route:

3 Environmental and aesthetic considerations of our river
4 and forest resources are not being considered
5 adequately, especially those resources in close
6 proximity, but not owned by abutters within 100 feet of
7 the current easement.

8 The Pemigewasset, in Ashland,
9 Bridgewater, New Hampton, and Bristol is a gem, does
10 not enjoy the same protection as waters to the north.
11 The river is enjoyed most by being on it, and the views
12 from it are wonderful. The steep banks at some of the
13 planned crossings appear, from the published maps, to
14 need up to 60 feet additional width of tree-clearing.
15 The risk of erosion during construction and maintenance
16 will be significant. Enjoyment of the relatively
17 unspoiled beauty will be significantly lessened by more
18 towers, more lines, and more clearing, and water
19 quality will decrease.

20 Peaked Hill Road, in Bridgewater, is
21 another gem, even this time of year. And, SEC members
22 saw a viewscape from Peaked Hill, a simulated
23 viewscape, but did not have the opportunity to travel
24 along Peaked Hill Road itself, which has significant

1 easements running adjacent to the road and within view
2 of many who live there.

3 Many other scenic vistas and spots of
4 beauty are unable to be seen from any bus tour route on
5 major throughways, but will be affected by Northern
6 Pass. Such is the New Hampshire landscape.

7 There is also a lack of an attempted
8 integration of existing overhead structures, as seen in
9 Ashland and Franklin today.

10 The underground/overhead issue is also
11 pitting town against town, with ForwardNH advance funds
12 potentially driving deep wedges, in potential town
13 buyouts to garner support.

14 Please note that the last public
15 decision of Plymouth Selectmen regarding Northern Pass
16 was a vote against the project. The community members
17 have not been privy to the conversations between
18 individuals and Northern Pass representatives. Please
19 do not assume the people of Plymouth support this
20 project.

21 With one foot in underground Plymouth
22 and one foot in overhead Bridgewater, my roots and my
23 heart in New Hampshire, I oppose the project. If it is
24 to happen, then let it specifically be buried down 93.

1 I appreciate the enormous task you, the
2 SEC, are facing. And, I do appreciate the chance to
3 speak. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Heather Townsend,
5 to be followed by Jon Wilkinson, and Alan McLain.

6 MS. TOWNSEND: Hi. I'm Heather
7 Townsend, from Bridgewater. I grew up playing along
8 the banks of the Pemi River, swimming and paddling in
9 boats down its near-wild tree-lined corridor. I love
10 the Pemi, in part, because of the wonderful resource
11 it's been to me, but also because it's been a -- it is
12 a resource available to anyone. It is a true public
13 good.

14 Northern Pass high-voltage lines will
15 cross the Pemi four times within a short span. It will
16 also approach the river closely, within yards, in two
17 more places. All of these places will have new towers
18 for high-voltage, and most also relocated towers up to
19 125 feet. Currently lines there are below the
20 treeline, new towers well above, often twice the height
21 of what they replace. There must be much additional
22 clearing. The Pemi will simply no longer be a
23 near-wild tree-lined corridor. That will be a
24 significant loss of a public good.

1 Today, my cousin and I went on the SEC
2 site tour of Plymouth to Franklin, at which we were
3 thankful to gain many specifics. The itinerary had
4 stops mostly at industrial substation, transition
5 station, or converter station locales. But, at our
6 request, the buses made another stop, a quiet riverbank
7 of the Pemi. This place will change dramatically, with
8 150 feet clearings and four towers, 65 foot, 75, 110,
9 and 125 feet. We were grateful the tour was willing to
10 stop there. We ask that the Siting Committee please
11 consider this undeveloped space of natural beauty as a
12 single example of many, repeated again and again along
13 the route. You cannot see all of them, but please
14 remember that they are there, and that their collective
15 loss is a huge one.

16 Full burial of the line would yield less
17 initial profit for Eversource and Hydro-Quebec, which
18 would be recovered in subsequent years of the project.
19 But full burial would preserve an invaluable public
20 good for New Hampshire. Please preserve that public
21 resource.

22 Thank you.

23 *[Audience interruption.]*

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jon Wilkinson, to

1 be followed by Alan McLain, and Jim Mason.

2 MR. WILKINSON: My name is Jon
3 Wilkinson. And, my first name is actually spelled
4 J-o-n. My last name is spelled W-i-l-k-i-n-s-o-n. I'm
5 a resident of Lancaster. And, I've lived and worked in
6 New Hampshire all my life. I'm here tonight to remind
7 everyone that the proposed Northern Pass Project is a
8 privately-funded merchant project. It is not a
9 publicly-funded reliability project. And, so, the
10 simple fact is that it is not needed, nor is it
11 necessary, especially right now as it is currently
12 proposed.

13 During the beginning of the possible
14 siting of this project, and over the past five years,
15 we have continually been told by the Applicant that the
16 line couldn't be buried. While at the same time
17 similar electrical transmission projects in our
18 neighboring states have advanced much more quickly,
19 virtually unopposed, due to being entirely buried.
20 Since then, the Applicant claims it has listened to the
21 requests for burial, and it has now struck a balance
22 that addresses those concerns in critical areas, like
23 the White Mountain National Forest.

24 I, and thousands of others, say the

1 Applicant has listened to none of our concerns
2 regarding burial. Instead, it has only listened and
3 acted regarding to its own desire to hopefully create a
4 continuous route. Just look, for example, at the
5 proposed routes in the Towns of Pittsburg, Clarksville,
6 and Stewartstown, where it is offering to bury
7 eight miles along Route 3, Route 145, Old Country Road,
8 North Hill Road, Bear Rock Road. That is a beautiful
9 area, like most of New Hampshire is. But burial isn't
10 being offered there due to reducing the visual impacts.
11 The Northern Pass had been stopped above ground in that
12 area by unwilling landowners. So, it's only hope of
13 getting through is to go underground where some
14 utilities generally have access.

15 The recently offered burial in and
16 around the White Mountain National Forest, along Routes
17 302, 116, 112, and Route 3 is a similar situation to
18 the one up in northern New Hampshire. Except in this
19 area, a special permit is needed through the National
20 Forest, which could put the project at risk. So,
21 instead, the Applicant eventually elected to go
22 underground, along the roads where some utilities
23 generally have access.

24 The Department of Energy's Environmental

1 Impact Statement on Northern Pass clearly states that
2 the full burial alternatives to the project along New
3 Hampshire highway and roadway right-of-ways would
4 create the largest number of jobs and create the
5 greatest tax revenues for towns. It also states that
6 the full burial alternatives to the project would have
7 the least impacts on the environment, the visual
8 resources, historical architectural resources, property
9 value, tourism, and recreation.

10 The Applicant would prefer us not to
11 focus on these facts and has attempted to cloud our
12 attention over and over with testimony from its hired
13 experts, lawyers, paid lobbyists, and promises of money
14 from its New Hampshire Forward Fund.

15 But, if the Applicant continues to seek
16 this approval for this project, it must do so by
17 abandoning its current approach, methods, and
18 antiquated technology. Instead, the Applicant must
19 move forward for New Hampshire by truly listening to
20 the overwhelming requests for additional burial, and
21 then use the latest advancements in the electrical
22 transmission industry, including HVDC Light.

23 I'm not an expert. I'm just one of the
24 thousands of New Hampshire people that even after more

1 than five years of lobbying by this Applicant, can see
2 through the fog and still knows that the Northern Pass
3 Project is not needed and should not be permitted as
4 processed. Thank you for letting me speak for New
5 Hampshire.

6 *[Audience interruption.]*

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Alan McLain, to be
8 followed by Jim Mason, and Harley Mason.

9 MR. McLAIN: My name is Alan McLain --
10 my name is Alan McLain, spelled A-l-a-n, M-c-L-a-i-n.
11 First, I'd like to thank the Forward Fund for choosing
12 the Balsams. Hoping to get the hotel going and the ski
13 area, and the golf course. It's a big tremendous help
14 to Colebrook, New Hampshire, and they need it. I would
15 encourage the Forward Fund to pick, Mr. Chairman,
16 Berlin, New Hampshire as their second choice of a
17 community that certainly needs your help.

18 Now, I'll read my statement. And, thank
19 you for that. I'm a property owner in Berlin, New
20 Hampshire, and a business owner. On the property side,
21 I'd like to see my electric rates drop, and, on the tax
22 side, get some relief. Northern Pass will have a
23 positive impact on both of these problems. Lower
24 energy costs are also important, if we have any hope of

1 rebuilding the -- and it will help in the hope of
2 rebuilding the North Country's economy.

3 On the business side, we have worked on
4 other energy projects here in Coos County. These
5 projects clearly injected money into our local economy,
6 they helped support our business, and provided critical
7 jobs for the people here.

8 Our involvement in these energy
9 projects allowed us to grow in size and position, and
10 helped us to build other projects, like switch
11 stations, control houses, and other service -- services
12 to utility companies. As a result, my employees are
13 buying homes, buying trucks, other products and
14 services that support our local economy. It is a good
15 involvement [employment?]. They're getting better pay,
16 and these projects will do the same for us.

17 I welcome this project and encourage the
18 Committee to fully support it. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jim Mason, to be
20 followed by Harley Mason, and Allen Bouthillier.

21 MR. J. MASON: Hi. My name is James
22 Mason. And, I'm from Franklin, New Hampshire. And,
23 I'm here to just share a small story with you. First
24 off, that Northern Pass transmission lines will go

1 within a quarter mile of my home. I'm in favor of the
2 transmission line, I'm in favor of Northern Pass.

3 But it does bring a lot of jobs, and
4 there's a lot of residual money. I've heard a lot of
5 opponents to it say that, you know, "once they're gone,
6 there's no money that's coming into the town", and
7 things like that, and "small businesses won't benefit
8 again".

9 But I have a small business in
10 Salisbury, New Hampshire that I started in 2003. And,
11 one of the power utility companies came through while I
12 started my business, and they needed a place to stage
13 and put static lines up on the transmission lines.
14 And, at that time, they came in and they were looking
15 for a place on a state highway, and I had that place.
16 They came in, they assisted me in bringing in some
17 gravel and building my yards. And, then, I opened my
18 retail store and they bought product there, and they
19 were a big boost when I first opened my business.

20 Last year, I happened to be involved
21 with a project in Seabrook, New Hampshire. And, I
22 watched the utility companies do the same thing down
23 there with the Yankee Fish Co-op.

24 They do leave a lot of residual money

1 after they're gone. And, there's a lot of benefit to
2 the towns and communities, and a lot of help to small
3 businesses.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Harley Mason, to be
6 followed by Allen Bouthillier, and Pat Hopp -- or, Jim
7 Page will be speaking for Pat Hopp.

8 MR. H. MASON: Let me introduce myself.
9 I'm Harley Mason. That's H-a-r-l-e-y and M-a-s-o-n.
10 I'm from the Town of Milan. And, I own and operate
11 Mason Enterprises, which is a excavating and trucking
12 company. We build complete sites -- subdivisions, we
13 build roads, we do complete site work for homes and
14 small businesses. We also process and sell gravel
15 products.

16 We support the Northern Pass as this
17 project is much needed in New Hampshire, creating
18 around 300 jobs and bringing millions of dollars into
19 New Hampshire for the workers and the small businesses,
20 giving our economy a big boost.

21 We were involved in the Portland Natural
22 Gas pipeline, which came through the Coos County in
23 2000 and 2001, as we supplied gravel, sand, and trucks.
24 This project put many people to work and brought

1 thousands of dollars into all the small towns. It was
2 a great economy boost.

3 Next came the wind towers on Dixville
4 Peaks, Kelsey Mountain, Owls Head Mountain, and Blue
5 Mountain, a total of 33 towers were installed. Our
6 construction crew doubled in size, as my men worked 12
7 to 14 hours a day. Seven days a week we trucked gravel
8 and sand and burial material on top of these mountains.
9 We produced over 54,000 yards of material which was
10 delivered to these mountains. This project had a
11 couple hundred people working again, bringing millions
12 of dollars into the area for local New Hampshire
13 businesses and boosting our economy.

14 The Northern Pass is a much larger
15 project, which will take two to three years to
16 complete, putting 300 workers to work. We are very
17 lucky to have this great project, and should be
18 overwhelmed to have the work and the large amounts of
19 monies that will be put into our state.

20 We are ready to challenge this project.
21 We the workers and contractors of New Hampshire have
22 the ability and the knowledge to start and complete
23 Northern Pass. We have the ability and knowledge to do
24 it in a professional manner -- a professional and safe

1 manner, working as a team. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Allen Bouthillier,
3 to be followed by Jim Page on behalf of Pat Hopp, and
4 then Manfred Hoertdoerfer.

5 MR. BOUTHILLIER: Let me introduce
6 myself. I'm Allen Bouthillier. I'm a resident of
7 Lancaster, New Hampshire. I was born and brought up in
8 Colebrook, New Hampshire.

9 I'm here today to tell you that I'm in
10 support of Northern Pass. Northern Pass is the type of
11 project that helps companies like mine to grow.
12 Started out in the logging business, and then we
13 diversified into the construction, excavation and site
14 work business. As I was sitting downstairs here
15 tonight waiting, got a call on my phone that another --
16 another paper mill in Maine shut the doors. Another
17 250,000 tons of wood that I sell to on a weekly basis
18 gone. That's 2,250,000 tons of wood in the New
19 Hampshire/Vermont/Maine area is gone. We no longer
20 have the ability to sell that. That's -- it's a big
21 impact. Part of the reason that Northern Pass is so
22 important, because of the upgrade of the Coos Loop, it
23 will make the Burgess Biomass Plant operate at
24 100 percent capacity, instead of 50 percent. It makes

1 me be able to keep all of my employees working all the
2 time. It gives landowners an opportunity to sell more
3 of their product. It keeps the timber industry viable.

4 As a landowner, I applaud Northern Pass
5 for taking the time and money to work with private
6 landowners in developing their new right-of-way.

7 Whether you're hiking, hunting, fishing,
8 or snowmobiling, I am sure that some people in this
9 room take for granted the ability to freely cross
10 private land for their own recreation and enjoyment.
11 And, many of us that own these large tracts of land
12 value our ability to provide this access. This isn't
13 the case in many states across the country where people
14 pay to access private land.

15 However, when these same people, our
16 state elected officials and others want to restrict our
17 ability to use this land to generate income from
18 sources like transmission lines, or require that only
19 government-owned rights-of-way be used, such as roads,
20 it threatens our ability to provide open access to our
21 land.

22 If these elected officials and other
23 folks like that restrict our ability to raise
24 capital from this type of project, we will be forced to

1 seek other sources of income, such as charging fees or
2 leases for public access.

3 I support Northern Pass because I want
4 this opportunity for my family and my employees, my
5 community, and I encourage the SEC to approve this
6 project as quickly as possible.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jim Page for Pat
8 Hopp, to be followed by Manfred Hoertdoerfer, and
9 Virginia Jeffryes.

10 MR. PAGE: Here to speak for Pat Hopp,
11 she was here earlier this evening. Her name is P-a-t-t
12 -- Patricia Hopp, H-o-p-p. She lives on Route 112, in
13 Easton.

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, what is your
15 name, sir?

16 MR. PAGE: Excuse me?

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Would you please
18 identify yourself. Please identify yourself.

19 MR. PAGE: James Page, P-a-g-e, is my
20 last name. And, I live next to Patti Hopp. Her home
21 is less than 25 feet, her living room, from the
22 underground line. She is extremely concerned about the
23 noise levels. She does work off-hours. She's very
24 concerned about blasting, sheet piling work, one of the

1 underground structures is less than 75 feet from the
2 side of her home. She has an underground oil tank
3 system. She has a rubble-cut granite foundation. With
4 750 feet of road opened at any one time, which is what
5 it says in Northern Pass's literature, how does she get
6 out? How does EMS respond to the area? With the
7 intersection -- it's very close to the intersection of
8 Route 116 and 112, how are these services going to get
9 to her? If that much road is open, she would have to
10 travel almost 40 miles out of the way to get to work.
11 She is greatly concerned about this.

12 She's also concerned about the electric
13 fields produced and the health effects so close to her
14 home. She tells me Route 112, she lives on the side of
15 the road. It's a heavy trucking route. And, she's
16 concerned about what effect will the large trucks,
17 mostly logging trucks and freight between Woodsville
18 and the 93 corridor, what effect will that have on the
19 buried lines, and also the rerouting of this kind of
20 traffic during construction?

21 Patti Hopp is not in favor of Northern
22 Pass and extremely concerned. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Manfred
24 Hoertdoerfer, to be followed Virginia Jeffryes, and

1 then Mr. Page on his on behalf.

2 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Manfred Hoertdoerfer.
3 Do you have my name?

4 MR. PATNAUDE: Yes.

5 MR. HOERTDOERFER: And, I did sign in.
6 All right.

7 Well, here we are. Tried, worn out,
8 trying to find the energy to speak, energy to listen,
9 trying to stay awake. And, I have to admire the
10 Commission hanging in, like you all do, at least the
11 ones that are left. And, I'd first say, about to get
12 into my preliminary, I'm not in the text yet, but I say
13 this from just because of where we are. I'd like to
14 thank the Commissioner and the members for hanging in
15 there with us.

16 Naturally, I have to wonder how much
17 you're into this at all, because you're all tired, and
18 listening is hard. And, you might not record
19 everything in your mind as you did earlier. It is just
20 like Eversource likes it. Perfect for them; not so for
21 us.

22 I've been at a few meetings now,
23 January 14th, in Laconia, it was a public information
24 session, one where Northern Pass presented their case

1 to the public. Opportunities for the public to ask
2 questions and make statements were provided, yet
3 Northern Pass used the first one and a half hours with
4 their presentation and with lengthy and repeated
5 answers to presented questions. By the time the public
6 was given the opportunity to make comments, it was just
7 like here, energy had been sucked out of the room, and
8 many had left. What had been advertised at great
9 lengths by the presiding Commission representative in
10 Laconia as a fair process that the Commission will
11 engage with due respect for input by the public seemed
12 rather like a staged play on a very tilted playing
13 field. But I told myself, okay, this is Northern
14 Pass's time to present their case, and the following
15 public hearings will be the time for the public to get
16 a fair chance.

17 So, I went to the hearing in Meredith on
18 March 1st. My hope that the public might get a fair
19 chance at these proceedings was misguided, I guess,
20 just like here. Even there, at the "Hearing for the
21 Public", Northern Pass gets first dip again, sucked up
22 the initial energy to present their case one more time,
23 and jumped on the opportunity to monopolize the floor
24 with lengthy answers by teams and experts to some

1 apparently planted questions by Northern Pass employees
2 on top of it. I thought this was to be -- supposed to
3 be a session for the public. Not so. Bear with me.

4 Again, by the time, we, the people, got
5 a chance to speak, just like here, many had left, and
6 we're faced -- we were faced with imposed time limits.
7 You, too.

8 If this is supposed to be an even
9 playing field, then why does the Northern Pass team sit
10 in front with the Commission and not next to the
11 public, facing the Commission as is common practice in
12 most public board and Commission hearings.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hoertdoerfer?

14 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please bring it to
16 a close.

17 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Not so here.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You can come back
19 at the end, if you have more.

20 MR. HOERTDOERFER: With all due respect,
21 I only expect to get the same fair allowance to speak
22 [inaudible] that Northern Pass has with multiple
23 questions with answers to the same questions.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hoertdoerfer,

1 you may come back at the end to say whatever you would
2 like.

3 MR. HOERTDOERFER: I don't want to do
4 that.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, I'm sorry.

6 MR. HOERTDOERFER: This is too
7 important.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm sorry. But
9 others need their opportunities to speak, and you can
10 come back at the end, if you would like.

11 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Well, you know, if
12 that's your sense of fairness, then we have a problem,
13 don't we?

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I am happy to stand
15 this process that we've followed here tonight up
16 against any process anywhere in the state. Thank you
17 very much.

18 Ms. Virginia Jeffryes, to be followed by
19 Mr. Page on his own behalf, and Henry Ahern.

20 MS. JEFFRYES: Hi. I'm Virginia
21 Jeffryes, J-e-f-f-r-y-e-s. I live in Franconia. I
22 work in Colebrook. And, I'm really tired. So, this is
23 not going to be as clear as it would have been a few
24 hours ago.

1 I won't repeat a lot of what got said,
2 but I will say that I'm against Northern Pass. And, I
3 know your body is not the one who decides on
4 Alternative 4a or going under 93, you have to simply
5 decide on what got presented to you. But, had it been
6 under 93 to begin with, I don't think we'd be here five
7 years later. And, under Route 3 or somewhere under a
8 roadway further north, I drive that route a lot, and I
9 know the difference between a 30-foot power line that's
10 carrying utility poles past people's houses, and a
11 100-foot utility line that's basically usurping
12 someone's lifelong view and happiness.

13 And, while I support jobs in Groveton
14 and Colebrook and the North Country in general, those
15 jobs can also be supported by burying the line, and not
16 stealing from the poor individual people whose rights
17 are being usurped.

18 And, you know, Northern Pass has put a
19 lot of spin on things in their own way. We get these
20 ForwardNH letters about once a month in Franconia.
21 And, one of them, maybe -- might have been, I guess, in
22 December, said "Good news. Our Application got
23 accepted as complete."

24 Now, I applied to be an intervenor,

1 because I happen to be an abutter, and I'm also on the
2 Conservation Commission in Franconia, and we're
3 intervening separately. But, so, I was talking to
4 someone else that's a neighbor, and I said, you know,
5 "Are you going to apply to intervene?" And, they said
6 "Well, no. It's a done deal. We got this letter that
7 said it was accepted." So, even the spin on their
8 letters is sort of putting out this false perception,
9 which is I'm sure what it's designed to do.

10 And, I guess the main point I wanted to
11 make tonight was just I guess I would plead with you
12 all, the SEC Committee -- Subcommittee, to just be
13 aware of spin as you read through applications, their
14 Application.

15 I'm a physician. And, when I went
16 through residency, which was in -- at Concord Hospital
17 maybe fourteen years ago, something like that, one of
18 the very first things that we learned was "Don't let
19 the drug reps in your office." You know, "Any data
20 that's generated by the pharmaceutical industry to push
21 their product is tainted." You know, "Read studies
22 that are by people that aren't funded by drug
23 companies."

24 And, I guess that's what I would say

1 when I hear experts, you know, with all due respect,
2 who are experts and various other people, wetland
3 experts and so on, stand up, is that they're being paid
4 for by the opposition. And, that just, by definition,
5 taints things. So, keep that in mind as you read
6 through this.

7 If I had a lot of money, you know, I'd
8 hire my own experts to produce data. But I don't have
9 the billions of dollars that these people are able to
10 put into it, millions of dollars, not billions. I
11 don't even have \$10,000 to go hire an environmental
12 firm to kind of do my own mitigation study.

13 So, that's, I guess, the only thing I
14 wanted to say. One more thing, before I go. First,
15 I'm not sure if anybody else from Easton is speaking
16 tonight. But I was interested in what the woman from
17 the AMC -- okay -- said about the 215 power poles with
18 creosote all over them that were at Reel Brook, I think
19 it was Reel Brook. In Easton, someone was explaining
20 at the meeting they had with Northern Pass a couple
21 weeks ago that Normandeau Associates had -- they've had
22 helicopters flying overhead *[inaudible]* and their
23 assessment of the environmental impact, despite the
24 fact that 215 is not a small number of power poles.

1 So, it's --

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please bring it to
3 a close now, Ms. Jeffryes.

4 MS. JEFFRYES: Okay. All right. So,
5 take it with a grain of salt. Thank you.

6 *[Audience interruption.]*

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jim Page, to be
8 followed by Henry Ahern, and Steve Darrow.

9 MR. PAGE: My name is James Page,
10 P-a-g-e. I'm a property owner in Easton. Northern
11 Pass will cross my driveway. I also have property in
12 Deerfield, New Hampshire. So, I'm affected in two
13 places. I spoke at a prior non-SEC hearing about jobs,
14 2,600 good-paying jobs. Where does this come from? Up
15 from 1,200, to 2,600. I'll give less than 1,200
16 good-paying jobs. How do I know that? I've been a
17 project manager and a superintendent on power line
18 projects, such as for the Los Angeles Department of
19 Water & Power, 500 kV line, 100 miles long; Salt River
20 Project, 765 line; Bonneville Power Authority, 345;
21 City of Austin, Texas; and others.

22 Most jobs are not full duration. Most
23 are very short duration. I know IBEW wants and
24 deserves jobs, as others. The numbers aren't there;

1 make me a believer.

2 Northern Pass stated that low-contact
3 ground equipment was generally not owned by the average
4 company bidding the work. Your contractor selected
5 boasts five -- an inventory of 5,000 pieces of
6 equipment, with their parent company owning and having
7 access to over 20,000 pieces of equipment. The biggest
8 and the best, how is it that equipment is not a
9 consideration, this type of equipment?

10 Northern Pass has stated that the
11 project will be built by conventional methods; no heavy
12 lifting by helicopter. On two projects in the United
13 States, 45 miles of towers were flown, 500 kV towers,
14 much bigger, much larger, and a lot rougher terrain
15 than what's here in New Hampshire, in seven working
16 days under my direction.

17 In different applications, on another
18 issue, Northern Pass has stated the amount of ledge to
19 be removed on one document says "unknown", on another
20 document it says "500,000" -- or, "5,000 cubic yards"
21 will be blasted. How about probably upwards of ten
22 times that amount. Northern Pass -- how does Northern
23 Pass intend to monitor -- monitor or mitigate the
24 effects of releasing blasting agents and residue into

1 adjacent [inaudible]. The State of New Hampshire just
2 released a state-funded study that should be read. How
3 do I know this will happen? I've been a licensed
4 blaster for 30 years. I've been blasting for lines in
5 utilities in several states across the United States.
6 Not just on power lines, roads, bridges, pipelines,
7 tunnels, jackings, borings.

8 On another note, has anybody ever
9 witnessed a bentonite release? It was mentioned by the
10 parties over here. Has anybody actual seen one?
11 That's with bentonite, when you're drilling, whether
12 you're drilling vertical shafts, horizontal shafts,
13 anything, when bentonite is released in an underground
14 strata, you probably won't see it. In my case, I live
15 along the wild Ammonoosuc River. There's probably a
16 lot of riverine cobbles and deposits along there.
17 You'll see the bentonite release probably in the river,
18 and it will be too late. You can't stop [audible]
19 suspensions of bentonite. Bentonite is simply a clay
20 product, it's a driller's mud. It's very difficult to
21 contain, and it has to be used in this type of work.

22 I also would ask the SEC to look into
23 the roadway easements, which they're asking for 24 to
24 30 feet wide, encompassing entire roads. I continually

1 read "nothing is an impact to the property owners and
2 the residents of New Hampshire." Makes us believers.

3 Thank you.

4 *[Audience interruption.]*

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Henry Ahern, to be
6 followed Steve Darrow, and Jane Difley.

7 MR. AHERN: Good evening. My name is
8 Henry Ahern. First, I'd like to thank the Committee
9 for spending this late night here in Plymouth with us.

10 I am a resident of the Town of Plymouth.
11 I have sort of a unique thing, that I will be one of
12 the few that will actually have burial and tower that I
13 will have to look at from my property. I own the deer
14 farm south of Plymouth, Bonnie Brae, on the Plymouth
15 town line, and I will have to deal with both.

16 With that said, 93, that's where it
17 should go. If they can drill under 93, or put power
18 lines underneath Route 3, all the way through the Town
19 of Plymouth and in front of my property, with the
20 cement slabs that are under that road, then they
21 certainly could deal with the small inconveniences that
22 it might take to go down 93.

23 The other thing -- advantage of 93
24 that's going on right now is we are spending a lot of

1 money in this state, millions, to expand 93. That
2 means there's digging, there's excavators there,
3 there's equipment there. All of that could be used at
4 the same time to bury these power lines.

5 The other major thing that I heard
6 several people mention is all the money that we're
7 going to save by doing the Northern Pass. The State of
8 New Hampshire is a power exporter. We produce more
9 electricity in this state than we use, and yet we still
10 have the highest electric rates in the United States.
11 There's something disconnected there. And, that is
12 because we're members of the New England grid, and our
13 power goes to Massachusetts and Connecticut, and every
14 other place that the grid wants to send it, and this
15 project is not going to decrease your electric rates,
16 because that power is all going to the same places
17 also. Where it does, it will be a miniscule amount.
18 Good supply and demand, in just the State of New
19 Hampshire, we would have some of the least expensive
20 power costs in the country.

21 Thank you very much for your attention.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Steve Darrow, to be
23 followed by Jane Difley, and Mary Martland.

24 REP. DARROW: Mr. Chairman and members

1 of the Committee, thank you very much for letting me
2 have an opportunity to speak. And, for the record, my
3 name is Stephen Darrow, S-t-e-p-h-e-n, D-a-r-r-o-w.

4 I am a New Hampshire State
5 Representative, from Grafton District 17. Among the
6 towns that I represent are Ashland, Bridgewater, and
7 Bristol. These municipalities will have a direct
8 impact from the planned underground towers --
9 overground towers and underground lines from the
10 Hydro-Quebec and Eversource Northern Pass.

11 I understand the importance of progress,
12 and the need for an ever-increasing demand for
13 affordable energy. I have many constituents who have
14 written me saying that they can no longer do business
15 in New Hampshire unless something is done about the
16 electricity rates.

17 However, I come before you this evening
18 to express my opposition to the Northern Pass as
19 proposed. It is my belief and hope that the proposed
20 project should be entirely buried. Much of the economy
21 in this portion of central New Hampshire is tourism.
22 The power line corridor of 90 to 100 plus foot towers
23 will permanently alter the lands they cross,
24 fragmenting forests, disrupting wildlife habitats,

1 disfiguring communities, and lowering property values.

2 Placing this new transmission line
3 underground resolves much of the visual impact and
4 greatly reduces the electromagnetic field strength.
5 But this option is more expensive. With one study
6 indicating that burying the line may cost ten times
7 more than an overhead installation. However, when the
8 following cost of an overhead study summed for a
9 100-year transmission line, the burial is actually a
10 bargain, at least for those who live with the project,
11 property value loss, decreased farm and forest
12 productivity, health costs, tourism income losses,
13 visual impacts, and environmental damages.

14 If other states can require the
15 transmission lines be put underground, and as I heard
16 Mr. Quinlan say earlier this evening that other states
17 are not doing that, and that's really not the case.
18 It's a fallacy. Then, let me rephrase that. If 52
19 miles of the Northern Pass can be put underground, then
20 the whole thing can be put underground.

21 All that is necessary is -- to see what
22 happens is to drive the proposed route of the Northern
23 Pass, and see the landscape that will forever change,
24 in order to save money in the short term.

1 The towers supporting the transmission
2 line may be 90 to 150 feet tall or more. The
3 right-of-way, which may measure 150 feet in width, is
4 frequently cleared of all vegetation, except for grass
5 and other low-growing plants. Depending on topography,
6 forests, and other factors, the transmission line may
7 be visible from a distance of three miles or more. In
8 fact, those who study the effect of new transmission
9 lines on views commonly begin their analysis
10 three miles out. When passing through a forest, a
11 transmission line corridor appears as an ugly gash
12 across the landscape. Such a scene detracts from the
13 beauty of an otherwise natural view. When located near
14 a community, transmission lines can lend an industrial
15 feel to what is otherwise tranquil residential
16 neighborhoods.

17 Why should any part of New Hampshire be
18 left with the scars of towers and transmission lines,
19 when it is possible to bury them and get them out of
20 site?

21 A project of this scope does not come
22 along frequently. I'm almost done. When it does, all
23 impacts and opinions should be considered before making
24 a decision. As I said before, the importance and need

1 for affordable energy exists. So, does the need to do
2 the right thing the first time. My hope is that this
3 will be done.

4 Thank you very much.

5 *[Audience interruption.]*

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jane Difley, to be
7 followed by Mary Martland, and Anita Craven.

8 MS. DIFLEY: My name is Jane Difley.
9 I'm the president/forester at the Society for the
10 Protection of New Hampshire Forests. I want to once
11 again thank you for your attention and for being here.
12 And given the latest of the hour, and since I have
13 copies for all of you, I know you will take a look at
14 it and read it later, I do have some new things to say.
15 And, they're on that piece of paper. And, given the
16 latest of the hour, I will leave it at that.

17 And, just in case it's not clear, the
18 Forest Society is, in fact, opposed to this project as
19 it is currently proposed. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you,
21 Ms. Difley. Mary Martland, to be followed by Anita
22 Craven, and Carol Dwyer. I think it's Mary Martland.

23 MR. PHILLIPS: I think it's "Nancy
24 Martland". And, Dr. Martland is out-of-state. My name

1 is Chuck Phillips, and I'm going to read --

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You are correct.

3 It is "Nancy". I apologize for that.

4 MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

5 M-a-r-t-l-a-n-d. My name is Chuck Phillips,
6 P-h-i-l-l-i-p-s. And, I'm, for a long term, a
7 Franconia resident, currently in Bethlehem.

8 I would like to take this opportunity to
9 reflect on some of what I've seen and heard at these
10 hearings. I happen to believe that we are very
11 fortunate to have the solution to our shared problems
12 staring us right in the face.

13 RSA 162-H:16 sets out four findings
14 required in order to issue a certificate. Most of the
15 statements I have heard in these hearings have centered
16 on two of these findings: Subparagraph (c), "The site
17 and facility will not have an unreasonable adverse
18 effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water
19 quality, the natural environment, and public health and
20 safety." And, Subparagraph (e), "Issuance of a
21 certificate will serve the public interest."

22 Opponents have focused mainly on
23 demonstrating the project's adverse effects and
24 proponents have focused mainly on demonstrating how the

1 project serves the public interest.

2 Opponents, myself included, point out
3 unreasonable adverse effects on the remarkable essence
4 of New Hampshire, our majestic yet intimate scenic
5 treasures, mainly due to visual impacts. Unreasonable
6 adverse impacts on the aesthetics of our landscapes,
7 our historic and cultural resources, and the natural
8 environment in particular, will result in deleterious
9 effects on preserved and protected public and private
10 lands, private property owners, real estate, our
11 recreation economy, and other related arguments.
12 Preventing these unreasonable adverse effects serves
13 the public interest.

14 Proponents seem to say that the project
15 serves the public interest, because it could supply
16 renewable energy at lower cost, construction jobs would
17 result, the infusion of capital a big project produces
18 will be beneficial to the state and local economies,
19 there could be considerable tax benefits to the New
20 Hampshire towns in which the project is located, and
21 other similar arguments.

22 I thought the SEC's task was to site an
23 energy project, not a jobs program, a tax relief
24 program, or an economic stimulus program.

1 Nevertheless.

2 We are extremely fortunate that there is
3 a solution to the longstanding, painful, and
4 unnecessary dispute this project has created. It
5 addresses the unreasonable adverse effects noted by a
6 project opponents, and actually enhances the public
7 benefits described by the proponents.

8 Full burial of Northern Pass would (1)
9 eliminate nearly all adverse effects having to do with
10 visual impact; and (2) result in more jobs, more
11 capital infusion, and higher taxes paid to towns,
12 according to the U.S. Department of Energy.

13 For years, the Applicant claimed it
14 could not bury any of its line. Opponents repeatedly
15 pointed out modern technology that made burial
16 practical and economically feasible. Last summer, the
17 Applicant announced that it could bury 60 miles after
18 all, to protect an important landscape, and adopted the
19 technology suggested by opponents.

20 By its action, the Applicant admitted
21 that the line can, in fact, be buried, and that
22 important landscapes are worth protecting.

23 All that remains, all that stands
24 between us and an end to this never-ending battle that

1 is hurting so many of us and poisoning our discourse,
2 is for the Applicant to figure out the financing. I
3 have every confidence that they can do that, if they
4 have the will to do so. Especially, if you ask them
5 to. Thank you.

6 *[Audience interruption.]*

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Anita Craven, to be
8 followed by Carol Dwyer, and Peter Powell.

9 *[Short pause.]*

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is Anita Craven
11 here?

12 FROM THE FLOOR: She's gone.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How about Carol
14 Dwyer?

15 FROM THE FLOOR: She's gone, too.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Peter Powell?

17 MR. POWELL: Peter Powell, P-o-w-e-l-l,
18 from Lancaster. I join in thanking everyone here for
19 their endurance.

20 I am about to start my 43rd year of
21 service as a realtor to the region above the Notches.
22 Like politics, all real estate is local. Studies not
23 performed here are irrelevant to the outcomes that can
24 be expected here. No study has been performed here,

1 because lines of the magnitude of those proposed do not
2 exist in the areas that will be affected. Be assured
3 that the impacts here would be far greater than in
4 urban or suburban areas, near job centers, where
5 studies have been done and degradation already exists,
6 where more degradation is added with less incremental
7 impacts, and where trade-offs have already been made
8 for the sake of convenience.

9 Here, where little degradation exists,
10 and money is spent for beauty, at the sacrifice of
11 convenience, the impact of a project like this would be
12 much more severe. You cannot put ugly objects on a
13 beautiful landscape without negatively impacting the
14 marketability and value of all those properties which
15 gaze upon it.

16 Even Mr. Chalmers, who did an interview
17 with NHPR, saying that he -- that the towers are not
18 assets, and he wouldn't want them in his backyard, was
19 quoted as saying "It is basically a view lot. And,
20 your view is down -- And, if your view is down the
21 valley, and you string transmission lines across that
22 valley, right in the middle of the viewshed, and that
23 becomes kind of the dominant feature of the view, I can
24 easily imagine your \$200,000 second home might only be

1 a \$75,000 second home or a \$100,000 second home,
2 something like that." This is the man who performed
3 the study for Northern Pass.

4 I need not elaborate, but will say the
5 language used still registers a disconnect between
6 where he has focused and where we live, where it isn't
7 just view lots with vacation homes, but primary homes,
8 farms, communities, holdings of acreage, where views
9 are long and beautiful, and where looking down or
10 looking up or looking across a landscape is all the
11 natural part of every day. There is so much at stake.

12 The market has been speaking to this
13 with its own eloquence for five years, as properties
14 have been rejected or sold at great discount. In like
15 fashion, where the line is now planned for burial, I
16 understand that values are recovering and properties
17 are again marketable. This from Andy Smith, down in
18 the Franconia/Sugar Hill area.

19 This isn't a manipulation of numbers.
20 It is the reality of the behavior which predicts the
21 numbers, which can only be tallied in retrospect, after
22 it may be too late to do so honestly.

23 And, the impacts are true not only for
24 individuals, but for businesses. Northern Pass is a

1 threat to our brand, and a threat to business
2 properties and business people, where towns -- towers
3 and lines would foreclose success, and discount the
4 future with cumulative impact effects. And, it is the
5 statement of our values to say that, if some of us
6 lose, we all lose.

7 I've got a number of other things. I'm
8 going to just basically give you a bullet. Because I'm
9 worried about other things, other than the things that
10 I know of from my daily work in my own profession. I
11 wonder what the impact is on supply and demand? When
12 we lost the jobs and the mills closed, up north we sat
13 many of us, on economic development committees, and
14 wondered what our future could be. How do we handle
15 the economic transformation? We felt that one
16 possibility would be the generation of energy by
17 alternative means, using the new technologies that we
18 hear about every day that is changing the landscape and
19 the prospects for new industries and new jobs.

20 I worry about the politics[?] and allure
21 that we experienced from cheap foreign oil that we had
22 20 to 30 years ago, and which turned out to be such a
23 debacle. It makes no sense to me to import power and
24 export capital, when it's the tradable sector of our

1 economy are being lost, where we used to make products
2 and bring capital back, we can't anymore.

3 Our economy is fragile up north.
4 Tourism is of vital importance. Dr. Lee, who did a
5 study for the North Country Economics Index here at the
6 University, tells us that the only strong point that we
7 had in 2015 was in tourism.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Powell, either
9 wrap up or you can come back at the end, after
10 others --

11 MR. POWELL: I'll wrap up now, simply by
12 saying that the rest of our economy struggled, and we
13 had the sixth quarter of decline in the index.

14 We can bury -- if we bury this thing, if
15 it has to happen, then it can -- the only way, not to
16 ask so much of us to sacrifice so much is to bury. Our
17 contractors will get more, the towns will still tax,
18 and we'll have an opportunity to be a less negative
19 impact.

20 Thank you very much.

21 *[Audience interruption.]*

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Kelly Wieser, to be
23 followed by former Senator Deb Reynolds, and Roz Lowen.

24 MS. WIESER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 My name is Kelly Wieser, spelled K-e-l-l-y, W-i-e-s, as
2 in "Sam", -e-r.

3 I thank you for this opportunity to
4 speak to the Committee, who has, obviously, an
5 extraordinarily large amount of work in front of them.
6 I'm going to submit my extremely extensive comments
7 that I've been working on while we've been sitting, in
8 writing, to the Committee later. But I wanted to
9 introduce myself, so that you could connect a face with
10 the name when you read them.

11 The most important thing that I need to
12 say to you here tonight is that I lost my job because
13 of Northern Pass, this proposed project. It's not
14 something that's going to happen in the future. This
15 is something that has happened to me already. And, my
16 family lost our business. Owl's Nest Resort and Golf
17 Club, just up the road, in Campton, New Hampshire,
18 which is where I'm from, and where I was born and
19 raised, and where we have chosen to raise our children.

20 So many things that people have said
21 here tonight I would echo. In terms of the importance
22 of our sense of place here in New Hampshire, and how
23 threatened that so many of us feel it is by this
24 project, how it was initially proposed and how it

1 continues to be proposed.

2 Some other thoughts I have, so I'm not
3 repetitive, are I keep hearing the term how
4 "prohibitively expensive to bury this project", and
5 this does echo some of the sentiments that have been
6 addressed earlier. If this project had been proposed
7 in a reasonable way, in a well thought-out way
8 initially, we would not still be sitting here today, we
9 would not be having this same conversation.

10 Yes, this Committee has a lot of work to
11 do. But, for six years, a lot of the people that were
12 concerned previously, and are still sitting here, have
13 done our work and shaping the proposal that's in front
14 of you right now. And, I think a lot of the opposition
15 deserves credit for having there be something in front
16 of you now that's better than what was initially
17 proposed.

18 My thoughts on the ForwardNH Fund are
19 that it's extremely ironic to me that a conservation
20 easement that I helped to fund was then somehow given
21 to a developer, a development, of which I consider to
22 be a very dubious benefit to people in the North
23 Country who actually live up there. Now, that
24 developer is being paid off by the Northern Pass to

1 give his support for the project. It's extremely
2 ironic to me.

3 I guess the final thing that I'll say,
4 since my time is almost up, is that I've been hearing a
5 lot of people talk tonight, and hadn't thought about
6 this before I came here, that they have a level of
7 concern -- a high level of concern with the buried --
8 where the buried line would go through, how it's going
9 to impact their land in front of or around their home.
10 And, I heard the Northern Pass folks express that they
11 were actually ready to go out now and start working
12 with people. And, this causes me a very high level of
13 dismay, because of the personal struggles that we had
14 as a family with the proposed project, that they would
15 actually go out and start to disrupt people's lives
16 with a proposed project that had not even received
17 approval yet, I find that to be extremely alarming to
18 me. And, I think that the Northern Pass folks should
19 consider that.

20 Thank you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Deb Reynolds, to be
22 followed by Roz Lowen, and Michele Noyes.

23 Is Deb Reynolds still here?

24 *[No verbal response]*

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How about Roz
2 Lowen?

3 *[No verbal response]*

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Michele Noyes?

5 *[No verbal response]*

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jason Lauze?

7 *[No verbal response]*

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mark Templeton?

9 *[No verbal response]*

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mark Monahan?

11 *[Short pause.]*

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Other cards I have
13 are Ryan Barber, Jeanne Menard, and Matt Denhart.

14 MR. MONAHAN: Mark Monahan,
15 M-o-n-a-h-a-n. I support the Northern Pass, because it
16 will be one of the biggest economic development
17 projects our state has seen in decades. And, it's
18 because -- and because it will provide jobs for people
19 like me. I'm a apprentice lineman and a member of
20 Local 104. I support the project, because local New
21 Hampshire workers will build it, and because I'm sure
22 I'm not alone in seeing my energy bills keep going up
23 and up. Not only will the Northern Pass decrease
24 energy prices across the region, but it will also bring

1 clean, reliable hydropower, instead of using fossil
2 fuels that pollute our state today.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ryan Barber.

5 MR. BARBER: I'm Ryan Barber, from
6 Rumney, New Hampshire, Class of 2006 --

7 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

8 MR. BARBER: Class of 2006 at Plymouth
9 State University.

10 Happy to speak at my alma mater on this
11 controversial issue. I'm also an inside wiring
12 apprentice, so, I will be involved in working on the
13 project. Although, I don't directly benefit from any
14 overhead transmission lines, I still am in support of
15 the project at large, in whatever way it can be
16 accomplished.

17 What I see today is a decaying
18 infrastructure, roads, bridges, and electrical
19 transmission lines, and a cheap fossil fuel-based
20 economy, which can't last forever. So, we, as a
21 species, I believe, have to use our resources now to
22 create an infrastructure in which someday fossil fuels
23 won't be required.

24 So, what we have in front of was is a

1 modern equivalent of a Roman aqueduct. It will, in
2 essence, lead to a progressive future that will
3 benefit, ultimately, it will act as a springboard
4 through which we will have the energy we need to create
5 an infrastructure that is diverse, and we can also
6 create other forms of renewable energies as well.
7 Diverse forms of them, not just wind or solar or hydro,
8 but, specifically, noncombustible forms.

9 New Hampshire is a very special place,
10 certainly. I have lived here most of my life. But we
11 aren't an island of ourself, we are also part of the
12 greater community, a greater nation. So, we do have to
13 share some of the responsibility in distributing
14 electricity through our grid at large.

15 Right now, there's an overabundance of
16 hydroelectricity being produced that is going into the
17 ground, not being used. This is going to give us the
18 ability to tap into that, and to distribute it and use
19 it effectively, which will allow us to shut down some
20 of those dirtier sources, and, again, springboarding us
21 towards a progressive future.

22 As far as jobs are concerned, yes, there
23 will be temporary jobs. However, this project will
24 represent up to ten percent of an apprentice

1 electrician's career. Ten percent is not a small
2 temporary job. It's a very large part of it. New
3 Hampshire has a very strong and skilled organized labor
4 force, electrical workforce. And, interestingly, when
5 Senator Bernie Sanders visited our training center in
6 the fall during his campaign, he asked a business
7 representative about if we wire up houses and stuff
8 like that. And, he replied "well, basically, we have
9 the skill to build anything from a nuclear fission
10 reactor plant, down to a switch in your house."

11 The New Hampshire electrical workforce
12 is very strong. And, we prefer to work in this state,
13 as opposed to working in New York, Boston, or
14 everywhere, when there aren't jobs available for us to
15 stay in our homes. We prefer to do that, than taxing
16 the Unemployment Insurance Program.

17 What I see in front of this company,
18 Eversource, is, and the Department of Energy and all
19 these people working towards it, is a highly skilled
20 team of engineers, environmental scientists, working
21 endlessly to try and create a project that's going to
22 benefit everyone, and listen as best they can of the
23 concerns of everyone in this state.

24 As a rural New Hampshire -- As a rural

1 New Hampshire resident, I understand the fear and
2 cynicism towards a corporate industry making a change
3 to our landscape and our resources. Being a citizen of
4 the humanity at large requires us to make some
5 sacrifices for the greater good. I have witnessed a
6 powerful form of democracy go on throughout this
7 project. They have been passionate-based on both
8 sides. And, it's my hope that we can transcend the
9 differences and create a future for the greater good of
10 our state and our nation and our species at large.

11 Thank you.

12 *[Audience interruption.]*

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jeanne Menard, to
14 be followed by Matt Denhart.

15 MS. MENARD: J-e-a-n-n-n-e, M-e-n-a-r-d.
16 Good evening, everyone. My comment tonight pertains to
17 the cost of the AC line upgrades. In the Transmission
18 Service Agreement of 2014, between Northern Pass
19 Transmission, as the owner, and Hydro Renewable Energy,
20 as the purchaser, there is language that addresses that
21 ISO-New England may determine that the costs of AC
22 upgrades are eligible to be included in regional rates.

23 It is in this Transmission Agreement
24 that references an appendix entitled "The Cost of AC

1 Upgrades", and it's clearly noted that this appendix is
2 not attached. There may be a good reason for this that
3 I don't understand.

4 The point of bringing this question
5 forward to the SEC this evening is to respectfully
6 request that there be further discussion as to not only
7 the cost and impact of the Northern Pass Project, but
8 also the cost and the impact to plug this project into
9 the grid, and who bears the cost of this.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Matt Denhart.

12 *[Audience interruption.]*

13 MR. DENHART: Good evening. I'm not
14 sure if the claps are that we finally reached, I think,
15 the last speaker. I assume, maybe those are what those
16 claps are about.

17 Thank you. Matt Denhart, M-a-t-t,
18 D-e-n-h-a-r-t. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and SEC
19 members, for running what has seemed to be a very civil
20 and useful session tonight. Something you might not
21 expect in a hockey arena.

22 I support the Northern Pass Project
23 because it will provide energy, for that basic reason.
24 So, in my short comments tonight, then I'd like to just

1 take a step back and talk a little bit about the
2 importance of energy itself.

3 If we look back in history, harnessing
4 and transmitting energy has ushered in America's second
5 industrial revolution. It brought power into
6 Americans' homes, allowing them to have lights; it
7 powered factories, which brought forth iconic firms;
8 and ushered in prosperity we've never seen in the
9 history of the world.

10 Today, electricity continues to be very
11 important. It still powers our factories, it still
12 heats our homes, lights our rooms, powers our
13 universities, and lets us live more fulfilling lives,
14 by pursuing things like leisure in hockey arenas and
15 all the different pursuits that we enjoy.

16 I fear that we often take electricity
17 for granted. I certainly do. I assume, when I plug in
18 an appliance, that it will just work, and it more or
19 less does. When it doesn't, we panic. You know, we
20 call the power company very quickly when the power goes
21 out to report it, assuming that others had not already
22 done so, and, you know, sort of wonder with some alarm
23 when it will come back on. In many cases, it can be a
24 matter of life and death for people, particularly

1 during the cold New England winters.

2 Now, other places in the world, they
3 don't always take power for granted. I've had the
4 opportunity to spend some time in rural Africa. And, a
5 power line isn't seen as a threat, it's seen as a
6 lifeline. Bringing power allows the people to
7 transform their lives and live a higher quality of
8 life.

9 So, the point is, I'm just asking the
10 Committee and all of us here to not take power and
11 electricity for granted. Particularly, that sources
12 like nuclear energy and coal are retired, it's
13 important we continue to support efforts like Northern
14 Pass to provide reliable and affordable energy to New
15 Hampshire, New England, and, indeed, to our country and
16 the world.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hoertdoerfer.
19 I hope you will tell us what your comments are on the
20 proposal, rather than your comments on the process.

21 MR. HOERTDOERFER: It is, it is on the
22 process, and it is important.

23 I was going, following the next
24 paragraph, to say, how can one justify imposing time

1 limits on the public, and not do the same for Northern
2 Pass? More so even as these "public hearings" are
3 expressly for the public's input. Northern Pass is not
4 the public, and the Commission allows them to take
5 front and center stage and more.

6 So, why does my feeling of discomfort
7 with the Commission and fear of eventually being pushed
8 off the tilted playing field get worse rather than
9 better? So, we keep coming back to these stage shows,
10 trying like hell to hang on and try to reduce the tilt
11 of the playing field before we get pushed off, and we
12 still hope to get a fair process.

13 It seems there's not even an effort to
14 make this process at least appear to be fair and
15 balanced. Where is the sensitivity to fairness when
16 Northern Pass sits up front next to the Commission?
17 And, as one comes in through the door, it already looks
18 like the Public versus Northern Pass and Commission. I
19 don't want to be there, it just feels that way.

20 Where is the sensitivity to the appeal
21 for postponement of hearings by a multitude of
22 individuals, municipalities and organizations? Where
23 is the sensitivity to the public's voice? I have heard
24 the comment from the public that Northern Pass is not

1 listening to us. I personally do not expect Northern
2 Pass to listen to us. They have one single goal, and
3 they will pursue this goal with all means possible and
4 available to them. That is their right and a given.

5 Rather my question is, is the Committee
6 and not only the Chair, listening?

7 Is the Commission overwhelmed by the
8 legal power of the Applicant and is thereby in reaction
9 and acquiescence to their demands, and how much is this
10 exemplified in the Chair's actions or reaction, instead
11 of action based on sensitive judgment?

12 It would needless to say that Northern
13 Pass has only one goal, as I stated above, and,
14 thereby, one should be aware that many of their
15 positions and statements have to be considered with
16 critical judgment, and cannot be embraced solely on
17 their assurance. And, this does not mean that they
18 provide outright lies; it is simply that their
19 perspective of an issue is driven by their goal and how
20 they define issues to serve their purpose.

21 That is where the Commission has a
22 responsibility to take the perspective and interest of
23 the public into contribution before making any and all
24 decisions, regardless of what the issue. That is what

1 RSA 126-H says -- 162-H says. So far, that does not
2 always seem to be the case.

3 Just a little more. Many of our elected
4 state officials have spoken out against this project
5 and are on record with their voices. And, let me quote
6 Jeanie Forrester, who spoke here earlier tonight. And,
7 I quote: "The legislative changes made to the SEC
8 statute were intended to improve public trust and
9 confidence in the SEC decision-making process. It
10 would be a great misfortune for all of us in New
11 Hampshire if the implementation of these changes were
12 to subvert this very goal."

13 And, end with this quote, and I quote
14 State Representative Brown, from this very district
15 here. Quote: "It is vitally important that the process
16 regarding Northern Pass is fair and transparent. At a
17 time when public trust in government at every level is
18 at an all-time low, it would be most unfortunate if
19 these hearings proceed as planned and give the
20 appearance of an unfair and unresponsive process."

21 And, the larger question for me still
22 is, do the hearings just appear to be unfair or is the
23 process rigged, and in the end we, the public, get just
24 pushed off the edge and the Commission operates just

1 like in the past?

2 I'd like to believe that today is a
3 different time, where push opinion counts and is
4 considered. That we can get due consideration of the
5 public's voice, and in a better way than how it was
6 managed here today. It does not feel that we are there
7 yet.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, that's the
10 last word from the public this evening,
11 Mr. Hoertdoerfer. I will not respond. Although, you
12 clearly have challenged the process in ways that I
13 think, if you were to poll the folks who were here
14 tonight, all 300 plus, I believe there are many who
15 would disagree with you. And, we will get into that --

16 *[Audience interjection.]*

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Excuse me, sir,
18 it's not your turn.

19 Now, we're going to adjourn this hearing
20 in just a moment. If there's something you would like
21 to speak -- say, I know you've spoken at other events.
22 Do you have a public comment you'd like to make on the
23 project?

24 MR. MULLEN: Very quickly. I would like

1 to comment that I observed the Committee all evening
2 tonight. They were very carefully paying attention to
3 everything that was said. I take my hat off to you all
4 for sitting through these meetings, meeting after
5 meeting after meeting.

6 I don't know where you stand on things,
7 but I have to congratulate you for paying so much
8 attention to us. I appreciate it.

9 *[Audience interruption.]*

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, sir.

11 I'll check with our Administrator and my
12 lawyer, to see if there is anything else we need to do?

13 (Atty. Iacopino conferring with Chairman
14 Honigberg.)

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Right. For those
16 who were interested in the prehearing conference, check
17 the website, check e-mails for where the location will
18 be.

19 With that, we will adjourn. Thank you
20 all.

21 ***(Whereupon the public hearing was***
22 ***adjourned at 10:50 p.m.)***