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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to a public hearing of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. We have one matter for consideration for today, a public hearing on the Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire, which now does business as Eversource, for a Certificate of Site and Facility, which is Docket Number 2015-06.

I have a number of remarks I need to make before we get started. But, before I do that, I'd like everyone on the Subcommittee to identify him or herself.

MR. OLDENBURG: I'm William Oldenburg, Department of Transportation.

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Martin Honigberg, from the Public Utilities Commission.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Kathryn Bailey, from the Public Utilities Commission.
MS. WHITAKER: Rachel Whitaker, alternate public member.

MS. WEATHERSBY: Patricia Weathersby, public member.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: In addition, to my far right is Counsel to the Site Evaluation Committee, Mike Iacopino, to my far left is the SEC's sole employee, Administrator Pam Monroe.

I'd also like to identify and introduce from the Attorney General's office, serving as Public Counsel in this matter, Peter Roth.

Peter, if you could stand up and wave.

MR. ROTH: Hello, everybody.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: On October 19th of 2015, Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire, which does business as Eversource Energy, submitted an Application to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee for a Certificate of Site and Facility to construct a 192-mile transmission line. The transmission line is proposed to run from the Canadian border in Pittsburg, down to Deerfield, approximately, as I said, 192 miles, with a capacity rating of 1,090 megawatts.

On November 2nd, pursuant to RSA 162-H,
I, as the Chair of the Site Evaluation Committee, appointed a Subcommittee to consider the Application. In turn, a number of the state officials who exercised their authority to designate senior members of their agencies to serve on the Subcommittee.

On December 7th of 2015, the Subcommittee met to review the status of the Application. At that time, the Subcommittee determined that the Application contained sufficient information to satisfy the application requirements of each state agency having jurisdiction under state or federal law to regulate any aspect of the construction or operation of the proposed facility. The Subcommittee also made an independent determination at that meeting that the Application contained sufficient information to carry out the purposes of RSA 162-H.

The Subcommittee subsequently issued a procedural order setting forth a number of scheduling matters. That order scheduled public information sessions, pursuant to RSA 162-H, in Franklin, Londonderry, Laconia, Whitefield, and Lincoln. Those public information sessions took place in January.

The Subcommittee also set a date for motions to intervene, and over 150 motions to intervene...
were filed. I can tell you that an order on the motions to intervene will be issued in the next two days.

On February 3rd, the Subcommittee issued two orders scheduling public hearings in Meredith, Holderness, and this hearing in Deerfield, for March 1st, 14th, and 16th. And, a separate order scheduling hearings in Colebrook and Concord for March 7th and 10th. The Colebrook and Concord hearings were held contemporaneously with public hearings for federal agencies, including the United States Department of Energy.

The public hearing we are here for tonight is required under RSA 162-H:10, I-c. We are required to hold at least one public hearing in each county in which the proposed project is to be located. And, those public hearings must be held within 90 days after acceptance of an application for a certificate.

In addition, we have announced, but have not yet scheduled, two additional public hearings to hear comment on the supplemental information that the Applicant filed in late February. One of those will be held north of Franconia Notch and the other will be held south of Franconia Notch. But, as I said, dates
and locations have not yet been set.

Notice of this public hearing was served upon the public by publication in the New Hampshire Union Leader on February 10th of 2016.

This evening, we will proceed as follows: We will first hear a brief presentation by the Applicant. For those who have attended earlier hearings in the last few weeks, we have asked, and I believe the Applicant is prepared to shorten its presentation somewhat, so we can get to the public part of this a little quicker.

Following that, the Subcommittee will have an opportunity to pose questions to the Applicant. Sometimes the Subcommittee does not have questions at this stage of the proceeding. We have had the opportunity to review the filings of the Applicant and other parties, and we will have further opportunities to question the Applicant and other parties under oath during the adjudicatory process. At the same time, the Subcommittee may have questions.

Thereafter, the public will -- the public questions will be posed to the Applicant. If you have a question for the Applicant, we ask that you write your question on one of the green sheets and get
it to one of the people who's walking around in a position to collect them. Please write neatly. We will sort and organize the questions as best we can by subject matter. We've had a number of thoughtful comments regarding the way the questions have been posed to the Applicant in the earlier sessions. We will continue to ask the questions through the Chair, through the Presiding Officer, so that they can be organized and not repetitive, if possible. We have also had comments and questions regarding the shortening/editing of the questions. The general rule that we're following up here is that we're not reading the statements that are associated with the question, unless they're necessary for the context. And, even then, we may reword them, so that they can be answered, so that they can be asked fairly and answered fairly. The classic example of an unfair question is "when did you stop beating your wife?" There are a number of questions that are posed in these, on the green cards, that read like that. Those -- I will tell you, statements like that, questions like that are not going to be read. The questions are designed to elicit factual information from the Applicant regarding the Application, regarding its specific terms.
Once all the questions have been asked -- oh, let me add, we've also asked the Company to try to shorten some of its answers. There are a number of questions that get asked that require extended discussion to explain context and information. There are others that can be answered more briskly, based on some of the presentation that has already been done or information that's been out there. So, we are going to do our best to try and get to the public comment portion of the evening faster than we have in the previous public hearings.

After all the questions have been asked and answered, we will take public statements or comments on the Application. If you would like to make an oral public statement tonight, please fill out one of the yellow sheets. Based on past experience, there are a lot of people who want to make public statements. If the numbers are what we expect them to be, we will ask you to put reasonable limits on how long you intend to speak. If you are able to keep your comments under three minutes, that would be wonderful. We will not cut off the microphone and we will not stop you at three minutes. If you need to go well beyond, say, four minutes, we will ask you to wrap up, and either
come back later or submit written comments. We have allowed people, and we will continue to allow people, who want to make extended comments, to wait until the end to complete their remarks, so that others can have their turn and their opportunity to speak.

If you would like to submit a written comment, we have blue forms for that. All the written comments get scanned and they're all posted on our website.

So, that's how we're going to proceed tonight. I don't think there's anything else I need to do, all right, before turning it over to Mr. Quinlan to begin their presentation.

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Thank you. Good evening. My name is Bill Quinlan. I'm the President of Eversource New Hampshire. I'm joined tonight by Jim Muntz, who's the President of our Transmission business; Ken Bowes, our Vice President of Engineering; Sam Johnson, who is a technical expert with Burns & McDonnell; and Lee Carbonneau, who is an environmental expert with Normandeau associates.

So, as the Chair indicated, I'm going to run through a very brief presentation, just to hit some highlights. And, then, obviously, look forward to your
questions and comments.

So, I've been involved in Northern Pass for about 18 months at this point. The first year of my involvement was really spent listening to New Hampshire. And, you know, we call it "stakeholder outreach", but there was a wide range of discussions we've had throughout New Hampshire to get input into the project that we were going to submit to the Site Evaluation Committee. Municipalities, landowners, environmental organizations, businesses throughout the state, labor, a wide range of outreach, to understand where are the issues and what could we do to make this the best possible project for the State of New Hampshire. That took, in essence, a year.

And, you know, during the course of that listening, one of the things we determined is, we needed to come forward with a project that struck an appropriate balance. And, the factors that I thought were important in striking the balance were we need a project that works technically, a project that addresses some of the major issues we've heard from the New Hampshire outreach, and then a project that's affordable. So, that's the balance that we targeted.

Throughout that year, there are really
only three major issues that came to the surface when you boiled it all down. You know, obviously, a lot of feedback on view impacts, given that, you know, we were proposing originally a largely overhead transmission route 180 miles long. Naturally, there are a lot of questions and concerns about aesthetic impacts.

Secondly, and we heard this universally from businesses and residences across the state, "what will this Project do to address the high energy rates that New Hampshire is experiencing?" You know, many folks are concerned, particularly businesses in the manufacturing sector, that they cannot be competitive with the highest energy costs in the nation. They want to understand what will this Project do to lower energy costs and, simultaneously, help the region meet its environmental goals by reducing reliance on fossil fuels.

And, then, thirdly, "what are the benefits to the State of New Hampshire?" You know, there's been a lot of misinformation that this Project is all about getting power from Canada to southern New England, and that all of the benefits were going to flow to southern New England. There's nothing in it for the State of New Hampshire and its residents. And,
it was clear to me from this listening that we had to address that very directly.

    So, those are the three issues we attempted to direct -- we addressed through our ForwardNH Plan.

    Here's what we come up with. This is the project as originally announced in 2010, and the project that we have proposed to the Site Evaluation Committee after a year of listening. And, it's fundamentally a different project.

    These are some of the trade-offs that we made, based upon feedback from New Hampshire. We have a longer route. We've added 12 miles to the route. How did that happen? It happened because we moved the line, from the western part of New Hampshire, more populated areas in the North Country, to the east. So, we essentially put in this east-west segment, so that we can get over to what's referred to as "Wagner Forest", which is a working forest, 24 miles long, where there were really no significant scenic or view impacts that were of concern, there's one property owner. So, we changed a north-south route, and we went east, and then south. And, it was really based on the feedback from New Hampshire.
The next thing we did is we looked at underground construction. What could we afford to do? And, what could technically be feasible from an underground perspective? And, these areas in yellow are now all underground. So, we went from a project that had -- had no underground initially, to one that has almost a third of its route now underground.

There's eight miles of it up here in the North Country, to get us over to Wagner Forest, and then an additional 52 miles that we committed to last year to essentially go underground around the White Mountain National Forest, the Appalachian Trail, Franconia Notch.

Now, I have gotten a lot of feedback, "why did you pick that area?" You know, "why not other areas in New Hampshire?" And, it was, in essence, based upon the feedback we had gotten from stakeholders across New Hampshire. Almost universally, they said "you need to do something to address that critically important area."

The areas in blue, those are all existing right-of-ways. So, we wanted to utilize the maximum extent possible corridors that already exist today, they're cleared, and there's transmission
infrastructure in them. So, we tried to avoid, to the
maximum extent possible, any new rights-of-way that
require lots of clearing. So, you'll see most of the
Project is blue, a large part of it is now yellow. So,
there's very limited amounts of new rights-of-way,
particularly when you take out the Wagner Forest.
Okay?

So, we've got a fundamentally different
route to accommodate 60 miles of underground
construction, which will make this the longest
underground HVDC line in North America. We actually
had to change the cable technology and change the size
of the Project. So, we went from what's referred to as
"conventional cable", to state-of-the-art cable
technology, to allow that amount of undergrounding. To
do it reliably, in a way that we felt technically
comfortable with, we actually had to scale down the
size of the Project. So, we no longer have a
1,200-megawatt project. We've taken about 10 percent
of the project capacity and eliminated it, based,
again, on New Hampshire feedback.

So, these are the trade-offs we've made.

What do all those changes mean from a project cost
perspective? They have added about a half a billion
dollars worth of project costs.

So, this is the balance that we made, based upon the feedback from New Hampshire. And, this is the balanced project that we've submitted to the SEC.

You know, we've gotten a lot of feedback since then. You know, "why not put it all underground, particularly in Interstate 93?" And, the fundamental reason for not doing that is it's not affordable. It's not an economic project. It would add an additional billion dollars to the project cost. So, a $1.6 billion project becomes a $2.6 billion project. And, when we look at who's going to pay for that additional billion dollars? It's not something anyone's willing to pay for.

So, that's the reason why we have landed on the project we have. We think it addresses the principal issues we've heard from New Hampshire in a balanced way.

On the issue of underground construction, you know, we get a lot of feedback that "everyone else in New England are building projects underground". You know, "you're using archaic technology, it's outdated."
This is just a quick snapshot of what's been built in New England over the last 15 years, almost 600 miles of large transmission infrastructure across New England. None of these projects are in New Hampshire. Over 90 percent of that is conventional overhead construction. Okay? So, less than 10 percent is underground. The only exceptions to this are in major cities. So, in Boston, you see this project in Boston, the "Boston Reliability Project", or those first two projects, which are Fairfield County, Connecticut, as you head into Manhattan. Okay? So, heavily congested areas, that's where you see underground, underground construction. Virtually everything else has been built overhead.

And, another, I think, important thing to recognize is that there's an existing line from Hydro-Quebec that runs right through New Hampshire today, it's called the "Phase II Line". This line in red exists today, all overhead. It essentially does the same thing that the Project is that we're proposing to do here. The tower heights are actually taller than what we're proposing here, and, in some instances, substantially taller. There are towers and structures along that line that are 240 feet tall. It's been
there for decades. And, it serves very reliably New
Hampshire and New England's energy needs today.

So, the point here is really that, you
know, if you look across New England as to what has
been built historically, and what's actually being
proposed to be built in the future, you know, the
60 miles that we are proposing here in this Project
will be the single longest underground construction in
New England, and as I said earlier, for this
technology, in all of North America. Okay?

Just on the issue of benefits to New
Hampshire. So, when we reintroduced that route last
fall, the other thing we knew we needed to address was
"what are the direct economic and environmental
benefits to the State of New Hampshire?" And, there
are many numbers on this slide. Some important ones
are the top line. When we look at it, and our experts
analyzed the cumulative benefits, it's almost
$4 billion of direct economic benefits to the State of
New Hampshire. I'm not going to read these, but this
gets to the point raised by businesses, "what's it
going to do to lower energy costs?" When we look at
it, under current market conditions, about $80 million
a year savings to businesses and residences across the
State of New Hampshire. Okay?

We also added benefits. The $200 million ForwardNH Fund are additional benefits we've made part of the Project as an ongoing expense to drive additional investment into the State of New Hampshire on some key areas of focus, particularly in host communities.

Property taxes. You know, taken a hard look at what does a $1.6 million project mean from a tax perspective, to the municipalities hosting the line; to the counties hosting the line; and to the State of New Hampshire? It's about 30 million a year.

Importantly, this is a great opportunity for us to create jobs and economic stimulation in New Hampshire. We announced last fall, as part of this, our "New Hampshire first" approach to sourcing the Project. So, wherever possible, we're going to use New Hampshire labor and services and goods to build and construct this Project. So, and we think there's great opportunities for the state that will come from that. You know, we've already been exploring some of these and making them a reality. In total, almost $4 billion of economic benefits.

The environmental benefits are also
quite significant, from the perspective of reduced carbon emissions across the region. Some things that we can do from a Project perspective to encourage small-scale renewable development, renewable generation development.

And, really, when you look at the benefits outlined here, they're unique. Both energywise, economically, and environmentally, we believe we've put together a benefit package for the State of New Hampshire that really complements the changes we've made to the Project route, and answers that stakeholder question "what's in it for New Hampshire?" Okay?

So, that's the thinking behind the ForwardNH Plan, which led to the filing that we've made. And, with that, I look forward to the questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do members of the Subcommittee have questions for Mr. Quinlan and his team this evening?

MS. WHITAKER: I have one.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Whitaker.

MS. WHITAKER: Mr. Quinlan --

Mr. Quinlan, the $7.5 million North Country Job
Creation Fund, is that different than the $200 million ForwardNH Fund? And, if so, how?

MR. QUINLAN: It is. So, that was a commitment that we had made actually prior to announcing the ForwardNH Fund. It is a North Country-focused job creation initiative. Where we've essentially established a board, an independent board. It already exists. It's chaired by former Senator John Gallus and other leaders in the North Country. And, essentially, we provide funding to that organization. They solicit expressions of interest, as to how those dollars can be used in the North Country to create jobs, and they make determinations. We've actually provided some advance funding to them already. That's one example of where we've, even prior to, you know, getting our permits or having this Project in service, we've already made investments.

So, their first round of grants took place in 2015. It's managed entirely by leaders in the North Country. And, it's completely separate and apart from the ForwardNH Fund.

MS. WHITAKER: Thank you.

MR. WAY: I have a question, too.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner
COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Thank you. The $3.8 billion impact for -- economic impact for New Hampshire, is that -- what period of time is that over?

MR. QUINLAN: So, many of those benefits are over a 20-year period, with the exception of the energy benefit. Because it's difficult to project energy markets and effects much longer than ten years out, our experts only felt comfortable on the energy analysis going ten years. So, the energy benefit, a 10-year period, everything else a 20-year period.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. And, on the energy benefit, would the savings amount change, if the Spectra Project and the Kinder-Morgan Project are built, and also if oil and LNG prices stayed low?

MR. QUINLAN: So, there are a lot of variables in that type of analysis, so view that as a snapshot in time. You know, they make -- the experts make assumptions as to, you know, power plant retirements, power plant additions, new gas infrastructure that may come into the region, what happens in the forward capacity market. And, so, there are a lot of assumptions underlying that analysis. A key one is what happens with gas infrastructure.
You know, if a substantial amount of new gas infrastructure comes into New England, you know, energy prices should moderate. We shouldn't see the spikiness that you see today.

Now, what happens long term? Does that drive coal and oil plants, the remaining coal and oil fleet out of the market, towards retirement? Do additional nuclear plants retire? You know, it's a fairly complicated model that looks at plant additions and subtractions. It does it under a range of scenarios.

The ones you're referring to specifically are low gas sensitivity and are high gas sensitivity. So, there are some sensitivities where we assume -- the expert assumes "there is no new gas pipeline". Okay? And, LNG goes overseas, as opposed to, you know, being parked in Boston Harbor, as it's been the last couple of winters. That leads to very high future energy prices. That's one bounding case.

The other bounding case is a lot of new pipeline infrastructure, so it no longer creates a scarcity situation.

So, you're focused on a key variable, "what happens under gas scenarios?" And, the experts
have analyzed a range.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Can you tell me where in the record that is, so I could look at that?

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, it's all under a expert report done by London Economics.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. You told me that the other day, I wasn't -- I didn't have time to look for it. But that's in the record somewhere.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I'll find it.

MR. QUINLAN: And, you'll see the range of scenarios they evaluated. And, there are a lot of variables.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. All right.

MR. QUINLAN: But gas supply is a key one, and gas price.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Yes. Okay. All right. Just a couple more questions.

MR. QUINLAN: Sure. Sure.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And you may not know the answers to these. But, on our first stop today, we were at Boyce Road, and we were --

MR. QUINLAN: Boyce Road?

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Boyce Road, in
Concord. And, we were looking at the crossing, and the person who was narrating the tour told us that the -- I think it was a 115 kV line had to be moved to the left. And, it looked like it was ten feet away from a house. And, I was wondering how you can move it to the left, when the house is right there? Does the code allow you to build a transmission line over the house or was it just a perception thing? I just, you know, if anybody could fill me in on that, I would appreciate it.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Bowes.

MR. JOHNSON: So, the house you're referring to is right on the edge of the right-of-way. By codes, you're not allowed to go over the house, unless you have appropriate clearances. The way that the design is going in that area is that the conductors will be facing into the right-of-way, or away from that house.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: And, they are designed to meet the National Energy Safety Code, so that it does meet the clearance requirements for that particular size of conductor.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Bowes, anything you'd add?

MR. BOWES: So, just to add that there are actually two properties in that Concord area that were built on the right-of-way and encroached on the easement area. We have designed around that, I think the one at least what Mr. Johnson just talked about. There is a second one where we've done a similar workaround, to allow the house to remain on the easement area or in the easement area, but the construction can take place around it.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Thank you. And, one more thing that I would ask maybe if you could draw for me, not here, but give it -- you know, file it. At the Concord hearing, we heard from a gentleman who was very upset, he lived in Deerfield, and I think his name was Mr. Bilodeau. And, he said that the Deerfield Substation backs right up to his property and that the line was going to end on his property. And, he was at the Deerfield Substation today, and I asked where the house was. And, some of the people pointed to the back.

And, so, I was wondering if you could provide a map that outlines the substation as it exists.
today, and then shows the footprint of the new
substation, and the location of his house and property
line?

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. We could certainly
do that. And, we have actually looked into the issue
raised associated with the Bilodeau property. Just
like any other issue raised here, where a landowner or
a municipality indicates they're not getting the
information they need, we're following up on every one
of those, because we've got a tracking matrix.

I'm going to ask Mr. Johnson to address
the Bilodeau residence.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: So, we did reach out to
Mr. Bilodeau yesterday, and we spoke to his wife, and
are in the midst of arranging a site visit.
Mr. Bilodeau lives to the south, off Nottingham Road,
of the actual substation itself, which is not on the
corridor that we'll be building the 345 lines are.
He's part of the corridor that stretches between
Deerfield and Scobie Pond. So, he's about a quarter to
half a mile south of the actual substation itself, on
the opposite side of the right-of-way from where the
substation is today.
[Audience interruption.]

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay.

MR. QUINLAN: But we'll provide a map.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Yes. Show me a map.

MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: That would be very helpful. Thank you.

MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Way.

MR. WAY: Mr. Quinlan, there's been some interest on the 2,600 jobs. And, I'm wondering, one, how you arrived at that number? But, also, too, if you've had the opportunity or will have the opportunity maybe to break that down a little bit more by the activity type? Are we talking about timber? Are we talking about journeyman linemen? And, maybe a little bit about the longevity of the jobs and -- over the long term.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, the details on the jobs analysis are in the same London Economic --

[Cellphone disruption.]

MR. QUINLAN: -- expert report, where they look at job effects. And, they do it both
analytically, and then they analyze it based upon comparable projects. And, they actually do break it down between direct jobs and indirect jobs. So, it's laid out in quite a bit of detail there.

Now, I'll give you a high-level, you know, sense for that. You know, a relatively small percentage of those are actual line workers doing electric work. Now, that's probably several hundred of those jobs. Many of those jobs are direct contractors or services that we need to retain to, you know, clear rights-of-way, deliver gravel, build roads. That's a large chunk. And, then, there's actually a second order job effect, which is the local businesses necessary to support, you know, a $1.6 billion infrastructure project. It's all laid out in quite some detail in that report.

Lisa, do you want to share any of those jobs breakdown? Lisa Shapiro is an economist. You want to introduce yourself and maybe add some light to this.

MS. SHAPIRO: Hi. My name is Lisa Shapiro. I'm an economist consulting with the Project. I didn't perform the study, but I did provide some of the inputs into it.
The breakdown is pretty detailed in the report. So, I think that would be more helpful to look at it. In terms of you asked a specific question about longer term jobs, there's also a modeling in the report with the lower energy costs. As you know, energy costs that are high do have an impact on job production and retention, they have an impact on expenditures of homeowners. And, so, there is a longevity of job production over 500 a year, based on the lowered energy costs, as well as the ongoing operating and maintenance. Which is not a significant number, but there is about three to five million dollars a year that will be spent for operation and maintenance, as well as for the ForwardNH Fund.

MR. WAY: And, Lisa, just one quick question. The "500 per year", does that also include the indirect jobs as well?

MS. SHAPIRO: Yes. From the -- that's from the REMI model.

MR. WAY: The REMI model? Okay.

MR. QUINLAN: And, we can -- we can provide you some citations that get you directly to that table and the analysis in the expert report.

MR. WAY: Okay.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are there any other questions from the Subcommittee?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I pulled one question as a follow-up on your answer to Commissioner Bailey regarding the London Economics study.

"Is that study available to the public or is that subject to the confidentiality motion?"

MR. QUINLAN: It's currently available in its entirety to the SEC. It is a confidential document. So, portions of it have been redacted. I believe we're working with Public Counsel on a public version, that just redacts or excludes the most sensitive information. And, I think those discussions are underway. So, I do expect a version of that to be publicly available, with only the most sensitive information that's not available.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There are a number of questions in this pile that reference "danger trees", I believe. And, there's different versions of it. But here's one that gets to a lot of the issues.

"Your Application to the SEC states that the existing centrally located distribution towers will
be relocated to the western edge of the right-of-way.
The new towers will be 80 to 125 feet in height. The
Application also states that, if existing trees on
abutting properties may endanger the new towers and
lines, that you will notify property owners prior to
cutting or trimming these trees. Can you explain how
this will be done and how it will affect private
property? Is this not an eminent domain taking if you
cut down their trees?"

MR. BOWES: So, for trees off of the
right-of-way, either the cleared or the uncleared
portion, we would get landowner permission to remove a
tree.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, if you
couldn't obtain such permission, what would you do?

MR. BOWES: We wouldn't remove the tree.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This is a question
for the SEC members: "Can the SEC members confirm that
they do not own shares of Eversource stock, including
any Eversource affiliates or subsidiaries?"

And, I'm fairly certain that I do not.

Does anyone on the Subcommittee?

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: No.

MS. WHITAKER: No.
[Multiple members indicating in the negative.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. The record will reflect that every member of the Subcommittee indicated they did not own stock in Eversource or any Eversource affiliate.

There are a number of questions about burial. "Why are portions of two current Eversource transmission proposals, the Seacoast Reliability Project and the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, proposed for partial burial?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project is an all-overhead line. I don't believe any of that project are proposed for burial. The Seacoast Reliability Project is a project that feeds into Portsmouth. A portion of it is underwater, which is through Little Bay. It's the most direct route. So, we're actually using a "jet plow" technique that we talked about at our last session to go underwater. And, there is a small additional area that we're contemplating burying, in and around the University of New Hampshire campus, because the line runs through the campus.

So, we have not yet filed the Seacoast
Reliability Project with the SEC. But, right now, there's the underwater stretch going through Little Bay, and a short area of underground construction on the University of New Hampshire campus. The vast majority of the line is overhead construction.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This next sheet has a similar assumption regarding the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, and you just said that's totally overhead, is that correct?

MR. QUINLAN: It is.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. This questioner goes on, though, to ask "whether burial could be expanded along the AC line in historic Deerfield or in Concord?"

MR. QUINLAN: Is this with respect to the Merrimack Valley?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No. That was an assumption of the question asker, that you were proposing to bury part of Merrimack Valley, and asked "why can't you use similar technology?" But forget about the assumption.

MR. QUINLAN: Again, at the outset, I tried to explain the rationale behind the areas that we've selected for undergrounding.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Just a minute, Mr. Quinlan. Just a minute.

Every speaker this evening, either to my right or in front of me, deserves your full and undivided attention and your respect. Any show of disrespect, if you feel you can't abide by that, you should probably leave.

Mr. Quinlan, you may continue.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, the balanced project that we've submitted to the SEC reflects, you know, the underground construction that we've determined was appropriate, you know, based upon the feedback, and based upon the other factors that I articulated, the cost of underground construction and the technical feasibility of it.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: A question for you and for Mr. Muntz: "Are power lines in your neighborhood buried?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, I live in Merrimack, New Hampshire, and the answer is "no", they're not buried. The distribution line into the area I live is buried. But there are many transmission corridors that run through Merrimack, including the Hydro-Quebec line that I referred to earlier.
MR. MUNTZ: I live in West Hartford, Connecticut. There is a small stretch of underground distribution lines along the main shopping district. And, to my knowledge, there are no other underground lines in West Hartford.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Can you make a very brief explanation of the difference between a distribution line and a transmission line?

MR. MUNTZ: A distribution -- go ahead.

MR. QUINLAN: Distribution basically are the low-voltage lines that feed into a neighborhood or a business. Transmission lines are high-voltage, and they carry large volumes of energy. They go -- tend to go much longer distances. And, they tend to be on rights-of-way, as opposed to in neighborhoods.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "A Hydro-Quebec project is being considered in Vermont. That project will be entirely buried underground or under Lake Champlain. Why can't you completely bury this and take and eat the additional cost or share these costs with Eversource" -- I'm sorry, "share the cost with ratepayers over the life of the project?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, that's referring to a project that was proposed into the New England RFP.
It's a relatively short project, I believe it's 60 miles in its entirety, 20 miles of which are underground, the rest is underwater, which is a very different technology.

Hydro-Quebec's involvement in that project is very limited. They are essentially providing backstop hydroelectricity. It's predominantly a project to bring wind power into Vermont from upstate New York. Hydro-Quebec's only role is to provide backstop hydropower when the wind is not blowing. So, their role is limited. They have no role in the project itself. They're purely a default energy supplier, if you will.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Separating Northern -- or, rather, Hydro-Quebec's involvement, I think the second part of the question is "why can't you do that and share the additional cost between ratepayers and shareholders?"

MR. QUINLAN: Again, the Project we've proposed is going to be the longest underground construction in North America. That's 60 miles of underground construction. I pointed at the outset that, if we pursued complete underground construction, the Project is not economically viable, meaning it's
not affordable. And, I think that's the principal reason for us not proposing an all-underground project. You know, it's technologically feasible, but it's not a project that is affordable.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Can buried lines be buried along state roads? And, if they are buried along state roads, would the state receive revenue from the -- for the use of that right-of-way?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, yes. We believe that transmission lines can be buried along state roads. That's a permissible use of a state right-of-way. I believe there is a modest payment made to the state for use of that right-of-way.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How many facilities, in addition to towers and the main substation, will be the subject of construction in Deerfield? And, is there any future construction in Deerfield envisioned?"

MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: There will be 87 345 kV AC towers that will be built. There will be 39 115 structures that will be relocated. And, there will be the improvements to the Deerfield Substation itself, a modest expansion to put in some additional electrical
infrastructure. We have no plans to further build out beyond this Project.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next question refers specifically to "the transition station in Bethlehem that will allow the overhead lines to go underground near The Rocks Estate." And, the questions are: "How large will the substation be? How tall will the buildings" -- I'm sorry, "the station". "How large will the transition station be? How tall will the buildings be? What steps will be taken to minimize the visual impact of a "substation-type" facility to the nearby properties?" And, the last question on this sheet is "Will "dark-sky" lighting and landscaping be considered?"

So, if you want to take those one at a time, I can repeat whatever you need repeated.

MR. BOWES: I'll start, and I think I may have them all. But the physical dimensions of the transition station in Bethlehem are 130 feet by 75 feet. The size of the building inside the substation, it's about 12 feet high, about 10 feet by 20 feet. The size of the structures, there are A-frame type structures in the substation, are just over 100 feet in heighth.
The screening or things that we will do around that substation will or could include, obviously, landscaping, with evergreen-type or natural types of vegetation. And, the "dark-sky" lighting is, is the lighting will be directed at the various equipment in the substation. So, I wouldn't say it will be directed all down. By the lighting will only be in use when they're working inside the substation at night. It will normally be a dark substation.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: With reference to Bear Brook State Park, "how high will the poles be in Bear Brook? Will some be as tall as 145 feet? And, are the poles in Bear Brook some of the tallest poles along the entire project?"

MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: I can't speak specifically to the exact number of structures in Bear Brook Park. They are in the 100 to 130-foot range. And, they tend to be towards the upper end of the heights on this Project, yes.

MR. BOWES: If my memory serves me, I believe there are nine or ten structures in the park.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: On our drive today, we were driven by a location that is probably outside
the park, that has the single tallest structure on the entire route. I've forgotten the exact height. Maybe someone else remembers?

MR. OLDENBURG: 165.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 160, I think. It was down in like a valley next to the road.

MR. JOHNSON: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, is that outside the park?

MR. JOHNSON: That's outside the park, yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm going to read this as it's written, although I'm not 100 percent sure I know what it means.

"How many cables and", I believe the word is "diameter will be used on the line?"

MR. JOHNSON: So, the underground cable is about four and a half inches in diameter. And, there is one per pole, one positive/one negative. So, there will be two four and a half inch diameter cables that will placed in the ground. There will also be 2-inch conduit put in for communication purposes, and there will be three of those. Those are, again, approximately two inches, and they will contain fiber
optic cable.

Sorry. The clarification there is, when I say "pole", I don't mean a tower. We're talking in a trench under the ground here, with a positive and a negative pole. A positive pole and a negative pole.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, the reference to "cables" refers then only to what is going underground?

MR. JOHNSON: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

MR. JOHNSON: If you'd like to know the diameter of the overhead cable, it's slightly over an inch, an inch and a half in diameter.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Thank you.

"It has been said that we all receive power from the same grid. Why are the New Hampshire rates higher than the rates in our neighboring states?"

MR. QUINLAN: They're actually not. You know, if you look at the rates across New England, just focusing on the energy rate, they're essentially equal. You know, there are seasonal variations at times. So, for example, Eversource New Hampshire customers benefit, particularly during high winter energy prices...
from the ownership of generation, it tends to provide a
safety net, if you will, from those high prices.

So, last winter, you know, our rates
were among the lowest in New England. In times of
abundant gas supply, to your earlier question, energy
rates across New England are, in essence, identical.
And, I'll say that there's one exception. So, it's one
pool, with one energy clearing price. There are times
when the grid is congested. So, if there's a
transmission constraint, which doesn't allow economic
generation to get into a region, then that area becomes
what's referred to as "congested", and prices in that
area would go up during the period of congestion. So,
that's kind of the exception to the "one price" rule.
But those are very limited today, as a result of those
transmission projects I showed earlier, which have, in
essence, eliminated congestion across the region.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This is a topic I
know there was a question about last time. "Is it true
that, in a number of places where you'll be overhead,
that multiple lines will be closer together than
recommended by", it says here "FERC", but I believe the
correct acronym is "NERC"?

MR. BOWES: So, in all cases where we
have multiple lines on the same right-of-way or with crossings of the lines, they all meet the National Electric Safety Code clearances. So, the premise of that question is not correct.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, there are no separate recommendations from NERC regarding spacing that are different or more strict than the Code?

MR. BOWES: So, the physical dimensions are set by the National Electric Safety Code. There are planning criteria that comes through NERC to ISO-New England. And, again, we meet all of those criteria as well, as indicated by the approval of the Project by ISO.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, a question that says "why are you ignoring NERC's recommendations in this area?" You would say "you are not ignoring any recommendations", correct?

MR. BOWES: That would be correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. "Are you risking major outages by placing lines as close together as they are?"

MR. BOWES: Again, I would say "no".

There is redundancy built into the system by its design and by the construction that's taken place across the
New England grid for decades.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is there any recommendation from FERC, from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, regarding how lines are placed within rights-of-way?

MR. BOWES: I believe it's NERC that has those requirements. I'm not aware of FERC requirements in that area.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This next sheet says that "the route today that we drove passed by crews installing poles in groves of an invasive species, specifically Japanese knotweed", I don't know if that's true, that is asserted here. "What best management practices were those crews using to prevent the spread of Japanese knotweed?"

Are those -- do you know, did we pass any Eversource crews today that were working?

MR. QUINLAN: I did not. And, without, you know, some definition as to the location, it's a difficult question to answer.

Lee Carbonneau.

MS. CARBONNEAU: Yes. I was on the bus trip. I think we did pass a few working crews. I can't say if they were working in an area with invasive
species or not, and I can't speak to exactly how they were dealing with that. But there are measures in place for the Northern Pass Project that would address invasive species and try to minimize the spread of such species during the construction of the line.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There's a reference to "best management practices" in that question, and there's one later in this pile that I've read but I can't find it real quick. Who's going to enforce best management practices in the construction of this Project?

MS. CARBONNEAU: The Northern Pass Project has written into their project management plans, all of the requirements that -- or, they're in the process of writing this up, all of the requirements that will need to be addressed, including best management practices, any of the state and federal permit requirements that are issued as part of the permitting process, as well as the additional methods of impact avoidance and minimization that the Project has already committed to.

Those things will be enforced, in part, by a series of environmental monitors that the Project will be paying for, to have on-site during
construction, to make sure that all of those
requirements and the plans that -- and everything
that's on the plans are followed. Again, there may be
some enforcement by the state and federal agencies.
They certainly have the right to come out and witness
any of the construction activities that are ongoing,
and make sure, to their own satisfaction, that those
standards are also being met.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We're
going to have to cut questions off at this point.
Because I've asked this many [indicating], and I have
this many sheets [indicating] still to go. So, we're
just -- we're going to have to cut off the questions,
so we can get to the public comments before dark.

"Would it be technically feasible to
bury the AC line through a section of Concord as has
been done elsewhere, specifically in Connecticut,
Middletown and Norwalk?"

MR. BOWES: We have not done any studies
on the underground of the AC portion of the line.
Short distances would likely be technically feasible.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If FairPoint can
bury its fiber optic lines next to I-93, why can't
Northern Pass?
MR. BOWES: The only fiber optic cables that I'm aware of buried on I-93 are for the State DOT purposes. I'm not aware of FairPoint. I'm not saying that they don't or have not done that. But I'm just not aware of it.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: But why can't you bury your lines along I-93?

MR. BOWES: So, we believe we would have to be in the undisturbed portion of I-93, if we were to build there. So, not in the median, not in the travel lanes, not in the breakdown lanes, and not in the shoulder, but to the far right-hand side of the highway, in the disturbed section of the right-of-way. And, that would lead to several issues around constructability, environmental impacts, public safety, as we're building, in essence, a road next to the road to do our construction, and ultimately would lead to very high project costs.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Will Northern Pass or Eversource or any other company involved in this purchase properties that will lose all their value, devastated by this project", is in the phrase of this question asker?

MR. QUINLAN: So, we have, as I said at
the outset, done a lot of outreach to landowners, and
are working with many of them to address questions or
concerns that they have about the Project. In some
cases, we are, you know, changing Project design to
mitigate impacts, whether it's structure heights,
structure location, structure design.

The notion that there's going to be a
material impact on property values, perhaps
Mr. Chalmers, just a quick comment on that.

MR. CHALMERS: Yes. Briefly, -- my name
is Jim Chalmers. We have looked at every sales of an
abutting property along the red alignment, the Phase II
alignment, in the last three years. And, we've also
looked at every sale of an abutting property along the
proposed route of Northern Pass. And, we've also
looked at about 150 sales of lots, where some of the
lots in the subdivision were crossed by the line and
some weren't. And, more often than not, there's no
affect of proximity to the lines. That's the results
of that research. And, on that basis, we don't expect
that the Project will have any widespread or consistent
effect on property values. We have found --

[Audience interruption.]

MR. CHALMERS: We have found particular
attributes of a property that make it vulnerable. And, we understand better what those are. And, there will be a handful of properties that may experience impacts, but that number will be very small.

This, you know, it may be worth to take another minute here, --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No more than a minute.

MR. CHALMERS: Okay. Those results to a lot of people sound counterintuitive. We know the direction of the effect of transmission lines on properties is generally negative for most people. In rural areas, some people see positive benefits. But, in general, they're negative.

But what you don't have any intuition with respect to is what weight that particular variable plays in the home purchase decision. You've got all the variables associated with the house, with the lot, with the neighborhood. Okay? And, all you can do is go look at the sales. And, when you go look at the sales, if you don't find an effect, which we generally don't, what that means, that doesn't mean that the effect isn't negative. It just means that it's not carrying a heavy enough weight in the decision calculus.
to show up in the market data.

MR. QUINLAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Will workers on the Northern Pass Project have an opportunity to continue working for Eversource after the Project is completed?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, one of the things that I talked about earlier was the "New Hampshire first" approach. As part of that, one of the things that we have launched, in collaboration with the IBEW, is an Apprentice Training Program, which really is designed to bring individuals who are interested in this trade, to this highly skilled trade, onto our projects, including Northern Pass. Give them an opportunity to receive, you know, state-of-the-art training. And, in some instances, we anticipate, you know, trying to recruit them as future Eversource employees. When we think about the electric worker of the future, projects like these are ideal opportunities to build out the craftsmen and to fully qualify a line worker.

So, the short answer is "yes". We do anticipate opportunities for many of the workers on this Project as part of that apprentice feeder program.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "What are some
examples of economic development projects that the
$200 million ForwardNH Fund will support?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, the four focus areas
were outlined on the slide. I won't repeat them.
Probably, the single best example of that is our recent
commitment we've made to the Balsams redevelopment up
in Dixville Notch. You know, it's a project that is
pretty far along in its development, from a permitting
perspective, and is really working on final project
planning and, ultimately, financing.

So, we have made an advance commitment
to that important project in the North Country, because
it's exactly the type of project that the ForwardNH
Fund is intended to make a reality. It's in the North
Country, it's a host community, it's economic
development, it's tourism. It's kind of the perfect
project for us to consider, and we've already made a
$2 million commitment to it, in advance of our Project
becoming a reality. We felt very strongly that that
was the right thing to do. And, it's probably the
single best example that I could provide you at this
point.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is that $2 million
in addition to the 200 million or is that the first
deduction from the 200 million?

MR. QUINLAN: It's the latter. We would ultimately consider it part of the ForwardNH Fund commitment, as an advance commitment.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Does Eversource support U.S. Representative Kennedy's bill", which is quoted here as "Fair Ratepayer Accountability, Transparency, and Efficiency Standards Act, to determine if Forward Capacity Market structure and policies are actually providing electric reliability at just and reasonable rates for consumers in New England?"

MR. QUINLAN: I'm not personally familiar with the bill. I am aware that, you know, capacity markets across this country, including in New England, are under review at a federal level, to look at whether they are really working. Are they incenting the investment they're intended to incent, to ensure that we have a reliable and diverse supply of power in the future? I think this bill is targeted on that very question, as well as, you know, are the rates being charged for capacity just and reasonable?

And, I'll give you an example of what's probably triggered this bill. You know, the capacity
market for the last decade has been a billion dollar a
year market for New England. Okay? In 2017, it's
going to be a three billion dollar a year market; in
2018, it's going to be a four billion dollar a year
market. And, that's -- those are just payments to
generators to ensure that the lights could stay on.
They have nothing to do with the generation of
electricity.

So, it's just a logical review to
conduct. You know, are we comfortable that those
multi-billion dollar increases that New England
customers are paying are effective? And, you know,
what can we do as a region to bring them back under
control?

So, I'm not personally familiar with the
bill. But I think capacity markets, in general, should
be looked at.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How much of the
proposed power will be sold or used in Deerfield? And,
how much of the proposed power will be sold and used in
New Hampshire?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, all of the power will
be delivered to Deerfield, New Hampshire. That's the
terminal of the Project. From there, it enters the New
England grid. We do anticipate a power purchase agreement with our partner, Hydro-Quebec, that will reserve a minimum of 10 percent of the total capacity of the line for New Hampshire customers. The balance of it is unaccounted for. So, there's been no transactions to commit any of the other 90 percent.

So, specific to Deerfield, you know, Deerfield is in our service territory. So, they would get a proportion of that, if you would. But, you know, I don't know off the top of my head what percentage that would be.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "What is the expected rate for electricity supply after completion of the Project?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, when you look at the combined effect on the wholesale energy market and the capacity market that I was just referring to, because Northern Pass will push both of them down, it's about $800 million a year across New England. New Hampshire is about 10 percent of New England's load, it's about $80 million a year in savings to New Hampshire customers. If you look at all of the customers in New Hampshire, residential and business, our estimates are it's about 5 percent reduction on the bill, for every
business and residential customer, not only in New Hampshire, but all of New England.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Two questions on this sheet, one of which you may have answered, or Mr. Chalmers may have answered.

"As a property owner in Deerfield, located on Cate Road, part of the power lines will be on this person's property. How will this affect this property owner and his property values?"

If there's anything -- if there's nothing other than what you have already said regarding property values, just say that.

MR. QUINLAN: Anything else? We have nothing to add.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. "How much of a disruption will this be for a property owner, like someone living on Cate Road?"

MR. JOHNSON: So, from a construction perspective, it follows, very briefly: Tree clearing, access road development, foundation installation, structure erection, and structure stringing. Those activities will be sequential. And, it may -- it may not be all at the same time. It might be a week or a couple weeks, and then, you know, the crews might come...
out a month later to do that again. All told, construction, in certain areas, is expected to be less than six months.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The last question on that sheet -- on this sheet asks about the possibility of burial. Is there anything you want to add to what you've already said about burial here in Deerfield?

MR. QUINLAN: No. I think I've pretty much explained the view of that, and the balance that we've worked to strike.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The first question on this sheet is an additional question about "compensating landowners for decreased property value, and will there be any offset to property owners whose property values decrease?"

Do you have anything you want to add to your earlier answer on that topic?

MR. QUINLAN: No. Although, I will just add one thing, which is kind of in the same area, which are the tax benefits of the Project. Like I shared at the outset that, you know, a project of this size will have a significant tax basis. And, it will contribute to those local municipalities from a tax perspective,
which is one of the factors in property valuation. We estimate that to be about $30 million a year, for the first 20 years of the Project.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This question asker believes that your tourism expert is from Florida. I don't know if that's true. But you -- "you talk about hiring New Hampshire people. How many of your experts here today, who are not employees of the company, are from New Hampshire? And, if they're not from New Hampshire, where are they from?"

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, can we quickly identify where you live? Lee?

MS. CARBONNEAU: Lee Carbonneau, with Normandeau Associates. I live in Loudon, and have been in Loudon for decades. And, my company is based in Bedford, New Hampshire.

MR. JOHNSON: Sam Johnson. I live in Connecticut. And, we have an office in Manchester.

MR. QUINLAN: These two gentlemen are with the Company. Mr. Varney?


MS. WIDELL: Cherilyn Widell. I live in Chestertown, Maryland. And, I'm a historic
preservation officer.

MR. BAILEY: I'm William Bailey, of Exponent, and --

[Court reporter interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No one heard that.

MR. BAILEY: I'm William Bailey, with Exponent. And, I live in Maryland.

MR. NICHOLS: I'm Mitch Nichols, from Nichols Tourism Group. I'm from Washington State.

[Audience interruption.]

MR. CHALMERS: Jim Chalmers, Montana.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Everyone here this evening deserves your respect.

MR. DeWAN: My name is Terry DeWan. I'm the landscape architect working on the visual impact assessment. I'm from Yarmouth, Maine.

MS. KIMBALL: I'm Jessica Kimball, also from Yarmouth, Maine. I work with Terry.


MR. HODGDON: I'm Mark Hodgdon. I'm a private attorney, in Concord. And, I live in Epsom,
MR. QUINLAN: That's it.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Please explain what distributed generation is?" And, the rest of the question is "why Eversource is not in favor of it?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, distributed generation is generally small-scale generation that is located close to the customers. It's not centrally located, like a large power station with, you know, long transmission lines. So, it's close to where the electricity is consumed. It could be, you know, a solar array on a house. It could be a fuel cell located on a college campus. It could be, you know, a small wind farm. These tend to be distributed, which means "local".

The notion that -- or, the statement that "Eversource is not in favor of distributed generation" I think is wrong. We are a long-time supporter of distributed generation. You know, through our three-state service territory, there's quite a bit of distributed generation at this point. You know, and it runs the gamut of all the areas that we just spoke about.

So, you know, it's clearly part of our
energy mix in the future. Generally, it does need to be backstopped by large central generation. Because, when the wind is not blowing and the Sun is not shining, and customers -- customers are demanding electricity, you need a reliable bulk power supply.

But there's clearly a place in New England and New Hampshire's energy future for distributed generation, and the two really need to complement each other.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "What percentage of the electricity along the line will be lost along the route?"

MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Bowes, losses.

MR. BOWES: So, losses on the transmission portion will be a few percent. There's also some losses with the conversion from DC to AC. But, in general, it's a fairly nominal value.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Back on distributed generation.

MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm going to read the question just as it's written: "Why is power for Connecticut and New York not generated near the end-user?"
MR. QUINLAN: Again, I think the premise under the question is not correct. There's quite a bit of generation, certainly, in Connecticut, which is an area I'm more familiar with. There's two large nuclear power plants in Connecticut, on Millstone Station, the largest single generation station in New England. There is an extensive amount of gas-fired generation in Connecticut as well.

I would, as I think about it, there's, I believe, more generation sited and operating in Connecticut than there is in New Hampshire.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Please explain where the "possible" 5 percent savings come from."

MR. QUINLAN: So, it's our estimate of what an $800 million energy and capacity market annual savings in the wholesale markets translates into on a retail customer's bill. So, it's an allocation of that $800 million annual figure down to the customer base, if you will.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Can you explain how sending money to Canada for this power will affect the Gross National Product?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, again, you know, our involvement in the Project, we are the developer and
the builder of the transmission line. The statement's incorrect, you know, in the sense that it is Hydro-Quebec who will be paying us for the use of the line that we have built and own. Hydro-Quebec will then sell their power into the markets of New England. Just like they do today.

They're one of the largest trading partners in the energy markets today. They have been enjoying that role for decades. In reality, New England is hugely dependent on power generated in Quebec every day. And, you know, they're a strong and active participant in those markets.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Following up on Hydro-Quebec's involvement and their legal standing in this proposal. The question is, "how does Hydro-Quebec have the legal right to existing Eversource rights-of-way, especially considering that Hydro-Quebec has publicly stated that they're a separate company from Northern Pass?"

MR. QUINLAN: Again, the Northern Pass line in the United States will be built, financed, and then owned by Northern Pass Transmission, which is a Eversource subsidiary. Hydro-Quebec will not own the facilities in the United States.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Please explain why New Hampshire is bearing the brunt of this project that is beneficial for the rest of New England."

MR. QUINLAN: As I explained at the outset, you know, the benefits to New Hampshire are quite significant for this Project. Deerfield was selected, because it's a optimal point in the electric grid to -- for the importation of a large amount of hydropower. So, electrically, it works. And, Mr. Muntz alluded to this earlier. The System Operator looked at that and said "you can inject that large amount of hydropower into that point in a safe and reliable way." So, Deerfield was selected because of the robust nature of the infrastructure. The reason we selected the route we did was we thought it was a great opportunity to advance both our energy and environmental goals, as a region and as a state, in a way that can deliver significant benefits to New Hampshire.

And, we have the benefit of an existing transmission corridor, back to the balance that we've been trying to strike. You know, and utilizing existing corridors was a key part of the decision-making.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: A safety question. "Emergency responders must have appropriate equipment for all hazards they face in the field. Does this project require any special equipment for first responders?"

MR. BOWES: It does not, with maybe one exception. I think we would want to do some training with the Franklin emergency responders for the converter station, just because it is a new technology, and there will be a large indoor component of that facility. So, that's probably the only exception. The rest is very similar to what is built and in service in the rest of New Hampshire.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Will the Company be paying for that training in Franklin?

MR. BOWES: Paying -- we would certainly be hosting and putting it on. I'm not sure that we would actually pay the fire department for that, no.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, the fire department, the City of Franklin won't incur the cost of that training, correct?

MR. BOWES: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "What is the risk to existing lines in the right-of-way if the
transmission towers fall in an ice storm?"

MR. BOWES: So, the Northern Pass Project is designed to the latest standards, which are different than standards have been in the past. They're a higher level. They're called the "heavy standards" of the National Electric Safety Code, which care about wind, extreme wind, and ice-loading. So, if those design criteria are exceeded, I mean, it is potentially possible that a structure could fail or a portion of the structure could fail, inherently in the design with the conductors, it will also fail in a manner that would most often be within the right-of-way. And, when I say "most often", in my 32 years in this business, I have not seen a structure fall outside of the right-of-way. So, I guess, while it's technically -- or, is a possibility; in practice, I just don't think it's a reality.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If it were to happen, how long would it take to get them back up?

MR. BOWES: So, a structure repair can take from a few hours to a few days.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next question is about trees again. This property owner has 300 year-old Black Tupelo trees that are on the edge of
their property line near the right-of-way. "Will the Northern Pass Project cut these trees down if they happen to be at a height that threatens the towers?"

MR. BOWES: So, if they're in healthy condition, and they're off the right-of-way, the answer is "probably no." I think we'd want to look at the specifics of the trees to make that determination. And, we're very willing to work with the landowner for that.

MR. QUINLAN: And, just if I may add. There was an earlier question about "hazard trees". A "hazard tree" is one that's been identified as an arborist as being "dead or dying". And, so, it tends to be an imminent risk to the infrastructure. It's generally not a healthy tree.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Will Northern Pass make it easier for New Hampshire to transition to other sources of renewable energy, like solar and wind?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, you know, there are -- there is a relationship here, and I had a slide that kind of highlighted it earlier. Which is the ForwardNH Plan in the Northern Pass Project does allow us the opportunity to upgrade the Coos Loop, so, the transmission loop in the North Country. There is a
substantial amount of small renewable facilities that feed into that loop that today are not operating, because the loop is constrained. This Project is creating the funding and the opportunity for us to upgrade that loop to allow that small-scale renewable generation, which is generally distributed generation, to run more, and to be more profitable, and also to create the opportunity for new small-scale renewables in that region, which is, you know, seems to be receptive to wind and other forms of renewable power. So, it's -- and this is something that has been contemplated for quite some time here in New Hampshire and has been cost-prohibitive. This Project gives us the funding source to make it a reality.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next two questions or the next two sheets both have questions directed to Public Counsel, which I'm not going to ask Mr. Roth to address, I'm just going to make him aware of the questions.

"In reviewing previous SEC applications, it appears that the Attorney General's Public Counsel only represents the interest of those who oppose projects. Does Public Counsel have a responsibility to represent all citizens, including supporters, or just
opponents?"

And, the second one is "how does Public Counsel determine what issues he or she fights for in this process? Are issues raised by opposing interests given more weight or will the issues like ensuring local jobs be an issue that Public Counsel advocates for?" People are watching you, Mr. Roth.

"Mr. Quinlan has stated that the incremental cost to bury the entire Northern Pass line would be approximately 1 billion." And, there's a series of questions based on that statement.

"Is this figure based on an assumed burial of the proposed route? If not, please describe the alternate route on which the figure is based."

MR. QUINLAN: Could you repeat the middle part for me? Is it assuming based on --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Is it assuming burial along the current proposed route?"

MR. QUINLAN: No. No. It assumes that the burial is in the public highway, not in the existing transmission corridor.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Would it be more expensive or less expensive to bury it in the proposed -- in the current proposed route?
MR. QUINLAN: It would be significantly more expensive to bury it in the current right-of-way. And, it would be significantly greater environmental impact to bury it in the existing right-of-way, which is generally forest, as opposed to in the public highway, which is disturbed.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Who did the burial cost study for you?"

MR. QUINLAN: Our Engineering team, including Burns & McDonnell. And, it's also been checked against the bids that we've received for construction, both underground and overhead, as we've, you know, competitively bid the actual construction of this Project. So, we now actually have true market data on the unit cost of construction for underground here in New Hampshire.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "When was that study done?"

MR. QUINLAN: Within the last several months.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Is that study available to the SEC and to the public?"

MR. MUNTZ: Those studies are actually part of a competitive bid process at this point with {SEC 2015-06} [Joint Public Hearing/Deerfield] {03-16-16}
MR. QUINLAN: And, so, what Mr. Muntz is referring to is, I alluded to the New England Request for Proposal, where transmission projects were competitively bid; Northern Pass is one of those. So that we could provide a firm cost estimate for Northern Pass, we actually have gone out and contracted for all elements of this Project.

So, the information Mr. Muntz is referring to is the data provided to us as a result of those processes. I believe we're bound under confidentiality with those contractors not to release unit data. I believe that, if the SEC were interested, I'm sure we can determine a way, in consultation with our providers, to provide that pursuant to a protective order perhaps.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This next sheet has ten separate questions on it, on many different topics. The first is, "where did Hydro-Quebec get all this water to produce so much electricity?"

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't make any of these up, folks.

MR. MUNTZ: Well, Hydro-Quebec has a
long history and an extensive network of dams. I think they have 42 or 43 generating stations that are in operation. They actually have lakes almost as big as the State of Connecticut. So, they've got an incremental amount of terawatt-hours stored and available to service not only Quebec, but all the surrounding markets.

MR. QUINLAN: Just for a sense of scale, Hydro-Quebec, their hydro system is about 40,000 megawatts of hydro generation. For a sense of perspective, all of the generation in all of New England is about 32,000 megawatts. So, it's a very significant hydro generation point.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: On our trip today we heard about helicopter fly-overs of the route. This question asker wants to know if they're yours? But wants to know how often you've been flying over the route? And, will you continue to be flying over the route with your helicopters?

MS. CARBONNEAU: I think the question refers to a discussion we had about looking for nests, raptor nests, or heron rookeries along the route, in which we -- our wildlife biologist did one fly-through of the route, from Canada all the way down to
Deerfield, to look for stick nests on existing structures or in trees along the right-of-way. That's the only fly-down that Normandeau has been involved in. But I will pass this on.

MR. JOHNSON: We did a LIDAR survey, which is a type of survey to get the topography of the land. And, we did that approximately two years ago. And, again, it was a one-time -- one-time usage.

MR. QUINLAN: Any anticipated additional fly-overs?

MR. BOWES: So, normal operations, we also do visual inspections via air for all the transmission system, at least on an annual basis. And, after every disturbance, we will also fly that portion of the line where a disturbance occurs. So, you could see several times a year, on certain lines, we may be through there.

MS. CARBONNEAU: And, we'll also have one more nest flight before construction.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "If employees are coming from out-of-state, where will they stay?"

MR. QUINLAN: Generally, as close to the work as possible. So, it will depend on the phase of the Project. But that's one of the benefits of the
Project, is that there will be workers.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Will any of the work be done at night?"

MR. QUINLAN: Do you work at night?

MR. JOHNSON: At this time, it's not anticipated that any work will be done. However, we do, when asked, in certain emergency situations, we may have to work at night.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Do you consider the towers to be a potential threat for terrorists and is there a threat to the entire power grid?"

MR. BOWES: So, any particular tower or any particular line, by its design, has redundancy built in. For Northern Pass, in the case of this line, it would be importing approximately a thousand megawatts of hydropower, it would actually provide some redundancy to the existing Hydro-Quebec line that imports about 1,200 megawatts.

I'm probably not the best person to ask about what targets are from terrorists. They seem to be things that generate a public or a human issue, rather than an object. So, in general, I don't think transmission structures are necessarily a target by themselves.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next question asks about how you'll respond to accidents. Do you have anything you want to add to what you've already said about accidents?

MR. QUINLAN: No.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Please speak to the problem of buzzing and the noise that has been heard and recorded under transmission lines."

MR. BOWES: So, there is a section of the Application that deals with the audible noise, from both the DC system up north, as well as the AC system. The levels of noise would be similar to what you would experience now under a transmission line. There's nothing out of the ordinary with that. They do tend to be higher noise levels during humid weather, as the air around the constructors starts to ionize. So, that it is a phenomenon that is very common, foggy weather as well. But you wouldn't expect to have any different levels than you have today on the transmission system.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You've already discussed "danger trees" at some length. So, I will skip that question.

I'm gone to read this as it's written:

"Is there a plan to have a "non-participant
moderator"? That may not be directed to you, but I'm not sure. Does it mean anything to you?

MR. QUINLAN: No.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If it's directed to "who is going to chair hearings like this?" The answer is "no".

"Please speak to how you're going to deal with traffic during construction."

MR. JOHNSON: So, from the overhead perspective, traffic would only be impacted at the entrances and exits of the right-of-way, which would be on public roads for the most part. And, there will be appropriate flagman and/or barrels or cones set up designating those areas. Typically, it's a one-on/one-off type of arrangement.

For the underground construction, we are working with the Department of Transportation to establish, you know, approved markings and traffic lights and jersey barriers and barrels and cones and flagmen and police detail. All of that has to be put together and approved by the DOT prior to construction beginning.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There are a number of questions regarding work between Deerfield and
Scobie Pond. They're scattered throughout the rest of this pile. But here's the first.

"You have stated that the only upgrades to outgoing lines that are not part of the Northern Pass Project consists of raising the height of nine structures between Deerfield and Scobie Pond. Deerfield has seen tremendous work along its right-of-way over the past few years that must therefore be part of the Northern Pass Project. Have these upgrades been factored into the cost of the project?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, any upgrades that have taken place in that corridor to date are totally unrelated to Northern Pass. And, we have not begun any construction activities associated with Northern Pass in that corridor.

And, I think the question is about right as to the number of structures impacted in that portion of the line.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm not sure that that's right. I think the question is directed at "from the substation to Scobie Pond", what work has been done in that corridor in the last few years?
MR. JOHNSON: So, as Bill mentioned, that none of the work that's been done in any of the areas around Deerfield is associated with the Project. Quite frankly, we can't do it until we have the permits. Which is the process that we're going through as we speak right now.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, that is the portion I was referring to, between the Deerfield Substation and the Scobie Pond Substation, out of the 600 or so structures in that existing transmission corridor, I believe there are approximately ten that have to be raised on average 5 feet. Those won't begin until this Project is permitted and we're in construction.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "So, the power gets to Deerfield Substation. How does it get out of Deerfield to end-users? What projects come after the Northern Pass Project? And, where is the plan for that?"

MR. MUNTZ: So, as part of siting any of the projects like this, where there's going to be a large, you know, it looks like to the system a generator that delivers power to Deerfield, the Independent System Operator, ISO-New England, analyzes
the system as it is and tells us what we have to do to
the system to upgrade, so that we can deliver that
power under all system conditions, under all generation
dispatches, under all seasonality, and under all load
conditions. They give us a list of upgrades. We've
done -- we're very close to getting that finalized list
from ISO. We've done the same study and come up with a
list of system upgrades, which include those ten poles
that need to be raised -- ten towers that need to be
raised by about five feet each. All of those upgrades
are included in our proposed Project.

MR. QUINLAN: So, there is nothing
required beyond what is already on the proposed plan.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "The Northern Pass
Project Application was accepted by the SEC in December
of 2015." According to this question asker, "some of
the information requested in the Application is either
missing or not sufficiently detailed. Does this mean
that the SEC has sufficient information about the
project to make a decision? And, if more information
is needed, please identify what that information is."

MR. BOWES: So, based on the new SEC
requirements that were approved in December, we have
filed a supplemental filing in February. And, it's
several pages, and it covers several new topics as well. And, that will be the subject of the two additional hearings that you mentioned at the beginning of this meeting.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This question asserts that "in 2003, a transmission line that runs over the right-of-way on this question asker's property suffered a significant accident. And, an 80-foot pole was pulled down in a wetland while a new power line was being pulled through. A tracked vehicle was dispatched immediately across the wetland to the location of the downed pole. Shortly thereafter, a helicopter with management people landed in the hayfield. It did not appear that there was any predefined approach to solve a serious problem like this. What measures does Northern Pass have in place to prevent serious problems like this and to solve them safely and quickly without collateral damage?"

MR. BOWES: So, I believe that that situation did occur in proximity to the Deerfield Substation as well. I would say that we have learned a lot since that experience. That, certainly, with the wetlands, we need to be very cognizant of where they are, not only during construction, as has been all
outlined for Northern Pass, but also for our ongoing operations and maintenance activity. So, whether it's vegetation management or whether it's emergency repairs on the system.

And, I think we are much better today than that situation that occurred in the past. And, I think we'll continue to learn from our experiences and improve.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "What is the system to be employed to assure that best management practices are complied with? What organization will serve as the neutral party to follow progress and report violations and stop operations if necessary?"

You may have -- you may have provided an answer to that earlier. If you have anything you want to add, you may.

MS. CARBONNEAU: I don't think I really have anything to add to that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How much larger than the existing substation will the new footprint of the new substation transformer be?"

MR. BOWES: So, the site will be about eight acres larger than it is today, the cleared area. And, I'm not sure how that relates to the transformer.
That's the total area, which includes, in Deerfield, it includes the static VAR compensators and capacitor banks, and I think there's either one or two transformers as well.

MR. QUINLAN: In that footprint.

MR. BOWES: Inside the 8 acres, yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "In order" -- this question says "in order for the additional power to leave Deerfield to go to Scobie Pond or other locations, upgrades to all of the existing towers will need to be made. Who will be paying for those upgrades? Shouldn't the costs be part of the Northern Pass Transmission Project?"

MR. MUNTZ: Yes. The ten towers we talked about that need to be raised are the only upgrades that are required for Northern Pass to deliver its power safely and reliably to Deerfield. The costs are included as part of the Northern Pass Project.

MR. BOWES: That is also true for any of the 115 distribution upgrades as part of the Northern Pass. They will be paid for by Northern Pass and not PSNH ratepayers.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "If those towers are not upgraded, can the power be used?"
MR. MUNTZ: If, for some reason, we didn't upgrade those towers, there may be some conditions that occur on the system where the ISO-New England would tell us that we need to either turn down the power delivery or, you know, turn it off, in an extreme case.

More than likely, since we're raising these towers five feet, there's a sag condition, where the -- because of the slightly increased power flow over those lines are getting too close to the ground under extreme conditions, so, we would expect that they would probably tell us, for example, "limit the output of the converter to 800, you know, megawatts, instead of 1,090."

However, we're going to raise those ten towers, and be able to deliver under all conditions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This question references "a sound proof wall", or a sound-reducing wall, "that would be built around the transformer. How high will the wall be? Are there other walls like this around other transformers? And, if so, how much noise reduction do they provide?"

MR. JOHNSON: I'm not aware of a wall that would be built around a transformer. The
existing -- trans -- or, the transformer that will be
installed as part of the static VAR compensator will be
outside in the open air.

MR. BOWES: And, attenuation from a
sound wall is part of the design. So, although it may
not be part of this Project, you can specify a certain
sound reduction based on the design now intended.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I do have an
understanding that there was a reference to a
"sound-suppressing wall" at the Deerfield Substation
today.

MR. BOWES: We'll find out at the break
and then provide an answer.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. Can I introduce
Mr. Bosse?

MR. JOHNSON: And, Mr. Bosse is a
project engineer.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

MR. BOSSE: As part of the Deerfield SVC
design, I did indicate today that there's a transformer
that is part of that extra yard. And, the sound study
that we have done results in the need for a sound wall
around that transformer.

MR. QUINLAN: Do you have a sense for
height?

MR. BOSSE: The transformer tank would probably be in the vicinity of either 10 to 12 feet. So, I would say, you know, 12-13 feet, roughly.

Bill, if I could, there was one question about the number of structures in Bear Brook State Park. Could I answer that question, because I have the data?

MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

MR. BOSSE: Okay. Nine structures, ranging in height from 110-foot to 145-foot, all monopole.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This is another question about the facilities beyond Deerfield, on the way to Scobie Pond. "Is nine the accurate number? And, what are the heights of the poles that will need to be modified?"

MR. JOHNSON: Ten is the number, and the average structure height existing today is about 75 feet. So, they will go up to 80 feet.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This is another question about "danger trees". I assume you have nothing you want to add?

MR. QUINLAN: Correct.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "You spoke about the existence of the Phase II overhead transmission line through New Hampshire as part of the rationale for building this project overhead. Please explain your reasoning in comparing a line built more than 25 years ago with a project being built today."

MR. QUINLAN: So, the purpose for that information was to illustrate what's been built in the region that's large-scale transmission. Most of the examples, the top ten examples that I showed, were all built in states other than New Hampshire, but in New England. So, those are all within the last ten years. So, the point of that was, all of the large-scale construction in the region, over the last ten years, including some projects we just put in service a month or so ago, have been overhead construction.

I included the Hydro-Quebec line for illustrative purposes, because there have been several questions about that existing facility. What is its route? What type of construction? And, how tall are the towers? You know, many aren't aware that there isn't even an existing line very similar to Northern Pass that runs through New Hampshire today, through towns like Hopkinton, Bedford, Pelham, that's actually
higher voltage, all overhead, and taller towers than what we're proposing here. It's just a point of reference.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How many jobs that will last more than two or three years will be created by this Project?"

MR. QUINLAN: I believe Mrs. Shapiro answered that question earlier.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Does burying the lines preclude the union people who are here this evening from working on the Project?"

MR. QUINLAN: No.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Is the existing line", that you just referenced a minute ago, and "was on Slide 3, is that available for increased flow of energy to southern New England?"

MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Muntz, maybe you might want to sure a little bit about the operation today.

MR. MUNTZ: Yes. So, that line is rated at 1,400 megawatts. Its rating varies actually, depending on system conditions, actually, as far away as out in New York State. But, whatever -- however you want to rate it, whether it's a steady rating or an actual rating on any given day, over the last five
years, that line has flowed at 90 percent of its
capacity. And, that's all-in. That's outages, you
know, downtime, whatever, that it's 90 percent full.
So, the line is essentially fully utilized, and there
is really no more room, because of, as I said, the
system conditions that really don't allow any more
power to flow on that particular pathway.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Please discuss why
you consider hydropower to be "clean energy". Although
it does not use fossil fuels, many consider it not to
be clean."

MR. QUINLAN: So, you know, I think many
have recognized that hydropower is a clean technology,
in the sense that you're not burning a fossil fuel and
you're not emitting carbon dioxide. And, that was
recognized most recently by the EPA, as part of Obama's
Clean Power Plan. The State of New Hampshire I think
recognized the environmental benefits of large-scale
hydro in our Climate Action Plan. And, certainly, the
six states across New England, as we've looked at "how
do you address today's energy crisis and deliver clean
energy?", have recognized the environmental benefits of
clean hydropower.

If you look at the emissions that I
referred to, from even a large-scale hydro facility early in its life, when it does have some emissions, versus any other conventional power supply, coal, oil, natural gas, they're dramatically lower from a hydropower. With the sole exception of nuclear, baseload nuclear is also non-carbon-emitting.

So, you know, that's the reason we believe it to be "clean". You know, many states have now recognized that, including the State of Connecticut, which recently was counting large-scale hydro against its Renewable Portfolio Standards. I think you're going to see over time other New England states, and nationally, states adopting that and recognizing the environmental benefits.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Are the IBEW people here tonight being paid to be here, if you know?"

MR. QUINLAN: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Are Eversource employees here tonight being paid to be here, other than the ones who are part of your presentation?"

MR. QUINLAN: No.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Are Eversource employees allowed to speak against the Project?"
MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This question starts with some context that "the SEC process a requirement that the Applicant identify historic resources, archaeological, historic buildings, and landscapes that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places." The question asserts that "Cultural landscapes and historic districts seem largely absent from the current Application materials." And, asks "why?"

MR. QUINLAN: Cherilyn Widell. She's our historic resource expert.

MS. WIDELL: Good evening. Yes. The SEC Application does require at least an assessment of the -- whether there is broadly an unreasonable adverse effect on historic sites. In preparation for the SEC Application, Northern Pass hired Preservation Company of Newington, New Hampshire, led by Lynne Monroe and her team and I to prepare a assessment of historic properties, which included cultural landscapes in its assessment.

For example, some of the cultural landscapes that were identified in that were Weeks State Park, which is listed on the National Register,
about 2.92 acres. But the cultural landscape actually encompasses about 400 acres. So, we looked broadly at that. One of the other cultural landscapes that was identified was the North Agricultural District in Lancaster, which includes 45 farms and over 1,600 acres.

So, we believe that the assessment, which is, actually, I don't think ever has an assessment been specifically done for an SEC Application before this, is complete and does include cultural landscapes.

MR. QUINLAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This next sheet has a few questions, some of which reference some of the discussion that took place in the Concord meeting. There was a commenter who said that he had "been able to refinance without a negative impact on his appraisal". I believe he said that the current transmission lines are in his backyard. He was "able to refinance without a negative impact and his appraisal was fine." Would you agree with this statement that "that does not necessarily mean that a home" -- "that a buyer is going to buy it at the price that the appraiser set"?
That's a "yes" or "no" question for someone over there.

MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Chalmers, do you have an opinion on this?

MR. CHALMERS: I would agree with that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: At the Concord meeting there was a mention and a discussion about how bringing in lower-priced power from Hydro-Quebec might have an effect on some existing generators. Have you made any attempt to analyze the effect on those generators?

MR. QUINLAN: No. What we have looked at is the effect on the market, and the generators that bid into that market in any given hour. And, the effect really is, as Mr. Muntz indicated, you know, Northern Pass looks like a low-cost generator delivering into New Hampshire. So, it displaces about an equal amount of higher-cost, generally carbon-emitting generation from that bid stack.

But we've not analyzed specifically which generators, and that would vary under market conditions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If your Project were to start putting small generators out of business,
would you do anything to try and mitigate the effects?

MR. QUINLAN: We don't anticipate Northern Pass having any adverse impact on small generators. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, we think we are going to actually enhance the prospects for that type of generation here in New Hampshire.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Do corporations like Eversource feel like they can do anything they want in New Hampshire without regard to the people affected?"

MR. QUINLAN: No.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "What safeguards are there in place that protect New Hampshire from any cost associated with maintenance or repairs of this line or the ramifications of the loss of power?"

That's three different topics: Maintenance, repairs, and ramifications of loss of power.

MR. QUINLAN: So, the maintenance associated with the Project, the costs of that are all covered under an agreement between us and Hydro-Quebec that has been approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. So, it's all covered under that agreement. New Hampshire customers are not party to that agreement and have no responsibility under it.
As to the second question?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ramifications of the loss of power?

MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Bowes addressed this earlier. We don't anticipate having those types of events with this line, it's a very highly reliable line. If it were to occur, the costs associated with that would be borne by the Project, namely Northern Pass and our partner, Hydro-Quebec.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "If ratepayers in Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts were willing to pay for the added $1 billion, would you completely bury the Northern Pass line in New Hampshire?"

MR. QUINLAN: Again, the project we bid into the New England Request for Proposal is identical to the Project we've proposed here. We think that is a competitive proposal into that solicitation. That's why we submitted it there, as a mirror image to what we provided to the SEC.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next sheet asks "how you're going to get the power from Deerfield to southern New England?"

Do you want to add anything to what
you've already said on that topic?

MR. QUINLAN: No.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Do you have an estimate of how many danger trees it will be estimated that you will need to cut down per mile along the proposed route?"

MR. JOHNSON: So, inherently, the maintenance and operation of the existing right-of-way today already addresses danger trees on a regular basis, should they -- should they occur. We actually do not expect to find any. And, if we do, it will be in the single digits.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That's along the whole route?

MR. JOHNSON: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You may have already answered this. "Will the lines create noise" --

MR. QUINLAN: Can I interrupt for one, I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sure. Go ahead.

MR. QUINLAN: So, we do have some new right-of-way that isn't today built. So, to the extent there were danger trees identified in the new
right-of-way, which is either in the Wagner Forest, that 24 miles, or that other 8 miles of overhead construction in the North Country, we would work with the landowners on the removal of potentially danger trees.

So, I just wanted to clarify, we do have some areas that aren't under our current tree-trimming policies.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This next question asks "whether there will be noise created by the overhead line, particularly crackling and arcing?"

Do you want to add anything to what you've already said about noise on the line?

MR. QUINLAN: No. I think Mr. Bowes addressed this earlier.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Will the Deerfield Substation" -- I'm sorry, "the Deerfield" -- yes, "the Deerfield Substation, will there be increased noise there?"

MR. BOWES: So, I think Mr. Bosse provided an update on that, that there is a new transformer going in there. And, there will be a sound wall around that to mitigate any noise impacts.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Last question. "Do
the towers that you are proposing as part of this project have the potential to carry an increased number of transmission lines and increased capacity beyond what is currently in the proposal?"

MR. JOHNSON: No.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. With that, we will end the question section. And, despite our efforts to push us along a little bit faster, we ended the question section at almost exactly the same time as we did two nights ago.

So, we are going to take a 15-minute, so that Mr. Patnaude's hands and machine can cool off, and we will be back at 20 minutes after.

(Recess taken at 7:05 p.m. and the Joint Public Hearing resumed at 7:23 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right, folks. We are going to get started with the public comment. We now -- would you please, please keep it down out there please? Thank you, thank you, thank you.

We have almost 70 people who have signed up to speak. If everyone takes three minutes, that's 210 minutes. And, if you do that, that's three and a half hours. So, again, we're going to ask you, if you can, to limit yourself to three minutes.
Here's a couple of other ground rules.
If you could spell your name, if there's any ambiguity in how your name is spelled, or sometimes even if there is not ambiguity, it would be helpful for the record if you could spell your name. If you have a written statement that you are reading from, there are two things about that. The first is to read slowly and clearly, so Mr. Patnaude can get it. The second is to give a copy to Mr. Patnaude in the bin that is to his left that he will hold up.

[Mr. Patnaude holding up the document bin for all to see.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We are going to have a timer up here, which, as I said at the beginning, we're not going to cut people off, but, when you get to three and a half minutes, I'm going to raise my hand. After you've gone a little bit longer, I will probably ask you a question, like "how much longer do you have?" or "can you bring yourself to a close?" If you need additional time, we're going to ask you to wait until the end. So, we'll ask you to stop then, and can back at the end. People have done it at each of the first two meetings. So, it's not a problem. But it is polite to everybody else here to give as many

{SEC 2015-06} [Joint Public Hearing/Deerfield] {03-16-16}
people a chance, before their babysitters could go to
college on them.

So, we'll call, basically, three names
at a time. So, we're going to start with Tony Giunta,
from the Franklin City Council, to be followed by
Senator Boutin, and Mr. Bilodeau.

MR. GIUNTA: Thank you very much, Mr.
Chairman. My last name is spelled G-i-u-n-t-a. I am a
City Councilor from Ward 1 in the City of Franklin.
And, I thank you for the opportunity to take my
testimony.

If I may please share with you some of
the demographics of the City of Franklin. We are 8,500
people. We are smack dab right in the middle of New
Hampshire. Of those 8,500 people, approximately 4,400
people are our labor force. Of those 4,400 people, a
little more than 1,000 of those people work at
manufacturing and industry. So, as a City Councilor,
I'm here to give you a little bit different spin on
what this project means. And, it's not necessarily
related to people's homes or people's individual bills.
It is related to manufacturing and industry. With such
a heavy reliance, one out of every four people in the
City of Franklin are relying on manufacturing jobs.
When I heard the statistic that electricity is the highest price than anywhere else in the nation right here in New England, that gives me pause, and it makes me a little bit nervous. So, for the last three years, I have been talking to our major employers in the City of Franklin. And, I've asked them "how is this impacting your bottom line?" And, their response to me has been "Significantly. We are becoming more and more noncompetitive, with not only foreign competition, but competition right here in the United States. And, if things don't change, I, at some point, will have to listen to my CFO, who continues to walk into my office as the CEO, and says "we have to do something about these high electricity costs"."

Now, it may not mean much for a homeowner that has a bill of $150, and it goes to 175. But, if you're paying a half a million dollars, three-quarters of a million dollars a year in electricity rates, you can go almost anywhere else outside of New England and reduce that by 50 percent. So, at some point, if you can drop a quarter of a million dollars or a half million dollars to your bottom line, and move 300 miles southwest of here, at some point, you have to start paying attention to your
CFOs.

Now, I think, mostly through their benevolence, a lot of CEOs have said "this is where we started, this is where we want to stay." At some point, they have to make that decision whether or not they're going to stay based on these high costs.

So, bottom line is, many of the manufacturers have told me, if things don't change, they're leaving. We've had one company that has already left. And, the bottom line is, is that, once we lose a manufacturer, they are very unlikely to come back. A company left about seven years ago. We contacted them recently and said "would you ever like to come back to the City of Franklin?" And, their answer was "Absolutely not. We love it here in South Carolina, and this is where we're staying."

We can't afford that in the City of Franklin, and the thousand people in my ward cannot afford to lose their jobs for manufacturers to leave.

So, I merely bring this up, because it's a different perspective. And, I please want you to remember the statements that I have made, these thousand people with their jobs depend on those manufacturers staying, and recognize that they are all
looking at your decision. And, I think if you're
decision is "no" to this project, they are going to
decide that there's really nothing coming down the pike
that will help us, and they are going to make that
decision to leave.

So, please, approve the Northern Pass,
and I ask you to do so as expeditiously as possible.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Senator David

Boutin --

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Excuse me. Every

speaker --

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- deserves your

attention and respect.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sir, if you can not

control yourself, you will be asked to leave.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Every speaker
deserves your attention and respect. You can ask the

people who are here who have been at other meetings.
If people want to applaud, they are free to applaud. I'm going to call the next speaker regardless of what they do.

But, if you want to boo or hiss or jeer, you're going to be asked to leave.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm done.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is that clear?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Senator David Boutin, to be followed by Philip Bilodeau, and Peter Bosco.

SEN. BOUTIN: Thank you. Dear members of the Site Evaluation Committee, first let me thank you on behalf of all the citizens of New Hampshire for your dedication and hard work. I am a State Senator from District 16, which includes Hooksett, Bow, Canada, Dunbarton, and three wards in the City of Manchester.

I come before you tonight to express my support for the Northern Pass Project. While there are many benefits, I believe, in having this project move forward, there are three that I'd like to highlight: First, it will reduce electric power prices by $80 million. Secondly, we can expect that it will yield $30 million in new town and state revenues. And,
thirdly, it will create over 2,000 much needed jobs.

I have been in the Legislature for eleven years. And, I have to tell you that, during all of that time, I have heard from ratepayers and businesses over and over and over again that we must take bold action to lower energy costs, more particularly, electric power energy rates.

If New Hampshire is going to be competitive in the regional, national, and global economy, energy costs must be contained and lowered. I believe the Northern Pass Project will get us there in a safe and environmentally sound manner. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Philip Bilodeau, to be followed by Peter Bosco, and Lance Clute.

Mr. Bilodeau, before you start, I want to go off the record for just a second.

[Brief off-the-record discussion ensued.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Bilodeau, you may proceed.

MR. BILODEAU: Thank you very much. I'm very thankful for the opportunity to talk tonight.

And, I do thank you for bringing me up a little earlier
than number 55 or something. I would also be very thankful to Commissioner Bailey for asking the question earlier this evening. I'm going to stay to the script, and so I'll be under three minutes. But, at the end, I'll probably make a few additional comments.

So, this evening, good evening. My name is Phil Bilodeau. Joan and Phil Bilodeau live at 140 Nottingham Road, in Deerfield.

Northern Pass ends in Deerfield. Northern Pass ends in Phil and Joan Bilodeau's backyard. I spoke in Concord on March 10th at the joint meeting of SEC and DOE. I was too passionate at that time, and I believe some of you recall, to actually describe my position, our position.

Our home is on four acres, and abuts the 65-acre Public Service substation. We personally built our home over the past 44 years. We were aware that Northern Pass would end in Deerfield. But, several years ago, Public Service of New Hampshire made improvements to the existing substation. Imprudently, we assumed those improvements would manage this new power.

We were notified as abutters of a wetlands permit application, in October, I'll say.
Upon review of the 750 plus pages of wetlands applications, we discover that a new substation will be built taking up approximately 5 acres. Now, remember, my lot, our lot, is only four acres in size. Clear-cutting the forest, taking 20 feet off the top of the hill, and filling in around 14 feet to flatten the five-acre site.

The existing station is approximately 1,500 feet away from our back porch. The new substation is proposed to be approximately 750 feet away from our back porch.

I'll speak aside here. Those numbers I'm getting from the plan that you have in front of you, which is a Public Service plan, and you'll notice there's a scale there.

The copy of the plan I provided you in this packet is from the wetlands permit application. The little square next to the number "416-14", on the left-hand side of the plan, is Phil and Joan's house. The big white blob, in the middle of the plan, is the proposed new substation.

We have filed for intervenor status. We experience that Northern Pass objected to our filing. We filed our objection to their objection. We urge the
SEC to grant our request for intervenor status.

Should all the objectors to high towers prevail and the complete route be buried, the power will still end in Deerfield in Phil and Joan's backyard. Our quality of life, the enjoyment of our property, the value of our property will be greatly diminished.

At the March 10th hearing, in Concord, Mr. Quinlan stated that Northern Pass had reached out and contacted affected property owners. Are there any doubts that Phil and Joan Bilodeau are affected? Phil and Joan were contacted yesterday, March 15th.

Please grant us intervenor status. I'll go off script for a moment. Again, to thank you, and to pick up on a comment that was said earlier by one of Mr. Quinlan's experts. And, I came in late, and so I think I heard something like "oh, the houses are a quarter of a mile away."

Well, I went out in the lobby -- I went outside for a while to get some fresh air, and I Googled how far a mile is.

Yes, sir?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No. I'm just letting you know --
MR. BILODEAU: Three minutes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- that you're at three and a half at this point.

MR. BILODEAU: This is quick. I Googled a mile, it's 5,280 feet, a half a mile is 2,640 feet, and I don't question the accuracy of this gentleman's experience with the plan that they provided. And, the question for the six-month period for construction, I question that you can build a five-acre substation that would take six months or less.

Thank you very much for the opportunity.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Peter Bosco, to be followed by Stephanie Labbe, and Lance Clute.

MR. BOSCO: Peter Bosco. That's B, as in "boy", o-s-c-o. I live in Shaftsbury, Vermont. And, I will travel three hours today each direction to be heard for barely three minutes.

I have intently followed and studied this issue since 2011. While Northern is not in my backyard, I consider New Hampshire my second home. I have traveled the country and think New Hampshire is one of the most beautiful states, your land, and the tourism it generates, is one of your greatest
resources. I have hiked and visited backcountry places in New Hampshire that few residents have probably haven't seen.

Over the past 35 years, I have spent tens of thousands of dollars recreating in your state. I have skied, camped, hiked, and vacationed four to six times a year, spending my money at your inns, camps, motels, restaurants, and gas stations.

I have waited months, years, actually, to say that, sadly, I will not come back, if these towers are built. And, I know I'm not the only one. It will be like a scar on a woman's face, always there, and she'll never get used to it. I, no one, will ever get used to those towers. If built as proposed, Northern Pass will have a profound negative effect on small business. It will have a cascading effect -- it will have a cascading detriment on tourism and the state economy. If I want to see industrial infrastructure, I can vacation in New Jersey. Don't be pennywise and pound foolish.

Most disturbing of all, this project will really only benefit a small group of outside shareholders at the expense of New Hampshire. The very soul of this beautiful state will be ripped out, all in
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the name of greed, ugly, unadulterated greed. Don't buy into their false promises of riches and jobs for all.

But the towers don't have to happen. As many of you are aware, a similar project is essentially green-lighted in Vermont, built entirely underground. The difference here is Eversource. Formally known as "Northeast Utilities", which, by the way, had the lowest customer satisfaction survey of any utility in the country.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Folks -- just a minute, Mr. Bosco. You know, I'd really like to be able to pay attention to what Mr. Bosco is saying. And, if you want to distract me from what Mr. Bosco is saying, you'll continue to interrupt him and clap. Why don't you wait until the end, because you clearly agree with him. Please, wait until the end. So, everyone can hear what he has to say. Thank you.

Mr. Bosco, you may continue.

MR. BOSCO: The clapping didn't bother me. But Eversource stands to make many billions of dollars over the life of these towers, while bankrupting that state's beauty and tourism industry.
And, don't let Eversource tell you that it can't be done underground. Much larger and more ambitious projects have been completed. The additional expense of burial can be paid down, in small part, by utility customers over a 40-year period. That, shared with an additional cost from Eversource, will make the difference. Again, the factor here is greed. If they want to access your land, they can do so underground, or not at all. And, why should some parts of the state have a buried line and other parts not? This is a divisive issue on so many levels and it didn't have to be like this. If it were up to me, I would have told Eversource to take a hike a long time ago. They need you more than you need them.

You only have one chance to do this right. Having towers that are up to 150 feet -- 153 feet high in sensitive viewsheds is clearly not the right way. I have no doubt New Hampshire tourism will take a huge hit if these towers are built. I, for one, will vacation in my home State of Vermont or travel to Maine.

Finally, this is the biggest decision for New Hampshire in a generation. For those of you empowered to make this decision, your political
aspirations and careers will forever be sullied if you approve these towers. New Hampshire voters will not forget. You will be held accountable. The will of the people, which is overwhelmingly against Northern Pass, and not monied interests, must be heard.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Stephanie Labbe, followed by Lance Clute, and Joe Dionne.

MS. LABBE: Good evening. My name is Stephanie Labbe, L-a-b-b-e. I am a civil engineer and a Project Manager for PAR Electric.

I have personally been involved in our operations in New Hampshire and throughout New England over the past ten years. Over that time, we have constructed and maintained a large portion of the transmission and distribution lines that deliver power to everyone's homes. We also play a major role in restoring power after major storm events, such as Hurricanes Irene and Sandy and the October snowstorm in 2011.

As a Project Manager, I am usually the first person to get involved in a project and the first person on site. I am the one who builds the beginnings of relationships with local businesses, so I can
personally attest to the benefits that a project of this size will bring.

On this project, it will not just be linemen that are put to work. You've heard, and I can confirm, that transmission line construction requires numerous subcontractors, for work such as tree-clearing, road-building, paving, equipment hauling, material hauling, survey and geotechnical investigation to name a few. We plan on hiring New Hampshire companies for these operations. They will employ New Hampshire residents. They will purchase or rent equipment in New Hampshire. They will purchase fuel in New Hampshire. They will rent office space and yard space in New Hampshire.

This is an important project, and one that I am proud to be a part of. It is important for New Hampshire and the future, and I support Northern Pass. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]
awarded the contract for Northern Pass. I want to thank the Site Evaluation Committee for the opportunity to speak. And, also, the fingers of the gentleman here, and of all of the meetings, the stenographers, because they do an unbelievable job.

Based on my past experience for projects, Northern Pass will add thousands of jobs, as has been attested to over and over. The greatest portion of these jobs are not through the line workers. The biggest portion, as the previous speaker said, will be from other work, and the services that they support.

We currently employ a large number of New Hampshire-based line workers, a lot of them here tonight. A lot of these men and woman work outside of New Hampshire currently. They don't work here, because there's no work here. There are other line contractors here tonight that also employ hundreds of line workers that are New Hampshire-based folks that work outside and in New Hampshire because of the lack of work. Construction of Northern Pass will allow all of these line workers to come home and work here in the state they grew up in.

I also wanted to give you an order of magnitude of some of the things that we will spend
money on as far as actual dollars and cents. We'll spend approximately $7 million on gravel; $8 million on concrete; duct bank system revenue of about $27 million; the workers will spend approximately $10 million on each, lodging and meals, over the course of the project; and, believe it or not, the purchase of ice, water, and Porta Potties will add about a million dollars to the local economy.

One other thing I want to touch on to spend is the equipment that we will use and the money we will spend on that equipment. We will rent most of the equipment that we use for the construction. We do own equipment, however, most of that equipment will be used elsewhere, and it's very expensive to transport. We will spend approximately $10 million to run that equipment, all bought locally in New Hampshire. There will be about a $20 million spend on repairs to that equipment, that we won't do ourselves, we will have that done by local shops throughout New Hampshire.

In closing, I would like to urge the Committee to approve this Application. The state's workforce, economy and wellbeing is best served by building Northern Pass.

Thank you.
[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Joe Dionne, to be followed by Jim Tighe, and Mike Skelton.

MR DIONNE: Good evening. My name is Joe Dionne, D-i-o-n-n-e. I am currently employed by PAR Electrical Contractors as New England's Health, Safety, and Environmental major -- Manager. We recently have been selected as the general contractor for the Northern Pass Project, if approved. I would like to thank the Site Evaluation Committee for allowing to speak in support of this project tonight.

I've been involved in our operations in New Hampshire for the past three years and will continue to work with our employees and Eversource to ensure all overall safety for the workforce, the public, and the environment.

PAR will be purchasing thousands and thousands of timber mats for this project from New Hampshire companies. We will use these mats to help protect and save sensitive environmental areas. We will work in accordance with local environmental agencies to make sure there will be no impact in these areas.

I am a Keene State College alum of
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Keene, New Hampshire, and currently have two other KSC alum working for PAR reporting directly to me. PAR is looking forward to recruit from the University of New Hampshire, Plymouth State, KSC, and other New Hampshire institutes to help build our Health, Safety, and Environmental team. Recruiting from local institutions will also help lead to opportunities in business management, human resources, accounting, and many more fields. This is a great opportunity to put young educated professionals in the field to gain experience and knowledge that will help further their careers. PAR will use this opportunity to give future generations a chance to build their careers on a very exciting project. This project will help these young professionals build their future in the State of New Hampshire and one day start building their families. I look forward to moving back up to the State of New Hampshire full time in this upcoming year.

In closing, I would like to urge the Committee to approve this Application. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jim Tighe, to be followed by Mike Skelton, and Jim DeStefano.

MR. TIGHE: Hi. Good evening. My name is Jim Tighe, T-i-g-h-e. I'm with Quanta Services.
I'm the Director of Business Development for Quanta. And, one of our operating companies, PAR Electric, is the general contractor for the project, for the Northern Pass Project. I wanted to thank the Site Evaluation Committee for the opportunity to speak to you tonight.

I support the project. This is one of the single most important projects in the country right now, and will address many of the energy issues we face.

If I could cover a couple of key points: New Hampshire jobs. There's a lot of people hurting in New Hampshire. The mills, loggers, concrete suppliers, this project is going to mean a lot to them. We have two operating companies in New Hampshire, PAR Electric that has a regional office in Bow, New Hampshire, and another company, called "JCR Construction", that operates in Raymond, New Hampshire.

Now, these two companies, some of which date back over 30 years, employ 200 people. And, these people live, work, and raise their families in New Hampshire. They're New Hampshire residents. They support this project. Quanta, the parent company of PAR Electric and JCR, is the largest IBEW employer in
the country. There's thousands of workers within the IBEW that support this project. And, I think, at one of the recent meetings I attended, there was 240 New Hampshire residents that work for the IBEW now that have to work away from their homes, in other states. And, we would like to try to bring those folks back home, to work in their towns, in their -- and be back with their families. And, Northern Pass will allow us to do that.

An important aspect of Northern Pass, and we worked closely with Eversource on this, is the "New Hampshire first" initiative. And, what that means is, we, as the general contractor, have a responsibility and an obligation to get as much participation of local New Hampshire businesses. I personally have gone out, probably not as an extensive a road trip as you folks, I know you've been on one looking at the route, but spent three days meeting with 70 different interested businesses, and these were excavation-type companies, loggers, clearing-type companies, concrete companies, asphalt companies, all New Hampshire-based that will work on this project.

And, I think I could give you, from an economic benefit standpoint, I think I could give you a
real-world example. Because I've heard a lot of folks saying that "these are out-of-state jobs, it's not going to help our economy." But here's a real-world situation that I was involved in personally. There was the Maine Power Reliability Project that started in 2010, and ran until 2015. And, it was a $1.4 billion project. So, dollarwise, it's comparable to Northern Pass. That project, we have real-world data on that project. It employed 390 contractors, 270 of those contractors were Maine companies. So, that kind of gives you an indication that this is going to drive businesses and jobs for Maine folks. At the height of that project, there was 2,700 jobs that were created, and a positive impact to the economy, to the local Maine economy, of $436 million. So, that's the kind of benefit we'll see with Northern Pass and New Hampshire. Very quickly, I just wanted to highlight, one of the issues with Northern Pass and one of the things it's going to solve is our energy crisis. We have a country that's migrating away from coal, and we're never going to do a nuclear power plant in this country again, after Fukashima. So, we need different sources of energy. Northern Pass is an ideal source of energy.
And, in closing, I'd like to urge the Committee to approve this Application. Northern Pass is a step forward in securing our future energy needs, while creating much needed jobs and a positive impact for New Hampshire.

Thank you so much.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mike Skelton, to be followed by Jim DeStefano, and Mark Bailey.

MR. SKELTON: Thank you. Good evening.

Mike Skelton, S-k-e-l-t-o-n. I'm the President and CEO of the Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce. The Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce is the largest chamber in the State of New Hampshire. We represent nearly 900 businesses from across the southern New Hampshire region. Our Board of Directors first endorsed the Northern Pass Project in 2012, and we reaffirmed this position in support of the project in 2015, after reviewing the details of the new route and the ForwardNH Plan. And, I'm here tonight to express our support for the project and to urge its approval.

In reviewing the project, the Board of Directors recognized the statewide economic development benefits of this project, as well as the impact of
accessing new, large sources of hydroelectric energy that can help stabilize our energy market.

As has been discussed tonight, New Hampshire faces a growing crisis around the cost of electricity. The business community, in particular, is greatly impacted by this issue, and it threatens our ability to grow our economy and create jobs. While demand for energy increases, the region has as well an increasing number of older generating plants coming off line, representing a loss of thousands of megawatts of electricity. This, combined with our increased reliance on natural gas power generation, leaves us vulnerable to price spikes due to an inadequate supply of gas into our region. While there is no single solution to this challenge, we know that we must increase the supply and diversity of our energy, if we're going to address this issue. And, Northern Pass does just that and is a step forward.

We believe Northern Pass is going to help address this issue in several ways. It's going to bring a thousand megawatts of new energy into the region, that will drive down the cost of electricity and save an estimated $80 million annually for New Hampshire ratepayers. Second, the purchase power
agreement between Eversource and Hydro-Quebec guarantees that New Hampshire customers will receive the lowest price for power. And, third, increasing the supply of clean hydropower into the region helps diversify our overall energy supply, which makes us less susceptible to the price spikes we've seen in recent years.

Now, I also have with me Mr. DeStefano's comments. He was not able to attend.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, just one second. Let me make clear for the people who are here. Our rules specifically allow for someone to read someone else's statement, if that person is unable to do that or is unwilling to do that. There are people here tonight, Mr. Page is one, who did that at the last meeting, and others have seen it. So, this is in our rules and allowed specifically in there.

So, Mr. Skelton, you may proceed for Mr. DeStefano. If you could spell Mr. DeStefano's name, so it's clear whose statement this is.

MR. SKELTON: Sure. James DeStefano, D-e-S-t-e-f-a-n-o. This is Mr. DeStefano's submission.

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Northern Pass Project and hope it gains
approval to be constructed to become operational.

I'm a lifelong New Hampshire resident, and have resided in Manchester for the past 16 years. I'm a shareholder in a New Hampshire-based commercial real estate services firm, an industry in which I've worked for the past 25 years. To disclose, I've been a vendor for some Eversource-owned real estate disposition projects over the years, including some active listings presently.

In my capacity as a commercial realtor on the frontline of economic development efforts in New Hampshire, I can attest to the significant disadvantage New Hampshire and New England has due to skyrocketing energy costs. Other than pockets of smart manufacturing, our state's manufacturing industry remains depressed. The last decade of brokerage has been filled with the sale of many vacant manufacturing facilities that formerly employed many thousands of workers repurposed into other uses.

My firm, Colliers International, was recently working with a Belgium company, Verstraete, in seeking to acquire industrial land to develop a 100,000 square feet state-of-the-art manufacturing plant with hundreds of employees to be hired. A leader in the
In the mould labeling industry, Verstraete decided to instead invest in Tennessee. According to an email from Verstraete's Deployment Project Manager, energy cost is twice as high in New Hampshire as compared to Tennessee, and was a critical site criterion in their decision to not choose New Hampshire.

I'm discouraged when I hear opponents contend that the electricity supplied by Northern Pass will be used primarily in southern New England; thus, the project should be opposed. Frankly, New Hampshire's economy is highly dependent on a regional economy. If Massachusetts and Connecticut and others suffer, so does New Hampshire.

New Hampshire communities would receive substantial property tax revenue from Northern Pass, and the project would create enormous construction job base.

I realize this project has generated tremendous public comment. For that reason alone, I sincerely thank you for considering my personal thoughts on Northern Pass. Please count me as a strong supporter of this project.

And, that concludes Mr. DeStefano's comments. And, just want to reiterate that the Chamber
is here in support as well. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mark Bailey, to be followed by Craig Trottier, and Tiler Eaton.

MR. BAILEY: Good evening, members of the Committee. And, thank you for the opportunity for public comment. For the record, my name is Mark Bailey, B-a-i-l-e-y. No relation to Commissioner Bailey. I am a Facilities Engineering Manager for BAE Systems. I am responsible for facility strategy and business practices, and energy is clearly one area of strategic concern for us.

BAE supports the Northern Pass plan under your consideration this evening. We feel it is important for the region. We feel it is important to BAE Systems. Our company is the state's larger manufacturer, and we are certainly a major consumer of energy here in New Hampshire. We employ roughly 4,500 employees here in the state, with sites in Nashua, Merrimack, Hudson, Litchfield, Milford, and Londonderry. This allows BAE Systems to make two informed and stark observations.

First, it's difficult for business to operate competitively in New Hampshire, as we've heard
from many speakers already. Compared to other regions of the country, we clearly pay a high cost for energy. We believe we must take action now to bring more supplies of energy to the grid for regional benefit.

Second observation is this: The cost disadvantage is addressable, if the right steps are taken and they're taken quickly. BAE systems, as well as all of New Hampshire businesses, need low-cost, reliable power to remain competitive with the rest of the country and the world.

The Northern Pass plan is balanced. It will improve our region's energy deficit by delivering clean, renewable hydroelectric power to New Hampshire and the region, and it does so with addressing environmental concerns.

The Northern Pass plan has other regional benefits, as we've heard as well tonight. It will provide millions of dollars in tax revenue to many local communities, and it will provide thousands of jobs for New Hampshire. That is why BAE Systems is leading a group of roughly 50, 5-0, New Hampshire businesses in support of this plan.

I have copies of our joint statement, and a list of the very diverse companies who have
signed on. I ask that it be included as part of the public docket.

You will note these companies span from every corner of the state. They are both large and small, representing a true cross-section of various industries and business sectors that make up the state's delicate economy.

BAE Systems looks forward to a thorough, fact-based review of the Northern Pass Project by this Committee. And, on behalf of BAE Systems, I urge you to act in a fair and timely manner. New Hampshire citizens and businesses cannot afford to wait any longer for action.

So, I close with a terrible, but appropriate cliché. I say, "If not Northern Pass, then what? And, if not now, when?"

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Craig Trottier, to be followed by Tiler Eaton, and Tom Mullen.

MR. EATON: Good evening. My name is Tiler Eaton. And, I'm from Nottingham. Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight.

I was born and raised in New Hampshire,
and I fully support the Northern Pass Project.

First, I would like to thank the SEC Committee, and especially Mr. Honigberg, for your management of these meetings. Of the 20 or more public hearings this project has had, these past SEC hearings have been the most controlled. Before your participation, many of the hearings were out-of-control, and many citizens' statements were booed or shouted down, and many citizens were intimidated into not speaking. Your management of these hearings have encouraged everyone, on both sides, to share their opinions, which is great.

There have been many statements on the record regarding the IBEW and our members. Some stating that we have come in by bus, that we have tried to intimidate people, or we are from out of state. I would like the record to show we are as much a part of the affected communities as any other group that has spoken about this project. Our members are very hard workers, very good members of their communities. Most are active and belong to not only IBEW, but other organizations, such as Sierra Club and Appalachian Mountain Club. They own homes, coach kids, go to church, have camps in the North Country, where they
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spend time hunting, fishing, hiking, and skiing.

I would also like to say to Mr. Quinlan of Eversource, I am proud to find out you are a resident of New Hampshire. Many of the speakers at previous meetings have told you to go back to Connecticut. Well, if we applied that standard to many of the people who have spoken at these recent hearings, we all could have gotten to bed a lot earlier in last few meetings.

I support this project for many reasons: New tax revenues for schools; lower energy prices; and cleaner environment, to name a few. But my expertise in these transmission projects, they create jobs for working families.

I have seen it and I have experienced it. Unfortunately, after 35 years of being a lineman, I have never worked on a transmission project in the State of New Hampshire. We have hundreds of members that live in New Hampshire, but are forced to work extended periods out of state due to the lack of opportunities in this state. Missed birthdays, missed anniversaries, kids' games, things most people take for granted. Extended stays in campgrounds and motels, and on the road meals, are very hard living to provide --
make a very hard living to provide for our families. Almost done. This project will allow them to come home. Three years of work in New Hampshire, and a huge opportunity for them. Something I have never experienced. Long-term work on a good project, and good pay and benefits. I encourage the SEC to give that a chance.

Also, the IBEW members are not paid to attend these meetings. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I attempted to call Craig Trottier. Is Craig Trottier here?

So, Craig Trottier, to be followed by Thomas Mullen, and Susan Seitz.

MR. TROTTIER: Good evening. My name is Craig Trottier, T-r-o-t-t-i-e-r. I've lived in New Hampshire for 48 ears. I'm an avid hiker. I've climbed all 4,000 footers many times. I'm a member of several outdoor clubs. And, I'm passionate about energy efficiency, environmental stewardship, and the economic wellbeing of our state. I'm also a strong supporter of the Northern Pass Project.

I've worked for Public Service of New Hampshire, now Eversource, since 1979. Most of my
career has been spent working with the largest energy
consumers in the state.

I speak to you today as a concerned
citizen with a background in the energy field, and
through a decision made completely on my own. Through
my career, I have seen how high electric rates have
contributed to business failures, and caused some of
New Hampshire's best employers to move operations to
other regions in the United States where energy is less
costly. I fear a continuation of this trend.

In a recent example, the owner of a
large, energy-intensive manufacturing facility told me
that an out-of-state competitor is selling product to
his New Hampshire customers at prices he cannot match.
Per this business owner, his competitor can undercut
his prices because of lower electric prices in the
competitor's region. This New Hampshire manufacturer
stands to save over $400,000 per year in electric costs
solely due to the Northern Pass Project. Also, this
same manufacturer has invested millions in energy
efficiency. So, efficiency is not the problem, price
is. And, $400,000 will go a long way in improving this
business's competitive advantage.

High electric prices in New Hampshire
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are clearly a serious problem and must be solved.

We know that several large power plants in New England have closed or are scheduled for closing. We also know that wind and solar energy are intermittent power sources that require baseload power plants for backup. As such, we need more new baseload sources to replace the plants that have and will close.

Further, we all know the ardent opposition to new gas pipelines and the issues caused by tight natural gas supplies during the winter months. Combine the natural gas issue with power plant closings, it is clear that electric prices have no place to go but up. If we do nothing, the manufacturer I mentioned and other businesses may not survive here in New Hampshire.

I have the highest respect for and, for the most part, side with those organizations who oppose the Northern Pass Project, but I do not side with them on this issue. As with everything in life, there is a need for balance. The arguments against new energy sources, most notably Northern Pass, are out of balance with the obvious needs of New Hampshire's businesses and residents.

There are thousands of miles of power
lines in New Hampshire, yet thousands of tourists continue to enjoy hiking and outdoor recreational activities.

I urge you to shift -- to sift through the hype and do what is right for New Hampshire. We cannot compromise the viability of our businesses and our future because of illogical fears, including the supposition that tourists will no longer come to visit this beautiful state. I urge you to approve the Northern Pass Project.

Thank you very much.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thomas Mullen, to be followed by Susan Seitz, and Jonathan Mitchell.

MR. MULLEN: Thank you, Commission members. Appreciate the opportunity to speak to you here this evening.

There's a fact that's, I think, missing largely in this room, and I want to call attention to it. I think the vast majority of the people that you see here in orange, and the vast majority that are here in blue, would like to see the Northern Pass Project go forward; nobody's arguing that fact. The issue truly and really comes down to "how it goes forward". And, I
take great exception, sitting in this chair over here a few minutes ago, hearing that contracts have been awarded to various contractors on this project, a project that you haven't even voted on yet. That I find immensely presumptuous on the part of the Northern Pass people.

The issue really does come down to "how they're going to do it". And, they can afford to do it underground. It's being done underground all around the world, at this stage, not just here in New Hampshire, but how about in Connecticut? The State of Connecticut now has a law on the books that requires "any and all distribution" -- excuse me, "high tension lines/transmission lines have to go underground in the State of Connecticut", must go underground. Now, why can they do it in Connecticut, but they can't do it here? I find something wrong with that.

I want to remind the folks here from Franklin that few, if any, people have a problem with this project going down to Franklin. We'd like to see it go down to Franklin, and be converted from HVDC over to AC power before it continues on its way.

There are probably more jobs that are available from this project if it goes underground than
there are overhead. The project will take longer to do it, and there will be more contractors that will be needed on those jobs.

And, so, the last thing that I want to bring to your attention, there is a website called "glassdoor.com". That's a website where people can go on the site and, if they work for a company, they're able to make comments about their company. And, you must identify yourself to the operators of this website. They then will check back to make sure that what you've registered for on this website is really true. And, so, I'm going to tell you a couple things that have been said.

First of all, I want to read a headline that's on this website: "Beware: There's been an internal campaign that had managers at Eversource rate positively on this site." So, there were lots of negative comments that finally Eversource woke up to, and they launched a campaign to get their managers to say positive things.

I'll read you some headlines.

February 8th, 2016, current employee: "Can this wreck be salvaged. Cons: Since the merger with NSTAR, the company is run more like a dictatorship than a
democracy. This has disenfranchised nearly everyone in 
the workforce in all positions. All the line workers, 
electricians, financial analysts, engineers, and 
low-level managers can see how their knowledge and 
decision-making skills are no longer valued by the 
ivory tower executives. Advice to management: 
Relinquish control back to local management. This 
could be a really good place to work for again. 
Communicate with people with the understanding that 
they have common sense and can see through all of the 
typical drone buzzwords.

Give me one or two more of these. "Last 
resort: I have been working at Eversource full-time 
for a year. The co-workers are great at this place. 
The cons: Disjointed management; low pay; no 
consistency of direction; directors means VIP status 
only; miserable."

And, the last one that I have, this is 
from a "Supervisor, current employee. I've been 
working at Eversource full-time for more than 10 years. 
Pros: The work is challenging. Cons: Upper 
management is not trustworthy and does not appreciate 
their employees."

This is a company that's asking you to
trust them that they can't afford to put this project underground. I beg to differ with them. They can afford to, and you should make sure that's exactly what they do do. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Susan Seitz, to be followed by Jonathan Mitchell, and Ron Charland.

MS. SEITZ: Hi. My name is Susan Seitz. And my name is spelled S, as in "Sam", e-i-t-z. I'm back, again. Today you visited Deerfield, for less than two hours. You ran out of time for the Committee's questions. To me, this says you do not value Deerfield. We are just an end location to you. You are pushing a non-reliability energy project on New Hampshire, with technology that is currently old, and will look even more outdated by the proposed start date of this project. I have been a lot -- I've been at a lot of these meetings, and have heard a great deal of contradictory information. At one set of meetings that New Hampshire -- we were told that "New Hampshire would not benefit energywise", then we were told that we would get "10 percent". You keep telling us "it's all about the grid." I beg to differ. This project is not about the grid; it's about New
Hampshire, our way of life. Thirty of the thirty-one (31) towns along this route are opposed.

You stated tonight that this is a project you believe works. New Hampshire has stated loud and clear, we do not.

I'm tired of hearing how this project is going to lower energy costs a possible 5 percent. $80 million savings at 1.4 million people in New Hampshire is 57.14 cents per person. I'm not really sure how that's going to help New Hampshire businesses. So, we just heard, one New Hampshire business is going to save $400,000 a year. So, if you take that off the top, how much is left for everybody else? The people of New Hampshire are going to end up paying more, not less, if this project goes through.

You have not listened. You are throwing money at the objections. If you had listened in the first place, the money that you are spending to buy people could bury most of this project.

All New England states do not believe that hydropower is renewable energy. Connecticut is the only one. But you are pushing this as a renewable green project.

Please, SEC, listen to New Hampshire.
Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jonathan Mitchell, to be followed Ron Charland, and Shane Buckley-Gray.

MR. MITCHELL: I'm Jonathan Mitchell. Got the spelling on that okay?

MR. PATNAUDE: Yes.

MR. MITCHELL: All right. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Jonathan Mitchell. I'm a Training Director for the IBEW Local 490. And, I'm here in favor of Northern Pass.

I'd like to address one thing, and it's the infrastructure. I've been to all but one of the meetings throughout the state, and I'm glad this is the last one. I've listened to all the pros and cons from Colebrook to Deerfield.

Included in a couple of the presentations, there was talk of -- or, actually, a statement made that this project was not one that had to be done "to keep the lights on". And, back in the cheap seats where I was sitting, the buzz was "Oh, good. We don't need to do this."

Well, myself, and many others like me, we're also back there thinking "Oh, good." You know,
"we're not going to wait until our infrastructure falters or fails to address it."

Far too many times, whether it be local municipalities or states, they abuse the hell out of their infrastructures, as the people in Michigan can attest to. And, I, for one, am very glad that Eversource has taken the reins and kept us ahead of the curve on that.

In closing, I just want to say I believe Eversource has bent over backwards with the people in New Hampshire, listened to their concerns, and addressed them through rerouting, and the means to, the methods -- wiring methods, I should say.

This is a good project, one that's good for New Hampshire. Let's get this thing done.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ron Charland, to be followed by Shane Buckley-Gray, and Kris Shores.

MR. CHARLAND: I'm Ron Charland, C-h-a-r-l-a-n-d. Retired in Deerfield. This is a very complicated business, to me, especially, but we all love electricity. We can't do without it. However, if this project becomes absolutely necessary, I think most people want the lines totally buried, so we won't
regret it the rest of our lives.

Deerfield has a double line of towers coming into the center of town already, and a double line of huge towers going out. Another line of these 120-foot towers or so in the middle of the existent would simply devastate the center of this village, and affect everybody's property values and increase our taxes.

We also think that 1,100 towers would be a huge risk to the New Hampshire image and natural beauty of our landscape. Our thousands of tourists and residents would be greeted by these 10- to 15-story towers on I-93 turnpike just beyond our State Capitol, and would cross I-93 twice by the time you get to the Lakes Region, and more of them by the time you get to the mountains. If we need this project, there is a modern, professional way of doing it without planting 1,100 towers in the heart of New Hampshire. Burying the line also creates jobs.

We have not heard much about other projects in progress, but there are, in Vermont, New York, and Maine. And, the Boston Globe, Union Leader, recently, in the month of January, had articles, also on the Internet have reports about them.
Vermont's New England Clean Power Link approval has been made to bury a hydropower line of 154 miles, from Canada to the -- through -- under the Lake Champlain, and underground for another 54 miles -- or, 57 miles to the New England grid. Construction starts this year, according to the article, and in service by 2019, all with new underground technology.

The same company is also building another line from Canada, buried in Lake Champlain and the Hudson River, as well as railroad beds, to supply New York City, one of their -- which is one of their largest state projects so far.

Eversource is an $18 billion market cap company. Almost $6 billion in revenues annually, serving Massachusetts, the Boston area, all the big cities, western Mass. area, Springfield and so forth, as well as Connecticut, the State of Connecticut, and New Hampshire. And, they can well do it professionally. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Shane Buckley-Gray, to be followed by Kris Shores, and Diane Shores.

Shane Buckley-Gray here?

[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Kris Shores, to be followed by Diane Shores, and Nick Karakoudas.

MS. K. SHORES: Hello. My name is Kristen Shores. I live here in Deerfield. I'm not going to make a speech. I don't -- I'm not a public speaker. I just want to say that, if this all could be buried, I would vote for this project. But, as it is now, I definitely oppose this project.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Diane Shores, to be followed by Nick Karakoudas, and James Page.

MS. D. SHORES: My name is Diane Shores. I live here in Deerfield. And, I, too, oppose this project.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Nick Karakoudas, to be followed by Jim Page, and Jane Difley.

MR. KARAKOUDAS: My name is Nick Karakoudas, K-a-r-a-k-o-u-d-a-s. I'm a farmer. I grow fruits and vegetables here in Deerfield. I live on the Middle Road.

This is the time of year that farmers are making plans and preparations for the coming
growing season. One particular task lends itself well to making a metaphorical comment here, if I may, on what is perhaps the inevitability of the Northern Pass Transmission lines.

The farming task I’m speaking of is being certain to have enough fertilizer on hand. To this end, there are dairy farms that deliver and dump raw cow manure to me, which will then decompose into the wondrous, sweet compost that we can then put on our fields, to nourish our soil and our plants here in New Hampshire.

Now, those big piles of raw cow manure are pretty gross. Nobody wants to see them or smell them; certainly not the neighboring homeowners.

It must be noted that these big, raw stinkin' piles will naturally decompose all on their own, if you just let them sit there. But it would take a really long time. All that time, we would be imposing, our farmers, on our neighbors, negatively affecting their quality of life, just so that my business can make profits.

So, I, and all farmers, quickly get to work on these piles. We move them, we flip them. This greatly increases the rate of decomposition, rapidly
turning them into that sweet-smelling compost.

Now, it must be mentioned that this flipping procedure comes with some financial cost to the farmer. In terms of running and operating the tractor and the operator to continuously work the piles.

It's an added expense that could be completely avoided by just leaving the towering, ugly piles right where they were dumped. I could tell the neighbors that it's just too expensive to work the piles constantly. Gee, sorry, but the numbers don't work for my business, it bites into my profits. So, the piles will just have to stay where they are, all big and stinky, for a very long time, so I can save some money. Too bad about my neighbors.

But, of course, I, and fellow farmers, would never dream of doing that. We want to do the right thing by our neighbors, even if it costs us more to do so. Rightfully, rules around proper storage and handling of manure have been codified into law by regulatory agencies, to be certain that the environment and our neighbors are protected, right?

Today, I fear greatly that the oligarchy has already spoken, and this so-called Northern Pass is
inevitable. If this is the case, then I implore you, the regulatory agency here today, the Site Evaluation Committee, to do its job and protect all of our New Hampshire neighbors whose properties will be irrevocably negatively affected by the giant towers and their pulsing electricity.

Bury the line, if it must cut through our state. It's not okay for a mega corporation to cite its own need for greater profits as justification for being a poor neighbor.

Site Evaluation Committee, do your job, make them be good neighbors. You work for us, not the oligarchs.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: James Page, to be followed by Jane Difley, and Joe Casey.

MR. PAGE: James Page. I'm a resident of Deerfield. P-a-g-e, for the last name.

In the beginning, prior to Northern Pass, there was a joint effort by Hydro-Quebec with Irving Oil to have a power line driven into the eastern provinces of Quebec, specifically Brunswick. To this day, these provinces have excess power. The whole idea was to provide Irving Oil Corp. with cheaper power, as
they would reap huge profits for their family-owned industries. Residential ratepayers would receive little or nothing, kind of like a slice of pepperoni pizza.

Well, the plan was voted down overwhelmingly by the people. So comes Hydro-Quebec and Eversource here.

Everything I read and hear from Northern Pass and their experts, they continually use the term "no impact". I'm tired of hearing this. Stop blowing smoke. If Northern Pass is going to rape, pillage, and burn New Hampshire, say so, be up front, be honest.

In a nutshell, Northern Pass will conventionally build 192 miles of line. That's a superhighway from Canada to Deerfield, whether it's overhead or underground.

In the wetlands, as an example, thousands of mats, multiple layers will be pressed into these areas, destroying everything below. Anybody walked a 180,000-250,000 pound pieces equipment over roads, mat systems, and other? I have in the past.

Blasting will leave chemical residues in the groundwater, roads to sites will have to be built extra-wide for the equipment used, tracks of
[inaudible] as an example, is 24 feet, D8s are 14-foot wide, sometimes equipment is rolled over.

State roads will be closed. In an area that I also own property, in Easton, New Hampshire, I measured the state roads, 23 feet, 8 inches wide, shoulder-to-shoulder, not white line-to-white line. No shoulders beyond that.

There's a structure going in the middle of that. It will take a 16-foot wide excavation to do that to set it in. Tell me how traffic is going to get back it. Very narrow, no other place to go.

I laid out five miles of your underground on Route 116 and 112. Real and potential wetland and road impacts are rampant. Who did the layout or was it just drawn off an aerial paragraph?

Noise levels on the work itself will exceed 100 decibels. A 340 kV line, in wet/damp conditions, will crackle at 45 to 60 decibels endlessly.

In Deerfield, Blandings and other turtles will lay eggs in the substation fill areas during construction. And, the New Hampshire timber rattle snake, not even noted by anybody, will be destroyed or banished from the Bear Brook State Park.
and the Pawtuckaway area. One was found at a home in Raymond just a few miles from this project.

Nothing has been addressed about real public safety. What happens when a converter or substation melts down? A good reference is the Selmar facility, in California, in the 1970s, which was hit by an earthquake. We have earthquakes here. What happens when miles of towers fall? We have tornadoes. We had an F1 in Deerfield recently. I've lived through an F1 in Texas, and I had twelve of my towers topple to the ground in every direction imaginable.

What about the huge uncompensated burdens on EMS statewide? When a town has to post additional EMS, as a town is divided and roads are closed for days at a time. What about EMS response training for the electrocution of a lineman, a construction worker, the snub anchor that pulled and dropped 10 miles of line and the towers during construction.

And, the children that played around the line, and when the sag was pulled up, they fell to the ground. No one was watching.

What qualifies the person to bring these things to your attention? I've been a transmission {SEC 2015-06} [Joint Public Hearing/Deerfield] {03-16-16}
line project manager and supervisor. I've supervised in-state highway construction, pipelines, jackings, tunnels, many other things. The answer that "BMPs are always practiced" holds no weight.

We, the people of New Hampshire, don't want payoffs, or tax incentives. We are not interested. We are looking for responsibility and respectfulness of our state and our people. We are being sold a Cadillac and given a Hugo.

Thank you for your time.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jane Difley, to be followed by Joe Casey, and Bob Elwell.

MS. DIFLEY: Good evening. My name is Jane Difley. And, I serve as the President/Forester at the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.

I'd like to thank the Subcommittee for the enormous investment of time of listening to the public during the five public hearings. There is already an enormous record to consider, and you are only at the beginning of your review process.

As I've listened over the past two weeks, there are three issues that I think are worth
First, the landscapes that would be adversely affected by Northern Pass, not just up north, but here in Deerfield as well, are part of New Hampshire's identity. We've heard from many that these are priceless assets worth protecting, for our own wellbeing, our economy, and for the legacy we leave for future generations. To allow these landscapes to be scarred by a merchant transmission line is simply unacceptable.

Second, there appears to be an opportunity to avoid nearly all of the adverse impacts of the project as proposed by considering interstate highway corridors for a completely buried transmission line. Yet, this alternative seems to be summarily dismissed by the Applicant as unaffordable and unworkable. I will tell you that the Forest Society, as a signatory to the Franconia Notch Parkway agreement, does not agree with Northern Pass Attorney Mark Hodgdon's interpretation of its limitations. There are options.

And, while the SEC may not have the option to insist that Northern Pass bury along interstates, you certainly have the opportunity to just
say "no" to the Application that's currently proposed due to adverse impacts that are avoidable.

Third, in the final analysis, the SEC needs to make a decision that it believes is right for New Hampshire. Your decision is not about what is right for Hydro-Quebec, for Eversource, for Northern Pass Transmission, or southern New England. I urge you to determine what is right for the communities and landowners most affected by the project as proposed. The affected communities, including those here in the central part of the state, have been speaking clearly about Northern Pass for five years, at town meetings, in petitions and at regulatory hearings that have been going on since 2011, these communities and their citizens have been saying that, if Eversource buries their Northern Pass extension cord completely, they can live with it. There is a win-win possible here, and you can be a facilitator for such an outcome.

Again, thank you for being here, and thank you for listening.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Joe Casey, to be followed by Rebecca Hutchinson, and Bob Elwell.

MR. CASEY: Thank you all so much for
giving me the opportunity to testify here this evening. My name is Joe Casey. I'm a representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. I reside in Rochester with my wife and four children, and I have lived in New Hampshire by entire life.

The IBEW has been in the business of training electrical workers in the construction industry for over a hundred years. Our focus is having the highest quality trained electrical workforce in the entire world.

Through our electrical apprenticeship and continuous journeyman training programs, our workforce take a great pride in the quality product that they produce.

We spend millions of dollars each year on specialized advanced electrical installation procedures. Our workforce have a complete and thorough understanding of every aspect of the installation they perform.

Above all else, the safety of our workforce and the general public that our completed product serves is our number one priority.

Having participated in many job-creation and job-retention workshops throughout the state, on
behalf of the state, including the New Hampshire Job
Creation Grant Committee. I have learned that
employers in New Hampshire and employees either lack
the financing or the desire to train our young
workforce for the 21st century. New Hampshire
employers today are desperately seeking workers whom
already possess skills that their company needs.

We and our employers take great pride in
seeking out local workers, whom have no electrical
background and/or the financial backing for continued
education. Our requirements for entry into our
training programs are a high school diploma or a GED
equivalent. The desire to work hard and willing to
learn our industry is their most important asset.

For every hour worked on this project,
Northern Pass will be contributing to our
apprenticeship training funds, over a million dollars
in training and workplace safety for New Hampshire's
workforce on this particular project.

Along with the earn-while-you-learn
programs we offer, all of our members are covered by a
Family Health Care benefit, and our employers also
contribute to individual retirement program. Ensuring
that our workforce is a benefit and not a burden to our
local communities.

These are real jobs, and although we train them for a solid career with us, the skills, work ethic, and confidence they acquire gives them an incredible leg up for any and all future endeavors.

The opportunities that the Northern Pass will provide for electrical workers and many other industries truly only come around in a lifetime -- once in a lifetime in the construction industry.

Many people have spoken about the opportunities of this project as temporary and meaningless. Well, I'm here to tell you, the life-sustaining skills and experiences that so many workers will acquire on this project will provide them with the necessary experience for lifelong careers.

I hope you all will consider these wonderful, truly life-changing opportunities that this project will bring while making the difficult decision on Northern Pass approval.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Rebecca Hutchinson, to be followed by Bob Elwell, and Andrew Robertson.

Is Rebecca Hutchinson here?
FROM THE FLOOR: She had to leave.


MR. ELWELL: E-l-w-e-l-l. My name is Bob Elwell. And, I came here to New Hampshire last September to start a company in Winchester, New Hampshire, called "New England Mat Company". Our parent company is Beasley Forest Products, out of Georgia. We came here to build timber mats for projects in the Northeast, specifically for electric projects in New Hampshire. We are starting, and we're making mats every day. We've only hired like five people at the time. But we are also -- we also are visiting sawmills in the area and buying timbers, and loggers are, you know, we're buying logs and those kinds of things. It's going very well. The project is going well.

I moved here from Pennsylvania. I'm looking to buy a house. This is all because of projects like Northern Pass that are in the area. I also like to hike. And, for the record, when I get to the top of a mountain, and I look out over the scenery, I don't really even pay attention to electric transmission lines. I look at the trees and the
mountains. And, it just doesn't even stand out to me as something that my eyesight sees.

I am really happy and very pleased to be a part of New Hampshire, and looking forward to spending the rest of my life here. And, as a General Manager of New England Mat Company, I would like to see 5 percent off my electric bill.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Andrew Robertson, to be followed by Denise Turcotte, and Michael Nolen.

MR. ROBERTSON: Good evening. My name is Andrew Robertson. And, I come before you as a Selectman from the Town of Deerfield. In March of 2013, the Town of Deerfield voted in favor of two warrant articles voicing opposition to the Northern Pass Project in its proposed form. Both articles were approved by near 2-to-1 margins. I offer the language of these articles as Deerfield's stated position on the project.

The first: "The Town of Deerfield shall state its opposition to any new overhead development of alternating current and direct current high voltage transmission lines within its borders; and in turn
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manifest the Town's strong preference for the burial of such lines, in a manner consistent with state and federal requirements, under rights-of-way and power line corridors now existing or to be established. Although burial in all instances is preferred, this statement of opposition shall not apply to distribution lines carrying electrical power and other utility lines, such as telephone and cable television, for Town residential or commercial use."

And, the second warrant article: "The Town of Deerfield shall state its opposition to the Northern Pass Transmission project as currently proposed, which, as currently proposed, will cause the significant expansion of existing power line rights-of-way; the installation of steel towers of heights up to 135 feet, well above the tree height, resulting in further impairment of Deerfield's rural, small town character and the further degradation of Deerfield's scenic vistas and natural scenic beauty; the development of the Town in a manner inconsistent with the Deerfield Master Plan; and the diminishment of the value of private property and assets for residents in proximity to the towers; the corresponding loss of property tax revenue for the Town; and the strong
possibility of negative health impacts."

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Denise Turcotte, to be followed by Michael Nolen, and David Crummey.

Is Denise Turcotte here?

FROM THE FLOOR: No. She's not.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Michael Nolen, to be followed by David Crummey.

MR. NOLEN: Hello. My name is Michael Nolen, N-o-l-e-n. I just want to thank the Committee for hearing us.

The State of New Hampshire's economy is linked to tourism, some regions more than others. The proposed tall towers can hurt people's livelihood in the regions who depend on tourism. There will be short-term benefits, of course, economic benefits that come along with the construction. But I think we should be considering some of the long-term harm that could be to the tourism in the state from the high towers. It must be considered. It's amorphous -- it's an amorphous factor, it's hard to quantify, but I think it's important.

I think burying the line is better.
Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]  

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: David Crummey, to be followed by Preston Samuel, and Bonnie Heisey -- or, Hersey.

David Crummey?

FROM THE FLOOR: No, he's gone.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How about Preston Samuel?

MR. SAMUEL: Good evening. My name is Preston Samuel, S-a-m-u-e-l. I represent the Lamprey River Advisory Committee, a Committee that is appointed by the 14 towns in the Lamprey River Watershed. It is promulgated under the RSA 483, the Rivers Management and Protection Program.

Our position requires that we advise on any permit that is applied for within the corridor. Interestingly enough, we have received the comments from -- or, rather, the permit applications from Eversource. But, in the process of looking at them, we realized that we've received similar applications on two prior occasions; one in August of 2013 and one in August of 2014, for the very same corridor. And, we always have comments, which we forward back to the DES,
but we always receive comments back, rebuttals to our
comments, from the proponent.

In the cases of the Eversource permits
of August 2013 and 2014, we never received any
rebuttals. That disturbed us. And, when we received
the most recent permit applications, it prompted us to
go to the field, first, for the reasons of discovering
whether a permit might have been issued, and whether
prior projects might have actually been finished. When
we got in the field, we noted that, yes, the projects
had been completed. We also noted that there were some
impacts.

We visited two sites. One was on
Mountain Road and one was on Church Street. Mountain
Road parallels the Lamprey River. And, in that area,
Eversource contractors have used an access road up into
the power line. It's a very steep hill, leaving
Mountain Road, going north. In that area, we
discovered that, following construction, it appears
that the site was not revegetated, and that erosion had
started, and that silt from the underlying soil had
begun to erode down and form a delta on a flatter
portion of land just outside of the wetland along
Mountain Road.
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We had concern for it, because the type of soil that's in the area is constituted by some baseball-size round cobbles that are all kind of cemented together by sand and silt in between the cobbles. Once the sand and silt washes out, one more storm, one more truck over the hill, and you're going to have some serious erosion.

At Church Street, we discovered something that was even more disturbing. A wetland about a 150 feet south of the road had been driven right through, without any matting, without any protection. The disturbance was so great that the subsoil was pulled to the surface.

After seeing those two, we went to Google Maps, and said "well, how often does that happen? Are we just looking at a weird case or what?" Just looking at Google Maps, you can see that there is significant disturbance of wetlands in Deerfield at various sites.

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

MR. SAMUEL: I have just a little bit more to go.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
MR. SAMUEL: We're concerned, because these disturbances obviously show that either the plans that Normandeau prepared were never followed in the field, or it shows that there are significant secondary impacts after the plan -- after the work was completed. One of the recommendations that we made on the prior permit applications was to put in gates to prevent secondary impacts.

All we have to say tonight is that there are rules and regulations in this state, under RSA 483, 482, etcetera. And, it appears that Eversource has been not paying attention to those rules and regulations.

If --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Samuel, please bring it to a close. If you need more time, you can come back at the end.

MR. SAMUEL: If Eversource cannot follow the rules and regulations, we recommend that they be remanded to the highway. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Bonnie Hersey, to be followed by Michael Bennett, and Linda Maxwell.

Bonnie Hersey?

FROM THE FLOOR: Bonnie, she's gone.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How about Michael Bennett?

MR. BENNETT: Good evening. My name is Michael Bennett. I live in Hampton, New Hampshire. I'm an avid hiker myself, from Ammonoosuc Falls to Mount Washington, --

[Court reporter interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:

MR. BENNETT: -- to Bear Brook, where I used to live right outside of the state park in Pembroke. I've been there around 15 or 20 times myself.

I support the Northern Pass Project, because it leaves the next generation that comes behind me with cleaner power than I inherited. For 15 years, I've been in an active career working on clean energy projects, such as the Moore Station, in Monroe; the Lempster Mountain Wind Farm, the Bow Clean Air Scrubber Project, and solar panel installations in Concord, New Hampshire.

Once this project is complete and supplies with hydropower, it is a step away from fossil fuels. It is a step away from West Virginia and mountaintop removal in Appalachian Mountains from coal
extraction, from natural gas fracking in Oklahoma, Idaho, and South Dakota, and tar sands removal in Canada. This is a complete divestment from fossil fuels.

In the construction field, we have a saying "We work our way out of a job." I prefer to say "We work our way into the next one." That difference is very important. And, yes, many of these jobs are temporary. The hotels and restaurants will eventually empty. It's what comes next after that is just as important. The influx of out-of-state revenue can be used to update the hotels and motels. It's an income to put a child through college. It's an expense paid for our highways, and investment to our school systems. It can be used to stock our ponds and lakes with fish to bring back tourism to New Hampshire.

I was dismayed Monday night, in Plymouth, when a representative of Franconia expressed profound concern over the potential view impacts. He was not concerned about the next generation having clean air to breathe or clean water to drink. He was more concerned that the impacted views could lower the value of people's second homes.

In closing, when I'm fortunate enough to
make it home to catch a sunset down in Hampton, over federally protected marshlands, I see next to the Sun a large dome. It is the Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant. It is not pretty, it is not perfect. But it is necessary to supply our state with power, to generate clean energy for New Hampshire and keep us away from fossil fuels.

In the 30 years since that plant has been built, the Seacoast area has not seen a drop in real estate prices since it was built. Seabrook is not the same town it once was. And, instead, Hampton has one of the best school systems in the state due to tax revenues generated from the transmission power lines, a thriving tourism industry that benefits having one of the top ten rated cleanest beaches in America.

These projects, they are necessary to push us forward. They are not perfect. And, I believe the right balance has been struck. Let's get it done.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Linda Maxwell?

[Short pause.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is Linda Maxwell here?
FROM THE FLOOR: No.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: TJ Jean?

MR. JEAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We're going to hear from Mr. Jean. We're a little past half -- come on, Mr. Jean, come up. We're a little past halfway. But we're going to need to take a break, because we're not going to get through this entire pile in one sitting. So, after Mr. Jean, we're going to take a break. And, I'll let you know, after he's done, who the first three speakers are after the break.

MR. JEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before I begin, I do have comments that were written by one of the speakers in the cards that's coming up. Do you want me to read that after my remarks or --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, we'll call you in the order when we get to that.

MR. JEAN: Okay. Very good. Thank you. Last name is Jean, J-e-a-n, first name Thomas. Thank you, members of the Committee, Mr. Chair. I am the Chairman of the Board of the Greater Rochester Chamber of commerce, and also the former Mayor of the City of Rochester. I want to thank the Committee for their time this evening. I know it's been a long evening
thus far, and it sounds like it's been a long several
stretch of evenings for you folks. So, I appreciate
your commitment to hearing the public this evening.

I'm here today to extend the Greater
Rochester Chamber of Commerce support of the Northern
Pass Project. As a business advocacy organization of
over 440 members, the Greater Rochester Chamber of
Commerce is proud to support our member Eversource.

We are especially thankful at
Eversource's continuing commitment to reducing energy
costs in the Granite State, and ensuring the reliable
delivery of electricity to residents and commercial
developments in New Hampshire.

We also appreciate modifications to the
plan, based on listening to all stakeholders of this
project, including residents in the communities in
which the proposed transmission line passes.

So, why does the Greater Rochester
Chamber of Commerce care about Northern Pass? Simply
put, economic development in New Hampshire, and
specifically in the Greater Rochester area is
increasing. From retail to industrial development, to
small and large businesses alike, all stakeholders care
to have clean, reliable, and cost-effective energy.
This project promotes just that.

Specifically, in Rochester, we have been fortunate to welcome Safran USA and Albany Engineered Composites to our premier industrial park. Reliable and cost-effective energy was a paramount concern in their decision to choose Rochester, and ultimately New Hampshire, to open their 350,000 square foot advanced manufacturing facility, which will add approximately 450 new jobs to the Greater Rochester area. This is why we must take immediate action to support this project, so that we can help reduce energy costs to our businesses in New Hampshire and help to promote further economic development.

And, members of the Committee, I know this is not going to be hard, I've sat on that side of the table several times in my tenure as Mayor. And, I can only appreciate that you're hearing both sides. And, I hope that you'll make the best decision in the best interest of our state. But I do urge you to look at this project closely, and to support it, and to expeditiously approve it, so that we can help provide relief to all stakeholders here in New Hampshire and in the region.

Thank you.
[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We're going to take a short break, a few minutes. Before we do that, I do want to make an announcement for those who are here. There has been an open question about where the prehearing conference would take place next week, scheduled for Monday, with a carryover to Tuesday, if necessary. The site has been secured, and that will take place in Concord, at the Holiday Inn, at the corner of Main Street and Loudon Road.

Our break will be about ten minutes. I'm going to ask you to do everything you can to come back here as close to ten minutes as you can.

The three speakers when we come back will be Linda Maxwell, Olaf Zwickau, and Justin Cormier.

(Recess taken at 8:59 p.m. and the Joint Public Hearing resumed at 9:09 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is Linda Maxwell here? We're ready to go. So, Linda Maxwell will be followed by Olaf Zwickau, and Justin Cormier.

MS. BRADBURY: Linda Maxwell asked me to speak for her. And, she would like you to know that she opposes this project. She had to go home.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, what is your name, ma'am?

MS. BRADBURY: My name is Jo Anne Bradbury.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Thank you, Ms. Bradbury.

Olaf Zwickau, to be followed by Justin Cormier, and Marion Smith.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, these are Olaf's comments. He had to leave. Want me to just put them in here?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sure. Moving quickly now. Justin Cormier, to be followed by Marion Smith, and Meredith Briggs.

Is Justin Cormier here?

FROM THE FLOOR: I think he went home.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Marion Smith?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How about Meredith Briggs?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Denise Greig? Ah, we found one.

MS. GREIG: Good evening. Thank you all...
for coming to Deerfield. We appreciate it. I am Denise Greig. I'm the Co-Emergency Management Director here in town. And, I'm here to express my concern about the public health and safety impact of the proposed project on the town.

Our emergency response in Deerfield is geared to a rural residential town. The critical numbers: Deerfield is 52 square miles, with over 80 miles of roads. We have 4,300 residents, and 1,670 households. To serve that population over that square miles, we have a volunteer rescue squad of nine persons, and I'm excluding fire personnel. So, the numbers shift a little bit. But, basically, we have a rescue squad of nine personnel. We have a volunteer fired of 22, approximately 22, plus trainees. We have a fire -- a police department of eight full-time employees and four part-time employees.

In addition to these very capable, hard-working individuals, we have other resources. We have Mutual Aid. Our Mutual Aid, the closest stations, are fire stations, are 20 to 30 minutes away, and also are mostly volunteer. Our State Hazardous Materials Response Team, 30 minutes away. The closest hospitals, Concord, Manchester, Exeter, 30 minutes away.
As Emergency Management Director, part of what we do is look at "what if" and "what next"?

It's all about looking at what happens -- what are the hazards that face this town, and, if they happen, what kind of damage will it cause? We've done our Hazard Vulnerability Assessment for our Emergency Operations Plan and our Hazard Mitigation Plan. No surprise, number one on the list in New Hampshire, in the southeastern towns, weather is our biggest issue. The town has ice, heavy snowstorms, rain, flooding, tornadoes, and other -- and straight-line wind events. We've had that all in the last ten years. FEMA data is clear: In the last 15 years, the trend in southern New Hampshire -- in New Hampshire, generally, we have seen a significant increase in the number of events that have been declared disasters.

A recent UNH weather study confirms that the Northeast has seen a 71 percent increase in heavy precipitation events, the largest increase in the nation. As our water and air temperatures rise, we expect to see these events increase in frequency and intensity. Deerfield's proximity to the Atlantic Ocean, with its warmer winds and its nor'easters, make us susceptible to those very heavy weather events.
Damage to the power lines and towers from severe weather events, such as ice, would have a significant impact on this town. If they fall -- if those towers fall, they will split our town in half.

We have the Community School on one half, the other half is where our fire, police, rescue, and town offices are located. The Deerfield Community School also serves as our primary shelter for this town.

In our Hazard Vulnerability Assessment, we identified other issues and hazards. Two of them, terrorism and cybersecurity. Federal Homeland Security has recognized that energy infrastructure, power lines and substations, are susceptible. The remote rural location makes Deerfield vulnerable to these risks.

My concerns: The burden on emergency volunteers, who will not only respond to car accidents and house fires, but to substation and tower accidents. Responders that should have the appropriate level of training. I know you said only Franklin needs extra training. But I'm not sure how a fire at two substations next to each other falls within basic fire training. My concern is that's a burden on our responders. Third, the impact on response time, in our town, if those wires fall down in the middle of town.
How long will it take to get from Central Station to 
Pleasant Lake in a crisis situation? And, although 
we're talking about, you know, disasters, let's talk 
about construction phase, when we're looking at the 
impact of construction, and slowing and blocking our 
roads.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Greig, how much 
more do you have?

MS. GREIG: About 35 seconds.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. We're 
watching.

MS. GREIG: All right. Finally, impacts 
on wetlands and potential flooding, again, an issue. 
Probably in an early stage, but, if you affect 
wetlands, you potentially affect flooding and roads and 
culverts. Again, a major issue in our town. That is 
where we've had significant damage and assistance from 
FEMA in the past.

So, I'm asking that you look at all of 
the issues, and you consider alternatives to the 
proposed project. Emergency personnel at every level, 
federal, state, and local, want to improve resiliency. 
Homeland Security is looking at microgrids as a means 
of improving resiliency in the energy sector. It's a
forward-thinking project. Maybe it fits better with the technology advances we have today. I encourage you to look long and hard at whether we need this project for the residents of New Hampshire, and to please make a decision to keep the public health and safety of our residents its priority.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sherry Godlewski, to be followed by Jo Anne Bradbury, and Robert Mathews. Is Sherry Godlewski here?

FROM THE FLOOR: Oh, no.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes, it seems she is. Oh, she left?

MS. BRADBURY: She asked me to speak for her.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

MS. BRADBURY: Hi. I'm Jo Anne Bradbury. I'm speaking for Sherry Godlewski. She had to go home.

She's asked me to say: Those speaking in support of the project are mostly not from Deerfield, and stand to benefit financially from the project.
That's it.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Bradbury, don't move, because you're up next.

MS. BRADBURY: It's my turn. I'm Jo Anne Bradbury. I own property and live in Deerfield. I grew up down south, but it's been my lifelong dream to live in rural New England. When I was looking for land back in the early '80s, I discovered Deerfield, an enchanting rural town, and I decided to settle here. Deerfield is where I want to spend my golden years. I love to roam the hiking trails on my own land and all over the state.

I have worked to create my special place here in Deerfield for over 30 years. By 1992, I saved enough to build a home. I worked hard at improving my land and home slowly over that 30-year period, one step at a time.

The proposed Northern Pass towers and lines, if built, will cross over my land. If you permit them to proceed with this project, I will see and hear these monstrosities every day for the rest of my life. At my age, I am older than I look, it's not possible that I will be able to sell out, at a loss, and start again. I will not be able to recreate what I
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have created here in Deerfield. I just don't have that much time.

Okay. So, the Applicant has brought in experts to tell you that these towers and lines will have no adverse effect on the property values and the aesthetics of this beautiful town and this beautiful state. Our common sense tells us that that opinion is nonsense. We all know what these towers will look like and what they will sound like, because our common sense informs us. The towers are massive, the electric lines have an incessant hum that will never go away, and the corona effect will create flashing lights. You don't need a Ph.D in this, that, or the other thing to know that these towers will devastate a large portion of the State of New Hampshire. Wetlands will be permanently destroyed by construction equipment. The expanded substation in Deerfield will ruin the value of the homes of everyone near it.

If this project goes forward, you will create a path of damage and destruction the entire length of the State of New Hampshire, from Canada to Massachusetts. There is no doubt that property values, aesthetics, health and welfare, wetlands and wildlife all will be irreparably harmed. Once these towers go
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up, you can't make it right again.

Why would someone want to do such a thing? Is it about power? Yes. I have to believe that it's about the power of corporate greed, and what greed will do, what greed will lead a corporation to do, and shame on you. We've just been through the biggest recession since the Great Depreciation, and corporate greed caused it. $8 billion is the amount of money that Eversource stands to make over the 40-year lifespan of this project. Don't let them take our land, our homes, and a corridor through our entire state.

Keep in mind that the rights-of-way that were granted in the '20s, '40s, '50s, did not remotely contemplate a construction project of this magnitude. The courts will adjudicate the issues relating to the rights-of-way.

You have many reasons to reject this project. In the words of Mrs. Reagan: "Just say no."

Thank you for your time.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Billy Kunelius, followed by Robert Mathews, and Barbara Mathews.

Billy Kunelius? All the way over in the
corner. To be followed by Robert Mathews, and Barbara Mathews.

MR. KUNELIUS: I'm Billy Kunelius, spelled K-u-n-e-l-i-u-s. I don't know if I should say "good evening" or "good night" at this point.

But my name is Billy Kunelius. And, I am a forester for Fort Mountain Company, a private logging company located in Allenstown, New Hampshire. And, I am here in support of the Northern Pass Project representing my company.

There has been significant support of this project from logging companies in the northern half of the country -- northern half of the state, I should say. But I just wanted to let you, as the Committee, know that logging companies here in the southern portion of the state also support this project. And, the improvement that it would make for the timber industry in this state.

The project is estimated to provide up to 2,000 or more jobs in our state, varying fields, one of those fields being loggers and the timber industry.

The work would include clearing right-of-ways for new Northern -- in northern New Hampshire, working on existing right-of-ways, and
clearing access roads.

Another aspect is that it would generate, I know speakers earlier talked about these crane mats or mats that they use in wetlands, these are made out of wood. There would be an increased demand for these mats. And, those are made from wood that we produce right here in New Hampshire, logging companies do. And, so, that would be an increased market for us, but not also for us, but for landowners throughout the State of New Hampshire would find better markets for their wood, for managing their private timberland, that has nothing to do with the Northern Pass, but they would have better markets for their wood.

This project has taken numbers of steps to include local contractors and ensure that we have the opportunity to work on this project in our state. I know my boss has talked to several people from the Committee about, you know, from Eversource and the Northern Pass Project, about the possibility of us working on portions of this project.

Our company, in Allenstown, employs 20 people right now, to run all facets of our operation. And, this would be a great opportunity for our company to thrive, as well as possibly expand into other areas.
And, we're ready to go and support the Northern Pass. And, we have employees, I know someone recently said, you know, most of these people being supportive aren't going to be from Deerfield. We -- a number of our employees are from Deerfield. So, we would be getting direct support back into Deerfield.

And, on behalf of Fort Mountain Companies, I would strongly encourage the Committee to put through the Northern Pass Project.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Robert Mathews, to be followed by Barbara Mathews, and Susan Arnold.

MS. MATHEWS: Hi. My name is Barbara Mathews. And, I'm speaking first for my husband, Robert, who had to leave. It's M-a-t-h-e-w-s.

Robert says: I'll be brief. The proposed location for the project in Deerfield has major problems in that these towers would cut directly through Deerfield's historic town center, and would damage the scenic and historic nature of the town. It's not that the project would be off in a corner where it would be unnoticed, the people of Deerfield would have to live with and suffer the consequences on
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Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you about the effects of the proposed Northern Pass Transmission project on all of the citizens of New Hampshire, and especially -- especially those who live in the areas through which the towers would march 192 miles from the Canadian border to its terminus in our Town of Deerfield, where we meet tonight. This line of towers, many of which will be far above the height of the adjacent trees, which will be highly visible, and a permanent scar across the face of our beautiful state. The power lines would traverse wild areas, scenic vistas, historic districts, and rural communities, all of them which would be forever besmirched. Property values in the towns in which Northern Pass would go will be greatly diminished by the introduction of this massive infrastructure.

Homes and lands that have been the life's work of many individuals and families across this state would no longer be the assets and treasured legacies that they were intended to be. The project
would create major adverse impacts on aesthetics, historic sites, the natural environment, and the public health and safety. Here in Deerfield, the towers would be directly adjacent to the historic center of town. If they were any closer, they would pass over the Congregational Church and be in the front yard of our beautiful old Town Hall.

The new, much taller towers will cross Routes 107 and 43 in the center of town. They will traverse -- excuse me -- they will pass by and be highly visible from homes, backyards, public lands, state parks, and hiking trails.

Construction of the new lines would disrupt wetlands and wildlife habitat. Since Deerfield would be home to at least one new large substation, there would be significant costs to the town for emergency response and public safety planning and implementation.

What is the purpose of this project that would have so many devastating effects on our Town of Deerfield and the State of New Hampshire? The Northern Pass is a for-profit project, not a public service project, and the reason is money, for the companies involved and their stockholders. New Hampshire does
not need this power from Hydro-Quebec. We already export more power than we use as a state. The plan was not that New Hampshire would get this power, rather that it would pass through on its way to larger markets in southern New England and New York City. The power is not clean, responsibly produced power as it has been billed, but it has been produced by destroying the landscapes and wildlife habitats, displacing native peoples, and drowning massive numbers of carbon sequestering trees.

And, I'm almost done. Why should the people of New Hampshire have their lives and futures irrevocably damaged for the sake of making money for large corporations, both foreign and domestic? In truth, there is no good reason. It is not right, and it can't be made right.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Mathews, do you have the written statements for the stenographer?

MS. MATHEWS: Not in the form that he could read, but I could make it available.

MR. PATNAUDE: I'll still take it, if I can.
MS. MATHEWS: You will?

MR. PATNAUDE: Yes.

MS. MATHEWS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Susan Arnold, to be followed by Judy Marshall, and Taras Kucman.

All right. You may proceed.

MS. ARNOLD: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. You've seen a lot of my face today and other nights. So, I will be concise. I do want to take a bit of my time just to join in others to thank for the attention and care you're all taking with this process. It's much appreciated, and, obviously, very important to an awful lot of people. So, thank you for what you're doing.

So, here in historic Deerfield, I want to touch on a couple of issues related to historic resource review. The first being just real concern about the Section 106 process, and the fact that it is so out-of-step with the timing of the SEC process. Could take up to five years to complete the Section 106 process. And, with the SEC on a much shorter statutory timeline, it's hard to understand what information, other than what the Applicant has provided, and we know they have provided you with significant information
about historic resources, what other information will you be using for [inaudible] the Section 106 information that's feeding in. So, that's another concern.

And, then, also here in Deerfield, I think we heard earlier the term "cultural landscapes". And, I was thinking about it as sort of the -- that's the tapestry of New Hampshire's character. And, that tapestry, that character, can't be captured in a site-by-site key observation point approach to visual impact analysis. And, really want to urge the Committee to think broadly about that category, it is a recognized National Historic category of cultural landscapes, and we have them here in New Hampshire, in Deerfield, up and down the line. And, very clearly, transmission towers that are 10 to 12 stories high clash with cultural landscapes.

And, finally, I just want to talk about energy diversity briefly, because that's been a big topic, that Northern Pass has discussed at every meeting. And, just that, what it sees to be that there's a real concern about overreliance on gas currently. But, with Northern Pass, if it gets added to the mix, and potentially some of the other hydro
projects that are in the New England Clean Energy RFP, we'll really sort of be trading reliance on one kind of power, gas, for another.

As Mr. Quinlan himself said tonight, New England is hugely dependent on power generated in Canada every day today. And, Northern Pass will just exacerbate that reliance. So, this idea that this is somehow hugely contributing to diversity I think we need to watch what that tilt is.

But, again, thank you very much. And, that's all I have to say.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Judy Marshall, to be followed by Taras Kucman, and David Doran, I think is the name.

Is Judy Marshall here? Yes, she's here.

MS. MARSHALL: My name is Judy Marshall, M-a-r-s-h-a-l-l. I was on my way out the door when I heard you, and had to stop and listen to Jo Anne Bradbury's statement. So, I did submit my statement in writing. But I stayed long enough to actually come to the mike.

I'm afraid that my statement is probably not as well-rationaled [sic] as many that have come
here, it's more emotional. I came here with the intention of just listening, but there's no virtue in silence, I guess.

When first presented with the prospect of Northern Pass, I was on the fence. After all, this is clean power and a better alternative than coal or nuclear. But, as I've seen the process play out, I've been deeply troubled by its methods of pushing the project through.

The first red flag was the Applicant dangling potential funding in front of the town and inquiring about "shovel ready" projects. Then, there was the lack of clarity of the Wetland Permit with its voluminous pages of data for the entire corridor. Now, the requests I've seen coming across my computer for more waivers from established rules, and the newest tactic, challenging individual motions to intervene one-by-one, in an attempt to lump everyone together, making these individual concerns generic and meaningless. Is the real motive just to wear everyone down till they tire of filing and refiling, and finally throw up their hands and throw in the towel?

I'm sadly coming to believe that the Applicant is a corporate giant that will manipulate the
system any way it can to push this money-maker through, claiming trickle-down economics in the form of increased tax revenues for the towns. Has there ever been a year that Eversource did not file an abatement for taxes in Deerfield?

I am concerned about the actual jobs to be created for this -- by this project. And, I understand, from what I've heard, that there are going to be multiple jobs that will benefit Deerfield and the State of New Hampshire. I am not opposed to that. We truly need more jobs in New Hampshire, whether it's under the apprenticeship program, sounds fantastic.

But, you know, I'm concerned about the way that things are moving in the project. What happens -- what happens if Hydro-Quebec someday pulls the plug? New Hampshire could be stuck with the blight of that big extension cord forever.

It's my understanding that there are only -- only around 80 abutters who will be impacted. That's 80 plus families shouldering the burden for the beneficiaries of this money-making endeavor. Even if that were a remotely accurate statement based on a subjective definition of "impact", where is the offer for direct compensation to those whom the Applicants
admit will be affected? Potentially increased tax
dollars and the additional jobs for a couple of years
don't even begin to pay for the permanent scarring of
our landscape.

If the SEC takes away nothing else from
this meeting, please, remember that this is a real
heartache for a lot of folks. That these are real
people being affected, and it's the little guy that
needs to be protected here, not big energy.

I hope that the SEC will not become
hardened by the barrage of voices clambering to be
heard, but will continue to listen, both with its head
and its heart.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Taras Kucman, to be
followed by David Doran, and Mike Collins.

MR. KUCMAN: Good evening. My name is
Taras Kucman. And, I appreciate this opportunity to
speak to the Committee again. I have introduced myself
in the past as a resident of Concord, living on the
right-of-way. I've also introduced myself as a former
Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

I presented a scenario last week that basically said
"the threat is clear and present", especially when we're talking about 250-foot right-of-ways in secluded, unsecured areas. We've got a public right-of-way with two 115 kV lines and a 345 kV line. To me, that's a clear and present danger.

I'm also speaking to you as someone who's working for a transformer service company. We maintain, we service, we test transformers, substations. On occasion, we're presented with transformers that were subjected to terrible through-faults, they exploded. We do -- and, we host and we conduct failure analysis on those transformers. Recently, it was Siemens, and other power generators, trying to understand root causes for these failures.

So, I am keenly familiar with what can happen with through-fault errors. As an engineer, I've said that "we're trained to build bridges and blow them up, if we need to." And, to the average engineer, blowing these poles together, from the 115 kV services to the 345 kV services, we can do it in our sleep. And, it's incumbent, I'm speaking to the Committee especially, it's incumbent upon you that, in that given scenario, ask the question, "are the breakers and the switch gears that protect the transformers, are they
robust enough to take such a shot?"  "Are the relays responsive enough to protect the rest of the grid when such an event happens?"  I have some real concerns about that.

Our engineer here from Eversource claimed that he really didn't have the wherewithal to give an honest answer as to whether or not the Code -- the National Electric Safety Code was going to be violated. And, frankly, I look at codes, and when I'm looking at the terrorist attitude out there, I'm sure that the towers in New York met every single code, except the one that might have specified that they should withstand two airplanes knocking them down.

We're looking at these towers. When I bought my property 20 years ago, there was a benign, simple right-of-way, two 115 kV services, no problem, on wooden towers. Let me just recap briefly. In 2007, I got a letter from Northeast Utilities saying "oh, by the way, we're going to be tearing down your wooden posts on the eastern boundary and we're going to push them out 25 feet.

In 2010, Northern Pass was coming, with eminent domain threatened. How did that work out? In 2013, Northern Pass was coming, the DOT has scoping
meetings, Draft Environmental Impact Statements. They were conflated. All those questions, those hundreds of questions that we asked were conflated, so that they were incomprehendible, and then they were summarily dismissed because they were incomprehendible.

In 2015, here we go again. In August, there was an epiphany. ForwardNH. Amazing. We will bury 52 additional feet --

Another minute please. We will bury an additional 52 miles, and that will be good. New Hampshire's share of the savings: $80 million a year. Ah! Pardon my Lewis Black moment. $80 million for the State of New Hampshire really translates to 1.2 million people receiving a pizza pie, pepperoni, per month. That's what it really amounts to for a family of three. And, if they make the trip, they won't be able to sit down and have enough to pay for the tip for delivery of service.

But, in any case, my concern is that it is disgraceful, and it's not fooling anybody. They will kick and claw to keep the power lines on the right-of-way, because you refuse to bury it down I-93. We get it. We really do. Why pay scratch to the State of New Hampshire, when you can run it down your
right-of-way and not pay a nickel.

I feel bad for Mr. Quinlan, I really do.

You've probably heard of the Greek God Atlas who's holding up the world right now. He was a Titan who rebelled against Zeus, and he was sent to hold up the world. Well, he must be looking at Mr. Quinlan now and saying "It must suck to be you."

You're going through all this for a bonus you're not supposed to get.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kucman?

MR. KUCMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please wrap up --

MR. KUCMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- or come back at the end.

MR. KUCMAN: I could go on. At the risk of sounding repetitive, and that -- that's okay, because repetition is the key to adult learning, as I have said before.

So, I'll say to the Committee just in brief, you have three choices: You can either accept the Application as it is; you can reject it as it is; or you can accept it with an exception, and have that exception be "bury all of it".
I thank you for your time.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: David Doran, to be followed by Mike Collins, and Suzanne Steele.

[Short pause.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It is possible that it's Dotan, D-o-t-a-n?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We'll never resolve what that middle letter is in this name.

Mike Collins, followed by Suzanne Steele, and Eric Stevens.

MR. COLLINS: Good evening. My name is Mike Collins, C-o-l-l-i-n-s. My family's lived in Deerfield over 35 years. I'm an IBEW Local 104 member, journeyman lineman. You've heard over and over again how jobs will be coming to New Hampshire to help people like me, families like mine, which is true.

I guess I only have one thing to add on top of all of those benefits. This is clean energy. It's what the country, not only New Hampshire, is striving for. It's the right thing to do. I want my
two little boys to grow up with cleaner air than what I have. It's not going to happen unless we do projects like this. It important. Should be done. I'm all for it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mike Collins, to be followed by Suzanne Steele, and Eric Stevens.

That was Collins? Sorry. My bad.

Suzanne Steele.

MS. STEELE: Good evening. Suzanne Steele, S-t-e-e-l-e. I've lived in Deerfield since 1993. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the Committee, for your time, during these sessions, the site visits, the hours that you've devoted so far, and that you will continue to devote during this time.

I hope that over the last two weeks you've gotten a better understanding of the public's concern. And, I hope that you've seen that there's overwhelming opposition to this project from all the communities that are proposed to have Northern Pass run through its borders.

This afternoon, you were driven through our rural town, and ended at Deerfield Substation. You also viewed the beauty of our historic town center.
You really asked some good questions this afternoon, and I really appreciate that. And, you asked questions that would be -- we would --

Let's see. Where am I? It's late. And, I've had two hours of sleep. Came in from Salt Lake City this morning. But that's another story.

You asked good questions to determine that there would be more than one tower that could raise over 100 to 140 feet tall, clearly visible from where we all stood at our Town Hall.

Go down here. I go to the Deerfield Community Church. And, based on today's comments, there would be no trees left between our church and the right-of-way. That was an awakening to me this afternoon.

I would like each of you to put yourselves in Jean -- in Joan and Phil Bilodeau's shoes. How would you like to have potentially the substation more than doubling in size and expanding right next to your home? Besides the months of construction noise, the end result would be that continuous 24 by 7 hum that we all heard this afternoon at the substation, and that massive amount of power converging next door.
Mr. Quinlan and the other executives -- the other executives from Eversource, and the Hydro-Quebec executives don't have any concern about the location of this additional power. Why? Because none of them live near any of the proposed new lines, the expanded lines, the Deerfield or Franklin substations. The only impact they would have is a lot of additional money flowing into their bank accounts. This is not a project to benefit New Hampshire citizens, but rather the bottom line of a Canada company and a company with Connecticut ties. New Hampshire is a net exporter of electric power; therefore, the continual message by Northern and Mr. Quinlan saying that we're in need of this additional power is untrue.

Having unlimited funds should not be a prerequisite for getting this project approved. It should be approved because it's the right thing to do. It must serve the public interests.

And, I have about a minute? Thank you. I'm a bit confused when I'm told that this project is benefiting the State of New Hampshire, when Northern Pass has said tonight even, that Mr. Les -- Les Otten, whom I used to work for, is going to get $2 million for
his Balsams project. Perhaps you and the Committee can figure out how this supports the entire state.

This project is not for the good of our community. In our immediate area, it would scar the Pawtuckaway mountains, impact our historic center, and, as we saw, 40 to 50 feet taller towers.

I am a Wellness Consultant, as I mentioned in Meredith, when I saw you all last. And, I am concerned about the health impacts. Although we are not abutters to the proposed plan, I am concerned for the families who are, and who would constantly be exposed to the dramatic increase of electromagnetic pollution from these proposed lines.

Burying the lines seem to be a better option, however, according to Eversource, not feasible due to the cost. Another concern is that potential long-term negative impact from these buried lines to the surrounding land, human and animal life.

I urge you to sift through the hype and make the best decision that's for our state, and the futures of our children. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Eric Stevens, to be followed by I am Jeanne Menard, and Emily Moore.

MR. STEVENS: Good evening. Eric
Stevens, S-t-e-v-e-n-s. It was just last September I was here, and at that point I was six months unemployed. I'm an IBEW member. The week after, I went to work for a month and a half, got laid off on Halloween. A couple weeks after I got laid off, I lost my unemployment because my benefits ran out. A month ago, I lost my health insurance for me and my family, because there's no work. As far as I'm concerned, I said it before, this is not the first power line that was ever built. You see them every time you walk out your door.

Myself, personally, I was embarrassed to see people laughing at these people sitting over here when they were saying where they were from. This isn't a choice, it's a livelihood, and it's a sacrifice that their family makes, just like all of us make, to earn a living for our families. And, that's not funny to me. It's downright rude, to laugh at somebody for the living that they choose to make for their families.

This project has been, you know, talked about for so long now. And, it's changed, and Eversource has made the changes to accommodate the negative that everybody has about it. Everybody's entitled to their opinion. I have mine, you all have
yours. You might not like mine, and I don't like others. That's the way it goes.

But me standing up here as a parent, you know, and a grandfather, you know, I think about my children. And, listening to some people talk, I feel like I'm talking to my child. I want my child to be better than me, I want them to have more than me.

The comment was made "if not now, when?" Well, by then, when might be too late. And, I'm sorry, I don't want to live with the fact of later down the road my children and my grandchildren paying for our mistakes of not doing something that should be done now for free. I just can't fathom it.

Myself, earning a living, well, that's my problem, not anybody else's. But, when I signed the books on November 2nd to go back to work, and I was 52nd, and I called last week and I'm 39th, that projects me like June or July, if it keeps going this way, before I can go to work. With no income, my wife going to work 10 to 12 hours a day just to get by, so we don't lose our house.

We go force this underground issue, it's not the way to go. It ends the whole project. It eliminates a couple thousand jobs, and it eliminates
hundreds of local businesses making potentially a lot of money off of this. And, later on down the road, everybody benefiting from it. I have a hard time with the math that everybody doesn't see.

Clean energy is the way to go. I support the project. And, I can go home tonight, go to bed, knowing that I tried for my Local 104 brothers and sisters, and for my children, for a better future for them, and for us to go to work. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jeanne Menard, followed by Emily Moore, and Richard Moore.

MS. MENARD: Good evening. Menard, M-e-n-a-r-d. I would like to start off by saying to Eric, I'm sorry. I feel it, too, in terms of disrespect own both sides. And, hopefully, we will all rise to higher levels. And, I am grateful to hear both sides. This is a wonderful opportunity, to be hearing and learning and listening. And, so, give hope we will get it right, in terms of treating each other well. So, thank you.

My comments this evening are focused primarily on the prefiled testimony of James Chalmers, and his Appendix 46 of the Northern Pass Application,
which refers to possible effects of Northern Pass on both property values and marketing times in local and regional real estate markets.

It is my hope that members of the SEC and the Counsel for the Public would agree on the absolute necessity to review additional research, which has not been written by an individual who was retained and paid for by a utility company, like Northern Pass, looking for support for a major high voltage tension line project.

In Appendix 46, Mr. Chalmers utilizes case studies, or sold property data from Corridor Number 2, which is an existing line which passes through Deerfield. In my opinion, this study does not adequately address before-and-after effects. Drawing empirical data from a line, whose tower heights are 45 to 75 feet currently, does not address property owners' concerns about the effects of the proposed project, whose tower heights are well above treeline.

The proposed heights on my family's property: Pole 301 is 135 feet; Pole 302 is 130 feet; 303 is 140 feet; 304 is 135 feet; and 305 is 120 feet.

There is literature which does address valuation guidelines for before-and-after effects of
transmission line projects.

For the record, I wholeheartedly agree with real estate broker/owner Peter Powell's remarks that were made in Plymouth. I will not repeat his points, but I echo his property value concerns.

In closing, the summary of Chalmers' report states that Northern Pass will have little to no impact on real estate value. In my opinion, this conclusion creates a terrible injustice to property owners throughout New Hampshire.

I am hopeful to participate in the SEC proceedings to bring the concerns about loss of property value to the table.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Emily Moore, to be followed by Richard Moore, and Admiral Maitland.

FROM THE FLOOR: The Moores left.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The Moores had to leave?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Admiral Maitland, to be followed by Erick Berglund.

MR. MAITLAND: Good evening, everybody.
My name is Admiral Maitland, just for the record.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Could you spell your name please.

MR. MAITLAND: M-a-i-t-l-a-n-d. I'm a proud Local 104 member. I'm actually also new to New Hampshire. I'm been in the energy industry for the past eight years. I say that, because, I actually -- I have an understanding of what goes on, and why I actually think there's a lot of benefits to the Northern Pass.

The Northern Pass, as far as environmentally, being that I'm -- I'm a substation operator down at the T in Boston, and I see the fuel exhaust that's burnt from the generator that actually goes up in the air. And, being that the Northern Pass will actually be clean energy, clean energy from Hydro-Quebec, that means that it will actually be a water dam jet engine, a turbine, and a generator, which means we won't use resources like fuel and gas and oil to exhaust the fumes in the air. So, I do understand the environmental part of it.

As far as the visualization of, you know, the problems people might have, I kind of don't really understand how that would really totally impact
in a negative way, especially when Eversource was nice enough to actually accommodate the folks that really cared about the views of, like, Appalachian Trails and the White Mountains, they actually decided to put that underground. So, as far as that's concerned, I mean, I think they were nice for doing that, because, actually, my experience in underground and overhead construction line work, it costs more to actually, like, run cable underground than actually overhead. And, then, when you're actually restoring and putting the feeder back together after an outage, regardless of redundancy or not, if that feeder is out, that feeder is out. And, it will take longer for a crew to find where that fault is and to restore that energy service back to our customers. So, I applaud Eversource on taking that step to make that work.

Another reason why I think this is a great project is because I'm not just here worrying and thinking about myself, I'm actually thinking about my kids' future, like the jobs that it will bring. It won't just bring 2,600 jobs to New Hampshire, because, after the construction phase, now you have to hire people who have to maintain the service, engineer the service, troubleshoot the service, and, you know,
well-qualified folks to actually manage and run the system.

   I'm sorry, I got like 30 seconds left. Besides that, it will help the economy. And, one of the things I do want to point, and this is my last statement towards it, is the fact that, if I remember reading right, it will bring $7.5 million to like training programs later on in the future, like I believe it was called the "Job Creation Fund", when I was reading on the site. And, that's something for the future of New Hampshire. Like we need more programs to help people learn trades and electrical and plumbing. Like this is the -- this is what New Hampshire needs.

   So, yes. That's all I got to say tonight. And, you all have a great night.

   [Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Erick Berglund, to be followed by Racheal Stuart, and Kate Hartnett.

MR. BERGLUND: Good evening. And, thank you for the opportunity to comment to the SEC regarding this project. Our family resides at 23 Nottingham Road, in this town, in Deerfield. We've been here for 45 years. The proposed transmission line will run 1,200 feet over our property, crossing an active
hayfield and a vibrant wetland teeming with wildlife. We are cherishing -- cherishing our views of Mount Pawtuckaway each day, knowing that they will be gone forever if this project is implemented. We adamantly oppose the Northern Pass Project.

The SEC must determine the cost/benefit of this project, and the cost/benefit for New Hampshire. And, the major component of the SEC decision process is to decide whether this project will serve the New Hampshire public interest.

Northern Pass is withholding its cost/benefit analysis, which was asked for in its Application to the SEC. I have put one together based on what we know today, and I'd like to take a look at that and tell you about it. This is brief, not as long as perhaps the real one.

At this point in the process, we have a fairly good knowledge of what Eversource is asking New Hampshire to pay for this project. More will be discovered as the SEC process goes forward.

Let's talk about the costs, the permanent hard costs, not in dollars and cents, but categories, if you will, or particulars, that will lead to costs ultimately.
To the landscapes: I don't know if you're aware that the landscape along and around the entire length of this project was declared a national treasurer by the National Public Trust. That will be something that we won't see as well after the project is done, if it is done. Loss of scenic views: We can expect damaged and destroyed wetlands; loss and damage to wildlife habitat; steel tower industrialization; loss/destuction of wildlife and endangered species; negative health impacts of EMF; negative impact on historic and cultural areas along the route; property value declines; infliction of potential health and safety hazards and fears, because Northern Pass fall zones are outside of the right-of-way; loss of danger trees outside the right-of-way; impact of future expansion of the Northern Pass corridor by spawning transmission lines to other areas and states adjacent to New Hampshire and to transmit energy from other new sources.

Impact of building Northern Pass, long-term and permanent: And, while details of many construction operations are not in the Northern Pass Application, we can be sure of traffic congestion, we've heard about some of that tonight. Noise,
crowding, property damage, and we're talking about over
a length of time, which I don't know what it is, but it
would be probably several years.

So, let's talk about benefits now. Yes?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Just wanted to let
you know you're three and a half in. So, how much --

MR. BERGLUND: Three and a half?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes.

MR. BERGLUND: All right. I didn't --
didn't time this right, excuse me. I'm almost there.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Understood.

MR. BERGLUND: Benefits: And, this is a
problem. There is no meat. Northern Pass has stated
New Hampshire residents may receive a 5 percent
reduction in electric energy costs. That is it. There
is a significant imbalance between the supposed
benefits of what Northern Pass proposes to give New
Hampshire for the cost New Hampshire is being asked to
pay.

So, questions to Eversource: Show us
your Northern Pass cost/benefit analysis? Show us the
power purchase agreement with Hydro-Quebec? Show us
the Memo of Understanding with Hydro-Quebec?

This is clearly a bad deal for New
Hampshire. The project is a speculative Eversource project to bring power to southern New Hampshire -- to southern New England, excuse me. It is not a reliability project to keep the lights on. The objective of this project is clear, it's to enrich the Eversource stockholders.

So, I urge the SEC to exercise its due diligence and study this project thoroughly. I expect the SEC to bring forth an honest decision that is fair to New Hampshire.

And, one last point, if I may. A different topic. I have a strong objection to this confidentiality. It's -- Eversource is dealing with the public here, and they're selling to the public in New Hampshire, that should not be -- that should not be kept from us. They're pitching to us, and we deserve full and complete knowledge of this project.

Thank you very much.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Racheal Stuart, to be followed by Kate Hartnett, Cathy Laforge.

MS. STUART: Hello. My name is Racheal, Stuart, S-t-u-a-r-t. I thank you for the opportunity to speak. I also want to thank the people in this room...
for being here. So many who have absolutely nothing to
gain, personally, financially, but are here out of
great care and affection for this community and this
state. I find it very moving.

I am opposed to the Northern Pass
Project, because it will have a negative impact on the
welfare of this community. I believe it will reduce
property values. And, I cheer you on Jeannie Menard.
I hope you can help the group to understand how that
works.

It does nothing to promote long-term
growth of industry for Deerfield. It will have a
negative impact on the environment, aesthetics, and use
of natural resources of this community and this state.
And, I would like to say a few more words about what I
mean by "use of natural resources" and the long-term
negative impacts.

In 2010, I was a member of a delegation
of ten foundations from around the country who were
invited to meet with USDA Secretary Tom Vilsack,
Undersecretary Doug O'Brien, at the White House, to
talk about the most pressing issues facing rural
America. And, guess what? Energy extraction and
transmission was at the top of our list. New Hampshire
is not the only place this is happening. Our argument at the time was that rural America was and is facing a new gold rush, that is large-scale extraction, generation, and transmission of energy. And, this will decimate the critical natural amenities that are the very key to the future for rural areas.

Not much has changed. At that time, I was talking about Coos County, now we're looking at the entire state, multiple projects. And, while rural areas may not have the financial wealth or political capital to buy our way to economic vitality, for us, for neighboring population centers, and for the entire state, we have natural assets that are essential and provide essential services now, and will in the future, if they are still here. The Northern Pass project threatens the landscape and the natural amenities that are the key to our long-term economic vitality.

So, I understand your charge, as I think it's in Chapter 162-H, I think it's fairly narrowly prescribed. And, I am looking at all of you asking you to lift your eyes up, lift your heads up and look at the broader context of this project, all externalities, and make sure that the true extent of the impacts, short- and long-term, are considered very deeply.
You know, like Jeannie, I really appreciate hearing all points of view. And, I think this is a great time to say that reasonable people can disagree on some of these topics. Will the short-term gains outweigh the permanent destruction of our natural assets that are our future wealth. Reasonable minds can disagree on that. I think it's up to the SEC Committee to really think deeply about that.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Kate Hartnett, to be followed by Cathy Laforge, and Michael Van Natta.

MS. HARTNETT: Kathryn Hartnett, H-a-r-t-n-e-t-t. Okay, night owls, I am not one. So, I'm going to be very brief. I'll try to raise things you have not heard before. I have five points.

Number one. Mr. Quinlan talked a lot in an earlier meeting about frequent referencing to "listening". My experience, as a planning board and conservation commission member since 2011, it is sales and marketing, and now listening. I discovered in RSA 162-H that the site and facility basically will not interfere with the orderly development of the region, with due consideration be given to the view of...
municipal planning commissions. Guess what? I've been
on a municipal planning commission; we have not heard a
peep from anybody from Northern Pass; 162 says
otherwise. I assert, like Phil Bilodeau, "maybe I'll
hear tomorrow. We'll see."

That's number one. Listening, maybe,
but not burial.

Number two. The applicants, who somehow
missed the chronic wetland damage that Mr. Samuel
referenced over on Church Street. And, it fits a long
record of nonperformance in town that we can document
going back to the early 2000s. One thing is said;
another thing is done. Track record. Okay. That's
point number two.

Point number three. It seems to me that
the heart-rendered stories about the jobs and the
economic benefits, and all of the supply-side things
that are happening, those all accrue with a different
level of design that avoids or minimizes adverse
impacts. Those jobs will stay there, they just come
out in a different form, as far as I can tell. But I'm
not an expert on that, I just sort of suspect it.

Number four. There's a real contrast
between what I've experienced as a sales and marketing
pitch and some of what you've heard tonight, about
employees' experience with the newcomers who now own
the former PSNH facility/company, from that website.
The track record about significant customer
dissatisfaction, which I didn't know and learned
tonight.

And, then, thirdly, I can tell you about
that wetland and erosion lack of performance, which is
happening in this town, and may happen elsewhere. And,
I've got a bunch of letters on file with specific
suggests on how to get around that, like with
Mr. Preston Samuel, no coming back feedback from those
points.

So, finally, I want to thank you, thank
you all for your listening. It's late. I can't
believe your appetite for taking in information. Thank
you very much for being here. This is qualitatively
different, a variant from the previous Eversource
winter meetings. We appreciate your visit. Please
come back.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Cathy Laforge, to
be followed by Michael Van Natta, and Sean Matthews.
MS. LaFORGE: Cathy Laforge, L-a-f-o-r-g-e. I'm going to be really brief. Deerfield has a vision and a plan, and a lot of volunteer hours have gone into that over the last couple of decades. I'm a Deerfield resident. The residents of Deerfield have been working hard to maintain the rural character and aesthetic beauty of our town. Northern Pass, obviously, does not subscribe to our plan, but burying the lines would preserve Deerfield's history and character, as this does matter to us.

I realize going from a $1.6 billion project to a $2.6 billion project is a lot of money, but that doesn't justify the ruin of our scenic byways and our declining real estate values. Bury the lines. The bottom line is that, once these towers go up, there's no going back. Temporary jobs that Northern Pass creates will be at the expense of our town -- our town's tourism industry, sorry, at the expense of our tourism industry and local businesses. We do need green energy. I totally, completely believe in green energy, clean energy. And, we can still have it with the lines buried.

Thank you very much.
[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Michael Van Natta, to be followed by Sean Matthews, and Bill Powers.

Is Mr. Van Natta here? Perhaps not?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How about Sean Matthews? Yes? No?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No. Bill Powers?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Maybe they all came together. Jason Bentley?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jim Mason? Yes.

The slips after Mr. Mason are Paula Duchano and Maureen Quinn.

MR. MASON: My name is James Mason. I'm a resident of Franklin, New Hampshire. I'm a business owner there, and I also own land in Canterbury, New Hampshire. My home and farm is near the travel route of Northern Pass. And, I'm also a former City Councilor for the City of Franklin.

I'm here to support the Northern Pass Project, and wanted to speak briefly on the great level
of misinformation that's been out there about the tax benefits and what can be expected from this project. A common statement that I've heard many times is the tax benefits from the project will disappear in just a few years. These statements are completely false. The reality is that these types of utility investments, whether transmission lines, pipelines, or other infrastructures, provide long-term benefits to the communities that host them. In the case of Northern Pass, the developer states that it has a 40-year life, but really might even be much longer than that.

But, unlike most developments that occur in a community, there is no increase in town spending. There's no children to educate. There's no extra police or fire or new roads to plow. There's nothing. No extra burden to the communities.

This, like many taxable investments, transmission lines do depreciate. But it takes a long time to fully depreciate a billion dollar investment at two, two and a half percent per year. This taxable investment will provide benefits for decades.

It is also important to point out that any billion dollar investment requires maintenance and upgrades. These will have added value that will fall
into future projects and add more tax revenue.

We also need to consider the impact of the increased tax rates on these investments. In many cases, while the value of the investments depreciates, the tax rate increases. The net result being that the owner of this project doesn't see their tax bill go down at the same rate as their investment depreciates.

There are countless examples of various types of utility infrastructure throughout our state that provide ongoing, reliable tax benefits to communities. Northern Pass will be no different, and our communities and other taxpayers need this type of investment to keep New Hampshire an affordable place to live and raise their family.

I can tell you, as a business owner in New Hampshire, my taxes, my property taxes are quite high. And, I know a lot of businesses are struggling to pay their taxes. It's a good 15 to 20 percent of their income every year of their business gross, as they start their year, they set aside to pay their property taxes, so they can keep themselves in their businesses. And, this burden is getting greater and greater on the landowners.

So, I welcome Northern Pass, and I hope...
it goes through.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Paula Duchano, to be followed by Maureen Quinn, and Harriet Cady.

MS. CARRY-DUCHANO: Hi. My name is Paula Carry-Duchano, C-a-r-r-y hyphen D-u-c-h-a-n-o. And, I object to Northern Pass on a number of different levels.

I own land which abuts the existing substation here in Deerfield, as well as the Deerfield Dowst-Cate Forest. Both of these properties are under conservation easement. It is frustrating to think that a part of the wetlands encompassed on these protected properties will undergo dredging and filling for the new Northern Pass substation. The Town of Deerfield and my family have put a lot of time and energy into preserving this land. My family owns 342 acres of land protected by the LCIP program.

As far as the promise of new jobs, after the new transformer was brought in a few years ago, and again last summer, the additional workforce I was seeing entering the substation each day all drove vehicles with Maine license plates.

The major upgrading of the access road
east of the substation, under the power lines, which I'm told has nothing to do with Northern Pass, but I feel like it's an upgrade in anticipation, was all done by out-of-state contractors. It did not appear that any of the local contractors benefited from this work.

The noise from the substation is extremely annoying. When I was at the site this afternoon, at the substation, the humming noise we were all hearing is audible at our house, which is almost a mile away. And, it is more annoying during the summer. Tonight I heard that there would be a sound wall in the new substation. But how can I trust that statement if the existing problem has not already been dealt with?

Feel that there's a lack of respect and consideration for the landowners. While my grandchildren were very excited, I found it a bit disconcerting when the helicopter, working with the crews who were working on the transmission line, landed in our back field, without any prior notice, permission, or explanation later as to why they were there.

And, so, as the owner of 300 plus protected, managed woodlands, I oppose Northern Pass.

Thank up for your time.

{SEC 2015-06} [Joint Public Hearing/Deerfield] {03-16-16}
[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Maureen Quinn, to be followed by Harriet Cady, and Kevin Cini, it's C-i-n-i, although that might be an "m".

MS. QUINN: Good evening. My name is Maureen Quinn, Q-u-i-n-n. And, I'm a resident of 47A Nottingham Road, here in Deerfield. I've been in Deerfield for almost seven years.

As a former pediatric oncology nurse, I've taken care of many young children, often losing their lives to cancer. And, I'm also a master's prepared public health professional. So, I read the Northern Pass Application with great interest, particularly Appendix 37, addressing exposure to AC and DC electric magnetic fields.

Despite the analysis and information provided by the Application to minimize concerns in this area, the potential health impacts resulting from the increased electromagnetic exposure this project presents to the residents of this community is of great concern to me.

There are several places in the Application which state such things as "The WHO report paid particular attention to childhood leukemia because
the most consistent epidemiologic association in the area of low-frequency EMF and the health research has been reported between this disease and long-term exposure to higher than average magnetic-field levels."

That's one area that the WHO expressed concerns about this.

"Consistent epidemiological evidence suggests that chronic low-intensity ELF magnetic field exposure is associated with an increased risk of childhood leukemia."

"The National Institute on Environmental Health Services working group classified ELF EMF as possibly carcinogenic, in a decision that the NIEHS called "conservative"."

"The International Agency for Research on Cancer, leading" -- "the cancer research agency for the WHO, and a leading scientific and health authority on cancer research and cancer causation, reviewed the literature to evaluate potential carcinogenic effects of ELF EMF in 2002."

"Evidence for all cancers from both epidemiological studies and laboratory animal studies was inadequate for ELF electron" -- "electric fields."

"The association between childhood
leukemia and magnetic fields observed in other studies remains unexplained. Thus, the results of recent studies do not change the classification of epidemiologic data as limited."

The situation regarding the existing scientific evidence as described in this Application is precisely why the public health concept of the precautionary principle is appropriate in this situation. The precautionary principle encourages policies that protect human health and the environment in the face of uncertainly risks. I believe this concept pertains particularly relevantly to the lack of knowledge regarding prolonged human exposure to elevated electromagnetic radiation, such as what will occur in this community, and many others, with the construction of the Northern Pass transmission lines.

Environmental scientists worldwide have proposed that this precautionary principle concept be adopted as the standard guideline in environmental decision-making with regard to policymaking and scientific inquiry. And, the concept has four central components: Taking preventative action in the face of uncertainty, which this data certainly provides; shifting the burden of proof to the proponents of
activity, which I don't believe is contained in the Application; exploring a wide range of alternatives to possibly harmful applications, particularly when this project is not necessary; and increasing public participation in decision-making.

As my contribution to public participation in the SEC decision-making, which I am extremely grateful for, I am not convinced that this project does not present potential public health risks.

I wonder how many Eversource employees would be enthusiastic about having the transmission lines and towers placed in their backyard, where their children and grandchildren play daily.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Quinn, how much more do you have?

MS. QUINN: Two paragraphs.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, how many paragraphs have you done so far?

MS. QUINN: I don't know. One big paragraph.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

MS. QUINN: Additionally, my decision to live in Deerfield was based on its historic and rural character, which are both threatened by this project.
I regularly hike in Pawtuckaway State Park, and many other parts of the state, I take great pleasure in the aesthetics of the views I experience on those hikes, and those views will be seriously impacted. And, I am sure I am not the only one who will choose to hike elsewhere if these towers are constructed, in Deerfield and the Pawtuckaway viewshed, as well as many other parts of the state.

I do believe my property values will be seriously negatively impacted by the proximity of these towers. No one on the Eversource side can prove this isn't likely. And, once this state's beauty is destroyed, it will never come back.

Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Harriet Cady, to be followed by Kevin Cini, Brian Tilton, and the last card from Erica Druke.

MS. CADY: I would like to say I am a Deerfield resident. I have lived here since 1984. And, I would like to make a couple of corrections to past testimony to begin. Except I put the wrong thing in.

[Referring to the court reporter's}
MS. CADY: Our selectman said there were two votes supporting Northern Pass. He neglected to tell you of the vote last year, where people who had enthusiastically submitted the first two petitions, then submitted a petition asking for money, $10,000 to fight Northern Pass, for legal fees, and that third vote was 2-to-1 "no".

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Cady, just to be clear. I believe his testimony was that the two votes were "to oppose Northern Pass".

MS. CADY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

MS. CADY: And this vote was 2-to-1 against giving them money to oppose.

I was a member of the Lamprey River Watershed Association to which Mr. Preston -- to which Preston testified. And, I watched, as I came down Church Street every day, the JCR placing mats and huge planks to go from this side of the road to this side of the road, through what were wetlands and areas they had to traverse. So, I do know they did attempt to do that, which they were asked to do.

I keep seeing "More trees, less towers", 
or "Trees, not towers". Well, there are pictures of Deerfield where all of Meetinghouse Hill, and where I live on Old Centre, were pastures. The view to Pawtuckaway Mountain, from Ridge Road, was clear, pastures. The days of the farmers are pretty well gone, and the fields and the pastures are not being kept up anymore.

So, now, I will proceed with testimony. Oh, by the way, of the Church Street power lines, as I go home many nights, I see moose, I see deer, I see fox. So, I don't think that the power lines has hurt our wildlife.

As a Deerfield citizen, I've been listening to the rhetoric of those who want pristine environments try to either stop Northern Pass legally or by making the Company's costs so expensive the project will become unfeasible. What has bothered me more and more is the use of my facilities for meetings by groups opposed, but especially a Town body, such as Conservation Commission, Planning Board, Selectboard, Heritage Commission, etcetera. If the loudest voices just happen to be on those bodies and send materials to the Site Evaluation Committee, but are doing so as if the whole community is speaking, isn't that called
"compelled speech"? The federal courts have determined public bodies must remain impartial, unless the whole public body they serve is in agreement, not majority votes, but all the community must agree. And, as I speak to you tonight, I prove that not all Deerfield citizens agree with what has been presented from those committees.

I have a prejudice for hydropower. I grew up in a town that had hydropower. We swam in the lake produced by it, we fished from the dams, and it goes from there.

I will leave the rest of this testimony, hoping you can read it. But, I will say to you, thank you so much. As a legislator, I have sat behind a table and taken testimony. And, I am so sorry for you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Kevin Cini?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Another ambiguity we'll never resolve.

Brian Tilton, to be followed by Erica Druke.

MR. TILTON: Good evening. And, thank you for staying this late hour. It sounds like it was a long day for you. I do appreciate all of your
attention to this matter today. It looks like you're actively engaged and absorbing information and asking questions. So, I appreciate it.

Brian Tilton, B-r-i-a-n, Tilton, T-i-l-t-o-n. And, I live in Hooksett.

One of the first speakers tonight was my State Senator David Boutin from my town. And, I just want to point out that no town in his district, in our district, would be, you know, directly impacted by Northern Pass. No towers will be in any of the towns that he represents, and, certainly, there would be none of that revenue to the towns coming to my Town of Hooksett.

Also want to point out that Mike Skelton, who speak earlier, the head of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, what he did not disclose to you is that he was a paid spokesman for Northern Pass prior to his position at the Manchester Chamber of Commerce. The question has come up many times about "widening the right-of-way", in the way the question was presented, the way it was answered. It's very important to understand two distinctions on the right-of-way. There's a legal widening of the right-of-way, meaning you expand the boundaries that
are contained in the property deeds on those easements. Or, you have the appearance of the widening, which is clearing the trees within the boundary of the right-of-way. To many people that are going to be directly impacted, those who are abutters to this property, they're going to see those trees cleared out right to the property line.

So, while the Applicant may say "we're not widening the right-of-way", that may be legally and technically correct, but the visual impact would be "that right-of-way is being cleared from end-to-end". And, you've probably heard, in fact, you heard from one person tonight, and at other hearings, where people are going to see that tree buffer disappear that currently exists.

I'm still outraged at the London Economic study being kept from the public. I don't know how you, as a Committee, can really understand and grasp what may be in that study that you're able to see, but we, the people, are not able to see. So, you will not be able to hear any opposing viewpoints or any other critical analysis of it. I think that part is wrong, and I think that study needs to either be released to the public or you dismiss it, because no
one, and I believe Peter Roth even testified that he's not able to see it, or, not testified, but written in an earlier objection to the Application being incomplete.

I've heard a lot of the people here speaking for Northern Pass try to say that there's great environmental benefits. Very important to note that not one single organization, environmental organization, supports Northern Pass, not one.

And, as far as energy prices, you want to talk about lowering energy prices? Look what the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is doing right now in investigating Eversource for having the higher transmission rates in the country, higher than anybody else, and that is what is driving up our cost of power.

I just saved more than 5 percent that these people are trying to say by trashing our state, I saved 11 percent just by switching to a competitive supplier for the electricity portion of this.

And, one last point. On tourism, to the "expert" of Northern Pass, I was wearing this shirt, which I hope I never have to wear again, I would be glad not to have to put this on anymore. I talked to some people years ago at Polar Caves Park with my
children, and I was wearing this short that day. And, I had some people ask me, "What is this Northern Pass? I see the signs everywhere." I said, "Well, this is, you know, they're going to build these towers", and I gave them a quick 30 second rundown. And, they said "I came here from Brooklyn to visit. I will never be back, if those towers go up." So, there's your tourism study right there.

Thank you very much for your time.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Erica Druke. Is Erica Druke here?

MS. DRUKE: I'm Erica Druke. I'm against Northern Pass for multiple ethical reasons. If Northern Pass is approved, there needs to be a minimum of three conditions met: All 190 miles of electric lines must be buried, towers are not necessary; New Hampshire needs to be in incentivized to develop their own independent, clean and renewable competitive sources of electrical power to feed into the grid; New Hampshire communities need to be allowed to do net metering at wholesale rates.

It may be true that Northern Pass will conjure a thousand jobs, but Northern Pass has never
said those jobs are going to New Hampshire residents. Maybe there should be a fourth condition: All 1,000 jobs will go to New Hampshire residents, not Canadians and not out-of-staters.

This project will be completed as quickly as possible to minimize costs, liability exposure, and maximize profits to investors. Who are these investors? Can the Northern Pass investors and shareholders be made public knowledge? It makes me very curious as to how who is really behind these major industrial energy projects in Canada. Is it just Canada following the "American dream" model of get rich quick or is it something else?

We've gone beyond the realm of nation states to the world of elitism, big business, and big money. We have a global economy that revolves around the billionaires boys club, who are irresponsibly exploiting the natural resources of the world for profit. These Canadian energy ventures, whether it be Tar Sands or Northern Pass, it's more than just about Canada trying to grow their own economy. Northern Pass is a cash cow for Canada and its investors.

Everyone needs energy, but what's in it for the U.S. except high electrical rates? Canada
wants to use New Hampshire as a bridge with a network of towers to connect into the U.S. energy system. Once this bridge of towers is built, there is nothing stopping Canada from damming up their whole countryside and sending higher and higher payloads of electricity, and adding more transmission lines over time. New Hampshire could become, in essence, an electrical highway or gateway to the U.S.

New Hampshire is not known for skyscrapers, but New Hampshire will be known for monster towers of steel carrying Canadian power south to the lower New England states and beyond. They will be impossible to miss. People won't be asking "what exit", like New Jersey, they'll be asking "what tower number do you live by?" These gigantic new towers will become the most prominent feature of New Hampshire's landscape, and they can't be erased; they'll be permanent.

The energy industry has a monopoly on the supply of power to consumers, and the public has a right to be a part of the equation. The public interest demands truly clean and renewable energy sources, not just the ones that private enterprises dream up to maximize their profits.
The public needs equal input in the entire process. It's the public that should be considered the true stakeholders here, not just the investors. New Hampshire says "no" to Northern Pass.

[Audience interruption.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Druke, do you have a written copy for the stenographer?

[Document handed to Mr. Patnaude.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Is there anything else we need to do this evening? I'm looking at Ms. Monroe.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: You can just announce the time. The prehearing conference will start at 10:00 a.m. on Monday.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The prehearing conference will start at 10:00 a.m. on Monday.

MR. ROTH: Pardon me.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Just a minute, Peter. That will be at the Holiday Inn, in Concord.

Yes, Mr. Roth.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to make a public comment at this point, I don't do that. But I just want to clarify something. Mr. Tilton suggested that we do -- that Counsel for the Public
does not have the London Economics study in an unredacted form. While that was true when we wrote the letter back in December, we subsequently received a copy of those documents in an unredacted form.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, Mr. Roth.

Anything else we need to do?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. If there is nothing, we will adjourn. Thank you all.

(Whereupon the Joint Public Hearing was adjourned at 10:43 p.m.)