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PROCEDINGS

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Public Comment Hearing of the Site Evaluation Committee. We have one matter before us this evening; it's the Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire, which does business as Eversource Energy, for a Certificate of Site and Facility, which is SEC Docket 2015-06. After the public hearing this evening, we will also have a meeting of the Subcommittee to discuss certain motions for reconsideration related to interventions.

Before turning to the public comment hearing agenda, I will ask the Subcommittee members to introduce themselves, starting to my left.

MR. OLDENBURG: William Oldenburg, Department of Transmission.

CMSR. BAILEY: Kate Bailey from the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Martin Honigberg from the New Hampshire Public
Utilities Commission.

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

MS. WHITAKER: Rachel Whitaker, public member.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sitting to my right -- I'm sorry, Patty.

MS. WEATHERSBY: Last, but not least, Patricia Weathersby, public member.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sorry about that.

Not present this evening is Craig Wright from the Department of Environmental Services.

Sitting to my right is Michael Iacopino, who is counsel to the Site Evaluation Committee. Sitting in the front row to my right in the beautiful light blue jacket is Pam Monroe, the SEC Administrator.

All right. We will now open the public comment hearing. I have to read, unfortunately, a short explanation of why we're here.
On October 19th, 2015,
Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public
Service Company of New Hampshire 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 line is proposed to
have a capacity rating of up to 1,090
megawatts, which will run through New
Hampshire from the Canadian border in
Pittsburg to Deerfield.

On November 2nd, pursuant to
R.S.A. 162-H:4(A), the Chair of the Committee
appointed a Subcommittee.

On December 7th, the
Subcommittee reviewed the Application and
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 that the
Application contained sufficient information
to carry out the purposes of R.S.A. 162-H.

On January 11th, 14th, 20th
and 21st, the Subcommittee conducted public
information sessions in Franklin,
Londonderry, Laconia, Whitefield and Lincoln.

Back in December, the Site
Evaluation Committee readopted its
administrative rules with amendments. The
readoption of the administrative rules was
required by New Hampshire law.

On December 28th of 2015, the
Committee Administrator asked the Applicant
to supplement the Application so that it
would comply with the newly-enacted
regulations. The Applicant filed
supplemental documentation on February 26th,
2016. Prior to and following the Applicant's
submission of supplemental documentation, the
Subcommittee received a number of motions
requesting that the Committee -- that the
Subcommittee postpone or suspend public
hearings in this docket and/or schedule
additional public hearings.
On March 1st, I issued an order denying the request to postpone or suspend the public hearings, but ordered that two additional hearings would be conducted to allow the public to comment on the supplemental documentation filed by the Applicant on February 26th of 2016. The Subcommittee has already conducted public hearings on March 1st, 7th, 10th, 14th and 16th in Meredith, Colebrook, Concord, Holderness and Deerfield. The Subcommittee has also held the first of the two additional public hearings for comment on the supplemental documentation; that took place in Whitefield on May 19th.

The Order of Notice of tonight's public comment hearing for the public to comment on the supplemental documentation was issued on May 26th of 2016. Please note that the purpose of this hearing is to receive public comments on the additional information documentation filed by the Applicant on February 26th, 2016; therefore, I would ask members of the public...
to limit their comments to the issues raised
in the supplemental documentation. Also, to
the people who have intervenor status in this
docket, please carefully consider whether it
is necessary for you to comment during this
hearing. As intervenors, you have other
opportunities to make your arguments, to take
discovery and to cross-examine the
Applicant's witnesses as part of these
adjudicative proceedings.

As I indicated, the purpose of
tonight's hearing is to hear from the public
on the supplemental materials. There will be
no presentation by the Applicant and no
questions for the Applicant. I will also
point out that the public comment period in
the Site Evaluation Committee proceedings is
extensive. We receive and consider written
comments, statements and reports from the
public throughout the pendency of our
proceeding up until the time that the record
is closed just before deliberations begin.

If you wish to speak, you
should sign up on the forms that were outside
and can be provided by Ms. Monroe down in front. Given the number of people who have signed up, we'll ask you to limit your remarks to three minutes. Please understand that when you get to three minutes, we will not stop you. When you get to 3-1/2 minutes, I will raise my hand. About 30 seconds after that, if it looks like you're not finishing up, I will ask you to either finish up or suspend your remarks and wait until everyone else has had a chance to speak for you to complete them.

One other comment based on what's gone on at prior public comment hearings. We know that people want to show their support for speakers, and we're not going to stop that. We would ask that comments, whatever you want to make, in the manner of cheering or clapping, be positive. Show your support if you would like to or for the people who have spoken, but please, you do not need to make negative comments about what anybody else has said.

The other thing I want to say
about that is we need to keep this moving so
that people will be able to leave here at a
reasonable hour. So when I read names, I'm
going to read three names. And each time I
read the names, I'm going to identify the
next two people to speak. So, after
someone's done, I would ask the next person
whose turn it is to speak to come to the
microphone, so that way we can keep things
moving, even if there is a short amount of
applause for a prior speaker. Is that a deal
that everybody feels they can live with this
evening?

Good. Thank you all for that,
for your cooperation on that.

All right. Mr. Iacopino, is
there anything else I need to do before
calling the first speaker this evening?

MR. IACOPINO: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
The first three speakers are: Representative
Herb Richardson, to be followed by Grafton
County Commissioner Martha Richards and
Representative Suzanne Smith.
The stenographer asked me to remind you that, if you have brought written comments this evening and are reading from something, if you could please leave a copy for the stenographer in the plastic bin on the table in front of me. That will help everyone make this record clear and complete.

Representative Richardson.

REP. RICHARDSON: Thank you, and thank you very much for allowing me to speak here tonight. For the record, my name is Herb Richardson. I am a state representative for Coos District 4. I represent the communities of Lancaster and Dalton. I'm also the vice-chairman of the Science, Technology and Energy Committee in the New Hampshire House of Representatives.

I am here to tell you, the SEC, that I have many local contractors in my district and in my county that are very happy with the Project Labor Agreement portion of the supplemental information that has been filed with you. They feel that Northern Pass is making a concerted effort to hire local
contractors as part of this project. We hope that the SEC will hold Northern Pass to this goal and this Project will keep to rekindle the economic well-being of the North Country.

The $200 million Forward New Hampshire Fund is very important to Coos County and the State of New Hampshire. A small amount of these dollars have already been given out, helping in my district alone: An electric car charger at our local campground in Lancaster put in by a local contractor; a simulator for our CTE Program at White Mountain Regional High School; a local child care center just starting out, giving them the opportunity for jobs, and most important, child care to our community. The newest project to get started will be new street lighting in Lancaster, saving energy costs for our residents. And once again, this project will be done by a local contractor, keeping jobs in the North Country.

Ladies and gentlemen, last evening I went from Lancaster to West
Stewartstown on county business. It once
again showed me how much Coos County needs
help. Take this trip sometime. It's
incredible. It's scary how many homes are up
for sale in the North Country. Check how
many businesses in Whitefield, Lancaster,
Groveton, Colebrook are now no longer in
existence. Coos County is hurting. We have
the highest unemployment rate in the state.
We have the highest under-employment rate in
the state, almost 6 percent on Medicaid
expansion. The poverty level is low [sic].
We pay one of the highest electric rates in
the Continental United States here in New
Hampshire. Will Northern Pass help lower
these electric rates? I believe they will.
Will the tax revenues help reduce property
taxes? I believe they will. Will Northern
Pass and the Forward New Hampshire Fund help
bring business and jobs to the North Country?
I believe so. We need help. We need jobs so
that our families have the ability to live
and work where they love.

Some say the proposed Coos
Loop upgrade will not help Coos County in the North Country. You and I know that is one of the most important projects that is needed in Coos County. Jobs, jobs, jobs, that's what it's all about.

I would like to applaud the SEC in its desire to try to get as much public input as possible into the review process for Northern Pass. And there does come a time when re-hearing the same information over and over becomes less about good public input and more about delaying the process. This really needs to be the last public hearing. This is only the second SEC hearing after we, the Legislature, rewrote the SEC process extending it to three months. I would like to encourage the SEC to rethink their plan to add the extra nine months. We had ample time to discuss this time needed during the legislative process.

Thank you for your time and your consideration.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next speaker is Grafton County Commissioner Martha
Richards, to be followed by Representative Suzanne Smith and Franklin City Councilor, Tony Giunta.

COMMISSIONER RICHARDS: The 2,000-day campaign continues. Good evening. I'm Martha Richards from Holderness, wearing two hats tonight: First, as a private citizen on a right-of-way now moved into downtown Plymouth, who proudly stands with the opposition fighting this project for six long years; and second, as one of the three Grafton County Commissioners who are all in full agreement with total opposition to the Northern Pass Project as currently proposed. As commissioners, we are also intervenors on this project.

So, here I stand before you all again tonight with a simple message which Eversource is loathed to keep hearing: Bury the whole project under I-93 and other state transportation corridors. With project plans going through the downtowns of Franconia, Easton, Sugar Hill, Woodstock, Thornton, Campton and Plymouth, do you have any idea of
what is being created here? Undoubtedly some businesses will fail during this time of extreme disruption. Our already fragile economy cannot take more losses. With Plymouth State University in Plymouth, I cannot even fathom the disruption on our Main Street. As commissioners, we are very concerned with our county's economic well-being, from tourist attractions and services to the plunging real estate market, to the lasting environmental damage, to probable health concerns. This all for a project that is not needed to keep the lights on.

By this point, you have hopefully waded through thousands of pages of documents from many sources and thus have begun to educate yourselves about this project. You're new to this. We have been living with this Black Monster for six years. But we are still here standing strong, like David and Goliath, against those lying, deceitful behemoths, Northern Pass and Hydro Quebec. We are not some backwoods hicks they
can roll over and conquer. They couldn't even buy off Plymouth with $10 million to move the line.

Your due diligence is expected as you ask the tough questions. For once, maybe we'll see a government entity work effectively to determine if this project is really something that will or will not benefit New Hampshire, not just line too many corporate pockets with obscene profits, profits garnered at the expense of severely disrupting people's lives perhaps forever by some ivory tower executives who don't give a damn about the hundreds of us living along the 192 miles of the Project. Please continue your reading and absorption of this gargantuan project. We, the opposition, can already tell you it is not needed and not wanted. We offer facts and we offer the truth. In your findings by September 2017 -- and thank you for that needed extension -- mandate its total burial in the right places and not in the heart of our communities. The Native Americans would plan out seven
generations for their actions in the environment. Surely, you can have the vision and foresight to treat the natural beauty of New Hampshire with near equal respect. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next speaker is Representative Susan Smith, to be followed by Franklin City Councilor, Tony Giunta, and Allen, with a last name I can't really read -- Barthillier? -- who lives in Lancaster.

REP. SMITH: Good evening. For the record, my name is Suzanne Smith. I'm a state representative. I represent Grafton County District 8, the towns of Plymouth, Hebron and Holderness.

I want to start by thanking the SEC for listening to the concerns of citizens and holding these two additional meetings or hearings. We understand the challenges you, the SEC, face: A lengthy application and an extended review process. But on those long nights when you are up late reading through thousands and thousands of
pages of documents from the Applicant and the
many, many questions and comments from
intervenors of the Northern Pass Project,
please do not lose sight of the fact that
behind every letter and question is a citizen
of New Hampshire who cares deeply about this
place we call home, about the natural
resources, the scenic beauty, the cultural
and historic resources and the strong tourism
economy, all of which benefit each and every
one of us, no matter what our walk of life;
the voices of the people who live adjacent to
Routes 3, 116 and 112, whose yards and
gardens stand to be disrupted by blasting of
ledges and digging in their yards, sometimes
within 50 feet of their homes; the voices of
people and communities who will be subjected
to tall towers and wide swaths of bare land
where they will be erected; the voices of the
municipalities who are faced with defending
their towns against the lure of big bucks
from the Forward NH Plan. I could go on. If
the Applicant had initially proposed to bury
the entire project, it would now, in all
likelihood, be built. But instead, millions
of dollars have been spent trying to work the
system. And now, six years into the Project,
the adjudicatory process has not even
started. I urge the SEC to seriously listen
to people, the people, and recommend burial
of the entire project. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
Tony Giunta, to be followed by Allen B., and
then Alan McLain. I would note that if you are
not sitting somewhere near to where the
microphone and the lecturn are set up, there
are a couple seats right down in front where
you can come down and sit when you're either on
deck or in the hold.

So, Mr. Giunta.

COUNCILOR GIUNTA: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman and members of the SEC,
Administrator Monroe. Good evening. My name
is Tony Giunta, I'm City Councilor for the City
of Franklin. And we have been here before, and
this is, I believe, the last time we will have
a chance to actually speak to the SEC.

So, you have heard from our
mayor, Ken Merrifield, who has told you of
the enormous importance of this project to
our city, $7 million in additional revenue to
a tax base that now generates $10 million.
That is a significant influx of funding for
our city, desperately needed. You have also
heard from our city manager, Elizabeth
Dragon, who has told you about diminishing
funds that are coming to our city on the
state level and on the federal level, which
makes it even more difficult to satisfy our
requirements as a municipality in the city of
Franklin.

But one thing I want to stress	onight is something that's near and dear to
me, and that's the environmental benefits
that come from this project. It is often not
talked about. I'd like to spend a moment on
it for you.

I've spent 15 years of my life
with the Department of Environmental Services
cleaning up our legacy sites, mainly
petroleum sites. And this is what has been
part of our civilization. This is how we
live. But we are dealing with cleaning it up. We are now looking at Northern Pass, a low carbon-emission source of electricity, to now take the place of that. So when I left the Department in 2007, I started a company called AMENICO, American Energy Independence Company. And the goal of that company was to collect waste vegetable oil from restaurants from all across New England. After nearly a decade, that company now collects about a million gallons a year of what used to either go down the drain or used to be thrown away in a landfill. The EPA has done significant studies and has found that for every gallon of that product that goes and replaces fuel oil or diesel fuel saves 22 pounds of carbon dioxide from getting into our environment. If you calculate it out, essentially what that means is that AMENICO saves the environment about 10,000 tons of CO2 emissions every year. Let's compare that with this project. We're talking about 3 million tons of CO2 reductions from this one project. That's 300 AMENICOs that can
happen with the flick of a switch overnight on this one project. To me, to know the blood, sweat and tears of creating AMENICO over 10 years and to know how awful it is to gather up this material and turn it into a renewable fuel is a staggering statistic for me, and it should be for you as well.

The other thing I want to add to you is, as we lose base generation power from nuclear power plants, a zero carbon-emission source, as we lose those units, what will replace them if not Northern Pass? I can tell you what will replace them: Natural gas. Natural gas is a backward step from where we are today. From a zero-emission carbon source now moving to natural gas is a step back for this whole region.

With those facts, Mr. Chairman and members of the SEC, I hope you will consider them and come to the same conclusion that I have come to, that this is a very good project and should be approved. Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next speaker is Allen B., who is going to spell and pronounce his name for us, followed by Alan McLain and Roger Hinds.

MR. BOUTHILLIER: My name is Allen Bouthillier -- last name is B-O-U-T-H-I-L-L-I-E-R -- from Lancaster, New Hampshire. My sons and I run an excavation and logging business in Lancaster. We have been in business for 32 years and presently have 35 employees. I would like to speak to you about how the PPA and this supplement will mean to my company and our employees. It is very important to the growth and viability of my company and our employees that this project be approved. Fundamentally, it is important for you to stop delaying the work so that we can go to work. I don't understand why you would start off with a nine-month delay in the approval process when there is already an agreement in place by legislators in the state to give you a year to decide. I believe the state government should be held to the same standards that they would hold my company to if
I don't perform on a project that I'm awarded
from the state. If I don't perform in a timely
manner, I would be fined severe penalties and
have a chance of losing my borrowing
capabilities.

I'm also concerned that this
public counsel has unfairly limited itself to
only representing those members of the public
that are opposed to the project. I don't
believe that this was the legislators' intent
when they created the Public Counsel, getting
help from the New Hampshire Attorney
General's Office be based on whether or not
you support the project. I'm not sure it is
fair to have the AG support the position that
the Seabrook Nuclear and its former owners
have taken against my small company and other
small companies like mine in Coos County.

Looking at the new experts that Public
Counsel is hiring, I am very concerned that
you are proposing a one-sided study to oppose
this project. Are you going to quantify the
positives that this brings to New Hampshire?

I know that Northern Pass will
increase tourism by creating new
opportunities for trails for ATVs, snow
machines and horseback riding, just like it
does in Vermont on the existing DC line.
Lowering the electric rates will benefit the
ski industry when they're making snow and at
full capacity at their hotels. Will this be
included in the study?

Another thing I would like to
share with you is a fact sheet published by
the USDA, which I have a bunch of handouts
that I will had you for the record.

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

MR. BOUTHILLIER: These
documents speak about the benefits of early
successional species habitat to wildlife. They
list power line rights-of-way as one of the
main sources of this habitat. Northern Pass
will create early successional habitat. As a
hunter, I would seek out areas like these to
hunt. A hunter is just another form of tourist
wearing an orange jacket.

Please consider all the facts
and stop delaying the approval of this
project. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next speaker is Alan McLain, followed by Roger Hinds and Jim Page.

MR. McLAIN: Good afternoon. My name is Alan McLain. I'd like thank you for letting me speak here again tonight. The letter is to the Site Evaluation Committee.

My name is Alan McLain. I'm a business owner. I support the Northern Pass Project. Hydropower is clean and doesn't use up our natural resources. An example is biomass or coal. I believe more supply options will lead to lower prices, as well as lowering the risk of energy shortages in the future. I'm one of the majority of New Hampshire residents that's in favor of this project. I feel the turnout at these meetings have definitely been one-sided and in favor of the opposition of the Northern Pass Project. This group has been very passionate in their beliefs. They arrive at the meetings showing signs against Northern Pass, wearing clothing to signify the same --
orange hats, shirts, shovels, etc. They are very, very vocal in these meetings, cheering, clapping and sometimes shouting rude outbursts. When someone speaks in favor of the Northern Pass Project, there is either dead silence or low grumbling in the audience against those of us that have a different opinion. These actions are a form of bullying, making New Hampshire residents in favor of this project afraid to speak up, uncomfortable and unlikely to speak. That is why the silent majority of New Hampshire residents that are in favor of this project stay silent. The moderators at these meetings have tried to keep order, but the outbursts continue. If the moderator were to keep this group quiet, they would cry foul and say they were not allowed to express themselves and that they weren't treated -- and that they have been treated unfairly. These actions go far beyond these meetings. This group is vocal in restaurants, coffee shops, churches, and everywhere they go. They are ready to argue and confront anybody
who opposes their views. Business owners are afraid to speak up to get lower energy costs that will help their bottom line due to this group's vocal campaign against this project. They fear lower sales if they support this project.

Friends of mine in the audience, when I have spoken in favor of this project, have told me they were members in attendance that swore they would never hire my company because I'm in favor of this project. My comment to that is that I share different religious beliefs, as well as different political views, so I should be able to have an opinion on the Northern Pass Project that differs from any of my customers or fellow neighbors. My employees are well-trained, hard-working. And I would ask you to reconsider and give my company a second look. I believe this project serves the public good and should be permitted without delay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next speaker is Roger Hinds, to be followed by Jim
Page and Roberg Clegg.

Mr. Hinds, the microphone is there. All right.

Well, while Mr. Hinds is getting his prop, the comments that you're making are strongly felt, coming from the heart. We understand the feelings and how significant they are. I want to remind people that this is -- the purpose of this public comment hearing was to provide comments on the supplemental information filed by the Applicant in late February. So far, I've heard one reference to that.

Mr. Hinds, please go to the microphone. You may proceed.

MR. HINDS: Thank you. Well, let's see. I think I just heard --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hinds, no one can hear you unless you come to the microphone.

MR. HINDS: I heard someone mention something about jobs that this will make for the communities. The construction itself is going to be the bulk of the work.
When the job is done, 90 percent of the jobs will be gone. What are those employees going to do then? Now, where do they come from? Probably from Canada, most of them. There was also mention how this power will benefit communities. Where are the communities? Massachusetts. So, what's the benefit for New Hampshire? Nothing. Imagine they'll throw us a bone sooner or later. Nobody mentioned how long it will take to build this system. I'm sure it will be up in the area -- I don't think they can give you a specific figure. And everyone else, it seems, do not want our landscapes spoiled by the view of the monstrosity of those towers ruining our landscapes. Will this ruin the value of our homes or will it affect tourist trade? More than likely. If there is no danger of radiation, then why do they have to build them so high? And what kind of study's on the wildlife, how it's going to affect it? Is there any endangered species at risk? Has the research been done on that? I know legally I believe they're supposed to.
Now, since when does a company from a foreign country have any rights to override us when we say no? I don't think the Fair Trade Agreement applies here because they're not benefiting us, at least not the New Hampshire people. Canada offers to build nuclear plant up there to run the power lines to New Hampshire for use. Fair trade, if you want to be fair about it... (inaudible) never see in our lifetimes, probably. They think they can work up at the landfill in Bethlehem... (inaudible) tax breaks from what I hear. Now, tell me if I'm wrong.

You are supposed to represent the people of New Hampshire. We are supposed to trust you. That you violate that trust and authority is not acceptable. Since our taxes pay your wages, that makes us your boss. It's our taxes paying you. And if you refuse to work as directed by New Hampshire, perhaps there's a need for a change.

Massachusetts is over-populated, and that's made the problem. No longer can they provide enough power for
themselves. I'd like to be a good neighbor, but that is really pushing it. There are other ways to get power, and it is cheaper to get someone else to pay for it other than the taxpayer down there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next speaker is Jim Page, to be followed by Robert Clegg and Susan Seitz.

MR. PAGE: Thank you for having me here tonight. I'm responding to Mr. Bowes' testimony regarding construction safety on Northern Pass, Eversource and their contractors' projects.

Are there any individuals here tonight trained in construction safety? I see a lot of IBEW workers, so I'm sure you have training. But it really makes me wonder what's really going on on the early prelim work. And I'll start with borings.

If you don't know what this is, this is a boring stake. It says on it "B7A, Easton, New Hampshire," about a mile and a half from my home. Somebody left these out. They pulled -- they did the prelim
borings late last summer, last fall. The holes were not backfilled properly, collapsed in. And I fell in Boring A8 last winter.

This is 7A. About three months ago it was still 18 inches deep on the side of the road. Road races and everything else going on up there, mountain bikers. So that's what happens with bore holes. There's a lot of boring work going on there right now. S. W. Cole is drilling on it. I know that people -- and I went so far as at least pleading with them. I called one of their engineers and said please go back behind you and make sure the holes are competently backfilled so somebody isn't injured or killed. You could have fell into 7A and fallen in the travel lane of the road.

So, let's go on to some photographs here. I'll put some on the table for the board to pass around and look at.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Page,

Ms. Monroe is going to help you.

MR. PAGE: These are recent photographs. This was a preliminary structure
just south of the Deerfield substation that's been recently completed in early May. Anybody seen anything like this before? How would you like your child, somebody -- your animals, whatever, to get out and get tangled up in this? This is ground wire that came off a wood pole structure --

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

MR. PAGE: It was just kind of half-baked, coiled up and left on the ground for people and kids walking around this and everything.

If you look in the photographs there, there's also a massive hole. That hole is only about 4 feet off the new steel structure. When I came across it a week and a half ago, that hole was 7 feet deep. It was one of the H-frame holes. Pretty obvious to me whoever backfilled it pushed a couple boulders in and dragged some gravel across the top of it. Mother Nature did the rest and left a 7-foot hole. The wire was left in the school bus turnaround. And Eversource was so grateful, they toppled a wood pole
structure and couldn't even take 20 seconds
to take the town sign off that said "School
Bus Turnaround." So that's what's really
going on out there.

I really wonder, what is the
real integrity of that structure right there
without somebody examining it, an engineer
who really knows what he's doing and making
sure the backfill of both existing legs
because it's so close to the new H-frame,
whether that structure even has the proper
integrity to it.

Recently, on a construction
site of mine in New Hampshire, and this was
only a few weeks ago, I had an Eversource
37.5 line arc to ground right outside my
office trailer, set fire to everything. Of
course, that never happens. It was due to
excessive side sway on the middle phase of
the line. I'll leave the rest to your
conjecture. Anybody like the video, get a
hold of me and I'd be happy to provide video.

Eversource projects recently
have had one death in New Hampshire. There's
been a death recently in Connecticut.

There's a police officer in Massachusetts who
got hit in the side of the head with a
backhoe bucket. So, in my opinion, there's a
management level clearly missing in
construction safety and competence. I
present these facts to you. What qualifies
me to speak about this? I am an OSHA
outreach safety trainer. You can judge a
project as to how it would be carried out by
how its early work is done. Thank you very
much.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next
speaker is Robert Clegg, to be followed by
Susan Seitz and Steven, whose last name starts
with B and lives Berlin.

MR. CLEGG: Members of the
Committee, I come here from the southern tier
of the state because I've been to a few of
these, and I notice that everybody thinks it's
all about the North Country. And I have to
tell you it's about jobs in the southern tier
as well. We see everyday more companies
closing shop and moving someplace where power
is more affordable. And the only way to fix
that is to bring in hydropower. We have to
have a mix. I understand that. We need solar.
But we can't wait any longer. And to bury the
line everywhere we all know adds a billion
dollars to the cost, and it would make it the
most expensive power in the New England region,
so it does us no good.

You know, I do a lot of
traveling. And I travel to Ireland and
Scotland, where you see lines in the view all
over the place. Because all of the ones I've
been to here, they always talk about their
view, the value of their view. So I asked
somebody, an old-timer, how he felt about the
view there. And he looked at me and said, "I
don't know what your problem is." He said,
"When I look at those lines across that
skyline, I view power to a hospital, power to
schools, reading lights and power to an
establishment where we share a meal at the
end of the day and a couple of pints." He
said, "What do you view?" And that's what I
want you to understand. That's what those
lines mean to everybody in the southern tier.

You know, we have all the
roads that brings all the economy in the
summer and winter to the North Country.
We're not asking anybody to bury those or
shut them down. We're saying let's play
fair. Give us the power that allows us to
exist, and we'll continue to give you the
people that allows you to exist. We need the
power in order to have factories operating.
We're not getting any new companies. And as
I said, I represent the small business
industry, and I also represent a group of
people who own an awful lot of commercial
industrial property. I can tell you that
every day somebody else moves to a place
where there is more affordable power to run
their company. Please let the Project go
forward. And the sooner, the better, because
if we wait until it's too long, not everybody
can work at McDonald's or mow loans.
Eventually the southern tier will look like
Coos County. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next
speaker is Susan Seitz, to be followed by
Steven B. and Phil Bedard.

MS. SEITZ: Hi, my name is Susan
Seitz, S, as in Sam, E-I-T-Z.

Deerfield is a small historic
town. We've been chosen at the end of this
project because that's where the lines cross.
You cannot tell me power lines towering over
our historic district, into our historic
areas, will not have a negative impact on our
town and all the other towns like us up and
down this line. Eversource is working in
Deerfield right now cutting trees on our main
roads and scenic byways. Promises made have
been promises broken on a very public
project. We are told trees would be tagged,
then we were told they ran out of tape and in
four weeks couldn't get more. We were told
that no trees would be cut without
homeowners' permission. Trees keep coming
down. We were told we had no right to know
who in Deerfield gave permission, it was
confidential information. This project
compared to Northern Pass is insignificant.
What will happen with the Eversource promises then? Eversource tells us we need this power for the grid. What Eversource has not told us is how many truly green projects all over New England will be lost if this project goes through. How many jobs will be lost? How many businesses will be closed because of this project? Instead they say, "Trust us. Put all your energy needs into our and Canada's hands. Nothing will go wrong."

As an Eversource customer, I am being told they want to increase my power costs because we didn't use enough electricity this winter. My cost will be double my neighbors who are served by the Co-Op. But they sit here telling us to give them access to destroy the New Hampshire way of life because they know what's best for them. They can help us with more power. They'll lower our costs. Trust them. I say no.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

Next speaker is Steve B., who is going to spell and pronounce his last name for us, to be
followed by Phil Bedard and Suzanne Steele.

MR. BINETTE: Hello, my name is
Steven Binette, B-I-N-E-T-T-E. I am the
president of Ray's Electric & General
Contractors, and we are located in Berlin, New
Hampshire. Our business has been
family-operated for over 59 years. One of our
specialties is underground utilities. One
eexample is that we were part of the first phase
of bringing utilities to the top of Mount
Washington.

Northern Pass, including Bill
Quinlan, has reached out many of us
contractors in the hope that we can be part
of this great project which the North Country
desperately needs. As we know, money spent
locally usually travels throughout our
communities. Our company has been selected
to install LED lighting in the town of
Lancaster, which is one of the early projects
funded by Eversource's Forward New Hampshire
Fund. As we understand it, the $200 million
Forward New Hampshire Fund will create jobs
for New Hampshire contractors long after the
construction of the Northern Pass is completed. We are excited to be -- we are excited to see that the Project Labor Agreement has been added in the supplement filing so that non-union companies like mine can bid on such a project. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is Phil Bedard, to be followed by Suzanne Steele and Richard Hage.

MR. BEDARD: Hello. My name is Phil Bedard. I'm a project manager for Ray's Electric. And I really didn't prepare a speech and I signed the slip, so here I am.

Anyways, being a project manager for several different companies over the last 10 years, I've seen projects dwindle in the North Country. And I think this project will be great for the North Country and for jobs. And I think Public Service has done -- Eversource has done a good job in changing and going to the burial of lines as much as possible and modifying their towers to make them look a little more aesthetically pleasing. I think we need lower energy costs
for industries up here, and I think they're
going in the right step. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
Suzanne Steele, to be followed by Richard Hage
and Kenneth Kimball.

MS. STEELE: Suzanne Steele,
Deerfield, New Hampshire.

I'd like to read parts of Alan
Robert Baker's article in the Commonwealth
Magazine. It's titled, "Northern Pass is not
a green answer," from June 17th.

Well-meaning policymakers in
Massachusetts are looking north, seeing in
Canadian hydropower a quick solution to the
need for more green energy. But one state's
environmental solutions may be another
state's environmental nightmare, and we
should all care about the whole picture, not
just our own piece, to achieve the greatest
long-term impact. There is nothing 'green'
about hydropower emanating from Quebec.
Massive hydroelectric dam and reservoir
building in Quebec has caused the inundation
of millions of acres of boreal forest,
destruction of entire river ecosystems and
release of mercury poison into the food
chain. New reservoirs also emit large
amounts of greenhouse gases for several years
after they are created. For those of us in
New Hampshire, a different form of
environmental damage is threatened. In the
quest to connect new hydro generation
facilities in Canada with consumers in
southern New England, Hydro-Quebec and
Eversource Energy have proposed construction
of a massive new high-voltage transmission
corridor that would cut New Hampshire in
half.

For nearly 200 miles, a path
stretching wider than a football field will
be home to heavy construction activities.
Fully two thirds of that distance will
contain over 1100 massive transmission towers
up to 15 stories high, spaced every 800 feet.
That path will despoil natural forest, state
parks, scenic and cultural byways, wetlands,
private land, and fish and wildlife refuges.
Roads allowing construction and the massive
clear-cut pathway will lead to damaging runoff. Thirty-one New Hampshire towns deeply depend on tourism -- hikers, foliage visitors, fishermen, skiers -- will see the heart of the economy threatened. Who travels north to look at metal towers strung with humming wire on every hillside and valley and coursing over pastoral streams and rivers?

For five long years we, the people of New Hampshire, have fought the effort to turn our state and its mountains into an extension cord for Massachusetts. Those leading that fight include the Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Appalachian Mountain Club, the Conservation Law Foundation, New Hampshire Audubon, the Sierra Club and other organizations. These groups and their sister organizations in Massachusetts should understand that a crucial component in stopping Northern Pass is preventing Massachusetts from outsourcing a third of its electricity market to subsidize Canadian hydropower. Simply put, there is no artificial-created and subsidized
market for Canadian hydropower, and there will be no transmission lines acting as extension cords. But the converse is also true: If Massachusetts, with its deep pockets and enormous energy appetite, does approve paying wildly above-market prices for power supply from Canada, it will be much more difficult to indefinitely fight off the relentless push by Hydro-Quebec and Eversource to build more transmission lines and sell the power to consumers in Massachusetts and other southern New England states. One thing is certain: New Hampshire residents and groups will continue to fight.

He goes on to talk about the delays, and he says that this means that whatever legislation Massachusetts passes, it has virtually no chance of helping the state meet 2020 carbon-emission reduction goals mandated by the Global Warming Solution Act.

This is an important point, since the 2020 mandates are a key argument used by proponents to make the case for Canadian hydropower.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Steele, how much do you have?

MS. STEELE: I have another page.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How many pages have you read so far?

MS. STEELE: A page and a half.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Would you, if you would like to finish, perhaps come back at the end, after everyone else has had a chance because now you're well over four minutes?

MS. STEELE: Okay. I will come back.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you.

Richard Hage, to be followed by Kenneth Kimball and Eric Jones.

MR. HAGE: Thank you for providing this opportunity. My name is Dick Hage. I'm a 41-year resident of Plymouth. In late February, the comments that were presented from municipalities that were listed, Plymouth was missing. So I hope you will accept these comments in that vein.
Six years ago, our select board honored the will of the constituents registered the town of Plymouth in opposition to the Presidential Permit intervention. At that point, we were one of 30 towns acting in solidarity, all voting overwhelmingly to oppose Northern Pass. As you know, that opposition has only grown larger and stronger across New Hampshire as negative impacts of construction and the deeply unethical behavior of Northern Pass and Eversource has been increasingly exposed. Recently, as you heard Martha comment, Eversource made an offer of $10 million to Plymouth in exchange for Main Street burial. Our select board scheduled a public meeting, a hearing right here in this room on May 9th. It was jam-packed. Twenty-eight people spoke -- chose to speak, and 100 percent were unanimously and staunchly opposed to Northern Pass.

Now, I want to read -- there was a petition that was out for the four days preceding that hearing; 778 people signed it,
and a fair number of them were non-Plymouth residents, but residents of New Hampshire who seek services, work or shop here in Plymouth. So I just want to read what it said on that petition.

We, the undersigned residents, business owners and taxpayers of Plymouth -- and then there was one for New Hampshire residents, but not Plymouth -- stand opposed to the Northern Pass Project transmitting energy through the town of Plymouth, overhead or underground. Burial of Northern Pass down I-93 is the only option we will accept. We urge you to say "No" to Northern Pass and Forward New Hampshire and, as intervenors, to fight this project actively.

Our board has continued to do exactly that. I will give you those signed petitions right here.

In my 43 years as a New Hampshire resident, I have never seen such mass-scale consensus about the values we hold dearly, and I suspect many of the signatures were motivated by those values, that beauty
matters, safety matters, property values
matter, clean and sustainable matter,
home-grown matters, flora and fauna matter,
Main Street merchants matter an integrity,
integrity matters. And what we as custodians
pass on to our children and they to theirs
deeply matters. Those precious values to an
organization that has the technical ability
and the financial resources to completely
bury this line, clearly those values do not
matter. Plymouth remains staunchly opposed
to Northern Pass, either above or below
ground, and we remain committed opposition
partners with our growing -- thank you.

So I respectfully ask you to
continue to be good stewards of our
collective values, to take the time to read
all of the testimony, to reject all forms of
Eversource bribery, to see through the facade
of Forward New Hampshire -- that is a
pittance, $200 million -- and to refuse to do
business with unethical parties. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Kenneth
Kimball, to be followed by Eric Jones and Jon
MR. KIMBALL: Thank you, members of the Committee. My name is Kenneth Kimball. I'm director of research for the Appalachian Mountain Club. Tonight we continue this now-almost-six-year debate of whether New Hampshire should certify yesterday's outdated technologies at the expense of New Hampshire's landscape, knowing that Northern Pass's competitors are using full burial technology. Northern Pass continues to work diligently to get to "No" on full burial to protect its expected large profit margins.

I'll limit my comments tonight to the supplemental materials that were filed. First, the Visual Assessment, Attachment 6. Under the revised SEC rules, the Applicant was required to increase its visual impact assessment from 3 to 10 miles. Attachment 6 includes required computer model viewshed maps out to 10 miles where the Project and a number of towers were modeled to be visible. Only 4 viewshed maps for the 192 miles of the proposed corridor are
provided, which are at a map scale of 1:250,000. This results in a greatly compromised ability to assess at a localized and site-specific level where the potential visual impacts would occur. With these small map scales, it would be informative for the SEC to also require the Applicant to provide, summarized in tabular form, the full corridor of visual impacts — for example: Acres visually impacted by visual distance zones — that is, 1 to 3, 3 to 5 and 5 to 10 miles — by resource categories, et cetera, to better understand the overall total visual impact of this project on the state's resources. The maps and information provided are too coarse for such purposes.

The selection, No. 2, of the viewpoints for additional photo simulations. The addendum materials at Attachment 8, similar to the original application, fairly clearly indicate how the representative photo simulation sites were selected. For example, of the numerous private residences impacted, 60 sites were selected — or excuse me —
were field-visited and 28 were selected for photo simulations. The logic tree used in this winnowing process still remains a black box, making it difficult at best to decipher or understand how these were actually winnowed down. That information needs to be provided on this winnowing process.

On the impact avoidance, minimize and mitigation criteria, the Applicant is required to provide a description of the measures planned to avoid, minimize and mitigate potential adverse effects of the proposed facility and the alternative measures considered but rejected by the Applicant.

In the additional filing, the Applicant continues to limit itself to avoiding visual impacts by using burial technology only where it has self-determined are the most sensitive landscapes along the route -- that is, the White Mountain National Forest. In reality, these burial decisions were based on the Project's inability to meet visual objectives and permitting challenges.
within the National Forest or to avoid landowner right-of-way constraints. Otherwise, the Applicant presents relatively ineffective visual impact minimization measures and its Forward NH Plan is bribery in disguise with no serious attempt to provide actual mitigation that has direct nexus to the severe visual impacts. The Applicant should be required to provide detailed cost and modified route information on additional or full project burial avoidance alternatives. Broad brush statements at these public hearings that they've achieved these overused -- that they've achieved their overused term "balance" using back-of-the-envelope calculations and "trust us" on why more full burial is not feasible and does not meet the avoidance alternative criteria. Finally, the request for waivers to the new rule. Northern Pass, as part of its supplemental filing, requested a waiver on the need to file a third-party
independent decommissioning plan and meet
financial assurance requirements as required
by the revised SEC rules. The AMC very much
appreciates and strongly endorses the SEC's
recent decision and order issued today to
deny the Applicants request for a required
decommissioning plan and financial assurance
waiver. We reserve the right to comment on
that plan once filed. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Eric Jones,
to be followed by Jon Wilkinson and Thomas
Moulis.

MR. JONES: Good evening. My
name is Eric Jones. I'm from Glencliff, New
Hampshire. I am both an intervenor and a
commenter tonight. And you could call me No. 3
because this is probably the third thing that
pertains to what we're supposed to talk about
tonight.

When the supplemental
information was filed by the attorneys for
the Applicants on February 26th, they did so
with a cover letter which, among other
things, described as follows their wetland
obligations: No. 2, identification of
wetlands surface waters and archeological
sites on property abutting the site that will
not be impacted by the Project. That is
their decision that it will not be impacted
by the Project. I was very disappointed
today at 3:30 when the decision relating to
these waivers was posted, or at least when I
got it, in that the wetland — the request
for the waiver of extended wetland
information, the request to not do that was
granted.

I would like to read to you a
paragraph written by Charlie Bridges, the
former head of the New Hampshire Fish & Game.

Our landscape is heavily
populated with wetlands. They are large and
they are small, permanent and ephemeral
vernal pools, interconnected and apart.
Whatever the configuration, wetlands and
adjacent uplands are often functionally
dependent on one another. When you consider
patterns of water flow, both surface and
subsurface, and wildlife activity,
wetland-associated wildlife view these areas
as systems, traveling between them along both
water courses and over land through upland
areas. Land-use activities, often some
distance from the wetland, can dramatically
affect water quality and flow as well as
wetland wildlife and habitat features.

Now, this particular paragraph
is in a letter recommending to the
Agriculture Department that they include all
of the land that my wife and I own in Stark
and Northumberland in consideration for a
wetland reserve easement. This is currently
happening. And the rest of the letter goes
on to say that the Jones property provides
critical wildlife habitat and an important
link between parts of the White Mountain
National Forest. Approximately half of the
property is in the highest ranked habitat in
the state by the Wildlife Action Plan. It
contains northern hardwood conifer, blah,
blah, blah, on and on about what it contains.
These habitats likely support large
assemblages of wildlife, including several
species of conservation concern, and perhaps
some state-listed species as well.
State-listed species that would likely
benefit from the permanent protection of this
property include American Martin, Canadian
lynx. And it goes on to outline the various
animals, amphibians, plants that will benefit
from this conservation easement.

So it sort of seems ironic to
me that the SEC has gone along with Northern
Pass's judgment that water doesn't flow
downhill. For instance --

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

MR. JONES: Very little. I'll
be good.

The right-of-way is on an
upper level relative to the wetland. The
wetland is in the right-of-way, but it flows
down into a much larger wetland. There's
over 2,000 acres of wetland in
Northumberland. I'm assuming the same is
true there, where if you pool the water here
and it goes over there, it doesn't make a lot
of sense to only measure the impact right here. I thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up, we have Jon Wilkinson, to be followed by Thomas Moulis and Brad Thompson.

MR. WILKINSON: My name is Jon Wilkinson, and I'm a resident of Lancaster, New Hampshire. I appreciate you letting me have a few minutes of your time and attention.

Over the past six years of hearings conducted about this proposed project, I have spoken many times on various concerns about its possible approval. Tonight I just want to restate one fact that has continually and very quietly been pushed aside by the Applicant about the Northern Pass, and that is the fact that this is a private merchant electrical transmission project, it is not a reliability project, which simply means it's not needed, nor is it essential to New Hampshire. But what is needed and is essential to the Applicant is New Hampshire's permission. Now, after the huge and unwavering public opposition to this
project, which includes thousands of New Hampshire citizens, landowners, visitors to New Hampshire, local and state officials, town voting, selectmen voting, signed petitions, demonstrations, and soon to be in front of all of you, intervenors against the Project, I, as one of those many voices in opposition, ask you to deny approval of the Project as it's currently being proposed.

But I also offer you might grant approval if the Applicant is finally willing to completely bury the transmission line within the state of New Hampshire's highways and railroad rights-of-way. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next speaker is Thomas Moulis, to be followed by Brad Thompson and Andrew Smith.

MR. MOULIS: My name is Thomas Moulis. I live in Ashland, New Hampshire, and I'd like to thank the Site Evaluation Committee for allowing me this time to talk, since we ran out of time the last time you were here in Plymouth.

Does everybody remember the
motto on our automobile license plates prior to "Live Free or Die"? It was one simple but powerful word, "Scenic." After the second world war, when families became more mobile with own cars and traveled around the country, they traveled the United States with the greatest free advertising for the state of New Hampshire right on their bumpers. Scenic. People came here by the millions to see if the word "scenic" was true. And it was. When all the large textile mills in this state who employed tens of thousands left New Hampshire to find cheaper labor, New Hampshire's beauty faithfully brought revenue to the state. When the shoe factories and paper mills abandoned New Hampshire to satisfy their investors, New Hampshire's scenic vistas never failed us. Now is the time for all who love the beauty of the state to step up and not let another large corporation dictate the direction this state goes. If Eversource wants Northern Pass to go through the state, then bury it along the I-93 corridor, all of it. There should be no
debate on anything that threatens New Hampshire's scenic beauty.

To all of us here in opposition to the current Northern Pass proposal, I have something to tell you. In May of 1977, when I was a much younger man, I would jog almost daily past the New Hampshire National Guard Amory in Manchester, where I used to live. What I observed amazed me. Hundreds of people were confined within the chain-linked compound of the armory. They were members of protesters of the nuclear power plant that was being built in Seabrook, New Hampshire. Then Governor Meldrim Thompson ordered over 1400 protesters arrested and confined. What resulted from those arrests was even more amazing. Those arrested refused bail and chose to stay confined for what they believed in. Governor Thompson lost his re-election bid, and the largest bankruptcy of a publicly-owned utility since the Great Depression occurred when PSNH forced themselves into bankruptcy.

So what I say to all of you
here in opposition, stay strong and resolute.  
Our cause is a righteous one. Thank you very 
much.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next
speaker is Brad Thompson, to be followed by
Andrew Smith and Peter Grote.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

During the Site Evaluation Committee hearing
last March in Colebrook, I used my allotted
three minutes to try to explain to the
Committee why I believe the Northern Pass
application submitted to the SEC last October
was and is incomplete. One of the very
important requirements that the Applicant had
to comply with was to show they had the legal
access to and control over the site they
propose to use for the 192-miles of utility
cables being laid from the Canadian border to
Deerfield. This certainly would seem to
indicate that any town or state permits would
have been initiated prior to the completed
application submitted to SEC. This has not
happened in Clarksville and Stewartstown. The
required permits to use municipal roads in
these towns have not been applied for, nor have
they been issued. Therefore, the Applicant, in
my opinion, does not have the ability or
permission to use any of our roads for this
project. They have apparently completely
overlooked the following responsibilities.
When you have a chance, and perhaps you already
have, I'd ask you to take a look at the State
It is a public document and reads very clearly.
Let me read the first two short paragraphs.

Title XX, which is about
Transportation, one of the items referred to
is R.S.A. 231:161. It states, Any such
person, co-partnership or corporation
desiring to erect or install any such poles,
structures --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Slow down
just a little or you're going to leave the
stenographer behind.

MR. THOMPSON: Any potential
co-partnership or corporation desiring to erect
or install any such poles, structures, conduits
cables or wires in, under or across any such
highways shall secure a permit or license
therefore in accordance with the following
procedures... and this following procedure
deals with jurisdiction. One of the three
jurisdictions are town-maintained highways.
The other two are city-maintained highways and
state-maintained highways, State of New
Hampshire DOT.

   Town-maintained highways.

Petitioners for such permits or licenses
concerning town-maintained highways shall be
addressed to the selectmen of the town in
which such highway is located, and they're
hereby authorized to delegate all or any part
of the powers conferred upon them by the
provisions of this section to such agents as
they may duly appoint. In this case they're
referring to Old County Road, which is a town
road in Clarksville, and Creampoke, North
Hill Road and parts of Bear Rock Road in
Stewartstown. As of this afternoon, Northern
Pass has not submitted, to our knowledge,
submitted any application as required by
R.S.A. 231:161 to use municipal roads in
Clarksville and Stewartstown as proposed in
their -- as they have clearly proposed in
their application. The SEC needs to look the
Applicants square in the eye and ask them
point blank: How do you propose to use
municipal roads in Clarksville and
Stewartstown when you have not applied to the
Board of Selectmen in either town as required
by state law?

The next very logical move by
the SEC would be to stop these proceedings
until a proper and completed application is
presented to the SEC by the Applicant. The
SEC might as well bring this issue to a head
now, as it is not going to go away. The
Applicant appears totally unaware of this
dilemma. I am co-spokesman for the abutters
intervention group of Pittsburgh, Clarksville
and Stewartstown. We call ourselves the
"Middle of the Road Gang of 9." That's
another story. We've been in written contact
with Jerry Fortier, project manager of the
Northern Pass Project Team. He has made --
he was made aware of this oversight on their
part initially in a May 14th, 2016 letter we
sent when we asked him who had given him
permission to do geotechnical work on our
roads, and then again in a June 13th, 2016
letter in which we explained the R.S.A.
231:161 rule --

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

MR. THOMPSON: Ten seconds.
To date, we have received no
reply to this question. We now propose the
question -- we've now asked the question
twice: Who, if anyone, has given you
permission to use town roads for this project
in Clarksville and Stewartstown?

Why should the SEC proceed
when Northern Pass does not have a clear,
defined and approved route? If they're --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Thompson, please wrap up.

MR. THOMPSON: Why are all of us
here tonight? Please ask these important
questions of the Applicant. And if you don't
get a satisfactory answer, these proceedings
should stop. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Andrew

Smith, to be followed by Peter Grote and Alex

Ritchie.

MR. SMITH: Good evening,

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

Thank you for being here tonight. My name's

Andrew Smith. I'm a New Hampshire native, live

in Twin Mountain, New Hampshire, and a small

businessman that operates in the central lakes

and White Mountains of New Hampshire.

My business, as many we've

heard tonight, uses electricity. We actually

like electricity. We like electricity to

come on and the lights and the computers to

work. I'm in the commercial real estate

business, and the high electric rates in New

Hampshire do cause concern. For that reason,

we have never opposed the import of the

Hydro-Quebec hydropower, but we strongly

opposed the Project as it's been proposed.

We live and work in New Hampshire because we

love New Hampshire. We love what it offers

us for quality of life, for the scenery and
the beauty, and we don't want to see it
spoiled. Myself and over 75 other businesses
in central and northern New Hampshire, Lakes
Region to the Seacoast to Southern New
Hampshire have signed a petition which I'd
like to just read quickly to you.

The following New Hampshire

businesses call on Eversource and

Hydro-Quebec to bury the northern

transmission line along highways and to

explore the use of I-93 for that purpose. We

believe the adverse impacts of towers and

transmission lines, including property value

impacts, scenic impacts and wetland impacts,

are such that the current Northern Pass

proposal involving 132 miles of overhead

lines should not be permitted by the SEC.

New Hampshire businesses, communities and

landowners should not have to subsidize the

cost to construct a private construction

project like Northern Pass. Do not let this

project scar the beautiful scenery and

landscape we enjoy and that should be there

for future generations to enjoy as well when
there are sensible alternatives. To this, there are over 75 businesses, both large and small. There's law firms, there's restaurants, there's tourist attractions, there's real estate companies, there's hospitality properties all signing. These represent over 5,000 employees that say approve this, but approve it correctly. Use the transportation corridors that we have and rail corridors to bury this line. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is Peter Grote, to be followed by Alex Ritchie and Dolly McPhaul.

MR. GROTE: Peter Grote, G-R-O-T-E. I represent the Town of Franconia. We very much appreciate that the New Hampshire public has had opportunities to comment and ask questions during this entire long series of hearings, public hearings. During this period we've learned many things about the Applicant, their methods, and recently their revised project. I want to follow up a little bit on what Andy Smith just said.

The Town of Franconia stated
publicly that it is completely opposed to the
method of transportation and delivery that
the Applicants have proposed. We intend to
ask the Subcommittee to require that the
Applicant install its proposed HVDC lines
down I-93 right-of-way from Bethlehem to
Tilton, in the event that the Committee
believes the Application has merit. Any and
all impacts, disruptions or issues,
short-term or long-term to be encountered on
the I-93 right-of-way alternative are nothing
compared to the multiple lists of problems
that the public, the state and the Applicant
will encounter by not burying the Project
down the Interstate I-93 corridor.

The state of Maine recently
has completed a buried line all the way down
Interstate I-95. Vermont has Interstate
I-91. And recently, Hydro-Quebec II, Phase
II, the New England transmission line, used
an existing corridor from Quebec to Ayer,
Massachusetts. These examples to us indicate
that the Applicant has not done its homework.

Thank you very much.
I have some time remaining, if I'm allowed, Mr. Chairman. I brought a couple visual displays since we're talking about visual impacts. These are not tower displays to scale. These are basically the underground trenches, one that goes underneath the Gale River and also the Baker Brook River and the crossing of Route 3. But the second one really shows a scale model of what these cables will be if you can see them underground. And if you'll permit me, I'll be happy to reveal them.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I hesitate to do this, but you can show us what you've got. I'm not going to give you legal advice, but it seems like this is the kind of thing you might want to use during the hearing on the merits when we're taking evidence. But if -- go ahead.

MR. GROTE: Actually, it's taken from the information that was already given to us. All we've done is blow up the diagrams that were provided by Eversource in some of its maps.
MR. IACOPINO: You're going to have to get near the mic.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You're going to need to be near the microphone or it's not going to happen.

MR. GROTE: Okay. Well, I really want the Committee to see this, but --

MS. MONROE: Want us to hold them for you here?

MR. GROTE: Yeah, yeah, that's great. How's this?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Here's the thing, Mr. Grote. How long is this going to take?

MR. GROTE: Ten seconds.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

MR. GROTE: This is -- actually, you can see this on the maps. Sorry. I'll turn it around. Here, how about if we do this. This is the road surface. This is the distance to the concrete protective pad, if that's the correct term. And those are the two cables, the two high-volt DC cables that go underground. And there's a distance of about
4 feet along this trench. And I have a safety concern, and others have a safety concern about this. We have frost problems. We have problems with repairs and maintenance. And that's the end of my speech.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

Thank you.

We're going to take two more, and then we need to take a break for the stenographer or her fingers or machine will start smoking.

Alex Ritchie is going to be followed by Dolly McPhaul before we break. And before we break, I'll tell you who the speakers will be when we come back.

MR. RITCHIE: Good evening and thank you. My name is Alex Ritchie, and I am here as a member of the Balsams team. And along with other businesses and chambers in the area of the state, I am here to express my support of Northern Pass Transmission. You have currently heard a lot tonight about the importance of Northern Pass in regards to lower energy costs and the creation of thousands of
new jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars
for economic development like tourism. But it
is also important to know that Northern Pass
will add a significant impact -- will have a
significant impact on reducing dangerous
emissions created from power generation. And
this is a benefit I think should be getting
more attention. Reducing greenhouse gas
emissions is good for New Hampshire. It could
slow down or potentially even stop the effects
of climate change. Since 2010, New England has
reduced its carbon emissions year after year
because of our investment in clean energy
efficiency and our commitments to developing
clean energy. Clean Canadian hydropower, which
currently makes up about 10 percent of New
England's energy, has played a major role in
lowering emissions. In 2015, renewable
Canadian hydropower helped the region offset
7.4 million metric tons of greenhouse gasses.
However, despite all this process -- all this
progress, New England's carbon reduction
efforts have slipped backwards as of late
according to our grid system administrator.
The region's carbon dioxide emission actually rose 5 percent in 2015 largely due to the closure of Vermont Yankee nuclear power plant, which was a major source of carbon-free electricity. Natural gas power plants have been used to make up the capacity lost by the Vermont Yankee closure, and burning natural gas releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. To make matters worse, it was recently announced that Pilgrim Nuclear Power station will close in a few years, another major source of carbon-free power in New England's supply system. Further, at the time when we need to be burning less fossil fuels to produce power, approximately 60 percent of the energy projects proposed in New England are natural gas-based. This will make it more difficult for the region to meet and sustain clean energy goals and to further avoid climate change impacts.

Northern Pass will bring clean hydropower to the region and lower carbon monoxide [sic] emissions, up to 3.3 million tons per year. As a comparison, this is the equivalent to removing 690,000
vehicles from the roadways. This project is a game-changing opportunity to ensure that we get back on track in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and more so in diversifying our fuel mix in addition to securing much needed additional energy capacity that is not being replaced as capacity across New England is being lost due to the retiring of many facilities. The time is now to seize this opportunity and move forward expeditiously as time truly is of the essence. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Last speaker before the break is Dolly McPhaul.

MS. McPHAUL: Good evening. Since I can't be an intervenor, this is the last opportunity I have to speak. I am not -- sorry -- but I wanted to make a rhetorical question and then try to make a point.

The rhetorical question is: I worked or attempted to help on the Site Evaluation Committee rule-making process. The rules were made. So I have to ask why were waivers granted? What is the point of making a rule if you allow waivers to be
granted? That's my question.

The statement I would like to make is that this Committee has to regard public interest in their decision-making progress. So I would like to list Ashland, Bath, Bethlehem, Bridgewater, Campton, Chichester, Clarksville, Colebrook, Columbia, Concord, Dalton, Deerfield, Easton, Effingham, Franconia, Haverhill, Holderness, Jefferson, Lancaster, Landaff, Lincoln, Littleton, New Hampton, Northumberland, Orford, Pembroke, Pittsburg, Stewartstown, Stratford, Sugar Hill, Thornton, Wentworth and Woodstock. I could spend the rest of my time listing for you the various select boards and planning board and conservation commissions that have also objected. I'm not going to take that time. But even the DOE has come up with a route that is more in the public interest than what we have now.

And so my point is, when you have all of these towns and a recent WMUR poll that covered the state of New Hampshire, just not along the route, stated that over
half of the state opposes the Northern Pass,
if you want to know about public interest,
this is public interest. There should be no
question. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're going
to take a 10-minute break. And the first three
speakers when we come back are Jack Saunders,
Pamela Martin and Peter Martin.

(Brief recess taken)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
We're back on the record. We're ready to get
started again. The first three speakers are
Jack Saunders, to be followed by Pamela Martin
and Peter Martin. Mr. Saunders.

MR. SAUNDERS: I have three
short questions, and I'll follow it by a final
question. My first question is regarding the
requirements that the Applicant provide proof
that the Northern Pass organization has the
adequate financial, technical and managerial
capability to assure they're in compliance;
also, show that Northern Pass can't afford to
bury the high-voltage cables as has been
suggested. I was wondering where I could look
at these figures that pertain to this. Are they available? That's one question.

The other is an old one I brought up at previous meetings, was the concern regarding the electromagnetic waves emanating from the high-voltage table being detrimental to the health of people or animals in the vicinity.

And the final, longer question is a little statement. I have not read the entire 27,000 pages of the Northern Pass Application or the 2500 pages of the supplemental materials filed on February 26th, but I have read enough of both to pose a question to the seven of you. If the public interest is what the public says it is, and if the vast majority of the public affected by the Project as proposed believes that the Project is not in the public interest, is it fair to conclude that the Project is not in the public interest? I respectfully suggest that, if after all the evidence is in, if the majority of you can answer this question with an affirmative
"yes," then the Project should not be granted
the certificate it seeks. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
Pamela Martin, to be followed by Paul Martin
and Paul Doucette.

MS. MARTIN: My name is Pamela
Martin. I live here in Plymouth. And since
we're here in Plymouth tonight, I'd like you to
know that at the 2012 town meeting, voters here
passed a rights-based ordinance for sustainable
energy. This ordinance prohibits new,
unsustainable energy production, transportation
or transmission through Plymouth. Industrial
hydroelectricity is considered unsustainable
energy because of the enormous environmental
and wildlife impact in its production.
Hydro-Quebec, Eversource's partner in the
Northern Pass Project, has flooded an area the
size of New Hampshire and Vermont combined and
has dammed all but 3 of its 16 largest rivers.
The remaining project which is being
constructed right now has flooded over
167 square miles of virgin forest. Wildlife
habitat and migration routes have been
decimated and the flooded forest no longer
sequesters carbon. Canada is the largest
contributor to deforestation worldwide.

The Northern Pass Application
states that their project will reduce
regional greenhouse gas emissions by more
than 3.3 million tons per year. It's not
true. Hydro-Quebec reservoirs release
methane, a greenhouse gas which is 86 times
worse for the environment than CO2. The
rivers are now poisoned by dangerously high
levels of methyl mercury, which is toxic to
wildlife, and the fish are unsafe to eat.
Fish is the Innu people's traditional food
and fishing is essential to their cultural
identity. But when the Innu complained,
Hydro-Quebec told them to eat less fish.

Their application states,
quote, Northern Pass has been designed to
effectively avoid and reduce impacts to
wildlife and to plant and aquatic species.
That is ridiculous.

Does Eversource seriously
believe that the wildlife plants and aquatic
species of northern Quebec don't matter?
Shouldn't the permitting process honestly
address the entirety of the Project since
Eversource states in their SEC application
they have partnered with Hydro-Quebec? And
if Hydro-Quebec and Eversource are that
uncaring about the environment and Innu of
Canada, should we have any realistic
expectation they will show the slightest
regard for New Hampshire's environment,
wildlife or people? Eversource can't have it
both ways. They can't say they will protect
the environment while partnering with a
corporation which is actively destroying it.
They claim that Northern Pass is clean,
renewable energy and that it offers
environmental benefits. Actually, it's just
the opposite. The federal EPA excludes hydro
from its Clean Energy Incentive Program, and
New Hampshire does not recognize large-scale
hydro as renewable energy. More than 150
groups have formed a coalition to oppose
large hydro.

So, to summarize, contrary to
their application, Northern Pass is not clean or renewable. If you doubt what I'm saying, just Google "dirty energy hydro." And read what environmentalists and scientists have to say. This is not something that happened in the long, gone past in a far distant galaxy. This is happening right now just north of us. A complex and undisturbed ecosystem is being ravaged for the profit of Hydro-Quebec and Eversource in order to export energy to New England via Northern Pass. What would it say about us if we approved the destruction of an entire ecosystem for the promise of cheap energy? Approval of this project would make us complicit in its environmental devastation. When the SEC analyzes Eversource and Hydro-Quebec's project from its starting point, not just the New Hampshire portion, the whole project, you must deny a permit for Northern Pass.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next speaker is Peter Martin, to be followed by Paul Doucette and Wayne Charron.

MR. MARTIN: I'm Peter Martin,
and I live in Plymouth. The real estate tax values in any towns near or in the path of the giant overhead power line would be negatively affected. Eversource claims that Northern Pass will add $30 million to the local tax coffers, but they fail to admit that they are suing one third of New Hampshire municipalities for tax abatements, mostly all small communities that cannot afford the cost of lengthy court battles. At the same time they trumpet the $30 million in additional taxes, they are busy petitioning the state to allow them a tax status that would cut the taxes they already pay by as much as 50 to 66 percent. In the case of Littleton, it would go from $22 million down to $11 million. So, in return for having to host an ugly, economically destructive project, the affected communities would also lose a very significant portion of the municipal income.

And another thing.

Hydro–Quebec knows full well about the efficacy of burial. Hydro–Quebec's own construction subsidiary, TransEnergie, has
testified by FERC in 2004, if you please, that modern burial techniques and advanced cable technology make burial a preferred method of long-line, high-voltage DC transmission. It can be efficiently installed in public corridors, requires less maintenance and overhead and does not suffer storm damage, making it cheaper long term than the 19th Century overhead installation.

So, who would actually benefit from the Project as proposed by Eversource while Eversource and investors would get a big, fat paycheck? Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island would get the energy, and New Hampshire would get the damage forever. To paraphrase an old country music song, "They get the gold mine, we get the shaft."

The SEC is faced here with a complete -- with a complex and onerous task. In essence, though, your deliberations boil down to one or two choices: Do you protect the best interests of the people and communities threatened by the Northern Pass proposal, or do you say "Yes" to a
not-needed, speculative, harmful project
sponsored by the bottom-line-only concerns of
a tone-deaf corporation? Eversource should
be directed to bury their project down
corridors identified by New Hampshire DOT or
deny approval to build the Project at all.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
Paul Doucette, to be followed by Wayne Charron
and Carl Lakes. Is Paul Doucette here?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It would
seem not. Wayne Charron?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All rightie
then. Carl Lakes. All right. After Carl
Lakes will be Jessica Charan, spelled
differently, and Ruth Niven or Neven. I think
it's Niven.

MR. LAKES: Hello. Thank you
for listening to me. I'm Carl Lakes from
Easton. I live on 116. And sorry if there's
going to be any duplication, but I've heard
some of the things I'm going to say, but I feel
so strongly about it that I'm just going to say
them again.

I am opposed to Northern Pass
in its entirety and recommend rejection of
the entire project. My reasons are as
follows: Hydro-Quebec has submerged millions
of acres of pristine forests through tree
genocide, dammed up 13 of 16 major rivers in
Quebec, damaged and destroyed millions of
acres of wildlife habitat, contaminated
reservoirs with excessive mercury, displaced
aboriginal peoples, added millions of tons of
CO2 to the atmosphere from decaying reservoir
beds and massive construction projects,
destroyed pristine recreational areas,
contributed to extensive wildlife extinction
through wildlife genocide. In 1984, 10,000
caribou drowned trying to cross a
Hydro-Quebec dammed river. That is
unconscionable. All of the above done for
money and collusion with the Quebec
government, with complete disregard for the
environmental and social impact. Opponents
in Quebec say that Hydro-Quebec pays off the
opposition to get what it wants. Sound familiar? So why is Quebec willing to rip out its heart and soul, the very essence that makes Canada, Canada? Yes, it's for money. But it is so much bigger than that. You see, New Hampshire, Maine, Vermont and New York are pawns in a chess match to bring the provincial government of Quebec billions of dollars from the United States to subsidize lower rates in Quebec, and most importantly -- and this is very important -- to become financially self-sufficient in its decades-long desire to break away from Canada and be a sovereign state. And we are a pawn in this game. Yes, mortal men and women, for reasons of nationalism, are destroying their own province in a stealth move to become independent. Do we really want to be party to this massive -- and I mean massive -- environmental destruction for self-serving reasons? This electricity is tainted with the blood of millions of creatures, the tears of generations of aboriginal peoples and the snuffing out of photosynthesis from plant
life -- stopping the absorption of CO2 and
the release of oxygen to combat climate
change -- all so millions can play video
games and watch television eight hours a day.

I do not support the current
underground or overground route. I found
myself supporting the I-93 opposition until I
learned the real truth of destruction and
deceive happening in Quebec. Northern Pass
must be stopped in its entirety and this
boondoggle rejected. I ask Northern Pass to
pack your bags and get the hell out of New
Hampshire. I ask the SEC Commission to stand
up to this wanton desecration of the
environment in Canada, which they are now
trying to export to the USA, by not allowing
our great state to be a facilitator to this
great unfolding tragedy. Just say "No."

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jessica
Charan, to be followed by Ruth Niven and Tares
Kucman. I guess Jessica's not here. Ruth --

MS. NIVEN: Niven is good.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Every once
in a while I get one right -- to be followed by
Tares Kucman and Anne Hunnewell.

MS. NIVEN: My name is Ruth
Niven. I'm from Franklin, New Hampshire.
Franklin is located along the proposed and
alternate routes for the Northern Pass
Transmission. Franklin, at the initial
unveiling of the Northern Pass plan, was
revealed as the site of a converter station.
The Northern Pass Project purchased land on
South Main Street in Franklin, the former
Thousand Acres Campground. I'd like you to
just keep the location of the alleged proposed
converter station that may or may not happen
there in mind.

The New Hampshire SEC asked
that all public comments be directed at
issues presented by additional information
filed by the Applicant. What about
information that hasn't been filed? For the
past year or two, I've seen Public Service
workers replacing and repairing lines
throughout the state. Normal maintenance;
right? Just more of it.
Consider this: On the Franklin, New Hampshire web site, posted 6/15/16, Eversource's New Daniel Substation off Webster Lake Road is a proposal by Eversource to build, and I quote, A new distribution substation in close proximity to the existing substations off of Webster Lake Road in Franklin, New Hampshire. The Project need is due to load growth and the Franklin area and in order to enhance customer reliability.

If you go up Carr Street in Franklin, you can see the serious upgrades already made to the existing substation. What actually has changed in our city to make this necessary? And of course, the best is the disclaimer, quote, This project is not related to the Northern Pass which currently is in the permitting and review phase with the State of New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee, unquote.

Really? Thank you for letting me bring this unfiled information to your attention.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is Tares Kucman, to be followed by Anne Hunnewell and Linda McDermott.

MR. KUCMAN: Good evening. My name is Tares Kucman. I'm an abutting intervenor from Concord, and I want to thank the Committee and the Chairman for allowing me to speak in front you again.

In the interest of full disclosure, I'm wearing orange, but I am pro growth, I am pro energy, I am pro manufacturing. And, heck, I don't even have a quarrel with the IBEW because, as far as I'm concerned, 1100 megawatts of buried electricity is every bit as electrical as it is strung up on towers, 1100 megawatts.

But if you take exception to your Attachment 10 of New Hampshire Electrical Operating Emergency Response Plan, in light of events that have happened in the last few months to the last couple years, in reviewing that attachment, I found that there was no provision addressing sabotage and/or terrorism, especially in today's climate. I
point this out specifically because it was precedent-setting June 9th, 2014, a close ally of the United States was rendered completely blacked out. It's an ally of 24 million people in that country were completely blacked out. What is 24 million? Let me put it in context. If you take all of New England, that's only 14 million. You'd have to add New Jersey or Michigan to that count to be 24 million people blacked out. I look at that as a risk, specifically in Concord when I'm looking at 250-foot-wide rights-of-way currently having two 115-megawatt services to be crowded within an additional 345-megawatt service.

The tactics are becoming more and more obvious. And take for example, last March 31st. It was all over the news. ABC, CBS, NBC and Fox from Massachusetts, as well as WMUR from New Hampshire, were covering in detail an Eversource event where there was an incendiary device tossed by some amateur up on transmission lines also coming from Canada. As I said, reading that document,
there was no provision there. The highest level of emergency responses is a Level 1. Level 1 is defined by "any outage which impacts as many as 20 percent of the customers for up to 10 days." I would submit to the Committee that the threat would be much more than 10 days if carried out, say in Concord.

In any case, I'd like to close just by saying that I was born in Connecticut, raised, educated in Connecticut, and I've been living in New Hampshire for the last 25 years. I have come to call New Hampshire my home. I just... I can't imagine how -- I come from a long line of peasants -- but when I look at this claim that it's going to be an additional $1 billion to bury it completely, I ask myself: This has been going on for five years. They have set themselves as an $800 million enterprise for each year in New England. Well, if you take that five years, there's $4 billion in lost opportunity. And they're not willing to entertain the idea of $1 billion to bury it
entirely. That doesn't make sense.

So I'll have to say it again.

Repetition is the key to adult learning. And
I'll say it again. Bury the Northern Pass
entirely. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Anne

Hunnewell, to be followed by Linda McDermott

hello.

MS. HUNNEWELL: Hello. I'm Anne

Hunnewell from Holderness, New Hampshire. I
want to thank you for letting me talk.

I know we've been saying a lot
about the environment, and I just wanted to
bring your attention to a recent article that
was in the National Geographic magazine. As
you know, this is the 100th anniversary of
the park system. And they have this article
where they were showing all these cities
throughout our nation and throughout the
world that are spending millions and millions
of dollars to create a park atmosphere within
their cities. And I thought to myself: We
already have these beautiful environments.

Why would anyone want to spend millions of
dollars to deface and to sacrifice this beautiful area? I think it's ironic that some people are willing to destroy nature's beauty for a little gain for a few people, while other people are willing to spend millions to create what we already have. I want to -- oh, what's the word I want? I want to hopefully have you approve this only if it is buried. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Linda McDermott, to be followed by Harriet Cady and Mark Templeton.

MS. McDERMOTT: My printer ran out of ink right before so I'm using this computer.

Hi, I'm Linda McDermott of Franconia, New Hampshire. I've previously testified about my opposition to underground lines in historic Franconia. Tonight I will bring another discussion.

"Thousands of tired, nerve-shaken, over-civilized people are beginning to find out that going to the mountains is going home, that wildness is a
necessity." That's by John Muir, a long time ago.

Northern Pass conducted a survey on tourism and found most people come to New Hampshire to visit family. I have been exploring New Hampshire for 16 years as a renter and 12 years -- well, 16 years, both as a renter and 12 years as an owner. When I travel here from Rhode Island, I'm often in heavy traffic. I think most people sitting in that traffic are traveling to visit something else in New Hampshire that's very special, especially when I later see jam-packed parking lots to trail heads, no vacancy signs and long waiting lines in restaurants and so on. Thousands of people travel through the woods and over mountains like ants, I always say, seeking the best scenic views on mountain tops, exhilarated by endless miles of mountains in lush green forests. People speak in amazement and blessings and exclaim how good they feel while in the raw beauty of this land. Now, picture miles of steel pylons and black
extension cords cutting a swath through that source of wellness and pristine beauty. They'd be an extreme disappointment in the collective grieving.

While doing research, I found a discussion among hunters about dilemmas in Dixville Notch because of hideous wind turbines and trail closings. I wonder if they'll return? Imagine a future of New Hampshire with miles of huge, ugly, noisy power lines, numerous access roads and acres of staging plots obscuring tourist destinations and views. No matter the activity, hiking, hunting, skiing, kayaking, boating, fishing, camping, people won't want to see power lines and will go elsewhere.

John Muir also said, "Everybody needs beauty... places to play in and pray in, where nature may heal and cheer and give strength to the body and soul alike." After my daughter was diagnosed with a severe kidney disease, we sought the mountains of New Hampshire even more for what it offers: A healthy break to breathe clean
air and boost your immune system. If
Northern Pass had existed, the opportunity to
restore her body wouldn't have been possible
in New Hampshire without a healing landscape.

In closing, Vermont is pretty
with its farms and rolling hills. Maine is
lovely with its coastline and lakes. But New
Hampshire is rugged and primal. People
escape to the mountains of New Hampshire
because it lacks the usual stressors and
eyesores in their daily lives. Visitors
immerse themselves in deep, dense, untouched,
unspoiled wooded forests and emerge renewed.
Please have the same foresight as the many
conservation groups which are funded by
thousands and thousands of people, like
myself even, who have been actively
preserving New Hampshire's natural resources
and precious heritage for future -- for
present and future generations. Don't allow
this steel giant to trample over New
Hampshire, a spectacular natural wonder.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
Harriet Cady, to be followed by Mark Templeton
and Tiler Eaton.

MS. CADY: Good evening. And I want to thank you for sitting in this heat and listening to all of this. It really is something.

Having served as a legislator in a hot hall and having served at hearings when I served on the Health Licensing Board for six years, and having served as a Regional Planning Commissioner for nine years, I understand the importance of bodies who work to hear what the citizens say.

I am more concerned with the fact that they claim we will hurt the beauty. Well, how do you know if it's beautiful if all you ever see is beauty? Isn't it a fact that when you drive over a new vista and all of a sudden you see it you say, "Oh, my God, that's beautiful"? Because you haven't seen beauty constantly, you more appreciate it in the spaces where you do.

I would like to speak to two issues. I am a Vermonter from an eleventh-generation Canada grandfather. I
visit Canada as a genealogist when the family
has reunions, and I see the high-tension
power lines and power poles, and I say, "My
God what an engineering feat." And then I
drive on and I don't see them anymore after
about two miles.

Every day in Deerfield I drive
under the center of town power lines, and
within 50 feet I don't see them anymore. I
realize that the towers will be there. But I
ask, do you realize, and does anybody here
realize what my 91-year-old town historian
said to me, "My God, if they blast and dig,
they will destroy Deerfield. They will blast
over 6 miles. They will dig wetlands. What
does that do to the environment? Doesn't
that destroy vernal pools? Doesn't that
destroy the water that goes through these
ledges that ends up in our wells?"

So I ask you to think deeply
before you make the decision to delay any
more what finally comes down to people, even
with their high-bred cars, plug into
electricity. And we want it there when we
want it there. New Hampshire pays the fifth highest tax -- electric rates in the United States. I want my electricity, and I want it reasonably priced so that we can attract industry, we can attract the kind of life that will make our state attractive to people who need jobs and so that there will be jobs.

Finally, there is a perception that many are saying all this town voted against Northern Pass. I'm sorry. You can't tell me that because I know that the town doesn't have, never has had a hundred-percent agreement on any warrant article in any town warrant. We're getting compelled speech, and I urge you to look up George Schultz versus the Lake George Water District [sic] and ...(inaudible) versus the Boston City School District. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is Mark Templeton, to be followed by Tiler Eaton and Margaret Mumford.

MR. TEMPLETON: Thank you for your time this evening. I really didn't prepare much of a speech. A lot of people put
in a lot of time and effort in what they had to say. And a lot of the talking points that people have expressed are kind of giving me some examples of things to talk about.

One of the benefits that people have been touting is that businesses are moving away because of lack of power. Businesses aren't moving away from New Hampshire because of lack of power. They're losing business because of manpower. A lot of business industries are moving further south because of the manpower in the employment pool. They can hire more people at a lesser rate. That's what businesses are looking for is increasing profit. You know, because we supply power, because Northern Pass promises more power, they think businesses will be lured back. That's not going to happen.

New Hampshire is a tourism state. The one asset that New Hampshire has is its beauty and its unspoiled resources. Adding more power lines is more of a scar on our environment. Nobody brings up examples
of how the power lines look everywhere else in the state. There's one section when I drove through Danbury, through Bristol, along Route 104, and there's a huge section where there's a swath that's gigantic. There's three long, parallel towers that are enormous. They're on par with what Northern Pass is projecting to install. And that's very disturbing. You know, you're right. We drive past it and we don't really see it because it's perpendicular to the road. But if you look at a Google Map of earth and look at our state, you can see these wide paths, like air strips. You know, we're signaling aliens or something with this power line infrastructure. But that's another topic.

But once these power lines are in, you can't get rid of them. They're an eyesore forever. And the only thing that Eversource and Northern Pass has promised is they're going to upgrade the existing lines.

And I failed to mention I'm from New Hampton. And I don't know if anybody from New Hampton actually spoke, but
one of my colleagues is from New Hampton as well. He said that New Hampton selected — at the town clerk's office, we collected 1100 signatures opposing Northern Pass, in its current form I guess is the current verbiage.

You know, we need power. How we get it, I think the people should have input, and how it's going to affect us. The benefits being touted about businesses aren't really that true. They're not really realistic. New Hampshire is a tourism state.

Go to Clark's Trading Post, go through the Franconia Notch. There's no major corporations building manufacturing facilities there. Manufacturing is gone. It's not coming back. We need to invest in the resources that we still have. Once we lose them, they're gone.

So, whether we support the Northern Pass, like, burying the whole thing, Eversource, they're is still going to get their investment back even if you deny their project or, you know, they eventually, like, withdraw it. Guess what? They're going to
get their money back by raising the
ratepayers -- increasing the rates. What did
Eversource do when they bought PSNH? They
raised everybody's rates. You know, they're
going to get their money back one way or the
other, either by wearing us out and getting
this built, which is going to be over-budget
over time, or the whole project is going to
be rejected and we're still going to pay for
it. So, please, either oppose it as it
currently is or highly suggest burying it so
it doesn't destroy our state. Please. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
Tiler Eaton, to be followed by Margaret Mumford
and then Suzanne Steele.

MR. EATON: Hi, my name's Tiler
Eaton. I'm from Nottingham, New Hampshire. I
don't have anything written tonight, but I
wanted to, after listening to a lot of the
testimony, wanted to hopefully help clear a few
things up, and that would be there is no set
transmission line that ruins through the entire
state of Maine on I-95 that exists, nor is
there a underground transmission line that runs up and down I-91 in Vermont. I say this fact, truth, knowing 'cause I've been in the industry for 30-plus years and this is what we do for a living. I'm a journeyman lineman, and there is no set project underway, completed. I just want that for the record. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Margaret Mumford, to be followed by Suzanne Steele.

MS. MUMFORD: Hi, I'm Margaret Mumford. And thank you for listening. I'm speaking tonight as a citizen of Plymouth. I am opposed to the Project. I've been nearly a lifelong resident of this town, and I have some specific comments and questions regarding the Applicant's February 26th filing.

First, Appendix 7, on the scenic resource identification, the view analysis, I'm wondering how was the list determined? What were the criteria for designating the listed resources as "low," "medium" or "high" quality? Many of us who live, work and recreate here consider the whole of the Pemigewasset corridor and all
forested and open lands in the state as
scenic resources. One could also consider
Plymouth's Town Common as a great cultural
and scenic resource.

Regarding the requested
archeological info that was redacted, perhaps
this is a misreading of R.S.A. 227-C:11 to
say that the info must be kept confidential,
as the R.S.A. actually states, and I quote,
Disclosure for the public for tax assessment,
transfer, sale or other consideration of the
property shall receive careful consideration
to minimize the risk to the resource.

Next, regarding Appendix 8,
with the photo simulation selections, my
opinion is that the sites and perspectives
were chosen carefully to minimize the effects
of the towers. Two examples: A river
crossing with no water in the view at all;
then the view from Peaked Hill Road across
the right-of-way to over 3 miles away to
another section of the right-of-way, but not
showing the view down from Peaked Hill itself
to its own right-of-way from the houses above
that they live with immediately adjacent.

The facts are -- that's my opinion. The facts are that there has been a winnowing of sites and the process for doing so is unknown.

Regarding Appendix 6, the scale, perspective and colors of the maps which show a site analysis show that sites with towers of less than 10 in number, they're very difficult to view. This number of towers is definitely significant for those living at that site.

And finally, regarding Kenneth Bowes' prefiled testimony, he notes the best practices management will be followed in the maintenance of the right-of-way of this project. However, currently along the Pemi in this region, there is evidence of lack of compliance on current rights-of-way. So I question the value of this statement. There is erosion from berms; there are ruts from equipment that is persistent, and there are abandoned poles.

In addition, missing from the
Project Operations Statement that he makes, there's nothing indicating the frequency of underground monitoring at all. And this is of concern to me as a resident of Plymouth.

If I can briefly make two other comments. Plymouth citizens had only 10 days of official notice before we had our public hearing, and we had over 200 attendees. And I feel I'm part of a vocal local majority.

Regarding other recent updates with the recent enactment of RSA 626, I request serious consideration of the option of I-93 burial. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Steele.

MS. STEELE: I want to thank you for allowing me to come back, first of all.

So, where was I? I was at the point where, for environmentalists, the damage that Northern Pass will cause, and the ongoing delays that make it unlikely that the Project would have any impact by 2020 should be enough to compel opposition to Massachusetts purchase of Canadian hydro.
But there are other good green reasons to oppose the Project. Massachusetts, New Hampshire and the rest of New England are home to some of the best and leading developers in the clean energy sector, particularly when it comes to solar, wind, energy efficiency and conservation. If Massachusetts outsources a third of its electricity market to the Canadian hydropower, it will permanently damage its local energy innovation. Crippling the green tech market with a hydropower mandate will reduce competition and suffocate efforts to clean -- to create clean energy regionally. Imagine hiking trails in the White Mountain and the Great North Woods over the next few years and trying to bypass ongoing construction for massive transmission lines. Instead of ridge lines and tree tops, imagine that the New Hampshire forests and mountain vistas were spiked with metal towers and transmission lines. If that seems wrong, then it's time to tell Governor Baker and the Massachusetts Legislature to cut the cord to
the Canadian hydropower. Tell them we can
solve green energy issues here at home and
that the current offering is a bad deal for
all of us.

I chose to read this article
tonight since it does share some of the
bigger picture with you, in case you're not
aware. New Hampshire didn't ask for this
project or ask for the power; therefore, we
should not suffer with the potential years of
construction, lifetime negative impacts to
our natural vistas, wildlife, human life, and
hideous, humming, gigantic towers stretched
across our state.

I thank you in advance for
your thoughtful and thorough consideration of
how the approval of this project would so
negatively impact our beloved state for
generations to come. We are the Granite
State, and I don't want our motto to change
to either the "tower state" or the "extension
cord state." Do you? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, thank
you all. Ms. Steele gets the last word in the
public comment hearing this evening. We're going to adjourn the public comment hearing and break for five minutes or so and then pick up with what should be a relatively short meeting to discuss a few motions for reconsideration or rehearing regarding interventions.

(Public Comment Hearing portion was completed at 8:39. A hearing for ruling on motions was held, with transcript provided under separate cover.)
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific</td>
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</tr>
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<td>115:21</td>
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<tr>
<td>spoiled</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>spoke</td>
<td>51:18;108:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spoken</td>
<td>11:2;31:8;62:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>90:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>69:4;84:23</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>102:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>35:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>17:17;21:14;52:9; 93:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards</td>
<td>26:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standing</td>
<td>18:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stands</td>
<td>17:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>60:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>start</td>
<td>20:17;26:19;35:19; 77:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>started</td>
<td>14:17;22:5;24:5; 82:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>starting</td>
<td>5:18;14:14;87:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state(s)</td>
<td>46:15;17;55:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station</td>
<td>79:10;94:9;14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statistic</td>
<td>25:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>10:3;88:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staunchly</td>
<td>51:20;53:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay</td>
<td>30:14;65:18;66:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stealth</td>
<td>92:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steel</td>
<td>37:15;101:24;   103:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>44:1;45:8;46:4;6,6; 50:1;3,7,13;110:16; 111:9;114:15,16; 116:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steel(s)</td>
<td>35:26;37:3;47:20; 91:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>36:24;37:7;16; 38:1,6,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>67:17;23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures(s)</td>
<td>13:1;5;67:20;77:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure(s)</td>
<td>25:14;17:46:2; 64:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure(s)</td>
<td>13:1;67:20;77:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td>35:19;42:2;44:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure(s)</td>
<td>53:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>43:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven(s)</td>
<td>39:15;42:2;44:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees</td>
<td>9:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td>9:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjected</td>
<td>21:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submerged</td>
<td>9:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submit</td>
<td>98:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>7:3;6;6;12;22;68:22,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsidiary</td>
<td>10:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsidized</td>
<td>48:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsidize</td>
<td>48:23;72;19;92:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsidized</td>
<td>48:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substrates</td>
<td>10:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsurface</td>
<td>59:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substations</td>
<td>37:1;95:3;6,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substations(s)</td>
<td>95:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsurface</td>
<td>59:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substations(s)</td>
<td>95:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsurface(s)</td>
<td>59:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substations</td>
<td>28:16;19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sudden</td>
<td>104:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffer</td>
<td>89:7;16;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient</td>
<td>7:18;8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffocate</td>
<td>115:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>17:23;81:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggest</td>
<td>83:22;110:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggested</td>
<td>82:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suing</td>
<td>88:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summarize</td>
<td>86:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summarized</td>
<td>55:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer</td>
<td>36:1;41:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer(s)</td>
<td>8:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submission</td>
<td>9:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public</td>
<td>27:14;33:11;35:16; 36:14;38:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rally</td>
<td>52:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suspend</td>
<td>8:22;9:3;11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustain</td>
<td>79:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainable</td>
<td>53:2;84:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>12:24;17:2;20:13; 44:1;45:8;46:4,6; 110:16;111:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swath</td>
<td>102:1;108:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swaths</td>
<td>21:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sway</td>
<td>38:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweat</td>
<td>25:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>switch</td>
<td>31:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swore</td>
<td>25:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system</td>
<td>22:3;33:10;78:24; 79:13;99:17;103:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems</td>
<td>60:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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