

1 **STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

2 **SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

3 **July 20, 2017 - 9:04 a.m.**

4 49 Donovan Street
5 Concord, New Hampshire

**PUBLIC COMMENT
 HEARING**

6 *{Electronically filed with SEC on 07-31-17}*

7 **IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-06**
8 **Joint Application of Northern**
9 **Pass Transmission, LLC, and**
10 **Public Service Company of**
11 **New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource**
 Energy for a Certificate
 of Site and Facility.
 (Hearing to receive public comment)

12 **PRESENT FOR SUBCOMMITTEE/SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:**

13 **Chrmn. Martin P. Honigberg** Public Utilities Comm.
 (Presiding as Presiding Officer)

14 **Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey** Public Utilities Comm.
15 **Dir. Craig Wright, Designee** Dept. of Environ. Serv.
16 **Christopher Way, Designee** Dept. of Business &
 Economic Affairs

17 **William Oldenburg, Designee** Dept. of Transportation
18 **Patricia Weathersby** Public Member
19 **Rachel Dandeneau** Alternate Public Member

20 **ALSO PRESENT FOR THE SEC:**

21 Michael J. Iacopino, Esq., Counsel for SEC
 (Brennan, Caron, Lenahan & Iacopino)

22 Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator

23 *(No Appearances Taken)*

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

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

I N D E X

PUBLIC COMMENTS BY:	PAGE NO.
Rep. Neal Kurk	9
Rep. Howard Moffett	12
Rep. Suzanne Smith	15
Sen. Bob Guida	18
Rep. Steve Rand	23
Tad Dziemian	26
Paul Pouliot	28
Patricia Kellogg	33
John Wilkinson	34
Ruth Niven	38
Dolly McPhaul	40
Brenda Shannon Adam	42
Kathie Aldrich Cote	45
Manfred Hoertdoerfer	49
Mark Bailey	54
Lee Ann Moulder	57
Carol Meredith	61
Dick Hage	65
Susan Ford	69
Maureen Ellingsen	74

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

I N D E X (continued)

PUBLIC COMMENTS:	PAGE NO.
Mary Parker Worthen	77
Rick Fritz	81
Martha Richards	84
Melissa Elander	87
Stephen Pascucci	90
Mark Templeton	94
Arlene Stoppe	99
Mary Centner	101
David Dobbins	106
Pamela Martin	110
Patricia Schlesinger	114
Kerry Motiejaitis	117
Scott Gahan	121
Mark McCulloch	123
Elaine Kellerman	126
Douglas Whitbeck	128
Stephen Fox	130
Geoff Daly	135
Peggy Huard	138
John Jones	143
Walter Carlson	145

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good morning,
3 everyone. Welcome to this public meeting of
4 the Subcommittee of the New Hampshire Site
5 Evaluation Committee. This Subcommittee is
6 hearing the Application of -- a Joint
7 Application regarding the Northern Pass
8 Transmission Project that's been submitted by
9 Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public
10 Service Company of New Hampshire, which does
11 business as Eversource Energy. The Docket is
12 2015-06.

13 Before turning to our business, I'm
14 going to ask the members of the Subcommittee to
15 introduce themselves, starting to my left.

16 MR. OLDENBURG: William Oldenburg,
17 Department of Transportation.

18 DIR. WRIGHT: Craig Wright,
19 Department of Environmental Services.

20 CMSR. BAILEY: Kathryn Bailey, Public
21 Utilities Commission.

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

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

3 MR. WAY: Christopher Way, Department
4 of Business & Economic Affairs.

5 MS. DANDENEAU: Rachel Dandeneau,
6 alternate public member.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There are three
8 other people I'd like to introduce. Pam
9 Monroe, who is sitting in the first row to my
10 left, is the Administrator of the Site
11 Evaluation Committee. Sitting immediately to
12 my right is Michael Iacopino, who is a lawyer
13 who is Counsel to the Site Evaluation
14 Committee. Sitting in the first row on this
15 side is Peter Roth, from the Attorney General's
16 Office, who is a statutory Counsel for the
17 Public in this proceeding.

18 The purpose of the meeting today is
19 to take oral statements from members of the
20 public on the Northern Pass Project. This is
21 the third of three meetings that are currently
22 scheduled for the purposes of accepting public
23 comment during the final hearings on the
24 merits, which have been going on since April

1 and will continue into September. The other
2 two meetings took place on June 15th and
3 June 22nd. Each meeting, including today's,
4 has been a three-hour meeting, starting at 9:00
5 and ending at 12:00.

6 In addition to the public comment
7 being received today, the Subcommittee has had
8 seven separate sessions for the purposes of
9 receiving public comment. Specifically, there
10 were public comment hearings on March 1st, all
11 in 2016, March 1st, in Meredith; March 7th, in
12 Colebrook; March 10th, in Concord; March 14th,
13 in Holderness; March 16th, in Deerfield; March
14 19th, in Whitefield; and June -- I'm sorry, May
15 19th, in Whitefield; and June 23rd, in
16 Plymouth.

17 In total, prior to the beginnings of
18 the most recent public comment hearings, the
19 Subcommittee has heard 28 hours and 38 -- 28
20 hours and 30 minutes of public comments orally.

21 In addition, there were public
22 comments provided during informational
23 sessions, in which the Subcommittee was not
24 present, but there are transcripts that we've

1 had the opportunity to review. Those were held
2 in 2016, on January 11th, in Franklin;
3 January 13th, in Londonderry; January 14th, in
4 Laconia; January 20th, in Whitefield; and
5 January 21st, in Lincoln.

6 We have also received written
7 comments. We don't know the exact number, we
8 haven't calculated the exact number, but it's
9 somewhere between 1,700 and 1,900 public
10 comments. They're running roughly 11 or 12 to
11 1 against the Project as it has been proposed.

12 Considering the number of comments we
13 have already received, and the number of people
14 that we have here today, we ask you to keep
15 your neighbors in mind. As we have at other
16 events, we are asking everyone to limit their
17 remarks to three minutes. That does not mean
18 we will stop you at three minutes. Thus far,
19 the way things have run, some people finish up
20 in 30 seconds, most people go between two
21 minutes and 45 seconds and three and a half
22 minutes, maybe a little bit more than that. I
23 won't step in and interrupt you until you get
24 to about four and a half, when I will ask you

1 to wrap up your remarks. There is a clock that
2 you'll be able to see, so you'll see how long
3 you've taken, so you have a sense of how
4 quickly you're moving.

5 Please not to -- please try not to be
6 repetitious. If someone has spoken and made
7 the point that you intended to make, please
8 feel free to say "I agree with my neighbor on
9 this point."

10 Please use the microphone that we've
11 provided. If there's a reason why you can't
12 use the microphone up here, there are
13 microphones around.

14 Speak clearly and slowly. Every word
15 is being transcribed. And it's important that
16 the stenographer be able to understand and
17 follow what you are saying. As Mr. Iacopino
18 likes to say, "we're here to make a record, not
19 break one."

20 We'll call for speakers largely in
21 the order in which they appear on the screen.
22 There will probably be some moving around. If
23 someone's not here, we'll skip over them and
24 see if they show up a little later. If we have

1 time to take people who did not sign up in
2 advance, we will give them the opportunity to
3 speak. Because there is a limited amount of
4 time and a lot of people, we ask you to be
5 ready when it is your turn.

6 With that, we will now proceed. And
7 the first name is not the first name on the
8 list, but it's the first name I'm going to
9 call, it's Representative Neal Kurk.

10 REP. KURK: Good morning, Mr.
11 Chairman and members of the Committee. For the
12 record, my name is Neal Kurk. I'm a State
13 Representative. And I appreciate the
14 opportunity to explain why I and so many of my
15 colleagues in the House and Senate continue to
16 oppose Northern Pass Transmission Project
17 unless it is buried, fully buried for its
18 entire length. My comments will focus on the
19 aesthetic aspects of the Project.

20 In order to issue a siting
21 certificate, the Committee must find that
22 Northern Pass does not have -- will not have an
23 unreasonably adverse effect on aesthetics or
24 the natural environment. As currently

1 proposed, Northern Pass would bring
2 1,090 megawatts of Canadian hydropower to the
3 southern New Hampshire grid on 345 kilovolt
4 lines running 192 miles down the center of the
5 state. Sixty of these miles would be buried in
6 the White Mountain National Forest and upper
7 Coos County. But the remaining 132 miles would
8 be hung from more than a thousand steel towers,
9 rising from 90 to 100 [150?] feet above the
10 ground, as high as the golden dome on the State
11 House, but without its aesthetic appeal.

12 The towers would be among the tallest
13 and ugliest manmade structures in New
14 Hampshire. Some 40 of Northern Pass's
15 above-ground miles would run through a new
16 swath of clear-cut forest and farmland north of
17 the Notches, but even the towers and lines in
18 existing Eversource transmission rights-of-way
19 to the south would rise far above the
20 surrounding forest canopy and town or city
21 skylines, making all of these industrial
22 structures visible to residents and tourists
23 for miles.

24 At these heights, I believe Northern

1 Pass would literally disfigure the face of our
2 state, and would permanently scar some of our
3 most iconic landscapes, destroying vistas that
4 represent what is most special, most unique
5 about New Hampshire to its residents and
6 visitors alike, our sense of place and the
7 image we seek to project to the rest of the
8 country and the world. It is inconceivable to
9 me that New Hampshire's brand, once signified
10 by the Old Man of the Mountain's craggy
11 profile, could soon be represented by a string
12 of industrial-grade steel towers more popularly
13 associated with the northern New Jersey
14 Turnpike.

15 They are, without a doubt, prominent,
16 dominant, and ugly. I believe any reasonable
17 person, resident or visitor, would consider
18 them individually, and especially collectively,
19 to have an unreasonably adverse impact on the
20 scenic resources of our state.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: One thing I
23 should have mentioned. If you have written
24 remarks, if you would provide a copy to the

1 woman who's just sitting next to the lecturn,
2 she will collect them for you.

3 Next up is Howard Moffett, to be
4 followed by Suzanne Smith and Bob Guida.

5 REP. MOFFETT: Thank you, Mr.
6 Chairman. Howard Moffett, from Merrimack
7 District 15 -- excuse me, Merrimack District 9.
8 The four of us who have signed this written
9 statement, which has been provided to the
10 Committee, are testifying this morning. And
11 I'm going to pick up on Pages 3 and 4 of that
12 document. Representative Kurk talked about the
13 damaging effects to New Hampshire's landscape.
14 I would like to just emphasize three points
15 about the alleged economic benefits of Northern
16 Pass, compared to two other announced projects
17 described at the bottom of Page 2: The New
18 England Clean Power Link and the Granite State
19 Power Link. And I should note that, although
20 the four of us who signed this document are
21 speaking this morning, there are over 100
22 co-signatories from among our colleagues in the
23 Legislature and former Legislature, who are
24 listed on the appendix to the statement.

1 The three points: First, we don't
2 have to destroy New Hampshire's natural beauty
3 in order to bring Canadian renewable energy to
4 population centers in southern New England.
5 Either the New England Clean Power Link or
6 Granite State Power Link would do that without
7 any new damage to New Hampshire's landscape.

8 Secondly, Granite State Power Link at
9 least would provide temporary construction and
10 tax benefits to New Hampshire, comparable to
11 Northern Pass, but without the offsetting
12 negative impacts on taxes of the viewshed
13 impacts of Northern Pass. New England Clean
14 Power Link won't do that, because it's being
15 built in Vermont. But both projects would have
16 the same market suppression effect that would
17 allegedly reduce electric rates paid by
18 ratepayers, for those -- and, in that respect,
19 the three projects are comparable.

20 But I would like to draw your
21 attention, I'm not going to go over it in
22 detail, but I'd just like to draw your
23 attention to the comparison at the bottom of
24 Page 3 of the written statement, which

1 basically compares the benefits, the rate
2 reduction benefits that have been alleged by
3 Northern Pass's expert, Ms. Frayer, which she
4 characterized as \$1.50 a month, or \$18 a year,
5 to a blended group of R/C&I ratepayers, using
6 an average of 300 kilowatt-hours a month.

7 We asked Granite State Power Link if
8 they could provide an apples-to-apples
9 comparison. They basically said "no, we can't,
10 because the black boxes are different." Ms.
11 Frayer uses REMI, the Regional Economic
12 Modeling. Granite State Power Link uses ESAI.
13 So, you don't know exactly -- we don't know
14 exactly what's going in and what's coming out.
15 You will have more access to that information
16 than we will, when -- well, you have for
17 Northern Pass, and you will when you hear from
18 Granite State Power Link.

19 But Granite State Power Link has
20 estimated that a comparable group of R/C&I
21 blended ratepayers, using 300 kilowatt-hours a
22 month, would save \$21 a year, three more than
23 Northern Pass.

24 With that, I'll end, because I want

1 to keep within my three minutes. Thank you
2 very much.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
4 Representative Suzanne Smith, to be followed by
5 Senator Bob Guida.

6 REP. SMITH: Good morning. For the
7 record, I am Suzanne Smith. I'm a State
8 legislator, a State Rep., representing Grafton
9 8, the Towns of Plymouth, Hebron, and
10 Holderness. And I want to thank you this
11 morning for the opportunity to comment on
12 Northern Pass. And I am, as Representative
13 Moffett stated, one of the group of four who
14 signed -- or, were the original signers of the
15 document you have in your hands.

16 The townspeople, businesses, and the
17 Selectboards of Plymouth have consistently
18 called for Northern Pass Project to be buried
19 along Interstate 93, separate from our thriving
20 Main Street and out of reach of the floods
21 which regularly affect the Pemigewasset River.
22 RSA 162-R, which became law in 2016, designated
23 state energy infrastructure corridors and puts
24 into place a procedure that energy transmission

1 projects may route their lines along these
2 corridors. The Federal Highway Authority has
3 approved changes to the New Hampshire
4 Accommodation -- Utility Accommodation Manual,
5 which gives the state the authority to
6 implement RSA 162-R.

7 Burying lines down Plymouth's Main
8 Street will effectively shut down businesses
9 during the busy tourist season, and detour the
10 many drivers coming into town from Interstate
11 93 to attend concerts and other social events
12 at the University and the Flying Monkey venue.

13 In May, the Northern Pass
14 Construction panel testified that construction
15 to downtown Plymouth would last three months.
16 Well, we all know how far afield construction
17 estimates can be. This Project would wreak
18 havoc during Plymouth State University's
19 graduation, and the return of students in late
20 August.

21 And it isn't just Plymouth.
22 Franconia, Woodstock, North Woodstock, gateway
23 towns to the White Mountains National Forest,
24 would suffer economically while the Project

1 digs up their main streets during the busy
2 summer season.

3 Burying lines along Routes 18, 116,
4 112, and 3 are also a public safety issue.
5 These roads were built originally as footpaths
6 and carriage roads, and they run along the
7 lowest paths of least resistance along the
8 rivers and streams in the White Mountains.
9 This makes them especially vulnerable to
10 flooding and unsuitable for cable or any other
11 burial.

12 Earlier this month these roads were
13 put to the test, when large areas of Grafton
14 County were hit by heavy rains, in some cases,
15 five inches in one hour. Route 116, in Easton,
16 where Northern Pass plans to bury lines under
17 the road, was one of the hardest hit areas.
18 The road was closed because portions of it were
19 undermined or washed away by the deluge. As a
20 sidenote, Interstate 93 was engineered to avoid
21 flooding impacts.

22 I'm also very concerned about private
23 property rights of homeowners along these
24 roads. The state does not own all of these

1 roads, but only maintains easement rights. The
2 width of these state easements varies greatly,
3 and in some cases stretch back to the 1700s.
4 Usage and historic record indicates a width of
5 only 33 feet along parts of Route 116. If the
6 roads are not wide enough, will the homeowners
7 involuntarily lose the use of their land,
8 gardens, driveways if the Project is routed
9 along these routes? Will the Project attempt
10 to use eminent domain?

11 I ask the Site Evaluation Committee
12 to look further into the poor choice which is
13 being proposed and consider New Hampshire's
14 energy infrastructure corridors, a better
15 option, in reviewing the Project.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
18 Senator Bob Guida, to be followed by
19 Representative Steve Rand.

20 SEN. GUIDA: Good morning, members of
21 the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity
22 to speak. For the record, I am Bob Guida,
23 State Senator from District 2, representing 27
24 towns, 19 in Grafton County, 5 in Belknap, and

1 3 in Merrimack. And my District will be
2 substantially impacted by this Project.

3 I speak in opposition to the
4 transmission project in terms of its current
5 formulation. It needs to be buried, for a
6 number of reasons that have already been
7 articulated, and the authorities of which have
8 already been developed, both federally and
9 statewide, with respect to the energy
10 corridors.

11 This is a project that has been under
12 fire since its inception, and with good reason.
13 There are several other much more financially,
14 politically, and less destructive projects
15 being proposed, amongst which are Granite State
16 Power Link, and they bring as much or more
17 power as Northern Pass will, with virtually
18 none of the potential carnage to be wrought on
19 our viewscapes, our businesses, and our
20 infrastructure in the small towns and
21 ecosystems, which will bear the major brunt of
22 Northern Pass if it's put through as proposed.

23 I invite the Committee to assess the
24 relative merits of those, and I know that you

1 will as part of your public duties. It will
2 clearly demonstrate that there are alternatives
3 that are far better than what is proposed in
4 Northern Pass for the people, businesses, and
5 institutions of our state.

6 I look to the economic benefit that's
7 touted for New Hampshire. And, at a blended
8 savings rate of \$18 per ratepayer, with 518,000
9 homes in the state and 134,000 businesses, it
10 will save New Hampshire ratepayers about 11 and
11 a half million dollars a year in energy costs.
12 However, one of the benefits that's touted is
13 the tax revenues that will accrue to the towns
14 of the utility property tax. I serve on the
15 Assessing Standard Board as well, and that is
16 an issue that is being vigorously researched
17 and investigated as we speak, because there are
18 some disparities that don't manifest themselves
19 overtly.

20 But the tax benefits from this
21 Project are paid for by the very same
22 ratepayers who are paying the electric bills,
23 because they will be incorporated into the
24 transmission and distribution charges that we

1 pay as part of our bill. So, there really is
2 no tax benefit. One for the community, but it
3 comes out of the very same pockets as the
4 taxpayers paying their property taxes.

5 Northern Pass will let New Hampshire
6 be used as a thoroughfare for power to benefit
7 southern New England states, by in large
8 mostly, that will result in irreparable, and I
9 repeat, irreparable harm, okay, to our
10 priceless resources, from which people travel
11 all over the world to visit. It will generate
12 profits for a foreign entity, which, if one
13 listens to testimony in past hearings, in fact,
14 is in violation of some of its own internal
15 treaties with its own indigenous peoples,
16 another factor to be considered. We're going
17 to support a foreign entity with questionable
18 follow-through on their own commitments to
19 their own people.

20 As public servants, our obligation is
21 to serve the people, businesses, and
22 institutions of New Hampshire. We're not
23 obliged to, nor should we allow ourselves to be
24 used to resolve the electric power shortfalls

1 of the southern New England states that have
2 chosen to foreclose on their own opportunities
3 to generate their own energy. They made
4 conscious legislative choices to foreclose on
5 the energy production and capacities that are
6 available in the free market. They continue to
7 pass legislation that, while politically in
8 vogue, ignores the realities of energy
9 production, and discounts rapidly evolving
10 energy science. We should not rush to do this
11 Project. There are projects emerging and
12 evolving in this state as we speak, which will
13 be coming to the public eye in the very near
14 future, which will afford us the opportunity to
15 generate our own power here in New Hampshire,
16 and distribute it amongst ourselves, without
17 having to use our state as a byway for other
18 states that have not afforded themselves the
19 opportunity to do so.

20 Please do not allow -- please do not
21 allow the savaging of our resources, our
22 natural resources and the uniqueness of our
23 North Country, and the diminution of our
24 heritage of independent thinking, from which

1 this state is well known worldwide. The
2 historic, the cultural and the natural
3 resources of New Hampshire should not be the
4 price paid to resolve the self-made power
5 crisis in the southern New England states.

6 I thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
8 Representative Steve Rand, to be followed by
9 Tad Dziemian.

10 REP. RAND: Good morning. I am Steve
11 Rand. And I am a State Rep. from the Town of
12 Plymouth, representing Plymouth, Holderness,
13 and Hebron. But I am here to speak to you
14 today as a Plymouth resident and as a Main
15 Street business owner in Plymouth.

16 So, I am the third generation in my
17 family to be an owner of Rand's Hardware, a 109
18 year-old business right on Main Street of
19 Plymouth, next to, across from the Common, and
20 in the direct path of the buried line that's
21 being proposed.

22 This project scares me, personally.
23 And I echo the sentiments that I've heard
24 before, but this gets right directly to me. It

1 scares me, because it's a business survival
2 issue, for me and for my neighbor businesses,
3 and our employees, all of whom rely on having
4 access to the fronts of our business, which
5 will be denied during this Project. So, you
6 may not know this, but, statistically, most
7 small businesses, and ours are all small on
8 Main Street, are not able to survive a
9 10 percent loss of sales, even for a very short
10 period of time. And I'm sure that this will,
11 in fact, occur when Northern Pass comes through
12 our town.

13 Plymouth has some history with this,
14 because Main Street has been through this
15 before. In the '90s, we did a Street
16 Improvement Project that took two months, tore
17 up pavement, eliminated parking, and was a
18 nightmare for pedestrians and cars alike, just
19 as we expect the Northern Pass Project to be.
20 The '90s project had an immediate and prolonged
21 effect on the Main Street businesses; many
22 businesses did not survive. And I expect that
23 this will happen again.

24 Here are the questions I ask myself,

1 and perhaps you would like to ask yourself:
2 Can Eversource, a for-profit company with a
3 Canadian partner, be allowed to disturb the
4 peace and prosperity of the small Town of
5 Plymouth, without respecting its opinion and
6 without any accountability to provide
7 compensation for all who suffer? Does the
8 \$1.6 billion project cost, that is often cited,
9 include the repayment, over time, of the
10 approximately personal loss of about \$200,000
11 of profit that I will expect to suffer? And
12 will the payments continue for a period of five
13 to ten years after the Project is completed, so
14 that I can rebuild the habits of my customer
15 base, which will be interrupted and will become
16 an ongoing problem, not a temporary problem?
17 So, for me to be fully compensated, it's more
18 than is generally considered.

19 The Town of Plymouth is on record as
20 being against the Northern Pass Project unless
21 it's buried under 93. And with the 93 option
22 apparently no longer on the table, I
23 understand, because of the extra expense of
24 doing it, it seems like we now -- now we know

1 that the same amount of power that Northern
2 Pass would deliver can be delivered by
3 two-thirds of the capital cost by the Granite
4 State Power Link, without disrupting the entire
5 North Country.

6 Why are we, in fact, continuing to
7 evaluate any Northern Pass proposal? At this
8 point, it seems, at a minimum, that the SEC
9 should shift gears to evaluate the two
10 proposals side-by-side. There's too much at
11 stake to do anything else. And no proposal, I
12 don't think, can properly be analyzed unless
13 alternatives are considered, no matter when the
14 alternatives appear.

15 Granite State Power Link is that
16 alternative. It gives New Hampshire a choice.
17 And, from what I see now, there will be no
18 contest.

19 Thank you for your attention.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Tad Dziemian, to
21 be followed by T.J. Jean.

22 MR. DZIEMIAN: Top of the morning,
23 members of the Committee and guests. And thank
24 you for allowing me to comment on the Northern

1 Pass.

2 My name is Tad Dziemian. And I own
3 and operate Neighborhood Energy of New England.
4 Headquartered in East Hampstead, New Hampshire,
5 we broker the supply of electricity and natural
6 gas to mostly commercial and industrial clients
7 throughout New England, with a large share here
8 in New Hampshire.

9 I am here today to fully, without any
10 question, and convicted with passion, that I
11 support the Northern Pass, because I get
12 firsthand feedback, primarily of complaints
13 from my clients, regarding the high cost of
14 electricity.

15 Shamefully, our region holds the
16 dubious distinction of having each state in the
17 top ten of our wonderful nation in terms of
18 having the highest cost of energy.

19 More importantly, despite a bear
20 market in natural gas, as the result of our two
21 mild winters, natural gas inventories in the
22 United States are the highest that they have
23 been in over six years, New England will suffer
24 through double-digit electric supply rates for

1 the next year, or longer, as a direct impact
2 from less supply in New England. And this is
3 primarily as the result of many power
4 generating facilities that are coming off line.

5 Therefore, once again, I am in favor
6 for initiatives that will help lower our cost
7 of energy, because I feel that we need to
8 attract and keep our consumers, especially the
9 larger ones, here in our region.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: T.J. Jean, to be
12 followed by I understand it's going to be Paul
13 Pouliot.

14 MR. POULIOT: Yes.

15 *[Short pause.]*

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No T.J. Jean?

17 *[No indication given.]*

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Paul
19 Pouliot.

20 MR. POULIOT: Good morning, ladies
21 and gentlemen of the State of New Hampshire
22 Site Evaluation Committee. My name is Paul
23 Pouliot. I am the Sag8mo, the principal
24 speaker, of the Cowasuck Band of the Pennacook

1 Abenaki People, which is based and
2 headquartered here in Alton, New Hampshire.
3 Chief René Simon and the elected officials of
4 Pessamit have asked me to deliver this message,
5 and to thank you for the opportunity to speak
6 to the Northern Pass public hearings. It is
7 with confidence and a better future that the
8 Pessamit Innu Nation is addressing you today.

9 And with me is the Elders Council and
10 members of the Tribal Council of the Pessamit
11 Innu First Nation. Their Chief, unfortunately,
12 could not make the travel for health reasons.

13 It is not the Pessamit's intention to
14 take a position on the impacts of the Northern
15 Pass Project in New Hampshire. However, we
16 want to share our experience with regard to the
17 source of electricity and its environmental and
18 social legitimacy.

19 In 1973, the Supreme Court of Canada
20 confirmed our Ancestral Rights, territories,
21 and the value of Indigenous treaties with
22 France and England. However, the Quebec
23 Government challenged the Canadian Supreme
24 Court's decision until 1996, when the Supreme

1 Court ruled against Quebec's position.

2 The Government of Quebec
3 strategically allowed enough time for the
4 completion of Hydro-Quebec, a government-owned
5 entity, to invade Nitassinan, our homelands.
6 As such, thirteen hydroelectric plants and
7 eleven reservoirs were implanted on our
8 homelands, without impact studies, without our
9 consent, and without compensation.

10 This state-run fraud now makes 29
11 percent of Hydro-Quebec's installed capacity,
12 which is illegally acquired at the expense of
13 the Pessamit. The Government of Quebec, which
14 is Hydro-Quebec's sole shareholder, has become
15 one of the largest and most profitable energy
16 companies in the West. In return, the Pessamit
17 have been plunged into environmental, economic,
18 cultural, and social chaos that has no
19 historical equivalency since the contact with
20 the Europeans in the 16th century.

21 Hydro-Quebec's flooding of all major
22 rivers of our homelands, which served as
23 transport routes, seasonal food resources and
24 fur trade, resulted in the forced and brutal

1 removal of the Pessamiuilnut and relocation
2 onto a reserve that was not and is still not
3 structured to ensure the economic well-being of
4 its population.

5 What's more, the Betsiamites River
6 near the reserve, whose salmon is one of their
7 sole sources of their diet, was also destroyed
8 by the peak demand cycling of Hydro-Quebec.
9 This salmon is currently on the verge of
10 extinction. Pessamit's right to fish, although
11 recognized by the Canadian Supreme Court, is
12 simply no longer applicable as the salmon are
13 simply not there anymore.

14 It goes without saying that the
15 Government of Quebec and Hydro-Quebec are
16 directly, with impunity, violating several
17 historic treaties, provincial and federal laws
18 and three international conventions, including
19 the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous
20 Peoples. The greed of the Quebec Government,
21 Hydro-Quebec's sole shareholder, is a form of
22 state delinquency that seems impossible to
23 curb.

24 The Innu Nation has never been

1 conquered, has never given up its rights over
2 its homelands, and has never accepted the
3 attempts to relinquish our rights.

4 For decades, the Pessamit has tried
5 to work within the confines of the democratic
6 and political venues in Quebec to enforce the
7 recognition of its rights. Our action outside
8 of Canada's borders aims to change the course
9 of history and to make New England aware that
10 29 percent of the electricity that Hydro-Quebec
11 intends to sell was acquired in an immoral and
12 illegal manner, to the detriment of the
13 Pessamit.

14 We thank you for your devoted
15 attention. Chief René Simon, Pessamit Innu
16 First Nation.

17 If I have any other time, I'd like to
18 say that the Cowasuck Band of the Pennacook
19 Abenaki People here in New Hampshire are also
20 not at issue with Northern Pass or Eversource.
21 But we are at issue with Hydro-Quebec. Their
22 commitment to expand into the Pessamit area has
23 created a ecological disaster. Their
24 watershed, their livelihood is all being

1 destroyed for the greed of Hydro-Quebec.

2 We have to now ask ourselves, should
3 we become complacent, should we be complicit,
4 should we be enabling Hydro-Quebec to continue
5 their expansion in the Pessamit territory at
6 whose expense? These poor people, it's an act
7 of genocide against them. Their lifeways,
8 their food sources, and their livelihood has
9 all been destroyed by the greed of
10 Hydro-Quebec.

11 I thank you for your time. There
12 will be written statements available in full
13 detail from the Pessamit Innu. And the
14 Cowasuck Band will make its written testimony
15 through the normal channels.

16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Next
18 up is Patricia Kellogg, to be followed by John
19 Wilkinson.

20 While Ms. Kellogg is coming up, would
21 people please take out their cellphones and
22 other electronic devices, and either turn them
23 off or put them on silent please? Thank you.

24 MS. KELLOGG: Good morning, members

1 of the Committee and to all gathered here. My
2 name is Patricia Kellogg. I live in Littleton,
3 New Hampshire, with my husband, Gardner
4 Kellogg, who is a licensed land surveyor in New
5 Hampshire.

6 What I'm going to show you is a copy
7 of a 19th century painting of the White
8 Mountains. What is placed on it is done to
9 scale by my husband. A picture is worth a
10 thousand words.

11 (Ms. Kellogg displaying painting
12 to the Subcommittee members and
13 the audience.)

14 MS. KELLOGG: Just say "No" to
15 Northern Pass. And I thank you for your
16 consideration.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Next
18 up is John Wilkinson, to be followed by Therese
19 Haberman.

20 MR. WILKINSON: My name is John
21 Wilkinson, and I'm a resident of Lancaster, New
22 Hampshire.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Wait. Can you
24 bring your microphone up?

1 MR. WILKINSON: Sorry.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thanks.

3 MR. WILKINSON: Again, I'm John
4 Wilkinson. I'm a resident of Lancaster, New
5 Hampshire.

6 First, let me say I recognize what a
7 laborious duty this has been for all of you.
8 So, I want to thank you for allowing me this
9 time to speak directly to each one of you.

10 After following the now seven-year
11 process of the possible siting of the Northern
12 Pass Project here in New Hampshire, I'm here
13 today to help you answer the question: "Should
14 this Project be approved?"

15 With no intent of possibly insulting
16 anyone's already lengthy deliberations, please
17 understand there is a simple answer. The
18 answer is "No". And the answer is -- and the
19 simple reason why the answer is "no" is the
20 undeniable fact that the Northern Pass Project
21 isn't needed.

22 If anyone looks beyond all the
23 propaganda and hype pumped out over these past
24 years by PSNH, now Eversource, with its hired

1 experts, lobbyists, and lawyers, attempting to
2 convince all of us of the incredible benefits
3 the Project might provide, it still remains
4 clear. The reality is, this Project really
5 isn't about electrical power at all. It's only
6 about the power and influence of money, and the
7 desire by now Eversource to exploit its
8 financial power on the State of New Hampshire
9 and its citizens for its own corporate gains.

10 Fortunately, New Hampshire residents,
11 landowners, citizens, and businesses have still
12 seen through the fog of the Northern Pass
13 advertising. And, after seven years of public
14 hearings, town meetings, petitions, and votes
15 cast, they remain united in protecting all of
16 New Hampshire individuals and to protect New
17 Hampshire's uniqueness. That "uniqueness" is
18 our state's incredible natural beauty and our
19 way of life for which tens of millions of
20 others come here also to enjoy.

21 So, I remind everyone again: This
22 proposed Northern Pass Project is not needed.
23 It's a merchant project. It's not a
24 reliability project. It must be held to a high

1 standard if ever to achieve approval here in
2 New Hampshire.

3 Finally, beyond all the debates of
4 any possible merits regarding the Northern
5 Pass, the currently proposed project clearly
6 does not benefit the public good of New
7 Hampshire. If it was approved, it would only
8 be a financial benefit to a select few, while
9 at the same time having a devastating and
10 adverse impact, not only on the State of New
11 Hampshire, but also on the well-being of far
12 too many individuals.

13 Therefore, the answer to the
14 Applicant's request for approval must simply be
15 "No", since the simple facts are that Northern
16 Pass is not needed and it is not right for New
17 Hampshire.

18 Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
20 Therese Haberman, to be followed by Gail
21 Knowles.

22 *[Short pause.]*

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Therese Haberman
24 here?

1 *[No indication given.]*

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'll take that
3 as a "no".

4 Gail Knowles?

5 *[Short pause.]*

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Not here. A
7 woman whose name I have mispronounced before,
8 and I will probably mispronounce now. Ruth
9 Niven.

10 MS. NIVEN: You are forgiven. It is
11 "Niven".

12 *[Laughter.]*

13 MS. NIVEN: I am opposed to Northern
14 Pass. I spoke against the Northern Pass when
15 it was first announced in October of 2010, in
16 Franklin, New Hampshire, my home town and the
17 proposed site of a converted terminal. I spoke
18 against it in 2011, in 2012, in 2013, 2014,
19 2015, 2016, and now in 2017.

20 I tried to think of something clever
21 to say, but I'm all out of clever. I only have
22 more questions and non-answers that arise from
23 the flood of contradictions that are spewed
24 from the dams of Hydro-Quebec.

1 The headline for the Union Leader, on
2 May 28, 2017, "Northern Pass predicts financial
3 windfall for towns". "Franklin could receive
4 anywhere from 3.2 million to 7 million in
5 additional taxes for the first full year that
6 Northern Pass operates, according to project
7 estimates." There's a big difference of
8 3.8 million. But what are numbers for, if not
9 to dazzle and confuse?

10 A ForwardNH Plan handout "The
11 Northern Pass Questions and Answers", "What
12 benefits will the Project provide for New
13 Hampshire? Energy costs lowered by 80 million
14 annually for New Hampshire business and
15 residential customers."

16 InDepthNH, July 6, 2017, Analyst:
17 "Customer using 300 kilowatt would save \$1.50 a
18 month with Northern Pass." I will gladly give
19 up \$18 a year to keep the Granite State from
20 being scarred forever by the Northern Pass.

21 I ask the New Hampshire Site
22 Evaluation Committee to refuse to be dazzled or
23 confused.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Dolly McPhaul,

1 to be followed by Brenda Shannon Adam.

2 MS. McPHAUL: My name is Dolly
3 McPhaul, and I'm from Sugar Hill.

4 On July 10th, a friend and I,
5 frustrated by the inadequate, incomplete and
6 irresponsible route of the Northern Pass,
7 decided to drive the New England Clean Power
8 Link. The differences we saw were amazing.
9 The New England Clean Power Link is a 154-mile
10 project to bring hydropower from Canada into
11 the New England grid. Ninety-seven (97) miles
12 will be buried under Lake Champlain, 57 miles
13 will be buried under roads along the route to
14 Ludlow, where the power is changed to AC
15 current, and then it goes into the New England
16 grid.

17 The New England Clean Power Link
18 comes into Vermont from Lake Champlain, at the
19 Stony Point, in the small Town of Benson. This
20 is a perfect place for a project to enter. It
21 is totally isolated, with barely a usable road.

22 The NECPL, in further concerns for
23 the Town of Benson, asked for and received
24 permission to bury their lines on back

1 town-owned roads till it joins to 22a. 22a is
2 a relatively isolated road, with plenty of
3 shoulders to bury the lines for the most part.

4 The next route, Route 4, is a divided
5 two-lane highway, that has sweeping shoulders,
6 plenty of space for burial, and allows them to
7 circumvent the Town of Rutland. Route 7 is the
8 same as Route 4, a divided two-lane road, with
9 wide shoulders.

10 The last two routes, 100 and 103, are
11 also isolated roads for the most part, with
12 sufficient shoulders to bury the cables,
13 without infringing on people's property rights.

14 There will be no burying of lines
15 through town centers. None. Siting a project
16 that shows concern for town centers and allows
17 business to continue as usual is the way that
18 the New England Clean Power Link has done
19 business, concern for community.

20 The NECPL is done with intensive
21 planning by experts who care about the people,
22 as well as the finished product. The Northern
23 Pass is a jumbled up mess of partially thought
24 out plans, partially conducted studies,

1 outdated maps and data, a staff of puppets, a
2 reliance on attorneys and contacts to make
3 exceptions, grant waivers, ignore deficiencies,
4 fool the public, lie if need be, and plans
5 "made as you go" without sufficient knowledge
6 and research.

7 The NECPL planned a route to best
8 serve the people. The Northern Pass planned a
9 route to only serve themselves.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Brenda Shannon
12 Adam, to be followed by Kathie Aldrich Cote.

13 MS. ADAM: There's the right way to
14 bury and a wrong way. On July 2nd, I drove the
15 proposed underground route, from Bethlehem to
16 Bridgewater, the day after the flash flooding
17 that damaged countless roads in Grafton County.
18 DOT trucks everywhere. Driving, I wondered if
19 the narrow, ancient corduroy roads would
20 disintegrate and swallow me up in an
21 underground river, like the videos I watched of
22 25A in nearby Orford. I passed places where
23 the road narrowed even more and bodies of water
24 lie close by, like on 116, approaching Bungay

1 Corner, or at Beaver Pond, in Kinsman Notch.

2 Road damage and closings were
3 everywhere. I imagined being in the midst of
4 the Northern Pass Project, dealing with
5 washouts like the one I encountered in
6 Thornton, on the newly paved Route 3. What if
7 the travel lane was the lane that got washed
8 out? What would residents do? Emergency
9 responders?

10 Old farmhouses, like mine, built long
11 before pavement, barns, stonewalls, fences,
12 gardens, septic systems, all lie close to the
13 pavement's edge.

14 Northern Pass proposes nearly a 120
15 percent increase in traffic on my road, Route
16 116. All heavy construction related vehicles,
17 further compromising the integrity of these
18 narrow roads not built to modern standards.

19 A further insult, the route cuts
20 through the heart of three significant economic
21 centers: Franconia, North Woodstock, Plymouth.
22 Northern Pass's so-called "expert" witnesses
23 and consultants seem to lack the critical
24 thinking required to identify Franconia area

1 businesses. Not on Main Street. They lack the
2 imagination to determine how businesses off the
3 route will be equally impacted.

4 And the needs of construction crews
5 don't match up with the services of most North
6 Country businesses, which are geared towards a
7 local and tourist economy. Will the
8 construction crews have their neon vests dry
9 cleaned at Franconia Business Connections? Use
10 their doggy daycare that Franconia Business
11 Connections also provides?

12 I just had my windows washed
13 yesterday by Beautiful Visions. They know I
14 won't be having them done during the
15 construction period that will go on for two
16 plus years. Why bother with all the dirt and
17 dust. Will the construction crews hire
18 Beautiful Visions to clean their truck windows?

19 Will they be eating leisurely
20 breakfasts at Polly's? How will that work?
21 That's Polly's Pancake Parlor. Their
22 construction day begins at 7:00. Polly's opens
23 at 7:00. Will there be rotating construction
24 crews filling the tables empty of tourists?

1 Book haircuts at The Strand Salon?
2 Stay in the honeymoon suite at Franconia Inn?
3 Will they make purchases at Mantiques and
4 Garnet Hill, or buy eggs from my neighbor at
5 Bear Country Farms?

6 When the workday ends, will they rent
7 a tennis court at Tamarack Tennis Court, and
8 then follow up with a six-course dinner at
9 Sugar Hill Inn?

10 I've been asking around and have yet
11 to find someone in the Franconia area who got
12 the invitation to be in the business
13 district -- directory. Maybe that's why they
14 want to keep it secret.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next up is
16 Kathie Cote, to be followed by Manfred
17 Hoertdoerfer.

18 MS. COTE: Good morning. For the
19 record, my name is Kathie Aldrich Cote. I am
20 here on behalf of the Franconia area
21 businesses. I have -- I believe you have been
22 presented with a packet of over 75 letters from
23 Franconia area businesses that will be impacted
24 by the proposed burial down Route 18/116

1 corridor in the Franconia area. I urge all of
2 you to take time to read each and every letter.

3 As a third generation family owner of
4 Polly's Pancake Parlor in Sugar Hill, which has
5 been in business for 79 plus years, I am very
6 concerned with how the proposed Northern Pass
7 burial project will impact our business. While
8 it is true, we are not on the direct proposed
9 burial path of Northern Pass, we know that
10 disruption in construction will impact our
11 business tremendously.

12 Franconia, Easton, Sugar Hill, and
13 Polly's have been known as a destination for
14 tourists escaping the heat, noise, traffic,
15 construction of cities since the early late
16 1800s. Our visitors speak often of the beauty
17 and quiet location that attracts them to our
18 area. While it is true that the proposed
19 project is going to be just a two-year plus
20 disruption, we know that this will have a
21 tremendous toll on all of our businesses. We
22 rely on these summer visitors to get us through
23 the leaner winter months. We know from
24 experience that any construction project in the

1 past has affected our access to our road has
2 affected our business. We have kept meticulous
3 attendance records going back to 1938, and we
4 also take note, when business is down, why.

5 Such small projects, as the annual
6 Franconia Old Home Day parade, the annual
7 triathlon, road paving, which one year was done
8 on a Sunday in August, even the current bridge
9 closing on Route 18 have negatively affected
10 our numbers.

11 Here are some numbers that will be
12 impacted. Last year, April to October, Polly's
13 served 71,000 plus customers, out of a total of
14 95,000 customers for the year. As you can see,
15 the bulk of our business comes during those six
16 months. During the height of the summer
17 season, we are serving on average 3,600
18 customers per week, with a height of 4,000 one
19 week in August. Of those customers, two-thirds
20 of them do travel from Franconia, along Route
21 18, to get to Route 117.

22 In 2016, Polly's collected and paid
23 to the State of New Hampshire \$108,000 in Room
24 and Meals Tax. Of that, 81,000 plus was

1 collected between April and October. Decreased
2 traffic will result in decreased income to our
3 state.

4 Polly's employs up to 50 employees,
5 two-thirds of whom travel from Franconia,
6 Littleton, Whitefield, Bethlehem, over Route
7 18, to get to Route 117. Of those 48
8 employees, 23 rely on Polly's as their main
9 source of family income. Our gross payroll for
10 2016 was \$480,000, not including officers. In
11 the least, these employees will be affected by
12 traffic delays and possible temporary road
13 closures. While business is negatively
14 impacted, we may have to lay off employees.

15 Polly's receives weekly deliveries
16 from twelve different vendors, all of them who
17 travel over Route 18 to get up to Route 117.
18 They will experience delays in the least, and
19 possibly loss of income due to decreased
20 business.

21 With our recent rebuild, we are in a
22 very tenuous place monetarily. And, if we have
23 any decreased business, it will be
24 devastational for us.

1 We implore you to consider the
2 long-term effects of this Project on our small
3 towns and businesses in the area. While mine
4 is just one letter, I urge you to read all 75.
5 Tourists will avoid the area and find other
6 destinations to visit. They may not return for
7 many years, if at all. They are the livelihood
8 of the bulk of Sugar Hill, Franconia, and
9 Easton businesses.

10 Thank you for your contribution.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Manfred
12 Hoertdoerfer, to be followed by Mark Bailey.

13 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Mr. Chairman,
14 members of the Committee. My name is Manfred
15 Hoertdoerfer. I reside in New Hampton. I'm
16 here to make -- give some comments on the
17 construction and review issues.

18 My write-up here is quite extensive,
19 so I will just limit myself to some excerpts of
20 what I have to say, and will provide you with
21 the full paper after I'm finished.

22 The New Hampshire DOT has issued a
23 recommendation for approval of construction
24 already. And stated in their project -- in

1 their submittal to the Committee that the
2 "Project construction plans and specifications
3 are still in development."

4 And, then, DOT goes on to great
5 lengths to explain that "underground facilities
6 shall be located outside of the pavement
7 areas", and "the Department has invested
8 heavily in the roadway infrastructure and needs
9 to preserve and maximize the life of the
10 roadway system". And, yet, then the Department
11 continues on to agree to conditions of
12 construction within the roadway section. The
13 Department is sacrificing their own principles
14 and the interests of the state and the citizens
15 to accommodate the Applicant.

16 In the interest of the preservation
17 of our state highway system, it should be the
18 obligation of the Applicant to find ways to
19 keep the construction outside of the paved
20 roadway section. If the Applicant is not
21 willing or able to design and install the
22 proposed system in accordance with UAM
23 requirements and the Department's own preferred
24 and stated criteria for preservation and

1 protection of our New Hampshire highway system,
2 then the Department should be consequential and
3 courageous enough to simply state that the
4 proposed installation within the highway
5 right-of-way is not acceptable and cannot be
6 approved.

7 The DOT noted in their letter of
8 April 3 to the SEC that an arrangement of
9 monthly meetings between the DOT and the
10 Applicant was used to further the process.
11 This review process used by the DOT is in
12 direct contradiction of the process required by
13 SEC guidelines. The Department has an inherent
14 obligation to facilitate the public's access to
15 all documents and proceedings in the spirit of
16 the SEC guidelines and has failed to do so.

17 Now one has to ask the question: Has
18 proper documentation been maintained for all
19 the interactions with the Applicant, such as:
20 To start with, who initiated this monthly
21 meeting program? Are their logs of all
22 coordination meetings with the time schedules,
23 names of participants, and agendas? Are there
24 transcripts for all these coordination

1 meetings? Are there copies of e-mails and
2 transcripts of telephone conversations and
3 lunch meetings?

4 All above noted documentation should
5 have been maintained and should be made part of
6 the public record on the SEC website.

7 Has the Department forgotten that it
8 exists and operates on behalf of the citizens
9 of the State of New Hampshire, who pay through
10 their taxes for its existence, and that it is
11 not an Empire of its own making?

12 Has the Applicant or the DOT
13 considered how the heat emission from the
14 buried cable can affect the cold weather
15 performance of the roadway section? Heat
16 emission from the proposed buried cable could,
17 under certain marginally cold freezing
18 conditions, create localized areas where,
19 amidst the generally frozen roadway surface,
20 such areas become defrosted and collect water
21 intruding from the surface, whereas adjacent
22 areas would remain frozen. Then that trapped
23 water would then, under some more severe cold
24 weather freeze conditions, freeze and could

1 generate localized blowups that we all know
2 from the typical potholes. Because the hole
3 would be sectioned in ways, designed and built
4 to start with, it doesn't allow it to drain out
5 anymore.

6 There does not seem to be any
7 experience with or track record for an
8 installation of an underground buried line in
9 climate conditions such as ours here in New
10 Hampshire. So, our state now becomes the
11 Guinea pig to find out if this would work.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
13 Hoertdoerfer, please wrap up.

14 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Yes. I have other
15 comments about construction details where
16 things are lacking. There are areas in the
17 documentation with stockpiles of excavated
18 material, which is not defined, except up to a
19 height of 35 feet, which could cause the -- the
20 details of erosion control are totally
21 inadequate, and we could have washouts and
22 downslope siltation, that we only know from
23 coal mine areas in Kentucky and Pennsylvania.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please wrap up.

1 MR. HOERTDOERFER: In general, I also
2 have something to say about the contractors'
3 practices, and how even some of the better
4 departments that have submitted -- reviewed the
5 process in an orderly fashion referred to "best
6 practices", or similar comments, allowed by
7 many permitting agency, that is asking for a
8 lot of trouble.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
10 Hoertdoerfer, you may submit the rest of your
11 comments in writing. Thank you very much.

12 The next speaker is Mark Bailey, to
13 be followed by Lee Ann Moulder.

14 MR. BAILEY: Good morning, members of
15 the Commission [Committee?]. My name is Mark
16 Bailey. No relation to Kate Bailey. I am the
17 Director of Facilities for BAE Systems. BAE
18 Systems supports the Northern Pass Project,
19 because of its economic benefits, its
20 environmental benefits, and its social
21 benefits, as well as its stabilizing impact on
22 the energy market in New Hampshire and New
23 England as a whole.

24 BAE Systems is the state's largest

1 manufacturer and a major consumer of energy.

2 In addition to our 5,500 employees here in New
3 Hampshire, the Company has many locations with
4 tens of thousands of employees across the
5 country. And this allows us to make two
6 informed and stark observations: First, it is
7 increasingly difficult to be competitive in New
8 Hampshire due to the high cost of energy in New
9 Hampshire compared with other regions of the
10 country. And, second, this cost disadvantage
11 could be minimized by taking the right steps
12 and taking them quickly.

13 BAE Systems, and all of New Hampshire
14 businesses, need low-cost, reliable energy in
15 the state to remain competitive in a global
16 marketplace.

17 The Northern Pass Project provides
18 clean, renewable hydroelectric power needed to
19 improve our region's energy deficit, and it
20 does so while addressing environmental impact
21 concerns. This is why BAE Systems stands with
22 a group of roughly 50 New Hampshire businesses
23 in support of the New Hampshire -- the Northern
24 Pass.

1 I have copies of our joint statement
2 here and a list of very diverse companies that
3 have signed on. As I did in the public hearing
4 in Deerfield, in March, I ask that this be
5 included as part of the public docket. Thank
6 you.

7 You'll note these companies span
8 every corner of the state. They are both big
9 and they are small. A true cross-section of
10 industry across many sectors which make up the
11 state's economy.

12 I appreciate the opportunity to speak
13 to you today because the views of BAE Systems,
14 as well as these 50 companies, and many others
15 not on the list, have not been duly represented
16 during these proceedings. BAE Systems, other
17 businesses, and business advocacy groups, such
18 as Chambers of Commerce, were denied intervenor
19 status on the basis that our views would be
20 adequately represented by the Counsel for the
21 Public. Unfortunately, this has not been the
22 case. This has been formally noted by BAE
23 Systems and others during these proceedings.

24 Counsel for the Public has responded

1 to this criticism by listing the meetings that
2 he has held with business groups. However,
3 listening to the concerns and actually bringing
4 them forth for the consideration by this
5 Committee are two very different things.

6 Sadly, the Counsel has prevented the
7 views of those who employ thousands of Granite
8 Staters, the views of those who support
9 Northern Pass from being represented to you. I
10 am proud to be able to speak to you today for
11 BAE Systems and others who support the Northern
12 Pass for the reasons I just outlined.

13 BAE Systems asks for a thorough,
14 fair, and fact-based review of the Northern
15 Pass Project by the Committee for the remaining
16 of these proceedings. Equally important, I
17 urge you to act in a timely manner. New
18 Hampshire citizens and businesses cannot afford
19 to wait any longer for actions that will result
20 in low-cost and reliable energy.

21 Thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Lee Ann Moulder,
23 to be followed by Julie Michel.

24 MS. MOULDER: Good morning. I would

1 like to thank the members of the SEC for
2 allowing me this opportunity to express my
3 opposition to the Northern Pass Transmission
4 Project. My name is Lee Ann Moulder, and I
5 reside in Holderness, a town which was on the
6 earlier preferred Northern Pass route.

7 My husband and I are from Long
8 Island, New York, and we came to New Hampshire
9 for the first time as tourists in 1993. Upon
10 seeing the natural beauty of New Hampshire, we
11 decided to buy property and build our
12 retirement home in New Hampshire. We built our
13 house in 1996, and used it as a vacation home
14 until retirement in 2005.

15 We have contributed to the economy of
16 New Hampshire in many, many ways. We have
17 employed the services of a number of
18 individuals in this state over the past 22
19 years, including real estate agents,
20 architects, building contractors, landscapers,
21 snow plow services, plumbers, electricians, and
22 every other type of service necessary to build
23 and maintained a home. We pay real estate
24 taxes on our property and we have purchased a

1 number of vehicles. In short order, we have
2 spent virtually our entire retirement income in
3 this state. The only thing we have taken
4 advantage of in New Hampshire is enjoying its
5 beauty.

6 Additionally, we have entertained
7 many friends and relatives in our home over the
8 past 20 years. And those individuals have also
9 spent money in this state on things such as
10 family attractions, including Mount Washington,
11 Clark's Trading Post, and Santa's Village. Our
12 friends and relatives ski and hike New
13 Hampshire's mountains, both state and privately
14 owned. They go snowmobiling in the winter in
15 the Great North Woods, and they rent boats in
16 the summer to enjoy the Lakes Region. They
17 shop at New Hampshire's outlets, including
18 Tilton, Merrimack, and North Conway. They eat
19 at New Hampshire restaurants and make purchases
20 at the state-owned liquor stores.

21 Many, with children applying for
22 college, have stayed with us so they could tour
23 New Hampshire's colleges, including Plymouth
24 State University, Keene State University, UNH,

1 and Dartmouth College. I should note that
2 often these families stay overnight in a local
3 hotel when touring a college.

4 Conversely, had my husband and I ever
5 imagined that a for-profit, above-ground
6 merchant-funded project would traverse this
7 beautiful state with its 100-foot plus towers,
8 we would never have purchased land, nor would
9 we have built a home in New Hampshire.

10 My point is that there is an
11 unquantifiable, but substantial, figure that I
12 believe you should take into consideration when
13 determining the economic benefits versus the
14 economic disadvantages of the Northern Pass
15 Project. While Northern Pass executives may
16 set forth what they tell you are the economic
17 advantages of temporary jobs provided and
18 purchases made by the workers in each town, I
19 believe that it is crystal clear that the
20 revenue stream brought into this state by
21 individuals, such as myself, who have moved to
22 this state because of its beauty, are permanent
23 in nature. I believe that these economic
24 benefits will far surpass the loosely

1 calculated benefits presented by the
2 profit-motivated corporate executives of
3 Northern Pass.

4 I think you should consider that
5 there is a permanent loss of revenue to New
6 Hampshire should any part of the Northern Pass
7 Project be approved above ground.

8 Thank you for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Julie Michel.

10 *[Short pause.]*

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Again, not here.
12 Carol Meredith, to be followed by Dick Hage.

13 MS. MEREDITH: Mr. Chairman and
14 members of the Committee, my name is Carol
15 Meredith.

16 As an ordained minister in the United
17 Church of Christ, who has served for 18 years
18 at Deerfield Community Church, I am much more
19 accustomed to giving sermons than three-minute
20 statements at public hearings.

21 I do know this: In the pulpit, it's
22 always a plus to begin with a joke, something
23 like "a minister, a rabbi, and a priest walked
24 into a bar", but I'm having a hard time finding

1 humor in the all-too-real possibility that the
2 bucolic countryside of Deerfield and New
3 Hampshire will be subject to the imposition of
4 Northern Pass.

5 Although I am a minister in a classic
6 New England congregational church, I want to be
7 absolutely clear that this morning I am
8 speaking not on behalf of my congregation. I
9 speak simply as a resident of the Town of
10 Deerfield, adding my voice to others who
11 believe that Northern Pass would have a
12 profoundly negative impact on the quality of
13 life in our town and state. Bringing in a
14 project of this magnitude would permanently
15 scar our town's character, which is defined by
16 historic buildings, rolling hills of forests
17 and farmland, and the rich past that we
18 recently celebrated during Deerfield's 250th
19 anniversary celebration.

20 Some people are moved by the tax
21 revenue that Eversource says it would pay to
22 impact its cities and towns. But, in the
23 corporate world, surely past actions are the
24 best indication of future ones. That's the

1 tendency at least that I see in my parishioners
2 and myself; unless we see a major benefit and
3 intentionally decide to put serious efforts
4 into changing, things don't change. I'll spare
5 you the details of a joke about how many people
6 it takes to screw in a lightbulb, and how, for
7 the lightbulb to change, it has to really want
8 to. But it's true of people, as well as
9 companies such as Eversource.

10 With its past record of renegeing on
11 taxes due -- that are due to the towns with
12 which it deals, including Deerfield, and with
13 its primary interest being its own bottom line,
14 Eversource can be expected to continue this
15 pattern of untrustworthiness and threats to
16 less well-heeled opponents. I understand
17 that's their job, to make as much money as
18 possible for the services provided. But,
19 surely, it's the job of citizens to stand for
20 values other than the profit motive.

21 As a minister, of course, it's
22 natural for me to think in terms of biblical
23 stories, and lately I've been thinking a lot
24 about David and Goliath from the Hebrew

1 scriptures. You don't have to be a religious
2 person to know the gist: Goliath was a huge
3 seasoned soldier, with a bronze helmet and
4 weighty armor, and a very sharp iron spear.
5 And young David faces him as he is, a small
6 shepherd boy, with only a slingshot and a lot
7 of faith.

8 I can't help but see the constituents
9 of this state who are taking on Eversource and
10 Hydro-Quebec as "Davids". In their modern-day
11 context, they are shepherd boys and girls,
12 compared to the corporate Goliaths, huge
13 amounts of money and army of well-paid experts.
14 In contrast, the volunteer activists I know are
15 not being compensated for the incredible number
16 of hours they are putting in. I have been
17 absolutely amazed at the commitment and grit of
18 the people from our town, who have set aside
19 their own needs for salaries and downtime in
20 order to fight this fight.

21 I hope and pray that you might give
22 their perspective greater weight, in order to
23 counteract their opposition's size and
24 resources. In the biblical story, David uses

1 that slingshot and miraculously wins the fight.
2 May the perspectives and priorities of the
3 "Davids" of the world win out in the end.

4 Thank you very much.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Dick Hage, to be
6 followed by Susan Ford.

7 MR. HAGE: Thank you for allowing me
8 to share my concerns. I'm Dick Hage, a 42-year
9 resident of Plymouth where I worked 41 years at
10 Plymouth State University. So, I address you
11 with a long perspective of the deeply negative
12 impact burial will have on the Town of Plymouth
13 and the University.

14 To truly appreciate the damage of
15 Northern Pass's burial proposal, you must
16 understand Plymouth's Main Street geography and
17 the decades-long and very thoughtful, over many
18 town meetings, the integration of community,
19 safety, business, cultural, aesthetic,
20 pedestrian, and vehicular considerations.

21 If you were to visit and experience
22 this integration, you would acknowledge the
23 linear nature of our narrow north-south Main
24 Street orientation with double-loaded parking,

1 critically little off-Main Street parking, very
2 limited east-west access and outlets, and a
3 bustling and vibrant North Country regional
4 service and cultural center for many thousands
5 beyond our 6,900 population.

6 With the University's 6,000 plus
7 enrollment, of which only 2,500 live on campus
8 and another 1,500 live in the town, that adds
9 2,000 plus daily commuters, in addition to
10 thousands of non-student commuters who come to
11 work, seek financial, insurance, medical,
12 personal care, specialty and necessity
13 shopping, regional schools, recreational,
14 cultural, sports, dining, entertainment, church
15 services, and many more needs. By one estimate
16 two decades ago, 60,000 people seek routine
17 services in Plymouth.

18 Plymouth is an incredibly vibrant
19 place, yet, because of our geography, we are
20 highly vulnerable to traffic disruptions the
21 magnitude of Northern Pass's burial proposal.
22 You have heard sad testimony of our losing
23 much-respected and highly-valued businesses due
24 to far less Main Street disruptions in our

1 past.

2 We, and you, have been informed by
3 Eversource that construction through our
4 business district would take a minimum of three
5 and up to four and a half months, and some road
6 sections completely closed for three to four
7 weeks. That would harm multiple businesses
8 that may also, like those before them, never
9 recover, and could irrevocably damage the
10 culture of our community and highly-valued
11 gathering places, such as our outdoor coffee,
12 ice cream, and restaurant venues, that you know
13 operate on as little as 3 percent profit
14 margin, already the very New Hampshire
15 businesses with the historically highest
16 attrition rates, regardless of construction
17 disruptions.

18 Northern Pass promises a single lane
19 of traffic on Main Street at all times. That
20 shallow thinking, derived from a complete lack
21 of understanding of Plymouth's pedestrian and
22 vehicular traffic patterns, major events, and
23 cherished culture, would significantly and
24 negatively impact many of our Main Street

1 businesses and Plymouth State University, and
2 would devastate those vulnerable to far more
3 minor disruptions.

4 And, of course, you need to also
5 carefully consider less economic, but more
6 important matters related to Americans with
7 Disabilities Act and human safety, in assuring
8 the timely and effective navigation of
9 ambulance, fire, police, and other emergency
10 response personnel and equipment.

11 More specifically related to the
12 University, hundreds to thousands of people
13 pour into Plymouth many times throughout the
14 year to attend convocation and commencement
15 ceremonies, Silver Center for the Arts
16 performances on Main Street, concerts on the
17 Common, multiple state high school championship
18 sporting events, weekly performances of the New
19 Hampshire Music Festival, summer sports camps,
20 professional conferences of all sorts
21 throughout the year, open houses and major
22 recruiting events, intercollegiate sports
23 competitions, and many more, many hundreds
24 more.

1 At the beginnings and ends of each
2 semester, the University works closely with the
3 town administrators and the safety officers to
4 work out traffic plans to minimize Main Street
5 congestion. And, with our best laid plans, it
6 is still common to see traffic back-ups on
7 I-93, given the geography of our narrow Main
8 Street and the limited route alternatives.

9 In short, for those and many other
10 good reasons you have heard, use of Plymouth's
11 Main Street is a completely misguided
12 proposition with devastating effects. So, I
13 ask you to please compare sane alternatives,
14 such as GSPL. And I ask you to please say "No"
15 to Northern Pass.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Susan Ford, to
18 be followed by Jack Gilchrist.

19 MS. FORD: Thank you. For the
20 record, my name is Susan Ford. I am a resident
21 of Easton and a former representative. I have
22 been following this issue since it started
23 seven years ago. Originally, the SEC process
24 did not consider the "public interest"

1 standard. This was a standard that was
2 discussed extensively as we reconfigured the
3 SEC siting process. While the "public
4 interest" standard is not defined as clearly as
5 you might like, it must reflect both the pros
6 and cons of every project.

7 When this Project started, it was
8 clear that PSNH thought they were dealing with
9 a bunch of "local yokels" from northern New
10 Hampshire that were just going to say "how
11 nice." The initial meetings I attended were
12 condescending and actually insulted the
13 intelligence of the residents in my area.

14 So, you know the arguments. I'm here
15 to just make some comments about what I've
16 heard over the last two public hearings.

17 First, the roads. We tell you we
18 can't deal with our roads being torn up for two
19 years. I spend lots of time in Concord, and I
20 know that Main Street, in Concord, was torn up
21 for two years. So, you may think "well, we did
22 it." However, even me, a non-Concord resident,
23 knew I could avoid Main Street construction by
24 traveling on Storrs Street, State Street, or

1 Green Street. There is one almost parallel
2 road to 116 in Franconia, and that's five miles
3 away. We can't go around the block. There are
4 no blocks. Serve the public interest and ask
5 Northern Pass to move to Plan B, or even Plan
6 X, Y, or Z. Bury the transmission lines along
7 I-93.

8 The first issue the New Hampshire
9 Legislature took up was eminent domain.
10 Eminent domain is not legal for stockholder
11 projects. Have you looked at the information
12 about the challenges of building along small
13 state roads? I have recently been introduced
14 to the term "unbuilt" roads. I don't know the
15 DOT definition of those roads. But, when the
16 July 1st storm came through Easton, and I could
17 see how those roads are built, they appear to
18 be cow paths with tar over them.

19 Route 116 is just too narrow to
20 accommodate burial of HVDC lines without
21 encroaching on public -- private property.
22 Think eminent domain; that's not legal in New
23 Hampshire for a project like this.

24 To serve the public interest, you

1 need to require Northern Pass to move to Plan B
2 and bury the transmission lines along I-93.

3 And then there's the tourism issue.
4 The tourism expert comes to New Hampshire from
5 Washington, and talks about traffic delays,
6 detours, and visual impacts. He doesn't
7 understand tourism in the North Country, and I
8 didn't either until I moved north. Most summer
9 tourism is from all those people hiking the
10 White Mountains. It's the magnificent views
11 that draw them to our area. It wasn't until
12 the Northern Pass issue came up that I went
13 back to the far northern region of New
14 Hampshire and realized what a spectacular area
15 it is. That's our heritage and New Hampshire
16 advantage. Don't destroy it.

17 When you see cars parked along the
18 side of the road, you know there is a hiking
19 path nearby. That's our tourism, and we depend
20 on that tourism. Would you build a second home
21 in Stewartstown that looks out at towers? Of
22 course you wouldn't, especially if technology
23 is available to allow burial of transmission
24 lines.

1 Technology exists to allow burial of
2 this entire Project. If you've ever had a
3 heart attack or cancer, do you go to a doctor
4 who is treating patients with 25 year-old
5 methodology? I feel the same way about this
6 Project.

7 I-93, an obvious corridor, is
8 available, and eliminates the possibility of
9 using eminent domain for a stockholder project.

10 Do you really think Massachusetts or
11 Concord -- Connecticut would allow 70 towers to
12 be built in Boston or Hartford? Why then in
13 Concord?

14 I'm not asking you to not feed the
15 New England grid. I'm asking that you first
16 support the public interest standard and look
17 at the alternatives that will satisfy and
18 support all the New Hampshire residents. Bury
19 the transmission lines along I-93.

20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jack Gilchrist,
22 and then we're going to take a ten-minute break
23 to allow the stenographer a chance to cool
24 down.

1 *[Short pause.]*

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jack Gilchrist
3 here? All right. I'm told Jack Gilchrist
4 isn't here.

5 So, we'll take our break now, ten
6 minutes, and then we'll resume.

7 (Recess taken at 10:29 a.m. and
8 the hearing resumed at 10:42
9 a.m.)

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Next
11 up is Maureen Ellingsen, to be followed by
12 Christine Pellegrini.

13 MS. ELLINGSEN: Good morning. My
14 name is Maureen Ellingsen, and my home is
15 located in a conservation zone in the Town of
16 Northfield. Like many people here today, I
17 oppose Northern Pass.

18 I wasn't born in New Hampshire, but
19 it has been my adopted state for over 30 years.
20 It's hard to understand why a project that
21 would destroy the natural beauty of this state
22 would be considered, especially when it will be
23 used to deliver power to southern New England,
24 not New Hampshire. Do you think that anyone in

1 southern New England will stop to think where
2 all that electricity came from and what was
3 destroyed in the process? I think not. The
4 more power we produce, the more power we'll
5 consume. Do we need more power or do we want
6 more power? There is a difference.

7 Northern Pass has agreed to bury some
8 of the line. However, New Hampshire's beauty
9 is not limited to those 60 miles. If the
10 towers are ugly in the White Mountain National
11 Forest, then I dare say they will be ugly along
12 the entire route.

13 Some years ago, when our neighbors
14 wanted to erect poles on our property to supply
15 electric service to their newly purchased land,
16 my husband and I asked if there were other
17 options available. The Co-op representative
18 said the lines could be buried, but at a
19 greater cost to our neighbors. Since we owned
20 the land where the poles would be located, we
21 declined access and the lines were buried.
22 Were our new neighbors happy? Probably not.
23 They made the mistake of assuming that we would
24 gladly let them trespass on our land in order

1 to save them money. Even though their bank
2 account may have been depleted more than they
3 had planned on, we considered it a win/win
4 situation. They got their electricity; we got
5 to keep our land intact.

6 Northern Pass wants this Project to
7 be approved. Millions of dollars have already
8 been spent to that end. So, I think we can
9 surmise that there will be a huge pot of gold
10 waiting for them if they succeed. Northern
11 Pass's profit margin may shrink if the line is
12 buried. But Northern Pass's profit margin,
13 like my neighbor's bank account, should not
14 determine whether this Project is approved.

15 Decisions often bring about
16 unintended consequences. This is a huge
17 project that will affect our whole state, not
18 just the North Country as its name implies.
19 Tourism, property values, employment,
20 environment, and people's health will all be
21 impacted. The supporters of this Project need
22 to be very careful what they wish for, because
23 we will all have to live with the consequences.
24 If this juggernaut is set in motion, there will

1 be no turning back.

2 Northern Pass will create a scar on
3 our beautiful state from Pittsburg to Franklin,
4 and then onto Deerfield. To me, and to many
5 others, that is unacceptable. Let's keep New
6 Hampshire beautiful for future generations.
7 Bury the lines or bury the Project.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Christine
10 Pellegrini, to be followed by Mary Parker
11 Worthen.

12 *[Short pause.]*

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is Christine
14 Pellegrini here? I'm told "no". How about
15 Mary Parker Worthen, to be followed by Rick
16 Fritz?

17 MS. WORTHEN: Good morning. My name
18 is Mary Parker Worthen. And I live on 75 Old
19 Stage Road, in Bristol, New Hampshire. And I
20 am opposed to the Northern Pass.

21 The proposed project will go right
22 through my property, and it is right out my
23 doorstep. I'm not sure if you can see the
24 photo that's out. But my family has lived and

1 farmed this property for over 100 years. And I
2 want to continue to do the same. My father and
3 grandfather both farmed this property since
4 1915. And we pasture animals out in these
5 fields where they want to put these lines. And
6 it is right out my doorstep.

7 And my father has put the majority of
8 our property into a conservation easement
9 within the Society for the Protection of New
10 Hampshire Forests. And he did this in 1990,
11 because he wanted to maintain the beauty of
12 this area. And with that, the location of my
13 farm, I cannot go back anywhere else or I
14 cannot put my house other than where it's at,
15 because the land behind it is an easement, and
16 directly in front of my house is going to be
17 the Northern Pass power lines. And I am afraid
18 that it's going to definitely ruin my view.
19 It's going to impact my animals that are
20 pasturing in that field.

21 And I just -- I have -- I have a
22 interest in doing weddings and venues that
23 would be, you know, we've had weddings there,
24 which were wonderful. But, if I get the

1 Northern Pass to go through, the towers are
2 going to be right there where you can't hide
3 them. And it just would impact me and my
4 future quite badly.

5 It has -- I just -- there's a
6 negative -- the irrevocable and negative change
7 that Northern Pass would bring to my doorstep
8 is just devastating to me. The history and the
9 quality and the stewardship that has been a
10 Worthen hallmark for over 100 years would be
11 forever lost to this close proximity and the
12 physical intrusion of the 100-foot steel
13 lattice towers, and the construction and loss
14 of the forest and rural setting in my area.

15 Peaked Hill Road was a -- was
16 designated a scenic road years ago, and it is
17 totally inappropriate for an industrial
18 overhead transmission line to be put up. I
19 urge the SEC to refuse the Northern Pass
20 Transmission its permit, because the Project is
21 totally -- totally disregards -- has a total
22 disregard for New Hampshire history, heritage,
23 and community. No private nor public industry
24 should have the right to destroy what has been

1 slowly and carefully built by people of New
2 Hampshire. And for what? Forty years of
3 electric power that passes through our state?

4 I believe that our homes and lands
5 are priceless in the stories they tell and the
6 values they reflect. Northern Pass is not in
7 the public interest. It has no value for those
8 of us who keep alive a legacy of land and
9 history for our children, our children's
10 children, and for generations of families to
11 come.

12 I urge the SEC to please refuse the
13 Northern Pass the permission to go along its
14 proposed path. It has alternative routes that
15 are more -- I believe more appropriate to use
16 than what they are proposing. It just would
17 ruin the State of New Hampshire if they
18 continue to do what they want to do. And I
19 think they should look for alternative routes
20 to take. And the whole route is bad for me,
21 but especially that it goes right through my
22 front yard, and it's within two football fields
23 of my front doorstep, will be these lines and
24 towers. And the noise, I am just afraid,

1 whether I hear it or subliminally hear it, it's
2 going to affect me and my animals. And I just
3 am concerned with that.

4 And I thank you for your time in
5 listening to me. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Rick Fritz. I
7 understand Andrew Renzullo has canceled. But
8 following Rick Fritz is Malia Ebel, who also
9 may not be here.

10 MR. FRITZ: Good morning. Thank you
11 so much for allowing me to speak. I grew up in
12 northwestern Connecticut, and went to college
13 in Boston, and, in that time, fell in love with
14 the White Mountains. And, after college, I
15 could have moved anywhere, well, I think I
16 could have moved anywhere, but I chose southern
17 New Hampshire, because of accessibility to not
18 only the Seacoast, but the mountains, hiking
19 and skiing, and what that allowed me to do.
20 And I chose to raise my family there. And the
21 hope is that my kids will choose the same
22 thing.

23 You know, I'm part of a large
24 community in southern New Hampshire that work

1 hard in southern New Hampshire, and, you know,
2 go up north to recharge, relax, and hike. You
3 know, we've hiked most of the 4,000-footers.
4 We ski every weekend up at Cannon. And that's
5 our livelihood. And there's a lot of people in
6 southern New Hampshire that do that.

7 We have since bought a second home up
8 in the White Mountains, and which allows us to
9 enjoy the mountains even more. And, you know,
10 that's what we do, and that's what a lot of our
11 friends do.

12 Living in Amherst, there was a
13 similar debate going on about 20 years ago with
14 cell towers. And, when I first had moved
15 there, the argument was we didn't want tall
16 towers, like Londonderry and Bedford did. And
17 the cell companies spent a lot of money trying
18 to fight us, because there was a lot of money
19 involved. And we kept saying "there's another
20 option", "there's another option". And we
21 ended up settling on smaller towers. A lot of
22 them look like Christmas trees. I know we
23 can't make these look like Christmas trees, but
24 they were small towers. And I have always

1 since had great cell coverage in southern New
2 Hampshire with smaller towers.

3 And the concern back then was a lot
4 of people talked about "you put these towers
5 up, and what happens when new technology comes
6 out? What are you doing to do, take the towers
7 down?" And people always said "Of course
8 they're not going to take the towers down."
9 And that's my similar concern with why, you
10 know, I oppose the Northern Pass, because what
11 happens when things change? They're not going
12 to come take the towers back down. Those
13 things will be there forever.

14 And I really believe that it will
15 prevent -- or, other people won't move up here
16 to do similar stuff to what I do. And, from a
17 personal side, I don't want to look at towers
18 when I'm hiking. I don't want to be a part of
19 that and see that.

20 So, I oppose the Northern Pass. It's
21 from a personal level, but I do think there's
22 an economic part of it as well. But it's
23 personally just to my enjoyment, my love of the
24 White Mountains. And I think it will make a

1 huge difference to people seeing those towers.

2 So, thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm told Malia
4 Ebel is not here. So, we're moving to Mark
5 Vincent, to be followed by Martha Richards.

6 *[Short pause.]*

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No Mark Vincent?
8 How about Martha Richards? Martha Richards
9 will be followed by Melissa Elander.

10 MS. RICHARDS: Good morning. I'm
11 Martha Richards of Holderness, formerly on a
12 right-of-way in Holderness, and a retired
13 four-term Grafton County Commissioner. While
14 in office, and with the current group of
15 commissioners, we all stand in complete
16 opposition to this Project. Even the late Ray
17 Burton told Hydro-Quebec to "pack up their
18 tents and go home".

19 By now, you have been inundated with
20 hundreds of comments and probably a 12-foot
21 high stack of documents, dealing with things
22 perhaps you never knew existed, all within a
23 year's time.

24 We, the orange opposition, have been

1 overwhelmed for the past seven years, fighting
2 this damnable, unwanted, unnecessary, for-greed
3 project. There has been amazing solidarity up
4 and down this 100-mile [180-mile?] telling
5 Eversource and Hydro-Quebec a big "No" to their
6 cockamamie plan for hundreds of outdated huge
7 transmission towers with a gazillion watts of
8 power for southern New England, raping and
9 pimping its way down New Hampshire's spine.

10 The hollow promises of new tax
11 payments, the dirty ForwardNH money, if a
12 community accepted the line, clean power, jobs,
13 and that ridiculous \$13 a year savings on my
14 electricity bill are the only -- are only some
15 of the deceitful practices foisted on what they
16 thought was a group of backwoods hillbillies.

17 Hydro-Quebec has already decimated
18 thousands of acres of the indigenous peoples'
19 land in Quebec, with their mammoth dams and
20 flooded regions that are releasing methane
21 gases from decomposing trees into our
22 atmosphere. The disappearance of their salmon
23 due to riverine changes from construction is
24 becoming a reality.

1 Many of our communities in Grafton
2 County, like Plymouth, are still experiencing
3 fragile economies. Though a former
4 commissioner, I am still fully aware of what
5 our towns will experience if their Main Streets
6 are ripped up and unpassable for months. Yet,
7 I-93 is a mere one-half mile from our downtown.
8 In our college and tourist town, it will be a
9 death knell for businesses. And empty
10 storefronts don't entice tourists, despite what
11 Julia Frayer tried to feed you in her report.
12 Gee, what a concept in economics, that, if one
13 town loses businesses, then shoppers would go
14 to the neighboring towns. So, who gives a damn
15 about our towns and our losses?

16 Complete burial down New Hampshire's
17 transportation corridors is the only logical
18 plan, if you approve Northern Pass's
19 Application. You have been told *ad nauseam*
20 about the environmental, real estate, scenic,
21 and safety issues. How much more do you need
22 to hear that this Project just is not suitable
23 in its current form, but, more importantly, is
24 not needed for reliability? Please really

1 listen, hear, and think about our comments from
2 the heart about the impact to thousands of us
3 from the Northern Pass Project and its greed as
4 it pushes its nefarious ways into our lives.
5 Let's show that, for once, New Hampshire can be
6 progressive, have a vision for our energy
7 future, be environmentally sensitive, and
8 either bury or deny the whole Project.

9 Fifty years from now your
10 grandchildren will hopefully still enjoy New
11 Hampshire's beauty. But, if you approve this
12 Project, you will have to live with its
13 consequences, which happened on your watch. Is
14 this what you really want to have happen?

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Melissa Elander,
17 to be followed by Stephen Pascucci.

18 MS. ELANDER: Hi. Thank you for this
19 opportunity. My name is Melissa Elander, and I
20 own a home along Route 116, in Easton, which is
21 part of the proposed burial route.

22 I would like to speak in opposition
23 to the Northern Pass as a property owner, whose
24 land borders the proposed route. And I would

1 also like to speak on behalf of 20,000 people
2 who have voiced their opposition to the Project
3 in two petitions that I'm presenting today. I
4 am one person, one story, and one voice, but I
5 stand here with 20,000 voices.

6 Over the last seven years, 14,000
7 paper petitions have been collected, and
8 they're on that dolly right there [indicating].
9 In addition, I created an online petition about
10 six months ago that's gathered 6,000
11 signatures, with 2,000 comments. These 20,000
12 signatures represent people who oppose this
13 Project and believe it will have negative
14 impacts to New Hampshire's tourism economy,
15 natural resources, and property values. It
16 will stifle the growth of local sustainable
17 energy projects, which would truly benefit
18 local economies by creating lasting jobs and
19 saving local people money, which would then be
20 put back into local businesses.

21 My husband Aaron and I own just over
22 one acre along Route 116, in Easton. It's a
23 relatively small space, but it represents our
24 largest investment and our greatest source of

1 equity. Our attachment to the place is deep.
2 We have a small lupine field that we planted
3 and a large fruit and vegetable garden between
4 our house and Route 116. We're devastated to
5 learn that this is part of a proposed staging
6 ground for work. And we also have major
7 concerns about how this will affect our
8 foundation, our well water, which is also our
9 neighbor's well water, and our property value.

10 I hope that you will hear my story
11 and consider how this will affect my life, but
12 I'm only one of thousands who will be
13 negatively impacted by this Project. And I'm
14 only one of 20,000 people who signed a
15 petition, because I believe this Project is not
16 for the public good. There are 20,000
17 signatures in opposition to the Northern Pass
18 here today, and this indicates that this
19 Project does not represent the values of many
20 New Hampshire citizens, visitors, and many
21 Eversource ratepayers, and it just does not
22 make sense for New Hampshire.

23 This Project is not worth the
24 long-term negative impact it will have on the

1 people and the communities that are most
2 directly affected by it. I oppose this Project
3 as one person deeply affected by it, and I
4 submit 20,000 signatures of people who stand
5 with me today in saying that this Project does
6 not benefit the towns and people of New
7 Hampshire.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Stephen
9 Pascucci, to be followed by Mark Templeton.

10 MR. PASCUCCI: Good morning. Thank
11 you for hearing me. My name is Stephen
12 Pascucci, Franklin, New Hampshire. Lived in
13 Franklin for sixteen years. And I want you to
14 know this issue was the number one determiner
15 in how I voted in the past election.

16 I've had it with humans treating
17 other humans as second rate citizens. I'm sure
18 somewhere there are people proud of how they
19 have been able to manipulate the First Nations
20 People, the political and judicial landscapes,
21 and citizens of New Hampshire. Such abject
22 treatment of the First Nations People is an
23 immediate deal-breaker. Regardless of how much
24 money is flowing into your pockets, no, this

1 isn't the price of progress. No, we don't have
2 to do this. After all the creating fear about
3 not modernizing and all the uproar about how
4 badly we need jobs, no, we don't have to break
5 promises and destroy people's homes and lives
6 so that we continue to progress. This is just
7 about a government corporation wanting a big
8 payday.

9 This Project does not modernize our
10 electric grid. Rather, it brings electricity
11 to and through our state across hundreds, if
12 not thousands of miles of power lines,
13 vulnerable to storms and other incidents,
14 increasing our susceptibility to sustained
15 power outages. Hydropower is an old-fashioned,
16 backwards manner of generating electricity that
17 is widely recognized to have many significant
18 negative impacts on the environment. In this
19 modern age, where we are moving to protect more
20 of our environment, we are removing dams, not
21 creating them.

22 A truly modern power grid would focus
23 on generating electricity from many smaller,
24 more local power sources. As solar continues

1 to decrease in cost, we and our New England
2 neighbors will continue to shift to solar. It
3 would behoove PSNH to get as early a start in
4 that direction as possible. That is where our
5 future lies. And I know a place in Franklin
6 that would be a great site for a solar park.
7 They can start there.

8 This is a project that keeps us in
9 the past, fueling conflicts with local
10 government over issues of net metering and cost
11 sharing. This is only going to get worse, and
12 you know it. Fewer and fewer people are going
13 to be shouldering higher and higher utility
14 costs until this gets passed off as a giant
15 weight on us taxpayers. That is unacceptable.

16 You want good jobs? Increase solar.
17 Stop acting like it can't be done. Stop acting
18 like, if we're against the power line, we are
19 against jobs. I'm against these jobs that
20 steal land from the First Nations People and
21 scar our environment. You should all be
22 against these types of jobs. You can make
23 other jobs; stop acting helpless.

24 I don't want to someday look back and

1 wonder "What the heck happened? How did it get
2 like this?" I don't want to someday be
3 debating in New Hampshire how we're going to
4 pay for dismantling old and dangerous towers
5 strangling our state with hundreds of miles of
6 power lines, useless, long after your contracts
7 have run dry. I don't want to be part of yet
8 another string of abuses handled -- handed out
9 to those who are easy to take advantage of.

10 Every hurtful and damaging project
11 becomes an excuse for the next hurtful and
12 damaging and clearly unwanted project, that
13 uses people and strips the land for the profit
14 of the few; that's illegal. When are we going
15 to have the integrity to say "we aren't going
16 to be a part of it, the buck stops here, and no
17 further"? The weight of public opinion is
18 clearly against this Project. Any approval
19 could only be interpreted as an open display of
20 corruption within a government that should be
21 hearing us and looking out for us.

22 There is a smarter, fairer, more
23 effective way to do this. We're not supposed
24 to be walking on the backs of others. We're

1 supposed to walk in consideration of others.

2 Thank you for your time.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mark Templeton,
4 to be followed by Arlene Stoppe.

5 MR. TEMPLETON: Good morning. My
6 name is Mark Templeton. And I appreciate the
7 time to be able to publicly give my opposition
8 to this project.

9 A lot of you might know that the
10 Northern Pass is more than just one power line
11 that goes through our state from Canada to
12 Deerfield. There is proposed upgrades and
13 infrastructure changes, the whole line --
14 existing line corridors in New Hampton, and
15 obviously the one going across 393. They're
16 planning on upgrading this infrastructure from
17 55-foot wooden H-frame towers, that are below
18 the tree level, and they're going to upgrade
19 these to the 100-foot plus, either the monopole
20 or the lattice infrastructure that they're
21 proposing for the Northern Pass. They're not
22 just installing one line. They're doing
23 upgrades, and they're going to increase height,
24 and it's going to be very visible. You know,

1 this -- you know, this is not in the public's
2 best interest, of having this kind of upgrade,
3 this very affects the aesthetics of our region.

4 And, you know, if you can see these
5 towers once they increase the height, you know,
6 I was kind of -- you know, I've been following
7 your SEC notes, your notes online, and you had
8 one of the -- the Society for the New Hampshire
9 Forests asked to have an example of a tree out
10 in your parking lot to give you a reference of
11 these heights. And that was a very good,
12 striking point, where I don't think you
13 understand that increasing these heights and
14 making them visually higher than the tree
15 lines, you may not see it from one perspective
16 standing at the road.

17 You know, in New Hampton, where I
18 live, you know, I look over that intersection
19 of Huckleberry Road, where the line comes
20 across that field. The existing towers are
21 below the tree level. And, when I go up on my
22 property, where I am building, I overlook the
23 Bridgewater ridgeline and the Bridgewater
24 mountains over, across the Pemigewasset River,

1 I can't see these 55-foot wooden towers.
2 They're invisible. And I never really noticed
3 these lines existed until the Northern Pass
4 Project started coming through. And they're
5 proposing upgrading those towers, installing
6 new towers at 100 plus, I'm going to see those.
7 Those are going to be highlighted, and they're
8 going to be blocking the ridgeline view for
9 myself and many other people in New Hampton,
10 especially in the Dana Hill regional area that
11 overlook that same Pemigewasset Valley. It's
12 not in our interest. It's going to affect the
13 aesthetics of our area.

14 Widening the corridors and decreasing
15 the vegetation buffer along that section in 93,
16 you're going to see, on 93 north, it's going to
17 be right there. There's going to be no trees,
18 and you're going to see both of those power
19 lines looming. And it's not the -- you know,
20 the aesthetics of what we want conveyed.
21 There's not a regional -- a local area that
22 makes it look rural, that's the appeal. We
23 don't need this industrial-looking tower.

24 So, there's examples of, you know,

1 poor construction processes. You know,
2 Eversource, you know, they're going to get
3 their contractors, and they're going to build
4 it in the least amount of money that it costs
5 them to build this. And these poor
6 construction practices and poor executions, you
7 know, and Eversource has been going through and
8 systematically increasing and replacing poles
9 and changing infrastructure across the whole
10 state.

11 And, for one example, in Laconia, on
12 Union Avenue, a couple years ago the City spent
13 millions of dollars and repaved the whole
14 street, redid all of the underground water and
15 sewer lines. Eversource was confronted and
16 asked "would you like to upgrade your lines at
17 this time?" And they said "No. We have no
18 plans to upgrade those lines." So, a year
19 later, Eversource comes through, they drill new
20 power line poles, and put new poles all the way
21 down the whole sub-line of that whole street.
22 Last winter, there was water coming out of the
23 ground where they drilled one of the new poles;
24 they struck the sewer line. Of course,

1 Eversource would have to pay for that. The
2 City went back and charged them. They came
3 back and tore up the new pavement and put a new
4 patch, a square where they patched the sewer
5 line. So, they just created more damage,
6 coming back and fixing something that they
7 didn't do right the first time.

8 And I'm just worried that, if
9 Northern Pass comes through, and goes through
10 the White Mountain National Forest and does
11 this drilling, they're going to do a very poor
12 job. They're going to ruin people's lives.
13 By, you know, either damaging their wells,
14 their septic systems, anything along that
15 route, where houses are right on that road. I
16 don't think they're going to do a very good
17 job.

18 And the fact that it's going to take
19 them, what, four or six seasons of doing the
20 construction? You know, that is way too long
21 to build this Project, and they're going to do
22 it very poorly. And I don't think that this is
23 in our best interest to allow them to do that.
24 And I implore you to say "No" to this Project.

1 Do them a favor, because the opposition is not
2 going to end with your decision. You know,
3 right now it's a regional problem and local
4 issues. And, if Northern Pass continues to be
5 built, you're going to find that this
6 opposition is going to go to the national
7 level. You know, just think of what -- like
8 the Dakota North Access Pipeline and all that
9 problem, all those protests happened, you may
10 see the same thing. So, do Northern Pass a
11 favor and say "No".

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Arlene Stoppe,
14 to be followed by Mary Centner.

15 MS. STOPPE: Hello. My name is
16 Arlene Stoppe, and I live in Ashland, New
17 Hampshire. I was born in New Hampshire, and
18 I've been a resident of New Hampshire my entire
19 life. I love my state. And I am totally
20 against this Project.

21 I rent out a house on Little Squam
22 Lake. It's a major part of my income. People
23 who come up to vacation in the Lakes Region,
24 they come to kayak and canoe and boat and hike

1 and bike, and they come for the views and the
2 scenery and the peaceful -- peacefulness of New
3 Hampshire.

4 See, the land in New Hampshire is not
5 flat. We have a lot of hills. We have a lot
6 of mountains. These towers 165 feet high,
7 above the Capitol building, 15 feet above the
8 Capitol building. Well, now you put that on a
9 hillside, and it's a lot taller than that.
10 There's going to be no way that these people
11 coming up to vacation in my town are not going
12 to see those towers when they're trying to
13 enjoy the scenic beauty of our state. This is
14 going to adversely affect my income. Who wants
15 to come up and see these towers everywhere you
16 look, when you're out there trying to enjoy the
17 scenery? Nobody that I know of.

18 My husband and I have done a lot over
19 the years with putting in solar hot water,
20 including hooking it up to furnaces, we have
21 done geothermal. We're in real estate, so we
22 have apartment buildings. And this is the
23 direction that New Hampshire should be going,
24 rather than these towers and this form of

1 electricity. And my father has worked his
2 entire life for the electric company.

3 This is definitely going to be very
4 destructive for our downtown areas, tearing up
5 the little Town of Ashland, and every other
6 little town and cities in New Hampshire to put
7 these things right down the middle of our
8 towns. We don't have a lot of streets in
9 Ashland, we don't have a lot of population in
10 Ashland. We don't have any big buildings in
11 Ashland. And these towers are going to be so
12 far above the highest building in my town, it's
13 going to be a major scar. I urge you please
14 not to let this Project go through.

15 Thank you very much.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mary Centner, to
17 be followed by David Dobbins.

18 MS. CENTNER: Hello. First, I would
19 like to thank you for the opportunity to be
20 here. I'm Mary Centner, from Lost Nation Road,
21 Groveton, Town of Northumberland. We have
22 lived there about fifteen and a half years. I
23 have four major areas of concern.

24 Number one: Our house is

1 approximately 1,000 feet from the Lost Nation
2 power substation Eversource ROW containing the
3 PNGTS natural gas pipeline and Coos loop, which
4 borders our property line, a major wetland land
5 area supporting wildlife.

6 In The 2016 Town of Northumberland
7 Assessment of Transmission Line Proposal
8 Report, this report notes that this area, a
9 large wet -- northern wetland complex, it says
10 number 1 -- or, Concern Area Number 1 for
11 damaging environmental impact. Three brooks,
12 Ames, Roaring and Moore Brooks merge and flow
13 under the ROW. And there's more to that, but
14 I'm also submitting a copy of materials and
15 websites.

16 Further environmental concerns are
17 the impact of the Northern Pass power lines
18 project on wetlands and their relationship to
19 the native wildlife and species of concern.
20 Burying the lines will not dismiss -- diminish
21 the major disruption of the area. Pages 9 and
22 10 of the town report show the maps, and Pages
23 6 and 7 the explanation of areas contained in
24 the maps.

1 Other attachments related to the
2 environment are as follows: New Hampshire Fish
3 & Game List of Endangered and Threatened
4 Wildlife of New Hampshire. I've also referred
5 to another report put together by this
6 interagency government effort, it's called the
7 "Impacts of Transmission Lines on Birds in
8 Flight". This is a lengthy report. So, I just
9 am submitting some excerpts. However, you can
10 get the complete report on the website. It is
11 most interesting in its impact on birds and
12 migration.

13 Number two: The safety issue. This
14 ROW has an existing natural gas pipeline.
15 There is a safety issue of building such high
16 towers over an existing natural gas pipeline.
17 A helicopter flies over frequently checking for
18 leaks at low altitude, and the towers could
19 conflict with his job. The consequences of
20 this could be collisions and undetected leaks
21 resulting in unforeseen problems. This concern
22 has also been expressed by other neighbors as
23 well.

24 The Coos Loop, as I mentioned before,

1 also runs through the ROW, raising the question
2 of "how many towers, along with the existing
3 pipeline, can fit into the existing space?"

4 Again, whether you bury the lines or
5 not, this is still a real safety concern. Our
6 property is in current use and borders this
7 ROW. How this will affect our property and/or
8 how much space they will need for this Project
9 is also unclear.

10 Number three: The threat to human
11 health from living near power lines has been
12 scientifically proven, and is especially
13 dangerous if you live within a thousand feet of
14 the towers. Childhood leukemia is only one of
15 the many disorders attributed to high power
16 transmission lines. Others include
17 neurodegenerative disorders, Alzheimer's
18 disease, brain cancer, DNA damage, sleep,
19 metabolic disorders, headaches, and
20 reproductive disorders, to name a few. Even
21 low exposure levels have been shown to cause
22 damage to cells. Again, please refer to the
23 Conclusions from the 2012 Bioinitiative Report,
24 and more information can be found on their

1 website, at www.bioinitiative.org. And I'm
2 also -- I've submitted that in my written
3 materials.

4 Another article related to that is EM
5 WATCH "Living Close to Power Lines",
6 www.emwatch.com.

7 Number four: This is also important.
8 I don't have a lot of time to get to it, but
9 the economic feasibility. See the article "The
10 Shock of Cheap Gas", from Bloomberg/
11 Businessweek Magazine and comments by Thomas
12 Centner, my husband, over there, mentioned --
13 okay. Tom was employed by American Electric
14 Power Service Company, it was a Middle Western
15 electric company. They were involved in
16 electric demand forecasting, and to cut the
17 need for unnecessary power plants. Based upon
18 his experience, the Project is unwise.

19 Number one, you have this flood of
20 cheap gas; two, solar power/wind power, cuts
21 demand; efficient electric appliances; four,
22 competing transmission line for National Grid
23 leads to glut of electricity. Because of these
24 above things I just mentioned, this Project

1 will lead to a glut of electricity causing a
2 poor rate of return and/or uncertain rate of
3 return.

4 To summarize this whole thing, the
5 Northern Pass Project will forever alter the
6 natural beauty of the landscape, threaten
7 wildlife, be harmful to our health, and disrupt
8 our way of life. Many questions still remain
9 about who will bear the brunt of the cost, the
10 temporary nature of the construction jobs,
11 criteria to burying only some of the lines,
12 when other states, in Vermont and Maine, are
13 building similar power lines underground, and
14 many other open issues that haven't been
15 addressed.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: David Dobbins,
18 to be followed by Pamela Martin.

19 MR. DOBBINS: Good morning, members
20 of the Site Evaluation Committee and fellow New
21 Hampshire citizens. My name is David Dobbins
22 and I'm a resident of Gilford, New Hampshire.

23 I'm here in opposition to the
24 proposed Northern Pass Project. Our Town of

1 Gilford is not anywhere near the proposed
2 Northern Pass Project transmission corridor,
3 nor do I own any property that is directly
4 affected by the proposed line.

5 The Site Evaluation Committee has
6 been given an important task and a great
7 opportunity. This is one of those defining
8 moments, a legacy moment, where we, as a state,
9 get to shape what our future looks like.

10 The proposed Northern Pass Project
11 remains an unnecessary commercial venture that
12 seeks to link a foreign-controlled power source
13 with southern New England states using New
14 Hampshire as a conduit. A project of this
15 nature, on such an industrial scale, cutting
16 through so many communities, with a span of
17 192 miles, is unprecedented in our small state.
18 As such, it should not be viewed as just
19 another transmission line, but instead with
20 serious consideration for how this expansive,
21 industrial-scale commercial development would
22 affect the very nature of our state. The
23 sense-of-place and way-of-life that so many
24 citizens and visitors alike enjoy will be

1 forever altered if this proposed Project is
2 ever constructed in its current form.

3 One of the most critical aspects of
4 this proposed Project is the precedent that
5 siting it would mean to our future. There have
6 been several areas of northern New England that
7 have been identified as great sources for wind
8 power and other forms of renewable energy. Of
9 course, these areas are distant from the
10 metropolitan load centers and will need new
11 transmission lines to connect them. These
12 corridors could be developed through commercial
13 ventures like the proposed Northern Pass.

14 Given the commercial venture nature
15 of the proposed Northern Pass Project, the
16 State of New Hampshire should require that this
17 Project, and all others to follow, be
18 constructed entirely underground so as to avoid
19 any of the detrimental aspects that accompany
20 overhead transmission lines.

21 As a citizen, I appreciate the task
22 that has been given to this Committee. But I
23 also appreciate the fear and uncertainty that
24 owners of properties all along the proposed

1 transmission line corridor have been living
2 under for close to seven long years. I hope
3 you can appreciate how difficult it must be to
4 have everything that you've worked for, your
5 heritage, and now your future, put under the
6 shadow of this proposed Project. Imagine for a
7 moment that these unnecessary industrial-scale
8 high-voltage lines are proposed to run adjacent
9 to your property. Wouldn't you fight for your
10 family? Wouldn't you push for a better
11 alternative? And wouldn't you expect your
12 government to protect you from unnecessary
13 harm?

14 This Project is not necessary for New
15 Hampshire. This Project is not right for New
16 Hampshire. If it were ever to be allowed,
17 there are other viable, full-burial
18 alternatives available, as identified in the
19 U.S. DOE Draft Environmental Impact Statement
20 conducted on this proposed Project. I ask the
21 Site Evaluation Committee to deny this
22 Application, because it's a commercial venture
23 that is not necessary, and its "promises" do
24 not outweigh its costs to New Hampshire.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Pamela Martin,
3 to be followed by Patricia Schlesinger.

4 MS. MARTIN: Good morning.
5 Eversource has used the word "clean" to
6 describe Northern Pass. The water in the
7 rivers and reservoirs of northern Quebec
8 certainly do look clean in the pictures. But
9 industrial hydro, just like fossil fuels,
10 release harmful emissions -- carbon emissions
11 into the atmosphere and high latitude dams,
12 like Hydro-Quebec, also release the neurotoxin
13 methylmercury into the rivers killing wildlife
14 and fish and endangering indigenous people
15 dependent upon food from the rivers.

16 New Hampshire does not have a
17 classification for clean energy, but we do have
18 one for renewable energy, and industrial
19 hydroelectricity does not qualify. Renewable
20 Energy has a specific definition. In fact, the
21 New Hampshire Legislature defined it in 2009 in
22 HB 61, and that bill stated we must consider
23 the impact that energy has on the environment.

24 The Government's Energy Information

1 Administration states sustainable energy must
2 "create and maintain the conditions under which
3 humans and nature can exist in productive
4 harmony." According to Chief René Simon of the
5 Pessamit Innu Band Council, the cumulative
6 effects of the Quebec-New Hampshire
7 interconnection will have "a terminal effect on
8 salmon productivity". The rivers diverted by
9 Hydro-Quebec, once teeming with life, are
10 basically becoming sterile. This is not what
11 you would call "productive harmony".

12 Eversource has stated Northern Pass
13 would result in \$3.3 million tons of carbon
14 emission reductions in New England. I can't
15 verify that number, but, even if that's
16 correct, 3.3 million tons is a drop in the
17 bucket, because Hydro-Quebec emits
18 approximately 104 million metric tons of
19 greenhouse gases every single year. Greenhouse
20 gas emissions don't recognize state or national
21 boundaries. Whether the gases are released in
22 Canada or New Hampshire, it doesn't matter. By
23 partnering with Hydro-Quebec, Northern Pass is
24 just as responsible for pollution and

1 environmental destruction as Hydro-Quebec.

2 The towns of Fitzwilliam,
3 Moultonboro, Peterborough, North Swanzey,
4 Hinsdale, and many other communities in New
5 Hampshire and all over the United States are
6 building their own community solar arrays. The
7 electricity generated by these systems power
8 town facilities, and the excess power is sent
9 to the electric grid. Solar is becoming more
10 flexible, cost-effective, and efficient every
11 year.

12 Advances in solar and wind energy,
13 battery storage, compost, algae, and other
14 innovative technologies supplied by
15 decentralized sources are the future of
16 renewable energy. Not a thousand miles, 192
17 miles of which would be in New Hampshire, of
18 outdated power lines transmitting non-renewable
19 energy from another country. Eversource is
20 living in the past. It's like they're still
21 manufacturing buggy whips in the automotive age
22 and discouraging innovation.

23 If environmentally harmful monster
24 projects like Northern Pass are approved, it

1 makes it so much harder for actual renewable
2 locally distributed energy projects to get
3 done. Town governments and citizens find it
4 impossible to justify the cost for real
5 renewable distributed energy projects when a
6 non-renewable project, such as Northern Pass,
7 monopolizes the field.

8 I am -- I will be submitting to you a
9 list of 24 environmental agencies that concur
10 that industrial hydroelectricity is not just
11 harmful, but devastating to the environment.

12 This is not just an economic issue or
13 a political issue; this is a moral issue. It's
14 a test of our values as New Hampshire citizens.
15 What does it say about us if we are indifferent
16 to the devastation of an entire ecosystem just
17 so we can lower our electricity bills by less
18 than \$20 a month?

19 Their own consultant has admitted
20 that Northern Pass will not significantly
21 reduce our energy bills, and the "clean" label
22 they have slapped on this Project is misleading
23 and specious. There is nothing about Northern
24 Pass that's in the public interest. The

1 savings are insignificant, it is destructive to
2 the environment, it would be a permanent blight
3 on our landscape, and would cause enormous
4 disruption to personal property and our
5 communities during construction.

6 Northern Pass is not a solution to
7 anything. Northern Pass is a huge problem.
8 Approving Northern Pass would be a betrayal of
9 the people and the environment.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Patricia
11 Schlesinger, to be followed by Kerry
12 Motiejaitis.

13 MS. SCHLESINGER: Good morning,
14 Committee. And I want to thank everyone here
15 for the education they have given me this
16 morning.

17 My name is Pat Schlesinger, from New
18 Hampton. I'm 45 years on the Conservation
19 Commission and former president of the
20 Pemigewasset River Council. At 88, I have seen
21 and experienced angst for years over town and
22 river protection. And Northern Pass is no
23 help. The Pemi, a forever north-south highway,
24 has a two plus miles portage in southern

1 reaches of the town called the "Long Carry",
2 skirting intense river rapids and today's Ayers
3 Island Dam; it's a good haul, recorded in
4 Captain Peter Powers 1754 Journal, town
5 histories, and a modern novel Look to the
6 Mountain. A '94 EIS of the dam area indicates
7 six prehistoric and four historic archeological
8 sites, and 40 other similar sites, all
9 unexplored. And we hope to change that with
10 current interest from PSU and New Hampshire's
11 archeologist.

12 While progress, and we must use that
13 word carefully, meant factories and treatment
14 plants along the Pemi, their discharges rang a
15 death knell: For 40 years, into the '70s, the
16 "putrid, paint-peeling Pemi" wore paint off
17 Bristol homes overnight. Hundreds of floating
18 islands sailing downstream were a constant.
19 Some was factory discharge, but too many were
20 mounds of turds, and not animal scat either. A
21 battle ensued in Concord, led by Senator Ed
22 Bennett of Bristol and New Hampton's Tom Urie,
23 and until they found federal funding to modify
24 treatment plants and erring factories closed;

1 Lincoln was the last, in 1980. But now we
2 could sit back and enjoy a sparkling river,
3 right? Wrong.

4 A clean river meant planning boards
5 bombarded; in '85, New Hampton had a request
6 for 35 shorefront homes, 30 feet apart, and the
7 Conservation Commission had a bid for gravel
8 excavation of a 100-foot river hillside that
9 would also fill an osprey wetland. New Hampton
10 called nine river towns to meet in January '86
11 and discussed a riverside corridor of 500 feet
12 on both sides of the river, with nothing closer
13 than 125 feet to the water. The next meeting
14 in February, Ashland's Phil Preston came armed
15 with specifics of a "Pemi Overlay Zoning". New
16 Hampton passed the Overlay very shortly, and
17 others followed, some with variations; the
18 first-ever New Hampshire protected shoreland.

19 And then the radio announcement:
20 Governor John Sununu was to give \$10,000 to the
21 Office of State Planning to look at river
22 shorelines. Ten seconds later my phone rang:
23 OSP sought our Pemi Overlay Zoning. So, we
24 knew we had something. But no offer of any of

1 the \$10,000.

2 Were we recognized? Indeed, the
3 Lakes Region Planning Commission gave us the
4 first Kim Ayers Award, and President George H.
5 W. Bush, the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation
6 Award. A successful, in 1992, Federal Wild &
7 Scenic designation of "recreational" for the
8 whole Pemi River was declared, but not accepted
9 by all, so denied to all. And, ironic today,
10 the towns voting against the Wild & Scenic back
11 then will have the Northern Pass line
12 underground, while we others get it above, with
13 some taller posts and additional river
14 crossings. By the way, a Military Air EIS of
15 '92 might be of interest to Eversource.

16 So, if we must have Eversource, and
17 those lines go above ground, in New Hampton or
18 anywhere, not under 93, are we to be shat upon
19 again?

20 I thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Kerry
22 Motiejaitis.

23 MS. MOTIEJAITIS: She's going to be a
24 tough act to follow.

1 Good day, everyone. My name is Kerry
2 Motiejaitis. And I'd like to thank you for the
3 time to listen to a list of concerns I put
4 together.

5 My husband Brian and I reside on Bear
6 Rock Road, in Stewartstown. We have lived
7 there for the last 19 years. We are full-time
8 caregivers for two developmentally disabled
9 gentlemen that live in our home full time.

10 It is my understanding that the
11 Northern Pass Project's plan is to put
12 Substation Number 4 686 feet from our home, and
13 200 feet from our property line. It appears
14 that the plan is to blow up extreme amounts of
15 ledge, removing what little bit of topsoil
16 exists up there.

17 I am concerned about the runoff
18 spilling over to our property causing possible
19 flooding or pollution of the West Branch of the
20 Mohawk River.

21 I am concerned about the amount of
22 traffic from oversized construction vehicles on
23 our tight squeezed dirt road, also used as an
24 ATV trail.

1 I am concerned about road closures
2 and how they're going to impact our travel to
3 work.

4 I am concerned construction will also
5 cause delays for any emergency vehicles that
6 may be called to our area.

7 I am concerned, where are these
8 construction vehicles going to park, while
9 they're up there doing their work?

10 I am concerned about where they're
11 going to crush the ledge. Are we going to have
12 to listen to all of this?

13 I am concerned about how many
14 truckloads of debris are going to be hauled,
15 and the impact it will have on our already
16 deteriorating roads. And where is all this
17 debris going to be hauled to?

18 I am concerned about where the debris
19 is going to land when the blasting begins. Are
20 our homes safe? Are my husband, myself, the
21 gentlemen that live with us safe? Is our well,
22 our septic safe? Are our neighbors safe? Are
23 our pets and our wildlife safe?

24 I am concerned about all the

1 concrete, steel, wires, etcetera, being hauled
2 in causing more delays and more deterioration
3 of our road.

4 I am concerned about the hot and cold
5 spots left under the paved and dirt portions of
6 our road and how this will affect winter travel
7 for us.

8 I am really concerned that this is an
9 already done deal, and that my opinion means
10 nothing.

11 And I'm absolutely concerned that the
12 Bear Rock Road that I live on, and have lived
13 on for the last 19 years, will never be the
14 same country road it is now. There are reasons
15 why people settle up there.

16 I would like to close by saying "why
17 does this need to be the location for
18 Substation Number 4?" With all of the property
19 Northern Pass owns up in our area, Substation
20 Number 4 could easily be located further down
21 Heath Road where no one resides. Or, better
22 yet, why can't Northern Pass bury the entire
23 project? I just hope it isn't too late to do
24 the right thing.

1 Thank you for your time.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. That
3 is the list of people who had registered. Is
4 there anyone who preregistered who wasn't here
5 when their name was called?

6 *[No indication given.]*

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
8 We've got time for some walk-ins, roughly five
9 or six. I'm just going to call them in the
10 order in which they signed in.

11 Scott Gahan. All right. While he is
12 coming up, is Mark McCulloch here? Yes? No?

13 *[Indication given.]*

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do you want to
15 speak? Okay. You'll be next.

16 MR. GAHAN: Hello. Yes. My name is
17 Scott Gahan, spelled G-a-h-a-n.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Where do you
19 live, Mr. Gahan?

20 MR. GAHAN: Excuse me?

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Where do you
22 live?

23 MR. GAHAN: Hampton, New Hampshire.
24 I live in Hampton, New Hampshire. We have a

1 second home in Jefferson. I grew up my whole
2 life in New Hampshire. I'm a third generation
3 of New Hampshire, and my son who's with me
4 today is a fourth generation from New
5 Hampshire.

6 My mother who just passed away
7 February 21st, 2017, at 95, was my inspiration.
8 She taught me all about nature and the weather.
9 She just loved the North Country of New
10 Hampshire. She lived here her entire life in
11 New Hampshire. At 85, she jumped out of a
12 plane, and, at 90, she did the zipline at
13 Wildcat with her grandson. But, more than
14 anything, she taught me to fight for what I
15 believe in and what is right. She would ask me
16 how that "Pass" thing was going. I told her we
17 were fighting as hard as we could. She said
18 "never give up." So, that's why I said to
19 myself "I need to do more."

20 So, on June 22nd through the 25th of
21 this year, for three or four hours each day, I
22 sat at the Appalachian Trailhead on Route 2,
23 with my son, in Randolph, to get hikers to sign
24 my petition to stop Northern Pass. I was

1 amazed at people's comments, but, more so, how
2 many of them said "we come here for the view".
3 I got 267 signatures, of which approximately 75
4 percent were from out-of-state, spending their
5 tourist dollars here.

6 So, in concluding, I would say, so
7 why would we put an ugly scar on our state that
8 would make them take their tourist dollars
9 elsewhere, when there is no benefit to the
10 state or its people?

11 Thank you very much for your time.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mark McCulloch.
13 Is Elaine Kellerman here?

14 MS. KELLERMAN: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You want to
16 speak? All right. You'll be next.

17 MR. McCULLOCH: My name is Mark
18 McCulloch. I'm from North Strafford, New
19 Hampshire.

20 The gal that delivered these, does
21 any of you feel a lump in your throat when she
22 was talking? You should have.

23 For seven years I've watched this
24 happen. I've heard it all. I've seen people

1 in these audience -- in this audience that have
2 been fighting this thing for seven years. They
3 put their hearts and souls into trying to come
4 up with ways of convincing the State of New
5 Hampshire and its elected officials to do the
6 right thing.

7 You've heard it all. And how long
8 have you been here? A couple of years involved
9 in this? Try seven years. You don't have no
10 idea how much this can ruin your lives. You
11 could hear it in the gal's voice who collected
12 20,000 petitions. This is ridiculous to put
13 citizens of the State of New Hampshire through
14 this process for this long.

15 All I've got to say is, yes, you have
16 heard it all. You know what's right and what's
17 wrong.

18 Since this Project has happened, my
19 wife and I installed solar; 75 percent of my
20 home and my business's power is produced by
21 solar. I know of other projects that are going
22 to go through. I look across the river and I
23 see that National Grid line. I know that
24 there's potential for towers to go through this

1 that are going to be taller, and I'm going to
2 see them.

3 That is nothing compared to what
4 these people that were sitting over here have
5 gone through. Can you imagine yourselves
6 getting pushed around like Hydro-Quebec has
7 done to these people? It's ridiculous.

8 For these businesses to say that they
9 need this power to support their -- support
10 their business. I've got one thing to say to
11 any one of those people that say they need this
12 Hydro-Quebec power: Go solar, stupid.

13 I have made a complete ass of myself
14 at times at hearings. I've slammed podiums.
15 And I'm sick of it. And I'm sure the people
16 that have been working way harder than I have
17 are sick of this, too.

18 When you get ready to raise your hand
19 or to vote, you listen to that lump in your
20 throat and in your heart, and you vote the
21 right way. You will never forgive yourself
22 later on if you do the wrong thing.

23 Have a good day.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Kellerman.

1 Is Douglas Whitbeck here? Douglas Whitbeck?

2 Yes. And you're interested in speaking?

3 MR. WHITBECK: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

5 You'll be next.

6 MS. KELLERMAN: Wow. That man had
7 passion. I came up here hoping to give you
8 some passion of my own, but I don't know how I
9 could possibly follow that. But I'll just tell
10 you very simply what I have to say.

11 My name is Elaine Kellerman. I'm
12 from Concord, how about that. I am opposed to
13 Northern Pass. I submitted written testimony
14 long, long ago, when it was first possible to
15 do so. But I wanted to take advantage of this
16 last opportunity to verbally state to you my
17 position.

18 I'm an abutter of the Northern Pass
19 route. I live in Alton Woods, which is an
20 apartment complex, on the east side of town, by
21 the mall. The towers, if erected, would be
22 literally in my backyard. I could walk there
23 probably two minutes flat, or plus.

24 But, more importantly, I want to talk

1 about the state, my state, my adopted state.
2 They would irreparably scar my adopted state.
3 I am a native of Kansas city, Missouri. I
4 moved here about ten years ago. We don't
5 choose where we're born, we just pop into the
6 world, but I chose, I was lucky enough, my
7 husband and I were lucky enough to move to my
8 chosen state. And we came here because of its
9 beauty. It's beauty. I was drawn here by
10 trees, by mountains, by the ocean, by views.

11 Sometimes I don't really believe that
12 people who live here truly appreciate what they
13 have. I just don't think you do. I'm not
14 trying to belittle my home state, it has its
15 advantages and its high points. But you have
16 something here that very few other states have.
17 You have to hold on to that, preserve it,
18 protect it, hold it close to your heart. You
19 have to stand tall for your state. It's your
20 state. You don't want to trade away its
21 beauty.

22 It's inconceivable to me that you
23 would allow Northern Pass to permanently scar
24 the state, like a surgical scar down the center

1 of it. I can't really even fathom that you
2 would consider such a thing. Honestly don't
3 know how you could sleep at night knowing that
4 you permitted the destruction of views for the
5 living and the future generations of your
6 state, and those who visit it and admire it.

7 So, I'm asking you to stand up for
8 New Hampshire. Stand up to the majesty of your
9 state, for its irreplaceable loveliness that
10 you will not be able to get back if this
11 Project goes through. Please think about that.

12 Thank you so much for your time.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitbeck.
14 Steve Fox, you want to speak? Okay. You'll be
15 next.

16 MR. WHITBECK: Mr. Chairman, members
17 of the Committee, thank you for the chance to
18 speak. I'm Douglas Whitbeck, from Mason, New
19 Hampshire.

20 I'm sure you have been presented with
21 reams of paper and loads and loads of numbers
22 in an attempt to justify the benefits of this
23 Project. Let me say that there are huge costs
24 which do not show up on balance sheets. The

1 cost to the First Nations People, who came to
2 speak to us today. Their huge cultural cost
3 imposed on them, against the laws of Canada, by
4 the Province of Quebec, referenced by
5 Representative Guida earlier today. And, yet,
6 if we accept this Project, we then become
7 complicit in those costs. For what? Thirteen
8 dollars off our electric bill?

9 There is also a huge environmental
10 cost, which people have spoken about today.
11 There are costs to the people along the route,
12 that these are not to be minimized, but they
13 pale in comparison to the environmental cost
14 experienced by our neighbors to the north.

15 And, because those costs do not show
16 up on a balance sheet, and because the costs
17 are up there, with other people, does not
18 justify ignoring them. Please consider that
19 when making your decision.

20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Steve Fox. The
22 next name is Geoff, I'm guessing the last name
23 is "Dacy"?

24 MR. DALY: Daly.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Daly". Okay.
2 You want to speak?

3 MR. DALY: I want to speak, yes.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You'll be next.

5 MR. FOX: Good morning, Mr. Chairman
6 and members of the Committee. Thank you for
7 this opportunity to speak.

8 Before I get into my prepared
9 remarks, I just want to make two observations.
10 One is, I am very pleased to see the bipartisan
11 response from our legislative members in
12 opposition to this Project. And the second is,
13 at the outset, Mr. Chairman, you mentioned the
14 large number of written responses you received,
15 and the 11 to 12 against, compared to those in
16 favor. That's been my observation. Also, we,
17 my wife and I and our family, we drive up north
18 every year, along Route 3. We vacation up in
19 Pittsburg. And all along there you see signs
20 against, at least 11 or 12 percent or higher
21 against this Project. You see signs like "Live
22 Free or Fry", "No to Northern Pass", my
23 personal favorite "Northern Pass-Kiss my
24 Donkey". So, I'm happy to see that there is a

1 lot of opposition to this, and I've learned
2 several things.

3 I oppose this Project. I'm a
4 resident of Concord. I oppose this Project on
5 many points, but I'm going to talk about the
6 aesthetic points in my presentation.

7 I've been a resident of Concord for
8 25 years, over 25 years, and the majority of
9 that time I've lived in East Concord. I will
10 not be able to see the proposed Northern Pass
11 Transmission towers from my house. However,
12 should the Project be built, and should it be
13 built using the Eversource preferred designed,
14 I will be able to see it on a daily basis. I'm
15 a cyclist. I ride my bike on Mountain Road,
16 Hoyt Road, Sanborn Road, Shaker Road, Oakhill
17 Road, and Portsmouth Street regularly,
18 sometimes daily. I walk through the Broken
19 Ground area of East Concord, a good portion of
20 which the City has wisely preserved. I shop at
21 the stores near the mall.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Fox, slow
23 down just a little.

24 MR. FOX: Thank you. I shop at the

1 stores near the mall. If Eversource's
2 preferred design is built, I will not be able
3 to escape seeing it on a daily basis, and,
4 frankly, being angered by its aesthetics.

5 I'm not an Eversource customer. I am
6 not an Eversource investor. I frankly don't
7 care if Eversource is profitable and makes the
8 highest possible return on its investment for
9 its stock -- excuse me -- shareholders.

10 I am, however, a resident of Concord,
11 and I do care whether my city, and, in
12 particular, its rural areas remain pleasing to
13 my eye, and to the eyes of anyone who resides
14 in the city, visits the city, or enjoys its
15 outdoor areas.

16 At the Site Evaluation Committee
17 hearing on March 10th, 2016, here in Concord, I
18 submitted a two-part question, which asked
19 about the return on investment should the
20 Eversource line be built as proposed, or if the
21 line were completely buried. From the
22 Eversource representatives, the answer to the
23 first part of the question was there would be a
24 \$90 million return in the first year and

1 declining over the life of the line, if it was
2 built as proposed. The answer to the second
3 question was they would actually make more
4 money if the line was buried, assuming they
5 could find the folks to pay for it. However,
6 they did not think Hydro-Quebec or the
7 customers in the three states that have
8 indicated interest in receiving the benefits of
9 that power, and those I take to mean
10 Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut,
11 would be willing to pay for it.

12 That leaves me wondering why the
13 State of New Hampshire should have to pay an
14 exceedingly large cost, that being an almost
15 200-mile laceration stitched together by steel
16 vertical structures, which would surely
17 discolor and rust over time.

18 I also wonder why any representation
19 of the proposed Eversource preferred design is
20 absent from the Executive Summary submitted to
21 this Committee, to the Public Utilities
22 Commission, rather than -- rather in the photos
23 in that document they included two beautiful
24 forest streams, another of a beautiful forest

1 and mountain ridge, and one of downtown
2 Franklin. No towers or transmission lines were
3 to be found anywhere in these photos. Rather,
4 the sole photo of any towers included two line
5 workers walking beneath the same type of wooded
6 towers currently found in the proposed
7 transmission route.

8 For a real representation of what the
9 Eversource preferred design would look like, I
10 invite people to use Google Earth and to find
11 ground-level views of, I may mispronounce this,
12 Trois-Rivieres, or other localities in Quebec
13 which are crossed by Hydro-Quebec transmission
14 lines.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Fox, please
16 try to wrap up.

17 MR. FOX: Unfortunately, these visual
18 images look like nothing like the streams,
19 forests, or mountain ridge seen in the summary
20 information submitted by Eversource. And,
21 instead, what we find are neighborhoods with
22 houses which are dramatically dwarfed by large
23 transmission towers in their backwards.

24 In conclusion, we, in Concord, and in

1 the remainder of the state, do not need
2 Northern Pass. It will be an eyesore if built
3 as proposed.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Next
6 up is Geoff Daly. Is Peggy Huard still here?
7 Yes. You'll be next. I assume you want to
8 speak, right?

9 MS. HUARD: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

11 MR. DALY: Good morning, Mr.
12 Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the SEC
13 Committee. I gave testimony back in June, and
14 have subsequently found out that subsequent
15 testimony given by Dr. Henshaw questioning Dr.
16 Bailey on EMF, nowhere within Eversource's data
17 do they give out any numbers of EMF
18 transmission from the existing power line or
19 the DC power line.

20 And I refer you to the Amherst High
21 School debacle ten years ago, where PSNH had to
22 redo a 235 kVA line past the school where the
23 measurements went halfway into the classrooms,
24 and they wondered why children were becoming

1 ill. And Dr. Bailey, who was part of a long,
2 long European study, never acknowledged his
3 part in that study.

4 I urgently request that this Board,
5 this Commission, and the public defender side
6 get Eversource to submit a full analysis of all
7 the data on the DC lines, which will be two and
8 a half times the radius of an AC line. That's
9 why they're 160 feet off the ground.

10 Because I've been with an EMF sensor
11 along some of the lines that run past my home
12 in Nashua. And they're 60 feet off the ground,
13 I can still get a measurement. And it goes up,
14 as one gentleman from the Pessamit tribe
15 described last night, the power increases early
16 in the morning, and then when everybody comes
17 home at night.

18 So, I went out one night at about
19 7:30. Sure enough, about another 2.5
20 Gausses [*sic*] came up on the meter. So,
21 please, have Eversource and Hydro-Quebec come
22 up with these health numbers, because the EMF
23 is very critical along the whole line. Even if
24 they bury it, you're going to get leakage.

1 You're going to get hot and cold spots.

2 Thank you very much.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Huard. Is
4 John Jones still here? John Jones?

5 *[Short pause.]*

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes? No?

7 *[No indication given.]*

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. I don't
9 see John Jones.

10 Walter Carlson? All right. Hang on.
11 Mr. Carlson, you'll still want to speak? Okay.
12 You'll probably be the last one.

13 I'm sorry, who are you? Sir, who are
14 you? Whose at the microphone? I'm looking for
15 Peggy Huard.

16 MS. HUARD: Right here.

17 MR. JONES: Oh, I'm John Jones. Did
18 you mention my name? No.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I did. I was
20 looking to see if you were still here, and you
21 are still here.

22 MR. JONES: Yes. I was right --

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Would you be
24 interested in speaking?

1 MR. JONES: Right here. Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Then,
3 you'll be after Ms. Huard.

4 MR. JONES: Thank you.

5 MS. HUARD: I guess it's still
6 morning, just barely. But, good morning,
7 members of the SEC and my fellow opposers to
8 the Northern Pass Project.

9 For those of you who do not know me,
10 I am Peggy Huard. I was the sole and formal
11 intervenor in another project proposed by
12 Eversource, the Merrimack Valley Reliability
13 Project. They have already been able to, in my
14 humble opinion, fraudulently obtain a
15 Certificate of Site and Facility for that
16 project.

17 I began to join forces in opposition
18 against the Northern Pass as a potential
19 tourist that may travel in the area proposed
20 for the Northern Pass. However, more recently,
21 I have become aware, quite by accident, that my
22 neighbors and I will once again be directly
23 affected by the Northern Pass, as the Applicant
24 plans to make certain upgrades to the

1 right-of-way, as it continues from Deerfield,
2 making its way to the very same ROW affected by
3 the MVRP, and continuing on directly behind my
4 house in another right-of-way. While these
5 upgrades appear to have been disclosed to the
6 U.S. DOE, they were not disclosed, to my
7 knowledge, to the New Hampshire SEC, nor were
8 those affected by these planned upgrades
9 informed or invited to participate in the
10 formal process for the Northern Pass.

11 I have made several comments to the
12 Northern Pass Docket, one referring those
13 interested to the docket for the MVRP. I read
14 and hear many of the same numerous concerns
15 about the Northern Pass as I had for the MVRP.
16 The concerns are only greater for the Northern
17 Pass, because this Project will affect a far
18 greater amount of land and people. I hear much
19 of the same flimsy and incompetent responses
20 continue to be provided by the Applicant.

21 My concerns go far beyond aesthetics.
22 The Applicant, their attorneys, the New
23 Hampshire SEC continue to deny and ignore the
24 dangerous health effects from the electric

1 magnetic fields associated with high voltage
2 transmission lines. The dangerous magnetic
3 fields will still be present with buried lines.

4 During the process for the MVRP, the
5 Committee has -- had ignored, the Applicant's
6 attorneys -- and the Applicant's attorneys on
7 numerous occasions have objected to credible,
8 revealing resources showing the dangers from
9 not only touching these lines and poles, but
10 dangerous effects from induction and coupling,
11 along with inappropriate behavior that is not
12 being communicated by the Applicant. One
13 report demonstrated how the standards that the
14 industry follows from the U.K. are too high.
15 Another resource showed the various dangerous
16 levels of electric shock. Many of these
17 reports and resources have been denied entry
18 into the docket for the MVRP, and continue to
19 be denied entry into the docket for the
20 Northern Pass as a comment.

21 You, the Committee, have also ignored
22 the Applicant's own expert witness, Dr. Bailey,
23 in the past, who has acknowledged the effects
24 these fields can have on the nerves and

1 muscles, in his testimony on both the Merrimack
2 Valley and Seacoast Reliability Projects.

3 You, the Committee, along with the
4 Applicant, has also ignored my past and
5 repeated complaints regarding my own negative
6 and debilitating experiences with the EMFs from
7 the existing high voltage transmission lines.

8 The scientific testing done of EMFs
9 anticipated for the MVRP, one project, reflects
10 the negligence across all of the projects
11 proposed by Eversource before you. Eversource
12 had admittedly tested a very small random
13 sample of areas to be affected by the MVRP,
14 which, in their own words, reflects "ideal
15 conditions". They did not test areas that
16 contain certain infrastructure, because "they
17 can alter or affect measured EMF levels". It
18 would seem to me that these areas would be of
19 the utmost importance. I am sure the same
20 negligence holds true for the measurements of
21 the anticipated EMFs for the Northern Pass
22 Project as well.

23 What isn't disclosed in the
24 Application in the New -- to the New Hampshire

1 SEC, is that Northern Pass is but one of many
2 projects overhauling a -- overhauling a massive
3 grid of existing power generation. You can
4 find more information on the Boston, New
5 Hampshire, and Vermont solutions and the manner
6 in which the grid operates on the ISO-New
7 England website; some of which I include in
8 comments in the MVRP Docket.

9 There are seven individuals before
10 me, making up the New Hampshire -- the
11 Committee that have been given the task to
12 determine whether the Applicants for the
13 Northern Pass should be awarded a Certificate
14 of Site and Facility to allow them to build
15 their proposed project. These individuals will
16 decide on their own, with all of their
17 historical incompetence and negligence, the
18 fate of not only one of the most beautiful
19 scenic areas in New Hampshire, but the fate of
20 the health, safety, and well-being of so many
21 New Hampshire citizens that look to the
22 government to protect them, not hurt them.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Huard,
24 please wrap up.

1 MS. HUARD: I invite --

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please wrap up.

3 MS. HUARD: -- my fellow opposers to
4 come out to Hudson, New Hampshire, to see the
5 destruction, lack of regard Eversource has for
6 citizens' public health and safety. I ask you,
7 the members of the New Hampshire SEC, don't
8 make the same mistake twice.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
11 We're going take -- we're going to take two
12 more people. We're going to take Mr. Jones,
13 and then Mr. Carlson. And then we'll be done.

14 MR. JONES: I won't keep you long.
15 My name is John W. Jones. I live up on -- in
16 North Sutton, New Hampshire, on a hillside
17 between Mount Kearsarge and Mount Sunapee. I
18 have just a few scattered thoughts here.

19 One of them is that, when we were
20 kids, our license plate said "Scenic New
21 Hampshire". And I think each and every one of
22 you will agree that that was a pretty nifty
23 thought. And I think you'd all agree that
24 "Live Free or Die" is a pretty -- pretty good

1 thought as well.

2 I have been to seven of these
3 meetings thus far, first chance to speak. I'm
4 impressed with the fact that one of our
5 greatest strengths in this country and in New
6 Hampshire is having our say. And I believe
7 you've all witnessed the strength, and you've
8 all listened to people having their say.

9 I wish that Ray Burton could be here
10 today. It was my privilege to hear him speak
11 publicly probably the last time in his life.
12 And, as you all know, he's a hero in the North
13 Country, and he was a friend of the common man
14 from Claremont to Canada. And he was
15 passionately, with all of his heart and soul,
16 against this notion.

17 Another thought of mine is that -- by
18 the way, he's here in spirit, I can feel that.

19 Necessity is an interesting thing.
20 When you need to have something done, you have
21 to make concessions. This Northern Pass
22 business is not necessary for New Hampshire.
23 My electric bill five years from now is not
24 going to be any less than it is today. If it

1 goes through, I will resent the fact that these
2 ugly towers will be taking electricity down to
3 Bridgeport, Connecticut, to light up a used car
4 lot, 20-acre used car lot every night of the
5 year.

6 Let's see. I got 48 seconds to go
7 here.

8 I want to -- I want to also,
9 sincerely, with my heartfelt thank you to each
10 and every one of you. Because I've looked at
11 you, and nobody's gone to sleep for hours and
12 hours and hours. None of you. You've been
13 earnest, you have been honest in your effort to
14 listen to us.

15 We don't need this Project. I hope
16 you can, when you review, when this is all said
17 and done, that you can reach into your hearts
18 and say "There's a better way to go."

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Carlson.

21 MR. CARLSON: Hi. I'm Walter
22 Carlson. And I come from Concord. And I want
23 to thank you all for staying past the noontime.

24 I want to just make a couple of

1 statements, reemphasizing some of the things
2 that have already been said about the
3 commercial -- this is a commercial venture.
4 It's not needed for system reliability. And,
5 in case you didn't get the message, this
6 electricity is going south. New Hampshire gets
7 nothing out of it.

8 Also, since I said I've been from
9 Concord, I live at McKenna's Purchase, over on
10 the east side. Those people who think you're
11 getting up close and personal with that,
12 they're proposing a 120-foot monopole about
13 100 feet from my back deck. Should things get
14 really bad, I might have some company in my bed
15 sometime, made out of steel.

16 But I want to point out another
17 thing. These poles they're proposing are
18 antique ideas. If you go and look at Europe,
19 Europe buries them all, all their power. You
20 get a whole benefit of that, not having too
21 much in the way of wind knocking things down.

22 And the other, last point I want to
23 make, they put out this "Property Value
24 Impact", Northern Pass did -- ForwardNH Plan

1 did. It's done by a guy named Chalmers, James
2 Chalmers. Primarily, he did his study out on
3 the northern Montana 640 foot -- miles of power
4 lines. And he comes back and he says "you
5 might get a small change in" -- excuse me --
6 "loss in property value", which is what my main
7 concern is. Not -- the 120-foot pole in bed is
8 really bothering me, but the value of my
9 property. A study called "Valuation
10 Guidelines for Properties with Electric
11 Transmission Lines", by Kurt K-i-e-l-s-i -- no,
12 -l-i-s-c-h [Kielisch], collected and analyzed
13 more than 2,500 pages of info and research
14 studies on property values, and found most
15 recent effects range from 10 to 30 percent loss
16 of value. McKenna's has 148 units. Losing
17 30 percent of their value would be a
18 significant impact on Concord. But Concord has
19 already gone on record requiring burial of the
20 power lines.

21 So, with that, I will say thank you
22 very much for your attention. I'm sorry you
23 had to be yelled at. But I hope you all have a
24 great day.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

3 Thank you all. We will adjourn this meeting,
4 and probably schedule one more of these at some
5 point, and publish notice of that, and probably
6 use the same sign-up system to have people
7 register to speak.

8 *(Whereupon the public comment*

9 *hearing was adjourned at*

10 *12:11 p.m.)*

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, **Steven. E. Patnaude**, a Licensed Shorthand Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes of these proceedings taken at the place and on the date hereinbefore set forth, to the best of my skill and ability under the conditions present at the time.

I further certify that I am neither attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the parties to the action; and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed in this case, nor am I financially interested in this action.

Steven E. Patnaude, LCR
Licensed Court Reporter
N.H. LCR No. 52
(RSA 310-A:173)