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

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

MR. OLDENBURG: William Oldenburg, Department of Transportation.

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

CMSR. BAILEY: Kathryn Bailey, Public Utilities Commission.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Martin Honigberg, from the Public Utilities Commission.
MS. WEATHERSBY: Patricia Weathersby, public member.

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

MS. DANDENEAU: Rachel Dandeneau, alternate public member.

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

The purpose of the meeting today is to take oral statements from members of the public on the Northern Pass Project. This is the third of three meetings that are currently scheduled for the purposes of accepting public comment during the final hearings on the merits, which have been going on since April...
and will continue into September. The other two meetings took place on June 15th and June 22nd. Each meeting, including today's, has been a three-hour meeting, starting at 9:00 and ending at 12:00.

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

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

In addition, there were public comments provided during informational sessions, in which the Subcommittee was not present, but there are transcripts that we've
had the opportunity to review. Those were held in 2016, on January 11th, in Franklin; January 13th, in Londonderry; January 14th, in Laconia; January 20th, in Whitefield; and January 21st, in Lincoln.

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

Considering the number of comments we have already received, and the number of people that we have here today, we ask you to keep your neighbors in mind. As we have at other events, we are asking everyone to limit their remarks to three minutes. That does not mean we will stop you at three minutes. Thus far, the way things have run, some people finish up in 30 seconds, most people go between two minutes and 45 seconds and three and a half minutes, maybe a little bit more than that. I won't step in and interrupt you until you get to about four and a half, when I will ask you
to wrap up your remarks. There is a clock that you'll be able to see, so you'll see how long you've taken, so you have a sense of how quickly you're moving.

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

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

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

We'll call for speakers largely in the order in which they appear on the screen. There will probably be some moving around. If someone's not here, we'll skip over them and see if they show up a little later. If we have
time to take people who did not sign up in advance, we will give them the opportunity to speak. Because there is a limited amount of time and a lot of people, we ask you to be ready when it is your turn.

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

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

In order to issue a siting certificate, the Committee must find that Northern Pass does not have -- will not have an unreasonably adverse effect on aesthetics or the natural environment. As currently
proposed, Northern Pass would bring 1,090 megawatts of Canadian hydropower to the southern New Hampshire grid on 345 kilovolt lines running 192 miles down the center of the state. Sixty of these miles would be buried in the White Mountain National Forest and upper Coos County. But the remaining 132 miles would be hung from more than a thousand steel towers, rising from 90 to 100 [150?] feet above the ground, as high as the golden dome on the State House, but without its aesthetic appeal.

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

At these heights, I believe Northern
Pass would literally disfigure the face of our state, and would permanently scar some of our most iconic landscapes, destroying vistas that represent what is most special, most unique about New Hampshire to its residents and visitors alike, our sense of place and the image we seek to project to the rest of the country and the world. It is inconceivable to me that New Hampshire's brand, once signified by the Old Man of the Mountain's craggy profile, could soon be represented by a string of industrial-grade steel towers more popularly associated with the northern New Jersey Turnpike.

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

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: One thing I should have mentioned. If you have written remarks, if you would provide a copy to the
woman who's just sitting next to the lecturn, she will collect them for you.

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

REP. MOFFETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Howard Moffett, from Merrimack District 15 -- excuse me, Merrimack District 9. The four of us who have signed this written statement, which has been provided to the Committee, are testifying this morning. And I'm going to pick up on Pages 3 and 4 of that document. Representative Kurk talked about the damaging effects to New Hampshire's landscape. I would like to just emphasize three points about the alleged economic benefits of Northern Pass, compared to two other announced projects described at the bottom of Page 2: The New England Clean Power Link and the Granite State Power Link. And I should note that, although the four of us who signed this document are speaking this morning, there are over 100 co-signatories from among our colleagues in the Legislature and former Legislature, who are listed on the appendix to the statement.
The three points: First, we don't have to destroy New Hampshire's natural beauty in order to bring Canadian renewable energy to population centers in southern New England. Either the New England Clean Power Link or Granite State Power Link would do that without any new damage to New Hampshire's landscape.

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

But I would like to draw your attention, I'm not going to go over it in detail, but I'd just like to draw your attention to the comparison at the bottom of Page 3 of the written statement, which
basically compares the benefits, the rate reduction benefits that have been alleged by Northern Pass's expert, Ms. Frayer, which she characterized as $1.50 a month, or $18 a year, to a blended group of R/C&I ratepayers, using an average of 300 kilowatt-hours a month.

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

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

With that, I'll end, because I want
to keep within my three minutes. Thank you very much.

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

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

The townspeople, businesses, and the Selectboards of Plymouth have consistently called for Northern Pass Project to be buried along Interstate 93, separate from our thriving Main Street and out of reach of the floods which regularly affect the Pemigewasset River. RSA 162-R, which became law in 2016, designated state energy infrastructure corridors and puts into place a procedure that energy transmission
projects may route their lines along these corridors. The Federal Highway Authority has approved changes to the New Hampshire Accommodation -- Utility Accommodation Manual, which gives the state the authority to implement RSA 162-R.

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

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

And it isn't just Plymouth. Franconia, Woodstock, North Woodstock, gateway towns to the White Mountains National Forest, would suffer economically while the Project
digs up their main streets during the busy summer season.

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

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

I'm also very concerned about private property rights of homeowners along these roads. The state does not own all of these
roads, but only maintains easement rights. The width of these state easements varies greatly, and in some cases stretch back to the 1700s. Usage and historic record indicates a width of only 33 feet along parts of Route 116. If the roads are not wide enough, will the homeowners involuntarily lose the use of their land, gardens, driveways if the Project is routed along these routes? Will the Project attempt to use eminent domain?

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

Thank you.

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

SEN. GUIDA: Good morning, members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. For the record, I am Bob Guida, State Senator from District 2, representing 27 towns, 19 in Grafton County, 5 in Belknap, and...
3 in Merrimack. And my District will be substantially impacted by this Project.

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

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

I invite the Committee to assess the relative merits of those, and I know that you
will as part of your public duties. It will
clearly demonstrate that there are alternatives
that are far better than what is proposed in
Northern Pass for the people, businesses, and
institutions of our state.

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

But the tax benefits from this
Project are paid for by the very same
ratepayers who are paying the electric bills,
because they will be incorporated into the
transmission and distribution charges that we
pay as part of our bill. So, there really is no tax benefit. One for the community, but it comes out of the very same pockets as the taxpayers paying their property taxes.

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

As public servants, our obligation is to serve the people, businesses, and institutions of New Hampshire. We're not obliged to, nor should we allow ourselves to be used to resolve the electric power shortfalls
of the southern New England states that have chosen to foreclose on their own opportunities to generate their own energy. They made conscious legislative choices to foreclose on the energy production and capacities that are available in the free market. They continue to pass legislation that, while politically in vogue, ignores the realities of energy production, and discounts rapidly evolving energy science. We should not rush to do this Project. There are projects emerging and evolving in this state as we speak, which will be coming to the public eye in the very near future, which will afford us the opportunity to generate our own power here in New Hampshire, and distribute it amongst ourselves, without having to use our state as a byway for other states that have not afforded themselves the opportunity to do so.

Please do not allow -- please do not allow the savaging of our resources, our natural resources and the uniqueness of our North Country, and the diminution of our heritage of independent thinking, from which
this state is well known worldwide. The
historic, the cultural and the natural
resources of New Hampshire should not be the
price paid to resolve the self-made power
crisis in the southern New England states.

I thank you.

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

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

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

This project scares me, personally.
And I echo the sentiments that I've heard
before, but this gets right directly to me. It
scares me, because it's a business survival
issue, for me and for my neighbor businesses,
and our employees, all of whom rely on having
access to the fronts of our business, which
will be denied during this Project. So, you
may not know this, but, statistically, most
small businesses, and ours are all small on
Main Street, are not able to survive a
10 percent loss of sales, even for a very short
period of time. And I'm sure that this will,
in fact, occur when Northern Pass comes through
our town.

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

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

The Town of Plymouth is on record as being against the Northern Pass Project unless it's buried under 93. And with the 93 option apparently no longer on the table, I understand, because of the extra expense of doing it, it seems like we now -- now we know
that the same amount of power that Northern Pass would deliver can be delivered by two-thirds of the capital cost by the Granite State Power Link, without disrupting the entire North Country.

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

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

Thank you for your attention.

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

MR. DZIEMIAN: Top of the morning, members of the Committee and guests. And thank you for allowing me to comment on the Northern
My name is Tad Dziemian. And I own and operate Neighborhood Energy of New England. Headquartered in East Hampstead, New Hampshire, we broker the supply of electricity and natural gas to mostly commercial and industrial clients throughout New England, with a large share here in New Hampshire.

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

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

More importantly, despite a bear market in natural gas, as the result of our two mild winters, natural gas inventories in the United States are the highest that they have been in over six years, New England will suffer through double-digit electric supply rates for...
the next year, or longer, as a direct impact from less supply in New England. And this is primarily as the result of many power generating facilities that are coming off line.

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

Thank you.

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

MR. POULIOT: Yes.

[Short pause.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No T.J. Jean?

[No indication given.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Paul Pouliot.

MR. POULIOT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the State of New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. My name is Paul Pouliot. I am the Sag8mo, the principal speaker, of the Cowasuck Band of the Pennacook
Abenaki People, which is based and headquartered here in Alton, New Hampshire. Chief René Simon and the elected officials of Pessamit have asked me to deliver this message, and to thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Northern Pass public hearings. It is with confidence and a better future that the Pessamit Innu Nation is addressing you today.

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

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

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

{SEC 2015-06} [Public Comment Hearing] {07-20-17}
Court ruled against Quebec’s position.

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

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

Hydro-Quebec's flooding of all major rivers of our homelands, which served as transport routes, seasonal food resources and fur trade, resulted in the forced and brutal
removal of the Pessamiuilnut and relocation onto a reserve that was not and is still not structured to ensure the economic well-being of its population.

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

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

The Innu Nation has never been
conquered, has never given up its rights over its homelands, and has never accepted the attempts to relinquish our rights.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

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

MS. KELLOGG: Good morning, members
of the Committee and to all gathered here. My name is Patricia Kellogg. I live in Littleton, New Hampshire, with my husband, Gardner Kellogg, who is a licensed land surveyor in New Hampshire.

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Wait. Can you bring your microphone up?
MR. WILKINSON:  Sorry.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:  Thanks.

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

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

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

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

If anyone looks beyond all the propaganda and hype pumped out over these past years by PSNH, now Eversource, with its hired
experts, lobbyists, and lawyers, attempting to convince all of us of the incredible benefits the Project might provide, it still remains clear. The reality is, this Project really isn't about electrical power at all. It's only about the power and influence of money, and the desire by now Eversource to exploit its financial power on the State of New Hampshire and its citizens for its own corporate gains.

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

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

{SEC 2015-06} [Public Comment Hearing] {07-20-17}
standard if ever to achieve approval here in New Hampshire.

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

[Short pause.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Therese Haberman here?
[No indication given.]

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

Gail Knowles?

[Short pause.]

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

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

[Laughter.]


I tried to think of something clever to say, but I'm all out of clever. I only have more questions and non-answers that arise from the flood of contradictions that are spewed from the dams of Hydro-Quebec.
The headline for the Union Leader, on May 28, 2017, "Northern Pass predicts financial windfall for towns". "Franklin could receive anywhere from 3.2 million to 7 million in additional taxes for the first full year that Northern Pass operates, according to project estimates." There's a big difference of 3.8 million. But what are numbers for, if not to dazzle and confuse?

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Dolly McPhaul,
to be followed by Brenda Shannon Adam.

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

On July 10th, a friend and I, frustrated by the inadequate, incomplete and irresponsible route of the Northern Pass, decided to drive the New England Clean Power Link. The differences we saw were amazing.

The New England Clean Power Link is a 154-mile project to bring hydropower from Canada into the New England grid. Ninety-seven (97) miles will be buried under Lake Champlain, 57 miles will be buried under roads along the route to Ludlow, where the power is changed to AC current, and then it goes into the New England grid.

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

The NECPL, in further concerns for the Town of Benson, asked for and received permission to bury their lines on back
town-owned roads till it joins to 22a. 22a is a relatively isolated road, with plenty of shoulders to bury the lines for the most part.

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

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

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

The NECPL is done with intensive planning by experts who care about the people, as well as the finished product. The Northern Pass is a jumbled up mess of partially thought out plans, partially conducted studies,
outdated maps and data, a staff of puppets, a
reliance on attorneys and contacts to make
exceptions, grant waivers, ignore deficiencies,
fool the public, lie if need be, and plans
"made as you go" without sufficient knowledge
and research.

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

A further insult, the route cuts
through the heart of three significant economic
centers: Franconia, North Woodstock, Plymouth.
Northern Pass's so-called "expert" witnesses
and consultants seem to lack the critical
thinking required to identify Franconia area
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businesses. Not on Main Street. They lack the imagination to determine how businesses off the route will be equally impacted.

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

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

Will they be eating leisurely breakfasts at Polly's? How will that work? That's Polly's Pancake Parlor. Their construction day begins at 7:00. Polly's opens at 7:00. Will there be rotating construction crews filling the tables empty of tourists?
Book haircuts at The Strand Salon?
Stay in the honeymoon suite at Franconia Inn?
Will they make purchases at Mantiques and
Garnet Hill, or buy eggs from my neighbor at
Bear Country Farms?

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

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

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

MS. COTE: Good morning. For the
record, my name is Kathie Aldrich Cote. I am
here on behalf of the Franconia area
businesses. I have -- I believe you have been
presented with a packet of over 75 letters from
Franconia area businesses that will be impacted
by the proposed burial down Route 18/116
corridor in the Franconia area. I urge all of
you to take time to read each and every letter.

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

Franconia, Easton, Sugar Hill, and
Polly's have been known as a destination for
tourists escaping the heat, noise, traffic,
construction of cities since the early late
1800s. Our visitors speak often of the beauty
and quiet location that attracts them to our
area. While it is true that the proposed
project is going to be just a two-year plus
disruption, we know that this will have a
tremendous toll on all of our businesses. We
depend on these summer visitors to get us through
the leaner winter months. We know from
experience that any construction project in the
past has affected our access to our road has
affected our business. We have kept meticulous
attendance records going back to 1938, and we
also take note, when business is down, why.

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

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

In 2016, Polly's collected and paid
to the State of New Hampshire $108,000 in Room
and Meals Tax. Of that, 81,000 plus was
collected between April and October. Decreased traffic will result in decreased income to our state.

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

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

With our recent rebuild, we are in a very tenuous place monetarily. And, if we have any decreased business, it will be devestational for us.
We implore you to consider the long-term effects of this Project on our small towns and businesses in the area. While mine is just one letter, I urge you to read all 75. Tourists will avoid the area and find other destinations to visit. They may not return for many years, if at all. They are the livelihood of the bulk of Sugar Hill, Franconia, and Easton businesses.

Thank you for your contribution.

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

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

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

The New Hampshire DOT has issued a recommendation for approval of construction already. And stated in their project -- in...
their submittal to the Committee that the "Project construction plans and specifications are still in development."

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

In the interest of the preservation of our state highway system, it should be the obligation of the Applicant to find ways to keep the construction outside of the paved roadway section. If the Applicant is not willing or able to design and install the proposed system in accordance with UAM requirements and the Department's own preferred and stated criteria for preservation and
protection of our New Hampshire highway system,
then the Department should be consequential and
courageous enough to simply state that the
proposed installation within the highway
right-of-way is not acceptable and cannot be
approved.

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

Now one has to ask the question: Has
proper documentation been maintained for all
the interactions with the Applicant, such as:
To start with, who initiated this monthly
meeting program? Are their logs of all
coordination meetings with the time schedules,
names of participants, and agendas? Are there
transcripts for all these coordination
meetings? Are there copies of e-mails and transcripts of telephone conversations and lunch meetings?

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

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

Has the Applicant or the DOT considered how the heat emission from the buried cable can affect the cold weather performance of the roadway section? Heat emission from the proposed buried cable could, under certain marginally cold freezing conditions, create localized areas where, amidst the generally frozen roadway coffer, such areas become defrosted and collect water intruding from the surface, whereas adjacent areas would remain frozen. Then that trapped water would then, under some more severe cold weather freeze conditions, freeze and could
generate localized blowups that we all know from the typical potholes. Because the hole would be sectioned in ways, designed and built to start with, it doesn't allow it to drain out anymore.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hoertdoerfer, please wrap up.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please wrap up.
MR. HOERTDOERFER: In general, I also have something to say about the contractors' practices, and how even some of the better departments that have submitted -- reviewed the process in an orderly fashion referred to "best practices", or similar comments, allowed by many permitting agency, that is asking for a lot of trouble.

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

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

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

BAE Systems is the state's largest
manufacturer and a major consumer of energy.

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

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

The Northern Pass Project provides clean, renewable hydroelectric power needed to improve our region's energy deficit, and it does so while addressing environmental impact concerns. This is why BAE Systems stands with a group of roughly 50 New Hampshire businesses in support of the New Hampshire -- the Northern Pass.
I have copies of our joint statement here and a list of very diverse companies that have signed on. As I did in the public hearing in Deerfield, in March, I ask that this be included as part of the public docket. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

MS. MOULDER: Good morning. I would
like to thank the members of the SEC for allowing me this opportunity to express my opposition to the Northern Pass Transmission Project. My name is Lee Ann Moulder, and I reside in Holderness, a town which was on the earlier preferred Northern Pass route.

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

We have contributed to the economy of New Hampshire in many, many ways. We have employed the services of a number of individuals in this state over the past 22 years, including real estate agents, architects, building contractors, landscapers, snow plow services, plumbers, electricians, and every other type of service necessary to build and maintained a home. We pay real estate taxes on our property and we have purchased a
number of vehicles. In short order, we have spent virtually our entire retirement income in this state. The only thing we have taken advantage of in New Hampshire is enjoying its beauty.

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

Many, with children applying for college, have stayed with us so they could tour New Hampshire's colleges, including Plymouth State University, Keene State University, UNH,
and Dartmouth College. I should note that often these families stay overnight in a local hotel when touring a college.

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

My point is that there is an unquantifiable, but substantial, figure that I believe you should take into consideration when determining the economic benefits versus the economic disadvantages of the Northern Pass Project. While Northern Pass executives may set forth what they tell you are the economic advantages of temporary jobs provided and purchases made by the workers in each town, I believe that it is crystal clear that the revenue stream brought into this state by individuals, such as myself, who have moved to this state because of its beauty, are permanent in nature. I believe that these economic benefits will far surpass the loosely
calculated benefits presented by the
profit-motivated corporate executives of
Northern Pass.

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

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Julie Michel.

[Short pause.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Again, not here.

Carol Meredith, to be followed by Dick Hage.

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

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

I do know this: In the pulpit, it's
always a plus to begin with a joke, something
like "a minister, a rabbi, and a priest walked
into a bar", but I'm having a hard time finding
humor in the all-too-real possibility that the
bucolic countryside of Deerfield and New
Hampshire will be subject to the imposition of
Northern Pass.

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

Some people are moved by the tax
revenue that Eversource says it would pay to
impact its cities and towns. But, in the
corporate world, surely past actions are the
best indication of future ones. That's the
tendency at least that I see in my parishioners and myself; unless we see a major benefit and intentionally decide to put serious efforts into changing, things don't change. I'll spare you the details of a joke about how many people it takes to screw in a lightbulb, and how, for the lightbulb to change, it has to really want to. But it's true of people, as well as companies such as Eversource.

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

As a minister, of course, it's natural for me to think in terms of biblical stories, and lately I've been thinking a lot about David and Goliath from the Hebrew
scriptures. You don't have to be a religious person to know the gist: Goliath was a huge seasoned soldier, with a bronze helmet and weighty armor, and a very sharp iron spear. And young David faces him as he is, a small shepherd boy, with only a slingshot and a lot of faith.

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

I hope and pray that you might give their perspective greater weight, in order to counteract their opposition's size and resources. In the biblical story, David uses
that slingshot and miraculously wins the fight.
May the perspectives and priorities of the "Davids" of the world win out in the end.

Thank you very much.

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

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

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

If you were to visit and experience this integration, you would acknowledge the linear nature of our narrow north-south Main Street orientation with double-loaded parking,
critically little off-Main Street parking, very
limited east-west access and outlets, and a
bustling and vibrant North Country regional
service and cultural center for many thousands
beyond our 6,900 population.

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

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

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

Northern Pass promises a single lane of traffic on Main Street at all times. That shallow thinking, derived from a complete lack of understanding of Plymouth's pedestrian and vehicular traffic patterns, major events, and cherished culture, would significantly and negatively impact many of our Main Street businesses.
businesses and Plymouth State University, and would devastate those vulnerable to far more minor disruptions.

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

More specifically related to the University, hundreds to thousands of people pour into Plymouth many times throughout the year to attend convocation and commencement ceremonies, Silver Center for the Arts performances on Main Street, concerts on the Common, multiple state high school championship sporting events, weekly performances of the New Hampshire Music Festival, summer sports camps, professional conferences of all sorts throughout the year, open houses and major recruiting events, intercollegiate sports competitions, and many more, many hundreds more.
At the beginnings and ends of each semester, the University works closely with the town administrators and the safety officers to work out traffic plans to minimize Main Street congestion. And, with our best laid plans, it is still common to see traffic back-ups on I-93, given the geography of our narrow Main Street and the limited route alternatives.

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

Thank you.

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

MS. FORD: Thank you. For the record, my name is Susan Ford. I am a resident of Easton and a former representative. I have been following this issue since it started seven years ago. Originally, the SEC process did not consider the "public interest"
standard. This was a standard that was discussed extensively as we reconfigured the SEC siting process. While the "public interest" standard is not defined as clearly as you might like, it must reflect both the pros and cons of every project.

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

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

First, the roads. We tell you we can't deal with our roads being torn up for two years. I spend lots of time in Concord, and I know that Main Street, in Concord, was torn up for two years. So, you may think "well, we did it." However, even me, a non-Concord resident, knew I could avoid Main Street construction by traveling on Storrs Street, State Street, or
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Green Street. There is one almost parallel road to 116 in Franconia, and that's five miles away. We can't go around the block. There are no blocks. Serve the public interest and ask Northern Pass to move to Plan B, or even Plan X, Y, or Z. Bury the transmission lines along I-93.

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

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

To serve the public interest, you
need to require Northern Pass to move to Plan B and bury the transmission lines along I-93.

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

When you see cars parked along the side of the road, you know there is a hiking path nearby. That's our tourism, and we depend on that tourism. Would you build a second home in Stewartstown that looks out at towers? Of course you wouldn't, especially if technology is available to allow burial of transmission lines.
Technology exists to allow burial of this entire Project. If you've ever had a heart attack or cancer, do you go to a doctor who is treating patients with 25 year-old methodology? I feel the same way about this Project.

I-93, an obvious corridor, is available, and eliminates the possibility of using eminent domain for a stockholder project. Do you really think Massachusetts or Concord -- Connecticut would allow 70 towers to be built in Boston or Hartford? Why then in Concord?

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

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jack Gilchrist, and then we're going to take a ten-minute break to allow the stenographer a chance to cool down.
[Short pause.]

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

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

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

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

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

I wasn't born in New Hampshire, but it has been my adopted state for over 30 years. It's hard to understand why a project that would destroy the natural beauty of this state would be considered, especially when it will be used to deliver power to southern New England, not New Hampshire. Do you think that anyone in
southern New England will stop to think where
all that electricity came from and what was
destroyed in the process? I think not. The
more power we produce, the more power we'll
consume. Do we need more power or do we want
more power? There is a difference.

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

Some years ago, when our neighbors
wanted to erect poles on our property to supply
electric service to their newly purchased land,
my husband and I asked if there were other
options available. The Co-op representative
said the lines could be buried, but at a
greater cost to our neighbors. Since we owned
the land where the poles would be located, we
declined access and the lines were buried.
Were our new neighbors happy? Probably not.
They made the mistake of assuming that we would
gladly let they trespass on our land in order
to save them money. Even though their bank 
account may have been depleted more than they 
had planned on, we considered it a win/win 
situation. They got their electricity; we got to keep our land intact.

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

Decisions often bring about unintended consequences. This is a huge project that will affect our whole state, not just the North Country as its name implies. Tourism, property values, employment, environment, and people's health will all be impacted. The supporters of this Project need to be very careful what they wish for, because we will all have to live with the consequences.

If this juggernaut is set in motion, there will
be no turning back.

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

Thank you.

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

[Short pause.]

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

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

The proposed project will go right through my property, and it is right out my doorstep. I'm not sure if you can see the photo that's out. But my family has lived and
farmed this property for over 100 years. And I
want to continue to do the same. My father and
grandfather both farmed this property since
1915. And we pasture animals out in these
fields where they want to put these lines. And
it is right out my doorstep.

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

And I just -- I have -- I have a
interest in doing weddings and venues that
would be, you know, we've had weddings there,
which were wonderful. But, if I get the
Northern Pass to go through, the towers are going to be right there where you can't hide them. And it just would impact me and my future quite badly.

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

Peaked Hill Road was a -- was designated a scenic road years ago, and it is totally inappropriate for an industrial overhead transmission line to be put up. I urge the SEC to refuse the Northern Pass Transmission its permit, because the Project is totally -- totally disregards -- has a total disregard for New Hampshire history, heritage, and community. No private nor public industry should have the right to destroy what has been
slowly and carefully built by people of New Hampshire. And for what? Forty years of electric power that passes through our state?

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

I urge the SEC to please refuse the Northern Pass the permission to go along its proposed path. It has alternative routes that are more -- I believe more appropriate to use than what they are proposing. It just would ruin the State of New Hampshire if they continue to do what they want to do. And I think they should look for alternative routes to take. And the whole route is bad for me, but especially that it goes right through my front yard, and it's within two football fields of my front doorstep, will be these lines and towers. And the noise, I am just afraid,
whether I hear it or subliminally hear it, it's
going to affect me and my animals. And I just
am concerned with that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And the concern back then was a lot of people talked about "you put these towers up, and what happens when new technology comes out? What are you doing to do, take the towers down?" And people always said "Of course they're not going to take the towers down."

And that's my similar concern with why, you know, I oppose the Northern Pass, because what happens when things change? They're not going to come take the towers back down. Those things will be there forever.

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

So, I oppose the Northern Pass. It's from a personal level, but I do think there's an economic part of it as well. But it's personally just to my enjoyment, my love of the White Mountains. And I think it will make a
huge difference to people seeing those towers.

So, thank you.

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

[Short pause.]

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

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

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

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

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

Hydro-Quebec has already decimated thousands of acres of the indigenous peoples' land in Quebec, with their mammoth dams and flooded regions that are releasing methane gases from decomposing trees into our atmosphere. The disappearance of their salmon due to riverine changes from construction is becoming a reality.
Many of our communities in Grafton County, like Plymouth, are still experiencing fragile economies. Though a former commissioner, I am still fully aware of what our towns will experience if their Main Streets are ripped up and unpassable for months. Yet, I-93 is a mere one-half mile from our downtown. In our college and tourist town, it will be a death knell for businesses. And empty storefronts don't entice tourists, despite what Julia Frayer tried to feed you in her report. Gee, what a concept in economics, that, if one town loses businesses, then shoppers would go to the neighboring towns. So, who gives a damn about our towns and our losses?

Complete burial down New Hampshire's transportation corridors is the only logical plan, if you approve Northern Pass's Application. You have been told ad nauseam about the environmental, real estate, scenic, and safety issues. How much more do you need to hear that this Project just is not suitable in its current form, but, more importantly, is not needed for reliability? Please really
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listen, hear, and think about our comments from the heart about the impact to thousands of us from the Northern Pass Project and its greed as it pushes its nefarious ways into our lives. Let's show that, for once, New Hampshire can be progressive, have a vision for our energy future, be environmentally sensitive, and either bury or deny the whole Project.

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

Thank you.

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

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

I would like to speak in opposition to the Northern Pass as a property owner, whose land borders the proposed route. And I would
also like to speak on behalf of 20,000 people
who have voiced their opposition to the Project
in two petitions that I'm presenting today. I
am one person, one story, and one voice, but I
stand here with 20,000 voices.

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

My husband Aaron and I own just over
one acre along Route 116, in Easton. It's a
relatively small space, but it represents our
largest investment and our greatest source of
equity. Our attachment to the place is deep. We have a small lupine field that we planted and a large fruit and vegetable garden between our house and Route 116. We're devastated to learn that this is part of a proposed staging ground for work. And we also have major concerns about how this will affect our foundation, our well water, which is also our neighbor's well water, and our property value.

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

This Project is not worth the long-term negative impact it will have on the
people and the communities that are most
directly affected by it. I oppose this Project
as one person deeply affected by it, and I
submit 20,000 signatures of people who stand
with me today in saying that this Project does
not benefit the towns and people of New
Hampshire.

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

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

I've had it with humans treating
other humans as second rate citizens. I'm sure
somewhere there are people proud of how they
have been able to manipulate the First Nations
People, the political and judicial landscapes,
and citizens of New Hampshire. Such abject
treatment of the First Nations People is an
immediate deal-breaker. Regardless of how much
money is flowing into your pockets, no, this
isn't the price of progress. No, we don't have to do this. After all the creating fear about not modernizing and all the uproar about how badly we need jobs, no, we don't have to break promises and destroy people's homes and lives so that we continue to progress. This is just about a government corporation wanting a big payday.

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

A truly modern power grid would focus on generating electricity from many smaller, more local power sources. As solar continues
to decrease in cost, we and our New England neighbors will continue to shift to solar. It would behoove PSNH to get as early a start in that direction as possible. That is where our future lies. And I know a place in Franklin that would be a great site for a solar park. They can start there.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your time.

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

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

A lot of you might know that the Northern Pass is more than just one power line that goes through our state from Canada to Deerfield. There is proposed upgrades and infrastructure changes, the whole line -- existing line corridors in New Hampton, and obviously the one going across 393. They're planning on upgrading this infrastructure from 55-foot wooden H-frame towers, that are below the tree level, and they're going to upgrade these to the 100-foot plus, either the monopole or the lattice infrastructure that they're proposing for the Northern Pass. They're not just installing one line. They're doing upgrades, and they're going to increase height, and it's going to be very visible. You know,
this -- you know, this is not in the public's best interest, of having this kind of upgrade, this very affects the aesthetics of our region. And, you know, if you can see these towers once they increase the height, you know, I was kind of -- you know, I've been following your SEC notes, your notes online, and you had one of the -- the Society for the New Hampshire Forests asked to have an example of a tree out in your parking lot to give you a reference of these heights. And that was a very good, striking point, where I don't think you understand that increasing these heights and making them visually higher than the tree lines, you may not see it from one perspective standing at the road.

You know, in New Hampton, where I live, you know, I look over that intersection of Huckleberry Road, where the line comes across that field. The existing towers are below the tree level. And, when I go up on my property, where I am building, I overlook the Bridgewater ridgeline and the Bridgewater mountains over, across the Pemigewasset River,
I can't see these 55-foot wooden towers. They're invisible. And I never really noticed these lines existed until the Northern Pass Project started coming through. And they're proposing upgrading those towers, installing new towers at 100 plus, I'm going to see those. Those are going to be highlighted, and they're going to be blocking the ridgeline view for myself and many other people in New Hampton, especially in the Dana Hill regional area that overlook that same Pemigewasset Valley. It's not in our interest. It's going to affect the aesthetics of our area.

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

So, there's examples of, you know,
poor construction processes. You know, Eversource, you know, they're going to get their contractors, and they're going to build it in the least amount of money that it costs them to build this. And these poor construction practices and poor executions, you know, and Eversource has been going through and systematically increasing and replacing poles and changing infrastructure across the whole state.

And, for one example, in Laconia, on Union Avenue, a couple years ago the City spent millions of dollars and repaved the whole street, redid all of the underground water and sewer lines. Eversource was confronted and asked "would you like to upgrade your lines at this time?" And they said "No. We have no plans to upgrade those lines." So, a year later, Eversource comes through, they drill new power line poles, and put new poles all the way down the whole sub-line of that whole street. Last winter, there was water coming out of the ground where they drilled one of the new poles; they struck the sewer line. Of course,
Eversource would have to pay for that. The City went back and charged them. They came back and tore up the new pavement and put a new patch, a square where they patched the sewer line. So, they just created more damage, coming back and fixing something that they didn't do right the first time.

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

And the fact that it's going to take them, what, four or six seasons of doing the construction? You know, that is way too long to build this Project, and they're going to do it very poorly. And I don't think that this is in our best interest to allow them to do that. And I implore you to say "No" to this Project.
Do them a favor, because the opposition is not going to end with your decision. You know, right now it's a regional problem and local issues. And, if Northern Pass continues to be built, you're going to find that this opposition is going to go to the national level. You know, just think of what -- like the Dakota North Access Pipeline and all that problem, all those protests happened, you may see the same thing. So, do Northern Pass a favor and say "No".

Thank you.

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

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

I rent out a house on Little Squam Lake. It's a major part of my income. People who come up to vacation in the Lakes Region, they come to kayak and canoe and boat and hike
and bike, and they come for the views and the scenery and the peaceful -- peacefulness of New Hampshire.

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

My husband and I have done a lot over the years with putting in solar hot water, including hooking it up to furnaces, we have done geothermal. We're in real estate, so we have apartment buildings. And this is the direction that New Hampshire should be going, rather than these towers and this form of...
electricity. And my father has worked his entire life for the electric company.

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

Thank you very much.

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

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

Number one: Our house is
approximately 1,000 feet from the Lost Nation power substation Eversource ROW containing the PNGTS natural gas pipeline and Coos loop, which borders our property line, a major wetland land area supporting wildlife.

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

Further environmental concerns are the impact of the Northern Pass power lines project on wetlands and their relationship to the native wildlife and species of concern. Burying the lines will not dismiss -- diminish the major disruption of the area. Pages 9 and 10 of the town report show the maps, and Pages 6 and 7 the explanation of areas contained in the maps.
Other attachments related to the environment are as follows: New Hampshire Fish & Game List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife of New Hampshire. I've also referred to another report put together by this interagency government effort, it's called the "Impacts of Transmission Lines on Birds in Flight". This is a lengthy report. So, I just am submitting some excerpts. However, you can get the complete report on the website. It is most interesting in its impact on birds and migration.

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

The Coos Loop, as I mentioned before,
also runs through the ROW, raising the question of "how many towers, along with the existing pipeline, can fit into the existing space?"

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

Number three: The threat to human health from living near power lines has been scientifically proven, and is especially dangerous if you live within a thousand feet of the towers. Childhood leukemia is only one of the many disorders attributed to high power transmission lines. Others include neurodegenerative disorders, Alzheimer's disease, brain cancer, DNA damage, sleep, metabolic disorders, headaches, and reproductive disorders, to name a few. Even low exposure levels have been shown to cause damage to cells. Again, please refer to the Conclusions from the 2012 Bioinitiative Report, and more information can be found on their
website, at www.bioinitiative.org. And I'm also -- I've submitted that in my written materials.

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

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

Number one, you have this flood of cheap gas; two, solar power/wind power, cuts demand; efficient electric appliances; four, competing transmission line for National Grid leads to glut of electricity. Because of these above things I just mentioned, this Project
will lead to a glut of electricity causing a poor rate of return and/or uncertain rate of return.

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

Thank you.

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

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

I'm here in opposition to the proposed Northern Pass Project. Our Town of Gilford
Gilford is not anywhere near the proposed Northern Pass Project transmission corridor, nor do I own any property that is directly affected by the proposed line.

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

The proposed Northern Pass Project remains an unnecessary commercial venture that seeks to link a foreign-controlled power source with southern New England states using New Hampshire as a conduit. A project of this nature, on such an industrial scale, cutting through so many communities, with a span of 192 miles, is unprecedented in our small state. As such, it should not be viewed as just another transmission line, but instead with serious consideration for how this expansive, industrial-scale commercial development would affect the very nature of our state. The sense-of-place and way-of-life that so many citizens and visitors alike enjoy will be
forever altered if this proposed Project is ever constructed in its current form.

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

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

As a citizen, I appreciate the task that has been given to this Committee. But I also appreciate the fear and uncertainty that owners of properties all along the proposed
transmission line corridor have been living
under for close to seven long years. I hope
you can appreciate how difficult it must be to
have everything that you've worked for, your
heritage, and now your future, put under the
shadow of this proposed Project. Imagine for a
moment that these unnecessary industrial-scale
high-voltage lines are proposed to run adjacent
to your property. Wouldn't you fight for your
family? Wouldn't you push for a better
alternative? And wouldn't you expect your
government to protect you from unnecessary
harm?

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

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

MS. MARTIN: Good morning.

Eversource has used the word "clean" to describe Northern Pass. The water in the rivers and reservoirs of northern Quebec certainly do look clean in the pictures. But industrial hydro, just like fossil fuels, release harmful emissions -- carbon emissions into the atmosphere and high latitude dams, like Hydro-Quebec, also release the neurotoxin methylmercury into the rivers killing wildlife and fish and endangering indigenous people dependent upon food from the rivers.

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

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

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

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

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

If environmentally harmful monster projects like Northern Pass are approved, it
makes it so much harder for actual renewable
locally distributed energy projects to get
done. Town governments and citizens find it
impossible to justify the cost for real
renewable distributed energy projects when a
non-renewable project, such as Northern Pass,
monopolizes the field.

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

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

Their own consultant has admitted
that Northern Pass will not significantly
reduce our energy bills, and the "clean" label
they have slapped on this Project is misleading
and specious. There is nothing about Northern
Pass that's in the public interest. The
savings are insignificant, it is destructive to the environment, it would be a permanent blight on our landscape, and would cause enormous disruption to personal property and our communities during construction.

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

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

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

My name is Pat Schlesinger, from New Hampton. I'm 45 years on the Conservation Commission and former president of the Pemigewasset River Council. At 88, I have seen and experienced angst for years over town and river protection. And Northern Pass is no help. The Pemi, a forever north-south highway, has a two plus miles portage in southern
reaches of the town called the "Long Carry",
skirting intense river rapids and today's Ayers
Island Dam; it's a good haul, recorded in
Captain Peter Powers 1754 Journal, town
histories, and a modern novel Look to the
Mountain. A '94 EIS of the dam area indicates
six prehistoric and four historic archeological
sites, and 40 other similar sites, all
unexplored. And we hope to change that with
current interest from PSU and New Hampshire's
archeologist.

While progress, and we must use that
word carefully, meant factories and treatment
plants along the Pemi, their discharges rang a
death knell: For 40 years, into the '70s, the
"putrid, paint-peeling Pemi" wore paint off
Bristol homes overnight. Hundreds of floating
islands sailing downstream were a constant.
Some was factory discharge, but too many were
mounds of turds, and not animal scat either. A
battle ensued in Concord, led my Senator Ed
Bennett of Bristol and New Hampton's Tom Urie,
and until they found federal funding to modify
treatment plants and erring factories closed;
Lincoln was the last, in 1980. But now we could sit back and enjoy a sparkling river, right? Wrong.

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

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

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

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

I thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Kerry Motiejaitis.

MS. MOTIEJAITIS: She's going to be a tough act to follow.
Good day, everyone. My name is Kerry Motiejaitis. And I'd like to thank you for the time to listen to a list of concerns I put together.

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

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

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

I am concerned about the amount of traffic from oversized construction vehicles on our tight squeezed dirt road, also used as an ATV trail.
I am concerned about road closures and how they're going to impact our travel to work.

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

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

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

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

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

I am concerned about all the
concrete, steel, wires, etcetera, being hauled in causing more delays and more deterioration of our road.

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

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

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

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

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

[No indication given.]

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

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

[Indication given.]

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

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

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

MR. GAHAN: Excuse me?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Where do you live?

MR. GAHAN: Hampton, New Hampshire.

I live in Hampton, New Hampshire. We have a
second home in Jefferson. I grew up my whole life in New Hampshire. I'm a third generation of New Hampshire, and my son who's with me today is a fourth generation from New Hampshire.

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

So, on June 22nd through the 25th of this year, for three or four hours each day, I sat at the Appalachian Trailhead on Route 2, with my son, in Randolph, to get hikers to sign my petition to stop Northern Pass. I was
amazed at people's comments, but, more so, how many of them said "we come here for the view". I got 267 signatures, of which approximately 75 percent were from out-of-state, spending their tourist dollars here.

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

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mark McCulloch.

Is Elaine Kellerman here?

MS. KELLERMAN: Yes.

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

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

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

For seven years I've watched this happen. I've heard it all. I've seen people
in these audience -- in this audience that have been fighting this thing for seven years. They put their hearts and souls into trying to come up with ways of convincing the State of New Hampshire and its elected officials to do the right thing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Have a good day.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Kellerman.
Is Douglas Whitbeck here? Douglas Whitbeck?
Yes. And you're interested in speaking?

MR. WHITBECK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

You'll be next.

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

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

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

But, more importantly, I want to talk
about the state, my state, my adopted state. They would irreparably scar my adopted state.

I am a native of Kansas city, Missouri. I moved here about ten years ago. We don't choose where we're born, we just pop into the world, but I chose, I was lucky enough, my husband and I were lucky enough to move to my chosen state. And we came here because of its beauty. It's beauty. I was drawn here by trees, by mountains, by the ocean, by views.

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

It's inconceivable to me that you would allow Northern Pass to permanently scar the state, like a surgical scar down the center.
of it. I can't really even fathom that you would consider such a thing. Honestly don't know how you could sleep at night knowing that you permitted the destruction of views for the living and the future generations of your state, and those who visit it and admire it.

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

Thank you so much for your time.

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

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

I'm sure you have been presented with reams of paper and loads and loads of numbers in an attempt to justify the benefits of this Project. Let me say that there are huge costs which do not show up on balance sheets. The
cost to the First Nations People, who came to
speak to us today. Their huge cultural cost
imposed on them, against the laws of Canada, by
the Province of Quebec, referenced by
Representative Guida earlier today. And, yet,
if we accept this Project, we then become
complicit in those costs. For what? Thirteen
dollars off our electric bill?

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

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

Thank you.

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

MR. DALY: Daly.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Daly". Okay.
You want to speak?

MR. DALY: I want to speak, yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You'll be next.

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

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

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

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

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

    MR. FOX: Thank you. I shop at the
stores near the mall. If Eversource's preferred design is built, I will not be able to escape seeing it on a daily basis, and, frankly, being angered by its aesthetics.

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

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

At the Site Evaluation Committee hearing on March 10th, 2016, here in Concord, I submitted a two-part question, which asked about the return on investment should the Eversource line be built as proposed, or if the line were completely buried. From the Eversource representatives, the answer to the first part of the question was there would be a $90 million return in the first year and
declining over the life of the line, if it was built as proposed. The answer to the second question was they would actually make more money if the line was buried, assuming they could find the folks to pay for it. However, they did not think Hydro-Quebec or the customers in the three states that have indicated interest in receiving the benefits of that power, and those I take to mean Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, would be willing to pay for it.

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

I also wonder why any representation of the proposed Eversource preferred design is absent from the Executive Summary submitted to this Committee, to the Public Utilities Commission, rather than -- rather in the photos in that document they included two beautiful forest streams, another of a beautiful forest
and mountain ridge, and one of downtown Franklin. No towers or transmission lines were to be found anywhere in these photos. Rather, the sole photo of any towers included two line workers walking beneath the same type of wooded towers currently found in the proposed transmission route.

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

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

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

In conclusion, we, in Concord, and in
the remainder of the state, do not need
Northern Pass. It will be an eyesore if built
as proposed.

Thank you.

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

MS. HUARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

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

And I refer you to the Amherst High
School debacle ten years ago, where PSNH had to
redo a 235 kVA line past the school where the
measurements went halfway into the classrooms,
and they wondered why children were becoming
ill. And Dr. Bailey, who was part of a long, long European study, never acknowledged his part in that study.

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

[Short pause.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes? No?

[No indication given.]

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

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

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

MS. HUARD: Right here.

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

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

MR. JONES: Yes. I was right --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Would you be interested in speaking?
MR. JONES: Right here. Yes.

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

MR. JONES: Thank you.

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

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

I began to join forces in opposition against the Northern Pass as a potential tourist that may travel in the area proposed for the Northern Pass. However, more recently, I have become aware, quite by accident, that my neighbors and I will once again be directly affected by the Northern Pass, as the Applicant plans to make certain upgrades to the...
right-of-way, as it continues from Deerfield, making its way to the very same ROW affected by the MVRP, and continuing on directly behind my house in another right-of-way. While these upgrades appear to have been disclosed to the U.S. DOE, they were not disclosed, to my knowledge, to the New Hampshire SEC, nor were those affected by these planned upgrades informed or invited to participate in the formal process for the Northern Pass.

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

My concerns go far beyond aesthetics. The Applicant, their attorneys, the New Hampshire SEC continue to deny and ignore the dangerous health effects from the electric...
magnetic fields associated with high voltage transmission lines. The dangerous magnetic fields will still be present with buried lines.

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

You, the Committee, have also ignored the Applicant's own expert witness, Dr. Bailey, in the past, who has acknowledged the effects these fields can have on the nerves and
muscles, in his testimony on both the Merrimack Valley and Seacoast Reliability Projects.

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

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

What isn't disclosed in the Application in the New -- to the New Hampshire
SEC, is that Northern Pass is but one of many projects overhauling a -- overhauling a massive grid of existing power generation. You can find more information on the Boston, New Hampshire, and Vermont solutions and the manner in which the grid operates on the ISO-New England website; some of which I include in comments in the MVRP Docket.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Huard, please wrap up.
MS. HUARD: I invite --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please wrap up.

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

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

We're going take -- we're going to take two more people. We're going to take Mr. Jones, and then Mr. Carlson. And then we'll be done.

MR. JONES: I won't keep you long.

My name is John W. Jones. I live up on -- in North Sutton, New Hampshire, on a hillside between Mount Kearsarge and Mount Sunapee. I have just a few scattered thoughts here.

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

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

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

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

Necessity is an interesting thing. When you need to have something done, you have to make concessions. This Northern Pass business is not necessary for New Hampshire. My electric bill five years from now is not going to be any less than it is today. If it
goes through, I will resent the fact that these ugly towers will be taking electricity down to Bridgeport, Connecticut, to light up a used car lot, 20-acre used car lot every night of the year.

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

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

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

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Carlson.

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

I want to just make a couple of
statements, reemphasizing some of the things that have already been said about the commercial -- this is a commercial venture. It's not needed for system reliability. And, in case you didn't get the message, this electricity is going south. New Hampshire gets nothing out of it.

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

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

And the other, last point I want to make, they put out this "Property Value Impact", Northern Pass did -- ForwardNH Plan
did. It's done by a guy named Chalmers, James Chalmers. Primarily, he did his study out on the northern Montana 640 foot -- miles of power lines. And he comes back and he says "you might get a small change in" -- excuse me -- "loss in property value", which is what my main concern is. Not -- the 120-foot pole in bed is really bothering me, but the value of my property. A study called "Valuation Guidelines for Properties with Electric Transmission Lines", by Kurt K-i-e-l-s-i -- no, -l-i-s-c-h [Kielisch], collected and analyzed more than 2,500 pages of info and research studies on property values, and found most recent effects range from 10 to 30 percent loss of value. McKenna's has 148 units. Losing 30 percent of their value would be a significant impact on Concord. But Concord has already gone on record requiring burial of the power lines.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

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

(Whereupon the public comment hearing was adjourned at 12:11 p.m.)
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