

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

NOTED AS PRESENT:

Counsel for the Applicants:

Reptg. Eversource Energy: Barry Needleman, Esq.
(McLane Graf Raulerson & Middleton)

Reptg. National Grid: Mark Rielly, Esq.
(Senior Counsel, National Grid)

Counsel for the Public: Christopher G. Aslin, Esq.
Assistant Atty. General
N.H. Dept. of Justice

Also noted as present for the Eversource Energy/National Grid Project Team who provided the presentation and answers to questions:

Jim Jiottis
(Manager of Transmission Engineering, Eversource Energy)

Bryan Hudock
(Project Manager, National Grid)

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

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

PRESENTATION BY EVERSOURCE ENERGY & NATIONAL GRID 25

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION 30

QUESTIONS BY:

Rep. Smith 30, 33

Mr. Iacopino (written questions) 36

Ms. Delehanty 46

Ms. Jones 55

Mr. Lynde 58, 84

Mr. Hallisey 73

PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY:

David Hennessey 86

Peggy Huard 89

Rich Cowan 93

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 MR. IACOPINO: Good evening, ladies and
3 gentlemen. And, welcome to a public information session
4 of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. We are
5 here tonight in Docket Number 2015-05, the Joint
6 Application of New England Power Company, doing business
7 as National Grid, and Public Service Company of New
8 Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy, for a
9 Certificate of Site and Facility.

10 My name is Michael Iacopino. I am
11 Counsel to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee.
12 Seated to my right is our Administrator, Pamela Monroe;
13 seated in the second row is Counsel for the Public,
14 Christopher Aslin.

15 This is a public information session.
16 I'm going to first go over an introduction about what it's
17 about, then give you some instructions on how we're going
18 to hold this meeting tonight, and then we'll get into the
19 presentations.

20 On August 5, 2015, the Applicants, that
21 is New England Power Company and Eversource Energy, filed
22 a Joint Application for a Certificate of Site and
23 Facility. That Application asks the Site Evaluation
24 Committee to issue a Certificate of Site and Facility,

1 it's like a permit, and in that certificate to approve the
2 siting, construction, and operation of a new 345 kV
3 electric transmission line. On September 23, 2015, the
4 Site Evaluation Committee reviewed that Application, took
5 advice from various state agencies, and determined that
6 the Application contained sufficient information for a
7 Subcommittee of the Site Evaluation Committee to carry out
8 the purposes of RSA 162-H.

9 The proposed transmission line will be
10 constructed in an existing developed transmission line
11 corridor, between New England Power Company's Tewksbury
12 22A Substation, in Tewksbury, Massachusetts, and Public
13 Service's Scobie Pond 345 kV Substation in Londonderry,
14 New Hampshire. The Project will consist of approximately
15 18 miles of new 345 kV transmission line. The Project
16 will also require the relocation of existing facilities
17 along some sections of the corridor, including the
18 existing 115 kV line, which is also referred to as a "Y151
19 Line", in order to accommodate the new line.

20 The Project will traverse the Towns of
21 Pelham, Windham, Hudson, and Londonderry. The Project is
22 in two counties. It's in Rockingham County and in
23 Hillsborough County. The Site Evaluation Committee is
24 required to hold public information sessions in each

1 county. Last week, we held the Rockingham County public
2 information session over in Windham, and tonight is the
3 Hillsborough County public information session.

4 The way that this meeting is going to go
5 tonight is we are going to have me present, from the
6 Committee's standpoint, information to the public about
7 how the Committee operates, and a little bit about how the
8 Committee will operate with respect to this particular
9 Project. After I do that presentation, we're going to
10 turn the floor over to representatives from Eversource and
11 New England Power for them to make a presentation going
12 into more of the specifics about the Project.

13 Once that's been done, we'll take
14 questions from the audience. We ask that any member of
15 the public who has a question, write your question out on
16 this white sheet, and there are plenty of them back there
17 at the table at the back of the room. If you write your
18 questions out, bring them up to Ms. Monroe up here, we'll
19 put them into categories, and we will present those
20 questions either to us, as the Committee, if there are
21 questions about the Committee process, or to the
22 representatives from the Company, if there are questions
23 about the Project themselves.

24 Once we've gone through all of those

1 questions and answered them, hopefully answered them all
2 to your satisfaction, the next step in the process will be
3 the time to make public comment. If anybody has a public
4 statement that they want to make about the Project, they
5 will be asked to come up -- well, first, they will be
6 asked to sign in on the yellow sheet in the back, so
7 please do that, especially if you wish to speak. But, if
8 you do wish to speak, we'll ask you to come up to the
9 microphone that's in front of the dais here and make your
10 statement.

11 And, we ask that, when you do that, you
12 do a couple of things. First, you identify yourself and
13 spell your last name. If you look to my right, your left,
14 you'll see that we have a court reporter here, Mr.
15 Patnaude, and he is taking down verbatim everything that
16 is said. So, it's important for him to get your correct
17 name and the correct spelling of your name before you make
18 your statement. Also, please speak slow and clearly, so
19 that he can take down what you have to say. After we
20 conclude with the public comment period, we will adjourn
21 the meeting.

22 So, let me begin and give you a brief
23 introduction to the Site Evaluation Committee and the
24 process that we'll go through with respect to this

1 particular Project. First of all, if you ever have any
2 questions about the Site Evaluation Committee, we have a
3 fairly extensive website. It is at *www.nhsec.nh.gov*.
4 And, I'll put that up at the end of the presentation as
5 well.

6 The purpose of -- the Site Evaluation
7 Committee is created by a statute, RSA 162-H. And, the
8 purpose of RSA 162-H is really a balancing act. It
9 creates the Site Evaluation Committee, and the Site
10 Evaluation Committee is charged with the obligation to
11 balance the benefits and impacts of site selection, and
12 that's energy siting selection; on the welfare of the
13 population; private property; the location and growth of
14 industry; economic growth; the environment; historic
15 sites; aesthetics; air and water quality; the natural
16 resources; and public health and safety.

17 Another purpose of the Site Evaluation
18 Committee is to avoid undue delay in the construction of
19 new facilities, and to provide full and complete
20 disclosure of everything about new energy facilities that
21 are proposed to be built for -- so that the public knows
22 what's going on.

23 And, finally, the Site Evaluation
24 Committee, through its process, ensures that the

1 construction and operation of energy facilities is treated
2 as an aspect of land use planning, in which all
3 environmental, economic, and technical issues are resolved
4 in an integrated fashion. In essence, the Site Evaluation
5 Committee is a statewide planning board for energy
6 projects. It's designed to integrate all of the various
7 permitting processes, as well as any environmental,
8 economic, and technical issues that might come along with
9 any particular project. And, when I say "designed to
10 integrate" means that all of those issues will be decided
11 at one place by one board, the Site Evaluation Committee.

12 The Site Evaluation Committee does
13 preempt local authority and ordinances. In other words,
14 the Site Evaluation Committee may approve the siting and
15 construction of an energy facility, even if that energy
16 facility has not gone before the town planning board or
17 zoning board. In essence, the Site Evaluation Committee
18 is the statewide planning board for energy projects.

19 It's based upon the "supermarket" theory
20 or a "one-stop shopping" theory of permitting. Rather
21 than requiring energy projects to go to numerous state
22 agencies to obtain numerous permits, and then go to
23 various town boards, the idea behind the Site Evaluation
24 Committee is to allow that all to be done under the

1 umbrella of one agency that will coordinate everything and
2 ultimately make the final decision on whether a
3 Certificate for Site and Facility, a permit, should be
4 granted or not granted.

5 Site Evaluation Committee's membership
6 is made up of the three Public Utilities Commissioners,
7 the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental
8 Services, the Commissioner of the Department of
9 Transportation, the Commissioner of the Department of
10 Resources and Economic Development, the Commissioner of
11 Cultural Resources or the Director of the Division of
12 Historical Resources. And, for the last five years or so,
13 in fact, it's been the Director of the Division of
14 Historical Resources that sits on the Site Evaluation
15 Committee. There are two public members, one of whom must
16 be an attorney, and both of whom must have expertise in
17 the issues that surround energy projects. And, there is
18 one alternate public member, who also must have expertise.

19 The Committee, as it exists today,
20 consists of our PUC Chairman, Martin Honigberg, he also
21 serves as the Chair of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation
22 Committee. Our DES Commissioner is Thomas Burack, he
23 serves as the Vice Chair. The PUC Commissioners on the
24 Site Evaluation Committee are Robert Scott and Kate

1 Bailey. Our DOT Commissioner is Virginia Sheehan. Our
2 DRED Commissioner is Jeffrey Rose. Elizabeth Muzzey sits
3 as Director of the Division of Historic Resources. And,
4 then, our public members are Roger Hawk and Patricia
5 Weathersby. Patricia Weathersby is the attorney member.
6 And, we have an alternate member, Rachel Whitaker. So,
7 those are the people who populate our Committee today.

8 Those individuals who are state agency
9 commissioners or division directors, they have the option
10 of appointing a senior staff member from their agency to
11 sit in their space on the Site Evaluation Committee. That
12 senior person must be either a staff attorney or a senior
13 administrator in the division, and some of our members
14 have done that for this particular hearing.

15 The Subcommittee, which is going to make
16 up the board that decides on this particular Project, is
17 going to be chaired by Anne Ross, who is the General
18 Counsel at the Public Utilities Commission. She's their
19 top-dog lawyer. And, she will be sitting as a designee
20 for Chairman Honigberg. Kate Bailey, a PUC Commissioner,
21 will sit on this particular panel. Jeff Rose, a
22 Commissioner of DRED, will sit on this panel. Michele
23 Roberge, who is a senior administrator in the Department
24 of Environmental Services, will sit for Commissioner

1 Thomas Burack. And, Richard Boisvert, our State
2 Archeologist, will sit for Beth Muzzey. And, our two
3 public members sitting on this particular Subcommittee are
4 Roger Hawk and Patricia Weathersby. Those are the folks
5 who will make the ultimate decision in this particular --
6 on this particular Application.

7 In every application for an energy
8 facility or a transmission line that comes before the Site
9 Evaluation Committee, we are required to notify the
10 Attorney General, and the Attorney General appoints an
11 Assistant Attorney General from his office to act as
12 Counsel for the Public. Counsel for the Public is
13 appointed by the Attorney General, and represents the
14 public in seeking to protect the quality of the
15 environment and in seeking to assure an adequate supply of
16 energy. Counsel for the Public has every right and
17 responsibility of any party that you would think of in a
18 court proceeding or anywhere else. He has an obligation
19 to represent his client, the public of New Hampshire, and
20 he can use the full panoply of methods that are used to do
21 that.

22 We are lucky tonight to have our Counsel
23 for the Public who has been appointed in this case here
24 today. And, I'd ask him to step up and introduce himself

1 and say a few words to you, Chris Aslin.

2 MR. ASLIN: Thank you, Mike. As you can
3 see, I'm Chris Aslin, Assistant Attorney General, in the
4 New Hampshire Department of Justice. And, I've been
5 appointed to be Counsel for the Public in this proceeding.
6 My role, as you can see, is sort of two tasks, of look
7 into the aspect of the Project that will affect the
8 environment, as well as assuring adequate supply of
9 energy.

10 To be clear, the role of Counsel for the
11 Public is not to be the individual attorney for each
12 member of the public, but for the public as a whole. So,
13 if people have individualized interests that are affected
14 by this Project, I can hear those interests, I will
15 incorporate them into the public's interest at large, but
16 individual members may want to be represented on their own
17 behalf in the proceedings.

18 My role in this is to be an independent
19 party that assesses the Project, and forms an opinion or
20 not, and asks for information. There's no
21 predetermination under the statute as whether I'd be in
22 favor or against the Project, that's to be determined
23 through the process.

24 But I am a resource for the public to

1 answer questions and to assist you in the docket, to the
2 extent I can, without actually being your lawyer. So, if
3 you have questions about anything and want to bring issues
4 to my attention, I'd be happy to talk to you after the
5 input session this evening. Thank you.

6 MR. IACOPINO: Thanks, Chris. The Site
7 Evaluation Committee has certain timeframes that it must
8 comply with. And, as I go through the timeframes, this is
9 really providing you the meat of sort of the process that
10 the Site Evaluation Committee uses.

11 Before an application is even filed, the
12 applicant, the people who seek to site and construct an
13 energy facility or a transmission line, must hold
14 pre-application public information sessions. Very similar
15 to what we're doing here tonight, they were required to do
16 that at least 30 days prior to their filing of the
17 application.

18 Once they have filed the application,
19 the Chairman, and in this particular case it was Chairman
20 Honigberg, takes that application and forwards it to any
21 state agencies that may have what we call "permitting
22 authority or other regulatory authority". So, for
23 instance, this application was sent over to the Department
24 of Environmental Services' Wetlands Division, as one

1 example. And, that's because, normally, if this was just
2 the construction of, say, a shopping mall, as opposed to
3 an energy project, that developer would have to go to the
4 Department of Environmental Services and get a Wetlands
5 Permit. We have the -- we have the application shipped
6 over to each agency that would have that type of
7 authority, and we ask them to respond to us, to tell us if
8 there's sufficient information in that particular part of
9 the application to satisfy their needs, what they would
10 use to assess the project in, for example, for a Wetlands
11 Permit.

12 At the same time, the Committee itself
13 undertakes a preliminary review, to determine whether or
14 not the application contains sufficient information for
15 the Committee to do its job. And, the Committee's
16 determination of whether an application is complete must
17 be made within 60 days after the filing. In this
18 particular case, that was done, I've already forgotten the
19 date, I believe it was October 2nd.

20 MS. MONROE: What day of what?

21 MR. IACOPINO: Acceptance? It was
22 October 2nd. And, that date then starts some new
23 timelines running. In virtually all of the cases that the
24 Site Evaluation Committee has, the Chairman will designate

1 a subcommittee, like he did for this particular case.
2 When somebody is seeking an application to construct
3 either a transmission line or an energy facility, that
4 subcommittee must have seven members on it. So, that's
5 part of the process as well.

6 Within 60 days of filing the -- of
7 accepting the application, the Committee must hold two
8 public information sessions. And, those -- I'm sorry,
9 within 45 days. And, that's what we're doing tonight. We
10 did one last week -- we have to do one in each county
11 where the facility exists. We did one last week over in
12 Rockingham County, in Windham. And, this meeting tonight
13 is the Hillsborough County public information session.

14 Within 90 days after acceptance of the
15 application, the Subcommittee must come to each county and
16 hold what's called a "Joint Public Hearing". At the Joint
17 Public Hearing, the Subcommittee itself will be joined by
18 representatives from the various state agencies that have
19 an interest in the project. And, at that point, that
20 joint hearing will be very much like the hearing we're --
21 like the proceeding we're having tonight, except you'll
22 have the whole Subcommittee there.

23 Within 150 days after acceptance of the
24 application, the state agencies who have an interest in

1 the application must present the Site Evaluation Committee
2 with draft conditions or draft permits, or provide the
3 Site Evaluation Committee with information letting them
4 know that "we need more information, this is what we
5 need."

6 After 240 days after acceptance of the
7 application, the state agencies must provide their final
8 conditions and final permits to the Site Evaluation
9 Committee.

10 It's at that point that the Site
11 Evaluation Committee undertakes what's called an
12 "adjudicative hearing". Very much like a courtroom trial.
13 The parties to the docket will come up to Concord, will
14 meet in a courtroom type of room. There will be witnesses
15 and cross-examination and arguments and motions and all
16 the things that you see on TV, and the Subcommittee will
17 hear all of those witnesses and the arguments of the
18 parties, and then they have to issue a decision, a written
19 decision within 365 days. So, between 240 days and 365
20 days is really the time when there's a lot of action going
21 on in any given case before the Site Evaluation Committee.

22 If anybody has ever seen one of our
23 decisions, they generally run around 100 pages, and then
24 have numerous attachments. It is a comprehensive process.

1 It covers all types of issues, issues that come from
2 virtually every state agency, and some things that most
3 state agencies don't even deal with.

4 And, at the end of the presentation,
5 I'll show you the types of things that the Committee must
6 decide in determining whether to grant or deny an
7 application.

8 That's the process. And, I've kind of
9 gone through a lot of this already. But the state -- all
10 the various state agencies have a role to play before the
11 Site Evaluation Committee. They help us out in
12 determining, first, whether or not the application is
13 complete. They review those permit applications, and they
14 make recommendations to the Committee. They can identify
15 issues of concern with respect to any proposal that's
16 within the application or with respect to any permit
17 requests. They can designate witnesses to come up and
18 testify at our hearings. And, it's very important to
19 understand that, if a state agency, and let me pick one,
20 let's say the Air Resources Division of the Department of
21 Environmental Services, says to the Site Evaluation
22 Committee "We could not" -- "An air permit is required in
23 this, for this energy facility, and we cannot grant one
24 because it does not meet our requirements." Then, the

1 Site Evaluation Committee cannot issue a certificate.

2 However, the Site Evaluation Committee
3 can impose additional conditions above and beyond what a
4 state agency wants on a committee. And, when determining
5 whether or not the Site Evaluation Committee agrees with
6 the state agency about the conditions, there's a process,
7 where we note and listen to what the state agencies have
8 to say, and they get to respond to the Committee.

9 Even before an application is filed,
10 there is a lot that goes into the process. There are
11 conferences with the -- between the applicants and
12 Independent System Operator. The ISO-New England is the
13 organization that runs our electric grid in New England.
14 They have to be on board. There are environmental and
15 resource studies that are undertaken, and actually become
16 part of the application in most cases. There are early
17 pre-permitting meetings with relevant state and federal
18 agencies, including people like U.S. Forest & Wildlife,
19 the Department of Environmental Services, Fish & Game, the
20 PUC, the Department of Transportation.

21 There should be coordination with your
22 regional planning commissions and with your
23 municipalities. And, in some cases, since this is a
24 transmission line project, so, they're seeking to build a

1 transmission line, so, conferring with a transmission
2 company is not likely. But many of our applications are
3 about generators, and they have to have a way to transmit
4 the power that they're going to generate. Power purchase
5 agreements, financing, eligibility for various tax
6 credits, and, as I indicated before, there should be a
7 pre-filing public information session held in each county.

8 What you have up before you is the
9 actual application. After all of that is done, that's
10 what this Application in this particular docket looks
11 like. There's five volumes, although I don't know exactly
12 how many pages it is, but it is voluminous. And, this is
13 a relatively short transmission line.

14 The Application has to contain
15 sufficient information to satisfy each state agency. And,
16 it also has to describe the project in reasonable detail,
17 identify the preferred choice and other choices for each
18 site -- for the site of each major part of the facility.
19 It has to describe in detail the impact of each part of
20 the facility, describe in detail any proposals for the
21 studying and solving of any environmental problems that
22 may arise as a result of the siting or construction of the
23 project. The application has to describe in detail the
24 applicant's financial, technical, and managerial

1 capability to construct -- to site, construct and operate
2 the facility. An application must document that written
3 notification of the project has been given to the
4 governing body in each community where it's going to
5 exist.

6 And, it must describe the elements of --
7 the elements of and the financial assurances for
8 decommissioning. Energy facilities don't last forever.
9 They do eventually get decommissioned, and there has to be
10 a process for that proposed in the application.

11 And, finally, they have to provide such
12 additional information as the Committee may require. And,
13 our Committee does require additional information. And,
14 that information is contained in a separate set of
15 regulations that the -- that the applicants, any applicant
16 to build an energy facility or a transmission line must
17 also file.

18 And, just for information sake, there is
19 presently pending a docket before the Site Evaluation
20 Committee where those rules and regulations are being
21 revamped. And, that's actually gotten some press lately,
22 and it's something that the public has participated in
23 quite vigorously.

24 There are many opportunities for public

1 participation in our process. First, you heard from Mr.
2 Aslin. You should feel free to get in touch with Counsel
3 for the Public, if you have information that you would
4 like the Committee to understand or if you have some --
5 or, if you need some understanding of his role or the role
6 of the Committee, his number is up there. There are these
7 pre-filing public information sessions that have already
8 been held. I wasn't at the one in this particular county,
9 but I assume it was very similar to tonight, where they
10 have the information outside describing the project and
11 showing you simulations.

12 There are the post-filing public
13 information sessions, which we're undertaking tonight.
14 There's that post-filing joint public hearing, at which
15 the public will be able to participate in, and that will
16 be held sometime within the next month and a half.

17 A city or town that is -- where the
18 facility is located can ask the Site Evaluation Committee
19 to come back to their town and to have additional
20 informational meetings. And, we take written public
21 comment from day one of any docket all the way through
22 until we issue a final decision. And, that written public
23 comment is required to be considered by the Site
24 Evaluation Committee.

1 An interested party can seek to
2 intervene and actually become a party before the Site
3 Evaluation Committee. Anybody whose rights, duties,
4 privileges, immunities, or other substantial interests
5 might be affected by the proceeding has the right to file
6 a motion for intervention. And, if they can demonstrate
7 such an interest, and that their intervention would not
8 impair the orderly conduct of the proceedings, they will
9 be granted intervention status. If granted intervention
10 status, they have the same role, if you will, in the
11 proceedings as the applicant has, as the company has, as
12 Counsel for the Public has; they're considered a party.

13 So, there are many, many ways that
14 members of the public can participate. Our meeting here
15 tonight being one of them, and then the other examples
16 that I've talked about, right through participating as a
17 party after moving to intervene.

18 What does the Committee do to make its
19 decision? That's governed by statute. And, the statute
20 says that the Committee must give due consideration to all
21 of the relevant information regarding potential sites or
22 potential routes. That means not only the route proposed,
23 but other potential sites and routes. The Committee must
24 also give due consideration to the significant impacts and

1 benefits of a project. And, the Committee must consider
2 whether the issuance of a certificate will serve the
3 objectives of RSA 162-H. That's that balancing test that
4 was in the very first slide.

5 Having done that, there are certain
6 findings that the Site Evaluation Committee must find in
7 order to grant a certificate. First, it must find that
8 the applicant has adequate financial, technical, and
9 managerial capabilities to assure the construction and
10 operation of the facility, in compliance with any terms
11 and conditions which are contained in the certificate.
12 The Site Evaluation Committee, in order to grant the
13 certificate, must find that the project will not unduly
14 interfere with the orderly development of the region, with
15 due consideration being given to views of municipal and
16 regional planning commissions and municipal governing
17 bodies. The Site Evaluation Committee, in order to grant
18 a certificate, must find that the project will not have an
19 unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites,
20 air and water quality, the natural environment, or the
21 public health and safety. And, finally, the Committee
22 must determine that the issuance of a certificate will
23 serve the public interest. If it fails any of those
24 standards, the Committee is duty-bound to deny the

1 certificate.

2 Again, if you want information about the
3 Site Evaluation Committee, the best place to get it is at
4 our website, *www.nhsec.nh.gov*.

5 And, that's all I have. The next stage
6 of this public information session will be a presentation
7 from the developers, New England Power and Eversource
8 Energy.

9 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, thank you,
10 everyone, for your attention tonight. My name is Bryan
11 Hudock, from National Grid. And, I'm here with Jim
12 Jiottis, from Eversource. And, we're going to conduct a
13 short presentation on the Merrimack Valley Reliability
14 Project.

15 The first thing we wanted to express,
16 before we really jumped into the Project itself, was our
17 commitment to open communication on this Project. We
18 greatly value the public's input. We want to make sure
19 that they are educated and informed about what we're doing
20 and when we're doing it. And, above all, we want to make
21 sure that we're listening and addressing community and
22 resident concerns and ideas.

23 So, one more thing before we jump into
24 the Project is just an overall explanation of the electric

1 system. So, I'll kind of discuss how power comes from
2 generating stations, where it's generated by coal, wind,
3 and so on. From there, it will go to a substation, where
4 it's converted to a high voltage that's carried on the
5 transmission system, which you can think of as the
6 highway, the backbone of the overall system. So, it's
7 designed to carry large bulk power large distances.

8 At certain points in the transmission
9 system, substations will tap in and convert that voltage
10 to a distribution voltage. And, that's what you see for
11 your -- the service to your homes and your businesses.
12 This is the lower voltage that's going to be carrying the
13 electricity through the local system.

14 So, the Merrimack Valley Reliability
15 Project is designed to improve the reliability in the
16 transmission system, that backbone of the system. It will
17 not affect the distribution system or the distribution
18 service.

19 So, where did this project come from?
20 The Independent System Operator is the independent
21 organization that's charged with maintaining the
22 reliability of the transmission system. So, they have a
23 very smart group of people that are constantly modeling
24 and testing the system to understand where there might be

1 potential weaknesses or issues.

2 And, in a recent study, what they found
3 is that southern New Hampshire and Greater Boston has some
4 of the fastest and most concentrated growing electric
5 demand in all of New England. And, additionally, beyond
6 that, what they found was that, with the existing
7 infrastructure, there's a number of potential overloads on
8 transmission lines, given certain contingencies.

9 So, National Grid and Eversource have
10 jointly proposed a solution, of which this Project, the
11 Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, is a major part, in
12 order to help meet these needs and ensure continued
13 reliability for our transmission system for the future.

14 So, we'll zoom in a little bit on the
15 Project itself. This is a new 345-kilowatt overhead line.
16 It starts at Scobie Pond Substation, in Londonderry, New
17 Hampshire, owned by Eversource. It proceeds south on an
18 existing right-of-way, passing through Londonderry,
19 Windham, Hudson, Pelham, and then, into Massachusetts,
20 where it goes through the Towns of Dracut, Andover, and
21 Tewksbury, where it ends at a National Grid substation in
22 Tewksbury.

23 So, overall, this Project is currently
24 estimated to be a \$123 million investment in the system.

1 Of that, over \$80 million will be invested in New
2 Hampshire. The line is approximately 24 and a half miles
3 long, on the existing right-of-way. And, we put in the
4 breakdowns for New Hampshire, the various towns, as far as
5 the expected line length and asset investment for the
6 overall Project.

7 And, as it currently stands today, we
8 are scheduling around a 2016 construction start, with a
9 goal to have the Project in service by 2017.

10 So, what are the benefits of this
11 Project? Well, first and foremost, a reliable electric
12 transmission system is something that benefits everyone in
13 New England, you, me, all of the citizens in New England.
14 We all depend upon a reliable electric grid and a reliable
15 electric system. So, this Project will help to meet those
16 reliability needs that have been identified by the
17 Independent System Operator.

18 Beyond that, for New Hampshire, there
19 will be significant local investment. So, as I said
20 previously, over \$80 million will be invested in New
21 Hampshire. This will benefit the towns involved, in terms
22 of tax revenues that will be realized, once the line is
23 placed in service. There will also be direct benefits
24 from the jobs that will be employed during construction,

1 and also the indirect benefits as well, from a sizable
2 workforce that will be requiring hotels, restaurants, gas,
3 all of those indirect expenditures will also benefit the
4 local economy as well.

5 So, I won't totally recap this slide,
6 but I think what we wanted to show is that, throughout
7 this process, there will be a number of opportunities for
8 community input. So, last week, we had our public
9 information session, and we're here tonight. And, we'll
10 have other opportunities for community input as well.

11 Beyond that, though, outside of the New
12 Hampshire SEC process, we just wanted to make sure, you
13 know, that we are open for communication. So, I have up
14 here the website, as well as the toll-free number. And,
15 you're welcome to discuss to any of the members that we
16 have in the audience tonight any questions that you have.
17 And, that idea of open communication is not just for
18 tonight, but going forward throughout the Project. So, we
19 want your feedback, we welcome your questions and
20 comments, and want to make sure you have every opportunity
21 to make your voice heard.

22 So, that being said, that concludes my
23 presentation. I think I'll turn it back over to --

24 MR. IACOPINO: Normally, our next -- our

1 next phase of the meeting would be to go into the
2 question-and-answer period. Does anybody else, other than
3 the two folks who provided questions, does anybody else
4 have questions?

5 *(No indication noted.)*

6 MR. IACOPINO: I'm going to take us
7 out-of-order just a little bit then. I understand there's
8 a state representative here who would like to make a
9 public comment, but needs to leave. And, so, if that
10 state representative --

11 REP. SMITH: Well, that would be me. I
12 didn't fill out a form, because I didn't think I would --

13 MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry,
14 Representative, I didn't get your name.

15 *(Inaudible.)*

16 MR. IACOPINO: You can fill it out on
17 your way out. Here is the microphone right up here.

18 REP. SMITH: Sure.

19 MR. IACOPINO: Please tell us your name
20 and spell your last name, so that the court reporter can
21 get it.

22 REP. SMITH: Sure. Representative
23 Gregory Smith, last name S-m-i-t-h. So, I'm one of the
24 state representatives here for -- representing Pelham and

1 Hudson. I haven't formed an opinion about this. But, as
2 you, I'm sure, are aware, Kinder Morgan is proposing to
3 build a large natural gas pipeline. I'd like to
4 understand exactly how that's going to work and how --
5 what the impact is. Because I can certainly see how you
6 guys are putting up your transmission line, but, in
7 conjunction with a parallel construction of a pipeline,
8 that seems problematic.

9 So, I guess my questions are, number
10 one, have you been talking to Kinder, in terms of how this
11 is going to work?

12 Number two, what is the impact going to
13 be, because Kinder is certainly talking about needing some
14 very large construction buffer zones when they do this?

15 And, then, from a permit perspective, is
16 this process completely decoupled, their permit is
17 independent of your permit, or are they somehow just
18 joined, because, again, they're happening at the same
19 time?

20 And, I think that's everything. Thank
21 you.

22 MR. IACOPINO: Why don't I let the
23 Company answer first, with respect to the specifics about
24 the two projects.

1 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, thank you for
2 that.

3 REP. SMITH: Do you want me to sit down
4 now or, I mean, --

5 MR. IACOPINO: You're welcome to --

6 REP. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. IACOPINO: Go ahead.

8 REP. SMITH: Thank you.

9 MR. IACOPINO: There's plenty of chairs.

10 REP. SMITH: Yes.

11 MR. HUDOCK: So, thank you for those
12 questions. And, we definitely understand the concern in
13 regards to the Kinder Morgan pipeline.

14 What we can say is that these projects
15 are independent projects. This is an electric
16 transmission project, designed to strengthen the
17 reliability of the transmission grid. Kinder Morgan's
18 pipeline is proposed for a whole separate need related to
19 the gas system and energy resources.

20 In terms of the overall coordination of
21 the projects, you know, with where we are today, you know,
22 we have the -- you know, the mandate from ISO to proceed
23 forward our projects, sorry, Independent System Operator.
24 And, that's the way we're proceeding, is to be open and

1 transparent about what we plan to do and when we plan to
2 do it.

3 In terms of coordination with Kinder
4 Morgan, they are still in their preliminary stages where
5 they're planning and designing. And, so, you know, we
6 have had communications to let them know where we plan to
7 move lines within the right-of-way, where proposed
8 structures will be located.

9 But, ultimately, you know, they have,
10 you know, control of their own project as well. And, so,
11 you know, we will require safety reviews, to make sure
12 that whatever is put in is safe in accordance to what we
13 have planned in the right-of-way.

14 But, in terms of the actual design,
15 their construction plans and everything else, you know,
16 we're always open to coordinate, but, ultimately, they're
17 independent projects. And, so, you know, we'll do our
18 best to minimize our impacts and continue those open
19 communications.

20 REP. SMITH: All right. Thank you.
21 Mike, if you could indulge me with two more quick
22 questions. The first is, there was a previous discussion,
23 six months ago maybe, I don't recall exactly, at the time
24 it was stated that there would be no new -- no eminent

1 domain, no new rights-of-way, that the entire Project will
2 be contained within the existing right-of-way. Is that
3 still accurate, "yes" or "no"?

4 MR HUDOCK: Yes. That is accurate. We
5 will not be using eminent domain or any other land
6 acquisition. We have -- this is all within the existing
7 right-of-way.

8 REP. SMITH: Okay. And, then, the last
9 question is, obviously, well, I would expect you put
10 together a preliminary engineering design, and at some
11 point that becomes final. When would a final engineering
12 design be completed, meaning you know exactly where each
13 pylon is going, locked and loaded, there are no changes?
14 When do you expect that to happen?

15 MR. JIOTTIS: I'll get that. Actually,
16 as part of the Application, there is just what you talked
17 about, with the caveat that, during the application
18 process, we're still working with abutters or landowners,
19 we can shift structures a little bit to satisfy someone,
20 you know, to get out of a viewshed or something.

21 So, what's filed in the application is
22 pretty much where the structures are going to be, but
23 there's a chance for some minor movements. Also, the
24 Committee itself could ask us to modify our design.

1 REP. SMITH: Okay. All right. Thank
2 you. Part of the reason I ask it here is, again, I'm
3 challenging how Kinder Morgan, again, understand
4 completely independent projects, and encompass how they
5 are going to finalize their application, if your design is
6 not finalized, because you're operating in roughly the
7 same area.

8 So, I thank you for answering my
9 questions. And, that's it. I will --

10 MR. IACOPINO: I was just going to
11 answer your question from the permitting and the state
12 side.

13 REP. SMITH: Yes, please.

14 MR. IACOPINO: Is that there is, in the
15 Application, numerous maps that do indicate where all the
16 major parts of the facility are going to be located, I
17 think even to GPS coordinates. And, that is all available
18 on our website, the entire Application, including those
19 maps, is variable for the public to see.

20 Secondly, everybody should know, I'll
21 stand up and say this, the Site Evaluation Committee does
22 not have authority to take property by eminent domain.
23 Whether it's in this particular docket, or any application
24 that Kinder Morgan or any other pipeline company may file

1 with the Site Evaluation Committee. The Site Evaluation
2 Committee does not have the authority to do that.

3 Right now, there is no application
4 pending before the Site Evaluation Committee from Kinder
5 Morgan.

6 REP. SMITH: Okay. I want to thank you,
7 gentlemen, and I want to thank the Site Evaluation
8 Committee and the public. I have my son with me, and I
9 have to get him somewhere. So, again, I thank you for
10 letting me jump the queue here, all right? Thank you very
11 much.

12 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. I'm now going
13 to go to the next question, which is somewhat similar to
14 the Representative's, but a little bit different. And,
15 this is for the Company.

16 Do you know if there is a law that
17 allows the Kinder Morgan pipeline to traverse the 90
18 year-old right-of-way? And, I assume this questioner
19 means the right-of-way you're constructing the
20 transmission line in.

21 MR HUDOCK: Okay. Well, I am not a
22 lawyer. So, I'll just say that up front. But, in terms
23 of, I will say, on a general basis, that transmission
24 lines and gas pipelines have and are, can be in the same

1 right-of-way. So, as far as a legal basis for that not
2 being allowed, that's not something that we're aware of.

3 MR. IACOPINO: The next question is very
4 close to that as well. What are the safety hazards
5 involved in collocating a gas pipeline across a power line
6 right-of-way or adjacent to it?

7 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, that's, again, a
8 very good question. You know, the one thing I want to
9 express is that National Grid and Eversource take the idea
10 of safety very seriously. So, regardless of what we are
11 talking about, and there's a variety of cases that may
12 happen in terms of things other than transmission lines
13 being mixed within the right-of-way, our first priority is
14 to make sure that whatever it is that it's safe. That
15 it's safe for us to operate and it's safe for our
16 customers.

17 So, regardless of whether it's Kinder
18 Morgan or some other complete -- you know, completely
19 different concept, we're going to do our due diligence to
20 make sure that whatever it is, before they have permission
21 from us, for whatever permissions they need, is that it's
22 going to be built and maintained safely for what we have
23 out there.

24 MR. IACOPINO: And, the third question

1 is about the same thing, but from a different aspect.
2 What are the environmental impacts of two consecutive
3 years of construction on electric lines and gas pipelines
4 on wildlife and threatened/endangered species? I assume
5 this questioner means assuming that both the pipeline --
6 that the transmission line is approved and the pipeline is
7 approved, and there's two consecutive years of
8 construction.

9 MR. HUDOCK: So, again, I think that's
10 another great question. And, you know, what I can say,
11 from our perspective, is that we take very seriously the
12 idea of minimizing our impacts when it comes to
13 construction in the right-of-way and establishing this new
14 line. So, we're going to do our best within to balance
15 all the factors that we have, in terms of our mandate on
16 providing this Project at an efficient cost. But, also,
17 too, to be able to respect the environment and try to
18 minimize impacts there, and the impacts to abutting
19 residents as well. So, we'll do our best to minimize
20 those impacts.

21 MR. IACOPINO: I think I have one
22 question. Ms. Huard, --

23 MS. HUARD: Yes.

24 MR. IACOPINO: -- did you mean for these

1 to be provided as questions?

2 MS. HUARD: Yes.

3 MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

4 MS. HUARD: Because I did want some
5 answers tonight.

6 MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

7 MS. HUARD: Last time I presented them
8 as comments and didn't get answers. So, --

9 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I just wanted to
10 make sure.

11 Okay. So, the next question is, please
12 describe the alleged constraints on our electric grid,
13 where they are, and how adding a transmission line from
14 one substation to another substation will alleviate the
15 constraints?

16 MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. I'll take that.
17 Good question. As far as constraints? I guess the
18 easiest way to think about this, there's a fixed number of
19 lines that go from Massachusetts to New Hampshire, or,
20 essentially, southern New England to northern New England.
21 If you think about each line is going to have some kind of
22 rating, it's going to be able to carry a certain amount of
23 power. What we look at is, when he start taking those
24 lines away, for whatever reason, you know, we assume that

1 there's a tornado, we assume that there's an operation or
2 routine maintenance, we have to still keep the lights on
3 when we lose some of those lines.

4 So, the constraints are, at some point,
5 when you take away enough of those lines, we can't supply
6 the existing load. And, that's what happens in this case.
7 There's a certain number of lines going north to south.
8 When we take out two or more lines, we don't have enough
9 capacity left to serve the load in either New Hampshire or
10 Massachusetts. So, that's why this extra line is being
11 put in, to make up for that loss of what's there today.

12 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. The next question,
13 I'm going to let you guys take a shot at it, then I'll
14 answer it from the Site Evaluation Committee's standpoint.

15 Are you familiar with the California
16 electricity crisis that was deliberately and fraudulently
17 created in 2001? It's actually a series of questions.
18 Have you contemplated whether the energy/electricity
19 crisis in New England is also being deliberately and
20 fraudulently manipulated for profit and greed and not for
21 a genuine need?

22 MR. JIOTTIS: I can comment that we are
23 familiar with what happened in California. I think
24 everybody, you know, knew what happened there. And, I

1 don't think -- from a utility person, it was pretty sick
2 to see somebody do that. But I really can't comment to
3 the other side of that.

4 MR. IACOPINO: Well, I can, from the
5 Site Evaluation Committee standpoint. And, that's part of
6 the reason why we're here. That's part of the reason why
7 we do what we do. That's part of the reason why we go
8 through the process that we go through. If the evidence
9 in this process demonstrates that somebody is acting
10 fraudulently, or that they're presenting false evidence,
11 or otherwise trying to manipulate either the market or the
12 Committee, the Committee will deal with that
13 appropriately. So, that's the way the Site Evaluation
14 Committee deals with issues like that.

15 And, in addition, we also have a Public
16 Utilities Commission in the State of New Hampshire, which
17 has a similar charge on a broader basis, because the
18 Public Utilities Commission regulates not just the
19 construction of energy facilities or transmission lines,
20 but also the energy market. So, there are two state
21 agencies in the State of New Hampshire that deals
22 specifically with things like that. And, if it's
23 determined that that is, in fact, what is occurring, there
24 will be appropriate action taken by each agency.

1 The next question you guys are going to
2 have to answer. It's pretty specific. What are the
3 actual sizes of the transmission towers proposed closest
4 to the road on both sides of David Drive? And, I assume
5 that's in Hudson.

6 MS. HUARD: I did get that question
7 actually answered already by someone. So, you can skip
8 over that.

9 MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

10 MS. HUARD: To make it easier.

11 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So, we'll skip
12 that question. The next question is, are you aware that
13 trees provide a natural barrier that weakens the strength
14 of electric fields? Have you contemplated the dangerous
15 and negative effects, the removal of this beneficial
16 barrier of trees, combined with the new and existing
17 electric fields, will have on the public health of
18 numerous individuals?

19 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, that's a great
20 question. And, I'll answer that one. In terms of the
21 question about EMF, electromagnetic fields, National Grid
22 and Eversource have followed that subject very closely, as
23 it's been, you know, a concern in the public and elsewhere
24 over the last several decades. So, we try to do our best

1 to stay up-to-date on the latest literature and the latest
2 science as new information comes to light.

3 And, so, what we can say is, you know,
4 one, that there has been no positive link between EMF and
5 adverse health effects when it comes to transmission
6 lines. And, two, we have done studies to model the
7 electromagnetic levels that will be here before and after
8 the Project. And, what we found is that, for this
9 Project, in the right-of-way, the electromagnetic fields
10 will either go down or will go up insignificantly.

11 MR. IACOPINO: And, is that, that
12 modeling, is that contained within your Application?

13 MR. HUDOCK: Yes.

14 MR. IACOPINO: The next question is, are
15 you aware of the many benefits that trees naturally
16 provide the environment? They absorb carbon dioxide and
17 remove it from the environment. This process is vital to
18 mitigate the effects of climate change. They also produce
19 beneficial oxygen for people to breathe. In a time when
20 our country and government is so concerned about reducing
21 the carbon footprint contributing to the drastic climate
22 change, how can you be so negligent with this Project in
23 removing such a large volume of trees?

24 MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. We are aware of the

1 benefits of trees. We take tree management very
2 seriously. We look at it in, primarily, from a safety
3 perspective, we have to keep the trees from our lines, so
4 they don't cause outages and they don't cause any injury.

5 As far as the impact to carbon on this,
6 I guess you could say that removing some trees will have
7 an effect. But, at the same time, there can be positive
8 effects on the environmental from the construction of this
9 line. In other words, not running a power plant somewhere
10 else. So, it is a trade-off, but it is a necessary item
11 to trim those trees.

12 MR. IACOPINO: And, then, the final
13 question that I have here, despite the other alternatives
14 that you evaluated, you chose this one due to cost. Is
15 cost a valid reason to endanger the public health of so
16 many?

17 And, before your answer, you know, if
18 you disagree with the premise of the question, you should
19 feel free to tell the public that you disagree with the
20 premise of it. I'm not -- we're not here to put anybody
21 on the spot. We're here to get information.

22 MR. HUDOCK: Sure. So, again, a valid
23 question from the standpoint that, you know, any time you
24 see a large project of this nature, you know, will it be

1 constructed safely? Will it be maintained safely? And,
2 the answer is, for Eversource and National Grid, that's
3 one of our highest priorities, is to make sure that it's
4 safe for the public and it's safe for our workers, and
5 it's safe going forward in the future.

6 So, certainly, safety is going to be a
7 consideration, and the top consideration, when it comes to
8 selecting and designing this Project.

9 MR. IACOPINO: Could you address the
10 "cost" part of the question?

11 MR. JIOTTIS: Sure.

12 MR. IACOPINO: I'll read the question
13 again. Despite the other alternatives you evaluated, you
14 chose this one due to cost. Is cost a valid reason to
15 endanger the public health of so many?

16 MR. JIOTTIS: Obviously, just to, you
17 know, restate what Bryan mentioned, you know, we don't
18 build things to endanger the public. We feel that what we
19 build is safe, we design around safety.

20 As far as cost, cost is one
21 consideration. But we do look at other issues. In this
22 case, as we've mentioned, it's being constructed in an
23 existing right-of-way. So, that was one of the items, one
24 of the selection criteria, is we're not going to create a

1 new transmission path. We're going to use an existing
2 location.

3 Excuse me. We also look at things,
4 siting it with other existing infrastructure. In other
5 words, not creating new paths, new transmission
6 right-of-ways. We look at our ability to construct the
7 project. Can we build it in the timeframe that it's
8 needed? I mean, you can come up with some ideas, if
9 you're not going to be able to construct it for 10 years,
10 that doesn't do anybody any good. So, when we do look at
11 a project, we look at something we can build in the
12 timeframe that's needed.

13 So, the cost is a factor, but it's not
14 the only factor.

15 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I don't think we
16 have -- are there any other questions? Oh, I see somebody
17 raising her hand in the back.

18 MS. DELEHANTY: Thanks. Should I go up?

19 MR. IACOPINO: Sure. It's probably
20 better if you just come up and speak your question. Just
21 please identify yourself and spell your last name for us.

22 MS. DELEHANTY: My name is Louise
23 Delehanty. I'm a member of the Pelham Conservation
24 Commission.

1 MR. IACOPINO: Spell your last name.

2 MS. DELEHANTY: Delehanty,

3 D-e-l-e-h-a-n-t-y.

4 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

5 MS. DELEHANTY: I'm a little nervous
6 being at the microphone. But there was a question
7 regarding wildlife. And, I don't know if you're aware of
8 the threatened and endangered species that are along the
9 route of the ROW. We have the northern black --

10 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

11 MS. DELEHANTY: We have the northern
12 black racer, we have the New England cottontail, and we
13 have Blandings turtle, they're endangered. We also have
14 threatened species. And, Pelham has quite the habitats
15 for all three. More so, they seem to be concentrated in
16 southern New Hampshire, southeastern, in the Pelham area.
17 And, these can be confirmed with New Hampshire Fish &
18 Game.

19 When you mentioned that the Project
20 would probably begin in 2016, I was reading that the
21 habitats for these endangered species, you would wait till
22 the spring to see where you were going to identify exactly
23 where the habitats were for all three threatened species.
24 So, if you start your construction, it would be in early

1 2016, in the winter, that way you won't really know where
2 the habitats are, where the concentration of these three
3 endangered species are.

4 And, I also read some information
5 regarding the Project, that you, just for example, for the
6 northern black racer, that they were going to be captured,
7 those that were found along the ROW, and microchips
8 inserted into the northern black racers. They were going
9 to be taken to a veterinarian to see if they tolerate it.
10 It seems like it's trivial to some people. But, in the
11 great picture, it's kind of like I even think myself that
12 it's really silly to trap them, microchip them, release
13 them. Wouldn't it be much better if you just didn't come
14 through any of the sites where the habitats are right now?

15 And, like I said, you can find out where
16 all of the -- they have been located, spotted, they have
17 been documented, photographs taken, all the information
18 sent to New Hampshire Fish & Game.

19 So, if you're starting your Project in
20 the winter, what's to happen to all of these three
21 endangered species? I don't know think you can just come
22 in and just do an upheaval of their sites. There are many
23 other -- there are lots of threatened species I won't go
24 into right now.

1 And, my other comment is, I live in a
2 55+ senior community. And, if you have maps, I would like
3 to see them, to where the existing center pole will be
4 moved to the western edge. And, if it's moved to the
5 western edge, it's moving ever closer to the boundary of
6 our common land. And, if the boundary -- if that pole is
7 moved there, then that means Kinder Morgan, should they
8 get the okay, they move even closer to us. So, we have 38
9 residents, who are -- some are in the 80s and 90s, and
10 quite concerned about Kinder Morgan.

11 Can you do anything about not locating,
12 not just for, I don't want to be selfish about just where
13 I live, but can you do something about not moving the
14 center pole right across from where to, you know, to the
15 wooden one that you're going to be constructing on the
16 western edge? Is there any way you can manipulate that a
17 little bit, so that there's more, I know they're still
18 going to be within the ROW, but, if it's not within the
19 ROW, if it's not even to abutters, then maybe there's more
20 wiggle-room should Kinder Morgan, you know, get approval.

21 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I've counted three
22 questions out of that, okay?

23 MS. DELEHANTY: Okay.

24 MR. IACOPINO: The first one I believe

1 deals with construction in the winter and the effect on
2 endangered and threatened species. The second deals with
3 microchipping of some of those species that may have been
4 suggested as a method.

5 MS. DELEHANTY: You can't capture them
6 to microchip them.

7 MR. IACOPINO: I just want to inventory
8 the questions, so that they know what to respond to. And,
9 the third is the collocation of the transmission line
10 being moved to the -- to the west side of the
11 right-of-way, and how that's going to collocate with the
12 Kinder Morgan pipeline, if it's ever constructed, --

13 MS. DELEHANTY: Uh-huh.

14 MR. IACOPINO: -- and affect the 38
15 residents of your 55 and over.

16 MS. DELEHANTY: Oh, and also any of the
17 homes. Because the western side is the side that's going
18 to accommodate the center power line, isn't it?

19 MR. IACOPINO: Well, they'll answer that
20 for you. But those were your three questions, right?

21 MS. DELEHANTY: Right.

22 MR. IACOPINO: Let's give them a chance
23 to answer them. And, if they're not answered to your
24 satisfaction, I'll give you a chance to ask another

1 question, okay?

2 MS. DELEHANTY: Thank you.

3 MR. IACOPINO: Go ahead.

4 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. Great. So, those
5 are great questions. So, thank you for asking all of
6 those. And, I'll do my best to remember and answer all of
7 them, but I might miss one or two. So, if I miss
8 anything, just maybe key [sic?] me in and I'll do my best
9 to get back to it.

10 So, in terms of the location of the
11 Project, you know, as was mentioned, we have posted our
12 Project plans within the Application, and that's
13 available. I'd also encourage you to, if you have some
14 questions about your specific situation, about where you
15 live in relation to the Project, that you find someone
16 that's in the audience from the team, a lot of them are
17 standing in the back here, and they can come help you, to
18 talk to you about exactly your specific location and the
19 Project.

20 In terms of the locations of the lines,
21 you know, we did a very large amount of due diligence, as
22 far as how the right-of-way was going to be configured.
23 We looked at, you know, as many options as we could within
24 the confines of that right-of-way. And, ultimately, the

1 design we came up with was the one that best balanced, you
2 know, the constraints that we have, in terms of cost, in
3 terms of environmental impact, and abutter impact.

4 And, so, I can tell you that a lot of
5 work went into selecting the position and the locations of
6 the lines that we have currently designed today.

7 MR. IACOPINO: Seasonal construction.

8 MR. HUDOCK: Seasonal construction. So,
9 our current intention is to start construction in late
10 2016. I would say that, in terms of your concerns over
11 endangered species, whether they're animals or plants, we
12 are and will be and continue to be in consultation with
13 Natural Heritage, New Hampshire Natural Heritage, and
14 other state agencies that have jurisdiction over
15 endangered species. And, you know, we've done things,
16 such as surveys and everything else, to make sure that our
17 Project will minimize any impacts to any rare or
18 threatened species. Because, obviously, that's of very
19 high importance to us to make sure we do that. So, we
20 have a number of, you know, ways to work around that, but
21 it's very important to us to minimize that impact.

22 MR. IACOPINO: Microchipping.

23 MR. HUDOCK: So, microchipping. So, I'm
24 not a ecologist or a wildlife biologist. I will say that

1 I did work on a project, not necessarily the exact same
2 project, but we built a substation in Massachusetts. And,
3 we actually ended up putting RF antennas on rare species
4 of turtles that was in the area, and we had a dedicated
5 turtle tracker, that would go out with his gear, it's like
6 a giant TV antenna, to go out and direction find the
7 turtles. And, you know, I think -- I see some people
8 chuckling, and it does sound kind of funny. But, in all
9 seriousness, the reason why we do that is because animals
10 move around. And, some of them are small and hard to
11 find, and, especially out there, you're in the woods, in
12 the brush. And, the last thing we want to do is have a
13 truck go out there and run over a rare species because he
14 didn't know it was there.

15 So, the idea of the tracker is for the
16 animals, okay, you want to be able to, you know, when
17 possible, know where they are and be able to keep them
18 clear of the construction area.

19 So, I can't really speak to the
20 specifics of the RF placement on the species. But I can
21 just give you an example of projects I worked on of why we
22 have tracking of the rare species, and it was for their
23 own protection.

24 MR. IACOPINO: And, her final question,

1 I think, dealt with the movement of the transmission line
2 to the western edge of the -- I don't know if it's to the
3 edge, but to the western side of the right-of-way, and the
4 collocation of any eventual Kinder Morgan pipeline. The
5 questioner was concerned that the pipeline would wind up,
6 I believe, between the transmission line and the edge of
7 the right-of-way, --

8 MR. HUDOCK: Sure.

9 MR. IACOPINO: -- and, obviously, where
10 she lives.

11 MR. HUDOCK: Right. So, you know, the
12 main statement I'm going to have about that is to kind of
13 repeat back what I started with. Is I know that our
14 engineering team spent a lot of time weighing all the
15 options that we had, because it's a complex project, and a
16 lot of considerations to balance, in terms of costs and
17 impacts and everything else. So, in the end, you know,
18 I'm really confident that the solution we came up with,
19 where one of our existing transmission lines will be
20 relocated to the west is the best solution in terms of
21 balancing the costs. Because, ultimately, that's what
22 we're here to do. So, we're looking to find the best way
23 that's going to balance all those constraints.

24 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. I think

1 that's all the questions we had. Did you have a question
2 or did you want to make a statement?

3 MS. JONES: No, I want to make ask a
4 question.

5 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Why don't you come
6 up to the microphone, ma'am. Is there anybody else who is
7 going to want to ask a question, I would ask that you
8 write it down, and then we can ask it, so we can avoid
9 some of the movement, because we will have public
10 statements afterwards.

11 MS. JONES: Sometimes you don't know if
12 you have a question until you hear what they say.

13 MR. IACOPINO: I know. And, next time,
14 I'll recommend at the beginning that people -- that
15 everybody grab a piece of paper on their way in. But go
16 ahead, ma'am, why don't you ask your question.

17 MS. JONES: I live in the same
18 condominium complex as Louise. I just wondered how --

19 MR. IACOPINO: Tell us your name and
20 spell your last name.

21 MS. JONES: Oh. Susan Jones, Pelham,
22 J-o-n-e-s.

23 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

24 MS. JONES: I just wanted to know about

1 your heavy-duty equipment that you have to bring in. I
2 went with one of the other girls around some of the
3 neighborhoods in Pelham, and they're quite lovely. And,
4 these power lines that you have up there I imagine were
5 built quite a while ago, and there wasn't as much homes --
6 as many homes as there are now. How much -- how are you
7 going to get your heavy-duty equipment in there without
8 taking down more trees? You know, there's no roads where
9 we live. There's one road. And, what trees we have there
10 now are gone.

11 MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. Good questions,
12 good concerns. Typically, with our Application, we're
13 going to lay out how we're going to get to structures. We
14 have to tell people how we're going to do it. And, if it
15 involves crossing any kind of environmentally sensitive
16 areas, we're going to have to -- those are going to have
17 to be permitted. Typically, we'll move our equipment up
18 and down the right-of-way, rather than coming in through
19 someone's backyard.

20 MS. JONES: You can't, really. There's
21 not much room. I went through a lot of neighborhoods,
22 there's not much room. You're going to stick your hand
23 out in the kitchen, out your kitchen window, and you're
24 going to be hanging on to a power line.

1 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Let's let them
2 answer the question.

3 MS. JONES: Sorry.

4 MR. IACOPINO: And, if you want to make
5 a statement, you'll be permitted to do so. Go ahead, sir.
6 I'm sorry.

7 MR. JIOTTIS: We do -- we do look at
8 those types of items for --

9 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

10 MR. JIOTTIS: Sorry. Okay. We do look
11 at that type of stuff to make sure we can get to our
12 equipment. We don't build stuff we can't get to. Even
13 what's there today, we had to get to there for one reason
14 or another. So, we know our equipment can move up and
15 down. We make a lot of provisions, matting of sensitive
16 areas, so we don't do damage around there. We won't come
17 across folk's backyards, unless we get their permission to
18 go into it. So, we do look at access very seriously, and
19 it is part of our application.

20 MS. JONES: All right. What --

21 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

22 MR. IACOPINO: Ma'am, why don't you --
23 is there another question? I see --

24 MS. JONES: That's all right.

1 MR. IACOPINO: I see the gentleman right
2 here, did you have a question, too?

3 MR. LYNDE: Yes, I do have a question.

4 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And, how about
5 you, sir, do you have questions over here, too?

6 FROM THE FLOOR: I do.

7 MR. IACOPINO: All right. Why don't
8 you, while he's writing, why don't you --

9 MR. LYNDE: Thank you. I actually
10 signed up to speak, but it was actually for questions,
11 so --

12 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Why don't you tell
13 us your name, spell your last name, and then ask your
14 questions.

15 MR. LYNDE: My name is Hal Lynde, that's
16 L-y-n-d-e, 114 Jeremy Hill Road. I'm also the Chairman of
17 the Pelham Board of Selectmen.

18 I wanted to deal with Kinder Morgan
19 first, all right. One of the things that we've talked,
20 when we first -- Kinder Morgan came in, and they said
21 they're going to locate in the right-of-way. And, so, I
22 want your honest assessment of whether they can indeed
23 locate within the right-of-way that you have?

24 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, that's a very

1 good question.

2 MR. LYNDE: They're all good questions.
3 So, you don't have to tell me that anymore.

4 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. But still, for you,
5 though, it still is a good question, and I will say that.

6 So, in terms of, what I can say is, is
7 that transmission lines and gas pipelines have coexisted
8 on right-of-ways that exist today in our systems, and it
9 will exist in the future. So, is it possible to safely
10 site a pipeline within a right-of-way that has
11 transmission infrastructure? Yes, under the right
12 circumstances.

13 For this one in particular, I can't
14 comment on the specific designs that Kinder Morgan has.
15 You know, but, when they do provide us with the design and
16 we do a full review, we'll ensure that it is safe.

17 MR. IACOPINO: And, from the Site
18 Evaluation Committee's view, when and if Kinder Morgan
19 files an application to build their pipeline, that's one
20 of the things that will be considered. The public health
21 and safety of that pipeline along the entire route will be
22 considered by the Site Evaluation Committee in the process
23 of that particular application, of issuing or denying that
24 particular application.

1 MR. LYNDE: All right. Thank you. Is
2 there a specified separation between a transmission line
3 and a pipeline? Because, obviously, you have a magnetic
4 field that could conceivably induce electricity into a
5 metal pipe. So, there must be some guidelines or some,
6 hopefully, some regulations or something. Is that the
7 case?

8 MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. The answer -- the
9 short answer is "yes". There's quite a few guidelines.
10 They cover things from as far as the distance, but they
11 also cover, when the pipeline is put in there, they have
12 to take certain actions to mitigate that induce a voltage
13 on their pipeline. So, there's a whole series of
14 regulations to cover just what you're talking about.

15 MR. LYNDE: So, how would I -- where
16 would I go to find those regulations? Are they a simple
17 set or something that just you have to dig through it?

18 MR. JIOTTIS: No. It's not going to be
19 simple. You would find them, there's things under some of
20 the IEEE standards, the electrical standards. You have to
21 also look at some of the pipeline standards that they use
22 to build them. So, they're going to be in a couple
23 different places.

24 MR. LYNDE: Okay. Thank you.

1 [inaudible]. What is the power rating of the proposed
2 pipeline? How much power do you intend to bring down on
3 that? What's -- a thousand megawatts? What's the number?

4 MR. JIOTTIS: The pipeline? I'm
5 sorry --

6 MR. LYNDE: No, I'm sorry. I said
7 "pipeline", it's the transmission line. I'll switch out
8 of Kinder Morgan mode and into the National
9 Grid/Eversource mode, okay.

10 MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. The line itself is
11 going to be 345,000 volts. Megawatt-wise, maybe
12 2,000 megawatts, in that range, 1,200 to 2,000 megawatts
13 in there.

14 MR. LYNDE: Okay. The other three
15 lines, there were two 245s, I'm not sure it's the right
16 number, and 110 kV, is it something like that?

17 MR. HUDOCK: 115. 115, sorry.

18 MR. LYNDE: 115. What is the power
19 rating -- how much power does that thing deliver in the
20 area, that small line?

21 MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. The small one
22 itself, it's really, I'm not so sure you can say it
23 "delivers power into the area". It's really just
24 connecting a couple local -- what we would consider "local

1 substations". But that might be in terms of a couple
2 hundred megawatts. So, it's significantly less than that
3 we're building with this line.

4 MR. LYNDE: Okay.

5 MR. JIOTTIS: And, the object of this
6 line is to move a large amount of power from Point A to
7 Point B.

8 MR. LYNDE: Okay. But is that small
9 line going from Point A to Point B?

10 MR. JIOTTIS: It's -- yes. But I'm
11 trying to use an analogy, it's not -- it's not designed to
12 move a lot of power from one point to another.

13 MR. LYNDE: No, I understand. So, my
14 question is, and this of interest, I think, to Pelham, and
15 is why not get rid of it? You have ten times the amount
16 of power coming down the 345. You're going to locate it
17 in the center, where the smaller line is. Save yourself
18 some money, don't relocate it, and save the neighbors
19 having to clear the right-of-way. Have you looked at a
20 cost/benefit trade-off of doing that?

21 MR. JIOTTIS: The short answer is "not
22 getting rid of it, we haven't looked at it." That smaller
23 line that you talk about, it's still needed, because that
24 serves the substation to serve the local load. The line

1 that we're building is, again, it's moving a lot of power
2 south to north, north to south, you know, across it.

3 The smaller lines you're talking about
4 bring power from, say, Pelham, up to Hudson, New
5 Hampshire, they're tied together. So, they go very short
6 distances, but they move a little bit of power, and they
7 get it closer to people's homes. Not to your house, but
8 it's that next step, from the larger line that you see,
9 simply goes from there down to the smaller line, and then
10 down to the lines on the road.

11 MR. LYNDE: So, are you -- you're not
12 going to look at that, I assume, are you? Or, could you
13 look at it?

14 I mean, I guess I'll turn to the Site
15 Evaluation Committee. I think it's a fair question to
16 ask, because of the impact on Pelham. Because what
17 they're doing now is going to have four power -- four
18 transmission lines, the small one's going to get relocated
19 to the edge of the right-of-way, probably 15 feet from the
20 edge, I think is the numbers I remember. So, it's going
21 to require clearing of a lot of trees and opening up a
22 significant area.

23 If it was feasible, why couldn't -- I
24 like to have a question as to why that couldn't be done?

1 So, fair enough?

2 MR. IACOPINO: The answer from the Site
3 Evaluation Committee is that, if that is a feasible
4 alternative, and I think what I hear them saying is that
5 that's not, because it serves a different load or a
6 different usage. But, if that is an alternative, there is
7 going to be an evidentiary process. And, one of the
8 things that was in my PowerPoint is that the Site
9 Evaluation Committee will consider what other alternatives
10 there are. And, if they find those alternatives to be
11 better, in their balancing test, as I explained before,
12 they may very well require something like that.

13 Although, I suspect, based upon the
14 answer that I heard the gentleman give, is that that's
15 probably not considered to be a feasible alternative, to
16 remove that 115 kV line, because it serves a different
17 purpose than the 345 kV. That's what I thought I heard.

18 MR. HUDOCK: One thing I could add onto
19 that, this one line we're talking about, the 151, we're
20 actually, when we are relocating it, actually rebuilding
21 at a higher capacity. So, that kind of gives you an idea
22 as far as the need for it. It isn't just that it's needed
23 as existed, it's actually needed in a higher capacity
24 form.

1 MR. LYNDE: So, it's going to be a
2 different size tower?

3 MR. HUDOCK: The towers that exist
4 today, it will be different from the towers that exist
5 today, where it is today, yes.

6 MR. LYNDE: I guess, where's all the
7 power coming from? Where's this extra 2,000 megawatts
8 coming from?

9 MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. I'll take that.
10 The very short answer is "it's coming from everywhere."
11 Our system is tied together, so the power flows, it's a
12 free-flowing system. The electricity that you have in
13 your house today could have come from Canada, it could
14 have come from Connecticut, it could have come from
15 anywhere. It's all tied together and just flowing across
16 the system. So, you really can't say, in this case, with
17 our AC transmission system, that power just moves from one
18 place to the other, it really just goes where the load is.

19 MR. LYNDE: I guess I'm struggling a
20 little bit with that comment, because I assume, coming
21 into Scobie Pond, I guess where that's the terminus of
22 this, you're telling me there's 2,000 megawatts of
23 capacity coming into that that's not being used right now?

24 MR. JIOTTIS: No. It's -- that where it

1 starts at is another substation with another five lines
2 that come into that from different parts of New England.
3 Some come from Maine, some come from New Hampshire, some
4 come from Vermont, they all tie together. So, it's not as
5 if there's extra capacity. We're just giving it another
6 route to flow down here, if we were to lose an existing
7 line. It's not really new capacity. It's just another
8 route to get power in the same place.

9 MR. LYNDE: Okay. So, then, if that's
10 the case, why do you feel the need to upgrade the 110 kV
11 line for higher power?

12 MR. HUDOCK: Right. So, in general, for
13 this entire Project, including this reconductoring, the
14 Independent System Operator is the one making the
15 evaluations of the power grid. So, they're taking into
16 consideration the load that's going to -- the load growth,
17 they're taking into consideration the condition of the
18 system as it stands today. And, they're the ones that
19 make the determination that a line needs to be replaced or
20 upgraded, or a new line needs to be installed. And, so,
21 they're the ones after, you know, these are very, very
22 smart people, with a high degree of technology at their
23 disposal, studying the system constantly to decide, you
24 know, what needs to be done in order to ensure

1 reliability.

2 MR. LYNDE: I understand. Obviously,
3 this thing is costing 180 million or something like
4 that -- I'm sorry, 125 million I think is the number you
5 used. And, is that going to show up in rate base
6 somewhere?

7 MR. HUDOCK: So, the answer is "yes".
8 The cost for upgrades like this, new lines like this, is
9 actually borne through all of New England. So, it's a
10 pooled regional cost is the way it works. So, if -- it
11 doesn't matter the location of the transmission line. So,
12 if this transmission line was magically in Connecticut,
13 those costs would still be borne by the ratepayers in New
14 Hampshire.

15 And, the way that cost is calculated,
16 it's allocated to the states on a formula based on load.
17 So, I think, as it stands, New Hampshire ratepayers pay
18 approximately 9 percent of the pool. And, so, that is --
19 the transmission costs are an element on your bill. This
20 Project, all of the transmission projects in the system is
21 the transmission costs. And, what we've done is we've
22 calculated what this Project impact would have on a bill.
23 And, the numbers we came back with, it would be, you know,
24 under \$2.00 a year for the average ratepayer.

1 MR. LYNDE: How much?

2 MR. HUDOCK: Under \$2.00.

3 MR. LYNDE: All right. So, that's
4 probably assuming that there's increase in load growth
5 also, because, if the load today was static, what would be
6 the impact then?

7 MR. HUDOCK: Well, in terms of the
8 study, what they look at, and as you mentioned, there's
9 load growth, the needs exist because of -- what they do is
10 a contingency analysis. So, they look and see, if this
11 line happened to go down, can we maintain a reliable
12 system? And, so, some of these needs exist at today's
13 levels.

14 MR. LYNDE: So, there's a couple things
15 in play here. The issue is reliability. So, we're adding
16 this 345 kV line to add reliability. But it's more than
17 that, because, obviously, it's much more power than what
18 you've got there now. So, somebody's got to pay for that
19 reliability, I guess that's my point. And, if their
20 projections are off, if people start generating more
21 electricity on their own, which may happen, of course, I
22 realize there's going to be a tug-of-war going on now
23 between people trying to get solar credits versus
24 generation. But, if you're wrong, then our rates are

1 going to go -- people using electricity, their rates are
2 going to go up, because that transmission line is going to
3 be in rate base. Is that a fair statement to make?

4 MR. HUDOCK: I think, in terms of when
5 you look at this project, yes. Will it cost the
6 ratepayers a marginal amount? Yes. But I will say that
7 the Independent System Operator does look at things like
8 load growth, like energy efficiency, new generation, they
9 take all of that into account. Because, ultimately,
10 they're -- they do not want to have a system that is
11 overcharging customers for unneeded infrastructure.

12 So, all that being said, in terms of
13 whether that's been analyzed for potential of new
14 generation? Yes. The short answer is "it has been", as
15 far as, you know, that's what their job is to do to make
16 sure they're accurately forecasting what's expected.

17 But the other thing I would just add is,
18 you look at the direct costs of this Project, like I said,
19 very marginal, you know, under \$2.00 for the average
20 ratepayer a year. But, you know, having a reliability
21 issue with the transmission system, that's going to be
22 felt by everybody. Transmission outages can have a
23 significant impact for everybody, just because of the
24 large regional effect that it's going to have. And, so,

1 that's why, you know, you're being proactive to construct
2 something to avoid significant negative consequences. So,
3 I mean, those could be catastrophic or huge, if the wrong
4 thing were to happen, which is why this Project is needed.

5 MR. LYNDE: Okay.

6 MR. IACOPINO: Sir, how many more
7 questions do you have?

8 MR. LYNDE: I think I'm all set. So,
9 I'm going to -- thank you.

10 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Okay. The
11 next question that I have, I'll read: Two weeks ago, and
12 this is from a member of the Windham Conservation
13 Commission, two weeks ago, at our town conservation
14 meeting, there was talk about permanent water crossings
15 and access roads. My concern is in reference to the many
16 wetlands and conservation properties along the proposed
17 path. What is the plan for more permanent crossings?

18 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, I'll address
19 that question. I would just say that, overall, you know,
20 as I think I mentioned a few different times, that, in
21 terms of construction of our Project, cost is certainly an
22 important issue, but also to minimize the impacts to the
23 environment. So, we want to plan and construct the
24 Project in a way that's going to minimize our constraints,

1 minimize those impacts, including wetlands. So, we have a
2 very robust plan that we have been constantly developing
3 and refining, in order to mitigate our wetland impacts.

4 And, in terms of permanent crossings,
5 you know, I think that part of the overall plan, where
6 there might be opportunities to avoid future impacts, we
7 might be implementing upgrades within the right-of-ways
8 for access and otherwise, that we would see an opportunity
9 to potentially avoid future impacts.

10 But, overall, when it comes to the
11 wetland impacts, again, this is something that we've spent
12 a lot of time and resources to develop a plan, but that
13 plan is ultimately going to be reviewed by the relevant
14 regulators to make sure that they agree that we're really
15 doing this in a way that minimizes the impacts.

16 MR. IACOPINO: But, with respect to the
17 plan that you have proposed, are the number of permanent
18 crossings and the increase in permanent crossings and
19 their locations all contained within the Application?

20 MR. HUDOCK: Yes. I mean, we show our
21 access within the right-of-way to our structures. So, as
22 far as that --

23 MR. IACOPINO: And, could you tell the
24 folks in the audience where in the Application they might

1 be able to find that information?

2 MR. HUDOCK: Well, we do have
3 environmental plans that is included within our
4 Application. So, I guess I would say, if there are
5 questions as far as crossings or other information about
6 our access, we would be happy to answer that.

7 MR. IACOPINO: And, from the Committee's
8 standpoint, as I've said before, the Application, and all
9 of its appendices, are on the website that I gave you the
10 address for before. I suspect that it's -- the volume of
11 the Application that contains the wetlands application --
12 applications that will contain that information about
13 permanent crossings.

14 Of course, the Site Evaluation Committee
15 could modify that as part of their process, if they deemed
16 it appropriate to do so. And, of course, the Division
17 of -- I'm sorry, the Department of Environmental Services
18 would have the opportunity to weigh in on that.

19 The next question is, can Kinder Morgan
20 move their pipe under the power line or move it at an
21 angle to the other side?

22 MR. HALLISEY: I have some other
23 questions. Can I use the microphone?

24 MR. IACOPINO: Sure. Come on up. Why

1 don't you start with that one, and then -- if you want to
2 explain it, that would be --

3 MR. HALLISEY: Yes.

4 MR. IACOPINO: Can you give us your name
5 please?

6 MR. HALLISEY: George Hallisey.

7 MR. IACOPINO: And, spell your last
8 name.

9 MR. HALLISEY: H-a-l-l-i-s-e-y.

10 MR. IACOPINO: I'm going to ask you to
11 speak slow, so he can take it down.

12 MR. HALLISEY: And, I'm the president of
13 that association that they said was people 80s and 90s,
14 they're exaggerating. It's not that high.

15 But my first question is, okay, can
16 Kinder Morgan go underneath your power line, if they
17 wanted to divert the pipeline from one side to the other?

18 MR. HUDOCK: So, the main -- and, I
19 think, really what the question is is, you know, what
20 detailed constraints are we going to allow Kinder Morgan?
21 And, honestly, you know, the best I could say to that is
22 that we will take their plans, study them, whether it's
23 crossings, whether it's crossing a series of lines,
24 whatever they do, we're going to study that thoroughly,

1 and verify it's safe, before we would give our okay on
2 that.

3 MR. HALLISEY: Under the basis of what
4 you're putting in with these power lines, okay, is there a
5 conflict anywhere bringing in that natural gas pipeline
6 underneath your power lines?

7 MR. HUDOCK: There are locations where
8 gas pipelines cross through a right-of-way. That
9 definitely exists today in other right-of-ways, and --

10 MR. HALLISEY: So, there's no -- so,
11 what you're saying, there is no problem with putting it
12 underneath. So, if we ask to have the pipeline -- the
13 pipeline coming down, and come off at about a 30 degree
14 angle, underneath your power lines, to go to the opposite
15 side, this would be not a problem with Eversource or
16 Liberty?

17 MR. JIOTTIS: I guess, and maybe to just
18 kind of restate that, we would have to look at where
19 they're going to cross. To say "there's no problem", it's
20 very dependent on what they're going to do, how close
21 they're going to be to structures. There's a lot of
22 things to make it so it's safe for everybody. But they
23 could present that. They could say they want to cross
24 here, and, as Bryan mentioned, we would look at it to

1 determine it's safe. Without seeing exactly where they
2 want to go, I can't tell you that's a "yes" or "no".

3 MR. HALLISEY: Let me ask you this
4 question. What would make it not safe for them to go
5 underneath?

6 MR. JIOTTIS: A few items. You could be
7 too close to a structure. So, in other words, if we ever
8 had to dig and replace a structure too close to their
9 pipeline. There could be other similar constraints,
10 physical constraints that would prevent us from working.
11 So, we wouldn't want the line there.

12 By the same token with them, they need a
13 certain amount of space to do work around their lines.
14 So, they probably couldn't put it right next to our
15 structure, because they need to be able to dig in their
16 trench. So, it's really a lot of physical constraints.
17 And, then, they've got to design it so electrically it's
18 protected, whether that's through some type of cathodic
19 protection or protecting for induced currents.

20 MR. HALLISEY: So, I guess my final
21 question on this one, would be then what you're saying is
22 that there would be no possibility of the electric -- of
23 the power up in the electricity coming down, going into
24 the ground where that pipeline would be underneath? Is

1 there a possibility something could happen there?

2 MR. JIOTTIS: There's always a
3 possibility of something. But, as part of their design,
4 though, they have to include the --

5 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

6 MR. JIOTTIS: -- include the safeguards
7 to prevent that from happening.

8 MR. HALLISEY: Okay. Next question.
9 The right-of-way that you're going to need to bring your
10 equipment down, do you know what the width of that
11 easement is that you're in now?

12 MR. HUDOCK: Which --

13 MR. HALLISEY: The easement that you
14 already -- that you have the power lines coming down?

15 MR. HUDOCK: It varies. There's a
16 number of different dimensions throughout the National
17 Grid and Eversource right-of-way. Within our Application,
18 we do show cross-sections that show our right-of-way
19 width. So, I think that's probably the best place to
20 refer, because it's also specific to locations of
21 right-of-ways.

22 MR. HALLISEY: But you don't know the
23 actual footage right now, --

24 MR. JIOTTIS: We do --

1 MR. HALLISEY: -- from one side to the
2 other?

3 MR. JIOTTIS: I'm sorry. Yes, we do.
4 But it would be specific, so, you would have to tell me
5 which location you're talking about. You know, for
6 example, where we start in Londonderry, we start at
7 600 feet. We eventually drop down to 350 feet. So,
8 depending on where -- specifically where you are and where
9 you're looking at, we --

10 MR. HALLISEY: Well, I'm looking at
11 where we are now, on the maps we have in the town, is
12 350 feet. Now, what you're saying for the actual
13 right-of-way, how much from the edge of that 350 feet over
14 are you going to need to be able to bring down your
15 equipment?

16 MR. HUDOCK: In general, you know, I'll
17 say, speak for National Grid, in general, our access is
18 actually through -- through the right-of-way. So, when
19 we're coming parallel to the right-of-way, the access
20 usually is inside of the right-of-way. So, we'll have an
21 access point from outside of the right-of-way, transition
22 into the right-of-way, and then are on --

23 MR. HALLISEY: Do you know what the
24 right-of-way is now, what the width of that right-of-way

1 is now?

2 MR. HUDOCK: Again, I would have to
3 refer back to the actual figures. Because, like I said,
4 it varies. We have about eight different sections
5 involved there. So, --

6 MR. HALLISEY: So, for my information,
7 what's the maximum that you need for that right-of-way?
8 From that -- from your easement? How much would you need?
9 Fifteen feet? Twenty? Twenty-five feet?

10 MR. JIOTTIS: I guess, for the location
11 of the line or to drive down?

12 MR. HALLISEY: To drive down, to bring
13 your trucks down, you have to bring down some heavy
14 equipment, okay, some cranes to get up to the top there.
15 So, how much space would you need there?

16 MR. JIOTTIS: It might be as little as
17 15 to 25 feet. It's not a lot.

18 MR. HALLISEY: Okay.

19 MR. JIOTTIS: But, again, as Bryan
20 mentioned, we don't necessarily have to drive down the
21 edge of the right-of-way. We can drive down the center of
22 the right-of-way, between the existing structures that are
23 there today, there's space in those.

24 The easiest -- the easiest way maybe to

1 answer is to, if you catch up with us afterwards, we can
2 go over some of the posters you saw outside, where we have
3 the specific right-of-way cross-sections, we can show you
4 the distances of where the structures are today, maybe you
5 can talk about that, as opposed to just kind of throwing
6 out an approximation.

7 MR. HALLISEY: Okay. Well, I'm happy to
8 have all the answers here. I appreciate that. I guess my
9 last question would be is, for the Site Evaluation down in
10 here, has anybody looked into the easement that was
11 granted for the power line that you're on right now, when
12 that was granted? And, who owned the land and who -- who
13 owned the land and granted it to a power company? Does
14 anybody know that?

15 MR. IACOPINO: That's part of, I mean,
16 to the extent that it becomes relevant to an issue in the
17 docket, the Site Evaluation Committee may look at that.
18 But I don't know exactly -- put it this way, nobody from
19 the Site Evaluation Committee, at this point in time, has
20 gone to the Registry of Deeds and researched the --

21 MR. HALLISEY: I have. It's tough to
22 find. But there was an easement granted by the Richardson
23 family in Pelham, okay, from that site line, way back, way
24 up into northern New Hampshire, to the original power

1 company, and they gave them that lifetime easement, to
2 only do nothing else but to put power lines up in that
3 area. So, I don't know myself if there's any other -- if
4 there's any other questions or hooks on that easement that
5 says "you can" or "can't do something", I think you need
6 to check into that.

7 MR. IACOPINO: Well, this is a power
8 line, though.

9 MR. HALLISEY: This is power lines.
10 Just power lines, not Kinder Morgan.

11 MR. IACOPINO: I know, but --
12 understood. And, maybe, in the Kinder Morgan docket, that
13 might become an issue.

14 But, from what you're saying is, a power
15 line, a transmission line, such as the Merrimack Valley
16 Reliability Project, would be within that particular
17 easement.

18 MR. HALLISEY: Well, has anybody
19 questioned about the abutters' rights, okay, to that
20 easement, that power line that you want take down and make
21 bigger?

22 MR. IACOPINO: Well, that's something
23 that, if the abutters want to participate in the
24 proceedings, there are many avenues to do that. Tonight,

1 expressing your opinion, as you have, is one of them.

2 MR. HALLISEY: Okay.

3 MR. IACOPINO: Providing written comment
4 to the Site Evaluation Committee is part of what the
5 public can do, and that is considered by the Site
6 Evaluation Committee. You're also free to speak with
7 Counsel for the Public, and Counsel for the Public can
8 determine, from his perspective, if that is an issue that
9 may be -- that he may want to have adjudicated in the
10 case.

11 And, finally, any individual who is an
12 abutter or has another -- some other right, title, claim
13 or interest that is affected by this Project, can file a
14 motion to intervene. And, the Site Evaluation Committee
15 will, if it's not going to impair the orderly development
16 of -- the orderly conduct of the proceedings, --

17 MR. HALLISEY: Right.

18 MR. IACOPINO: -- will grant that
19 intervention. There's a process for doing that. There is
20 a procedural order on the Site Evaluation Committee
21 website that has a deadline for the filing of petitions to
22 intervene. And, I think it's November 13th, but you
23 should double check that on the Site Evaluation
24 Committee's website.

1 MR. HALLISEY: Will do.

2 MR. IACOPINO: So, if you or your condo
3 association chose to participate, you would file a motion
4 to intervene. I'll give you an example. We're doing an
5 adjudicatory hearing tomorrow, it's not on an application,
6 but there are -- there is a *pro se*, when I say "*pro se*",
7 self-represented environmental agency representing itself,
8 as well as a group of abutters who have intervened,
9 they've hired counsel in that particular case, and they're
10 proceeding in an evidentiary hearing tomorrow and Friday
11 out in Newington. So, there is avenues that are available
12 for the public to participate, and to bring issues, like
13 the one that you raise, to the attention of the Committee.

14 MR. HALLISEY: Okay. Is there somebody
15 here at the end that I can talk further about this legally
16 that would know more about this?

17 MR. IACOPINO: You can talk to me about
18 participation. I think you might want to talk to them
19 about your questions about the cross-sections and where
20 near your condo association --

21 MR. HALLISEY: Yes. Unfortunately, we
22 have -- one of our owners, okay, is a lawyer, and he
23 couldn't be here tonight. So, he wanted to find that out.

24 MR. IACOPINO: Who is it?

1 MR. HALLISEY: Huh?

2 MR. IACOPINO: Who is it?

3 MR. HALLISEY: His name is Kevin
4 Shanahan.

5 MR. IACOPINO: Have him give me a call?

6 MR. HALLISEY: Okay.

7 MR. IACOPINO: I have a card here.

8 MR. HALLISEY: You have a card. I'll
9 get that right now. That's good.

10 All right. I'm done. I thank you for
11 your time and questions, okay. And, just so we can get it
12 on the record down in here, okay, we, 24 units, townhomes,
13 contribute \$120,000 a year in the taxes to the town, we
14 are totally against the pipeline, as you can well imagine.
15 All right. And, anything we can do, in any which way at
16 all, okay, to throw a log in front of the train, we're
17 going to try and do that. And, I thank you.

18 MR. IACOPINO: And, let me just remind
19 people, because we're coming up to the public statements,
20 this is not a hearing about the Kinder Morgan pipeline.

21 MR. HALLISEY: I understand.

22 MR. IACOPINO: This is a hearing about
23 the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project.

24 And, at this point -- at this we're

1 going to -- you're raising your hand, sir. What can I do
2 for you?

3 MR. LYNDE: Could I ask one more
4 question?

5 MR. IACOPINO: How long of a question is
6 it?

7 MR. LYNDE: It's straightforward.

8 MR. IACOPINO: All right.

9 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

10 MR. LYNDE: Okay. It's Hal, actually,
11 it's Harold, H-a-r-o-l-d, I go by "Hal", and the last name
12 is Lynde, L-y-n-d-e. You want the address? 114 -- okay.
13 I'm sorry.

14 MR. IACOPINO: We've got it. He's fine.

15 MR. LYNDE: Okay. On the 110 kV line,
16 you said it's an "upgrade". Does it -- could you -- is it
17 an upgrade in power capacity, and the size of the wires,
18 how much current you can push through them, *etcetera*?
19 Could you explain that for me please?

20 MR. HUDOCK: Sure. Yes, I can do that.

21 So, first, just a small correction. It's 115 kilovolts.

22 MR. LYNDE: Oh, 115. I'm sorry.

23 MR. HUDOCK: But, in terms of upgrading
24 it, those lines will stay at the same voltage it is today.

1 So, it will be 115 kilovolts. But we will be installing a
2 higher capacity conductor on it. So, a different type of
3 conductor that has a higher capacity.

4 MR. LYNDE: So, what's the power rating
5 before and after?

6 MR. HUDOCK: I'd have to get back to you
7 afterwards, as far as the before and after power rating.
8 I don't have that off the top of my head.

9 MR. LYNDE: Are you doubling the current
10 that goes through there or something like that?

11 MR. HUDOCK: I don't think it's
12 something like that, no. But, as I said, I can give you
13 the exact number.

14 MR. LYNDE: All right. So, how would
15 I -- how will I get the answer?

16 MR. HUDOCK: If you want, we have people
17 back there, including our engineer, who might be able to
18 give you a better answer.

19 MR. LYNDE: That would be good. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. We're now at the
22 point in the public information session where we're going
23 to move into public comments. I think we have four folks
24 who have signed up to speak.

1 So, we'll start with Mr. David
2 Hennessey, if you could come up to the microphone,
3 followed by Mr. Lynde.

4 MR. LYNDE: I'm all set.

5 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And, so, we'll
6 follow Mr. Hennessey with Ms. Huard. And, actually, we've
7 got Mr. Hennessey on here twice. So, you get just one.

8 MR. HENNESSEY: Just once, I promise.

9 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

10 MR. HENNESSEY: David Hennessey,
11 H-e-n-n-e-s-s-e-y. I'm Chairman of Zoning here in Pelham,
12 and also Chairman of Nashua Regional Planning Commission.
13 But I want to stipulate that I'm speaking just for myself,
14 as a homeowner and landowner, whose land is being
15 traversed by this, by the power lines.

16 That's a 1922 easement, by the way, for
17 that right-of-way across my land, that was issued over 90
18 years ago, and now you're filling it out. But that's
19 okay. What you might not hear often in these hearings is
20 I'm not opposed to the power lines.

21 I am asking the SEC to ask for a
22 six-month delay in this whole process. And, the reason I
23 think ought to be obvious by now that the 800-pound
24 gorilla in the room is the pipeline. Now, our

1 understanding at NRPC is that Kinder is making its
2 application to the FERC this month. The lines have
3 changed several times here in Pelham as to the proposed
4 line where that pipeline is going. So, I don't blame you
5 guys for not knowing and how to answer the effect on your
6 system.

7 So, my response is, let's wait to see
8 that final application to FERC, and see where the pipeline
9 is going, to see how it will affect the power lines. And,
10 then, maybe we can kind of work together through the SEC
11 to do the kind of due diligence that you have promised and
12 fulfilled. And, I'll give you guys credit. You've
13 addressed many of the issues that I've brought up and has
14 been brought up since January.

15 But you can't answer a lot of the
16 questions here, because you don't know what's going to
17 happen with the pipeline. As recently as three weeks ago,
18 Kinder changed its route here in Pelham, to go from the
19 west side of your power lines, to the east side, with a
20 straight line right across under your power lines, right
21 into my easement. And, weeks ago, my wife and some of
22 your representatives went out there and looked at
23 birds-foot violets --

24 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

1 MR. HENNESSEY: Birds-foot violet, which
2 is a -- something, I don't know, it's not an endangered
3 species, --

4 FROM THE FLOOR: Threatened.

5 MR. HENNESSEY: -- a threatened species.
6 And, you folks, you know, took that information and put it
7 out there. My concern is, the timeline that we're looking
8 at, according to your records, you mentioned today this
9 construction might go in late 2016. What I had seen
10 before was it would be built in 2016 with construction
11 ending January 2017, would be done.

12 Kinder is -- reports saying that's when
13 they're going to start. Now, under your filings, you're
14 saying that you're going to fix all the -- all the dirt,
15 earth, and all disturbed areas. So, I'm envisioning this
16 thing, with you folks all neatly tamping down all of the
17 work. Patting all the endangered species on the back
18 saying "come on back, folks". And, here come the dozers
19 from Kinder on the very same month.

20 So, to me, it is pretty self-evident
21 that we need some coordination, some discussion between at
22 least your experts and Kinder's with SEC. Not approval,
23 we all understand, Kinder is not -- does not need your
24 approval. However, they have stated to Nashua Regional,

1 and they have stated in public forums, that they do intend
2 to appear before you as a promise.

3 So, my answer, and here's the question,
4 but this is my statement, it's my request. Let's push
5 this back until we can look at the Kinder filing, know
6 what we're dealing with, so that we can get this thing
7 done correctly the first time, and not come back weeks and
8 days, after you guys are all done, and deal with these
9 same issues all over again. Over and over again tonight
10 we've heard the same problem and the same answers, "we
11 don't know".

12 Let's wait till we do know, and then
13 address them. Thank you.

14 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Next person
15 who signed up for a public comment is Peggy Huard.

16 MS. HUARD: Hi. I'm Peggy Huard,
17 H-u-a-r-d. I am actually from Hudson, New Hampshire. I'd
18 like to speak to a few of the responses to the questions
19 and comments that the people from Eversource and National
20 Grid have made.

21 First and foremost, there are two
22 reports in their Application that talk about the effects
23 of both electric and magnetic energy, the health effects,
24 one being nerve and muscle damage. There are two

1 extensive reports, so, I beg you and I urge you to read
2 them carefully, as well as do your own independent study.
3 I have great concerns about this. There are already four
4 transmission lines, with four towers, four sets of towers.
5 The four sets of towers run perpendicular to our road, and
6 two of those come behind my house and several other homes
7 on David Drive.

8 I do, in the last year, do feel what is
9 outlined in some of these reports, and just write them off
10 to normal health conditions. But, now, reading the report
11 saying "this is why it's happening." So, I urge you to
12 consider that. Because, if it's already happening, a
13 fifth line is going to completely devastate the people in
14 that area.

15 The environment. The consecutive
16 construction, there are also reports on that that I have
17 read. And, the dates have been given to you. And, as the
18 previous speaker spoke, one will be cleaning up, and the
19 other will be destroying it again, leaving them to clean
20 up.

21 My road, David Drive, where the power
22 lines are, is a watershed for our pond. They do have this
23 outlined in the maps. There's also aquifers there. One
24 of the poles that are proposed to go along the road are

1 right -- is right at the edge of the aquifer. Is that
2 sufficient? The activity of drilling that pole, is that
3 going to affect that aquifer that feed our wells. There
4 are two streams, one on David Drive and one on Lenny, that
5 feed down to our pond. I know they have been limited on
6 what they can do with the existing poles, because of the
7 water in that area.

8 We have deer that run along the power
9 lines, we have birds that run along the power lines. The
10 birds, the turkeys, all of those, if the electromagnetic
11 energy fields affected humans, what is it going to do to
12 these animals?

13 One report I had read talked about the
14 consecutive construction and what could happen. Is that
15 all of this will leave and not come back, and that would
16 drastically change, not only our neighborhood, but the
17 neighboring -- the very local ponds, and this is one of
18 our most precious natural resources in Hudson.

19 I also wanted to speak to a comment that
20 was made, and I'm not sure if I understood it correctly.
21 I've studied the power lines intensely on the GIS mapping.
22 I'm actually sat there and traced the power lines from
23 destination to destination. So, I know that we have a
24 long transmission power line going from Comerford, New

1 Hampshire, which is fed off the Hydro-Quebec, all the way
2 down to Sandy Pond, in Groton. And, that Sandy Pond is a
3 station that reduces the voltage. So, as it comes through
4 at a high voltage, I thought I heard them say that some of
5 these substations tap off that transmission line. Which,
6 if I'm hearing that correctly, they're coming -- that
7 power is coming off at a high voltage, before it was even
8 intended on being used. So, maybe I heard that wrong, and
9 that can be clarified.

10 Because if you're tapping off as it's
11 going down, something that lowers the voltage to get it
12 ready for use, then it's coming to our houses at a very
13 high -- a higher voltage than was intended.

14 I could go on and on forever, because I
15 have intimately looked at this more than probably most of
16 citizens. I've looked at the Application, I've looked at
17 the drawings. I'm actually disgusted by -- I'm actually
18 disgusted that you would even contemplate putting a fifth
19 set of power -- transmission lines and towers on any of
20 our property. We are already inconvenienced. We are
21 already being harmed. And, for you to even consider this,
22 and to have to go this process, and not have a process
23 that says "this is an absurd proposal", it's just
24 unforgivable to me.

1 I beg you to come out to the site and
2 look at it for yourselves. Stand under the power lines
3 for a little bit. Bring a fluorescent light bulb, I don't
4 know, but come and hear the fizzling, hear the crackling,
5 hear the noise, and then consider what you would be doing
6 to all of these people by approving it. Thank you.

7 MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I think that
8 exhausts those speakers who have signed up. Is there
9 anybody left who would wish to make a statement?

10 *[No verbal response]*

11 MR. IACOPINO: All right. Just -- okay.
12 Why don't you tell us your name and spell your last name?

13 MR. COWAN: Rich Cowan, C-o-w-a-n, from
14 Dracut, Massachusetts.

15 MR. IACOPINO: From where, I'm sorry?

16 MR. COWAN: Dracut, Massachusetts.
17 Since this is a project that crosses state lanes, I had
18 the opportunity to file a comment in the Merrimack
19 Reliability Project, you know, at the Massachusetts DEP
20 process, the Massachusetts -- it was filed in the
21 Environmental Reporter. The environmental impact
22 statement that I received, it's a 1,000 page document, it
23 was not placed online for anyone to see it. It's kind of
24 difficult to share it with people. I wish it was placed

1 online.

2 But the questions I had about this
3 regarding the insufficient answers received from the power
4 company, when I asked a question "what is the increase in
5 capacity provided by this line?" If you're taking --
6 taking a corridor with four transmission lines and adding
7 another one, but you're getting one, and then replacing
8 the older model with a newer model, a higher capacity one,
9 then you are, in effect, you know, adding more than two
10 lines' worth of capacity to this line.

11 But, you know, unlike the pipeline
12 projects, where the capacity is clearly stated, the
13 capacity of the line hasn't been stated. And, it's very
14 clear that the volts times the amperage is the power. And
15 you know, when you talk about transmission lines, like
16 proposed from Canada, you talk about transmission lines
17 that have a wattage of a certain amount. For example,
18 they're talking about -- I believe they're -- I believe
19 they're talking about transmission lines with, is it 1.2
20 gigawatt capacity, for example. So, if someone could
21 answer that question, it would be useful.

22 And, if someone could explain why, when
23 we're having a decrease in power consumption in New
24 England, it needs to go up that much. Maybe it does need

1 to go up. Maybe they do need to replace some of the older
2 circuits with newer circuits to modernize them. But it
3 just seems to me that the increased capacity, not only is
4 it very suspect, but it hasn't been explained. If you
5 reduce the increased capacity of the line, instead of
6 increasing it by, you know, 30-40 percent, which is what
7 it seems like you're doing, but you just increase it by
8 10 percent, it would probably meet the energy needs that
9 we have, without requiring additional 15 to 20 feet of
10 easement, we talked about requiring a fifth line in that
11 corridor. So, that question, you know, they didn't answer
12 it when I asked it. You could look at the responses by
13 Eversource to my comments, Rich Cowan and Larry Cantrill,
14 in the Massachusetts environmental impact report. We also
15 asked questions about electromagnetic radiation as well
16 and the pipeline proximity. But, you know, it would be
17 important, especially considering that they are -- now
18 there's -- the pipeline route in Dracut actually are in
19 flux right now as well.

20 So, that's my comment. And, my request
21 for you to get them to publish this stuff online and
22 reveal what's the old capacity, what's the new capacity,
23 because that's, you know, nowhere is that explained.
24 Thank you.

1 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. All right. I
2 think I have no other folks signed up to speak or make
3 comments.

4 One thing that I will say, I forget
5 which speaker mentioned it, it is common for the Site
6 Evaluation Committee to do a site visit in all of our
7 cases where there's a proposed new transmission line or a
8 new energy facility. It is likely that that will happen
9 in this case. And, of course, all of the public comments
10 and the questions and the answers that were given here
11 have been recorded verbatim, and they will be reviewed by
12 the members of the Subcommittee, who will make the
13 ultimate determination on this Application.

14 With that, I'd like to thank you all.
15 We're going to adjourn this public information session.
16 Thank you.

17 **(Whereupon the public information**
18 **session was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.)**