

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

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

May 27, 2009 - 1:05 p.m.
21 South Fruit Street DAY III
Suite 10
Concord, New Hampshire

In re: SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:
SEC DOCKET NO. 2008-04:
Application for Granite
Reliable Power, LLC, for
a Certificate of Site and
Facility for the Granite
Reliable Power Windpark in
Coos County, New Hampshire
(Deliberative Session)

PRESENT: SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:
Thomas B. Getz, Chrmn. Public Utilities Commission
(Chairman of SEC Subcommittee - Presiding)
Donald Kent Dept. of Resources & Econ.
Dev.
Glenn Normandeau Fish & Game Dept.
(Executive Director)
Robert Scott (Director DES - Air Resources Div.
Christopher Northrop N.H. Office of Energy &
Planning
William Janelle Dept of Transportation
Michael Harrington Public Utilities Commission

* * *

Counsel for the Committee: Jaye L. Rancourt, Esq.

COURT REPORTER: Susan J. Robidas, LCR No. 44

I N D E X

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

MOTION by DIR. NORMANDEAU that this Project as proposed does not adversely affect public health and safety	5
SECOND by MR. HARRINGTON	6
DISCUSSION by:	
DIR. SCOTT	6
MR. HARRIGAN	6
RE-SECOND by MR. HARRINGTON	8
AMENDMENT to the Motion by CHAIRMAN GETZ	8
VOTE ON THE MOTION AS AMENDED	8
MOTION by DIR. SCOTT that if we were going to incorporate this 401 Water Quality Certificate, there would be no undue adverse impacts to the environment, water or air, based on this Project	11
SECOND by DIR. NORMANDEAU	11
VOTE ON THE MOTION	12
MOTION by DR. KENT that we find that the Project, properly conditioned, will not have an unreasonable adverse impact on the natural environment	21
SECOND by MR. NORTHRUP	21
VOTE ON THE MOTION	22
MOTION by DIR. SCOTT to enlarge the time to June 30th	26
SECOND by DIR. NORMANDEAU	26
VOTE ON THE MOTION	28

1 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Good
2 afternoon. We're back on the record in
3 Docket Site Evaluation Committee 2008-04
4 concerning the application of Granite
5 Reliable Power.

6 On the notice that we issued
7 on May 12th, it indicated that today we would
8 reopen the adjudicatory proceeding to allow
9 cross-examination regarding the Altona
10 turbine and the High Elevation Mitigation
11 Agreement. We've conducted those
12 adjudicative proceedings, and we have closed
13 the record with respect to the adjudicative
14 portion of the proceeding.

15 The notice also indicated that
16 we would go into further deliberative
17 session. So at this point, that is what we
18 may do. I would -- going back and looking at
19 notes from previous deliberative sessions, my
20 notes indicate that we had not made a finding
21 with respect to public health and safety, the
22 natural environment, or air and water
23 quality, and my recollection as well, with
24 respect to the issue of public health and

1 safety under the statute. Part of the reason
2 that we did not address a finding in that
3 regard was due to the issue of the
4 surrounding the Altona turbine facility. We
5 have completed the record on that. So I
6 guess I would turn to the Committee, and
7 Director Normandeau in particular, who led
8 the discussion on these issues, to see if
9 there are other issues we need to address,
10 any further conversation, anything to address
11 in general or in particular with respect to
12 the Altona turbine. So, Director Normandeau.

13 DIR. NORMANDEAU: In my view,
14 there is not. I think's it's been covered.
15 And it seemed to me that, given that the
16 turbines proposed here have a totally
17 different mechanism for feathering, there's
18 really no connection. And with that, I
19 suggest maybe moving forward on that issue.

20 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Harrington.

21 MR. HARRINGTON: Well, since
22 I'm the one who's raising this issue, I just
23 wanted to comment on it briefly. I agree
24 with Commissioner Normandeau. I think the

1 description provided by the Applicant shows
2 it's a totally different type of control
3 system. It appears to be somewhat of a
4 failsafe system, in that the solenoid power
5 is lost when you lose grid power, and they
6 open up -- that opens the valve to
7 pressurizing the control system and stops the
8 blade. So I have no concerns with that issue
9 at all.

10 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I guess,
11 from my perspective, that seems to address
12 the one outstanding issue of fact with
13 respect to the additional information we
14 requested. In previous deliberations, we
15 also went through a series of review of the
16 proposed -- all of the proposed various
17 conditions in the docket, a number of which
18 go to the issue of public health and safety.
19 So, I guess, that was -- do we -- is there
20 any motion with respect to a finding on
21 public health and safety? Director
22 Normandeau.

23 DIR. NORMANDEAU: I'd make a
24 motion that this project as proposed does not

1 adversely affect public health and safety.

2 CHAIRMAN GETZ: And would
3 that -- well, let me just ask this question.
4 First, is there a second to that motion?

5 MR. HARRINGTON: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. For the
7 record, Mr. Harrington has seconded. Any
8 discussion? Mr. Scott?

9 DIR. SCOTT: I just -- again on
10 the same topic, we did have discussions
11 earlier about signage and posting and that
12 type of thing. So, again, as we get to --
13 assuming we do a certificate, there would be
14 potential conditions and that type of thing
15 you may want to consider, if I remember, if
16 my memory serves me correct.

17 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Harrington.

18 MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. Going
19 along with that same concept, one of the -- I
20 don't know if it's an open issue. But the
21 issue that hasn't been brought to our
22 attention is how it's going to resolve the
23 Cohas Trail relocation, because right now, it
24 appears that it goes right over the top of

1 Dixville Peak, right, you know, directly in
2 line with where the turbine's proposed to be.
3 So we would have to have some way of
4 addressing that as a condition on this one as
5 well, which I think is what Mr. Scott was
6 referring to.

7 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Well, I
8 think as a general matter, we -- to the
9 extent we can deliberate some additional
10 issues today, then I think we should do it.
11 But I think what we're going to have to do is
12 have a further set of -- a final set of
13 deliberations on whether this project should
14 go ahead, whether it should be -- go ahead
15 subject to conditions, that we revisit the
16 list of conditions and a definitive set that
17 would apply. But I think that, given the way
18 we've proceeded so far in these
19 deliberations, and looking at the findings
20 under the statute, I guess, would you accept
21 a friendly amendment?

22 DIR. NORMANDEAU: Yes. Be my
23 guest.

24 CHAIRMAN GETZ: That the

1 finding today be that there is no adverse
2 effect on the public health and safety of the
3 proposed proceeding, subject to the
4 particular conditions that we've discussed
5 and that we will narrow and formalize in a
6 separate meeting. So amended?

7 DIR. NORMANDEAU: So amended.

8 CHAIRMAN GETZ: We got a
9 re-seconded to that from --

10 MR. HARRINGTON: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Let me
12 just get an indication. Are there any
13 concerns, questions, thoughts about that
14 process? Seeing nothing, then the motion has
15 been made and amended and seconded. All
16 those in favor of the motion, please signify
17 by saying "aye."

18 (Multiple members indicating
19 "aye.")

20 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any opposed?

21 (No verbal response)

22 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing no
23 opposition, then the motion is -- passes
24 unanimously.

1 I guess the next issue then I
2 would turn to is the issue of air and water
3 quality, and which really wasn't the subject
4 of any of the additional information that was
5 requested by the subcommittee. But there
6 have been -- a number of conditions and
7 permits have been filed by DES. So I guess
8 I'd turn to Director Scott, who led the
9 discussion on the issue of air and water
10 quality.

11 Is there any updates or
12 concerns or discussion that you would like to
13 make at this time?

14 DIR. SCOTT: I would like to
15 draw the Committee's attention to -- I
16 believe we all have copies. I believe since
17 we last discussed this, if my memory serves
18 me right, the Department of Environmental
19 Services has issued a Final 401 Water Quality
20 Certificate for the wind park, for the
21 project. As part of that, there are multiple
22 conditions. As part of that process,
23 preliminary, I believe, permit -- Ms. Linowes
24 had submitted comments to the Department

1 which were very substantively the same as
2 comments we've received. And in issuing that
3 document, the 401 Water Quality Certificate,
4 the Department also issued findings of fact,
5 or a response to public comment. So it
6 detailed -- many of her comments are
7 considered to have been answered in that same
8 document. Within the water-quality
9 certificate itself, some changes were made
10 from the original draft. One was -- again, I
11 think I mentioned in my earlier discussion --
12 about the frequency of some of the monitoring
13 at the site. And I think there was a little
14 bit more detail brought about. There was
15 some earlier discussion about location of the
16 pads in the wind tower, et cetera, and were
17 there efforts made to mitigate or minimize
18 wetlands impacts. That was discussed
19 somewhat in the findings and these answers
20 also. So I feel fairly comfortable with that
21 water-quality certificate, if it were to be
22 incorporated into a certificate, that we
23 would have appropriately answered water
24 concerns.

1 On the issue of air, I don't
2 think it's been contested by any of the
3 parties here that there would be adverse air
4 impacts -- again, unless somebody can remind
5 me of any issues that I'm not aware of.

6 So, based on that, unless
7 there's any discussion, I would move that if
8 we were going to incorporate this 401 Water
9 Quality Certificate, there would be no undue
10 adverse impacts to the environment, water or
11 air, based on this project.

12 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Is there a
13 second to that?

14 DIR. NORMANDEAU: I'll second.

15 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Director
16 Normandeau.

17 Any discussion?

18 (No verbal response)

19 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing no
20 discussion, all those in favor of the motion
21 made by Mr. Scott that we find that the --
22 subject to the appropriate conditions set out
23 in the certificates by the permits by DES,
24 that we find that the air and water quality

1 will not -- there will not be an unreasonable
2 adverse effect on air and water quality, all
3 those in favor of that motion signify so by
4 saying "aye."

5 (Multiple members indicating
6 "aye.")

7 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any opposed?

8 (No verbal response)

9 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Note for the
10 record there is no one in opposition to that
11 motion, that it was carried unanimously.

12 Okay. Turning to the issue of
13 natural environment, which I think was
14 largely the focus of the adjudicative portion
15 of the hearings held this morning. Ready for
16 a motion on that item or not, but I think we
17 should have -- be good to have some
18 discussion about what we heard this morning,
19 any deliberations, discussion about that.
20 And there was an issue that was handled in
21 the first instance for a description of the
22 issues by Dr. Kent. So I would turn to Dr.
23 Kent with any discussion, issues, thoughts or
24 any other discussion by the members of the

1 subcommittee.

2 DR. KENT: Thank you. The
3 Committee had five outstanding questions
4 which we attempted to answer this morning.
5 One, that we verify the spruce fir forest
6 boundaries and how that occurred. I would
7 offer that Fish and Game witnesses addressed
8 that issue in much greater depth than they
9 had previously. And from my standpoint, I
10 accept that they understand where the
11 boundaries are for the spruce fir.

12 The second issue was
13 determining if additional logging has
14 occurred. We had that answer in part from
15 the Applicant and corroborated by Fish and
16 Game this morning. The answer was, no, there
17 was no additional logging since they looked
18 at the areas in 2008.

19 Third issue had to do with the
20 extent of logging and when that logging
21 occurred within the mitigation parcels. We
22 got answers to that question for each of the
23 sites this morning. So we have a much better
24 understanding of when logging occurred, and

1 the condition of the forest, in addition.

2 Fourth, we heard more
3 testimony this morning about the habitat
4 characteristics within the mitigation lands
5 and whether they're adequate to support
6 viable populations of the species concerned.
7 The discussion this morning, for my part, was
8 adequate to address that issue.

9 And finally, determine if,
10 cumulatively, from a landscape scale, that
11 mitigation issues are going to be addressed
12 by the proposed settlement agreement. And we
13 heard quite a bit of discussion from the
14 witnesses this morning. And again, I would
15 say that my concerns were alleviated.

16 So, because of the discussion
17 this morning, I think we have enough
18 information to draw conclusions about the
19 natural environment. And I would throw to
20 the Committee, of course, to discuss what
21 we've heard.

22 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any further
23 discussion, questions for Dr. Kent, or
24 thoughts? Mr. Harrington.

1 MR. HARRINGTON: Well, I
2 thought a lot of the discussion this morning
3 involved what if -- you know, the balancing
4 between the two, the mitigation land versus
5 the land that was going to be consumed for
6 the winter. But I think it was Attorney
7 Mulholland who put it rather succinctly at
8 the end, that we're not trying to determine
9 if there's no effect. I think everybody
10 realizes that putting in roads and sticking
11 up a lot of wind turbines is going to have an
12 effect. The question we need to be looking
13 at is whether it is an unreasonable impact.
14 And I think, based on what I heard this
15 morning, that this mitigation proposal does
16 not present an unreasonable impact, as far
17 as, you know, the land-use issue of the
18 consuming land for the roads and turbines and
19 being balanced by the purchase of the
20 mitigation lands.

21 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Director
22 Normandeau.

23 DIR. NORMANDEAU: Something
24 that I wanted to elaborate on or discuss,

1 whatever, talk about for just a second was
2 also Mr. Weber, in his testimony, mentioned
3 the partnership aspect of those funds and
4 that the -- and that that would probably just
5 be a piece of it. But, you know, frequently
6 where we have a situation with federal monies
7 we do a three-to-one match. So the -- those
8 funds that are being offered as part of the
9 mitigation package actually represent a small
10 portion, possibly only 25 percent of the
11 entire amount of money that may be able to be
12 leveraged for purposes of mitigating this
13 parcel because of the -- as Mr. Weber
14 mentioned, you know, this is usually just a
15 small piece of when you buy -- when you're in
16 these land purchases. So I think we have a
17 pretty extensive mitigation potential here
18 with this package.

19 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Anyone else?

20 Mr. Janelle.

21 MR. JANELLE: I think part of
22 the question was, we wanted some verification
23 of what was on the mitigation site. And the
24 Fish and Game folks were familiar with the

1 habitat that was there. And I think we heard
2 that this morning, that they are familiar
3 with it. They're familiar with where it's
4 connected. And that gave me more comfort
5 with that mitigation package. So...

6 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay.

7 Mr. Scott.

8 DIR. SCOTT: I agree with that
9 sentiment. Obviously, it's difficult anytime
10 you take this type of high-value land. And
11 what we're talking about, changing the use of
12 it, is a difficult decision. But I think Mr.
13 Weber was a big help. And one of the points
14 he made, I think with me, is this really --
15 you got to look at this holistically with the
16 mitigation agreement and with what they
17 could -- probably will be done with the
18 \$750,000, again, if it can be leveraged.
19 There's a balance here. And what struck me
20 as important also is taking into account that
21 this is all private land, there's no guaranty
22 of what would happen in the future, unless it
23 has again gone into permanent easement,
24 conservation easement. And that's what's

1 being done with a lot of this. So, to me,
2 it's a difficult decision. But I think you
3 have to look at the balance of the whole
4 package and this mitigation agreement. And
5 the discussion this morning made me feel a
6 lot more comfortable.

7 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Harrington.

8 MR. HARRINGTON: Just one other
9 comment on that as a follow-up to it.

10 Mr. Scott said -- and that's -- as I asked
11 this morning, I think we have to take this
12 into consideration. We're not just talking
13 about the option on the mitigation of land of
14 logging or not logging. There's always a
15 possibility that some of this land could turn
16 into a permanent development. I mean, we've
17 certainly seen enough of that across various
18 parts of New Hampshire. And I would bring
19 people's attention to part of the mitigation
20 proposal that says if and when the retained
21 land is permanently abandoned by the owner
22 for wind energy production, which presumably
23 will happen some day off in the future, if
24 this project were to be built, it would be

1 conveyed to the owner of the adjoining
2 high-elevation lands for the purpose of
3 perpetual conversation -- conservation. So
4 we're also setting aside some additional land
5 that really hasn't been spoken about, because
6 whether it be 30 or 40 or 50 years from now
7 when this wind project is no longer viable,
8 those lands will be turned over for perpetual
9 conservation land. So I think there's -- you
10 know, in balance with the State, it works out
11 pretty well.

12 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Anything else?
13 Any other discussions?

14 (No verbal response)

15 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Let me just
16 point to two things in the statutes. We have
17 the issue of whether we want to make a
18 finding whether the project will have an
19 unreasonable adverse effect on the natural
20 environment pursuant to 162-H:16-IV. And the
21 preamble to Section IV also says that the
22 Site Evaluation Committee -- or in this case,
23 the subcommittee -- after having considered
24 available alternatives and fully reviewed the

1 environmental impact of the site or route and
2 other relevant factors bearing on whether the
3 objectives of this chapter would be best
4 served by the issuance of the certificate,
5 must find a number of things, which we've
6 been making findings on, and then gets us
7 back to the natural environment, which, you
8 know, relates to the issue of the
9 environmental impact generally. So, I guess,
10 just trying to put that in context, we have a
11 few more steps to take in this proceeding.
12 But at this point, specifically with respect
13 to whether we want to move ahead, we'll make
14 a finding on the issue of whether the project
15 will have an unreasonable adverse effect on
16 the natural environment. I just open up that
17 question, whether we want to address that
18 today or have a motion or -- Dr. Kent, do you
19 have some thoughts on how to proceed?

20 DR. KENT: Yeah. I think we've
21 had a good amount of discussion on this
22 issue. And on balance, thinking of the
23 settlement agreement and the efforts that
24 have been made for bird and bat studies that

1 will be made in the future, and alternatives
2 analysis and minimizing impacts by shifting
3 the project from west to east, conditions
4 that are going to be imposed for the roadway,
5 I think on balance we have -- the Applicant
6 has met the burden with the proper
7 conditions, that I would move that we find
8 that the project, properly conditioned, will
9 not have an unreasonable adverse impact on
10 the natural environment.

11 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Is there a
12 second to that?

13 MR. NORTHRUP: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Recognize Mr.
15 Northrup is the second to that. Any
16 discussion? Any thoughts or questions?

17 (No verbal response)

18 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing
19 nothing, then all those in favor of the
20 motion please signify by saying "aye."

21 (Multiple members indicating
22 "aye.")

23 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any opposed?

24 (No verbal response)

1 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing none
2 opposed, note for the record that the motion
3 and finding carries unanimously, which then
4 gets us back to, I guess, some comments I had
5 started out the afternoon with.

6 I think we do need to spend
7 some time in a further deliberative session
8 going through all of the potential conditions
9 to the project and to address in a final way
10 whether this application or certificate will
11 be issued, and if it is issued, what
12 precisely the conditions would be. So I
13 guess it's my thought that that's something
14 that could take a considerable amount of
15 time, going through item by item, and it
16 would be something that would better be
17 served by resuming on another day so that we
18 can look at these, all of the potential
19 conditions, and are comfortable whether they
20 serve the purpose that we intend for them.
21 So just -- is there any thoughts or comment
22 on that approach or any proposed alternative
23 approaches? Mr. Harrington.

24 MR. HARRINGTON: Just more of a

1 process question than anything else. I
2 realize we're not allowed to discuss these
3 issues in private. But is it possible that
4 we could, as individuals, go through our own
5 notes and collect the various conditions that
6 we might have noted down through these many
7 days of hearings and submit them to counsel
8 so they can kind of put them together and
9 eliminate the duplicates and so forth to come
10 up with a singular list that then can be
11 distributed?

12 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I think
13 counsel already at one point from previous
14 deliberations had put together an outline
15 from all the different sources of all of the
16 conditions. I think what -- based on what
17 we've -- the discussions we've had during
18 deliberation that one day that we had the --
19 that we went through all of the conditions, I
20 think based on that, based on our findings
21 and conversations about all of the different
22 findings, I think it's reasonable for counsel
23 to put together in one place a set of
24 conditions that then would be the subject of

1 our next deliberative meeting. I think
2 that's a fair way of doing it.

3 MR. HARRINGTON: Well, I guess
4 what I was getting at is, maybe if they could
5 do that, refine that list and distribute it
6 to everybody, is it possible for us to
7 respond back to counsel if we felt he was
8 missing something, so that we can start out
9 with a complete list for the next
10 deliberative session?

11 CHAIRMAN GETZ: This will be
12 the first time I note for the record today --
13 I should have done this earlier -- Ms. Jaye
14 Rancourt is sitting in for Mr. Iacopino as
15 counsel for the subcommittee today.

16 I'm not sure about the answer
17 to that question. I don't know if you have
18 any thoughts on --

19 MS. RANCOURT: My thought is
20 that if we're not discussing the substance of
21 the conditions and you're just saying add
22 this condition to a list for a discussion in
23 the open session --

24 MR. HARRINGTON: Yes.

1 MS. RANCOURT: -- that's
2 acceptable, because then those conditions
3 will be discussed in open session and be on
4 the record that someone suggested an
5 additional condition which was added, and
6 this is the condition, and it's all part of
7 the open session and deliberation, I think
8 that's fine.

9 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Then, some
10 condition -- or a particular condition noted
11 by a single member that has to be put on the
12 list, so there would have been no quorum
13 issue that we'd have to be concerned about.

14 MS. RANCOURT: Correct.

15 MR. HARRINGTON: I'll try to
16 stay away from asking questions like that in
17 the future. But thank you for the answer. I
18 appreciate it.

19 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Well, I
20 guess one thing we do need to do before we
21 leave today is -- well, let's make sure.
22 Does everybody agree with that process, that
23 we're going to need an extra day of
24 deliberations to finalize our consideration

1 of this application?

2 (No verbal response)

3 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Well,
4 that being the case, then we have two issues.
5 We have to find a date, which I guess we can,
6 you know, do off the record through counsel,
7 to find -- I don't think it'd be helpful to
8 try to go through our calendars here. But we
9 do need to find an additional date for us to
10 resume deliberations.

11 And then the other thing is we
12 have previously enlarged the time for
13 consideration of the application to April --
14 May 29th, which is two days from today. So
15 we would have to -- I don't imagine we're
16 going to meet tomorrow to resume
17 deliberations. So I think we need to
18 consider a motion, another motion to enlarge
19 the time. And Mr. Scott.

20 DIR. SCOTT: I move we enlarge
21 the time to June 30th.

22 CHAIRMAN GETZ: June 30th? Is
23 there a second?

24 DIR. NORMANDEAU: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN GETZ: There's a
2 second. Okay. Any discussion about -- is
3 that too much time, not enough time, just the
4 right amount of time?

5 DIR. SCOTT: Well, obviously,
6 the sooner --

7 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Correct. I
8 think that it's probably wise to give us some
9 time, because we're going to have to go
10 through the -- we're going to have to address
11 the practical issue of seven very busy
12 calendars. We're going to have to spend the
13 day in deliberations addressing the issues.
14 And however this turns out, there's going to
15 have to be a written order, which is going to
16 take some time. So I think June 30, to me,
17 sounds like a reasonable extension of time.

18 So, any other thoughts,
19 comments?

20 (No verbal response)

21 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Hearing
22 nothing, all those in favor of, pursuant to
23 R.S.A. 162-H:6-a, IX, enlarging the time
24 frame for consideration of the certificate,

1 that we enlarge the time to June 30, 2009,
2 please signify by saying "aye."

3 (Multiple members indicating
4 "aye.")

5 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any opposed?

6 (No verbal response)

7 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing none
8 opposed, then the motion carries unanimously.

9 Is there -- let me go through
10 my list and turn to Ms. Rancourt. Are there
11 any other process issues that we need to
12 address today that you're aware of?

13 MS. RANCOURT: I don't believe
14 so.

15 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Then the
16 one thing we will need to do is we'll have to
17 issue a subsequent notice of when we will
18 resume deliberations. Since we're doing this
19 subject to a previous order, I don't think
20 that requires separate publication in the
21 newspaper. But when we issue the order
22 setting the next date for deliberations, it
23 will be provided to all the parties, and it
24 will be made available on the Site Evaluation

1 Committee web site.

2 Is there anything else to
3 address this afternoon?

4 (No verbal response)

5 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Hearing
6 nothing, then we will recess the meeting for
7 purposes of deliberations, and we will resume
8 deliberations on a date that will be set by
9 an order to be issued as soon as possible.
10 So we'll close the proceedings for today.
11 Thank you, everyone.

12 (Whereupon the deliberations were
13 adjourned at 1:40 p.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2 I, Susan J. Robidas, a Licensed
3 Shorthand Court Reporter and Notary Public
4 of the State of New Hampshire, do hereby
5 certify that the foregoing is a true and
6 accurate transcript of my stenographic
7 notes of these proceedings taken at the
8 place and on the date hereinbefore set
9 forth, to the best of my skill and ability
10 under the conditions present at the time.

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

18
19 _____
20 Susan J. Robidas, LCR/RPR
21 Licensed Shorthand Court Reporter
22 Registered Professional Reporter
23 N.H. LCR No. 44 (RSA 310-A:173)
24