STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

August 22, 2018-9:08 a.m. 21 S. Fruit Street Concord, New Hampshire
\{Electronically filed with SEC 9-04-18\}
IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-04
Application of Public
Service of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy for Certificate of Site and Facility (Prehearing Conference)

PRESIDING: Michael J. Iacopino, Esq.
(Presiding as the Presiding Officer)

- and-

Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator

COURT REPORTER: Cynthia Foster, LCR No. 14

## APPEARANCES :

Reptg. Counsel for the Applicant:
Barry Needleman, Esq. (McLane Middleton)
Adam Dumville, Esq. (McLane Middleton)
Elizabeth Maldonado for Eversource Energy
Reptg. Counsel for the Public:
Christopher G. Aslin
Asst. Atty. General
N.H. Department of Justice

Reptg. University of New Hampshire and Town of Durham:
Douglas L. Patch, Esq. (Orr \& Reno)
Reptg. Conservation Law Foundation:
Thomas F. Irwin, Esq.
Reptg. Town of Newington:
Susan S. Geiger, Esq. (Orr \& Reno)
Reptg. the Darius Frink Farm:
Helen Frink
Reptg. Donna Heald:
Marcia Brown, Esq. (NH Brown Law)
Reptg. Joyce Crowley Revocable Trust:
Justin Richardson, Esq.
Reptg. Keith Frizzel
Joshua Lanzetta, Esq. (Wadleigh, Starr \& Peters)

## I N D E X

Page
Purpose of the Prehearing Conference and Appearances 4

Stipulations or Settlements 7
Withdrawals of Any Testimony13

Applicant's Witness Schedule and Order of Cross-Examination18

Counsel for the Public and Intervenors'
Witnesses73

Exhibits - Timing and Format 98

MR. IACOPINO: All right. We're going to get going. Good morning, everybody. We're here for a Prehearing Conference in Site Evaluation Committee Docket number 2015-04, the Application of Public Service Company of New Hampshire doing business as Eversource Energy for Certificate of Site and Facility, otherwise known as the Seacoast Reliability Project.

Today's hearing is a Prehearing Conference. We are scheduled to begin adjudicative proceedings next week. The Administrator issued a notice of this hearing, this Prehearing Conference, on August 10th, 2018.

Now we're going to follow the agenda that she had set forth in that notice which begins with explaining the purpose of the hearing. Most of you, I see very many familiar faces. Most of you understand what the Prehearing Conference's purpose is. It's basically for us to get ready for the adjudicative hearings. By statute, the Prehearing Conference can include discussion of offers of settlement, simplification of issues, any stipulations or admissions to any issues of fact or proof which
may be in dispute, limitations on testimony or number of witnesses, any changes to the standard procedures used during administrative and adjudicative hearings by consent of the parties, consolidation of examination by witnesses if possible, and any other matters which aid in disposition of the proceeding.

So basically this is an informal process for us all to get ready for the hearings that begin next week. I think probably we should first just go around the room and have everybody who's here identify themselves and if you are a representative of a party in the proceeding, identify which party you represent, and I'm going to start with Mr. Needleman at the front table on my left.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Barry Needleman and Adam Dumville for McLane Middleton representing the Applicant, and with us is Beth Maldonado from Eversource.

MR. IACOPINO: And behind you?
MS. FRINK: Helen Frink representing the Darius Frink Farm in Newington.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. And behind Ms.

Frink?
MR. LANZETTA: Josh Lanzetta, Wadleigh,
Starr \& Peters, representing Keith Frizzell.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Sir?
MR. FITCH: Matthew Fitch, one of the
Durham Intervenors.
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: If you could just
make sure your microphone is on. It's when the red light's on. For Ms. Foster, the court
reporter. I appreciate it.
MR. IACOPINO: Chris?
MR. ASLIN: Chris Aslin acting as Counsel for the Public.

MR. IACOPINO: Susan?
MS. GEIGER: Susan Geiger for the law firm
of Orr \& Reno representing the Town of Newington
and with me this morning is Denis Hebert who is
Chairman of the Newington Planning Board.
MR. IACOPINO: Good morning. To
Mr. Hebert's left?
MS. MILLER: Vivian Miller, Durham
Residents.
MS. HEALD: Donna Heald, Durham Residents, and I'm with my attorney, Marcia Brown, who is
not here at the moment.
MR. IACOPINO: She's here though.
MS. HEALD: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: And behind you is Justin.
MR. RICHARDSON: Good morning, Mike,
Pamela, everyone here. Justin Richardson with
Upton Hatfield for the Joyce Crowley Revocable
Trust and Mark Crowley who is here as well.
MR. IACOPINO: Doug?
MR. PATCH: Douglas Patch, representing the
Town of Durham and the University of New Hampshire.

MS. LUDKE: Leslie Ludke working with the Conservation Law Foundation.

MR. IRWIN: And Tom Irwin representing Conservation Law Foundation.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Having explained the Purpose of the Prehearing Conference, our next item on the agenda is discussion of any Stipulations or Settlements of any issues.

We did receive a few days ago a stipulation between, stipulation between the Applicant and Counsel for the Public with respect to, well, it's styled as stipulation and request for
findings of fact from those two parties jointly, and I guess the first question that I had, you want me to just go with this?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes. Go ahead.
MR. IACOPINO: First question $I$ had was have all the parties, first of all, seen that stipulation? If you haven't, can you raise your hand?

Doug, you haven't seen it?
MR. PATCH: I just want to point out for the record that we saw it when it got filed, but we were not consulted at all before it got filed. We didn't even know about it.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. That's obviously one of the things that we can discuss. I thought I saw a hand go up over here on the left?

MS. FRINK: I have not seen it.
MR. IACOPINO: Do you have access to the docket right now? Are you online?

MS. FRINK: Not online.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Ms. Monroe has a copy you can take a look at, Ms. Frink. Thank you.

For those of you who have had the opportunity to look at it, do any other parties
envision that they may join in that stipulation and request for findings of fact either totally or partially at some point before we begin these adjudicative proceedings? Let me start with Ms. Geiger.

MS. GEIGER: Subject to check with my client, there may be some provisions within the stipulation of facts that Newington can agree to, but there are some that Newington will not agree to.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Richardson?
MR. RICHARDSON: I apologize. I was not aware of the filing. I'm trying to look it up right now so I'm -- I will certainly agree to anything that is reasonable under the circumstances, but I can't evaluate which particular findings right now.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. Ms. Brown?
MS. BROWN: As far as my client, Donna Heald, we haven't had a chance to digest it so we're going to need to delay our response to it, but, again, we would make every effort to accept stipulations that are reasonable, and I believe that's the same as the spokesperson for the

Durham Residents.
MR. IACOPINO: Is that correct, Ms. Miller?
MS. MILLER: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Doug, you already told us you hadn't had a chance, you weren't brought in when it was drafted. What's the Durham/UNH position with respect to --

MR. PATCH: I have not gone through it in detail with my client so I'm not prepared to say what we might or might not agree to at this point in time.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Frink, I know you haven't had a chance to see it yet.

Mr. Lanzetta?
MR. LANZETTA: We're in the same position. We haven't been through it with Mr. Frizzell yet. We would agree to anything reasonable.

MR. IACOPINO: And I'm sorry. I skipped over CLF. Sorry.

MR. IRWIN: That's okay. Yes. I've reviewed the stipulation preliminarily, but not with an eye towards determining whether we might join the stipulation or parts of it. I suspect we may be in a position to join parts of it, but

I doubt that we will be in a position to join it in its entirety.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. Just want to get a sense of where everybody is with that and doesn't look like there will be any sort of global stipulation. Maybe on some issues if you all take a look at it. Really encourage it. You know, there are some, I guess what really requests for the Committee to find facts contained their document which may not really be much in dispute, but I'll leave that up to you all because you're the parties to determine whether or not it is, but we do strongly encourage you to agree. If there are facts in the stipulation that's been presented, we encourage you to agree. We also encourage you to come to any stipulations that you can. Obviously, this one was not reached by all the parties, only reached by two of the parties, and even though the time from the Procedural Order has passed for filing it, obviously if there are stipulations you're free to notify the Committee of that, obviously through Ms. Monroe's office and with copies to everybody else. So I just
want to encourage you to look at that. If there are things you can agree to agree. If there are other stipulations, stipulate.

Ms. Geiger?
MS. GEIGER: Just to clarify the record, with respect to the Town of Newington we were not given an opportunity to review this stipulation before it was filed with the Committee, and so I don't want the record to reflect that we were unwilling to stipulate prior to this time. It's just that we were not consulted prior to the time that this particular stipulation was filed.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. Thank you. MR. RICHARDSON: Can $I$ just chime in? I'm just reviewing this now. Paragraph 12 refers to all of the project being located within an existing right-of-way, and I think our intervention is pretty clear that we don't agree with that conclusion, and we want to dispute that one at the hearings. MR. IACOPINO: Okay. MR. RICHARDSON: I didn't want by my silence to have that go --

MR. IACOPINO: No, what you told me, Justin, was that you didn't have an opportunity to review it yet, but $I$ guess you've at least seen one thing that you're pretty sure you're not going to stipulate to.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah, and I apologize. I think inadvertently my client did forward this to me, but $I$ was not on the Service List and somehow I missed this when it came in so I didn't even realize it was before us today. So I apologize for that.

MR. IACOPINO: Nothing to apologize for. Let's move on though.

Withdrawals of any Testimony. I'm going to look first to the Applicant. Is there any change in the testimonies that -- you have filed some substitutions which are in the record and I think all of parties should be aware of if they've been reviewing what you filed.

Is there any anticipated withdrawals, substitutions or other types of activity like that with respect to the Prefiled Testimony from the Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No. Not with ours.

MR. IACOPINO: Do you expect any further amendments, I guess we do, but can you tell us what further amendments you may expect before we get to the adjudicative? Or should we expect in the middle of the adjudicative hearing?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: To our testimony?
MR. IACOPINO: No. To the Application in general at this point. It's no secret that you're still in negotiations with the Department of Environmental Services who is not here today. Am I correct?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. I was thinking about that, and I was also thinking about some other things so certainly everybody is aware of the DES issue. We are continuing efforts with individual parties in some cases to sign MOUs, in some cases to reach some form of settlements, partial, potential, $I$ just don't know. So to the extent any of those efforts are successful at any point in the proceedings, obviously we would introduce that to the Committee, and it may affect elements of our testimony.

MR. IACOPINO: Let me go to Counsel for the Public. Next. Do you expect any changes?

MR. ASLIN: I do not.
MR. IACOPINO: Amendments, withdrawals of testimony?

MR. ASLIN: I don't plan to amend the Application. No, I don't anticipate any changes to the testimony at this point.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Geiger? As far as the Town of Newington goes, is there still negotiations with further MOUs with Newington?

MS. GEIGER: No. There are two MOUs that are in the, well, an MOU and a supplement or an amendment that are in the record with Mr. Hebert's Prefiled Testimony.

I guess the other thing that was referenced in the Supplemental Testimony filed by the Applicant is that there is, there are some conversations ensuing with the Department of Historical Resources, Division of Historical Resources, and Eversource and Newington will be meeting to discuss potential MOU regarding impacts to historical resources. And if there's an agreement reached, I imagine that that will come in, will be marked as an exhibit.

MR. IACOPINO: What about from Newington's
perspective? Is there anything that you anticipate withdrawing, substituting, changing? MS. GEIGER: No, the only thing I would mention is we'd like to get Mr. Weinrieb's Prefiled Testimony marked as a full exhibit. The issues that he's raised in his testimony have been resolved by the MOU that was filed with Mr. Hebert's testimony. We'd like not to have to bring him here to swear to his testimony under oath, and what I would propose is to have Mr. Hebert adopt Mr. Weinrieb's testimony as his own simply to have it in the record to provide background information for the Committee regarding the MOU issues, and I guess I would, when we get to it I can ask, I guess you'll be asking whether any parties have questions for Mr. Weinrieb, and if they don't I would hope that there could be assent to having Mr. Hebert adopt that testimony.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. We'll return to that particular issue when we get to the list of the testimonies. Okay.

Ms. Brown? Did you anticipate any changes
to the testimony, any substitutions, any
withdrawals?
MS. BROWN: No, and that pertains to Donna Heald and the Durham Residents with the caveat that if circumstances change, we have a continuing obligation to inform the Committee of any changes.

MR. IACOPINO: Understood. Mr. Richardson?
MR. RICHARDSON: We obviously didn't file Prefiled Testimony, but we are expecting numerous other witnesses to revise their testimony on cross-examination.

MR. IACOPINO: I'll look forward to your vigorous cross-examination. Mr. Patch?

MR. PATCH: Both Durham and UNH are still in the process of working out MOUs with Eversource that have not been resolved yet. You know. We're hopeful those will be resolved before the hearings begin. You know, they're on limited issues but important issues.

And then with regard to withdrawal of testimony, no. We're not withdrawing any testimony. I mean, presumably, depending on what, how the DES issues gets resolved, it can certainly have a significant impact on the

Original and Supplemental Testimony, particularly that our four expert witnesses have filed.

MR. IACOPINO: CLF.
MR. IRWIN: CLF has no witnesses.
MR. IACOPINO: Let me go over to Ms. Frink.
MS. FRINK: I do not anticipate withdrawing or changing any of my testimony, and I do not have any witnesses to present.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Lanzetta for
Mr. Frizzell?
MR. LANZETTA: We have no changes.
MR. IACOPINO: All right. Let's get to the order of witnesses.

All right. The Applicant has provided a list, and I'm just going to go through the manner in which they wish to present their witnesses and the dates. This was brought to us today. So I'll go through it, and then we'll, I don't know if there's any reason to discuss the order, but if there is, we'll discuss it.

On August 29th, the Applicant proposes to call William Quinlan and the Construction Panel which includes Kenneth Bowes, David Plante, Lynn

Farrington, William Wall, Mark Dodeman and Nick Strater so that's 7 witnesses on that panel.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: It's Frazier, isn't it?

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Farrington is Ms.
Frazier now. Okay.
On August 30th the Applicant is intending to call Victoria Bunker and the Construction Panel again. On September 17th, the Applicant is proposing the Construction Panel, Robert Andrew, and Aaron Cullen.

On September 18th, the Applicant intends to call its Environmental Panel which includes Sarah Allen, Ann Pembroke, Kurt Nelson, Bjorn Borkman and Dr. Craig Swanson so that's a five-person panel.

That panel will continue on September 20th followed by Robert Varney, and the Applicant indicates that Mr. Varney may appear on the 18th as well if the Environmental Panel concludes on the 18th. And Mr. Varney would be followed on September 20 th by Dr. Lisa Shapiro who the Applicant reports is generally available, and if a gap arises in the proceedings, she's available
to come in and fill that gap. They're willing to provide everybody with reasonable notice about that.

But if everything goes according to the way they have their witnesses scheduled, she would be the last witness on September 20.

On September 21 the Applicant proposes to call Dr. Chalmers followed by Cherilyn Widell. On September 24, the Applicant proposes to call David Raphael followed by Dr. Bailey, and we do have a note from the Applicant here that that's the only day that Dr. Bailey is available for cross-examination. Of all the days that we've designated?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Up through the 24 th.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: If pressed, we might be able to find another time, but it's pretty difficult right now.

MR. IACOPINO: Barry, is this document something that you've sent out to all the parties yet?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: We gave it to them this morning.

MR. IACOPINO: All right.
MR. RICHARDSON: Can I ask a question about the list that's been distributed? When it says the Construction Panel, and then it lists -- so that's the same Construction Panel that's going to appear each day? And then there's going to be different people with the panel on the following days? Do I understand that correctly?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No. So when it says Construction Panel, all 7 members of the panel will be there and will be available for questioning. The only reason that there is an interruption there is because Dr. Bunker is out of the country in the second half of September, and so we have to get her completed before the end of the day on August 30th, and so our intention, depending on how things go and the estimates of time that people offer for what they're going to need, would be to interrupt the Construction Panel for a brief time to get her up and done and then continue with Construction Panel at some -- I think folks understand it's extraordinarily difficult to understand how long these things are going to take, especially when
we haven't gotten estimates from people. So we're doing our best to try to line folks up based on our assessments of how much time these Panels may take and our witnesses' availability. MR. IACOPINO: I assume she's not available on the 29th. Is that the issue?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: She is available on the 29th, but our preference is to get going with the Construction Panel before we start talking about the archeological effects.

MR. RICHARDSON: So then the Construction Panel is testifying on its own, and then when they're done, they're done. It's just that it's going to have to continue over some time. You're not going in conjunction with the other witnesses that are on that day. That's not the appropriate -- did I get that right?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: We're not going to have room to put more than 7 people up on the witness dais anyway.

MR. PATCH: Looks like 6. Is it 6 or 7? MR. IACOPINO: Six. I'm sorry. But that's going to max out our witness stand in any event.

MS. GEIGER: Newington's preference would not be to break up testimony that was provided by the Construction Panel. I mean, if Ms. Bunker is availability for the 30th, and we can get her testimony in completely on that day, I think she should be allowed to do that.

MR. IACOPINO: You mean on the 29th?
MS. GEIGER: 29th. I'm sorry.
MR. IACOPINO: They're proposing her on the $30 t h$.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's not something we want to do. Our intention is to talk about the project that we're trying to build and how we propose to build it as much as possible before we start talking about effects. And I guess we'll hear later today what people's estimates are for the amount of time they'll need for Mr. Quinlan, but our hope and expectation is we can get a fair amount of testimony from the Construction Panel done before we have to turn to Ms. Bunker for a brief period of time.

MR. IACOPINO: Doug?
MR. PATCH: I'm not sure this is the time you want to hear it, but $I$ think any witness
that has anything that pertains to DES conditions that they would impose really ought to wait until we know how that's being resolved. And I know some of the Construction Panel people, for example, Mr. Wall, and possibly a couple of the others, but Mr. Wall, in particular, has a lot of testimony about jet plowing. So unless you want to make him available to come back later, it seems to me that the appropriate thing to do would be if you want to go ahead on the 29 th and the 30 th is to take witnesses who basically have nothing to do with what DES might or might not say, what the Applicant and DES might or might not agree to -excuse me. Assuming that the Committee decides to let them go ahead with those discussions. So I think it's problematic in terms of how it's being proposed. So I think that's something that's very important to get straight today. MR. IACOPINO: What we don't have is we don't have a DES representative here. All we have is a letter that we received from them asking for additional time until September 1? September 7th to respond.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: September 7th.
MR. IACOPINO: So that's where DES is with respect to this. What we did was the DES was forwarded a letter from the Chair, from the Presiding Officer, because it appears that the Applicant's requesting that conditions that may be different from what DES has proposed be adopted, and so in order to try to get as much of that issue up front instead of waiting until deliberations to notify DES, the Presiding Officer asked DES to respond, and hopefully we will get a response, and as we've all heard already, there are still negotiations going on.

I mean, I think the issue that's raised, Mr. Needleman, is a concern because obviously we're not even going to have any DES response until September 7th, it appears. And I do understand Mr. Wall does testify somewhat about the submarine construction which sort of crosses with the environmental issues.

So I just have to caution you that it may turn out that you may have to have some of these people return. I don't know if you've contemplated that, but depending on what DES
provides on September 7 th or thereafter, the Committee itself may have questions that involve witnesses from your Construction Panel.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So a couple of points on
that. First of all, the motion was filed yesterday. I hadn't even had a chance to talk to my client about it, let alone start to put an objection together.

MR. IACOPINO: Which motion, the DES request?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, the Durham motion to delay the proceedings which Doug is talking about.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm not even talking about that right now. I'm just talking about in terms of the way that you have it scheduled, your Construction Panel pretty much up first after Mr. Quinlan, we know there will not be a DES response -- well, they could, I suppose, but they've asked until September 7 th to respond.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Right.
MR. IACOPINO: Which means that once they do respond, the parties and of course my concern is more the Committee, may have questions based
upon however DES responds and whatever agreements you may or may not come up with with them, there may be additional questions that are best directed to members of your Construction Panel.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Understood, and as it's laid out in that schedule, our expectation is that the Construction Panel is going to be back here on September 17 th after whatever DES provides to the Committee has been filed. So to the extent people have those sorts of questions they would have that opportunity in the normal course the way we've laid this out.

MR. IACOPINO: The witnesses would be here. I mean, ultimately, the Presiding Officer will decide if there's an issue to be decided. Mr. Patch?

MR. PATCH: I just think it's important to clarify some time before the hearings begin. Would I be expected on behalf of my client to ask all of the questions that $I$ have at this point in time of that Construction Panel on those days before we hear from DES? Because it would change, it could change significantly the
cross-examination that $I$ do of some of those witnesses because, obviously, everything and anything in the DES recommendation we have to assume at this point is still in flux.

You know, we got what the statute says is a final decision from DES, we submitted testimony based on that, Supplemental Testimony, and I prepared my cross based on that, and I just found out on Monday that there are ongoing discussions, as Mr. Pelletier says. So I think that puts us at a distinct disadvantage. You know, if we're expected to prepare a cross, you know, where we don't really know what the DES recommendation ultimately may be, then $I$ just think that's really, it is really very difficult for us to prepare for that.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Well, obviously, you have a motion filed with respect to requesting a delay in the proceedings, and that will be decided by the Presiding Officer. We're not going to decide that here today, and I understand that most of what you've just said is an argument to support that. But right now we're going to move forward on the basis that
we're beginning next week and subject to whatever Ms. Weathersby rules on your motion. MR. PATCH: Can $I$ just say one more thing and then $I$ won't say anything more about it? MR. IACOPINO: Sure. MR. PATCH: If the motion isn't decided until the morning of the 29th, and I have to come prepared to cross-examine witnesses, not knowing what the Committee is going to do about that, and not knowing what the DES changes might be, I think that's fundamentally unfair.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well --
MR. IACOPINO: I'm sure that we will make it as fair as is humanly possible, and what I was going to discuss is what does happen when we do this is it does sort of create sort of a merry-go-round of examination because we may be halfway through the parties' cross-examination, we may be done with half of the parties. Your DES stuff comes back, we've got to give another audience to those parties to come back and now cross-examining because there's information from DES that may affect Mr. Wall's testimony or
other members of the Construction Panel. It does make it somewhat disorganized just in terms of the flow of the evidence. Obviously, we'd prefer to have the witness, the cross-examination, the redirect, and then move on to the next party without having to come back and do further cross-examinations or even further redirects which may be required.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Understood. I wasn't going to say anything about this, but we haven't had the chance to object. I do disagree with the way Doug is framing this issue. I don't believe that there's anything unusual about this in relation to how this has happened in other proceedings, and people have always had a full and fair opportunity to cross-examine and to raise any concerns they have in their post-hearing briefs. I fully expect they would get that chance here as well. And as I said, the way things are structured right now, we expect that that Construction Panel will continue to be available well after DES says whatever they're going to say here and people will get to ask that Panel questions as this is
laid out here.
MR. IACOPINO: Susan first.
MS. GEIGER: Yes. I think there's another argument to be made to support having the Construction Panel testify after we get information back from DES as to whether or not they're going to change any of their conditions, and that is administrative efficiency. A lot of parties could be spending a lot of time preparing cross-examination on issues that may be mooted out by something that DES decides. So I don't think it would be appropriate or fair even to the Committee members to spend a lot of time questioning witnesses on issues that may change. So I would strongly urge that the Construction Panel not be testifying until after we have some final word from DES as to whether or not it's going to change any of its final conditions.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: The DES issues as it relates to the Construction Panel is one minor issue in a whole range of issues. This Construction Panel, if anybody looks at the testimony that they've provided, covers an
enormous amount of ground that has nothing to do with DES conditions. And so, you know, the notion that, first of all, it should be delayed because of that, I don't think is right. Second of all, the Applicant has a right to present its case and its witnesses the way it wants to present it, and it's our intent, it's the way we want to present the case is to lead with the Construction Panel because that's what makes sense in the context of the proceeding, and as I've said before, we fully expect people will have an opportunity to ask that panel whatever questions they need to ask them.

MR. IACOPINO: Anybody else? Ms. Frink. MS. FRINK: I would like to support Attorney Patch and Attorney Geiger. I intend to raise some very serious DES-related issues in my questioning as well so I'm very eager to have this issue of the negotiations, the ongoing negotiations resolved before we proceed.

MR. IACOPINO: Anybody else?
Mr. Richardson?
MR. RICHARDSON: Two things. One is the statute contemplates that the DES conditions are
final going into the hearings when you look at the days that have been counted, and I think it was a four-month gap between the final
conditions and the ultimate decision, and I think that's what's intended here. What we're presented with is a problem where a construction witness may say well, we've spoken to DES about this condition and they're going to change it. We're not going to know DES's position which is something that the statute kind of lays out in the schedule.

You know, I don't know that this is the best way to resolve it, but one thing that the Committee may need and the parties may need is to know what DES's position is if a witness is asked a question and says well, DES is going to modify it's that or it's not going to modify what we proposed, we're stuck with this, you know, alternative where we can't guess what the DES's position is. I wonder if it would make sense, and I believe the Committee has the lead authority to subpoena DES and make their official available, and $I$ know that sounds unheard of, and it's not something that has been
practiced before.
MR. IACOPINO: Justin. It's been done.
MR. RICHARDSON: Oh, it has? Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: Yes. A letter went from the Presiding Officer to DES asking first for a response to attach to the letter was the conditions that the Applicant is seeking. We asked them to respond within ten days in writing. We received a letter from them asking to extend that to September 7th. So that's been done. Whether or not a representative is going to be here subject to cross-examination from DES, I don't know yet.

MR. RICHARDSON: In the ten-day response time that's in that letter is statutory. It's in 162-H:7 A. And so by delaying it until after the hearings, we're left without a piece of information we need to know, and, obviously, the methods of construction impact my client directly.

MR. IACOPINO: Unfortunately, that ten-day is not statutory in the context of the case where we are now. That's only when, the only time that the ten days becomes statutory is when
the Subcommittee determines that they're going to issue conditions that are different. What we have done is we've, identifying that this may be a problem, we've asked them to respond earlier than the statute actually would require us to do. If we followed the statute to a "T," we would be in deliberations, the Committee would determine that they're going to issue some condition that is different than that requested by DES, and the Committee then statutorily would be required to notify DES and get a response from them within 10 days.

Anticipating there could be issues, the Presiding Officer sent a letter to DES asking them to respond within ten days. There's no statutory requirement there at this stage of the proceeding.

MR. RICHARDSON: I misunderstood what the letter was. I thought $I$ was invoking that provision so that's why I made that statement. But let me, I think what that does is that makes it right back to what Attorney Geiger just referenced which is administrative efficiency because now we're faced with a potential where
the conditions we all think apply may not apply. MR. IACOPINO: Well, it certainly makes it more administratively efficient than it would be under the statute because you're going to have more opportunity and all the parties will have more opportunity to address the issue, whether through cross-examination or argument if it all comes out while the adjudicative proceeding is going forward and does not begin at the time of deliberations. So that's just, you know, it's -- neither one is the best scenario, but I think this one is better. Mr. Patch.

MR. PATCH: Two quick points in response to what Mr. Richardson said. One, in terms of a subpoena, the letter from the Presiding Officer invited DES to attend today, and they didn't attend. So they may be invited to attend to the hearings, but if they're not going to attend, then a subpoena might have to issue.

And the second point is that in that letter, the citation, you said it wasn't a statutory ten days, but the letter cites the statute. So, you know, it seems to me that it invokes the statute, I think Mr. Richardson's
point was that, and I think there's support for this in some prior committee rulings that the Committee doesn't really have the authority to waive a statutory deadline. So I think that's effectively what is happening, including with the final, quote, unquote, final decision.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Aslin?
MR. ASLIN: I think this is important discussion, but perhaps in front of the wrong body since the Presiding Officer is the one who has to make the decision on the motion. So there are some important arguments that have been made, but I think for the expediency of this Prehearing Conference I would suggest that we move forward, and I would request or just make the statement that to the extent we're agreeing on any schedule today, I would reserve the right to recall or whatever is necessary to ask witnesses questions about the DES recommendations after they come out if a Panel has been completed.

MR. IACOPINO: Understood. But remembering that today is an opportunity to maybe try to avoid some of those recalls and what not, but
doesn't seem like there's going to be much agreement on that at this point. So I don't have any problem with moving on to, at least based upon what everybody knows today, determining what type of examinations, how long we intend to spend with the various witnesses unless anybody else has anything else that they feel they need to say about the order that the Applicant intends to present its witnesses. Mr. Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Since we are really talking about scheduling, could the schedule that is stipulated or issued today based on these discussions include a place holder that says for the, and in particular I'm looking at the marine construction issues, to have that witness return after the DES recommendations so that we're not by coming out of this proceeding, we're not leaving ourselves without a remedy in the event that DES does modify its terms and conditions.

MR. IACOPINO: We have a number of days beyond what's the ones that the Applicant has suggested. They've suggested that their
witnesses are going to go through September 24th. We have a number of days after September $24 t h$ where our Committee is available. Obviously, we've got to hear from the witnesses from the other parties. But also there are days that are built in there for that, and I'm sure that if the Presiding Officer determines that a witness need to be recalled, she will do that, and she will determine whether to make a place holder for it or not.

MR. RICHARDSON: Understood. But at least if there's some stipulation among the parties here today that contemplates that a witness may be recalled to address DES conditions, then, you know, we can rely on that, and then we could make our arguments to say when we were here today we discussed this issue, we agreed to do this. Whereas if we don't do that, the Applicant can say well, tough luck, they testified. I'm not calling them back.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, Justin, I'm not saying that, and I wouldn't say that, and I'll repeat what I said before. The Construction Panel will be here on September 17th.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. But his concern is more, it's not just about the 17 th. It's about having the ability to respond to whatever the DES, to ask questions of the Construction Panel based on whatever changes or maybe DES won't change a thing, but based upon whatever the response from DES is. I understand. And as I said to you before, I mean, and I think you understand this as well is that if the parties request and the Presiding Officer determines it's the best way to proceed, you may be requested to have some of these witnesses be recalled subject to further cross-examination. It wouldn't the be the first time it's happened, and it may very well happen, and I'm sure the Presiding Officer if that becomes the case will try to do that in a manner that is as fair as possible to all of the parties involved.

Mr. Patch?
MR. PATCH: To the extent that you are going to write up what happens today, I would just like it to be noted for the record that Durham and UNH oppose having the Construction Panel testify until we hear the final results
from discussions with DES or until the Committee decides on our motion that those discussions should not continue. And so I think, you know, I would just like that to be noted in the record and that we would be agreeable to taking other witnesses on those two days who are not ones who have basically anything to say about the DES recommendations, but an opposed to having them go on either one of those days until the DES issues are resolved.

MR. IACOPINO: Are there any of the
Intervenors who don't oppose it? Raise your hands. Seeing none, I'll note that all of the Intervenors oppose it. How about Counsel for the Public? Chris, if you have a position. If you don't have a position, it's entirely okay. MR. ASLIN: In response to Attorney Patch's request for concurrence, Counsel for the Public concurred with only the portion of the motion that had to do with access to communications that have gone on with DES. We haven't taken a position on the delay question. I would, from my perspective I'm okay with having a chance to get at the witnesses after the DES decision is
made.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. But the question is based on, his opposition as stated is to the order proposed by the Applicant.

MR. ASLIN: I do not object to the order.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. All right. Let's
move on then.
So we anticipate the order of case presentation to be that it's the Applicant followed by Counsel for the Public followed by Durham/UNH, followed by Newington, followed by CLF, followed by the Durham Residents, Ms. Heald, the Millers, that group, followed by Durham Historic Society which by the way, are they here?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: No.
MR. IACOPINO: Followed by Mr. Frizzell, followed by Ms. Frink. Is Mr. Baker out, too?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes. Mr. Baker told me he would not be here, and he has no questions for any witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: Followed by the Nature Conservancy who we haven't heard from lately either, correct? And then followed, last but
not least, by Mr. Richardson for Crowley Joyce Revocable Trust.

So that's the order that we have sort of put here, and what I'd like to do is go through starting with the Applicant's witnesses and go around the room for each party just to get an idea, you will not be held to this. When you say I'm going to be an hour with the witness, nobody is going to have an alarm clock on telling you okay, you said an hour, you're going to stop. This is so we can schedule these things as best as possible. So give us your best estimate based on what you know today. I understand, we don't have to address the fact that there's some things in flux every time that we answer how long you may be with the witness. We understand that things are in flux, particularly with the construction and Environmental Panels, and the response from DES.

MR. ASLIN: Mike, can $I$ comment on the order of inquiry? The rules do contemplate that Counsel for the Public follows the Intervenors and that that's what the rules say unless the Presiding Officer makes a finding that it would
be more appropriate for expediency or other reasons. So I think it's appropriate to follow the rules, and I'm wondering if the Presiding Officer has taken a position on this officially?

MR. IACOPINO: No. This is just staff putting together a list. Okay?

MR. ASLIN: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: I wasn't even aware of that rule --

MR. ASLIN: 202.20.
MR. IACOPINO: If you desire to go last and that's what the rules say, you'll go last.

MR. ASLIN: Okay. I think it's appropriate for it to flow that way, but $I$ know it has been changed in the past.

MR. IACOPINO: Just because I have a cheat sheet that's working in the other direction, we're going to turn to you first.

MR. ASLIN: Happy to go first.
MR. IACOPINO: We'll go through the
witnesses that are on the list. Okay. So for
the Applicants?
MR. FRINK: Excuse me, Mike. I have a
question.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. I didn't see your hand, Ms. Frink.

MR. FRINK: I have a question about the Applicant's witnesses. If $I$ could just have a refresher on those witnesses testifying on historic resources. I believe Victoria Bunker worked on archeology? And who are the other witnesses who are specialists in historic resources? I believe Cherilyn Widell, I'm not sure about David Raphael. Barry, perhaps you can help.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure. Vicky Bunker, you're correct, is archeology. Cherilyn Widell is above-ground historic resources, and that's essentially it. Dave Raphael is Visual Impact Assessment.

MR. FRINK: Okay. Thank you very much.
MR. IACOPINO: So Chris, I'm going to start with you, and we'll go through the Applicant's witnesses first, and this is your best estimate as to how much time you're going to take with them, understanding that you'll be going last so other people may have asked some of your questions already. So beginning with

Mr. Quinlan.
MR. ASLIN: I anticipate 15 or 20 minutes for Mr. Quinlan. The Construction Panel? MR. IACOPINO: We don't have them in the same order so I'm going to go to Mr. Andrew. Is that going to throw you off too much? MR. ASLIN: No, that's fine. Mr. Andrew, 15 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Then the Construction Panel.

MR. ASLIN: I would anticipate two hours for the Construction Panel, given that I'll be going last.

MR. IACOPINO: And Mr. Cullen on financials?

MR. ASLIN: Probably five minutes.
MR. RICHARDSON: I apologize. Mr. Iacopino, is there a list you're working off of? The prehearing order had the order of examination, but it didn't have the witness order. Are we going off the Applicant's proposed list, which list are we going off?

MR. IACOPINO: We're going off a cheat
sheet that Ms. Monroe put together for me, and
it's just basically, it's not the list of the order of the witnesses. Just so you're aware. But I'll try to tell you what their area is so that that can refresh your recollection.

MR. RICHARDSON: That would be helpful because $I$ have a list that I made, but it's off of the testimony that's been offered. Some of that has been superseded so I'm trying to -it's hard to catch who's testifying.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Cullen is one of the financial witnesses, okay? That was the last one Counsel for the Public told us. The next one is Mr. Raphael on aesthetics. MR. ASLIN: I especially about a half an hour for Mr. Raphael. MR. IACOPINO: Now, we had Widell and Bunker as one, anticipating that that would be a thing. So Ms. Widell, let's start with Ms. Bunker.

MR. ASLIN: For Ms. Bunker, probably 20
minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And Ms. Widell?
MR. SIMPSON: I'd say 30 to 40 .
MR. IACOPINO: And then the Environmental

Panel consisting of Frizzell and Ms. Pembroke, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Borkman and Mr. Swanson. I may have missed up some of the Mr. or Ms. there. MR. ASLIN: I anticipate about an hour and a half.

MR. IACOPINO: And then on electromagnetic fields, Dr. Bailey?

MR. SIMPSON: Probably five minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Varney for orderly
development of the region and tourism.
MR. ASLIN: About a half hour.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chalmers on property values?

MR. ASLIN: Probably 30 to 40 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And Ms. Shapiro on
economics, employment and tax revenue?
MR. ASLIN: Five minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Let me take you down to the Intervenor witnesses for Mr. Aslin for Mr. Selig from Durham/UNH? MR. ASLIN: About ten minutes. MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham/UNH panel of Famely, Schultz, Jones and Dacey, I believe that's the -- Doug, that's your Environmental

Panel, right?
MR. PATCH: Yes.
MR. ASLIN: 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And for Denis Hebert from
Newington?
MR. SIMPSON: Ten to 15.
MR. IACOPINO: Is that all?
MR. ASLIN: I can make it longer if you want, Mike. Two days.

MR. HEBERT: Mike, you have a good memory.
MR. IACOPINO: So Mr. Weinrieb will not actually be here? Okay? So we'll take him off.

MR. ASLIN: And I don't have any objection
to Mr. Hebert adopting that testimony. I might have a couple questions on it, but if they can could be answered by Mr. Hebert, that's fine.

MR. IACOPINO: As I said before, we'll get back to that when we're done trying to get an idea on people's expected times here.

The Durham Residents, I assume they're going to testify as a panel? Is that correct? Do you know how long you'd be with them?

MR. ASLIN: I would say, so just to make sure I have the right witnesses, this is Ms.

Heald, Dr. Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Miller and Mr. and Mrs. Fitch?

MR. IACOPINO: Correct.
MR. ASLIN: I think 20 to 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And the Durham Historic
Resources are Sandberg and Mackie?
MR. ASLIN: Also 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Frizzell?
MR. ASLIN: Five minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Frink?
MR. ASLIN: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And we've been told that
Mr. Baker is not going to be here.
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: No. He's not here today. He filed Prefiled Testimony.

MR. ASLIN: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Let me then, just because it's, again, this is not, the way that I'm going through this is not consistent with the order that's in the thing so next person I'm going to talk to is Durham/UNH, Mr. Patch. Understanding you have a motion pending and understanding that you have reservations about the order, let's take it through.

With respect to Mr. Quinlan, based on what you know now, do you know how much time you're going to need to cross-examine him?

MR. PATCH: I guess I'd say approximately 25 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: And for Mr. Andrew on system stability, reliability and need for power?

MR. PATCH: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And on the Construction Panel?

MR. PATCH: I mean, the thing that's throwing me off is $I$ didn't know we were going to have six people on that panel. The testimony you actually came in as three people together. So that's kind of thrown me a bit. And so I guess, just to be safe, $I$ had a fair amount for Mr. Wall, and so I guess I'll say two hours for that panel.

MR. IACOPINO: And everybody, be, you know, when I say be conservative, it means the longer time here. Okay? So if you think, you know --

MR. PATCH: Can I just ask? Is there a reason why there have to be 6 people on one panel? Because that seems to me, you know, why
you can't do the way it came in as testimony like three and three or three and one, Wall was all by himself, and so, you know, I guess we could have ten on a panel if you want. But why six? Six seems like an inordinate number.

MR. IACOPINO: We've historically worked with the manner in which the Applicant or any party which wishes to present its witnesses, you know, so that's where it comes from.

MR. PATCH: I guess I'd just like to go on record as opposed to being to having all six on one panel, but that having been said I'd say two hours.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. And Mr. Cullen on financial capabilities?

MR. PATCH: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And for Mr. Raphael, visual impact and aesthetics?

MR. PATCH: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And again, for Ms. Bunker?
MR. PATCH: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Widell?
MR. PATCH: 20.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Environmental Panel
of Allen, Pembroke, Nelson, et al?
MR. PATCH: Is et al --
MR. IACOPINO: Swanson, Borkman.
MR. PATCH: So they're all together now two
which is different from the way the testimony
came in. So, again, I object. So I guess I
would say two hours for that panel.
MR. IACOPINO: For Dr. Bailey on the
electromagnetic fields, public health and safety?

MR. PATCH: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Varney on orderly
development and tourism?
MR. PATCH: 20.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chalmers with property
values?
MR. PATCH: Ten.
MR. IACOPINO: And Ms. Shapiro on
economics, employment and tax revenue?
MR. PATCH: Five. Maybe less.
MR. IACOPINO: And then for Counsel for the
Public has their, we're just calling it
Environmental and Construction, but is it your
intention, Chris, to call Mr. Whitney and

Mr. Ladewig together?
MR. ASLIN: Yes. They have Joint Testimony
so they would be on a Panel together.
MR. IACOPINO: So with respect to Whitney
and Ladewig on Environmental and Construction?
MR. PATCH: I'll say 45.
MR. IACOPINO: For Lawrence on aesthetics
and visual impacts?
MR. PATCH: 20.
MR. IACOPINO: And for Ms. O'Donnell on both historic and archeological?

MR. PATCH: 20.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. You intend to
cross-examine Mr. Hebert for how long?
MR. PATCH: At great length. 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. For the Durham
Residents panel?
MR. PATCH: I guess I'd say maybe 15 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. For the Durham Historic Association?

MR. PATCH: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Frizzell?
MR. PATCH: Five.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Frink?
MR. PATCH: Five.
MR. IACOPINO: And Mr. Baker?
MR. PATCH: Five.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. We're going to
turn to Newington. Ms. Geiger.
I'll go through the list starting with
Mr. Quinlan.
MS. GEIGER: Mr. Quinlan, I have ten
minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Andrew on system, need, reliability, stability?

MS. GEIGER: 30 to 45.
MR. IACOPINO: On the Construction Panel?
MS. GEIGER: 45 minutes to an hour.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Cullen on financial
capabilities?
MS. GEIGER: Five.
MR. IACOPINO: Minutes?
MS. GEIGER: Minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Raphael with respect to
visual impacts and aesthetics?
MS. GEIGER: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Bunker. Underground.

MS. GEIGER: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Widell aboveground historics?

MS. GEIGER: 45 minutes to one hour.
MR. IACOPINO: On the Environmental Panel.
MS. GEIGER: That would be 45 minutes to an hour.

MR. IACOPINO: On public health and safety, electromagnetic fields with Dr. Bailey?

MS. GEIGER: Five minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Orderly development, tourism with Mr. Varney?

MS. GEIGER: 45 minutes to an hour.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chalmers on property value?

MS. GEIGER: 20 to 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And Ms. Shapiro?
MS. GEIGER: Five minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Go on to Counsel for the Public's witnesses on his Environmental and Construction witnesses, Whitney and Ladewig?

MS. GEIGER: 20 to 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Chris, how does he say that?
MR. ASLIN: I think it's Ladewig.

MR. IACOPINO: On aesthetics?
MS. GEIGER: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And on historic and
archeological, Ms. O'Donnell for Counsel for the Public?

MS. GEIGER: 45 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Selig nor
Durham? Durham/UNH?
MS. GEIGER: Five minutes.
MS. IACOPINO: For the Durham Environmental
Panel? Is there somebody missing from that
panel? Actually, you don't have this so never
mind. I thought there might be. I have Famely,
Schultz, Jones and Dacey. Is there another
witness on that panel? Okay. All right.
Sorry. Ms. Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: Ten to 15.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham Residents?
MS. GEIGER: Five.
MR. IACOPINO: For Durham Historic?
MS. GEIGER: Five.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Frizzell?
MS. GEIGER: 15 to 20.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Frink?

MS. GEIGER: 15 to 20.
MR. IACOPINO: And Mr. Baker?
MS. GEIGER: Five.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Okay. Mr. Irwin
or Ms. Ludke. CLF. Start at the top again.
Mr. Quinlan.
MR. IRWIN: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Andrew on system needs, stability.

MR. IRWIN: Five minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: The Construction Panel for the Applicant.

MR. IRWIN: 60 to 90. Call it 90, to be safe.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Cullen, financial
capability.
MR. IRWIN: Five to ten.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Raphael with respect to
visual impacts and aesthetics.
MR. IRWIN: 15.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Bunker, archeological.
MR. IRWIN: None.
MR. IACOPINO: And Ms. Widell, aboveground historics.

MR. IRWIN: None.
MR. IACOPINO: On the Environmental Panel.
MR. IRWIN: 90 to be conservative.
Probably closer to 60.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Dr. Bailey with respect to public health and safety and electromagnetic fields.

MR. IRWIN: None.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Varney on tourism and orderly development.

MR. IRWIN: 10 to 15.
MR. IACOPINO: Property values with
Dr. Chalmers.
MR. IRWIN: None.
MR. IACOPINO: And Ms. Shapiro on economics and employment and tax revenue.

MR. IRWIN: Five.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Going to Counsel for the Public's witnesses now for Mr. Whitney and Mr. Ladewig, Environmental/Construction.

MR. IRWIN: 20 to 30.
MR. IACOPINO: On the aesthetic expert,
Mr. Lawrence.
MR. IRWIN: Ten.

MR. IACOPINO: And on Patricia O'Donnell
for historic and archeological for Counsel for the Public.

MR. IRWIN: None.
MR. IACOPINO: Any questions for Mr. Selig
from Durham/UNH.
MR. IRWIN: Yes. 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham/UNH
Environmental Panel.
MR. IRWIN: 20 to 30.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Hebert.
MR. IRWIN: Five to ten.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham Residents panel.

MR. IRWIN: Ten to 15.
MR. IACOPINO: For Durham Historic.
MR. IRWIN: None.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Frizzell.
MR. IRWIN: Five.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Frink.
MR. IRWIN: Ten.
MR. IACOPINO: And Mr. Baker.
MR. IRWIN: 15 to 20.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. Okay.

We're going to turn to the Durham Residents. Ms. Brown, are you going to speak for them as well?

MS. BROWN: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MS. BROWN: For today.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. All right. So let's
start with Mr. Quinlan.
MS. BROWN: Mr. Quinlan, ten minutes.
Construction Panel, half hour.
MR. IACOPINO: Can $I$ just back you up?
What about -- my list is a little bit different.
So I've got Mr. Quinlan you said ten minutes.
You said 30 minutes for the Construction Panel.
I have in between that Mr. Andrew on system
stability, need for power and reliability.
MS. BROWN: Just five minutes. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: The next one that $I$ have is
Mr. Cullen for financial capability.
MS. BROWN: I don't think we're going to
have any for him. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Raphael on visual
impacts and aesthetics?
MS. BROWN: 45 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Ms. Bunker for archeological?

MS. BROWN: I don't believe we will have any.

MR. IACOPINO: And Ms. Widell for
aboveground historic?
MS. BROWN: The same.
MR. IACOPINO: And then the Environmental Panel?

MS. BROWN: Environmental Panel, half hour. I'm sorry. 45 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: On Dr. Bailey with respect to EMF and public health and safety?

MS. BROWN: 45 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Varney on orderly
development and tourism?
MS. BROWN: Say 15.
MR. IACOPINO: Property values with
Dr. Chalmers.
MS. BROWN: One hour. Maybe less.
MR. IACOPINO: We'll put it down as one. Again, these are just estimates. And for Ms. Shapiro?

MS. BROWN: I doubt the Durham Residents
will have any questions for her.
MR. IACOPINO: All right. Moving on for
Counsel for the Public's witnesses, the
Environmental/Construction Panel of Whitney and
Ladewig?
MS. BROWN: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For the aesthetics witness,
Mr. Lawrence?
MS. BROWN: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. O'Donnell on
historics and archeological?
MS. BROWN: I doubt we will have any
questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Any questions for Mr. Selig
from Durham?
MS. BROWN: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham/UNH
Environmental Panel?
MS. BROWN: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Or Mr. Hebert?
MS. BROWN: 15.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham Historic
Association witnesses?
MS. BROWN: Five.

MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Frizzell?
MS. BROWN: Five.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. Frink?
MS. BROWN: Five. Actually, 15.
MR. IACOPINO: And for Fat Dog Shellfish,
Mr. Baker?
MS. BROWN: Five minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
MS. BROWN: Now, I have a question. We are, the Durham Residents have been grouped together for presentation. Are we not allowed to cross-examine our, the separate witnesses within the Durham Residents? Friendly cross?

MR. IACOPINO: Generally not. We'll talk about that more after. Friendly cross becomes an issue. We'll talk about that more after we go through in list of the parties' anticipated.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Nobody is here for Durham Historic. Right? So Mr. Lanzetta, we're going to turn to you on behalf of Mr. Frizzell. Going to go through the list.

MR. LANZETTA: I may be able to expedite this for you.

MR. IACOPINO: Sure.
MR. LANZETTA: We would like to just have 45 minutes with Dr. Chalmers.

MR. IACOPINO: Just Dr. Chalmers?
MR. LANZETTA: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Nobody else?
MR. LANZETTA: Nobody else.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. Ms.
Frink? I'll turn to you now. How much time will you need with Mr. Quinlan?

MS. FRINK: I don't anticipate any questions of him.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. For Mr. Andrew who is the witness with respect to system stability, reliability and need?

MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Construction Panel
of the Applicant?
MS. FRINK: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. For Mr. Cullen on the financial capabilities of the Applicant?

MS. FRINK: Five minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Raphael, visual
impacts and aesthetics?

MS. FRINK: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. Bunker,
archeological?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. Widell, aboveground historic resources.

MR. FRINK: I estimate 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. For the
Applicant's Environmental Panel?
MS. FRINK: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. I just had to make a note here.

For Dr. Bailey with respect to EMF?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Varney on orderly
development and tourism?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Dr. Chalmers? Property values?

MS. FRINK: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. Shapiro on
economics, employment and taxes?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: So now turn to Counsel for
the Public's witnesses. The
Environmental/Construction Panel, Whitney and
Ladewig?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Aesthetics?
MS. FRINK: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. O'Donnell on
historic and archeological?
MS. FRINK: 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Turning now to the other
convenience we have Mr. Selig who's going to
testify for Durham/UNH?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham/UNH
Environmental Panel?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Hebert?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham Residents?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham Historic
Association witnesses, Sandberg and Mackie?
MS. FRINK: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Frizzell?

MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: And for Mr. Baker?
MS. FRINK: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Okay. So now Nature Conservancy is not here.

All right. Mr. Richardson, turning to you. I'm going to go through the same list.

Mr. Quinlan?
MR. RICHARDSON: He's electric need or
electric liability?
MR. IACOPINO: He's the President of the company. He's going to testify about the background of the project, the need and alternatives that they considered?

MR. RICHARDSON: I don't anticipate questions for him.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Andrew is system stability, reliability and need?

MR. RICHARDSON: I don't anticipate any questions for him.

MR. IACOPINO: Construction Panel?
MR. RICHARDSON: We're looking at an hour. It's hard to say though because I think we're going to be last in the order so many of our
questions will probably be covered so I'm kind of saying knowing that before.

MR. IACOPINO: Give me your most conservative meaning the longest is you might expect, and we'll work with that.

MR. RICHARDSON: One hour.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Cullen on financial capability.

MR. RICHARDSON: Probably maximum of 5 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Raphael with respect to visual impacts and aesthetics?

MR. RICHARDSON: Having seen him testify before, I'm going to say one hour.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Bunker, archeological issues?

MR. RICHARDSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. Widell, Applicant's aboveground historic expert?

MR. RICHARDSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: The Environmental Panel?
MR. RICHARDSON: One hour is probably the maximum.

MR. IACOPINO: For Dr. Bailey on the EMFs
and public health?
MR. RICHARDSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Varney. He's
orderly development.
MR. RICHARDSON: No, no, no. I wrote him
down. I want to say what $I$ wrote down. 30 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: And for Dr. Chalmers on property values?

MR. RICHARDSON: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And for Dr. Shapiro,
economics, employment and taxes?
MR. RICHARDSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Turning to Counsel
for the Public's witnesses, Mr. Whitney and Ladewig, Construction and Environmental?

MR. RICHARDSON: Maximum of 30 minutes, probably less. I think on that witness, and this is something we haven't talked about, when we get to, I don't want to say friendly witnesses but for lack of a better word friendly witnesses, we're probably reversing the order of cross so the Applicant goes last.

MR. IACOPINO: Correct.

MR. RICHARDSON: And then the Towns would be going before me, on some of the Applicant's witnesses, the towns would be coming after me. So we'd basically be the first witness questioning so that's -- so that was.

MR. IACOPINO: I don't know if you're first, but I understand what you're saying.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: So 30 minutes with that Panel though?

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Counsel for the Public's aesthetics, Mr. Lawrence?

MR. RICHARDSON: Five or ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And for Ms. O'Donnell on historic and archeological?

MR. RICHARDSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Selig from Durham?
Town Administrator in Durham?
MR. RICHARDSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham Environmental
Panel? Durham/UNH Environmental Panel? That's the one with Dr. Jones.

MR. RICHARDSON: I think 15 minutes would
be the maximum.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Hebert?
MR. RICHARDSON: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm expecting a biting
cross-examination.
MR. RICHARDSON: Denis and I, as you know, served on the Planning Board together and our discussions always, we don't think alike on the issues so sometimes even when we agree it takes us a while to get there.

MR. IACOPINO: How about for the Durham
Residents panel?
MR. RICHARDSON: I don't anticipate questions.

MR. IACOPINO: And for the Durham Historic witnesses, Sandberg and Mackie?

MR. RICHARDSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Frizzell?
MR. RICHARDSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. Frink?
MR. RICHARDSON: No questions. And for Fat Dog Shellfish, Mr. Baker?

MR. RICHARDSON: Can I say unknown? I
don't anticipate any at this time so that's
fine.
MR. IACOPINO: All right. That's fine. As
I said before, if it changes, it changes, and we'll deal with it at the time. Okay. So I think, is there any Intervenors that I haven't asked? Okay.

Going to turn to the Applicant now and start with Counsel for the Public's witnesses. Mr. Needleman or who ever is going to answer for the Applicant, with respect to the Whitney/Ladewig panel? How much time do you expect to spend with them?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's ESS, right?
MR. IACOPINO: Yes.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: One hour.
MR. IACOPINO: For the aesthetics witness,
Mr. Lawrence?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: One hour.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. O'Donnell on
historic and archeological?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: 1.5.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Selig, the
Administrator in Durham?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: One hour.

MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham Environmental
Panel?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: 1.5.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Hebert?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: 1.5.
MR. IACOPINO: For the Durham Residents panel?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's the Durham Point
Abutters?
MR. IACOPINO: Yes. We've been calling them Durham Residents.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: One hour.
MR. IACOPINO: For Sandberg and Mackie for
the Durham Historic Association?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: One hour.
MR. IACOPINO: For Mr. Frizzell?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I included Mr. Frizzell
within the Durham Point Abutters, I guess.
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: He's in Newington.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Right. I'm sorry. 15 for
now.
MR. IACOPINO: Minutes.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: For Ms. Frink?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And for Mr. Baker?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: We're going to take a ten-minute break. We'll go off the record. We'll come back at 20 minutes of 11.
(Recess taken 10:29-11:04 a.m.)
MR. IACOPINO: Everyone is here. We'll go back on the record.

Mr. Needleman, I understand you did a calculation of the expected examinations and have something to report.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. So at the break what I tried to do was add up all of the estimates that everybody provided with respect to the Applicant's witnesses, and I came to, using the conservative ranges of each estimate, about 34 to 35 hours of cross, and then I assumed about 7 hours per day of actual testimony time, and so that gave me about five days of cross for our witnesses. I then assumed maybe, it's always hard to predict, but maybe adding in another full day for Committee questions that might relate to our witnesses gives me a ballpark of
about six days for the Applicant to present its case.

The way we had our witnesses laid out right now we were estimating 7 days, the $29 t h$ and the 30th of August and then September 17, 18, 20, 21 and 24. So we all know that these things never really go as planned, but it seems as though it's pretty reasonable to assume that we could get our case done by the 24 th, and as I mentioned earlier, the one issue it presents is that we have challenges with availability of some witnesses at some times and so we'll always do our best to try to fill gaps and keep things moving, but that may not always be possible if things proceed the way it looks like they will here.

MR. IACOPINO: And this goes for everybody. To the extent you see an issue arising with respect to your witnesses, whether the proceeding's lasting longer than you anticipated or it's going faster than you anticipated and you see that when we get to your witnesses there might be an issue of availability, please address it right away, as soon as you have an
inkling that it may cause a problem for two reasons. Number one, to give everybody fair notice that there may be a change or their witness is going to be called sooner than anticipated or later than anticipated. And also for the Committee and staff so we know maybe that there are gaps when we're not actually meeting and everybody can use those gaps for whatever they need them to be, if that happens. We prefer not to have gaps. We prefer to have everything go like clockwork. And I know with all of your hard work that will happen.

But we understand. Appreciate the calculations, Mr. Needleman. And again, for you and for everybody, as soon as you have an issue, as soon as you see an issue that the schedule may be running sooner or later and it may cause a scheduling problem, let's let everybody know, and you can do that through Ms. Monroe, myself, and amongst yourselves. Please don't be afraid to talk to each other.

Okay. That being understood, I just want to go through what $I$ understand the order of the examinations are going to be. When the

Applicant's witnesses are up, the order is going to be we're going to start with the town of Durham/UNH, followed by the Town of Newington, followed by Conservation Law Foundation, followed by the Durham Residents, followed by Mr. Frizzell who has very little, actually only one witness, followed by Ms. Frink. Is the Nature Conservancy going to be involved or not?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: You missed Durham Historic.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. Durham Historic will go before Mr. Frizzell. Then Mr. Frizzell. Then Ms. Frink. Mr. Baker. And then the Nature Conservancy and then the Crowley Joyce Revocable Trust followed by Counsel for the Public batting cleanup.

And then what would happen is with respect to each, for instance, when we then move to Counsel for the Public's witnesses, Counsel for the Public obviously would not be cross-examining its own witnesses so that order will go in the same order, just eliminate the party who's calling the particular panel. And that would be the same as we go through each of
these.
MR. PATCH: And put the Applicant in as last, right?

MR. IACOPINO: Well, just before Counsel
for the Public. Right? You want to go last for everybody, right?

MR. ASLIN: I don't think the rule specifies that so --

MR. IACOPINO: I don't even know we had the rule.

MR. ASLIN: The rule says order of inquiry is Applicants, Intervenors and then Counsel for the Public, 202.20.

MR. IACOPINO: I have to go to my rules expert here. I know it's the way we've done it, but you've raised this before so --

MR. ASLIN: It says the order shall be the Applicant or other party bearing the overall burden of proof, then Intervenors and Counsel for the Public.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: For overall presentation of witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes, that's the presentation, right?

MR. ASLIN: Says evidence shall be offered in the following order. Yes.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, yes. The Applicant will go last with respect to the adverse parties. Other parties. And I guess that puts you second to last.

MR. ASLIN: Except for my witnesses, yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Right. Okay. So not seeing or hearing any objection to that, okay. All right.

There was a question just, I don't know if it was just before or just after we broke, Ms. Brown asked about cross-examination within panels, and I assume what you mean is like, for instance, having Ms. Miller cross-examine Regis Miller and examination like that amongst the individuals in the panel? Is that what you were inquiring about?

MS. BROWN: Yes. If the Durham Residents themselves had questions of each other, I didn't know how that would work because, I mean, there are individual, I mean, I've got Donna Heald as a client. The Millers aren't my client.

MR. IACOPINO: Right, but they were all
combined for purposes of presentation of evidence, argument and cross-examination and other participation.

MS. BROWN: So I just wanted to make sure, a clarification to what extent. So you're reading it broadly, and that answers my question.

MR. IACOPINO: Right. So we're not going to have them questioning each other within the Panel. And that's based on, that quote, by the way, was from the intervention order that was issued back on --

MS. BROWN: Yes. I've seen the order.
Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: -- August 24th, 2016. Okay.
Spokespersons. We need to understand who is going to be the spokesperson for the Durham Residents. Is that going to be you, Ms. Brown?

MS. BROWN: I think we had it as is Vivian Miller was the spokesperson, but that doesn't mean that counsel for some of the participants within that group can't speak; is that correct?

MR. IACOPINO: Generally. I mean, generally when somebody has a question or has an
argument to make, but we don't want to be in the middle of the proceeding and trying to figure out, okay, you know, now the group's breaking up. Durham Residents who are combined as a group for intervention purposes. Generally that means that one person from the group will do the cross-examination of witnesses, not all of them, you can have like, for instance, you might assign somebody to do Environmental, assign somebody else from the group, but it's one person. It's not everybody in the group gets to ask their own questions of each witness. But we also generally like to know who we turn to to get the answers to those questions, and that's who we generally have designated as a spokesperson.

MS. BROWN: As you saw today, functionally, the residents that are here were turning to me so I guess that would be default me.

MR. IACOPINO: And we appreciate having a lawyer do it because sometimes lawyers understand better. When I start talking like a lawyer or when certain members of the panel start talking like a lawyer, they understand it
better.
MS. BROWN: I was just trying to keep the wall between my client and who is not my client and the spokesperson can functionally muddle it so as long as we're all clear.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. All
right. Before we move on to exhibits, there was
Ms. Geiger raised an issue with respect to
Mr. Weinrieb and having, Mr. Hebert is going to adopt, you anticipate to have him adopt

Mr. Weinrieb's testimony. Does anybody in the room object to that?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, I'm not sure. I guess I'd like a clarification. If the Applicant and Newington agree that all of the issues in Mr. Weinrieb's testimony has been addressed by the MOU, why is it necessary to keep that testimony in the case?

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Geiger?
MS. GEIGER: Well, we wanted to keep it in the record to give the Committee a basis for understanding what the Town's position was prior to the MOU and then the fact that those issues, if you will, have been resolved. So we wanted
to connect the dots back from the statements in the MOU back to the original concerns that the Town had. That's all.

MR. IACOPINO: Did anybody else want to
discuss that? Mr. Aslin? Any issues?
MR. ASLIN: I have no issues.
MR. IACOPINO: That's her response. Do you object?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No. I don't think we'll object.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. All
right. One other question for the Applicant. We have the pending motion for the delay. Do you know when you will be filing a written objection?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Best estimate is Monday. If we can do it sooner, we will, but, like I said, I haven't even talked to my client yet about it.

I had one other question.
MR. IACOPINO: Sure.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't know if you were going to get to it.

It would be helpful for us to have
something definitive about the order of presentation of all the other witnesses; in particular, whether Counsel for the Public is going to go first or last.

MR. IACOPINO: I think he intends to go last.

MR. ASLIN: I think that's what the rules contemplate, but $I$ can be flexible on order of witnesses.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's fine.
MR. IACOPINO: Let's hold off for one second, and let me just make sure the rest of my checklist is done, and then we'll address the order of presentation.

So let me throw this out there. Is there any objection to doing it in the same order that we do the examination? So that would be once the Applicant is completed the presentation of all its witnesses, we would then proceed to the Town of Durham/UNH, followed by the Town of Newington. CLF doesn't have any witnesses, right?

MR. IRWIN: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Followed by the Durham

Residents, followed by Mr. Frizzell, Ms. Frink, Nature Conservancy and Crowley Trust. I keep skipping the Durham Historic. I'm going to do that again.

Town of Durham/UNH, followed by Newington, followed by Durham Residents, followed by the Durham Historic Society, followed by Mr. Frizzell, followed by Ms. Frink, followed by Mr. Baker, followed by the Nature Conservancy.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: They don't have any witnesses either.

MR. IACOPINO: They don't have anything to present. Followed by the Crowley Trust.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: They don't have -they weren't allowed witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: So last but not least, Counsel for the Public. Does anybody have any objection to that order? Mr. Patch.

MR. PATCH: I don't have an objection, but I think part of what we were supposed to do today was to come in and talk about potential scheduling conflicts for our witnesses, and so I can give you those now.

I think based on what I've heard so far,
the conflicts that Mr. Selig has and at least a few members of our panel are all in September, but so in the event that we were to go according to what Mr. Needleman said this morning, I think we would be fine. But just so you know, Mr. Selig is unavailable after 2 p.m. on September 18th. I sent an email about this back in June. I'm not available on September 20, 21 or 24 .

In terms of the panel, Mr. Jones is unavailable between September 17 and the 21 st. And then Mr. Famely has a conflict on the afternoon of the 20 th.

MR. IACOPINO: Is that it for your witnesses?

MR. PATCH: That's it other than that he mentioned August 29th and 30th as potential conflict, but that doesn't seem to come into play.

MR. IACOPINO: Which witness? On August 29th and 30th? I understand it's probably going to be in the Applicant's case at that point.

MR. PATCH: Famely and Schultz on the 29th, Famely also on the 30th, and then Jones

September 17 to 21. And then Selig after 2 p.m. on the 18th and unavailable on the 20 , 21 st or 24th. And then the afternoon of the 20th is Famely. Those were all the conflicts.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: So we may have, the 24 th of September would be when we'd start the Intervenors' witnesses.

MR. PATCH: So we could start with the panel that day, but we couldn't start with Mr. Selig.

MS. MONROE: Perhaps Mr. Hebert could go on his vacation if he testified on the 24 th?

MS. GEIGER: Of September. Yes, that's true. Mr. Hebert based his vacation on the original schedule that was issued by the Committee that did not include the October hearing dates. So he is in a position right now of having to forfeit some money to make arrangements to be here in October. If he could avoid that, $I$ think he would appreciate it.

MR. IACOPINO: So what are the dates he's not available?

MR. HEBERT: I'm gone October 10th to the 22nd. What I'm trying to resolve, I've been on
this for five years now and to not be here for the final thing is crazy, but I'm trying to resolve that in my mind. I was trying to find out what we're doing today and what we're going to do, and I'm going to make a determination at the end of the day with my significant other what we're going to do.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you.
MR. PATCH: Just to note for the record, we have no objection for Mr. Hebert going first before Durham and UNH so --

MR. IACOPINO: You want to just agree to
that now? Does anybody have any objection to that? If we switch that order and put Newington ahead of Durham?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's fine with us.
MR. IACOPINO: Does anybody object to that?
(No verbal response.)
MR. IACOPINO: So we'll write up the report from this hearing with Newington going first followed by Durham/UNH as far as order of presentation goes.

And then if we started and finished with Mr. Hebert on the 24 th, Mr. Patch, you could
start with your Construction Panel after
Mr. Hebert on that day?
MR. PATCH: Yes.
MR. ASLIN: I also have one scheduling
issue which is Ms. O'Donnell is not available on the 17th of October, the last day that's scheduled. So depending on how things are moving along, that could become an issue, but $I$ can have her go first for Counsel for the Public witnesses to try and avoid that date.

MR. IACOPINO: Any other? Ms. Frink?
MS. FRINK: On September 20th, I will not be available. If I could complete my questions for the Environmental Panel on the 18th, that would be fine.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So that will likely require, it may require that you ask on that day, and we move you during the course of the day.

MR. FRINK: Very good. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay? But I did make a note of it, but don't forget to ask that day because things will start to roll, and I'll forget.

MR. FRINK: That's fine.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else have any known scheduling problems? Mr. Lanzetta?

MR. LANZETTA: Mr. Frizzell has conflicts for the $29 t h$ and $30 t h$ and the 21 st and 24 th.

MR. IACOPINO: August?
MR. LANZETTA: August 29 and 30 and
September 21 and 24 th.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. While Pam is scanning our calendar here, does anybody else have any scheduling conflict that they're aware of at this point in time? Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I think
Mr. Frizzell, yes, I think that's okay because I think if all goes according to plan, which it never does, September 24 th we would have Mr. Hebert and then we follow with the Durham/UNH Environmental/Construction Panel, and I would suggest that the Durham Residents be available in the event things move a little quicker on the 24 th.

MR. ASLIN: Pam, will you be issuing kind of daily status updates as you did for other proceedings?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I can do that, sure.
MR. ASLIN: Just to give people a heads-up on where we are and where we're headed.

I'll also ask the horrifying question of what happens if we can't complete the examination of witnesses within the 10 days that we have scheduled, would the expectation be that the deliberation days would be used for hearing days? And should people plan on securing witnesses, if needed, on those days? I don't want to be there, but I've got to ask.

MR. IACOPINO: I think the best answer to that question is if it looks like we're going to exhaust all those days and not be finished, there's going to be a canvass of the Committee and try to find other days, not counting those deliberation days, but if we get pushed all way out to the deliberation days, we'll be pushed out to them. I mean, there's only so many hours in a day.

MR. ASLIN: If we do bleed over into those days, it's going to have to push deliberations out.

MR. IACOPINO: Everybody would prefer not
to.
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Do you see the look of horror on my face?

MR. IACOPINO: But at least based upon the initial, that shouldn't be an issue based upon these initial estimates anyway.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: It might be a good idea to plug Ms. O'Donnell in, you know, a morning of a day so that we get her scheduled and work around her.

MR. IACOPINO: For everybody who has witnesses that have an issue and you see that there is, that there may be a place where you can make things run smoother by maybe having that witness come on a different day, don't be afraid to, first of all, talk with each other about it, and to raise the issue with the Chair. So that, I mean, everybody wants things to go as smooth as possible with everybody being heard as competently and as prepared as possible.

All right. I guess we're going to move on to exhibits at this point.

Oh, that's right. Friendly cross.
Oftentimes we get concerns raised and questions
asked about friendly cross. That is, essentially, cross-examination of witnesses by parties who share similar interests. The official view that has been expressed by the Committee in the past is that friendly cross is frowned upon. It doesn't mean that it won't be allowed to any degree, but we ask you to please not use it as a strategy. We ask you to remember that oftentimes friendly cross just leads to repetition and what's already in the Direct Testimony, and that will likely not be allowed.

If there is, of course, cross-examination that expounds or clears something up, that's appreciated, but if it's merely just to repeat using different words the same thing that folks have already testified in their Direct Testimony, please don't do it. Anything else you want to mention?

MR. ASLIN: Mike, on a related topic?
MR. IACOPINO: Yes, sir.
MR. ASLIN: Direct exam of witnesses for the Intervenors and Counsel for the Public, they have not yet had an opportunity to respond to

Supplemental Testimony. The Applicant's witnesses had that week where they got to respond to the other parties' Supplemental Testimony. Is it anticipated that some limited direct to address new issues that were raised in supplemental would be allowed?

MR. IACOPINO: Limited direct regarding new issues is generally allowed. Also sometimes there have been changes that need to be addressed before everybody starts asking questions about something that's changed. So there is some leeway given on direct. And of course, the party also has the opportunity to redirect and to the extent that the issues are raised in cross-examination or they sort of cross over or whatever, there's also that opportunity as well.

But if you have something, the best way to deal with it, because it's actually helpful to the Committee as well because you're telegraphing, saying, you know, did you have some testimony to respond to what was said by so-and-so. We know what you're getting at, it gives a marker for the Committee who will be
sitting up her listening and not talking during that period of time. So it's helpful that you sort of highlight it and give us road signs as we go through it.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I want to note that I do have a concern about that. I understand that maybe for unusual reasons it was allowed in Northern Pass. I think there were problems with it. That same issue came up in the Antrim Wind docket with respect to Counsel for the Public's aesthetics expert. We objected there, and it wasn't allowed. So this is still an issue that when it comes up, we may want to be heard on it. MR. IACOPINO: Right. But just to make sure, in Antrim Wind what was not allowed was entirely new testimony. It wasn't really, I mean, I think that Counsel for the Public in that case tried to categorize it as responsive, but it really wasn't, and there had been ample opportunity for her to address it prior to when she tried to present it. At least, that's my recollection of it.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think it was specifically to address the same thing, things that had come
up. So we can both go back and look at it, but that's my concern.

MR. IACOPINO: It will be limited. I can tell you that. Ms. Geiger?

MS. GEIGER: What is the Committee's reference about having witnesses either summarize or dispense with summarizing their Prefiled Testimony? I know in some cases, Committees have just limited direct examination to swearing the witness and having them adopt their testimony under oath, and then making the witness available for cross-examination. But I don't know what this particular Panel's preference is with respect to hearing a short or brief summary from the witness themselves orally.

MR. IACOPINO: I can't speak for every
member of the Subcommittee. I don't know, I really haven't had that conversation with the Chair either. Generally, I think what we expect is that you're going to swear the witness in, have them introduce themselves and then submit them for cross-examination. We really don't need a summary of the testimony. The Committee
has read that testimony, and they're ready to hear the cross-examination.

MS. GEIGER: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: But obviously, again, if something has changed or something it turns out needs to be clarified, you know, then ask. Best thing to do is ask to do it. If there's something, if you think you need -- for instance, Ms. Geiger, if you put your witness up there, and you think there's a need for that witness to summarize some aspect of the testimony, ask for permission and Ms. Weathersby will make a determination as to whether it's necessary or not or whether it should be allowed. I don't know if "necessary" will be the standard, but -- any other questions regarding conduct of the adjudicative proceedings themselves? Okay.

Let's move on to exhibits then. We had asked for -- let me just explain something is that as you all are aware, there's a lot of paper in this case. Most of the Subcommittee members will be sitting here with a computer. They will be using the computer to look at
exhibits. We're going to be -- we're going to over there, right?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes. We'll be at Donovan Street for hearings and deliberations. MR. IACOPINO: We'll be at Donovan Street for these hearings, but $I$ don't think we have the same setup there as we had before.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Right, but that's why I asked them to bring the thumb drives because my plan is I would have those available for the Committee.

MR. IACOPINO: The Committee members are likely to be looking at exhibits on the computer that's sitting in front of them. That's why we ask for them to be electronic, and my apologies to Ms. Frink because when she asked me I gave her totally wrong advice. Luckily, Ms. Monroe corrected me, and we got it straightened out. But that's why we ask for them to be on the thumb drive.

It's also helpful to have a list because what we're going to do is we're going to take your list, we're going to turn them into a master list that will be available to everybody
and just makes it easier to organize the record. So that's why we've asked and so far how are we doing?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I don't have the Durham Residents'.

MS. BROWN: That's correct. We were going to, we have a handwritten version. We did not get together prior, sufficient time prior to today's prehearing to get the list completed, but it is essentially just the Testimonies and Supplemental Testimonies and with a few discovery responses.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: So will you provide those to me marked?

MS. BROWN: Can we have until Friday to provide those to the parties and to the Committee?

MR. IACOPINO: Will that work for you?
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes, I'll make it work.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Tom.
MR. IRWIN: Thank you. Two questions.
First with respect to the Donovan Street setup.

I understand during the Northern Pass proceedings there was an ELMO available for use. Is that, will that not be the case?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: That's my understanding. It will not.

MR. IRWIN: Okay. So that does mean the witness panel will also have a computer in front of them and then exhibits will be flashed up on their screens or should we plan on having hard copies and sharing as necessary with witnesses?

MR. IACOPINO: I would recommend that you have a hard copy.

MR. IRWIN: Okay. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Actually, even when we used the ELMO on the other things, I always recommend you bring an extra hard copy anyway because sometimes those things don't work.

MR. PATCH: If there's a panel of six, how many hard copies do we have to bring?

MR. IACOPINO: It's up to you. I would prefer that you had six and make everything run smoother, but if you want to have them pass it up and down, it's up to you. I suppose you could have a reason why you might want to show
it to one person on a panel and not to another, but I mean, it's probably easier if you have enough for everybody.

MR. RICHARDSON: Mike, doesn't that create problems when you ask a witness to mark something so you'd have six witness copies, you might have six different witnesses all marking them? I think if you only have one copy and a witness marks it, then your record is pretty unclear.

MR. IACOPINO: We're asking you to premark your exhibits, but to the extent that something gets marked up during the course of somebody's cross-examination or testimony, it's going to be up to the person who is doing the cross-examination to make their record; and if that means that you have to then create six exhibits and call them Exhibit 100 A, B, C, D, E, $F, G$, or $100.1,100.2$, that's the way to do it. I can't try your case for you. You're going to have to do it in a manner --

MR. RICHARDSON: Right. But I was thinking like in Superior Court, the copy that the witness had would be the actual exhibit.

Sometimes you give a courtesy copy to the judge or the clerk, but the stenographer at the end of the day holds the witness's copy and keeps that for the record. So that's, I'm assuming that's kind of what the Committee does, although I'm not sure it's consistently followed.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes. No, we basically follow that. If there's something that's marked up, and you want what was marked up to become an exhibit, and I'm asking you didn't anticipate it to be an exhibit beforehand so you didn't premark it, you would ask that it be marked and entered into the record.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. Okay.
My question that $I$ did have relates to the exhibits and have we all exchanged them now because I only have one drive here. I don't know what other parties have, and I've been printing out all the testimony and we have that, but what $I$ don't have is discovery requests responses which $I$ think people are marking. So how is that going to work?

MR. IACOPINO: Well, You should certainly, everybody should be exchanging their witness
lists with everybody as well as your exhibits. Now, obviously some of the exhibits everybody may have already. You may come to an agreement with another party that these are my exhibits, but you already have these, I don't need to make another copy of somebody's testimony for you.

But to the extent the exhibits are not something that's already been distributed, please make sure that you've provided copies to everybody. And I understand that sometimes as part of cross-examination you come in with new exhibits that weren't premarked. The reason why we like them to be premarked is so that we're not passing a piece of paper along a dais with whatever the panel is and then that piece of paper has to be passed along to everybody on the Subcommittee to see what the heck you're talking about.

So that's why we prefer that these things be disclosed in advance, and we frown on new exhibits during cross. We understand that it happens.

MR. RICHARDSON: Understood.
MR. IACOPINO: We also understand that
someone might want the element of surprise, so to speak, although in these types of things that usually doesn't go over very surprisingly, but nonetheless, if there is something like that, be prepared to have copies for everybody. And we would prefer that you provide it to us in advance electronically.

MR. RICHARDSON: I understood, Mike, what you're saying. My question was just more practical. It appears I don't have, I think parties are marking things other than the Prefiled Testimony such as data request responses. I only have one set that I'm holding. Or do I need to get from the Committee all of the data responses so that I've got those because I can't download them. They're not on the website.

MR. IACOPINO: You're going to have to get those from -- we don't have them, I don't think.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I just got these, but --

MR. IACOPINO: We don't have all the, the Committee does not have the Interrogatory Data Requests.

MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. All right.
MR. IACOPINO: So to the extent, and I would urge you all to please give Mr. Richardson if he asks you for them the Data Requests that you've gotten answers to and that you've asked. But we as the Committee don't have them. They're not filed with us.

MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. Thank you. And I just so I need them to get from the parties, anyone who is producing new exhibits I just need to get a copy. Doesn't have to be right here today, but if we could do that I'd appreciate it.

MR. IACOPINO: In your exchange of exhibits amongst each other, we don't care if you email them to each other, give each other a thumb drive or whatever. As long as you get copies of them to the other parties or if you agree I don't need those because I already have them because I got them when the Application was filed or I got them when the testimony was filed. Mr. Patch. You had a question?

MR. PATCH: I do, thank you. So you were talking about cross-examination, and so to the
extent that we have other documents other than the list that we're providing today that we determine we want to ask on cross-examination, should we bring 8 or 9 thumb drives for Committee members? Should we bring just hard copies? How should we handle that?

MR. IACOPINO: Ultimately, we want
everything electronically because it makes it easier for the record, and as you recall, many people in the room are probably aware, the Supreme Court is actually going to electronic records now. And it's easier for us to maintain the record electronically. But we're going to be, you know, you're going to have the same limitations you have in a Superior Court room. You're going to need to provide stuff on paper over there if it's new, and if you don't want to exchange it beforehand. Obviously, again, we encourage everybody to exchange everything beforehand, but to the extent that you don't, be prepared to have enough copies for the Committee, for the witnesses, and --

MR. PATCH: But in terms of electronic availability to the Committee, if we were to,
the day before or a couple of days before when we made the final determination if we emailed it --

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: You can email them to me, and I'll make sure that $I$ forward them to the Committee.

MR. PATCH: Okay. Thank you.
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I'll be filing, I'll have the electronic files here in one, all compiled, all the exhibits. So yes, if you email them to me, I'll get them to the Committee.

MR. PATCH: Presumably we could email them to the entire Service List including you and that might be the best way to do it.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes.
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: That's what $I$ was going to say. Anything that you send to Pam or the Committee, please copy to everybody. Unless you have some reason to file a motion for protective order of some kind.

MR. PATCH: Then if we did that, then presumably we don't need 20 copies that day, you
know. If we've sent it out by email, maybe we only need four copies for the stenographer and one for each of the witnesses or whatever it is. MR. IACOPINO: If we have it in advance, we're going to do our best to make sure that the Committee members have it in whichever format the particular Committee members are using. Most of them are going be on their computers so it would be electronic, but if one of our Committee members is on paper, we'll make sure they have that piece of paper if we have it in advance.

MR. PATCH: Okay.
MR. ASLIN: I'd like to clarify that. Do you want a hard copy for the stenographer?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: If you submit it in advance electronically to me, and it's premarked, I don't see any need to also submit it on paper.

MR. ASLIN: So the Committee doesn't need any paper copies if it's been provided electronically in advance.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: To the extent that any

Subcommittee member decides they want to work on paper, we'll provide the paper to them.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: And if it's
voluminous, I might ask you to provide it for me.

MR. ASLIN: Of course. And we should submit, I assume, updated exhibit lists if we are adding exhibits.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes.
MR. ASLIN: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Was there any other questions about exhibits?

MR. ASLIN: I'll speak up about my exhibits real quickly. I have a couple thumb drives with me, but $I$ didn't want to create a dozen of them before I knew how many people actually wanted one. So if any parties want a copy of Counsel for the Public's exhibits, please let me know, and if it's all or a subset, that would be helpful, and I'll make sure you get them quickly.

MR. IACOPINO: Any other questions about exhibits? Okay. Any other business that we haven't addressed that any parties believe
should be addressed?
MS. GEIGER: I have a clarification
question, and that is in terms of the issue that we spoke about earlier, the Construction Panel, are we to assume that unless we hear otherwise from the Presiding Officer that the Construction Panel will be going on the 29 th and 30 th of August?

MR. IACOPINO: Yes.
MS. GEIGER: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Our default is to allow the party calling their witnesses, putting on their case on, to put their case on in the fashion they desire. But I did have specific requests that the opposition be noted in the report. It will be. If you, you might want to file a motion if you want to ask specifically for the relief above and beyond what's been down here. It's up to you all.

Anything from the Applicant? You guys conferring over there. It sounded like you might have something to raise?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't think so. We've gotten two drives from Justin and Chris, and
then we got Durham and Newington's relatively brief exhibit list. And I think we have all the documents. We haven't gotten anything from anyone else so I'm not sure what the status of their exhibits are or lists.

MR. IACOPINO: After we're done today, will everybody just please touch base with each other and make sure that if you haven't provided your exhibits to all of the other parties that you make arrangements to do so. You should be doing it. It's one of the rules. So please, I don't want to be in a situation where we have to take an hour when we're supposed to be beginning the hearing because people didn't get exhibits. Mr. Patch?

MR. PATCH: Just to clarify that issue though, my understanding is other than Mr. Richardson who came into this late, everybody, for example, should have the five exhibits that we have on our list which are Prefiled Testimony, you know, two versions of that, one Supplemental and then two responses to Data Requests that we sent to Eversource. Everybody else should have those.

MR. IACOPINO: If they were distributed to everybody through the Service List, they should. If anybody in the room or any other party who is not in the room doesn't have them, you should talk to Mr. Patch after this proceeding is over today.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I can send out, resend the parties on the service list if that would be helpful for people.

MR. ASLIN: That does remind me of something. When people are sending out exhibits to you in advance of hearing days, should they be using the parties-only Distribution List and not, so the discovery list as opposed to the full service list?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes, and I'll take care of getting them to the Committee.

MR. ASLIN: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Richardson, what did you mark your exhibits again so that everybody knows? You told us, but $I$ don't think everybody --

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: JCT?
MR. RICHARDSON: JCT, and I sent them out.

They're all marked that way so people should have them.

MR. IACOPINO: It's different than what we had in the Notice of Final Prehearing Conference.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: He wasn't in it. MR. IACOPINO: He wasn't even in it. MR. RICHARDSON: We weren't in it so I had to make something up and that seemed, it looked like three letters designations were being used, and that one looked available.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. If nobody else has any issues to raise, we're going to adjourn for the day. We'll issue a report of this Prehearing Conference, and we are scheduled to meet on August 29 th at 9 a.m. at 49 Donovan Street. Thank you.
(Hearing ended at 11:13 a.m.)
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| 29:2 98:12 | 57:15 63:7 | wonder 33:20 | 1175:6 | 79:13 |
| website 105:17 | 65:14 70:18 | wondering 44:3 | 11:04 75:7 | 20th 19:17,22 |
| week 4:11 5:10 | 71:4 73:16 | word 31:17 | 11:13 114:18 | 87:13 88:3 |
| 29:1 95:2 | 77:4 78:7 | 70:21 |  | 90:12 |
| Weinrieb 16:17 | 82:12 87:20 | words 94:16 | 133 | 21 1:4 20:7 76:5 |
| 49:11 83:9 | 93:15 97:10,12 | work 69:5 77:12 | 141:21 | 87:8 88:1 91:8 |
| Weinrieb's 16:4 | 97:15,21 98:9 | 80:21 93:10 | 15 46:2,8 49:6 | 21st 87:11 88:2 |
| 16:11 83:11,16 | 98:11 101:7 | 100:18,20 | 51:852:16 | 91:5 |
| went 34:4 | 102:5,6,9,24 | 101:17 103:22 | $54: 15,18,22$ | $221: 3$ |
| weren't 10:5 | 103:24 | 110:1 | $57: 17,2358: 1$ | 22nd 88:24 |
| 86:15 104:12 | witness's 103:3 | worked 45:7 | 58:20 59:11 | 24 20:9 76:6 |
| 114:8 | witnesses 3:9 5:2 | 52:6 | $60: 15,2362: 17$ | 87:9 |
| whatnot 37:24 | 5:5 17:10 18:2 | working 7:13 | 63:6,9,16,19 | 24th 20:15 39:2 |
| whichever 109:6 | 18:5,9,14,18 | 17:15 44:17 | 63:21 64:4 | 39:3 76:9 |
| Whitney 53:24 | 19:2 20:5 | 46:18 | 65:19 66:1 | 81:15 88:3,6 |
| 54:4 56:21 | 22:16 24:12 | wouldn't 39:22 | 67:23 70:10 | 88:12 89:24 |
| 59:19 63:4 | 26:3 27:14 | 40:14 | 67.23 70.10 | 91:5,8,16,21 |
| 67:2 70:15 | 28:2 29:8 | write 40:21 | 162-H:7 34:16 | 25 51:5 |
| Whitney/Lade... | 31:14 32:6 | 89:19 | 17 76:5 87:11 | 28th 115:17 |
| 73:11 | 37:19 38:6,9 | writing 34:9 | 17 | 29 91:7 |
| Widell 20:8 45:9 | 39:1,4 40:12 | written 84:14 | 17th 19:9 27:9 | 29th 18:22 22:6 |
| 45:13 47:16,18 | 41:6,24 42:21 | wrong 37:9 | 39:24 40:2 | 22:8 23:7,8 |
| 47:22 52:22 | 43:5 44:21 | 99:17 | 90:6 | 24:11 29:7 |
| 56:2 58:23 | 45:4,5,8,20 | wrote 70:5,6 | $183: 776: 5$ | 76:4 87:17,21 |
| 62:5 66:5 | $47: 2,1148: 19$ $49 \cdot 2452 \cdot 8$ | X | 18th 19:12,19,21 | 87:23 91:5 |
| William 18:23 | 49:24 52:8 56:20,21 59:19 | X 3:1 | 87:7 88:2 | 114:16 |
| 19:1 | 63:3,23 64:12 |  | 90.14 | 3 |
| willing 20:1 | 67:1,22 70:15 | Y | 2 | 47:23 48:14 |
| Wind 96:9,15 | 70:21,22 71:3 | Yeah 13:6 <br> years 89:1 | 287:688:1 | 50:4 52:19 |
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