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PROCEEDINGS
(Hearing resumed at 1:35 p.m.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: We're going to get started.

Attorney Aslin.
MR. ASLIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Good afternoon. As you know, I'm Chris

Aslin. I've been designated as Counsel for the Public in these proceedings.

I wanted to start with just confirming the scope of the APE, or the area of potential effect. And as I understand it, the direct APE is the extent of the right-of-way corridor itself, which is, in most places, 100 feet wide; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the indirect APE is defined as a half-mile to either side of the center line of the right-of-way?
A. Yes.
Q. And indirect APE is used to look at things
like visual impacts primarily?
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A. Yes.
Q. And did you rely on the LandWorks viewshed mapping to --
A. Yes, for the zone of visual influence.
Q. Okay. And you understand that that modeling uses a 40-foot assumed tree height; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then the direct APE is supposed to look at direct effects -- in other words, kind of physical interaction with resources; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In your review of historic resources, did you include access roads and marshaling yards, laydown areas, as part of the direct APE?
A. Yes.
Q. So for those that have been identified, you did review those for above-ground resources?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Thank you.

And would you agree that vibration effects from construction can have direct impacts on historic resources?
A. Yes.
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Q. And that those direct impacts could occur outside of the right-of-way corridor itself?
A. Yes, they could for a given project.
Q. All right. Are you aware of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation's vibration policy for construction?
A. I've been on the web site and seen some related to it, but $I$ would not call myself an expert on the New Hampshire Department of Transportation's vibration policy.
Q. Okay. Well, I will show you on the screen what's been marked as CFP Exhibit 19, and it is a section of the New Hampshire DOT standard specifications, which I'll represent are for DOT construction projects. And it's the Section 211, which is titled "Vibration Monitoring." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware of using this kind of standard for other projects with regard to historic resources?
A. Yes, I'm familiar with it being used in other projects.
Q. Thank you.
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A. Not this one particularly, but generally vibration monitoring, yes.
Q. Thank you.

And I just wanted to point out, see if you would agree with this proposition: That in Section 3.4 of this standard, it does reference pre- and post-construction condition surveys and going out as far as 150 feet to look at the potential impacts of vibrations on structures. Do you see that?
A. I see it.
Q. And does 150 feet seem like a reasonable distance to consider potential vibration effects?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think that it could be -- vibration effects could extend beyond the 150 feet?
A. I guess so.
Q. Depending on the type of construction?
A. Yes.
Q. But I think you said --
A. Yeah, I was just going to say I'm familiar with earthquakes. So, yes, definitely.
Q. But for this project, I think you testified \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
that you have not considered whether vibration monitoring would be necessary or appropriate with regard to historic resources.
A. I've not considered vibration monitoring.
Q. So, to the extent that the construction process causes vibration, it would be possible for it to impact resources that are outside of the direct APE.
A. It is possible.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Now, with regard to your identification process for historic sites, do I understand correctly that what you looked for were sites that would -- that are either listed in the national or state registry or are eligible for listing?
A. Could you repeat that question again?
Q. I'd be happy to. I'll try to make it more clear.

In performing your identification of historic sites for this project, am I correct that you limited your review to resources that qualify either as eligible for listing
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in the National Register of Historic Places or are actually listed?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in fact, in your supplemental testimony, which is Applicant's 143, on Page 8, which is electronic Page 9, starting at Line 11, you have a critique of Ms. O'Donnell's interpretation of the SEC rule defining historic sites. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. I'll give you a second to get to the page. Page 8 of your testimony.
A. Yes, I see it here. Hmm-hmm.
Q. And so you criticized Ms. O'Donnell's interpretation as being "overly broad." Is that a fair summary?
A. Yes, overly broad. Yes, the area of potential effect that she used, which was 6 miles, yes.
Q. I'm sorry. I'm skipping past the APE portion and looking to the middle of that paragraph where you're talking about the definition of "historic sites" under Site 102.23.
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[WITNESS: WIDELL]

And would you agree, also, that you felt Ms. O'Donnell's interpretation was overly broad?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the definition in the rules; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, I think you're citing it there in your testimony.

MR. ASLIN: If we could flip over to the Elmo, please.

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. So on the screen I'm showing you the definition in Site 102.23. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And as you can see, it refers to the definition of "historic property" under RSA 227-C:1 Paragraph 6. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then it goes on to say the term includes, and then it lists the definition of "historic resources" under the 106 process essentially; is that correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. I take it from your testimony that you interpret this language to mean that, really, historic sites as intended by the legislature -- or intended by the SEC is limited to sites that are eligible or listed in the national registry?
A. No, it's not limited. Its definitions are different. It's not limiting.
Q. Okay. But $I$ believe you just testified a few minutes ago that you looked only at resources that would be listed or eligible for listing in the National Registry.
A. That is the only example that is given in this definition.
Q. Okay. But you don't dispute that the term includes, as used here, would indicate that there could be other things beyond that one example that would meet the definition of "historic sites."
A. Yes, but $I$ can't imagine what would not meet National Register eligibility. I think there's a broad misunderstanding that things eligible for the National Register are only things that are nationally significant. Most
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
things that are on or eligible for the National Register are locally significant, are important to a local community, may not even have anything to do with architecture, too. And so...
Q. Okay. So if I'm understanding your answer, the realm of resources that might be eligible for listing in the National Register is quite broad and includes things of local significance.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I want to take a look at the rule promulgated by the Department of -- or the Division of Historic Resources, rather, that has to do with the same definition. And so this is the rule, Cul, $C-U-L, H 102.15$. And would you agree that this is essentially defining the same -- well, it's referring to the same statutory definition of "historic property" that's used in the SEC rules; is that correct?
A. It would appear so, yes.
Q. Okay. Would you accept that this is DHR's rule as opposed to the SEC's rule?
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A. I don't see anything that says "DHR," but I'm going to trust the Counsel for the Public.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And what I wanted to point out was, after the recitation of the statutory definition, which is in both rules, this rule has a rather long recitation of things that "historic property" includes, longer than the SEC's definition. Do you see that? So, starting here, going all the way to the end.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And so $I$ wanted to get your take on some of these subcategories and whether they are things that you would deem as potentially eligible for listing in the National

Registry, even though they're broken out here by DHR as separate categories.

So the first one is, in fact, National Registry. But then it goes on to talk about, starting right here, properties identified as "historic properties" by the State of New Hampshire pursuant to RSA 227-C.

Now, in your experience or in your understanding, is that a separate category,
or could it be a broader category than those listed as eligible or listed in the National Register?
A. Are you referring to the statement, "properties designated as historically significant by a local governing body"?
Q. No, the prior clause, starting with "properties identified as historic" right above that.
A. By the state of New Hampshire?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So you believe that is a sub -- that could be -- if we did a Venn diagram, would that bubble be entirely within the bubble for properties eligible for listing in the National Register?
A. Yes, it may be. I don't know when they meet the state of New Hampshire who is identifying them. Are they qualified to be identifying historic properties? That would be a question $I$ would have.
Q. All right. Fair enough.

And then the second -- well, the next
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clause talks about properties designated as historically significant by a local governing body, local legislative body, et cetera, so essentially local entities. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it again your position that all such locally designated resources would also be eligible for listing in the National Register?
A. No, not necessarily all.
Q. So then you would agree that this definition of "historic property" could be interpreted to be broader than just things that are eligible for listing in the National Register.
A. No, just different. I do not see the words "integrity" and "significance" anywhere. And the reason why that's important is if a historic property has no integrity or significance, it would be difficult to have an adverse effect on it.
Q. Okay. But I'm looking solely at the definition of "historic sites," which under the SEC is equal to the definition of
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
"historic property" under the statute.
A. I didn't know that this was the definition for the SEC.
Q. It's not.
A. Okay. Thank you.
Q. And just to review that, this is the definition of "historic property" interpreting the statutory definition -- this is DHR's interpretation. And then the SEC references the same statutory definition of "historic property" and has a shorter list of things that it could include. Is that a fair summary?

So, kind of wrapping that up, if I understand your testimony, you looked at things that were either eligible or listed in the National Registry and did not consider things that wouldn't meet the criteria for listing.
A. We looked at everything. We looked at all of the properties that were brought forward by the Durham Historic Association. And a key part of the process of identifying historic properties is to fill out an inventory form.
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That is part of the memo and direction that we have received, everyone has received, from the Division of Historic Resources. It's how you go through the SEC process, the Section 106 process. So we looked at everything. But you have to be able to fill out an inventory form.
Q. Yes, but you did not fill out an inventory form for things you didn't feel were eligible for listing on the National Registry; is that correct?
A. No, that's not accurate. We filled out an inventory form for everything that we were directed by the Division of Historic Resources to look at and consider, and that is based by the Division of Historic Resources on the preparation of a Project Area Form, which is this, which is where you pretty much begin the process in New Hampshire for both the SEC and for Section 106. And that gives you the universe of area, project area. It's even beyond the APE for what historic properties might be out there, whatever they may be. And then there
are recommendations made once you do that to the Division of Historic Resources, and it is they who decide what needs to be inventoried, or sometimes we call it "surveyed." But it's not surveyed like you think. It's documented as historic properties.

So we didn't choose what was surveyed. We were directed and at all times in consultation with the Division of Historic Resources.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

But do I understand correctly you made recommendations to DHR as to what resources had been identified within the Project Area Form?
A. Yes. And they changed those recommendations and added some and subtracted some.
Q. Yes. But what $I$ was trying to get at is your interpretation and your recommendations were limited to things that you felt were eligible for listing in the National Registry?
A. No. When we received the report from the Durham Historic Association, as is shown in my testimony, we very carefully took each and \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
every one of those sites that was pointed out to us and revisited them, looked at them in relationship to our Project Area Form. And so we considered everything that we were aware of or was brought to our attention.
Q. And when you took another look at those sites identified by the Durham Historic

Association, did you recommend to DHR that any of them should receive further review or be labeled as a historic resource?
A. Yes. All of the historic walls that were in the Project, the direct project area, direct APE in the historic districts.
Q. So let's talk about stone walls for a little bit then. When you performed your analysis of the impacts or the effects of the Project on historic resources, you completed effects tables; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe you have ten resources that you created effects tables for?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your analysis of those effects, you found adverse effects for two of those
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[WITNESS: WIDELL]
resources?
A. No, there are four adverse effects.
Q. Yes, but in the effects tables that you submitted to DHR initially, I believe --
A. Oh, initially.
Q. -- there were two. We can go through them. See if $I$ can find it quickly.
A. No, I'm finding originally there were four adverse effects in my testimony.
Q. Well, let me -- am I correct that your initial prefiled testimony was filed before the effects tables were completed?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And your supplemental testimony was filed after DHR made its recommendations?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in between those two times, you submitted effects tables to DHR.
A. That's correct.
Q. And that's Applicant's 164? Well, I'll represent that it is.
A. It's this.
Q. Okay.

MR. ASLIN: Dawn, if you could switch
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back to the computer, please.
BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Okay. So what I've got on the screen right now is Applicant's 164, which is labeled "Historic Properties Effects[sic] Tables." And we're in the middle of the document right here. But would you agree that this exhibit has all the effects tables you submitted to DHR? It's 111 pages.
A. Yes.
Q. We could go through it, but I'll represent that only two of them found adverse effects, and those were the Pickering Farm and the Newington Center Historic District. Does that seem accurate? We can look through --
A. Yes, because it was brought to our attention, through the Durham Historic Association, their concerns for the stone walls. Eversource then responded immediately and very openly and strongly, went and met with representatives of the Durham Historic Association, took a complete walk of those stone walls where they were located, mapped them, identified their concerns and then
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[WITNESS: WIDELL]
identified a way. So, yes, those were not originally included because we did not believe that there would be an effect on those. So I believe that those are the adverse effects to the historic districts you're talking about. So I think we're in agreement, but $I$ now understand what you mean, because they were not originally in the effects tables, although discussion of their significance was in the description of the districts.
Q. Okay. So what I want to do is look at those two historic districts in your effects tables, and those are the Durham Point Road District and the Newmarket and Bennett Roads Farm Historic District.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. So the first one $I$ have on the screen -- and this is the effects table for the Durham Point Road Historic District, and we're on electronic Page 21 of Applicant's Exhibit 164. Does that look correct, that I'm referring to the right effects table?
A. Yes.
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[WITNESS: WIDELL]
Q. Okay. The first subcategory -- well, let me back up.

There's seven categories that you address for effects under Section 800.5 --
A. I'm not sure I numbered them. But yes, that sounds correct.
Q. And so the first one's physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property. And here we're talking about a historic district. So it's a large area; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I just highlighted portions of your evaluation that have to do with stone walls. So, you know, at the top here you're talking about potential construction impacts to one stone wall and an historic archeological site. Then you have a more specific description of impacts to stone walls here.

So would I be correct that, at the time you completed your effects tables, you were aware of the stone walls within the district and that there could be some impacts?
A. Yes, but we thought we would be avoiding them. But yes, yes.
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Q. And you say you thought you'd be able to avoid them. But you do know here in the middle that one wall may be impacted --
A. Yes.
Q. -- among other potential impacts.

So if we skip down to the bottom of the effects table, you have your ultimate recommendation for that historic district; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's in this box, "Recommended Finding"?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Okay. And you found at this time no adverse effect.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And you state that the Project will not have a direct or indirect adverse effect on the Durham Point Historic District, notwithstanding the fact there could be some impacts to at least one of the stone walls; is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. So at that time you didn't feel impacting \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
even one stone wall would rise to the level of an adverse effect?
A. That's correct.
Q. Given that stone walls are contributing elements to the historic districts, and you listed it in the Direct Effects section, there is a direct effect if you impact a stone wall; is that right?
A. Yes. And that's why the Durham Point Historic District is listed as an adverse effect.
Q. Correct. And that was after input from the DHA and also from DHR.
A. Yes.
Q. We'll look at that in a second. I want to take a quick look at the other historic district, the Newmarket and Bennett Roads Farm Historic District, which is on electronic Page 54 of Applicant's 164.

So, again, we're referring to the, you can see at the top of the page, the effects table for the Newmarket and Bennett Roads Farms Historic District; correct?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
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Q. Again you've identified in the Physical Destruction section that there may be some impacts to stone walls within the right-of-way. And in fact, there are nine stone walls that would be in the district. And I think you say that displacement of the walls to widen existing breaches may be required and that they will be rebuilt.
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. So you're again noting that there will be some direct effects to stone walls within this historic district; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, you know, at the bottom of that section you say, "minimal physical damage to the wall segments in one or two locations will not affect the overall integrity of the large district." Is that why you again didn't find an adverse effect at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. So, in other words, you felt that the direct impacts to stone walls was not large enough to impact the overall historic district's integrity.
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[WITNESS: WIDELL]
A. "Large" might not be the right -- we felt we might be able to avoid them and that we would not have an adverse effect on the historic district.
Q. Okay. And so, again, your recommended finding here was no adverse effect. And you say that it will not alter, either directly or indirectly, any of the significant characteristics that qualify the historic district for inclusion in the National Register in a manner, et cetera.

So your opinion, at that time at least, was that impacting stone walls would not impact directly or indirectly any of the significant characteristics of the district.
A. No, I wouldn't exactly characterize that -we really felt we would be able to avoid them mostly.
Q. Notwithstanding there being some direct impacts listed.
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And so following the submission of your effects tables to DHR, DHR eventually came back on August 1st with this letter, which
has been marked as Applicant's 167, giving the final report on their decision about what adverse effects there might be; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And at that time, on Page 2, they did find that there would be adverse effects to those two historic districts; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And based on that, the Applicant has done some work to try and address the impacts to stone walls and come up with mitigation measures; is that correct?
A. Yes. But $I$ would say, remember this process really is lead by the Division of Historical Resources, as is indicated here by your line of questioning. They asked the Applicant about it, and the Applicant met, as I indicated, with the DHA and walked and identified every stone wall within the direct APE and then formulated, carefully formulated processes particular for either avoiding or using existing breaching or timber matting or building a platform. So the DHR definitely
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lead this process for identifying the adverse effects. And we were -- I think we responded extremely carefully and extremely thoughtfully and included the whole community every step of the way in that process.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

In your analysis of effects, and in terms of identifying resources in general, would a stone wall be qualified as a historic resource by itself, or must it be part of a historic district or other property?
A. It is possible that a historic stone wall could qualify by itself. Sitting here, I can't think of one particularly. But it would be something like in our battle fields where it is a point of battle, or the wall in Berlin, or of particularly fine trades, craftsmanship that in its own right is a work of art. Perhaps Robert Frost's stone wall would be one of the ones that would also have great significance by itself. Usually, however, it would contribute to the significance of a district or an individual property or a landscape.
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it
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
Q. And is that the reason that stone walls don't take a leading role in your Project Area Form? They're mentioned in context but not as a separate category of resources. Is that --
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you mentioned a minute ago that the mitigation for stone walls is proposed here, and that is outlined in part in the Memorandum of Understanding with DHR; is that correct?
A. Yes, for those that are in the historic districts of Newmarket and Bennett Road and Durham Point Historic District.
Q. Right. And so for those stone walls within the two historic districts that have been identified as having adverse effects, DHR has agreed to mitigation. And that's outlined on Page 3 and 4 of the MOU, which is Applicant's 200; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. For those stone walls that are not in those two historic districts, I think there are two categories. Let me know if you disagree.
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One would be stone walls within the other historic district that's been identified, the UNH Historic District, and then the second category would be all other stone walls that are not in the historic district. Is that a reasonable way of dividing them out?
A. Actually, if I could, there are all other stone walls. But they have also been defined. So all other stone walls that are outside of the historic districts in Durham are being dealt within an agreement with the Town of Durham and UNH. So, although they may be in the UNH Historic District, they're all being looked at as part of that agreement document that is still being discussed.
Q. Right.
A. There is also a letter of commitment from Eversource to the Town of Newington for historic districts -- I mean, excuse me -stone walls that are within the area of potential effect.
Q. Thank you. And I agree that I think there's been testimony already that Eversource has committed to protecting stone walls
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
throughout the Project corridor.
What $I$ was trying to get at is, does the fact that some of these stone walls that have been identified are within an identified historic district play a role? They were not included in DHR's review as an adverse effect, but they are a part of the character-defining features within the UNH Historic District. Is that a fair assessment?
A. Yes, they can be or maybe not be. Given the significance of the University of New Hampshire, which is primarily for architecture and education, there are some stone walls in the University of New Hampshire Historic District which actually predate the University of New Hampshire; so their significance is kind of separate from the reason why the University of New Hampshire is eligible for the National Register. But they may be in the area of potential effects, so they have been carefully mapped and included in that letter with the University -- I'm sorry. I'm
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confusing that with Newington. Excuse me. They are part of the discussion of the agreement document with the University of New Hampshire.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And with regard to the mitigation proposal of using timber matting either to bridge over walls or put work pads elevated above walls, have you ever been involved in a Project that has used that type of mitigation?
A. Not directly, but $I$ had quite a thorough discussion with construction crews with Eversource and through a series of photographs was able to understand the process.
Q. Okay. And it's your assessment as a historic resource expert that that will be adequate to protect the stone walls?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

The MOU also has mitigation for the Pickering Farm, and that is, at this point, production of a historic booklet about
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
agriculture on the farms in the Newington area; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you explain to me the relationship between that booklet and the impacts to Pickering Farm? In other words, in what way does creation of the booklet mitigate the impact of the Project on Pickering Farm?
A. The only mitigation actually -- meaning you lessen the effect -- that we've proposed, meaning Eversource, is planting, with the permission of the property owner, on the south side of the corridor, which might diminish the visual effect of the new structure.

The booklet is -- was suggested as mitigation at a meeting in Newington with the Division of Historic Resources. I do not know precisely why that was chosen. So it can -- the booklet itself can't lessen the visual appearance of the structure. But in the field of historic preservation and historic resource mitigation, it is not uncommon for an educational product or
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something else to be used as mitigation for and unmitigatable adverse effect. And that's what we have here.
Q. Okay. And do you know who proposed this particular mitigation?
A. I believe it was the DHR themselves, but I'm not sure of that completely. I was not at that meeting.
Q. So you were not directly involved?
A. No, I was not.
Q. On Page 5 of the MOU there's a section for Monitoring. And again, this is Applicant's Exhibit 200. And the first bullet is that there would be monitoring each year following execution of this MOU until it expires or is terminated. Can you help me understand when the MOU would expire or be terminated?
A. If you scroll down further, I think it says. But from my memory, $I$ believe it is when the adverse effects are dealt with or when the Project is finished, completed. We can look at that for the precise language that's in there.
Q. Sorry. There's a section on termination,
which is different than expiring.
A. Yeah, that's not termination. Termination is a different thing. This is when the work is completed. Would you like me to find it?
Q. If you can do it quickly, sure.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. It's on Page 4 under... let's see. Sorry, sorry. Page 3. This agreement shall be null and void if its terms are not carried out within five years from the date of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee written approval. Prior to such time, Army Core of Engineers may consult with the other signatories to reconsider the terms of the MOA. That's the MOA, which is attached to the Memorandum of Understanding. Excuse me.
Q. Would it be correct that your general understanding is that it continues until the latter of the Project being completed or the adverse effects being mitigated through whatever mitigation is required?
A. Actually, I would just say this generally, not as -- it's improperly placed under Termination, which is upon completion of the \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
measures outlined in the Stipulation section of this agreement. Eversource's obligation under this agreement shall be considered complete and this agreement shall terminate. So it kind of has two things in that clause. You're the attorney, not $I$ am. But to me, as a state preservation officer, I would say they're obligated to do all the stipulations within five years.
Q. Five years. Okay. Because what I was struggling with was the monitoring was supposed to be yearly. But it sounds like monitoring may end as soon as the Project's built.
A. That may be, yes. Looks like everything will be completed within five years.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

The MOU also includes a number of plans that are to be implemented as part of the Project: A Historic Property Monitoring Plan, the Unanticipated Discovery Plan --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and the Training Plan.
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
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A. Yes.
Q. And those are part of, I think it's Appendix, some part of this document. So that starts at Page 38 of Applicant's Exhibit 200.

And do $I$ understand the Historic Properties Monitoring Plan correctly, that essentially environmental monitors do all the monitoring? And there's a plan for who they report to and what happens, but that's the core of the monitoring plan?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that's outlined in the section called "Environmental Monitors" on electronic Page 43.

And you've referenced a few times the Unanticipated Discoveries Plan as sort of the protection against impacting other unknown or unexpected resources; is that fair?
A. Yes, and human remains.
Q. Right, which would fall under the purview of Dr. Bunker.
A. Not necessarily. We can review that if you would like. There is -- it would be reported out from the field to the state archeologist
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
and, I'm sorry, the person in charge of deaths for the state --
Q. Coroner.
A. The coroner. Thank you.
Q. So what I wanted to ask you about specifically was on Page 47 of the PDF, and that's this category of Procedures for Unanticipated Effects on Historic Architectural Properties. And I'm trying to understand what that is. Is it that you might unexpectedly have an indirect effect on an architectural structure?
A. These would be direct effects. It might be possible that you would find a stone wall, and not the kind that we've been talking about, but a building.
Q. Like a cellar hole or something?
A. Yeah, a cellar hole would probably be archeological but... what else? This is certainly beyond my experience. But it could be a part of a building that you find because it has been buried. Yeah, a bridge abutment, something like that would be an architectural feature. And then you let the archeological
historians and the archeologists fight over it because it's underground. But it is things like that.
Q. So this is really looking at direct effects, not indirect effects.
A. Yeah. I guess it might be possible to find something that had been overlooked and it would be treated the same way. It could be a cabin. I found that in my experience, where there are miners cabins or a stove from a cabin that you find suddenly in the woods. It is an occupation site that you didn't know existed until someone was working in that area and found it.
Q. Okay. And have you ever in your experience done any sort of post-construction review for indirect effects to look for those kinds of resources that might have visual impacts that wasn't anticipated?
A. Post-construction review. Can you help me understand what you mean by that?
Q. Sure. Going back after the project is built to see if there is any visual impact on historic resources that was unanticipated.
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A. No, I have no experience doing that.
Q. So you were relying on your estimation of visibility to historic resources that you do at the beginning of the process.
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. Just a couple more questions.

There was some testimony earlier today about Beech Hill Road and whether it qualifies as a historic resource. And I wasn't clear on what your answer was. You seem to be describing the area that the road is in as something that was reviewed for historic value. But do you consider historic roads themselves to be potential historic resources?
A. Yes, they could be.
Q. Okay. And was that assessment made for Beech Hill Road, for the road itself?
A. It was considered, but it was not found to be a historic road unto itself, and we were not requested by the Division of Historic Resources to complete an inventory form on that historic resource.
Q. Okay. And is that why the proposal to use it
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as an access road is not any sort of adverse effect on the road itself because it's not --
A. Yes.
Q. -- been identified as a resource? (Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. Yes.
Q. And am I correct that the proposal is to lay gravel over that historic road for access purposes?
A. I don't know that.
Q. You don't know. Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.
A. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you very much. So we'll take some questions from the Committee now. Any questions?

Mr. Fitzgerald.
MR. FITZGERALD: I have a couple.
QUESTIONS BY SEC MEMBERS AND COUNSEL:
BY MR. FITZGERALD:
Q. Good afternoon.
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A. Hello, Mr. Fitzgerald.
Q. Michael Fitzgerald. I'm the assistant director of the Air Resources Division at DES.
(Discussion off the record.)
Q. One of the earlier questioners asked you some questions about your qualifications. I believe your resume indicated that you meet the requirements of the Secretary of Interior's -- you were asked specific questions about degrees that you had. But does your experience, combination of experience and education, meet the requirements that were listed under the Secretary of the Interior's requirements?
A. Yes, sir. If you looked at that more closely, you would see that it also includes an associated field or related field, which history certainly is. And you also get credit, if you will, for practical experience.

I have been in the field of historic preservation since 1976, which was a great time to get into it. And further, my
experience and knowledge has been recognized by federal agencies, such as the National Park Service, the Department of Defense, also Governor Pete Wilson of California, Governor Kean of New Jersey, Governor Harry Hughes of Maryland. So I believe that I meet the Secretary of Interior's standards for professionals in both history and architectural history. And I appreciate the opportunity to clarify that. Thank you.
Q. Thank you.

Do they provide documentation, or that's just a requirement that you certify that you meet? Do they send you a letter saying you have met these requirements, or is there certification, so to speak?
A. They don't give you certification. We don't have letters after our -- but I was the state historic preservation officer for California. And although key to that is appointment by the governor, you must meet the professional standards as well. So it has been acknowledged quite publicly for decades. Thank you.
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Q. All right. Thank you. Appreciate that. Stone walls. What general characteristics make a stone wall of historic significance?
A. Generally you would be looking for it to be 50 years old or older. But that isn't an absolute requirement. It would have to have integrity. And so it would have to be a recognizable entity of the characteristics of the stone wall. So, the materials, the workmanship, its location, purpose of either being a boundary wall or a separating wall, those are the sorts of things that you would look at.
Q. Okay. In general, are stone walls over 50 years old?
A. In general, my understanding is that they are. I guess we are making new ones, but the methodology is probably somewhat different except for the highest-level craftspeople today.
Q. There's been a lot of discussion today relative to both stone walls and roads, I think, being in a historic district and being \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
considered historical. So could you sort of clarify that. I think I heard you say that if a stone wall is within a historic district, it's considered a historic stone wall. Is it considered as part of the historic district or considered in and of itself as a historic resource? Bear with me.

I have no knowledge of this area, so --
A. No problem. I'll be happy --
Q. And the same thing for roads.
A. I think you heard me say that it is what we call a "contributor" or "contributing element," meaning it adds to the significance. Now, when I say that, a historic district normally has a period of significance, meaning it dates to a particular time. And so a stone wall in a historic district that was built last year would not be considered something that contributes to understanding the history of the historic district. But other stone walls that are from that time period would be considered significant in a historic district.
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Q. Okay. Thank you.

So was your testimony that if a stone wall or a historic feature is within a historic district, it is considered, for lack of a better term, as part of that historic district --
A. Yes.
Q. -- overall?
A. Yes.
Q. But does that individual feature, does it receive attention in terms of it's in the historic district, it's a -- is a stone wall outside of a historic district treated any differently than a stone wall inside a historic district?
A. Yes, when we are adding in the fact that we have a project here. So, remember we talked about the area of potential effect, direct one and indirect one. So that comes into play as to whether the project will have an adverse effect on any of those elements within the historic district to tell you what's important about that place. And you might have a direct effect on a wall if it's
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in the way of having to put something in place for a project, or it may be the district may visually see one of the structures in the Project. So that's direct and indirect.
Q. Okay. Roads. If a road is considered a historic resource, as opposed to, you know, a stone wall is a configuration or whatever, a road particularly may have been paved over or, you know, paved numerous times, might have been created a hundred years ago, but so how do you make a determination that a road is historic? Is it the corridor that it travels in, or is it some characteristic of the road itself?
A. It could be all of those things. Once again, you go back to those things that we mentioned about materials, workmanship, setting, location. And how that would apply to a road is, is the road visibly following the same pattern? Has it not changed? Are there attributes about integrity of that road that are able to convey its significance and age and that sort of thing?
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Roads can also be an important part of historic districts. Within the historic district, Nimble Hill Road would be an example of where maybe in some part of the road it has been changed by the addition of a brand new fire department on Nimble Hill Road, but within the boundaries of the Newington Center Historic District, Nimble Hill Road has integrity and significance and value.
Q. I believe that takes care of my questions. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Any questions?

Attorney Duprey.
MS. DUPREY: I have one. Thank you. QUESTIONS BY MS. DUPREY:
Q. My question is about the transition structure relating to Ms. Frink's house. I think initially you had said you didn't think it would be seen from the house, or maybe just over the top. And then I felt like in later questioning you were equivocating over that.
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}

So I guess I'd like to just be clear as to what you believe. I think that, and I'm asking if I'm correct in my understanding, that the full transition structure would not be seen from the house.
A. Yes, that is true. I believe that the full transition structure would not be visible throughout the historic district, as I indicated earlier. The photographs from the --
Q. Let me interrupt you. I'm not asking from the full historic district. I'm asking about from her home.
A. I cannot speak from inside her home, which she asked me to do. I don't have knowledge from the information and viewshed simulations that we have seen. Further, the photographs that she provided for the location of that in the corridor and the surrounding of the vegetation, $I$ do not believe that it will be seen from the rear of that house, of the Frink Farm house.
Q. Thank you. So the transition structure is set in --
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A. Yes.
Q. -- a corridor of trees on either side --
A. A hundred feet. Yes, it is.
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. And the house would look towards that corridor and trees?
A. If we looked at a map, you would see that that house is, what, southeast of the corridor. And I'm afraid to estimate exactly how much, but it is a substantial field.
Q. Okay. And it's your belief that if you were standing just inside the house or just outside the house, that what you would see is possibly something over the tops of the trees?
A. Just rear of the -- yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. DUPREY: That's all.
QUESTIONS BY PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Q. Hello, Ms. Widell.
A. Hello.
Q. I have some questions here just following up on some of your testimony. I just want to be sure I understand your testimony.
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
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The SEC's definition of "historic sites" that Attorney Aslin had on the screen, it's my understanding that you now agree that a property could be included in that definition even if it is not listed or eligible in the National Historic Register?
A. Oh, yes, we would consider that. We always have, yes. Yes.
Q. Okay. And so could you tell me the process you used to determine if there were any properties identified as historic by the State of New Hampshire, the state itself. Attorney Aslin put different definitions from the DHR -- or I know it's different initials -- but the historical resource's definition, those properties identified by the state or local governing bodies, boards, commissions, et cetera. And I'm trying to understand the process that you went through, if any, to determine properties that might be included in that definition which are not National Register properties or eligible for the National Register.
A. Well, the process for identifying historic
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properties which is laid out in the -- for the SEC is laid out in a memo which I attached to my testimony. But I'll give a very brief -- the first part of that would be to fill out an inventory form of the historic property. And it must have basically integrity and significance. And so then it is likely to be eligible for the National Register if it has sufficient integrity and significance to be included on an inventory form that is accepted by the Division of Historic Resources. Not everything is, but it is likely that it's --
Q. To get to that step to know which properties to inventory, forgetting about APE and all of that, just which ones -- I mean, did you reach out to Durham or Newington, Madbury, Portsmouth, and say, hey, this corridor's coming through. Are there historic properties that we should be aware of? What kind of involvement did you have with the local communities?
A. We are instructed by the Division of Historic Resources to complete a Project Area Form.
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And the first step in developing that is to first see what exists, what does the Division of Historic Resources already have in their files. Also, there are themes. So believe it or not, there is a great deal of information, probably files, on stone walls that are significant. But certainly on engineering, on agriculture, on all of that sort of stuff that you would also access and look at. And then research the area itself: The documents that DHA spoke of today, the stack pole history, the history completed by the Durham Historic Association, 1985; there's a 1670 John Scott map of the area. Those are looked at for the Project Area Form. So the material that is in the community is used to figure out what to look at.
Q. So in those early days, did you reach out to the affected communities, or did you wait until, say, Durham Historical Association said, hey, you're missing this stuff, and they sent all the information to you?
A. In this case, Durham contacted Eversource,
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
yes.
Q. So in the early days --
A. And I believe the Division of Historic Resources as well.
Q. The early days of deciding which to inventory, you relied on state resources and your own investigation, but you didn't reach out to the local communities to get their input.
A. We looked very much at the exact same documents that they provided in the material they gave us later on, the bibliographies and materials, yes. Yes.
Q. Okay. Concerning the booklet that's essentially mitigation for the impacts to Pickering Farm, if a booklet like that already exists, we heard some comment earlier, if that information has already been gathered in a booklet similar exists, would that reduce its effect as a mitigation measure?
A. I cannot speak to that. But there's always opportunity to amend an agreement if a community or the Division of Historic

Resources believes that is not appropriate. But my understanding is that there was support for this by the Division and the community.
Q. Do you have a --
A. Or some of the community, yes.
Q. Sorry to interrupt. Do you have other suggestions for mitigation for the Newington Historic District if that booklet perhaps isn't effective or it's decided there should be something else?
A. Not specifically, no. There are a whole variety. And DHR is very experienced in looking at mitigation projects, and I'm sure they could be very helpful in coming up with some suggestions.
Q. Quick question about the APE. I understand that the direct effects, it was the width of the right-of-way, and then for visual effects, it was a half-mile to each side of the corridor --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for the one-mile APE. And that one mile was based on our rules for an urbanized
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areas; is that correct?
A. I do not know why it was chosen. The Division of Historic Resources chose it based on their experience of this type of project and this type of environment.
Q. And did they direct you to use that both for the Section 106 process as well as the SEC process? Or in what context was that recommendation made?
A. It was in the context of the SEC process to determine visual effects. The 106 process, which was lead by the Army Corps of Engineers, the federal permit area was limited to wetlands.
Q. The various plans -- there were four plans prepared: The Historic Properties Monitoring Plan, Unanticipated Discovery Plan, Historic Properties Training Plan, and the Curation and Repatriation Plan. Each of those plans has been completed; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And have those been accepted or approved by the Department of Historical Resources?
A. Yes.
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Q. And have key personnel for those plans been identified? There was testimony about some environmental monitors, but I'm sure there's some key personnel, and I'm wondering if those have been identified yet.
A. No, not to my knowledge.
Q. And who selects those key personnel?
A. I believe there's a process. And once again, you would need to meet the professional
standards for the Secretary of Interior for key things, for archeology, for architectural history.
Q. And does the Department of Historical

Resources sign off or have a part in selecting those personnel?
A. I believe, yes, they do.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I know
it's called something else. I apologize,
Director Muzzey. Department of Cultural --
DIR. MUZZEY: Division of Historic
Resources.
BY PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Q. I think that's all the questions. That's all my questions. Thank you.
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A. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Mr.
Way.
QUESTIONS BY MR. WAY:
Q. Good afternoon. How are you?
A. Hi. Good, Mr. Way. Nice to see you again.
Q. Nice to see you.
A. Thank you.
Q. Make sure that I'm clear on the MOU. The next steps for the MOU -- it's a signed document?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. But I notice it has signature blocks for the communities as well, Newington and Durham. Do they have to sign that? Can it be implemented without their signature or --
A. Yes, it can be implemented without their signature.
Q. But you certainly would want their signature --
A. Yes.
Q. -- I would expect.
A. Yes, they have been invited and are aware of the document, yes.
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Q. And in terms of $I$ think what Ms. Weathersby was asking about, the booklet, I'm kind of interested in a little bit more detail, just a little bit on the booklet, but maybe on the genesis of how that came to be.

We were at a public hearing the other night, and the booklet was mentioned, not really in a flattering way. I'm not sure it's going to be a best seller. But it was sort of a point of derision, not necessarily because of the booklet itself, but because in their minds it started out as something larger with mitigation and then it got less and less and less, and then it got to a 30-page black-and-white, hundred-copy booklet.

And I'm also -- because I had seen your supplementary testimony. And what you had taken out -- I believe you took out the $\$ 5,000$ in funding. So at some point someone thought that that was a good idea. And you mentioned that you had talked with community leaders, but you seemed to kind of gloss over that. Was that original plan crafted with
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the community?
A. I have to tell you that $I$ was not in the room when any of this was discussed or decided. Eversource has been very open to recommendations from the community and the Division of Historic Resources as to appropriate mitigation for the Alfred Pickering Farm. The original recommendation that was received was for up to $\$ 5,000$ to be used for appointing of contributing buildings that are listed in my testimony. That was accepted, and it was ready to be moved forward. And then my understanding is that Division of Historic Resources, and perhaps some community leaders, but I don't know who or why, decided that something else would be more appropriate, and this was what was agreed upon. I can't really give you any more information than that. I think Eversource has worked very hard to figure out what would be appropriate mitigation, acceptable to the Division of Historic Resources and the Town of Newington for this adverse effect.
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Q. With all due respect to my friend here at the Division of Historic Resources, but in terms of this booklet, do you think that that's an appropriate mitigation strategy?
A. It can be. There can be all kinds of things for mitigation. And I have found that the more creative, the better. Something that's long-lasting I think is an excellent choice because you're adding to the long-term preservation of the historic resources for something that is affecting a historic resource. But there's so many things, I'd be hesitant to actually name any, because I think it really needs to come from the community and the state historic resource officer and the Project proponent.
Q. So you're convinced that the idea in part came from the community was somewhat with Division of --
A. Yes.
Q. -- Historic Resources --
A. Yes.
Q. -- was agreed upon?
A. But $I$ was not there, so I'm not going to be
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helpful in that.
Q. Too bad.
A. Thank you.
Q. I mean, I also understand the question about the outreach to the communities. I never understand the hesitancy to reach out to the communities, to just call them up, the historical representatives of a community, and just to talk, just to find out their perspective. What is the hesitancy to do that?
A. I do not know. I certainly, in my government capacity, have done it many, many, many times.
Q. Did you have the liberty to do that?
A. You mean in this particular -- actually, it probably would not have been appropriate, given the work I was doing with the consultant who knew and has been working in this.

I think Lynn Monroe, who is the executive director or president of Preservation Company, has been working in historic preservation in New Hampshire for at \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
least 40 years and began her career in this area documenting Rockingham County and that sort of thing. So I think she's extremely familiar with local resources, as well as other resources.
Q. Well, yeah, $I$ have no doubt that there is a familiarity.
A. Yeah.
Q. Just I guess I still just never understand that one hesitancy.

All right. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

MR. FITZGERALD: Can I ask a follow-up on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Yes.
BY MR. FITZGERALD:
Q. Could you clarify for me the role of a consulting party versus a party who is a direct party of the MOA or MOU and whether -how communication of those consulting parties is handled?
A. Yes. I'd be happy to do that. In the Section 106 process, which is always run by the federal agency -- in this case, it's the
[WITNESS: WIDELL]

Army Corps of Engineers because they're issuing what we call a Clean Water Act 404 Permit -- the signators all have certain responsibilities in an agreement document. And consulting parties are those that are invited, that are interested in the outcome, and they have different roles. Normally they are involved in participating in the public meetings, invited to the public meetings, invited to provide information, and kept informed by the federal agency through e-mails, letters and invitations to the public meetings, and then being offered an opportunity to sign the agreement document. The signators are the ones as you saw that are responsible for carrying it out. A signator always has some kind of responsibility in the agreement document and often also has an ability to terminate the document, amend the document. That's just a quick --
Q. So in this case, I believe the two towns, Newington and Durham -- I believe Ms. Frink indicated that she was also a consulting
party. I don't know if there were others or not. Are they invited to review or to help participate in crafting the MOU in any way, or are they just given a final copy and said -- given the opportunity to either sign or don't sign?
A. They are definitely provided with a draft of the document and informed along the way as it is developed.
Q. Okay. So I thought I heard Ms. Frink testify this morning that she was not invited to meetings discussing this, or was unaware of them. Is that -- why would that have happened?
A. I can't speak to that. It would have been the responsibility of the Army Corps of Engineers for the Memorandum of Agreement.
Q. And that would be the same for the towns also?
A. Yes, for that document. Yes.
Q. Are there any other private parties that are consulting on this issue?
A. No. It was the Frink Family and Town of Newington, $I$ believe.
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gray areas for how things may have evolved or how something like that fell through the cracks, the end result being that she didn't get to have that consultant role. How do you get the answer to that? Why was she removed? I mean, you must be wondering. How does one find that out?
A. In my experience, it would be the state historic preservation officer would inquire to the Army Corps of Engineers' cultural resources representative that was responsible for complying with Section 106 for this process because they are the ones responsible for the Memorandum of Agreement. It is the Army Corps of Engineers. And for the SEC process, it would be the Division of Historic Resources.

BY MR. FITZGERALD:
Q. So were the towns invited to play a role and had the ability -- were they notified of these meetings and had the ability to participate?
A. Yes.
Q. But Ms. Frink was not --
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A. Yes. Yes, I did see notices of public meetings, yes. And there were a number of them. And they referred in the Memorandum of Agreement to specifically the dates when they were held and where.
Q. Has there been communication with the towns? They have not signed these MOAs. They chose not to, apparently. Has there been communication with them as to why or why not they --
A. I don't know that.
Q. I guess we'll find out.
A. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Director Muzzey, do you have any questions?
DIR. MUZZEY: I do. Thank you.
QUESTIONS BY DIR. MUZZEY:
Q. Good afternoon.
A. Hello.
Q. I'd like to talk a little bit more about stone walls and, in particular, timber matting.

Earlier today you described that you had been given a description of how the timber
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matting operation would work to protect a wall. And I'm wondering, could you describe for us what a timber mat looks like, how big is it, how heavy, what's it made of, that type of thing?
A. Yeah. Strange. The pieces of wood are kind of lined up parallel to one another, connected, so that it can go over a stone wall. So I guess things can be moved or carried over a stone wall. I don't know how heavy it is.
Q. Do you know how big the timbers are?
A. They looked 6-foot maybe to me.
Q. Are they planks --
A. They look like planks.
Q. -- or big square things?
A. Yeah, they look like planks. Yeah, yeah.
Q. And so once the timber mats are placed, what goes over the timber mats?
A. I guess equipment, people, carrying --
Q. Trucks? Do trucks go over the timber mats?
A. No, I did not get the feeling that trucks went over them, no. But perhaps. No.
Q. And in your experience, are you aware of how \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
timber mats were developed? Were they developed specifically for stone wall mitigation?
A. No, I don't know how they were developed. And I seriously doubt that they were developed for stone wall mitigation. MR. FITZGERALD: If I could just follow-up on that?

BY MR. FITZGERALD:
Q. The timber mat then lays directly on the wall and activities occur over it. I grew up with a stone wall in my yard, and I know that especially over time they become unstable and rocks will wobble and so on. So the laying of a timber mat over this and then having activities go on over that, does that generally have an impact on the stability of the wall? I gather it's intended to protects the wall, but --
A. It is intended to protect the wall. And these treatments were identified in Consultation with the Division of Historic Resources and Eversource for the stone walls in the Durham Point Historic District and
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Newmarket and Bennett Road. I can only assume that the cultural resource professionals who are negotiating this agreement, including Mark Dobrowolski of Eversource, who was cultural resources manager and now is actually with the Division of Historic Resources, has had extensive experience with these treatments for avoiding damage to stone walls from construction. MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.

BY DIR. MUZZEY (CONT'D) :
Q. I'm wondering -- I share Mr. Fitzgerald's concern for the stone walls. I'm wondering, is there a way to test whether timber matting is an effective mitigation tool prior to it being implemented on the large number of stone walls in this project area?
A. Yes, I'm sure there would be. If we take a look in the monitoring plan and training plan, there is a great opportunity for teaching all those that are involved in and around the cultural resources to learn how to identify them, how to protect them. That might be an excellent place to do exactly
what you're talking about, Ms. Muzzey.
Q. Although it's not specifically part of those plans, right now.
A. I don't think that the actual training plan has been formulated. So I think it would be very possible to include that. And I think it would be a great idea.
Q. Is there any recourse in the plans, or anywhere else in the Project documentation, if a property owner feels that a stone wall has not been reconstructed properly or has been irreparably damaged by timber matting or the reconstruction process that happens in some cases? What would a property owner or community do in that case?
A. There is opportunity and a provision in the Memorandum of Understanding for any property -- any individual to bring to the attention concerns about the implementation of this agreement. So that's pretty wide open and strong and good for that.
Q. Could you point that out to us and tell us what the exhibit number is?
A. Yeah, yeah.
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
Q. Thank you.
A. May take me a little...
(Witness reviews document.)
A. It's on Page 4 of the Memorandum of Understanding. Dispute Resolution under No. 2. "If at any time during the implementation of the measures stipulated in this Memorandum of Understanding an objection should be raised by an interested member of the public, the parties will consult to determine the appropriate response."
Q. So this is the Memorandum of Agreement.
A. No. I'm sorry. This is the --
Q. This is the MOU.
A. Yes, this is the MOU.
Q. Okay.
A. So this includes the Memorandum of Agreement as well. And it also includes the plans, the monitoring and the training, the curation and ...
Q. So we know that stone wall protection is sprinkled throughout a number of agreements --
A. Yes.
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Q. -- and Memorandums --
A. Yes.
Q. -- of Understanding.

This is an MOU that deals with the
Newmarket and Bennett Roads Historic District stone walls and the Durham Point Historic District stone walls.
A. Yes.
Q. So we heard a lot this morning about the stone walls that are in the larger UNH district.
A. Yes.
Q. Would there be some recourse for property owners or the community in the case of there being concerns about the reconstruction and the protection of those?
A. I don't know precisely because that's still in draft form. But it certainly would be possible to include such a provision.
Q. Now, that document is not signed. For some reason, the Applicant and the community of Durham cannot come to an agreement. Does that leave those stone walls unprotected?
A. I can't speak to that directly. But having
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worked with Eversource, I can't imagine that they would not also care for the stone walls within the area of potential effect through that and in the direct area of potential effect. They have been committed to caring for stone walls and have gone a great way with letters signed by Mr. Quinlan himself. So this has not been dealt with at a very low level. It has been done at the highest level of this company. And I just, from my experience working with them, I think they would take that responsibility very carefully, even without a signed agreement. I speak for myself, but --
Q. Sure, sure. Well, and thank you for your opinion.

Although there isn't -- if that document
is not signed, there is no legal obligation and there's no recourse for property owners.
A. I'm not the one who can answer that.
Q. I understand.
A. If there was an adverse effect to a historic property, there might be something that could be done, but...
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
Q. Do you think the Applicant would be amenable to sort of amalgamating all of these various commitments into one condition that would provide the public and the communities and the property owners some reassurance? Right now it does seem sort of a confusing path as to how this is all going to happen.
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

My other stone wall question is these documents seem to address construction. Although, we do know that this project, if constructed, will be in place for some time, there may be need for maintenance on the line long after we're all involved with this project.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Do you know whether the Applicant would be amenable to having some sort of condition that would address operations in the years ahead and how historical resources, and in particular, stone walls, foundations, that type of thing, how they are treated in
operations going forward?
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A. I do not know, and I have not had conversations related to that. So I can't speak to that, no.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. FITZGERALD:
Q. Continuing our tag-team approach, is timber matting, in your experience, a generally accepted method of protection for stone walls that are going to be in the corridor and possibly traversed by equipment and so on?
A. I cannot speak to that as well as perhaps the Division of Historic Resources, which included it in this document. So I bow to their knowledge and experience, certainly with the treatment and care of stone walls since it is certainly one of the most iconic things in New Hampshire landscape.

MR. FITZGERALD: This may have been the subject of the construction panel. But Mr. Needleman, can the Applicant point to a place where there's information on experience with the use of timber matting for stone walls? I know it's used for wetlands in general. But is there anyplace in the Application that has some
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> information on experience in using this for stone walls?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I can't recall off the top of my head if that's somewhere in the record. But we will look and let you know.

MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Can I also add to that request? I think there's some confusion as to what this looks like. We've heard of boards leaning against the stones. I'm picturing a bridge, you know, going up on either side and crossing over and not touching the wall. So I think if we knew what timber matting looked like as it crossed a stone wall, either a picture or a description of that would be helpful. So I'd like to add that to that request as well.

MR. FITZGERALD: I believe there was a picture during some of the discussion with the Construction Panel. So if that could -- if that could be referenced, I believe they're almost like the concrete mattresses. They're articulating. They're just pieces of wood connected together but --
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MR. SCHMIDT: I think they actually bridge the wall.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO obviously there's some confusion here. So perhaps if the Applicant could enlighten us as to the construction of timber matting over a stone wall.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure. I think Mr. Fitzgerald's recollection is correct, that there were pictures. But we'll get them to you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you.

MR. ASLIN: And madam Chair, if I could just direct you. This is Chris.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Yes, Mr. Aslin.

MR. ASLIN: Applicant's 127 has a photograph and discusses this mitigation.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Applicant's 127?
MR. ASLIN: Yeah. So if you look at that, that might help.

MR. FITZGERALD: What page? Oh,
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there's only four pages.
MR. ASLIN: It's only four pages.
But the discussion on stone walls starts on the first page and there's a photo on Page 2.

MS. BROWN: If you don't mind if
Durham Residents Counsel also chimes in. The mats were also referenced on Durham Residents 13 but did not have stone walls.

MR. FITZGERALD: So, based on this picture, it appears the timber mat is actually supported above the wall. Does it apply on the wall directly? Is that the case?
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MR. FITZGERALD: This appears to show that there's blocks or something on either side so that the mat doesn't rest on the wall. Is that -- can you confirm that also?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes, we will do that.
MR. FITZGERALD: 'Cause I believe I heard testimony earlier that it didn't just lay across the wall.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I believe the explanation up there may help. I'm not positive.
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MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Are there any further questions for Ms. Widell? Yes, Director Muzzey.

BY DIR. MUZZEY (CONT'D) :
Q. Sort of on a similar line of thought. We've heard concern from the Town of Durham about some of the small roads, such as Beech Hill Road, and the historic nature of that road. Perhaps its significance in history is part of the Province Road. But the suggestion has been that it will be protected by gravel and then the gravel removed after the construction and where access is no longer needed.

In your experience, have you seen this type of measure used to protect a small, narrow, dirt road such as this one, and how successful was it?
A. No, I have not actually had experience with gravel on a road such as this. I can't speak to that. I'm sorry.
Q. We also heard about the historic quarry in
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
the Durham Point Historic District this morning and concern for a bench that didn't seem to be within the sensitive area that's been defined. And you seem to agree that this aspect of the quarry, as well as the cut ledge that was mentioned, were beyond the sensitive area that's been delineated?
A. Yes. And I have learned from my colleagues that that is part of the discussion of the agreement with the Town of Durham to extend that sensitive area to include that.
Q. Do you know how that would work, how it would be mapped, which sets of maps we've been looking at?
A. I can't speak directly to that. You can see the sensitive area. And Ms. Muzzey, I would assume that that sensitive area would be expanded to include Quarrymen's Bench?
Q. But we don't know if that's beyond the stone wall mapping or the environmental mapping, the construction mapping?
A. It's all in one map, as far as the cultural resources. The stone walls and that sort of sensitive cultural areas are on one map. So
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I would imagine that it would be that one. And those are the Project maps.
Q. Well, I believe we were looking at the environmental mapping this morning when she mentioned that. It was on environmental mapping, not the stone wall mapping. And that also raises a more general question $I$ have. I don't know about other people here on the Committee today, but I have about 12 or 15 exhibits open that cover the various types of maps, the agreements, that cover the very historic nature of this project area. We've seen errors in some of those maps, whether boundaries are incorrect or data layers are used to identify where historic districts are. And I do have a concern how this will all get wrapped up into something where environmental managers that may be trained but don't have a cultural resources background will be out in the field trying to make sure all of these very good ideas are actually implemented.

Again, in your experience, can you think of a more straightforward tool or process
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that could be used with this project in order to ensure all this diverse information is actually implemented in an efficient and accurate way?
A. Well, $I$ have to agree with you that those corrections that we talked about need to be made. And then in reviewing these plans in the training program, $I$ think will, and using them on a regular basis will, they need to be ready for that process. And the materials that are used for the training will be reviewed, I'm sure, by the Division of Historic Resources. And I think that that would be an excellent check to make sure that those things have been incorporated into the documents.
Q. It was not my understanding that the Division of Historic Resources had a role to play in the training of field staff.
A. I can't imagine that there wouldn't be some role as far as -- because it is the chief archeologist that would be called if there's some unanticipated discovery. So I would think there would be some coordination in
[WITNESS: WIDELL]
that training program.
Q. If that is not present -- well, I wouldn't want to commit a state agency into stretching its resources in this situation --
A. Fair enough.
Q. -- so I'm going to stop my questioning on that topic right here.
A. Fair enough. But through the -- Eversource has had an outstanding cultural resources manager. I believe they're in the process of hiring a new one because the Division of Historic Resources now has that individual. So I can't imagine that individual would not be in a position of responsibility and obligation to make sure that the documents accurately reflect the location of the sensitive areas and the stone walls and make sure that that is properly done.
Q. Thank you.

Just a question about the transition
structure at the Frink Farm in Newington. We have a couple of visual simulations that have been created. One is in the effects tables, Page 88 of Exhibit 164, and then one is in
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the, actually, the Visual Assessment for Aesthetics, Exhibit 142, Page 19. And in those views, and I know they're simulated views, it appears that the transition structure is not within the tree line. It appears to be in front of the tree line in an area that is potentially more visible.
A. It is definitely intended to be placed 100 feet back -- and that's in the effects tables -- from the edge of the wood line there on the corridor. If it doesn't exactly show that, that is the placement of it.
Q. And that was 100 feet back into the wooded corridor?
A. Hmm-hmm. Corridor, yes.
Q. Thank you. And I believe you said this morning that you had recommended that vegetation be placed, was it along Nimble Hill Road, to potentially block the view of that transition structure?
A. Yes. In one portion Nimble Hill Road is actually vegetated for most of it going along the east-end edge of the Frink Farm. There are a couple of locations where there are
[WITNESS: WIDELL]

88
openings. They're not very wide, but they are almost directly across from the view down that corridor. So I had recommended to Eversource that they consider placing some vegetation in those couple areas where there is no vegetation.
Q. And do you know whether the property owners agreed with that or --
A. I do not know that.
Q. So that's not really a mitigation measure in place --
A. No.
Q. -- at the moment.
A. No, it was not indicated. It's not on the effects tables. But it was a recommendation that I provided to the Company.
Q. Was there any consideration of vegetative screening closer to the actual structure?
A. I don't know if that's possible, no. I certainly did not do that.
Q. We also had some discussion this morning about the stone walls that appear to be between the Frink and Pickering Farms. They would therefore cross the utility
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right-of-way. Is that your understanding of those walls as well?
A. No. I am not sure of the location of the photograph that Ms. Frink showed this morning. They do not appear to be in the right-of-way. They appear to be on the south side of the right-of-way separating the Frink Farm and the Alfred Pickering Farm. That appeared to be the location, but I do not know precisely.
Q. So they may be walls that don't have a treatment plan yet prepared for them?
A. That's possible. They're boundary walls. It's a boundary wall as well, yeah.
Q. And we don't have a process yet in place if that type of thing comes up?
A. No, there is an agreement letter for those that are in the area of potential effect. And the boundary wall, there is an existing state law, that if there's any effect between, the property owners must be consulted.
Q. And what was the letter you had mentioned?
A. There is a letter with the Town of Newington
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with Eversource that specifically identifies the walls in Newington that would be cared for through the Project. It is attached to my testimony. I can tell you --
Q. But we don't know if this wall was part of that letter.
A. I do not know that. That's right, yes.
Q. All right. Thank you. I think that is all my questions. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Attorney Needleman.
Attorney Iacopino, do you have any questions?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Nothing else from the Committee?
Attorney Needleman, redirect.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: So, Director Muzzey, you had mentioned the multiple maps. And I think that Ms. Allen, when she was testifying, indicated that they would all be combined and updated prior to the start of construction. We can confirm that.
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## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Ms. Widell, let me start with some questions that Mr. Patch asked you earlier. With regard to the MOU that we talked about, he asked questions about involvement of consulting parties. And you initially said that the consulting parties here were Durham and in Newington, and I think you corrected that later when you were talking to Mr . Fitzgerald. But just to be clear, who are the actual consulting parties?
A. The Frink Family and the Town of Newington.
Q. And to your knowledge, did Durham request consulting party status?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. They had the opportunity to do so; is that right?
A. Yes. Pretty much anyone that has an interest in a project, yes.
Q. And are you aware of the fact that, even though Durham didn't request consulting party status, they had the opportunity to comment on both MOUs, and in fact did so?
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A. Yes, I believe they did. Yes.
Q. Can you describe for the Committee your understanding of the efforts that DHR and Corps made here during this entire process to solicit public input and provide opportunities for the public to participate?
A. Well, as I said earlier, both the Corps and DHR have a responsibility to invite the public to participate in looking at identification, the assessment, the agreement documents, and through e-mails and the public meeting minutes and notifications have seen extensive work by the federal and state agency to bring in the public. And that is recorded in the agreement documents in the "whereas" clauses.
Q. Let me go back to stone walls again. This was again an issue that Mr . Patch raised. And he asked you about the difference between the list of stone walls that the Durham Historic Association came up with versus the narrower list of stone walls included in the MOU. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
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Q. And am I correct that in layman's terms, there's the universe of stone walls and then there's a narrower subset which are historic stone walls? Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's the historic stone walls that are included within the MOU; is that correct?
A. Yes. And specifically, in the two historic districts, Durham Point and Newmarket and Bennett Road.
Q. And so those other stone walls that are not considered historic stone walls, are you aware of whether there are generally any regulatory obligations that relate to those walls?
A. No, other than boundary walls where there's a requirement if there's an effect, to talk to the property owners.
Q. But notwithstanding that, those additional stone walls in Durham are going to be included in this MOU that the Applicant and Durham are working on. Is that your understanding?
A. Yes. As I stated earlier, Eversource is
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going way beyond, frankly, their responsibilities to include care for those stone walls during the construction work within the area of potential effect where they might be directly affected.
Q. Mr. Patch asked you, and others have asked you about the granite quarry site and the stone bench there. And he asked you about the expansion of the flagging, and I think Ms. Muzzey asked you about that as well. Is it correct that that is another topic that is going to be addressed in the Durham MOU, and in fact, I believe Durham and the Applicant have agreed to the expansion of that as Durham wants? Is that your understanding?
A. Yes, that is my understanding.
Q. And we'll turn to that later.

So I want to ask you a couple questions related to what Ms. Boepple was talking about. She asked you about the Knights Brook corridor. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Put a description up. And according to her description, I think it included the Frink
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property. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the description ended by saying that every effort should be made to preserve this open space. Do you remember it saying that?
A. Yes.
Q. In your opinion, is the Project as proposed consistent with that goal?
A. It definitely fulfills that goal and does expand open space within that field behind Frink Farm in a way that it hasn't had since I believe 1948 when those distribution lines were placed there.
Q. So, going back to that for a minute. If the Project is approved as proposed, the distribution lines currently in the Frink field would be removed; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So in that case, is it your opinion that this proposal is not only consistent with the goal, but actually advances it?
A. It does advance it, yes.
Q. We talked quickly about the signatures of the MOU. And I think you said that you believed
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that Newington did have the opportunity to sign the MOU; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree that Newington has had extensive opportunity for involvement in this historic assessment process here?
A. Yes. From the materials I have seen, yes.
Q. I want to go to some questions that Mr. Aslin asked you a few minutes ago.

I think he began his questioning by asking you about your criticism of Ms. O'Donnell's testimony, and in particular, about your view that her definition of "historic sites" was overly broad. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Regarding that criticism, Ms. O'Donnell included things in her definition of "historic resources" like "current use properties," for example; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, and she also included I think other types of properties that you felt didn't meet the definition of "historic resources"; is
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that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So, setting aside the disagreement that you have with Ms. O'Donnell, was there ever a point in this process where DHR indicated to you that you should expand your analysis to include current use properties?
A. No.
Q. Was there ever a point in the process where DHR indicated that the way in which you were identifying historic resources was too narrow, or did they criticize that approach?
A. No.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I want to call up Applicant's Exhibit 224, if we could, Dawn. BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. This is a May 31st, 2016 DHR letter. And in this letter, about halfway down, it indicates that the resource identification process is essentially complete, subject to one other form being submitted. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And so this is DHR's indication that you completed that process. And in making that
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indication, they actually specifically refer to RSA 162-H:7, IV. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it your understanding that $162-\mathrm{H}$ is actually the New Hampshire state law that governs this siting process?
A. Yes.
Q. So did you understand that DHR believed that you had correctly identified historic resources under the siting process?
A. Yes, most definitely.
Q. And then just -- well, we'll go to the next one. So let me turn to stone walls again. I want to clarify something.

You at one point answered a question about stone walls in relation to the MOU, I think it was Ms. Muzzey's question, and said that Eversource in the MOU had committed to avoidance for five years. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I want to turn your attention to Section D. 2 of the MOU. And we don't need to put it up. But that's actually not correct. There
is no limitation on the amount of time that Eversource will avoid stone walls in the corridor under the MOU; is that correct?
A. I am corrected.
Q. And finally, $I$ guess it's not a question for you but a representation. Ms. Muzzey asked what happens if the Durham MOU is not executed. And Eversource, I can represent that Eversource would be willing to have all of the conditions of the MOU that have been agreed to thus far made conditions of the Certificate even if we don't ultimately agree on those last few. And when Mr. Selig testifies later, we'll understand what the "last few" are.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Nothing further.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you.

MR. FITZGERALD: Madam Chair. If I could just ask Mr. Needleman?

There was one point today where I believe Ms. Frink indicated a problem in one of the maps identifying the proximity of the Frink Farm to the historic district. Can you
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have someone take a look into that and see and give us feedback on whether that's accurately portrayed on the map or if there's a problem that needs to be resolved there? MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure. Yes. My recollection is it was already covered. I think it was pointed out when Ms. Allen testified. And I believe Ms. Allen agreed with Ms. Widell that the historic district representation needed to be extended over further on the map. And I think that's one of the number of corrections to the maps that we understand needs to be made before they're finalized so that they're all accurate.

MR. FITZGERALD: I wish I could remember that far back.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, somebody sent me an e-mail a few minutes ago, so...

MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank
you, Ms. Widell, for your testimony.
WITNESS WIDELL: Thank you very much
for the opportunity to do that today.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Let's
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take a break, and we'll come back at quarter of four. At that time Mr. Selig will be our next witness. I think it's highly unlikely Mr. Hebert will be reached today, but we will get to Mr. Selig. Thank you. (Brief recess was taken at 3:34 p.m., and the hearing resumed at 3:50 p.m.) PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Let's get started. If the witness could be sworn in, please.
(WHEREUPON, TODD SELIG was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.) PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Attorney Patch. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PATCH:
Q. Mr. Selig, could you please state your name and your address for the record, and your position.
A. Yes. My name is Todd Selig. I'm the administrator with the Town of Durham, New Hampshire. I live in Durham, at 3 Nobel $K$ Peterson Drive.
Q. If you could pull your microphone a little
closer, too, so we can hear you.
How long have you been in that position?
A. I'm in my 18th year as the administrator for the Town of Durham.
Q. And could you give the Committee just a brief summary of your qualifications.
A. Yes. I've been in the public sector doing either municipal or school administration for the last 25 years. I'm originally from Laconia, New Hampshire. I have a bachelor's degree in history and medieval renaissance studies from Syracuse University and a master's degree in public administration from the University of New Hampshire. In addition to that, I've done some specialized study programs at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. I've done two of those.
Q. And you submitted prefiled testimony in this docket, dated July 28th of 2017, which, along with the four attachments, has been marked as TD-UNH Exhibit 1; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections to that
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testimony?
A. I do not.
Q. And if you were asked the same questions contained in that exhibit today, would your answers be the same?
A. They would.
Q. During this morning's testimony and this afternoon, actually, in fact, there has been some -- there have been some references to an MOU between Durham and Eversource. Are you familiar with that?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Madam Chair, I
object. This is additional direct examination and it's not appropriate.

MR. PATCH: Mr. Needleman asked questions about the MOU of Mr. Bowes. I can cite you the specific place in the testimony. If you'd prefer, if you want to ask questions about it. But there have been some misrepresentations this morning about the MOU and the status of it, so we were trying to be helpful to the Committee. But it's really up to you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I'll
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sustain the objection. If it does come up in cross, you can address it again on redirect. MR. PATCH: Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. PATCH:
Q. And Mr. Selig, did you take some pictures of Little Bay?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection. This is just additional direct examination. I don't think it's appropriate.

MR. PATCH: There's an exhibit that we offered, which we presented yesterday to Mr . Raphael, and I wanted to substantiate that he took those pictures.

MR. IACOPINO: Exhibit 25?
MR. PATCH: Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: The objection's overruled. You may continue.

BY MR. PATCH:
Q. Are you familiar with the pictures that we have put in as Exhibit 25, TD-UNH 25?
A. I am, yes.
Q. And did you take those pictures?
A. I did take those pictures.
Q. And when did you take them?
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A. I took them on the late afternoon/early evening of Friday, October 5th, 2018. They were taken at approximately 4:30 p.m.
Q. And we also introduced an Exhibit No. 26 which shows the tidal chart for that day. Are you familiar with that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that essentially shows you took the pictures during, it was approximately low tide?
A. Yes, that's correct. Low tide was around 3:30 that day, and the earliest we could get out on the water was 4:00, which got us out to the location at 4:30.
Q. Okay.

MR. PATCH: I would like to ask him more questions, but my sense is you don't want to hear them.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: That's correct.

MR. PATCH: Thank you.
WITNESS SELIG: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: First
cross-examiner will be Attorney Geiger from the
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}

Town of Newington.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Selig. For the record, my name is Susan Geiger, and I represent the Town of Newington. I'd like to ask you a couple of questions about those photographs that have been marked as TD-UNH Exhibit 25. Are they photographs of Little Bay along the approximate location of the proposed crossing by this project?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. And why did you take those photographs?
A. I thought it would be important to get out on the water once more with all of the most recent information to ascertain the potential impacts to the shoreline and the estuary, both on the Newington side and on the Durham side. I thought that by doing so, I could help this Committee understand what it's like out on the bay and potential impacts. You've heard a lot from abutters, you've heard from citizens, you've heard from the Applicant, and you've heard from intervenors. But I
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thought it might be useful to get firsthand feedback from me in a timely way in the midst of the proceedings.

So I arranged the tour with the Great Bay Waterkeeper. And unfortunately, her boat broke down, and so we obtained a ride with Fred Short, who's a professor scientist at the Jackson Lab Estuary at the University of New Hampshire. And he brought myself and the Great Bay Waterkeeper, Melissa Paly, and town engineer, April Talon, out. And we spent about two hours on the water looking at both sides, Newington and Durham, the middle channel, trying to gauge aesthetic impacts as well as natural impacts to the Project. And we also spent a little time on the Little Bay and went around the corner into the Great Bay as well to evaluate the difference between the two areas.
Q. Mr. Selig, I'm going to show you the first photograph in TD-UNH Exhibit 25. Could you please explain what that depicts.
A. Yes. So if you look on the far left side --
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
> and it looks as though it's been cut off of
this particular image -- the far left is the cable house on the Newington side of the bay. That's the historic cable house. And I thought it would be helpful to get a sense of what it looked like on the Newington shoreline. And I have a host of other photographs. Some of them proceed farther to the right where the shoreline is significantly more natural. This is really the most developed part of the Newington side. And what you can see are some homes along the route dock and the approximate location of where the proposed concrete mats and exit point from the bay would be of this project if it was approved.
Q. I know it's hard for you sitting there, but could you please -- I'm not going to try to point to it because I'm not exactly sure I know, but --
A. I believe it would be --- there's a white house that's sort of left of center, and it would be left of that in that clearing of trees. That's approximately the location.
Q. Now, turning to the second photograph that $I$
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have in the same exhibit, TD-UNH 25, could you please explain what this is.
A. I can. This was taken to show how shallow it was from a vantage point of one of the other photographs that you probably have there. There's a second photo as well that shows a crab crawling on the ground. And there's a photograph of an oar with mud on it, and there's the oar. And in essence, at this point, which is again an hour off of low tide, approximately, there was about 9 inches of water below us in this location. And if you show the tall picture, which is sort of -- thank you. That's it. And if you -can you rise, go the other way? Yeah, a little bit farther to the very bottom. You can see the bottom left corner is the gunnel of our boat, okay. And now you can see it's quite shallow in this location. And now, again, if you slide the photograph down so we can see the shoreline, you can see how far we are from the shore.

Now, the white building you see here is the property that Eversource purchased on the
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}

Durham side of the shoreline. And you can't really see it here. It's in shadow. But between that white house and the shoreline is the historic brick cable house on the Durham side. But this gives you a sense of how rural that shoreline is on the Durham side. And here is the brick cable house with the white home above that Eversource purchased. You can also see the historic distribution line stanchion or poles which were used to support the line that went underneath the bay, which is no longer operable at this time.

So it gives the Committee, I think, a sense of what this shoreline is like. And in my opinion, it's contradictory to what we've heard from Mr. Raphael, in terms of the, quote, unquote, moderate scenic value of the Little Bay. I would disagree with that assessment.
Q. Mr. Selig, have you personally visited this area before October 15th of this year?
A. Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Madam Chair, I'm
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going to object at this for two reasons: This is friendly cross-examination, and it's an example of aligned parties eliciting testimony from each other that's not at all adverse. And it's also an example of testimony and material that could have and should have previously been included before this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: YOu want to address that?

MS. GEIGER: This is a new exhibit that the Town of Newington had not seen until TD-UNH had marked it, and we felt it was appropriate to ask some questions about it to give the Committee a better understanding of Mr. Selig's position on this matter. If the Committee doesn't believe this line of questioning is helpful, then I'll move on. (Discussion off the record between Presiding Officer and SEC Counsel.) PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I'm going to sustain the objection and ask you to move on.

MS. GEIGER: Okay. I'll ask a different question then.
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BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Mr. Selig, along the corridors of Little Bay, do you understand that this project will involve the placement of concrete mattresses along the shores?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you believe that the placement of concrete mattresses along the shores of Little Bay will impact that resource and recreation?
A. I do. I also, based upon my visit on the 5th of October, was struck by how shallow the estuary is along the tidal flats. And in reviewing the photographs of the jet plow barges that Eversource has provided in the past as part of this docket, I'm questioning how close that barge realistically can get to the shoreline. And I am concerned that the 20-foot wide by 30 -foot long, for example, estimate of the impact on the Durham side may be significantly understated. I suspect because of the depth that it will be necessary for the diving hand digging to be done to a more significant degree than what
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has been represented. And I have a concern that the impact may be greater than what we are lead to believe today.
Q. Mr. Selig, did the Eversource visual impact expert, Mr. Raphael, speak with you or other representatives at the Town of Durham as part of his evaluation of potential aesthetic impacts of this project?
A. He did not. And I'm very concerned and perceive that as a shortcoming in this process. Neither Mr. Raphael nor the historic expert we just heard from contacted the Town of Durham in advance to get our opinions and perspectives about this project. We are in the very best-situated position to provide very objective information and granular information about what's most important to our community, both in terms of what our Master Plan aspires to achieve, ongoing issues that we deal with on a daily basis to try to preserve the natural beauty and aesthetics and scenic quality of our community and the history. And it's very unfortunate and an oversight in the process.
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Q. Now, in the Town of Durham, when new proposed development on the Bay or on the Lamprey or Oyster Rivers is being considered, do developers of new projects evaluate those projects' impacts only from roadways, or do they do so from the shores of Little Bay?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Madam Chair, same objection. I think this is also beyond the scope of any of his testimony.

MS. GEIGER: It's my intent here to get Mr. Selig's input on behalf of the Town of Durham on his assessment of the Project's impacts.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I think it is beyond the scope of his testimony. I'll sustain the objection.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. I believe there had been some testimony in the past about scenic roads. Are there scenic roads in Durham?
A. We have a number of scenic roads, yes.
Q. Do you know the process by which those roads are designated as scenic by the Town of Durham or any other town in the state of New \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}

Hampshire?
A. I do. Scenic roads are something that are taken very seriously by townspeople, not only in Durham and Newington, but across the state of New Hampshire. Typically, if people live on an older road and there are attractive stone walls and lovely trees, old-growth-type trees, many times the residents there want to ensure that the trees are not cut down on a willy-nilly basis and that the walls are preserved. So, in a community, the state statutes says, I believe it's ten voters or ten people -- you do not necessarily have to be a registered voter. You can be a property owner on the road -- can petition the board of selectmen to place a warrant article on the town meeting to designate a road as a statutorily designated scenic road.

In Durham, we have a town council. We no longer have a town meeting. We have a nine-member council that has both governing and legislative authority. But in Durham, in 1970, Durham Point Road was designated as a scenic road by our town meeting, when we
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still had a town meeting. And what that means is that any trees that are 4 feet or more off the ground and have a girth of 15 inches cannot be cut except by permission from the local planning board or another appropriately designated board by the town meeting. And so in Durham, that board is the planning board, the Durham Planning Board. And anytime somebody wants to do adjustments to a stone wall or do cutting, they have to come before the planning board to do so. In fact, at this very time, Eversource is before the Durham Planning Board seeking permission to do some cutting on Durham roads that are scenic roads. And the planning board is going through a process right now of evaluating the policies we have in place to ensure that the cutting is not too extreme, because the people who live along these roads want to ensure that the aesthetic qualities, the scenic beauty of the roadway which drew them to purchase property on that roadway, remain intact. And these scenic road designations can sometimes be the bane of
existence for a local road agent or public works director because it can often seem plain as day that a tree needs to come down because it's a problem with plowing or a concern in one way or another, and the residents on that road often will disagree -MS. DUPREY: Madam Chair, excuse me. Madam Chair, this explanation is non-responsive to the question that was asked, which was process. It's gone on for five minutes now on this.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Right. Mr. Selig, if I could refocus you.
A. Sure.
Q. Perhaps I could truncate this a little bit. Would you agree that RSA 231:157 outlines a process by which a town may designate a road as a scenic road in New Hampshire? Would you agree with that?
A. I would, yes.
Q. Thank you.
A. Yes. And my comments were simply to explain that in fact --

MS. DUPREY: Enough, enough. Thank
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you.
A. -- we care a lot about these scenic roads and designate them for a reason.
Q. Now, is this project visible from scenic roads in Durham?
A. It is.
Q. And which roads are those?
A. Bennett Road and Durham Point Road.
Q. Are there other scenic roadways in Durham other than those two?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Madam Chair. This is friendly cross and simply elaborating on testimony that's already in or should have been in.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: This is also beyond the scope of his testimony. He had no testimony about scenic roads.

MS. GEIGER: One last question, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Please go ahead.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Mr. Selig, has the Town of Durham expended resources to participate in this process?
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A. We have. We've expended $\$ 239,000$ to date on both environmental consultants to vet the proposed crossing of the bay and on legal fees.
Q. Why did the Town do that?
A. Because we care deeply about these resources.
Q. Thank you. I have no further questions.

MS. GEIGER: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Next
examiner will be Attorney Irwin or the Conservation Law Foundation.

I will say that probably sometime during Attorney Irwin's cross-examination I will be leaving, and leaving you in the capable hands of Attorney Schulock as chair. But I will indeed, of course, read the transcript of whatever takes place after I leave.

Please proceed.
MR. IRWIN: Thank you, Madam Chair.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. IRWIN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Selig. For the record, I'm Tom Irwin. I represent the Conservation
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Law Foundation.
A. Hello.
Q. Referring to your prefiled testimony, specifically TD-UNH Exhibit 1, on Page 5, starting at Line 6, you start a discussion about the ecological issues that Little Bay is facing. And in the context of that discussion, specifically starting at Line 9, you reference the 2013 State of the Estuaries Report, published by the Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership. Am I correct that you have a role in the Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership?
A. I am. I'm on the management committee, which essentially is the board of directors for the PREP.
Q. And what exactly is the Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership, or PREP?
A. It is a partnership essentially that is established under the National Estuarine Research Program, which falls under the United States Environmental Protection Agency. And the goal is to provide resources and community regional collaboration around
an important national resource. And the Great Bay Estuary is considered an estuary of national significance. So the Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership was established many years ago to bring together a variety of stakeholders with different interests -economic, social, aesthetics, environmental -- to evaluate the health of the estuary and to put in place strategies to improve the health of the estuary, because unfortunately the estuary is an impaired water body. It's at risk.
Q. And as referenced, your testimony specifically references and includes as an attachment the 2013 State of the Estuaries Report. Does PREP -- does the Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership periodically prepare these reports to inform the public on the state of the estuary data trends?
A. They do. There's a five-year cycle. And at the time of my testimony submittal in 2017, PREP was in the process of updating the State of the Estuaries Report. And in 2018, this year, PREP came out with a new report, an
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updated report, that confirms that the estuary is still in peril. The estuary -PREP established a variety of indicators which outlined ways in which we can understand the health of the estuary is in decline. And those include things such as total suspended solids, nutrient loading, nitrogen concentration, phytoplankton concentration, seaweeds, dissolved oxygen levels, eelgrass in particular -- that's a very important measure -- bacteria and toxic contaminants, among many other things. And I see you have a copy of the report there.
Q. Yes. I'm showing what's been marked as CLF Exhibit 22, which is the 2018 State of the Estuaries Report.

So, in your testimony referencing the 2013 report, you mentioned indicators that PREP applied and determined that out of 16 environmental indicators, 12 either had negative or cautionary trends.
A. That's correct.
Q. Are you familiar with the 2018 State of Our Estuaries Report and the extent to which
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those indicators changed?
A. The 2018 report expanded the number of indicators to try to better explain for our constituent audience in the Seacoast and across New Hampshire ways in which the estuary is in peril and ways in which we can measure whether there are improvements. And the good news in this report was that there was progress in preserving more land for conservation. There have been improvements to a number of the wastewater treatments plants and all of the sewer communities that empty into the bay. And the EPA and the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services are in an ongoing process to continue to improve the effluent outflow from those wastewater communities, in particular, trying to reduce the amount of nitrogen that's being deposited into the bay. And the communities surrounding the bay have spent millions of dollars over the last several years to address this very important issue.

But they've looked as well at the shellfish beds. And we've seen an increase
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in those. But again, unfortunately, eelgrass is continuing to be in a very tenuous position. And for those who don't know, eelgrass is essentially the linchpin to the health of the estuary. The grass provides a safe place for small fish to thrive and for larger fish to hunt for them and for other mammals and things to come and hunt those creatures. And so a healthy estuary is very important to the ecosystem of the entire region, and the rivers that empty into the bay as well.
Q. So just a quick question about the page that I have up on the projector right now. This is Page 12 of the 2018 State of Our Estuaries Report. It's an Indicator Summary. If you could, for the Committee's benefit, just briefly describe, or I can walk us through it, the large orange circle contains a number of indicators indicating cautionary trends; is that correct?
A. Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Madam
Chair. The original report was attached to his
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testimony. I think if he wanted to attach an updated version and explain any issues of importance to the Town, he could have done so. This just sounds like repetitive friendly cross.

MR. IRWIN: Madam Chair, I have no control over what testimony this witness provides or has provided. What I'm doing is bringing his testimony up to date with more current information. I would agree this would be friendly cross. It's duplicative if I were going through this process with the 2013 report, which the Committee already has. This is additional information, more current information that will benefit the Committee.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: If the witness wanted to update his testimony in July with this report, he could have done so and should have done so.

MR. IRWIN: This is not my witness. WITNESS SELIG: I can see the health of the estuary is still very --

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Just a minute. Mr. Selig, hold on just a minute.
(Discussion off the record between Presiding Officer and SEC Counsel.)

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I'm going to allow the testimony and overrule the objection. This is a change of -- there certainly was a lot of testimony about the state of the estuary, and there has been some new information. You may ask him about it.

MR. IRWIN: Thank you, Madam Chair.
BY MR. IRWIN:
Q. So, Mr. Selig, the indicators in the orange circle are indicated as cautionary trends for the estuary; is that correct?
A. Well, my color may not be the same as yours. So the indicators in the large, $I$ view this as yellow, are cautionary; the indicators in the orange are negative; and the indicators in the blue shows some positive movement. So the news wasn't all bad in the 2018 State of our Estuaries Report, but there are still significant concerns. And at the local level, we're all working very hard to address them.
Q. Thank you.
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And would you agree, Mr. Selig, that the State of the Estuaries Report in this case, the 2018 State of the Estuaries Report, is the most recent, accurate and most comprehensive assessment of the state of the Great Bay Estuary?
A. It is, yes.
Q. Thank you.

So you mentioned today and in your prefiled testimony investments that municipalities have made. What investments, and to the extent you can talk about specific dollars, has the Town of Durham made in upgrading or optimizing the operation of its wastewater treatment facility?
A. Sure. The Town of Durham, so the Committee understands, handles the wastewater flow both from the Town of Durham and the University of New Hampshire. And so our treatment plant processes about 1.2 or 1.3 million gallons a day of sewerage. And we spend approximately half a million dollars a year on upgrades to the plant on an ongoing basis to try to improve our effluent quality so that we
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reduce the amount of nitrogen and other harmful matters that we're releasing into the Oyster River which flows into the bay.
Q. Mr. Selig, are you aware of investments that the towns of Newmarket and Exeter have made in their wastewater treatment facilities?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Relevance.
A. I am.

MR. IRWIN: This goes to further information. I am not asking this witness to rehash what he has provided in his prefiled testimony. I am looking to elicit additional information for the benefit of the Committee about investments that municipalities are making to protect this resource. And I would add, this will be about two minutes worth of questioning.
(Discussion off the record between Presiding Officer and SEC Counsel.)

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I'm going to sustain the objection.

BY MR. IRWIN:
Q. Mr. Selig, can you speak to the investments
that the Town of Durham has made in stormwater management?
A. Again, the Town of Durham and the University of New Hampshire work together in terms of addressing stormwater to comply with our federal permits. And we have made ongoing investments over the last five years to improve what we do. That includes sweeping the streets on a regular basis to get material off the streets because that eventually will run into our catch basins, into our rivers and into the bay. We also have been improving outfalls and storm drains and spend approximately $\$ 40-$ to $\$ 70,000$ a year on those activities to try to make those improvements on an ongoing basis. We've also had to improve our tracking of what we are doing. We've worked to try to -- well, I'll stop there.
Q. Thank you.

MR. IRWIN: I guess, Madam Chair, to preserve this issue, I guess I'd like -- the objection was sustained. On what basis? I'd like to preserve the right to argue that I
should be able to ask questions that go beyond the substance of his prefiled testimony. It's related to it, such as impacts and municipal investments, but that is not locked into his testimony. I believe this witness, over whom I have no control, is not my witness, has additional information that goes to matters such as the types of investments that municipalities have made to protect this resource, the priority that the communities are making to protect this resource. And I believe I should be able to ask those questions.
(Discussion off the record between
Presiding Officer and SEC Counsel.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO that information which you wish elicit from this witness is not really relevant for this Committee. What we're charged -- the fact that towns have made investments to help the bay improve its water quality is not directly related to what this committee needs finds as to the impact of the Project on the bay.

MR. IRWIN: Okay. Thank you. I
appreciate that clarification. Thank you.
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BY MR. IRWIN:
Q. Mr. Selig, I assume during the course of this proceeding you've heard testimony about concrete mattresses?
A. I have.
Q. Does the Town still have concerns with the potential installation of concrete mattresses?
A. We do.
Q. Have those concerns increased from information that you've learned during the course of this proceeding as to the number of concrete mattresses that might be used?
A. We suspect the number of concrete mattresses that will be ultimately required because of the shallow depth of the crossing are underestimated by the Applicant.
Q. And do you have concerns that the installation of concrete mattresses may interfere with the public's use and enjoyment of Little Bay, including, but not limited to, residents of Durham?
A. Yes.
Q. You've also heard, I assume, during the
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course of this proceeding additional
information about horizontal directional drilling?
A. Yes.
Q. In your prefiled testimony at Page 8, Lines 17 to 19, you state that the fact that HDD could be technically challenging should not trump the negative impact of the proposed plan to Little Bay.

Since the time of your prefiled
testimony, and having heard additional
information and analyses from the Applicant
about the feasibility of horizon directional
drilling, has the Town's position on HDD changed?
A. It has not. We still believe that the SEC should have its own impartial analysis done on the HDD alternative so that we can have an unbiased perspective.

MR. IRWIN: Thank you. I have nothing further.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: We'll
next hear from the Durham Residents, Attorney Brown .
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MS. BROWN: I know we requested 15 minutes, but hopefully we can get it done in five or less, or more.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. BROWN:
Q. Mr. Selig, in your prefiled testimony, which is marked as Town of Durham-UNH Exhibit 1, you mentioned that you had attended a number of meetings. And so first question we have is do you know when the Applicant first notified the Town of Durham of the Project in relation to those meetings?
A. I do. Take me a moment to find it, but I do. (Witness reviews document.)
A. It was on 11/22/13. So, November 22, 2013.
Q. Thank you. I didn't know you had a specific date. Thank you.

Now, was this before -- or did you attend a meeting with the Applicant that was held at the Durham High School?
A. I did.
Q. And was this before that? Was this 2013 date before that meeting at the high school?
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A. It was long before that meeting at the high school, yes.
Q. Okay. Were some of those meetings on negotiations to resolve concerns?
A. Well, the initial contact was from representatives from Eversource who met with myself and our public works director and our town planner, again, in November of 2013. And the purpose of the meeting was to let us know that they, Eversource, perceived, believed, had concluded that there was a power problem in the Seacoast, and working through ISO-New England had determined that it was important to bring additional power to the coast because the -- I don't have the terminology, and I apologize -- the maximum, the peak demand was already being exceeded during certain times during very hot days or very cold days.
Q. I appreciate the explanation of what the content of those meetings were. I'm just trying to get the timing of them.
A. Right. So that initial meeting was intended to inform us that they were working on a \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
solution. They had looked at three or four, I think four different alternatives -- a northern route, a southern route, a route that came through Durham, and then in addition there was a transformer alternative in Newington that they looked at. And based on their review at that time, and working with ISO New England, they thought that probably the Durham route would be the route they were favoring at that time. But they had no information about what that entailed. We didn't have information about pole heights or how the bay would be crossed. All that was to come. And we didn't hear from Eversource again --

MR. SCHULOCK: Mr. Selig, can I
interrupt you for a second?
WITNESS SELIG: Yes, yes.
MR. SCHULOCK: Ms. Brown, would you
repeat your question, because I believe his answer is non-responsive.

MS. BROWN: The answer -- or the question was $I$ wanted the timing of when he first learned of the -- or when he was first
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approached by the Applicant and when they commenced negotiations. And his explanation appears to be explaining that they didn't start negotiations because these were preliminary. I believe that's the context. But if you want him to tighten it up to my request --

MR. SCHULOCK: Yes, please.
A. So Eversource returned to brief us on where they were in January of 2015. So, a little more than a year went by while Eversource worked on their project. And when they returned, Eversource and representatives from Durham, and eventually UNH, met with Eversource to try to work through concerns we had regarding the Project.
Q. Okay. If I could --
A. And we had probably 30 or so meetings. We had a lot of meetings. I think Eversource has a tally of the number of meetings with Durham, and they have 34 meetings listed.
Q. And you're referring to a list. Do you have an exhibit number on that?
A. APP EX 214.
Q. Thank you. So next question is at what point \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
did the Town of Durham understand that the Project is as it is now?
A. Well, the Project was not exactly as it is now. There were numerous modifications that were made in discussions with Durham and UNH.
Q. And were those modifications as a result of negotiations?
A. They were a result of discussions about concerns we had.

And to answer your prior question, Eversource held a pre-application and public information session, open house, at the high school in Durham, at 55 Coe Drive, on April 22nd, 2015. And Durham televised that session.
Q. Was that public information session a meeting that the public could comment at?
A. It was a meeting the public could hear about the Project at. But there was not, as I recall, the ability for the public to provide much feedback.
Q. Okay. And that was a meeting that you attended, not that the Town sponsored it. But you were just attending the Applicant's
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meeting; is that fair to say?
A. Yes. There were several parts of that meeting. I don't want to be non-responsive. So cut me off if that's not what you want to know.

There were several -- that meeting was an interesting meeting. It was -- there was a portion of the room that was set up a little bit like a trade show venue -MS. DUPREY: We're into now the non-responsive territory.

WITNESS SELIG: Okay. That's fine.
BY MS. BROWN:
Q. So is it also fair to say that the Town did not have any input on whether the testimony from residents could be offered at that public information session?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr. Chair. This feels like friendly cross again.

MS. BROWN: Want me to rephrase the question?

MR. SCHULOCK: Yes, please.
BY MS. BROWN:
Q. Mr. Selig, at this public hearing or public
meeting that you're talking about at the high school, you did not have any input as to whether the public could comment; is that fair then?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection. This all relates to material that happened years ago and could have and should have been included in his testimony if it was important to him. This is just aligned parties eliciting additional information from each other.

MR. IACOPINO: We have as part of the record the transcript of this, I believe. Wasn't that submitted? This is the meeting of April 7th, 2015, something like that.

WITNESS SELIG: April 22nd, 2015.
MR. IACOPINO: April 22nd. So we have the transcript of that meeting in our record.

MS. BROWN: Yeah, I will rephrase the question, because we're trying to parse out when the Town was involving the public or not. And Mr. Selig has referenced that he has held meetings, and we're trying to understand the nature of those.
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BY MS. BROWN:
Q. So then, did the Town have public meetings on its own that it sponsored where it discussed the Project and where the public could comment?
A. Yes.
Q. And what time period did those start?
A. The Town invited Eversource to participate in a public forum at the town hall in Durham on June 22nd of 2015. And we had a panel of Eversource representatives who spent three or four hours answering questions from concerned Durham residents. We had a very well-attended meeting.

And then, in addition, on July 22nd, 2015, Durham organized a bus tour of the route. And we filmed that on our local PEG station. And interested residents were able to come. And we aired those -- we aired the tour on TV.
Q. And so are both of those meetings that the Town noticed and held?
A. Those are meetings the Town organized and held. Eversource, on its own, held a variety
of other meetings.
Q. Yeah, but I'm just trying to get a sense of the Town-sponsored --
A. The Town viewed this primarily as an Eversource project, and we looked to Eversource to provide the notice, the meetings, the outreach to the community.
Q. So, then, when the Town held the two meetings that you just identified, and one of them was the bus meeting, did the Town go through -or did the Town satisfy the notice requirements of those public meetings?
A. They were public information meetings. There was no notice requirement to fulfill. We did let people know about them, and we broadcast the fact that they were occurring in our weekly Friday updates and newsletter which goes to about 3200 Durham subscribers weekly, every Friday.
Q. So then it sounds like, is it accurate, that the Town did not send notice to abutters specifically for these meetings?
A. We did not.
Q. And would you agree that abutters would have \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
had a heightened interest in the Project than non-abutters?
A. Absolutely. And I know as well that, in fairness to Eversource, Eversource did, on many occasions, send notices to abutters of various proceedings.
Q. But did you just testify just a moment ago that, even though Eversource had sent out those notices, that the Town did not rely on those notices as it's own -- as the Town's obligation to notice a public meeting?
A. Well, Eversource -- again, if you look at Exhibit APP EX 214, which Eversource has provided, they list eight public input events. And Eversource did all of the noticing for those events. And in addition, the Town of Durham let people know as well through our weekly Friday update newsletter.
Q. I think I had a "Yes" or "No" answer that I was looking for on that.
A. You'll have to repeat that question again. I'm sorry. I lost you.
Q. Is it correct, then, that you had testified just a moment ago that the Town did not rely
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on the notices provided by Eversource as the Town's -- satisfying the Town's obligation to perfect notice of a public meeting?
A. Well, there are eight different events that Eversource has listed, and they provided all the notice for their events and --
Q. I think that's responsive. Thank you.
A. Okay.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Selig, I'm jut going to remind you to please listen to the question and answer the question that's asked, okay, without going beyond what's being asked of you. You're going to be questioned by people who are not lawyers now, so some of the questions may not be as direct as we would like, and it would be easy to get off track. So we'd ask you to please listen to the question and answer the question.

WITNESS SELIG: I'm not trying to go off track. It's just that for five years now we've been working through this process in a painstaking way, and they're not "Yes" or "No" questions.
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MR. IACOPINO: I certainly understand. And I wasn't asking for a discussion about it. I was just cautioning you, okay.

WITNESS SELIG: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. MACKIE :
Q. I have one question. Yesterday, Mr. Raphael, in his visual assessment explanation, talked about something called the "Mills Byway," and Durham has one. Can you explain what that is?
A. I can. The State of New Hampshire Department of Transportation has a Scenic Byway Program. And Durham and Newmarket and Rollinsford worked together for two years to propose with the Strafford Regional Planning Commission a byway, called the "Mills Scenic Byway," which stretches from Newmarket to Rollinsford. And the route through Durham is along Newmarket Road/Route 108. And it travels from, again, Newmarket along 108 into the center of Durham and then heads towards Dover.
Q. So this is a state program that has to pass
some kind of threshold to be approved?
A. There are national criteria, and the Department of Transportation vets those and ultimately approves them. There's a whole process. There are public hearings that we went through to have the byway approved. And the goal is to promote the cultural and scenic characteristics of an area to promote tourism primarily.
Q. Thank you.

MR. SCHULOCK: Mr. Aslin.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Selig.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. For the record, I'm Chris Aslin, acting as Counsel for the Public.

In your testimony, which is TD-UNH Exhibit 1, on Page 2, you set out the Town's preference for a number of options. And one of those options or preferences, I guess, is that horizontal directional drilling be used for the crossing of Little Bay; is that correct?
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A. Yes.
Q. And you've heard testimony since your prefiled testimony about the feasibility of that option; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And we've also heard testimony about the additional cost of that option.
A. Yes.
Q. And you understand that it's significantly more costly, according to the Applicant's testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Given that it's more costly, does that change the Town's preference in any way?
A. It does not.
Q. Okay. And if the cost, the additional costs of using HDD were localized to New Hampshire customers as opposed to all New England customers, would that change the Town's preference in any way?
A. First, they should not be. But second, no, it would not.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

You also have testimony on Page 10
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regarding the process you've engaged with the Applicant on in agreeing to an MOU. Do you recall that testimony?
A. We've not yet agreed to one, but we are in negotiations with them.
Q. Correct. So you state on Page 10 of your testimony, at Lines 5 and 6, that you have had no outreach from Eversource concerning your latest iteration of the MOU. And that was as of, I guess, June of 2017. Have you had -- since the time of your testimony in July of 2017, have you had further discussions with Eversource?
A. At that time, other than Eversource indicating in these proceedings, not directly to Durham, that they'd be open to such an MOU, we've had no outreach from Eversource or movement from Eversource toward an MOU. Since that time, the submittal of my testimony, we have. And we've exchanged numerous drafts, and we are trying to work towards a final draft that is amenable to both parties. We're not quite there yet.
Q. Okay. And so at this point you have not
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reached agreement. But are those discussions ongoing?
A. They are, yes.
Q. Okay. All right. And I believe in your testimony you stated that if you can't reach agreement on the MOU, you would ask that the provisions of the draft be included as conditions of the Certificate, if one is issued by the Committee; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that remains your position?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

On Page 11 of your testimony, you have a conclusion that the Project as proposed at the time of your testimony would have -sorry -- would unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region. Has that opinion changed in any way based on updates since your testimony?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And in what way does the Town of Durham feel the orderly development of the region would be unduly interfered with?
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A. We believe it's inconsistent with our Master Plan. We believe it will have negative historical impacts and visual impacts, scenic impacts. And I think, in addition, and very significantly, we're concerned about the environmental impact on the Little Bay, which we, in Durham, have worked tirelessly to protect.
Q. And you mentioned a few different categories that are also other criteria that the Committee reviews, such as aesthetics and environmental concerns. Is it the Town's position that those impacts also play into the orderly development criteria?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And how so?
A. Well, we have a concern that --

MR. PATCH: Mr. Chair, I think I'm going to object to that question as asking for a legal conclusion. And I guess if Mr. Aslin wanted to put in front of Mr . Selig the criteria in Section 16 so he understood the distinction that $I$ think Mr. Aslin is trying to make, then maybe $I$ wouldn't have an objection.

But I think he's essentially trying to distinguish between the orderly development criteria that the Committee uses and some of the other criteria. And I'm not sure without Mr. Selig having that in front of him, that he understand the nuances that Mr . Aslin is trying to get at.

MR. SCHULOCK: Mr. Aslin.
MR. ASLIN: I'd be happy to put it in
front of him.
BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. And Mr. Selig, my intent is just to tease out which particular impacts you feel would impact or affect the orderly development of the region as opposed to the environmental or aesthetics. But I think I can put up the rule.
A. Can you make it a little larger, please? And which section should I be reading?
Q. So this is Site 301.09 , which describes the categories of information that go into the decision-making of orderly development. And you'll see Subpart A has to do with land use impacts; $B$, economy; and C, employment. It's
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
cut off, but there's only one more paragraph below there. And within each of those there's some subcategories, such as tourism and real estate property values.

And so with regard to the environmental impacts, $I$ just want to understand if the Town -- I understand the Town has a concern with environmental impacts. But does the concern go beyond the environment and reach into issues like the economy or land use?
A. I think land use in particular.
Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.

With regard to the environmental concerns that the Town has expressed, in particular with the Little Bay crossing, would it be fair to say that the Town is concerned with the level of risk that they see with this proposed jet plowing process?
A. Yes.
Q. But that the Town also does not have specific knowledge of what the impacts will be?
A. That's correct. Our experts have tried to offer suggestions to mitigate the risk to the extent possible. And we've tried as a
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community to be very reasonable and objective as part of this process. And so, you know, A, our feeling was this SEC should require that the transformer alternative be evaluated. If that's not feasible, if that's what the group determines, then, $B$, let's look at HDD and make sure that's not a better option. And if it's determined through an objective review that it's not, then, $C$, if the Committee still feels the Project should go forward, let's do everything we can to protect the resource as part of the jet plow process. And so our environmental team has focused in on the jet plowing and has offered a lot of suggestions as part of this process.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Have you had any discussions with the Applicant regarding potential restoration or other mitigation in the event that there are impacts from the jet plowing?
A. We have not. The only caveat is -- I don't know if this is what you're getting at. The Applicant would be required to contribute monies to the ARM program. But that's not
[WITNESS: SELIG]
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Q. Okay.
A. I would like to note that this is a large project, and we have limited resources at the local level. And so Durham, as a municipality, focused our attention primarily on the impacts of the crossing of the bay. And the Durham Historic Association, which occupies a base in our historic building in town and is the keeper of our artifacts, focused on historic impacts. And I did ask the Division of Historic Resources to keep the Durham Historic Association up to date on any meetings that were going to be taking place regarding history. And unfortunately, a meeting did take place in Newington with the Army Corps people and NHDHR and Newington representatives, and neither Durham nor the Durham Historic Association were notified of that meeting. We found out about it from Newington representatives, and after the fact.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. So we requested then a meeting with NHDHR and met with them on October 27th, 2017.
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MR. SCHULOCK: Mr. Selig, we're getting a little bit beyond the question at this point.

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. So, thank you, Mr. Selig.

Have you -- has the Town as opposed to the Durham Historic Association been receiving notices of any kind or communications from the U.S. Army Corps regarding the Section 106 process?
A. We have not, no.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Last question I think. In your discussions with the Applicant, has the Applicant either sought out or discussed with the Town obtaining a license to install utilities either under or over municipal roads, pursuant to the RSA 261:160 process?
A. They have not, to my knowledge.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. ASLIN: No further questions.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: So I have, I'm
guessing, somewhere between a half-hour and 25 minutes.
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MR. SCHULOCK: Proceed then.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Selig.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I want to start -- Ms. Brown was asking you questions about the interactions that the Applicant has had with Durham, and that's where I wanted to start.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, could you put up Applicant's Exhibit 214, please.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. You have been alluding to this document. This is a summary of the contact history that the Applicant has had with Durham and UNH; is that correct?
A. It is. Yes.
Q. I think, as you mentioned earlier, it indicates that the first meeting that the Applicant had with the Town was in November of 2013; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the document indicates in total that there were 34 meetings between that point in
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}

June of 2018 with the Town, with the Town and UNH, with various groups; is that right?
A. That's right.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Now I want to put up Applicant's 215, if we could, Dawn.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. This is a similar document. It pertains to contacts directly with UNH. Have you had a chance to look at this as well?
A. I have.
Q. And the first meeting, according to this document, was in December of 2014; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you agree that this also indicates that there were a total of 38 meetings between then and August of 2018, again, some combined with Durham; is that right?
A. That is correct.

MR. PATCH: Mr. Chair, I'm going to object to that question. You know, Mr. Selig is here to testify for Durham, and I don't think he can speak to all of the meetings that the Applicant might have had with UNH. I mean,
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he can certainly speak to ones where there were joint meetings. But I think the question was about all of the meetings with UNH, and so I would just object to that question. Maybe he can reframe it.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure. I'm not asking for any particular substance. I'm asking simply about the fact that it occurred, as indicated on the document.

MR. SCHULOCK: Okay.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Let me now go to Applicant's Exhibit 140, Attachment A, which we've seen before. And I'm going to refer you to Page 1 , which is, for the Committee, PDF Page 15. This is the broader outreach summary that we put into evidence. And I want to focus in particular on the design changes that occurred prior to the time that the Application was filed. This is the prefiled phase.

So, on Page 1, am I correct that when meetings first began between the Applicant and Durham, Durham expressed concern about various roads in town, including Cutts Road,
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Ffrost Road [sic], Sandy Brook Drive neighborhoods and the views from Little Bay and Main Street is that right?
A. We did.
Q. And on the bottom of Page 1, over to Page 2, that recounts a range of revisions that were made to the Project as a result of the Town's input prior to the time that it was filed; is that fair to say?
A. Hold on a moment. I have to just read it. I'm sorry.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. It does. It's accurate.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And if we could go over, Dawn, to Page 4 of this document.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. And I understand that you can't speak directly to UNH. But certainly given that UNH is in Durham, I'm going to expect that you might be familiar with some of these changes. And you can tell me if you're not.

I think that at the tech session we talked about this issue, and I think that we talked in particular about the pole locations
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in town. And I think you agreed with me that over the course of about a ten-month process, you and Eversource sat together and went through literally every pole location in Durham; is that correct?
A. We did.
Q. And this document also shows another of the prefiling changes that occurred was that additional 2100 feet of underground under Main Street in Durham; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then we heard about this a moment ago, the ARM fund. So let's speak to that.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So let's jump to Page 20 of the document, Dawn.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. And if I'm going too quickly, please just stop me.

Durham expressed concern about the way
in which ARM fund money would be used; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And the $A R M$ fund is the aquatic resource mitigation fund; correct?
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A. Yes.
Q. And this is meant to be money that's paid into communities as part of mitigation for wetlands impacts, among other things; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And the Town wanted money from the ARM fund associated with this project directed toward the Wagon Hill Project; is that correct?
A. We felt if the Project was happening in Durham, the impacts were in Durham, the money should be allocated to Durham. So, yes, that's correct.
Q. And in fact that has happened; is that right? That's the agreement.
A. It's in the Application. If the Project is approved, then that would happen.
Q. Right. And according to this document, in excess of $\$ 200,000$ would be directed from the ARM fund to the Wagon Hill Project if the Project was approved; right?
A. That's correct. Yes.
Q. So that was all the prefiling outreach that occurred. I want to talk now about
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post-filing.
So the Application was filed. But you'd agree with me that the Applicant and Durham didn't stop talking about Durham's concerns after the Application was filed; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so, again, looking at Attachment A -- I'm on Page 2 right now -- there were a range of design changes that also occurred as a result of Town input after the filing; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And one of the things that happened after the filing, and I think we heard about this earlier, was that the Durham Historic Association raised concerns about environmental and cultural damage in the right-of-way. Do you recall that happening?
A. Which right-of-way are you referring to?
Q. We're talking about the Seacoast Reliability Project right-of-way --
A. In town, yes. That's right, yes.
Q. And do you recall that event?
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A. Not specifically, but I know they did.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And if we could go to Page 3, Dawn.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. That event is recounted on Page 3. And is it correct that as soon as the DHA raised this concern, the Applicant responded and agreed to a site walk to look at the issues that DHA was raising? Do you remember that?
A. Let me just read this for a moment.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Yes, that's correct. The Applicant did schedule a site walk.
Q. And that site walk happened with the Applicant, with members of DHA, and also with state representatives from DHR and DES; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And do you remember what the outcome was of that site walk?
A. I do.
Q. What was that?
A. Bill Quinlan wrote to the Town of Durham to indicate that they did not in fact find the
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A. Where do you want me to look? I'm sorry.
Q. I'm looking at the Memorandum of Understanding section, focusing in particular on the issue of the Town's concerns about construction. Are you there?
A. I'm starting to read it now, so...
Q. Okay. Let me know when you're set.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. So this was -- what you're highlighting here had to do with UNH specifically. I think these are UNH, not Durham's.
Q. UNH discussions. But we engaged in similar discussions with the Town of Durham; is that right?
A. You did. These just seem to focus more on UNH .
Q. All right. And Applicant's Exhibit 197, which I think you had a chance to look at, was the draft Durham MOU; is that right?
A. I have. I'm not sure which version you're referring to, but I have.
Q. Well, it's the last version that both parties agreed to present to the Committee. And hopefully we'll have a new one shortly. And

I wanted to ask you about that.
You mentioned a moment ago that both parties are working towards resolution of that issue. Is there a way for you to briefly summarize for the Committee what those last remaining sticking points are?
A. Yes. The Town of Durham wants to define which roadways would be utilized if the Project is approved. In particular, Eversource continues to list Penny Brook Lane, which is in the center of our downtown. And we're concerned about the impact that large equipment and large poles being transported through that busy area in the heart of Durham with 16,000 students of UNH would have. So we'd like to remove Penny Brook Lane in the portion of Main Street that's listed from the list. And in addition, we would like to add protection of historic resources, and we've not yet reached agreement on that.
Q. When you say "protection of historic resources," is it fair to say that the disagreement is actually fairly narrow? So
in other words, there's no disagreement at this point about the extension of the protection around that quarry area that we heard about earlier; is that right?
A. Well, Eversource does not want to list the quarry area on its construction plans, which is perplexing to us. So I don't know if I agree with your statement.
Q. Well, the quarry area, if protections agreed to with respect to the quarry area were adequately identified, would that address your concerns?
A. Well, I would refer you to our most recent draft to you, which did satisfy our concerns, but which you or your team deleted reference to noting that area on the construction plans. So that was of concern to us.
Q. And the other area I think that we heard
about this morning was this issue about the use of ground-penetrating radar.
A. That's correct, near the grave site on UNH campus. And also use of the two Class VI roads, both Beech Hill and Foss Farm. We would prefer you not use those roads because
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A. That was our feeling, yes. We wanted to ensure that these issues were addressed in some form.
Q. So do we both agree that, with respect to the issues we agree on, we would be amenable to having those be Certificate conditions, if the Committee issued a certificate, and with respect to those conditions we disagree on, if we can't resolve our differences, we would be okay with the Committee resolving them for us?
A. We would look to the Committee to resolve them. So, yes.
Q. Now I want to take you to Page 1, or PDF Page 36 of Exhibit 140, which continues to be the outreach summary.

Pages 22 and 23 provide a complete summary of all of the changes that were made to the Project in Durham and around UNH as a result of community input. Have you had an opportunity to look at this yet?
A. Can you make it larger so I can see?
Q. Sure. It carries over to the next page, too.

Let me know when you're set.
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[WITNESS: SELIG]
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Could you go to the next page, please?
(Witness continues review of document.)
A. Those are accurate.
Q. Thank you.

When I was asking you questions at the tech session, you agreed that Eversource had worked very hard, over a long period of time, to understand and address Durham's and UNH's concerns; is that right?
A. What I said is, given the parameters your team had, yes.
Q. And is it fair to say that this list reflects those efforts?
A. It does.
Q. And I think earlier you were asked a question about abutters. And I think you also agreed at the tech session that Eversource had made a good-faith effort to respond to the concerns of abutters of Durham; is that correct?
A. To the extent $I$ knew about concerns, yes, Eversource was responsive.
Q. And I assume as the town manager for several
years now while this project is going on, you certainly heard about abutters' concerns; is that correct?
A. I have. I can't say I've heard from all abutters, but I've heard from many.
Q. Well, in your prefiled testimony, which is TD-UNH Exhibit 1, you raised concerns about the Little Bay crossing. And at Page 6, Lines 14 to 16 , you said that, at a minimum, it's imperative that the Project not contribute in any way toward future degradation of Little Bay and the estuary. Do you recall that?
A. I do.
Q. Now, I think that the concerns that you had about Little Bay relate in large part to the environmental analysis and the environmental conditions that were contained in the DES review of permits; is that fair to say?
A. Can you state that again, please?
Q. Yeah. To the extent that you've got
environmental concerns in Little Bay, is it fair to say that those concerns, in one way or another, relate to the various conditions
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in the DES permits here?
A. Yes. DES adopted many of the Town of Durham's suggestions, not all of them. And our team still has some concerns.
Q. Well, you anticipated my next question. What I was going to ask you is, during this entire process, is it correct to say that Durham, through you, through its attorneys, through its experts, Woods Hole Group, which we'll hear about a little bit later, had a full and robust opportunity to make your concerns known to DES?
A. We've had an opportunity to make our concerns known to DES up until a point. But our understanding is that there have been ongoing conversations between Eversource and DES which are resulting in revisions to the draft final permit, and we do not have insight into what those are or what the implications of that might be.
Q. In fact, those revisions were presented to the Committee via a letter from DES at the end of August; is that right?
A. Many were. My understanding is those
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recommended, and we can speak to the Woods Hole Group about this. But certainly a fair number of the conditions you proposed DES adopted, and those appeared in that final permit; is that right?
A. Many of the --

MR. PATCH: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to object because I think he's getting into an area that's more appropriate for the environmental panel which will be testifying next week.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm asking, you know, the Durham representative at a general level if conditions that his experts proposed ended up in the permits. I would think he would have direct knowledge of that.

MR. PATCH: As long as it's only at a general level, $I$ guess $I$ would not object. But to the extent it gets specific, then the environmental panel is really the one to ask that of.

MR. SCHULOCK: Well, let's proceed then and see.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure. That was
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actually the last question on that topic. Well, almost.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. With respect to the discussions that we had at the tech session, $I$ think when $I$ asked you about this, you told me that you believed DES listened patiently and respectfully to Durham's and UNH's concerns; is that right?
A. They did.
Q. And I think you also agreed when I asked you about this at the technical session, that the Town did have a fair opportunity to present its concerns to DES; is that right?
A. We did. To date I would say. To date. If there are changes as a result of the conversations that are now occurring, our team has not had an opportunity to evaluate those or provide feedback on them.
Q. Understood. Thank you.

Let me turn to Applicant's Exhibit 101, Appendix 44A. This is a document -- well, let me ask you if you're familiar with this document. Have you seen it before in this proceeding?
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A. I'm not sure. Can you describe the document for me, please?
Q. Sure. The Applicants introduced an expert, Lisa Shapiro, who talked about local property tax impacts of the Project. Were you present for that testimony?
A. I was not, no.
Q. Are you familiar at all with what Ms. Shapiro said?
A. I am, yes.
Q. Actually, we did also talk a little bit about this at the tech session, if you recall.
A. Can I just ask, was this from April 12th, 2016? Is that what this document is? Is this a document that was submitted by Lisa Shapiro on that date?
Q. I'm not sure of the date of 101.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Could somebody tell us?

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. October. October 12, 2016, I'm told -MR. DUMVILLE: March 29th.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Or I'm sorry. March 29, 2017, the amended \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
testimony.
A. Okay.
Q. So in this document, according to

Ms. Shapiro, it indicates that if the Project were built as proposed, the investment -- the value of the investment in Durham would be $\$ 43.3$ million; is that right?
A. That's what it says.
Q. And Ms. Shapiro projected that in the first year, that would result in property tax payments of somewhere between -- well, it's on the next page, if we can flip to that.

She projected that would result in property tax payments of somewhere between about $\$ 748,000$ and a little under $\$ 1.1$ million; is that right?
A. That's what she projects.
Q. And I asked you about this specific topic at the tech session and what your view was if that came to pass and those property tax payments were made. And I think you told me that you thought, even at the floor of 748,000, that would be a meaningful tax
benefit for Durham; is that right?
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
A. It would certainly be a meaningful tax benefit. However, Eversource has currently appealed its assessments locally from 2014 through to the present time, and so I do not have a high level of confidence that we will necessarily see these values when and if the Project is built. And so these are highly speculative from my perspective.
Q. Do you understand that the $\$ 748,000$ floor is her calculation using the most conservative methodology and that it's really a base?
A. I'm not aware of her methodology. I'm sorry. But I --
Q. So you --
A. -- question whether the dollar amounts we see here will necessarily come to pass. There's also ongoing conversation at the state level in terms of the ways in which municipalities can tax utilities.

So in our conversations locally in Durham, we have not focused on the potential tax benefit of the Project because, No. 1, Durham tends to place other values higher -aesthetics, scenic quality, history -- than

\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}

What he essentially said here was that, if the Project were constructed, it would benefit the Town of Durham by adding additional transmission lines to the Madbury Substation which directly serves Durham and UNH. Do you remember seeing that before?
A. I don't. I'm sorry.
Q. I did ask you about this at the tech session, and I asked you whether you agreed that, if the Project were built and it achieved its stated goals of enhancing electric reliability in Durham and for UNH, would that be beneficial for businesses and residents in the area. And I think you told me you thought it would. Does that sound right?
A. I would agree with that.
Q. Nothing further. Thank you, Mr. Selig.
A. Thank you.

MR. SCHULOCK: Questions? Mr. Way. QUESTIONS BY SEC MEMBERS AND COUNSEL: BY MR. WAY:
Q. Good evening, Mr. Selig.
A. Good evening.
Q. Just a couple questions. We talked a little
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bit about the concrete mattresses, and you mentioned that your concern was that the size of the mattresses was underestimated of how many mattresses would be needed.
A.

Yes.
Q. And I think you're basing that on your knowledge of the flats. And from what I saw from your exhibit, 25 I think -- and you said you had engineers working on this as well. Assuming that Eversource has -- they're equally -- or they're familiar, obviously, with the landscape as well. What is leading you to believe that they've underestimated beyond the fact that -- obviously, I agree it's incredibly flat and goes out very far. What do you have to base that idea on?
A. Really, no science. It was our surprise at low tide on how extensive the flats are and how shallow they are. And I want to make sure that you as a board, as you're reviewing the submittals from the Applicant, are comfortable that in fact what they think they can achieve, they'll be able to achieve.

The --
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Q. And if I could just clarify one thing you said. So when you said "no science," are you saying on their part or your part?
A. On my part.
Q. Okay.
A. And it was an observation, and it caused our town engineer and I to say we want to make sure the Committee's aware.
Q. Fair enough.

We talked a little bit about orderly development. It was put up on the screen, some of the criteria that we have to look at. When we were talking with Robert Varney, we were talking about some of the effects on the economy, on tourism. And a couple things struck me in your prefiled. I think you said that Durham was a magnet for the economy in the area. And then $I$ was looking back to Bob Varney's prefiled and supplemental prefiled, and I think -- yeah, supplemental prefiled, and he was talking about the Town of Durham and trying to get a sense of, okay, so there's an impact. And that's one of our things we have to assess is if there's an
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
impact, what is the extent of the impact. So I think you had, like, 194 businesses in Durham, and I think 84 of those were impacted. I didn't see a lot of any quantification from Mr. Varney on that. And I wanted to give you the opportunity.

Is there anything from your standpoint to quantify that? Usually, a lot of times we get something that says if this were to occur, $X, Y$ and $Z$ would happen either to the workers of the business or to the economy of the area.
A. In my prefiled testimony, I was trying to make the point that the estuary itself is a magnet to the region and a real resource to the state and the Seacoast. Aside from providing reliable power, which is important, we don't perceive the Seacoast Reliability Project will have any net positive economic impact for the Town of Durham. Certainly it would provide additional tax dollars. And we'll have to see what those dollar amounts are. But in Durham, we place a very high value on the beauty of the community. And we
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work really hard in our planning board, our conservation commission, all of our boards, and our Master Plan, to preserve that quality of life. And it's very difficult for our community to see a large power project blazing the trail through Durham that we have no say over, other than to participate in this process, and which we would never approve locally if it was up to us, because the tall poles and the impact to the bay, et cetera, would have too much cost from not a cash point of view, but other meaningful qualities for us.
Q. And I don't want to take us off course because I hear what you're saying. I guess I'm going to talk to you as the town manager now. And you heard some of the businesses that Mr. Varney was working with -- the garden center, the boating, some of the oyster farms. Is there any business that you're aware of that hasn't been talked about in Durham that's going to experience a difficulty that we should be aware of that has not been mentioned or addressed?
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
A. Those impacts to our businesses -- I do not perceive negative impacts to our local downtown businesses as a result of the Project. Not significant impacts or meaningful ones. The primary business of most of the downtown businesses focuses on the University community, both on campus and off. It's not necessarily focused on the bay.

Now, in Newington, there's boating docks and things like that, public -- private boat area. We don't have that on the Durham side. It's, for the most part, very natural, and there are homes along the shore.
Q. Thank you very much.

QUESTIONS BY MR. FITZGERALD:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Selig. Your prefiled testimony indicates you're speaking on behalf of the Town of Durham. Have you been authorized in some specific way to -- in other words, has the Town taken a vote on a position or whatever and/or the -- you said you have a town council I guess; is that correct?
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A. We do.
Q. Have they taken a specific position and authorized you to communicate that? Has that position been communicated in writing somehow?
A. The council has empowered me to take the lead on the Project. And I have kept them in the loop on all of our filings and on the process. In fact, we met last evening. And I updated the council on where we were and essentially what we'd be commenting on today. There's not a town meeting vote. We don't have a town meeting. There's not a council resolution. We wanted to take a more nuanced approach to say, you know, A, we'd rather you take a different route altogether and not impact our town; B, if you're going to come through the town, let's look at HDD and have as little impact as possible on the bay; and C, if it's going to come through town, we want to make sure that the crossing of the bay using jet plow has as little impact as possible. So we felt that would provide the most value to you as you -- as the decision
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maker in this docket.
Q. So you feel that your testimony represents the position of the Town and not just your position as town administrator?
A. Of the Town Council of the Town of Durham.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

With regards to -- you've obviously
heard testimony that there would be significant additional costs to HDD and significant time. And I believe you were asked a question previously about the additional costs if this were to be localized to New Hampshire. If the ISO-New England were to find that this was, in their opinion, not necessary -- and I know you stated that you would hope they wouldn't do that. But if they were to find this wasn't necessary and localize those costs, have you looked at or talked with Eversource in any way about what that cost impact might be to ratepayers in New Hampshire, and is that a consideration of the Town? And I guess I'll make this very broad. But is the consideration of avoidance of potential brown-outs and blackouts if PSNH
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is not able to get this additional power into the region part of your consideration of impacts?
A. I think our view is why should the Town of Durham bear the brunt of a project in its entirety in Newington that is of benefit for the state. It feels to us as though the state should share in that cost. So if you approach this project with the notion that the Great Bay Estuary is a cherished resource for the state of New Hampshire, and to protect it certain precautions have to be taken, including potentially HDD , and if the cost is $X$, that's the cost of providing the power. And if that means that a different route, perhaps the Newington step-down transformer alternative, becomes more cost-effective, it will provide more power as well, then maybe we should look there. That's the approach we've taken.
Q. So if those costs were apportioned to all ratepayers in the state of New Hampshire, that would address your concern that that would -- because the Town of Durham will
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benefit from this project. You're part of the Seacoast Region; correct?
A. We are. That's correct.
Q. Okay. So the fact that, you know, Durham is experiencing the same impacts that the rest of the Seacoast is, and additional costs are imposed as a result of those concerns, these concerns, your position is that that is an acceptable trade-off?
A. It is. Durham would still have poles that are three times as high, at least two, in some cases three times as high as we have now coming through the right-of-way that comes through town. So there would be impacts. Many would argue negative impacts. But at least the bay would remain in the largely undeveloped way it is, the state it is today.
Q. Okay. Your environmental consultants, I heard you refer to them as "our experts" or "environmental team," as $I$ understand it, they're expected to testify in these proceedings later. They -- in looking at their testimony and your testimony, particularly from 2017, it seems that a
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
number of concerns were raised that were relative to the environmental impacts on Great Bay and that there was recommendation for an evaluation of $H D D$ versus jet plowing. There was -- your consultants recommended a test trial. They amended their testimony and provided an updated testimony in -- I forget the date. But anyway, it was -- and I believe that those things that had been requested -- the test run, the commitment to a test run, and an evaluation of HDD versus jet plowing -- were conducted. You did not update your testimony. So your conclusions even upon receiving the Normandeau evaluation of what the impacts, expected impacts to Great Bay are and the trial run, the commitment to a trial run, and the evaluation of the trial -- of the jet plowing, the position is still the same, that you think the impacts -- those haven't addressed your concerns in any way?
A. They were partly responsive to our concerns. But we felt that, and still feel, that an independent, a truly independent vetting of
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the HDD should be conducted, and then we'd have a greater level of confidence in the results.

In terms of the trial run, we're appreciative that the draft permit has that language in it. But our understanding is the amended permit will now have like a 14-day time period between when the trial period takes place and actual jet plowing occurs. And we're not sure how anyone's going to have time enough to review that, respond to that, change the course of the plan with such a short period of time. So our team is advising us that there should be a more lengthy period between the trial run and the actual activity, the installation.
Q. Okay. Do you feel that the Normandeau evaluation and testing and, not mitigation but I guess their protocols that they've proposed for monitoring, do you feel that those have any impact on your position? Do those offer you any --
A. It certainly -- the conditions that NHDES has put in place for the crossing certainly
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}

$$
2-20 \rightarrow 0
$$

mitigated many of the initial concerns that we had. Our consultants believe that there should still be some additional things that are done, and there's still some outstanding questions.
Q. Have those been communicated to Eversource?
A. Well, at this time we're all waiting to see where DES and Eversource are in their discussions. My understanding is that the parties don't know. The intervenors don't know. And we'd like an opportunity to see that document and to comment on it.
Q. But I may be getting ahead. In reviewing the testimony, the updated testimony of your environmental team, it seems that they had raised specific concerns and questions with regards to the proposal. And I'm just wondering if Durham feels those should be communicated to the DES and/or Eversource prior to the conclusion of any discussions between those parties to resolve the final plan for evaluation of the Project. Would that seem reasonable?
A. I think what we were more interested in was
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
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parties to understand your concerns before they finalize their discussions?
A. I do think so, yes.
Q. Because they're pretty clearly laid out in the prefiled testimony. So, I mean, obviously they're public at this point.

Okay. That answers my questions at this point in time. I'll reserve the rest for the environmental panel.

QUESTIONS BY MS. DUPREY:
Q. Mr. Selig, something that you testified to has to do with the effluent that the Town of Durham is putting into, I believe you said it was the Oyster River, which then flows into the bay?
A. Yes.
Q. And I presume that effluent has some amount of nitrogen in it?
A. Yes.
Q. How much? Do you know?
A. I do. It varies depending on the day. We're averaging somewhere in the three to five parts per milliliter I think. Our
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understanding is that this project with the jet plowing will produce approximately 300 times the nitrogen release that we would produce in a day. So we are concerned that that would be potentially a shock to the estuarine system. And in addition, it will stir up sediment, which creates cloudiness in the water, which prohibits sunlight from penetrating, which has a negative impact. So that's a concern we have.
Q. And could you reduce the nitrogen level further? Could the Town of Durham reduce the nitrogen level further than it has already?
A. The Town of Durham is the leader,
essentially, in the Seacoast --
Q. That's not the question that $I$ asked.
A. -- and we are already at the limit of technology. So, no.
Q. You're at the limit of technology?
A. We are, yes.
Q. All right. Thank you.
A. And that's part of why we're so concerned. QUESTIONS BY MR. SCHMIDT:
Q. Good evening. How are you?
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A. Very well.
Q. A couple of things we heard earlier regarding Mr. Raphael and Ms. Widell not contacting the Town and so on.
A. Yes.
Q. What I'm wondering is, with all the meetings, the 34,38 meetings, were those same issues brought up with Eversource staff that your consultants might have brought up? What I'm wondering is if the same topics were addressed, just not with the consultants.
A. Well, in the 34 or so meetings that are mentioned, the Town did bring up concerns about general historic impacts. But at that time, we did not have specific burial grounds, locations of stone walls, things such as that. We were talking about generally here's the right-of-way, here are the roadway crossings, here are the kind of style of poles, the placement of poles, the crossing of Main Street, how can we try to
mitigate as many impacts as possible.
Inherent in those conversations were certainly scenic impacts. For example --
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}

WITNESS SELIG: And Mr. Chairman, cut me off if $I$ go astray. I'm not -- I'm trying to be succinct.
A. So, for example, at the crossing -- excuse me -- at the entry point from the Eversource right-of-way to the bay, the Town was interested in Eversource moving the transition tower much farther away from the shore of the bay.
Q. No, I understand. I just --
A. But it proved infeasible. So we --
Q. The general question was fine.
A. Okay.
Q. Thank you.

So the discussions at those meetings, is that what prompted the Durham Historic Association, et cetera, to supply the input?
A. It was only after the Application was filed did the Durham Historic Association become active. That's really when the Project was -- when townspeople started to tune in clearly because something was happening.
Q. All right. Thank you.

Also, there was some discussions about
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
[WITNESS: SELIG]
your MOU that was still ongoing. And I wanted to just make sure I got one of the items correct.

Was it mapping of the quarry that is one of the outstanding issues? Is that --
A. Putting it on the construction plans and flagging the area, particularly the granite quarry with the bench, to make sure it's not impacted during the construction.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And you mentioned that the Town wants to remove the use of Penny Brook Lane and part of Main Street. Are there alternate avenues to the --
A. We believe there are. In terms of Main Street, we need to have a conversation with Eversource and sit down and understand where they're coming from, because there is a portion of Main Street, of course, where they're going under Main Street, and they'll need to access that location. But we want to ensure that, if the Project is approved, as equipment and poles are brought through town, that it's not impacting heavily traveled
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roads and traffic patterns and things like that.
Q. You feel there's reasonable alternatives, though?
A. We do, yes. We do.
Q. Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: That's all I have.
QUESTIONS BY MR. SCHULOCK:
Q. Mr. Selig, does the Town of Durham question whether this project is necessary to provide reliable electric service to the region?
A. Officially, we take Eversource and the ISO at their word. That's what they tell us. They're the experts in that area.
Q. Thank you.

QUESTIONS BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Do you still have your Exhibit 25 in front of you, the pictures?
A. I don't. I'm sorry.
Q. Well, you took those pictures; is that correct?
A. If they're --

MR. IACOPINO: Dawn, can you pull up TD-UNH 25?
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A. Yes, I did take that picture.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Okay. Now, what kind of camera did you use to take that picture?
A. It is a Sony A Series R2. Sony AR2 with a 24 to 135 lens I think.
Q. 24-135 lens?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that a digital camera or a film camera?
A. It's a digital camera.
Q. And did you use any other tools or anything to gauge the scale of the photograph?
A. I did not. I just took it. I did not try to scale it.
Q. Seems to be in an panoramic mode. Does the camera have a particular mode to --
A. Yes, it does. It's a panoramic view. And I was trying to capture as much of that shoreline as possible so people could sort of see what it was like.
Q. And in doing that, did you have to move the camera?
A. I did, yes.
Q. Okay.
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A. Now, the photos on the other side were just still photos, but this was a panoramic.
Q. And on this particular one, how did you choose that particular position to take the picture from?
A. I took probably ten pictures along the shoreline. And this captured the brick cable house at the far left and as much of the shoreline to the right as possible. I wanted to show how natural it was over to the right because there's been testimony here that Little Bay is not as lovely as it is.
Q. Okay. And if we go to the last page of the exhibit, please, the picture of the Durham side.

MS. GAGNON: UNH 26?
MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry?
MS. GAGNON: 26.
MR. IACOPINO: I have it as
Exhibit 25. But it's Page 5, electronic Page 5. Yeah. There we go.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Okay. And you used the same camera for this picture?
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A. I did, yes.
Q. And did you use a panoramic mode for this as well?
A. No. This is zoomed. I zoomed in. The photo, where you can see the gunnel of the boat which is up and down, was in the 24 mode so you could see, you know, the distance from shore. And this was trying to zoom in as far my camera would reach from the same location to try to capture the cable house and the house and where the transition would come into the bay.
Q. With the same lens?
A. Same lens.
Q. Okay. And again, no other tools or anything used to gauge scale or anything with --
A. No, no.
Q. -- with respect to this picture?
A. No.

MR. IACOPINO: I have no further questions.

MR. SCHULOCK: Mr. Patch.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. PATCH:
\{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 10 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{10-16-18\}
Q. Mr. Selig, I have just a couple of follow-up questions.

Do you remember that Mr. Fitzgerald asked you about the ability of the environmental panel to comment on essentially what Eversource's position is? This was just a few minutes ago.
A. Yes.
Q. And I kind of wanted to walk through with you the sequence of events, just to make sure it's clear in the record.

Now, it's your understanding that on February 28th, DES filed, after listening to the comments that had been made by Eversource and also by Durham's experts, had filed what was called at the time a "final decision," February 28th of this year; correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And then do you recall that it was early July of this year that at a tech session we had asked a question of an Eversource witness -actually, I believe it was Ms. Allen -- as to whether they had any further correspondence with DES, and we got a response back, I think
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it was 10 days later, saying that in fact they had had conversations? And then it was, I believe, just a few days after that, July 20th, that our environmental panel filed their supplemental testimony --
A. Yes.
Q. -- which at that time had to be based on the February 28th document; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then a week after that Eversource filed their rebuttal testimony, I'll call it --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in which they laid out some of those issues. And then it was August 31st, I believe it was, that DES submitted sort of their update to the final decision, where they came forward with a number of changes to the February 28 th permit conditions that they had issued. Does that sound correct?
A. It does.
Q. And so have our environmental panel had any opportunity under the procedural schedule to comment on either the July 27 th testimony or the August 31st changes to the final decision
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that DES issued?
A. No. That's a concern of ours.
Q. Okay. That's all the questions I have. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

MR. SCHULOCK: Thank you all very much. We'll adjourn for today and meet back here again tomorrow morning.
(Whereupon the Day 10 Afternoon
Session was adjourned at 5:50
p.m., with the hearing to resume on October 17, 2018
commencing at 9:00 a.m.)
[WITNESS: SELIG]
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| upon (5) | vegetated (1) | voter (1) | Way (40) | 26:7 |
| 36:24;61:18;62:23; | 87:22 | 115:14 | 3:9;13:10;22:1; | width (1) |
| 112:11;190:14 | vegetation (4) | voters (1) | 29:5;31:6;34:6;40:8; | 56:18 |
| urbanized (1) | 50:20;87:18;88:5,6 | 115:12 | 48:1;59:3,4,6;60:8; | willing (1) |
| 56:24 | vegetative (1) |  | 66:3,8;67:16,18; | 99:9 |
| use (16) | 88:17 | W | 72:14;76:6;85:4; | willy-nilly (1) |
| 41:24;57:6;78:22; | Venn (1) |  | 94:1;95:11;97:10; | 115:10 |
| 96:19;97:7;131:20; | 14:14 | Wagon (2) | 107:2;109:15;117:5; | Wilson (1) |
| 150:23;151:10,11; | venue (1) | 161:9,20 | 143:23;146:14,20; | 44:4 |
| 167:20,22,24;198:12; | 138:9 | wait (1) | 148:19,22;160:19; | wish (2) |
| 200:3,11;202:2 | verbal (1) | 54:20 | 166:4;171:11,23; | 100:15;130:16 |
| used (21) | 90:15 | waiting (2) | 180:19,21;185:20; | within (27) |
| 4:23;6:22;9:19; | version (3) | 192:7;193:2 | 187:19;189:17; | 14:15;18:14;23:21; |
| 11:16;12:20;33:10; | 125:2;165:20,22 | walk (7) | 190:21 | 26:3,11;28:20;30:15; |
| 35:1;52:10;54:17; | versus (4) | 21:22;124:18; | ways (5) | 31:1,11,20;32:4,8; |
| 61:10;78:23;82:18; | 64:18;92:21;190:4, | 163:8,13,14,20;203:9 | 122:4;123:5,6; | 36:10;37:9,16;46:3; |
| 84:15;85:1,11; | 11 | walked (1) | 168:1;178:18 | 47:3,22;49:2,7;76:3; |
| 110:10;131:13; | vet (1) | 28:19 | WEATHERSBY (39) | 83:3;87:5;93:7;94:4; |
| 145:22;160:20; | 119:2 | wall (50) | 4:3;42:14,17; | 95:10;151:2 |
| 201:23;202:16 | vets (1) | 23:16;24:3;25:1,8; | 49:14;51:19;58:17, | without (6) |
| useful (1) | 145:3 | 26:15;28:20;29:9,12, | 22;59:2;60:1;64:15; | 59:16,17;76:13; |
| 107:1 | vetting (1) | 16,19;39:14;45:3,10, | 69:14;79:7;80:3,12, | 143:13;150:4;168:2 |
| uses (2) | 190:24 | 12,12;46:3,5,17;47:3, | 16,20;82:3;90:11,16; | Witness (28) |
| 5:6;150:3 | VI (1) | 12,14,24;48:8;70:2,9, | 99:17;100:20,24; | 36:6;74:3;100:22; |
| using (8) | 167:22 | 10;71:2,6,10,12,18, | 101:8,13;103:24; | 101:3,9;105:22; |
| 6:19;28:23;33:7; | via (1) | 19,20;73:10;74:21; | 104:16;105:19,23; | 125:7,16,20,21; |
| 79:1;85:8;146:17; | 172:22 | 77:10;79:13,14;80:2, | 111:8,20;114:14; | 128:11;130:5,6,17; |
| 178:10;186:22 | vibration (10) | 7;81:11,12,16,21; | 118:15,20;119:9; | 133:15;135:18; |
| Usually (2) | 5:21;6:6,10,16;7:2, | 83:20;84:6;89:14,19; | 125:23;126:3; | 138:12;139:15; |
| 29:21;183:8 | 13,16;8:2,5,7 | 90:5;116:10 | 128:21;130:15; | 143:20;144:5; |
| utilities (2) | vibrations (1) | walls (79) | 132:22 | 159:12;163:11; |
| 155:17;178:19 | 7:10 | 19:11,14;21:18,23; | web (1) | 164:21;165:8;170:1, |
| utility (1) | view (8) | 23:13,18,21;24:21; | 6:7 | 3;197:1;203:21 |
| 88:24 | 87:19;88:2;96:13; | 25:4;26:3,5,7,11,22; | week (2) | wobble (1) |
| utilized (1) | 126:15;177:19; | 27:13;28:12;30:1,8, | 174:11;204:10 | 71:14 |
| 166:8 | 184:12;188:4;200:17 | 15,22;31:1,4,8,9,20, | weekly (3) | wonderful (1) |
| V | viewed (1) $141: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 ; 32: 3,15 ; 33: 8,9,19 \\ & 45: 2,15,23 ; 46: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 141:17,18;142:18 well-attended (1) | $\begin{gathered} 168: 15 \\ \text { wondering (8) } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | views (3) | 54:6;69:21;71:23; | 140:14 | 58:4;68:6;70:2; |
| valuation (1) | 87:3,4;159:2 | 72:9,13,17;75:6,7,10, | wetlands (3) | 72:12,13;192:18; |
| 179:2 | viewshed (2) | 23;76:2,6;77:22; | 57:14;78:23;161:4 | 196:6,10 |
| value (6) | 5:2;50:16 | 78:8,15,22;79:2;81:3, | what's (6) | wood (3) |
| 41:13;49:10; | visibility (1) | 8;83:23;86:17;88:22, | 6:12;47:23;70:4; | 70:6;79:23;87:10 |
| 110:18;177:6; | 41:3 | 89:2,11,13;90:2; | 113:17;122:14; | wooded (1) |
| 183:24;186:24 | visible (3) | 92:17,20,22;93:2,4,6, | 143:13 | 87:13 |
| values (3) | 50:7;87:7;118:4 | 11,12,15,16,20;94:3; | whereas (1) | woods (3) |
| 151:4;178:6,23 | visibly (1) | 98:13,16;99:2;115:7, | 92:16 | 40:11;172:9;174:1 |
| vantage (1) | 48:20 | 10;196:16 | WHEREUPON (2) | word (1) |
| 109:4 | visit (1) | wants (4) | 101:11;205:9 | 199:13 |
| varies (1) | 112:11 | 94:15;116:9;166:7; | white (4) | words (6) |
| 194:22 | visited (1) | 198:11 | 108:20;109:23; | $5: 9 ; 15: 16 ; 26: 21$ |
| variety (4) | 110:21 | warrant (1) | 110:3,8 | 34:6;167:1;185:21 |
| $56: 13 ; 121: 5 ; 122: 3$ | visual (13) | $115: 16$ | whole (3) | work (14) |
| $140: 24$ | 4:24;5:4;34:14,21; | wastewater (5) | 29:4;56:12;145:4 | 28:11;29:18;33:8; |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 3 ; 63: 18 ; 70: 1 ; \\ & \text { 83:12;92:13;94:3; } \\ & 129: 4 ; 136: 14 ; \\ & 147: 21 ; 168: 16 ; 184: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { zoom (1) } \\ 202: 8 \\ \text { zoomed (2) } \\ 202: 4,4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9: 5 \\ 144(1) \\ 3: 5 \\ 145(\mathbf{1}) \\ 3: 6 \end{gathered}$ | 2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 169:17 } \\ \text { 231:157 (1) } \\ \text { 117:16 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2 (7) |  |
| worked (7) | 1 |  | 28:6;74:6;81:4; | 200:5;202:6 |
| $61: 20 ; 76: 1 ; 129: 18$ |  | 14-day (1) | $145: 19 ; 159: 5 ; 162: 9$ | 24-135 (1) |
| 136:11;144:16; |  | 191:7 | 179:23 | 200:7 |
| 149:7;170:8 | 1 (10) | 15 (4) | 20 (1) | 25 (12) |
| workers (1) | 102:22;120:4; | 84:10;116:4;133:1; | 160:15 | 102:9;104:14,20, |
| 183:11 | 133:8;145:19; | 158:15 | 200 (3) | 20;106:8;107:21; |
| working (13) | 158:14,21;159:5; | 150 (3) | 30:20;35:13;38:4 | $109: 1 ; 155: 23 ; 181: 8$ |
| 40:13;63:19,23; | 169:14;171:7;178:22 | 7:9,12,17 | $2013 \text { (8) }$ | 199:17,24;201:20 |
| 76:11;93:22;126:22; | 1.2 (1) | 156 (1) | 120:9;121:15; | $26(3)$ |
| 134:12,24;135:7; | 127:20 | 3:7 | $122: 18 ; 125: 12$ | 105:4;201:16,18 |
| 143:22;166:3;181:9; | 1.3 (1) | 15th (1) | $133: 16,23 ; 134: 8$ | 261:160 (1) |
| 184:18 | 127:20 | 110:22 | 156:21 | 155:18 |
| workmanship (2) | 1:35 (1) | 16 (3) | 2014 (2) | 27th (2) |
| 45:11;48:18 | 4:2 | 122:19;149:22; | 157:12;178:3 | 154:24;204:23 |
| works (2) | 10 (4) | 171:9 | $2015(6)$ | 28th (5) |
| 117:2;134:7 | 146:24;147:6; | 16,000 (1) | 136:9;137:14; | 102:20;203:13,17; |
| worth (1) | 204:1;205:9 | 166:15 | 139:14,15;140:10,16 | 204:8,18 |
| 128:17 | 100 (3) | 162-H (1) | $2016 \text { (3) }$ | 29 (1) |
| wrapped (1) | 4:17;87:9,13 | 98:4 | 97:17;176:14,21 | $176: 24$ |
| 84:17 | $101(2)$ | 162-H7 (1) | $2017 \text { (7) }$ | 29th (1) |
| wrapping (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 175:20;176:17 } \\ & \mathbf{1 0 2 . 2 3 ( 2 )} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 98: 2 \\ \mathbf{1 6 4}(\mathbf{5}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:20;121:21; } \\ & 147: 10,12 ; 154: 24 ; \end{aligned}$ | 176:22 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |
| $\underset{186: 4}{\text { writing (1) }}$ | $9: 24 ; 10: 14$ | $20: 20 ; 21: 4 ; 22: 22$ | 176:24;189:24$\mathbf{2 0 1 8 ( 1 1 )}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 106 \text { (11) } \\ & 10: 22 ; 17: 5,21 ; \\ & 57: 7,11 ; 64: 23 ; 68: 12 \\ & 153: 5,9,16 ; 155: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 167 (1) |  | 3 (5) |
| written (1) |  |  | 2018 (11) 105:2;121:23; |  |
| 36:11 |  | 28:1 | 122:15,23;123:2; | 30:19;36:8;101:22; |
| wrote (1) |  | 1670 (1) |  | 163:3,5 |
| 163:23 | $108 \text { (2) }$ $144: 21.22$ | 17 (3) | $127: 3 ; 157: 1,17$ | 3.4 (1) |
|  | 144:21,22 |  |  | 7:6 |
| Y | 11 (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 132: 6 ; 179: 24 ; \\ & 205: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 202 (1) | 3:30 (1) |
|  | 9:7;148:14 |  | 3:15 | 105:12 |
| yard (1) | 11/22/13 (1) | 180 (1) | 20-foot (1) | 3:34 (1) |
| 71:12 | 133:16 | $3: 9$ | 112:19 | 101:6 |
| yards (1) | 111 (1) | 185 (1) | 20th (1) | 3:50 (1) |
| 5:14 | 21:9 | $3: 10$ $18: 1$ | 204:4 | 101:7 |
| year (11) | 119 (1) | 18th (1) | 21 (2) | 30 (1) |
| 35:14;46:18;102:3; | 3:3 | 102:3 | $22: 21 ; 179: 24$ | 136:17 |
| 110:22;121:24; | 12 (4) | 19 (3) | $2100 \text { (1) }$ | 300 (1) |
| 127:22;129:15; | 84:10;122:20; | 6:12;87:2;132:6 | 160:9 | 195:2 |
| 136:10;177:10; | 124:15;176:21 | 194 (2) | $211 \text { (1) }$ | 301.09 (1) |
| 203:17,20 | 127 (2) | 3:11;183:2 | 6:16 | 150:20 |
| yearly (1) | 80:18,21 | 1948 (1) | 214 (3) | 30-foot (1) |
| 37:12 | 12th (1) | 95:12 | 136:23;142:13; | 112:19 |
| years (18) | 176:13 | 195 (1) | 156:11 | 30-page (1) |
| 36:10;37:9,10,16; | 13 (1) | 3:12 | $215(1)$ | 60:15 |
| 45:6,16;48:11;64:1; | 81:8 | 197 (1) | 157:5 | 31st (3) |
| 77:20;98:19;102:9; | 133 (1) | 165:17 | $22(3)$ | $97: 17 ; 204: 14,24$ |
| 121:5;123:22;129:7; | 3:4 | 1970 (1) | 122:15;133:16; | $3200 \text { (1) }$ |
| 139:6;143:21; | 135 (1) | 115:23 | 169:17 | 141:18 |
| 144:16;171:1 | 200:6 | 1976 (1) | 224 (1) | 34 (4) |
| yellow (1) | 139 (1) | 43:23 | 97:15 | 136:20;156:24; |
| 126:16 | 179:12 | 1985 (1) | 227-C (1) | 196:7,12 |
| yesterday (2) | 14 (1) | 54:13 | 13:22 | 36 (1) |
| 104:11;144:8 | 171:9 | 199 (2) | 227-C1 (1) | 169:15 |
| Z | 140 (2) ${ }^{158: 12 ; 169: 15}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3: 13,14 \\ \text { 1st (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10: 18 \\ \text { 22nd (5) } \end{array}$ | 38 (3) $38: 4 ; 157: 16 ; 196: 7$ |
| zone (1) | $87: 2$143 (1) | 27:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22nd (5) } \\ & 137: 14 ; 139: 15,16 ; \\ & 140: 10,15 \\ & \mathbf{2 3} \text { (1) } \end{aligned}$ | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |



