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PROCEEDINGS
(Hearing resumed at 1:04 p.m.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: We are going to resume our deliberations on the topic of historic sites. Director Muzzey, you can pick up where we left off.

DIR. MUZZEY: Thank you. So this morning we ended with the list of what we call "above-ground resources" that were identified by the Applicant and concurred with by the review agencies of the list of historic sites within the Project area. I thought it might be useful now to discuss what the archeologists have done and how they went about their efforts to identify and evaluate archeological resources. There are a number of reports, as I mentioned, most of them marked confidential, of the different phases of archeological investigations that occurred within the Project area. I think rather than to work our way through all of those reports, it may be more helpful to look to testimony of Victoria Bunker, Dr. Victoria Bunker, who did the archeological investigation. She has
three exhibits of testimony: Exhibit 18, which dates from April 12, 2016; Exhibit 77, which dates from March 29th, 2017; and then Exhibit 144, which dates from July 27th, 2018.

MR. WAY: Eighteen, 77 --
DIR. MUZZEY: And 144.
So, looking at Exhibit 18, Dr.
Bunker begins by discussing the various phases of archeology, beginning with what is Phase I-A, which is a review of the Project area from a historical perspective: What archeological sensitivities have been identified in the past; what reports have been done in the past; what are the land features, water features, expected area of sensitivity based on that, as well as areas of disturbance. That was completed for the entire width of the corridor. The review agencies did not request archeological investigations beyond the width of the corridor, except for in case of known laydown areas, marshaling yards, access roads, things happening that would have ground-disturbing characteristics outside of the right-of-way.

Those were reviewed as well from a Phase I-A perspective.

And then for areas that were judged to be archeologically sensitive -- that means having a potential for archeological sites -the consultant team went out and did what was called Phase I-B surveys, which is where they actually go walk the area, put a shovel in the ground, may do some corings. I won't explain the entire steps of all the phases of archeology because I think that's recorded pretty well within our record already.

At the end of both Phase I-A and Phase B investigations, reports were submitted to the Division of Historical Resources and, as appropriate, the Army Corps of Engineers for their review and either their concurrence or recommendations for work otherwise.

Typically within the archeological process, affected areas coming out of a Phase I-B investigation would be recommended for Phase II, which is more intensive shovel test pits. This phase is to determine whether or
not an intact archeological site exists, what the extent of that site may be, and what would be its areas of significance that make it important. If the site at the end of Phase II has been identified and defined and does have importance, the nature, extent and significance of the site, and it is impacted by the project, then a Phase III archeological investigation would follow. That involves, again, even more testing underground, and some portion of the site would be recovered and curated and interpreted.

Given Dr. Bunker's work on this project, flipping now to the end of her testimony, Exhibit 18, prefiled testimony dating from 2016, her consultant team was still within the Phase $1-A$ and $I-B$ investigations. So if we flip to 17 -- 77 -I've got too many PDFs open on my computer. Just a sec.

I'm going to suggest that we skip
instead to 144. So, on Page 5, Dr. Bunker states that the Project has been designed to
avoid potential archeological sites and that no further work is needed. She then continues her testimony with an attachment that reviews a number of potential archeological resources that were identified by the Durham Historic Associates. And she addresses five of those and discusses efforts to use the Phase I-A Phase I-B methodology and that she could find no further need for survey.

Of particular note, a grave marker that was found near the Main Street intersection at UNH that we saw this morning, it's referred to as an "isolated headstone," where there is some concern from the Durham Historic Association that that may be an actual burial site. And although Dr. Bunker did not recommend the treatment, the Applicant has agreed to do what we heard called "ground-penetrating radar" in order to see whether the soils there are intact, whether they're undisturbed and whether there's anything that wold suggest a grave shaft would be in place.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Director Muzzey, is that the Samuel Hill grave site?

DIR. MUZZEY: Yes, it is. Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Thank you.
MR. WAY: Director Muzzey, and is that the only place that the ground-penetrating radar will be used on or needs to be used on that you're aware of?

DIR. MUZZEY: It's the only place that I'm aware of that the Applicant has committed to using the ground-penetrating radar and the only place where it was specifically requested.

MR. WAY: Only place requested.
DIR. MUZZEY: Yes.
MR. WAY: All right. Thank you.
DIR. MUZZEY: Now, there are
commitments in the Memorandum of Understanding and the Memorandum of Agreement that we can look at more specifically regarding archeology, and that has to do with if additional changes or additions are made to 015-04\} [DELIBERATIONS-DAY 2 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{11-29-18\}
areas of disturbance for this project -- for instance, if a new laydown area or marshaling yard or access way was identified -- the Applicant has committed to completing comparable archeological investigations in those areas to see whether there are any archeological resources that should be considered and/or avoided, as project plans may change.

Does anyone have any other additional questions or comments about how the archeological investigations unfolded for the Project?
[No verbal response]
DIR. MUZZEY: I'm wondering, then, since we've mentioned the MOA and MOU, if the group would like to turn to those agreements and see what the conditions are that were made to consider the adverse effects that were found for above-ground resource.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Before we get there, would it be helpful just to summarize the results of all those surveys? It's my understanding that Dr. Bunker
determined that only the LaRoche Cellar Hole site in Durham would be considered as potentially eligible for listing in the National Register and recommended avoidance of that site and then --

DIR. MUZZEY: Not only avoidance of the site, which is achievable, but also its protection not only of the potential site itself, but then a buffer around it during construction. And I would add, of course during maintenance activities as well for the life of the Project so it's protection is ensured.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: And she also addressed the sites suggested by the Durham Historic Association and reviewed those in her Phase I and Phase II as well, I believe -- sorry. Phase I-A and Phase I-B surveys --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Valentine Hill Canal, Norton Cellar Hole, Edgerly Farm, and found no evidence of archeological artifacts, features or
components. And then she went on and did that one at Samuel Hill graveyard where they -- she didn't need think anything needed to be done further, but they did agree to do the ground-penetrating radar.

DIR. MUZZEY: That was the agreement, I believe, with Counsel for the Public and the Applicant.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Right - And then the Moody graveyard suggested by DHA was determined to be outside of the right-of-way. Davis Thompson graveyard, and Ryan Stevens Memorials were outside of the access road by Foss Farm. So we thought that was kind of the results of her surveys?

DIR. MUZZEY: Well, those five areas you just discussed are summarized in Applicant's Exhibit 144, and they do represent additional work that the Applicant did in response to archeological concerns presented by Durham Historic Associates. And I did want to make a note that, you know, throughout New Hampshire, but particularly on the seacoast, there is a
history of many, many family burial grounds and graveyards being present on the landscape, and often in places we don't expect because the surrounding landscape has changed remarkably since they were first used as family burial graveyards.

And I do appreciate the efforts of the Durham Historic Association to identify those graveyards and voice their concerns for them. Graveyards are protected not only as potential historical and archeological sites in New Hampshire state law, but they are also protected as graveyards, and there are a number of state laws which indicate that a 25-foot buffer needs to be extended around those. We do know there's a history of people being buried outside what is now considered the cemetery boundaries, and hence the need for that type of 25-foot buffer, as well as just, you know, large construction equipment sometimes requires that type of buffering. So, those grave sites and graveyards will be protected in the Project not only through this historical review, but
by those other state laws.
MR. WAY: Quick question.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Mr.
Way.
MR. WAY: So the ROW is basically your area of your APE for this project for archeological, correct, the width of the buffer -- the width of the ROW, the right-of-way?

DIR. MUZZEY: Yes.
MR. WAY: And you're talking about a buffer zone for those that have been identified. But if there's something immediately outside of the right-of-way, is there a buffer zone that impacts activity within the right-of-way, or is it either it's in or it's out?

DIR. MUZZEY: Well, any access roads and marshaling yards and laydown yards would be outside of the right-of-way, and those were considered because those do represent potentially ground-disturbing areas that could affect the archeological resource. There may be a chance when, not in this project that I'm
aware of, although it could be in another project, where an archeological site could extend beyond a right-of-way. And in those cases, the site would be identified and protected using the same types of tools that we've already mentioned.

MR. WAY: All right. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: So at the end of the day here, after all these studies were done, the only site that was identified by any party involved here of archeological concern within the right-of-way is the LaRoche Brook Cellar Hole site. Maybe I phrased that wrong. The only one that needs specific avoidance is that LaRoche Brook Cellar Hole site. How would you describe -how would you sum up the results of her surveys?

DIR. MUZZEY: I would sum it up just as you have. We do have a condition that addresses the unexpected discovery of archeological resources. That's in the Memorandum of Understanding and the MOA. So I would add that discussion to it as well. So
if we could turn to the Memorandum of Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding, we can review those quickly.

Once again, $I$ have paper copies of these documents. Does anyone have the exhibit number?

MR. SHULOCK: I think the MOU is Exhibit 200, but the MOA I'm not sure --

DIR. MUZZEY: MOA in that COPY, the MOA may be an appendix to that.

MR. SHULOCK: It is an Appendix A.
DIR. MUZZEY: Okay. So if everyone could flip to Exhibit 200, that would be terrific, and I can quickly walk us through these to see if people have additional questions.

Again, just to refresh memories, the MOA is the agreement between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Division Historical Resources as the state historic preservation office, and Eversource. It relates to the areas within the APE that Corps took jurisdiction due to the presence of wetland impacts. And so it only considers
the adverse effects to historic and archeological resources in those areas. If we -- all of these agreements begin with a number of "Whereas" clauses. But the stipulations which designate mitigation begin on the second page.

The first stipulation lays out the process for providing plans for what's called "Historic American Engineering Recordation of the Little Bay Underwater Cable House Historic District." And you can read the specificity of how those will be recorded. This is providing archival documentation of the cable houses as they were built and as they exist today. The survey efforts that were completed on this resource in particular are not an archival record of them, and so this archival record is specified. It's reviewed and approved by not only the Division of Historical Resources, but the National Park Service, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers.

MS. DUPREY: Can you say what exhibit you're on? I thought we were on 200.

DIR. MUZZEY: We are. Again, I was using paper copies. So we're actually on the appendix to the MOU.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: It's PDF Page 9.

MS. DUPREY: Thank you.
DIR. MUZZEY: Sorry about that.
The stipulations continue with
specifying the process for stabilizing, relocating and then rehabilitating the Durham Cable House. I mentioned earlier that this is to be done in a manner that complies with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and it's approved by the New Hampshire SHPO and needs to be completed within five years of the execution of this agreement. And then exterior interpretive signage, as well as interior interpretive displays in Durham and Newington are specified. And these stipulations, of course, have an educational outreach component, and it's meant to share the information with the greater public and provide greater public benefit for the
activities that are going on with this resource. And those are to be completed within three years of the execution of the agreement.

The administrative conditions that follow --

MR. FITZGERALD: Excuse me. Does the public have access to those cable house areas other than from the bay?

DIR. MUZZEY: That's a good point. The one in Newington is privately owned. And so, no, there is no public access to that one. Visually, there's public access to anyone who --

MR. FITZGERALD: Sure.
DIR. MUZZEY: -- you know, is in a kayak, in a boat and that type of thing. The Durham one is on property that I believe is owned by Eversource. It's what we've been calling the "Getchell property."

MR. FITZGERALD: Right. But they haven't indicated any plans to allow public access to that, have they?

DIR. MUZZEY: I don't know the
answer to that question.
MR. FITZGERALD: Okay.
DIR. MUZZEY: Although, we do know that with the interpretive signage, as well as interpretive displays, that the public will have access to information about that resource. And that's part of the purpose of providing that public interpretation.

MR. FITZGERALD: I guess that's what I was getting at is how would the public access that information if they can't get to it.

DIR. MUZZEY: Outside of the water's edge view.

MR. FITZGERALD: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
think the signage is going to be located at Fox Point you just said, on public land owned by the town of -- the town.

MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
DIR. MUZZEY: The administrative conditions that follow under Roman Numeral I, we have the post-review discoveries condition. This is one of several places the idea that if
some sort of archeological resource is discovered, how things should be handled. The duration of the agreement, there's a monitoring and reporting clause which asks the Applicant to provide a yearly summary of how the stipulations are being carried out and their progress, along with administrative stipulations that cover dispute resolution and then termination of the agreement. So that's --

MR. WAY: Director Muzzey, what is the recourse if something isn't done? Some of these have durations of three years, of five years.

DIR. MUZZEY: If you look under the Dispute Resolution section, as well as the Amendments section, it lays out a process of what would happen in cases where the agreement is not carried out as specified and what are each of the parties' responsibilities and when would the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation be called in in order to address a dispute.

The format of this Memorandum of

Agreement is very similar to all Memorandums of Agreement that are used for Section 106 reviews that result in adverse effects to the historic resources. And in fact, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has issued guidance as to how these documents should be formatted and clearly explains the nature of the adverse effect and the steps taken to avoid, minimize and then mitigate those adverse effects.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I have a question perhaps for counsel. These agreements have provisions that they can be amended. And if we make the compliance with these agreements a condition of approval, if the agreements are later amended, is there any further involvement with the SEC?

MR. IACOPINO: Depends on the actual wording of your condition. You can certainly require approval of any further amendments to them. I don't think that's been the practice. Generally when there's been MOUs and things like that that contain a dispute resolution, the matter is generally left to the parties,
and we've only dealt with the issue later on if it's actually brought to us with a request.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay.
Thank you.
DIR. MUZZEY: The Division of Historical Resources has requested four conditions to be added to the Project's Application for a certificate if awarded.

The first condition notes the condition of certificate upon compliance with stipulations in the mitigation documents executed by DHR/SHPO, Corps and Applicant.

Because the agreement does have an Amendment clause and a process that would lay out how an amendment should be done, as well as a Dispute Resolution clause, my interpretation is that the Applicant, as well as the agencies involved, would be in compliance with the stipulations if it was amended, as long as it followed the process laid out in the agreement.

So, turning back to PDF Page 1, I
believe, to the Memorandum of Understanding, this again is between the New Hampshire SHPO

Officer, as well as the Applicant. This is in accordance with RSA 227-C:9. That's the other area of jurisdiction we discussed. It's a similar-looking document; however, these deal with properties that are outside of what the Corps considered what its jurisdiction is. And they are listed at the bottom of first page of the Agreement: Alfred Pickering Farm in Newington, Durham Point Historic District, Little Bay Underwater Cable Terminal Houses, and the Newmarket and Bennett Roads Farms Historic District.

If we turn to the second page of the stipulations, we have the first one addressing the Alfred Pickering Farm, where we note that the use of a weathering steel H-frame structure on the property minimizes the adverse effects to the farm. And then a second stipulation is the publication of a publicly-oriented booklet that will discuss the history of agriculture in Newington. And that booklet is to be prepared by a qualified architectural historian and drafts reviewed
by the DHR prior to its publication.
Both in our proceeding and the Public Comment Meeting we had at Pease during this proceeding, we heard criticism of this stipulation, although it does provide the public benefit that is so important with mitigation, as well as it does deal with the history of agriculture. And we are looking at a farm in this case that's adversely affected. Some provided comment that it was not a sufficient mitigation stipulation. So I'm wondering if others on the Committee have thoughts or concerns or possible resolution of the various opinions of this stipulation.

MS. DUPREY: I originally thought that, too, but it was partially out of ignorance. And when I read Ms. O'Donnell's report and people questioned her on various things that you could do to mitigate, they were very much, $I$ thought, in the vein of this. And I think I just wasn't sufficiently educated and familiar with the types of things that could be done. Was anything else specifically suggested by people from the area
that they felt was a better option?
DIR. MUZZEY: Well, if we turn to Applicant's Exhibit 248, it lists a number of preservation and history-related goals that the Town of Newington had suggested as possible mitigation. No. 1 on that list was construction of the transmission lines through Newington underground. And then if that was not possible, the following improvements are requested to mitigate what's referred to as the "damage" on this exhibit -- we would also call it "adverse effect." And you can see that they all deal with the National Register-listed Newington Center Historic District. There are eight items specified, from repair of the old stone school, chimney repair at the old parsonage and at the meeting house. There's a suggestion of tree planting, forest management. Again, the Newington Center Historic District was enlarged in the early ' 90 s with the addition of the town forest. There's discussion of a soccer area --

MR. WAY: What exhibit is that?

MS. DUPREY: 248.
DIR. MUZZEY: 248. Some work that could be done creating composite maps using historic maps and GPS technology, and then a set of trail markers for the town forest. It's the eighth -- well, what I assumed was the eighth request. There are also two bullets at the bottom that $I$ believe you could consider as 9 and 10, which is manage the scenic aspect of the district, working to preserve existing stone walls and some that need repair, and then the idea of creating a buffer along Arboretum Drive to protect the district, town forest and residential areas.

MR. WAY: And were any -- I don't think any of these were considered -- well, they were considered, but I don't think any of these are put before us right now, correct, other than they're just in the exhibit?

DIR. MUZZEY: Earlier in the record there is discussion of potential chimney repairs at the old parsonage --

MR. WAY: I recall.
DIR. MUZZEY: -- and the meeting
house. Those were replaced with the agricultural history, public outreach effort.

MR. WAY: Because in terms of the booklet, with all due respect, I'm in the skeptical camp. You know, I think it was described almost as a "pamphlet," with a very limited, I would imagine, limited shelf life. It just didn't seem robust to me, in terms of the mitigation strategy. I remember when I was having the -- I was sitting through the presentation, and I remember looking at the exhibit as you just said, Exhibit --

DIR. MUZZEY: 248.
MR. WAY: -- 248, too many PDFs, and thinking that it would make more sense to do something a little bit more long-lasting and sustainable from that inventory list. I didn't go much further than that. And, you know, I'm not ready to give up completely on the pamphlet. But $I$ wasn't really sold on the value of that. I don't know about anybody else.

MS. DUPREY: Since this is part of an MOU that's been signed, I'm just wondering
if we were to just say we wanted something instead of the pamphlet, what are the mechanics of that? Do we really have the ability to do that?

MR. IACOPINO: You have the legal authority to condition it if you're inclined to grant the certificate, to condition that certificate in any way pretty much that you choose, that there's a record for. If you believe that there is some impact on the historic resources that can be mitigated, you can issue additional conditions over and above their MOU for --

MS. DUPREY: Okay. So we can't trade it out. We can't take something out of the MOU. What we could do is add something.

MR. IACOPINO: NO, I think you could say we condition the certificate on the MOU, with the exception of section whatever. I mean, $I$ don't know what section this is.

MS. DUPREY: But even if we did that, this is still an agreement with the DHR. I mean, maybe for purposes of the SEC they don't have to do it. But they're still going
to have to do it.
MR. IACOPINO: Correct, but --
MS. DUPREY: I just think we should be clear about that.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, that's what I thought you were asking is what can the SEC do.

MS. DUPREY: No. I was asking is we can't trade one thing out for another. And what you're saying is you can add something on top of it.

MR. IACOPINO: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: And we could not hold them -- the SEC, we cannot hold them to a condition that we don't necessarily feel as though they need to comply with. And my guess is if we did that, they'd go back and seek to amend their MOU to eliminate that. But, you know, who knows.

I think there's some value to the pamphlet. I don't think it's enough. I think we've heard loud and clear from the people that lived in Newington, and from Mr. Hebert on behalf of the planning board
and his familiarity with the historic district, that they considered it vastly inadequate as mitigation. So I'm not sure -I don't think it's a bad idea, but I think we need to do -- I think the Applicant should do more. I can't prioritize what project should be dealt with. So $I$ would probably be in favor of a sum of money that would go to the historic district to use for one of these projects. I think I'd take out the soccer field one.

MR. FITZGERALD: Is the historic district an entity?

DIR. MUZZEY: The historic district is a geographic area --

MR. FITZGERALD: Right. But so the historic district --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: MY understanding is there's a Historic District Commission.

DIR. MUZZEY: There is a Historic District Commission that is an arm of town government in Newington.

I will point out for the record that the property that is adversely affected within the town of Newington is the Alfred Pickering Farm. It is adjacent to the historic district, but it's not in the historic district as it is defined today. The owners of the Alfred Pickering Farm have not been interested in various mitigation options that may have existed for mitigation that is on their property. That would be normally the first focus of a mitigation effort, something to improve the historical values of this individual farm. And they have -- from what I've gathered from our proceeding, they have not been interested in that, but instead have asked for the focus to be on the Newington Center Historic District, which was not found to have an adverse effect. It's unusual in my experience for a property owner to specify I want the mitigation there in that historic district. Although, we have had a number of cases in the past where mitigation was not possible at an adversely affected resource, and so we
have cast a wider circle with mitigation in order to replace historical values elsewhere in the community, a historically-related property or to achieve some other goals stated in, say, a historical resources chapter in a master plan or some sort of other planning document in the community. PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Does anyone else want to chime in concerning possible mitigation for the Alfred Pickering Farm booklet versus something else? Do we want to resolve it or table this or... DIR. MUZZEY: I guess in order to continue the conversation about your suggestion, you had suggested some sort of dollar figure that would be awarded to the town's historic district commission or the town itself. Did you have a dollar figure in mind?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
think that's something we can kick around. I think it needs to be enough to make a difference, but not enough to solve every problem in the district. You know, between
the 20- to 30,000 range, 15 to 30 ? Yeah, $I$ mean, you look at some of these projects, and to do a couple of them, it's 10-, 12,000 or more for the smaller ones. I think there was a suggestion that the most important one to the town was the Stone School, I think. And that, of course, is 200,000 , which I think is too much. I don't know. What do other people think?

MR. WAY: I'm also sensitive to the fact that, as I recall from testimony, that I think one of these was removed from the -- was taken off the table because it would have cost the community more in effort than it would have in value.

DIR. MUZZEY: The chimney repair was characterized in that --

MR. WAY: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I'm wondering if there's some way to tie it back to the damage done. And maybe that's beyond our area of expertise. I guess the more I think about it, it probably is. But the effects to the farm, you know, are visual
effects to its integrity as a scenic farm, right. That was the --

DIR. MUZZEY: Well, in this case we're talking about a historic farm. So it's the historical attributes and the historic setting of the farm.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: The setting was a part of the evaluation and the adverse affects.

DIR. MUZZEY: Yes, the setting and landscape.

MR. WAY: I like the idea of having some set amount of funds available to do something. I'm not exactly sure what that something is. I'm a little hesitant, even though I may not like the pamphlet or see a lot of value in it, to choose from this list. And since $I$ don't necessarily know the priorities, I'm not sure how to move from there.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
would have it go to the Historic District Commission to use as they see fit with their priorities, obviously to be used in the
historic district for improvements there, to buildings or landscape, whether it's the trees or a building repair.

MR. WAY: We don't really know how much is being spent on the pamphlet either. I don't think that came out.

DIR. MUZZEY: I would say it's more unusual for there to be dollar figures attached to mitigation agreements. That's not the practice everywhere. But the practice in New Hampshire is, rather than quantify it from a dollar perspective, what appropriate mitigation is, is to address the effects, the adverse effects, and then to develop a mitigation package of actions that will address those adverse effects without specification to a dollar figure.

One exception to that is another project that was before the Site Evaluation Committee, where due to adverse effects to a historic village, historic district, a small grant program was established under the management of the Land and Community Heritage Investment program, which is part of New

Hampshire state government and has very well-established granting processes and procedures which protect historical properties all across the state of New Hampshire. And so there was a hundred thousand dollars in that case. And again, that is based on the nature of the effects contributed to a grant program. And then historic properties within the affected historic district could apply for that funding. That was a mitigation stipulation that worked out very well, in my opinion. PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO, you know, another thing we could do is leave it up to the town to know what to do. Maybe the town works -- whether it's the town or the Historic District Commission, maybe we actually leave it with the town itself, the selectmen, to work with DHR to come up with a plan for spending whatever dollar amount we feel is fine, whether that's on a booklet or whether it's on improvement to a property or something that otherwise would mitigate the adverse effects to the Alfred Pickering Farm.

MR. WAY: It's not a bad idea. And even when we talked about the booklet, it may not just be the aspects of the booklet, but the fact that in the digital age, you know, it may be more a web site. It may be some other things for distribution. It may be an existing publication. I seem to recall them saying there was an existing publication that might be enhanced and even distributed more. So we might be able to take that and make it into something even better. But once again, I don't want to just be shooting in the dark and deciding for the community what's best for them.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I don't think we have that expertise.

MR. IACOPINO: I was just going to point out for the record that I believe that statement came at the Public Statement Meeting when we took public statements in Newington.

MR. WAY: That there was?
MR. IACOPINO: That there was a previous publication that addressed the same sort of subject matter.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: So as I'm sitting here, I'm thinking of some issues with my town with historic buildings and preservation. And I think a lot of towns struggle with the same kinds of things. So one of it is just digitizing historic documents. You know, maybe that's what we want to spend it on. There's so many ranges of things that they could use -- the funds could be spent on whether it's a booklet or whether it's digitizing records, not town records but historical records, building improvements. And I don't think we can judge for the Town of Newington. So I think I would be comfortable with a certain sum of money -I'm not sure what that is -- to go to the town, but with having working collaboration with DHR, if you don't mind, Director Muzzey, to come up with a plan to spend that money in a way that benefits the history of the town of Newington.

MR. FITZGERALD: So I share some of the concern about that we don't have the expertise here to make a determination. So
one thought that comes to me is obviously someone in negotiation of this MOU had in mind an amount of money that was going to be spent to prepare this pamphlet. And I'm not sure whether the pamphlet is an adequate response or not. But $I$ guess if we're thinking about an amount of money, that the money certainly should not exceed or, you know, should be equivalent to the amount that was going to be spent here. And I share Susan's concern that when we start popping things out, we have an MOA or MOU that requires them to do a pamphlet and we require them to donate money to the historic district, $I$ understand we can impose above and beyond. But $I$ would certainly be more comfortable with us pulling that -- you know, conditioning our approval on the MOA, with the exception of that. Then the historic office can do whatever they want with it and that we recommend an equivalent amount of money be donated to the historic society. And I understand that's basically what Susan -Ms. Duprey -- I'm sorry -- was calling for. MR. WAY: So when you say "an
equivalent amount of money," would that mean that in the MOA the booklet would still be in place and purchased, or that they could substitute what they would have done on the booklet with a new project outside of the MOA? MR. FITZGERALD: I'm suggesting whatever amount of money they would have spent on the booklet would be the amount that they would donate as opposed to -- you know, and then it would be up to the parties to negotiate with the office of SHPO, whatever it's called, to determine whether or not they still need to do the booklet.

MR. SCHMIDT: I think they originally agreed to do the chimney repair. So maybe the value we should use is the higher of the two.

DIR. MUZZEY: Well, I would just like to remind folks that our Chair spoke that she didn't feel the booklet was sufficient. So I'm wondering if you felt that, both from the scope of the booklet, as well as the other educational programs attached to it, plus something additional was needed, that just
swapping out a dollar figure for the booklet would not address that insufficiency.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I think it needs to be more than a couple thousand dollars. I found the booklet inadequate. I found the booklet helpful, in that it would provide not only the Town of Newington, but anyone who was interested in researching this, more information about farming in the area through the ages. There was going to be a digitized copy. Presumably DHR would have it. So, you know, it would be a resource.

MR. WAY: Does it already exist, though?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: But it may already exist. And what tends to happen I think with a lot of these things is it has limited utility to most people; whereas, everyone in the town of Newington is going to drive by the Alfred Pickering Farm probably at least once a week, but they're not going to go to the library or historical society and pull up the pamphlet from the
shelf or go online and seek it out. It's something that one's sort of in your face and one you have to go hunt for. So I don't think that the hidden -- I shouldn't say hidden -but the remediation addresses the impact. So I think there needs to be something more. Is the booklet a good idea? Sure. But it's very limited in its utility, in my opinion. So I would rather have a larger impact for the greater community in Newington and those that travel through that historic district that enhances the aesthetics of the district in some manner. Whether that's the tree planing or chimney -- I think the chimney repair is probably not a good idea -- but painting a building, buying new clapboards, something. I don't know what it is. That's why I don't want to make that decision. I think it should be left up to the community to know where that should be spent. So I think the $\$ 2500$ or whatever is too little. I think it needs to be significantly more. But nor do I think it needs to be $\$ 100,000$. But $I$ think it needs to be more than the booklet.

MS. DUPREY: Just in response to that, because I looked down the list, and I'm not looking at it right this minute, but as I did look down, a lot of it had to do with tree planting. And it just occurs to me that the Applicant agreed of its own volition to do an incredible amount of tree planting. True, it has to do with the aesthetics and not the historic. But they're investing a lot of money that but for the fact they agreed with Mr. Lawrence they might well not have to do. So I feel like we've really done the tree planting thing as far as the Applicant goes. At least in my mind, $I$ feel like they've made some pretty huge offers with respect to tree planting. And I'm not convinced that more tree planting added by us is really appropriate. So when I look at the other things that are on there, they didn't ask to paint a building. I mean, they put forth, like, eight things, and none of it was painting buildings. It was two chimneys, which apparently in retrospect they don't want to do a $\$ 200,000$ school, which we don't want
to do. So $I$ just feel a little bit in a quandary about that. I'd rather give the amount of money for both chimneys. I feel like -- I know you feel like that's really low. I don't, given everything else that the Applicant is doing here.

But I did want to ask Director Muzzey how did the pamphlet get arrived at. Do we know how that -- because we're second-guessing it, and I'm wondering how did that come up. Because I'm remembering Ms. O'Donnell's testimony, and I've been scanning through trying to find where she was suggesting things that could be done as mitigation. And there were things like workshops and whatnot. They're not these huge things that we seem to be contemplating now. So that led me to question how did the pamphlet come up, who made that suggestion. And I just wanted to be sure before we're second-guessing it, you know, who we're second-guessing.

DIR. MUZZEY: I don't think there is
a wealth of information within the record as
to the origins of this stipulation.
And I did want to note that of course it's the publication of a publicly-oriented booklet on the history of agriculture in the town of Newington, and it also includes, following the booklet's completion, a public presentation in the town to celebrate Newington's agricultural history, provide an overview of the research that was completed in order to publish the booklet with a wide variety of visuals for the public. Other information presented may include how to list a property to the New Hampshire state or National Registers of Historic Places, how to seek assistance with maintenance issues and/or other preservation-related issues. So the idea of a workshop or a public presentation, that type of thing, was included within this larger stipulation.

But to get more specifically to your question, earlier in the record we saw draft MOUs. They specified the chimney repairs. We did hear testimony that -- it
slips my mind right now as to where we learned that the town was less interested in chimney repairs. And then we have the information that additional consultation was held with the community and then have the new draft of the MOU with this idea in place.

MS. DUPREY: Thank you.
MR. WAY: I do remember, too, yeah,
Counsel Iacopino. I remember the public hearing, and I do remember one person describing the mitigation efforts and sort of starting up here at a high level and then working down and down to the point it was a pamphlet. And that pamphlet, that booklet -and it wasn't very well regarded at that point in the hearing. And I remember that was sort of a consensus of the group, which might be expected. But that had an impact on me, as I think about it: How is it going to be accepted in the community? It's already kind of a point of -- it seemed like it was a point of derision at that meeting.

DIR. MUZZEY: I've been taking --
oh, go ahead.

MR. SCHMIDT: I do want to note in the town's master plan, in the historic chapter, there are certain recommendations that they have requested, and they're of a much grander scale. But maybe something could be worked towards targeting one of those highlights that the town itself has noted. One is the Newington Old Town Center. They recommend maintaining it and continuing the character, et cetera. But there was one in particular that struck my eye. Knights Brook Corridor, one of the region's scenic and historically significant landscapes, 250-acre tract situated immediately northwest of the town center, comprised of the Frink Farm, Pickering, Hislop and former Rowe properties. Every effort should be made to preserve this open space.

Maybe there's something we can target in that avenue that would benefit within the corridor of the proposal, but also something that the town has specifically highlighted a need for.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
think it's an excellent idea. I just don't know how much it would cost, what it would be -- is it a preservation easement, a conservation easement, et cetera? I think it's something that should be left up to the town to work in consultation with DHR so that the town knows what they're priorities are and maybe they can leverage this to get grant funds or matching funds or -- you know, I don't know. I don't think we can solve what the answer is. I think we need to decide should we do a booklet, should we do funds or should we do a combination; and if we do funds, what's the right amount of money.

MR. WAY: Or give the parties the option, too. I mean, once we -- I mean, we obviously can say what we'd like to have happen. But I mean, if both parties, to Ms. Duprey's point, are married to the booklet, fine, yes. But I think from my standpoint, I'd like to have something a little bit more. I'd love to give the parties the option to explore that and decide on their own what that might be. I think you do have to have a
little bit of a sum of money in there above and beyond. I think if you're going to choose the other option, they should be able to forego the pamphlet and put that money towards whatever that second option might be. So, you know, I think it's something a little bit more flexible. But, I mean, obviously, I may be encouraging something more that's already in there.

MR. FITZGERALD: I'd just like to recognize, also, that we're mitigating for the Pickering Farm and we're mitigating for its cultural setting I guess or whatever.

DIR. MUZZEY: Its historic setting and landscape.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah. And certainly it's my feeling the intent of the booklet is related to farming, to highlight farming in Newington. I'm not sure how fixing chimneys or doing other activities relates to mitigating for a farm as a historic resource. So I just -- if we do something there, I think it should be, you know, signage for the farm or, you know, I don't know. But it should be
related to that.
DIR. MUZZEY: So just to summarize some things I've been hearing in this discussion, a possibility would be to set aside a certain sum of money to be managed by the Historic District Commission. The sum of money should provide wide public benefit, and the result of its use should be publicly accessible. Possible uses for this sum of money can be the publication of an agricultural history booklet, as specified in the MOU. It could be utilized to enhance the preservation values found in the Newington Center Historic District or further promote the town's agricultural history, or achieve goals as outlined in the historic resources chapter of the town's master plan.

A couple things that $I$ would want to add to this type of stipulation, just representing best practices, would be to include a time limit on the utilization of the funds so that they are spent and made publicly available in a timely way. I would suggest some sort of reporting back to the

SEC, so the SEC has an understanding of how this mitigation measure unfolded. And as has been suggested, I would have the NHDHR play a review role in whatever activity is planned.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: MY only change to that is we haven't heard from anyone from the Historic District Commission itself of whether they're capable or willing to manage the funds. So I think we'd probably be better to look to the town itself to work with its bodies and then obviously in consultation with DHR to come up with a solution, but obviously specify it's for historic purposes. I think Mr. Fitzgerald wants to tailor it not to just historic, but historic/agriculture-related. I don't feel that's necessary, but I understand the tie-in. I don't know if that's too limiting.

How do people feel about this as a general concept?

DIR. MUZZEY: I think making mitigation measures in general, it's best to tie the mitigation measures as closely as possible to the nature of the adverse effect.

But when that is not possible, as I think I said earlier, it is possible to suggest other mitigation measures that achieve other preservation goals in the community. In this case, we've heard a great deal of criticism of the agricultural and historical ideas and ways to promote that. Like others have said, I still see value in doing that type of thing. So I'm comfortable listing it as one of the options that this mitigation fund could be used for, but not necessarily saying it's the only option, because the community has suggested other goals and, in particular, things happening in its historic district and the Knights Brook idea. I think giving some suggestions may encourage some creative thinking without tying them to one particular end result.

MR. WAY: And I know the answer to this question. At this point in the game -and Michael, I'm looking down at you -- at this point in the game, there's no reaching out here. So there's no way to reach out to the Durham Historic Association. There's no
way to reach out to the Applicant or anyone to try to marry this a little bit better so we're not putting something prescriptive in place or something that they don't even want. They may have bought lock, stock and barrel into this pamphlet and, you know, resent us even having this discussion. But I doubt that.

And so am I correct in saying, Mike, that we have to just deal with this amongst ourselves and there's no reaching out on this topic?

MR. IACOPINO: I would agree with that. And I would suggest that the only way for you to "reach out" is by the delegation authority that you have to delegate things like this to a state agency or the Administrator of this Committee. And if you're going to do that, I would request that you are as specific as possible with respect to that. In other words, you don't want to leave either the DHR or Ms. Monroe trying to figure out exactly what the mitigation should be, whether it should be limited to farm lands or something. You should make it as specific
as you can. For instance, if your condition is that there will be a sum of money put aside for $X$ mitigation to be agreed upon by DHR and the Town of Newington, you're authorized to do that. You can delegate that authority to the DHR or to your Administrator to work with the Town and come up with a plan for the mediation -- for the mitigation. Sorry.

MR. WAY: And Director Muzzey mentioned about the LCHIP effort that was done in the past. In some of the previous cases, have we done something -- I have to imagine we've probably done something similar to this.

MR. IACOPINO: Primarily
conservation easements.
MR. WAY: Conservation easements?
But did it end up having sort of the same structure as what we're talking about right now?

MR. IACOPINO: I don't remember them coming up too much in the context of historical. I think they've come up in environmental --

MR. WAY: But in conservation, it
would be the same thing. It'd be a small bucket of money, or large, whatever that bucket is going to be, given to the

Conservation Commission, and the Conservation Commission, they do whatever they're going to do with it in terms of their own organization.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes.
MR. WAY: But we would not prescribe what type of conservation.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, actually, we have.

MR. WAY: We have.
MR. IACOPINO: We have designated that these funds are to be used to obtain a conservation easement on a certain piece of property. I believe that happened in the Antrim case. So we have been very specific. Whether you have to be that specific, you'll have to understand what you're planning on doing. But you can be less specific than that. Of course, all of your findings have to be based upon the record before you. So you've got to find on your record that this mitigation is appropriate.

MR. FITZGERALD: Does anyone recall who expressed dissatisfaction with the booklet, what testimony that was part of?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
There was lots of public comment about it at the meeting in Newington. I believe Mr. Hebert was asked specifically when he testified. We cross-examined him towards the end of the proceedings, and he also was critical of that, as I recall, in his testimony. Therefore, that lead us to question further the historical consultants when we had a chance to again cross-examine concerning possible other mitigation.

MR. FITZGERALD: I guess I'm just going to suggest that most likely we arrived at a booklet or pamphlet related to farming because somebody at some point insisted that it be -- that mitigation be related to farming. And, you know, I can't think of a lot of things to mitigate the impact on a farm. But $I$ would assume there was a lot of discussion. And although it might not be satisfactory, people arrived at a booklet and
some educational resources and so on. And so I guess I'd just be afraid that whatever we do ought to be in the same vein, if we decide to do something different than what's in here.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: It was my understanding, and maybe, Director Muzzey, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't believe Newington had a lot of input into that mitigation decision. Is that typical that the mitigation package is worked out more between the Applicant and DHR, or do you -- or does DHR typically involve the community as part of that discussion? DIR. MUZZEY: My assumption would be that the community would have been involved with that discussion. That would have been the more typical pattern.

MS. DUPREY: I feel like we're casting about a lot for something we don't need to be. Exhibit 248 is titled, "Newington Goals for Eversource Transmission Line Mitigation." It's quite specific. This is what the Town has asked for. So it seems to me that, if in fact we want to give a sum of
money, that we give a sum of money as the Chair woman has described to the Town in furtherance of their stated goals in 248. I don't know why we have to be necessarily looking to the master plan and other things to figure this out. They've given us a list that is evidenced in front of us in this proceeding. And so if the desire is to give a sum of money, I say we give it to the Town and we use this as the evidence that Attorney Iacopino's reminding us, that we need to be cognizant of, in furtherance of the goal of their choosing, along with Director Muzzey's suggestion, that it be spent within a certain amount of time. And I don't know if they report it to the DHR or what, that in fact it was spent for one of these goals, not all of which look historic to me I will admit. The fence at the soccer field doesn't look historic to me. But this is the mitigation that they've asked for. I mean, maybe the distinction here is it's not historic mitigation. Is that the concern that we have? It's not historic as opposed to maybe
aesthetics?
MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I don't think Exhibit 248 is Newington's goals for the entire mitigation of the line through Newington. You know, their No. 1 is construct it underground. But then they say if you can't do that, then -- but it's not specific. I think what we're talking about is specific mitigation for impacts to the Alfred Pickering historic resource.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I recall that this was their suggested mitigation to deal with properties that were still in the historic district, even though Pickering Farm is not. But it's on the line, just over the line. Probably should be in the district, but it's not, as Director Muzzey already talked about.

So let's try to get a sense of where we are. Do people feel as though we should do something beyond the booklet? Is there anyone who doesn't feel we should do something beyond? Ms. Duprey and Mr.

Fitzgerald feel as though the booklet's
sufficient mitigation. Mr. Shulock, Mr. Way, Mr. Schmidt, Ms. Muzzey and myself feel as though we should do more. Is that -Director Muzzey? Mr. Way's shaking his head "Yes" and other people "Yes."

MR. WAY: I'm not going to die for this one, but $I$ don't see the value of $a$ hundred copies.

MR. SCHMIDT: I do as well at the end of the day.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Director Muzzey.
DIR. MUZZEY: I think it would be more responsive to the concerns presented to us from the community of Newington if additional mitigation were supplied.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: So it sounds like a majority of the board wishes us to go beyond or instead of the booklet.

MR. WAY: But if I could, as Ms.
Duprey mentioned, I would opt to keep it as simple and flexible as possible, nonprescriptive, based upon what has been presented to us, working with DHR and the
conditions that were put forth by Director Muzzey.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO
I'm going to put you on the spot. What's your proposal? What's the first step of your proposal to talk about?

MR. WAY: In terms of a dollar figure?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Just what you think the condition should read, both in dollar and terms.

MR. WAY: I actually thought your amount of 20,000 was a fair amount to get some things done. And in terms of the actual wording, I might like to think about that a little bit. But I mean, the only thing I'm not sure of is who it should go to. Should it go to the association or the Town of Durham?

DIR. MUZZEY: I don't want to put
you on the spot, but we're talking about Newington.

MR. WAY: I'm sorry.
DIR. MUZZEY: So your worry is over.
MR. WAY: No, no. I was thinking --

I'm sorry.
MR. FITZGERALD: Durham was very excited.

DIR. MUZZEY: Sorry, Durham.
MR. WAY: Sorry, Durham.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: He meant Newington but said Durham.

MR. WAY: You almost walked out of this, Todd. So, my apologies.

So, yeah, I would say probably \$20,000. I think it also should have the ability of switching out the funds that would have been done on the booklet and be used towards that $\$ 20,000$. Or are we getting overly complicated at that point?

MR. FITZGERALD: Hmm-hmm.
MR. WAY: I'm hearing "Yes."
MS. DUPREY: Hmm-hmm.
MR. SHULOCK: I thought the four of you were talking about the booklet plus something. Or are you talking no booklet at all?

MR. WAY: I see no value to the booklet myself, particularly because the
community said, as I recall, that there was already a booklet in place. I mean, we can keep it but --

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I see the booklet as being an option for them; if they have $\$ 20,000$, that they can $u s e$ it for the booklet if they'd like, or they could use it on something else. But that's a decision for the Town. I see it go either -- what I meant when I was polling everyone was do we just do a booklet, or do we do funds that can be used for a booklet or some other project.

MR. SCHMIDT: Right. That's the way
I understood it. I think 20,000 is a fair number, and the Town can choose to use the money towards the booklet. I think the money should go to the Town, targeted for historic preservation.

DIR. MUZZEY: My suggestion would be for the funding to go to the Town to work in partnership with the Historic District Commission to achieve preservation goals for the community.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: With
or without oversight of DHR?
DIR. MUZZEY: I would suggest the continuing oversight of the DHR.

MR. WAY: And that should be right in the condition.

DIR. MUZZEY: And I still believe that it's important that whatever the activity is they fund provide wide public benefit, that there be a time frame attached to its expenditure, and that they provide reporting back to the SEC as to how the funds were utilized.

MR. WAY: Last time was two years, as I recall, for the booklet.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.
MR. WAY: I think that's sufficient.
DIR. MUZZEY: It was actually two years for the booklet, and then there was the public presentation that would follow. So I think two years is kind of too short.

MR. WAY: You think so?
DIR. MUZZEY: Yeah.
MR. SCHMIDT: I agree. I was
thinking five or ten. When a project goes
through an entire process, it certainly would take more than two years, and that's if they choose to use it for a project type of issue. So I was thinking five to ten.

MR. WAY: So, five to ten to spend \$20,000?

DIR. MUZZEY: I'd be comfortable with five years. I mean, $\$ 20,000$ is not that much money. What may add to the project time frame is if they actually use that to leverage other funding. But I still think five years is probably a good target goal. And they would have the opportunity to seek an amendment if needed.

MR. SCHMIDT: When I went to the higher end, $I$ was thinking for a match.

And maybe, Director Muzzey, you can help me. If a town was to apply for some sort of matching grant, what is the current wait for that? Is there a process to get into a program or to get approved for funds, and the backlog is maybe several years or no or...

DIR. MUZZEY: It really depends on
the program. Common preservation-related grant programs in New Hampshire are the Conservation License Plate Program, as well as the Land and Community Heritage Investment Program. So it's not a question of how long the backlog is, it's more a question of how competitive the grant round is, whether or not a project was chosen for the round. Those rounds occur every year. And so, you know, in the event that the town did seek to apply for a grant, they would still, within the five-year time frame, would have time to apply for the next round.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay.
MR. WAY: But even, Director Muzzey, your idea of keeping this flexible, I think if they have an opportunity that came up that extended beyond five years, Mr. Schmidt's time frame, I think that's fine as well.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, I'd be fine with
that. What I'm concerned about is there's a project for 100,000 and they go for a match, get 20,000 for a match. I don't know about the bureaucratic delay, if it's doable. But
if we could build in some sort of process that's initiated within the five years or something like that, I'm fine with that. PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: So it sounds like we have a five-year term unless extended by agreement between Town of Newington and DHR, with a progress report perhaps to the SEC at that five-year time period or before, when the funds are spent. Attorney Iacopino, do we have any issues regarding the state agency with changing the terms of permits, or is there anything there we need to be thinking of? MR. IACOPINO: Well, it depends what you decide to do. If you -- RSA 162-H:7(a) says that if you intend to propose certificate conditions that are different than those proposed by the agencies having permitting or other regulatory authority, you have to notify the agency to get their input on whether or not what you're proposing is in conformity with the law and whether or not it's appropriate in light of the agency's statutory responsibilities. I don't know that this is a
change because $I$ don't know exactly what it is that you're proposing. Right now there's a Memorandum of Understanding that, as I understand it, there's a recommendation from DHR that you adopt the Memorandum of Understanding. I don't know that that's a condition. So, I don't know that that would actually trigger it.

DIR. MUZZEY: I don't believe it actually was a recommendation from the agency. It's from a letter dated August 1st, 2017. If the Site Evaluation Committee approves this project, the Project's application for certificate, the DHR/SHPO requests the following conditions be included: No. 1, condition the certificate upon compliance and stipulations in the mitigation documents executed by the DHR, the Corps and the Applicant. So I think we could characterize it as a "request." But if we don't condition the certificate, if awarded, on the rest of the mitigation stipulations, we're going to get into some pretty fancy wording.

MR. IACOPINO: I lost you at the
very end there. You consider this to just be a request for this condition. That's why I'm saying it's a recommendation, not a permit that has a condition in it.

DIR. MUZZEY: They have requested that four conditions be added to the certificate, if awarded. If we don't do No. 1, condition the certificate upon compliance with stipulations in the mitigation documents, we'll have to condition the certificate individually on all of these mitigation conditions. Or we can just say, no, it doesn't matter.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO
that's a request, not a permit condition?
DIR. MUZZEY: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: That was my first
thought. I guess ultimately it depends upon what it is you want to try to do here. Is this something that's going to be in addition to what is in the MOU, or is it going to be something that changes the MOU?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: MY
understanding of our discussion was that we
were going to leave the MOU alone, not require compliance with the section concerning the booklet at the SEC level, leave any agreement between the parties to the parties, and condition the certificate, on a separate condition, that a sum of, it's been suggested $\$ 20,000$, be given to the Town of Newington to work in concert with the Historic District Commission and New Hampshire DHR to decide how to spend those funds and to then spend those funds within five years. Is that -- it's not eloquently put, but basically what we've been -- is that everyone's understanding of what we're talking about as a certificate condition?

MR. WAY: That's the bones of it, yes.

MR. IACOPINO: It's in addition to. DIR. MUZZEY: I feel it may be better practice to take the avenue that our attorney just mentioned about contacting the state agency and suggesting whether the change can be made and then just being able to make the blanket statement that these agreement
documents are part of the certificate.
MR. FITZGERALD: Can I make a suggestion? Seems to me we could accept the condition of the MOA, MOU, whatever it is, with the exception of that one, that satisfies the SEC. Whatever the historic office wants to do beyond that is fine. And then we condition the Applicant spend an amount, $\$ 20,000$ or whatever, and delegate the authority for doing that to the historical office to work in conjunction with the Town of Newington and Newington Historic Commission and representatives of the Pickering Farm to, you know, implement a plan for the use of that money.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Trying to get that farm piece in there. Give you credit.

MR. FITZGERALD: I don't care. It doesn't necessarily have to be the Pickering Farm or something. But, you know --

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I think there's been -- my understanding of the involvement with the folks that own Pickering

Farm is that they haven't been particularly willing to have a lot of dialogue concerning the Project. So I wouldn't want to condition this on their approval or their input if they do not want to participate in that process.

DIR. MUZZEY: One of my concerns is I wouldn't want the Site Evaluation Committee to put a state agency into an administrative difficulty, where one of the aspects of their agreement documents is now not part of the certificate. I think that puts the agency in a difficult position and reopens negotiations on the agreement between the community, the agency and the Applicant as to whether or not that was an appropriate stipulation and what should now be done with it. That's why I would prefer to exercise what $I$ believe $I$ heard is the Committee's option to go back to the state agency, see whether the stipulation can be changed within this document and then have what $I$ view as the need or solution where the two documents just become part of the certificate.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO,

Attorney Iacopino, could we then do an either/or condition where the Applicant and parties to the MOU will seek to replace that condition with that as suggested by the Committee and amend that agreement? And if that does not occur, then instead we will then go to what we said where the Committee then will impose that condition? That pretty much assures that the agreement will be amended. MS. DUPREY: Can we not just assign an arbitrary value to the pamphlet, like let's say it's \$1500 and the grant's another $\$ 18,500$, and let them figure out how to get out from under the pamphlet? I just think that we're doing too much here. I don't think we need to do all this. Maybe you think the pamphlet's worth $\$ 500$. I don't know what it is. But whatever it is, let's just come up with our own number and let the DHR thing alone, and the parties that are expert at this, they can figure it out.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
think we are spending too much time on this.
I agree.
(Various SEC members voicing agreement.) PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: But I don't think that solution solves Director Muzzey's -- you know, why don't we take a 10-minute break, get clear our heads a little bit, maybe talk to counsel and then come back.
(Recess was taken at 2:39 p.m.
and the hearing resumed at 2:50 p.m.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO
let's resume our deliberations concerning mitigation for the Alfred Pickering Farm's work site. Ms. Duprey, I think you may have a suggestion.

MS. DUPREY: I did. And I wouldn't be true to myself if $I$ didn't first try to put something on the record. So I would once again like to call people's attention to Patricia O'Donnell's remarks towards the end of her testimony. I went back and looked at the transcript, and of course did not note the page, but noted in there that she was asked about mitigation. And she was asked about this pamphlet specifically. And I think it might have actually been you, Madam Chair, who
asked her were there other kinds of mitigation -- or someone did, let me say that -- were there other kinds of mitigation that she could suggest. And she suggested perhaps a workshop on rebuilding your stone wall, and I think another one on historic stone walls. So I just put that out there because I think that's very much in keeping with the kind of thing we're looking at here. And she went on to say there's all kinds of things you could do. It's such a rich pallet. And by that, I don't think she was really referring to going and spend money. I think she was referring to the kind of things you can do to educate the public, which this is very much in keeping with that. So I think it was an appropriate mitigation effort. That said, I'm in the minority. I can count heads. And we've been struggling with how to manage this situation, and I think the best thing that we can do is to set aside an amount of money -- and I'm going to propose $\$ 20,000$; that's a number that's been discussed here, and people can take issue with that -- and to
say that we unlink it from the MOU and MOA and leave those documents as they are. I don't think going back to the agency is a good idea. I think it's just overly complicated, and the lawyers will spend $\$ 2,000$ figuring that out. So let's just give a sum of money. Give it to the Town to be spent in furtherance of their notion of mitigating the Pickering Farm, with oversight or review by DHR, and to be spent within five years. And I think that's it. I think that's enough.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO
just to make sure I understand what you're proposing, it's what we were talking about before the break, but uncoupling it from the requirement in the MOU that the booklet and educational presentation be done.

MS. DUPREY: That will remain.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO that will remain.

MS. DUPREY: Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: And
this will be a condition that the Committee
imposes in addition to whatever is in that

MOU .
MS. DUPREY: Correct.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Am I understanding you correctly?

MS. DUPREY: Yes. And if the parties on their own separately decide they want to approach DHR to unencumber themselves of the booklets, I think that's between the parties and DHR. I don't think that we need to be in the middle of that. So I suggest that we do this separately; that it be in mitigation of the Pickering Farm, where there was a lot of consideration to going underground. We're not doing that, so I think we're justified in giving a sum of money, if that's what we so decide. And I think the only thing that's up in the air is $\$ 20,000$. I'm suggesting that as the number that you all had been tossing around before. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Thank you. I actually like your suggestion. We've all felt, and I think I vocalized and many of us have vocalized that there's value to what has been proposed as mitigation, and
we just didn't feel it was far enough. So I actually like that proposal. I'll just leave it at that.

How do other people feel about this proposal, both uncoupling and dollar amounts, or any other terms concerning the proposal?

MR. WAY: I like the proposal, and I like the uncoupling. I accept not changing the agreements whatsoever.

Did you mention about reporting back to the SEC? I think we probably want to --

MS. DUPREY: I did not.
MR. WAY: We probably would like to keep that in there. I think I'm good.

MR. SCHMIDT: I'm good as well.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: And Director Muzzey, you look like you're going to say something.

DIR. MUZZEY: I like that solution as well. It's far more efficient, far more straightforward. I do have a concern about the dollar value. We're talking about preservation activities here that are being
done by professionals, potentially talking about doing things to repair historic buildings, potentially large projects, trying to match those large projects. I actually had a dollar figure in mind closer to $\$ 50,000$. I certainly would be willing to compromise on that. But I just think not too much in this day and age with professionals involved can be accomplished with $\$ 20,000$.

MS. DUPREY: I guess I'm not sure we're the only ones who have to contribute to the pool of money. So I think 50,000 is really a lot. And I'm going to leave it to others to say how they feel about it. But it's higher than what $I$ had in mind, that's for sure.

MR. SCHMIDT: I agree. Like I
mentioned earlier, there's opportunity to use whatever money we allocate as a matching fund to leverage other -- I'm not sure what percentage you have the ability to match. But say it's 80 percent or whatever. I think 20,000 is a comfortable level.

MR. WAY: I think I'll stick with

20,000.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I'm getting the sense that 20,000 we feel is enough. I can go higher. Having done some preservation projects, coordinated a few myself, $I$ know that that doesn't go far by a portion of a project. But then, you know, $\$ 20,000$, it depends on what the mitigation is. Twenty thousand could go a long way towards a stone wall educational seminar and, you know, some of the other smaller projects. So I'd love to go higher, but I understand there has to be -- I think 20 would be a minimum. Maybe we could go to 30 or 40 . But I'm sensing 20 is the amount that the group is kind of settling on. Is that --

Mr. Shulock, how are you feeling?
MR. SHULOCK: I'm actually
indifferent to the amount. I'm just happy that the pamphlet remains because I think it actually would be beneficial to the town to have a historically, professionally researched and prepared booklet on the history of the town made available to everybody. I think
that that will have a lasting effect well beyond trimming the tree or whatever they might do with the money. So I'm comfortable with the proposal as it is, and I'll look to other people to decide an amount.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO I'm sensing $\$ 20,000$ as not interfering at all with the MOU. Are people -- is anyone objecting to that?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO, none.

MR. FITZGERALD: Sold.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Going
, going, gone. All right. For now, let's have that as our condition and say, "It's not over until the fat lady sings," and we can revisit it if someone really wants to. But let's move on. I don't even know where we are. Director Muzzey will reorient us.

DIR. MUZZEY: Why don't we continue with our discussions of the stipulations in the Memorandum of Understanding. And we can travel across Little Bay to Item II, the

Durham Point Historic District.
The Durham Historic Association has been very active in identifying a variety of stone features that are within the project area or are adjacent to the project area. These include stone walls, stone fences, cellar holes, some stone features that relate to the railroad corridor, mile markers and culverts. We've heard discussions of foundations, quarries, grave sites and burial grounds. And so the stipulation has identified a number of stone walls within the Durham Point Historic District and lays out a process for either avoiding or minimizing the impacts to those stone walls. This would be during both construction and maintenance of the line. We have mapping that identifies WP-32, 33, all of these walls and where they appear on plan sheets.

I will add that we also had discussion during testimony, I believe both with the construction or environmental panel, as well as the historical consultants, I believe Vicky Bunker or Cherilyn Widell, that
discussed the fact that one of the measures to avoid the stone walls is the use of timber matting. It's a technology or tool that was used initially with wetlands, wetlands impacts and avoiding those. There's some concern about the fragility of some of the stone features within the project area. And so the Applicant has agreed to first test whatever method is used on the stone wall, whether it's the use of timber matting and/or timber matting in conjunction with a bridge, and then to be assured, given the way the equipment that would cross the wall in that situation, that the stone wall is not damaged by it and then report back to the Division of Historical Resources in order to confirm that's appropriate treatment for these fragile resources. We also had quite a bit of discussion of the granite quarry and the stone remains affiliated with those within and adjacent to the project area. Those are addressed in Item II. Again, the use of timber matting is suggested there as a
protective measure.
Moving on to Part III of the stipulations covering the Newmarket and Bennett Roads Farms Historic District, another large historic district with a lot of stone walls that may or may not be impacted by construction and maintenance. And again we have the stone walls identified and the treatments specified for those walls. Administrative conditions follow. You'll notice some similarities with the administrative conditions in the MOA that we discussed first, some general provisions, including the use of environmental inspectors who have been trained in the identification and appropriate treatments for cultural resources such as human remains, grave-associated artifacts, other types of unintended discoveries that sometimes happen on construction projects, dispute resolution, monitoring and reporting, similar to the other document. And then amendments and termination clauses -- I'm sorry. I think I have in my copy -- I've actually skipped a
portion of the Memorandum of Agreement, that if folks don't mind we could circle back to. Surprised none of my Committee partners pointed my mistake out, but I appreciate that.

Amendment to the Memorandum agreement. That's the agreement that includes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers where a number of plans will assist the Applicant in constructing the Project in a manner that avoids harm to historic resources. Plans are dated May 2nd, 2018, and they are: Historic properties monitoring plan, unanticipated discovery plan, historic properties training plan, and a curation and repatriation plan. So these plans provide further procedures, as well as standards for how historic properties should be treated within the corridor. They specify what qualifications are needed for professionals who will be caring for them and how they will be integrated into other construction documents and maintenance processes.

MR. SHULOCK: And for people looking
for it, that all begins on PDF Page 38.
MS. DUPREY: That's Appendix B?
MR. SHULOCK: Appendix C.
DIR. MUZZEY: Did anyone have
further comments or questions about the agreement documents or the associated plans that are meant to ensure their success?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO,
Director Muzzey, I understand there's four plans that DHR has required and has reviewed and approved: Historic properties monitoring plan, an unanticipated discovery plan, historic properties training plan, and curation and repatriation plan. Those have each been completed and accepted by or approved by DHR; is that correct?

DIR. MUZZEY: That's correct. PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you.

MS. DUPREY: Sorry. I was referencing plan plans, maps, and I see these plans now in Appendix C. Thank you.

DIR. MUZZEY: If we're set with that
topic, I think we have a couple more that we
need to cover, one being the additional concerns of the Durham Historic Association and then the concerns presented by the Counsel for the Public's historical expert.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I don't think we've reviewed -- have we reviewed in detail the proposed MOU between Eversource and the Town of Durham? Because there are some conditions in there that we may want to extend beyond just the Town of Durham. That was Exhibit 270.

MS. DUPREY: Exhibit 70 did you say?
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: 270.
DIR. MUZZEY: I believe that also relates to some of the concerns of the Durham Historic Association.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Pretty much addresses those concerns --
DIR. MUZZEY: So I think we look at those together.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay.
Great.
DIR. MUZZEY: Let's start with
Exhibit 270.

MR. WAY: Looking at Page 9, electronic Page 9.
(SEC members reviewing document.)
DIR. MUZZEY: Everybody all set? So under the category of Historical Resources, the Applicant has agreed to take all appropriate and necessary steps to avoid and/or minimize impacts to historic resources in the Town of Durham. Particularly noted are historic stone walls and cellars that are in the easement area. Eversource will monitor work adjacent to those resources, seeking to avoid or minimize impacts, and they will also have agreed to comply in this document with the four plans we were just talking about in the mitigation documents with the Division of Historical Resources. B notes that in the event new information or evidence of historic sites, archeological sites or other resources is found within the direct area of potential effect -- so this is talking about things that will be directly affected by construction or operation, ground-disturbing activities, that type of thing -- Eversource agrees to report
the findings to the SEC, the DHR, the Town of Durham, the Durham Historic Association, with a notice that a report has been filed. Any change in construction plans that could affect resources need to -- the Applicant needs to notify the SEC, DHR, Town of Durham. That's a commitment that's been made in a number of other places as well.

Under D, the Applicant will be taking all necessary and appropriate steps to protect the following historic resources in Durham: We have stone walls listed in a letter that $I$ know is on the record, dated May 17 th , to protect walls situated in wetlands in Durham shall be protected by timber mats. Impacts to other stone walls, boundary stone walls within the rights-of-way or access roads shall be avoided through the implementation of the measures that we've been talking about, either not traversing the wall, traversing through an existing breach, traversing using timber matting or a temporary bridge, or placing a work pad on top of the timber matting to alleviate -- to
elevate the work pad above the wall. This is where we find the commitment to do ground-penetrating radar of the Samuel Hill family burial site near Main Street in downtown Durham. And the Applicant commits to complying with all the recommended requirements of the unanticipated discovery plan, which is Appendix $C$ of the Memorandum of Understanding, between the SHPO office and the Applicant. And I would also note that, as I mentioned earlier today, cemeteries and grave sites are protected under other state laws as well. And under 227-C:8 there are very detailed instructions as to how the state archeologist, as well as the medical examiner, get involved if human remains are found and the steps that need to be taken. So that protection is very well and very specifically spelled out in state law.

MR. WAY: Director Muzzey, in terms of the training of workers to identify remains as they encounter them possibly during construction, in your opinion, your experience, that's effective and that's
something we can rely on?
DIR. MUZZEY: I was going to flip to the actual verbiage on that in the plan. I can speak in general. In my experience, people do not like to encounter human remains, or they're concerned with human remains --

MR. WAY: I think that goes without saying.

DIR. MUZZEY: I think at this point in our day it does cause a chuckle. But it's also a very sensitive issue, and it can become an even more sensitive issue if they're Native American human remains. And we have some special requirements placed upon us with those.

There's both orientation training as well as supervisor training that is part of the plan. This is in addition to what Applicants are typically required to do. And so with additional training, my hope would be that compliance with this would be even more secure.

MR. WAY: And in the past, your experience is that that has been effective.

The training has sufficed.
DIR. MUZZEY: You know, I may not be remembering accurately at this point in the day, but this training represents a new type of mitigation measure to many, many of our projects. So I can't say that, you know, we've done training six times and it's been a hundred percent helpful. I'm assuming it will be helpful, and it is more effort than other projects have put forth. So --

MR. WAY: Certainly can't hurt.
Fair enough.
MS. DUPREY: I would just add to that, that one of us asked that of one of the experts, and her answer was that generally people very much wanted to comply with these terms and, you know, felt that -- my words, not theirs -- it would be being a "good citizen," shorthand way of describing it. So she was an expert who hired those people. She was asked if she would be the expert overseeing this, and she said she hadn't been retained yet. But just for whatever that's worth.

DIR. MUZZEY: Okay. So, back to the Town of Durham/Eversource MOU. Bottom of PDF 9, top of PDF 10, we continue with the quarry sensitive area. Boundary shall be expanded west. We heard testimony from the Durham Historic Association that they had concerns about how the site was defined. And that's specified here to include the granite slab bench near the top of the steep quarry cut, and that would be flagged during construction in order to protect it. And then there's also a fifth commitment for the Applicant to use timber matting on the Class $V I$ portion of Beech Hill Road. That's the road that the Durham Historic Association felt was originally part of the Province Road, a very historic road from early in the state's history, and protect the historic stone walls and wetlands that surround it. On Foss Farm Road, another use of timber matting as a protective measure shall be taken along with efforts to protect the historic stone walls and wetlands.

It's my understanding that the

Durham Historic Association, with these additions to the Town's MOU, were satisfied with the protections that would be put in place for the properties that they felt were locally important.

Does anyone have any further comments or questions about these as well? MS. DUPREY: Did you say we were going to go through the Durham Historic Association matters separately, or were they encompassed fully in this review we just did?

DIR. MUZZEY: I think it would be wise to look at perhaps their post-hearing brief and see if there are any additional things that we felt should be incorporated.

MS. DUPREY: I was just going through the post-hearing brief again. I read it last weekend and just wanted to comment that I thought it was really an excellent brief. We decided differently than they've asked for in a number of cases, but I just found it clearly written, very helpful, and I appreciated it.

DIR. MUZZEY: Did you note any
additional areas that may require protections?
MS. DUPREY: Flipping through it right now, thanks.

DIR. MUZZEY: Oh, okay.
MR. FITZGERALD: Do you have an exhibit number?

MS. DUPREY: Of the brief?
MR. FITZGERALD: Oh, oh, okay.
(SEC members reviewing documents.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
think one thing $I$ noted in my notes regarding archeological resources was the issue raised by DHA. They were disputing Dr. Bunker's determination that the Nathaniel Norton Cellar was not a cellar, and they wanted examination of that site by an independent expert. I think there are other concerns concerning archeological issues that were resolved by Dr. Bunker. Personally, $I$ take a lot of faith in Dr. Bunker's analysis and I don't feel that's necessary. I think it was very thorough. But that's something that they're asking for that was not resolved as part of the archeological resources.

MR. WAY: Which page are you on? PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I just have it in my notes, but I can probably find it if you give me a minute.

MR. FITZGERALD: While you're looking, I would concur. Dr. Bunker's testimony on that was pretty solid and convincing that she had given it a very adequate and thorough evaluation, in my opinion.

MS. DUPREY: I would also note that a major point in this brief is about the APE. And I thought Director Muzzey's comparison of the APE to what's done with telecommunications towers that are quite a bit taller than this was very instructive and made sense to me as to why the APE was set as it was. And that didn't get -- wasn't discussed when the hearing was going on, so the DHA didn't have a chance to hear that. But it was useful for me to understand that.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
actually don't see in their brief the issue about the Nathaniel Norton Cellar Hole. It
must have been in another party's... or perhaps it was addressed, but I don't see it in the brief.

MR. SHULOCK: So it looks like they did have a disagreement on the Samuel Hill family burial site?

DIR. MUZZEY: Hmm-hmm.
MR. SHULOCK: Is that right?
DIR. MUZZEY: Hmm-hmm. And that's the site when I was outlining the conditions in the Town of Durham and Eversource MOU where the Applicant has committed to doing ground-penetrating radar in order to determine whether that site actually does contain a grave shaft or if it is more of a commemorative placement of a grave stone in a general location of where the community feels that person was buried.

MR. WAY: Mr. Shulock, do you have a page number where the Samuel Hill burial was mentioned?

MR. SHULOCK: Page 31 of the brief.
(SEC members reviewing documents.)
MR. WAY: So that's addressed.

DIR. MUZZEY: As I'm sure we all recall, the Durham Historic Association had a rather long list of stone walls and stone features that are present within the right-of-way, both within identified and evaluated historic districts, such as Durham Point and the Bennett Road Historic District, and some that were outside of those areas as well. And it has been a challenge to locate all of those stone features and determine whether or not they're within an already historic district or not. Dr. Bunker's final testimony addresses some of those features, as does the final or supplemental testimony of Cherilyn Widell. They went back and looked through the list of DHR concerns and responded to them, and that's here in one of the exhibits. I believe it's Applicant's Exhibit 143 for Widell's responses, which we haven't looked at yet. So if we turn to Page 12 and then 13, it begins a list of approximately 50 areas of concern. Let me just flip ahead. 17 -- I'm sorry. I overstated. So I found this a very careful
review. I don't know if everyone else has had the opportunity to go through these concerns. They address both above-ground and below-ground resources. The types of stone resources that the DHA has been referring to are sort of on the edge of a below-ground or above-ground concern. They're both of them. And an interdisciplinary approach such as the one the Applicant took is helpful in that matter.

At the risk of suggesting another plan be added to the duties of the Applicant in order to fully address the Town of Durham's and the DHA's concerns for these types of stone features on the landscape, particularly those outside of the designated historic districts, I think some of the conditions could be combined into a plan that provides stewardship for these areas both during construction and operations. We know from experience that, you know, it's natural for there to be a great detail of attention placed on things during construction.

Although, given the importance of these areas
to the local community, it would be wise to have a plan in place in order to ensure their protection and appropriate treatment through the life of the Project, including maintenance activities during operations.

So I would like to suggest, in order to make sure we have taken into consideration all of these smaller features on the landscape, that that type of plan be put in place to ensure their stewardship and, you know, provide the Applicant with an opportunity to demonstrate the stewardship of these resources.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: And
Director Muzzey, before we get into a discussion of that, backing up to DHA for a moment, is it fair to say that every site identified by DHA as potentially being an impacted historic site has been evaluated by the Applicant, and either a mitigation measure has been suggested for it or it has been determined that there's been no adverse effect -- no impact to that site? It seems like the review, I think it was 31, however
many resources it was attached to Ms. Widell's testimony, seemed to address each of the sites brought to her attention by DHA. And I think there was some discussion with her about this point as kind of closing that loop if it's still open.

DIR. MUZZEY: There were some stone features outside of the designated historic districts that the DHA had concern with. And my interpretation of the DHA concerns were not just whether the construction of the Project would have an adverse or no adverse effect on those features, but as we move forward in time, and with maintenance activities, how the stone features may be treated in that area. So even if we had no adverse effect on a resource today, they were questioning whether or not future maintenance activities may present some adverse effects. And so my intent would be that if a stone feature, or whatever the appropriate title may be, stewardship plan was put into place, that that would provide additional insurance that those locally important features would be cared for
in the future.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: BY way of stone features, you're referring not only to walls, but cellar holes and -- could you tell us what you mean by "stone features"?

DIR. MUZZEY: Stone walls and fences, stone features that may relate to the railroads, construction such as culverts and mile markers. There are various types of foundations. There's the quarrying activities.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO, pretty much any man-made stone creation, but not a boulder field. There has to be something that's created by humans through history. Is that --

DIR. MUZZEY: Something that's been altered for human activity.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: And the reason for a plan, as $I$ understand it, is not only to address construction issues, which I think for Durham this MOU does a pretty good job of, but extending it to other towns during construction, but also dealing with
maintenance, line maintenance, et cetera, for basically as long as the Project is in existence or through decommissioning?

DIR. MUZZEY: That would be my recommendation. I mean, I think there's an opportunity here for this line to actually provide important stewardship of these features. I think if this utility corridor had instead been available for various types of modern construction, those features would be lost. And I think the goals of having both the transmission line in place, as well as protecting these resources, can happen together and provide a tremendous amount of public benefit.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
have a concern, and maybe it's not a valid concern. But are we asking the Applicant to address not only impacts to the stone features that it creates, but also to somehow maintain these features as they are impacted by others? Or nature? I don't want to get -- I think a stewardship plan is they're basically adopting the care of these things through their life.

And while that would be wonderful, I think that's a burden to put on the Applicant to address, you know, somebody comes through on an ATV, and I don't know what, but, you know, it'll be an impact by someone else and they have to go out and fix it. I don't want -I'm hesitant to impose such a -- that kind of burden on them.

DIR. MUZZEY: Well, that's understandable. Even within this project's development, we've seen record of local concerns and discussion of whether natural degradation had harmed the stone resource versus more active human interactions. So that may be something that needs to be discussed and communicated between local advocates and the Applicant. But I don't believe it needs to be a stumbling block for the entire plan.

MR. FITZGERALD: I guess I'm raising a concern that the utility or Applicant doesn't have control over these lands. They have an easement and a right to construct their project, and therefore they have a
responsibility to ensure these historic archeological resources are not damaged. But do they have -- I mean, I don't want to say -I don't have any issue. I think, you know, the thought of trying to maintain these and ensure they're not damaged is a positive thought. But I guess my question would be: Is that the responsibility of the Applicant over the long term, where they don't have control over the property?

MS. DUPREY: Could you state what you want to do again? I'm sorry. I've forgotten, given how much discussion we've had here. And $I$ just want to be sure, as I'm listening to what people are saying, I'm looking through the lens of what you actually suggested. And so I don't want to let go of that.

DIR. MUZZEY: These types of plans follow different names. So it could be called any number of things. But $I$ would call it a "stewardship plan" for the historic stone features that exist within the corridor. And it could be specified during Applicant's
operations, maintenance and construction to avoid the problem that Mr. Fitzgerald just mentioned, and our Chair as well, and how those will be treated throughout the entire corridor.

MS. DUPREY: So you're asking that they prepare a plan like they did for environmental resources, if you will. Could have been a monitoring plan or whatever it is --

DIR. MUZZEY: It could be a section in the Best Management Plans.

MS. DUPREY: That they provide some plan for how they're going to protect these resources that they've agreed that they're not going to touch in the course of the construction and maintenance of the Project. Is that what you're saying?

DIR. MUZZEY: Yeah.
MS. DUPREY: So let us know how you're going to avoid these things, if you will. We know what they're going to do with stone walls, but this might be a part of it. You're going to go over them, you're going to
go through an existing opening, you're going to take it down and rebuild it as a last resort, and the first being don't touch it in the first place. That kind of thing, is that what your --

DIR. MUZZEY: And also as a way to consolidate the many responsibilities that begin to touch on these types of measures in a lot of different conditions and a lot of different locations, it seems like a wise idea to combine all of those responsibilities and commitments into one basic document that extends throughout the corridor. MS. DUPREY: So it would be a document that in effect says what they're going to do to protect these things in the course of their construction and maintenance afterwards.

DIR. MUZZEY: Yes.
MS. DUPREY: It's a written plan to
say what they're going to do to not violate these stone resources, if you will.

DIR. MUZZEY: Yes.
MR. WAY: And you see this as a
consolidation of all the other conditions that are included.

DIR. MUZZEY: Yes.
MR. WAY: That's a good idea.
DIR. MUZZEY: There are
tremendous -- I mean, I know the Applicant has wide-ranging resources, but there are a lot of conditions with this project that have been proposed. So I was looking for a way to perhaps make their implementation efficient and straightforward and more trackable.

MR. WAY: I think that's more streamlined, provided, as the Chair mentioned, that we're not saddling them with the oversight from this point forward or forever. I think it's a good idea.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Director Muzzey, this would be a plan that they would develop in consultation with or approval by -- I think we need to have DHR integration here somehow that it's developed to DHR's standards.

DIR. MUZZEY: Well, and DHR is referenced in a lot of the other conditions as
well. So I think it would be beneficial to that agency in order to have a more consolidated approach. But I would agree that they could review and approve the plan.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Part of their job is to ensure employment for the Department of Historic Resources.

DIR. MUZZEY: I think there are a lot of people working on that. Don't worry about that.

MS. DUPREY: I'm okay with it as long as it's related to their operations, not anybody else's. It's what they're going to do out there. I would think they're going to put something like this together anyway to be certain that there's uniformity in their operations as they build out something like this. So I could see it.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: DO you feel a need to sketch out in general terms how these would be treated, such as was done in the MOU for Durham with the use of timber matting, to report back if it's not being successful? I don't know how deep we need to
go or just say -- because we want to be sure all stone walls and cellar holes, et cetera, are protected. That was a major point throughout the discussion about historic properties and historic sites. And everyone was kind of in agreement, I thought, about let's get a condition that protects all stone walls and stone features throughout the corridor. So this type of agreement I think will do that, but $I$ don't know how specific you think we need to be with our condition, or maybe it can be suggested by counsel as to how specific we need to be, or whether we leave it to DHR and the Applicant to work through.

Any thoughts on that, Mr. Iacopino?
MR. IACOPINO: I would recommend
that you be as specific as possible in any order that we make so that DHR knows what you're delegating them to do. So, to the extent that Director Muzzey can provide us with sort of a list of the things she thinks should be in there, we could then turn that into a condition in the final order.

MS. DUPREY: Can we say something
along the lines of the Applicant will develop a list of protocols for the protection of the stone features in order to meet the terms of the permit, if it's granted, so that the direction is that's what it's supposed to be doing? So we talked about stone walls and places and the protocol being: First, avoid; second, go over; third, go through; fourth, take down and rebuild. It seems to me that if we link it back up to the requirements that are imposed should the permit be granted, the certificate be granted, that that will give the direction. I don't want this to grow. I don't want there to be 40 new steps that they need to take that are beyond what our certificate would state. So, for me, that would be the parameter I would feel would give DHR guidance.

Director Muzzey, do you feel like that gives DHR enough guidance?

DIR. MUZZEY: I do. I think that's a final suggestion. I think the Applicant is well on its way to creating appropriate protocols and there's not a great need for us
> to wordsmith or provide a detailed explanation.

MS. DUPREY: To me, this is a take-off in part from the training for the personnel they're going to have out in the field. I mean, it's the same kind of thing. DIR. MUZZEY: Hmm-hmm.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO are folks in agreement that the stone features stewardship plan is -- that creation and adherence to such a plan would be a beneficial condition if a certificate is to be granted? Or is there anyone who doesn't think so would like to talk about this further?

MS. DUPREY: I don't like the title.
I really don't. It's not a joke.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Yeah, stone feature protection --

MS. DUPREY: Protection protocol. I'm way better with that.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, how does this sound as a condition: That the Applicant shall develop and comply with the protocols, subject to DHR's review and approval,
identifying measures that will be implemented to preserve historic stone features located within the right-of-way during construction, operation and maintenance of the Project?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I think I would add decommissioning, if it is decommissioned.

MS. DUPREY: Could you read it again into the mic.

MR. IACOPINO: Sorry. The Applicant shall develop and comply with the protocol, subject to DHR's review and approval, identifying measures that will be implemented to preserve historic stone features located within the right-of-way during construction, operation and maintenance of the Project. And the Chair recommended to put it through to decommissioning.

MS. DUPREY: Do we not somewhere have laid out what they're supposed to be doing in terms of the protection? My only quarrel with what you've read there is that it leaves it to the imagination of someone, I'm not sure exactly who, what they're doing. I
thought we knew what was happening. I thought we knew we were avoiding something, going over something, that sort of thing. I just don't want this to get way bigger than it already is.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO there was testimony that was from the experts that that was the proper way to do it and that they intended to adhere to that. But at the same time, they haven't been hired to do the monitoring. We do have the MOU between Eversource and the Town of Durham that specifies protection for the stone walls through avoidance, not traversing through the existing breach, traversing the wall using timber matting or temporarily bridging. This is in the MOU between Eversource and the Town, as I said.

MR. IACOPINO: It's on Page 9 of the MOU .

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO that's there. But it's between -- it's an agreement that's just between Durham and Eversource. So we don't -- I don't think we
have anywhere else in our certificate conditions yet that goes beyond the Town of Durham concerning stone walls.

MS. DUPREY: What you're citing is who is the enforcing party, to some degree. And what I'm concerned about is that the activity that needs to be done isn't growing. Because I thought we knew what we were doing to protect these various things. And I don't have any problem with that being memorialized and people signing on the dotted line. And Eversource can state, you know, with more particularity how it happens, and DHR can look at it. I just don't want it to grow. That's really what I'm saying.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: So we could just extend this condition to all towns along the route and maybe wordsmith it a little bit so it continues through maintenance and decommissioning, et cetera.

But Director Muzzey, could you tell us if there's a benefit and what the benefit is to having sort of a separate document concerning the protection of stone features,
rather than just a condition in the certificate? Is there a benefit; and if so, what would that be from a DHR or historic site perspective?

DIR. MUZZEY: We have a number of commitments that are scattered across different conditions. And my sense is that not all of them cover all of the features that the Durham Historic Association identified, as well as stone features throughout the corridor. So having a plan that the Applicant can incorporate, and incorporate into their normal daily business activities throughout the life of the Project, gives them something to refer back to after the certificate has long been granted, if so granted, and implemented. It seems to be in line with their commitment to Best Management Practices. It presents Best Management Practices for a specific type of feature. And it seems to also pair well with the four plans that have been specified in the Memorandum of Understanding with the Division of Historical Resources.

MR. SHULOCK: If I may? I think the benefit of making it a requirement is that it would give the Company a head start on preparing an operations manual, because they will most likely -- well, I feel confident that if we tell the Company that they have to protect stone features anytime they conduct construction or maintenance activities within the corridor, that they will do that. And what they will most likely do is prepare an operations manual or a section in their operations manual for their employees or their contractors to follow so that they know what it is they're supposed to do when they go in and do the maintenance in that corridor. And they will have all of those requirements in one place for their employees and their contractors to read so that they're aware of those requirements as they go in.

MS. DUPREY: The only difference I would cite -- and I hear you. But when you prepare an operations manual, usually you're doing it yourself. You're not having any agency then oversee it. And that's -- I just
don't want there to be regulatory creep here. I guess that's really what my concern is. They're mandated to do this, and now we bring DHR in to oversee those plans. I don't know. Would it anyway, Director Muzzey?

DIR. MUZZEY: Not necessarily, no. That's why I saw the value of having a plan that specified all this. And then as the Company chose to -- and with that plan being approved by the DHR, then they can implement that in their operations manual and other places without further interference of a government agency.

MS. DUPREY: Do you see this as being something, these sorts of issues as being something there's been great contest over, the way that you protect these types of resources?

DIR. MUZZEY: Outside of the request to do a trial, particularly with timber matting over stone walls, I think it's all fairly common sense.

MS. DUPREY: Okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: It's
our responsibility to be sure that these sites that have been identified are protected. And I don't think it's the SEC's role to oversee that. So that would be something that we ask for assistance with DHR sort of in the normal course. We ask the Applicant to develop protocols, which they will do anyway, but to outline those protocols and run them by DHR to be sure that they're adequate. I think it's certainly acceptable, and that gives me some reassurance that the Committee, and in conjunction with relying on DHR, is actually protecting these things which everyone has agreed are very important and very prevalent in this area.

MS. DUPREY: So have we done this in other cases?

DIR. MUZZEY: We do have historic property management plans on other portions of utility corridors.

MS. DUPREY: Okay. Good. That makes me feel better.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO, do folks feel as though developing a protocol
plan to address stone features as described by Director Muzzey is a good idea?

Do you need me to be more specific?
MR. IACOPINO: I just need to know the language that we have is sufficient to cover what you're asking the Applicant to do.

MR. WAY: Can you read it one more time?

MR. IACOPINO: Sure. The Applicant shall develop and comply with the protocol, subject to DHR's review and approval, identifying measures that will be implemented to preserve historic stone features located within the right-of-way during construction, operation and maintenance of the Project, and shall remain in effect until decommissioning of the Project.

MR. SCHMIDT: I don't think we want to limit it to within the right-of-way. Maybe within the construction limits. We have laydown yards and so on, marshaling yards.

MS. DUPREY: Are we marshaling in
areas that have historic features in them?
MR. SCHMIDT: We haven't seen them
all, but maybe a stone wall.
MS. DUPREY: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: Would the term
"project site" satisfy you, Mr. Schmidt?
MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.
DIR. MUZZEY: I think that language sounds appropriate.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
agree. Anyone feel as though it doesn't and they want to talk about it some more?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay.
So I think we're done with stone features for now. What's our next topic?

DIR. MUZZEY: I believe when we were talking about the DHR's final reporting to the Site Evaluation Committee and its request for additional conditions, we spent a great deal of time talking about the first condition, which is conditioning the certificate upon compliance with stipulations in the mitigation documents. This is found in a letter dated August 1st, 2017, from the Division to the Site Evaluation Committee. But I did want to
note there were three other requested conditions by the agency. All three are common conditions that have been placed in past SEC proceedings.

Two, if the Applicant changes plans for the proposed project, and such changes lead to newly discovered effects on historic properties, the Applicant shall consult with the DHR/SHPO to resolve any adverse effects.

Three, if any unanticipated archeological resource, historic properties or other cultural resources are discovered as a result of project planning or construction, the Applicant shall consult with the DHR/SHPO to determine the need for appropriate evaluative studies, determinations of National Register eligibility, and/or mitigation measures if needed to resolve adverse effects.

This type of condition would come into play if a different marshaling yard or laydown area was chosen, that type of thing, or with some of -- during the proceeding we also talked about requested mitigation in
areas such as Wagon Hill Farm for other resource protection. Those types of changes are what we were talking about with Condition 3.

Condition 4, authorizing the DHR/SHPO to specify the use of any appropriate technique, methodology, practice or procedure associated with archeological, historical and other cultural resources affected by the Project; however, any action to enforce the conditions must be brought before the Committee. I believe that language is taken out of the RSA $162-\mathrm{H}$. So I wanted to make sure those were on the record and to see if any Committee members had any questions about those.

MS. DUPREY: Could you read the last one again.

DIR. MUZZEY: Yeah, that language is not --

MR. IACOPINO: There's some language missing from --

DIR. MUZZEY: Is there?
MR. IACOPINO: It's from the
delegation statute. So it should say "delegating authority to DHR to specify the use of appropriate techniques or procedures associated with archeological, historical or other cultural resources affected..." it's on Page 3 of Exhibit 167, where it just looks like they left out some words there trying to mimic the statute.

MR. WAY: Where is it, Michael?
MR. IACOPINO: Applicant's
Exhibit 167, bottom of Page 3, Subparagraph 4.
(SEC members reviewing document.)
MR. WAY: Director Muzzey, none of these conditions are already included in other aspects of what we're doing in MOUs -- no, never mind.

DIR. MUZZEY: All set?
MR. WAY: I am.
DIR. MUZZEY: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Am I
correct, Attorney Iacopino, that these are standard conditions?

MR. IACOPINO: Yeah. Yes, they are.
The fourth one is a sort of catch-all,
assuming it's going to deal with situations where something comes up and the Applicant and DHR can deal with it in the first instance. Therefore, it would be delegating the authority to DHR to specify the use of appropriate technique, methodology, practice or procedure addressing the archeological, historical or cultural resources affected by the Project. So we can massage that into the language that has been in other decisions as well.

MR. WAY: These seem reasonable to me.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yeah.
MS. DUPREY: Were these not part of the stipulation between Counsel for the Public and the Applicant?

MR. IACOPINO: I don't think so.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: NOW, the only stipulated condition concerning historic sites is that they were going to file with their Best Management Practices for work near archeological and historic sites and will adhere to the BMPs --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Will adhere to the Best Management Practices consistent with all sate and federal permit requirements. I think these would be good to have as conditions of our certificate, if we are to grant one. Does anyone disagree with that or would like to talk about this further?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay. Hearing none, let's move on.

DIR. MUZZEY: Let's move on. The only other item on my list, and you folks may have others, is that the Counsel for the Public of course had a consultant that addressed above-ground resources and critiqued the Applicant's submissions on those and recommended some things that were very different from what we've talked about all day. So I feel that we may at least want to review a few of those in order to make sure that we're all on track on how things are being done. The material is within the testimony sections, of course, and it is also
within Counsel for the Public's Exhibit, I believe, it's 5-a. Yes, it is, as well as the post-hearing brief by Counsel for the Public. MR. WAY: Do you have a page on 5-a? DIR. MUZZEY: Well, we could begin with one of the issues that was very different from the review we've talked about throughout the day on Page 8, E , Comprehensive Identification of Above-Ground Historic Sites. And there are a number of bullets listed. The consultant, Heritage Landscapes out of Vermont, throughout this document was recommending a broad definition of "historic sites," particularly those holding cultural value, regardless of their assessed age, and in particular, listed the types of resources in the bullets that follow: Historic graveyards, conservation lands, recreation lands, designated scenic roads, trails, public waters, current use lands, town-identified sites of scenic or cultural value, and stone walls and fences.

Related to that is the issue that the Heritage Landscapes report disagreed with
the area of potential effect that was defined by the review agencies for this project.

They felt it should be much larger and suggested an area of potential effect that extended for either three or ten miles. The report, in my reading, also merges some of the criteria that are assigned to the aesthetics area of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee review and that are not appropriately discussed here under our Historic sections. Perhaps in the consultant's professional experience those two areas are evaluated in similar fashions. But with the rules before the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee, we review aesthetic resources under one set of criteria that includes historic sites, but that have a second set of criteria to focus specifically on historic site impacts.

So if we take a look at the list on Page 8 under $E, I$ have confidence that the review completed to date did consider historic graveyards. We have several conditions that relate to those, as well as
state laws even outside of the Site Evaluation Committee laws that address their protection.

Conservation lands, including town forests, I was frankly surprised that she felt those types of resources were not considered in the review of this project. Interestingly, we do have a town forest that's been designated historic, and it has been since the early 1990s, being the Newington Center Historic District and the town forest that is included there. Similarly, recreation lands would have been considered as well. We've had discussion of designated scenic roads under the aesthetics considerations. We don't -- trails were also considered under the aesthetics consideration, as were public waters, designated rivers and public water access points. We also do have a historic site that crosses Little Bay, as we discussed earlier, and that does include a portion of public waters. We've had a discussion of current-use listed parcels already, and I
feel that that was not a missing aspect of the historic resources review. And we've spent a great deal of time talking about town-identified sites of scenic or cultural value, particularly as it relates to stone features within the right-of-way, which also then in turn relates to the last bullet as well, stone walls and fences.

So I felt these areas were appropriately covered within our review and in the materials that we had reviewed in this proceeding. But certainly I do want to hear from others to see if you shared any of these concerns as well.

MS. DUPREY: I think part of the complaint was that perhaps the Applicant's experts didn't identify all these things. But regardless of that, certainly I think we discussed them all and they got before us. So, for purposes of our decision making, I feel like we did review these things. MR. WAY: Agreed. MR. SCHMIDT: Hmm-hmm. PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:

Concerning the definition of "historic sites," I agree with Ms. O'Donnell, to the extent that what should be considered an historic site is beyond that which is listed in or eligible for the historic register. But at the same time, even Ms. O'Donnell, in her cross-examination, agreed that there had to be some age associated with a property to be considered historic. It had to be both important in some manner in history or culture, and it had to have some longevity. And we talked about the playground or tot lot or something, and that even if that was something on her list as something that was missed, it really didn't qualify as a historic site that this Committee and the experts should be spending time evaluating in great depth.

So I feel as though the sites that were identified were comprehensive, and sites that were brought to their attention by others, where they indicated they should have been considered, the Applicant's experts then did consider those. I don't know of any property that is being claimed as being
historically significant that has not been addressed. I mean, there's a long list I suppose from Ms. O'Donnell. But I think the Applicant has addressed what's on that list and said, no, that really doesn't belong here in our analysis. I found Ms. O'Donnell's list to be overly broad.

MS. DUPREY: Didn't her list in part come from the APE that she was advocating for, which I thought that Director Muzzey so well laid out the rationale behind what it was? So I think that, to the extent that it was in the APE, that $I$ think we've all agreed was the appropriate $A P E$, that we did review all of them. I think her issue is, in large part, that it should just be a way bigger APE than what we felt was necessary.

DIR. MUZZEY: My read of her report is that, you know, there's a large number of places that she should of -- she thought should have been evaluated further. That number is made larger by the fact that she was suggesting a larger APE than we've considered for this project. So the numbers would be
diminished just by diminishing the APE down to the half-mile that we are looking for this project.

I also remember questioning Ms.
O'Donnell. We were talking about conservation lands because obviously conservation is very important in the historic context in New Hampshire. It's something people in New Hampshire have been working on since the 19th Century, and it's something where we have a number of historical properties and historic districts across the state that address the significance of conservation activities in that area. It's not something that is ignored on a regular basis here in New Hampshire. I did question her about, well, if the conservation land -- if the conservation activities dated from a hundred years ago, should that be evaluated? She agreed. And then I said, well, what if they were, and I forget the date, but it was 2005 or something fairly recent? And she agreed, no, that was too recent of an activity. I'm
not certain whether conservation is an important historic context for other places Ms. O'Donnell has worked, but it is an important context here in New Hampshire. And I feel if there were conservation lands within the Project area, they would have been recognized in the effort that the Applicant applied.

MS. DUPREY: I would just also like to say that $I$ reread the briefs last night on this particular issue. And while I'm not going to be sufficiently eloquent to summarize it, the Applicant's brief was very, very strong on the definition in particular and what the protocol has apparently been. Maybe "protocol" is too strong of a word. What people have done previously in coming before this Committee in terms of what they should be looking at. And I was persuaded by that section of their brief, that both what the Applicant had done and what we had done was in keeping with our past procedures.

DIR. MUZZEY: I can also note, I don't think I mentioned this earlier in the
day, that at least from a regulatory sense, the state historic preservation office in every state is assigned the responsibility of coming up with a process for identifying and evaluating both above-ground and below-ground historical resources. So that's a common responsibility across the country. And in this case, the Applicant did utilize both the guidance and the processes that the state historic preservation office specified for identifying and evaluating resources.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: It is important to note, however, that the SEC process is different and separate from the 106 Review Process, and it is broader than that. I'll just leave it at that.

DIR. MUZZEY: Did anyone else have any additional concerns that came out of the testimony and the reporting of Heritage Landscapes, as well as Counsel for the Public's post-hearing brief, that relate to historical or archeological properties that we need to talk about?
(SEC members reviewing documents.)

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Just one more issue, or at least one. But there's one more issue to address with regard to historic sites. If folks could pull up Durham Historic Association's brief, Page 25, PDF Page 25.

MS. DUPREY: I don't think we have a hard copy, so do you have a cite to that?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: It's Page 23 of the hard copy.

MS. DUPREY: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: So in there, Durham Historic Association makes an allegation, and everyone probably remembers the image to which she was referring, the section of the right-of-way going through Durham with the lines. It was hard to tell how many lines there were. But there were, like, four lines as we looked at it. And there was an allegation that the Google Earth aerial image had been doctored or Photoshopped, and she showed eight or more gray electric lines in the easement where only three thin black lines exist presently. And

Ms. Widell was examined about that. So I think we should make a finding of fact as to whether we believe that image had been doctored or Photoshopped to make the existing conditions look more egregious or perhaps more intense -- save the judgment part -- more intense of a use than what is actually there.

MR. FITZGERALD: What page are you on?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I'm on Durham Historic Association's brief, PDF Page 25. It's Page 23, and it refers -- we can pull up the image if you folks don't remember it.

Do you have a cite for the image, Mr. Iacopino?

DIR. MUZZEY: Okay. I have at least one of them. If we look at Exhibit 164, on Page 67, the image at the top of the page $I$ believe may be one of the images that she had concerns with.

MR. WAY: 164 where?
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Applicant's Exhibit 164. Which PDF Page?
015-04\} [DELIBERATIONS-DAY 2 AFTERNOON
ONLY] \{11-29-18\}

DIR. MUZZEY: PDF 27, and the top image.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: And we should also look at Committee Exhibit 11. That was a response to a request for more information where the Applicant confirms there was only a three-phase, meaning three conductor lines comprising three overhead wires on the top of each pole with a neutral wire below. It attributes it to a distortion created by enlargement of the image.

MS. DUPREY: Was there something unique about this particular area that would cause someone, if they were to look at this entire project and doctor something, that this would be what they would pick? Because I can think of a lot of other places I'd be doctoring. I mean, Little Bay would pop right up there at the top. So I'm disinclined to think anyone selected this particular thing to doctor up. I do understand Durham's sensitivity to these things. I really do. I think they've, you know, shown some distress over this process. And so I think that leads
people to maybe conclude things that they might otherwise not. And I just don't see the sense of why you would choose this particular image to doctor among the dozens of images that we have. And I couldn't support any kind of finding that someone doctored it without more evidence. So I would say we find that it was not doctored, at least not intentionally. MR. SHULOCK: If I could add to that? I think I would actually need some form of expert testimony to tell me whether a digital image taken from a satellite had been doctored. I just don't think that I have the wherewithal to determine that on my own.

MR. FITZGERALD: Committee
Exhibit 11, we have a statement from the Applicant that says, "We have confirmed with Preservation Company that they did not alter the photo." Unless we have information other than somebody's guess that -- and I think I recall at the time that we compressed the photo a little bit, you know, and looked at it. And so I don't see how, just based on an assertion that it looks doctored, that we
could take any position other than to accept the Company's...

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO I'm getting the sense that the Committee feels as though we do not believe that the -- we take the Applicant at its word and do not believe the photos in Exhibit 164, on Page 9, have been doctored by the Applicant. Is there anyone who disagrees with that or would like to discuss that further?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: We have one other request from Durham Historic Association, and that is back to what we started with yesterday I think. They've requested an independent monitor of historic resources to be sure they're complying with all the Best Management Practices and agreements and memorandums.

DIR. MUZZEY: I'm wondering if our counsel could just review for us what an intervenor or community, what recourse they have if they feel, anyone, any member of the public, that the Applicant is not abiding by
the conditions of the certificate.
MR. IACOPINO: Any person can make a complaint to the Administrator of the Committee. The Administrator of the Committee would then investigate it. And if it warrants further evaluation, there's an entire enforcement procedure under RSA 162-H:12 which has some timelines when a notice would be given to the Applicant that's in violation. Obviously there would be a quasi-judicial process involved. Ultimately, sanctions could be imposed up to and including suspension of the certificate.

MS. DUPREY: And on top of that, I presume all of the enforcement authority that DHR has, you know, that someone would go register a complaint with DHR or the Attorney General's office. I don't know. I think there are a lot of avenues to discuss issues with people who would be willing to listen.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO I
interpret some of this desire for an
independent monitoring going back to the stone
wall issue and cellar holes that were very
important to Durham Historic Association -(Court Reporter interrupts.)

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: -- in addition to other concerns they had. But they had a major concern about stone walls. So I'm just trying to, in my head, play out a situation where we have a protocol in place that's been approved by DHR, and Best Management Practices have been submitted, memorandums are in place, during construction, inadvertently or on purpose, you know, a bridge collapses and a wall is damaged and it's not fixed. And I'm trying to understand -- you know, and the homeowner is back in the back 40. Nobody notices it for a while. So what happens then? So I want to understand how that plays out.

Director Muzzey, is there any way you can address -- would DHR have any role there, or would they have to file a dispute with the dispute resolution? I guess they could come back to the Committee and say -I'm just thinking out loud here, stream of consciousness here. They could come back to
the Committee and say they're not following through on these conditions of the certificate. Would Counsel or Director Muzzey or anyone else like to comment on my stream of consciousness?

MS. DUPREY: Why can't that be in the protocols? I mean, isn't that what the protocols are about to some degree? If you knocked over a stone wall, maybe you have to tell somebody.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: But my situation is they do not live up to the protocol. They do not fix the wall --

MS. DUPREY: But isn't --
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: -and what happens? That's why the independent monitor $I$ think is sought, so that they're trying to have another person there with a stick saying you will do what you're supposed to do.

MS. DUPREY: So you've got to call this independent monitor up every single time you might go near a stone wall? I don't know. They're going to be $24 / 7$ on duty?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I'm not trying to advocate for it. I'm just trying to understand how their concern is addressed.

MS. DUPREY: I think their concern is addressed the same way any other concern is addressed. Someone discovers it and they report it to the appropriate agency, and that's what happens. I don't think somebody can be out there every day doing this. I mean, maybe when they finish a segment, somebody comes in and looks it over. I could maybe live with that. I just think without some parameter around it, it's just more burdensome than the benefit is.

MR. WAY: I think it goes back to that discussion we had yesterday when we were looking at technical capability and talking about it's the element of trust. I think, one, we decided there is a technical capability, and I don't think there's been anything put forth to us that said they wouldn't be able to implement this. We put into place some other protections today. I
think we have a complaint procedure. And, you know, I think to do much more than that in this case would just be overburdensome. DIR. MUZZEY: My interpretation of the suggestion of having an independent historic monitor is that in areas of historically sensitive areas, the monitor would be in place in order to avoid the problem of a breached stone wall, a destroyed cellar hole site. And so we wouldn't -- to avoid getting into enforcement. Because the problems would not happen in the first place because an independent monitor would be on hand to ensure that. I find I'm having difficulty understanding how that type of process would be put in place in any type of way that approaches practicality. The only time that we, the Division of Historical Resources, have requested monitoring is in areas of archeological sensitivity where the expectation is fairly low of archeological resources being present. But it exists to the degree that we feel archeological monitoring during construction would be helpful to be
able to call off the bulldozers if expectations change. And we have put that type of monitor in place for very specific archeological situations. None of those were identified for this project. And so I would -- I just don't see how this type of request could be implemented. It's difficult.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I think it goes back to the training. And there is a training plan and reporting plan. And if those are done correctly, this won't happen; or if it does, it will be reported. And if there is a problem, you can complain to the SEC or complain to DHR. They can go through a dispute resolution process. So I don't feel there's a need in this instance for an independent monitor as well. I'm getting the sense that that's the sense of the Subcommittee. Does anyone want to talk about this further or disagree?

MR. FITZGERALD: I just want to -- I think we did talk about this yesterday. I think there's some inherent distrust with small entities and individuals dealing with a
major corporation. I think that sense of trust has been exacerbated, in particular with the Durham Historic Association and the failure to meet with them. I would hope the Applicant would take away from that that it might be wise to sit down and talk to folks who have concerns. But I think in this case, this opens a Pandora's box for us if we -because basically what this is saying is we don't trust the Company to monitor this appropriately. And if we don't trust them to monitor this, do we trust them with any other plan? I think this creates a significant problem. So I would certainly not support it. MS. DUPREY: I would just also say that if the Applicant isn't able to establish some kind of trust, we're going to have an independent monitor and it's going to be the Durham Historic Association. You might want to create some relationship there. MR. FITZGERALD: Might rather deal with the Administrator.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Does
anyone have other issues concerning historic
sites that we should address?
DIR. MUZZEY: We're good.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I think we're ready to poll the board.

After hearing everything concerning the identification and analysis concerning the effects on historic sites and the mitigation plans and all the other plans and conditions concerning historic sites that we've been discussing, whether at this point, which again is not final, at this point, whether you feel as though the Project will have an unreasonable adverse effect on historic sites.

Mr. Fitzgerald.
MR. FITZGERALD: I believe that the Applicant has met all the requirements and we can move ahead.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: DO
you feel as though the Project will have an unreasonable adverse effect on historic sites?

MR. FITZGERALD: Do $I$ believe it will have an adverse effect?

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: DO
you believe it will --
MR. FITZGERALD: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: -
have an adverse effect, an unreasonable
adverse effect?
MR. FITZGERALD: My conscience is whispering in my ear. No.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Ms.
Duprey.
MS. DUPREY: NO.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Mr.
Way.
MR. WAY: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Mr.
Schmidt.
MR. SCHMIDT: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Mr.
Shulock.
MR. SHULOCK: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Director Muzzey.
DIR. MUZZEY: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: NOI
do I.
015-04\} [DELIBERATIONS-DAY 2 AFTERNOON
ONLY] \{11-29-18\}

I think we have time just to do air quality. Do you want a five-minute break and we'll do air quality? I think that's our next topic. I'm not sure we'll have a chance to get into water quality. Why don't we break for five minutes. We can discuss and at least do air, and then we'll discuss if we want go beyond. But my inclination is probably to stop after air. So let's take a five-minute break.
(Recess was taken at 4:37 p.m.
and the hearing resumed at 4:47 p.m.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay
we are going to reconvene and discuss the Project's impact on air quality. Mr. Fitzgerald can you lead us off.

MR. FITZGERALD: Certainly. As Assistant Director of the Air Division, I've been waiting for this for a long time, and I hope that we're willing to dedicate the remainder of our day to this topic.

So, in terms of air quality issues with this project, the only guiding document is the site rule which requires us to make a
determination that there will not be an unreasonable adverse effect to air quality. And then there's, of course, all of the departmental rules and requirements. Nothing in this project rises to the level of a permitting requirement with regards to the Department. And really, the only suggested air quality issue is that of dust control and suppression during construction activities. And the Department has very specific regulations. Env-A 1000 requires of all construction projects that require no specific -- there be no emissions of dust from activities such as these and requires Best Management Practices and the use of water wetting down the sites, et cetera, to ensure dust is not generated and does not leave the site.

So, assuming that we believe that the Best Management Practices have been proposed, the Applicant has asserted that construction may have short-term effects resulting from fugitive dust. And to minimize this, environmental monitors will
review ongoing activities and will confirm that BMPs, such as mulching, covering soil stockpiles, installing wind breaks, water trucks and installing crush stone aprons, will be complied with, and that contractors will adhere to state laws relative to idling, excessive idling of the vehicles.

So those are the only issues that have been raised. And I don't believe that there was any testimony or further information that would support taking any other actions with regards to air quality. DIR. MUZZEY: I wouldn't want to disappoint.

MR. FITZGERALD: Is it a farming question?

DIR. MUZZEY: No, it's not.
So, according to our rules, as we determine whether or not a project has an unreasonable adverse effect on air quality, we are charged with determining -- with considering the determinations of the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services in regard to this issue. So, in
that no sort of approval or permit is required from the Air Division of DES, you're telling us that we have nothing to consider?

MR. FITZGERALD: That's correct.
But I'd like to confirm that under the state agency permits and DES review and determination, there was nothing -- there was nothing from DES.

DIR. MUZZEY: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I would just like to point out that Mr. Frizzell, in his prefiled direct testimony, I think was the only one who raised an air quality issue. It was very vague. It states will the Project have an unreasonable adverse effect upon the air quality, water quality, natural environment and wildlife on the Frizzell property? And his response was some adverse environmental effects will inevitably occur.

MR. FITZGERALD: But none specific to air.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: NO.
Just a general that he's going to have some
environmental effects. But the question concerned air quality. So I just wanted to get it out there that a concern may have been raised about air, but it was not specific.

Does anyone have anything else they'd like to say concerning air quality and effects of this project on air quality?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I
will then poll you as to whether you believe this project will have an unreasonable adverse effect on air quality.

Mr. Fitzgerald.
MR. FITZGERALD: I do not.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Ms.
Duprey.
MS. DUPREY: NO.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Mr.
Way.
MR. WAY: NO.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Mr.
Schmidt.
MR. SCHMIDT: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Mr.

Shulock.
MR. SHULOCK: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Director Muzzey.
DIR. MUZZEY: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: NOI do I.

All right. I think it's too late in the day to get into water quality, which will be our next subject to take it up when we next meet, which is Monday afternoon.

MS. MONROE: 1:00.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Yeah,
Monday at 1:00. Have a nice weekend
everybody. We'll adjourn for the day.
(Whereupon the Day 2 Afternoon
Session was adjourned at 4:53
p.m., and the hearing to resume on Monday, December 3, 2018
commencing at 1:00 p.m.)
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