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(Hearing resumed from lunch recess at 1:45 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. We're
going to resume. Our order of proceeding this afternoon, we'll start with cross-examination of this panel by counsel for the public, followed by questions from the Committee, and we'll see where we are at that point. Attorney Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you very much. Allen Brooks, counsel for the public. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. The broad topics that $I$ want to cover -- I don't know that I have too many questions on this, because we have gone through them in the technical session. But one thing -- I'm going to start with air. And one thing on the air is that $I$ think you mentioned that you're going from an EPC to a baghouse?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
Q. When was that decision made?
A. (Bravakis) I can't recall.
A. (Frecker) I'm not exactly sure when the decision was made, Mr. Brooks. It was
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addressed in the prefiled air permit application that was submitted, and that application was revised May 18th.
Q. That anticipates my next question, which is that the air permit application was submitted and reviewed with the understanding that there would be a baghouse, not an CPE?
A. (Frecker) In the revised filing, that is correct. It addressed a fabric-filter baghouse for particulate control rather than an CPE.
Q. And the recommendation back from DES Air Division related to a baghouse and not an CPE?
A. (Frecker) They accepted that because it also came with a lower particulate emission rate.
Q. Okay. How did you achieve -- and if you can't answer this, that's fine, 'cause this is... my understanding was an CPE was a more significant control device than a baghouse. How are you able to achieve a lower emission rate with a baghouse than an CPE?
A. (Frecker) I actually think that in some
applications a fabric filter can be more efficient than an electrostatic precipitator. One of the things that was also proposed, committed to in the amended air permit application, was the use of sorbent injection to achieve a lower SO2 emission rate. And sorbent can build up on the bags to provide an even higher filtration efficiency and particulate control efficiency.
Q. Okay. So the sorbent basically makes the holes in the bag smaller, in other words?
A. (Frecker) That's correct. But the baghouse, in and of itself, was able to achieve the lower particulate emission rate. The sorbent injection just provides an added level of abatement.
Q. I think the existing facility, was there already an CPE in place or room for an CPE?
A. (Frecker) There is an electrostatic precipitator that exists there now that operated on the former recovery boiler.
Q. And why was a decision made to go to a baghouse instead?
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A. (Strickler) Well, $I$ think the key is, as we talk about the SO2 control, you need to have a baghouse in order to get the level of SO2 control with a dry sorbent injection. They have to go together. When you add the SO2 control, we need to also have a baghouse for that to perform. So that was the principal decision to go that way.
Q. But in general, you are -- and I remember this from the permitting -- you're meeting all of the essentially most stringent requirements for BACT LAER, whatever they are, for emissions for the facility.
A. (Frecker) That is correct.
Q. Right now, you're not under, as far as I know, any CO2 control, including the RGGI program, because you're not a fossil fuel-fired unit.

Any prediction of, given that EPA is looking at $\mathrm{CO2}$ right now and that there are many people in Congress looking at C02, about what might happen and how you might respond if there are CO 2 regulations in the near future, let's say within next decade?
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A. (Frecker) I think with regard to what we know about the regulations right now, we can say that with EPA's tailoring rule, which requires permitting in 2011 for very large sources of CO2, that that will not impact the project, because the project will have completed its air permitting by that time. With regard to EPA's greenhouse gas emissions reporting rule, the project will likely be subject to reporting. EPA is in the process of refining their position with regard to sources of biogenic CO2, such as biomass facilities. We're not sure what EPA may do, but we don't see -- or we at least see, based upon their positions in the past, that they have a favorable perspective with regard to biogenic emissions of CO2 from biomass plants compared to fossil fuel sources.
Q. Do you believe that, given whatever your predictions are about the possibility of C02 regulation or legislation, that the plant will remain economically viable, based on what you now know might happen over the
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next, let's say decade?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
Q. Okay. That's all the questions I have about air.

Moving on to water, and specifically groundwater, there are obviously contaminants at the site right now in the groundwater. Can you tell me -- maybe just review quickly before my question.

You don't plan on doing anything significant at this point in terms of disturbing any of the contaminants in the groundwater? In other words, when we did the plant walk, you discussed the fact that, because there's an existing structure, you won't have to do as much drilling to get to bedrock, that kind of thing. So my understanding is that, even with the drainage swales and retention basins and things like that, that you're not going to really puncture into contaminants that much. Is that correct?
A. (Frecker) That is correct. The data that we have shows the groundwater levels at the
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site exist 10 feet or more below the surface. And the deepest foundations that are contemplated at this point are about 8 feet. Even if there was some encountering of groundwater, the levels of organics that are found are not particularly difficult to handle. They're relatively low-part-per-million type levels of very readily treatable organics that can be well managed.
Q. For the purposes of the record, we just haven't had much time to look over the agreements that you've had with the town, and probably members from the public, to the extent that they've even gotten them, haven't either.

Can you tell us kind of what the -what you're envisioning doing, what your agreement is with respect to, let's say monitoring and testing of groundwater, including the geographic scope? Is it limited to just the Laidlaw site? Does it go beyond that? Does it encompass what we would usually refer to as maybe a Phase 1 or
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a Phase 2 environmental assessment? Can you just talk about that?
A. (Frecker) Yeah, I think I can answer it in two ways. One is, independent from what the City may do, and Laidlaw may assist the City in doing -- and I'll touch upon that in a moment -- we have committed to, in the application, conducting the necessary studies, subsurface studies in the areas where there would be intrusive activities, excavations of any size, and properly characterizing the soils, sampling the soils and materials in those areas to make sure that all those materials are properly handled. So there will be a subsurface investigation to some degree to assure that all of the construction activity occurs properly, without causing any harm to public safety.

With regard to the stipulations that have been negotiated with the City, the City has talked to at least one consultant about a preliminary scope of work which would occur in multiple phases, which would
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include soil and groundwater sampling, both in the location of the project, focused in the area where the project would be built initially, and expanding to other portions of the site itself. I believe that that scope, as I characterized it, is a draft scope of work. But at least it sets forth the structure for how those investigations may be conducted. And I should say, part of the stipulation is for Laidlaw to provide a significant level of monetary support and cooperation in having that study conducted.
Q. A member of the public recently sent me an e-mail I'd like to go over with you regarding groundwater contamination. You mentioned some of the, I think, organic compounds that are there. This e-mail mentions significant mercury pollution -- this is what he's saying -- at the chloro-alkali plant. Can you tell us about the relationship, if any, between your Laidlaw project and the previous chloro-alkali plant?
A. (Frecker) Yeah. The chloro-alkali plant is
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actually on the northern parcel of what was the former pulp mill facility. So if you went about a quarter of a mile or so up here, along the river bank, is where the chloro-alkali plant is. And that's where EPA has been doing investigations with regard to mercury contamination.
Q. Okay. And you're aware of those studies?
A. (Frecker) Yes, we are.
Q. Having been familiar with those studies, do you have any concern about the Laidlaw project and impacts to the Laidlaw area from that site?
A. (Frecker) No, we don't, for a couple of reasons. First of all, as I indicated, we anticipate doing relatively shallow excavations for footings and foundations of the few structures that need to be constructed for the project itself. Our evaluations of depth to bedrock, based upon prior studies done at the facility, do not indicate that any blasting will be required. And if there should be some nominal encountering of bedrock, it can likely be
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done through mechanical means of removing that without going into blasting activities. So we certainly don't anticipate a level of disturbance that would propagate vibrations and things all the way up the river to cause any harm or impact on the existing chloro-alkali site.

With regard to the site itself, the investigation done by GZA back in 2003 installed a number of groundwater monitoring wells and conducted a number of soil samples. And out of the 13 groundwater monitoring wells that GZA had installed, 7 of those did not show levels of any metals or organics above the groundwater quality concentrations codified in the New Hampshire regulations. As a matter of fact, one of the recommendations that GZA made in their report was that additional sampling of groundwater and soils should be conducted to determine if the levels of mercury which were detected were, in fact, not just associated with natural background, because they were only a couple of part per billion
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above the regulatory standards in the state of New Hampshire. So, very, very different levels and minimal levels down in the site where the project will be constructed, as compared to the chloro-alkali site.
Q. And you answered another one of the member's concerns, which was -- his statement is the proposed turbine building will require substantial foundation work which will easily reach into bedrock. It sounds like you do not believe that to be true, or that that won't require significant blasting or other activities.
A. (Frecker) We don't believe that the installation of the footings and foundation for the turbine buildings will encounter a need to remove existing bedrock.
Q. Okay. Thank you. The correspondence that I have is from a person named Alex Driessen. Did Mr. Driessen ever contact you with these concerns previously?
A. (Bravakis) No, sir.
A. (Strickler) Not me.
Q. So you never turned him away and said we
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don't want to hear about these --
A. (Bravakis) No.
Q. Okay. Do you know who Mr. Driessen is?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
A. (Strickler) Yes.
Q. Who is he?
A. (Bravakis) I know Mr. Driessen as a environmental consultant in the state of New Hampshire and a member of the Clean Power Development project team.
Q. Had he come to you with these concerns, would you have addressed them with him?
A. (Bravakis) I think we would have been glad to discuss the issues with him.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. I have a few questions. One of them is a follow-up to an answer that you gave concerning the groundwater monitoring wells on the site that GZA installed.

Are all of those wells still intact and operable?
A. (Bravakis) I don't know the answer to that, Mr. Roth. I have not -- we have not actively pursued looking into those wells.
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Q. So you don't know whether any of them are, in fact, still usable?
A. (Bravakis) I do not know.
Q. Okay. And you haven't conducted your own groundwater survey to date?
A. (Bravakis) Not to date, no.
Q. Okay. I have three documents. These are Public Counsel 1, 2 and 3. These are the covenant not to sue, the $T 1$ transformer and the Dummer Yard leachate agreement. I'm going to give these to you. I just introduced them today, so hopefully you're already familiar with them. But I just wanted to ask you a few questions. Are you familiar with these three documents?
A. (Frecker) Only on a very superficial level.
Q. Now, starting with Public Counsel No. 1, the covenant not to sue, what's your at least superficial understanding about what this is?
A. (Frecker) And I'll give you an answer as an engineer and not an attorney --
Q. That's fine.

SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}
A. (Frecker) -- and that is that owners of the site going forward will not be held -- and, again, please don't parse legal terms on me -- but will not be held financially or otherwise responsible for existing conditions at the site that may have been caused by prior owners.
Q. Very good. That's my understanding of it as an attorney as well. Mr. Frecker, if you wouldn't mind turning to Page 6 of Public Counsel No. 1?
A. (Frecker) That's the CNTS?
Q. Yes. And in particular, if you wouldn't mind focusing your attention on Paragraph 4. Are you familiar with Brownfields covenants not to sue and covenants not to sue in general?
A. (Frecker) Only from a very superficial level.
Q. Okay. Well, perhaps this paragraph will be familiar to you. As you stated, there's a protection for the owner for existing contamination. And is it your understanding that this covenant would run in favor of the
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Applicant here?
A. (Frecker) That is my personal understanding, yes.
Q. Okay. And you may not be aware of this, but -- and perhaps you are. I'll ask you.

Are you aware that the Department of Environmental Services, a year or so ago, issued a letter to the Applicant, informing it that the covenant was generally still applicable to it?
A. (Frecker) Yes, I'm aware of that.

MR. ROTH: Okay. And I haven't introduced that letter, but I guess I'd like to hold a place for it as an exhibit, with your agreement, Barry?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: We agree.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: We'll tentatively identify that as Public Counsel Exhibit 4.

MR. ROTH: Thank you.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. So, on Paragraph 4 on Page 6 here, would you just read the Roman numerals one and two.
A. (Frecker) Sure.
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Q. And if I can interrupt you already? In looking at that, would you agree with me that this is sort of the carve-outs from the covenant itself? Perhaps take a moment to...
(Witness reviews document.)
A. (Frecker) Yes, I would agree with your characterization of that as a "carve-out," if you will.
Q. And would you look at or tell the Committee what Roman I and II say.
A. (Frecker) Roman I says that claims based upon the release of additional pollutants, contaminants, hazardous substances, other than existing contamination that occurs at the acquired property after the date of closing; and Roman II covers claims based on negligent or reckless aggravation of the existing contamination by a purchasing entity or its assigned.

So it's my understanding that these are essentially saying that if a subsequent owner were to do something that contributed additional pollutants, or through negligent
or reckless aggravation of existing contamination, that they may be held responsible for that.
Q. So I would assume that, now that you're familiar with those two carve-outs, that when you go about this project, you're going to avoid being negligent or reckless in aggravating existing contamination?
A. (Frecker) Above and beyond whether this legal document existed, we would do that because it's the right way to do a project, and we don't want to cause any harm to public safety or anybody who works on the project.
Q. Okay. And is that a little bit tricky to do when you perhaps aren't fully familiar with what existing contaminants are located on the site?
A. (Frecker) All the more reason that we said the first thing that we would do is additional investigation to get better familiarity with the contaminants that are on the site.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
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Turning your attention now to Roman -I'm sorry -- Public Counsel 2. And this is identified as "Agreement for Addressing PCB Contamination at the T1 Transformer Area." Are you familiar with the $T 1$ transformer area?
A. (Frecker) Generally.
Q. Can you point on the chart where that is in relation to your project?
A. (Frecker) I can. It's this shaded area located right essentially along the river bank here, between where the proposed roadway would pass to the north of the building that would house the emission-control systems for the project.
Q. Okay.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Sorry, Mr.
Frecker. It's just hard for some of us to see -MR. FRECKER: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: -- with you standing on that side. Can you perhaps point again so --

MR. FRECKER: Sure. It's this shaded area right here. It's currently enclosed SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}
by a chain-link fence and asphalt-paved. You may recall having seen it when we were doing the site walk.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. And can you tell the Committee what the $T 1$ transformer site is, to the best of your knowledge?
A. (Frecker) Essentially as simple as its name: That there was a transformer there that had leakage or issues that created PCB -subsurface PCB contamination, and that there was a remediation project to largely address that issue and to cap and cover that to make sure that there weren't ongoing issues or exposure.
Q. Okay. And is there a cap and cover now on the $T 1$ site? Has that been completed?
A. (Frecker) As I indicated, there is an asphalt cover. The area is paved with asphalt.
Q. Okay. And do you expect any project activities to occur on the T1 transformer site?
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A. (Frecker) No.
Q. Now turning your attention in the document to Page 6, Paragraph 26. Can you read Paragraph 26 to the -- out loud for everybody.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Sorry. Just to be clear, you're in Exhibit 2, Public Counsel Exhibit 2?

MR. ROTH: That's correct. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Can you read Paragraph 26?
A. (Frecker) Sure.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Frecker) "Fraser agrees to bear the cost of all long-term cap maintenance following the submission and final evaluation of the final revised post-clean-up report described in Paragraph 21. Fraser will also abide by any use restrictions, institutional controls and deed restrictions."
Q. Okay. And you're familiar with institutional controls and use restrictions in general as a --
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A. (Frecker) Generally, yes.
Q. Okay. And now can you now turn to Page 8, Paragraph 39, and can you read the first sentence there.
A. (Frecker) Yes. "The provisions of this agreement shall apply to and be binding on the parties and Fraser's successive assigns from time to time, and any and all officers, directors, employees and agents of Fraser and its successive assigns from time to time."
Q. Okay. Now, as an engineer, in your understanding with respect to an assign of Fraser, would your understanding be that that assign would be required to maintain the cap and do monitoring in accordance with Paragraph 26?
A. (Frecker) With the qualification that I'm an engineer, not an attorney, that's my understanding.
Q. Okay. Do you know whether, in fact, this agreement was -- well, strike that. I'll just leave it at that. Thank you. Now, the last one, this is Public
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Counsel No. 3, captioned "Agreement for the Treatment of Dummer Yard Leachate." Are you familiar Dummer Yard?
A. (Frecker) Generally, yes.
Q. Can you show us on your plan where Dummer Yard is in relation to the project?
A. (Frecker) I believe that the Dummer Yard is the landfill that was located -- is located -- is that Dummer Yard that's located across the street? Or is that --
A. (Strickler) Yes.
A. (Frecker) No, I'm not entirely familiar with Dummer Yard, I guess.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Dummer Yard leachate?
A. (Frecker) Only that $I$ have heard of it.
Q. Okay. All right. I will stop there. Thank you. That's all I have on this particular subject. I will ask you more questions on other things, though. Thank you.

BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. Okay. The next questions are about sustainability. And if you want to turn to your Exhibit 60 --
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A. (Frecker) Did you say 16?
Q. Six zero.
A. (Bravakis) Sustainability condition.
Q. Okay. And without revealing what may be confidential discussions, $I$ just want to ask some questions about what counsel for the public might be looking for and your responses to those topics.

The one, if you look at Paragraph 4, it talks about an incentive program that will financially reward landowners. We appreciate this offer. We think it's a good thing. We are looking to see if you'd be willing to put an actual dollar amount on that fund so that we can -- you know, for a couple reasons: One, we want to know how valuable it's going to be; and two, we want to make sure that both of us can figure out whether you've actually met your obligations. So, is there a willingness to do that or to look at that possibility?
A. (Strickler) Yeah.
A. (Bravakis) Yes, sir.
Q. With respect to Paragraph No. 6, we would
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prefer that preference actually be given to these people. In other words, we'd like to change it to say whenever possible, you will use these -- you know, someone certified or operating under one of those programs. And I don't know -- again, we're in discussions about this. I don't know if you can make the commitment. But I'd like to know about your willingness to explore how to make that have some teeth to it and actually use those individuals.
A. (Bravakis) We would be willing to explore that.
Q. The end of Paragraph 6 had a similar provision regarding an annual fund designated to help support suppliers. With this paragraph and with the next paragraph, Paragraph 7, we would be looking again to have some specific amount in the funds so that we can both, you know, know its value and to monitor that. Would you be willing to explore that as well?
A. (Bravakis) Yes, we would.
Q. I think that's all I have on the actual
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sustainability agreement, other than some things we may discuss.

But actually, I do have a question about the LandVest item we spent a lot of time on before. We tried together to do some math. That didn't work out so well, so I won't ask you any more questions about adding things up.

But in general, the LandVest study, the numbers we were talking about came out to something like 6 million plus 750,000, somewhere in that range. Remind me, though. The actual use for the pulp mills that have now shut down and the other kind of users, wasn't that a much higher number than that previously? Wasn't it like 1.2 million or something like that --
A. (Bravakis) Yes, it was.
Q. -- in that range?
A. (Frecker) Exactly right.
Q. So why didn't the LandVest study come out with a number that reflected something akin to what the actual use had been before? One would expect that people who actually did
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that previously, that there would be that availability. Do you know why there's a discrepancy between those?
A. (Bravakis) My sense is that some of that wood -- LandVest looked at this -understand, LandVest's study was a high-level first filter for us, and it looked at a defined area. So my sense is that some of that wood came from outside of that defined area.

As I have mentioned in my supplemental testimony, that as we -- excuse me -- as we learned more about how the wood, the movements in the markets work, we understand that some wood can come as close as 10, 15, 20 miles from a facility, some wood can come as far as 200 miles from a facility, based on truck traffic patterns and the efficient use of trucks in relationship to where the different markets are.

So the reason, my sense, is that LandVest didn't come back with that number exactly -- it would make sense that they would -- is because some of that wood
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actually came from outside of that region.
Q. So you put an artificial bound on a hundred-mile radius, or whatever it was that you did.
A. (Bravakis) Yeah.
Q. In reality, you think the economics of the operating pulp mills may have been such that they were able to get greater transport range outside a hundred miles?
A. (Bravakis) Yeah. What we've learned is that the realities of the market create amoeba-shaped wood sheds. It's nice and neat to think of them all in circles, but that's not practical and that's not real. That some wood sheds -- I always think of it like pushing on a balloon or something, where you push one end in and it comes out the other, and you push that in and it comes out the other. So, some facilities in Maine, for example, would probably come in and consume some of that wood that went to the Burgess Mill site. When we come back, those mills, those facilities in Maine would probably realign with their existing wood
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sheds before the departure of the Burgess Mill. So, although we'd like to think of it in circles, it's really more of amoeba-shaped in its dynamic. It's changing all the time.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. I just have a couple follow-on questions to what Attorney Brooks was asking you.

Now, the 1.3 million tons that was consumed by the previous players is an interesting number, and I'm curious if you know where that number came from.
A. (Bravakis) It came from some interviews we've had and discussions with people in the area that are familiar with that, including some folks that actually procured fuel there and some people that are very familiar with the wood market in the area.
Q. So you don't have any documentation or sort of formal studies showing where that figure -- how that figure was derived?
A. (Bravakis) No.
Q. And do you know what period of time that that figure applied to?
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A. (Bravakis) I believe it's the recent past, right before they shut down.
Q. And is it your understanding, in the recent past, right before they shut down, that wood use by the pulp facilities players in the North Country was -- would you describe it as an all-time high or an all-time low?
A. (Bravakis) I think it was -- and I'm trying to recall. I did get some information from UNH on this. I think it was neither of the two. I think it was somewhere in the middle.
Q. Okay.
A. (Bravakis) I could probably follow up with more information on that if you like.
Q. There was a comment that you made when you were being questioned by Attorney Rodier earlier that was interesting to me, and it was with respect to the 50 -percent, 70-percent issue. And what you said was that the wood cutters want to utilize everything they can to create more revenue for themselves. And as the markets show up, people come and supply them, no barriers to
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entry. Would you -- and my understanding of what you were saying is that that pushes sort of the top -- or the collectors of the low-grade wood to collect more of it in more localized areas. Is that a fair characterization of what you said?
A. (Bravakis) I'm not sure that's -- maybe I'm not sure it would have to be necessarily localized. It would just be if there was a market, then they'd be able to utilize those tops and branches that they've been leaving in the woods. If they were closer, obviously, they have a competitive advantage because of less trucking costs. But it's a byproduct. It's a waste product of the logging operation that typically goes to biomass plants. Nobody goes into a timber harvest to cut the tops, nor do they take good-quality timber wood and make it into wood chips.
Q. But based on what you said, isn't it true that a person motivated by profit isn't going to leave half of the tops laying around on the forest floor? They're going

SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}
to scoop them all up and bring them to your mill.
A. (Bravakis) One would think so. But there are two things that also enter into play. When a timber sale is conducted, and especially with respect to what we're trying to propose in our sustainability provision, it's done under the guidance of a timber -of a forest -- a registered forester. And it's also done under the -- many times under a management plan or under some type of certification program that the land is involved in. So the timber -- the landowner is -- his motivation is to grow high-grade timber. His motivation is to grow veneer logs and not to grow tops and branches to sell to biomass plants. So it's counterintuitive for him to just over-harvest his land to sell to the lowest market. So that's -- there's more to it than the logger making those judgment calls on the land.
Q. But wouldn't you agree that there is an incentive for perhaps an unscrupulous logger
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to buy land cheap, cut it all down, remove every stick, sell it and move on? Correct?
A. (Bravakis) I believe that some people would operate in that fashion.
Q. Okay.
A. (Bravakis) I would like to point out, if I may, that in our sustainability condition, we will not buy wood from suppliers who are found to be repeat offenders of state or federal laws governing timber harvesting. And if a logging contractor were in violation on numbers of occasions, he would not be or she would not be able to supply to our facility.
Q. Are you aware of any law that would prohibit a landowner from cutting every stick of wood off of his land --
A. (Bravakis) No.
Q. -- and bringing it to your mill and selling it to you?
A. (Bravakis) No.
Q. When you were talking about the amoeba and how the -- you were trying to explain to Attorney Rodier how it is that what looks
like sort of a minimally adequate amount of wood becomes bigger because of this market shift from the users in Maine who had kind of come in to take some of the market that used to belong to the Burgess Mill, if I'm characterizing this correctly. I'm curious as to what portion of this sort of market realignment you might attribute to a timber company moving from sort of 50-percent leave-behind, you know, increasing its share of wood that they deliver to you by leaving less on the ground. Do you have some sense for how much of your -- this improvement in the basket is going to come by more efficient delivery?
A. (Bravakis) Yeah. It was actually in the addendum. That was what explained, I think, between the 6.7 and the 7.2 or 3 million tons a year.
Q. Correct.
A. (Bravakis) So, whatever that difference would have been. So, $600,000,700,000$ additional tons might come in by better utilization, according to the LandVest
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study.
Q. So, in fact, almost all of your timber need could come through better utilization.
A. (Bravakis) Conceivably it could by that analysis, yes.
Q. And how does that interplay with sort of this idea that the market shifts, because now you're using more of it locally, so the mill in Maine now has to go somewhere else? How that does that work?
A. (Bravakis) Well, it could also be that some low-grade material that's not going into pulping operations that are 50 miles away, for example, or on the other side of Berlin, it might make more sense for a forester or a logger, even though that stem is worth more in stumpage value, it might make sense because of the savings in trucking to chip that up and send that to our facility. And there are -- you know, one could say that a portion of the round wood pulp that currently goes to the pulp markets might get redirected to go to a biomass plant if there are efficiencies gained on the trucking.
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Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you about the trucking efficiencies in a minute.

MR. ROTH: Do you want to move on to the contract, or should I continue?

MR. BROOKS: Yeah, if you think that's best.

BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. Yeah, I'll ask you a question about the Cousineau -- I don't know if you have a contract in place. I think you said that you don't yet, but you're working on it. Is that the -- how do you say that name and how do you -- spell it for me.
A. (Bravakis) Cousineau?
Q. Cousineau, yeah.
A. (Bravakis) C-O-U-S-I-N-E-A-U.
Q. You mentioned that this -- I believe that it was the intention to have that be your sole source contract for the next 20 years?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
Q. And that Cousineau was probably the biggest wood supplier in New Hampshire, it sounded like.
A. (Bravakis) Not only -- yeah, in New SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}

Hampshire. And they sell to other plants as well, but mostly -- they're located in New Hampshire.
Q. Do you know what percentage of the market share they have in New Hampshire, in terms of --
A. (Bravakis) I do not.
Q. -- wood share?

Do you think there's any kind of danger to the regional economy for an already big wood supplier to get a very large wood supply contract, in terms of competition or other kind of economic market reasons that might be detrimental?
A. (Bravakis) Yeah. I understand. That's a really good question. Cousineau doesn't produce wood chips. What they do is they contract -- they basically connect the dots between the myriad of suppliers and the markets that exist. So it's in their best benefit and our best benefit for them to contract with the area producers to supply the facility. That would be the first place they might want to look, and then, in
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addition to that, take advantage of truck inefficiencies through backhaul for suppliers that are further away. So they don't -- there's no intent, and I don't think it's realistic to think that they would exclude any local contractor. Quite the contrary. We have maintained a position early on that the local contractor harvesting wood in a sustainable manner under management programs, et cetera, has a distinct competitive advantage over contractors that are further away, just by the location of our facility.
Q. Do you think that there is any risk to you, in terms of price, by locking into a long-term contract with one vendor instead of kind of spreading it out between a few vendors?
A. (Bravakis) The details on the pricing haven't been worked out. I think there could be a risk if that's not done properly. So we have not worked out all those terms yet, so I really can't answer that. But I think, done improperly, there could be a

for the timber harvesting. It was more a question for the Applicant, in terms of -- I think you answered this -- which is, basically, if I don't know the contract payment terms, then $I$ can't know what kind of security you have hedges against high prices. So without that, I guess we'll have to wait.
A. (Bravakis) That's right.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Does Cousineau manage the logistics of delivery and trucking?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
Q. How much wood would a -- no. How much wood would the project have on hand on any given day?
A. (Bravakis) We have designed the plant to have a 30-day supply of wood on hand in our two storage areas. And that would be a combination of chipped wood and round wood. There could potentially be some off-site storage on yards, as I explained before. Logging contractors might not have chippers, so they would log and harvest round wood and
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stockpile the tops and branches. And that could be sold or destined to come to our facility. So that could act as almost satellite storage areas in the forest to be utilized maybe during times of year when it's more difficult to get into the forest because of weather conditions.
Q. If Cousineau were to fail as a business enterprise and essentially go belly up -we've seen that happen -- where would that leave you?
A. (Bravakis) Well, we would -- what we would have to do is we would have to assume the contracts and the management roles that they have assumed -- as far as the supply I'm talking about. I'm not talking about the business aspects of it. I'll leave that to my business partners to talk about.

But with respect to the supply, we would assume and go in and connect with the contracts that they have made with their suppliers. We would look at the personnel that they have and either hire them or replace them, and take that over if we
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couldn't find a suitable alternative to Cousineau.
Q. That would be a pretty significant disruption, though, wouldn't it, if they --
A. (Bravakis) It might, it might not. You know, I think once -- after all, remember, Cousineau does not cut the wood. They manage the process. So if we can assume that management and reconnect with all the existing suppliers -- who need that cash flow. They need that wood to go. So they need that market. Presumably, if Cousineau were to have financial difficulties, it wouldn't cascade down to the people who are supplying our facility through a Cousineau arrangement. So we would want to keep that going as -- keep that moving forward as seamlessly as we possibly could.
Q. Are you structuring your agreement with Cousineau to provide for that kind of a reach-through?
A. (Bravakis) I haven't. I can't speak to that because $I$ haven't in detail reviewed the agreement. But as soon as we have it in a
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form to share with you, we will. So... BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. Just to clarify, previously you talked about Cousineau with respect to also providing wood to the Schiller plant. And I think we may have gotten a misunderstanding about that.

Cousineau isn't the only supplier of wood to Schiller; right? I mean, it sounded like at one point you were saying they were the sole supplier of --
A. (Bravakis) No, no. I believe they're from what I understand, sometimes they supply 5 percent, sometimes 12 percent. But it's typically 10 percent or less of the supply to Schiller is supplied by Cousineau. BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Wouldn't it be more prudent to have a variety of different procurers? I know, for example, there's one called North Country Procurement. Split it up, have your eggs in more than one basket, so to speak.
A. (Bravakis) Obviously, we've done our homework. We've looked and talked to
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others. We felt this was the best pathway forward for the project. Unlike other providers of fuel, Cousineau actually takes title to the facility. They don't just take a margin or price of a delivery. They actually -- so they have more control over the supply. And what they do is they have numerous suppliers all over the place that they can direct to their clients, rather than arranging with one supplier to go to one client and they just take a piece of it. So if there's an over-supply here and an under-supply there, they're better equipped, from what $I$ understand of their business model, to make those adjustments. And I think that, plus my personal knowledge of their ability to source and their relationships to get out there and find the wood, that was the reason for our selection with Cousineau.
Q. All right. You have in your testimony and today spoke of backhauling as kind of an expansion device of the ability to bring in wood from greater distances. What portion
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of your wood supply do you think will be met by the use of backhaul?
A. (Bravakis) I really can't answer exactly how much. I do know this, though: From what I understand of the way the markets work nowadays, as opposed to when the markets worked when biomass plants were first built, that the trucks are under extreme pressure to maintain or keep margins. And to do that, they need to be -- they need to carry fuel. We've all seen trucks going to Canada. They're taking logs to Canada. And we don't know what they take going down. It could be finished lumber. So, trucks act as -- in this day and age, within the wood market in the northeast, trucks, and the efficient use of trucks, act as a vital link in making the connections.

And if I could point out, in my
supplemental testimony I describe a situation where it was a hypothetical situation based on reality, as I understand it from talking to different folks in the industry, where trucks will bring finished
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lumber, for example, or products from Canada down to the Metropolitan New York area, for example. They will then go to, on their way back, maybe go to the Catskills or some forests down in that area and bring logs back to the mills in Canada, because there aren't any mills down in that area. So now we've created a timber harvesting opportunity for that area which might not have had one before.

Now, Maine takes -- a lot of times they take bark from Canada. And there's no bark markets in Maine, which come in different types of trucks for bulk delivery. They'll take that down to that same area and satisfy the market there, looking for a backhaul to go back. So, because there's a timber harvesting operation there, now the contractor can say, instead of leaving that low-grade either in stumpage form or in the woods, I can chip that up, load this truck up and sell it to a biomass plant in Maine. As ridiculous as it sounds, that's the way things move. So the truckers are a key
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component in how wood moves throughout the northeast. And it's just one brief example of how dynamic the market is, from my understanding.
Q. I understand the concept. I'm trying to get at some of the specifics and what product from Berlin would be backhauled to other places that have forestry that would supply low-grade wood to your plant.
A. (Bravakis) Could be bark from mills that get -- that come in to Berlin or come off of debarking operations, let's say like a pellet operation, and we weren't burning it. Bark has a high-value use as landscape, not in the northeast, but around Metropolitan New York. It has a huge demand. Or around southeastern Massachusetts or the Boston area. A truck, a closed truck with a self-unloading floor could take bark down there, and then they're looking for a backhaul. So they want to bring something back. So they could contract with a local land-clearing operation, or the local utility who clears trees and rights-of-way,
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and backhaul chips to the biomass plants. And that's typically the way it happens.
Q. But you don't have any -- there's no study or specifics that you have about how -(Court Reporter interjects.)
Q. You don't have any studies or specifics about how that would actually work in practice for your facility?
A. (Bravakis) Not specifically. No studies, no. It's just discussions we've had.
Q. Now, you had named in your testimony four entities that were -- I think it was your assertion they were receiving wood by backhauls. Do you know how much wood they're receiving by backhaul?
A. (Bravakis) This is in my first testimony?
Q. I believe so.
A. (Bravakis) I believe there was, at that time -- I stand corrected. I thought it was somewhere around 50,000 tons or so.
Q. So, do you know what percentage of --
A. (Bravakis) That percentage of 750 would be, you know, less than 10 percent.
Q. So you think something like 10 or 15 percent
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of your supply would come through backhaul?
A. (Bravakis) I'd like to answer that, but I think I really can't answer that until we understand and get a little closer to the time when actual contracts are going to be written with the suppliers and the plant will get fuel. It most likely won't be less than that. It could be more than that.
Q. Changing subjects somewhat now. Before lunch, Attorney Rodier was trying to get you to explain 6.1.2 of the PPA, and he stopped, to my surprise. I thought he was just about ready to get you to tell us what it means. And I guess I'd ask you if perhaps during lunch you thought about it and consulted with your team and maybe you could tell us now what that means, how that's supposed to work.
A. (Bravakis) Well, I can tell you this: The reimbursement he was referring to is not a reimbursement for the price we pay for fuel. The wood price adjustment has a connection with the amount of money we receive for electricity.
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Q. And how does it work? Because there seems to be some relation to the price of fuel at Schiller.
A. (Bravakis) That's correct.
Q. Can you just sort of walk us through what -how that works?
A. (Bravakis) Well, you know, I would like to do that. I think what I would prefer to do, though, if it's -- in all due respect, is defer this question to my colleague, Michael Bartoszek, who was deposed on the PPA and the business matters, if I may.
Q. That's fine.
A. (Bravakis) Okay. Thank you.
Q. Now, this is a question for -- I guess the next line is for both you, Mr. Bravakis, and Mr. Frecker.

As I understand it, there's a significant amount of ashes that will be produced by the plant on a regular basis. Is that fair to say?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
A. (Strickler) Yes.
Q. And how much will there be? How much ashes
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will be produced on a daily basis or a weekly, or whatever metric you want to do?
A. (Frecker) That issue was addressed a little bit more in the responses to one of the data requests from the technical session. I don't recall, right off the top of my head. But in that response, it indicated that the quantity of $f l y$ ash -- that is the ash taken out of the combustion area exhaust from the boiler, controlled by the electrostatic precipitator -- would be on the order of 100 --
Q. You mean by that, the electrostatic precipitator that you're not using? MR. BROOKS: You mean the baghouse.
A. (Frecker) I'm sorry. Thank you. The fabric-filter baghouse would be on the order of about 120 tons per week.
Q. And what are you going to do with that?
A. (Frecker) It was further indicated in one of those responses that there were discussions with the Androscoggin Valley Regional Refuse Disposal District, and their confirmation
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that they had the capacity to accept that material at the Mount Carberry landfill.
Q. Okay. So you've already started contact with Mount Carberry to bury it up there.
A. (Frecker) That's correct. And furthermore, as I think was discussed at the technical session, a more favorable potential outcome for that material would be an alternative beneficial use for land supplement, land application material, as is often done with fly ash from biomass facilities from many generating facilities throughout the northeast.
Q. How much ash will you store on the project site?
A. (Frecker) I believe that the ash storage system, at least at the time the application materials were filed, hadn't been fully -it's designed and not been fully finalized. But I believe the number talked about was about a week's worth of ash generation.
Q. And that will all be inside a structure, a building somewhere?
A. (Frecker) That's correct. It will be
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contained within a silo.
Q. And where is that silo going to be located with respect to, for example, the Androscoggin River?
A. (Frecker) I don't believe the exact placement of that device has been finalized at this time; although, I think it could be reasonably expected to be located close to where the electrostatic precipitator building would be located.
Q. You mean baghouse?
A. (Frecker) This is the fuel oil tank -excuse me?
Q. The baghouse?
A. (Frecker) And initially it was talked about having that ash silo located between the boiler and the turbine building and the stack. Again, that location may alter some degree.
Q. And you said there would be, I think -- did you say there was going to be a week's worth in there at a time?
A. (Frecker) I believe that's the number that's been talked about.
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Q. And would you -- and maybe this is for Mr . Bravakis or... would you agree to a condition that no ashes could be stored outside and that no more than a week's worth would be kept in the silo?
A. (Bravakis) I believe we can do that.
Q. That's all I have on this subject.

BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. I had a couple more questions on the PPA, but we'll defer them to Mr. Bartoszek.
A. (Bravakis) Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Before you do that, if $I$ can just interrupt?

Am I to understand, though, that Mr. Bartoszek is the person who explanation of the PPA should be directed to?

MR. BRAVAKIS: Yes.
A. (Frecker) And if I may, Mr. Roth. If you'd like to go back to the Dummer Yard, I think I could probably answer your questions on that.
Q. (Roth) Oh, okay. The question I would ask is, does the project have any continuing responsibility with respect to the Dummer
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Yard?
A. (Frecker) I don't believe that to be the case. I initially didn't recall the Dummer Yard because it's not a property that's really part of the project in any way.

As I understand the Dummer Yard, it's a closed portion -- it's a closed landfill located on or about the area of the Mount Carberry landfill. And the leachate from that Dummer Yard closed landfill is conveyed down to the wastewater treatment plant that formerly serviced the Fraser pulp mill. And that, I believe, is the subject of the document that you had provided. Inasmuch as the project has not acquired that wastewater treatment facility for any purpose, I wouldn't believe that the requirements of this document would extend to Laidlaw. It seems to address primarily the ongoing treatment of the Dummer Yard's leachate, in that wastewater treatment facility, which, to my understanding, is currently owned and operated by the same party that has responsibility for the Dummer Yard leachate,
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the Androscoggin River Valley Regional Refuse Disposal District, if I'm not mistaken.
Q. I'm not sure about that, actually. But your testimony is that it's not going to be Laidlaw, the applicant's, responsibility.
A. (Frecker) That's correct.
Q. Where is the wastewater stream from the facility going to go?
A. (Frecker) To the City of Berlin municipal wastewater treatment plant.
Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Strickler, I've been trying to figure out what's going on with the reorganization and the new chart and how you fit in anymore. And it looks as though, from the new chart that was suggested, that Fibrowatt and Fibrominn are now more like, you know, ex-in-laws; whereas, before it appeared to be an equity interest in the project, now there's a dotted line connecting Homeland to the Applicant. Can you describe what happened there and what's supposed to happen?
A. (Strickler) What is supposed to happen --

MR. RODIER: Excuse me.
Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Could we have a reference to an exhibit on that question so we can follow it?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you for that suggestion.

It would be helpful if you could provide a reference, Attorney Roth.

MR. ROTH: It's the new organizational chart that came, I think it was the August 16th --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Exhibit 8.
MR. ROTH: Sorry?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Exhibit 8.
MR. ROTH: Exhibit 8? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Exhibit 8 you say, Attorney Needleman?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I believe so.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. And I guess at the same time I'd like to look at the original org chart which was attached to the initial testimony of Mr . Bartoszek.
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MR. IACOPINO: The initial testimony of Mr. Bartoszek is Exhibit 33, and that chart is there.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Do you have these in front of you?
A. (Strickler) I do.
Q. Now, it looks -- it's the last page of -- it would be Page 9 of Mr. Bartoszek's original testimony, and it stands by itself on the other one. Okay.

In the original organizational chart, we see on the right there Fibrowatt, and Fibrowatt operations owning 100 percent of Homeland Renewable. Homeland Renewable and Laidlaw BioPower owning together all of Homeland and Laidlaw Energy, which had 50 percent of the Applicant; correct?
A. (Strickler) That's correct.
Q. Now, if you look at the new chart, the only connection between Homeland Renewable is a dotted line between Laidlaw Berlin BioPower, LLC. What does that dotted line represent?
A. (Strickler) That represents an agreement with NewCo to provide services to the
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Applicant, $O \& M$-- operations and maintenance services -- construction management and development services.
Q. Okay. And is that alongside of or on top of the Babcock \& Wilcox agreement?
A. (Strickler) With respect to construction, it would be -- we'd be overseeing the construction and the contract with $B \& W$.
Q. And now, initially you had -- I say you. I mean, you know, Fibrowatt and Homeland had an ownership interest. And that's been bought out?
A. (Strickler) No, I wouldn't say it was bought out. But it has been severed. There is no -- we no longer will have an equity interest in the Applicant.
Q. Okay. And will -- if Laidlaw decides they don't want to listen to you anymore, could they fire you? Could the Applicant fire Homeland?
A. (Strickler) Under a contractual arrangement that we would have with NewCo providing those services, I suppose that relationship could be such that we could be terminated.
Q. So is the contract going to be with NewCo, or is it going to be with --
A. (Strickler) It's a contract with NewCo, but we're providing services to the Applicant.
Q. So this org chart is not -- the second one, the new one, is not really complete, because to me it raises the implication or implies that the relationship between Homeland Renewable is just with Laidlaw Berlin BioPower. For example: If you look at PJPD Holdings and the lease to Laidlaw, there's a nice dotted line across there showing the contract. But there's no line like that between Homeland and NewCo. Do you have any ownership interest in NewCo?
A. (Strickler) No, we do not.
Q. Or PJPD?
A. (Strickler) No.
Q. Okay.

MR. RODIER: Mr. Chairman,
excuse me. I hate to do this. I didn't understand. I think it's important to understand what the pronoun "we" refers to there. Could we just get a clarification on that? Is it do you SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}
have any ownership interest, or we don't? And there's so many entities here. I may be out of line, but $I$ would suggest we get that clarified so the record's clear.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you, Attorney Rodier.

Attorney Roth, do you wish to try to get clarification here?

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. If you'd like to -- if there's any way you can shed any light on that, I'd appreciate that.
A. (Strickler) Well, I'm not a hundred-percent sure exactly the question. But if I may, I'll try. We do not -- Homeland Renewable Energy or Fibrowatt operations do not have ownership interest in NewCo.
Q. Or you personally?
A. (Strickler) No, I do not.
Q. Okay. And are you an officer or director of any of those other entities?
A. (Strickler) Of Homeland Renewable Energy and Fibrowatt Operations, I am.
Q. But not of NewCo or --
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A. (Strickler) No, I'm not.
Q. Now, I understand that the ownership-change arrangement has not yet occurred. Is that your -- is that correct?
A. (Strickler) That is correct.
Q. Okay. And when do you expect that to happen?
A. (Strickler) I'm not a hundred-percent sure. But tomorrow, Mike Bartoszek, I think will -- could be questioned more on the details of that transaction.
Q. Okay. Now, do you expect -- going more now towards operational and management. Do you live in New Hampshire now?
A. (Strickler) No, I do not.
Q. Are you going to move here?
A. (Strickler) No, I'm not.
Q. How about --
A. (Strickler) If I might clarify that?
Q. Sure.
A. (Strickler) Okay. What we typically would have is a plant manager who would be responsible for the day-to-day operations of the facility. He would report to our VP of
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operations that works for me. But the plant manager who has the responsibility for the day-to-day operations of the plant will be based in New Hampshire.
Q. Is that going to be Mr . Fervee or Mr. Loulakis?
A. (Strickler) No.
Q. No?
A. They are -- they'll provide assistance, you know, to us in any matter related to the project. But they would not -- I would not expect them to be the plant manager.
Q. And they're not -- are they going to live in New Hampshire or move to -- do they live here now? Are they going to move here?
A. (Strickler) I don't know.
Q. Now, with respect to operations at

Fibrominn -- and, you know, please don't take this the wrong way -- but are there -have there been any deaths or serious injuries in the operation of the Fibrominn facility in Minnesota?
A. (Strickler) No.
Q. How long has that been in operation?
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A. (Strickler) We took over control from the contractor in October of 2007. Since that time, we've had no lost-workday cases. So it's over a thousand days that we've had no lost-workday cases.
Q. Has there been any downtime in the plant itself -- that is, out of operation because of management or technical difficulties, please stand by?
A. (Strickler) Well, these plants are very complex. They do go down for maintenance. Equipment does break down, has to be -- they go down for servicing of the facility. That does happen.
Q. And do you know what percentage of the time has been in downtime or out of operation, I suppose off-line?
A. (Strickler) The facility in Benson, Minnesota you're referring to?
Q. Correct.
A. (Strickler) We have projected a capacity factor this year of around 85 percent. So that would give you an indication of its production.
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Q. And that capacity factor -- I always get confused on this -- does that include planned outages?
A. (Strickler) Yes, it does. That's including planned and unplanned, yes.
Q. So the 15 percent of theoretical non-operation includes the planned outages?
A. (Strickler) It's probably about 50/50 for that facility. I might add, the Fibrominn facility burns primarily poultry litter, which is a much more difficult fuel to manage than wood chips. And I would expect the Berlin facility to be a much, you know, higher capacity factor.
Q. Okay. Now, in Mr. Bartoszek's -- I'm sorry if I'm mispronouncing his name -- testimony, he said that the development and construction is the Applicant and Homeland. I guess I'd ask you. Who does what?
A. (Strickler) Refer me to the words he used. Do you have a page that... I probably should let you ask him that question.
Q. Well, if you can just answer the question. Is it your -- here, I'll ask it this way:
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Is it your understanding that the development and the construction of the plant is sort of a shared enterprise or a shared activity between you and the Applicant, between Homeland and the Applicant?
A. (Strickler) The development was shared. The role for Homeland would be to oversee the construction of the project, irrespective of the ownership change that's been discussed.
Q. So you're going to --
A. (Strickler) Either way, we were going to be involved under the construction, for overseeing the construction, reporting to previously -- or under the current situation, to the Applicant.
Q. So you're sort of operating as general contractor for the owner of the construction?
A. (Strickler) Wouldn't call it a general contractor arrangement. It's really an oversight role, overseeing the construction of the project, you know, managing the EPC contract with $B \& W$, as well as any other
> construction-related activities that might -- that aren't within the $B \& W$ scope, peripheral to the site.
Q. And after construction, during operational, is that going to be Homeland again, or is that --
A. (Strickler) Be a Fibrowatt operation, which is Homeland.
Q. Okay. Unless, of course, as we discussed a minute ago, they terminate the contract according to its terms.
A. (Strickler) Yeah.
Q. Okay. And who's going to have sort of the contracting power, the signing authority for different things? For example: The Babcock \& Wilcox contracts. Is that going to be something Fibrowatt signs or Homeland or --
A. (Strickler) Probably be the Applicant.
Q. The Applicant? What's your time line for sort of completing construction and placing in service?
A. (Strickler) Right now, we're looking at between a 26- and 32-month construction period. That includes all the way to what
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I'll call commercial operations. It includes the testing and commissioning of the facility as well.
Q. Do you have sort of a place-in-service date picked or envisioned?
A. (Strickler) Well, it would be -- not yet. I mean, it would be somewhere in that range. Once we complete the work that $B \& W$ is undertaking now under the pre-EPC contract, we plan to formulate that with very specific dates.
Q. And are there any sort of hazards, if you will, that could cause significant delays in the place-in-service?
A. (Strickler) Not -- only something that would be unforeseen. You know, some odd weather event or something like that.
Q. Okay.
A. (Strickler) I mean, it would be unforeseen circumstances that possibly could come up.
Q. And are you familiar with the ARRA guidelines for the investment tax credit?
A. (Strickler) I'm not sure that I know that term. If you describe the guidelines, maybe
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I can --
Q. It's the program where once a property is placed in service, the owner is entitled to a tax credit payment.
A. (Strickler) Oh, okay. Yeah. Sure. The ARRA was the word that $I$ was wasn't familiar with.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Could you, just for the record, describe what ARRA is, Counsel? Could you spell it?

MR. ROTH: A-R-R-A.
A. (Bravakis) Yeah, it's the American Recovery --
A. (Frecker) Reinvestment and Recovery Act.
A. (Strickler) Yes, I am familiar with that. Now I got it.
Q. Have you looked at the guidelines that --
A. (Strickler) I have, and several other people on this project team have looked at it. Yes.
Q. And do you know what you have to do to be able to participate in that program?
A. (Strickler) There's a number of different ways to participate in that program, various
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ways to comply with the requirements.
Q. And do you have a vision for how you're going to do that?
A. (Strickler) Ideally, we'd start construction. That would be the first, you know, before the end of this year. That's our plan.
Q. Yeah, that's a milestone; right?
A. (Strickler) That's our plan. But there are other ways to still comply. If you look through those requirements, there's other ways to comply still, even if you don't start construction. So we're looking at these alternatives as well, just as a Plan $B$.
Q. Okay. All right. There was one more question $I$ wanted to ask Mr. Bravakis. As sort of kind of a follow-up to our discussion a minute ago about the sustainability. And our sense, I think we -- you agreed that there is some incentive for an unscrupulous, you know, timber owner to kind of work the property as hard as he can in order to get as much wood
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|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | to the facility as possible; correct? I |
| 2 | mean, I think that was pretty clear. And |
| 3 | the sustainability rules or the |
| 4 | sustainability condition, would you agree |
| 5 | that that's kind of an important modifier of |
| 6 | that market tendency? |
| 7 | A. (Bravakis) Hmm-hmm. |
| 8 | Q. And so that as a condition to this, it's an |
| 9 | important thing to do, to have a |
| 10 | sustainability condition. |
| 11 | A. (Bravakis) Hmm-hmm. Yes. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN BURACK: I'm sorry. |
| 3 | The answer is yes? |
| 4 | MR. BRAVAKIS: Yes. |
| 15 | MR. ROTH: I'm all set. |
| 16 | Do you have anything else? |
| 17 | MR. BROOKS: I don't believe |
| 18 | we have any further questions for this panel. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank |
| 20 | you. |
| 21 | We're going to take a |
| 22 | 10-minute recess here. And when we return, we |
| 23 | will commence questioning by the members of the |
|  |  |

MR. RODIER: Mr. Chairman, may
I ask one question? Do you anticipate any offering of an opportunity for redirect or any recross?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I think we'll see what folks are asking to be able to do, and we'll see if we can accommodate that or not, okay.

We'll take a 10-minute recess. (Whereupon a recess was taken at 3:05 p.m., and hearing resumed at 3:25 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we will resume here. And before we turn to some questions from members of the Subcommittee, I have a question for Attorney Needleman.

Do you have a motion or motions that you wish to make at this time relating to the Babcock \& Wilcox agreement and the Cousineau agreement? Do you wish to address those at this time?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes, I do.
Thank you.
Those are documents, as I
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indicated, that we expect to be providing. Portions of those agreements do contain confidential terms, and we would ask that the Committee agree, consistent with how it's treated our confidential documents in this matter, to also treat those documents confidentially in the same way.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Do you
intend to make a written motion to this effect, or do you want to put on the record now the rationale that you would have for treating those documents confidentially, understanding that we have to meet a balancing test, as I think you know, in order to be able to treat a document as confidential?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think for purposes of expediting this proceeding, what I'd rather do now is make the oral motion and put that on the record, if I may.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. And
you will Subcommittee written motion setting forth, in particular, your detailed reasoning why these documents contain confidential information?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. And |
| 2 | we'll -- |
| 3 | MR. BROOKS: Mr. Chairman -- |
| 4 | I'm sorry. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN BURACK: We will |
| 6 | receive that from you tonight or by tomorrow |
| 7 | morning? |
| 8 | MR. NEEDLEMAN: I would expect |
| 9 | by tomorrow morning. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank |
| 11 | you. |
| 12 | MR. ROTH: I just wanted to |
| 13 | confer with Attorney Needleman for a moment about |
| 14 | another document. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN BURACK: We'll just |
| 16 | take a pause for a moment. |
| 17 | (Discussion off the record between |
| 18 | counsel.) |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. |
| 20 | Attorney Needleman, do you have something |
| 21 | further? |
| 22 | MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. I just |
| 23 | want to clarify. There are two documents we're |
| 24 | talking about. With respect to the pre-EPC |

contract, we will be asking that that be treated confidentially by the Committee, but we will -we'll be comfortable with certainly all members of the Committee and any parties to this proceeding -- any parties, I think, except CPD -having access to that. And we have discussed that, I understand, with CPD's counsel, and I believe they agreed to that.

With respect to the Cousineau wood supply agreement, we will be seeking confidential treatment for portions of that document, primarily related to confidential commercial business information. And we will submit that in redacted form. And subject to those redactions, I think we would be comfortable with any parties to the proceeding having access to that document.

And, as indicated, we will be submitting a written document. But the basis for us seeking confidentiality will be similar, if not identical, to the basis we have articulated with other documents in this proceeding: Relying on the exclusions in the New Hampshire Right To Know Law that protect from public disclosure SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}
documents containing sensitive commercial and financial business information.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank
you. Just to clarify, you're anticipating, then, your written motion would, under the terms that you've described, provide access to these documents to various parties to this proceeding, but not to members of the public; is that correct?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank you. We will take your motion, your oral motion under advisement, and we will rule upon it once we've received your written motion tomorrow morning.

## MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. <br> CHAIRMAN BURACK: I might say

 that my anticipation is that the Subcommittee will schedule a portion of this hearing to be a closed session solely to the parties entitled to see and review these various confidential documents. At this point, my sense is that this could possibly occur as early as tomorrow SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}afternoon. More realistically, it's probably going to be Wednesday or Thursday. And so I would simply ask, Attorney Needleman, that you ensure the availability of any of the parties or any of your client's principals to be here during those periods of questioning as well.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Understood. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay.

Attorney Needleman, I'm also going to make the request -- and Mr. Bravakis made reference to the availability earlier of one or more of the LandVest study authors. I'm going to request that you make that individual or individuals available to the Subcommittee for direct questioning.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: We have been in contact with somebody from LandVest and expect to have them here tomorrow for questioning.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. If you would kindly let Attorney Iacopino know who that individual or individuals would be and when you would expect them to be available, that would be helpful.

I'm going to start with an
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additional set of requests here of the Applicant that I think would be most helpful for us to receive prior to our taking Mr. Bartoszek's testimony and having him cross-examined by the parties and questioned by the Subcommittee. And this is my list of requests at this moment. If you see any aspects of this to be problematic, please let me know. But there have been, as you know, some not insignificant changes to the corporate structure and ownership relationships here and responsibilities of the entities as compared with what was originally submitted to the Committee. So I'm going to ask you to provide the following: First, the names and titles of all of the officers or directors or other principal employees of each of the entities listed on the organizational chart that appears at Exhibit 8, your Exhibit 8, Attorney Needleman. So I see a total of six different entities listed there.

Second, would you please provide us with the names and titles of all of the -- I believe these are all LLCs, with one exception, one being a corporation -- so with
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respect to all the LLCs, the names of the members and the managing members; and with respect to the corporation, which is Homeland Renewable Energy, Inc., all the members of their board of directors.

Would you also please provide us with a written description of each entity's role with respect to this project, as well as a written description of the lines of authority and reporting among and between these various entities.

Next, I would ask you to provide us with a written description of the experience and qualifications of each entity as they would relate to this proposed project. I recognize that for some of these entities you may have already provided this, but for others you have not. It'd be most helpful to the Committee if you could put this all together for us in one package.

Next, could you please identify for us whether any of these entities are publicly traded, Attorney Needleman. I don't know if you know the answer to that question,
right offhand.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Somebody will quickly correct if I'm wrong from the back, but I don't believe any of the entities listed on the organizational chart on Exhibit 8 are publicly traded companies.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. That being said, are the owners or shareholders of any of these entities publicly traded companies?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm not
certain. But $I$ can get you that answer pretty quickly, I think.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. I
would appreciate it if you would. My understanding, but perhaps this is not accurate, is that NewCo Energy, LLC is owned in whole or in part by a publicly traded company, which I believe has been identified in some of the documents as LLEG? But $I$ may be mistaken about that.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That is not correct, no.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Now, I know that my understanding is that, prior to SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}
just within the past couple of weeks or so, you have been in touch with counsel for the Committee -- for the Subcommittee, informing them of this -- informing us of this change in the ownership structure. My understanding is that there were some issues relating to being able to disclose information prior to some kind of a public filing. Am I misunderstanding things? Can you clarify for us what the ownership relationship is between NewCo Energy and an entity that would require some kind of a public filing?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. If you look at Exhibit 33, the last page, No. 9.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: This is
Exhibit 1 to the testimony of Michael Bartoszek?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Correct.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: The publicly
traded entity is at the top of that chart, Laidlaw Energy Group, Inc., which at this moment continues to have an ownership interest in the Applicant. It is contemplated that once this transaction goes forward, it will no longer have

SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}
that ownership interest, and so the publicly traded company has no connection to the proposed new owner of the facility. And so at the time that we were sharing this information, the sensitivity with respect to making that information public pertained to that publicly traded company. It had nothing to do with the new owner.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. And so that the new owner is NewCo Energy, LLC. That's the proposed new owner; correct?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Correct.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: All right.
Can you, or is Mr. Bartoszek going to be in a better position to answer this question as to what the timing of that transaction is anticipated to be?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I can give you the general contours right now.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: If you
would, please.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: It was our
desire to do everything we could to try to consummate that transaction before this hearing
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began, and we have been working aggressively to do that. We have not succeeded. We are continuing to work aggressively on that transaction in hopes of finishing it as soon as possible. But $I$ can say, with a high degree of comfort, that it is the intent of both parties and the goal of both parties to have that transaction consummated on or before August 31st. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Having said that, it would still be very helpful to us to have information relating to Laidlaw Energy Group, the same basic information that we requested of these other entities, and to have information -- if this is a publicly traded company, if you have copies of their annual reports for the past several years, if you're able to provide those to us, say for the past four to five years; as well as if there have been any filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission by Laidlaw Energy Group within the past year, if you can provide us with copies of those as well, please.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I will look
into that. I don't know, as I sit here, what, if
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anything, is available pertaining to those. But we will look into that. I will also note that they were contained in that original organizational chart. And I don't recall, off the top of my head, but I believe some information was provided in the original application pertaining to that.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Okay. Going to now open this up to members of the Subcommittee to ask questions of this panel. As you will understand, I'm going to ask the Subcommittee members to hold any questions they might have at this time relating to any of the confidential documents or confidential aspects of documents which we have public, redacted versions. But otherwise, we will, as I said, now take questions from members of the Subcommittee of these panelists. And who would like to start? You want to start, Mr. Harrington?

EXAMINATION
BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. I'm just going to address my questions to the group, and whoever's the most
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appropriate person can answer.
You included in one of your filings some information on a study that was done by Massachusetts on whether or not biomass is to be considered a renewable power supply -my understanding is there was some misstatements taken out from that report, taken out of context -- but that Massachusetts is in the process of drawing up new, more restrictive rules on whether they -- what types of biomass plants they would honor as part of their REC system for the renewable power. And maybe this gets into the Purchase Power Agreement. I'm just not sure. So if it does, we can leave it go until then.

But if Massachusetts were to put out rules that would not qualify your plant for renewable certificates issued in Massachusetts, and since they have 48 percent of the New England market, what would be the effect economically on the Laidlaw project?
A. (Bravakis) I can answer this one. I don't
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believe it will affect our project, because my understanding is that PSNH is going to be using the RECs from our facility to satisfy their obligation under the New Hampshire RPS, which is not subject to any rules or regulations promulgated in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
Q. And maybe I'll leave questions on pricing on that to go to later then.

We kind of mentioned this idea of the ownership structure, but we need a little bit more information.

One of the things that kept coming up in the earlier testimony is the 6 tons of -or 6 million tons of biomass and then the addition of 750,000 or more to feed the Laidlaw facility. When was that six -- I couldn't get this straight. The 6 million tons, was that with the three or four mills up and running, or was that after they closed?
A. (Bravakis) After they closed.
Q. So it was after they closed.

Okay. And you had stated in a few
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places whole tree chips and that most of this was coming out of what would otherwise be waste wood. So the way this would work is, an assumption on my part, people cutting down trees, if there's any value to the trees for lumber or pulp, I guess, they would sell them there because they'd get a higher price than they would for just burning them?
A. (Bravakis) Correct.
Q. So they go for that for that reason. Okay. Another question here. And I know the interconnection agreement is confidential, but I don't think this part of it is.

Throughout the document you talk about -- it mentions a 70-megawatt facility. Looking at that, the gross turbine output is 65.9. And then you take off the service load, 7.2 megawatts. And so your net output is somewhere in the high 50s? Is that the correct numbers?
A. (Strickler) The gross is a little over 70. And after you use the parasitic loads, we bring it down to 63 net.
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Q. Well, maybe when we get into the interconnection agreement, then we get into the specifics, because that doesn't seem to match with what's there. So...

There's going to be some further testimony given on this, I believe, the whole idea of how much can Coos Loop hold. And I know you connected under the minimum interconnection standard; is that correct?
A. (Strickler) Yes.
Q. So there's no assurance that your power can or will be delivered. There's -- put it this way: If the Noble Wind project is up and running, if the other proposed plant, biomass plants are built, the existing plants are running, would there be times, to the best of your knowledge, when Laidlaw cannot be dispatched at a hundred percent simply due to the line being full, the transmission line being full, if in fact you weren't the lower-priced one.
A. (Bravakis) You know, I would like to answer that, but I'm afraid that I'm not the key person. I want to defer to my colleague,

Ray Kusche, when he testifies. He's been responsible for all our interconnection, ISO relations, et cetera, if that's acceptable to you.
Q. Sure. And maybe this -- I'm not sure. One of these gentlemen was talking on environmental things. Now, I know you had the best available technologies specified in your air permit. But there's also been some proposed new regulations that I believe would affect biomass plants, proposed by the EPA, and with statements from -- and this is not going to be an exact title, but someone like the president of the American Biomass Power Association or something to that effect, saying that these new RECs could raise havoc on biomass generating facilities, and, in fact, could shut some of them down.

Is your plant going to be able to comply, or is it being built to comply with those new regulations? Or are you just going to wait and see until they become final?
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A. (Frecker) I believe the regulations that you're referring to are the maximum achievement control technology standards for biomass generating facilities, of which EPA has a proposed rule out and is still in the process of working towards finalizing that rule.
Q. That's correct.
A. (Frecker) What it will look like in its final form we're not yet sure. And, given that this project is still finalizing its design and development, there are opportunities to further enhance the emission controls, if that would be necessary. But we don't know the answer to that yet. But we suspect that we could deal with it.
Q. So you would see the resulting outcome, and then if you have to make changes, you'd make them at the time, assuming that you hadn't put any --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
Q. You would just wait to see what happened and then change as necessary when the new rules
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came out.
A. (Frecker) We definitely need more clarity on exactly how the rule will look and how it will apply to the project before we're able to deal with that.
Q. Assuming you're going to be in the forward-capacity market, what's the approved capacity supply or obligation? Do you have one; and if so, what's the first effective year --
A. (Bravakis) If I may, I'd like to again defer that to Mr. Kusche.
Q. Okay. And this other question, I guess, will probably be deferred as well. This was on the -- it was -- and I don't even -- I'm not sure -- see if $I$ can find it. Someone made the -- and that was deferred, that question as well.

And there was some talk earlier on the capacity factor of the proposed facility. What do you estimate? What are you using, at least for economic planning purposes, for your capacity factor?
A. (Strickler) Eighty-seven and a half.
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Q. On the wood supply, there was a lot of talk of sustainability and what all that meant and everything. And you had mentioned that some states have existing requirements that have certain rules associated with how you can harvest lumber and so forth; and New Hampshire didn't have those, so that's why you were going forward with this sustainability proposal that was attached, I think, as 60.

So are you going to impose those requirements on wood coming in from other states? And what if it's for something, you know, that's being clear-cut on purpose because they're going to put a factory there or roads or whatever like that?
A. (Bravakis) I think that our sustainability condition isn't specific just to New Hampshire. Our sustainability condition is to the sources of supply of the fuel. So, yes, we would apply it to all suppliers that come in that fall under this -- these conditions.
Q. Would you have an exemption for people who
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were doing it because they were going to put in a new factory or something like that --
A. (Bravakis) Well, obviously we have no control if there's going to be a change of use, if there's land development going on somewhere where they cut all the trees.

That happens. We know that happens. And the choice of burning that wood or not using it is less, in our view, than converting it to energy.
Q. So you have an exception to that --
A. (Bravakis) Yes, obviously. This applies to pretty much the highest level of, in everybody's mind, how to protect the natural resources and preserve the working, sustainable forest.
Q. And since the amount of wood seems to be a big point of contention here -- how much is available and how far you can go to get it -- having this sustainability agreement, how much of a negative effect of that will have on your wood supply -- i.e., there's going to be some people that might say we're not going to comply with this, which would
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reduce it -- and was that taken into account when the studies were done?
A. (Bravakis) I mean, that's a great question. And that's one we struggle with all the time because, as I think we've mentioned before, other plants don't impose these conditions on themselves. So we're taking this pre-emptively to try to demonstrate a willingness of our commitment of good stewardship of the forest. However, having said that, it has to be done in a manner that doesn't hamstring the project in its ability or put it at a competitive disadvantage. And at the time we are now in the regulations and procurement of fuel, we have to be sensitive that we don't paint ourselves in a corner, if you will, by imposing limits on us that would disallow otherwise good suppliers from supplying to the facility. So we struggled with that when we developed this. We met with a number of organizations that were very familiar with this. Some of us wanted more limitations, some of us suggested to have
less. So we're constantly balancing that. And this is not done. But we are confident that, once done, it will be a good blend of both of those aspects.
Q. But you didn't do any analysis where you felt as though it would limit, you know, 95 percent of the prospective suppliers --
A. (Bravakis) No, we did not.
Q. That's all the conditions I have for right now -- all the questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you,
Mr. Harrington. Mr. Jannelle.
EXAMINATION
BY MR. JANNELLE :
Q. Part of the LandVest study on Table 6 lists --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Could you say what exhibit you're on, please? MR. JANNELLE: Actually, I'm on Appendix $P$ in the application, the biomass study.

MR. IACOPINO: And the application is Exhibit 1, for the record. BY MR. JANNELLE:
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Q. There's multiple facilities, some pulp facilities, some power facilities. The power facilities use a 75-mile radius or less, and it shows that it seems like there's significantly less consumption. Public Service has got the highest consumption of 450 tons. But many of the others are around 200 tons, 250 tons. You mentioned that the Burgess Mill used 1.3 million tons of pulp. I assume that's -the majority is round wood and not what you would consider tops and branches and things like that.

Is your facility a large facility, or is it -- it seems to be, looking at that chart. Or is it typical?

And given that you're going to need 750 [sic] tons in order to run it, would you be using more round wood instead of pulp? It just looks, looking at some of the other power plants, if they're using tops and branches, there's a lot less volume within a 75-mile radius. And you're going out another 25 miles, granted. But it's not
three times more.
A. (Bravakis) Okay. To answer your first question, our facility would be a large user as a biomass facility, but not a large user of low-grade material. NewPage in Rumford uses a total of 2.2 million tons a year, of which I believe 1.8 goes into paper-making, and the balance goes into their boiler system.

To answer your second question, please keep in mind that this study and the following addendum was, I would characterize as our first 50,000-foot view of is there enough wood. There were a number of assumptions made in this analysis, which as we start drilling further and further down it gets refined more.

So the methodology that they use was to say a plant that would use X -amount of tons would go out $x$-amount of miles to get their wood. The practical reality is that they might at some point go -- as I was explaining before, the wood sheds get defined more by market conditions than they
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do by availability.
What we were simply trying to do is saying a plant of our facility, if one makes the assumption that a three-hour drive -and we got this from not only LandVest, but talking to suppliers and contractors -would go out a three-hour drive, or 100 miles, is there enough wood that could be sustainably provided to supply this plant? We then took it -- and what we learned at that, in tops and branches alone there was, I believe, if my memory serves me right, there's like 2.6 million tons just in tops and branches. But we then took it one step further and said, well, how does that affect other existing facilities? We weren't really concerned with projects that were -being developers, we know that most projects are underdeveloped and never get built. So we didn't want to put a hypothetical in there, but we wanted to say, let's see what exists now. So we kind of overlaid that on top, and what we learned is that we kind of clumped it all together as low-grade
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biomass, a combination of tops and branches and round wood. Some of that round wood will always go to higher-use markets -- pulp markets, tie logs, et cetera. Some of it that's going to pulp markets now would get redirected into a biomass plant, along with some tops and branches that were left in the woods.

So I guess it's a long way of saying there's no simple answer to your question. But we are confident that the work that LandVest did on this initial filter for us is very true and accurate, and then we're redefining it more.
Q. There's also rail access to this site?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
Q. Is there future thought of using that, or would that open up another wood shed someplace if that were to become available?
A. (Bravakis) Yeah, the thought of the rail -I was the one who kept pushing that. I wanted to make sure we had easements in place to bring rail in at some point in the future. I would characterize that as
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leaving an option on the table now, when we can do that, rather than not having that option. And my thinking, and our then -collectively, our thinking was this might open up markets for wood that are not served now where we could access additional wood. It also might play very well into, as regulations move forward on trucking and carbon emissions related to trucking and moving biomass, this might serve a function, and especially going east-west, which is most difficult in the northeast, as we all know. So we left that option on the table, and I fully suspect that at some point in the future that will play a role in this facility. But later, not further -- not sooner.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. IGNAGTIUS: Thank you. I
do have questions. I don't have a microphone. If people can't hear me, wave and I will speak up.

EXAMINATION
BY MS. IGNATIUS:
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Q. Mr. Bravakis, let's work on some of the wood issues a little further since we're there right now.

The company you're using is out of Henniker, New Hampshire. Is there any way that using a Henniker-based company changes the location for the source of wood; and is that a concern, given the discussion about the help needed to Coos County area loggers?
A. (Bravakis) Okay. That's a great question. And let me say this: As I was explaining before, Cousineau is an aggregator of supply. They're not the ones who have the logging crews, own the trucks, own -- you know, go out and harvest the wood themselves and bring it in. What their role is, is to put boots on the ground and to execute contracts, supply contracts to come to the facility. They will install personnel at the site that will go to work every day. And remember that the fuel is going to be consumed in Berlin, not in Southern New Hampshire. So, think of the logistics. It's a distinct competitive advantage for
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somebody close to Berlin, who has less trucking burden, to deliver fuel to that facility than somebody further away. So the answer is, no, they will not preclude the opportunity for local suppliers to supply the mill.
Q. There's agreement with the City that I know the Berlin witness will address. But as I looked at it, there is a specific requirement that there be an effort to obtain wood from local vendors at Section 8 -- Paragraph 8. This is in the City of Berlin exhibit list, if you want to turn to it. Tab 1, Paragraph No. 8. No, that didn't work. Paragraph number...

All right. Page 8, No. 8, under community benefits it says, to the extent feasible and economically reasonable, Laidlaw shall use its best efforts to prioritize the purchase of wood fuel from local owners and operators that meet with the sustainability terms. I'm paraphrasing the end of that.

How does Cousineau know that that's the
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requirement with the City?
A. (Bravakis) That will be a condition of our permit, and that will be a component of our supply agreement with Cousineau.
Q. Mr. Bravakis, you also were asked by Mr. Rodier if you agreed with his conclusion that whatever wood supply is there, it pretty much uses it up and there will be nothing left for a Clean Power Development project or a new wood pellet entity, or if there would be a new pulp mill come in. And you said you disagreed with that conclusion. Can you explain to me why you disagree with that conclusion?
A. (Bravakis) I disagree with the conclusion because, as stated in the addendum of the LandVest study, and if I can -- if I could read the conclusion.
Q. Okay.
A. (Bravakis) In bold on Page 4 it says, "Therefore, because this study is to estimate the sustainable availability of low-grade fiber to the proposed Laidlaw BioPower plant, it is our best estimate that
producers will supply over one million tons per year in excess of current consumption."

Our plant is going to be using 350,000 tons -- I mean 750,000 tons. I apologize. Therefore, there is excess available. And that's not taking into account the fact that we know, once we are there, opportunities will arise for backhauls even further beyond us that don't currently exist. Some of the suppliers that have come in to fill the vacuum when the mills left will realign to positions where they were in the past. So that 6 million tons, if you were to somehow be able to see that in the future, overlaid with our plant on there, would probably be less.

So, I firmly believe -- and most of the experts that I've spoken to who have practical knowledge out in the field also agree that there's room for us and others.
Q. Are you making an assumption of the price of wood when you calculate the economic viability of the company, of the project?
A. (Bravakis) We have -- obviously, we have --
in our financial performance, we have basic assumptions on wood pricing.
Q. And is there a range that you're assuming in your assumptions?
A. (Bravakis) It depends on the time of year, but -- or the year that we start. But I recall that our range is in the low to mid 30s. That's our speculative guess right now.
Q. That's per ton of wood?
A. (Bravakis) per ton of wood delivered to the plant at roughly 45-percent moisture, fuel content -- moisture content.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And I'm sorry. If I could just interrupt for one minute? $I$ just wanted to remind the Committee that we provided a document which is subject to confidential treatment. It's a one-page pro forma that contains some of this information. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. BY MS. IGNATIUS:
Q. And what happens if that assumption turns out to be too low, in terms of price of wood?
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A. (Bravakis) There's a rippling effect throughout our pro formas. But one thing I'd like to point out -- and, you know, I think my colleague, Mr. Bartoszek, could elaborate on the business end more.

Part of our business model is to keep the capital costs of a new biomass plant lower than a greenfield project. And that's no secret why we purchased the facility. We mentioned this in the past. To build a brand new biomass plant today is in the $\$ 4$ to $\$ 5,000$ per kilowatt installed. Our plant, our estimate is going to be roughly half of that. That's significant and gives us an advantage when it comes to absorbing fluctuations in the market. Having said that, we have been told by our consultants and experts that there currently is a glut of wood on the market, and it's expected to remain for the foreseeable future. So we do not anticipate a wild swing in wood pricing. MR. IACOPINO: And just for the Committee members, the pro forma that Mr . Needleman referenced is Exhibit 43. It's
contained in the confidential binder that we received this morning.

BY MS. IGNATIUS:
Q. One other question on wood, I think. The City agreement -- and this is on Page 7 of the city's Exhibit 1, I think. I'm sorry. It's Paragraph 5 on Page 3 of the city's Exhibit 1. It says that there's a requirement that the facility burn biomass and exclude any materials derived in whole or in part from construction and demolition debris; is that correct?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
Q. And if that, for some reason, should no longer be a condition of the City, would the project burn construction and demolition debris?
A. (Bravakis) We have no plans to burn construction and demolition debris. The plant is not being designed to burn it. This is a clean biomass combustion system.
Q. And so your procurement requirements with your vendors would include that as well?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
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Q. Mr. Bravakis, tell me about safety precautions. I assume that the chips and ash can be flammable?
A. (Bravakis) Yes, of course.
A. (Strickler) The ash doesn't burn.
A. (Bravakis) The ash doesn't burn, but the chips --
Q. That was a trick question.

But the storage of wood and storage of ash after combustion, are those safety concerns?
A. (Bravakis) Certainly that's something that you have to plan for. And we'll start with the wood chips first.

There has to be, and we will institute, a regimented plan of first-in/first-out delivery systems. So, in other words, the first load that comes in is the first one to get burned. You know, so you're constantly recycling so you don't have stagnant piles. The piles will be constructed in a manner to shed water and movement. Let's remember that we benefit from 25 years of biomass plants using the same material in the
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northeast. And my colleague, Ray Kusche, operated one for 15,20 years up in Greenfield, Maine. So there's a lot of experience with respect to that.

In regards to the ash, I believe -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- there's a water-quenching system that gets applied to the ash before it gets stored and moved off site.
A. (Strickler) It's primarily for dust control. It's not a -- ash isn't generally flammable, really, as a problem to the plant. So the ash is conditioned, as Lou said, for dust control.
Q. Is there any additional training that local fire departments will need to have to respond adequately to a problem on site?
A. (Strickler) If $I$ can answer that question, please?
A. (Bravakis) Yeah.
A. (Strickler) Obviously, there's been some time since, you know, there's been any large industrial facility there. We would normally go in and work with the fire
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|  | 113 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | department and explain to them every aspect |
| 2 |  | of the project that, you know, might have an |
| 3 |  | issue with respect to any fire protection. |
| 4 |  | So we work very closely, you know, with the |
| 5 |  | fire department in Berlin to make sure |
| 6 |  | they're aware of chemicals, you know, and |
| 7 |  | the safety aspects of the project. |
| 8 | A. | (Frecker) And if I could just offer, Mr. |
| 9 |  | Bravakis and I met with the fire chief for |
| 0 |  | the City of Berlin early on in the design |
| 1 |  | phase of the project, reviewed our site |
| 2 |  | plans with him, showed him the utility |
| 3 |  | drawings that we have that show the location |
| 4 |  | of hydrants, access roads, perimeter roads |
| 5 |  | around the facility. He provided some very |
| 6 |  | good constructive comments to us on those |
| 7 |  | that led to some modifications in the design |
| 8 |  | to assure that they could have suitable |
| 9 |  | access. And he seemed pretty pleased with |
| 0 |  | what he saw and indicated that he looked |
| 21 |  | forward to continuing to work with the |
| 22 |  | project as it was going to construction. |
| 23 | Q. | Also among the City's concerns are noise |
| 24 |  | levels. And since you're on the stand now, |
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and we can talk to the City witness later -the noise provisions are on Page 2 of Exhibit 1, the City's proposed conditions.

You have set a level for noise at 70 dB at the facility's property line at certain times and below 60 dB at that same property line during the evening and early morning hours; is that correct?
A. (Frecker) That's correct.
Q. Noise is a hard one to understand with these numbers. But can you give any example of what 60 dB and 70 dB might be? Anything comparable to those sounds that we can understand?
A. (Frecker) Well, it's generally accepted, without the benefit of these amplifying microphones, that a normal conversation between you and I would be on the order of a 65-decibel sound power level, sound-pressure level that your ears would experience, as one basis.

You can look at the background measurements that were conducted in locations in the city as part of our noise
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study and see that in the downtown area, right now there are existing sound levels during the daytime hours that are in that 65- to sometimes 70 -decibel range. So it's not inconsistent with what you'd see in a downtown, semi-urban environment with traffic and people moving along in a busy area.
Q. When the site was last used as a mill, do you know anything about the sound levels that people would have experienced on the perimeter of the property?
A. (Frecker) We do not. We did not take measurements, nor did we look for measurements of when the site was operating before, because we wanted to have the project evaluated in its own right with consideration of existing conditions and with consideration for what the City might otherwise impose upon a similar type of project. So we didn't seek to try to say this would be better than the old mill or similar to the old mill. We said it won't cause a problem because we don't believe the
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levels will increase significantly beyond existing conditions without a mill there. And it's consistent with the sound levels that the city's own planning boards and government have determined are suitable for industrial development.
Q. The noisy components, if you'll take a highly technical term, the noisy things on the site would be the chipping, combustion?
A. (Frecker) There is a chipping building, which would be a sound, a source of sound. The cooling tower itself is actually a significant source of sound on energy projects. The building that houses the steam turbine, because the steam turbine can be a rather loud device, is a source of sound. We modeled extensively looking at trucks moving through the site, looking at equipment handling wood chips around the site. We even looked at the sounds created by the conveyors that would move the wood chips up through the site. We looked at the sounds that would be radiated from the boiler building, from the emission-control
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system, from the steam-turbine building.
The model was very comprehensive in considering all those source of sounds.
Q. And your measurements of sound that are agreed to in the city's terms are not at the actual location of the sound being emitted, but at the perimeter of the facility, of the property itself?
A. (Frecker) At the property line. That's correct.
Q. How are you going to measure those sounds?
A. (Frecker) With the same type of instrumentation that we used to measure the background sound levels in the community; essentially, meters designed to accurately measure sound levels and collect and average that data over that period of time.
Q. So the amount -- the levels that you're establishing are average numbers over a set number of hours?
A. (Frecker) We've presented there's a number of ways to average sound-level data, and we've presented it in what's referred to as Leq, or equivalent sound levels. They're
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basically one-hour blocks in most of our analysis. The reason for using that Leq, or equivalent sound level, is it takes into consideration -- it's the equivalent continuous sound level that would be generated. It takes into consideration varying spikes in noise, rather than using a sound level that has just exceeded 50 percent of the time, which doesn't really take into account these higher pressure spikes. The Leq takes care of that and helps include those in the analysis.
Q. Is the Applicant hiring any additional sound expert for this testing, or did they already have within their control meters for that kind of work and the expertise to evaluate --
A. (Frecker) My firm conducted all of the background sound-level measurements, and we did all of the modeling for the project. We have sounds experts on our staff that have 20-plus years of doing this. And we as a company have done sound-level analyses for dozens of energy projects.
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Q. Will you remain involved in it at the actual construction and operational point, so that once the plant is operating, will you still be available for that testing?
A. (Frecker) We will be available and we hope to be involved. But even if the developers chose to seek service from somebody else, there are a number of qualified firms that are capable of doing that type of work.
Q. Mr. Bravakis, the agreement with the City also references sale of thermal energy; correct?
A. (Bravakis) Hmm-hmm.
Q. And I'm looking for the right page for that to point people to. Page 7, Paragraph No. 6. This is, again, Exhibit 1 of the City's list. And the City can testify to this when they're on the stand.

But while you're here, what is your expectation of the availability of thermal energy that would be available to businesses that might co-locate on the site?
A. (Bravakis) I'm glad you brought that up. We have not discussed today -- and it's a
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significant component of that project -- our agreement with the Gorham paper mill to provide them hot water from all the waste heat that we can capture off of the facility. What that means, for those of you who are unfamiliar with the site, or perhaps didn't recall, the Gorham paper mill and the Burgess Mill were the combined paper mill, with the pulp being made up in Berlin and the paper being made in Gorham, and then connected with a bunch of pipes. Water from the Androscoggin River is taken in north of us on the adjoining property through an underground system, comes into a filter house and travels down to the Gorham mill. It's the lifeblood of that facility.

We have an agreement in place with Fraser Paper, who operates and owns the Gorham mill, to allow them to manage the filter house, which we own, which is on our property, maintain the piping system and the water that goes down there. We also have an agreement with them whereby we will work with them to put in the system that will
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capture the heat that is normally wasted in a stand-alone power plant like this -essentially, the heat that gets dissipated to the atmosphere through the cooling towers -- and we'll convert that to hot water through a heating exchange system. So, instead of them taking 33-degree hot water from the river, they will be able to get $90,100,110$ degrees. We have to work out the details. That will be a significant savings for them, for their thermal energy. In exchange for that, they have provided us right-of-way, an easement down the strip of land where all the pipes are connected, of which we will use to connect to the $E$ Street substation. So that's our agreement with them.

Now, I bring that up because, once the final engineering is done on that, there is a possibility that there will be excess heat that they won't need, which we have said on numerous occasions we would make available to any businesses that will co-locate on our site. The project will consume this area
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Gorham mill we'd be able to work out to provide some heat. So that's -- and we've enumerated that in the stipulation with the City, which would be a condition of the permit.
Q. And are you saying you don't know the -- how much excess will be available, or are you saying you don't know whether any excess will be available?
A. (Bravakis) I don't know how much excess. And the reason $I$ don't is, our engineers could figure out how much we could produce, but the paper mill doesn't know yet. The paper mill, as you know, is going through transition. And they're probably going to transition more into a tissue mill. How that affects their low profile, we just don't know yet. We're first obligated to them, under agreement, to provide as much as we can. But we would like to use it all. It makes the plant more efficient, and it's a benefit to the economic well-being of the community.
Q. Mr. Strickler, I want to ask you a couple
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questions about the change in the ownership structure that has recently been discussed. Why, to your knowledge, did that change occur?
A. (Strickler) Well, we had been brought in and got involved in this project, back almost a year ago now, working with the Laidlaw folks. And they had an agreement, a relationship with a company, PJPD, and in fact, brought together by them. And so we were sort of working together closely with all the parties. But there are three parties. And it was a challenge to say that -- you know, three parties trying to develop a project and agreeing to every decision, it was a challenge. We worked he very hard to overcome those challenges. In fact, you know, the project has gotten, you know, pretty far. But $I$ think at the end that the ownership change is actually going to provide a single person, a single entity, if you will, even through the Applicant that will provide a more cohesive and more streamlined decision-making process. Our
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involvement will remain the same, as the company that provides the construction oversight and the operations and services to the Applicant.
Q. Is it a change that your company sought?
A. (Strickler) I think it was -- I would say it was mutually agreed that this was something that would be beneficial to the overall project, and we agreed with that change and supported the change.
Q. And when did this reorganization firm up as a plan?
A. (Strickler) Relatively recently.

Probably -- I don't have the dates. But certainly in the last month or so.
Q. Was there any event that triggered that change to go from a challenge, as you say, over the past year to a much more concrete --
A. (Strickler) No, there wasn't a specific event. No, not in my opinion.
Q. And is your expectation that, once the development and construction phase is complete and we're into the operational
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```
phase -- well, tell me what is then the role
of your company?
```

A. (Strickler) We would provide operational and maintenance services to the Applicant going forward through an agreement with NewCo.
Q. And going forward for a set period of time, or, as far as you know, going forward for the full operation of the plant?
A. (Strickler) Exactly. Yeah, for a long term. It would be a long-term arrangement.
Q. You were asked a few questions about the plant manager and whether that was someone who would be local, and you said yes.
A. (Strickler) Yes.
Q. Has there been a plant manager identified?
A. (Strickler) No, not yet. We typically would start looking for that after construction started, you know, to identify and recruit the plant manager. We have -- actually, we have quite a few people on our list of potential candidates going forward that we just sort of have for all our projects.
Q. I think that completes my questions. Thank you.
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CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you
very much. Mr. Northrop?
MR. NORTHROP: Yes, I just
have a couple questions.
EXAMINATION
BY MR. NORTHROP :
Q. One is going back to kind of a follow-up to Mr. Harrington's, some of his questions about the sustainability condition.

Your proposed wood supplier, kind of broker, would be Cousineau. Who is responsible for enforcing that sustainability condition? Would that be Cousineau, the wood supplier, or Laidlaw? Or how would that enforcement actually take place? Or how would you know that the wood was actually being -- the wood being received was actually complying with the conditions of that sustainability document?
A. (Bravakis) The enforcement -- I'm not sure how to answer that. The enforcement that Cousineau is complying with, the terms and conditions of the supply agreement, would be subject to the same type of contractual
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obligations any contract would. And the sustainability component would be a part of that. How we -- so Cousineau will be contractually obligated to adhere to the sustainability conditions.

I don't know -- I can't speak about the remedies. Once we have the contract finalized, we'll be able to see that and share that with you.

With respect to how do we know whether it's done, if that's part of your question? If you've seen the sustainability piece, there's a metrics in the end, a reporting and verification section which talks about the number of wood supplied, the breakdown of biomass, the volume supplied by various groups, et cetera, et cetera, number of acres participating. So there will be an accounting process, if you will, that will measure whether or not we're meeting the goals of our sustainability and procurement policy.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Bravakis, were you just referring to Exhibit 60?

MR. BRAVAKIS: Yes.
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MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
BY MR. NORTHROP :
Q. Just one other question. And I apologize. This may be something we've asked, several of us, over and over again, sort of keep asking it in a different way.

But going back to this 6 million tons of wood in the region, if $I$ could understand it, would it be a fair characterization to say that that represents the wood that's harvested within this region, some area, and that the wood could be used locally if there are lots of users, if there are lots of biomass plants or pulp mills or furniture makers or whomever was consuming wood? But, then, on the flipside, if there weren't a lot of consumers, users of the wood locally -- meaning there were no biomass plants or pellet manufacturers or no users -- would this wood still be consumed, but by entities further away, meaning the wood would still be produced in the region, but it would be used further in Maine or in New York or Pennsylvania or something like
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that, so that this 6 million tons of wood -I guess the crux of my question is, how much would that fluctuate? Would that number go down drastically if there were fewer local users? And conversely, would that number go up a lot if there were more users? Or is that a number that would stay relatively constant, but the users would just either be closer or further away?
A. (Bravakis) Yeah, I think I understand the question. It's a very difficult one to answer, and I'll tell you why.

Consider NewPage, the paper mill in Rumford, Maine. They alone use 2.2 million tons a year of low-grade material. If they were to go out of business, that would be -that would blow that -- that would strike a significant blow to the infrastructure in the area to obtain that wood. I think in my experience and my knowledge, the further away you go, it's not practical to take wood in northeastern United States, in northern New Hampshire, and ship it to Pennsylvania, for example. Maybe with rail, maybe with a
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lot of ingenuity and very high energy costs or something you could do that. So I would -- and this is an opinion, because I don't have a crystal ball any more than anybody else does. But my guess is that if you took out the largest consumers of that material in that area, that 6 million consumption would go down drastically. On another score, having been involved in this project and biomass energy for 30 years, $I$ see this as a paradigm, shifting event, if you will, where for years and years and years the fiber in Berlin, the city the trees built, was used and converted to paper. I think that business model is not viable in the future because it's difficult for a paper mill in the northeast to compete on a worldwide scale. But the fiber's still there. That low-grade material is still there. And every and any forester that I've ever spoken to wants biomass plants because they want to weed that garden. They want to grow the straighter, stronger trees. And if you
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can't get that low grade out of there for markets, you can't do that. So now the opportunity is to construct, build renewable generating facilities -- ours being one, others that have been proposed, pellet manufacturers, as you suggested. And so it's really a question of timing: Can these new projects be phased in if the writing's on the wall and the long-term future of the pulp and paper industry in the northeast is going to be challenging, to say the least.

So it's a long-winded answer to say that I think that if the market, the consumers left now, that 6 million would go way down.
Q. Thanks. That helps. No further questions. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.

Mr. Stewart.
EXAMINATION
BY MR. STEWART:
Q. My questions are on Exhibit 60, the sustainability condition. As one of the regulators on the Committee --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
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Q. You've indicated that Laidlaw will not buy wood from suppliers who have been found to be repeat offenders of environmental laws and regulations. How will you do that? How frequently will you check on your suppliers? And how will we know that that's occurring?
A. (Bravakis) Good question. This is an interesting -- when we first put this out, we said we don't want anybody who violates the laws. But we were quickly told we needed to be careful, because sometimes a very reputable, good logger will inadvertently cross a brook or do something that will give him a violation, and do it once and maybe never to do it again. So we didn't want to say anybody who had a violation.

We consulted with different organizations throughout the state as we were developing this to get their guidance. And what we learned was that there are -I'm trying to remember. I think it's under 10. I think it's like five or seven identified repeat offenders in the state of
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New Hampshire of logging practices who have -- of the thousand or so contractors. So it's a pretty small universe that we can work with, these groups that helped advise us, to keep us updated on.

And we will make it a condition of the agreement with Cousineau that they will not purchase wood or use wood from these known offenders. And I believe there's a tracking and a registry -- and please correct me if I'm wrong on this because I'm not that familiar. But I believe that after you have so many offenses, you get into the select few. And we will identify them and not purchase wood from them.
Q. Do you agree that it would be reasonable for you to report that as part of your reporting and verification, which I see as described in Exhibit 60? I mean, it would seem to me that we would want to have that report on an annual basis, along with the volumes of various -- you know, where the biomass is coming from and so forth, that this has been checked and there's been enforcement against
certain loggers or what have you.
A. (Bravakis) Could be a slippery slope. I don't think we'd have a problem saying who we're not buying from. But I think there might be confidentiality issues or issues with how Cousineau procures to say who we do provide from and what they're supplying. You know, it's business relationships. But I don't believe we would have a problem reporting that these contractors we have not purchased from for these reasons, if that's --
Q. Yeah, I think that's kind of where I was going.
A. (Bravakis) Okay.
Q. This 700- to 750,000 tons annually, more or less, going into this plant if it were built, what percentage do you think at the beginning are going to be from sustainable profits -- well, logging operations? Do you think it's going to 20 percent or 50 percent? Or what do you think? I'm just trying to get a handle on this.
A. (Bravakis) I guess it's how you define
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"sustainability." If you're saying from third-party certified lands --
Q. Yeah, I'm referring to Condition 6.
A. (Bravakis) -- from tree farm systems, from SFI or SFC, conservation lands, I can't answer that. What $I$ can say is that the wood that will come to the plant in the beginning and during will -- our supplier will adhere to this. So they will have some period of time before the plant starts operation to start making those relationships and start bringing wood into the facility. And from what I understand, a lot of the forest land, a lot of the timber land that will be supplying the facility have already set up management programs, conservation programs, or they're under SFI or SFC -- which are third-party verification systems -- or a tree farm system, or under management of a forester, or even the smaller properties in current-use programs or being harvested by licensed foresters. What we didn't want to do, we didn't want to come and try to present the fact that we
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were going to somehow be this overarching agency to rule how the wood comes. We understand the realities. And we understand that landowners -- and I own 80 acres of land in Vermont. I was a tree farm member and part of the current-use system. We understand that there are a lot of programs in effect now. We just want to dovetail with those.

So I can't give you a specific answer, but I will tell you that the wood that will come in will adhere to this policy.
Q. So how will you give preference to lands that are third-party certified versus lands that are not, in terms of receipt of wood?
A. (Bravakis) We haven't developed the details of exactly how we do that yet. But we will be doing that. And as soon as we do, we'll share that with the Committee. We fully intend to put together with Cousineau a procurement plan that will spell that out.
Q. Do you think it would be reasonable for us, within the certificate, if we were to certify the project to have goals for
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ramping up the whole sustainability over some time period?
A. (Bravakis) We could certainly consider it. But as we said before, we need to be careful that we don't put ourselves in an economic disadvantageous place with respect to the other biomass plants, paper mills that don't need this or don't do this on their own. This is voluntary on our part. But we certainly would -- could consider some reasonable expectations or goals.
Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: You're all
set now?
MR. STEWART: All set.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Before I
continue here, Attorney Needleman, I just want to draw your attention to R.S.A. 162-H:8. And I'd just ask you with respect to the list of items that I requested of you earlier, that you confirm that the information you're providing will fully satisfy that standard with respect to all the entities and the individuals that you're reporting on. I note, for example, that the SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}
statute specifically requests that we be provided not just with names of members and association, but also with the residences. So I'd just ask you to pay close to the attention to the requirements of that section of the statute and confirm that the materials you're preparing will fully satisfy that set of statutory requirements. Okay? Thank you.

Go ahead, Ms. Muzzy.
EXAMINATION
BY MS. MUZZEY:
Q. I had a few questions, and the first is about the transformer area that is mentioned in Public Counsel Exhibit 2. Are you still considering a recreational trail along the river that would pass by that area?
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
Q. Could you describe how close that trail would be to the transformer area?
A. (Bravakis) Right next to it. Is that close enough?
Q. That's pretty clear, yeah.

Do you know whether that area has been studied to a sufficient degree that you have
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confidence in building that trail?
A. (Bravakis) I'm sorry. I didn't hear that.
Q. Do you know whether that site has been studied to a sufficient degree that you would have confidence to build that trail without causing additional environmental problems?
A. (Bravakis) We haven't gotten to that level of detail yet.
Q. So that's still needed?
A. (Bravakis) Yes. That's our intention to do that.
Q. You also talked about a silo that would be used to store the fly ash. Do you have any sense about how large that would be, how tall that would be?
A. (Frecker) Let me just -- let me just clarify one point. When Attorney Roth had asked me about that silo, I had said that the design was contemplating a silo that could hold up to one week's of fly ash generation from the fabric-filter baghouse. And looking back at the supplement to the application that was filed in May, it in fact said that the
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capacity will be sufficient to accept a minimum of 24 hours. It doesn't state what the maximum would be. So I just want to make sure that that was factually clarified. But given that it talked about 120 tons per week of ash generation, ostensibly about 20 tons a day, I think that's the size of a reasonable tractor-trailer truck, if I'm not mistaken. We probably need to get back to you on that.
A. (Strickler) We'd be guessing on that right now.
Q. All right. That's fine. Thanks.

In discussing the noise and the use of the Leq measurement, that's averaged over an hour's worth of time?
A. (Frecker) Yes.
Q. And you talked about spikes. So if the average over an hour was at 60 , is it possible that the spikes would be far louder than that, followed by a quieter time? Is that how that works?
A. (Frecker) That's possible. And we need to be careful when we say "average," because it
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is an equivalent sound level that takes into consideration the additional energy created by those spikes. So it assumes a continuous sound power level that would be addressing those spikes over that period. But absent that technical issue, our background measurements which we took in the project area over a 24-hour period at several locations really showed relatively constant sound levels, without large spikes occurring.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And then finally, just to ask a couple questions about the LandVest study.

Now, their calculations were based on users currently -- at the time of the study, the users with the 6-million-ton measurement. In their research, was there any type of discussion about longevity of those users or the stability of those businesses, as to whether they're likely to change in the future, that type of thing?
A. (Bravakis) No, there wasn't.
Q. So that wasn't considered.
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And you've described that as a 50,000-foot look at the wood basket. And then you also talked about drilling down to get a better understanding of how things work. Do you have any written materials that the Committee could look at for further deliberation on that?
A. (Bravakis) No more than the LandVest study, the addendum that they did. We did look for similarities in the other studies that I believe the Committee has access to that were mentioned in the LandVest study. If they don't, I can get those.
There was an INRS study and another LandVest study, a Caldwell study. But a lot of it came from interviews with folks that actually procured fuel for the Burgess Mill, interviews with business owners in the area that procure and have procured logs and wood forest products for years, interviews and discussions with logging contractors and with operators associated with a large paper mill -- I mean large saw mills and the adjoining paper mills. So we've been
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A. (Bravakis) Yes. They have two recovery-boiler conversions. If John is still here -- one is in Bowater, Kentucky.
A. (Strickler) Yeah, Kentucky.
A. (Bravakis) Kentucky.

MEMBER FROM AUDIENCE: No,
Tennessee.
A. (Strickler) Yeah, Tennessee.
A. (Bravakis) Bowater, Tennessee. And in Florida? One in Florida?

MEMBER FROM AUDIENCE: No.
Tennessee. And the other one's in Georgia.
A. (Bravakis) In Georgia.

I think Mr. Strickler can talk about it, because a team of his engineers went down to view --
A. (Strickler) Yeah, we sent a group down to visit the facility in Kentucky, I believe it was.
Q. Has that facility been converted at this point --
A. (Strickler) Oh, yes.
Q. -- and is it operational?
A. (Strickler) It's been operational. And the SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}
report said the owners were very pleased with the work that was done.
Q. Okay.
A. (Bravakis) If I may?
Q. Yeah.
A. (Bravakis) Excuse me for interrupting. B \& W, Babcock \& Wilcox, has done many, many biomass, many, many systems, as you know. These were specifically black liquor boilers converted to fluidized bubbling bed. So they --
Q. And this is what the case is here?
A. (Strikler) Exactly.
A. (Bravakis) Yeah. So they had specific experience to our project. And the one in Kentucky is relative, size-wise, within the same range.
Q. And the final air permit that was issued by the Department of Environmental Services, I would describe the emission limits in there as being fairly stringent emission limitations. Do you know how those facilities -- or how that facility has performed?
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A. (Strickler) With respect to the facility?
Q. Yeah. Basically, how is the facility performing? Is it meeting its emission guaranties? Is it --
A. (Strickler) I don't recall that we -- I would have to check with our group to see if they asked that question. I just don't recall.
A. (Frecker) But I can tell you, Mr. Wright, that $B \& W$ is actively involved in reviewing the emissions limitations that were part of the permitting process and concurring that they felt that they could meet those limitations.
Q. I think I just had one other simple question.

Obviously, using a cooling power, there will be a period of time of the year where there will be visible pooling from the cooling tower. Have you done any studies as to what percent of time that would occur and under what conditions?
A. (Frecker) Yeah, we did do modeling of the cooling tower plume primarily to evaluate
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the potential for icing and fogging on area roadways. And that modeling demonstrated there would not be any occurrences of icing and fogging due to the design of the cooling tower, in large part associated with very high-efficiency drift eliminators that would control and prevent water droplets discharged from the tower. That modeling, conducted using what's called the seasonal annual cooling tower impact, or SACTI model, also predicts visible plumes. And it shows that during daylight hours the plume height would be lower than the boiler building about 50 percent of the time and lower than the stack itself, I think on the order of about 95 percent of the time.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr. Kent?
MR. KENT: Thank you.
EXAMINATION
BY MR. KENT :
Q. This morning, Mr. Bravakis, you took exception to the idea of the wood supply
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being additive. You could just take the 6 million and the 750 , and it didn't shake out. So obviously, that's what your consultant did to give you an idea. If we don't use that additive approach, what do we do to estimate the wood supply?
A. (Bravakis) Wood supply, wood consumption from the supply area.
Q. Yes.
A. (Bravakis) I don't know. What I'm saying -what $I$ was trying to say is that it's just not simply a function of adding the two together and saying that would be the consumption once the plant is operating. What would happen is the areas now that are taking advantage of the fact that Burgess Mill has a competitor for that wood is no longer in existence. They have come in and taken wood that would have gone to that Burgess Mill, even though they might be further away. So that wood could be traveling out of state to other locations. Once that plant's going in, they will reassess whether or not they want to compete
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|  | 150 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | with a local user again. Our sense is that |
| 2 | they probably will not. And some of those |
| 3 | facilities that are now -- where the wood is |
| 4 | now being taken out of the Berlin area and |
| 5 | going away will start coming into our |
| 6 | facility. And they will be purchasing wood |
| 7 | perhaps in areas around them that might be a |
| 8 | little bit more competitive, but not as |
| 9 | economically advantageous as coming into an |
| 10 | area that just lost a hundred or a million |
| 11 | tons a year. |
| 12 | So I can't tell you how that |
| 13 | realignment, what that will look like. But |
| 14 | the point $I$ was trying to make is that $I$ was |
| 15 | trying to describe -- see if we can do it |
| 16 | again. |
| 17 | The movement of the wood market is very |
| 18 | dynamic and fluid. And it really depends. |
| 19 | It's all connected. So if a plant in New |
| 20 | York, in Fort Ticonderoga, New York, has a |
| 21 | problem, it can affect facilities in Jay, |
| 22 | Maine by where wood moves via the trucking |
| 23 | network. And once the mills went out in |
| 24 | Gorham -- I mean Berlin and Groveton and |
|  | 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\} |

Gilman, it didn't necessarily mean less wood was harvested. It meant that that same wood, maybe less, was. But predominantly the same wood might have been harvested but transported out. And once they come in, there will be a more competitive environment. And those that are accepting it will perhaps choose not to be part of that 6 million that we've identified and purchase their wood up in Maine or out in New York State or elsewhere, because the opportunity won't be there once we're in there to fill that void, so to speak.
Q. Did the LandVest study show the 1.2 million tons a year that was not now being consumed by local mills went out of state?
A. (Bravakis) No. I think I alluded to the fact that 1.2 had been used by mills, and then they went in and did an analysis of what the current consumption is. There's no way to really know where that wood is going. They did not look at the consumption when the mills were operating, other than saying
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what we know now is there's roughly 6 million, if you will, and the pulp mills used 1.2 or 1.3 million when they were operating. That was a premise that essentially gave us confidence that there's enough wood in the area for our plant, which is roughly -- would consume roughly half of that, a little bit more than half. But they did not do that.
Q. So your working assumption is that 1.2 million is going to be redistributed or sitting in the woods?
A. (Bravakis) I think a combination of the both. But my guess is redistributed. But I'm sure that some logging contractors went out of business, and so, you know, it's in the woods in that case.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So there is -- you acknowledge there is a competitive aspect to this?
A. (Bravakis) Absolutely.
Q. So we'll save pricing questions for the closed session.
A. (Bravakis) Yes.
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Q. Now, the sustainability -- first, let me ask a very general question. When you talk about sustainability, are you talking about sustainability of timber available to flow as biomass, or are we talking about sustainable forest in a broader sense?
A. (Bravakis) We were talking about biomass. But if I recall in the -- I have to look at the study. I have to refresh myself. But our approach was to identify if the wood could be sustainably harvested for our plant for biomass. And so they looked at the -basically, they looked at growth and removals, net growth compared to removals. That included round wood, which is saw timber and pulp wood and tops and branches. And they looked at the FIA data, which is more conservative data, and they looked at growth and removal and said that it's growing faster than being removed. And then they also compared that to state reported data, of which New Hampshire has -- it's more rigorous reporting than some of the other states. So they understood that, and
they tried to interpolate between the two sets of data to come up with their conclusions.
Q. Does your concept of sustainability include leaving 50 percent of the tops as waste wood, as you referred to it, in the woods? Or is this assuming everything's coming out to meet market demands?
A. (Bravakis) No, it's not everything coming out. I think when we looked at it, it was assuming they looked at current conditions, which, because it's a pulp and paper market, a lot of it, the limbs and tops are left in the woods and not brought out. So, yeah, left in the woods.
Q. Now I'm asking specifically about your sustainability practices.
A. (Bravakis) Oh, okay.
Q. You don't address that issue of whether you're leaving a certain percentage of tops, your waste wood, so to speak, in the woods in your sustainability practices. You also don't mention what low-grade wood is. You don't define the product. Are those things
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you're willing to entertain, or was it already discussed and didn't make it into the practices?
A. (Bravakis) I mean, that's a great question. We certainly thought about how much we want to weigh in on being the forest cops. And we felt that, as I was trying to explain before, there's a lot of, between regulations, between voluntary programs, a lot in place that the timber -- timber land owners want to maximize the return on their land over the long haul, for the most part, the ones that $I$ know. And that doesn't necessarily mean liquidation clear-cuts, as somebody suggested before. What it means is growing high-grade timber products. And to do that, there needs to be markets for low grade. And for landowners to engage in that practice of owning and maintaining and managing lands, they hire foresters; they enter into management programs on their own; some of them will join and be subject to third-party verification. But for the most part, people who own and hold timber land
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want to grow the highest quality log, because it takes their resource, which is the land and the sun, and turns it into the best return of fiber that you can have. They don't want to grow it into wood that goes into a biomass plant, although parts of that eventual tree will go there. The reality is that most of the forests in the northeast are pretty much overstocked and underutilized. And separate from some areas that have had good low-grade markets, high grading has been the predominant forestry practice: Taking the best, leaving the rest. That's why most foresters we talked to are delighted that a biomass plant will go in to help the -- it gives them another tool that they can offer their landowner to do good management practice, good management of timber harvesting practices.
Q. Have you determined -- and we don't have to get into details today. But have you determined at what minimum capacity your facility can operate -- for example: If for some reason down the road you can't obtain
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> 750,000 tons per year and you bag it down to 500,000?
A. (Bravakis) We haven't looked at that. We're confident we can get that wood. We're confident we can get it for the life of the plant.
Q. Thank you. I'll save my questions for LandVest and closed sessions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank you. And in light of the hour, I am going to hold my questions until tomorrow, and Attorney Iacopino will do the same.

Mr. Harrington, did you have a question?

MR. HARRINGTON: I have one follow-up question for them. I can wait until tomorrow if they're going to be back.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Well, we will start $I$ think tomorrow morning with the same panel. Why don't we hold the question until tomorrow, okay.

To help speed us along tomorrow, I will, Mr. Frecker, let you know one question $I$ will ask you to address; and that is, SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 1 - AFTERNOON SESSION] \{8/23/10\}

I'll ask you to be prepared to walk us through the list of all of the permit applications that have been filed associated with this application and give us the status of each of those. If you can be prepared to do that, that would be very helpful.
A. (Frecker) No problem.
Q. If you could do that in very, in kind of a succinct and direct fashion, that will help. MR. IACOPINO: The other thing is really for the Committee members: Hearing Room B tomorrow is going to -- there's a meeting in there from 10 to 12 that's going to have a bunch of people in it, just so you're aware. When you come in, you might want to take your stuff out here. They're going to need to get into that room.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Unless
there's objections from the parties, I would propose we convene at 9:00 tomorrow morning here in this room. So we will stand adjourned until 9:00 tomorrow morning. Thank you.
(Whereupon the Day 1 Afternoon Session was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.)
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