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$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { (Hearing resumed at } 1: 50 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m} .) \\
\text { CHAIRMAN BURACK: Good }
\end{array}
$$

afternoon. Yes, it's raining outside, but that's not necessarily the reason why I have somebody sitting next to me different from who was here before. I'd like to introduce Kristin Clouser, who is an associate of Mike Iacopino. Kristin will be here for about another hour, hour and a half or so this afternoon. Mike had to step out to deal with another matter. But we do expect Mike back later.
I am at this time going to make a very special exception to the process that I told you all we would be following here with respect to public comment. We have one individual in the room who, due to his unusual schedule and commitments, has asked to be able to very briefly address the Committee, solely as public comment. This is not an opportunity for question and answer. But $I$ wish to assure any other members of the public who are here who wish to speak, that there will be an opportunity for others who wish to do so before we close these proceedings. And again, I'm hoping to be able to
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close these proceedings by Friday.
So at this time, I'd like to ask if Raymond Burton, Executive Councilor for District No. 1 , would like to briefly address us with public comment.

Whenever I call his phone and get his voice mail, the message always says, "Please keep it brief." And I know, Councilor, that you will do the same thing.

MR. BURTON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Site Evaluation Committee, first of all, $I$ commend you on the work that you do. You are trying to bring together a decision here from various points within state government and without state government. I appear in support of this project in Berlin, New Hampshire. Having represented Androscoggin Valley now for 32 years at the end of this term as a member of the New Hampshire Executive Council, this project has local support. There is wood waiting to be processed, and there are people waiting to find work. And that's my three points I would make, Mr. Chairman. And, again, thank you, Members of the Site Evaluation Committee, in the work that
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you continue to do.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Councilor Burton. Appreciate you taking the time to be with us here today.

Okay. We will now return to the questioning of the panel of witnesses that we have before us, Mr. Bartoszek and Mr. Strickler.

And Attorney Roth, would you please proceed.

MR. ROTH: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Stop me if I'm venturing into confidential information, but $I$ saw somewhere a suggestion that you were anticipating a financial closing in January of next year. Is that --
A. (Bartoszek) We'd expect to close the financial closing of the project financing by the end of this year.
Q. By the end of this year?
A. (Bartoszek) Correct.
Q. And obviously, you're confident you're going
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to make that, given the information you provided before about Key Bank?
A. (Bartoszek) Yes, we have a high degree of confidence in the financing.
Q. And in your experience in the financial markets in the past year or two, with special reference towards this past year, what financings of biomass projects have closed of this magnitude?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, Mr. Roth, I think, if I recall correctly, in response to a similar question in the technical session, I think we may have provided some details on that. It's a little difficult for me to recount, off the top of my head. I can tell you that a very large transaction, referred to as Nacogdoches Power, was acquired by a southern company I believe this past year. It's a 100-megawatt project in Texas. Not sure about all the financial details associated with that transaction.

Over the past few years there have been
a number of large power project financings.
Probably would be easier to get you
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information as a follow-up than to try to recount them off the top of my head.
Q. Okay. But other than the Nacogdoches project, you can't think of anything specific in the past year that you can tell us about where financing has closed on a biomass project?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, I guess it's fair to say that transactions of this type are often not publicized or widely publicized. So, no, I guess the answer is, no, I can't tell you specifically. But it doesn't mean that they haven't occurred.
Q. Okay. And with respect to Nacogdoches, is that a project finance, or is that a completed project just being refinanced or sold?
A. (Bartoszek) It's a project financing. I also can tell you that there is another large project, I believe, planned or proposed by the same developer of Nacogdoches in Florida. I don't recall exactly where.
A. (Strickler) Gainesville.
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A. (Bartoszek) Gainesville, Florida. And I'm not sure of the status of the financing of the project. But it is, again, a very large project, approximately 100 megawatts, that received -- my recollection is they received over the last year -- entered into a power purchase agreement with a local utility in Florida.
Q. For your reference, your counsel very helpfully included as Exhibit 57 what looks like a Web site print about the Nacogdoches facility in Texas. And Exhibit 58 looks like a press release about the Gainesville --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Counsel,
these are Applicant's Exhibits 57 and 58 to which you're referring?

MR. ROTH: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. All right. Now, you're hoping, I imagine, to obtain some of the investment tax credit money that's available through ARRA. I assume you were here the other day when we
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were discussing that briefly --
A. (Bartoszek) Yes.
Q. -- where $I$ was asked to actually remember what ARRA stood for?
A. (Bartoszek) It's the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.
Q. And are you familiar with that program or what you need to get that money?
A. (Bartoszek) I'm generally familiar, yes.
Q. Can you describe that process a little bit and what you're hoping to get from it.
A. (Bartoszek) As the program currently stands, the requirement in order to receive the investment tax credit, which is a tax credit -- actually, my recollection -- is it 30 percent?
A. (Strickler) Yeah.
A. (Bartoszek) Thirty percent of the capital cost of the project can be taken as an upfront grant or tax credit. The requirements to meet the program are that the project commence construction by the end of the year. And there's some specific guidelines as to what constituents
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commencement of construction. There are also some alternatives of commencement of construction that involve capital expenditures. But I probably would refer you to the -- I'd rather not recount all those in specificity, but --
Q. For example, among those alternatives, isn't it true that you can -- if you, I think, start the manufacture of the key component before the end of the year, that that would qualify you for investment tax credits, at least for that component?
A. (Strickler) If it met a certain amount of money and it was a non-cancelable purchase order, yeah.
Q. Okay. Or you could start construction, put the shovel in the ground and --
A. (Strickler) Exactly. Continuous --
Q. And sort of in your business model, in your mind, anyway, what are you hoping -- how much are you hoping to sort of get a hold of from this program? How much? How many dollars?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, as we've discussed, the
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overall capital budget of the project is somewhat fluid because the EPC contract hasn't been finalized. Based on an approximate construction cost in the hundred to $\$ 120$ million range, presumably looking at a credit in the $\$ 30$ to $\$ 40$ million range.

And I guess I don't want to be overly cumbersome about this, but to kind of briefly explain again the sort of breakdown in the corporate structure, PJPD is the owner of the assets, the physical assets and the physical property. One of the reasons that arrangement is commonly set up that way is so that that entity can receive the tax benefits.
Q. So PJPD would be the Applicant and the one looking to recover this money; correct? Is that what you're saying?
A. (Bartoszek) PJPD, as the property owner, would receive the tax credit. However, more likely than not, it will be a capital item with respect to the project. So if the tax credit is received, it will be part of the overall capital structure of the project.
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Q. But on which side? The left side or the right side, $I$ guess, is what I'm trying to get at, based on what you just said.
A. (Bartoszek) It will be contributed presumably as equity to the project.
Q. Okay. Now --
A. (Bartoszek) Probably also worth noting that in the calculations we've done to date and in the financial model we've supplied as part of the request for information that's considered confidential, we have not included assumptions with respect to the ITC due to the uncertain nature as to whether or not we'll qualify for it.
Q. Right. I noticed that, and I'll ask you about that in the confidential session.

So that 30 percent, or $\$ 40$ million, will come in to PJPD and be used somehow by the Applicant in this proceeding as part of the equity investment? I'm still a little confused about how that works.
A. (Bartoszek) Well, my assumption would be -and, again, we don't know that we're definitively going to get it. So at best,
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we have to make an assumption at this time. If you go back up the left side of the chart, you see the source of the equity capital. And you go back up to NewCo, NewCo's contributing cash equity to finance the development of the project. So, as I mentioned earlier, we contemplate we received an allocation of New Market Tax Credits, which will result in new additional equity going into the project. And similarly, $I$ would expect that if we are able to get the proceeds of the ITC, again, that would be additional equity contribution on the part of PJPD, or one of those entities to the equity of the project.
Q. So, you actually brought me to a question I was going to ask you, and that is: The ITC and the New Market Credit, are they going to stay in the project, or are they going to be used to essentially return investment to NewCo in response to their having paid money in to build the project? Because as I understand both of these, certainly the ITC you don't get until you're done with
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construction? Correct? Then you go operational --
A. (Strickler) That's right.
Q. -- and the New Market comes in over a seven-year period. Is that your understanding?
A. (Bartoszek) The New Market Tax Credit is a seven-year program, but it's effectively monetized so that there's an upfront contribution to the project. So we're projecting a gross contribution from New Market Tax Credits of approximately 12 million. And from that, you would subtract the two and a quarter million I mentioned earlier that would be available as a community loan fund, and the other $\$ 500,000$. And that money would basically stay with the New Market allocatees. It wouldn't be given to us at all. And it would be given to them to finance those programs in the community. So that gets you down to a net amount of roughly 9 million, and that would be the additional equity to the project.
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Q. And the question was: Does that money stay in the project, or is that going to be returned to the NewCo investors?
A. (Bartoszek) I can't answer definitively on the part of NewCo. But I would say typically you would expect the money to stay in the project, because it's going to be part of the inducement for the lender in order to make his commitment to the project. Generally, people who are going to commit or act as senior lenders and commit considerable capital like that are not going to want to see a lot of capital exiting the deal on the part of equity. They're going to want to see as much money stay in the deal as possible.
Q. Now, when you began, when you were first introduced to us, I thought -- and maybe I just heard you wrong -- but I thought I heard you say the New Market was going to be 44-1/2 million.
A. (Bartoszek) That's right. It's a little complex. But the overall, the allocation -the New Market Tax Credit Program is a
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program of the U.S. Treasury Department in which entities invest in community development entities, who, in turn, make funding available to projects in low-income communities, so the purpose of which is to incentivize economic development in low-income communities. The gross amount of the New Market Tax Credit allocation is 44.5 million. But without going into a lot of detail, the net amount that flows to the project is approximately the 9 million $I$ outlined and the other approximate 3 million that goes to the community. The balance is basically additional money contributed by the project as equity to the New Market. So, basically, part of our senior debt we will allocate to make up that balance of that 44.5 million in order to get those equity proceeds. So we got to put in money to get money.
Q. I'm still confused. So, the New Market Credit is 44 million.
A. (Bartoszek) It's 44.5 million.
Q. Of that, after you take out the community's
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share, you get 9 million.
A. (Bartoszek) That's right.
Q. Can you try to explain again what happens to the other, like, 30 million?
(Discussion between panel members.)
A. (Bartoszek) Yeah. Right. One point to consider is that the tax credit itself is taken and monetized, so that it's basically, in consideration for the cash that comes to the project, a party who has the tax need is buying the tax credit and monetizing it.

But it's not -- they're not getting
44 million in benefit for 12 million in contribution. It's a -- I can't really say exactly what the spread would be. But I can tell you that in the overall capital structure, part of the 44.5 million would be comprised of a B Tranche of our senior debt, and then the balance of the 44.5 million is the equity component which flows to the project.
Q. Okay. So, in essence, the Treasury, the United States Treasury, through this New Market Tax Credit, is going to be a B
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Tranche lender to the project?
A. (Bartoszek) No, it's third-party lenders who buy tax credit for investment tax credit.
Q. Okay. I think I understand that.
A. (Bartoszek) And Perhaps if we have the representative from Key Bank, if he's available this afternoon, he may even be able to give you a better explanation of how the B Tranche is associated with the New Market Tax Credit, since he's the guy who would be structuring that.
Q. Okay. That's fine. I think I know enough about it to move along to other things.

Now, as I understand the -- one of the tests for the New Market Tax Credit is the accountability, which would require membership on the board by either residents of the low-income communities or, in fact, low-income persons. Do you anticipate that Laidlaw will have Berlin residents on the board?
A. (Bartoszek) I think that refers to the community development enterprise, Mr. Roth. I don't believe that refers to the ultimate
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recipient of the funds, because, as I mentioned earlier, the funds for the community are not given to us; they're held by the community development entity who invests them on the part of the allocatees to benefit the community. So I'm pretty sure that's what that's referring to.
Q. So the 44 and the -- so you're not really the recipient of the New Market credits. You're just one of the beneficiaries of them?
A. (Bartoszek) That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now that makes more sense to me than before.

Now, there was some talk this morning about how many jobs there will be, and there was some discussion about whether there was some relation to the number of jobs to the number of tons of wood, in response to a question from Commissioner Stewart -- I should say Director Stewart. Sorry. MR. ROTH: Didn't mean to put you in the wrong spot.

BY MR. ROTH:
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Q. And the answer was not totally clear, other than Mr. Bravakis believed there would be 200 jobs as the infrastructure is rebuilt. Is that your understanding, that there will be 200 jobs in the woods in Coos County?
A. (Bartoszek) My understanding is that you're obviously going to have primary jobs at the plant. We projected that to be approximately 40 jobs. Then there's a certain amount of secondary economic benefit from the creation of an enterprise like this. And there are a number of ways to try to estimate that. And what we've tried to do is refer the Committee to third-party estimates, such as the one prepared in connection with the PSNH filing, and also the one which I believe can be found on the Massachusetts Department of Energy Web site. The basic synopsis of that is that they projected approximately three jobs per megawatt of power. So that would equate to 210 jobs. It's actually two jobs per megawatt and then an additional job for each of those two jobs that are created.
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Q. And you haven't done any independent study of your business model and your business plan on actual job creation in the North Country of New Hampshire. You're just relying on this sort of generalized model from Massachusetts.
A. (Bartoszek) We have very detailed projections with respect to our direct employment. It's harder, obviously, to estimate secondary benefits. But we felt that the most conservative way would be to defer to third parties who obviously spent some time and have some expertise in making these estimates.
Q. And yesterday, I believe, Mr. Richmond testified that he thought that the infrastructure for putting crews into the woods in the North Country to provide fuel for your facility would -- could be rebuilt by the time you're up and running in 32 months or so. Do you expect that to happen in the absence of an actual demand? Are people going to go out and invest money in the equipment before the demand is actually
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present, say two or three years in advance?
A. (Bartoszek) I think it's like any other business opportunity. People are going to see this as a good opportunity, and they're going to try to capture it. So I expect that maybe they won't invest two years in advance, but as the project draws closer to commercial operation, certainly they'll be making -- presumably be making those investments. And as I mentioned, the loan fund that we're -- that's part of the New Market Tax Credit certainly, I believe, will play a role in that.
Q. And do you think that there's the likelihood that, because of Mr. Richmond's or Cousineau's supply chain that is bringing up chips from Massachusetts, staging them in Henniker, bringing them up here, you know, doing -- he has a fairly intricate and interesting mechanism for bringing fuel around. Do you think that because of that process and that logistics, that the number of jobs could decrease in the North Country?
A. (Bartoszek) No. I mean, I think you've
\{SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 3 - PM SESSION] \{08-25-10\}
[WITNESS PANEL: STRICKLER/BARTOSZEK]
heard extensive testimony that the game -both from Mr. Richmond and my colleagues -that the game plan is to get the fuel as close to the facility as possible. Clearly, that is in the economic best interest of the facility, to keep down transportation costs. So I'm not going to contradict what folks who are probably more knowledgeable about this have asserted.
Q. And is it your understanding, or do you agree with what was testified to earlier by Mr. Bravakis, and Mr. Richmond, I guess, that pulp -- that the demand for pulpwood -where the demand is high, the price goes up?
A. (Bartoszek) I think it's a logical supply-demand argument, that in the North Country, if there is a higher demand for pulp, that you're going to have -- that that's going to create upward price pressure on wood chips. Seems like a logical assertion.
Q. Okay. Now, I think it was Mr. Richmond who testified this morning about NewPage. And he said they've weathered a lot of tough
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competition, but now they're -- I think there was the suggestion that perhaps, you know, nobody should be betting on their continued existence. But do you think that NewPage is probably sort of breathing a sigh of relief while Fraser is gone and they've got kind of the wood supply to themself?
A. (Bartoszek) You're really kind of asking me to delve into areas where I've got really little knowledge, Mr. Roth. I mean, I would say, as a general argument, you would think a business -- when a business has diminished, competition presumably might be better for them; or it might not be, as we've heard earlier arguments, that creation of infrastructure, in the case of wood chips, could benefit competitors. So it's really tough for me to draw a conclusion or to agree or disagree with your assertion.
Q. Okay. I might be done. I'm just checking.
A. (Bartoszek) My fingers are crossed.
Q. All right. I think I'm all set for the time being. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank You,
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Attorney Roth.
Okay. Now going to have an opportunity for members of the Subcommittee to ask questions of these panelists. Who would like to start?

MR. ROTH: I'm sorry. I did see one more.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Please proceed. BY MR. ROTH:
Q. As you understand the business model of the company, you're obviously seeking a permit to operate up to 70 megawatts. That's your nameplate capacity. And you've got basically 60 megawatts of capacity factor there. That's correct; right?
A. (Strickler) Seventy megawatts is the gross input. We need to generate power to operate all the equipment within the plant. So that's what the -- that's where the 63 megawatts comes from.
Q. Sixty-three.
A. (Strickler) Around seven or eight megawatts of internal-used power.
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Q. The question $I$ have is, if -- you know, we understand that sort of wood in/power out, lots of wood in, lots of power out. If you needed to, or if there was a good reason, or if there was a reason to, could you operate at -- you know, profitably, could you do it at, say, 50 megawatts? Could this project work with a 50-megawatt license?
A. (Strickler) I mean, economics would suffer, from what we projected.
Q. Okay. And I guess the last is, there was some talk about the railroad. And have you budgeted or come up with a figure for what it's going to cost to re-establish the tracks and get that working again?
A. (Strickler) Could you repeat the question? I'm sorry.
Q. There was some talk yesterday about use of the railroad spur to connect to the $S t$. Lawrence and Atlantic Railroad line. Do you have a budget for how much it's going to cost for you to re-establish that link?
A. (Bartoszek) I'm not sure if that falls within our overall capital budget. I know
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we've had -- we've talked to the railroad and explored this as a potential opportunity. But I'm not sure in what depth we've gone regarding estimates.
A. (Strickler) I'm not aware of any estimates either.

MR. ROTH: Okay. Now that's really all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you, Attorney Roth.

All right. We're now going to take questions from the Subcommittee. Who would like to start? Mr. Harrington, please.

INTERROGATORIES BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Just getting back to these tax credits again. I got a little bit confused there. Are you getting the investment tax credit, as well as this New Market Tax Credit, the 30-percent investment tax credit?
A. (Bartoszek) Yes. They're two separate programs.
Q. So you're eligible for both programs.
A. (Bartoszek) Yes, I believe so.
Q. And you'll be taking the 30-percent
\{SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 3 - PM SESSION] \{08-25-10\}
[WITNESS PANEL: STRICKLER/BARTOSZEK]
investment tax credit, as well as this New Market Tax Credit that came out to be about 9 million. So, 30 percent of the ITC will be on what figure, approximately?
A. (Bartoszek) On the -- well, the Treasury Department presumably has defined what qualifies for the tax credit. So I've just kind of roughly based it on an estimate of our construction budget and excluded the other costs for reserved funds and things like that. So, based it on roughly a $\$ 110$ to $\$ 120$ million budget.
Q. And do you have to subtract the New Market Tax Credit off of that before you take the 30 percent, or do you take it off of the full 110?
A. (Bartoszek) No, they're --
Q. I realize they're two separate programs. But sometimes if there's some type of a tax break or --
A. (Bartoszek) Is there a double-dipping?
Q. Yeah, double-dip.
A. (Bartoszek) Right. And I understand that certain programs would preclude you from
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taking one tax credit and then taking another, essentially precluding you from double-dipping. But these are two very separate and distinct programs. So the ITC is geared toward incentivizing creation of alternative energy generation, whereas the New Market Tax Credit Program is geared toward revitalizing low-income communities. So they're two very separate and distinct tax credits. And it's my understanding that you do not need to make any substraction, one from the other.
Q. So you're going to be getting somewhere in the vicinity of $\$ 40$ million in tax credits between the two programs.
A. (Bartoszek) Yes. Well, just to be clear, as I believe Attorney Roth pointed out, we're not the actual recipient of the tax credit. The tax credit will go to an entity who has a tax need, who, in turn, will purchase the tax credit, and then the proceeds will flow to the project; whereas, the ITC is received by the project based on its capital costs.
A. (By Mr. Harrington) Okay. One more thing
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on your structure. And $I$ almost hate to go into that. But I'm just trying to figure out, if $I$ look at the chart, NewCo Energy Company owns a hundred percent of everybody, apparently, that actually has any ownership in the plant, not someone they're hiring to manage a contract or something like that. So if there's a major decision that has to be made, it's a million-dollar, $\$ 10$ million decision, and it's got to be made today, who gets the phone call? Someone at NewCo, or whoever the head of NewCo is, which I still haven't been able to figure out? Or is that done at Laidlaw? Or how does that work?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, if $I$ may, it's not very much different than it was before. So, NewCo was always up here as the equity investor. And NewCo made the investment to acquire the project assets, the physical assets of the plant, as I explained earlier, because that's a good deal for them because they will get a lease payment from us as the lessee, and they will receive tax benefits.
Q. I understand. I'm not asking you to repeat
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things, because of time purposes, but --
A. (Bartoszek) And then over here, on this side, we are the Applicant making those decisions. And we will continue to basically -- we will continue to make those decisions now. Obviously, NewCo's directors and our directors, upon closing of the transaction, will be the same. So there will be certain governance requirements. And obviously, the board will give direction to management. But $I$ would expect that the company's officers will make decisions in the same manner as they made them before.
Q. Thank you. And you don't need to pull this out. But on Exhibit 35, Page 2, it talks about the PPA. It says the PPA is an essential element of the project, as far as obtaining financing goes.

So, to make it real clear, it sounds as if, if the PPA is not approved, or it gets approved in a much different manner than it's now written, that would put the project on dead stop.
A. (Bartoszek) It certainly wouldn't be good
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for the project. I mean, I guess in your alternate scenario, where it's approved in some other form, I guess we have to see what that was. But certainly, it probably definitely wouldn't be good if it was rejected. And it probably wouldn't be good if it was modified.
Q. And I'm just trying to get a feel for your business plan going forward here. You're planning to build a new power plant. And based on the figures we've been kicking around, it's going to be somewhere in the vicinity of about $\$ 2300$, $\$ 2400$ a kilowatt installed. You have to go through a permitting process, all this other stuff that hasn't been done. And in the region, in New England right now, people are buying and selling fairly new, more efficient -more efficient than this plant by quite a bit -- combined-cycle gas plants for around $\$ 400$ a kilowatt, which is drastically less than you're proposing to build a new one. What's the business plan that allows you to go forward and build a new plant in the same
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market for $\$ 23$ - to $\$ 2400$ a kilowatt, where a plant that's gone bankrupt is willing to sell for $\$ 400$ a kilowatt?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, that's a great question. I mean, what creates the incentive for a plant like this is the desire to see the shift in this country and in this region to sources of alternative energy. So, certainly the RPS is, we think, a very smart decision on the part of the State of New Hampshire and creates incentives for projects like this. Because the thought process of let's build lots and lots of gas plants, we've gone through that cycle before, when everybody believed gas to be really, really cheap and ran out to build a lot of natural gas plants; and the result was tremendous dependence in the northeast on natural gas, and when natural gas prices went up dramatically, was an incredible impact on ratepayers. So, again, I kind of think there's a number of good reasons why we need a plant like this, including diversification of our overall sources of
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energy and a shift to alternative energy sources.
Q. Okay. I would comment that natural gas prices also did go down substantially --
A. (Bartoszek) Absolutely.
Q. -- and total cost of electricity in New England over the last -- from 2008 to 2009 was cut in half, mostly due to decreases in natural gas prices. So that's a huge decrease in cost to ratepayers.
A. (Bartoszek) Absolutely. But I'm sure you probably agree, it's a fairly volatile commodity --
Q. Certainly has been in the past.
A. (Bartoszek) -- and that volatility creates a lot of difficulties in terms of managing that kind of business or getting financing for that kind of business.
Q. Moving to the, $I$ guess we're calling it the WPA, the wood price adjustment. We've heard from, well, $I$ guess we certainly have to call him an expert -- he's certainly the most expert person I've ever heard on dealing with all this wood and moving it
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around and what it cost, Mr . Richmond. And he basically said, for various reasons, the net result is that the cost of wood going to Schiller is going to be basically the cost of wood going to the Berlin plant. So, even though we've had -- I understand the reasons that you said, that having the cost based on Schiller's cost lets Public Service monitor the prudency of their purchasing rather than relying on you to do that; in effect, if you both buy well, in the sense that you're both using the same supplier, in all likelihood the price of the wood is going to be very, very close to each other.
A. (Bartoszek) I agree with that.
Q. So if the price of wood goes up for Schiller, it's probably going to go up for you; if it goes down for Schiller, it's going to go down for you.
A. (Bartoszek) Certainly that is the assumption we've made, yes.
Q. Okay. Now -- and I just want to make sure we all agreed on that one.

Now, one of the things that happened in
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New Hampshire a few years ago is we restructured the electric markets. And there was some discussion earlier on whether this was good for the ratepayers or bad for the ratepayers. But one of the main driving factors behind the restructuring of the electric markets was to move the risk of electrical generation from the ratepayers to merchant generators.

Now, since you're not a utility, you have to be a merchant generator, because there is no other option. But it seems to me, under the circumstances, you are trying to shift with Public Service all of the risk associated with the generation, various things that cause risk, back to the ratepayers.
A. (Bartoszek) Well, Mr. Harrington, that's a great question. It's kind of a policy argument, really. Obviously, we're an independent generator. And there are a lot of good things associated with independent generators: Distributed generation, creation of competition. And I guess
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different people would have different viewpoints on that.

But the main reason, I'd come back to the point we made about the PPA. The PPA is a necessity to create a certain stream of cash flows, to create financing. And if you don't create the new plants, if you don't provide mechanisms to allow new plants to get financed and new generation to come online, ultimately it would have a detrimental impact on ratepayers, because if energy consumption goes up and we don't have plants built to serve those needs.

So I wouldn't agree that we're shifting at all. We're just trying to create a contract -- trying to create a mechanism that allows the certainty of cash flow to allow the project to be financed. In the absence of that, it would be very difficult to finance the project.
Q. But $I$ might just state that right now there's certainly nothing except a huge surplus in generation in New England -- in fact, the forward-capacity market cleared
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the floor price with 18 percent more generation than was required. So we're certainly not in any immediate need of new generation in New England.
A. (Bartoszek) Well, if I might respond?
Q. Sure.
A. (Bartoszek) I mean, certainly, that's -obviously, nobody has a crystal ball. We can't know what the future of generation's going to look like or energy needed in the region's going to look like. But, again, I might circle back to the fact that this is part of the RPS of the State of New Hampshire. So it's not just an argument of do you need a new power plant or do you need more electricity. It's diversification of the portfolio of electricity in the state of New Hampshire to include alternative sources.
Q. And I guess I'll -- well, I'll save that one to the last.

If your company were to move forward with this and -- let's say the plant got built, and in a couple years from now there
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was some improved technology that would allow you to invest capital into your plant. And let's say we were talking efficiency of somewhere in the vicinity of 25 percent. Let's say you could boost that up to 28 or 29 percent. You would increase your profits, given the PPA structure, without getting into any of the confidential stuff. Your profits would go up quite a bit on that; would they not?
A. (Bartoszek) It's hard to say, to answer the hypothetical. But I would expect whatever kind of new technology would probably cost a lot of money, too. So the capital cost might offset increased profitability.
Q. Any increase in profits due to increased efficiencies in the plant would not change your PPA with Public Service.
A. (Bartoszek) I don't believe so, no.
Q. Okay. So, again, seems like ratepayers are bearing the risk here, but they don't get the benefits of increased efficiencies of the future.
A. (Bartoszek) Well, but again, I mean, with
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all due respect, that is speculation. We don't know that there will be those in the future. And then, of course, it's going to require somebody to take a business risk and say -- you know, let's say to get that efficiency you've got to spend $\$ 30$ million, and then to earn that $\$ 30$ million back you got to run the plant for 10 years in order to get payback on your investment. So, somebody's going to have to make a decision at some point in the future of whether or not it makes sense to invest in those technologies.

Generally, the project financing contemplates that the plant's going to operate the way it's designed and built for the term of the contract. That's one of the reasons why the contract is a necessity and why the cash flows are predicated upon the term of the -- or projected based upon the term of the contract.
Q. I guess my point I'm trying to make here is, under a previously structured market, this would have been -- had vertically integrated
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utilities. And the utility at that point would basically have some type of fuel adjustment clause, just like you have now: The cost of fuel goes up, they get to collect more for the rates; the cost of fuel goes down, they charge more. But they're willing -- their costs don't really change. They just get compensated for whatever the fuel costs are. Very similar to the agreement you have with Public Service. Now, if for some reason the cost of fuel goes up, the ratepayers are going to pay more. And that's the risk they're taking. They seem to be taking the risk involved with this. And I don't see you people having the risk. You have the advantages with this contract of being a regulated utility, but you're not regulated by anybody. And I just think that -- that just strikes me as obviously --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr.
Harrington, if I may, we're here to ask questions. Is there a specific question associated with that statement?
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BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. One last question. Would your company be willing to build this plant if your company takes the risk rather than the ratepayers?
A. (Bartoszek) I believe that the company's taking an enormous financial risk. To date, I believe we've invested close to \$14 million in this project. And that number goes up every day, and will go up and up until we get to a financial closing. And then at that point, again, private investors are going to commit a hundred-some-odd million dollars to this. So I think there's a lot of risk being taken by the project and its proponents.
Q. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you,
Mr. Harrington.
Other members of the
Subcommittee with questions? Mr. Northrop. MR. NORTHROP: Thank you.

INTERROGATORIES BY MR. NORTHROP:
Q. I just have actually one question. It's really more of a clarification than a
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question, and it involves the New Market Tax Credit and how that impacts the City of Berlin.

Just correct me. My understanding is that Laidlaw Berlin Biomass will be receiving a 2.25 million [sic] part of the New Market Tax Credit, and that will form the basis of a community loan fund that the City of Berlin will manage? And also, I think part of that 2.5 million [sic] will also include a $\$ 500,000$ community development grant that the City of Berlin will also be managing? Am I correct in that? Is that an accurate -- I just want to see how this --
A. (Bartoszek) I don't think the City of Berlin will be managing the loan fund. My understanding is -- and I can clarify this during the break. But I believe the management remains with the allocatees, the community development enterprises. And I believe that they have some requirements to have some independent third parties involved in the management. The funds don't come to
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us. They stay with the allocatees or with some disinterested third party who's charged with overseeing the disbursement of those funds or the use of those funds.

And the $\$ 500,000$, my understanding is that is going to be able to be used in the community.
Q. Okay. Are the allocatees -- have they been created yet or identified, or is that -- I guess if not, then who would do that, and when would that take place? Is there sort of a process or a mechanism that would --
A. (Bartoszek) Yeah. To become a community development enterprise, you have to be approved by the U.S. Treasury Department. So one of them involved in this process would be the New Hampshire Business Finance Authority, probably an entity well known to you. So they are already in existence. And they have already, my understanding is, approved the allocation of these tax credits to the project.
Q. Okay. And this may be another question for the people from Berlin. But the North
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Country Council, is that also an entity that might be an allocatee of these --
A. (Bartoszek) I don't believe so.
Q. Okay.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: If I may, is there somewhere a list of who the allocatees are at this point? Is that something that's public record at this time?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't know if it is. If we could find out at a break? We actually had somebody here for a couple days who knew everything about these things.

MR. BARTOSZEK: I'm pretty
sure we could get that to you, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. It
would be helpful if you could provide that to us. It would be helpful information. Thank you.

MR. NORTHROP: I'm all set.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank you.

Other questions at this point?
Ms. Muzzey, go ahead.
INTERROGATORIES BY DIR. MUZZEY:
Q. Earlier today when you were describing all
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the groups that had been involved -companies, LLCs and people who were involved now -- I believe you said that Laidlaw Energy would have a consulting contract on an ongoing basis?
A. (Bartoszek) No. Myself and Mr. Bravakis and Mr. Kusche, in testimony that you'll hear I guess later or tomorrow, the officers of LBB, of the Applicant, will have an ongoing agreement which governs our continued involvement with the Applicant. So, not the corporate entity, Laidlaw Energy Group. Myself individually, Mr. Bravakis individually, Mr. Kusche individually, will enter into a consulting agreement with the Applicant to continue to provide those services to the Applicant.
Q. So you as officers of LBB will have a consulting contract with LLB -- LBB.
A. (Bartoszek) Yes, that's right.
Q. Can you describe what your duties would be under that contract? Or is that something we need to talk about in the confidential session?
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A. (Bartoszek) I mean, I don't think it's really confidential. I mean, generally, my role is to continue in the same role as before. It's not -- in my experience, it's not really uncommon to have some sort of an employment agreement, whether you're an equity holder or not an equity holder in an enterprise. So it's really just a formalization of my role with the company in the form of a contract -- or in the form of a consulting agreement. But my understanding -- and it is in draft form. It hasn't been finalized yet. But my understanding is the intent is basically that we are to continue in the same roles as we were in previously for the Applicant.
Q. As you were prior to the upcoming transaction.
A. (Bartoszek) Prior to the closing of the transaction, to continue in the same role as CEO and vice-president -- my role as CEO and Mr. Bravakis' and Mr. Kusche's role as vice-presidents and corporate officers.
Q. Thank you.
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A. (Bartoszek) You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Director
Muzzey, any other questions? You're all set? DIR. MUZZEY: I'm all set.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr. Wright.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. WRIGHT:
Q. Just one quick question. I recognize this may be somewhat in the future. But earlier there was some discussion about the payment of property taxes from the project to the City of Berlin. And I was just curious if the facility anticipates in the future if it apply for property tax exemptions under R.S.A. 72:12-a for either air or water pollution-control equipment?
A. (Bartoszek) I don't know the answer to that. I could try to get back to you. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay.

Anything else?
MR. WRIGHT: No.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr.
Bartoszek --
CMSR. IGNATIUS: Go ahead.
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CHAIRMAN BURACK: Go ahead if you'd like.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: Okay. Thank
you.
INTERROGATORIES BY CMSR. IGNATIUS:
Q. In most immediate follow-up, did I understand correctly when you said, in response to Ms. Muzzey, the officers of LBB will have a consulting contract with LBB?
A. (Bartoszek) Yes, I believe so. Yes.
Q. So your role as officer of the company doesn't involve -- routinely wouldn't involve the work that you would be doing as a consultant? It's baffling to me why you need a contract to perform the duties of an officer of the company.
A. (Bartoszek) I think it's not uncommon at all to see a company's officers or a chief executive work in that role under some sort of a formal contract. I'm sure if you were to research, you know, many other companies, you would find that oftentimes there's some sort of employment agreement. Keeping in mind, we're selling our equity holdings to
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another party now, and that party presumably wants to have certain rights with respect to our employment if we fail to perform our duties or if, you know -- I think safe to say that it's probably always in the best interest of parties to be able to reduce the understanding to some kind of agreement, to ensure everything is clear between the parties.
Q. But your -- after the transaction, you will be CEO of --
A. (Bartoszek) Of the Applicant.
Q. -- of the Applicant.
A. (Bartoszek) And I'm CEO of the Applicant now.
Q. So if the board's dissatisfied, they can terminate you? If the board's not dissatisfied, you continue on? I just don't understand why you need an additional consulting agreement to do your duty as CEO of the Applicant.
A. (Bartoszek) Again, I'm not -- I want to try to answer the question. But I mean, I've had employment agreements in the past for
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companies that I've worked for. And to me, it's kind of a commonplace thing. It's not unusual for someone to say I want to have an agreement that governs what you're going to do for me, how you're going to do it and what happens if you don't do it.
Q. Okay. When is the transaction due to take place, the reorganization of the entities?
A. (Bartoszek) We fully expect it's going to close on or prior to the 31 st of this month.
Q. Thank you. You're right. That was testified to yesterday.

And there's been some discussion of this before, but can you just describe again what was the impetus for Laidlaw Energy Group to be out of the corporate picture here?
A. (Bartoszek) Laidlaw Energy Group is an indirect equity holder in the project. It was never a direct equity holder in the project, because it holds its equity in the project through its ownership of -ownership interest in another LLC. And since -- and that ted liability company owns
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the Applicant right now. So it's owned between Laidlaw Energy Group and the entity shown in the original organizational chart. And those entities are selling their equity to another party. So when they -- when that entity sells its equity to NewCo, Laidlaw Energy Group, as an indirect shareholder, as a shareholder in the company that's selling the equity, will no longer be an equity holder. It's simply, I think, just clarifying that.
Q. And where do Novus Energy and Northstar end up in the reorganization or as a result of this transaction?
A. (Bartoszek) I'm sorry. Those are two other entities that are -- I should have been clear.

So the ownership of the Applicant, Laidlaw Berlin BioPower, is owned 100 percent by Laidlaw BioPower, which is owned 50 percent by Laidlaw Energy Group, 25 percent by Novus Energy, LLC and 25 percent by Northstar Energy, LLC. So when those entities sell their shares in the
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Applicant to NewCo, they are -- they've sold their equity, so they're no longer equity holders. And the officer of Novis is Mr. Bravakis; the officer or the member -- the managing member of Northstar is Mr. Kusche; and I'm the chief executive of Laidlaw Energy Group; hence, our execution of the consulting agreements to remain in our roles for the Applicant.
Q. So after this transaction, Mr. Bravakis and Mr. Kusche will no longer have an equity interest in the Applicant.
A. (Bartoszek) That's correct.
Q. And in addition, the equity interest that Homeland held will also be removed as a result of this transaction.
A. (Strickler) That's correct.
A. (Bartoszek) That's correct.
Q. Homeland Renewable.

There was mention, Mr. Bartoszek, that you said you thought -- you weren't certain whether you would qualify for the investment tax credit. Is that due to the timing issues, or are there other reasons why you
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think you may not qualify?
A. (Bartoszek) It's the timing issue we're concerned about.
Q. So that's the end of 2010 that you've got to meet one of those tests of under construction or other alternate tests.
A. (Bartoszek) That's right.
Q. And you also said, "as the law currently stands." Is there discussion of extending any of those deadlines that might be of assistance if things are delayed for you or anyone else?
A. (Bartoszek) Certainly I know there have been some discussions in Congress. But it's not -- it's hard to say how that's going to end up.
Q. How about the New Market Tax Credit? Is there also a deadline to remain an allocatee under that?
A. (Bartoszek) That's a good question. Those credits need to be utilized by the... I believe it's technically November 15th. But I know under certain circumstances it can be extended to the end of the year. So we are
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under a similar end-of-year deadline with respect to the New Market Tax Credits.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Sorry. If I
may? You said end of 2015?
MR. BARTOSZEK: NO. I'm
sorry, Mr. Chairman. My understanding is that the deadline to utilize the New Market Tax Credits is November 15, 2010. But I am -- it's my understanding that there's also certain circumstances that basically can extend that until the end of the year. So my point is, I believe we are under the same year-end deadline to utilize the New Market Tax Credits as we are, as the law currently stands, with respect to the ITC.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you
for the clarification.
BY CMSR. IGNATIUS:
Q. So if the project is not up and running by the end of the year -- not up and running and operational -- but moved to whatever qualifying criteria there are to meet that deadline, do the New Market Tax Credit monies go back into a pool to be reallocated
\{SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 3 - PM SESSION] \{08-25-10\}
[WITNESS PANEL: STRICKLER/BARTOSZEK]
to other projects?
A. (Bartoszek) I'm not sure how that works with respect to the allocatees. I'm not sure if it's lost or -- I know that -- and this is just anecdotally. I've been told in the past by representatives of allocatees that they're often gauged by the Treasury Department, with respect to future allocations, based on their past ability to utilize the tax credit. So I guess it's sort of common sense that if you're able to put tax credits to work and create economic development activity, the Treasury Department's probably likely to consider you next year when they give out their allocation; and if you're not very successful in doing that, they might not. But that's strictly anecdotal.
Q. What would the impact on the project be if, for whatever reason, you were not able to meet the qualifying criteria for one or both of those tax credits?
A. (Bartoszek) That's a good question. As I mentioned earlier with respect to the
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financial model that we provided in the confidential documents, we've not included either of those, taking credit for either of those in that financial model.

But to give you the response I got from Key Bank when I discussed this with them, the basic response is every bit of equity of this type is helpful to the financing of the transaction. So, certainly it's -- it creates a more likely closing of the -financial closing of the project financing to have these than to not have these.
Q. Is there a contradiction in removing some of your equity partners from the project at this stage, if people want to see as much equity as they can and you're now taking three equity players out of the picture -four, actually, I suppose, if you consider Laidlaw Energy Group?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, no, because we're not taking equity out of the project company. This is all occurring sort of one level up, between -- among the shareholders of the Applicant. So there's not -- there are no
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dollars coming out of the Applicant. This is basically -- to put it quite simply: Myself and Mr. Kusche and Mr. Bravakis and other people involved with our organization have worked for a number of years to develop this project. And over time, as we've reached certain milestones, the value of the project as it stands has increased. And this is a business arrangement among the partners to those equity holdings. But it doesn't detract anything from the equity of the project.

I might also just add to that, that the timeliness of this is really coincidental. But once we decided to do this, we wanted to try to get it done really prior to this process, but at least during the process, so that we could -- the Committee would be fully aware of it. We didn't want to do it after the fact because we thought that would be perceived negatively. We wanted to fully disclose it to the Committee.
Q. Well, $I$ was wondering about the timing. So thank you for bringing it up.
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You said it's coincidental to this process. Tell me if I'm wrong. My assumption was that, if you get it to this stage and, as you say, you put significant funds to get to this stage, and that if it never -- the project never was financed, never went to construction, you would be reimbursed what you've been paid, and that it was not coincidental but was very geared towards the timing of the status you brought the project to to this state. Is that incorrect?
A. (Bartoszek) Yeah, that's not quite correct. The... I'm sorry. I just kind of -- I don't think I've had enough caffeine this afternoon.

Obviously, we reached a business arrangement that we felt worked for all the parties. And we do -- I'm sorry. Can you just restate the question?
Q. Sure. And you're allowed to space out every now and again. This is hard.

I'll tell you my assumption and you can tell me if this makes any sense or not:
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That part of what's going on here is that you're at a significant crossroads in the project. You've put considerable time and money into it. And this transaction, due to close the end of this month, would be to allow you and the other equity members, who no longer will be equity owners, to be cashed out, effectively, for what they put in, be reimbursed for that; and then the project will go forward, if it's successful in obtaining financing into the future, but that your upfront expenses will be recovered.
A. (Bartoszek) Okay. I've got it now. So, two points: Part of the reasoning behind this -- and I think it's probably one of the major reasons behind this -- as I mentioned earlier, there are a lot of parties involved in this. When you see us all go out of the room, we all go out as a team. We all go out into one room together. But there are a lot of different entities. There's

Homeland, there's Laidlaw, there's all these different groups which are really formed for
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corporate purposes, for liability purposes. But I think we all kind of act as one big team. And certainly a big part of this is to try to streamline that and make one organization be the owner. So I'm the CEO. The buck stops with me. I'm the decision-maker. And I'm reporting up to one board, and that's that. And that is, we feel, beneficial for a lot of reasons, from an accountability standpoint, from an operational standpoint, from a financing standpoint, to be able to clearly articulate, just as I think you folks have asked here: Who's in charge?

And then certainly to your other point, without going into confidential details, it's not about being reimbursed or anything like that. When you value equity of something, you're going to look at the potential future cash flows that something might generate to that equity, and then you're going to apply certain discount factors based on the risks, or the perceived risks. Obviously, as the project moves
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forward toward financial closing and commencement of construction and commencement of operation, the risks go down, down, down.

So, for us, we feel it's also a good business arrangement that allows us to remain a part of this, what we feel is a really good project that we've owned for a long time and taken very far along, but also be able to realize some, you know, benefit for our work.
Q. In your testimony on Exhibit 33, Page 8 -and if you want, $I$ can just read you the sentence rather than scamble for the documents. But that's where it is.
A. (Bartoszek) Sure.
Q. There's a reference to the REC pricing that I'd like you to clarify. At the top of Page 8 it says the price for such RECs -these are the ones that PSNH will purchase -- is based on the New Hampshire Alternative Compliance payment. What does that sentence mean?
A. (Bartoszek) It would be hard for me to
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clarify that a lot further without being -I think it would be more appropriately done in the confidential session, if you don't mind.
Q. All right. That's fair. Thank you.

On the materials that you submitted in response to a request from the Chairman at the beginning, or maybe the end of the first day, of who the participants are in NewCo and who the officers are in the various entities -- and that's been marked as SEC Exhibit 1 -- I wanted to ask you about a couple of the people who appear quite often in that exhibit and are also in some of the other project development documents.

Richard Cyr, $C-Y-R$, appears as a member of the board of NewCo, as a member of the board of Laidlaw Berlin BioPower, as the manager of Aware Energy Funding, and as a manager of PJPD. Is that correct?
A. (Bartoszek) Yes, I believe that's correct.
Q. And he also lives in New Hampshire?
A. (Bartoszek) That's correct.
Q. Can you tell us more about Mr. Cyr? I know
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we have a brief paragraph about him. But he's obviously a significant player in the this whole project picture.
A. (Bartoszek) I know Mr. Cyr as a very successful businessman. And, obviously, his biography is included in the documents. I'm not sure, really, what more you'd like to know. I think he's a very well-respected businessman in New Hampshire. And it's hard for me to speak for him, unless there's anything more specific you're looking for.
Q. I don't have any information to the contrary. I just really don't know. Experience with energy facilities?
A. (Bartoszek) I think that the individuals -certainly Mr. Mueller, who has extensive experience in Accenture's utility practice, and Mr. Ferree, who has extensive experience, hands-on experience building power plants -- bring tremendous oversight experience to the board of these organizations. It's not untypical to see -or atypical to see someone with just a general strong business background on a
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board of directors who may not necessarily have industry-specific experience to function as a director of the company, to bring that viewpoint.

So, Mr. Cyr is a very successful businessman in his own right. I don't know that he has specific energy-industry experience, other than his investments in this project.
Q. Mr. Desrosiers is also a name that's listed here as a manager of NewCo, and also says he's from New Hampshire; correct?
A. (Bartoszek) Correct.
Q. And I don't -- I think there is a brief paragraph. I've forgotten. Can you tell me more about Mr. Desrosiers?
A. (Bartoszek) I know Mr. Derosiers' job is mainly administrative. I don't believe he holds any board positions of oversight with respect to our organization.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm sorry to interrupt. I had mentioned to Mr. Iacopino before we had lunch that Keith Mueller is actually here from NewCo. And to the extent that
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the Committee would find it helpful to hear from him at any point, he is available as well.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: Thank you.
And he is a member of the NewCo Energy board and an investor?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. And also on the oversight board of LBB.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: All right.
Thank you.
BY CMSR. IGNATIUS:
Q. Are some of the key people in this project also participants in other projects of yours?
A. (Bartoszek) No. We forged this business relationship solely with respect to this project. We certainly considered other business arrangements, but we don't have any other formal business arrangement in another project at this time.
Q. So, PJPD isn't part of other biomass ventures that you may have either operating or under development?
A. (Bartoszek) No. Quite to the contrary.

These are all special-purpose entities
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formed for the express purpose of ownership in this project. So they would not hold any other investments in any other activities.
Q. And the principals involved in those?

Similarly not involved? I know PJPD, for example, may be a single entity, single-purpose entity. But the people involved in that, or Aware Funding, for example, are they part of sort of a team you've worked with in other projects?
A. (Bartoszek) That's really how I was answering your question. Certainly we have a relationship with these folks that we've formed over the last couple years. And we considered other business arrangements, but we have no other formalized business arrangements at this point.
Q. I think every other thing I have relates to confidential matters, so that's it for now. I appreciate your time.
A. (Bartoszek) Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Ms. Ignatius.
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INTERROGATORIES BY CHAIRMAN BURACK:
Q. Mr. Bartoszek, I'm going to give you a little bit of an intermission here to catch your breath, and we'll talk to the Maytag salesman -- the Maytag repairman, I should say.
A. (Bartoszek) That's great.
Q. Seems to be wondering why he's here, perhaps.

Mr. Strickler, could you please summarize for us what it is that you believe, first, Homeland, and then Fibrowatt, brings to the table in terms of expertise and qualifications to enable us to get this job done?

And before I do that, I seem to -- before I ask you to answer those questions, I seem to recall that we do have your brief biography someplace here. Can you refresh our recollection where that is, perhaps?
A. (Strickler) I think in my testimony, amended testimony of August $16 t h$.
Q. And that is exhibit?
A. (Strickler) Exhibit 52.
Q. Exhibit 52. Thank you.
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Can you summarize for us, please -- and again, we're looking at the first page of your amended testimony, which, again, is Exhibit 52.

Can you summarize your educational background.
A. (Strickler) Sure. I have a B.S. in mechanical engineering from the University of Delaware. I have a professional engineer's license from the State of Delaware. I've been working on Fibrowatt projects since 2000, and prior to that worked on other alternative energy projects as a developer, construction manager and operations manager for 10 or 15 years prior to that.
Q. So has your entire professional life been spent in the arena of energy and alternate energy?
A. (Strickler) Yes, it has.
Q. Thank you. And you joined Homeland in what year?
A. (Strickler) Actually, if I start with Fibrowatt --
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Q. Sure.
A. (Strickler) -- I started with them as a consultant in '99 and became their first employee in the United States in 2000. Homeland purchased or acquired Fiberwatt's interest in the U.S. in 2003, I believe. So I became an employee, effectively -- or we're still an employee of Fibrowatt, but Homeland owns Fibrowatt as a holding company.
Q. And what has been the largest project that you have worked on development of since you joined Fibrowatt?
A. (Strickler) The Fibrominn project in Benson, Minnesota. It's a 55-megawatt, poultry waste and some biomass project in Minnesota.
Q. And what was your role with respect to that project?
A. (Strickler) I was responsible for the development of that project and the construction and operations, and continue to be responsible for the operations of that project today.
Q. Did that project -- similar to the way this
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was proposed to be handled, did that project involve a pre-EPC contract and an EPC contract?
A. (Strickler) Absolutely same approach was used. As being involved in this project, Homeland's been involved in this project well over a year now. So we brought that approach to this project, going in and entering into a pre-EPC contract in advance of a full EPC contract.
Q. Is it the expectation of the parties that you personally, Mr. Strickler, will remain involved in this project --
A. (Strickler) Yes.
Q. -- through the next 26, 32 months, assuming it receives a certificate?
A. (Strickler) Yes, and will continue during the operations phase as well is my expectation.
Q. What are you anticipating to be your role during both of those two phases?
A. (Strickler) Ultimately responsible for providing the service under the agreements that we've outlined today under the
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construction services and development -construction services agreement. Ultimately responsible for meeting those obligations and performing the work that's dictated under those agreements, which is essentially the development services and completing the development of the project; and then oversight of the construction of the project -- essentially, overseeing the EPC contract with $B \& W$; and then, following that, operations, ultimately responsible for the operation services agreement, making sure that we comply, live up to all the obligations and responsibilities under that agreement on behalf of Fibrowatt Operations.
Q. So if I can summarize, you effectively are going to be the key person, the lead for the entire project development team in overseeing Babcock \& Wilcox's work to actually get this project up and running.
A. (Strickler) To be clear, I will be responsible, ultimately responsible. I have construction managers, I have operations vice-presidents that work for me that will
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be involved in each of those phases, providing their specific expertise, their specific experience that they bring to the table in those areas, including operations, engineering and process reviews. We have a fairly significant, for a small company, a significant engineering presence and background of all of our people that work under me.
Q. Thank you. Is Ronald Davies one of those people --
A. (Strickler) That's right. Correct.
Q. -- you would be relying upon?
A. (Strickler) Yes, during the operations.
Q. I note that in Footnote 19 at the bottom of Pages 90 to 91 of exhibit -- Applicant's Exhibit 1, there's a fairly extensive biography, or biographical information regarding Mr. Davies.

Is it your expectation that Mr. Davies is going to be moving to New Hampshire as part of this process?
A. (Strickler) As I testified earlier, what we do is we have -- we will have a plant
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manager who will be in Berlin every day, you know, ultimately responsible for the day-to-day operations of the facility, who will report to Mr . Davies.
Q. And Mr. Davies will remain in Minnesota?
A. (Strickler) No. He's in our corporate offices in Pennsylvania.
Q. And where will your offices be during the time of the development of the project?
A. (Strickler) I'll be in our corporate offices in Pennsylvania. If I might add?
Q. Please.
A. (Strickler) That's the same structure we now have with our Fibrominn project, where the plant manager is on site in the town of Benson every day. He reports to Ron Davies. And I would say that, based on my experience, this is a typical approach. It brings -- it allows us to have one person be able to bring, through Ron Davies, all of the necessary resources to bear to assist the plant manager in the operations of the plant, whether it be environmental, whether it be engineering or technical, whether it
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be any kind of construction activity that might be required during operations.
Q. Thank you. I apologize, as I did not structure my question here very well of you. But I started with a question relating to what you feel these two entities, Homeland and Fibrowatt, bring to the table in terms of experience and qualifications. We've gone through various aspects of that. Is there anything that you think is important for the Subcommittee to be aware of with respect to either of these entities, beyond what we've already discussed here?
A. (Strickler) I think I might add that, during the construction phase, the oversight role that we're going to be playing, it's a function we've done before with respect to the Minnesota project, we're doing on other projects that we develop -- or, in fact, others might develop. And we've got a core group of people who work together to make sure that the contract is adhered to, that any issues that might come up under that contract, be technical or even non-technical
\{SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 3 - PM SESSION] \{08-25-10\}
[WITNESS PANEL: STRICKLER/BARTOSZEK]
matters, are dealt with effectively and quickly. At the end, our role is to make sure the plant gets built on time and within budget, and making sure the EPC contractor complies with all the requirements.
Q. Thank you. Now, as I understand it, the Fibrowatt project you described is a poultry litter project?
A. (Strickler) That's correct.
Q. The other projects -- and I've been online and looked at other aspects of the Fibrowatt Web site. Other projects that you're exploring, am I correct, are all related to poultry litter?
A. (Strickler) That's correct. I would say that in Minnesota and -- the Minnesota project and all of the other projects, poultry litter projects we're involved with, do use a certain amount of bio -- of wood chips, similar fuel we'd use here in the LBB project. And so we're very familiar with handling and operating and combusting wood waste of the nature we're going to be using here in the Berlin project.
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Q. So you feel that your company collectively has the experience with construction and operation --
A. (Strickler) Correct. Absolutely.
Q. Just let me finish my question.
A. (Strickler) I'm sorry.
Q. You feel your company has the experience and qualifications to be able to manage the construction of and the operation of a facility such as that's being discussed here in Berlin?
A. (Strickler) Absolutely.
Q. Thank you. Okay. We've worked the Maytag repairman here.

Mr. Bartoszek, if you don't mind, I'd like to just come back to you for a few minutes here.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: And then
we'll take a break, unless anybody has further questions of this panel, and we will then turn to Ms. Laflamme.

BY CHAIRMAN BURACK:
Q. But Mr. Bartoszek, $I$ wonder if you would please do the same for us as Mr. Bravakis
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did yesterday -- and that is, let your hair down a little bit and tell us about your background.

We heard earlier that you attended both Rutgers and DePaul University but did not graduate from either of those institutions; is that right?
A. (Bartoszek) That's correct.
Q. What did you do after you left school, and what has been your trajectory? What has been your professional life or other experiences that might be relevant to what we're talking about here today that has brought you to this point today?
A. (Bartoszek) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I spent about 10 years in the securities industry, where I worked initially with Merrill Lynch and with Bear Stearns and Oppenheimer \& Company.

My first job, basically I sold securities to corporate and institutional clients. Then, as I moved on in my career, when I got to Oppenheimer \& Company, I sat on the municipal bond trading desk, and $I$
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started to work with larger institutions. One such client, the LeFrak Organization, is a large real estate development company in New York City, probably one of the largest --
Q. Sorry. What was the name of the company?
A. (Bartoszek) L-E, capital F, R-A-K. Probably one of the largest privately-held real estate concerns in probably in the U.S. Started to get involved more in project finance, where municipal bonds were utilized to finance private activity purposes; and similarly, when $I$ went on to First Albany Corporation, which is another regional broker-dealer in New York, held a similar role.

When $I$ went on subsequently to a firm by the name of Ricklen \& Associates, I went there with the purpose of starting a project finance group. And myself and some colleagues focused specifically on raising capital, acquisitions, divestitures and providing financial advice in connection with major capital projects.
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One of the clients $I$ represented and one of the projects that $I$ was involved in that was very successful, we worked with a company called KMS Energy, which we subsequently represented in connection with the initial public offering of the KMS Power Income Fund. Basically, we acted as financial advisor to KMS in connection with the accumulation of several different power-generation assets and then the acquisition of a large, municipal solid-waste facility based in Ontario, Canada. We financed the acquisition of that with initial -- by arranging initial capital and then subsequently a large initial public offering in Canada of the KMS Power Income Fund. And I continued to represent other similar independent power producers of that type, in addition to doing other types of financing of major capital projects.

Another example of one of our clients would be the CanFibre organization, K-A-N F-I-B-R-E [sic], who constructed medium-density fiberboard facilities in both
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New York and in Riverside, California. These were projects that were underwritten with tax-exempt bonds in excess of a hundred million dollars, both of which were underwritten by Merrill Lynch. And we acted as financial advisor to CanFibre in connection with the assembly of that project financing and the successful financing of those projects.

I went on to -- part of my business involved I guess what are commonly called workouts, where you work with arranging financing for turnaround-type situations or stress situations. So I took a role as CEO of a brokerage and asset management firm, W.R. Lazard, Laidlaw \& Mead. And the purpose of that role was to oversee the -well, it was to attempt to reorganize the firm, or, if unsuccessful, to oversee the disposition of the firm's assets. And that's what we ultimately did. The firm had somewhere between 3 and 4 billion in assets under management at the time, in addition to a broker-dealer business. And we basically
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had to unwind and wind down that transaction. So, acted as a representative of the company in its bankruptcy filing in the Southern District of New York.

And ultimately, after winding down that project, I formed -- at that time is when I formed Laidlaw Energy.
Q. What year would this be now?
A. (Bartoszek) Be 1999.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Bartoszek) So, 1999, I was asked to represent a client who was seeking to sell a power plant. And we -- in the state of New York. And we went around and tried to find buyers. And the responses we got were never -- weren't very attractive. So, having done transactions for a number of years, you sometimes find how you do a lot of work for little glory. Transactions fall apart many times and get put back together. So that started prompting me to think that perhaps this would be an attractive acquisition opportunity, to start my own business endeavor. So I raised some
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capital. I contributed equity and arranged some debt financing, and we acquired that -or I acquired that power plant, which I owned and operated for a few years.
Q. And again, this power plant was what? What was its name and where was it located?
A. (Bartoszek) This is called Laidlaw Energy Environmental. It's located in Ellicottville, New York.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Bartoszek) So we bought the facility in 1999, and we operated for a few years as a natural gas-fired facility. And we were -you know, I guess you'd say we were faced with a number of challenges. The natural gas marketplace -- prices of natural gas increased dramatically during the time of our ownership. And notwithstanding our holding a long-term -- or holding a contract for natural gas, the providers of natural gas to the facility decided not to honor that agreement; so we were forced to try to find alternatives. And it was at that point that we approached the New York State Energy
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Research and Development Authority and discussed the idea of converting the facility to biomass fuel. Got a very good reception. But ultimately, this was an idea that our lenders didn't want to go for. So we ultimately ended up selling our equity interests in that project profitably and moved on to other ventures. At that point $I$ formed Laidlaw Energy Group, with the objective of focusing on alternative energy projects.

We also subsequently reacquired the Ellicottville project and spent a number of a years trying to continue to operate it as a biomass facility. But basically in 2003, we shifted our focus entirely to beyond alternative energy projects and acquiring equity interest in alternative energy projects and in developing projects of this type.
Q. Thank you for that comprehensive background. It's helpful to understand your background in the financial industry, because I think it helps us to understand how it is you
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might be able to explain a few other things to us now.

Trying to understand why you would have formed the Aware Fund to provide funding to PJPD. Why wasn't funding provided directly to PJPD by funding entities?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't form it. But my understanding is it's just simply to limit liability, just to -- NewCo would lend -- invest money in Aware; and Aware, in turn, would lend money to PJPD to formalize that arrangement to record the loan between the two entities, and to limit liability between the various special-purpose entities. It's a pretty common approach in the power industry to have these multiple special-purpose entities for limiting liability purposes.
Q. Thank you. I'd like to ask you to turn now to Committee Exhibit 1A, which was provided to us this morning. This is entitled "NewCo Energy, LLC, (a Development Stage Enterprise) Balance Sheets." This is as of December 31, 2009 and August 16th, 2010.
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And it reads "Unaudited." Do you have that document in front of you? It's just a one-page document.
A. (Bartoszek) Yes, sir.
Q. Thank you. Could you please, very briefly, and as succinctly as you can, walk us through this document and explain to us what is being -- what we're being told about the assets and liabilities and equity positions of NewCo Energy specifically.
A. (Bartoszek) Well -- certainly. NewCo is we see at the top of the chart. And since the transaction for the acquisition of the interest of the -- membership interest of the Applicant has not yet closed, that is not incorporated into this financial statement, but the entities down the left side of the chart would be. So this is a consolidated -- or actually -- I'm sorry. I believe it is a consolidated balance sheet. It's not marked as such.
Q. So I'm sorry. Just to be clear, this essentially is showing us the assets and liabilities relating to Aware Fund and PJPD.
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This does not include Laidlaw Berlin BioPower, LLC's assets; is that correct?
A. (Bartoszek) That's correct.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Bartoszek) But it would reflect the investment in Laidlaw Berlin BioPower, because, as you may recall, NewCo was the equity funding to LaidLaw Berlin BioPower. So, presumably that would be reflected on this balance sheet.
Q. So if we can just -- maybe I'll just try to lead you through it here.

If we go down to, first, current assets, cash and cash equivalents, there's \$100. That's the equity that's essentially been put in as cash initially; is that right? What does the $\$ 100$ represent?
A. (Bartoszek) Yes. Essentially, it's just a placeholder for cash on the balance sheet. As the cash has been contributed to NewCo, it's being deployed to finance the ownership of the assets you see under property and equipment, and to fund those development costs. So it doesn't -- as a
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special-purpose entity, it does not hold a lot of excess cash.
Q. Thank you. So the next heading here is Property and Equipment at Cost. And the first line is construction in progress, lands and buildings. And for both 2009 and 2010, do you agree that it shows a figure of $\$ 5,579,577$ ? What does that number represent?
A. (Bartoszek) My understanding is that represents the acquisition, cost of the acquisition of the former Burgess Mill assets, as well as costs contributed to the development of the project.
Q. Thank you. And the next line, equipment, shows $\$ 623,801$. What is that?
A. (Bartoszek) Again, Mr. Chairman, it might be best to explain that all three lines include -- or certainly the top two lines -land and buildings, and the second line, equipment, includes costs associated with the acquisition of the physical assets of the former Burgess Mill site separated into two categories: Land and buildings, and
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moveable equipment.
Q. Thank you. And the next line, then, development costs, appears that that figure from the 2009 date to the 2010 date increased by some $\$ 3$ million. And that's construction in progress, development costs. Can you explain to us why that increased over that time frame?
A. (Bartoszek) Sure. That reflects capitalized capital contributions to the development of the project. So, as cash is being contributed from NewCo to LBB for the purposes of paying for the development of the project, it's being put on the balance sheet, and it's capitalized on the balance sheet as an asset.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Under the Other Assets heading there is a line for investment deposit, and it shows $\$ 0$ in 2009, but $\$ 500,000$ in 2010. What does that $\$ 500,000$ represent?
A. (Bartoszek) I'm not sure. We do have deposits for collateral purposes with ISO-New England. But I'm not sure if it's
\{SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 3 - PM SESSION] \{08-25-10\}
[WITNESS PANEL: STRICKLER/BARTOSZEK]
that entry.
I should probably note that this balance sheet was prepared by NewCo. So it was not prepared by myself, so I'm not necessarily familiar with every entry on here.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. I'm going to ask counsel if they'd let us know what that figure represents.

BY CHAIRMAN BURACK:
Q. Do you know what the next line, $\$ 21,439$ in security deposits represents?
A. (Bartoszek) I don't.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Can you briefly summarize for us what your understanding might be of the liabilities and members' equity section of this balance sheet is?
A. (Bartoszek) Presumably, Mr. Chairman, that represents the capital contributions of the various people you saw listed in the other part of the exhibit, the folks who are identified as the current and former Accenture Utility Group members --
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basically, the capital contributed by the investors of NewCo.
Q. Thank you. So, would it be your understanding -- or would you conclude from looking at this, that the total equity available to this project through NewCo Energy as of December 31, 2009 was $\$ 9,155,215 ?$ Is that correct?
A. (Bartoszek) Correct.
Q. This is just members' equity?
A. (Bartoszek) Yes. Correct.
Q. And that the total liabilities and members' equity as of December 31, 2009 was \$9,482,309; is that correct? I'm just looking at the bottom line of that first page.
A. (Bartoszek) Oh, yes. I'm sorry. Correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And then as of August 16 of 2010, the total equity had increased; is that correct?
A. (Bartoszek) Yes, that's correct.
Q. And what did that increase to?
A. (Bartoszek) My understanding is that would be additional investment.
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Q. Okay. So the additional investment resulted in an increase to $\$ 9,405,215$; right?
A. (Bartoszek) Correct.
Q. And there was also an increase in the liabilities there as well in 2010; is that right?
A. (Bartoszek) That's correct. The additional capital contributed to finance development costs. The additional approximately \$3 million in development costs was represented on the balance sheet as a loan; and hence, it resulted in the increase in the current liabilities column to offset the increase in the development costs line item on the assets section.
Q. So what's your understanding, then, of the total liabilities and members' equity as of August 16, 2010? What's that dollar amount?
A. (Bartoszek) $\$ 13,044,931$.
Q. Thank you. Is there anything about this balance sheet that you think would be important for this Committee to understand that we have not discussed?
A. (Bartoszek) I think the only thing I might
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point out -- and I'm not sure to what extent this touches on information in the confidential session, Mr. Chairman -- but my understanding and my recollection is there are additional capital commitments available to the project from NewCo under certain contracts that I believe have been provided confidentially. So the equity you see reflected here may not account for those additional contributions that are available as equity to the project.
Q. But your understanding is that we would be able to ascertain that by looking at, would it be the NewCo membership agreement or the -- where would those be articulated?
A. (Bartoszek) I believe that it is referenced in the development agreement or the amendment to the development agreement provided as one of the confidential documents to the Committee.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Bartoszek) I also -- maybe correct me if I'm mistaken. I think it might also have been mentioned in response to one of the
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interrogatories, I believe, from Public Counsel. It was identified as a certain amount of additional capital that was identified as being available to the project as of that date of that response.
Q. Thank you.

MR. NORTHROP: I'm sorry if
this has already been asked. But looking at all of this, is really the only asset that belongs to LaidLaw Berlin BioPower the lease?

MR. BARTOSZEK: Generally --
and I don't mean to be -- to give you a clever answer. But material contracts could be considered assets. So they may not be balance sheet assets. But, for example, the power purchase agreement, which is -- to which Laidlaw Berlin BioPower is a counter-signatory, obviously presents value to $L B B$ and is, therefore, an asset, although may not be reflected on the balance sheet. Similarly, the lease would not be reflected on the balance sheet. But that statement is basically correct. The material contracts are the primary assets of LBB.
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INTERROGATORIES BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. So where do the parties go if the situation arises, where do they go to seek compensation if there's, for instance, a violation of your certificate, there's a violation of your agreement with the City or any of the other agreements that you've made?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, it's a little bit challenging to answer because it sounds like you're sort of asking me for a legal conclusion. But I'd say that, obviously, limited liability companies are formed for the purpose of limiting liabilities. So the Applicant's going to contain all assets of the project. And it depends on what snapshot in time you look at. If you look at the as-constructed plane, it's obviously going to contain all the assets of the --
Q. That's not. That's going to belong to PJPD under this; right? The equipment, the building, the land all belongs to PJPD. It's leased to Laidlaw; correct?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, the senior lender, the
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folks who financed the project are going to hold the assets, all of the assets, including material contracts, as collateral for that loan. So what $I$ think is ultimately going to happen -- or what I'm quite sure is ultimately going to happen is you're going to see the consolidation of these entities at the time financing occurs, so that the lender ensures that he's adequately collateralized; and presumably, that entity is going to assume all of the obligations of the Applicant, if it's not the Applicant itself to which everything is consolidated into. More than likely, it's going to be a newly formed, bankruptcy-remote, special-purpose entity. Obviously, everything's going to be assigned to that entity as the project company. So ultimately, that entity -- that one entity is going to be responsible for everything.
Q. So what you're telling us is that there will be another restructuring that will occur at the time that you close on your financing.
A. (Bartoszek) Restructuring is probably not
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the correct word. I mean, as part of a financial closing, the investors may require a newly formed special-purpose entity because they would be concerned about historical or contingent liabilities. So really what they're going to do is they're going to want a brand new special-purpose entity that's going to hold everything at that time. So I wouldn't characterize that as a restructuring. I would characterize that as kind of a customary way a financing of this type is done.
Q. Sort of a customary restructuring.

The reason $I$ ask is because it's not uncommon in our orders to require that, if there's a change of ownership, that you have to come back and present that to the Committee. So I ask for that reason. The other reason $I$ ask is, if there's a violation of any of the conditions of the certificate, is NewCo Energy -- which appears to be where the money actually is -is NewCo Energy going to be the entity to whom the Site Evaluation Committee should
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look if there's some kind of violation or something that involves problems with the plant?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, the project company is the -- I'm not trying to suggest a change of ownership. That's probably why I shied away from using the term "restructuring."

Clearly what we're trying to show here is somebody's selling their equity and somebody's buying it. If you want to call it restructuring, whatever you want to call it. I'm not trying to suggest that that's going to occur again at the financial closing. I'm simply trying to suggest that, while $I$ can't tell you exactly, some entity is going to have to hold all of the collateral at closing, at financial closing. And that entity is either going to be the Applicant or it's going to be some immediate successor to the Applicant formed at the closing for that express purpose, and it'll be basically all the same people who assign all of this to that. So maybe I'm giving you too much information. But $I$ would say
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the Applicant is the one who's ultimately going to be responsible for everything.
Q. No, sir. I'm trying to get all of the information, because I think it -- we've seen many energy projects come through this Committee. And you might say that this is typical. But this is not that typical, at least to what we've seen in this Committee. I mean, we've seen a lot of special-purpose entities that sort of go up the ladder. But where you have sort of these two arms coming off of where the real assets are with NewCo and then this lease-back arrangement, that is different than this Committee has seen in a very long time, and that's why I'm asking about it.

And I guess the question is: Is NewCo willing to guarantee the conditions of the certificate?
A. (Bartoszek) Well, I can't --
Q. Or do you know?
A. (Bartoszek) I'd have to -- I can't answer that question.

MR. IACOPINO: I have no other
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questions.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Any other questions at this time?

MR. HARRINGTON: Just one
follow-up.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr.
Harrington.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Right along what you just said, it has to do with Public Counsel 2, which is the agreement for addressing the PCB contamination. This kind of goes along with what Mr . Iacopino was just talking about.

Given that PJPD will actually own the land, are they the ones who are going to be the assigned -- assignee under this agreement with Fraser? Or is it going to go to Laidlaw, who will run the project? I guess they lease the property?
A. (Bartoszek) That's correct. The lessee is responsible for paying all obligations of the project and for taking responsibility for all -- any of the obligations under those agreements.
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Q. So they would be responsible to pick up Fraser's responsibilities under this agreement with the EPA.
A. (Bartoszek) I'm not sure. Fraser's responsibilities --
Q. I'm referring to Public Counsel's Exhibit No. 2, which is an agreement for addressing PCB contamination on the T1 Transformer area in the Burgess Mill. And it says anybody who is an assigned under the agreement, is Fraser's assigned under the agreement. And I'm trying to determine if that's going to be Laidlaw or PJPD or NewCo Energy.
A. (Bartoszek) My understanding -- and we may need to do a little clarification. But my understanding is that issue is currently managed by Fraser, though it may sit on our physical property. It is dealt with and handled by Fraser. So, financial responsibility I believe is the responsibility of the Applicant. But the actual responsibility for maintaining the area in question is Fraser's. That's my understanding. But we may need to clarify.
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Q. Can you get back to us on that, please? MR. NEEDLEMAN: Actually, I may be able to clarify that now. It was one of the questions the Committee asked us yesterday. And I meant to go over it this morning with Mr. Frecker and forgot to do that.

When we looked at it last night, I believe the way it works is that PJPD, as the owner of the property, is the successor and assigned. Prior to the time that this lease is executed at closing, under the development agreement, Laidlaw is the current operator of the site and has responsibility for maintaining the integrity of the T1 area, which essentially means just respecting the fence line and ensuring that the impervious cap on the site remains in place and that has been done.

Laidlaw will have the same responsibility under the lease when that is executed. And the development of the site as it's contemplated, and as you see in that drawing, is that it will not in any way affect that area. And I think during the site tour that area was actually pointed out to you. So that's
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my understanding of how this will work.
MR. HARRINGTON: And again, so Laidlaw will be responsible for maintaining it in its present status; but PJPD, as the owner of the land, will have responsibility for what? Nothing or --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, PJPD, as the purchaser of the land, from NEDC I think it was, becomes assignee under the agreement. But PJPD then has the arrangement where Laidlaw is on the property. PJPD is not. So PJPD had to ensure that whatever entity was on the property respected the integrity of the $T 1$ area. And they do that initially through the development agreement and then subsequently through the lease.

MR. HARRINGTON: But if there was a problem with non-compliance with this agreement, it would be the responsibility of PJPD to remedy that; maybe getting Laidlaw to do something, but they're the ones held responsible.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think that's correct. I mean, ultimately, they're the property owner. They must be responsible. They
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may have contractual recourse to $L B B$, but they're still responsible.

MR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you,

Mr. Harrington.
We will take a 10-minute
break. And we will come back here at five minutes of four, and we will do our best -- we'll see how long the questioning goes. We'll do our best and see if we can get through Ms. Laflamme's testimony here. We appreciate everybody's patience. Thank you.
(Discussion off the record.)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Go back on
the record.
I apologize. I didn't check
to see if anybody had additional questions for these folks.

Did you, Counsel, have
additional direct for these --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Not at this point.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Do
others have additional questions?
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MR. RODIER: Just a few.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay.
Again, I made a commitment to Ms. Laflamme that we would do everything we could to get through her testimony today. I hope you gentlemen are available still tomorrow?

MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. I
think that's what we'll have to do. So we'll have to take Ms. Laflamme next and we'll have to come back to wrap up this panel.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's fine.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank you.
(Whereupon a recess taken was 3:55 p.m., and the hearing was resumed at 4:10 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: We're going to resume here. And before we hear from our next witness, I'm going to ask Attorney Iacopino to mark a couple of documents for the record.
(Laidlaw Exhibit 38A marked for
identification.)
(City of Berlin Exhibit 5 marked for
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## identification.)

MR. IACOPINO: Yes, Your
Honor -- Mr. Chairman. I've been provided with an additional exhibit, a confidential exhibit from the Applicant. I've been advised that it was intended to be presented in their exhibit book that they provided, although it was left out by accident. So what we've done is we've marked it as Applicant Exhibit 38A, Confidential. And I'm going to pass that out to Committee members. If you could put that in your notebook Section 38. The ones I'm passing out, though, aren't marked.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we were provided today with an amended version of exhibit -- of City of Berlin's Exhibit No. 1, and that has now -- the amended version has been marked as Berlin 5. And I understand that Ms. Laflamme will be testifying about that exhibit and perhaps differences between that exhibit and Exhibit 1. Now, just so the record's clear and the Committee understands, this Berlin 5, the title that is printed on the cover still says "City of Berlin Exhibit 1"; however, it's been
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amended, and the amended version has been marked as Exhibit 5. So you want to keep your copies marked accordingly. And that's it for new exhibits.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay.
Attorney Van Oot, please proceed.
MR. VAN OOT: First, I'd like to thank the Chair and the Committee and the other parties for allowing Ms. Laflamme to go on at this time so that she can go back to her work and, in this case, back to her vacation.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Before you proceed, I realize we need to have the witness take an oath, be sworn.
(Whereupon the witness was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.) PAMELA E. LAFLAMME, SWORN

MR. VAN OOT: Thank you very much.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. VAN OOT:
Q. Ms. Laflamme, would you please, just for the record, state your name and title.
A. My name is Pamela Laflamme. I am the City
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Planner for the City of Berlin.
Q. And are you the sponsor for the City of Berlin Exhibits No. 1 and now 5, 1 through 5?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you tell the Committee whether there have been any significant changes to City of Berlin Exhibit No. 1 regarding the proposed stipulations with LaidLaw Berlin BioPower, LLC since the exhibits were submitted to the Committee on August 20th?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you please summarize those significant changes.
A. Yes. Okay. So what is now Exhibit No. 5, in Part III, Item No. 1, Truck Traffic Issues, the first four sentences have been revised to read as follows: "Laidlaw shall not allow wood fuel deliveries between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m. weekdays. Laidlaw shall not allow wood fuel deliveries before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. All deliveries are expressly subject to the noise levels specified in
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Part II, No. 1. And Laidlaw agrees to monitor noise levels at the property line on weekdays between 5:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. In the event that noise levels at the property line on weekdays between 5:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. exceeds 60 decibels, and such excesses are clearly attributable to fuel deliveries that are being made, then Laidlaw shall not allow wood deliveries before 6:00 a.m. on weekdays."
Q. Thank you. Are there additional significant changes to the proposed stipulation filed with the Commitee?
A. Yes. Also Exhibit 5, Part IV, No. 1, Community Benefits. The following sentence has been inserted following the fourth sentence: "In the event that the River Walk design developed by the City does not meet Laidlaw's expectations upon said review and comment, and the City does not wish to make further modifications in response to the City's comments, the parties agree to submit the dispute to private resolution process."
Q. Actually, I think there's a typo. It should
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be --
A. Thank you.
Q. -- "in response to Laidlaw comments."
A. Laidlaw, yes. That would be right.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I'm sorry.
We don't see that at all in the version that was just provided to us. So, again, could you -you're on Page 6 of this agreement?

MS. LAFLAMME: Oh, no. I'm on
page -- oh, yeah. No, I'm on Page 3.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: You are on
Page 3.
MS. LAFLAMME: Of No. 5. Oh, wait. I'm not on Page 3 of No. 5. I'm on my Page 3. But you're in Exhibit 5.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: We're on
Exhibit 5.
MS. LAFLAMME: That's on
Part IV, Item No. 1, which is on Page 6, perhaps, of the document you're holding?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: That's correct.

MS. LAFLAMME: And that was
following the fourth sentence.
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CHAIRMAN BURACK: There's long
sentences here. You're starting --
MS. LAFLAMME: Yes. Starts with the word "additionally" on Page 7 in the middle of that very long paragraph.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes. Okay.
MS. LAFLAMME: Am I correct,
Peter? Excuse me?
MR. VAN OOT: I'm sorry.
There may be some confusion. At least on our copy, on Page 6 there's a long paragraph. And it begins with the sentence, "In the event that the River Walk design developed by the City does not meet Laidlaw's expectations, and the City does not wish to make further modifications, the parties agree to submit the dispute to private resolution process." That is in our --

MR. SCHNIPPER: Is that in
there?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: That is in
there. It's just that we heard Ms. Laflamme insert some additional words after the terms "further modifications." At least that's what I thought I heard.
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MR. SCHNIPPER: In that

```
case --
```

(Court Reporter interjects.)
MR. VAN OOT: I'm sorry.
Thank you. What is in certificate -- Exhibit No. 5 would be the language that would stand. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. MR. VAN OOT: Thank you.

BY MR. VAN OOT:
Q. Now, if you could please proceed with the additional changes under Part IV-1.
A. Yes. In addition, the funding obligation of Laidlaw under Part IV, where we're still at No. 1, has been revised to provide that, "Laidlaw shall provide $\$ 325,000$ to reimburse the City for its design costs and permitting costs, which such remainder of the $\$ 325,000$ balance shall be placed into a maintenance fund accessible to the City for use in the maintenance of the River Walk and other costs and expenses incurred relating to the site evaluation process."
Q. And are there any other significant changes to the stipulations?
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A. Yes. In Roman Numeral -- the same Roman Numeral -- sorry, Community Benefits.

Part 13 of Community Benefits: "The funding by Laidlaw has been established at an amount not to exceed $\$ 125,000 . "$
Q. Thank you. And are you now prepared to adopt City of Berlin Exhibits No. 1 through 5 , as so revised, on behalf of the City of Berlin?
A. Yes.

MR. VAN OOT: Okay. Actually, there is one other additional revision that was provided in the copy of -- in Exhibit No. 5. And if I may, for the record, if I could please read it, Mr. Chairman, into the record and ask if you would also adopt these changes --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Sure. MR. VAN OOT: -- this change.

And this was actually in response to some questioning that was provided, I believe, on Monday. And that's a new Paragraph 14 under Part IV. And I'll just read it, if I may, for the record and then ask the witness if she'll confirm it.
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It reads as follows: "Laidlaw shall regularly consult with and inform the city fire department on its emergency and safety procedures, and shall maintain and submit to the city's emergency planning committee and fire department material data safety sheets, paren, MSDS, close paren, for any hazardous chemicals used or stored at the facility."

BY MR. VAN OOT:
Q. Would you confirm that that also -- that change has also been added --
A. Yes.
Q. -- to the exhibit?
A. Yes. Thank you.
Q. Thank you. So now are you prepared to adopt the City of Berlin Exhibits No. 1 through 5, as so revised, on behalf of the City of Berlin?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Thank you. And can you provide a brief summary of the City's objectives in negotiating the stipulation with the Applicant.
A. Sure. Well, $I$ would say primarily it comes
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down to quality-of-life issues and stewardship for the city; the health, the welfare of the community; economic development for the city. And the city, as you can see in the stipulations, really did focus on these quality-of-life issues -such as noise, the appearance of the facility, the grounds, the surrounding area, dust, traffic -- and worked really hard for community benefits that will work to enhance the community for not just the residents, but visitors to the area. And as we've said, this was from a lot of people in the community: A community group, planning board and the city council.
Q. Okay. And also there's under the subsurface scope of work under Part IV-13, the potential for long-term redevelopment and revitalization of the site by providing some baseline for the environmental conditions; is that correct?
A. Absolutely, yes. That would be helpful.
Q. Great.
A. Thank you.
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Q. Thank you.

MR. VAN OOT: And the witness is now available for cross-examination.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Going to first turn to Applicant's counsel, Attorney Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. I just two comments.

One, I wanted to thank Ms. Laflamme and the City for working with us to negotiate this. I think we reached a point where we have something that both parties are happy with and can live with. And it's been a good, productive process.

I also want to note that I
believe, if you look at Condition No. 13 in Section IV, there's supposed to be an Exhibit 1D. And I'm not sure we have that attached.

MR. SCHNIPPER: I'm sorry.
Well, it's -- that isn't in the new packet. It's in the original packet that was distributed on Monday.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay.
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MR. SCHNIPPER: So this packet
lacks that. But the Committee has Exhibit 1D, which was submitted to the Committee on Monday morning.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Can we -MR. VAN OOT: For the record, that's the scope of work for the Phase II environmental site characterization.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: And this is a document dated August 10, 2010 from New England EnviroStrategies, Inc., addressed to you, Attorney Van Oot?

MR. VAN OOT: Yes, Mr. Chair. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. I have nothing else.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Attorney Rodier, do you have something for this witness?

MR. RODIER: No, we have no questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much. Counsel for the Public?

MR. BROOKS: Thank you, Mr.
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Chairman.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. Thank you, Ms. Laflamme. A couple questions about the riverfront walk, which is great, I think, incorporation of public access.

I believe the way the agreement is structured is that there's a payment from Laidlaw of something like $\$ 325,000$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's going to cover some of the upfront design work and other things you may have already started or completed.
A. We have not started.
Q. Okay. Do you know how much will be left over for actual maintenance of the walk? Do you have an estimate of that?
A. We only have a very preliminary estimate as to the cost of the design and the construction oversight, and that comes up to be 150,000, I believe. Somewhere in that vicinity. And so the rest would be left for us to develop a maintenance fund or whatever else to support the project.
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Q. Okay. And has the City or Laidlaw done any kind of calculation on whether that's sufficient for the maintenance, the long-term maintenance of the access way?
A. I don't believe that that has actually been figured out at this point.
Q. Obviously, the walk is going to be right next to the industrial section right there, but also right next to the ball fields on the southwest side.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. So, any consideration of -- I know it's going to be closed during the winter months, I believe. But any consideration of crime-prevention, like providing adequate lighting or motion-sensor lights or something like that out there?
A. Lighting. We do want lighting in the plan. We want lighting in the plan. I'll stop there.
Q. I believe the testimony previously was that the walk is going to go very close and actually abut on the T1 transformer site that's fenced off. Have studies already
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been done around that site, and maybe even along the rest of the walk, about whether it can be constructed without disturbing anything under the ground or anything that might cause a problem?
A. The engineer that gave us the initial preliminary proposal indicated that that would come up during the design process and that they felt confident that they could somehow go around it. And I think that might come up even in the preliminary landscaping scope that Laidlaw -- actually, it's one of the exhibits in here as well.
Q. And I assume that the walkway is going to be pavement?
A. No, it likely will not be paved. I don't believe it will be able to. It's right along the river, and I don't believe that they're able to actually use pavement due to new shoreline protection rules.
Q. Okay. That was part --
A. That's what I'm led to understand.
Q. Yeah, that was part of my question, too.

Several of the areas do overlap into at
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least the 50-foot zone. Not all of it's going to be, in some respect, within the shoreline zone, but --
A. Correct.
Q. Have those preliminary discussions with the shoreline program and DES taken place?
A. Only very, very preliminarily through the engineer that we have talked to. He's had a few side conversations, but nothing formal.
Q. Okay. Do you know what the surface is that's proposed?
A. They indicated that they had just done a project in Littleton. And I can't recall what -- it's some sort of, obviously, non-permeable design. But it wasn't... I can't recall. I don't remember. But it wasn't pavement and it wasn't stone dust. It was something that was more permeable than that.
Q. Well, $I$ know DES has kind of a little pilot going on in that parking lot with some permeable, looks like pavement type of material. I don't know if that's what you're --
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A. We'd be willing to look into whatever material works for the project.
Q. Where does the, let's say, the northeast side of the walk connect to? Can you access it from both sides right now, or do you have to wait for further development to get out on that --
A. We would have to wait for further development to go further.
Q. And the other side, like you said, comes out on, what is it? Community Street --
A. Yes.
Q. -- down there? And I assume there's no opportunity in the future to continue the riverfront portion because there's a substation or something kind of blocking on the other side next to the ball field. That's my recollection, anyway.
A. There is something that would probably prevent it from being contiguous. But perhaps we could go around it again, depending on how much space there is between that and the ball fields.
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be kind of down on Community Street a few hundred feet?
A. Yes. That would likely be -- I forget which exhibit. But there is mention of a 17- or so, approximately, space parking lot that can be used for the walkway or for the ball fields.
Q. And do you know, is parking permitted on Community Street? I ask that partly because --
A. Community Street, I believe, yes.
Q. That's good. Because I asked that partly because I parked on that myself. So I wanted to know --
A. Excellent.
Q. -- if $I$ was doing the right thing.
A. That's fine.
Q. Okay. I think that's all the questions I have.

Do you have any questions?
MR. ROTH: I have a couple.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. I noticed there were a number of important
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restrictions -- things like noise, appearance and other things.

And I guess I should have said this first. But I think, you know, from counsel for the public's perspective, we're glad that the City got involved and worked out such a nice agreement. It actually made our job somewhat easier, knowing that you had capable eyes and your own attention on it.

The questions -- the first question I have is, I noticed that there does not appear to be any specified consequences for the Applicant for failing to abide by any of the limitations in here. What's your understanding of what would be the consequences if, for example, the project violated the noise limitations?
A. I do not know the answer to that. MR. VAN OOT: If I may, we would anticipate that they would also become part of the certificate and, therefore, could be potentially enforced by other parties than the City.

BY MR. ROTH:
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Q. Okay. My second question has to do with Part III -- or Part IV, Paragraph 8. Do you mind reading that paragraph for the --
A. Where are you? I'm sorry.
Q. Paragraph 8 of Part IV.
A. Oh, Part IV.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Can you give us a page number, please?

MR. ROTH: It's in the middle of Page 8.
A. So you mean Item 8. Okay. "To the extent feasible and economically reasonable..." is that where we are?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. "...Laidlaw shall use its best efforts to prioritize the purchase of wood fuel from local owner/operators, so long as the fuel is procured from timber harvests that adhere to Laidlaw's sustainability and procurement policies."
Q. Do you understand the use of the term "local owner/operators" to mean residents of the City of Berlin?
A. I personally don't think of "local" that
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way. But $I$ actually could say I don't understand the actual intent of this particular phrase.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. And there was a lot of discussion about whether the Applicant was going to -- or how much of its wood was going to be sourced from sort of the immediate vicinity, or Coos County, I guess. And do you have an understanding of what that's -- what that is?
A. I do not.
Q. No? Okay. That's all.
A. Okay.
Q. Thank you.
A. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Members of the Commitee have questions for Ms.
Laflamme? Mr. Northrop.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. NORTHROP:
Q. I just have a few. And counsel for the Public touched on this a little bit. This is back to the river walk and the ATV trails that are going to be developed. Do they -- will they connect to
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anything that exists now, or are there plans -- does the City of Berlin have plans in the future to connect these to anything? And how do these trails fit into the master plan for the city of Berlin?
A. Certainly. The ATV trail -- that's an easy one. Actually, the ATV trail at the moment exists. We're one of the, or the only community in the state that allows ATVs on its street at the moment on a designated trail that connects Jericho Mountain State Park to ATV trails in the Township, Unincorporated Place of Success.

In the wintertime, we do not allow snowmobiles on the street. And so the snowmobile trail is what we would actually probably be using this for, connect both those trail systems. And that is part of our master plan, to make recreation connectable, some connectivity between those two large trail systems.

As for the river walk, the City, back in 2003 or '04, had first initiated ideas for a river walk on the westerly side of the
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river, with a vision of eventually coming up with a loop of some sort. And so anywhere that we have been able to get the chance to find spots for the river walk on the east or west side we've been going after. We currently don't have funding for our westerly side. But this easterly side would end up being a first phase of what we consider to be a multi-part project.
Q. Thanks.
A. You're welcome.
Q. Just one more question about the 17-space parking lot. That's a brand new -- or is that a brand new parking lot, and is there any parking that goes on there now haphazardly or --
A. There was in the past haphazard parking. But this would be a more organized parking lot that would be accessible for both the users of the ball field during summer months, the river walk during the summer months. And we actually haven't -- we're not closed to the idea that we might use the river walk during the winter months,
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depending on design and agreements that we come up with.
Q. Okay. That was sort of another part of the question. Would the parking lot be available both in the summer for the ball field and sort of walking trials, and also in the winter for snowmobiles or ATV --
A. I'm not aware of any limitation on the use, because it will be turned over to the City for the City's purposes to regulate, as far as who parks there.
Q. Okay. All right. Thanks.

MR. NORTHROP: No further questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Mr . Iacopino and then Mr . Jannelle. I'm sorry. Mr. Harrington and Mr. Jannelle. Looking at too many places at once.

MR. HARRINGTON: Be my guest.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: No, go
ahead, Mr. Harrington.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Sort of a follow-up to Public Counsel's question. There's a lot of things in here
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that are sort of unique to Berlin, as compared to being internal to the plant, having to do with noise ordinances and so forth. How would you anticipate those would be enforced?
A. I think, as Attorney Van Oot said, we're hoping that it's somehow wrapped into conditions or stipulations laid out with this project so that it's enforceable back to this particular -- as far as I understand, we're not going to be able to have local zoning to enforce some of these things, and that's why we want to tie it to the certificate.
Q. I didn't mean so much as how it would become a regulation, but how that regulation would be enforced. For instance: Who's going to determine if the noise is above a certain level at a certain time?
A. That's a great question. We actually have asked, and Laidlaw has agreed to providing noise-monitoring stations in a couple locations. It's on Page 2, Roman II, Item 1 in the middle of paragraph, that they will
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agree to conduct additional noise-monitoring for informational purposes at designated monitoring stations at locations in the city to keep track of those particular issues.
Q. And is there any provision that -- I haven't studied this -- that if there were complaints of noise, that Laidlaw would agree to do some additional monitoring at a particular location?
A. The end of that paragraph indicates that they will go good faith with us to identify sources of such excesses and explore appropriate --
Q. Thank you. That addresses my concern.
A. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr.
Jannelle.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. JANNELLE:
Q. Obviously, this project's going to create a lot of truck traffic, as I'm sure you're aware.
A. Yes.
Q. Are there specific routes that Berlin has specified for Laidlaw to --
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A. Not for Laidlaw specifically, but we have specific truck traffic routes within the city for truck traffic to move.
Q. And given the level of traffic this project will generate, the City's comfortable with those routes?
A. Yes, at this time we are.
Q. Okay. I see under Roman III, under truck issue -- or Truck Traffic Issues, Item 3 says, "Laidlaw will develop a truck delivery policy." Has that been developed yet? Have you seen that?
A. I do not believe it has been yet developed. I could be wrong.
Q. Thank you.
A. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Ms. Ignatius -- Commissioner Ignatius.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: Thank you.
INTERROGATORIES BY CMSR. IGNATIUS:
Q. A little bit more on the noise monitoring. It sounds as though Laidlaw has agreed to conduct additional noise monitoring at specified sites. Do you have any equipment
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for noise monitoring to do your own independent testing?
A. We don't at this time.
Q. Okay. So you'll rely on their reports.

And is there a schedule of monitoring?
A. No, not that I'm aware of. Not at this point. It's going to probably be triggered by a complaint, I would imagine.
Q. Okay. There's references to measuring, I think related to the truck deliveries, to measure at the property line --
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- at five to six in the morning during truck delivery periods; correct?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. That's on Page 5 of the agreement. And the property line -- it's a huge property.
A. Yes.
Q. Is there an understanding between the City and Laidlaw of what location that will be?
A. The language just follows the City's own zoning, that we measure noise at the property line. So, no specific location along the property line has been set. So it
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would be along whatever point, $I$ guess, on the property line that someone would indicate there was an issue with noise.
Q. So those are some of the details that the City and the Applicant will have to work out as the plant --
A. Indeed.
Q. -- would become operational.
A. Yes.
Q. And by testing at five to six in the morning when truck deliveries are arriving, is that in order to really look at the noise of the trucks, as opposed to the ambient background noise?
A. Yes, that would be definitely the issue at that point. The City's own zoning -- no, nothing. That's all right. I'll take that thought back.
Q. I mean, if there's something else, go ahead and think about it.
A. No, that's okay.
Q. You have a master plan in Berlin.
A. Yes, we do.
Q. This project is consistent with the master
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## plan?

A. The City did a future land use map which went along with our master plan and was just approved in March of 2010. And that area is labeled -- I guess that's all we can call it for now -- was labeled and called for future land uses of industrial, commercial and recreational along the whole 120 -acre middle parcel. So I would say at this point it's consistent until we do anything else otherwise. And the property is zoned industrial business.
Q. And one of the requirements of this Commitee is to determine if a proposed project is consistent with the orderly development of an area. Do you have a view on that criteria that we're supposed to evaluate?
A. It's the City's position that this fits in with the orderly development of the area. So...
Q. There was testimony or public comment at the beginning of this proceeding that the economic development of Berlin would not be enhanced by the project. There's been other
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public comment that it would be enhanced by this project. What's the City's view on whether the economic future of Berlin is helped or hurt, or neither, with this project?
A. Again, the City's position is that, indeed, this helps with economic development and helps the community.
Q. Has your economic development corporation taken a position on this project?
A. I believe they -- we don't actually have a municipal economic development department. But we do have a local Androscoggin Valley Economic Recovery Corporation, and I believe they submitted something just recently to the Committee.
Q. And your --
A. I haven't seen it.
Q. Your regional planning commission, the North Country Council, have they taken a position?
A. I don't believe they have. I don't remember seeing anything.
Q. Finally, there are many different funds and numbers in your agreement and in the
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testimony today. I want to be sure I understand all of them.

You have $\$ 125,000$ set aside for some subsurface conditions investigation for further development.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that for possible development of the rest of the --
A. Site.
Q. -- parcel of the old Burgess Mill?
A. Yes. Yup.
Q. Then there's the $\$ 325,000$ set aside for the river walk development and maintenance;
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Those two funds are separate from the \$500,000 economic development monies that Mr. Bartoszek testified to?
A. Yes, to my knowledge.
Q. And who will hold that $\$ 500,000$ amount? Do you know? Is it the City of Berlin or some other entity?
A. Which amount?
Q. The $\$ 500,000$ fund.
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A. I do not know.
Q. And then, in addition, there's a \$2.25 million amount of money to benefit Berlin. Is that fair to say?
A. I don't know enough about it at this point.
Q. Related to the New Market Tax Credit.
A. Hmm-hmm. Exactly.
Q. So you don't know if that will be held by the City or by a non-profit entity or --
A. From what I know about market tax credits, it would not be held by the City. It would be held by whoever the economic development agency is that they're working with.
Q. At this point, have City representatives been involved in any discussions about how best to use either of those two economic development-related funds?
A. Not to my knowledge, but there could be some discussions going on that I'm unaware of.
Q. All right. That's all I have. Thank you.
A. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Counsel, Attorney Iacopino
informs me that the Committee did receive today a
\{SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 3 - PM SESSION] \{08-25-10\}
letter from the Androscoggin Valley Economic Recovery Corporation, which I believe is the entity you were referring to, Ms. Laflamme -MS. LAFLAMME: Yes, it is. CHAIRMAN BURACK: -- regarding
the project. And we will be posting this, if we have not already done so, posting a letter to the -- on our Web site and providing it to members of the Committee.

There also previously was a
letter, a comment letter submitted by the North Country Council regarding this project, and that is also in the public record for this project.

Do you know the date on which
that was filed, Attorney Iacopino?
MR. IACOPINO: North Country
Council was July 9th. And the Androscoggin Valley Economic Development is dated August 12th. We just received it today. It was misdirected to the PUC.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
INTERROGATORIES BY CHAIRMAN BURACK:
Q. Ms. Laflamme, I'm just looking at this yellow picture that's attached --
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A. Yes.
Q. -- to the exhibits to your testimony. This is actually an attachment, looks like, to Exhibit 5. And I just want to confirm my understanding of what we're seeing here. At the top here, this is the eastern side of the property; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is showing the river walk area?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's the area to which the $\$ 325,000$ would apply; is that correct?
A. Indeed.
Q. Down below here, this is essentially the western side of the property?
A. Yes. Oh, no, no. Sorry. That's the eastern side. The other side's the western side.
Q. I'm sorry. I had it backwards. You're right.
A. No, that's okay.
Q. So this is the western side here.
A. Yes.
Q. This is the eastern side down below.
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A. Correct.
Q. And what is being constructed here and who's going to pay for that work and who's responsible for that?
A. That is where we would like the ATV trail to go, snow-machine trail. And that would be an easement provided to either the local clubs or the state, whoever maintains the trail, and be constructed by the local clubs and the state, whoever comes to do that particular work.
Q. And what would be the source of funding for that?
A. No idea.
Q. So this is not something that would be funded --
A. Correct.
Q. -- by Laidlaw?
A. No.
Q. Have there been any discussions that you are aware of by any local entities expressing interest in doing this work and providing funding?
A. I know that the State is interested in
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acquiring that easement for a trail right there. So --
Q. When you speak about the State, are you speaking about the Bureau of Trails --
A. Sorry. Bureau of Trails, yes.
Q. -- in the Division of the Department of Resources and Economic Development.

Thank you.
A. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Any other questions, Mike?

MR. IACOPINO: Actually, I do have just one question.

I just want to make sure I
understand. There's not a separate agreement that's signed by the City and the Applicant. What you're asking to be done with this document is for this to become conditions of the certificate, if one is issued by this Commitee.

MR. VAN OOT: If I may, yes, that's what we would, both, I think -- I'll let Mr. Needleman speak for the Applicant. But that is the intention of both the City and the Applicant.
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I also should clarify for the record that the city council has been regularly briefed on these stipulations as they've evolved, and as recently as last week. But some of the changes have just happened, and we expect to be meeting with the city council to get their ratification of the agreement on behalf of the City, or the City entering into the stipulation. And we expect to have that quite soon.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And it is the intention of the Applicant that whatever we end up with be attached to the certificate.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Any further questions from any parties for Ms. Laflamme? If not, we thank you very much for being with us today.

MS. LAFLAMME: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: We
appreciate your patience.
MS. LAFLAMME: No problem.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: I note that it is approximately quarter of five. And I want to get a sense as to -- Mr. Bartoszek and Mr. Strickler are still here -- how much more
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time or questioning do people think they might have for these gentlemen.

Did you have anything
additional?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, I
indicated that I didn't before. I think I might, though I'm not sure I'm prepared to right now. So if you decide to go forward, I guess I'll have to forego. If we wait until tomorrow, I may have a few questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I want to get a sense as to others.

Mr. Rodier, do you have some additional questions you would like to pose to these gentlemen?

MR. RODIER: No more than 10 minutes, 5 to 10 minutes.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Five to 10
minutes?
Public counsel?
MR. ROTH: Yeah, 5 to 10
minutes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Other
members of the panel?
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(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. I
think what we will do, if this makes sense, is we will shortly recess for the day, and we'll pick that up very briefly tomorrow morning. And if you wish to do your redirect first, Attorney Needleman, and then we'll do whatever other questions folks may have. We will then turn to the testimony of Mr . Kusche and see how quickly we get through that. Assuming that we're able to complete both of those by approximately lunchtime, possibly earlier -- I don't have a sense yet. Maybe we can get a sense quickly from folks as to how much time they think they're going to need with Mr. Kusche.

How much time do you expect to be with Mr. Kusche?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'll be very brief with him.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: So, 5 or 10
minutes?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Mr.
Rodier?
\{SEC 2009-02\} [DAY 3 - PM SESSION] \{08-25-10\}

MR. RODIER: Forty-five
minutes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Forty-five
minutes? Okay.
Counsel for the Public, do you have a sense as to what your likely questioning will be of Mr. Kusche?

MR. BROOKS: Between 20 and 30 minutes.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. And I suspect members of the Subcommittee will as well. I think it's -- given all of this, it's probably realistic to expect that we should be able to complete the panel of Mr . Bartoszek and Mr. Strickler tomorrow morning, followed by Mr. Kusche, with a goal of, ideally by lunchtime, possibly sooner, being in a position to go into a closed session, or non-public session, for us to be able to ask questions specifically related to the content of the confidential documents in this proceeding. I will announce -- work with Counsel Iacopino, and we'll announce a schedule as early as we can tomorrow morning, in terms of the sequence in
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which we will take those documents on. And we'll try to sequence this so that we're able to include Clean Power Development at the beginning of the process. Whichever document it is, or documents, they would be entitled to ask questions about, we'll cover those first, and then we'll take the others up in series by request to counsel and to members of the Committee. So that we can try to do this as efficiently as possible, we will ask our questions about each of the documents separately -- that is, we'll work through a particular document and get everybody's questions about that document done and then move on to the next, if we possibly can. I understand there may be some things that may relate to different documents. But I think that may be a more efficient way for us to get through this process, certainly with respect to those documents to which Mr. Rodier would have an opportunity to ask questions about.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, how would you like the witnesses to be available for questioning? Do you want them all sitting up
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there? Do you want them coming and going?
MR. IACOPINO: How many are
there?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, I mean, it's conceivable that all five witnesses may need to speak to some documents, depending on what you're talking about. I mean, they all touch on some of them in some way. Most of the confidential documents $I$ think are financial and probably pertain to Mr . Bartoszek and Mr. Strickler. For example: The wood supply agreement would relate to Mr. Bravakis. The various documents that were designated confidential from ISO would relate to Mr. Kusche. So it depends on how you handle it.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. Chairman, just by way of notice, we would anticipate that we would want to ask Mr. Richmond several questions. He did say that certain answers were confidential, and we would like him available for that.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I forgot to mention him.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr. Richmond
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will also be available?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I believe so.
MR. RICHMOND: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: All right.
Very good.
I think probably what would make the most sense is just to have all the gentlemen here in the room toward the front, and we'll try to work out an arrangement so that we can do this as efficiently as possible and not have to have people jumping up and down and moving around, if that makes sense to everybody.

Any other questions from
counsel? Attorney Rodier?
MR. RODIER: Yeah, Mr.
Chairman. And I really appreciate your comment about getting the topics out of the way in the first part of the day before you go into confidential session, because that would then give me an opportunity to leave. I've got two business days to write a brief after I get a transcript. I got other things I kind of like to do. So my wish would be to put Mel Liston on Friday morning at 9 a.m. Am I correct that these
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are the only two witnesses that would be left? CHAIRMAN BURACK: Those would be the only two witnesses remaining. So my hope and my plan would be that we would be able to get through both of those witnesses on Friday.

MR. RODIER: So that's what
I'd like to do, even if we end early tomorrow, is come at 9 a.m. Friday; that way, I can be released to get some other things done, rather than sitting outside and waiting to see --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I think that makes sense, if that's agreeable to the other parties.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's fine with us.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay.
Attorney Rodier, we'll make that work. We'll make that happen.

MR. RODIER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: You're
welcome.
Anything else? Very well.
MR. VAN OOT: Mr. Chairman, we
may have some limited questions for Mr. Bartoszek
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regarding just the New Market Tax Credits in follow-up to some of the inquiries that were asked earlier today. But other than that, I don't believe we'll have extensive questioning for any of the other witnesses.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. MR. RODIER: There is one other quick thing. The system impact study is -I checked it -- for public disclosure. But I'm going to try to do my cross-examination of Mr. Kusche by not getting into the protected material. I don't think it's necessary, because our premarked Exhibit 5, I believe, comes from the ISO Web site. There was a public release of information that we think could very well -- we fully expect would be sufficient for our purposes. So I just wanted to mention that. I'm going to try very hard to make sure we don't have to put a transmission into -- issue into the confidential session.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
I appreciate that.
Again, $I$ would ask all counsel to please, with respect to -- and I believe
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people have been doing this -- to try to ask all the questions that you can in the public session so that we limit the questioning in the non-public session as much as we possibly can to those items that truly go to the content of the confidential documents in this proceeding. In fact, we do have to limit it to that purpose. MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes. MR. ROTH: Final housekeeping issue. This exhibit, was Mr. Iacopino able to determine that the printing thing would work? MR. IACOPINO: We're going to give it a try.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: We will do our best to have a copy made of this with the assistance of the Applicant, and once we've done that, we will have it marked as an exhibit of the Applicant.

Is there anything further?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Hearing and seeing none, $I$ thank you all, and we will stand recessed until 9:00 tomorrow morning.
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