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PROCEEDING
(Hearing resumed at 2:09 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: We will go ahead and resume here. Attorney Roth, would you kindly restate your question that you had posed just before we took a break, and we'll continue.

MR. ROTH: Yes, sir. It will at least give me an opportunity to reformulate it, since I've had -- some of this I make up as I go along.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. We asked in some data requests for the Applicant to provide sensitivity analyses of its pro formas to test the basic business model against various scenarios. And, the response that we got was a refusal to do that, because I think that the Applicant stated that they thought "it was speculative, and therefore not informative." Do you remember that response?
A. Generally, yes. In the technical -- second technical session?
Q. Yes. Let me just -- I'll see if I can find it. We asked for a sensitivity analysis on fuel cost increases, and the answer was "Trying to state a price point where the Project becomes uneconomic is purely a hypothetical exercise subject to changes in the
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
underlying assumptions of the energy markets over the next 20 years that cannot be reasonably predicted." Do you agree with that statement?
A. No, not entirely, $I$ don't. And, I don't know who made that response. I don't believe that was me. And, I'm not going to speculate on who did from our team. But, at the time of the second technical session, I think we had not yet reached finalization of our Power Purchase Agreement with Public Service of New Hampshire, and we had still not reached agreement in concept, anyways, with fuel suppliers. Both of those events have now taken place. And, I think that it's -- we're in a better position to have less uncertainty on those components of the economics of this project.

With regard to my involvement, my
testimony does say that I have been involved in the budgeting and pro forma development of the Project. And, that certainly was the case in the -- for most of the period of the development of this Project.

However, my roles in that now are very limited, now that we have -- the Project has proceeded to where we now are looking at financing and talking to financial institutions and developing a much more sophisticated pro forma, if you will, for the purposes of attracting
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
investment capital. So, I think it's best that I probably, because of my shifting role in that, to let others address questions that you may have about our pro forma and financial models and such.
Q. Unfortunately, I'm going to actually ask you a few more questions about it, but I'm not going to get into -plow into the details of the pro forma that was prepared.
A. Okay.
Q. But, and I think you suggested that the lenders are going to be very interested in a detailed and robust pro forma, is that correct?
A. I think that's fair to assume.
Q. And, would you agree that the one that was produced was not terribly robust and detailed?
A. I don't have that in front of me. Is that an exhibit you can --
Q. I believe that's --

MR. IACOPINO: A confidential exhibit. MR. ROTH: It's a confidential exhibit, but I'm not asking you to say anything about it of a confidential nature.

MR. IACOPINO: Forty-three.
WITNESS KUSCHE: I'm sorry. Could you
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
just repeat the question.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Would you agree that the pro forma provided in

Exhibit 3 -- excuse me, Exhibit 43 is not terribly
detailed and robust?
A. I would agree that it's not terribly detailed. But, as far as robustness, I'm not a financial person and I'm not an economist, but $I$ would characterize it as being "attractive and healthy". I don't know what "robust" means.
Q. What was the first one?
A. Attractive to investors.
Q. Okay.
A. And a healthy cash flow.
Q. Do you believe that this pro forma would be acceptable as a basis for a lender to make a lending decision?
A. You know, again, in my humble opinion, no. I'm sure that the lenders would be --
Q. Okay.
A. -- looking for more additional data to complete their due diligence.
Q. Okay. Now, without, again, getting into the details of any of the actual numbers, just because $I$ have a number of questions about the actual numbers. But this
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
morning or before the lunch break you spoke about capacity market penalties that the Project might incur under certain scenarios. Were any of those, as far as you know, factored into the pro forma?
A. I believe they were. At least the last pro forma that I was involved in, I assigned what I would call a "UCAP rating". Taking our capacity -- and, I'm not saying that that's included in this exhibit. Just saying what I did in the last time I was involved. Took the capacity number, and assigned a UCAP rating to it. To be very conservative, assigning less than the full capacity for capacity payment purposes, because there are adjustments made. And, so, just assuming that we might not be available at one of the times when ISO measures your capacity, and I don't want to speculate on what percentage factor $I$ used, but I did include something.
Q. Okay.
A. And, we can certainly get you the detail and whether or not that was included in this pro forma.
Q. So, you can't tell by looking at it whether it was included?
A. I cannot.
Q. Okay.
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
A. You'll notice that the "income" line includes "electricity", "REC", and "capacity revenue". So, it's --
Q. So, the underlying number that was included for capacity revenue should --
A. They're all lumped in together there.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. I guess the rest of my questions about it are probably going to be confidential. So, I'm going to withhold them for now. Will you be available during the confidential session?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And, as far as the sensitivity analysis, is it your understanding that the lenders looking to vet this Project are going to look for sensitivity analyses?
A. I would expect so, yes.
Q. And, given what you know about sort of the Project's place in that process, when would you expect to have sort of the pro forma ready, and with all of the sensitivity analyses?
A. I really would have to leave it to someone else on our team to answer that question, because I'm not directly involved.

MR. ROTH: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have. Oh, I'm sorry. I do have another one. And, this \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
[WITNESS: Kusche]
one hopefully you'll find interesting.
WITNESS KUSCHE: Uh-oh.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. I noted from your first testimony that you have a Master's in Forestry from SUNY-ESF. Maybe it wasn't called "ESF" at the time. Was it "ESF" at the time or did they --
A. Yes. The Environmental -- or, Environmental Science \& Forestry School, ESF.
Q. Okay. And, I took my son there to go look at it last spring, and he didn't particularly like it.
(Laughter.)
BY THE WITNESS:
A. I no longer live in Upstate New York.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. The question $I$ have is, based on your experience in running a biomass company, and your Master's degree in Forestry from a nationally-respected institution on forestry, do you have, in your mind, sort of a figure for how many people it takes to generate a ton of biomass for a power plant?
A. Let me go back to the beginning. I have a Master's degree, but it's not in Forestry. I have a Master's degree in Environmental Science and Land Use Planning
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
from the Forestry School at the State University of New York, in Syracuse.
Q. Okay.
A. So, I'm not a forester. In fact, I didn't take a single course while I was undergoing my Master's degree. And, then, to answer the question, no, $I$ don't. When I managed the Greenville Biomass Project in Maine, we never analyzed anything from that metric, using that metric.
Q. Okay. When you managed that facility, do you have sort of a percentage of the biomass that was produced in the immediate vicinity, and I mean to say 50 miles?
A. Yes. We had -- that was a relatively small plant, approximately 16 megawatts net, on a really good day. And, so, we consumed approximately 180,000 tons a year of biomass fuel. We had, at times, 50 suppliers, from 50 separate loggers, sawmills, chipping operations and such. Because of our proximity in the highway to Canada, where across the border there are a great number of sawmills, sawmills that are still doing very well, because the Canadian government helps support those sawmills, we got a relatively large amount of sawdust and bark from those sawmills. So, it's not perfectly analogous to the situation in Berlin. But,
even with the access and proximity of those sawmills, we probably varied between getting, I would say, 30 percent and 50 percent of our wood from those Canadian sawmills. The rest of it was procured essentially within -- most of it within 50 miles of our plant. And, as has been described here, it's not a perfect circle. There were back hauls involved from our suppliers. There were loggers who would move to different areas; sometimes close to us, sometimes far away, who we had a good relationship with. So, it was constantly changing. But $I$ would say that most of our -- probably at least half of our fuels generally came from within 75 miles of the plant.
Q. Okay. And, would you expect to have a similar experience with this facility?
A. "Experience" meaning?
Q. Fifty percent of your fuel coming within 75 miles of the power plant?
A. Well, again, it's never apples and apples. But $I$ would expect that we would get as much fuel that could be produced sustainably from as close a proximity to the plant as can be achieved. Simply because the economics are favorable for everyone involved to do that, to source the wood as close as you can. The loggers are
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
going to make more, the landowners are going to make more for their stumpage or biomass stumpage, if you will. Transportation is less. It just makes -- it's logical, it makes economic sense, to source as much as close as possible.
Q. But you're not willing to hazardous a guess at a percentage of what that would be?
A. No, because it's really predicting the future. And, it's impossible to know how these things are going to develop over time. And, it's going to be an evolution. There will be an infrastructure that is going to be built up there as the opportunities are presented for our plant. And, I know that there's a big interest from people who are in the logging industry, who want to get back in the logging industry. And, the most attractive customer that they can possibly have is a big biomass plant, which is constantly taking wood. And, so, I think we're going to represent a very attractive new customer for low-grade wood. And, I think there's going to be a response locally, and we're going to utilize that as best we can.
Q. And, the final question, you perhaps heard me asking about the cost of outfitting a chipping crew. Do you have any opinion about whether it's a million five (1.5
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
[WITNESS: Kusche]
million) or half that?
A. Well, it depends on how you -- how you want to look at that. A chipper alone, a brand-new chipper alone, roughly $\$ 600,000$. But you can't do it with just a chipper. You need other pieces of equipment to cut the logs, get the logs to the chipper, you need trucks, you need a lot of equipment to do modern forestry or modern logging. So, it really depends upon how you define that. Whether it's just the chipping operation or whether it's the whole infrastructure that's needed, from start to finish, delivery, and cutting to delivery.
Q. Do you think it's a realistic figure that it could be as much as $1,500,000$ ?
A. I think, if someone was to start from scratch, yes. MR. ROTH: Okay. That's all.

CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:
A. And, needed to buy all of those components, yes.

MR. ROTH: All right. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you, Attorney
Roth. Mr. Harrington.
MR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. I have a
few questions.
BY MR. HARRINGTON:
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
Q. I wanted to start out with -- this is something that there seems to be a little bit of confusion over. The figure keeps being used as "70 megawatts output from the generator". Yet, if you look at the SIS study that the ISO used, and, in fact, in the capacity supply obligation you were assigned, they have the generator output at 65.9, taking off 7.2 for station services, you get to 58.7. So, is that the accurate output of the plant?
A. No. We're now -- we've now advanced into more detailed design of our plant, with the entry of our EPC vendor and others. And, when we've -- keep in mind that, when we initially made our application for interconnection, it was in February of 2008 , two and a half years ago. Under the ISO rules, you are not allowed to increase that amount at all. You can decrease it by 60 percent.
Q. Otherwise you'd lose your place in the queue.
A. Exactly. And, so, at some point later in the design effort, it was determined that, in fact, that boiler, because of its construction and because of B\&W's experience in modifying these boilers, could actually produce more energy than that. $S o$, we went back to ISO, and ISO repeated the rules to us, and said "at some point, when you know exactly what your incremental
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
capacity is going to be, you will need to go back in, make an additional supplemental interconnection request, which will be assigned a new queue number, and go through the studies, to determine whether or not that extra amount can be put on the grid. And, if it is put on the line, what upgrades are going to be required for that."

We're in the process of starting that now, as our design has evolved, and the resolution is pretty good now on what it is that we're going to be requesting for an additional increment. And, we're in the process of beginning that.
Q. So, that would be the 70 megawatts, less the 7.2 station services, would be your output?
A. Exactly.
Q. Okay. And, as of right now, though, your maximum allowable output is 58.7?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you. There was a question on the plant efficiency. I don't know if you know this off the top of your head. There was a lot of different things discussed on this. But the figure was given at 37 and a half percent moisture content, that it would come out to be 87.5. But it appears the nominal number that
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
people are using for moisture content is 45 percent, which would lower the efficiency somewhat. Do you have the efficiency of using 45 percent? I mean, either you have it or you don't. I don't expect you to calculate it right now.
A. The answer is "no." But I want to back you up a little bit in that. 37.5 percent and 45 percent are moistures of wood. The "87.5" I believe you're referring to is a capacity factor?
Q. Yes. Yes.
A. They're completely unrelated. The capacity factor addresses what percentage of the year the plant will be producing its full output.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. Not whether it will be at 63 megawatts or 57 megawatts or anything else. So, they're really apples and oranges.
Q. Maybe I misstated what I was trying to get at. If you go to 45 percent moisture content, you're going to have to burn more wood in order to get the same output. And, that's, I guess, what $I$ was looking at, the fact that you would burn more wood. How much more wood would you burn at 45 percent, I guess?
A. Okay.
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
Q. And, I'm not asking for a number right now, but --
A. The answer is "yes", you would burn more wood, because you're having to basically evaporate out more moisture. So, you're losing --
Q. So, your actual output is going to be 58.7 megawatts, if you're running at 100 percent power? That was the -- that's what you're allowed to put out, even though you can put out more in the future?
A. That's correct. Based on a net, net figure, yes.
Q. And, you're connecting, as we discussed earlier, under a minimum connection standard, and your intent is to be a baseloaded plant?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Again, what's the EcoMin of the plant? EcoMin, economical minimum run.
A. In our interconnection request, I believe we used 30 megawatts.
Q. Thirty megawatts. And, there was a lot of discussion on this, and, again, one other question on the technical filing, the ramp rate was listed in there as going at one megawatt per three minutes going up. Do you have an equivalent one going down, without having to just dump steam into the condenser?
A. I don't, at this point. I think that that's something
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
that we'll be relying upon, our engineers, --
Q. Okay.
A. -- and specifically B\&W, to provide to us.

Okay. Getting back to this whole idea of the interconnection that we were talking about earlier this morning, there's a lot of discussion on exactly what's going on there. And, I think it's fair to say that, using the capacity supply obligation of 58.7 , that's what you should be -- that's what the ISO will pay you for for capacity, and so you should be able to deliver that, with the assumptions they make on the capacity supply obligation of other people on that loop, such as Granite Reliable, which, as you stated, was I think 30 megawatts.

So, the issue, I guess, comes then is what happens when Granite Reliable is not running at 30 megawatts, which is their capacity supply obligation, but they're running at, say, 90 megawatts? And, there's the Clean Power Development plant, which, again, is assumed above you in the queue to be running -- they could be running at 29 megawatts, plus you have the hydros, plus you have the Whitefield biomass plant. It would appear that all of those plants cannot run at 100 percent of their output at the same time? You say
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
-- you've got to say something.
A. Yes. Yes, I agree with that.
Q. Okay. So, I think the issue here is then that, for example, as you mentioned before, that the hydro plants are going to self-schedule and bid in at zero, because there's no cost, no additional cost for the fuel. I think the same, would you agree, the same applies to the wind plant?
A. My understanding is that wind plants can also self-schedule.
Q. Yes. So, what it's going to come down to is which of the biomass plants can run, and probably not all of them can run simultaneously, even if the wind is -- if it's a very windy day, which also corresponds to generally a light load day, so you would have a lighter load on the Coos Loop, so that would make the problem even a little bit worse.
A. The only distinction $I$ would add there is that it's up to ISO, but I know that many times ISO will not shut off one biomass plant. I mean, they will do it according to economic dispatch.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. But, assuming that everybody is bidding in at the same point, they bring everybody down a little bit.
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
Q. So, I guess, the thing I wanted to get across here is that some plants, some -- maybe some existing plants, like the Whitefield facility, there could conditions that arise that cause that plant to back down in power or not be dispatched at all?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you know what the heat rate is of the Whitefield plant?
A. I do not. I know that it's a similar plant to Greenville, but they have made a number of modifications to that. And, so, I wouldn't hazard a guess on that.
Q. But $I$ guess we've established what $I$ was trying to get there. So, this is what I'm trying to get at, your plant. The ability of your plant to load-follow is, generally, the larger the plant, the bigger the mass, the harder it is to do. So, if you go into a day where you think you're going to be able to, you know, you might even -- I guess I should ask you a question. Would you get to the point where you'd start doing your own wind predictions, based on what you think the output of Granite Reliable would be to plan your run for that day?
A. I don't know that I'm experienced enough or qualified
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
enough to answer that question. But we will have a certain degree. A biomass plant is not as agile as a gas-fired plant in following load like that. But it does have a certain amount of ability to do that. There's a lag time. Obviously, it's a wood fire. But our goal will be to run as much as we can, as often as we can. And, we'll be subject to economic dispatch under those circumstances. And, ISO will have all of our operating characteristics, they'll know exactly what our abilities are to shed load or to come up. And, so, we'll be taking orders from ISO.
Q. Okay. Good. Kind of jumping around here. Just the earlier conversation to clarify the record, we seem to be interchanging "MIS economic dispatch" and the term "MIS going into effect". But that really doesn't happen, does it?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. That only has to do with interconnecting, --
A. Correct.
Q. -- not running? Okay. And, did I -- let's see. MR. HARRINGTON: That was it, I guess. The Chairman will be happy to hear your correcting your testimony saved me a whole list of questions that $I$ had crossed out. So, --
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
[WITNESS: Kusche]

WITNESS KUSCHE: One thing I would like to add, if I may? And, I mentioned it earlier, but I want to just emphasize it. And, this comes from a very recent conversation with an ISO representative, his name is Alan, Alan McBride, who those of you who have worked with him, know that he's a very experienced and credible person at ISO-New England. He clarified to me that UCAP rating of a plant is not affected during any instance of economic dispatch. And, that's an important point here, when you're looking at the revenues of our plant, our capacity payment revenues from our plant, that we will not be downgraded under circumstances when we have been economically dispatched.

BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Right. The capacity only applies to your ability to give your capacity supply obligation during the time of a shortage event.
A. (Witness nodding in the affirmative).
Q. Which, if there was a congestion on the Coos line, and you couldn't deliver the full 58.7 megawatts --
(Cellphone distraction - court reporter interruption.)

BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. What $I$ was trying to say is that, I agree with you
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
completely, that it doesn't have anything to do with your capacity supply obligation and your capacity payments, unless there is a shortage event, in which case the ISO is going to say "deliver your 58.7 megawatts right now." Now, more than likely, that's going to happen at a time when the wind isn't blowing, and you'll be able to deliver all of them. But the possibility exists that, for some reason it was a very windy, hot day, and I don't know, maybe the cold front hit northern New Hampshire, but it hasn't hit the rest of New England, and you wouldn't be able to put out the full 58.7 , at which case you'd be subject to penalties in your capacity payments?
A. Correct.

MR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Just so we got that straight. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: I have one question,
actually, it's for Mr. Needleman, based on
Mr. Harrington's questions. Yesterday, I believe there was a data request from the Committee for some calculations, and with regard to the efficiency ratings, that you were going to provide us, at different moisture levels.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. I think they have \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
been done, and they're just double checking them. So, we'll have them to you as soon as we can.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Commissioner Ignatius,
do you have questions?
CMSR. IGNATIUS: Just a few. Thank you.
BY CMSR. IGNATIUS:
Q. Mr. Kusche, this is about the net output of the plant at 58.7 megawatts. Is that the level that was used in the Feasibility Study?
A. I believe so.
Q. All right. And, was that the amount used in the System Impact Study?
A. Yes.
Q. In the interconnection agreement that you're now beginning to go through in draft form, is it 58.7 megawatts as the net output?
A. I believe it is, but $I$ would like to confirm that after looking at the document, which I don't have with me.
Q. All right. You can let us know later if it's different from that.
A. Okay.
Q. And, you said you were beginning to work on an application of some sort to bring that incremental
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
[WITNESS: Kusche]
capacity to ISO and have them work through that. Do you know when you might be filing that request?
A. Our goal is to have that done by the end of next week.
Q. Submit it to ISO?
A. Submit it to ISO.
Q. Any expectations from the ISO on how long it would take them to go through that study?
A. "No", is the short answer. It really depends upon their backlog. And, they have taken a long time to do some of these studies in the past. But they have assured me that they're much more streamlined and are working through them much faster now.
Q. Could we be talking about a year or more before it's finalized?
A. It's possible.
Q. So, what is the Applicant asking for, in terms of a certificate? What level of output?
A. We are assuming that we will be -- we will complete the incremental increase with our interconnection, so that we will be a 70-megawatt gross plant, with a 63 megawatt net output.
Q. And, you're assuming that, by the time the plant would become operational, the ISO piece in bringing that incremental capacity would have been completed?
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
A. Yes, we are.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: Thank you.
MR. HARRINGTON: Mr. Chairman, I just
have a follow-up question?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes, please.
BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Getting back to the efficiency issue, I just looked in your 1.
A. Yes. Exhibit 1?
Q. Exhibit 1, Page 38, where it says "This equates to a fuel to gross power output of approximately 25 percent. The efficiency will vary to some degree with fuel moisture content, as added heat input is required to vaporize water contained in fuels with a higher moisture than in the design fuel." So, I guess my question appears to be backed up by what was stated here, is that, as the water content of the fuel goes up, the efficiency goes down. So, I'd still ask for the efficiency at the 45 percent, versus the 38 and a half. And, also, while you're doing that, this is for gross power output of 70 megawatts, and the gross power output that we're dealing with, at least for the time being, until it's adjusted otherwise by the ISO, is 65 .9 megawatts. So, I'm not sure if that means you
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
just burn less wood or you run it at full max, and you only are allowed to put out that much, I'm not sure how you -- I'm not familiar with biomass plant regulations. So, does this mean you're going to get a lower efficiency or you just cut back on the amount of fuel you put in, because of the lower output?
A. Well, again, I'm not an engineer, especially a boiler engineer. But we would use less fuels, the plant would operate at its 95 percent level or whatever that is.
Q. Okay. All right.
A. Which is still very much at the peak efficiency. So, I --
Q. I think that answered my question, as far as I'm concerned. But $I$ would like the efficiency at 45 percent moisture content.
A. Okay.

MR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Any other questions from the Subcommittee for this witness at this time?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Very good. In a moment, I'm going to ask one of our members to make a motion to enter into nonpublic session. But, before I do \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
that, $I$ just want to take a moment to try to plan the remainder of at least what I could see as being the public hearing portion of this entire proceeding. So, I just want to take a moment to just look at the list of witnesses. We will have -- we have now completed presentation, with the exception of going into nonpublic session to review certain documents, we've completed the witnesses from the Applicant's case in chief, as well as the City's case in chief. And, we just have the remaining witnesses, we will have new witnesses, as $I$ understand it at this point, would be Mr. Liston and Mr. Gabler.

And, so, Attorney Rodier, what I'd like to understand first from you is how long do you anticipate it's going to take you with each of these witnesses to do your direct with each of them? And, then, I'm going to ask counsel how long they currently anticipate it will take for cross-examination of each of those two witnesses?

MR. RODIER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gabler is going to be a brief direct, five minutes, let's say. Okay? Mr. Liston is in a little bit different category, because what I've asked him to prepare for is that, when he gets up there, I said "we want to respond to the critique that, at the request of the Committee, was elicited from the Applicant." So, I wanted him to take \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
ten minutes, let's say, to just go through, you know, each of the points that was made, and briefly respond or rebut. I've told him time is of the essence. And, we're interested in some very, you know, concise comments. So, I think we're looking -- we could be looking at 15 minutes for Mr. Liston.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Then, that's very helpful. Parties who would be cross-examining these witnesses, do you have a sense approximately of how much time you currently think you might require for each witness?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thirty to forty minutes for Mr. Liston; about ten minutes for Mr. Gabler.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. City of Berlin?
MR. SCHNIPPER: The City doesn't have any plans to cross either of those witnesses.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. And,
Counsel for the Public?
MR. BROOKS: Probably about the same as Attorney Needleman stated.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: So, you're anticipating approximately 30 to 40 minutes for Mr . Liston, and approximately 10 minutes for Mr . Gabler, is what you're anticipating?
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MR. BROOKS: Correct.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: So, I'm just looking at this, just trying to approximate this. It looks to me like, realistically, we're probably looking at approximately two hours, not including the questions from the Committee for Mr. Liston's testimony, approximately a half an hour for Mr. Gabler's testimony. That's what it's looking like to me. And, again, I don't have a sense yet as to how much time the Committee itself will have.

The other things that we have on our agenda to complete would be closing arguments or a summary. And, again, the agenda does note, if deemed to be necessary by the Chair, and I guess my question at this point of each of you is how strong is your desire to be able to make a brief closing summary here?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I would certainly appreciate the opportunity to, maybe about 10 or 15 minutes, to make a closing statement.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Mr. Schnipper?
MR. SCHNIPPER: I mean, no. The City simply wants -- just wishes to urge the adoption of its proposed conditions. Could do that right now.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. So, you just made it. Attorney Rodier?
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MR. RODIER: Okay. Well, our desire, Mr. Chairman, is extremely, because we've only got, and I know it's not anybody's fault, it's because of the legislative timetable, but we've only got two days to do a brief, which really can't be done. Well, can't be done in the way we would normally do a brief, if we had all the time in the world. So, we would probably need 15 minutes. CHAIRMAN BURACK: All right. Counsel for the Public?

MR. BROOKS: We don't anticipate making a closing statement.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Okay. So, it looks like we probably have to plan for approximately half an hour for closing arguments. I don't know if there will be any outstanding motions or verification of exhibits that we'll have to deal with. I'm hoping that we've taken care of most of those items as we've been moving along.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Can I make one comment, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: There are a number, I initially moved most of our exhibits into the record. Since that point, a number of additional Applicant \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
exhibits have been introduced, which I haven't moved at this point. I was just going to wait until the end to make sure we capture them all.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: That's fine. And, we can move all of those into the record at the end.

MR. ROTH: And, Mr. Chairman, we also may have at least one other, perhaps one or two others, to bring in.

MR. IACOPINO: Will you have those by
tomorrow?
MR. ROTH: I hope so. And, we have one of them here already. But I'm afraid -- this is the Dummer Yard Leachate Agreement. I believe there's more to it, and I wanted to chase that down. So, --

MR. IACOPINO: We'd like to have them by the close of the evidence.

MR. ROTH: Of course.
MR. IACOPINO: Without having to hold the record open.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. And, as I indicated before, $I$ will leave time at the end for any additional public comment. I recognize there may be members of the public who are not here now who may want to comment, but $I$ just -- just to get a general sense of \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
interest, $I$ just want to know, are there any members of the public here today who would anticipate being here at the close of the proceeding tomorrow who would like to be able to make public comment?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: One, two, three.
Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: And, Mr. Chairman, also there was an representative from Indeck who indicated to me --

MR. RODIER: Right.
MR. IACOPINO: -- that he would like to make a public comment as well.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. And, again, just for those members of the public here, I would ask you to please keep your statements very brief. I would ask you to keep them to no more than three minutes, but you're welcome to prepare a longer written statement for submittal to the record. But, again, I'd ask you to please be to the point and be as brief as you can. Okay. This is all very helpful. And, what is not clear to me, and will not be clear to us until we have gotten into this process of looking at the confidential documents in nonpublic session, how long this is actually \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
going to take. We're going to -- we will recess at 5:00 sharp today. So, we will make our way through a list of -- I believe it's 11 different documents here, as rapidly as we can. I may, depending on how timing works out here, I may ask us to convene at 8:30 tomorrow morning, rather than 9:00. And, it may be that we will commence with a continuation of nonpublic session. But, again, we will not know that until the close today. If by some chance we complete our nonpublic session before the end of the day today, we will not -- we will come back very briefly into public session, but it would only be for purposes of sealing the record. So, if there are folks who want to make sure they're not missing any of the public session, and you plan to leave as soon as we go into closed session, you're certainly welcome to stay. But, again, the only thing $I$ would anticipate occurring in public session, after we do conclude that, if we do conclude it today, would simply be a sealing of the record of the nonpublic session. And, then, we would recess until tomorrow morning.

MR. RODIER: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Are there any other procedural questions?

MR. RODIER: Minor housekeeping
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question?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes.
MR. RODIER: If the Committee decides to start at 8:30 in the morning, and none of the CPD folk are around, would you e-mail us?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes. We will certainly let you know.

MR. RODIER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Likewise, if it turns out that we are going to need additional time in nonpublic session, we will try to let everybody know that. And, certainly, we will let the parties know that as well. We will otherwise post a sign on the door outside explaining that we are still in nonpublic session.

Okay. And, I've just been advised by counsel that, tomorrow morning, if we need to return to nonpublic session, we will open in public session and do a new motion to go into nonpublic session. So, that's how we will proceed with that. But, again, we'll certainly -we will send an e-mail out tonight to the parties letting them now where we are, and approximately how much additional time we anticipate we would need for a nonpublic session, if it appears that's going to be necessary tomorrow morning. Okay?
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And, again, it appears to me, based on what you all have told me about your expectations for the remaining witnesses, that we should be able to complete this entire process by certainly no later than 4:00 or 5:00 tomorrow afternoon. But, if we can do it sooner, I would urge all of us to do that.

So, having said that, $I$ will, in a moment, ask for a motion to enter nonpublic session. I will explain, again, before we do that, that under the terms of the confidentiality orders that have been issued in this proceeding, there are only limited parties entitled to see certain documents. And, members of the public are not -- will be asked to leave the room, as will be any other parties who might have the authority to see certain documents, but not all documents. So, for example, I will ask Mr. Richmond, or any others from Cousineau, to stay outside the room, except during times when we're asking questions about documents that relate specifically to his work. I will take these not in the order that you hear them in the motion, which will be just based on their numerical sequence of their numbering, but I will take them in a sequence that $I$ believe will enable us to make it possible to get first through those -- those documents that involve all of the parties, so that we will \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
enable Mr . Rodier and the folks from Clean Power Development to then leave, so that we can then proceed to other documents that would only involve the three parties of the Applicant and the City and Counsel for the Public. So, any other questions, before we take a motion to enter into nonpublic session?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Very well. Do you
have a motion?
MS. IGNATIUS: I do. Mr. Chairman, I move that we enter into nonpublic session. The purpose would be to discuss the content of the material deemed confidential under RSA 91-A:5. And, the documents in question we believe are the following list: Applicant Exhibit 1, Appendix Q, the System Feasibility Study; Applicant Exhibit 38, Development Agreement documents; Applicant Exhibit 38A, the First Amendment to the Development Agreement and Lease; Applicant Exhibit 39, the Power Purchase Agreement; Applicant Exhibit 41, the Hancock comfort letter; Applicant Exhibit 42, the Key Bank comfort letter; Applicant Exhibit 43, the Laidlaw Pro Forma, Applicant Exhibit 56, the System Impact Study; Applicant Exhibit 61, the Pre-EPC Contract; Applicant Exhibit 62, the Cousineau Draft Fuel Supply Agreement; and \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}

Applicant 63, the redacted Cousineau Draft Fuel Supply Agreement.

Mr. Chairman, as presiding officer, you previously found these documents to be exempt from the Right to Know Law, under 91-A:5, IV, as records pertaining to confidential, commercial, and financial information. And, the documents have been provided to the Committee under seal.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you for that motion.
(No verbal response)
MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Northrop. I'm now going to ask for a roll call vote, which is required by our statute, in order to enter into nonpublic session. And, we'll ask our counsel if he would please call the roll.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Dr. Kent?
DR. KENT: Yea.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Wright?
MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Muzzey?
DIR. MUZZEY: Yes.
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MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Stewart?
DIR. STEWART: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Northrop?
MR. NORTHROP: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Janelle?
MR. JANELLE: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Commissioner Ignatius?
CMSR. IGNATIUS: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: It's unanimous.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. A unanimous vote of the Committee, therefore representing a majority having voted "yes", we will now go into nonpublic session. And, $I$ would ask that all members of the public please leave the room. Again, as I mentioned before, we will notify the parties when we return to public session. And, we will open tomorrow morning in public session, and, if necessary, return to nonpublic session.
(Pages 41 through 138 regarding the confidential nonpublic session are contained under separate cover.)
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(Hearing resumes on the public portion of the record.) CHAIRMAN BURACK: We are now back in public session. And, Ms. Ignatius, do you have a motion? CMSR. IGNATIUS: I do. Now that we're back in the public session, I move to seal the transcript of the nonpublic session just concluded, because the contents of the transcript involves documents that have been found to be exempt from public disclosure, pursuant to RSA 91-A:5, IV, as being confidential, commercial, and financial documents.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this vote must be -- must carry by a two-thirds majority. So, we will have to take a roll call.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Would you please proceed to do so.

MR. IACOPINO: Dr. Kent?
DR. KENT: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Wright?
MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Director Muzzey?
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DIR. MUZZEY: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Stewart?
DIR. STEWART: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Northrop?
MR. NORTHROP: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Janelle?
MR. JANELLE: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Commissioner Ignatius?
CMSR. IGNATIUS: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: It's unanimous.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. So, seeing that more than two-thirds of the Committee members have voted in the affirmative, the transcript will be sealed. And, we -- again, we are now in public session. But we will now -- we will recess until 8:30 tomorrow morning. At which time I expect we will, very shortly thereafter, entertain a motion to go back into nonpublic session to continue review of confidential documents. Thank you.
(Hearing adjourned at 5:17 p.m; to
reconvene Aug. 27, 2010, at 8:30 a.m.)
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 4/PM Session-PUBLIC] \{08-26-10\}
\{SEC 2009-02\} (DAY 4 PM SESSION) - August 26, 2010
LAIDLAW BERLIN BIOMASS, LLC

|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \text { 23:8 } \\ & \text { affirmative (2) } \\ & 23: 18 ; 140: 17 \\ & \text { afraid (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:24;27:16;36:23; } \\ & \text { 37:1 } \\ & \text { Appendix (1) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 4 | 9 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \$ 600,000(\mathbf{1}) \\ 14: 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4: 00(1) \\ 37: 4 \\ \mathbf{4 0 ( 1 )} \\ 30: 22 \\ \mathbf{4 1}(\mathbf{2}) \end{gathered}$ | 9:00 (1) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { afraid (1) } \\ 33: 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38: 15 \\ \text { apples (3) } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 35:6 |  |  |
|  |  | 90 (1) | afternoon (1) | $12: 19,19 ; 17: 16$ |
| 1 |  | 19:18 | 37:5 | Applicant (17) |
|  |  | 91-A5 (3) | again (18) | 4:11,15;26:16;29:24; |
| 1 (4) | 38:19;40:22 | 38:13;39:5;139:9 | 7:17,22;12:19;18:14, | 32:24;38:4,14,16,17,18, |
| 27:8,9,10;38:15 | 42 (1) | $95(1)$ | 19;19:20;28:7;31:8,12; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Applicant's (1) } \\ & 29: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{1 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}(\mathbf{1}) \\ 14: 14 \end{gathered}$ | 38:20 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 14,19 ; 35: 7,15 ; 36: 19 \\ & 37: 1,9 ; 40: 18 ; 140: 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 1.5 | 7:4;38:21 | A |  | application (2) |
| $\begin{gathered} 1.5(\mathbf{1}) \\ 13: 24 \end{gathered}$ | $45(7)$ |  | $4: 13$ | 15:13;25:24 |
| 10 (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 1,3,7,19,23 ; 27: 19 \\ & 28: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  | agenda (2) | applies (2) |
| 30:23;31:17 |  |  | 31:11,12 | 20:7;23:15 |
| 100 (2) | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ability (3) } \\ & \text { 21:15;22:4;23:15 } \end{aligned}$ | agile (1) | $\underset{31: 17}{\text { appreciate (1) }}$ |
| 18:6;19:24 |  |  | ago (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 17 \\ & \text { approximate (1) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11 (1) | 5:00 (2) | able (7) |  | approximate (1) |
| 138 (1) | 35:1;37:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 15 ; 34: 4 ; 37: 3 \\ & \text { above (1) } \end{aligned}$ | agree (7) | approximately (10) |
| 40:22 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 3 ; 6: 14 ; 7: 3,6 ; 20: 2,7 \\ & 23: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 14,15 ; 27: 11 ; 30: 9 \\ & 22,23 ; 31: 5,6 ; 32: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 15 (3) | 5:17 (1) $140: 23$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { above (1) } \\ 19: 20 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 30:5;31:17;32:7 | $50 \text { (5) }$ | acceptable (1) | Agreement (9) | $36: 21$ |
| 16 (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 12,16,17 ; 12: 3,5 \\ & 56 \text { (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7: 15 \\ \operatorname{access}(1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 9,10 ; 25: 15 ; 33: 13 ; \\ & 38: 16.18 .19 .24: 39: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { areas }(1) \\ 12: 9 \end{gathered}$ |
| 11:14 |  |  |  | 12:9 arguments (2) |
| 180,000 (1) | 38:22 |  | ${ }_{\text {ahead (1) }}$ | arguments (2) 31:11;32:14 |
| 11:15 | 57 (1) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { according (1) } \\ 20: 21 \end{array}$ | Alan (2) | arise (1) |
| 2 | 58.7 (9) | accurate (1) | 23:4,5 allowable (1) | 21:4 |
|  | $23: 20 ; 24: 5,12 ; 25: 9,16$ | 15:8 | allowable (1) | around (2) |
| 2:09 (1) |  |  | 16:17 |  |
| 4:2 | 6 | $12: 22$ | 15:15;18:7;28:2 | 8:6,10;15:6;16:3 |
| 20(1) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{across}(2) \\ & 11: 19 ; 21: 1 \end{aligned}$ | alone (2) | assigning (1) |
| 2008 (1) | 60 (1) | $7: 23,24 ; 18: 5$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14: 3,3 \\ \text { along }(\mathbf{2}) \end{array}$ | 8:11 <br> assume (1) |
| 15:14 | 15:16 |  | along (2) $4: 9: 32: 18$ | assume (1) $6: 13$ |
| 2010 (1) | 61 (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { actually (4) } \\ & 6: 5 ; 15: 21 ; 24: 18 ; 34: 24 \\ & \text { add }(\mathbf{2}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 4:9;32:18 } \\ \text { Amendment (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 6:13 } \\ \text { assumed (1) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 140:24 | 38:23 |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Amendment (1) } \\ 38: 17 \end{array}$ | assumed (1) <br> 19:20 |
| 25 (1) | 62 (1) |  | amount (6) | assuming (4) |
| 27:11 | 38:24 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { add (2) } \\ 20: 18 ; 23: 2 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| 27 (1) | 63 (3) | added (1) 27•13 | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 22 ; 15: 16 ; 16: 5 \\ & 22: 4 ; 25: 12 ; 28: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 13 ; 20: 23 ; 26: 18,22 \\ & \text { ssumptions (2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 140:24 | 17:15;26:20;39:1 |  | 22:4;25:12;28:5 <br> analogous (1) |  |
| 29 (1) | 65.9 (2) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { additional (8) } \\ & 7: 20 ; 16: 2,11 ; 20: 6 ; \\ & 32: 24 ; 33: 22 ; 36: 10,22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { analogous (1) } \\ 11: 24 \end{array}$ | 5:1;19:11 |
| 19:21 | 15:7;27:24 |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \mid \operatorname{assured}(1) \\ 26: 11 \end{array}$ |
| 3 | 7 |  | analyses (3) $4: 12 ; 9: 14,19$ | Attorney (5) |
| 3 (1) | 7.2 (2) | address (1) <br> 6:3 | 4:21;9:12 | 30:20;31:24 |
|  | 15:7;16:13 | addresses (1) $17: 12$ | analyzed (1) | attracting (1) |
| 30 (5) | 70 (3) ${ }^{\text {(3) }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { adjourned (1) } \\ & \text { 140:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:8 } \\ & \text { answered (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5: 24 \\ \text { attractive (4) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 12:2;18:17;19:14,17; | 15:3;16:13;27:21 |  |  |  |
| 30:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70-megawatt (1) } \\ & \text { 26:20 } \\ & \text { 75 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { adjusted (1) } \\ 27: 23 \end{array}$ <br> adjustments (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { anticipate }(6) \\ & 29: 13,16 ; 32: 10 ; 34: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Aug (1) |
| 37 (1) |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \operatorname{Aug}(1) \\ 140: 24 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 37.5(\mathbf{1}) \\ 17: 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 75(2) \\ 12: 13,17 \end{array}$ | adjustments (1) 8:13 | $35: 16 ; 36: 22$ | authority (1) |
|  |  | adoption (1)$31: 21$advanced (1)$15 \cdot 10$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { anticipating (2) } \\ 30: 22,24 \end{gathered}$ | $37: 14$ |
| 38 (3) | 8 |  |  |  |
| 27:10,19;38:16 |  |  | anyways (1) | 8:14;9:10 |
| 38A (1) | 8:30 (4) |  | 5:10 | away (1) |
| 38:17 | 35:5;36:4;140:19,24 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15:10 } \\ \text { advised (1) } \end{gathered}$ | appear (1) | 12:10 |
| 39 (1) | 87.5 (2) | 36:15 | 19:23 |  |
| 38:18 | 16:24;17:8 | affected (1) | appears (4) |  |
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|  | 15:21 | 5;15:5;16:1;17:9,11; | circumstances (2) | concluded (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | border (1) | 19:8,10,11,17;23:10,15, | 22:8;23:12 | 139:6 |
|  | 11:19 | 16;24:2,2,13;26:1,24 | City (4) | condenser (1) |
| B\&W (1) | Both (1) | capital (1) | 30:14,15;31:20;38:4 | 18:23 |
| 19:3 | $5: 11$ | 6:1 | City's (1) | conditions (2) |
| B\&W's (1) | brand-new (1) | capture (1) | $29: 9$ | $21: 3 ; 31: 22$ |
| 15:20 | 14:3 | 33:3 | clarified (1) | confidential (11) |
| back (14) | break (2) | care (1) | 23:7 | 6:19,20,22;9:8,10; |
| 10:22;12:7;13:15; | $4: 5 ; 8: 1$ | 32:17 | clarify (1) | $34: 23 ; 38: 13 ; 39: 6 ; 40: 23 ;$ |
| 15:22;16:1;17:6;19:4; | brief (6) | carry (1) | $22: 13$ | $139: 9 ; 140: 22$ |
| $21: 4 ; 27: 7 ; 28: 5 ; 35: 10$ | 29:19;31:15;32:5,6; | $139: 15$ | Clean (2) | confidentiality (1) |
| $139: 2,5 ; 140: 21$ | $34: 16,20$ <br> briefly (2) | case (5) 5:18;24:4,12;29:8, | 19:19;38: | $37: 10$ |
| backed (1) 27:16 | briefly 30:2;35:10 | $\operatorname{cash}(1)$ | 34:22,22 | 25:18 |
| backlog (1) | bring (3) | 7:14 | close (7) | confusion (1) |
| 26:9 | 20:24;25:24;33:8 | category (1) | 12:9,21,24;13:5; | 15:2 |
| Bank (1) | bringing (1) | 29:20 | 33:16;34:3;35:8 | congestion (1) |
| 38:20 | 26:2 | cause (1) | closed (1) | 23:19 |
| bark (1) | BROOKS (3) | $21: 4$ Cill | 35:14 | connecting (1) |
| 11:23 | 30:19;31:1;32:10 | Cellphone (1) | closing (5) | 18:10 |
| based (6) | budgeting | 23:21 | 31:11,15,18;32:11,14 | connection |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10: 16 ; 18: 9 ; 21: 21 ; \\ & 24: 18: 37: 1.21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5: 17 \\ \text { built (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { certain (6) } \\ 8: 3 ; 22: 2,4 ; 29: 7 ; 37: 12, \end{array}$ | CMSR (6) 25:6,7;27:2;40:10 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 18:11 } \\ \text { conservative (1) } \end{array}$ |
| baseloaded (1) | 13:12 | 15 | 139:4;140:11 | 8:11 |
| 18:12 | BURACK | certainly (8) | cold (1) | constantly (2) |
| basic (1) | 4:3;14:20;25:4;27:5; | 5:18;8:19;31:16; | 24:9 | 12:11;13:17 |
| 4:13 | 28:19,22;30:7,14,17,21; | 35:15;36:7,12,19;37:4 | comfort (2) | construction (1) |
| basically | 31:2,19,23;32:8,12,21; | certificate (1) | 38:20,21 | 15:20 |
| 18:3 | 33:4,20;34:6,14;35:22; | 26:17 | coming (1) | consumed (1) |
| basis (1) | 36:2,6,9;38:8;39:9,14; | Chair (1) | $2 \cdot 1$ | 11:15 |
| 7:16 | 40:12,14;139:2,13,18; | 31:13 CHAIRMAN (50) | commence (1) | contained (2) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { become (1) } \\ 26: 23 \end{gathered}$ | burn (5) | CHAIRMAN (50) $4: 3 ; 14: 20 ; 22: 22 ; 25: 4 ;$ | comment (5) | $\begin{array}{r} 27: 14 ; 40 \\ \text { content }(7) \end{array}$ |
| becomes | $17: 20,22,23 ; 18: 2 ; 28: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 3,5 ; 28: 18,19,22 \\ & 29: 18 ; 30: 7,14,17,21 \end{aligned}$ | $32: 19 ; 33: 22,24 ; 34: 4,$ | 16:23;17:1,19;27:13, |
| 4:23 | $\begin{gathered} \text { business (1) } \\ 4: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:18;30:7,14,17,21; } \\ & 31: 2,19,23 ; 32: 2,8,12,20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ \text { comments (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17;28:15;38:12 } \\ & \text { contents (1) } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \underset{10: 22 ; 16: 12 ; 25: 16,23}{\text { beginning (4) }} \end{aligned}$ | buy (1) | 31.2,19,23,32.2,8,12,20, 21;33:4,6,20;34:6,8,14; | 30:4 | 139:7 |
| Berlin (2) | 14:18 | 35:21,22;36:2,6,9;38:8, | commercial (2) | continuation (1) |
| 11:24;30 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 10 ; 39: 3,9,12,14 ; 40: 11, \\ & 1214 \cdot 139 \cdot 2111314 \end{aligned}$ | 39:6;139:9 | $35: 7$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { best (2) } \\ & 6: 1 ; 13: 21 \end{aligned}$ | C | $\begin{aligned} & 12,14 ; 139: 2,11,13,14, \\ & 18 ; 140: 12,13,15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Commissioner (3) } \\ 25: 4 ; 40: 9 ; 140: 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { continue (2) } \\ 4: 6 ; 140: 22 \end{array}$ |
| better (1) |  | chance (1) | Committee (8) | CONTINUED (1) |
| 5:13 | $17: 4$ | 35:8 | 24:20;29:23;31:6,9; | $14: 17$ |
| bid (1) | calculations (1) | changes (1) | 36:3;39:7;40:15;140:16 | Contract (1) |
| 20:5 | 24:21 | 4:24 | company (1) | 38:23 |
| bidding | call (4) | changing | 10:17 | convene (1) |
| 20:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:6;39:15,18;13 } \\ & \text { called (1) } \end{aligned}$ | 12:11 <br> characteristics (1) | complete (5) $7: 20 ; 26: 18 ; 31: 11$ | 35:5 conversation |
| $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{big}(\mathbf{2}) \\ & 13: 13,17 \end{aligned}$ | called (1) | 22:9 | 35:9;37:3 | $22: 13 ; 23: 4$ |
| bigger (1) | came (1) | characterize (1) | completed (3) | Coos (2) |
| 21:16 | 12:12 | 7:8 | 26:24;29:5,7 | 20:16;23:19 |
| biomass (12) | can (23) | chase (1) | completely (2) | correcting (1) |
| 10:17,21;11:7,11,16; | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 20 ; 6: 17 ; 8: 19 ; 12: 22, \\ & 24: 13: 16,21: 15: 16: 16: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $33: 14$ | 17:11;24:1 | 22:22 corresponds (1) |
| 13:2,17;19:22;20:12,20; | 24;13:16,21;15:16;16:5; <br> $18: 8 \cdot 20 \cdot 9,12,13 \cdot 22 \cdot 6,7$. | checking $25: 1$ | components (2) 5:14;14:18 | corresponds (1) |
| bit (5) | 25:2,20;32:19;33:5; | chief (2) | concept (1) | cost (4) |
| 15:2;17:7;20:17,24; | 34:20;35:4;37:5;38:2 | 29:8,9 | 5:10 | 4:21;13:23;20:6,6 |
| 29:20 | Canada (1) | chipper (4) | concerned (1) | counsel (6) |
| blowing (1) | 11:19 | $14: 3,3,5,6$ | $28: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 16 ; 30: 18 ; 32: 8 ; \\ & 36 \cdot 16 \cdot 38 \cdot 4 \cdot 30 \cdot 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| $24: 7$ | Canadian (2) 11:21;12:3 | chipping (3) <br> 11:17;13:23;14:9 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { concise (1) } \\ 30: 4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 36:16;38:4;39:17 } \\ & \text { course }(\mathbf{2}) \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { boiler (2) } \\ & \text { 15:19;28:7 } \end{aligned}$ | capacity (24) | circle (1) | conclude (2) | 11:5;33:17 |
| boilers (1) | 8:2,7,10,12,12,15;9:2, | 12:7 | 35:17,17 | court (1) |
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| 23:21 | 14:2,8;26:8 | 36:13 | 5:1;15:22 | 22:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cousineau (3) | described (1) | double (1) | engineer (2) | example (2) |
| 37:17;38:24;39:1 | 12:6 | 25:1 | 28:7,8 | 20:4;37:16 |
| cover (1) | design (4) | down (6) | engineers (1) | except (1) |
| 40:24 | 15:11,18;16:9;27:15 | 18:22;20:11,24;21:4; | 19:1 | 37:17 |
| CPD (1) | desire (2) | 27:18;33:14 | England (2) | exception (1) |
| 36:4 | 31:14;32:1 | downgraded (1) | 23:7;24:11 | 29:6 |
| credible (1) | detail (1) | 23:12 | enough (3) | excuse (1) |
| 23:6 | 8:19 | Dr (4) | 9:7;21:24;22:1 | 7:4 |
| crew (1) | detailed (5) | 39:19,20;139:20,21 | enter (5) | exempt (2) |
| 13:23 | 6:11,15;7:5,6;15:10 | draft (3) | 28:24;37:8;38:6,11; | 39:4;139:8 |
| critique | details (2) | 25:16;38:24;39:1 | 39:16 | exercise (1) |
| 29:23 | 6:7;7:22 | due (1) | entertain (1) | 4:24 |
| cross (1) | determine (1) | 7:21 | 140:21 | exhibit (18) |
| 30:16 | 16:4 | Dummer (1) | entire (2) | 6:16,19,20;7:4,4;8:8; |
| crossed (1) | determined (1) | 33:13 | 29:3;37:4 | 27:9,10;38:15,16,17,18, |
| 22:24 | 15:19 | dump (1) | entirely (1) | 19,20,21,22,23,24 |
| cross-examination (1) | develop (1) | 18:23 | 5:4 | exhibits (3) |
| 29:17 | 13:10 | during (4) | entitled (1) | 32:16,23;33:1 |
| cross-examining (1) | developing (1) | 9:10;23:8,16;37:17 | 37:12 | existing (1) |
| 30:8 | 5:23 |  | entry (1) | 21:2 |
| currently (2) | development (6) | E | 15:11 | exists (1) |
| 29:16;30:10 | 5:17,19;19:19;38:2, |  | Environmental (3) | 24:8 |
| customer (2) | 16,18 | earlier (4) | 10:8,8,24 | expect (6) |
| 13:16,19 | different (6) | 18:10;19:5;22:13;23:2 | EPC (1) | 9:15,17;12:14,20; |
| cut (2) | 12:9;16:21;24:22; | EcoMin (2) | 15:11 | 17:4;140:20 |
| 14:5;28:5 | 25:20;29:20;35:3 | 18:14,14 | equates (1) | expectations (2) |
| cutting (1) | diligence (1) | economic (5) | 27:10 | 26:6;37:2 |
| 14:11 | 7:21 | 13:4;20:21;22:7,14; | equipment (2) | experience (4) |
| D | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { DIR (4) } \\ 39: 24 ; 40: 2 ; 140: 1, \end{array}$ | 23:8 <br> economi | $14: 5,7$ <br> equivalen | $10: 16 ; 12: 15,16 ; 15: 21$ <br> experienced (2) |
|  | direct (2) | 18:15 | 18:22 | 21:24;23:6 |
| data (3) | 29:15,19 | economically (1) | ESF (3) | explain (1) |
| $4: 11 ; 7: 20 ; 24: 20$ | directly (1) | $23: 13$ | $10: 6,6,9$ | 37:9 |
| day (7) | $9: 21$ | economics (2) | especially (1) | explaining (1) |
| 11:14;20:14,15;21:17, | Director | 5:14;12:22 | 28:7 | 36:13 |
| 23;24:9;35:9 | 139:24 | economist (1) | essence (1) | extra (1) |
| days (1) | disclosure (1) | 7:8 | 30:3 | 16:5 |
| 32:4 | 139:8 | effect (1) | essentially (1) | extremely (1) |
| deal (1) | discuss (1) | 22:15 | 12:4 | $32: 2$ |
| $32: 16$ (1) | $38: 12$ discussed (2) | efficiency (11) | established (1) | F |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { dealing (1) } \\ 27 \cdot 22 \end{gathered}$ | discussed (2) | 16:20;17:2,3;24:21; |  | F |
| decides (1) | discussion (2) | 14 | 18:3 | facility (3) |
| 36:3 | 18:18;19:6 | effort (1) | even (5) | 11:10;12:15;21:3 |
| decision (1) | dispatch (4) | 15:19 | 12:1;18:7;20:13,17; | fact (4) |
| 7:16 | 20:21;22:7,14;23:9 | either (2) | 21:19 | 11:4;15:5,19;17:21 |
| decrease (1) | dispatched (2) | 17:3;30:16 | event (2) | factor (3) |
| 15:16 | 21:5;23:13 | electricity (1) | 23:17;24:3 | 8:16;17:9,11 |
| deemed (2) | distinction (1) | 9:2 | events (1) | factored (1) |
| 31:12;38:12 | 20:18 | elicited (1) | 5:11 | 8:4 |
| define (1) | distraction (1) | 29:24 | everybody (3) | fair (3) |
| 14:8 | 23:21 | else (2) | 20:23,24;36:11 | 6:13;9:7;19:7 |
| degree (6) | document (1) | 9:20;17:16 | everyone (1) | familiar (1) |
| 10:17,23,24;11:6; | 25:19 | e-mail (2) | $12: 23$ | $28: 3$ |
| 22:2;27:12 | documents (16) | 36:5,20 | evidence (1) | far (5) |
| deliver (4) | 29:7;34:24;35:3; | emphasize (1) | 33:16 | 7:7;8:3;9:12;12:9; |
| 19:10;23:20;24:4,7 | 37:12,15,15,18,24;38:3, | 23:3 | evolution (1) | 28:13 |
| delivery (2) 14:11,12 | 13,16;39:4,7;139:7,10, $140: 22$ | enable (2) $37: 22 ; 38: 1$ | 13:10 evolved (1) | faster (1) |
| depending (1) | done (4) | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \text { 37:22 } \\ \text { end (5) } \end{array}$ | $16: 9$ | fault (1) |
| $35: 4$ | $25: 1 ; 26: 3 ; 32: 5,5$ | $26: 3 ; 33: 2,5,21 ; 35: 9$ | Exactly (5) | $32: 3$ |
| depends (3) | door (1) | energy (2) | 15:18,24;16:15;19:6; | favorable (1) |
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| 12:23 | 30:12 |  | 31:7;32:14 | 39:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feasibility (2) | Forty-three (1) | H | hours (1) | informative (1) |
| 25:10;38:15 | 6:23 |  | $31 \cdot 5$ | 4:17 |
| February (1) | found (2) | half (7) | housekeeping (1) | infrastructure (2) |
| 15:14 | 39:4;139:8 | 12:12;14:1;15:14; | 35:24 | 13:11;14:10 |
| few (3) | front (2) | 16:23;27:20;31:7;32:14 | humble (1) | initially (2) |
| 6:5;14:23;25:6 | 6:16;24:10 | Hampshire (2) | 7:17 | 15:13;32:23 |
| Fifty (1) | fuel (13) | 5:9;24:10 | hydro (1) | input (1) |
| 12:17 | 4:21;5:11;11:16; | Hancock (1) | 20:4 | 27:13 |
| figure (5) | 12:17,20;20:6;27:11,12, | 38:20 | hydros (1) | instance (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10: 19 ; 14: 13 ; 15: 3 ; \\ & 16: 22: 18: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 15,17;28:5;38:24;39:1 | happen (2) | 19:22 | 23:8 |
| 16:22;18:9 filing (2) | fuels (3) $12 \cdot 12 \cdot 27 \cdot 14 \cdot 28: 8$ | $22: 16 ; 24: 6$ | hypothetical (1) 4:24 | institution (1) $10 \cdot 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { filing (2) } \\ & \text { 18:20;26 } \end{aligned}$ | 12:12;27:14;28:8 | happens (1) | 4:24 | 10:18 |
| final (1) | 8:11;17:13;23:20; | happy (1) | I | 5:23 |
| 13:22 | 24:12;28:1 | 22:22 |  | intent (1) |
| finalization (1) | future (2) | harder (1) | IACOPINO (30) | 18:11 |
| 5:8 | 13:8;18:8 | 21:17 | 6:19,23;24:17;25:3; | interchanging (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { finalized (1) } \\ 26: 14 \end{gathered}$ | G | Harrington (14) | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 9,15,18 ; 34: 8,12 ; \\ & 39: 19,21,23 ; 40: 1,3,5,7,9 \end{aligned}$ | 22:14 <br> interconnecting (1) |
| financial (5) |  | 23:14,23;24:15;27:3,6; | 11,13;139:14,20,22,24; | 22:18 |
| 5:22;6:4;7:7;39:6; | Gabler (4) | $28: 17 ; 40: 7,8 ; 140: 8,9$ | 140:2,4,6,8,10,12,14 | interconnection (6) |
| 139:10 | 29:11,18;30:13,23 | Harrington's (1) | idea (1) | $15: 13 ; 16: 2 ; 18: 16$ |
| financing (1) | Gabler's (1) | $24: 19$ | 19:4 | 19:5;25:15;26:19 |
| 5:22 | 31:7 | hauls (1) | Ignatius (11) | interest (2) |
| find (2) | gas-fired (1) | 12:7 | 25:4,6,7;27:2;38:10; | 13:13;34:1 |
| 4:20;10:1 | 22:3 | hazard (1) | 40:9,10;139:3,4;140:10, | interested (2) |
| fine (1) | general (1) | 21:11 | 11 | 6:11;30:4 |
| 33:4 | 33:24 | hazardous (1) | immediate (1) | interesting (1) |
| finish (1) | Generally (4) | $13: 6$ | 11:12 | 10:1 |
| 14:11 | 4:18;12:12;20:15; | head (1) | Impact (2) | interruption (1) |
| fire (1) | 21:16 | 16:21 | 25:13;38:22 | 23:22 |
| 22:5 | generate (1) | healthy (2) | important (1) | into (21) |
| first (5) | 10:20 | $7: 9,14$ | $23: 9$ | 6:6,7;7:22;8:4;15:10; |
| $7: 11 ; 10: 4 ; 29: 13 ;$ $37 \cdot 23 \cdot 38 \cdot 17$ | generator (2) | hear (2) | impossible (1) | $18: 23 ; 21: 17 ; 22: 15$ |
| $37: 23 ; 38: 17$ five (2) | 15:4,6 gets (1) | 22:22;37:20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 13:9 } \\ \text { include (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 24 ; 29: 6 ; 32: 23 ; 33: 5 ; \\ & 34: 23 ; 35: 10,14 ; 36: 18 ; \end{aligned}$ |
| 13:24;29:19 | gets (1) 29:22 | heard (1) | 8:16 | 38:6,11;39:16;40:16; |
| FLOOR (1) | given (2) | Hearing (4) | included (4) | 140:21 |
| 34:5 | 9:16;16:22 | 4:2;29:3;139:1;140:23 | . 8:8,20,22;9:4 | introduced (1) |
| flow (1) | goal (2) | heat (2) | includes (1) | $33: 1$ |
| 7:14 | 22:6;26:3 | 21:7;27:13 | 9:1 | investment (1) |
| folk (1) | goes (2) | helpful (2) | including (1) | $6: 1$ |
| 36:4 | 27:17,18 | $30: 8 ; 34: 21$ | $31: 5$ | investors (1) |
| folks (2) | good (5) | helps (1) | income (1) | 7:12 |
| 35:12;38:1 | 11:14;12:10;16:10; | 11:21 | 9:1 | involve (2) |
| following (2) | 22:12;28:22 | higher (1) | increase (2) | 37:24;38:3 |
| $22: 3 ; 38: 14$ follow-up (1) | government (1) | $27: 14$ | 15:15;26:19 | involved (6) |
| follow-up (1) 27:4 | 11:21 | highway (1) | increases (1) | 5:16;8:6,9;9:22;12:7, |
| $27: 4$ forester (1) | Granite (3) | $11: 18$ | 4:22 | . 23 |
| forester (1) | 19:13,16;21:22 | hit (2) | increment (1) | involvement (1) |
| 11:4 | great (1) | 24:10,10 | 16:11 | 5:15 |
| Forestry (7) | 11:19 | hold (1) | incremental (4) | involves (1) |
| 10:5,9,18, 19,23;11:1; | Greenville (2) | 33:18 | 15:24;25:24;26:19,24 | 139:7 |
| 14:7 | 11:7;21:10 | hope (1) | incur (1) | ISO (18) |
| form (1) | grid (1) | 33:11 | $8: 2$ | 8:14;15:5,15,23,23; |
| 25:16 | 16:5 | hopefully (1) | Indeck (1) | 19:9;20:19,19;22:8,11; |
| forma (12) | gross (4) | $10: 1$ | $34: 9$ | 23:4;24:4;26:1,4,5,6,23; |
| 5:17,24;6:4,7,12;7:3, | 26:20;27:11,21,21 | hoping (1) | indicated (2) | 27:23 ISO-New (1) |
| 15;8:4,5,20;9:18;38:22 | guess (12) | $32: 16$ | $33: 21 ; 34: 9$ | ISO-New (1) |
| formas (1) | 9:7;13:6;17:21,23; | hot (1) | industry (2) | 23:7 |
| 4:12 | 19:15;21:1,12,13,19; | 24:9 | 13:14,15 | issue (3) |
| forty (1) | 22:21;27:15;31:13 | hour (2) | information (1) | 19:15;20:3;27:7 |
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| issued (1) | legislative (1) | 9:14;10:10;14:2;15:4; | mean (5) | more (19) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37:10 | 32:4 | 29:4 | 11:12;17:3;20:20; | 5:23;6:5;7:20;13:1,2; |
| items (1) | lender (1) | looked (1) | 28:4;31:20 | 15:10,22;17:20,22,22; |
| 32:17 | 7:16 | 27:7 | meaning (1) | 18:2,3,8;24:5;26:11,13; |
| IV (2) | lenders (3) | looking (13) | 12:16 | 33:13;34:17;140:16 |
| 39:5;139:9 | 6:10;7:18;9:13 | 5:22;7:20;8:21;9:13; | means (2) | morning (9) |
| J |  | 17:21;23:10;25:19;30:5, $5 ; 31: 2,4,8 ; 34: 23$ | $7: 10 ; 27: 24$ measures (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 1 ; 19: 6 ; 35: 5,20 ; 36: 4, \\ & 16,24: 40: 20: 140: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | less (6) | looks (2) l | measures (1) $8: 15$ | most (6) |
| Janelle (4) | 5:13;8:11;13:3;16:13; | 31:3;32:13 | megawatt (2) | 5:18;12:5,11;13:15; |
| 40:5,6;140:6,7 | 28:1,8 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o o p }}(2)$ | 18:21;26:21 | 32:17,23 |
| jumping (1) | letter (2) | 19:12;20:16 | megawatts (18) | motion (11) |
| 22:12 | 38:20,21 | lose (1) | 11:14;15:3;16:13; | 28:24;36:18;37:8,20; |
|  | letting (1) | 15:17 losing (1) | 17:15,15;18:5,17,18; | 38:6,9;39:10,13;139:3, |
| K | 36:20 | losing (1) | 19:14,17,18,21;23:20; | 12;140:21 |
|  | level (3) | 18:4 | 24:5;25:9,17;27:21,24 | motions (1) |
| keep (3) | 25:9;26:17;28:9 | $\operatorname{lot}(4)$ | members (7) | 32:15 |
| 15:12;34:16,17 | levels (1) | 14:7;16:21;18:18;19:6 | 28:23;33:23;34:1,15; | move (4) |
| keeps (1) | 24:23 | lower (3) | 37:12;40:17;140:16 | 12:8;33:5;38:11;139:5 |
| 15:3 | light (1) | 17:2;28:4,6 | mentioned (3) | moved (2) |
| Kent (4) | 20:15 | low-grade (1) | 20:4;23:2;40:18 | 32:23;33:1 |
| 39:19,20;139:20,21 | lighter (1) | 13:19 | metric (2) | moving (1) |
| Key (1) | 20:15 | lumped (1) | 11:8,9 | 32:18 |
| 38:20 | likely (1) | 9:6 | might (6) | much (14) |
| Kind (1) | 24:5 | lunch (1) | 8:2,14;21:19;26:2; | 5:23;12:20;13:4; |
| 22:12 | Likewise (1) | 8:1 | 30:10;37:14 | 14:14;17:22;22:6;26:11, |
| kindly (1) | 36:9 |  | miles (4) | 12;28:2,11;30:10;31:9; |
| 4:4 | limited (2) | M | 11:12;12:5,13,17 | 36:21;39:14 |
| KUSCHE (4) | 5:20;37:11 |  | million (2) | must (2) |
| 6:24;10:2;23:1;25:8 | line (3) | Maine (1) | 13:24;14:1 | 139:15,15 |
|  | 9:1;16:6;23:19 | 11:8 | mind (2) | Muzzey (4) |
| L | list (4) | majority (2) | 10:19;15:12 | 39:23,24;139:24; |
|  | 22:23;29:4;35:2;38:14 | 40:16;139:16 | minimum (2) | 140:1 |
| $\mathbf{l a g}$ (1) | listed (1) | makes (2) | 18:11,15 |  |
| 22:5 | 18:20 | 13:3,4 | Minor (1) | N |
| Laidlaw (1) | Liston (5) | making (1) | 35:24 |  |
| 38:21 | 29:11,20;30:6,13,23 | 32:10 | minutes (11) | name (1) |
| Land (1) | Liston's (1) | managed (2) | 18:21;29:19;30:1,5, | 23:4 |
| 10:24 | 31:6 | 11:7,10 | 12,13,22,23;31:18;32:7; | nationally-respected (1) |
| landowners (1) | little (5) | many (2) | 34:17 | 10:18 |
| 13:1 | 15:2;17:6;20:17,24; | 10:20;20:19 | MIS (2) | nature (1) |
| large (1) | 29:20 | market (1) | 22:14,15 | 6:22 |
| 11:22 | live (1) | 8:2 | missing (1) | necessary (3) |
| larger (1) | 10:14 | markets (1) | $35: 13$ | 31:13;36:24;40:21 |
| $21: 16$ | load (4) | 5:1 | misstated (1) | need (8) |
| last (3) | 20:15,16;22:3,10 | mass (1) | 17:18 | 14:5,6,7;16:1;32:7; |
| 8:5,9;10:10 | load-follow (1) | 21:16 | model (1) | 36:10,16,22 |
| later (3) | 21:15 | Master's (5) | 4:13 | needed (2) |
| 15:18;25:20;37:4 | locally (1) | 10:5,17,22,23;11:5 | models (1) | 14:10,18 |
| Laughter (1) | 13:20 | material (1) | 6:4 | Needleman (7) |
| 10:12 | loggers (3) | 38:12 | modern (2) | 24:18,24;30:12,20; |
| Law (1) | 11:17;12:8,24 | $\boldsymbol{m a x}(1)$ | 14:7,7 | 31:16;32:19,22 |
| 39:5 | logging (3) | 28:1 | modifications (1) | net (6) |
| Leachate (1) | 13:14,15;14:8 | maximum (1) | 21:11 | 11:14;18:9,9;25:8,17; |
| 33:13 | logical (1) | 16:16 | modifying (1) | 26:21 |
| Lease (1) | 13:4 | may (8) | 15:21 | New (9) |
| 38:18 | logs (2) | 6:3;23:2;33:7,22,23; | moisture (8) | 5:9;10:14;11:1;13:19; |
| least (6) | 14:6,6 | 35:4,5,6 | 16:23;17:1,19;18:3; | 16:3;24:10,11;29:10; |
| 4:7;8:5;12:12;27:22; | long (5) | Maybe (5) | 24:22;27:13,15;28:15 | 36:18 |
| 29:2;33:7 | 26:6,9;29:13,16;34:24 | 10:5;17:18;21:2;24:9; | moistures (1) | next (2) |
| leave (6) | longer (2) | 31:17 | 17:7 | 5:2;26:3 |
| 9:20;33:21;35:14; | 10:14;34:18 | McBride (1) | moment (4) | nodding (1) |
| 37:13;38:2;40:18 | look (5) | 23:5 | 28:23;29:1,4;37:8 | 23:18 |
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| nominal (1) | 28:9 | 24:3,13 | 4:23;15:18,24;18:24; | proceeding (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:24 | operating (1) | peak (1) | 20:24;21:20;23:9;29:11; | 29:3;34:3;37:11 |
| none (1) | 22:9 | 28:11 | 31:14;32:24;33:2;34:20; | process (5) |
| 36:4 | operation (1) | penalties (2) | 139:15 | 9:17;16:8,12;34:23; |
| nonpublic (20) | 14:9 | 8:2;24:13 | points (1) | 37:4 |
| 28:24;29:6;34:24; | operational (1) | people (4) | 30:2 | procured (1) |
| 35:7,9,19;36:10,14,17, | 26:23 | 10:20;13:14;17:1; | portion (2) | 12:4 |
| 18,23;37:8;38:6,11; | operations (1) | 19:12 | 29:3;139 | produce (1) |
| 39:17;40:16,21,23; | 11:17 | per (1) | posed (1) | 15:22 |
| 139:6;140:21 | opinion (2) | 18:21 | 4:5 | produced (3) |
| normally (1) | 7:17;13:24 | percent (17) | position (1) | 6:14;11:11;12:21 |
| 32:6 | opportunities (1) | 12:3,3,17;15:16; | 5:13 | producing (1) |
| northern (1) | 13:12 | 16:23;17:1,3,7,7,19,23; | possibility (1) | $17: 13$ |
| 24:10 | opportunity (2) | 18:6;19:24;27:11,19; | 24:8 | Project (8) |
| NORTHROP (7) | 4:8;31:17 | 28:9,15 | possible (3) | 4:23;5:14,17,19,21; |
| 39:12,15;40:3,4; | oranges (1) | percentage (4) | 13:5;26:15;37:23 | 8:2;9:14;11:7 |
| 139:11;140:4,5 | 17:17 | 8:16;11:11;13:7;17:12 | possibly (1) | Project's (1) |
| note (1) | order (3) | perfect (1) | 13:16 | 9:16 |
| 31:12 | 17:20;37:20;39:16 | 12:6 | post (1) | proposed (1) |
| noted (1) | orders (2) | perfectly (1) | 36:13 | 31:22 |
| 10:4 | 22:11;37:10 | 11:24 | Power (11) | provide (3) |
| notice (1) | others (4) | perhaps (2) | 5:8;10:21;12:18;18:6; | 4:12;19:3;24:22 |
| 9:1 | 6:3;15:12;33:7;37:16 | 13:22;33:7 | 19:19;21:4;27:11,21,21; | provided (2) |
| notify (1) | Otherwise (3) | period (1) | 38:1,19 | 7:3;39:7 |
| 40:19 | 15:17;27:23;36:13 | 5:19 | predicted (1) | proximity (3) |
| number (10) | out (12) | person (2) | 5:2 | 11:18;12:1,21 |
| 7:23;8:10;9:4;11:20; | 15:1;16:23;18:3,7,8; | 7:7;23:6 | predicting (1) | Public (24) |
| 16:3,24;18:1;21:10; | 22:24;24:12;28:2;35:4; $36 \cdot 10,20 \cdot 139: 15$ | pertaining (1) | 13:8 | 5:9;29:2;30:18;32:9; |
| $32: 22,24$ numbering (1) | 36:10,20;139:15 | 39:5 | predictions (1) | $33: 22,23 ; 34: 2,4,13,15 ;$ $35 \cdot 11,13,16 \cdot 36 \cdot 17$. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { umbering (1) } \\ & 37: 21 \end{aligned}$ | outfitting (1) | piece (1) 26:23 | 21:21 | 35:11,13,16;36:17; <br> 37:13;38:4;40:17,19,20; |
| numbers (2) | output (18) | pieces (1) | 38:23 | $139: 1,3,5,8 ; 140: 18$ |
| 7:23,24 | 15:3,7,8;16:14,17; | 14:5 | prepare (2) | Purchase (2) |
| numerical (1) | 17:13,20;18:5;19:24; | place (3) | 29:21;34:18 | 5:8;38:19 |
| 37:21 | 21:22;25:8,17;26:17,21; | 5:12;9:17;15:17 | prepared (1) | purely (1) |
| 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:11,21,22;28:6 } \\ & \text { outside (2) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{plan}(4) \\ & 21: 22 ; 29: \end{aligned}$ | 6:8 resen | $4: 23$ |
|  | 36:13;37:17 | 35:14 | $29: 6$ | 38:11 |
|  | outstanding (1) | Planning (1) | presented (1) | purposes (3) |
| $15: 6 ; 19: 8,12,18$ | $32: 15$ | $10: 24$ | $13: 12$ | $5: 24 ; 8: 12 ; 35: 11$ |
| $23: 16 ; 24: 2$ | over (3) | plans (1) | presiding (1) | pursuant (1) |
| Obviously (1)22:5 | 5:1;13:10;15:2 | 30:16 | 39:3 | 139:8 |
|  | own (1) | plant (34) | pretty (1) | put (7) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { occurring (1) } \\ 35: 16 \end{gathered}$ | 21:21 | 10:21;11:13;12:5,13, 18,22;13:13,17;15:9,11; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:10 } \\ & \text { previously (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 5,6 ; 18: 7,8 ; 24: 11 \\ & 28: 2,6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { off (3) } \\ & 15: 7 ; 16: 20 ; 20: 20 \end{aligned}$ | P | 16:19;17:12;18:12,14; | 39:4 | Q |
|  |  | 19:19,22;20:8,20;21:4,8, | price (1) |  |
| officer (1) $39: 3$ | Page (1) | 9,15,15,16;22:2,3;23:8, | $4: 22$ pro (13) |  |
| often (1) | Pages (1) | 10,1,25:8,8 28:3 | pro (13) $4: 12 ; 5: 17,24 ; 6: 4,7,1$ 2:3, | $21: 24$ |
| 22:6 | 40:22 | plants (6) | 7:3,15;8:4,5,20;9:18; | queue (3) |
| one (17) | particularly (1) | 19:23;20:4,9,12;21:2, | 38:21 | 15:17;16:3;19:20 |
| $6: 14 ; 7: 11 ; 8: 14 ; 9: 24$ | $10: 11$ | 2 please (6) | $6: 2 ; 9: 8 ; 12: 2,12 ; 20: 1$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10: 1 ; 18: 19,21,22 ; 20: 20 \\ & \text { 23:1;24:17;28:23;32:19; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parties (8) } \\ & 30: 8 ; 36: 12,20 ; 37: 11, \\ & 14,24 ; 38: 3 ; 40: 19 \end{aligned}$ | please (6) |  | $\mathbf{R}$ |
| 33:7,7,11;34:6 |  | 40:18;139:19 | problem (1) | ramp (1) |
| only (10) | past (1) | plow (1) | 20:16 | 18:20 |
| 20:18;22:18;23:15; | 26:10 | 6:7 | procedural (1) | rapidly (1) |
| 28:2;32:2,4;35:11,16; | pay (1) | plus (2) | 35:23 | 35:3 |
| 37:11;38:3 | 19:9 | 19:21,22 | proceed (3) | rate (2) |
| open (3) | payment (2) | pm (2) | 36:19;38:2;139:19 | 18:20;21 |
| $33: 19 ; 36: 17 ; 40: 20$ | 8:12;23:11 | 4:2;140:23 | proceeded (1) | rather (1) |
| operate (1) | payments (2) | point (13) | 5:21 | 35:5 |
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| rating (3) | 29:9;37:3 | 29:12,18;31:24;32:1; | 22:13 | 10:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:7,10;23:7 | remember (1) | 34:11;35:21,24;36:3,8; | seems (1) | soon (2) |
| ratings (1) | 4:17 | 38:1 | 15:2 | 25:2;35:14 |
| 24:21 | repeat (1) | role (1) | self-schedule (2) | sooner (1) |
| reached (2) | 7:1 | 6:2 | 20:5,10 | 37:5 |
| 5:8,10 | repeated (1) | roles (1) | send (1) | sophisticated (1) |
| ready (1) | 15:23 | 5:20 | 36:20 | 5:23 |
| 9:18 | reporter (1) | roll (3) | sense (4) | sorry (2) |
| realistic (1) | 23:21 | 39:15,18;139:16 | 13:4;30:9;31:8;33:24 | 6:24;9:24 |
| 14:13 | represent (1) | room (3) | sensitivity (5) | sort (5) |
| realistically (1) | 13:18 | 37:13,17;40:18 | 4:12,21;9:12,14,19 | 9:16,18;10:19;11:10; |
| $31: 4$ | representative (2) | Roth (14) | separate (2) | $25: 24$ |
| really (8) | 23:4;34:9 | 4:4,7,10;6:20;7:2; | 11:17;40:24 | source (2) |
| $9: 20 ; 11: 14 ; 13: 8 ; 14: 8$ | representing (1) | 9:23;10:3,15;14:16,19, | sequence (2) | $12: 24 ; 13: 4$ |
| 17:16;22:15;26:8;32:5 | 40:15 | 21;33:6,11,17 | 37:21,22 | specifically (2) |
| reason (1) | request (5) | roughly (1) | Service (1) | 19:3;37:19 |
| 24:8 | 16:3;18:16;24:20; | 14:4 | 5:9 | speculate (2) |
| reasonably (1) | 26:2;29:23 | RSA (2) | services (2) | 5:6;8:15 |
| $5: 2$ | requesting (1) | 38:13;139:9 | 15:7;16:14 | speculative (1) |
| rebut (1) | 16:11 | rules (2) | session (33) | 4:16 |
| 30:2 | requests (1) | 15:15,23 | 4:19;5:7;9:10;28:24; | spoke (1) |
| REC (1) | 4:11 | run (7) | 29:7;34:24;35:7,9,11,13, | 8:1 |
| $9: 2$ | require (1) | 18:15;19:23;20:12,13; | 15,17,19;36:11,14,17,17, | spring (1) |
| recent (1) | 30:10 | $21: 22 ; 22: 6 ; 28: 1$ | 18,23;37:8;38:6,11; | $10: 11$ |
| 23:3 | required (3) | running (7) | 39:17;40:17,19,20,21, | standard (1) |
| recess (3) | 16:7;27:13;39:16 | 10:17;18:6;19:16,18, | 23;139:3,5,6;140:18,21 | 18:11 |
| 35:1,19;140:19 | resolution (1) | $20,21 ; 22: 20$ | sharp (1) | start (5) |
| recognize (1) | $16: 9$ |  | $35: 2$ | 14:11,15;15:1;21:20; |
| $33: 22$ | respond (2) 29:22•30.2 | S | shed (1) <br> 22:10 | 36:4 |
| 140:24 | response (7) | same (6) | shifting (1) | 16:8 |
| record (8) | 4:14,17;5:5;13:20; | 17:20;19:24;20:7,7, | 6:2 | state (2) |
| $22: 13 ; 32: 23 ; 33: 5,19$ | 28:21;38:7;39:11 | 23;30:19 | short (1) | 4:22;11:1 |
| $34: 19 ; 35: 12,18 ; 139: 1$ | rest (3) | saved (1) | 26:8 | stated (4) |
| records (1) | 9:7;12:4;24:11 | 22:23 | shortage (2) | 4:15;19:13;27:16; |
| 39:5 | restate (1) | sawdust (1) | 23:17;24:3 | 30:20 |
| redacted (1) | 4:4 | 11:23 | shortly (1) | statement (4) |
| 39:1 | resume (1) | sawmills (7) | 140:20 | 5:3;31:18;32:11;34:18 |
| referring (1) | 4:4 | 11:17,20,20,22,23; | shut (1) | statements (1) |
| 17:8 | resumed (1) | 12:1,4 | 20:19 | 34:16 |
| reformulate (1) | 4:2 | saying (2) | sign (1) | station (2) |
| 4:8 | resumes (1) | 8:7,8 | 36:13 | 15:7;16:14 |
| refusal (1) | 139:1 | scenarios (2) | similar (2) | statute (1) |
| 4:14 | return (3) | 4:13;8:3 | 12:14;21:9 | 39:16 |
| regard (2) | 36:16;40:19,21 | SCHNIPPER (3) | Simply (3) | stay (2) |
| 5:15;24:21 | revenue (2) | 30:15;31:19,20 | $12: 22 ; 31: 21 ; 35: 18$ | 35:15;37:17 |
| regarding (1) | 9:2,5 | School (2) | simultaneously (1) | steam (1) |
| $40: 22$ | revenues (2) | 10:9;11:1 | 20:13 | 18:23 |
| regulations (1) | 23:10,11 | Science (2) | single (1) | Stewart (4) |
| 28:3 | review (2) | 10:8,24 | 11:5 | 40:1,2;140:2,3 |
| relate (1) | 29:7;140:22 | scratch (1) | SIS (1) | still (5) |
| 37:18 | Richmond (1) | 14:15 | 15:4 | 5:10;11:20;27:18; |
| relationship (1) | 37:16 | seal (2) | situation (1) | 28:11;36:14 |
| 12:10 | right (14) | 39:8;139: | 11:24 | straight (1) |
| relatively (2) | 14:19;16:16;17:5; | sealed (1) | small (1) | 24:16 |
| 11:13,22 | 18:1;22:17;23:15;24:5; | 140:17 | 11:13 | streamlined (1) |
| Reliable (3) | 25:12,20;28:10;31:22; | sealing (2) | someone (2) | 26:11 |
| 19:13,16;21:22 | 32:8;34:11;39:5 | 35:12,18 | 9:20;14:15 | strong (1) |
| relying (1) | robust (4) | second (4) | sometimes (2) | 31:14 |
| 19:1 | 6:11,15;7:5,9 | 4:18;5:7;39:12;139:11 | 12:9,9 | studies (2) |
| remainder (1) | robustness (1) | seeing (1) | somewhat (1) | 16:4;26:10 |
| 29:2 | 7:7 | 140:15 | 17:2 | study (6) |
| remaining (2) | Rodier (10) | seem (1) | son (1) | 15:4;25:10, 13;26:7; |
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| $\begin{gathered} 38: 15,22 \\ \text { stumpage (2) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { though (2) } \\ & 16: 16 ; 18: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:3;15:15;18:10;22:8; } \\ & \text { 23:12;37:9;38:13;39:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { voted (2) } \\ 40: 16 ; 140: 17 \end{array}$ | Y |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subcommittee (1) | $4: 16$ | undergoing (1) | W | Yard (1) |
| 28:20 | three (4) | 11:5 |  | 33:13 |
| subject (3) | 18:21;34:6,17;38:3 | underlying (2) | wait (1) | Yea (1) |
| 4:24;22:7;24:12 | times (4) | 5:1;9:4 | 33:2 | 39:20 |
| Submit (2) | 8:14;11:16;20:19; | uneconomic (1) | wants (1) | year (3) |
| 26:4,5 | 37:17 <br>  | 4:23 | 31:21 | $11: 15 ; 17: 12 ; 26: 13$ |
| submittal (1) | timetable (1) | Unfortunately (1) | water (2) | years (2) |
| $34: 19$ sugested (1) | 32:4 | 6:5 | 27:14,17 | $5: 2 ; 15: 14$ |
| $\underset{6}{\text { suggested (1) }}$ | timing (1) | University (1) | way (2) | Yesterday (1) |
| 6:10 | 35:4 | 11:1 | 32:6;35:2 | 24:19 |
| summary (2) | today (5) | unless (1) | week (1) | York (2) |
| $31: 12,15$ SUNY-ESF (1) | 34:2;35:2,8,10,18 | 24:3 | 26:3 | 10:14;11:2 |
| SUNY-ESF (1) | together (1) $9: 6$ | unrelated (1) | welcome (2) | Z |
| supplemental (1) | told (2) | up (9) | what's (2) |  |
| $16: 2$ | 30:3;37:2 | 4:9;13:12;17:6;18:21; | 18:14;19:6 | zero (1) |
| suppliers (3) | tomorrow (9) | 20:18;22:10;27:16,18; | Whitefield (3) | 20:5 |
| 5:11;11:16;12:8 | 33:10;34:3;35:5,20; | 29:22 | 19:22;21:3,7 |  |
| supply (8) | 36:16,24;37:5;40:20; | upgrades (1) | whole (3) |  |
| 15:5;19:8,12,17; | 140:19 | 16:6 | 14:10;19:4;22:23 |  |
| 23:16;24:2;38:24;39:1 | ton (1) | upon (3) | willing (1) |  |
| support (1) | 10:20 | 14:8;19:1;26:8 | 13:6 |  |
| 11:21 | tonight (1) | Upstate (1) | wind (5) |  |
| sure (5) | 36:20 | 10:14 | 20:8,9,13;21:21;24:6 |  |
| 7:17;27:24;28:2;33:3; | tons (1) | urge (2) | windy (2) |  |
| 35:13 | 11:15 | 31:21;37:6 | 20:14;24:9 |  |
| sustainably (1) | took (3) | Use (2) | wishes (1) |  |
| 12:21 | 4:5;8:9;10:10 | 10:24;28:8 | 31:21 |  |
| Syracuse (1) | top (1) | used (6) | withhold (1) |  |
| 11:2 | 16:20 | 8:16;15:3,5;18:16; | 9:9 |  |
| System (3) | transcript (3) | 25:9,12 | within (4) |  |
| 25:12;38:15,22 | 139:5,7;140:17 | using (4) | 12:5,5,13,17 |  |
| T | Transportation (1) | 11:9;17:1,3;19:8 utilize (1) | without (3) |  |
|  | trucks (1) | 13:21 | WITNESS (8) |  |
| talking (3) $5 \cdot 22 \cdot 19 \cdot 5 \cdot 26 \cdot 13$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14: 6 \\ \operatorname{try}(2) \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 24 ; 10: 2,13 ; 14: 17 \\ & 23: 1.18: 28: 20: 30: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5:22;19:5;26:13 } \\ & \text { team }(\mathbf{2}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{try}(\mathbf{2}) \\ & 29: 1 ; 36: 11 \end{aligned}$ | V | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:1,18;28:20;30:11 } \\ & \text { witnesses (9) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 5:6;9:21 | Trying (6) | vaporize (1) | 29:5,8,10,10,14,17; |  |
| technical (4) | 4:22;17:18;21:13,14; | 27:14 | 30:9,16;37:3 |  |
| 4:18,18;5:7;18:20 | 23:24;31:3 | varied (1) | wood (11) |  |
| ten (2) | turns (1) | 12:2 | 12:3,24;13:17,19; |  |
| 30:1,13 | 36:9 | various (1) | 17:8,20,22,22;18:2;22:5; |  |
| term (1) | two (6) | 4:13 | 28:1 |  |
| 22:14 | 15:14;29:17;31:5; | vary (1) | work (3) |  |
| terms (2) | 32:4;33:7;34:6 | 27:12 | 25:23;26:1;37:19 |  |
| 26:16;37:10 | two-thirds (2) | vendor (1) | worked (1) |  |
| terribly (3) | 139:16;140:16 | 15:11 | 23:5 |  |
| 6:15;7:4,6 |  | verbal (3) | working (1) |  |
| test (1) | $\mathbf{U}$ | 28:21;38:7;39:11 | 26:12 |  |
| 4:12 |  | verification (1) | works (1) |  |
| testimony (5) | UCAP (3) | 32:15 | 35:4 |  |
| 5:16;10:4;22:23;31:6, | 8:6,10;23:7 | versus (1) | world (1) |  |
| 7 | Uh-oh (1) | 27:19 | 32:7 |  |
| thereafter (1) | 10:2 | vet (1) | worse (1) |  |
| 140:20 | unanimous (3) | 9:13 | 20:17 |  |
| therefore (2) | 40:13,15;140:14 | vicinity (1) | Wright (4) |  |
| 4:16;40:15 | uncertainty (1) | 11:12 | 39:21,22;139:22,23 |  |
| Thirty (2) | $5: 13$ | vote (3) | written (1) |  |
| 18:18;30:12 | under (10) | 39:15;40:15;139:15 | 34:18 |  |

