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MR. IACOPINO: They have also provided a one-page exhibit entitled, "Cate Street Capital, Inc. Project Development and Investment Management." This was submitted at the request of the Committee and it has been marked as the Applicant's Exhibit No. 68.
(Laidlaw Exhibit 68 marked for identification.)

MR. IACOPINO: The third
exhibit that has been presented to us from the Applicant in response to a question from the Committee is entitled, "Laidlaw Berlin BioPower, LLC Response to Site Evaluation Committee Request to Applicant's Witness Dammon Frecker for Information Regarding the Project's Estimated Wood Fuel Consumption." And this is a two-page document that is marked as Applicant's Exhibit No. 69.
(Laidlaw Exhibit 69 marked for identification.)

MR. IACOPINO: The Applicant
has also provided a one-page exhibit which has been marked as Exhibit 70. Exhibit 70 is a one-page exhibit containing the FIA URL. And
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
that is Exhibit 70, Applicant's Exhibit 70.
(Laidlaw Exhibit 70 marked for identification.)

MR. IACOPINO: The next new exhibit is Exhibit No. 71. It is entitled, "Kusche," K-U-S-C-H-E, "Supplemental Testimony, Exhibit 55, Line 16." And this is that portion of the testimony that Mr . Kusche corrected at the beginning of his testimony, and it's marked as exhibit -- Applicant's Exhibit No. 71.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Can you -okay. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. Is there --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: No, we're
fine. Thank you.
(Laidlaw Exhibit 71 marked for identification.)

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And the final new exhibit from the Applicant is marked as Exhibit 72, Applicant's Exhibit 72. And it is a two-page, oversized document containing two photographs and two insets demonstrating a visual simulation with ash silo, existing view looking
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
northeast from recreation site towards facility. That's in the lower right-hand column of the first page of that exhibit. And that exhibit is Applicant's Exhibit 72.
(Laidlaw Exhibit 72 marked for identification.)

MR. IACOPINO: I also
understand that Mr. Rodier has a motion to make that pertains to Clean Power Development Exhibit 3, and a request for redaction and non-public disclosure.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr. Rodier, do you wish to make that motion at this time?

MR. RODIER: Yes, I do. We complied with the applicable protective order. What's available on the Committee's Web site is the public, redacted version of the testimony. However, when the docket -- our exhibit book was prepared -- I think it's Exhibit 3 -- it's in that book. Inadvertently, the non-public, unredacted version is in the exhibit books handed out. I don't think anybody on the Committee or any other party has a copy of that exhibit book. But in any event, what we really should do is we
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
should substitute for our -- we want to add an Exhibit 3A, which is the public, redacted version. And we want to protect the original Exhibit 3 that's in the exhibit book, which unfortunately was the unredacted version. Pursuant to the Committee's applicable protective order, the Committee recognized that this is, you know, energy infrastructure critical, something like that. It should be protected. Everybody understood that. And it was our error in putting our book together. So we'd like to correct that. MR. IACOPINO: Can I ask Mr. Rodier a question?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Please do, Attorney Iacopino.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Rodier, as
I understand it, what was contained in the answer to question -- or in the supplemental testimony of Mr. Gabler in Exhibit 3 included portions of the system impact study that was previously ruled to be a non-public document by the Chairman; is that correct?

MR. RODIER: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And so
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
what you're doing is you're offering a redacted version for a public version. You're asking the Committee -- you're asking the Chairman to order that the original Exhibit No. 3 be a non-public document -- is that correct -- because it contains critical energy infrastructure information?

MR. RODIER: That's right.
MR. IACOPINO: All right. I have already marked the redacted copy as a public record, CPD 3A.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. I appreciate your motion, Attorney Rodier, and I grant your motion. And we will follow-up in writing to set forth and confirm the basis for our granting of this motion.
(CPD Exhibit 3A marked for identification.)

MR. IACOPINO: And I'm passing out copies of 3A to the Committee. But just so the Committee knows, Document 3 you're entitled to, and it has more information in it than 3A.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: But
Document 3 should now be labeled as a
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION]\{8/27/10\}
confidential document.
MR. IACOPINO: Yes, you should
label it as, "Confidential," and you should not disclose it to the public.

I understand that Mr.
Needleman has three or four questions asked by the Committee, where he has been asked to get the answers and get back to us. And I understand that he has those answers now, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if you want to take them up at this point or --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: How much time do you think you need to provide us with these answers?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Five minutes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Five
minutes? Why don't we go ahead and do that, just so that we can largely complete your case in chief.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
One of the members of the
Committee, I can't remember who, asked what the criteria were for extending the period of time
that the New Market Tax Credit allocations could be granted. And the information that I've received tells me that extensions are purely at the discretion of the allocatees and that the allocatees have several factors that incentivize them to disburse these credits quickly, including that the allocatees get a fee the quicker that they're disbursed; and also, if they demonstrate that they are disbursing these, they will get more of them from the Treasury. And so those incentives, combined with the fact that it's purely in the discretion of the allocatee, I believe answers the Committee's question on that. The Committee asked how
frequently the FIA data is updated. And we received brief response by e-mail from the Forest Service that told us that new data is added once per year, but there is no specific time during the year when they add the new data, that it is done largely based on when they receive it and collate it. We were not able to get more information than that.

Mr. Wright, at one point, asked whether the facility would be applying for
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an exemption under RSA 72-A related to certain pollution control equipment. Pursuant to the stipulation with the City, it is not our intention to do so at this point. There is a provision in the stipulation that exclusively reserves the right to the City and the Applicant to discuss the negotiation of a payment in lieu of taxes. And based on my discussion with the City, it is our intention to try to undergo that process, and presumably any pollution exemption would be accounted for in that process.

And then I believe the last outstanding question was that the Committee had asked us whether we would be able to get any additional air emissions information pertaining to the two Babcock \& Wilcox boiler conversions that were mentioned in Georgia and Tennessee. We have continued to try to get that information and have no further update beyond what Mr. Frecker provided to you the other day. And that was it. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Needleman.

Attorney Rodier, before I turn things over to you to present your first witness,

I just want to explain for the members of the public who are present, and really for all the parties, what we were working on late yesterday afternoon and this morning up until our lunch break, and how I'm hoping to proceed from here.

We were in a non-public
session starting middle of the afternoon yesterday until just before our lunch break today to review a series of 12 confidential documents that were all presented to us by the Applicant. In the course of our consideration of those documents, there are just a couple of topics that came up that I think it's important that we state on the public record.

One, is there was some discussion regarding information that would be collected by the Applicant pertaining to wood usage and sources of wood in connection with their would supply agreement, to which would be attached their Exhibit 60, which is a proposed sustainability condition. And we asked the Applicant whether they would consider reporting data they collect pursuant to that document, as well as possibly other data relating to wood
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
usage, whether they would consider reporting that periodically to the Committee. And I understand that the Applicant indicated that they would not object to such a condition if the Committee were to issue a certificate in this matter.

Second, there was another exhibit, Exhibit 38, a confidential exhibit of the Applicant which is entitled, "Development Agreement and Associated Documents." This agreement had appended to it certain documents, which, upon closer examination, the Committee determined are, in fact, public documents because they had been recorded in the registry of deeds; and accordingly, those documents will be released and made part of the public portion of the record in this proceeding. And that portion of the transcript of the non-public session relating to inquiries about one of those documents will also be made part of the public record in this proceeding. And again, $I$ just wanted to just put those pieces of information on the record of the public proceeding here -- the public portion of this proceeding, I should say.

I believe those are all the
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housekeeping items we need to attend to. My goal here for this afternoon is to do our best to try to get through Clean Power Development's case in chief, which is a presentation of two witnesses, Mr. Liston and Mr. Gabler, and then to proceed to closing arguments, resolution of any outstanding motions, and then opportunity for public comment. We're just going to have to see how quickly this process moves forward. I'm going to ask counsel and all parties involved to please be as clear and direct as you can in your questioning and cross-examination of the witnesses, and we will see if we're going to be able to complete all of this this afternoon or whether we're going to have to extend this portion of this proceeding to another day. So, with that, Attorney

Rodier.
MR. RODIER: Okay. Mel

## Liston.

Mr. Chairman, if we get to the point where there may be a time constraint, CPD's certainly willing to stand down to allow the people who drove all the way from Berlin here \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
this afternoon to make public comment, to do it today so they don't have to drive down again Monday. That's just the worst case. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.

I appreciate you making me aware of your willingness.

MR. RODIER: Okay. Can we have Mr. Liston sworn in, please.
(WHEREUPON, the witness was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

MELVIN E. LISTON, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RODIER:
Q. Mr. Liston, will you identify yourself.

What's your full name?
A. Melvin Edward Liston.
Q. What's your current title at CPD?
A. My current title at Clean Power Development is as the general manager.
Q. Okay. And when we filed -- we're talking here about what's been marked for identification as CPD Exhibit 1; is that correct.
A. Exhibit 1 is what? My testimony?
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]
Q. Yeah. Let me just -- let's just assume that's the case, okay, so we can keep going. And in that testimony, what title did you designate for yourself?
A. President of CPD.
Q. Okay. So is that -- that would be a correction to your testimony --
A. Yes. That's the only correction.
Q. And you're saying that's the only correction.
A. That's the only correction.
Q. Okay. Now, you prepared this testimony yourself?
A. Yes.
Q. Nobody else wrote it for you or anything like that?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And is it accurate, fully accurate, to the best of your information, knowledge, and belief?
A. You're talking about the prefiled testimony?
Q. Yes.
A. I adopt it completely. It's accurate based upon the information that was available to
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
us in the documents and the application of Laidlaw BioPower at the time we submitted it, which was in May 2010.
Q. Okay. Now, mindful of the Chairman's admonition, if you will, that we want to keep this moving, I would like you to begin by sort of a brief statement of the purpose and summary of your testimony, if you would.
A. Okay. My testimony is obviously about biomass. There's several areas of that that we have to go over in greater -- lesser or greater amount. It involves project sizing; fuel requirement; fuel supply available, which has a couple of subsets involved; and sustainability and price; concern for the ratepayers, and the effect on green jobs.
Q. Okay. And those kind of correspond with the subject headings in your written testimony; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Well, let's turn to Page 4 of what's been marked as CPD 1. That's your prefiled testimony. Do you have it in front of you?
A. I do.
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
Q. Okay. I want you to -- on Page 4, there's a section here on proper project sizing.
A. Correct.
Q. Can you just briefly summarize where you're coming from on that.
A. Well, proper project sizing would be that it matches the fuel available on a sustainable basis and an affordable price for a merchant power developer who needs to be -- as a merchant power developer, take a fuel risk. And there are a number of things that correlate in that. But generally speaking, a 50-mile radius is the max. Now, there are examples around the country that are totally different than what we have in Berlin, where there are larger radius plants. You probably will get into that. But 50 miles is the max.

And in the case of Berlin, because of the fact that the northern part of New Hampshire, from a biomass development standpoint, is basically mature -- in that, there are a significant number of biomass plants already up there -- therefore, there
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]
is a significant demand on the same resource that another plant would use.
Q. Mr. Liston, are you trying to say you don't put the cart before the horse -- meaning, you don't -- you know, what comes first is you look at the fuel available, and then you say what's the proper project size? The reverse of that is if you say, okay, this is the project size, now let's go and determine how much fuel we need, how we're going to get it? Is that what you're saying? MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, before he answers this question, I want to object to the direct testimony being given and the leading questions asked by Attorney Rodier. I don't believe that the Applicant's witnesses were provided an opportunity through a series of leading questions to essentially elaborate on their direct testimony. The purpose of the proceeding is to provide an opportunity for cross-examination. A brief statement about the purpose of the testimony is one thing, but $I$ think Attorney Rodier is going way beyond that at this point.
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, we would join in that objection.

MR. RODIER: Well, Mr.
Chairman, if I could respond. I thought I understood yesterday, you said, how much time do I need for my direct testimony. I said 15 minutes. You said very good.

As far as the leading questions are concerned, we're here to get through this thing as quickly as possible. I know. Obviously, I ask leading questions on cross-examination all the time. I know the difference. And I'm just doing this to keep things moving. I don't think there's any prejudice to any party at all from what I'm doing.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Attorney Rodier, I'm going to allow you to proceed. I hear the objection. I did tell you yesterday, yes, you could have some time to quickly get a summary of his testimony out here. But I would ask you to please recall that the Committee has had this testimony, we have all reviewed this testimony. And I think if there are very
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]
particular pieces that you wish to call out and, for example, to confirm that Mr. Liston still subscribes to those positions, I think that's fine. But $I$ think ultimately what we need is an opportunity for us to be able to ask questions of Mr. Liston. Okay?

MR. RODIER: Okay. I
understand that. And I think that's very fair and it's appropriate. So I guess what I'm going to do then is ask --

BY MR. RODIER:
Q. Mr. Liston, you heard what the Chairman advised us to do?
A. Correct.
Q. I'll ask you to take one minute or two minutes, one minute, to finish up what we've tried to do here in summary of your position.

MR. RODIER: By the way, Mr. Chairman, I did rise the other day and say, when the Committee gave Laidlaw every opportunity to comment and critique on Mr. Liston's testimony, I said we're going to need an opportunity to respond and rebut, Mr . Chairman. And I thought
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
we all agreed to that. But having said that, I understand Attorney Iacopino has in mind some questions that may help resolve our concern on that.

BY MR. RODIER:
Q. So, Mr. Liston, would you take a couple minutes then and wrap it up.
A. So as we get into the next category, which is fuel requirement, that involves a determination using a number of different variables which are somewhat arbitrary. Sometimes some of the numbers that you might pick would be what would be called conservative and others might be aggressive. But when you're making these analyses about the fuels required, you're looking at things like the moisture content, the boiler efficiency. We should also be looking at the turbine efficiency or the plant heat rate --
Q. Mr. Liston, I'm going to have to ask you to move on to Existing Biomass Use is Understated. We've only got a limited amount of time here, okay.
A. Existing biomass...
Q. That's the next section, on Page 13. Just looking for one or two sentences on each. I know that this is kind of unexpected from what I prepared you for, but it is the way it is.
A. All right. Major issue $I$ would have with this is that the chart, Table 1 , was presented to us in the application. And it's got a lot of errors and a lot of flaws and a lot of misleading information. But it does establish that there was 6.2 million tons of wood assigned.

And then we go into the discussions. I mean, there's facilities left out. There's a major error in the consideration of the Schiller plant, which plays into this whole thing quite nicely. And --
Q. Okay. Mr. Liston, how about fuel that was -- how about moving on to fuel availability? That was on fuel consumption. How about a few words on fuel availability? Of course, that means how much is available, as you know more than $I$ do.
[WITNESS: LISTON]
A. Yup. Got to get to the right page, I guess, for that.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Can you tell us where in your testimony you address that issue?

MR. LISTON: Page 13 is where I want to go for that.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Page 13.
MR. LISTON: Yes. Starts at Page 13. I'm going the wrong direction.
A. Oh, okay. That has to do with how the biomass is assigned and all the assumptions about use of biomass. So we started out with a, I think 6.2 million amount of fuel. That gets to 6.7 through an increased utilization factor, which I think was misleadingly talked about. And then it goes to, I believe, 7.2, which is as a result of a more competitive market, which means price.
Q. Okay. That was good.

Did I hear you correctly by saying your last matter in summarizing your testimony was green jobs? Did you say that?
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION]\{8/27/10\}
A. Concern for the ratepayers and green jobs, yes.
Q. Okay. Can you briefly summarize your testimony on those two areas.
A. Well, once again, in order to put a 70-megawatt plant down in the middle of a bunch of existing plants where the forest supply of material is already presently used up or accounted for, fuel's going to have to come from a great distance. And every implication is that their plan for this is that they're going to be able to pay more to make that happen; also, that they're going to pay more and be able to attract wood away from other users, which is going to have a negative impact on their ability to stay economically viable and, therefore, their ability to maintain what green jobs they have.

There's at least five biomass plants that are in close proximity, with about 100 employees that work in those plants.

It's pretty clear from conversations I've had with them, that they're all
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]
concerned that, if this goes forward, they won't be economically viable and that they'll shut down.
Q. Okay. How about a few words on -- what did you say? Concern for ratepayers?
A. Well, obviously --
Q. Give us a long sentence, one sentence, okay, on your concern for ratepayers.
A. This plant is going to pay an above-market rate and appears to have out-of-the-market terms in a redacted purchase power agreement. That is not a merchant power plant.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Let's stop there. That was very good.

MR. RODIER: This witness is ready for cross-examination, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Rodier. Be assured that you will have a full opportunity for any redirect here, if there are any additional items --

MR. RODIER: Sure.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: -- that you
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[WITNESS: LISTON]
wish to ensure are brought out, that are not brought out.

So, the first party who will have an opportunity to cross-examine this witness will be the Applicant, Attorney Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you, Mr.
Chair.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Liston.
A. Hi. Good afternoon.
Q. Could you turn your attention to Page 35 of your prefiled testimony, please.
A. Thirty-five?
Q. And could you please read aloud Lines 9 through 11.
A. "The most serious impact that will assuredly play out relates to the increased pressure that will be placed upon local forest resources to supply biomass. It is an illusion to think that the local area will not be over-harvested in the 70-megawatt Laidlaw scenario."
Q. Thank you. When you wrote that, you did not \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
know that Laidlaw would actually have the supply agreement that we now know about with Cousineau; is that correct?
A. That's correct. It was not part of the prefiled information.
Q. And you also had not seen the proposed sustainability condition which Laidlaw has submitted as Exhibit 60; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you also had not heard all of the testimony that this Committee has heard over the last four and a half days; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you had also not heard various expressions from the Committee from time to time about the desire to see -- to ensure that Laidlaw would purchase as much wood as possible from local resources; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Given all of those things that you did not have access to, which you now have access to, do you still believe your statement here
to be true?
A. Absolutely true.
Q. You told me at the technical session on June 25th that your proposed plant in Berlin will use 340,000 tons per year of wood; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you also told me that you will sustainably acquire that wood from a 30-mile radius; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you said here today, and you said previously, that you believe the Laidlaw plant is too big; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you've also suggested that you really can't go out beyond a 50 -mile radius to get wood; is that correct?
A. You can't get it out there with a favorable price beyond the 50.
Q. And so you would suggest that there's no way that Laidlaw can get its 750,000 tons of wood within a 50-mile radius; is that correct?
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A. Laidlaw can get a million tons of wood at 50 miles if they pay more money than everybody else because it will come out of the other power plants. Two million, even. I don't know what the upper limit -- they can have it all if they can pay whatever price it takes.
Q. We've gone through a lot of analysis here trying to look at the different ways to figure out whether there's enough wood. What I'd like to do is take a moment, forget all of that, and just focus on your facts and the numbers you used and explore from that perspective. And what I'm going to do is go up to the board so everybody can see what I'm thinking. And I wonder if there's an easy way for you to turn around and follow along with me on this.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And I guess
we'll probably designate this as Applicant's Exhibit 73; is that right?

MS. VAUGHN: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: I would just
ask that as you do this, you be mindful that the
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]
stenographer is taking down everything that's said. So, Mr. Liston, if when you do speak, if you could turn in her direction so she could see your lips.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, excuse me. It's a little unusual for the witness to be forced to stand to watch Attorney Needleman testify. And I can't see the board.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm happy
to -- want to pull a chair around?
(Mr. Needleman drawing on White Board.)
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So what I've done here is drawn a circle with a line and I've put 30 on there, and that represents a 30 -mile radius. And I've got your plant in the middle of the $30-\mathrm{mile}$ radius. Do you follow that so far?

MR. RODIER: Mr. Chair, the hearing's not about CPD. So I just would make that general objection, okay, and leave it to you to decide if this needs to be curtailed.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I'm going to allow this line of questioning to proceed. But I hear your point.
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BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. In order to get the area here, we take pi times the radius squared; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. So if we multiply 3.14 times the radius squared, which is 900 -- are you following me?
A. I am.
Q. -- we get 2,826 . So there's 2,826 square miles in your circle; is that correct?
A. I'm not going to challenge your math.
Q. Okay.
A. It is what it is.
Q. Then you told me you're going to use 340,000 tons of wood for your plant; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So, if I take 340,000 tons and I divide it by 2,826 , I get 120.3 tons of wood per square mile in that radius. So you're telling me that your plant will sustainably acquire 120.3 tons in that radius; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So, if I now expand the circle out and make
[WITNESS: LISTON]
it a 50 -mile radius, which you say is the maximum, and we assume that the Laidlaw plant is in there, let's do the math. Again, doing the area, pi times the radius squared, we multiply 3.14 times 50 squared, which is 2500, and we get an area of 7,850 miles, a much bigger circle. And then when we multiply 7850 times 120.3, I get 944,355 tons of wood available in that 50-mile radius. So, using your math, that shows that there's almost 200,000 tons more available for Laidlaw than we're proposing to use; isn't that correct?
A. That's absolutely wrong.
Q. Why is that wrong?
A. I'm going to come up and draw pictures now.
Q. Sure.
(Mr. Liston drawing on White Board.)
A. Let's assume this is north. You left -good trick. You leave me with one that won't write.
Q. I think there's others that will work.
A. North. So this would be east, okay, west and south. So let's just say that Berlin's,
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like, right there, okay. Starting right about here, you got White Mountain National Forest that gets bigger as you go up, okay. Thirty miles away you got a plant called Whitefield right about here. Then you got another one over here called Bethlehem. And you got another one on the Vermont border. We'll say that's there. Right there. They're all -- I think this one's 16, this one's 20 and this one's 20, okay. There's almost 60 megawatts of installed power there. Each one of them has an overlapping thing, okay. Each one of them, using your -- what do you call it, amoebas -- they have a tendency to go where the fuel is available, in whatever direction. Nobody goes in here. This is No Man's Land.

So that piece right there, as you go out into your thing, you're not going to be able to get wood out of all of this. And that is a rough interpretation of it.

But as you get here, you're up against another outfit that also has 30 miles. So that 30 -mile one is going right around like
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that, and this one's going right around like that. Okay?

These guys -- as you know, wood goes where it's easiest. So if you drew a line right through there, you might say we're in contention with this bunch, okay, because that's the median line. And if we have to get extra, it's going to come from up here. It's going to come from up here.

We also looked at -- or in our study, we also get almost half of our wood from round wood. We don't use the round wood -or we don't think of the round wood the same you do. We consider it opportunity wood. We're interested in the round wood that really doesn't have another market, that if you put it on a pulp load, if you deliver a pulp load that's got logs like this and logs like this, you got a downgraded pulp log load. You're going to get less for that. The kind of pulp logs we're talking about presently go for about 23 tons, or something like that. They dry faster than wood chips. So the more of them you buy -- oftentimes
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they're lighter when they're delivered, so you're not paying as much for it. And it's a more effective way of keeping your fuel costs down and getting the volume you need.
Q. So if I could just pause for a minute. So you're basically saying that the analysis works out to 30 miles. But when we extend it from 30 to 50 , there's something going on in that next 20 miles that causes it to break down. That's your argument?
A. You're coming up against three plants here. If you want to go out 40, you got Alexandria --
Q. Well, actually --
A. -- and down here just a little bit further --

MR. RODIER: Let the witness --
(Court Reporter interjects.) MR. RODIER: I said we should let the witness finish his answer before interrupting him.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: The witness certainly may finish his answer.
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A. Unless you got another question, I think I'm finished there.

MR. RODIER: I didn't even --
I was unable to hear your answer, Mr. Liston, because of Attorney Needleman. So, if nobody else --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Repeat your last couple sentences and your response, please.
A. What he's asking about is what happens as you go beyond the 30 -mile.

Actually, by the way, we figure these things as the wood -- I think it was in 20-mile -- how much wood you get in $20-\mathrm{mile}$, how much wood you get in $30-\mathrm{mile}$, in bands. So as you go out to the next one, if we say the next one is 60 or 70 miles, let's say, that's a band. And because of that distance, that wood coming from that band costs more than the wood that's coming from the 30-band or from, say, a 10-band, okay. But the further you go out, the more facilities that you're impacting.

And when you're talking about any high-grade logs -- I know it was brought up
in testimony, about the idea that there used to be 1.2 million tons of demand in Berlin. A big piece of that demand is now handled through Shelburn, which is, I think, one town south of Gorham, the Shelburn Landing where they bring in the logs, debark them. I don't know if they grind them. I think they might chip them there. Or they may deliver them in log form. But they're basically gathering these logs out of this area that you say, you know -- or some of the people have said those logs are no longer, you know, producing, or we're going to win them back. Well, you're going to win back wood from these power plants, from that Shelburn Landing where they collect logs and then truck them over to NewPage in Rumford.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. Well, let me ask it this way: You would agree with me that, certainly in the first 30 miles, if Laidlaw were built, they would have the 340,000 tons available that your plant proposes to use -- assuming for the moment your plant is not built, just looking
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at Laidlaw; is that fair to say?
A. That's absolutely correct.
Q. And you would agree with me that there's some amount beyond that area, from 30 miles to 50 miles. And I've suggested it's about 950, which is 200,000 more than we need. You're suggesting it's some amount less; is that correct?
A. I would be surprised if it was as much as you think. You're picking up on diminishing returns as you go out, with competition coming back at you from other facilities.
Q. Do you know how much wood would be available, using your math, if we took those circles out just to 55 miles?
A. I didn't study it.
Q. One point one four million tons.

Do you know how much would be available, using your math, if we took it out to 60 miles? One point three six million. So, just going out to a 60-mile radius, using your math, we have 1.36 million tons available, which is 700,000 tons more than this plant needs.
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
A. No way. No way.
Q. I'm just using your numbers. We don't have to --
A. What I'm telling you is you have hardly any wood that's available in this next band going south because it's already taken by other facilities. The only way you're going to get it is to pay a higher price and take it away from other facilities that presently use it and maintain three jobs.
Q. Now, you also assessed in your testimony the amount of wood that you think the Laidlaw facility will use; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did this in several ways. And what I want to do is look at a couple of the ways you did it and ask you some questions about it.

Let me begin by looking at your testimony on Page 12, if you would, please. I'm looking particularly at Lines 2 and 3. And we've talked a lot about this "rule of thumb" and 13,000 tons per megawatt during this proceeding. I just want to ask you
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]
some questions about that.
Have you had a chance yet to read Committee Exhibit No. 11, which is the
"Energy From Forest Biomass Potential
Economic Impacts in Massachusetts"? Are you familiar with that?
A. That's the one you gave out yesterday?
Q. I believe so, yes.
A. I'm about halfway through it.
Q. Okay. I'm looking -- do you have a copy of it?
A. I think so.
Q. I'm looking on Page 15 of that exhibit.
A. What's the exhibit number?
Q. It's Committee Exhibit No. 11.
A. I know I got one, but I don't know if $I$ have it with me.
Q. We can get you a copy.
A. I've got one. "Energy from Forest Biomass Economic Impacts in Massachusetts." Is that the one?
Q. Yes.
A. All right. I got it listed as 10 .
Q. I may be wrong.
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A. It's 11, huh.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I believe we have marked that as Committee Exhibit 11. BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Okay. I'm looking at the top of Page 15.
A. Yeah, I didn't read this far. But, anyway.
Q. And there's an incomplete paragraph on the top of Page 15, but there's a point that starts on the second line toward the end where it says "From these figures." Do you see that?
A. Which paragraph?
Q. It's the incomplete paragraph at the top of Page 15.
A. Okay.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Okay. "From these figures..." -- you want me to read it?
Q. Yeah, could you please --

MR. RODIER: Excuse me just a second. Mr. Liston, only if you know the answer to the question do you have to answer it, okay. You're not familiar with this document, so I'd like you to only answer if you are sure of your
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answer.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. Could you please read that, Mr. Liston, out loud.
A. I can read it.
Q. Okay.
A. "From these figures we then calculate biomass plant wood demand to be 10,389 tons per megawatt of biomass capacity per year, or 1.7 million additional tons of wood chips annually for the 165-megawatt scenario to be modeled."
Q. Thank you. Could you look at Page 15 of your testimony, please.
A. I presume that when I read something I don't get a chance to comment on it? Is that the way it is?
Q. We'll come back to it.
A. Okay. Which page you want me on?
Q. Page 15 of your testimony.
A. Okay.
Q. Looking at Line 10 -- there's obviously more there than just Line 10 -- tell me if I'm characterizing this right. You are saying
in your testimony that, based on 2009 data, the PSNH Schiller plant used 533,721 tons of wood; is that right?
A. Not there. I'm basing that on a piece of paper I got from the timberland owners that verifies it, because Public Service provided that information to them.
Q. And I'm not contesting that. I accept that number. Do you know what size plant PSNH Schiller is?
A. Fifty megawatts.
Q. And do you know how many tons per megawatt that would equate to if you divided 533,721 by 50 megawatts?
A. I don't have a calculator.
Q. I can represent to you that it would be 10,660 tons per megawatt.
A. That has to do with the amount of hours' operation at full load. That's a dispatched plant that doesn't run very often. They have a lot of maintenance problems. I suspect they got a really poor availability.
Q. Do you have a copy of exhibit -- Applicant's Exhibit No. 57 in front of you?
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A. No.
Q. Let me give you a copy.
A. I got my own.
Q. Oh, do you?
A. Of course. You listed it and I made it.
Q. I'll take that back then.
A. I got to find it, though. Yes.
Q. Applicant 57 is a description of a proposed biomass plant named the Nacagdoches generating facility; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And do you see a heading on that sheet that says "Size"?
A. That's a 100-megawatt biomass plant.
Q. Okay. And if you go down to the Technology section, the second paragraph, do you see that?
A. Well, $I$ don't know if $I$ have the same exact thing. I've got a bunch of stuff I took off. You better give me yours back.
Q. Let me make sure you're looking at the right one. Do you see that second paragraph?
A. Size, you're talking about?
Q. The second paragraph under Technology.
A. Okay. Technology consists of bubbling fluidized --
Q. Well, I'm not asking you to read that. I'm asking if you see the second paragraph under Technology that begins, "Approximately..." (Witness reviews document.)
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. What is the fuel consumption estimated for this plant?
A. The fuel, which consists of agricultural waste --
Q. No, the total amount. Approximately how much --
A. I'm going to define the fuel.
Q. I'm asking you to just --

MR. RODIER: This witness
should have an opportunity. He's being confronted with something that's not his testimony at all. He deserves an opportunity to take a moment to read this and think about it for a moment, rather than being pressured for an answer on the spot, Mr. Chairman.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Please take as long as you'd like to read \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
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the document and let me know when you're ready.
A. I'm ready.
Q. Okay. Under Technology, the paragraph that begins "Approximately," what are they saying will be the total amount of fuel used at this facility?
A. Approximately 1 million tons of fuel, of which is multiple kinds of biomass, not wood chips.
Q. I understand. And the size of the facility is 100 megawatts; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. So, then, it would be correct to say that this facility will use about 10,000 tons per year -- 10,000 tons per megawatt of fuel; is that correct?
A. You know, it's fuel of multiple parameters and specifications. Some of it's dried, some of it's wet. It's not wood chips.
Q. Are you familiar -- could you turn to Exhibit 58, please.
A. Exhibit 58. I don't have any exhibits up here.
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Applicant's 58, Counsel?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Correct.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. Take a minute to read that, please.
A. You want me to read the whole thing, or just
the part you got underlined?
Q. Well, if you're more comfortable reading it all, you certainly can. But I'm just going to ask you questions about the parts I have underlined.
(Witness reviews document.)
MR. RODIER: I'm going to have to look on because $I$ don't know what he's underlined, Mr. Chairman. May I approach and stand by the witness?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes, you may for that purpose.

MR. RODIER: Okay.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. Do you know the size of this facility, Mr.

Liston?
MR. RODIER: One moment,
please. This print is so small, I can't read it.
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So I'll just let Mr. Liston do the best that he can.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. Okay. What's the size of this facility?
A. The same as in all of the three that they proposed: They're all 100-megawatt plants that burn multiple types of biomass, a minor component of wood. And they use a 75 radius -- a 75-mile radius, each of them.
Q. How much fuel will this consume per year?
A. One million tons.
Q. So that's also about 10,000 megawatts per ton; is that right?
A. Totally unapplicable, but yes.
Q. And do you have Applicant's Exhibit 59 in front of you?
A. No, but you got one for me, don't you?
Q. I certainly do.
A. This is how I collect them. I make sure that you give them to me. Biopak...
Q. Would you take a minute to read that, please.
A. They've changed the name of it.
(Witness reviews document.)
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MR. RODIER: Mr. Chairman, could we have an explanation of what this -- the point this is going to, the relevance?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Attorney
Needleman, can you express for us what the relevance is of this line of inquiry?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Liston's testimony was that a rule of thumb is 13,000 megawatts -- or 13,000 tons of fuel per megawatt. And I'm using these to illustrate that's incorrect and that --
A. You misunderstand my testimony. It's -BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. Well, I'm sure you'll have --
A. It's 13, 000 tons per megawatt for a wood-fired biomass plant.
Q. I'm sure you'll have an opportunity on redirect to clarify that.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's the
purpose of this testimony and these exhibits, Mr . Chair.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. I'm going to allow you to proceed.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay. Thank
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
you.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. And this is the last exhibit I'm going to use here. So, Mr. Liston, how large is this plant?
A. Three hundred and fifty megawatts.
Q. And do you see a little bit further down, I think in the third paragraph, how much fuel it's going to use per year?
A. Three million tons.
Q. And so that comes out to about 8,571 tons per megawatt; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. So, let me then summarize this and ask you a question based on the summary.

Exhibit No. 11 talks about 10,389 tons per megawatt. We have the Schiller station at about 10,660. We have these two plants in Gainesville and in Texas at about 10,000 tons per megawatt. And we have this very large plant in the UK at about 8500 tons per megawatt. Now, you compare that to the Laidlaw proposal, which is going to be about 10,700 tons per megawatt. And I
[WITNESS: LISTON]
guess the question is, in light of these examples, do you think it would be reasonable for the Committee to conclude that that estimate of 10,700 tons per megawatt for Laidlaw is a reasonable estimate?
A. I believe that it would be totally unreasonable for the Committee to even consider anything related to these non-woodfired biomass plants.
Q. Now, you also assessed the total amount of fuel that the facility is going to use based on its air permit application; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your prefiled testimony, on Page 9 you reproduced a letter from Peter Bloomfield; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that letter was dated May 6th, 2010; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you relied on that letter to come up with estimates about the amount of fuel that
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the Laidlaw plant would use; is that correct?
A. It was one of the examples.
Q. Now, Applicant's Exhibit No. 17 is CPD's June 14, 2010 response to our data requests. Did you participate in that response?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And there was an attachment that you provided to us which was inadvertently left out of the book, and I'm going to ask that it be distributed, which was Attachment No. 6 to that response. I'll certainly give it to you and give you a chance to read it. But I'm wondering, as you see that, whether you recall that attachment at all.
(Witness reviews document.)
MR. IACOPINO: Are you going
to be offering this as an exhibit?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm going to offer it as an amendment to our Exhibit No. 17. MR. IACOPINO: So, should we just mark it as 17A?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That would be
fine. Thank you.
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A. That's my handwriting on Attachment 6. So I guess I did see it. And it does serve as an example of the many different ways of looking at this topic of how much fuel is going to be used.

MR. IACOPINO: Can we stop for one minute so $I$ can have the stenographer mark this.
(Laidlaw Exhibit 17A marked for identification.)

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, the exhibit that's being discussed right now is now marked as Applicant Exhibit 17A. It is a May 7, 2010 letter or memo signed by Peter Bloomfield of Steam \& Power Engineers. I'm going to pass that out to the Committee. 17A.
A. I'm ready to go, Barry.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Please proceed.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. This letter from Mr. Bloomfield is dated May 7th, 2010; is that right?
A. Correct.
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Q. Can you explain why this letter wasn't referenced in your testimony in some way?
A. It says "Attachment 6," so it must have been given to you at some place.
Q. Oh, it was supplied to us as part of your data responses. I know I got it. What I'm curious about is why was this letter not included in your prefiled testimony.
A. No reason. Prefield testimony on Pages 7 through 12 serve only to show that there are many different ways of coming up with a number of fuel. On the low end, you call it conservative; on the high end, it's aggressive. I can skew them any way, just like you can. I can make it come out high or I can make it come out low. What we need is something that's reflective of reality.
Q. Well, let's look at how Mr. Bloomfield did the calculation in this May 7th letter.

Can you turn to the second page of that letter, please. And do you see the paragraph about halfway down that begins with the word "However"?
A. Yeah.
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Q. Could you read --
A. Yes.
Q. Could you read that, please.
A. "However, the green wood that is purchased will average 45 percent as received. The facility will have to buy 754,000 tons of 45-percent moisture content fuel in order to end up with 721,400... at forty-two five [sic] when it dries."
Q. So, in this letter, Mr. Bloomfield is saying that the facility's going to need 754,000 tons of fuel at 45-percent moisture, which is the number that we both agree is the right moisture content. So it sounds to me like Mr. Bloomfield's agreeing with our number here; is that right?
A. I believe that, based on the assumptions that was used in this particular one, he would be agreeing with you, yes.
Q. And on Page 10 of your prefiled testimony, you reproduced a graph that we supplied to you; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you look --
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A. It's a --
Q. And if you look at that graph, at a 45-percent fuel-moisture content, according to that graph, isn't it correct that we would be using about 750,000 tons a year of fuel?
A. I believe I questioned the graph, as to where it came from. But, obviously, the conclusion you would have on the point that you provided, where you want to focus, based on this graph, would be 740-, 750,000 tons, yes.
Q. So our graph and Mr. Bloomfield, in that other letter, seem to agree with each other; is that correct?
A. Did he use 87.5-percent capacity factor?
Q. Looks like it. He's referring to Attachment 9.
A. Okay. If he did, then on that particular analysis you agree.
Q. Who is Mr. Bloomfield?
A. Bloomfield is a member of Clean Power Development and a Steam \& Power engineer. Also owns the Concord steam plant here in \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
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Concord, New Hampshire.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Liston. I have nothing else at this time.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you,
Attorney Needleman.
Counsel for the public.
MR. BROOKS: Thank you. Mr.
Chairman.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. Since it's up there and I can't resist, I do want to look at what $I$ think is marked as Exhibit 73 on the board. I believe --
A. Pretty messy, isn't it?
Q. It's coming along pretty nicely. I don't know if $I$ want to add to it.
A. I hope I don't have to do any more drawing on that particular one.
Q. We do have, I guess, Berlin as kind of the center of the universe. That sounds right to me so far.

I do want to talk about the geography, just to get it right. And obviously, you're not a cartographer, so I don't expect you to
do it off your head.
But if Berlin is in the center, you have the White Mountain National Forest up to the northeast. My recollection is that the White Mountain National Forest is to the west and to the south --
A. Could very well be.
Q. -- of Berlin.
A. Doesn't matter, really, when you're looking at a circle. It affects the circle going out. So wherever I put it there -- you know, when I'm up in Berlin, I may have IT wrong. When I look up river, I think I'm looking up north. So if I've got it wrong, then that's what it is.
Q. Well, it may matter, though, with your description, partly because the unavailability of the outer circle -meaning the $50-$ mile radius -- might be the same to the south, if it's all White Mountain National Forest, both within the 30 and within 50. And that might be the same to the west as well. In addition, there seems to be, in reality, overlap on the west
in what you're calling the Whitefield plant. So if you had a circle for Whitefield, and you had an overlapping portion of the White Mountain National Forest, I mean, isn't it true that wouldn't matter, that that wouldn't be any different for you or for the Laidlaw project? If it's unavailable there, it's unavailable within --
A. It's unavailable for everybody, yes.
Q. Right. And it would be unavailable for Whitefield also if it was the White Mountain National Forest there.
A. Correct. Can I draw a new map?
Q. It's tempting. It really is.
A. I will. I want to do another one.
Q. Well, we can't erase anything on there, though.

MR. IACOPINO: Wait, wait.
Why don't we copy this one.
CMSR. IGNATIUS: You can also flip it if you want.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
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(Laidlaw Exhibit 73 marked for identification.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: We're on the record.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, there's been a new exhibit marked. It's Applicant's Exhibit No. 73. And it is a drawing that was taken off the White Board with the White Board printer. We only have the original here. Does anybody from the Committee wish to see it right now, or have you seen enough? Thank you. MR. NEEDLEMAN: Could I just be told what is the pending question?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes, what is pending question, Mr. Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: Whether or not the testimony was correct before: If there are overlapping zones, basically unavailability because of the White Mountain National Forest for both the 30 -mile radius and the $50-$ mile radius, then, you know, does it matter whether you're going 30 or 50? It's going to affect both the Laidlaw radius and the CPD radius the same if basically that whole chunk is taken up by White
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Mountain National Forest.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Do you understand the question, Mr. Liston?

MR. LISTON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: And what's
your answer to that question?
BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. Or will we see it visually when you --
A. Yes, that's what $I$ want to do. I don't want to not draw this picture after all of this.
Q. But if we can do it in just a minute or two maybe --
A. Oh, you want a fast one. There we go. (Witness drawing on White Board.) We're going to call this state of New Hampshire, which makes this the state of Vermont and makes this the state of Maine. We won't even talk about -- yeah, I'll put Massachusetts in there, too. That'll be somewhere down here. Is that close enough?
Q. Yeah.
A. All right. We've got the Schiller plant right about there. Berlin's location is right about here. White Mountains looks
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something like this, if I remember right. That's pretty big. Come down here, and right about in this area will be Whitefield. Over there is Bethlehem. And then you got down here crossing the Vermont side somewhere is Ryegate. You drop down about 40 miles as the crow flies, which I don't know exactly where it is on this map, but you got Alexandria. You get down in, I think this area, you got Tamworth. Somewhere in that area you got Bridgewater. And then you've got Concord Steam. And that's it for the big biomass plants right now.

MR. KELLY: Hemphill.
MR. LISTON: What's that?
MR. KELLY: Hemphill?
MR. LISTON: Hemphill, right.
That's somewhere in this area, Barry?
MR. KELLY: Up 89,
Springfield, New Hampshire.
MR. LISTON: I'll put it
there.
A. All right. So now $I$ don't really know what
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the 30 -mile ring looks like, really. But it's something like that. Maybe a little bigger.

And then these people want to have a 30-mile radius. They're actually a little smaller, so they have a little smaller ring. And this one would have a little smaller ring. This one would have a smaller ring. What did we put in here? That's Alexandria. They got a ring. Obviously, this particular one at Whitefield's impacted on a lot of sides, so they're going to draw from down in here. Okay. Make an amoeba, so to speak. They're going to have something that looks like that. These two are going to -- they got pretty much of a draw area that works for them, okay. Springfield's about the same size, so they probably overlap into Vermont. This one's Bridgewater. Tamworth's a 22-megawatt plant. Can't quite make a circle because the White Mountains are there. So we have to have a little bigger circle. Concord Steam's really small right now. Really small. This one was
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described as having a 75-mile radius. I don't know if $I$ got this to scale. But it's 100 miles almost exactly to here.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: When you say
"to here," you're speaking of --
MR. LISTON: To Portsmouth -CHAIRMAN BURACK: This is the

Schiller Station you're referring to?
MR. LISTON: -- from Berlin.
A. So that tells you that's the outer radius of a 100-mile thingamajig. So it's going to look something like that for Laidlaw. So I've got -- obviously, I've got my miles -if that's a hundred miles, then all these circles are a little bit bigger, because that wouldn't be 30 . So they're all a little bit bigger. But you can see what the issue is. And then you've got NewPage over in here that uses a tremendous amount of wood. And then you got --
Q. Okay. Mr. Liston, I'm sorry. I just want to keep us on track in the questioning. And you're doing a great job drawing. But we might be able to answer my question -- leave
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that there, and we can maybe take notice of a public document.

My question was just basically in terms of availability. You're both starting in Berlin. And when I say "both," I mean CPD and Laidlaw. And you're drawing --
A. Correct.
Q. -- radii right out from there.
A. Yeah.
Q. So the simple question is: To the extent that either someone else's circle, like Whitefield or whoever is another plant, or White Mountain National Forest, overlaps both of those radii, the effect's going to be the same: They're both off limits, either way.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And I don't know if it's possible to just take notice of a page from a Gazetteer or something like that, that shows White Mountain National Forest area versus the Berlin area, because $I$ do believe that to the west of Berlin there's a significant amount of overlap between White Mountain

National Forest area and other -- but I don't want to go any further on the drawing for now because we're taking too much time on that question. I really do appreciate you indulging me on that, Mr. Liston. I do. It's helpful.
A. Okay.
Q. You talked about the fact that -- well, first of all, let's just make sure I have some basic information correct.

How much wood were the two mills -- or not the two mills -- whatever number of mills that shut down, how much were they using before they shut down?
A. Talking about the paper mills up in Berlin and Groveton?
Q. Yeah. In fact, you can lump in any wood user that would now qualify as biomass that's now shut down. How much had been being used that's no longer being used?
A. Timco project was pretty small. I think about 4 megawatts. So they probably used, I don't know, 40,000 ton. Does that sound right? Yeah.
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Q. And what about the mills and other --
A. Wood BioEnergy, which was 9 megawatts or -so, yeah, would be 90,000 tons...

MR. RODIER: Keep your voice up.
A. Paper mills supposedly used between one -is that what you want to know? They used between 1 and maybe 1.1 to 1.3 tons of mostly pulpwood and some chips.
Q. Okay. Is that 1.3 million tons?
A. Yes.
Q. And you mentioned two other plants: One at 40,000 and one at 90,000 ?
A. I think that's correct, yeah. No, those numbers can't be right. That doesn't match. Got the wrong numbers there.

MR. LISTON: Bill, you want to do a calculation for me?

BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. Well, if you don't know, just say you don't know.
A. I don't know, really.
Q. Does it sound correct that at least the mills used approximately 1.3 million tons
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before they --
A. I based it all on the newspaper articles when they closed and what their managers said the amount of wood they used and the problems they had getting volume and price.
Q. Okay. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?
A. The 1.1 to 1.3?
Q. Correct.
A. That's between the two of them. And I don't doubt it for a second.
Q. The proposition was made, I believe by the Applicant, that because now approximately between 1.1 and 1.3 million tons are no longer being used, that that is available for the Applicant. You seem to dispute that. Where do you believe that 1.3 or 1.1 million tons is going now?
A. Well, certainly in the $30-$ mile radius there's still some potential available which used to be tapped regularly by them. The NewPage facility gathers pulp logs for -- I mean -- excuse me -- the Shelburn facility gathers pulp logs for the NewPage paper mill
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in Berlin -- I mean in Rumford, Maine. And a lot of the other paper mills -- I mean, they still had to make pulp. The market was in trouble, so they had to drop a little bit of pulp production. But they still had customers and they had to supply them. So they picked up producing the pulp in other locations. So, some of it might be going to a pulp mill in Quebec, some of it might be going to pulp mills in Maine. But they all found new markets. Some of it's going to existing wood-fired plants.
Q. Were those biomass plants in existence before the mills shut down or after?
A. Let's see. I believe they all were in existence before it shut down.
Q. So those biomass plants would have been in competition already with the plants that have now shut down.
A. I wouldn't be surprised if that many biomass plants were part of the problem that forced them to have to shut down.
Q. You mentioned that there was some concern among other biomass plants about the Laidlaw
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project --
A. Correct.
Q. -- is that correct? How do you know that?
A. I regularly talk to managers of plants, people who work in the plants, various wood people, so on and so forth. They often call me and talk to me. And they've had a concern, but their attitude was that they didn't think that this would go this far.

And they're pretty well committed to opposing the purchase power agreement when that comes up.
Q. But as far as you know, they've chosen not to participate in this process.
A. I believe that some of them are going to participate today as a, you know, Johnny Come Lately type of thing.
Q. We might refer to that as public comment?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's see. I think on Page 4 of your testimony you make an estimate about how much -- basically how many megawatts of biomass production can reasonably occur in Berlin. Take a minute to get there and let
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me know when you --
A. You on Page 4?
Q. Yeah.
A. Hmm. I don't see it. What line?
Q. Start at the top. "Within a reasonable distance..."
A. Okay.
Q. And it starts on the page before that. So take a minute if you want to get yourself situated.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. I'm ready.
Q. Okay. So your statement is that you have -well, that $C P D$ reduced the size of its proposal to 29.5 megawatts because that was essentially exactly what you calculated the region could sustain.
A. Correct.
Q. But there's no connection to the fact that -- as far as I know, the SEC limit on review of projects is 30 megawatts. And there's no correlation between the fact that you're a half-megawatt less than --
A. Based on the study. Prior to that, we had
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two projects working simultaneously: The Lancaster project and the Berlin project. A lot of things can go wrong with projects. They get an early vat, whatever, transmission lines, whatever. In this particular case -- and like down in Winchester, we reduced our project size from 50 megawatts to 20 because of water limitations.

The project in Lancaster, it was transmission issues. And when we got the fuel study -- which pretty much applied to the spot in the Berlin, but $I$ doubt if Lancaster would have been much different. It's a little bit further west. So 30 miles takes you into Vermont. It's a slightly different circle. We never intended to do them both. It was one or the other. And so we dropped it down to 29.5 , yes.
Q. If the Laidlaw project is approved and their PPA is approved -- in other words, they're going forward for production -- does that mean CPD will voluntarily cease efforts to construct and operate the 30-megawatt
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plant -- or the 29.5-megawatt plant?
A. If they get a permit here and then they wind up getting a purchase power agreement, the way I think it's going to be, I don't think I'd want to build a power plant within a hundred miles of them.
Q. Okay. So can I interpret that as a yes, that you will voluntarily cease efforts to construct and operate a plant?
A. Yes. Excuse me. I got to make one correction there. All of these proceedings are subject to legal appeal. And we have no intention of stopping.
Q. Sure. I mean, $I$ can change the question to say, if they get the final green light, whenever that is --
A. Whenever that is.
Q. Okay. I believe on Page 30 of your testimony you mentioned concerns -- I think it was Page 30. Yeah, the second and third lines. Let me know when you're there.
A. Thirty. Second and third?
Q. Yes. And I believe this refers to that there are concerns from the environmental
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> community. So, take a minute and look at that.

(Witness reviews document.)
MR. RODIER: I'm sorry. What page?

MR. BROOKS: Page 30.
A. Yeah. Okay.

BY MR. BROOKS :
Q. So, based on what information do you base this statement that there's concern from the environmental community?
A. On two things: One is what's going on in Massachusetts with the -- what's it called, the Manomet? -- and the total re-evaluation of RECs and what we anticipate might come out of that, where it's leaning. And the other one was the letter from the Sierra Club -- not the Sierra Club -- the Wilderness Society.

But generally, I participate in conservation outfits and I -- you know, so it's kind of a discussion that's pretty much out there, the concern for our forests, the balance between protection or conserving
versus using. It's a balance.
Q. Are the groups that you talked to here today?
A. No.
Q. Part of your testimony, I believe Page 34 -and I'm going to look at the statements on Lines 15 and 16. In general, I believe this is talking about economic risks. And there's the statement, "Such risks could easily cause a facility to fail on a purely economic basis." Do you see that?
A. We.
Q. If Laidlaw obtains both a fuel purchase agreement and a power purchase agreement that is economically favorable to them, does this danger go away? Not to say there might not be other concerns that you've raised. But is this danger alleviated?
A. Well, I don't have the unredacted portion, so I have no way of knowing what the actual clauses are relating to fuel adjustment or compensation. But without a doubt, if they can be paid enough to draw wood from great distances, that will work for them. So, in
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that case, the facility may not be Laidlaw that dies, it would be the competing facilities that don't have that advantage.
Q. And that brings me to my next question. And I mean it as an honest question and not a loaded question, because there are a lot of things that play at once --
A. Exactly.
Q. -- in the North Country. It's a dynamic situation.

So the question is: If a new, large facility causes an existing, let's say, wood consumer to fail, is that necessarily a bad thing for the orderly development of the region and for the economics of the region?
A. Absolutely. The power plants that are presently built, and in most -- in some of the cases all paid for, they are the cheapest electricity that can come from biomass that the ratepayers can get. They don't have the disadvantage of debt service. Not all of them. Some of them have been refinanced. But the ones that don't have debt service, that's a pretty significant
[WITNESS: LISTON]
piece of the pie. And so if we were looking to get energy from biomass, the existing facilities is the very best deal.
Q. For the ratepayers.
A. For the ratepayers.
Q. Okay. Let's take the ratepayers out of the equation for a minute. Presumably they'll be looked on very carefully when the PPA is examined by the PUC, including the Office of Consumer Advocate. So if I can take them out of the puzzle for a moment and look at the business, jobs, economy of the North Country.
A. Okay.
Q. Is it necessarily a bad thing if a larger plant, let's say, displaces a smaller plant?
A. Depends on -- on the issue of jobs, it depends on how many jobs are lost. If you create 40 jobs but destroy 100 , that's not a net gain of green jobs. If you're harvesting wood and it's in the same area, and it's presently being harvested by somebody else that goes to a different market, you're not creating a new job in the
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woods; you're just delivering it to somebody else.
Q. And is the converse true, that if you create a hundred jobs and you lose 30, that overall, that might be beneficial for the region?
A. If you create more jobs on strictly a jobs thing, if you create more jobs than you lose, that's progress on that particular aspect.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. You were here for most of the testimony over the last four and a half days, and you probably heard a lot of the discussion about trying to determine just how many jobs are going to be created. And based on your experience and your work in this area, do you have a figure on how many work -- how many jobs are created by volume of biomass? For example: If, you know, your project was -- how many? Three hundred thousand tons?
A. Three hundred forty thousand.
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Q. So, 340,000 tons. Did you have worked up in your mind a figure for how many jobs, say per ton of biomass, was going to be created?
A. No. What we have is 23 employees. We have a more mechanized design than Laidlaw. Laidlaw is dependent upon handling all their fuel with front-end loaders. So they got an extra, probably, 9 people on payroll that are just running loaders 24/7; whereas, ours has a mechanical handling system. So we don't run our loaders in the nighttime or weekends. So, you know, there's less employees there.

But when you get into the woods, if you create a demand for biomass -- everybody uses different equipment. But basically, nobody has an edge over anybody else, as far as creating jobs. It really comes down to how much biomass is going to be harvested. You can't take credit for saying we're going to use 70 megawatts of wood, or 750,000 , and say that's going to create all new jobs in the forest and in the harvesting and delivery, because what's going to happen is
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that existing operators, first and foremost, are going to just have a more efficient operation. They got a bigger market. They can probably work more. They might hire on one guy. So it's not -- and if you're able to pay more money and you cause other projects to fail, then you're not replacing them with harvesting; you're just getting the fuel supply that used to go to them.
Q. Right. I heard you make that point with Attorney Brooks.

But as far as you know, there's no way to sort of link --
A. Every project's different.
Q. -- biomass volume to jobs.
A. Yeah, I think the -- the thing about all of my testimony is that you can have numbers on the low side, numbers on the high side. All through this is to prove that. And what I think this Commission has to do is err somewhat on the side of conservative versus taking the aggressive numbers and accepting them, okay. If you were to talk about fuel and the amount of fuel you have in here --
can we talk about that or --
Q. No. I wasn't asking you about that.
A. All right.
Q. How much wood were you expecting that your project would procure within Coos County?
A. I'd have to look at the map of the 30 -mile radius and how much of that was in Coos County. But I would think that would be a lot of it. Almost all of it.
Q. Well, if, for example, I described for you that the White Mountain National Forest actually doesn't run sort of north-south, the way you depicted, and, in fact, runs more or less east and west --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and creates sort of a block south, a large block that you can't get at, and then you've got chunk that's west of Berlin -so, basically you're looking at sort of east of Berlin and north -- I'm assuming you would source your -- if you were talking about Coos County, would you source your wood out of that area?
A. A lot of it would come from the north of us,
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]
all the way up to the top of New Hampshire, and some into Maine. We would probably even maybe attract some wood out of Vermont in that radius.

Ours wasn't based on a radius disregarding rivers and roads and the white Mountains. Our study takes all of that into account.
Q. So what percentage of your supply, then, do you think would come from within what's available to you in Coos County?
A. Well, that's a number I'm not really prepared to give you accurately. But I'll just give you a number. I believe it would be somewhere in the 75 - to 80 -percent range.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Now, I notice -- I have heard, and maybe this is simply hearsay, that some of the forest areas sort of north of Milan and Dummer are owned by a small group of large landowners and that some of those have long-term contracts and pledges to provide specific volumes of timber to other mills.

Are you familiar with that dynamic?
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A. Correct.
Q. And does that dynamic interfere with the ability of a newcomer, such as yourself or Laidlaw, to get wood from that wood lot?
A. In some cases it would and in some cases it wouldn't. It would depend on who's doing your harvesting and whether they're connected there. But also, those deals that you're talking about, land-use deals, are known. Every single one of them, including what you would call the confidential parts, are known by the party that studied -- did our fuel study.
Q. Okay. Now, there was some suggestion, I thought, that was made that there would be a competitive disadvantage to a power producer to be required to obtain some portion of its wood supply in -- locally. Do you agree with that?
A. No.
Q. Is there an environmental benefit of any kind to importing the wood from longer distances or from, say, you know, staging yards in Henniker and down in Massachusetts?
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A. I'm going to separate economical from environmental. You did ask environmental.
Q. That's right.
A. The environmental analysis has positives and negatives. The trucks use diesel fuel and so on and so forth. But if you're talking about are you going to go a longer distance, as opposed to doing something wrong in the forest, in my case we'll go a longer distance. We're not going to do anything wrong in the forest.
Q. Okay. Now, I asked some questions about how long it was going to take to develop a logging and chipping infrastructure in Coos County. I guess I'll ask you two questions about that.

One, do you think it's going to be necessary to develop that infrastructure, or do you think it's already there?
A. I think most of it is there. It just has to expand. And if it has strong markets and volume that it can shift to, I think a lot of them have the capabilities to buy another single piece of equipment or hire on one or
two guys and expand their operations. A lot of them -- now, if they have a more local market, in some cases, especially the guys north of us, okay, if they have to bring their chips south, we're going to be the first plant they would have to drive by. So they may have some economies there, in that they can make more trips per day with a truck. If you have a truck that's going to have to go, let's say from Berlin to Schiller, okay, you may only be able to get one, maybe two trips in a day, okay; therefore, you have to carry all the costs of that truck and the driver against those two deliveries; whereas, if you have a close delivery within the $30-$ mile radius, you maybe make five trips a day; therefore, you got a much more efficient utilization of your equipment and your employees.
Q. You've probably -- I'm sure you heard the testimony from Mr. Richmond about Cousineau's sort of long-haul and back-haul logistics; correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. Do you think that when word gets out in Coos County that Laidlaw is going to use Cousineau with the long-haul and back-haul logistics, is that going to incentivize or disincentivize people in Coos County to invest in further logging equipment and infrastructure?
A. I think that as this comes out about Cousineau, Cousineau is probably going to have a lot of trouble, because the companies that he's been supplying to don't want this. And, you know, for him to become the exclusive supplier of a competitor that can put them out of business, that's a big deal to them.

And your answer is correct. If people are looking at investing a million or two or three in additional equipment, taking on crews and the obligation of hiring people, and you're supplying with somebody who's going to be putting together other mechanisms to bring fuel in from 100 to, we heard, as much as 200 miles away, there's no assurance there. That's shifting sand,
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okay. That's not a solid base for them to go out and borrow the money and expand their harvesting capabilities.
Q. Okay. Now let's assume that Laidlaw's assertions that it's going to maximize its local wood procurement opportunities is true. Do you think that that maximization of local opportunities is going to cause local wood prices to increase?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And do you have any opinion on what impact that increase might have on the existing users, such as the NewPage mill?
A. I think they could all potentially be put out of business. I don't know where that particular paper mill is, whether it's regaining health, it's healthy, or whether it's on the edge. I don't know where they're at right now. But if you start driving up their raw material cost, it can't be a good thing for them. In the paper -in the electric generating plants in that area, it's a lot clearer, because they're not going to be able to follow this price up
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very far at all. They don't get paid a lot of money right now selling to the market, okay. They have to do a lot of different, interesting strategies to stay in business. And there's times when they can't generate because the product they sell isn't worth what the fuel -- the variable cost of fuel. So, if the price of fuel starts going up, they are destroyed. The end result is that Laidlaw then gets their volume and replaces them. But the problem is, there's a much -many more employees involved in that decentralized approach to power. And that decentralized approach to power has a lot of very significant advantages as to the way it helps the transmission lines and as to the way that it gives multiple markets for the wood people to go to. I think if you talk to the guys out in the woods, they're going to tell you we'd rather have all those little plants than one great big plant, because when that great big plant isn't running, we don't have anyplace to take our wood. Also, once there's only one plant out
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there and no competition, we get screwed.
Am I allowed to put that in testimony?
But, you know, the better system is to have smaller, more efficient plants. It helps the transmission system because you don't have to do upgrades. You're supplying power locally. And it produces more tax space for more communities, and it produces a more dispersed green jobs base.
Q. Thank you. That's all the questions I have. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.

Let's have questions now for Mr. Liston from the Subcommittee. Dr. Kent, do you wish to start? DR. KENT: Thank you, Mr.

Chair. I have a series of questions. I'll be as quick as $I$ can through this.

INTERROGATORIES BY DR. KENT:
Q. The wood suppliers within Laidlaw's proposed wood basket, are they subject to exclusive long-term agreements?
A. Some of them would be, I would assume. But it would be with the parties who own the land, I would think, not the harvester or the broker. It would be ultimately with a
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landowner.
Q. Can you give me some kind of feel for what percentage of that wood basket might be already tied up long-term versus subject to change at their whim?
A. No, but I can tell you that the available forest mass is a declining amount, okay. So whatever we think we have out there today, it's a declining amount for a lot of reasons. And it isn't just about development, where you take forest land and turn it into house lots. Things are on the horizon, such as carbon sequestration, wanting more appropriate long-term protection, so that the forests we have today continue for generations. Therefore, that utilization factor that was brought up, which I hope I get a chance to talk about, okay, eventually we're going to go to the point where that's going to become much more important, and you're going to be able to have -- say if you had a thousand acres. It wouldn't be a thousand acres that you could harvest from. There would be pieces that
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were -- the soil was too thin. There would be pieces that are set aside for wildlife habitat and --
Q. Mr. -- we're never going to get done quick.
A. Okay.
Q. I mean, I need you to answer my question and not pontificate for me.

When Laidlaw -- if, hypothetically,
Laidlaw goes into operation, do you imagine they'll force closures or force realignment of existing wood baskets for existing facilities?
A. They'll definitely force closures.
Q. Why wouldn't there be a realignment?
A. You mean the amoeba effect you're talking about?
Q. We have wood baskets.
A. Correct.
Q. As new plants have come on over the years, new facilities, has there been historic realignments of wood baskets to accommodate facilities?
A. I would suspect that every operating business reacts to the next operating
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business that comes online. The question is, do they have that ability.
Q. Now, have we seen closures as new facilities are added?
A. Hmm. I don't think any of the closures to date have been as a result of new facilities, but they have been as a result of not being able to get enough fiber.
Q. And what particularly are you referring to? What facility has closed because they couldn't get fiber?
A. The Timco operation closed because of the availability of fiber for their lumber, for instance; the high-grade got so bad, they couldn't compete. Your two Berlin mills that we were talking about closed because they couldn't get enough fiber at an affordable price. So those are some I can think of.
Q. Okay. What would have been an affordable price? Is that they weren't able to pay market price, or they were, but --
A. Well, if you -- if demand -- supply and demand always apply. If the demand
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increases, the price goes up. But some of the parties won't be able to pay that price because their business model can't handle it, so they go out of the business. Eventually the demand comes back to what can be sustained, but it's at a -- it's not necessarily even at a higher price, because after the others are out of business, then the demand goes back to a supply and demand. So the price that the -- for instance, if this happened up in Berlin, and two or three or four plants went out of business, chances are, with Laidlaw the only one standing, they'll probably get cheaper wood than any of the rest of them were paying when they were all running, because the demand will now be lower than what it was when they were all in business.
Q. Is it unusual -- you know, because I'm not in the wood business, that seems like normal course of business for businesses, that there's competition and shifting and people come on and people disappear from the markets.
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A. You are correct. And supply and demand applies. So the question we have right now is: Do we want to have a Laidlaw project come on, a single project, at the expense of three or four others? And those three or four others enhanced our electric system through the distributed location of them. And they enhanced the situation for the people who are in the forest products business because they have multiple locations to take their wood instead of one. And they employ, collectively, more people, and they pay taxes to more towns.
Q. Maybe we should go at it this way: What do you consider a high fuel cost?
A. High fuel cost?
Q. Yes.
A. In today's market, it would probably -- it's based on what you can sell your products for. In today's market, a new merchant plant that's selling to the market, okay, or is out getting what they call strips, short-term obligations, a high fuel price for them probably $\$ 28, \$ 29$ a ton.
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Q. You're saying existing today --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- 28, 29 is high?
A. No. Well, I'm saying at that point, they still have trouble operating because the price of electricity as a merchant selling into the market is very low. The combination of revenue sources coming to these plants are selling energy, capacity payments and renewable energy credits.
Q. We heard testimony earlier that, for Schiller and facilities north of the Notch, 30-plus is typical. But you're saying 28, 29 is high and will drive people out of business.
A. No. I think it's high, but it may not be the point they'd drive out of business. The prices right now for the timberland owners in the third quarter -- excuse me -- in the second quarter of 2002 --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Second quarter of 2002?

MR. LISTON: Excuse me. 2010. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
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A. In the north zone, wood chips had a low price of 22 and a high price of 33 , with an average of 28.5. And in the quarter before that, the low price was 23 and the high was 33 and the fuel average was 28 . So, basically the same. And it's the same going back into 2009. It's 24 to 32 , with a 29 average.
Q. Let me ask my question again. At what point -- at what price do we force facilities to close because they can't afford the price?
A. I think you're getting there at $\$ 34$ a ton for the existing facilities, unless they can get a purchase power agreement from somebody that improves on market prices.
Q. Could you explain a little more detail your concern about Cousineau's relationship with Laidlaw and how that will force the closure of other facilities.
A. Well, for starters, Cousineau described himself as supplying fuel to the Schiller plant as if he was their supplier. But he isn't.
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Q. Excuse me. I believe his testimony was that he supplies 10 percent of Schiller.
A. That's right. And then he corrected it and he said, "I supply 10 percent." But in that process, he said he understood their fuel supply and where they got their wood and understood all that, okay.

But this Laidlaw project affects Schiller. Schiller won't go out of business. It's going to wind up costing the ratepayers more for the Schiller operation. But it won't go out of business, because Laidlaw's going to cut deep into their supply area.
Q. Do you have some evidence to substantiate that statement?
A. I'm going to use my map again. I think he mentioned they're right up on the ocean. They're built right on the ocean --
Q. I understand that. But how does Laidlaw cut into Schiller's supply, that they are no longer able to operate? Is that what you --
A. No, I didn't say they wouldn't be able to operate. I said their price for elect- --
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their price for fuel's going to go up and it gets passed through to the ratepayer. So their price for fuel is going to go up, and the ratepayer's going to pay more for what energy comes out of there.
Q. Because Laidlaw is monopolizing the fuel supply?
A. No. We said that they would get wood from 75 miles, supposedly in a arc, which is actually bigger than that. Be something like that. They take in a lot of Massachusetts. They have a 180-degree side where they can get their fuel.
(Mr. Liston drawing on White Board.)
Q. So when you say -- excuse me. Are you suggesting that there's -- we've reached our limit of available wood there?
A. Pretty close.
Q. Have you done an analysis of that --
A. The University of New Hampshire did. They said that they figured that -- I think it was Hebert -- that the remaining potential -- the remaining potential for the state of New Hampshire, if we were using all
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the wood in the state of New Hampshire, the remaining potential is like 80 megawatts. If you used it all, 80 megawatts, if you used it all to generate electricity. This is the same wood that we would make wood pellets out of. It's the same wood we would make firewood out of.
Q. Understood. You just brought up something we have not on the record -- we've never seen it. So, perhaps it would be helpful if you provided that study, substantiating your statements, okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. Thank you.

You're familiar with 162-H, the energy facility evaluation, siting, construction and operation statutes?
A. I believe so. I don't have -- you know, I wouldn't say that $I$ could quote it chapter and verse. Usually when $I$ have a question related to that, I would go and look at it.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the criteria this Committee must use to evaluate whether a certificate should be granted or not?
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A. Yes. And let me see if $I$ can dredge that up.
Q. I'll make it simple for you since you don't have it in front of you.
A. Okay.
Q. Are you suggesting that Laidlaw does not have adequate financial, technical or managerial capability to construct and operate a facility?
A. No.
Q. Are you suggesting that the Laidlaw plant will interfere with the orderly development of the region?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Why?
A. Well, for one thing, I would presume that, if you destroy existing employers who are presently in green jobs, so that you have a net loss of jobs, that that's not a very orderly development. I would also say that, if you destroy projects that enhance the electrical system by providing power in pockets where the power would have to come in and now it goes out, some of those
situations would cause the utilities to have to do upgrades. An example is the Tamworth project. The Tamworth project specifically prevents the need for Public Service Company to have to run stronger lines in there and put in bigger transformers, et cetera, because they're generating power out versus the power having to come in.
Q. Do you have any studies that you know of that demonstrate an expected impact, a negative impact to the region if Laidlaw were to become operational?
A. I don't believe anybody's done such a study, including Laidlaw. I would presume that the Applicant would be the one that would have to study that.
Q. Do you know how the municipal and regional planning authorities in governments feel about this project? Have they spoken regarding the orderly development?
A. Some have. Some have held their -- you know, in each municipal organization there's people that are pro and con, okay. So you've got that situation. You've seen some
[WITNESS: LISTON]
> of the officials from Berlin come in here and show support; but yet, in the case of the mayor, he has to speak for himself, okay. He got a real problem speaking for his council because it's not that unanimous.
> Q. All right. Are you stating that Laidlaw will have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air or water quality, the natural environment, public health and safety?
> A. Aesthetics.
> Q. Aesthetics?
A. Yes.

MR. RODIER: May I, Mr.
Chairman, give Mr. Liston a copy of the statute, just so he can look at the actual words. If it's dragging this out too much, that's fine.

DR. KENT: I've finished questioning Mr. Liston. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: All right.
Thank you very much. I don't think it's necessary for him to see the statute.

MR. RODIER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: But thank
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you.
MR. RODIER: Mr. Chairman, at this point, some of these people from Berlin drove down here like this morning. So I don't know what you want to do. But I don't know if now is a good -- some of them are the affected wood plants, I heard. I don't know what you want to do, but maybe now is the time.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr. Rodier, thank you very much. It's my intention to give the Subcommittee an opportunity to continue to question this witness. And once we have concluded that, I will then assess whether it would be an appropriate time or not to allow public comment. I do note that the hour is about 4:00. You have an additional witness, Mr. Rodier. And my sense at this point is that it does not -- we'll assess where we are, once we've completed Mr. Liston's testimony, to determine whether we're going to need additional days to complete the evidentiary portion of this process.

Mr. Wright, do you have
questions?
MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.
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INTERROGATORIES BY MR. WRIGHT:
Q. Just a question, Mr . Liston.

The facility you're designing in
Berlin, what's the expected life of that facility?
A. Of the Clean Power facility?
Q. Yes.
A. Fifty years.
Q. Fifty years? Okay. So the existing plants in New Hampshire were built -- most of the existing plants on your map, when were they designed and built?
A. Most of them were 25 years ago.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Director
Muzzey, do you have questions?
DIR. MUZZEY: No, I don't.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Director
Stewart?
DIR. STEWART: Just really one simple thing.

INTERROGATORIES BY DIR. STEWART:
Q. Do you have any quantitative information as
to where the 1.3 million tons went that the
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
pulp mills were using? I really haven't gotten anything concrete on that from the Applicant's review, or yours. In other words, it seems to me that since the mills went down, the other pulp mills haven't bumped up in capacity by some huge amount. In fact, more likely than not, in the current economy they've gone down some. And the other energy facilities are not using more, to any great degree. So I'm just trying to understand where that 1.3 million is going or if it's staying in the woods, and why that capacity is not there for these other facilities.
A. Well, it's just not there. And the pulp industry, when they were harvesting in the local area, I have no idea how much they harvested, say within a 30-mile radius of the Berlin facility or the Gorham facility. But that wasn't the only place they got pulp. Some of their pulp or pulp logs came all the way from the Maritime Provinces. And that was contributing to their problem with price.
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There is some of the capability that's still there. As we did say, there's 340,000 tons of material. Additionally, though, you don't get more material if some other things aren't happening. The ability to take material out of the woods -- remember, this is the low-end material associated with the high-end harvest. If the high-end harvests aren't happening, okay, then you're not going to have as much material available to you, even if you're needing it. So the demand is going to exceed the supply, the price is going to go up, and it's going to be a problem. It has a tendency to be related to what's going on in the economy at the time. So there's a lot of different parts and pieces of it.

But I think, also, that when these power plants that are up there were built, they obviously cut into the supply for these paper mills or pulp mills that had been there for a long time, as far as the local supply. So, to some extent, they negatively impacted them. Most of the wood -- let's
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just say the wood was 50 miles away. It just turned direction and went to the closest pulp mill. It didn't stop getting harvested. It just went to somebody else. There's still a demand. And if a big supplier drops out, there's a hole in the supply that gets made up by other facilities.
Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you,
Director Stewart.
Mr. Northrop.
MR. NORTHROP: Yes. I just
have one question.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. NORTHROP:
Q. You had made a statement to the effect that Timco closed because they couldn't get enough high-quality wood. Can you tell me what Timco is? Is it a power plant? Is it a pulp mill? What is Timco?
A. Timco was a lumberyard that $I$ think did about 20 million board feet of pine lumber. It did maybe $\$ 8$ million of something other than pine. They had their kilns. They had
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
a small cogeneration plant, wood-fired cogeneration plant that I built -- or I managed the construction for. And Public Service bought out their rate order, okay. And when they did that, it changed their dynamics because they no longer could dry their wood at a reasonable price. They had a cogeneration way of drying their wood, and they had to go to buying oil to dry their wood.
Q. But primarily, were they a sawmill to create lumber --
A. Correct. They were primarily --
Q. -- boards, essentially?
A. -- a sawmill to do lumber. And they provided some of their own fuel for the plant. Probably purchased about 80 percent of their fuel needs.
Q. Okay. But they were a sawmill to create boards, and they had a cogeneration -- sort of as a byproduct, they created their own heat to run a kiln to --
A. They heated their buildings and they did not use their own electricity because of the way
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it was structured.
Q. But you said they closed primarily because they couldn't get enough high-quality wood. I'm assuming to cut into the boards --
A. Correct.
Q. -- to create the boards.

Do you think that, if the overall health of the forest were improved so that more high-quality wood was available, would that be a factor that might help Timco have survived, or perhaps allowed them to resume? If the forest health was better, so that more high-quality wood was available, would that be beneficial to Timco, or to those --
A. Whatever their --
Q. -- companies like that?
A. Excuse me. I'm sorry. Whatever radius they drew their logs from and whatever types of management those landowners had, both of those things could have affected them. But the first thing is they could have gotten more into managing their forest for higher production. But at the same time, they ran into the situation where they demanded more
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than what the resource could supply, and they eventually got to the point where they couldn't afford it anymore.
Q. But if the supply was increased, would that have been beneficial to Timco, if there were more high-quality logs available, high-quality timber available?
A. I believe they would have stayed in business if their price for raw materials was lower.
Q. Thanks.

MR. WRIGHT: No further questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Mr. Janelle?
MR. JANELLE: No.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr.
Harrington.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Mr. Liston, $I$ have a couple questions.

First, you had quoted some prices for wood chips, I believe -- low, high, average -- out of some type of a document. Could you give us the name of that document a little more specifically? You said
something, but $I$ didn't have a chance to write it down.
A. I'll give you the three copies, because the gentleman's in the background and he can probably replace them. But why don't I just give you three copies of the Timberland Owners magazine that comes out three or four times a year -- four times a year.
Q. Give them to Mr. Iacopino.
A. There's a lot in here, okay. And you can look at the low-grade pulp logs. They're always worth more than wood chips --
Q. Thank you.
A. -- than the low end.

MR. IACOPINO: Are these all the same? Are these copies of the same book? No, they're different.

MR. LISTON: They're three different charts, three different quarters.

MR. IACOPINO: So you're just
looking at the chart, not the whole magazine.
MR. LISTON: You can copy them or you can keep them.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Want to
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have them marked?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Why don't we just mark the page that you're seeing there as whatever exhibit this would be.

MR. IACOPINO: I'll have these marked as the next Clean Power exhibit, CPD 6 I believe we're at.

And do you want to mark them right now, Mr. Chairman, or should we wait?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: We can. Go ahead and mark them right now.

MR. IACOPINO: And the first one we'll mark is the NHTOA Market Pulse, Low-Grade, Third Quarter 2009. That would be Clean Power Development Exhibit 6.

And the next one would be the NHTOA Market Pulse, Low-Grade, First Quarter 2010. And that would be CPD 7.

And the final exhibit will be
NHTOA Market Pulse Low-Grade, Second Quarter 2010. And that would be CPD 8. And I can get copies for the Committee later.
(CPD Exhibits 6, 7, 8 marked for identification.)
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CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr.
Harrington, you may proceed.
BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Getting back to a couple specific questions. It seems as if the testimony we've heard on the availability of wood has been one constant throughout, given by Laidlaw, their experts and yourself, and that is: If you're willing to spend enough money, there's plenty of wood. Do you agree that's correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So, rather than harp on how much is available and from what mileage, it really comes down to price.

Now, in your opinion, if the Laidlaw plant was to come online, what would that be, the effect of wood prices, let's say in the Berlin area and then in New Hampshire as a whole?
A. It's really going to depend on how long the competition can hang on. If they're going to hang on, the price is going to rise until they can't hang on anymore and enough of
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them drop out and go out of business, and then the price comes back down to a lower supply-demand scenario. So, ultimately Laidlaw goes forward. Six months to a year, they don't have that competition and they're paying what the price is today.
Q. Okay. And I guess that same statement could made be about Clean Power Development, except on basically half the rate that Laidlaw would do it, because you would bring in about 30 megawatts and --
A. There's a difference, though. Clean Power Development is a pure merchant power plant. We don't have anything in a purchase power agreement that would allow us to run the price up.
Q. And as far as your plant goes -- obviously, it's not built, so it would be a brand new plant, assuming latest technology.

In comparison to the existing plants out there operating right now, would you say your heat rate is the same, a little bit lower, or significantly lower?
A. Ours would be a little higher. And
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depending upon the steam customer load, it can be as much as 62 to 70 percent, depending on the number of steam customers we have. If the Fraser Paper mill stays in business and we supply them with steam somewheres down the road, minimum is 62-percent efficient, probably 70. We're going to push for a district heating system, and that will seasonally help our --
Q. Okay. Well, I was talking about heat rate and you're talking about efficiency. So let's just stick with one term. We can stick with your term, efficiency. Your plant, you're saying, is more efficient than the biomass plants up there now that are 20, 25 years ago old; is that correct, if it was built as designed?
A. Yes.
Q. You had mentioned -- and maybe this gets cleared up by a statement Mr. Rodier made and by other people who are going to speak. But we've heard from Laidlaw that the existing plants were in favor of the Laidlaw plant, in discussions that they had with
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them. You have stated that they're opposed to the plant. And as best I can find, they haven't been here. They haven't filed as intervenors, nor have they submitted any written statements. So, can you explain, if their, as you state, very existence of their plants depends on Laidlaw not being built, why they have not filed as intervenors, or at least put in written testimony saying, like many people have, in favor or opposed to the plant?
A. Well, in a lot of cases they have to sell their power to Public Service, or try to sell their power to Public Service Company. And they're caught in that particular situation of biting the hand that feeds you. But Public Service is only offering very, very short terms that they'll buy power from any entities, and nowheres near the kind of deal that $I$ believe this deal is.
Q. Well, I'm a little confused. Are you telling me these plants do not sell their power into the wholesale market?
A. Some of them do. But they're not going to
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run very long on any moment or any period of time when their variable costs exceeds their revenue. So they would either cycle down to a lower level and stay on, like, spinning reserve, or if it looks like you're going to have a long period of time, they would probably shut down and wait.
Q. Okay. But you're bringing in Public Service. You're saying that they would like Public Service to pay them above-market rates, and that's why they don't criticize this, in hopes of getting a better deal with Public Service?
A. I think they don't criticize it, because if they did, then they wouldn't be able to get the rates that they do get.
Q. Well, I don't think we're getting anywhere in that conversation, and the day is getting late. I think that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you,
Mr. Harrington.
Commissioner Ignatius.
CMSR. IGNATIUS: Thank you.
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INTERROGATORIES BY CMSR. IGNATIUS:
Q. Mr. Liston, you've said a couple times that, in your view, the Laidlaw project is not a merchant plant. Can you tell us more about what you mean by that.
A. Well, merchant plants historically take all the risk. And that's the purpose for the merchant plant. Sure, they want to mitigate the risk. They want to have as best of a deal that they can, as far as a purchase power agreement. But it gets down to the point where merchant plants do take risk on fuel supply. It may be a shared risk or it may be some type of arrangement, but they take the risk of -- the risk of capital and the risk of operations. And the purpose for that, when we first deregulated our utilities, to some degree, to get the risk away from the ratepayer and to get away from the automatic payments related to return on capital, and got some power plants in this state. So if we are going to have merchant power plants today, they do need purchase power agreements. But you have to be very
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careful to balance what they need with what's good for the ratepayers and what's good for the environment, also.
Q. So, is it fair to say, in your view, the purchase power agreement takes away too much of the risk from the Laidlaw plant?
A. Based on the unredacted portion and the testimony that I've heard from the Laidlaw Applicants, I think, yes, they got a above-market, out-of-the-market deal that allows them to do this.
Q. You also said you thought the utilization factor was misused, you said earlier this afternoon. Can you explain what you think -- and I assume that's the 70-percent utilization of the --
A. Correct. Let me find the right document for that, something that's already filed. That's Exhibit 9, I believe, which is the "Forest Biomass Retention and Harvesting Guidelines for the Northeast" by the Forest Guild, the latest edition being May 2010.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Pardon me.
If I may interrupt you just a minute. We're
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]
talking about Committee's Exhibit 9; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: I've got my own copy, so $I$ don't know. I just put down Exhibit 9. And I don't know -MR. IACOPINO: It is Committee Exhibit 9, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. MR. IACOPINO: May 2010. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
A. And when the LandVest people produced their original study, they basically came up with 6.2 million tons of available material, and then made the statement, based on a better utilization factor, going from 50 to 70 on apparently some component part of this, they could get that up to, I think it was 6.9. And then they said, based upon a more competitive market, which can only mean the ability to pay more, that they were going to get that up to 7.2 million tons. But the problem with the -- when they're talking about the utilization in the testimony, they're talk about utilization was like
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getting more tops and getting more parts and stuff.

But from a Forest Guild standpoint, on Page 5 and 6 you will see that only on certain pieces of ground would they even consider it. I mean, there's pieces of ground out there where the soil is thin towards the top of a rock mountain, where there's not enough soil for any harvest or any utilization. And then, as you know, there are other pieces of ground, if you have a thousand-acre piece of ground, you know, wetlands and so on and so forth. And this guideline goes into the number of different things that might apply to some of the working forests, such as wildlife considerations and so on and so forth.

So the highest yield, which would be 75 to 63 percent, would be on places where you had it in a 15- to 20-year harvest cycle and you never -- and when you harvested, you didn't take more than one third of the basal area of the forest, of the component that didn't have any other problems, okay. By
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"any other problems," I mean the silviculture in the soil is correct.

Now, if you go through, like I say, a big piece of ground, you're going to find places where you shouldn't take any. You're going to find places where you have to take less than that. The 50-percent utilization that we have today is nothing but that. It's a 50-percent utilization. It is not tied to forest practices. It's tied, as Mr. Richmond, I think his name was, said, to how much they can effectively get when they drag trees out of the forest. They break off limbs and there's all kind of things that fall off. And by the time they get it out to the landing where they're going to chip it, and they chip it, they're averaging 50-percent utilization. In some places they're taking a lot more than that, because -- and in some places they're taking none.

But there is no study been done on the state of New Hampshire, let alone the hundred-mile footprint of where they want to
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draw their wood from. There's no study that's been done as to what portion, you know, the categories, if you will -- like studying the soil -- you know, there's no map that says on this section you can take 20 percent and on this section you should take zero and on this section you can take 70. So, to assume that you can go on to a piece of ground and take 70-percent utilization without harming it is an incorrect assumption from a sustainability basis. And that's what the Forest Guild is talking about.

And if you look at back at their
testimony on the different things that they listed that they were going to have in their, I think they call it sustainability thing for the City of Berlin, okay, the Forest Guild guidelines were not part of that.

Now, remember, they testified -- and I believe it's correct -- that the Forest Guild is made up of licensed foresters. So, licensed foresters come together and they
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create these guidelines, okay. This is a guideline that presently isn't being paid attention to. It's not something that's part of what's going on. So, to say that you can take 70 percent more of the wood and -- all the tops and limbs -- and can have that factor and that it's sustainable is not true.

Additionally, when you're talking about sustainability, if you're a consultant and you're going to have any value for what they've done, 6.2 million is the sustainable amount. The only way to get it higher is through this increased utilization. But if 6.2 is the sustainable amount, and then you do something like raise the price to encourage people to harvest more than that 6.2, then that's not sustainable forestry. If you exceed the supply of what is identified as sustainable, then you're beyond sustainable.
Q. So you heard Mr. Richmond testify that he thought 70 percent was a reasonable figure, 70-percent utilization. You think he's just
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wrong?
A. I think Mr. Richmond agrees with me. I think Mr. Richmond, when he was asked that question, talked about the fact that you could skid material out and you're going to lose some. And he was evasive, but basically, you know, $I$ don't think he agreed with it.
Q. You testified a few minutes ago that you thought the Laidlaw application fell short on the question of the aesthetics of the region, but you didn't get a chance to explain that. What's your thinking there?
A. I think my thinking is similar to a lot of the people up in Berlin who basically don't want this project because they live next to it, is that there's no way that this project is attractive, even after they get done what they're going to do with it. It's going to be a noisy thing downtown with a lot of trucks coming and going. It's going to have a great, big, giant wood pile hazard right in the middle of the city surrounded by wooden structures. I mean, there's a lot of
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issues. There's a lot of issues.
Q. All right. Mr. Richmond also testified that, for different reasons, the average price of wood chips in the North Country was about on par with the average price of wood chips at the Schiller station -- one having to do with the ocean cutting off and limited storage area, and the other having to do with the geography being that far north. Do you disagree with that?
A. Yes. I think the mills up in the northern part of the state, at least right now, are paying a lower price. And it's reflected in the documents; although, that's not the most recent one. It hasn't come out yet. But I think right at the particular point they're paying a lower price today because of that so-called glut that they talked about a lot. And that glut is as a result of a long period of easy winter and no mud season, so that a lot of the high-end material has been cut down and the brush piles are still out there. So, until they work through that brush pile inventory, you know, they're not
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going to get rid of that glut.
But now, when you talk about Schiller, everything I've ever heard about Schiller is that it's the highest paying place in the state. They pay more for wood than anybody else. I think a lot of that's got to do with their just-in-time supply, because there's going to be times when they're almost running out and they're absolutely desperate, and so whoever they can get to bring them in fuel quickly is going to get paid a premium. There's also -- you know, for a lot of the suppliers, it's a long run over to Schiller. They can get paid more, but it's a long run, so there's less efficient utilization. And I think they have a pretty heavy turnaround time. That is the time when they pull in before they get weighed and dumped and can get back on the road. And during the Christmas season, I know that's even intensified even more because of the traffic jams in that area. So, Schiller, hands down, is the most expensive power plant in the state, as far
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as their fuel supply.
Q. Thank you. No other questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Attorney
Iacopino, questions for the witness?
MR. IACOPINO: Yes. Thank you.

INTERROGATORIES BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. What $I$ want to do is -- and I didn't want to do it this way originally, but I think I'm going to because it'll be faster. I want to go over some questions that were raised by your direct testimony first, and then I'm going to ask you questions that will give you an opportunity to respond to some of the critiques of your testimony by witnesses from the Applicant.

But the first question that $I$ want to ask you is, looking at Exhibit 73, the original diagram that was up there, and even looking at the diagram that's still on the board behind you, aren't you a little bit afraid that you're, in fact, making Laidlaw's point about the wood basket being more like an amoeba then concentric circles?
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A. It is not concentric circles. I mean, there are parts of it that you can't deal with. But I mean, if you do a study of 30 miles, for instance, each ring around that mile represents distance. So as you go out in distance, each ring has a different amount of fiber that it can supply. But it also has a different delivery cost, so it becomes more expensive the further you go out. And in each ring, the way it was studied for us for our project by, you know, Eric Kingsley of Innovative Natural Resources, you're looking at that ring as to what that particular ring can produce. If that particular ring is missing a large piece of productive area, then that's what you figure for the volume from that ring.
Q. But that missing piece of productive area, in fact, causes the market to develop in a non-circle shape; isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you agree that there would be adjustments with even something perhaps not just from competition, even just from usage
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of the forest, that those shapes will change over time?
A. Those shapes will change. And you don't have -- even in the area, you don't have a lock on it, okay. The individual harvesters have arrangements with different places to bring so much wood and so on and so forth. So, harvesters for the different locations can be working in overlapped territory.
Q. The next question $I$ have from your direct testimony -- I may have gotten this wrong, so please let me know.

It seems to me at the beginning of your direct testimony you suggested that you were actually going to use a different mix of wood than what Laidlaw is proposing to use. Could you explain that?
A. Well, I don't know. I don't remember that. Talking about in direct testimony?
Q. Yeah, I believe it was in your direct testimony, yes.
A. Well, one of the things I saw when I was looking at the Laidlaw thing, first of all, I think they said they were going to use 15
percent of the sawlogs, all of the round, low-end round wood in their hundred-mile radius, plus wood chips. But when we saw something else that came after that, it was in the sustainability --
Q. Okay. But Mr. Liston, I'm not talking about amount of wood. I'm talking about the types of wood.
A. Yeah.
Q. Should I believe that both your plant -your proposed plant and the Laidlaw proposed plant are going to be using the same types of fuel?
A. No, we're not.
Q. Okay. Please tell us what the difference in those fuels will be.
A. Well, we would use whole-tree chips and logs that we brought on site to chip. We would not probably use bark. We would not use wood pellets. And we wouldn't chase the board-end market or the forest product's waste market, because it's substantially taken -- at least the sawdust component is all wrapped up with the Jaffrey pellet mill.

They got a lock on almost all of that. So we have fewer supplies or fewer sources that we're going to take our fuel from, yes.
Q. So what you're saying is you're going to be more selective in the type of fuel that Clean Power Development plant will use than --
A. Yes.
Q. -- what is proposed for Laidlaw?
A. I'm not sure if we would want to use bark, or how much we'd want to use it. It causes problems for your boiler maintenance. It adds ash, you know, to the thing. And it can cause you to have glass forming in the boiler and all kinds of things that will give you problems.
Q. Would bark be the only difference in the make-up of the wood at your facility as opposed to the Laidlaw facility?
A. The largest difference that $I$ saw in theirs was the inclusion of wood pellets. They are going to use wood pellets for fuel. And that has some serious ramifications that you should focus on. If you would like me to
say what it is --
Q. Go ahead. We'll give you the opportunity to explain why using wood pellets is a problem.
A. Okay. Now, this plant, we're talking about having approval based on the amount of tons of biomass. Wood chips or wood pellets are 10-percent moisture, okay, even 8-percent moisture content. They've already taken it out in their wood pellets. Whereas, whole-tree chips are delivered anywheres from 55 percent in the dead of the winter to maybe sometimes you get lucky and 45 percent on delivery.

But if you are -- if you have a limitation on the amount of wood by weight, one of the ways to cure that is to bring in more dense fuel that weighs less. And you might think that that's okay. But I mean, what they're doing is they can have a fuel that winds up with them having less or meeting their tonnage requirement, but the fact is that that tonnage of wood pellets comes from more trees or more fiber than what would have come from wood chips.
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Q. If I understand your testimony correctly, their model is based on the same average moisture content that your plant is based on, 45 percent. So if you have 10 percent in some wood chips, but 50 percent in some, the average is going to be 45 percent. And that's what, from an engineering standpoint and an economic standpoint, is what's the best for their plant. At least that's what I hear them saying. Do you agree with that?
A. Yeah. Remember, they're -- I'm questioning their volume. I believe they're going to use more wood than what they say. And one of the ways that they -- if they find out themselves that it is going to be more wood, and they're restricted to the volume, one of the ways they could get their volume down when measured by weight would be to bring in more BTU-dense fuel. And wood pellets are significantly more dense fuel, BTU-dense.
Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears a little bit. You mentioned two facilities, Shelburn and NewPage. First of all, what is Shelburn?
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A. Shelburn's an accumulation lot that brings in pulp logs and debarks them. I'm not sure if they chip them there, but they may. And their product is for the NewPage Paper mill in Rumford. You know, it's a local place to accumulate logs and debark them and ship them out to the Rumford mill to be turned into pulp.
Q. And do you know who owns Shelburn?
A. I'm pretty sure it's NewPage.
Q. And did Shelburn -- did this lot, I guess, or accumulation yard in Shelburn, did it exist before the paper mills in Berlin and Groveton went out of the business?
A. I don't know. It could have. It could have existed. And I don't know at what level it was at for operations then or now.
Q. And Shelburn is in Vermont?
A. No.
Q. It's in Canada?
A. No. I think it's the next town south of Gorham. It's right close to the Berlin-Gorham area.

MR. ROTH: East of Gorham.
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. And what about NewPage? Did NewPage exist --
A. Yes.
Q. -- before the paper plants in Berlin?
A. NewPage has existed for a long time.
Q. You made a comment during your, I believe it was your direct examination, that, "If we have to go further than our 30 miles, we're going to do that, because we're not going to do nothing wrong in the forest." Do you recall making that statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Well, do you think that Laidlaw or its supplier, Cousineau, will do something wrong in the forest; and if so, what?
A. I think that their price will encourage over-harvesting.
Q. I'm asking about them.
A. That's what I'm saying. I think that's what would happen and that's what they would do.
Q. And you think that, despite the sustainability conditions that they've provided to the Committee?
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A. Yes, because the sustainability criteria that they have there are focused on existing laws and forest practices and certifications of loggers and so on and so forth. But it's not -- it doesn't use these guidelines. And this is -- I think the other day we were asking around, does anybody have a definition of sustainability? Well, the Forest Guild does.
Q. Okay. But when you're saying "these guidelines" you're referring to the May 2010 Forest Biomass Retention and Harvest Guidelines that just came out two months ago, three months ago.
A. It's been out in about four previous drafts. And when it was utilized by them, it was in an early draft.
Q. And if they utilized these guidelines as part of -- if they were required to utilize these guidelines as part of their certificate, would that help to calm your concern about that?
A. It would.
Q. How many plants does Clean Power have under \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
development right now?
A. Two .
Q. And what's the total capacity or, you know, nameplate capacity?
A. Berlin's 29 megawatts right now, and Winchester is 20.
Q. So that's 49 megawatts; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you mentioned in your direct testimony about a study that suggested that only 80 megawatts were available in the entire state. Do you recall that?
A. In the footprint of the state of New Hampshire, yes, that's what was studied by the UNH professor.
Q. And yet, Clean Power, if you build those two plants, would take up 50 megawatts of that.
A. Absolutely true. But we wouldn't take all of the fuel out of -- selectively out of that, just that basket. I mean, we're right on the border with Vermont and Massachusetts, down in the lower corner, lower western corner of the state.
Q. You also testified a little bit about
employment and keeping people employed in the North Country and how you believe that Laidlaw may create -- ultimately wind up with less jobs being created, or a net loss of jobs.

Would you agree that one of the things that is important for employers is that they be stable employers?
A. Yes.
Q. And would you agree that a power plant employer that has a power purchase agreement, or a long-term power purchase agreement, is a more stable employer than one who does not and is just a merchant?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you also agree that a power producer that has a supply agreement is also a more stable employer?
A. I'm pretty sure all of them have supply agreements, as would we.
Q. And is it important to have that to be stable?
A. Yes.
Q. And so the difference between Laidlaw and
the existing plants, as I understand it, then, is that Laidlaw has this purchase power agreement that is what you consider to be a competitive edge; is that correct?
A. Absolutely.
Q. All right, sir. I'm now going to turn -- do you have your testimony in front of you?
A. I do.
Q. Because I want to give you an opportunity to respond to some of the criticisms made of your testimony. And the first one I think goes to Page 4 of your testimony, down at Line 19.

And if you recall, I asked Mr. Bravakis and the representative from Laidlaw about whether or not they agreed that your -- that 50 megawatts was the highest capacity that could be reasonably sustained in the area. And they disagreed, and they gave us examples of other large manufacturers. How do you respond to their examples?
A. Their examples are not wood-fired biomass plants. Biomass is a large category. Everything from municipal sewerage to
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agricultural waste, to wood, to turkey manure in the south. I mean, there's a number of different things.

When you get into the Texas situation, where the Nacagdoches plant is being built or operated -- I'm not sure exactly where they're at right now -- they got a hundred-megawatt plant. They're going to be supplied from 75 miles. I believe, if I recall correctly, less than 40 percent of their supply is wood. They're in a place where -- they're actually in a part of Texas where there is a lot of wood, and they don't have competing users for this low-end wood. They also are going to use construction debris and regular wood waste that goes to one or more large municipal things that are in the surrounding area. And they're also going to depend on agricultural waste, but it doesn't say what types of agricultural waste.
Q. Now, are you getting this information from Exhibit 57 that was presented by the --
A. No, I have my own knowledge of this thing
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and my own papers.
Q. Because I'm just going to read you what it says about the fuels in Exhibit 57.

Applicant 57 says, "The plant will be fueled with biomass materials, including forest residue from surrounding areas, wood-processing residues and clean municipal wood waste."

Do you have information that there is different fuel than that to be used in Nacagdoches?
A. You said wood biomass?
Q. Right. Forest residue from surrounding areas, wood-processing residues and clean municipal wood waste. I'm just reading from the exhibit.
A. Did you say agricultural waste?
Q. I don't see that in there.
A. Okay. Well, I know I have papers and documents that say they would use agricultural waste and construction debris. I will have to find them. I guess that's your stuff.
Q. Okay. The information that we've been
provided with regard to the Gainesville Renewable Energy Center -- are you familiar with that one, Exhibit 58?
A. Same company is developing three of these 100-megawatt biomass plants to draw fuel from 75 miles. Each one of them have found places in the United States where they can get that much biomass from multiple sources.
Q. And in this particular exhibit, Exhibit 58, it suggests that the project will be fueled by biomass, including forest residue from the surrounding heavily wooded areas of northern Florida, wood-processing residues, and clean municipal wood waste. Are you aware of that?
A. No. I mean, you got a document there that they've provided you. And I'm telling you there's other documents out there that get into it more --
Q. That's my point. Is there something more about what that particular plant is going to use for fuel that you're aware of?
A. I'll keep looking for it.

MR. RODIER: Perhaps we can
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provide that to the Committee rather than Mel trying to find it right now.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. If you can --
A. The other aspect is that those plants are in virgin locations -- that is, there are no competing biomass energy plants around them. When we talk about northern New Hampshire, we're in a situation, even by Laidlaw's analysis, is heavily used. Whether it's 6.2 million or 7.2 or 7.8 , out of all we have, that's a pretty high utilization of biomass already, okay. And so we're talking about setting down another plant where there are several existing plants. And that's not the same as what the Texas scenarios have. Q. If you can find that, we'll take that from you, okay, Mr. Liston. I want to move on to the next area.

Page 7 of your testimony, you made the statement that -- well, actually, it starts on the bottom of Page 6, "Laidlaw did not come to be a 70-megawatt project as a result of thorough analysis of biomass fuel
potential within a reasonable distance of Berlin. Quite to the contrary. It is based upon trying to make everything else fit for an existing facility. That does not lend itself well for size reduction to match the fuel availability constraints and other issues." Now, Mr. Bravakis and the representative from LandVest took issue with that. And they explained the way that they made the determinations that they did.

Do you have any information, other than simply your suspicions, that this is the way that plant was actually sized?
A. They proved my case with their fuel studies and whatever comes out of the transmission studies, that there's problems accommodating that size facility. There could be problems related to transmission. But I clearly and totally, with every fiber in my body, believe that there is not enough wood up there for that type of facility and that there will be ramifications that result in less green jobs.
Q. Just a little bit down on that same page,

Page 7 of your prefiled testimony, you reference the prior LandVest study, the one performed for North Country Council, which has become one of our exhibits in this proceeding.
A. Which lines?
Q. I'm sorry. It's Line 7. And that is a study that's been marked as -- I don't have it handy. But there is a Committee exhibit. Actually, it's Committee Exhibit 2. And you indicated that the smaller area chosen by LandVest at that time for that study, because it was deemed a reasonable supply radius, given trucking distances, cost to bring the biomass to market. And if you recall, the representative from LandVest disagreed with you. He said that this was a hypothetical plant, without any specifics, and that's why they used the radius that they used.

Do you have any reason to disagree with his statement of why he used that particular radius?
A. I think he used that particular radius
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because, in the largest boiler situations, 75 miles is what they have to look at. That's what Schiller looks at. But you know --
Q. I understand you believe that. I guess I'm asking you why. Is there anything that you base that belief on?
A. The distance base is based on the cost and the trucking thing. As you go out further, there's poor utilization of trucking, and you're exposing yourself to a lot of extra diesel fuel, and you're exposing your delivered fuel price to spikes in diesel fuel, okay. And these are the kind of things, if you're a merchant power producer and you don't have the ability to get compensated for extra cost of operations, these are a big deal. So you would keep your line -- keep your distance down to where you would not be so heavily impacted with spikes in diesel fuel. The last time it went to a high was $\$ 4$-something a gallon, okay. A new high might be $\$ 5$ or $\$ 6$ a gallon, and that's going to drastically
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impact the price of fuel coming in from greater distances.

As I mentioned before, the utilization on the trucks, that's a cost. That's a cost, because the further you are away, the fewer trips that truck and that driver can make in a day. And that's how they are compensated. If they deliver four loads a day, and it is 120 tons of biomass for a given truck versus two loads a day, now that's a big difference. They got to make all their profit on those two loads versus making it on four loads. So those things, as a merchant power producer, can come back and bite you. But if you have an arrangement that's outside of the market, that is not a merchant power situation, where -- in other words, you have some of the elements passed to you that would normally only be available to a utility, then, you know, that's a totally different situation.
Q. And by saying that, you're talking about the purchase power agreement; right?
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A. Yes.
Q. And is it your belief that none of the biomass producers up there presently have any kind of purchase power agreement?
A. Oh, no, they do. But they just -- they don't have those types of deals, and they don't have the long-term relationships. Some of them, you know, they're more closer to selling power related to the cost of energy today and that sort of thing.
Q. But to the extent they have purchase power agreements, those purchase power agreements are going to have to be complied with by their counter-parties; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. On Line 16 of Page 7, where you reference the Ellicottville facility and the 50 miles for that facility, the response when $I$ read that portion of your testimony to Mr . Bravakis was that Ellicottville is a very small facility. I believe six or seven megawatts. Do you disagree with that?
A. No.
Q. And do you disagree with his complaint that
a smaller facility like that would, in fact, draw from a much narrower range?
A. I would think that a small facility like that would have been able to get all the wood, if it's a forested area, and any reasonable amount of stuff, probably within 30 miles or 25 , something like that. They should have been able to get the wood they needed for that little plant really close.
Q. Okay. So do you agree that getting wood within 50 miles would not be something that would be unusual for a plant of that size?
A. That's correct.
Q. Let me draw your attention to the bottom of Page 9, and this is the Bloomfield letter that you put in.
A. What page?
Q. Page 9. And you cut and pasted Peter Bloomfield's letter of May 6, 2010 into your testimony. And do you recall I asked Mr. Bravakis, and I believe Mr. Frecker responded as well, that the calculations used by -- their response to this portion of your testimony was that the calculations
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
used by Mr. Bloomfield conflated the maximum firing rate for the plant, when it should have been using an average firing rate. Do you agree with that?
A. Yes. I don't know if he should be using an average firing rate. But the maximum firing rate probably wouldn't have been the right one.
Q. And then there was a lot of discussion on Page 12 of your -- well, not a lot discussion on Page 12. But a lot of Page 12 of your testimony generated lot of discussion about rules of thumb. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you relied upon this portion of, I believe it was provided to you as a data request. But the second portion of this Table 3 on Page 12 has a rule of thumb of 1.7 green tons of wood, 45-percent moisture content, to make one megawatt hour of electricity, using most existing technologies. And if you recall, Mr. Bravakis and the representative from
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LandVest, whose name I can't remember -MR. JANELLE: Mongan. CMSR. IGNATIUS: Mongan. BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Yeah, Mr. Mongan -- both indicated they didn't agree with that rule of thumb. I'm going to ask you, do you agree with that rule of thumb?
A. My whole purpose with all these calculations is to show that it's a range, that depending upon whatever your goal is, you can come up with a high number or a low number. But it is absolutely dependent upon the assumptions that you make. If the assumptions that you make are all aggressive, you are going to come up with a lower amount of wood.
Q. And ultimately with respect to this particular sub-issue, the Committee has to determine what that range -- what the range is that they're going to consider. And I guess the question is, do you believe that, as a rule of thumb, it takes 1.7 green tons of wood at 45-percent moisture content to make 1 megawatt hour of electricity?
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A. I think that's probably what Eric Kingsley, who provided that, has experienced in the power plants that he's been associated with, when he looked at how much wood they need.
Q. What about in your experience?
A. I think it's probably on the high end of the range. I think I gave a span here of a range of low and high, and my conclusion was that basically that's what it is. It's a span. The real number is based on the assumptions you make, okay. The assumptions you make are going to give you a projection. If you're aggressive with all those numbers, you're going to get a low number. If you're conservative, you're going to get a higher number.
Q. So, in essence, you're really telling us the same thing that the Laidlaw witness told us.
A. Except that they have taken the aggressive numbers to make their determination.
Q. And so your dispute is where along that range one should rest.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And finally, with respect to
[WITNESS: LISTON]
calculations of the usage for the Laidlaw plant, at Line 9 on Page 12, there is a calculation based on a fuel flow rate of 124.9 tons per hour. And I guess the response -- and you came up with an excess of 900,000 tons of biomass using that fuel flow rate. And Mr. Frecker explained that what that is. It was taken from the air permit. But that's just a short-term, maximum type of fuel flow rate that would only occur under certain circumstances. Do you agree with him about that?
A. Yes.
Q. So, do you agree that that might not be a reasonable estimate of what the actual biomass that may be used by this plant is?
A. That's showing the higher end of the scale.
Q. Mr. Liston, I've got two other areas I want to ask you about from your testimony and the responses that we heard from the Laidlaw witnesses.

And the next area is on Page 14, the math errors that you identified in criticizing the estimates of existing
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biomass use from Laidlaw. And basically, you pointed out what is clearly -- the table had a column called "Wood Assigned" to each facility, and if you multiplied those numbers across they did not apply.

But we heard testimony from
Mr. Cousineau and Mr. Bravakis that that column was not meant to be the product of the other columns, but that it was, in fact -- that that "wood assigned" number was created as a result of not just the quantitative analysis, but also interviews and the knowledge of Mr. Cousineau on what various plants actually drew from the wood basket. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have any reason to disagree with those numbers, with that caveat that this was -- that these weren't supposed to be multiplied across?
A. I couldn't disagree more. At the tech session in Berlin, $I$ asked specifically Mr. Mongan, "Do I subtract this number and" --
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(Court Reporter interjects.)
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Slow down.
A. In other words, I looked at the chart and said here's a number, what's the formula. He confirmed the formula. And their numbers are wrong. And that's where it was when, I believe, produced this document. Or maybe I did this before. No, we did this after that. I forget which order they came in.

But, you know, the Applicant put in all kinds of information. I mean, their numbers are all over the place, okay. I mean, they got different numbers quoted for fuel here. They got different numbers for BTUs. And at this late stage, they're changing the numbers. This is a serious shell game here, if I'm supposed to look at their information and come up with something that's realistic. So now what they're saying is that what Mr . Mongan told me up in Berlin -- and you were there -- is incorrect. They're also telling me that Mr. Mongan's LandVest company -- he sat here and said, we, after talking to this
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Cousineau fellow, decided that he's more knowledgeable than we are, and therefore, we're going to throw out our calculations and use his assumptions, okay. To me, that's an end result that's purely contrived. They found out they had problems. Here's how they covered it up. They can't cover up the fact that they had the wrong number for the Schiller plant. That's documented. And that one, they just -- nothing we can do about that. But $I$ contend that these are math errors. And I believe that's correctly what they were. And the only way they could explain them away was to have Mr . Cousineau come in, who $I$ don't think is really qualified to just take those numbers and skew them. And that's what they did.
Q. The last area $I$ want to get into is the whole utilization area. And you referenced just recently, towards the end of your testimony before the Committee began questioning, I believe Committee Exhibit 9, which is the Forest Guild report from May
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2010. And if $I$ understand what you're saying correctly, it's not as simple as just expanding the use of the tops and branches that are left on the forest floor. You have to consider how many acres you're logging and what the soils are and that type of thing; is that correct?
A. And any type of land-use covenants or wishes of the landowner that wishes you to leave certain trees because they are some type of wildlife habitat. But the piece that deals with the soil, okay, and the humus in the soil, which is really what it comes down to, because we're talking about down-wooding material -- if you were on a steep hill, you probably shouldn't be taking too much of it because you need it to prevent erosion. If you're on the top of that mountain where there's open, bald mountains with rocks and thin, thin soil, and you take your trees from that scenario, zero is the right amount to take. You need to leave it all in there. There's only some places in any given wood lot where that increased utilization would
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be appropriate.
Q. Well, wouldn't you agree, I mean, there's certain places where you can't log and there are place where logging is very prolific and very suitable? Do you agree with that?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so somewhere there's an average; isn't that correct?
A. The average they referred to is the average utilization of what they drag out of the woods and chip.
Q. Right. And what they're saying is that the average right now appears to be 50 percent. But on average, the forest could probably support 70-percent utilization.
A. That's what they were contending. And that's absolutely wrong, okay. Because they're saying that they're going to be able to get this higher utilization which involves that the land be in a 15- to 20-year cutting cycle, with no more than one third of the basal area removed. And in that scenario, you need to leave behind one quarter to one third, which would be 33
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percent. So you're talking about 67
percent --
Q. Well, 66- to 75-percent utilization.
A. Yeah, only if you have those conditions and you don't have a soil problem in addition.
Q. But would you say that, on average, the hundred-mile radius doesn't have those conditions?
A. I'm saying it's never been studied and nobody knows.
Q. I don't have any further questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LISTON: Done?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Attorney
Rodier, do you have any redirect that you would like to do with this witness?

MR. RODIER: I do. But what I really want to say, Mr. Chairman -- and I'm, probably going to test your patience with me, and I apologize in advance -- we've had very important people come down here to give public comment today under the representation that they would be fit in. One person, who's the owner of
[WITNESS: LISTON]

North Country Wood Supply, has left in exasperation. We feel that prejudices us. It's after 5:00. I don't think people who drove down should have to wait any longer. I hope you understand how we feel.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I
understand. This has been a time-consuming process for all of us. And if somebody had to leave today, it's not to say they could not come back at the close of these proceedings. Or they could provide written testimony to us, which we will certainly all look at. Or they can come back when we do, in fact, close this proceeding. What I would like to do at this time is ask how many members of the public that are here who would like to provide brief public statements to the Committee. One, two, three, four, five, six. And before -- let's do this. We're going to take, say about a five-minute break here, until 5:15. And I'm going to ask during that break, I'm going to ask the members of the public if they would come up and speak with Mr. Iacopino to give him their names.
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I would ask you each to please plan to speak for not more than three minutes or so. There will not be questions from the Subcommittee for you. This is simply an opportunity for you to provide public comment. If you care to submit a written statement, you are most welcome to do so. And again, until this proceeding actually closes, and it appears to me we will not close this proceeding today -- that is, the evidentiary portion of this -- until this is closed, we will welcome written comment from any parties who wish to submit written comment. I'm informed by counsel that we can actually receive written comment until the time we actually issue a decision in a proceeding. So there will be ample opportunity for members of the public to submit written comment.
So let's take a five-minute
break now and ask members of the public who would like to address us briefly to see Mr. Iacopino. When we return, we will hear those public comments.
(Whereupon a recess was taken at 5:10
p.m. and the hearing resumed at 5:25
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p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you
all. We appreciate your patience with us. We've been trying to work out some future scheduling in this proceeding, and I will discuss that further, once we have taken public comment.

I understand there are six
individuals who would like to address us, and one of these individuals has asked to present a letter from another entity that was not here at this hour. So I'm just going to take these more or less in the order in which they appear here.

On my list, first, Mr. Jasen
Stock. Ask you to please come forward and stand just fairly close to the stenographer so that she can hear you readily. And if you can, stand a little bit over to this side so that she can also read your lips and make it easier for her. PUBLIC COMMENT BY JASEN STOCK

MR. STOCK: For the record, my
name's Jason Stock. I'm the executive director of the New Hampshire Timberland Owners

Association. I first want to thank the Council for taking public testimony. I know it's been a
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long and tedious process, and I will be brief. Our association represents timber owners in the forest products industry. And our members represent about a million acres of timberland across the state of New Hampshire, and the companies and individuals who harvest that timber and process it. We have wood energy plants as members of ours. And it's not common for us to really insert ourselves in projects -proceedings such as this, in that clearly there are competing interests here and competing private businesses. And we're an industry trade association, so this is a little bit of an awkward spot for us. But based on some of the comments I heard today and some of the discussion, particularly around wood supply and sustainability, I thought it may be helpful for me to try and shed some light on this for the Commission, and would offer that, in the future, we are available to answer questions. If I say something that you have a question about, we certainly -- I'd like you to look to us as a resource.

We have an interest certainly
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
in wood supply and the forest industry market. Some of our -- it was actually nice to see some of our literature being used as a reference here. This is something we track. We do it as a trade association.

This question about wood
availability is much more complex than drawings with circles and dots on the White Board. And I wanted to point that out. Factors that go into whether -- there's critical differences in wood availability versus wood supply. We have studied the issue. We did a study in 2007, in conjunction with the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, looking at wood supply. And what $I$ can say is, based on that study, from a biological context, there's wood on the landscape. In fact, based on those results, New Hampshire continues to grow more wood than we're harvesting. But the question comes about whether it's available. And factors such as logging capacity, competing uses, diesel fuel pricing, land ownership patterns and attitudes, and ultimately the price that's paid for those wood chips, really factor into that. So when you
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wrangle with the question, is there wood on the landscape, is there wood out there, we certainly would contend, yes, there is. How much of it is available really becomes a business question. It really comes down to what the pro forma says, what the investors are willing to stomach in terms of risk, and all these other factors that come into play.

One other factor that I think was mentioned earlier that really lays into this is the health of the sawmill industry. Loggers do not get into the business of producing biomass. Loggers log. They produce logs. They send them to a sawmill. If they're really lucky, they produce nice, clean, clear logs that go to a veneer mill and get used in furniture and tables such as we're sitting behind. Biomass is almost always a byproduct. It's the tops. It's the limbs, as is pulpwood. That's the byproduct. So when you look at logging capacity, loggers -that's directly correlated or directly tied to sawmill health, sawmill viability.

So, as you deliberate and as
you look at this and scratch your head and say,

$$
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are there going to be adequate loggers out there, is there going to be an infrastructure to supply wood to whether it's a 70- or 30-megawatt facility, a question you need to be asking yourself or contemplating is, what's the sawmill industry look like, how is that fairing, because that has a direct correlation. If sawmills are healthy, you're going to have loggers, and you're going to have biomass, which is a byproduct of those operations.

The other piece that we look at is landowner attitudes. The U.S. Forest Service has done -- they do periodic studies looking at landowner attitudes. I'm talking about private, non-industrial landowners. Almost always when you look at these studies, most landowners do not own land for economic purposes. They own it for a host of reasons: Recreation, seclusion, aesthetics. To cut -- to grow and cut wood is not -- almost always is not a top three, or even fifth option as to why they own it. So, again, the question about
is this project, or any project going to result in the wholesale liquidation of timber across the

[^0]state of New Hampshire, or within the region, you need to think that that region is owned by independent landowners and, as is the Yankee tradition, with very independent thoughts and ideas about how their land should be managed. So to say we're going to put a 70-megawatt facility in, and all that land is going to get mowed because everyone's going to say, you know, time to cash in, that's just not going to happen. The same concern was voiced when the current biomass plants were put in, and history has shown us that's not what's going to happen.
The other -- I'm wrapping up
here. The concern in terms of sustainability is one that -- sustainability is -- there's many metrics and many definitions of sustainability. You've heard mention of a forest stewards guild. Sometimes you'll hear the term, "if growth exceeds harvest or removals." That's one metric. And you can get three foresters in a room, and you can have -- you'll have what results in four definitions of what is sustainability. So, just looking at simple math and saying, well, growth exceeds harvest,
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therefore, we're sustainable, that's not always a good metric, in that, as forests age and zeniths, growth slows down. When that happens, is that, in fact, sustainable? You start moving towards an older forest. You lack the biological diversity, and you start having biological and even start having some wildlife management concerns. So it's a complex issue. And to get at this issue of sustainability, you really need to be careful. It's not just a simple mathematical equation looking at growth versus harvest.

The other piece is that
whatever restriction you apply to wood supply, it's certainly going to result in increased cost, one way or the other. And recall that one of the factors that affects wood availability to the plant is a competitive marketplace. These power plants are competing against paper mills. They're competing against pellet mills. They're also competing against some low-grade sawmills, sawmills that make pallets and posts and piers. Sustainability standards that are placed on this particular segment of the industry can ultimately \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
[WITNESS: LISTON]
put them at a disadvantage, and in the long run they would not be competitive.

So, again, when you look at
those standards, something that needs to be contemplated is you're in a competitive marketplace. We're talking about utilities. But these utility-type consumers are competing in a very competitive marketplace. And, again, you start layering on standards or requirements, and we may lose it altogether. May issue a license that will never come to fruition.

So, on that note I'll conclude my comments. And, again, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak at this late hour. And I know questions are not -- the intent was not to ask questions. But we are available, and we'd be happy to answer questions or come in at a later date. Thank you. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Stock. Before I call the next witness, Mr. Liston, I apologize. I meant to excuse you, at least for the moment. So if you wish to go --
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[WITNESS: LISTON]

MR. LISTON: I can't sit here and get this view? All right.
(Witness excused.)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: All right.
Our next witness will be, $I$ believe it's Tim
Chase --
MR. CHASE: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: -- of
Bristol?
PUBLIC COMMENT BY TIM CHASE
MR. CHASE: Yeah. I'm
speaking on behalf of myself and Indeck Energy.
We appreciate the chance for you to --
MR. HARRINGTON: I didn't get that. What energy?

MR. CHASE: Indeck,
I-N-D-E-C-K, Energy.
I'm currently the plant
manager at the Indeck-Alexandria Energy facility. It's a 15-megawatt, wood-fired generating facility in Alexandria, New Hampshire. The project buys its wood from local suppliers and sellers, and the power generated from the facility is sold into the ISO New England
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electric grid.
Indeck questions whether the power purchase agreement between PSNH and Laidlaw meets the energy needs of the New Hampshire ratepayers. The 70-megawatt Laidlaw development was not competitively bid to ensure the lowest reasonable cost, and the facility's draw of wood supply from a 100-mile procurement radius may have a significant adverse effect on the wood supply market in New Hampshire.

Indeck's ability to compete as a merchant generating facility in New Hampshire is directly impacted by the development of the Laidlaw project and the power purchase agreement with Public Service. Please find attached the testimony, including rebuttal statements, on the Laidlaw project and PPA with PSNH.

Given the interest of Indeck and the testimony provided, Indeck requests to inform the Commission that we are a party that is directly affected by the Laidlaw project, and that no other party can adequately represent Indeck in this proceeding. And I just have some bullet points I'd like to touch on and I'll be

[^1]finished.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Please do
so.
MR. CHASE: Curt Richmond of
Cousineau, testifying on behalf of Laidlaw, fabricated a quote from myself, the plant manager at Indeck-Alexandria. Neither myself nor Indeck-Alexandria ever stated support for the Laidlaw Berlin project.

Curt Richmond of Cousineau, testifying on behalf of Laidlaw, misrepresented as 100 percent of wood that Cousineau supplied to the Indeck-Alexandria plant. Since May of 2010, Cousineau's has only supplied 60 percent of Indeck-Alexandria's wood. And for 2010 as a whole, it has only supplied 76 percent.

The 100-mile biomass procurement radius encompasses much of New Hampshire, including the wood basket for all of the other New Hampshire biomass projects, including PSNH's Schiller station. Half of the area's inside of New Hampshire, the other half is in Vermont and Maine. Unlike the majority of New Hampshire biomass projects, Berlin is less than

20 miles by road from Maine and less than 30 miles by road from Vermont. The cited economic development will necessarily benefit Maine and Vermont as much or even more than New Hampshire.

The Laidlaw Berlin power
purchase agreement with PSNH was not competitively bid to ensure the lowest reasonable cost and contains terms and conditions that are unlikely to protect the interest of the ratepayers.

## Another term of the power

 purchase agreement, the cumulative reduction, saddles New Hampshire ratepayers with above-market costs, with only a possibility of relief through a purchase option at the end of the 20-year power purchase agreement. Based on the biomass budget, the plant intends to purchase wood chips at an above-market price, seriously impairing the profitability of other biomass plants within the 100-mile radius wood procurement zone, yet recovers its cost as indexed to the biomass cost at PSNH's Schiller station, which is in the same\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
wood procurement zone.
The PPA also compensates
Laidlaw Berlin for RECs, renewable energy certificates, at a price which is a percentage of the alternative compliance payment level over the life of the PPA, which saddles ratepayers with likely above-market prices that justify the financing for the project.

As mentioned earlier, if the
PPA is allowed, it could adversely impact the budgeted wood price for small merchant, electric-generating facilities, to the point of potential shutdown. Approximately 20 jobs and 40 indirect, loggers and truckers, jobs for each facility could be affected.

Those in favor have touted
that this PPA is directly in line with the renewable portfolio standard. However, it appears that this power purchase agreement will far exceed the need. The approval of this power purchase agreement can have a significant impact on the future of the New Hampshire REC market well past 2014. Thank you.

MR. HARRINGTON: Excuse me,
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}

Mr. Chairman. Just one correction.
I think on Page 4 -- on Page
2, Section 4, where you say in your testimony, Gary A. Long, CEO of Laidlaw Berlin, I assume you mean CEO of PSNH?

MR. CHASE: Yes. In the
footnotes, sir?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah.
MR. CHASE: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you
very much.
MR. CHASE: Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Next going to call upon Thomas McCue of Berlin. PUBLIC COMMENT BY THOMAS MCCUE

MR. McCUE: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. My name is Tom McCue. I live at 27 Cambridge Street in Berlin, New Hampshire.

On that site plan, when you're looking at it, up along the top, along the left-hand side is where Cambridge Street is. I'm a resident. I base my law practice there. I'm a taxpayer in Berlin, and I'm a PSNH customer. I
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serve on the Berlin City Council, representing, Ward 2. I'm the city council's rep to the planning board. I served on the citizens advisory committee, where the stipulations that the City of Berlin submitted were -- began. I'm Berlin's representative to AVRRDD, the Androscoggin Valley Refuse Recovery and Disposal District, which owns the Mount Carberry landfill, where you heard the ash from this proposed facility will be going. AVRRDD also owns the former Burgess Wastewater Treatment plant. And I'm Berlin's representative to the North Country Council.

My biggest connection to this project, though, is every day when I go out my back door and I turn to go down my back steps, I see that boiler. And I'm worried. This project, I've said to people, it reminds me of the television commercial for a hotel reservation company, where the fellow is out working in his yard and the guy shows up with the helmet and the flight suit and hands him a check for his refund, and the guy says, Why didn't you just mail the check?" The reply is, "We have a Hovercraft."

This project seems to have all been driven by, "We have a boiler." I call it the "ugly beige boiler building." It's horrible to look at, at this point. And I'm worried because, as I understand it, this will be the third time this boiler has been reconditioned or retrofit. It was a used boiler when it came to Berlin, and now they're trying to turn it into yet another use. When it comes to this project, our city council very often breaks down 5-4. We're a nine-member body, and it's pretty much 5-4. And at this point, there are five that seem to support and there are four of us that certainly do not support the project. And frankly, $I$ find that to be a very reasonable representation of our community. The community is heavily divided on this issue. It's been a very divisive issue. I have had lifelong residents tell me that they have never seen such a divide in opinion, and so strong opinions. I worry about property taxes.

Earlier this afternoon, Attorney Needleman corrected or qualified some of the earlier testimony about pollution control devices. I can
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tell you that the city council budgeted this year extra monies so that our utility assessor could, in fact, be negotiating with the Laidlaw project and with Clean Power Development about payments in lieu of taxes.

I'm certainly worried about a
company that filed a $\$ 10$ million civil rights lawsuit against the Town of Ellicottville. And what you didn't hear on that one, too, because it wasn't asked, but one year after that suit was filed, the attorneys for Laidlaw petitioned to withdraw because they had not been paid. And in March of 2009, substitute counsel filed an appearance. And when I checked this morning, that case is still languishing on the docket. That's in the Western District of New York, in Buffalo, U.S. District Court.

I'm worried about the case that's here in our court, the U.S. District Court for the District of New Hampshire, where Waldron Engineering, whose work is in that application, filed suit against the Applicant for breach of contract and not getting paid.

I worry that PSNH is using
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this project as yet another end-run around de-regulation.

And I was worried about the statute under which this Subcommittee operates. I facetiously used to say it was $162-\mathrm{H}$, the H for highjack. It was highjacking local control.

And as this Committee may recall with the Clean Power Development project, our local planning and zoning boards and city council handled that matter. I will admit, after sitting for the five days of this hearing so far, I'm glad it's your job and not our job to sort this thing out. This is an amazing project. This is a lot of work. And I can understand why the legislature set up this system that it did.

And I want to thank Attorney Needleman and all of the McLane team, the Office of Public Counsel, certainly our attorneys, the City of Berlin's attorneys, Attorney Rodier. I want to thank all the witnesses. People have done an awful lot of work. And I've learned a lot, but I'm still worried about this thing.

Our attorneys, the City's
attorneys, when this matter got started, even
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though many of us wanted to fight this project -many of us still oppose it, many in the community still oppose it -- came to realize that perhaps the better course of action would be to get what we could out of it if it were to go through, and to get this Committee to impose conditions and basically take over the control that we would have had at the local level to impose the types of conditions that we would have saw fit. And that's what the stipulations were all about. As I said, there was a citizen advisory committee where it all started. And I believe the Committee actually got that set of stipulations submitted at one point. I served on that committee. It then came to the planning board, where again I was involved with it. And ultimately it went for approval to the city council. So I've been so many times through those stipulations. I have a file that thick on those. But I'm glad that we got them in. They're not perfect. For example: I was one of the people that $I$ didn't want trucks delivering before 6:00 in the morning. What we ended up with, though, is reasonable. We had a
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compromise: They can start at five. But if between five and six there are enough complaints, there's going to be some testing and see.

I was also one who was very
much -- felt very strongly about decommissioning, that the residents of Berlin not get stuck with a project half-done or, even if it got done, started running and ended up shutting down. Granted, some of the materials, some of the construction would be able to be sold for value. But what would be left? We had some bad experiences with wind farms, and that's where a lot of this became. And the decommissioning fell out. In the business of politics, or the politics of business, however you want to look at it, that got negotiated away. But it's a reasonable set of stipulations. It's certainly better than not having anything in there.

If, and I know it's a big if,
but if this Committee should decide to issue a certificate, as you decide the conditions -- and I'm sure there will be many -- bear in mind that it's your agencies, it's your departments who will be responsible for ultimately enforcing
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them. I was very pleased to hear from a few of you questions about who would ultimately be responsible in that chart they had of the organization. It's like, as I believe it was Attorney Iacopino said, we don't want to get to a point where we're going back to somebody and they're saying, oh, well, that's not us, you've got to go see this one. Very glad to see that, because this is troublesome. This is worrying. But you are our recourse. As the public, as the citizens, when constituents are calling me if there are complaints, if there are problems, you are the ones we are going to be turning to. Please keep that in mind as you draft your conditions.

And, too, you know, it's
interesting. As I was thinking about this, I realized how -- it's not lost on me -- that $I$ was before this Committee, the Subcommittee, last winter. And at that time $I$ was advocating that you not take jurisdiction of the Clean Power Development project, that you deny that petition. I said at that time we didn't need to be protected from ourselves. And now I'm back
asking you to protect us. It's not lost on me. So I would ask that you certainly incorporate the City of Berlin's stipulations in your conditions. And I would hope you will find a way to bind all the entities that were on that chart. They should all be bound by these conditions and stipulations. This project, the management, ownership, it's been something of a moving target. For many years now we've been involved with Lou Bravakis and Ray Kusche. Mr. Bartoszek has been behind all of it. Now things are going to change. So, again, I hope you will find a way to be sure to bind all of them, because it's you that we, the public, are looking to. The Office of Public Counsel certainly did what they could representing us.

But it was like Attorney Roth, earlier, when he and I were talking, as he pointed out to me -- I said, "Those of us who have a problem with this project are looking to you to represent us," and he said, "Yes, but the public includes the county commissioners. It includes your mayor and all those who do support the project."
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But ultimately, we're -- you are who we are relying on. You have the expertise. And again, $I$ want to thank all of you for your efforts. It's been a lot of work.

You've got a lot of work ahead of you. Like I said, I realize now, I'm quite glad it's you that have to deal with this and not us at the local level. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you,
Mr. McCue.
Now I'd like to call on
Mr. Carl Belanger from Gorham for a brief public statement.

PUBLIC COMMENT BY CARL BELANGER
MR. BELANGER: Chairman Burack
and Commissioners, thank you for allowing me to address the Committee. My name is Carl Belanger. I'm presently employed by Laidlaw in Berlin as site manager. I met and toured most of you around the site a few months back. In the past, I was superintendent of the recovery boiler and the cogen for Fraser Paper. Before that, I was assistant superintendent of utilities for Fraser Paper. And I still work closely with Fraser \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}

Paper, since a lot of my co-workers are still working with them. And we deal closely every day. I can say that from conversations with Fraser Paper, they're willing to do business with either Clean Powers or Laidlaw and do not want to get involved with any dispute or get in the middle.

To correct Tom, the recovery boiler was built in 1993 as a new boiler. It was built partially inside of an old structure from 1966.

When the pulp mill shut down, it wasn't an issue of not enough wood. There was plenty of wood. There were other issues, other reasons for the pulp mill going down that I am not allowed to talk about.

I have here in my hand 231 pages of petitions that were signed, petitions that were collected by Scott Coulomb, who was a former businessman in Berlin. Scott has since moved out of Berlin, and he left these petitions in my office. There are 2061 signatures from Berlin residents -- from Berlin and surrounding communities; 1585 of these signatures are from

[^2]Berlin; 476 are from the surrounding communities. I'd like to leave this with the Committee. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Just place them there. And these are signatures on? MR. BELANGER: In support of Laidlaw.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. MR. BELANGER: One of the
ladies who collected these signatures, who canvassed for these signatures, was a former lab tech at the pulp mill, who had worked there 35 years. She's been unemployed for the last four years, so she had plenty of time on her hands. She went out and collected 400 or 500 signatures. She came back to see me and she said she canvassed 103 people to get 100 signatures. So that's a good turnout, I mean, a good rate. And she felt that there were very few people, less than five percent of the people from Berlin, from what she saw, who were against it.

One thing I want to say is
that wood suppliers and wood users will not strip their resource and shut their businesses down. It's in their best interest to conserve their
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resources to continue operating.
That's all I have to say.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Next like to call upon Mr. Barry Kelly of Berlin. PUBLIC COMMENT BY BARRY KELLY

MR. KELLY: Hi, I'm Barry
Kelly from Berlin, New Hampshire. I run a sawmill. I've been running that sawmill since 1975, when my father died. It was a mill he bought with a partner in 1945. I was born there, my father was. My great-grandfather came there from St. John, New Brunswick, to work in the emerging paper industry in 1882. So we've been there a long time and seen a lot of things happen. Some good, some bad.

There were five paper mills, pulp and paper mills, in 2001. That's where the 1.3 million tons was used. The first to close was the Gilman Paper. They used a hundred thousand for energy. The next one was in 2005. Groveton Paper Companies stopped using wood in their boiler. That was another hundred thousand tons. Then, the following year, 2006, Groveton
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Paperboard announced their shutdown. They were using about 125,000 tons for paper. And three months later, that's when Fraser announced its permanent closing. And they were using 200,000 tons for fuel and 800,000 tons for paper. That's over 1.3 million. And that was the usage then. Three or four years before that, there was even a little more usage because things were better. Things had been cutting back. If you had asked me 10 years ago, would I think that -- in the future, what would be worth more: Wood for energy or wood for paper? I'd say paper, the highest and best use, no question. My thinking has changed tremendously. Those mills closed not because they couldn't get wood. They closed because they couldn't get customers. Places like Chile, Brazil, Indonesia are making paper so much cheaper than we can in the United States, that it's killing the paper industry.

What I fear more about is not running out of wood. What $I$ fear is one of those three paper mills in Maine closing. Fifty miles from us is NewPage. NewPage has that satellite
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plant in Shelburn. They chip there for that mill in Maine. NewPage is owned by investors,

Cerberus Capital. I don't know if you know the name. Cerberus Capital is written up often in the Wall Street Journal. They're the biggest owner of Chrysler, got bailed out by the government. They've had a terrible track record with investments, gotten into trouble with many of their funds. And they are the primary owner of Rumford. So, for the last year to two, people have been worried about what's going to happen in Groveton -- what's going to happen in Rumford. It continues, but it's tenuous, because paper made in the United States is expensive. So I worry about the future.

Energy. Look what's happened to energy in the last 10 years and look what's happened to paper. We're using less paper. We're all using Internet. We're not faxing, we're e-mailing. But we're using more energy. And the energy we're using is coming from places like Venezuela or the Gulf, places that we want to stop using the energy from there and be self-sufficient. We've got a great story to tell
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with energy.
The biggest thing I see for
Berlin -- I don't think this is a good project for Berlin. I think is this is a great project for Berlin. You people were there at the hearing in Berlin earlier this year. There was an easy two-thirds in support of it there. It has grown. There are way more than two thirds of the people in Berlin supporting it now. And people outside the area support it because it impacts more than just Berlin. It impacts the whole North Country. That wood will come from easily within 50, most likely 100 miles, because of back-hauls and agreements you make and jobbers who come from here, buy cut wood over there and bring the load home at night. I don't worry about that. I worry about keeping the people going in Berlin.

If you had an industrialist show up in Berlin and you said, "What would be the best thing for that plant?" Tom McCue worries about us being left with Laidlaw. I worry what we're left with now. We've got a continuously used industrial site that's a hundred years old. It's covered with rubble.

It's undeveloped right now. It's adjacent to one of two superfund sites in the state, that chlor-alkali plant that we talked about earlier. It's across the street from the second largest landfill in the state. It's on the border of the Androscoggin River. It's beautiful. But it's got two dams there making hydropower, so you can't use the river. We've got water frontage. But believe me, that site is no Rye, New Hampshire. It needs -- something needs to be done with it.

It's the perfect recycling project. You're going to bring in -- you're going to say, what could we put on there? We're going to use it for what it is. We're going to take a product that's grown locally. You all see those signs on the roadside stands, "buy locally." That's what we're doing. We're taking a product that's grown right close to home. We're converting it in town, and we're sending it outside the area to bring dollars back into the North Country. And we don't even need to use roads to send that out because we can send it over power lines. We've got the trained \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
workforce there in the woods to produce the wood. We've got the trained people in the paper mills who can run boilers and can run equipment. We've got what we need in place. It is an excellent project for the city of Berlin.

And the nicest thing is it's
tied not to a world market for wood that's up and down, that's so cyclical that you can't get contracts that mean anything. If you've got -if you're working with a company that's got a 20-year contract for power, you can get a contract from them that you can bring to the bank and borrow money to buy equipment that's going to take you five years to pay off. I worry about the paper industry, that the contracts are worth nothing. People today can't borrow money to keep equipment current. Worry about bringing the price up a few dollars? You know what that tells me? That means loggers will be able to afford health insurance. They'll be able to replace their equipment and keep their crews going.

I ask you to -- and no pun
intended to -- to permit us to be able to grow this green energy industry in New Hampshire.
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We've got a great story to tell up here. Wood for the power, wind, the 99-megawatt that you were all involved in up just north of us, which you can see from the hills in Berlin. We've got water. We produce over 30 megawatts of water power on 6 miles of river from Berlin and slightly below. We've got methane gas coming out of the landfill. We're burning off about two megawatts right now, and we're hoping to tie that in to keep the paper mill going in Gorham. But we've got green energy everywhere. It's what Obama got elected on, the promise of green jobs. He hasn't done too well yet. But here's a chance to see those green jobs come to fruition. Concord's known as the Capitol

City, Manchester's the Queen City. Berlin has always been known as the "City That Trees Built." I ask you to allow us to continue to be the "City That Trees Built" and the city that is sustained by trees well into the 21st Century. Thank you. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Kelly.

Now call upon Mr. Jon Edwards.
And Mr. Edwards, $I$ understand you wish to make a
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brief statement of a personal nature. And I know that we did hear from you at the commencement of this proceeding. So I understand that we may -I hope we will hear not a repeat of what we heard from you before, but additional information. I understand you also have a letter from D.G. Whitefield, LLC that you wish to present to the Committee as well; is that correct?

PUBLIC COMMENT BY JONATHAN EDWARDS
MR. EDWARDS: Yes. And in addition, I'd like to say that Barry Kelly is a very difficult act to follow, by the way.

I guess I'm going to begin by just some personal comments. My name's Jon Edwards. I'm an owner of a real estate company up in Berlin. I purchased that company from a fellow that was in the business for 37 years. And he always told me to take the advice of people that have been in the business for the longest time, in whatever you're doing. And I guess what $I$ would like to do is to suggest that we're hearing from Indeck today, we've heard from Gestamp, and a little later I'm going to be reading something from Marubeni, all sharing
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concerns, and all in the field, all very well respected in biomass, telling us that they have some concerns over sustainability. And on the other hand, we have a company by the name of LandVest, who owns a lot of land, manages a lot of land, and has demonstrated that they'll change their story to confirm that there is enough wood. We're hearing from Mr. Kelly. He's been in the woods business for decades. His family's been in the woods business for decades. His family's also been a heavy landowner for decades. And $I$ guess the question sometimes begins -- or becomes whether or not there's any biases that show up. This has been a very
interesting week. I found out that we need to have approximately 2,000 trucks' worth of chips on this land in the middle of our city at any given time to provide 30 days' worth of fuel. And so $I$ looked at this room and I said, ah, we can fit about four trucks in here. So if we piled them 500 high, that's what we need for chips in the middle of our town. And if the wind blew in the town, where arsons have been prevalent, that 1920 's vintage house, or, for
that matter, blocks of houses in close proximity to any wind blowing, $I$ wonder what kind of effect that would have, being that the city just decided to allow for that to happen without it being enclosed.

I really think the question
has moved from sustainability to economic development and orderly development in northern New Hampshire during this week. We were told we could put it in the middle of Boston if we pay enough for the chips. The issue is, economic development's already in place with biomass facilities. We're being told by Marubeni today, and Indeck, very successful biomass companies, with operations in Alexandria, Whitefield, RyeGate, et cetera, they're concerned. Wood price increase and over-harvesting can impact 178 megawatts of biomass facilities. I have a list with me that suggests, if we were able to say that we derived three jobs from every megawatt, that that could potentially affect 534 jobs that are already in New Hampshire.

I'd like to suggest that
Mr. Kelly points out that 1.3 million tons of
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wood no longer being used by the mills is missing in the area due to liquidated harvesting.

There's a company -- and I've provided some information from this company, by the name of Dillon, that's been pulling $\$ 40-$ to $\$ 50,000$ per week of wood out of Berlin. I urge the Committee members to review the timber tax records I view on a regular basis as the Chairman of the Berlin Board of Assessors. We're selling away our northern forest in a much different manner than before.

As mayor, Mayor Grenier stated on Monday, one of the Dillon's tracts was liquidated harvested as part of the federal prison project. I'd impress upon you that it could have been harvested properly with a great deal of money obtained and still be a working forest. Now that forest has lost four years of growth and ruined the playground for fish and game for people in the area.

These same practices in Anson,
Maine led to devastation of forestry within a hundred-mile radius, which, coincidentally, is the same maximum rule of thumb we've been told is
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}

Laidlaw's wood target area. I've also included some documents that show this devastation led to sweeping legislative changes in Maine.

In Ellicottville, $I$ spoke to a fellow by the name of Mr. Northrup, who Laidlaw purchased the mill from in that town. And this gentleman told me that he had looked into the possibility of switching that plant over to biomass and said that he had found out it was not sustainable to do so in that area at a reasonable price. That same person also told me that Laidlaw went into receivership and that he was owed over a million dollars in owner financing at that time.

I also received a call from one of the vendors in Ellicottville that said when the same company went into receivership, he was owed in excess of a hundred thousand dollars. I would encourage you to research just how many power purchase agreements PSNH actively is negotiating right now. On computer searches, I'm not finding out too much about PSNH --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}

MR. EDWARDS: I'm not finding
that Laidlaw is currently negotiating power purchase agreements with too many people at this point in time.

Coincidentally, PSNH has also said they want their own power plants and has established a provision of right of first refusal in the Laidlaw power purchase agreement. That defies current law. I think we need to question whether this company is under the definition of orderly development or monopoly development.

Also, this leads to a question of whether or not logging infrastructure, otherwise known as equipment, is necessary to provide loans in close proximity to Berlin. I'm referring back to Dillon's liquidation of harvesting at this point. If we go west, liquidation harvesting has been clearing the forest from Berlin to Groveton. Also, we have land trusts that are formed in the Randolph-Shelburn are greatly diminishing in supply. Going north, we have the liquidation harvesting known as Success, where Dillon purchased over 45,000 acres that have been \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}
stripped. Going east, we have NewPage already taking priority for their Rumford plant. And where Mr. Kelly is concerned for NewPage, NewPage is concerned for Laidlaw -- is concerned about Laidlaw.

I'd like to submit that I've provided some information here where this Laidlaw project can substantially affect 97 direct employees in the area, 62 direct employees outside of the immediate area, which I'll hand to you afterwards. And again, I also have some articles on T.R. Dillon coming out of Maine and the damage that he's done so far in New Hampshire.

As I mentioned earlier, I have a statement from D.G. Whitefield. This has been prepared by their president and CEO, Marubeni Sustainable Energy, Terry Williams. This is dated August 25th, 2010. And they have empowered me to read this statement for them.

It says, "To Whom It May
Concern: D.G. Whitefield, LLC is a 19-megawatt, clean biomass electricity generating facility located in the industrial park in Whitefield, New \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}

Hampshire. The facility entered commercial operations in March 1988. D.G. Whitefield employs 20 full-time personnel on site, and through its daily operations directly supports the employment of many additional personnel by the more than two dozen logging companies in its annual combustion of more than 225,000 tons of poultry chips. D.G. Whitefield is a green energy facility, qualified as a renewable energy credit, REC, generator in the Connecticut Renewable Portfolio Standard. D.G. Whitefield is also contemplating certification as a New Hampshire REC generator.

In recent years, D.G.
Whitefield has invested millions of dollars in pollution control systems and other equipment to become one of the lowest emission biomass facilities in North America. The combination of the environmental benefits of the green energy and RECs produced by D.G. Whitefield" --

MR. RODIER: Can you keep your voice up?

MR. EDWARDS: -- "together
with the consistent and substantial local
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economic benefits that the facility provides to its community make D.G. Whitefield a critical local beneficial resource.
D.G. Whitefield competes directly with a number of biomass facilities in the northern region of New Hampshire and Vermont for its wood supply. Additionally, the facility competes with several large paper mills in the western region of Maine. Currently, wood fuel supplies are balanced and adequate to meet the needs of all competing markets; as a result, market prices remain stable. However, it is clear that additional demands placed on a limited biomass market supply will drive operational costs higher. These resulting market conditions will be exacerbated, considering the demand that a proposed 70-megawatt project will create on the available wood basket.
D.G. Whitefield and other
biomass facilities are wholesale providers of competitive electricity and REC products. As such, D.G. Whitefield exercises no pricing power over its end-product buyers and is essentially a price taker, in quotations.
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}


[^3]cost of which will be incorporated into fuel prices and passed along to consumers, including D.G. Whitefield.

> As with other biomass
facilities operating in the ISO New England power market, D.G. Whitefield revenues are hampered by depressed and sharply competitive energy rates. In addition, wood prices have dropped dramatically in recent years. Wood fuel costs, while currently stable, constitute approximately 70 percent of the total operating costs of a facility such as D.G. Whitefield. Laidlaw is brazenly assuming it will control and utilize the remaining available supply of wood and likely gain control of wood now going to other sources. In order to economically accomplish this task, they will have to be able to pay more for business [sic] fuel than any of their competition. Although blocked by confidentiality pricing protection, the PSNH-Laidlaw partnership, and resulting power purchase agreement, apparently has a generous, open-ended pass-through on fuel cost.

The Commission, along with the
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}

New Hampshire PUC, should consider such fuel pass-through an unfair advantage for Laidlaw and anti-competitive to every other free-market competitor in the region. This behavior is monopolistic and certainly not in the best interest of the ratepayer or of the continued health of a competitive regional power or REC market.

If provided with an unfair advantage of a fuel price pass-through mechanism, D.G. Whitefield and other neighboring facilities would be forced to increase the price offered for the limited biomass fuel supply to maintain fuel sources. The resulting financial losses would initially trigger capacity reductions to minimize cash operating losses and ultimately result in the facility's closure, loss of local jobs, and a reduction in green energy production throughout the state. D.G. Whitefield will be at a competitive disadvantage with this proposed large-scale biomass facility, particularly if the Laidlaw facility benefits from an above-market rate order that includes fuel cost recovery mechanisms. This would effectively allow Laidlaw
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to pass through regulator-approved fuel costs to captive electricity customers. This presents an unfair competitive advantage that threatens the continued viability of D.G. Whitefield." That's signed, "Sincerely, Terry Williams, President and CEO of Marubeni Sustainable Energy." And that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you
very much, Mr. Edwards. And that, I believe, concludes public comment from any members who are here in the public today who wish to share their thoughts with the Committee. And I thank all of you for your patience and for taking the time to be with us here today.

Going to talk briefly here before we recess about our future schedule here. Having conferred with members of the Committee on their availability, what I am going to propose -- and I just want to make sure this isn't going to cause any serious issues from a scheduling standpoint for counsel or the parties here -- I propose to reconvene here -- I believe we have a room available here; is that correct?
\{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}

CMSR. IGNATIUS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: We do have a room available here on Friday, September 10th, at 9:00 in the morning, at which time we would complete the examination of Mr . Liston and then have the testimony of Mr . Gabler and his examination. We would then provide time for closing arguments any additional oral public comment that people would like to provide. I would ask the parties then to file their post-hearing briefs not later than September 17 th . And I will note that the Committee members are looking likely to deliberate between September -- give me just a moment here, please -- between September 20th and 22nd. I cannot at this point tell you exact times on one or all of those days when we would meet to deliberate, but $I$ would anticipate that would likely occur here in this room as well. Whether that would enable us to actually issue a final decision in this matter by the 23rd of September is obviously far less certain. I think it may be reasonable to expect that we can determine what our final decision will be by the \{SEC 2009-02\}[DAY 5-PM PUBLIC SESSION] \{8/27/10\}

22nd, but that we may not be able to -- in fact, I think it's probably unlikely at this point that we would be able to issue a written decision by the 23 rd of September. But we will have to see if we have to extend our timeline at that point. But that's what we're looking at. And I just want to hear from the parties if this schedule, from just a scheduling standpoint, causes any serious issues or concerns.

Mr. Needleman?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, not for me. That's fine. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.

Mr. Rodier?
MR. RODIER: Well, certainly not for us, because $I$ had to write a brief by September 8 th, and now I've got a longer time. So, you know, we're perfectly happy.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Very good.
Thank you.
Mr. Roth?
MR. ROTH: That's fine with
us.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Very
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|  | 213 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | good. |
| 2 | Again, I want to thank |
| 3 | everybody who has been with us to provide |
| 4 | testimony and thank all of the parties for their |
| 5 | participation. We will reconvene on |
| 6 | September 10th, and we will issue a scheduling |
| 7 | order here shortly. |
| 8 | Again, thank you all. We will |
| 9 | stand adjourned until September 10th. |
| 10 | (Whereupon the Day 5 Afternoon Public |
| 11 | Session was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.) |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
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| 204:18;205: 8, 9,19; | 88: 3 | 23: 2;56: 3;81:21 | 83: 1;90:12;94:11,11; | fabricated (1) |
| 207: 2, 5;208: 7;209:18; | essence (1) | 84:10;104: 2;184: | 98: 1;99:14;103:17; | 176: 6 |
| 210: 6 | 156:17 | examples (6) | 107: 9,11;117:20; | facetiously (1) |
| enforcing | essentially | 20:14;54: 2;55: 3 | 118:23;140: 2;143: 1; | 183: 5 |
| 185:24 | 21:18;74:16;111:14 | 143:20,21,22 | 147:15;148: 4;154:22; | facilities (28) |
| engineer (1) | 206:23 | exasperation (1) | 157:24 | 25:15;39:22;41:12; |
| 59:23 | establish | 164: 2 | expand (4) | 42: 7, 9;79: 3;80: 3; |
| engineering (2) | 25:12 | exceed (3) | 34:24;87:21;88: | 94:12,20,22;95: 3, 7; |
| 137: 7;182:21 | established | 109:12;127:19;178:20 | 90: 2 | 98:12;99:11,14,20; |
| Engineers (1) | 203: 7 | exceeds (3) | expanding (1) | 108: 9,14;110: 8;137:22; |
| 56:15 | estate (1) | 120: 2;171:19,2 | 161:3 | 178:12;200:13,18; |
| England (2) | 198:15 | excellent (1) | expect (2) | 205:18;206: 5,20;208: 5; |
| 174:24;208 | estimate (4) | 196: 4 | 60:24;211:2 | 209:11 |
| enhance (1) | 54: 4, 6;73:21;157:15 | except (2) | expected (2) | Facility (53) |
| 103:21 | Estimated (2) | 117: 9;156:19 | 104:10;107: | 5: 8, 9;8: 1;12:24; |
| enhanced | 6:15;48: 9 | excess (2) | expecting (1) | 42:13;47:10;49: 7,11,15; |
| 97: 6, 8 | estimates | 7: 5;202 | 84: 4 | 50:21;51: 4;54:12;58: 6; |
| enough (16) | 54:24;157:2 | exclusive (2) | expense | 71:22,23;78:10;79: 1,12; |
| 32:10;63:11;64: | et (2) | 89:13;92:19 | 97: 4 | 95:10;102:16;103: 9; |
| 78:23;95: 8,17;110:18; | 104: 6; | exclusively (1) | expensive (4) | 107: 3, 5, 6;108:19,19; |
| 112: 3;116: 9,24;124: 9; | evaluate (1) | 13: 5 | 130:24;132: 9;193:14; | 135:18,19;148: 4,17,21; |
| 148:20;185: 2;189:13; | 102:23 | excuse (11) | 207:24 | 152:17,18,21;153: 1, 3; |
| 199: 7;200:11 | Evaluation | 33: 6;44:20;71:23 | experience (2) | 158: 4;170: 4;171: 6; |
| ensure (4) | 5: 5;6:13;102:16 | 76:10;98:19,23;100: 1 ; | 81:18;156: 5 | 174:19,21,24;175:12; |
| 29: 1;30:17;175: 6 | evasive (1) | 101:15;112:17;173:23; | experienced (1) | 178:15;180:10;204:23; |
| 177: 8 | 128: 6 | 178:24 | 156: 2 | 205: 1, 9;206: 1, 7; |
| entered (1) | even (24) | excused (1) | experiences (1) | 208:12;209:21,22 |
| 205: 1 | 32: 4;39 | 174: 3 | 185:12 | facility's (3) |
| entire (1) | 64:18;85: 2;96: 7 | executive (1) | expertise (1) | 58:11;175: 7;209:17 |
| 141:11 | 109:11;124: 5;128:18; | 166:21 | 188: 3 | fact (22) |
| entities (3) | 130:21,21;131:19; | exemption (2) | experts (1) | 12:11;15:12;20:20; |
| 119:19;187: 5;207: 6 | 132:23,24;133: 4;136: 7; | 13: 1,10 | 116: 8 | 69: 8,17;74:19,22;84:13; |
| entitled (6) | 147: 9;170:21;172: 7; | exercises (1) | explain (9) | 108: 7;128: 4;131:22; |
| 5:19;6: 2,12;7: 5 | 177: 4;183:24;185: 7; | 206:22 | 14: 1;57: 1;99:17 | 132:19;136:22;153: 1 ; |
| 10:21;15: 8 | 192: 8;195:22 | Exhibit (89) | 119: 5;122:14;128:13; | 158:10;160: 8;164:13; |
| entity (1) | event (1) | 5:18,22,22,23;6: 2, 6, | 133:17;136: 3;160:15 | 168:17;172: 4;182: 3; |
| 166:10 | 8:24 | 7,10,17,19,22,23,23,24; | explained (2) | 207:21;212: 1 |
| environment (2) | eventually (3) | 7: 1, 1, 2, 5, 5, 7,10,10, | 148: 9;157: | factor (9) |
| 105: 9;122: 3 | 93:19;96: 5;113:2 | 17,20,21,21;8: 3, 3, 4, 5, | explanation (1) | 26:16;59:16;93:17 |
| environmental (7) | Everybody (6) | 10,18,19,21,23;9: 2, 4, 4, | 52: 2 | 112:10;122:13;123:15; |
| 76:24;77:11;86:21; | 9: 9;32: 3,15;62: 9; | 19;10: 4,17;14:20;15: 7, | explore (1) | 127: 7;168:24;169: 9 |
| 87: 2, 2, 4;205:19 | 82:15;213: 3 | 7, 7;17:22,24;30: 8 | 32:13 | factors (5) |
| equate (1) | everyone's (1) | 32:21;43: 3,13,14,15; | exposing (2) | 12: 5;168: 9,20 |
| 46:13 | 171: 8 | 44: 3;46:23,24;49:22,23; | 150:11,12 | 169: 7;172:17 |
| equation (2) | everywhere (1) | 51:15;53: 3,16;55: 4,18, | express (1) | facts (1) |
| 80: 7;172:11 | 197:11 | 20;56: 9,12,13;60:13; | 52: 5 | 32:12 |
| equipment (12) | evidence (1) | 63: 1, 6, 7;115: 4, 6,15, | expressions (1) | fail (3) |
| 13: 2;82:16;87:24 | 100:15 | 19;122:19;123: 1, 5, 7; | 30:16 | 78:10;79:13;83: 7 |
| 88:19;89: 6,18;196: 3, | evidentiary | 131:18;144:23;145: 3, | extend (3) | fair (3) |
| 13,17,21;203:14;205:16 | 106:21;165:10 | 16;146: 3, 9, 9;149: 9, | 16:15;38: 7;212: | 23: 8;41: 1;122: 4 |
| erase (1) | exacerbated (1) | 10;160:23 | extending (1) | fairing (1) |
| 62:16 | 206:16 | exhibits (5) | 11:24 | 170: 6 |
| Eric (2) | exact (2) | 5:18;49:23;52:20; | extensions (1) | fairly (1) |
| 132:11;156: 1 | 47:18;211:16 | 115:23;149: 4 | 12:3 | 166:15 |
| erosion (1) | exactly (5) | exist (2) | extent (4) | fall (1) |
| 161:17 | 65: 8;67: 3;74:16; | 138:13;139: 3 | 68:10;109:23;152:11; | 125:15 |
| err (1) | 79: 8;144: 6 | existed (2) | 207:19 | familiar (7) |
| 83:20 | examination (5) | 138:16;139: 6 | extra (5) | 43: 6;44:23;49:21; |
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| 85:24;102:15,22;146: 2 | figure (6) | flies (1) | 40: 9 | 82: 7;83: 9,23,24;86:13; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| family's (2) | 32:10;39:11;81:19; | 65: 7 | forma (1) | 87: 5;89:22;91: 7, 7, 8; |
| 199: 9,10 | 82: 2;127:23;132:16 | flight (1) | 169: 5 | 97:15,16,23;99: 5,22; |
| far (19) | figured (1) | 180:22 | formed (1) | 100: 5;101: $3,6,13$; |
| 22: 8;33:17;44: 6; | 101:21 | flip (1) | 203:20 | 111:16,18;121:13; |
| 60:21;73: 9,13;74:20; | figures (3) | 62:21 | former (3) | 130:11;131: 1;134:13; |
| 82:17;83:12;91: 1 ; | 44:10,17;45: 7 | floor (1) | 180:11;189:20;190:10 | 135: 3, 5,22;136:17,19; |
| 109:22;117:17;121:10; | file (2) | 161: 4 | forming (1) | 137:19,20;141:19; |
| 129: 9;130:24;178:20; | 184:19;211:10 | Florida (1) | 135:14 | 145:10;146: 5,22; |
| 183:11;204:13;211:22 | filed (8) | 146:13 | formula (2) | 147:24;148: 6,14; |
| farms (1) | 17:20;119: 3, 8; | flow (3) | 159: 5, 6 | 150:12,13,14,21;151: 1 ; |
| 185:12 | 122:18;182: 7,11,13,22 | 157: 3, 7,10 | forth (7) | 157: 3, 6,10;159:14; |
| fast (1) | final (5) | fluidized (1) | 10:15;73: 6;87: 6; | 168:21;192: 5;199:18; |
| 64:13 | 7:20;76:15;115:19; | 48: 2 | 124:13,17;133: 7;140: 4 | 206: 9;207: 8;208: 1, 9, |
| faster (2) | 211:21,24 | focus (3) | forty (1) | 18,23;209: 1,10,13,13, |
| 37:23;131:10 | finally (1) | 32:12;59:10;135:2 | 81:24 | 23;210: 1 |
| father (2) | 156:24 | focused (1) | forty-two (1) | fueled (2) |
| 191:10,12 | Financial (3) | 140: 2 | 58: 8 | 145: 4;146:10 |
| favor (3) | 5:19;103: 7;209:14 | follow (4) | forward (5) | fuel-moisture (1) |
| 118:23;119:10;178:16 | financing (2) | 32:18;33:17;90:2 | 16: 9;28: 1;75:22; | 59:3 |
| favorable (2) | 178: 8;202:13 | 198:12 | 117: 4;166:14 | fuels (3) |
| 31:19;78:15 | find (13) | following (2) | found (5) | 24:16;134:16;145: 3 |
| faxing (1) | 47: 7;119: 2;122:17; | 34: 6;191:2 | 72:11;146: 6;160: 6; | fuel's (2) |
| 193:19 | 125: 4, 6;137:14;145:22; | follow-up (1) | 199:15;202: 9 | 27: 9;101: 1 |
| fear (2) | 147: 2,17;175:15; | 10:14 | four (19) | full (3) |
| 192:21,22 | 181:15;187: 5,13 | footnotes (1) | 11: 6;30:12;41:17; | 17:15;28:21;46:19 |
| federal (1) | finding (2) | 179: 7 | 81:14;96:12;97: 5, 6; | full-time (1) |
| 201:14 | 202:22;203: | footprint (2) | 114: 7, 8;140:15;151: 8 , | 205: 3 |
| fee (1) | fine (6) | 125:24;141:13 | 13;164:18;171:21; | fully (1) |
| 12: 7 | 7:16;23: 4;55:24; | force (5) | 181:13;190:12;192: 7; | 18:18 |
| feeds (1) | 105:17;212:12,22 | 94:10,10,13;99:10,19 | 199:20;201:18 | Fund (1) |
| 119:16 | finish (3) | forced (3) | frankly (1) | 5:20 |
| feel (4) | 23:16;38:21,24 | 33: 7;72:21;209:12 | 181:15 | funds (1) |
| 93: 2;104:18;164: 2,5 | finished (3) | foremost (1) | Fraser (6) | 193: 9 |
| feet (1) | 39: 2;105:18;176: 1 | 83: 1 | 118: 4;188:22,23,24; | furniture (1) |
| 110:22 | fired (1) | Forest (58) | 189: 4;192: 3 | 169:16 |
| fell (2) | 54:10 | 12:16;27: 7;29:19; | Frecker (4) | further (14) |
| $128: 10 ; 185: 13$ | firewood (1) | 36: 3;43: 4,19;61:3, 5, | 6:14;13:19;153:21; | 13:19;38:16;39:21; |
| fellow (4) | 102: 7 | 21;62: 4,12;63:19;64: 1; | 157: 7 | 53: 7;69: 2;75:15;89: 6; |
| 160: 1;180:20;198:17; | firing (4) | 68:13,21;69: 1;82:23; | free-market (1) | 113:11;132: 9;139: 9; |
| 202: 5 | 154: 2, 3, 6, 7 | 84:11;85:19;87: 9,11; | 209: 3 | 150: 9;151: 5;163:11; |
| felt (2) | First (24) | 93: 7,11;97: 9;112: 8,12, | frequently (1) | 166: 5 |
| 185: 5;190:18 | 5:11,18;8: 3;13:24; | 22;122:20,21;124: 3,23; | 12:15 | future (8) |
| few (7) | 21: 5;29: 3;40:20;69: 9; | 125:10,13;126:12,19,22; | Friday (1) | 166: 4;167:19;178:22; |
| 25:22;28: 4;128: 9; | 83: 1;88: 6;112:21; | 133: 1;134:21;139:11, | 211:3 | 192:11;193:15;207: 2, 3; |
| 186: 1;188:20;190:18; | 113:20;115:12,17; | 16;140: 3, 9,12;145: 5, | front (5) | 210:16 |
| 196:18 | 121:17;131:12,17; | 13;146:11;160:24; | $19: 23 ; 46: 24 ; 51: 16 ;$ $103 \cdot 4 \cdot 143 \cdot 7$ | G |
| fewer (3) | 133:23;137:23;143:1 | 161: 4;162:14;167: 3 ; | 103: 4;143 |  |
| FIA (2) | fish (1) | $172: 5 ; 201: 10,18,18$ | $\text { 195: } 8$ | Gabler (3) |
| 6:24;12:15 | 201:19 | 203:19 | front-end (1) | 9:19;16: 5;211: 6 |
| fiber (8) | fit (4) | forested (1) | 82: 7 | gain (2) |
| 95: 8,11,13,17;132: 7; | 148: 3;163:24;184: 9; | 153: 5 | fruition (2) | 80:20;208:15 |
| 136:23;148:19;207:17 | 199:20 | foresters (3) | 173:11;197:14 | Gainesville (2) |
| field (1) | Five (13) | 126:23,24;171:20 | fuel (99) | 53:19;146: 1 |
| 199: 1 | 11:15,16;27:20;58: 8; | forestry (2) | 5: 9;6:16;19:13,13; | gallon (2) |
| fifth (1) | 88:17;164:18;181:12; | 127:18;201:22 | 20: 7,10;21: 6,10;24: 9; | 150:22,24 |
| 170:21 | 183:11;185: 1, 2;190:19; | forests (5) | 25:19,20,21,22;26:14; | game (2) |
| Fifty (5) | 191:17;196:14 | 77:23;93:15;124:16; | 36:15;38: 3;48: 8,10,14; | 159:17;201:20 |
| 46:11;53: 6;107: 8, 9; | five-minute (2) | 168:14;172: 2 | 49: 6, 8,16,18;51:10; | Gary (1) |
| 192:23 | 164:20;165:18 | forget (2) | 52: 9;53: 8;54:12,24; | 179: 4 |
| fight (1) | flaws (1) | 32:11;159:10 | 56: 4;57:12;58: 7,12; | gas (1) |
| 184: 1 | 25:10 | form (1) | 59: 6;75:12;78:13,21; | 197: 7 |
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| thering | goes (14) |  | 40: 3;183:10 | alt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40:10 | 6:17;28: 1;36:17 | (71:18 | handling | 90:17.170: |
| thers (2) | 0:23;94: 9;96: | 171:18,24;172: 3,11; | 82. 6.10 | hear (13) |
| 71:22,24 | 03:24;117: 4,17; | 201:19 | hands (3) | 22:19 |
| gave (4) | , |  | (1) |  |
| $: 21 ; 43$ | Good (18) | $3: 9 ; 26: 1 ; 32$ | writing (1) | 1;171:18;182: |
| Gazetteer | 15;29:10,11;35:20; | 7,138:11;145:2 | handy (1) | heard (23) |
| 8:19 | :21;106: 6;122: 2, 3; | 0: 5;155:21;157: 4; | 149: | 23:12;30:10,11,15; |
| gears (1) | 2: 2;190:17,17; | 8:13,21;19 | hang (3) | 81:15;83:10;85:17; |
| 137:21 | 1:16;194: 3;212:19; | guideline (2) | 116:22,23 | 88:20;89:23;98:11; |
| general (3) | 213: 1 | 24:14;127 | happen (9) | 106: 7;116: 5;118:22; |
| 19;33 | Gorham (6) | Guidelines (8) | 27:13;82:2 | 122: 8;127:22;130: 3; |
| generally | 40: 5;108 | 122:21;126:1 | 1: 9,12;191 | 57:20;158: 6;167:15; |
| 20:12;77:2 |  |  |  |  |
| generate (2) |  |  |  |  |
| 91: 5;102: |  | 122:22;124: 3;126:12, | 96:11;193:16 | 5. 2.165.24.183:11 |
| generated (2) |  |  |  |  |
| 4:12;174:23 | 4:18 | 171:17 | 9: 5 | earings |
| nerating (6) | grant (1) | 1 | happens (2) | 207:21 |
| 47:10;90 | 10:14 | 93: | 39: 9;172: | hearing's (1) |
|  | grante | (3) | py (3) | 33:19 |
| ati |  | 83: 5;180:21 | 33: 9;173 | arsay |
| 93:16 | gr | guys (4) | h | 85:18 |
| ge |  | 37: 3;88: 1, 3;91:19 | 42: | heat (4) |
| 205:10,13 | gr |  | harmin | 24:19;111:22;117:22; <br> $118 \cdot 10$ |
| 208:22 | great (11) |  | harp (1) | heated (1) |
| entleman | 27:10;67:23;78:2 |  | 116:13 | 111:23 |
| 2: 7 | 21,22;108:10 | , | Harrington (8) | heating (1) |
| entleman's (1) | 8:22;193:24;194: 4; | half (6) | 113:17,18;116 | 118: 8 |
| 114:4 | 97: 1:201:16 | 0:12;3 | 20:21;174:14;178:24; | heavily (4) |
| rap | gr | 7: 9;176:21 | 79:8 | 146:12.1 |
| 60:22;129: |  | half-done (1) | harvest (10) | 150:20;181:17 |
| Georgia (1) | great-gra | 85:7 | 93:24;10 | heavy (2) |
| 13:17 | 191:12 | half-megawatter | ;127:17;140:12; | 130:17;19 |
| lestam |  | 74.23 | 2 | Hebert (1) |
| 198:2 | 203:2 | halfway | ested | 101: |
| gets (8) | green (19) | 43: 9;57:2 | 0:22;82:19;108:18; | held (1) |
| 6:15 | 19:16;26 | hampered (1) | 0: 4;124:21;201:14,16 | 104:21 |
| :10;101: 2;110: | 58: 4;76:15;80:20;92: 9; | 208: 6 | harvester | helmet (1) |
| 118:19;121:11 | 154: | Hampshire (4) | 92:23 | 180:21 |
| iant (1) | 155:22;196:24;197:11 | : 5,10;20:21;60: | harvesters (2) | help (4) |
| 128:22 | 12,14;205: 8,19;209 | 4:16;65:21;85: | 133:5,8 | 24: |
| ilman (1) | Grenier | 1:20,24;102: | harvesting (12) | 140 |
| 191:20 | 201:12 | 7:10;116:19;125 | 80:21;82:23;83: | helpful |
| iven (9) |  | 1:14;147: 8;166:2 | 8: 7;90: 3;108:16 | 69: 6;102 |
| 21:14;30:22;57:4; | 175: | 7: 5;168:14,18;171: 1 ; 174:21:175: 4,10,12; | 122:20;168:19;201: 2 ; | helps (2) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 116: 7 ; 149: 14 ; 151: 10 ; \\ & 161: 23 ; 175: 18 ; 199: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { grind (1 } \\ 40: 7 \end{gathered}$ | 4:21;175: 4,10,12; | harvests (1) | 91:16;92: 5 emphill (3) |
| ves (1) | ground (6) | ;178:22;1 | 109: 8 | 65:15,17,18 |
| 91:17 | 4: 5, 7, | 2:20;191: 8;195 | hazard (1) | Henniker (1) |
| (4) | 26: 9 | 96:24;200: 9,2 | 28:22 | 86: |
| 183:12;184:20;186: 8; | group | 4:14;205: 1,12;206: 6; | head (2) | re's |
| 188: 6 |  | 209: | 1: 1; | 159: 5;160: 7;197: |
|  |  | hand (4) | heading | Hi (2) |
| 135:14 |  | :16 | 7:12 | 29:1 |
| Glossar | Groveton (6) | 204:10 | heading | igh (19) |
| 5:21 | (16;138:1 | handed | 19:18 | 57:13,15;83: |
| lit (3) | 4;193:12;203:1 | 8:21 | health (8) | 4:1 |
| 129:18, | grow (3) | de | 90:17;105:10;112: 8, |  |
| oal (2) 16.1 .155 .11 | 168:18:1 grown (3) | 96:3 handled (2) | $12 ; 169: 11,22 ; 196: 20$ | $150: 22,23 ; 155: 12 ;$ |
| 16: 1;155:11 | grown (3) | handled (2) |  | 156: 6, 8;199:21 |
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| high-end (3) | hours' (1) | imagine (1) | 127:14;161:24;172:15 | insert (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 109: 8, 8;129:21 | 46:18 | 94: 9 | increases (1) | 167: 9 |
| higher (9) | house (2) | immediate (1) | 96: 1 | insets (1) |
| 42: 8;96: 7;112:22; | 93:12;199:24 | 204:10 | Indeck (8) | 7:23 |
| 117:24;127:13;156:15; | housekeeping (1) | impact (10) | 174:12,16;175: 2,18, | inside (2) |
| 157:17;162:19;206:15 | 16: 1 | 9:20;27:16;29:17; | 19,23;198:22;200:14 | 176:22;189:10 |
| highest (4) | houses (1) | 90:11;104:10,11;151: 1; | I-N-D-E-C-K (1) | installed (1) |
| 124:18;130: 4;143:17; | 200:1 | 178:10,21;200:17 | 174:17 | 36:11 |
| 192:13 | Hovercraft (1) | impacted (4) | Indeck-Alexandria (4) | instance (3) |
| high-grade (2) | 180:24 | 66:11;109:24;150:20; | 174:19;176: 7, 8,13 | 95:14;96:10;132: 4 |
| 39:24;95:14 | huge (1) | 175:13 | Indeck-Alexandria's (1) | instead (1) |
| highjack (1) | 108: 6 | impacting (1) | 176:15 | 97:11 |
| 183: 6 | huh (1) | 39:22 | Indeck's (1) | Institutions (1) |
| highjacking (1) | 44: 1 | Impacts (4) | 175:11 | 5:20 |
| 183: 6 | humus (1) | 43: 5,20;194:10,11 | independent (2) | insurance (1) |
| high-quality (6) | 161:12 | impairing (1) | 171:3,4 | 196:20 |
| 110:18;112: 3, 9,13; | hundred (10) | 177:20 | indexed (1) | intended (2) |
| 113: 6,7 | 53: 6;67:14;76: 6; | implication (1) | 177:23 | 75:17;196:23 |
| hill (1) | 81: 4,22,24;191:20,23; | 27:11 | indicated (3) | intends (1) |
| 161:15 | 194:24;202:18 | important (5) | 15: 3;149:11;155: 5 | 177:19 |
| hills (1) | hundred-megawatt (1) | 14:13;93:21;142:7, | indirect (1) | intensified (1) |
| 197: 4 | 144: 8 | 21;163:22 | 178:14 | 130:21 |
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| 25: 5;31:21;32:17;38: 3; | 66:21;68:13,20,24; | 148: 1;153: 6,11;171: 1 ; | 9,18;207:16,17;208: 8, | Wright (5) |
| 39:11;40:19;42: 1, 1, 7; | 84:11;85: 6;101:14; | 177:21;194:12;201:22 | 9,15,16 | 12:23;106:22,24; |
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| 84:13;85: 1;91:15,17; | 36: 5;62: 1, 2,11;65: 3; | 200: 4 | wooden (1) | 35:21;114: 2;212:16 |
| 97:14;108:22;111: 8,24; | 68:12;198: 7;200:15; | Witness (28) | 128:24 | writing (1) |
| 127:13;128:17;131: 9 ; | 204:16,22,24;205: 2, 8, | 6:14;13:24;17: 9; | wood-fired (5) | 10:15 |
| 132:10;148: 9,12; | 11,15,20;206: 2, 4,19,22; | 28:16;29: 4;33: 6;38:18, | 52:16;72:12;111: 1 ; | written (11) |
| 160:14;172:16;187: 5 , | 207: 1, 6;208: 3, 6,12; | 21,23;44:16;48: 6,16; | 143:22;174:20 | 19:18;119: 5, 9; |
| $13 ; 194: 8 ; 198: 12$ ays (8) | $\text { 209:11,19;210: } 4$ <br> Whitefield's (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 12,16 ; 51: 24 ; 55: 16 \\ & 64: 14 ; 74: 11 ; 77: 3 \end{aligned}$ | wood-processing (3) 145: 7,14;146:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:11;165: 6,11,12,14, } \\ & 17 ; 193: 4 ; 212: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $32: 9 ; 42: 15,16 ; 56: 3$ | Whitefield's 66:11;207:13 | 106:12,16;123: 3;131: 4; | woods (9) | wrong (17) |
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