## STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

September 10, 2010-9:13 a.m. Public Utilities Commission
21 South Fruit Street MORNING SESSION ONLY Suite 10
Concord, New Hampshire

RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2009-02
Application of Laidlaw Berlin
BioPower for a Certificate of
Site and Facility for a 70 MW
Biomass Fueled Energy Facility in Berlin, Coos County, New Hampshire. (Hearing on the merits)

PRESENT:
Thomas Burack, Cmsr. (Presiding as Chairman)

Amy Ignatius, Cmsr. William Janelle, Asst. Dir. Elizabeth Muzzey, Dir.
Harry Stewart, Dir.
Craig Wright, Asst. Dir. Donald Kent, Administrator Christopher Northrop Michael Harrington

SITE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE:
Dept. of Environmental Services

Public Utilities Commission Dept. of Transportation N.H. Div. of Historical Res. Water Division - DES
Air Resources Division - DES Dept. of Resources \& Econ. Dev. Office of Energy \& Planning Public Utilities Commission

Counsel for the Committee: Michael J. Iacopino, Esq.

COURT REPORTER: STEVEN E. PATNAUDE, LCR No. 52

ALSO PRESENT:
REPTG. THE APPLICANT: (Laidlaw Berlin BioPower)

REPTG. CLEAN POWER DEVELOPMENT: James T. Rodier, Esq. COUNSEL FOR THE PUBLIC:

Barry Needleman, Esq. Gregory H. Smith, Esq. Cathryn E. Vaughn, Esq. (McLane, Graf, Raulerson \& Middleton)
K. Allen Brooks, Esq. Senior Asst. Atty. General N.H. Dept. of Justice
I N D EX

PAGE NO.
PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY:
Mark Saltsman 13
Robert Berti 17
Michael O'Leary 31

WITNESS: MELVIN E. LISTON (RESUMED)
INTERROGATORIES FROM SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS BY:
Mr . Harrington 34
Chairman Burack 39
Cross-examination by Mr. Needleman 42
Redirect examination by Mr. Rodier 43

WITNESS: WILLIAM W. GABLER
Direct examination by Mr. Rodier 46
Cross-examination by Mr. Needleman 50
Cross-examination by Mr. Brooks 66
Cross-examination by Mr. Iacopino 131, 138
INTERROGATORIES FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS BY:
Mr. Harrington 88, 127, 136
Dr. Kent 115, 119, 135
Mr. Janelle 117
Cmsr. Ignatius 122
Chairman Burack 129
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}



#### Abstract

PROCEEDING CHAIRMAN BURACK: Good morning. I'm going to call to order today's hearing, which is a continuation of the hearing process in State of New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee Docket Number 2009-02, Application of Laidlaw Berlin BioPower, LLC, for a Certificate of Site and Facility for a 70 megawatt biomass fueled energy facility in Berlin, Coos County, New Hampshire.

My name is Tom Burack. I serve as Chair of the Committee, in light of my capacity as Commissioner of the State's Department of Environmental Services. Because there are a few new faces in the room here today, I am going to ask the members of the Committee who are -or, the Subcommittee who are present to introduce themselves. I will note that one of our members has been delayed, due to some travel issues. I expect he will be here within approximately the next half hour. So, my plan here is to try to get through a number of procedural issues prior to the arrival of our one missing member. And, my hope is to be able to put off the continuation of the actual testimony and examination of witnesses until our other member has arrived.

Having said that, $I$ would now entertain \{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}


a motion by the Applicant. Mr. Needleman.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The motion pertains to a request for treatment -confidential treatment of a particular document that we submitted this morning. It requires a slight bit of background explanation. After the conclusion of the hearing last week, the Applicant met with Public Counsel and also with the State Forester to discuss the sustainability condition that we had proposed. And, as an outcome, as an outgrowth of that discussion, we reached agreement with the Public Counsel regarding that condition, and have submitted, as an exhibit, a stipulation to that effect, and have also submitted an amended sustainability condition that I think now has addressed all of Public Counsel's concerns.

One component of that agreement was that we agreed to amend a provision of the Cousineau Contract, to deal with a particular supply issue. That amendment is one that the Committee has before it, but it pertains to sensitive market and commercial information. And, so, we are asking that that amendment be treated as confidential, pursuant to the statute and consistent with the Committee's prior rulings.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you, Attorney
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}

Needleman. So, it is your position then that the information that you are seeking to have treated as confidential by the Committee is information that would be exempt from public disclosure under the Right to Know Law, because it contains confidential commercial or financial information, is that correct?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes, that's correct. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Have you shared, and I do have a copy of your written motion here in front of me, dated this morning, have you shared a copy of this with all of the parties to the proceeding?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: The motion?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes.
MS. VAUGHN: Yes.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes, we have.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. I understand then that, Counsel for the Public, you assent to the relief sought?

MR. BROOKS: Correct.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. And, I also understand you're representing that you have conferred with the City of Berlin and they assent to the relief sought?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}

CHAIRMAN BURACK: That's correct. Mr. Rodier, what is your client's position on this motion?

MR. RODIER: Well, this, we wouldn't get a copy of it. We got a copy of the Cousineau Agreement, as you know, it was redacted, but we wouldn't get a copy of this. I really, you know, I really don't know what the subject matter of it is, beyond the general description that was given. But I would say this. Just generally speaking, in this proceeding, we've tried to consent to everything that we can. We have consented to a number of motions.

But, I mean, this one here, I think we're going to draw the line, and we're going to object on the basis that, you know, $91-\mathrm{A}$ is to protect confidential information from being disclosed to the public. We're a party to the proceeding. Yes, it's fair to say we're a competitor. But we're a party. This amendment goes to our issue, availability and sustainability. We cannot exercise our right to litigate the issue, one of the two issues the Committee said was -- we had a substantial interest in, if we can't see the document.

I think, like previously, you know, we see things, you had a confidential session on the Cousineau Agreement, I think that worked out okay. And,

```
{SEC 2009-02} [Day 6/AM Session only] {09-10-10}
```

that's really, in my view, you know, how this should be handled. Otherwise, we have, you know, we're asked to being -- to object to something we really don't know about. But, in any event, I think we've got a right to see something that goes to the heart of one of the matters in this proceeding, so that we can decide what we want to do about it. And, there's nothing in what $I$ am saying now that should be construed as trying to be obstructionists, because we've done everything we can in these hearings to try to keep moving it along. Particularly, you know, very targeted, concise cross-examination, and a lot of concurrences.

So, for those reasons, CPD respectfully objects.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Thank you, Attorney Rodier.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, may I respond?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes, you may.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: We appreciate
Mr. Rodier's concerns. But I would point out that we made an effort to only redact those portions of the Cousineau Contract that we truly believed were highly sensitive and involved competitive information. And, we did provide the
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
rest on a confidential basis to Mr . Rodier and his client. Had this provision originally been in the contract, it would have been redacted as well for precisely the same reason. So, we think we have addressed all of their concerns. And, we don't believe that treating this narrow provision as "confidential" would do any violence to his ability to represent his client adequately, nor would it be in any way inconsistent with the prior decision that this Committee has made.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Thank you, parties, for the arguments. I'm going to take this motion and the argument under advisement. I'm going to review the document in question in camera, and then $I$ will make a ruling later today on this particular motion.

Attorney Needleman, do you have any other procedural matters at this time?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Nothing that requires Committee action. Only to note that we have provided, in addition to the sustainability condition and that amendment, we have provided two other exhibits, 74 and 75, which are both affidavits; one from Mr. Kusche and one from Mr. Richmond. I don't believe that we have copies for everyone yet, because they were just signed a few minutes ago, but we will have copies shortly.

```
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CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much. We will provide those to the Committee and have them -and be sure they're provided to the other parties as well, we'll need to have them marked at an appropriate time here.

Okay. My plan for today is to get through all of the remaining testimony, any additional public comment, as well as closing arguments. My goal is to adjourn by 3:30, or sooner, if all of our hearing work is completed. What I'd like to do now is get a sense as to whether there are any members of the public here today who would like to have an opportunity to make brief public comment?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: One, two, three.
Okay. What I'm going to do, because we are still awaiting the arrival of one of our Subcommittee members, I'm going to entertain this public comment now. Going to ask the members of the public, who wish to address the Subcommittee, to please keep their comments very brief and to the point. We will be happy to receive any written statements, in addition to your oral statements here this morning.

I will note for the record that I did receive, I believe it was yesterday, by e-mail from one of
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
the people who provided public comment at our last hearing, Mr. Jasen Stock, of the New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association. He did submit a written testimony or a written statement, which is also or will be included as part of the public comment file in this matter and, of course, shared with all of the members of the Subcommittee.

So, with that, I would ask the individuals who raised their hands, if they would please just tell me their names one at a time. Sir?

MR. SALTSMAN: Mark Saltsman.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mark Saltsman. And,
Mr. Saltsman, what is your affiliation?
MR. SALTSMAN: I have no affiliation.
I'm the Vice President and General Manager of Concord Steam Corporation.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Okay. Who is our next public member?

MR. BERTI: My name is Robert Berti.
And, I am President of North Country Procurement. It's a fuel management company located in Rumney.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Okay.
And, sir?
MR. O'LEARY: Michael O'Leary. I'm the
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}

General Manager of Bridgewater Power Company.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: What was the company,
sir?
MR. O'LEARY: Bridgewater Power Company. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Very good. If we may, I'd like to just take you gentlemen in the order in which you've introduced yourselves. I'll ask you please to come forward, introduce yourselves again, spell your name, if you would please, for our court reporter. And, again, please keep your comments very brief, and we'd welcome written submittals as well.

You know what, what you might want to do is sit right there at that table right by that microphone. I will note for the record, by the way, that the City of Berlin's counsel informed us that they did not expect to be present today. Please proceed.

MR. SALTSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Members of the Committee, my name is Mark Saltsman, spelled $S-a-1-t-s-m-a-n$. As I stated earlier, I'm the Vice President and General Manager of Concord Steam Corporation. We're a local district heating utility here that produces steam for use throughout the City, using wood as a fuel source.

Originally, and I'll try to be very
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
brief, originally, I had tried to keep myself at an arm's length from this entire project, because there is some affiliation. The President, my business partner at Concord Steam, is associated with Clean Power Development. So, I want to clarify that now. But, quite honestly, what has really raised concern on my part, as I read testimony from earlier hearings here, is the fact that, while I was greatly concerned with the sustainability of the wood supply up in the northern region and the effect that that would have on the other power producers up there that use wood as a fuel source, that was quite troubling to me to begin with. But $I$ really didn't consider it my fight. Because I was operating under the assumption that that -that would mostly affect those plants up north. Those of us in the southern part of the state or central part of the state that were using wood would, while we would be affected and would have to be concerned with what would happen to the price and the availability of fuel somewhat, I really didn't see it as something that I needed to get involved with, because I thought there was enough support against this facility going in that it really didn't concern us.

But now that I've heard that there's a contract with Cousineau, who operates essentially in our

[^0]backyard, to bring fuel supply from the southern part of the state and from Massachusetts and from other areas of the southern part of the state, there's great concern on my part. I believe this is going to severely affect our ability to purchase, and at least purchase fuel at a reasonable price. Because, essentially, what you've created here, if you allow this project to go forward, which is way too big at 70 megawatts, if this project was a 30 megawatt, a 20 megawatt project, I wouldn't be sitting here today. I don't think most of those who oppose this project would be sitting here today. I think the project's way too big for a single-point wood supply, from a wood supply issue.

What we, essentially, what we create, if we allow this to go forward, is one buyer, and I know it's Laidlaw, but, effectively, it's PSNH. We've got one buyer, with two plants, that will control well over 50 percent of the wood supply in the marketplace in New Hampshire. And, allowing them to have a contract with Cousineau throws another monkey wrench in the works. And, I think it's going to create some real problems for us to continue to get wood supply at a reasonable rate. I have ratepayers $I$ have to be concerned for. And, I think this is going to severely affect our ability to protect their
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
interests. Because I'm going to be subject to Cousineau opening that woodyard over there, and bringing wood from the areas that I typically buy wood from, we're pretty good about staying within a 30 -mile radius, some of it may reach out to 50 now and then, but, generally speaking, most of our wood comes from reasonably close to this facility. And, with Cousineau opening that yard, it's going to create a real difficulty for us to competitively buy wood, without chasing the price. And, the price will go very high, I can guarantee you that. We've been doing this, Concord Steam has been doing this for 30 years. We know the wood market. We know how it operates. And, I'm telling you folks today to carefully consider this, because it's going to create a real issue. And, basically, you're creating a monopoly, if you allow this to go forward, at least it's going to be an oligarch. And, I don't think it's going to be good for New Hampshire, and I don't think it's going to be good for the forests, and I don't think it's going to be good for the ratepayers of this state, our ratepayers and PSNH's ratepayers.

So, I just would like to bring those
issues forward. And, thank you for your time and consideration.
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CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Saltsman. We'd now like to call upon Mr. Robert Berti.

MR. BERTI: I've got -- it's basically a outline of my testimony. I didn't -- you may wish to follow.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. These are copies for us?

MR. BERTI: Those are copies for you. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. This will be made part of the public comment file in this proceeding.

MR. BERTI: Not knowing -- my name is Robert Berti. That's spelled B-e-r-t-i. And, I am President of North Country Procurement. That's a fuel management company located in Rumney. We've been in business now for about 25 years. I have given you an outline of my background. I'm a licensed forester and a licensed surveyor in the State of New Hampshire. I hold degrees from the University of Massachusetts and the University of New Hampshire. I have served on several boards in this state. As a forester, I own a company called "FORECO", which manages 45,000 acres of land in both New Hampshire and Vermont. One of our clients is the City of Concord.
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The company that I work for, besides arranging for the fuel contracts, we're not brokers, have done fuel resource studies and analysis, and I've outlined those in the outline. They include companies such as Bethlehem Power, in Bethlehem, New Hampshire; Bridgewater Power, in Bridgewater, New Hampshire. We've done projects in Connecticut and Rhode Island. We did the Wood Fuel Analysis for the Schiller Station. And, we have worked as consultants for Green Energy Power.

But I do want you to recognize today that I'm here not representing any firm or any company. I am not hired today to be here. I'm here on my own nickel and my own time. And, one of the reasons $I$ am here is $I$ have several concerns on information that I have gleaned from different testimony. And, $I$ do admit that $I$ have not read in detail, and I have not been provided with all of the information, but part of and quite a bit of the information that $I$ have heard and have read is quite disturbing to me, not only as a wood fuel manager, but also as a forester.

Presently, the procurement company that I am present for -- president of buys for five facilities -- nine facilities in three states. We work in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts. Of those
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
facilities, six -- five of them are power plants, two of them -- three of them are thermal plants, one of them being Concord Steam, and one is a school district.

Our firm, as I mentioned, we are not brokers. We set -- we manage wood fuel contracts for different power plants and the thermal plants. And, basically, what we do is we make arrangements between the plants and the timber companies for deliveries to those plants. We work with the plant managers in assessing what is available, what we feel the prices should be, but those contracts or wood fuel agreements are direct between the producer or the timber logger and the power plant or the thermal plant.

I have already mentioned that I am not here representing any company or firm, although I have consulted for several companies and firms throughout New England. My concern, as I had mentioned it, is really basically in four areas, or at least I'd like to make comments in four areas. And, amongst those is the forest industry, the forest resource, the procurement -procurement analysis, and ratepayer concerns.

A little bit of background on the forest
industry, and what biomass or fuelwood or whole tree harvesting has meant to this industry. It was basically

$$
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an industry that did not exist 25 years ago. Most timber harvesting at that time was done by chainsaw and with skidders. And, with the advent of biomass harvesting, a whole new industry was allowed to develop. And, it had -it has had positive benefits on timber harvesting and on the timber industry. It certainly increased production as the mechanization grew. It had a significant benefit on safety. There was a substantial increase in the capital investment that these individuals made in equipment. And, I will say for you that there are many business operators out there who are in the industry that have capital investments that exceed $\$ 2$ million.

I would say that many of these people who are in the industry have had excellent track records. And, probably, if you equate them to other people who have started industries, they have a better-than-average track record.

All of these individuals who are in business deal directly with the sawmills and the pulpmills and generally with the power plants. They do not need to have someone in between them, buying their wood, and then reselling it to the different entities that $I$ have mentioned. They're very capable, they're very successful. And, what existed years ago, where there were a network of
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
brokers throughout the Northeast, that has pretty much gone by. And, I find, and I think all of us in the industry will recognize that the relationship between the timber producer or the logger is a direct one, a direct link, with the different facility that he might be selling to.

So, that's kind of a quick analysis of where the forest industry is and where $I$ think it will continue to go.

My second comment I wish to make today is that issue of the forest resource. The silvicultural benefits from whole tree harvesting and the biomass industry has been extremely positive. As a forester, I can tell you that the results in our forests have been extremely beneficial. We have a great outlet, because of the power plants, for low-grade materials. Pre-commercial thinnings that were unavailable to us 25 years ago are now available. There's less damage to the forest floor. And, the damage, the residual damage to the forest, to the remaining trees, has been substantially reduced.

I have heard a lot of testimony around sustainability. And, $I$ will tell you that, $I$ know if you ask three lawyers for an opinion, you'll get four answers. But, if you ask four foresters about sustainability, you

```
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will get ten answers. Because, really, there isn't a good measure of sustainability. I think on a very low level or a very basic level, "sustainability" means to me "keeping land in the state where it will continue to grow trees." Once you cut it off, pave it, or make another use of it, that acre of land isn't sustainable anymore. So, as long as a forest remains growing and trees are on it, it is sustainable. It is growing product.

A more defined definition of
"sustainability" can mean to some people that you "cut what the average growth is on an annual basis." And, that's not really true. There are times, in the age of a forest or an age of a large landscape, where, if the forest is young, you do not cut that annual growth. You are adding annual growth. So, in a sense, to keep that forest sustainable, your cut is less than the growth is. As the forest matures, you may actually get into a situation where you cut more than what is growing on an annual basis. So, "sustainability", in that term on growth is really a moving target, and you should try to understand that.

I think what I have heard people talk about "sustainability", and I may be wrong on this, but foresters, and I think the general public, is concerned

[^1]about cutting trees at a certain age for a certain product that, if left to grow, would have a higher value. So, example, if someone was to go into the forest and cut a tree down and make biomass out of it, fuelwood out of it, and five years or ten years from now it was going to be a pulpwood tree or a sawlog tree, we would not call that "sustainable harvesting". So, it's a difficult area to understand, and a lot of people don't grasp it. But I really think that that is the issue before you, and it's something that really must be considered. It's not, "are you cutting your forests too heavily?" "Are you cutting the wrong trees, for any individual product, for any individual mill, or for any individual use?"

I have also heard some attempts to put monitoring on the type of harvesting that is done so it is done in a sustainable manner. Some of this is out there, and I'm not sure what the arrangement and what the agreements are between the parties involved. But I will tell you this, Burlington Electric and Ryegate Power, their permit requires them to have a very simplified plan. It doesn't talk about "sustainability", it's just that you follow certain forest practices, generally, best management practices. You have controls on erosion control and you don't have overcutting. The cost, and

[^2]this is generally a small map and a one-page on what you're going to do there, and there's some follow-up by the State of Vermont and by the foresters that work with both Ryegate Power and Burlington Electric.

I was down to a hearing at the DOER in Massachusetts, and Burlington Electric was there, and they have their own issues going on on timber harvesting and whole tree harvesting. And, Burlington Electric states that their cost for about 300,000 tons a year averages one -- \$1.75 a ton. So, that's what their oversight costs. That does not include the cost to the State of Vermont to have their Fish \& Game people go out and monitor the work that has happened and review the cutting plans. So, it isn't just $\$ 1.75$ per ton, it's $\$ 1.75$ a ton to the plants, plus the cost to the State of Vermont.

I have a statement, and it's probably the only one in there. And, again, as I mentioned, I have not read in depth the testimony of the procurement costs and their analysis. However, based on some of what $I$ have heard, on the type of fuel they're going to buy and the cost of it, I find, again, this is my opinion, to be lacking in depth and several conclusions that have been made to your Committee to be misleading. And, the understanding of wood production and the availability and

[^3]the costs to be flawed. And, I have reason for this statement.

First of all, the comparison of wood consumption that existed at Groveton and Berlin is not the same as the type of material that's going to be used at the proposed Berlin Project, the 70 megawatt. Groveton was using a product which we call "dirty chips". It basically means they took bolewood or pulpwood, and they chipped it with the bark on to make cardboard. Worked for several years in the North Country for Bethlehem Power. And, generally, they were able to pay five to seven dollars more a ton for that type of material, compared to the product that Bethlehem was buying. Bethlehem or the power plants generally buy the very top of the tree. They do not buy much of the bolewood or the pulpwood portion of the tree. Can't afford to. Pulpwood is worth a lot more than biomass chips or fuel chips.

Berlin was buying pulpwood, they were not buying fuel chips. So, just because there may have been a volume of wood that was being sold and bought at these facilities, that should not be equated to the availability of the product that is there.

I have read that there is more than enough wood in that area to fuel this 70 megawatt plant.

```
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Well, I will tell you that our firm, which purchases -- I shouldn't say "purchase", that manages 1.3 million tons of fuel a year, two and a half years ago, in three plants that we manage fuel for, it was almost impossible to keep those plants fueled. We were paying as high as $\$ 35$ a ton, but we could not compete with the pulpwood market. I want to say that again. We could not compete with the pulpwood market. And, that's when both Groveton and Berlin did not exist. We were competing for products that existed or markets that existed in Maine. And, the price that they were paying for pulpwood far exceeded any price that the power plants could pay. So, I just want to make sure that you understand, there was no power plant in Berlin at the time, the existing plants that were there had a very difficult time to buy wood.

There is discussion about bark, and the availability, I don't know how much bark they're going to buy, but I have a pretty good idea about the cost of bark. First of all, bark is a terrible fuel. It will contaminate, if you have piles of wood, it will -inventory, it will contaminate your piles, and it will cause a fire in your pile, if left too long. But the value of pine and spruce bark, at certain times of the year, at the plant is between $\$ 40$ and $\$ 45$ a ton. It goes
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for mulch. It goes down to Massachusetts. It goes to Connecticut. It goes to Rhode Island. It goes to the Cape. It goes to southern New Hampshire. And, that market is very strong during the months of January to July.

I have had -- I've heard discussions about "back haul". I am very aware of back hauling. At one time, when the market for land clearing and our economy was really going great guns, a significant volume of material came back on back hauls. They would take bark down to Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and they came back with chips. Well, now, land clearing is off. The second item that has happened is Schiller Station is there. And, Schiller Station absorbs what minimal land clearing is there. I would say several of the plants that were dependent have bought a significant amount of whole tree chips or fuel chips, maybe as much as 50 percent, that number is down to 5 or 10 percent.

The other issue that has happened in southern New England is a lot of these facilities or a lot of these producers, who used to sell chips upward, here, are now taking those same chips, putting colorization in them, and selling them for mulch. So, that kind of orangy, reddish material you'll see around the malls and

```
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all, that's not really bark that's coming down from the northern part of New Hampshire or Vermont or even Canada, that is material that is actually produced in the southern tier, in the southern tier of New England, they put color on it. And, so, that material is not available anymore. I have heard some discussion about rails. I have had a lot of experience on rails. I have done three studies on rails. I spent six months with the Vermont railroad system, trying to buy fuel into Ryegate Station. And, after six months, we found that it would cost us, I believe, $\$ 6.00$ more a ton than what we could buy product for. I don't know how much experience you've had working with railroads, but they are very convoluted. And, every time you cross somebody else's track, you pay a fee.

I am a principal in the Russell Biomass Project, have been for five years. And, one of the things that the State of Massachusetts required was us to do an intensive study on rail systems in producing our -- and buying our chips and delivering them on rail. And, after six months of studies on that, it was concluded it was going to increase our cost by $\$ 20$ a ton.

The current marketplace for chips in northern New Hampshire is between $\$ 27$ and $\$ 29$ a ton. In
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central New Hampshire, it's $\$ 27$ to $\$ 28$ a ton. And, in the south, it's $\$ 24$ to $\$ 28$ a ton.

I have tried to, and I did, as I mentioned, a study for Clean Power Energy. And, they originally requested a analysis on pricing and availability on a 50 megawatt plant. We came back to them, and based on the availability, the price structure of other plants, the competition, we recommended that they not build a plant higher than 25 to 30 megs. We said "you can build it, but you're going to have to pay a price which is substantially higher than the -- than what the current area is paying for chips." And, you know, I'm not sure about all the ratepayers and all what happens. But, when you're building a new plant, it's certainly more expensive, your payments and so forth, and the cost of fuel. And, the other plants are already existing and they're paid for, and didn't know how they were going to do it. But we concluded that a plant could exist in Berlin, but we questioned and we recommended that they not build anything more than 25 to 30 megs.

So, my thoughts on it, knowing what the present price of electricity is, and what the plants can pay, and what's available, I think that, if that Laidlaw Project goes in, the impacts on two existing plants will
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be severe. The impact on two other plants will be moderate to severe. And, two other plants will be slight to moderate. But it will have impacts.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr. Berti, I'm going to ask you, if you would please, you've given us written testimony. We've taken a considerable amount of time here. If you could just summarize quickly for us the remainder of your testimony.

MR. BERTI: I will quickly summarize. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.

MR. BERTI: I feel that there is a considerable amount of uncertainty in the information that's been presented to the Committee. I think a plant can and should be built in the Berlin area. I think the Committee has to have a better and complete understanding of what "sustainability" is. I really question who's interest is being served if this plant is built. And, I think you need to have a professional, comprehensive study on availability, pricing, the electrical needs, and the agreement that exists between Laidlaw and Public Service of New Hampshire. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Berti. I would now like to call upon Mr. O'Leary, if I have that correct? And, ask you to please come forward.
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And, again, please state and spell your name for us. MR. O'LEARY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, thank you very much for affording me the authority to speak. My name is Michael O'Leary, O apostrophe L-e-a-r-y. I'm the General Manager of Bridgewater Power Company. Bridgewater is a 15 megawatt wood-to-energy facility located in Bridgewater. We've been in operation since 1987. We generate approximately 130,000 megawatt-hours per year, about enough capacity for 15 to 20,000 homes. We procure and burn about 230,000 tons of chips annually. With a value to the economy of about $\$ 7$ million, at today's pricing. We employ 20 people directly at the facility. We indirectly employee about 100 people in the woods procuring that product for the facility. We sold, under a long-term power purchase agreement, to Public Service Company of New Hampshire for 20 years. We then, in 2007, entered a three-year power purchase agreement with Constellation Energy Commodities Group. Our contract with Constellation Energy ended on August 31st of this year. We have tried unsuccessfully, for more than six months, to enter into a new power purchase agreement that will keep our facility viable. Let me say that again. We have tried for more than six months to enter into a power purchase agreement

```
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with many, many off-takers to keep our facility viable. We're currently selling into the ISO-New England real-time market, power prices in the ISO, real-time power markets, will not keep our doors open.

We're very concerned that the construction of the Laidlaw facility will further undermine our ability to operate. A 70 megawatt plant will have a reach for fuel well over 100 miles and greatly impact our market. Further, the contract being proposed for the facility, in Section 6.1.2, outlines a fuel adjustment that limits fuel risk to the owners and ties the price of fuel to the price of fuel from Schiller Station. Schiller Station is a rate based plant, and fuel risk at that facility is borne by ratepayers. Therefore, the index that the Laidlaw plant is benchmarked against is a facility that has no fuel price risk.

Our facility has no such backstop, and never has. Higher fuel prices and pressure on supply will likely force us out of business. It seems that the certainty of existing jobs and existing facilities should be the number one priority, so that existing jobs and benefits of these facilities are not lost or traded for speculative jobs.

Thank you. And, I would be happy to
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entertain any questions.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Mr. O'Leary. And, if you do have a written statement, we'd be happy to receive it.

MR. O'LEARY: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Are there any other members of the public present today who would like to be able to make a public comment in this proceeding? Thank you very much.

MR. O'LEARY: Yes. Thanks.
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Seeing none, I'd now like to inquire of the parties and the Committee, when we were wrapping up at our last session, we were taking testimony here, and "cross-examination", I should say, of Mr. Liston, the first of Clean Power Development's two witnesses. And, I just want to inquire as to whether, Counsel for the Public, do you have any additional questions for Mr. Liston?

MR. BROOKS: We do not.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: You do not. Okay. Do members of the Committee have additional questions for Mr . Liston at this time? Attorney Needleman, did you have any additional questions for Mr . Liston?
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: No.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Mr. Harrington does have a question. Mr. Liston, if you would be kind enough please to return to the witness table here. You've already taken an oath, so it's not necessary for you to do so again.

MR. LISTON: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: And, we thank you for returning.
(Whereupon Melvin E. Liston was recalled to the stand, having been previously sworn.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Please proceed,
Mr. Harrington.
MELVIN E. LISTON, Previously sworn
BY MR. HARRINGTON :
Q. Mr. Liston, just a couple of questions. It seems like a lot of discussion we've had, and including the people who just gave public statements, is to the effect that the Laidlaw plant being 70 megawatts will just consume too much wood. Is that basically one of your objections to the plant?
A. It will consume too much wood, and the implications are that it has the ability to pay too much for it, or a
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one-of-a-kind ability to pay more for it.
Q. But, if your development went forward, you would consume somewhere around 30 megawatts, so a little less, say 40,45 percent of the wood that Laidlaw would consume?
A. Correct. Our sizing is based upon the amount of wood that is available at a reasonable price within the $30-\mathrm{mile}$ radius.
Q. But we've also heard a lot of testimony here that, basically, that the wood market is not necessarily limited to 30 miles, due to this back hauling and all these other different things that were discussed, that it appears that, at least to some extent, it's a -more of almost a statewide market. Would you agree with that or disagree?
A. I think there are circumstances whereby sometimes people have product far away that they can't get rid of any other way. But anybody that was in the southern part of the state is going to have to drive by other facilities to get to Berlin. So, I would presume that they would take the first facility that was paying market price.
Q. And, speaking of other facilities, is Clean Power planning on or is at least in the planning stages of
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building another biomass plant in southern New Hampshire?
A. Yes, we have one in the ISO-New England queue that we are actively developing in Winchester, New Hampshire.
Q. And, what's the size of that plant?
A. Twenty megawatts.
Q. So, what you're proposing then is for Clean Power to have about 50 megawatts of wood burning capability in New Hampshire?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And, are there -- is there a third or fourth plant in the wings or planning stages?
A. We're looking at several locations, like Groveton and other places, and then continue to look at the Anheuser-Busch situation, for much smaller facilities, yes.
Q. But that would start approaching the 70 megawatts of Laidlaw, as far as wood consumption then, wouldn't it?
A. I believe that, within the footprint of New Hampshire, that there may be as much as 80 megawatts' worth of potential. But that's the same potential that would have to be used by the pellet industry and all users of biomass. Then, that would assume that -- that would be reaching absolute maximization. And, somewhere shy of
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that you have to stop, or, you know, you have issues when, you know, sometimes there won't be enough supply.
Q. Okay. Well, I guess what I'm trying to get straight in my mind here is that we keep hearing that, at 70 megawatts, Laidlaw is going to cause massive disruption of the wood industry and existing power plants in New Hampshire. But, if Clean Power comes in at 30 , and then an additional 20 , which is now 50, there must be some incremental effect on that. Maybe not massive disruption, but some disruption. Some other plants will close, the price of wood will go up, and will cause problems to existing facilities?
A. Not as long as the facilities are built small enough, as we approach the point of maximization, as long as they're built small enough, so that they can live off of fairly local supplies of wood.

The Clean Power Project does not draw from Cheshire County, for instance, but the Winchester Project would. So, within a 30 -mile radius of Cheshire County, we would be looking at that. And, that's in the southwestern corner of the state. And, so, probably 15 to 25 percent of the wood would come from New Hampshire, a similar amount would come from Vermont, and maybe as much as half might come from
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Massachusetts, looking at just a circle.
Q. So, you're saying then that it's not just the total megawatts that count, it's how they're distributed geographically?
A. It's very important that they be -- additionally, like I'm talking with a utility in Vermont, and their interests are that they locate a power plant in a place where they can avoid having to make transmission upgrades. In other words, they have to feed into an area that presently doesn't have power. And, by installing a plant in a specific location, you can save that utility the ability to -- the need to have to upgrade transmission lines to get more power into that area.

The whole southwestern part of New
Hampshire, who has Keene and everything in there, I know, other than a few hydro projects, there's no generation there. So, it is a -- it is like a black hole for power. And, prior to the Pinetree-Tamworth Project, that Tamworth location was the same thing. And, I believe back then, 25 years ago, when we were developing that, that Public Service Company was facing considerable upgrades to bring transmission lines in there to feed that area. They may have done something
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about it since then. But, at that point in time, they were very favorable that that plant be located in that spot, because it solved transmission issues for them. MR. HARRINGTON: All right. Thank you. That's all the questions I had. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Other questions from other members of the Committee?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, if the
Committee does not, I wanted to ask a follow-up.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: I do. And, we'll come to you. And, $I$ do have a question for you, Mr. Liston. MR. RODIER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes.

MR. RODIER: At an appropriate time, I have just one redirect, if you want to permit me to do that at some point?

CHAIRMAN BURACK: We will. We'll do our cross-examination on the direct, --

MR. RODIER: Good. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: -- then come back and do your redirect, and then see if that spurs any further questions for this witness.

BY CHAIRMAN BURACK:
Q. Mr. Liston, you mentioned a moment ago that you thought
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that there was an 80-megawatt limit to the amount of capacity that could be added to the existing electrical capacity, based on biomass in this state, is that correct?
A. No. What I mentioned there was the footprint of the State of New Hampshire. The University of New Hampshire did do a study, and we did talk about this the last time, and I didn't search it to bring it in. But the University of New Hampshire did do a study, and I can't remember exactly the professor's name, but it's fairly -- it's a fairly recent study. And, basically, they were looking at the low-grade biomass potential of the footprint of New Hampshire. In other words, how much was growing, so to speak, or what could be taken from New Hampshire. What parameters they used to do their study, I don't know. But, at that time, reflecting that availability as megawatts versus so much wood available, they referred to it as the total capability being in the area of 80 megawatts, is what would be appropriate to locate in New Hampshire, dependent upon New Hampshire fuel resources.

And, I would say that that concurs with my own opinion and other studies that we have, that it is somewhere in that neighborhood. If you go beyond
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that, it doesn't mean that you couldn't have more megawatts in New Hampshire, but, if you're drawing fuel from other states, other localities. But the actual amount that we have available as a New Hampshire grown source was something like that.
Q. I believe in your testimony last time, and my notes reflect that you mentioned a "Professor Aber of UNH"?
A. I believe that's pretty close to his name. But, yes. And, I forgot to bring it in, okay? But we can get it to you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I am going to request that you provide a copy of that for the record as quickly as you can here for the Committee. And, we'll mark that as a Committee exhibit. We'd like to have that included here please.
(Committee Exhibit 12 was reserved for the record request.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Other questions from
the Subcommittee for this witness?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. If not,
Attorney Needleman, questions?
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
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Q. Mr. Liston, the last time when you were testifying, Dr. Kent asked you the following question: He said "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?" And, the first portion of your response was "I don't believe anybody's done such a study." Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. My question to you is with respect to the PSNH Schiller Project. Are you aware of any studies or third party assessments that have been done that show the construction of that 50 megawatt wood-fired plant had the sort of negative impacts that you've been talking about here?
A. No.
Q. And, the same question with respect to the Burlington Electric facility. Are you aware of any reports or third party studies that showed that that facility, once constructed, had the sort of negative impacts that you're talking about here?
A. No.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Attorney
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Rodier, you have some redirect?
MR. RODIER: Yes. Just one area. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RODIER:
Q. And, it follows up on Mr . Harrington's question here. And, actually, it goes back to an exchange that Mr. Harrington had with Mr. Liston when he was here last time. And, Mr. Liston, the question from Mr. Harrington: "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, it is: If you're willing to spend enough money, there's plenty of wood. Do you agree that's correct?" And, the transcript, I believe, says "That's correct." Do you recall that exchange?
A. I do.
Q. Now, that question and simple answer that you gave, "that's correct", really gets to this point. Since the PPA was divulged and became public, that has become the core issue on the biomass issue, has it not?
A. It is the core issue, is their ability to pay more than all so-called "competing" projects.
Q. Right. So, it's not, as you said before, in responding to a question from $I$ think it was the Chairman, but,
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anyway, it's not just the size of the plant, it's the economic muscle it may have to just elbow other existing users out of the way, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

MR. RODIER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Any follow-up
questions on that redirect?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: No.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Counsel for the Public, anything further on this?

MR. BROOKS: No.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Members of the Subcommittee, any further questions for Mr. Liston?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Very well. Mr.
Liston, thank you very much.
WITNESS LISTON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Appreciate your returning today. Just going to go off the record here for just a moment here.
(Off the record.)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Before we turn to the next witness, $I$ just want to get some clarification. There were a number of requests that were made of various
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parties at prior sessions for submittal of additional information. And, Attorney Needleman, do you have -- one of the items that had been requested was some calculations demonstrating the amount of fuel that might be used based upon different sets of assumptions. Do you have those prepared to be submitted to the Subcommittee today?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I believe it was provided last time. I think that's Exhibit 69. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Exhibit 69, okay. Just want to --

MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah, I'll take a look at it.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that clarification for us. Okay. Very well. Now like to ask, Attorney Rodier, if you would please present your second witness? Did he step out for a moment?

MR. LISTON: Probably went to the men's room.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Why don't we do this. Why don't we take a five minute break, and then we will resume with Mr. Gabler's testimony. So, we'll come back by about 10:15 by that clock, just a very quick break.
(Whereupon a recess was taken at 10:11
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a.m. and the hearing resumed at 10:32
a.m.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I'd like to resume our session. And, Attorney Rodier, I'd ask you if you would please present your next witness.

MR. RODIER: Yes. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. The next witness, CPD's only other witness, is William Gabler. And, I'd ask that he be sworn in.
(Whereupon William W. Gabler was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court

Reporter.)
WILLIAM W. GABLER, SWORN
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. RODIER:
Q. Mr. Gabler, do you -- well, you are sponsoring prefiled Exhibit CPD 2, CPD 3, and CPD 3A, is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And, let me just ask you, let's just clarify, the difference between CPD 3, that's the unredacted, nonpublic version, and $3 A$ is the redacted public version?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So, what $I$ want to do here is, at this point, is ask you with respect to the prefiled testimony in CPD 2
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and 3, did you prepare those yourself?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And, that is -- those are based on your own knowledge and expertise?
A. Yes.
Q. And, as you're here today, do those exhibits still reflect, to the best of your information, knowledge and belief, what you want your testimony to the Committee be?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't have any changes, is that what you're saying?
A. No changes.
Q. Okay. So, what $I$ want you to do, you know, time is a precious commodity at this point, and without doing any, you know, harm to the substance of your testimony, can you give a brief summary?
A. Yes. And, I made a few notes here, and so I'll reference that. Permitting the construction and operation of the proposed Laidlaw Berlin BioPower plant will clearly impact the orderly development of the region through the resulting imposition of minimum interconnection standards, otherwise known as "MIS", on the region. The System Impact Study done by ISO-New England, which was Laidlaw Exhibit 56, very -- it shows
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very explicitly that operation of the Laidlaw Project will result in the curtailment and/or shutdown of the existing generation on the Coos Loop. In the base case assumed for the study, Berlin Hydro, Smith Hydro, and the Whitefield biomass plant would be shut down. In reality, it could be any generator, including LBB, that would be shut down on any given day. And, the resulting disorder to the region would bring a future of uncertainty and economic uncertainty, not only to operating power plants, but fuel suppliers for those projects.

The negative impact of the orderly
development of the region could be avoided through a comprehensive upgrade of the transmission system, but Laidlaw has chosen not to provide that upgrade. As is indicated in the most recent version of the System Impact Study, Laidlaw anticipates spending $\$ 3.06$ million for the interconnection and minor upgrades to bring the system up to minimum interconnection standards.

The New Hampshire Public Utilities
Commission and the North Country Transmission
Commission have been studying this issue for about three years, and have heard testimony that a more
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vibrant upgrade, which would allow operation of all projects, could be in the vicinity of $\$ 100$ million or possibly more. KEMA is currently working on a study of those cost allocations for the State of New Hampshire. That draft report was due out last week. It has been delayed and will be out shortly. However, given the sizable cost, Laidlaw has chosen not to pursue that avenue. They have clearly stated in letters to the Transmission Commission that the addition of such costs could well make their project economically unfeasible. So, MIS was created as a transitory transitional model, to allow a plant to be built while the transmission upgrades were being done. It needs to be kept at that. In order for the stability and security of the region, the upgrades need to be done and included as part the Laidlaw Project, as is the normal protocol for the interconnection of all generators in ISO-New England.
Q. Does that conclude your summary?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm terribly sorry to interrupt.

MR. RODIER: Okay.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: May I approach for a
minute, and you could as well, Jim.
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MR. RODIER: Sure.
(Atty. Needleman and Atty. Rodier conferring with the Chairman and Mr . Iacopino.)
(Atty. Rodier conferring with Witness Gabler.)

MR. RODIER: So, he's available for cross-examination.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Attorney Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. Mr. Gabler, let me start with your prefiled testimony, on the bottom of Page 2.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Could you tell us which exhibit you're in please? Which piece of his prefiled testimony?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think it's the non-redacted version.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: So, this is going to be --

WITNESS GABLER: So, Exhibit 3?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I believe it's
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Exhibit 3.
WITNESS GABLER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Just a moment
here. Have we not --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay. It's the full version, which I think maybe is number 2.

WITNESS GABLER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: All right. So, we're on CPD Exhibit Number 2. Thank you.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. And, if I've got the right version, I'm looking at the very bottom of Page 2, Line 23. And, the paragraph begins by you generally laying out your concerns about the Project and the consequences you think it will have on the North Country. And, then, I'm looking at the sentence that begins at the very end of Line 23, that begins "Projects that are", do you see that one?
A. Okay. And, I'm sorry, I must have a different printer. So, I have a different line number. I'm trying to --
Q. Well, the sentence I'm looking at says "Projects that are fully permitted and ready to be built may well be brought to a standstill by the economic uncertainty brought on by MIS." Do you see that sentence?
A. Correct.
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Q. When you say "Projects that are fully permitted and ready to be built", do you mean the CPD Berlin Project?
A. Or the Granite Reliable Wind Project or, if Laidlaw gets the permit, it could be the Laidlaw Project.
Q. Okay. And, when you talk about "the economic uncertainty brought on by MIS", you agree with me that imposition of MIS is an ISO decision, this Committee has no jurisdiction over that?
A. Oh, absolutely.
Q. Okay. Now, going further down in the next paragraph, I think it's on Line 5 in my version, you say "issuance of a permit for the construction of the Laidlaw Berlin BioPower Project will likely have a significant negative impact on the orderly development of the region." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to refer you to a number of exhibits. And, you can feel free to look at them, if you want, but, in the interest of time, $I$ was going to skim through them. The first is Applicant's Exhibit 31 [32?], which is a letter from the Mayor of Berlin to the Committee, which we've marked as an exhibit. And, in that letter, the mayor says "In my view as Mayor of Berlin, Laidlaw Berlin BioPower is the most significantly positive new
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economic development project for this area in over 30 years." Have you had a chance to read this letter at some point?
A. I have read it.
Q. And, then, in Exhibit 32 [31?], that's a letter to the Committee from the Coos County Commissioners' Office, signed by Burnham A. Judd, the Chairman of the Committee. And, at the final line in there, the letter says "The Laidlaw BioPower Project most positively affect" -- "would most positively affect the orderly development of the region and return our forests to their historical use as working forests." Have you had an opportunity to look at that letter?
A. I have read that.

MR. RODIER: Mr. Chairman, these -- I hate to interrupt. These questions go to a legal term "what is the orderly development of the region?" And, that's really up for this Committee to decide. Mr. Gabler is here to talk about transmission, which is a very narrow, technical specific issue. He's not here to try to draw -- although, I will agree, I guess he did say that, the "orderly development of the region". What I'd like to do, though, is suggest to the Committee that we not take statements that have nothing to do with transmission and

[^4][WITNESS: GABLER]
ask him to comment on it. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Attorney Rodier, I hear your objection. I am going to allow the line of questioning to continue, at least for the moment. And, we will give it, and the questions that are -- or responses that are given such weight as we deem appropriate.

MR. RODIER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Were you present in the room when the representative of the City testified that, in the City's official view, "the Project was consistent with the development -orderly development of the region"?
A. Yes.
Q. And, are you aware of the letter that the Androscoggin Valley Economic Recovery Corporation provided to the Committee recently, which also essentially says that "the Project is consistent with the orderly development of alternative energy industry in the region." Have you had a chance to look at that?
A. Yes.
Q. So, my question to you is, taking the views all of these different authorities, the City of Berlin, the Androscoggin Valley Economic Development Corporation,
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and the Coos County Commissioners, is it your testimony that they are all wrong with respect to this being consistent with orderly development and you are right?
A. I would say I disagree with them.
Q. Okay.
A. As in all things, any groups of people may disagree over an issue. Based upon my experience as a state legislator, as a County Commissioner, and as selectman and chairman of a planning board, and working within Grafton County for a number of years in all those capacities, I have a different opinion.
Q. At the technical session in Berlin, I actually asked you specifically what you mean when you use the term "orderly regional development", because I wanted to be sure of your understanding. And, what you said to me was "protection of existing projects and economic interests." Do you remember that?
A. I remember the question. I don't remember it being exactly quoted as that, but --
Q. I wrote it down, because it was very important, I wanted to make sure I understood what you were talking about. Do you have Mr. Liston's testimony available?
A. I do not.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Could we get a copy of
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that?
MR. RODIER: He's got it.
WITNESS GABLER: Yes, I do. I forgot I had this here.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't recall what exhibit this is.

MR. RODIER: One.
WITNESS GABLER: I think Exhibit 1.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Exhibit 1.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Are we referring to CPD Exhibit 1?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's correct. And, I'm looking at Page 17 of that testimony.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: So, it's Page 17 of
37.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. And, beginning on Line 11 there, Mr . Liston says "the SEC must give thoughtful consideration to the many smaller industrial and municipal users of biomass as well as the numerous alternative proposals of various types that would also depend upon the same resource." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So, it seems to me that, when you look at what Mr .
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Liston is arguing here, and you look at your definition of "orderly regional development" as "protection of existing projects and economic interests", aren't you really arguing that it's the Committee's job to insert itself into the free market and choose among competing projects?
A. No. And, reflecting upon what you say my quote was, I think that may well have been taken out of context. Because I don't think I would have limited myself to merely speaking of "existing projects". I may well have said that in the context of both protecting or taking in consideration for existing jobs and projects, as well as numerous other ones that may be coming into place. As I said in my testimony, my written testimony, that it includes existing projects and projects that may well be -- either are or may be permitted to build in the future. So, what I'm looking at is, "orderly economic development" is a broad-reaching term, in my opinion, which includes not a protectionist philosophy for perhaps antiquated or projects that have gone beyond their time or economic interests that have gone beyond the time, such as a horse-and-buggy operation, if you will, to catch that analogy. But, what I'm saying is, the Committee needs
to recognize that, in permitting the construction of this project, as we've heard testimony from a number of other power plant operators and interested parties, that permitting the operation of this project may well result in a shutdown of their existing, currently viable projects, because of the impact in rate orders, rate PPAs and wood price adjustments.
Q. You talked a moment ago about "antiquated" facilities. What do you mean by that?
A. Well, my example was that -- I'm trying to make an analogy that there could be industries that are beyond their time. Such as, at the turn of the 20 th century, one could have argued that horse whip manufacturers were going out of style. And, so, it would be improper, in my estimation, to protect an industry who's past its time, such as a horse whip manufacturer. Just trying to really make an analogy, of where it would be inappropriate to consider the long-term viability of those projects -- those industries. But, a situation that we're talking about here, you have currently viable, operating industrial facilities, of the same technological basis as what is being proposed, and the Committee needs to recognize that, by allowing the construction of this facility and the 40 resulting
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jobs, they may well doom as many as a half dozen other projects employing 100 people.
Q. I asked Mr. Liston this question, let me ask you as well. Do you have any third party studies or any reports of any type to support that assertion?
A. Other than listening to the testimony of the power plant operators from Bridgewater, Whitefield, Alexandria, power procurement agent for more plants beyond that, direct testimony, I think that would suffice as an answer.
Q. But you have no third party studies that have actually examined this issue and reached that conclusion?
A. Correct. Perhaps one is needed.
Q. And, are you aware of any studies that looked at the impact that Schiller had and did Schiller cause any of those effects when it was built?
A. No. But perhaps we should have one. I mean, maybe the Committee should call for such a study before moving forward on the Laidlaw Project.
Q. Mr. Rodier asked Mr. Liston a moment ago what his concerns were, and he identified "pricing", in particular, and used the phrase "economic muscle to elbow out existing users." Is that a concern you share as well?
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A. I'm not sure how that has to do with transmission.

MR. RODIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm just going to renew my objection. That's got nothing to do with transmission that $I$ can see.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, it all relates to orderly regional development.

MR. RODIER: He's testifying on transmission issues. It was his opinion it's going to be "disorderly".

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's what I'm asking about.

MR. RODIER: Transmission is going to be disorderly. Not Schiller, not the PPA, nothing else, but transmission.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, will you stipulate that his opinion is purely limited only to orderly regional development as it pertains to transmission and nothing else?

MR. RODIER: What I would say, and I'm happy, you know, at this point, I think the record should stand. I think, from here on in, that I objected, you were allowed to proceed, he gave his answers. I'm sure he's happy with his answers. But I suggest that we stick to the effect that -- the transmission issues and their
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effect on the big picture, rather than asking him to dissect Mr. Liston's testimony.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you, Attorney Rodier. Again, I'm going to allow this questioning to proceed. And, the witness will answer the questions as he can.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Well, again, let me just repeat it, so it's clear. Mr.

Liston expressed a moment ago about "pricing" and "economic muscle" having an effect on the orderly development of the region. Do you share that concern?
A. I do. Because I believe that the Power Purchase Agreement that has been proposed by the Applicant is inordinately -- places an inordinate burden on the ratepayers of the State of New Hampshire by obligating them to pay for Renewable Energy Credits, whether or not they have any value. To pay for a forward capacity market payment, whether or not it has any value in the auction. To adjust for fuel prices based on another region that is totally disoriented or, you know, from the actual region of operation. They have the ability to have a total unbridled bill for whatever fuel they want to -- they want to buy. That will create the economic muscle that will create unorderly economic
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development, impacting not only renewable power generators in the region, but potential industries in the region who now have to pay higher prices for their energy to PSNH.

I recently met with some officials in Winchester who are interested in bringing a new project to their area, and they were quoted that PSNH would charge them 21 cents a kilowatt-hour for their rate; they wanted to get power directly from us because it would be a lot cheaper. Just as an example how the inordinately high rates of electrical power can have disorderly impact by dissuading new businesses from coming into a location.

So, yes, in a very broad-reaching
statement, I think it will have a -- economic muscle will create disorderly impact.
Q. Well, let me give you a hypothetical. If you're not correct, and if, in fact, this facility ultimately has some type of incentive to ensure that it procures wood at the lowest price available, wouldn't that change your analysis dramatically?
A. No. Because they're still paying for -- the ratepayers are going to pay for Renewable Energy Credits whether or not they have any value. Even if they have got zero
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value, ostensibly, Laidlaw will get $\$ 60$ a megawatt-hour for each of those RECs, because that's the current market price -- or, the current alternative compliance price. Additionally, the Forward Capacity Market payments will be dictated not by what their true market value is in the auction, but by what PSNH stipulates in the PPA. There are a number of factors in this that give all of the risk to the ratepayers and none to the Applicant.
Q. Aren't those policy arguments about whether or not the state's Renewable Portfolio Standard is a good idea?
A. Well, you asked what impact it would have, and I'm just citing an impact.
Q. Right. But, I'm asking now, aren't those policy arguments that are essentially criticizing the state's Renewable Portfolio Standard?
A. No, not at all. What I'm criticizing is the PPA, which creates an inordinately amount -- inordinate amount of risk on the ratepayers, and none on the supposed merchant generator that should be taking the risk.
Q. So, you're -- I'm sorry. Go on.
A. And, that's, you know, if and when a decision is ever made on a policy issue, then that should have impact on the PPA. That's what I'm trying to say.
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Q. So, you're basically arguing that this plant will have some sort of favorable pricing model, and that's your concern?
A. That's what shows in the PPA. And, when you wanted to talk about the "broad economic impact", that's what I come down to, because it's about dollars. And, the dollars are reflected not so much in the wood or the biomass or the actual specifics of the transmission capacity and whether or not the cabling is 336 ACSR or 795 ACSR, the real muscle impact is dollars, and dollars stem from the PPA. Therefore, the PPA has to be the point of discussion for economic impact.
Q. Are you familiar with this Committee's June 9th, 2010 order on Clean Power Development's contested motion for a clarification and/or rehearing? I assume you had a chance to read that at some point?
A. I may have read it, but I don't -- I'm not familiar enough to discuss it.
Q. Okay. Well, I want to read you one or two lines from there, and then $I$ can put it in front of you so you have it. One thing that the Committee said was "The fact that one electric producer may be able to command a better fuel price or develop a better output pricing model than another is not within the regulatory
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authority of the Committee." Given that the Committee has expressed that issue, with respect to your motion and with respect to the PPA, does that alter your testimony at all?
A. No. Because the true discussion of the PPA will happen before the Public Utilities Commission. But this Committee needs to be aware of, obviously, since you submitted it as an exhibit, the Committee needs to be aware of the PPA and take those impacts into account in their decision. And, whether or not the -- if they issue a permit, may well be conditional on ultimate approval of the PPA. Therefore, to that extent, the PPA has to be a part of the discussion.
Q. There's another portion of this that said "The Committee has no authority to regulate competition or any of its components, such as pricing, that may exist between competing facilities." Isn't that, in fact, exactly what you're arguing for with respect to CPD?
A. Not at all. I'm not asking for any regulation. Asking for a clear evaluation of the public good, and what is the -- what is the -- in the interest of the economic development and the orderly development of the region, and taking that into account, not to regulate, but to oversee and work with the information to provide a
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permit, or not provide a permit, based upon how they perceive that facility will impact the region. That's their job. That's not regulation. Or, it is regulation to an extent, but not regulation in the way that you choose to use the term here.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. I have no other questions now.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Counsel
for the Public.
MR. BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just going to ask Mr. Rodier a brief question before I proceed.
(Atty. Brooks conferring with Atty.
Rodier.)
MR. BROOKS: Thank you. Just a few questions.

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. The first was based on your direct testimony, and you reiterated a statement about I believe the Smith Hydro plant and one or two more hydro facilities. Can you repeat that again, just so I make sure I understand what you were saying?
A. The lineup, distribution -- the generation distribution
lineup that ISO-New England proposed for their base
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
case showed that, in order to allow Laidlaw to operate at 59 megawatts, and, by the way, I want to make an additional point here, that it's not just 59, it's 64, because they announced at the last hearings that they were going to add five to that. So, there's going to be an additional five megawatts beyond that shut down. But, in order to make the 59 megawatt shutdown that would be necessary to allow Laidlaw to operate, the base case model they used shut down Smith Hydro, Berlin Hydro, and the Whitefield biomass power plant. Now, my point being, that was their base model. It could be any plants, plant or plants that are shut down. That's just the ones they chose to shut down to do their analysis.
Q. Okay. Because we've heard testimony that, and correct me if I'm wrong, because my understanding may not be as good as yours, that a run-of-river facility, which I believe Smith Hydro is, and I'm not as familiar with Berlin, would get to bid zero into the market and, therefore, you would expect someone bidding zero would actually be allowed to run. Is that your understanding as well?
A. And, let me make -- there will be a bidding process under MIS. And, if all the plants bid zero, what they
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will do then is prorate who can generate power. With Laidlaw on the lines, and the winds blowing hard for the Granite Reliable Wind Project, there will be approximately twice as much generation capacity on the loop as there is loop capacity. So, if all the plants bid zero, everybody will be allowed to operate at half capacity.
Q. When you say "all the plants", are you including Laidlaw and others are bidding zero in that?
A. Correct. And, I'm making a generalization so that you understand that it will become, under MIS, it will become a bit of a bidding war for who's allowed to run the next day. And, so, if all of the operating plants, Smith Hydro, Berlin Hydro, Pontook Hydro, the Brookfield -- other Brookfield Hydro assets, Lost Nation, Whitefield, Clean Power, and Laidlaw all come on line, and all bid zero, then the ISO protocol is that each plant will be prorated. Given the fact that the generation capacity will be approximately double that of the loop capacity, I conclude that every plant will then be limited to 50 percent production the following day. So, it's either -- you either shut down specific plants or, if everybody bids zero, everybody gets shutdowns to some extent.
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Q. All right. If everyone bids the same amount, your understanding is that the actual generation will be prorated based on capacity?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. But how could a plant, like, let's say, Whitefield or Laidlaw bid zero into that market?
A. They can choose to.
Q. They can choose to. Has that ever happened? And, I'm not trying to be disingenuous about this question, $I$ really want to know if that actually occurred?
A. And, yes, it can occur. Because what happens is, bidding zero doesn't mean "you will get paid zero." Bidding zero means "I will take whatever the market rate is for that hour." And, so, they then become market takers, if you will. And, if the rate's only three cents a kilowatt-hour or $\$ 30$ a megawatt-hour one hour, they will take that. And, then, at 8:00 on an August evening, when everybody's got their air conditioners running at full blast and it's $\$ 120$ a megawatt-hour, they will take that, too. So, "zero" just means "I will take whatever you give me." And, so, in a very real sense, as you heard from the Bridgewater -- the Bridgewater plant manager who was here earlier this morning, said that he
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is currently on a take -- a rate taker. He's bidding zero into the market right now. Whitefield currently has a PPA, but, when that expires, they will be a price taker also.

A little bit of a long-winded answer, but, yes. "Zero" doesn't mean "I'm getting zero." It means "I'll take whatever you give me." So, yes, everybody can/will bid zero into the market.
Q. So, it's your understanding that there is nothing that would allow a run-of-river hydro facility to basically ensure a preference to run under the situation you're describing?
A. There is none. And, if you remember, Mr. Kusche had that statement in, but he then replaced it with a different statement, saying that, "in his experience, no hydro has ever been forced to shut down." And, I would argue that, maybe in his experience that's true. But, in other people's experiences, it's also true that they have been regulated or curtailed in operation under MIS.
Q. And, you have personal experience of a hydro plant being curtailed --
A. No. I have no personal experience.
Q. Okay.
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
A. What I'm saying is that, under the ISO protocols, there is no provision to require any of the hydros to operate. They will bid into the market just like any other project. When Mr. Kusche says "hydros are allowed to bid into the day-ahead market and set their own schedule", that's true of any generator. Any generator does that. And, so, the hydros are exactly on the same plane economically, in dispatch, and whatever other factor you want to consider, as any other power generator.
Q. Thank you. And, you used some numbers about transmission capacity and generation, saying that, in your assumption, there might be twice as much capacity as there was actual ability for transmission on the line. And, just to make sure, those numbers include the proposed CPD project?
A. Oh, yes. Yes.
Q. You talked about the fact that it's possible other existing facilities, and I'm assuming more likely biomass facilities, may have to shut down if the Laidlaw Project comes on line, is that accurate?
A. Given economic, it's probably more accurate, yes.
Q. I'll ask you the same question that I asked Mr. Liston, which is, is it necessarily bad, and you might have
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specifics about why you believe it's bad here, and I'll let you follow up with that, but is it necessarily bad for a new project to displace existing projects?
A. I'm going to give you a "it can be."
Q. Well, how about if we start out with the -- because I want to give you chance to give the "it can be".
A. Yes.
Q. So, let's just start out with the "is it necessarily bad", and then I'll give you a chance to qualify?
A. Necessarily, no.
Q. Okay.
A. Right.
Q. Then, go ahead.
A. But it can be. And, what I'm really talking about is, you heard Mr. Berti this morning talk about how Laidlaw, operation of the Laidlaw plant would have moderate to severe impact on four operating plants, and minor impact on two others. You heard testimony from other power plant plant managers saying it will impact their plant. So, it can be, in the sense that, if Laidlaw -- if allowing Laidlaw to operate shuts down four projects, each one of them which employees 20 to 25 people, you've now lost 80 to 100 jobs to garner 40 . And, at a rate impact that is negative for all of PSNH
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ratepayers, potentially, given the dynamics of the current PPA that's proposed. So, yes, it can be, because of the immediate impact to those four or five plants and those 80 to 100 jobs, and ratepayers.
Q. And, your opinion is not just "can it be", but, in this situation, it will be?
A. I hate to say "it will be", because I try to avoid absolutes. But I say it has a very significant probability to be.
Q. Is there any study that you know of that compares jobs to jobs, jobs potential versus jobs that might go away, if Laidlaw comes on line?
A. No. Again, other than the testimony of different plant managers.
Q. From that testimony, have you gleaned that more jobs will be lost than will be created?
A. That's my -- that's what I surmise from hearing their testimony, yes.
Q. Do you have any number that you can place with that?
A. Well, other than $I$ just said, the four plants that were moderate to severe impact, and each one of those employs 20 to 25 people, that's where I came up with 80 to 100.
Q. Okay. And, that assumes that "moderate to severe
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impact" means a "shutdown" of that facility?
A. Yes. And, additionally, you heard Concord Steam, which currently is trying to build a 17 megawatt replacement unit, to make themselves economically viable in the long run, may well not be able to build that project going forward. And, if, in fact, wood chips become -the price of wood chips becomes untenable, they'll be forced to go back to oil, which will reduce the number of jobs there also.
Q. In part of your prefiled testimony, if I'm looking at the right one, when you look at the total capacity for the Coos Loop, my recollection is that there were some different numbers, some different iterations of numbers of what that -- the total transmission capacity actually were. It started off being somewhere around 60 additional megawatts, --
A. Yes.
Q. -- then another study that said "well, if you sag the line, you get another 40, so you get up to 100."
A. Yes.
Q. Can you take me through the iterations of how those numbers came about?
A. Sure. And, this is something, I'm sorry, I may get a little engineer-anal on you, so if --
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
Q. That's okay. And, I might get a little glazed, so --
A. The current construction of the Coos Loop dates back to the 1940s. The southern portion of the line is ACSR 795 cabling, which has an 80 megavolt amp capacity. The two northern segments are a combination of 336 and 795 ACSR. Those are reduced to 60 megavolt amps, when you factor in -- when you bring in power factor and three-phase line systems and all that. What was concluded by the North Country Transmission Commission, which I've been a part of since its very inception, actually goes back to the Public Utilities Commission document in 2007, is that the current loop, as it -- as exists, has the ability to export about 60 megawatts of electricity.

Now, I should also point out that that conclusion is based upon the fact that the system that exists up north is generation neutral. Meaning that there's about the same amount of load as there is generation.
Q. Meaning no exports, for now?
A. Well, what is there right now is generation and load neutral. The generation about equals the load; nothing's going out. Yes. Therefore, the existing capacity to export is limited to 60 megawatts.
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But the important thing to take note of here is that that 2007 study is actually based on 2005-2006 data, which was when the power -- the pulpmills were operating. And, some of that information goes back and includes the load of Groveton, Wausau, and Burgess pulpmills, which are now shut down, losing a significant amount of load. So, there may actually be, as an engineer, I would say there may actually be less than 60 megawatts of export capacity. But the PUC conclusion in 2007 was there was 60 megawatts of export capacity.

That would not allow the interconnection of the Noble or the Granite Reliable Wind Project. So, in order to allow the interconnection of the Granite Reliable Wind Project to export their full 99 megawatts capacity, they were tasked with the chore, with the job to resag and reconductor portions of the Loop. The reconductoring being a significant amount of the 336 ACSR cabling. So, they resagged -- they're going to resag and reconductor that, the Loop. That will expand the capacity to at least 100 megawatts. And, based upon the information I've seen, it will expand it to somewhere around 125 megawatts, 130 megawatts, when they're all said and done. That then was part of the
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basis or was involved in what we were looking at with our project, because that obviously provides full room for both the Granite Reliable Wind Project and the Clean Power Development Project to come on line and operate.

Now, further studies beyond that presented to the Commission by PSNH said "if you want to go anything beyond that, your best move is to build the capacity to a 400 megawatt capacity, which would cost somewhere between 150 and $\$ 200$ million. That has now been cut down to $\$ 125$ million, and taking -- by taking advantage of some other stuff in some more recent PSNH testimony. But the bottom line being that the more significant upgrading beyond that 125 megawatt capacity will require replacement of more conductors and a more -- more in-depth restructuring of -remanufacturing of the transmission infrastructure.
Q. Okay. Can you take a look at Page 8 of your testimony? CHAIRMAN BURACK: Take a break for just a moment here.

MR. BROOKS: Sure.
(Off the record.)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: So, you are now on
Page 8 of --
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[WITNESS: GABLER]

MR. BROOKS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: This is Exhibit 2?
MR. BROOKS: Exhibit 2.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: CPD's Exhibit 2.
MR. BROOKS: Correct.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: And, where are you on
this page?
MR. BROOKS: Lines 11 and 12.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. On those lines, there is some discussion about "minor upgrades", looks like done in a study by Siemens, for ISO-New England, where it says "available capacity [to be] between 120 and 140 megawatts", what is that
talking about?
A. I've honed that down to 125 to 130.
Q. Okay.
A. So, that's --
Q. But is that the $\$ 125$ million investment you're talking about or is that something less than that?
A. No. That's something -- this is the completion of the -- and, what $I$ said, it's approximately $\$ 10$ million, for Granite Reliable Wind Project to do the resag and reconductor. That $\$ 10$ million will increase the Coos
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Loop's capacity to 125 to 130 megawatts.
Q. Okay. So, that's the "minor upgrade" that's being referred to here, is the resagging and the conductors?
A. Well, "minor", right. That's the Granite Reliable Wind Project one, yes.
Q. Okay. So, we have that total number. On Line 14, you have a parenthetical calculation that says "99+27+64", do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And, I believe that that refers, in order, to Granite Reliable 99?
A. Yes.
Q. Twenty-seven about, that's the CPD?
A. That's the net output, net output for Clean Power.
Q. Right. You're going to lose two and a half, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And, 64, which, again, net output for Laidlaw?
A. Correct.
Q. We heard testimony from Mr . Liston that, and granted it was qualified to say he's "going to wait till the end of the day", but that, if, essentially, if Laidlaw gets a green light, if we're done both the permitting process and the appeals process, Laidlaw is coming on board, then CPD is not going to be constructed and
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operated. If that's the case, then we're never going to have a situation where all three of these numbers are going to be added up. Because, if the 64 is there, then the 27 is going to be gone, is that correct?
A. If we assume that, yes.
Q. Okay. So, if -- at that point, we're just dealing with 99 megawatts represented by Granite Reliable and 64 represented by Laidlaw Berlin, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, the capacity factor for the Granite Reliable Project is around a third of their total, so 33 or so. And, that's due to their nature as a wind project, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So, is it fair to say that much of the time the Granite Reliable Wind Project will not be operating at 99 megawatts?
A. Oh. Clearly true.
Q. So, is it also fair to say that, under normal operating conditions, there is room on the transmission line for both the Granite Reliable Project and the Laidlaw Berlin BioPower Project?
A. If you assume CPD does not go forward, yes. There's room most of the time.
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Q. Okay. Thank you. You mentioned some concerns for ratepayers, and $I$ don't know if that goes a little bit beyond the transmission issues that you wanted to talk about, but, to the extent you're comfortable, I'll ask you a couple questions and you tell me what you know about the ratepayer concerns. First of all, is it -- I think you used the words that the "true discussion" will be before the PUC on whether the PPA is in the interest of the ratepayers. Is that accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it -- well, let me ask you a question that will make everyone uncomfortable. Do you think that this Subcommittee has the expertise needed to review whether or not the PPA is in the best interest of the ratepayers? And, you have to look at them when you tell them.
A. Some do and some probably do not.
Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that the actual hearings before the PUC will just be pro forma, or that there actually will be an in-depth look at whether or not the ratepayers are being protected?
A. Oh, I absolutely believe there will be an in-depth analysis and discussion of the PPA at the PUC.
Q. So, why isn't it enough, let's say, for a condition of
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the SEC certificate to say that something that was going to be true as a necessity, which is that "the PUC review and approval of the PPA is necessary before the Laidlaw Project can go forward"?
A. Oh. And, that may well be a condition it poses. And, I think I acknowledged that earlier in another question. That $I$ would hope, at a minimum, that would be imposed as a requirement.
Q. And, is that enough protection with respect to ratepayers?
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. Okay. You talked a little bit about the fact that PSNH, as far as you understand the PPA. Has to buy the RECs that are generated, even if those RECs have little or no value?
A. (Witness nodding in the affirmative).
Q. First of all, is the concern that you have spurred on in some way by the changes that Massachusetts recently made in its program? And, if so, tell me about that?
A. It is spurred on in part. The nexus of that discussion comes out of Massachusetts, yes. I know they're in the process. The new rules were due out the first of September, but they're now coming out the middle of September. And, it is anticipated that those rules
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will require any biomass project, in order to get a Renewable Energy Credit, must be combined heat and power, with the minimum efficiency of 60 percent.

In my discussions in Boston as I participated, I was a speaker at the Northeast Regional Biomass Conference in Boston two weeks ago, three weeks ago. And, one of the discussions down there with DOER staff and personnel and other parties from around the region is that it is anticipated that Connecticut and Rhode Island may well follow suit with similar requirements in the not-too-distant future. This will result -- the analysis and the discussion around the tables that day was that that will result in a flooding of the market in New Hampshire if we don't change also. Because all of the generators who can no longer qualify for RECs in Connecticut, Rhode Island, or Massachusetts, will now flood the New Hampshire market, further depressing the value of Renewable Energy Credits in this state, which are currently in the teens of dollars, to in the single digit dollars, if not subdollar cents.

Additionally, I have been involved in some discussions that there is -- there may well be changes proposed to the New Hampshire Renewable
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Portfolio Standards in the upcoming legislative session.

So, bringing all of those together, yes,
I have some concerns that, in the -- in the not-too-distant future, the Renewable Energy Credit that Laidlaw Berlin BioPower would qualify for may well be meaningless, have no value. And, as I read the PPA, and as was stipulated by Mr. Bartoszek, PSNH will be required to pay full value, even if they have no value.
Q. That was my next question, and this is more because I don't have that section of the PPA in front of me, I know you had a redacted version. You said they "pay full value". What would "full value" be if the market price for RECs has dropped?
A. Well, and what I read on the PPA, what I remember reading, is that the -- it appeared to be a percentage, excuse me, a percentage of the alternative compliance payment that's written in the tables of the RSA. And, at this point, those values are $\$ 55$ or $\$ 60$ a megawatt-hour. And, so, if they're getting paid that or some significant percentage of that, when, in fact, the true market value is $\$ 18$, as it is today, or 50 cents, as it is two years from now, then that would be a travesty on the ratepayers of New Hampshire.
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Q. Under, as far as you know, though, now, under the current RPS programs as they exist in New Hampshire and the other states, these RECs do have value?
A. They have value. But far below the value of the alternative compliance payment.
Q. And, you just stated that the payment from PSNH is based on a percentage of that. And, just to make sure, the redacted version that you have, though, doesn't show you what the --
A. It doesn't show. I just -- I interpolated from the way the sentence -- of sentence structure, that it appears to be a percentage. That's just my supposition.
Q. Okay. And, so, you don't, for your testimony, you don't know whether that percentage is a high percentage or a low percentage?
A. I do not.
Q. Is it -- well, let's put it this way. Is there a danger that, in the upcoming legislative session, that the New Hampshire RPS program changes such that, essentially, the RECs go away in the New Hampshire program as well? Is there a danger of that happening in your estimation?
A. I think that there's little likelihood of that happening. I think there is a potential that the RPS
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
will be changed to perhaps model the Massachusetts requirement for efficiency, or some other step that will impact the value of those credits.
Q. Okay. If -- and, let's look at Massachusetts. So, if you're a generator in Massachusetts, and you want to have Massachusetts recognize the Renewable Energy Credit, you have to not just be, let's say, a biomass facility, you have to satisfy some other things, like cogeneration and that kind of thing?
A. (Witness nodding in the affirmative).
Q. In order to, under Massachusetts law, even generate what they would consider to be a REC?
A. Correct. That is -- that is what is anticipated to be in the new rules that come out next week.
Q. Okay. So, if New Hampshire made the same change, wouldn't that mean that the Laidlaw Project would be generating, creating fewer RECs?
A. I'm not sure fewer. They actually would not qualify for any RECs under that paradigm.
Q. Well, "fewer" is less than a whole bunch, right?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, let's say "few or none", if they generate few or none, then PSNH doesn't have to buy any, right?
A. As I read the PPA, as I recall reading the PPA, it says
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"the RECs generated or could have been generated." And, I think that, even if they're no longer called "Renewable Energy Credits", if I recall the paragraph correctly, they would still get payments from PSNH for the RECs they might have potentially generated had they qualified for RECs.
Q. So, is it your understanding that that language "could have been generated" means "could have been generated if the laws were different" or "could have been generated if the operation of the plant were different"?
A. If the laws were different.
Q. Okay. As far as you know, is there any change in law provision in the PPA? And, again, I'm trying to remember the redacted one that you saw. So, I'm going to ask you to --
A. There is a "change in law" provision, I read it, but I couldn't quote it to you.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. I think that's all the questions that I have.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you, Attorney Brooks. Members of the Subcommittee have questions for Mr. Gabler? We'll allow you to start Mr. Harrington.

MR. HARRINGTON: I have a number of
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questions, actually.
BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Starting with the "base case" you spoke about, where, and I don't think, even though this is in a document that's marked "Critical Energy Infrastructure Information", I don't think this part of it classifies as that, you've already used these figures. You talked about the project dispatch of 59 megawatts, where it also shows Berlin, Smith Hydro, and Whitefield at zero, is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But isn't this, when something is done MIS, they basically zero out the other projects as the standard method of doing it? This doesn't imply necessarily that none of those other projects could run if the Laidlaw Project was running at 59 megawatts, it's just the method used when they do an MIS calculation, they basically zero out the other plants?
A. Under -- yes, under MIS, they're reflecting that 59 megawatts will shut down. They just chose these three plants as their example.
Q. Okay.
A. They could well have put in Lost Nation or Pontook. Those are just the three they picked to model their
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analysis out of.
Q. Okay. And, then, going onto the next table in there, 4.3, where they talk about " 2012 Generation Dispatch", and I know you probably might not have this in front of you, but I'll just tell you what's on the table. And, it lists "Biomass Project Queue 229" at "29" megawatts, which I believe is the Clean Power Development?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And, "Biomass Project Queue 251", which I believe is Laidlaw. It shows, again, in this model, it shows in peak, shoulder, and light seasons, which is the load factor you were talking about, because, depending on the load, the output is going to change. It shows, in all of them, with Laidlaw running at "66", "66", and "66", that what you've identified as "Queue 229", which is the Clean Power one, running at "29", "29", and "29". So, the implication here is that, with the Laidlaw plant running, at least in this example, that the Clean Power Development plant could run at its full rated output?
A. Oh, very clearly. But you'll also notice two lines above that that it curtailed the Granite Reliable Wind Project by 57 megawatts.
Q. Well, I'm not sure if "curtail" would be the correct
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term there. I think what they're doing is modeling the wind, and they're using an estimate of "63", "57", and "42".
A. No, no. This was not the model. This is the generation dispatch lineup.
Q. I guess my point is there that those numbers might be reflective of more reality based on wind, because it's not going to be 99 megawatts very often, as you stated earlier?
A. Oh, clearly, it won't. But --
Q. And, then, --
A. But, again, it reflects that there's a 57 megawatt curtailment.
Q. Okay.
A. And, if the wind is blowing on an April day, Granite Reliable will not be able to generate to their full capacity.
Q. And, going up that same chart a little bit further, where it shows "Whitefield" and "Berlin", as in the previous example, they're all "zeros" there?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So, if, as you stated, that Laidlaw was operational, and then Clean Power would not go forward, the 29 megawatts that were allocated on the capacity
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output from the Clean Power Development could, in fact, be used to dispatch Berlin and Whitefield, which I think come to, at least to some extent, it's obviously more than 29 , but they would be allowed to make up some of that?
A. Yes. But I'll also point out, if you go farther up, "Ashland", which is the interconnection point for the Bridgewater power plant, see, that shows Bridgewater being shut down. There are a number of other "zeros" there that go well beyond what you just articulated.
Q. Right. But, as far as, again, is Clean Power's concern, what this is showing, with Laidlaw operating at 66 megawatts, Clean Power would be able to operate at 29 megawatts?
A. Oh, clearly, we can, as long as those other plants shut down. So, again, it becomes -- it goes back to, under MIS, it becomes a bidding war, and somebody will shut down. They just postulated this lineup of shutdowns, which is curtailing the wind project, shutting down Whitefield, shutting down Berlin, shutting down --
Q. And, what we can't see from that, let's assume -- let's go a little bit through how the bidding strategy actually works. You had made a statement that "people would bid in zero and be price takers", I think you
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referenced that to some of the existing biomass plants.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. But, in fact, what these plants did is their net going-forward cost is not zero. And, by that, I mean, if, let's just say, in a hypothetical, existing biomass plant has a net going-forward cost of $\$ 5.00$ a -- 5 cents a kilowatt-hour. They are not going to bid in zero and take and risk the chance of getting -- only paid 2 cents per megawatt -- per kilowatt-hour, because they would then lose 3 cents a kilowatt-hour by operating. They would be better off not operating at all. So, wouldn't they bid their net going-forward cost of 4, and, if they don't clear, they don't clear?
A. As a matter of fact, I know a number of biomass plants, or I can name one specifically is Alexandria, I talked to the plant manager a week ago, he is bidding zero and taking whatever he gets. And, if he's losing money, he's losing money.
Q. Okay.
A. Whitefield operated like that for a while. That is how they operate.
Q. Okay. So, just so I'm clear on this. What you're saying is, rather than not operate and not lose money, but not make money, they would prefer to operate and
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## lose money?

A. That's what they have been doing.
Q. Okay.
A. And, I cite, unequivocally, that was the conversation, because I had the same question of Mr. Chase. And, he explained to me that, because they can make money at 8:00 in the morning, they need to operate through the night and lose money, take -- bid zero all night, and take whatever they can get, to keep their plant up and running, so that they're ready to go and making money during the day, when, again, they bid zero.
Q. Okay. So, what you're saying is certain times of the day they're getting more than their net going-forward costs?
A. Correct. Correct.
Q. Okay.
A. Because, with a biomass plant, as you well know, you can't start it up and shut it down like you can with a combustion turbine. You have to keep the boiler warm, you have to keep the fuel flowing. And, so, they operate, at certain hours, certain times of the day, or certain days, they lose money.
Q. But, overall, they must -- their bidding strategy must be to the point where they actually are making money or
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they would be better off not running at all?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. On the other hand, someone who would bid zero would be more typical of a hydro or a wind plant, where there is no net going-forward costs at all?
A. Very clearly. Those are traditional price takers.
Q. So, getting back to that chart we were talking about, when you said that noble would be curtailed by so many megawatts, talking about the Granite Wind Project. In effect, that was just for modeling purposes, because wouldn't Noble always bid in zero, since their fuel cost is zero?
A. They will always bid zero.
Q. So, if they're always going to bid zero, and, on average at least, the biomass plants are going to have a net going-forward cost above zero, because of fuel costs, that almost always then you're going to see a wind plant dispatched at 100 percent of its output, whatever that output happens to be that day?
A. That's up to how the plants bid and how ISO -- I mean, I don't think that's a question $I$ can answer. That's up to the ISO process and how the plants bid.
Q. Well, you've made statements about how this if going to work, and I'm just trying to understand. It seems to
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be based on the fact that a biomass plant would continually bid in a situation where they're losing money. And, they're going to have net forward -- net going-forward costs because of the cost of fuel. There are going to be days where a biomass plant may say "it's cheaper for us not to operate today, because we think the electric prices are going to be quite low", is that correct?
A. And, you and I would both conclude that. But, in my experience, having talked with plant managers of biomass plants, that's not what they're doing.
Q. So, again, your contention is that they operate to lose money?
A. Not to lose money in the long run. But they operate at full load, at zero, with the expectation that, in the long run, they will make money, even though they're losing it certain hours of the day.
Q. Well, I guess that's my point, what I'm trying to get across.
A. But they bid zero the whole time.
Q. You're saying they always bid zero --
A. Yes.
Q. -- regardless of what they predict the clearing price in the wholesale market will be?
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A. Correct.
Q. I find that a very strange strategy, but let me move on to a couple of other things. On Page 9 and 10 of your testimony, $I$ think it's the bottom of 9 and the top of 10. It basically says, very top of 10 , it says "Table 4-2 reflects the dispatch lineup that was considered in the feasibility study. That table identifies 59 megawatts of existing generation on the Coos Loop that ISO-New England anticipates would be called on to shut down when the Laidlaw Berlin [Biomass] operates at full power."

Now, that is, when you made that
statement, what were you assuming for load conditions on the Coos Loop, as well as the output of the Granite Reliable Wind Project?
A. And, if you'll go back to the beginning, it reflects Table 4.2. That's where $I$ was referencing.
Q. Okay. So, you're just saying --
A. My statement here, it says "Table 4.2 reflects the dispatch lineup", and then I say "That table identifies 59".
Q. Okay. So, you're referring to that --
A. Which, again, I need to correct, and it should be "64", really, because they're going to add five to that.
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Q. Well, getting on to the 64, though. Right now, all they're authorized by the ISO for is 59 megawatts?
A. Correct.
Q. Correct. And, if they were to go to 64 , they would have to go back into the queue and go through the interconnection process over again, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And, they would have to re-file that and go through the whole thing?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. You made a statement that the "MIS is transitory". And, you know, I'm not an expert on tariff, the ISO tariff, but I don't remember seeing anything in there talking about the "MIS being a transitory" or "temporary" issue. It's simply a option that generators could take. And, in fact, aren't there many generators who take that option, and they're interconnected under MIS and stay that way for many years?
A. A generator, any generator can interconnect under MIS, you're absolutely right. And, I couldn't call the reference out to mind right now. But there is a reference, and it goes back to one of the Commission meetings, the meetings of the North Country
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Transmission Commission, where MIS was discussed, and I think it might have even been in the PUC 2007 report, identifying that long-term operate -- that the goal of MIS was never intended to be long term. That it was -its anticipated use was for a transitory, to allow -allow a project to get the ability to interconnect under excessive generation situations, while the transmission infrastructure was being developed to allow their long-term operation under less than MIS.
Q. Okay. But, again, just so we get this clear then, there's nothing -- there is no requirement or rule or anything that says that MIS is transitory. You can stay connected under MIS as long as you'd like?
A. You can. What -- the world just needs to recognize that long-term operation under MIS requires a bidding situation, and will require, when generation capacity exceeds line capacity, plants are shut down or prorated on their generation.
Q. Okay.
A. And, that is not a desirable, from an economic development and stability standpoint, that's not a long-term -- desirable long-term situation.
Q. You mentioned "upgrades to the Coos Loop", and I think you used the terms, something to the effect that
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"upgrades that Laidlaw chose not to do", meaning it would boost the whole overall thing of the Coos Loop. Is Clean Power Development going to choose to do those same upgrades when they interconnect or are they going to go with basically the minimum amount of costs required to interconnect?
A. There are no upgrades required beyond our interconnection.
Q. But you're not going to do any additional upgrades, so that, let's say, the other -- the existing biomass plants that you may displace when you operate would also be able to operate?
A. But we're not going to displace -- I mean, there is sufficient grid capacity for us to operate along with all of the other existing plants.
Q. And, Noble at 100 percent?
A. And, Noble at 100 percent.
Q. And, at a light load condition?
A. Yes.
Q. And, could you cite me the study that shows that?
A. I'd have to go back and find our study.
Q. Or maybe you could send us that then further on.

Because actually what I'm looking for is, Clean Power at 29 megawatts, Noble at 99 megawatts, and all the
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existing generation --
A. Yes.
Q. -- on the Loop at 100 percent, and light load conditions for the Coos Loop?
A. And, beyond that, we had a very lengthy discussion with ISO-New England regarding that, if there was not enough, that we could cycle with the wind project. So, we've already had all those discussions with ISO --
Q. But that's a different story. Now, you're talking about cycling with the wind project. You are talking voluntarily you would cycle with the wind project to allow the other plants to stay on?
A. Yes.
Q. So, you would reduce your output voluntarily to allow, let's say, the Whitefield facility to go at 100 percent?
A. Yes. We had that, we had extensive discussions with ISO-New England regarding that the technology exists to monitor grid capacity, as well as wind and output of Granite Reliable. And, it's a comparatively simple technology to put a throttle control device on the turbine and throttle back if the wind picks up. If, in fact, ISO were to ever declare that we were a burden on the line.
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Q. Okay. I'm just -- I'm getting a little confused here. Let's go onto what you just stated about the "throttle control device". If that is happening, I'm assuming, since the wind can change fairly instantaneously, you're talking about a steam dump, the residual heat in your boiler is not -- you can't just turn it off like you can, let's just say, a gas stove. You're going to continue to producing power for some time, so you would simply just dump the excess steam at that point, rather than running it to your generator?
A. No. There exists sufficient response technology to adjust to anticipated wind changes, and that's not a problem.
Q. So, you can basically load-follow almost instantaneously?
A. Well, not instantaneously, because the wind -- the ability to forecast wind development, wind speed, is very sophisticated. And, they can predict from 15 minute intervals what the wind is going to do. And, as -- if, hypothetically, they were saying the wind's going to be up in 20 minutes, in a half hour, and we're approaching a grid capacity situation, we have time to respond to that.
Q. Okay. And, getting back to your original statement
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which got me a little confused, I thought I heard you say that Clean Power Development, if the line was running towards max, and the wind was going to pick up, and, in fact, that was anticipated by Noble, because they would have had it bid in for that hour, --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- they bid in a higher amount. So, let's just say, at 1:00 in the afternoon Noble's output was expected to go up, and they had bid in, in fact, an additional 20 megawatts based on a projection of increasing winds, that Clean Power Development is going to reduce their output by that amount to accommodate the wind?
A. Uh-huh. Yes.
Q. And, also to allow the other plants, such as Whitefield, to stay at 100 percent?
A. Yes.
Q. So, again, what you're saying, so I got this clear, because this seems like a very strange way to run a business, you're going to voluntarily reduce your output so that one of your competitors can stay at 100 percent output?
A. Yes. It's called "community and social
responsibility". And, we recognize that we're not the head of that train. We're joining on as a participant
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in the Coos Loop. So, it's ethically and socially responsible to take that action.
Q. And, is this agreement written down anywhere that you're going to operate your plant that way?
A. No, it turned out we didn't have to operate that way, because the System Impact Study said that it was not -by the way, all of these discussions occurred before the System Impact Study.
Q. Okay. But now you've confused me again. What you're saying is, again, let's have Laidlaw is running, the wind is running, the wind is going to pick up, the option is someone is going to have to cut back. Let's just say Laidlaw has bid in lower than you have, for whatever reason. So, they're going to clear, they're going to be dispatched. Now, the question comes in, who is going to be dispatched next? And, it would probably be the plant that bid in, you know, whoever made the lowest bid, is that correct?
A. Now, you've interjected Laidlaw. They weren't part of the previous discussion. So, I'm not sure what paradigm you're operating in now.
Q. Well, I'm trying to talk about, if there's a close to maximum amount of output from the Coos Loop. And, that's with, let's just say, Laidlaw running at full
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power, everybody running at full power, but the wind is low enough to allow that. So, you're going to have all the existing generators, as well as the new -- two proposed new generators, Clean Power and Laidlaw, are running at 100 percent, because the wind, Noble Wind is putting up five megawatts.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. There's a prediction for a cold front to come through, and the wind is going to increase quite a bit. And, Noble makes their estimate, this should happen easily by 1:00, they put in a zero bid for 1:00 at 60 megawatts. Now, the line is going to be overloaded. All those plants cannot operate at that point. So, that's what I'm trying to figure out. What you're saying at that point is, even though you have a plant that could run and could be dispatched, because I'm assuming you're more efficient than the older plants, so you're bidding pretty lower, you're going to voluntarily curtail your output to allow your competitor to run and make more money. That's what I think I'm hearing.
A. And, that's a long hypothetical question, which I'm not at all sure how to answer.
Q. Well, $I$ mean, see if $I$ can make it clearer then,
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
because it's pretty straightforward. Here's the conditions: Everyone is running at 100 percent. Noble is running at zero, because it's dead calm. The Loop can hold that situation, is that correct?
A. Correct. But let's go back to what I tried to bring out. The reason the Noble Wind thing came up, you started talking about "could the Loop handle both us and Noble Wind, Granite Reliable Wind?" And, what I said was "Yes. The System Impact Study shows that." Before that, we even had a discussion that we would shut down or, you know, could curtail to match the wind. All of that went out the door, and we never pursued those discussions or taking that official position, when it was determined that, by the System Impact Study that it was unnecessary.
Q. It was unnecessary for Clean Power to curtail when Noble was running at 100 percent?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And, --
A. Now, when you add the Laidlaw Project, --
Q. Uh-huh.
A. -- if the Laidlaw Project were to take a similar position as to what we espoused and what we pursued, that they would curtail their operation, to allow both
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us and Noble to operate at full power, just like we were prepared to say that we would do that to allow Whitefield to operate at full power, then I would say that's a very ethical discussion we should have.
Q. Okay. So, what you're basically, getting back to this now, like I said, the scenario I'm trying to say here is, everybody is running at full power, there's no wind. So, that's Clean Power is running at full, Laidlaw is running at full, Whitefield, all the others. The wind is going to pick up from zero megawatts to 75 megawatts. There will be not enough room on the Coos Loop to handle all of that. Someone is going to have to cut back. That normally would be done under economic dispatch, whoever bid the highest -- or, the lowest -- the highest in that would be -- is going to reduce. What you're proposing is some alternative method, where the good guys decide "we'll cut back because we're good corporate citizens and allow the other companies to run." That's the scenario you're suggesting?
A. I'm not sure I proposed that, but --
Q. Okay.
A. I'm just saying, that's the type of decision that we made as Clean Power Development taking an appropriate
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ethical position. And, if Laidlaw were to take a similar position, $I$ would entertain those discussions.
Q. But you feel as though now, because the SIS study that was done for Clean Power showed that wasn't necessary, that you're no longer in that position?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Okay. So, I guess, just to be clear then, what you're saying is that, if you take Laidlaw out of the picture here, there is no circumstances where Clean Power running at full power could cause the other existing biomass plants to be curtailed due to economic dispatch, even if Noble is putting out 99 megawatts?
A. That's what I believe to be true.
Q. Okay. You mentioned something about "talking to people in the southern part of the state", and they were looking for cheaper power, 1 think it was -- is it a Winchester plant?
A. Winchester.
Q. Okay. And, you said that they -- they said "Public Service was going to charge them 21 cents a kilowatt-hour"?
A. Correct.
Q. Could you please quote me what rate that is, because I've never heard of a rate that high?
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A. I never heard of it either. When I talked to the developer, he said "that's what they told me my power was going to cost me."
Q. Is it safe then to assume that that person is making a mistake?
A. I can only surmise. And, the exact number I think was irrelevant to what $I$ was trying -- the point I was trying to make. The point $I$ was trying to make is that the rates that people are charged by Public Service New Hampshire has an impact on whether or not there's going to be more economic development in a region. You can make that 17 cents or 15 cents or whatever the number is. But, if that number is high or escalates due to an inordinately burdensome PPA, then that will impact economic development. And, that's the point I was trying to make.
Q. Okay. You had said -- you made a lot of discussion about Noble and the resagging and reconductoring of the line. Are you familiar with the results of the -- I believe it was the August Reliability Committee meeting?
A. I've seen the minutes.
Q. In that, I had asked questions specifically about this, because that was the meeting where both Laidlaw and
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Clean Power Development, where their interconnection agreements were approved by the Reliability Committee. MR. RODIER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to mention one thing. I inquired of ISO-New England -- I inquired of Monica Gonzalez, one of the lawyers for ISO-New England, if we could discuss the results of that -- is this the meeting at Mount Washington?

MR. HARRINGTON: About Washington?
MR. RODIER: This was the meeting at Mount Washington Valley?

MR. HARRINGTON: Yes.
MR. RODIER: She said "No, you can't.
It's protected."
MR. HARRINGTON: Well, I'm not going to discuss the specifics.

MR. RODIER: Okay. I just wanted to say that, and caution my witness as well. That we wanted to go beyond what was in the agenda in these hearings, and they said "no way." So, --

MR. HARRINGTON: Yes, I understand that there's some --

MR. RODIER: Okay. That's fine.
MR. HARRINGTON: -- to talk about
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specifics, we can't do that. But I'm not going to be asking about a specific substation or circuit breaker or anything like that.

MR. RODIER: Okay.
BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. One of the questions $I$ asked on that was, looking at what was being required of both Clean Power and Laidlaw, in order to interconnect, it struck me as strange, because I thought some of the stuff that was being done should have already been covered under the Noble upgrade. And, I was told that, in fact, on recalculation or whatever the word is, that a lot of the stuff that Noble had initially thought to be required to do, i.e. the resagging of the lines, was not necessary and, in fact, will not be done.
A. Hmm .
Q. Given that, because that seems to be the basis for a lot of your testimony and some of the figures here that you've put out. Do you think that all your figures are still accurate?
A. You've just given me a new data point, so I would have to go back and analyze.
Q. Okay. I would request that maybe you do look at -- go back and look at that and see what was actually
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required of Noble, and see if that has an impact on some of the figures that you've come up with here.
A. Because all of that is based upon the Public Service testimony to, as you well know, the North Country Transmission Commission. And, what they have said and what was said, having been a full intervenor in the Granite Reliable Wind Project, I was privy to all of those discussions. And, it was always expected that it would be a full resag/reconductor, and, in fact, that was what was required under their system impact study. So, you've given me a new sentence 30 seconds ago --
Q. Okay. I don't expect a real answer on it then. Thank you. Just one last question then. On Page 3, you talk about the possibility of economic -- this is your testimony, CPD 3. "The possible impact of layoffs and lost employment in the plants, as well as forestry and trucking communities would be staggering." And, this is all kind of talking about the idea that "projects fully permitted and ready to be built being rolled back to a standstill by the economic uncertainty brought on by MIS." But MIS is an existing thing that's applied all over New England, is that correct?
A. Correct, on a short-term basis.
Q. Okay. Again, we get back to the "short-term basis".
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Can you tell me where, in the ISO tariff, where it identifies the MIS as a "short-term" fix?
A. And, again, I can't do that off the top of my head. I will have to go find it.
Q. Okay. Because my understanding is that MIS is something that you can exist on for 50 years, if you want to?
A. Right. But the imposition of dispatch under -- you can interconnect MIS and be dispatched for 50 years. But the imposition of dispatch protocols under MIS, when generation capacity exceeds line capacity, is a whole different game. That's a different use of the term "MIS". It's the same term, but it has a very different meaning.
Q. And, could you explain that please?
A. Well, by interconnecting under Minimum Interconnection Standards, you're merely saying "I just want to do the basics to hook up. I don't need to or don't want to improve the grid, because it's not necessary. I'm fine." You know, we're looking at connecting under MIS, because no grid improvement is necessary.

However, once, and I'll go find the ISO protocol to quote you, but, once the generation capacity exceeds line capacity, now MIS takes on a whole different
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meaning, because now MIS invokes bidding curtailments and shutdown of plants, as soon as the generation capacity exceeds line capacity. So, it's -- even though the term is the same, they have two very different meanings.
Q. But every plant that is connected on the Coos Loop right now is interconnected under the MIS.
A. Could well be. I don't know that for a fact, but --
Q. And, these rules have been in effect for some time. So, they all knew that, as with Clean Power, you realize that, if you interconnect under MIS, there could be times when you are curtailed because of insufficient line capacity?
A. Correct. But, given the fact that's there's 60 megawatts of excess capacity, those generators currently connected never worried about it. And, with what we had knowledge of, the anticipated Granite Reliable Wind Project upgrade, we were told we would never have to worry about it. So, we -- and everybody interconnects under MIS.
Q. You were told you "would never have to worry about it" by who? I mean, who told you you never had to worry about someone else --
A. Maybe I shouldn't have said "never have to worry about
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
it." We were told "it was not a problem to interconnect under MIS." We would not be curtailed.
Q. Provided that everything stayed static with the interconnection of Clean Power?
A. Sure. Yes. Because then the anticipated protocol is that the next interconnector who wants to come on will do the upgrades necessary to the grid to allow all of the parties to continue to generate.
Q. The "anticipated protocol", where is that anticipated protocol written down?
A. I couldn't quote it to you.
Q. You're saying there is some protocol somewhere that says "the next generator coming on line has an obligation to upgrade the grid"?
A. Not an obligation. It is anticipated the next generator coming on.
Q. Anticipated by who?
A. I'll have to go find the book for you.
Q. Okay. Because my understanding of MIS is that, if you have 100 megawatts of capacity, you could connect up ten 100 megawatt plants here if you wanted to, and all of them would be modeled as "Let's model the one plant with the other nine shut down. Can you do it? Yes, you can." Is that correct?
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A. Correct.
Q. So, there's really no anticipation of protocol that says "the tenth plant coming on should upgrade so all ten can run at 100 percent." It only says that "you're going to run based on economic dispatch on the capacity of the line."
A. (Witness nodding in the affirmative).
Q. So, it seems as if you're implying there's some obligation of somebody coming on to do something, and I'm trying to figure out where that comes from?
A. I'll have to get the book for you.

MR. HARRINGTON: All right. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you, Mr.
Harrington. Other questions for this witness? Mr. Kent -- Dr. Kent.

DR. KENT: Thank you. A couple of
questions.
BY DR. KENT:
Q. Under a scenario of increased competition, where we're generating more capacity than we have line capacity, if everybody decided to bid zero, how would the price be set?
A. The price is then set by the market. ISO establishes
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what the regional market price is for that hour. And, each of those participants would then get whatever ISO said the value of that is for that hour.
Q. Would that market price be enough to keep facilities running or would it be too low to keep some facilities running?
A. Yes. It could be either. And, my example being the Alexandria biomass plant, currently, that's currently how they operate. In some hours they lose money, in some hours they make money.
Q. But, in the long run, they're making enough money to keep the plant going?
A. Correct.
Q. If competition was such and the market price was set as such, are we looking at a scenario where the less efficient plants are somehow booted out of the market because they can't live with the market price?
A. I'm not sure that would be the case. Because it may not be so much efficiency as it is corporate backing or who wants to stay in the game long enough to drive the other guys out of business, in a gas war analogy, if you follow what I'm saying there. So, it may or may not result in less efficient shutdowns.
Q. Just to paraphrase, so I make sure this is clear. So,
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if you were a facility that was not breaking even at a minimum, but had backing, it would try to wait out the competition, and wait for somebody else with less deep pockets, backers, to go under, thereby reducing competition and allowing you to get the price you needed to keep going again?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. This Massachusetts scenario you talked about with the potential for REC credits only going to combined heat and power and 60 percent efficiency, I've got that right, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. How many facilities operating in New Hampshire would satisfy that? Or, if you don't know specific numbers, are there facilities that would not qualify for RECs?
A. To my understanding or to my knowledge, none of the existing New Hampshire biomass plants will meet that criteria.

DR. KENT: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Other questions?
Mr. Janelle.
BY MR. JANELLE:
Q. A question, in your testimony, on Page 3, this is Exhibit 2, you talk about -- and you've talked about in
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questioning here, the possible loss of jobs as a result of Laidlaw coming on line and effects on the other plants. In your testimony, you talk about the loss or the "impact" to the "forest and trucking communities could [also] be staggering." I mean, to me, you still need chips, if Laidlaw comes on line. Is there going to be less chips if Laidlaw were to come on line and the other plants were to come off line? Can you explain how that --
A. Good question. And, here, I must admit I'm taking somewhat of a parochial view in the sense of New Hampshire impact. 700,000, 750,000 tons of chips is 750,000 tons, and clearly employees loggers and truckers. My view here was that, whereas currently we have a diverse group of plants distributed around the state, all of 20 megawatts, give or take, and they take fuel from within discrete circles around the state. So, therefore, the loggers are, for the most part, employed locally. 750,000 megawatts [sic] we've heard is at least 100-mile circle, if not more, and will stretch into Massachusetts, Connecticut, Quebec, Vermont, Maine. So, a number of those, as a result, clearly, what I'm hearing there is that a number of those jobs will now be exported to Quebec,
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Massachusetts, Connecticut, because the loggers will no longer be employed locally.
Q. But wouldn't it still make more sense to get the chips closer to the plant, if possible?
A. Oh, it would make more sense.
Q. And, wouldn't it benefit a facility like Laidlaw to do that, get them as close to home as they can?
A. It would be totally logical to get them as close to the home as they can. But, by their own admission, they can't. They have got to go to Quebec, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. And, so, we're going to end up employing loggers there, to the detriment of New Hampshire loggers probably.

MR. JANELLE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Dr. Kent.
DR. KENT: One more question.
BY DR. KENT:
Q. In a scenario with increased competition, market price will be less than, $I$ would imagine, in some circumstances less competitive bid pricing. People are going to get less, if they have to live with market price, than if they -- whether it was the "look-forward cost" or something?
A. Uh-huh.
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Q. Okay. Is that going to be good for ratepayers?
A. Well, bear in mind, when $I$ say "the market cost", the market cost is not established by the biomass plant or even Merrimack Station coal plant. 76 percent of percent of the time, the market price is established by the natural gas plants in southern New Hampshire and Massachusetts. On margin, 76 percent of the time, those gas plants establish what the market price will be for a given hour.
Q. So, it's not just within electricity, it's competing against other energy sources?
A. Absolutely. And, in the winter, that's why electric prices go up in the winter, is because of the competition for natural gas. That's why electric prices are depressed right now, because gas prices have gone from $\$ 12$ an MCF to $\$ 8$. And, in the winter, when there's heating demand, and natural gas prices go back up to 10, electric prices will follow. So, yes. Three quarters of the time, natural -- the price of natural gas, which is a fungible commodity, will determine what the electric market rate is on any given hour.
Q. Does that mean, as a ratepayer in New Hampshire, PSNH is not driving the cost of my energy?
A. Absolutely correct.
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Q. So, how does the ratepayer win? This just got more complicated for me, because, you know, we kept pointing to PSNH passing along costs to ratepayers. But, if I just understood you, PSNH can't do that independent of the energy markets?
A. Oh, PSNH is in a different situation. PSNH is the only modified regulated -- unregulated utility in the United States. They, in the deregulated environment, continue to own their own generation, which provides most of their power. So, PSNH rates are not based upon, to the extent, are not based upon natural gas prices, they're based upon their cost of generation. Which is why PSNH rates, in general, have risen, while other utilities have fallen, because they're buying electricity off the market. And, with the decrease in natural gas prices, their rates have dropped. Where PSNH doesn't own a natural gas plant, they don't enjoy that. And, I should always say, this is my understanding of it. I'm not on the Commission. So, with a smile, $I$ will say that's my understanding, is that those prices are different than what $I$ just articulated earlier. That three quarters of the time the ISO market, the price of electricity is based upon the price of natural gas. DR. KENT: Thank you.
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BY CMSR. IGNATIUS:
Q. Most of my questions I think have been addressed, and I hesitate to go back into the MIS discussions, but I just want to be sure we're talking about the same thing. "MIS" is for "Minimum Interconnection Standards", correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, that's a provision under which generators can pay the minimum to interconnect and still be able to operate, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. If one -- and that's optional for a generator?
A. Correct.
Q. If one chooses to go under MIS, is there any guarantee that they will be dispatched --
A. No.
Q. -- at any given time?
A. No.
Q. All right. And, so, there's a risk by doing MIS, that the trade-off is you spend less for interconnection, but you're at risk that you may not always be able to be dispatched?
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A. Yes.
Q. All right. And, the dispatch decisions are what we call "economic dispatch", when there's more, as you say, more power coming on than line capacity?
A. Correct.
Q. So, the MIS decisions generators make are then impacted by the economic decisions -- economic dispatch decisions the ISO makes?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. For years then the generators who have been under MIS in New Hampshire have had a good deal, haven't they?
A. Yes, I guess you could say that.
Q. I mean, it's a good thing that they were able to pay the minimum?
A. Right.
Q. And, because of capacity being greater than the amount of power coming onto the lines, they were generally dispatched, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. As more generators come on, the risk grows that they will not always be dispatched?
A. Correct.
Q. When you use the phrase "shutdown" in your testimony, I
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want to be sure I understand what you mean by "shutdown", because it has two very different senses to it. One is sort of a "shutdown and mothballing" of a plant, and one -- I think at times you used "shutdown" to mean "curtail"?
A. To mean "zero output", you know.
Q. Okay.
A. Or some curtailment of less than full power, perhaps as low as zero output.
Q. All right. So, you're really talking about, from time to time power may be cranked down, there may be less output that's dispatched, or none at all on particular times?
A. Correct.
Q. And, that is scheduled by the ISO on an hour-to-hour basis, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So, you might be on for a number of hours, off for a number of hours?
A. Or, in the case of a biomass plant, where you can't start up and shut down from hour-to-hour, you may lose money for hours. All of which has a long-term economic impact on the operation, and could result in the plant being shut down and mothballed.
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Q. In the true "shutdown/mothballed" sense?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. When you first testified in the opening of your statement this morning, you said that the "Laidlaw plant has the potential for the shutdown of a number of existing generators." Did you mean "shutdown" in the hour-to-hour dispatch sense or "shutdown" in the mothball sense?
A. Both.
Q. Is it a realistic possibility you see that existing generators will be truly shut down and closed, if the Laidlaw plant goes on line?
A. I think it's a very real possibility. I think it's also a very real possibility that, as was admitted by Mr. Bartoszek in a letter to the North Country Transmission Commission, that, you know, they may or may not have the financial backing to operate, if the transmission -- with the necessary transmission upgrades, in order to avoid MIS and to do those things, they may not be able to be constructed. And, in fact, there was a discussion, and I think it was even -maybe Mr. Harrington made it, that it's, at the North Country Transmission, that operating under MIS, it would be difficult for anybody to get financing, if a
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financier knew they were going to continue to operate under MIS.
Q. You keep saying "operating under MIS". Everyone's operating under MIS.
A. Dispatched, economic dispatch.
Q. Okay.
A. Under economic dispatch.
Q. Thank you.
A. Maybe that's a better way to separate the two, sorry.
Q. Okay. That helps. Thank you. I guess one other area I just wanted to get clear. Is you had described earlier this morning that, at times, you would have considered, if necessary, cycling on and off with wind to keep everybody going, and that you would be interested if Laidlaw were willing to consider a similar sort of arrangement?
A. I think it could or should be discussed.
Q. And, I just want to be sure I understand, compared to Mr. Liston's statement, that was reaffirmed today, that if the Laidlaw plant were certificated and operational, Clean Power would not develop in the Berlin area. Is that your view?
A. I'm not sure that was reaffirmed today, if somebody said that Mr . Liston said that. It's not my view.
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
Q. Okay. I think he said that was correct, but maybe I got it wrong.
A. I don't know either.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: All right. Thank you. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Other questions? Go ahead, Mr. Harrington.

MR. HARRINGTON: This should just be one follow-up question.

BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. This is in response to what Dr. Kent had said. There was a discussion about whether the most efficient plant would be dispatched, and you had said something that, "if they had corporate backing, with deep pockets, that maybe they would run", presumably, I guess, at some type of a loss, "to drive some of the competition out"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And, then, you made the statement that they could -- they could "drive the competition out and then that would cause the price to go back up." But, as you stated in response to another question, gas and sometimes oil almost always sets the price in the electric market in New England. So, in effect, driving somebody out of business, in this case, another biomass plant, would have no effect on the price. The price
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wouldn't go back up. It would still be the price, the marginal clearing price would be what it is, based on gas or oil?
A. Yes. And, I didn't mean the "price of the product would go up". Maybe I misunderstood the question. But what I meant was "the price of the biomass would go down", which would make the plant more economically viable.
Q. Okay. Oh, meaning the "cost of fuel would go down"?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So, I just wanted to make sure I got that right. And, just a follow-up question on the load-following capability. You had stated that Clean Power Development has "load-following capability" to react to the changes in the output of, let's say, the Noble Wind Project. But, then, you stated that "biomass plants", and maybe this is unique, that capability is unique to Clean Power, "would have to bid in more hours, sometimes at a loss, because they couldn't react quick enough." So, I'm a little confused as to what you're getting at.
A. No. What I said was, "some of the biomass plants continue to operate, even though they're losing money, rather than shut down", and cool the boiler off and go
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into hot standby.
Q. Okay.
A. Because, then, the time to refire and come back up to temperature is too long.
Q. Okay.
A. So, it's not a response, as in a throttle thing, it's turning the engine off, is what I --

MR. HARRINGTON: Okay. That's all I
had, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank you.
BY CHAIRMAN BURACK:
Q. Mr. Gabler, I just want to follow up on a set of questions that Dr . Kent asked you earlier, regarding the proposed regulatory scheme in Massachusetts that you referred to.
A. Yes.
Q. Involving combined heat and power and a requirement, as you've reported to us the rule -- well, maybe you could just summarize for us first what you understand Massachusetts to be considering as a rule change for eligibility in this program?
A. Somewhat of just a quick background, back eight months ago, the state took a -- decided to take a much more serious look at biomass power from a broad perspective.
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They conducted a study, they hired the Manomet Research -- I forgot the official name, the Manomet group to do a study. That study came out, was released, as been discussed, I was in Massachusetts for several of those presentations and discussions. Led to the head of DOER, whose name I can't think of right now, to issue a letter a month ago, at the behest of Governor Patrick, calling upon DOER to write a new set of regulations, and gave them some general outline as to what those new rules should probably entail. One of those very clearly is that biomass in the future should only get -- be qualified as "renewable" if it is combined heat and power, with a minimum efficiency of 60 percent.
Q. Thank you. That's helpful. And, I believe you also told Dr. Kent that it is your opinion that "none of the existing biomass fired plants in New Hampshire would meet that standard"?
A. I do not know of any in New Hampshire that meet that standard.
Q. Would the Clean Power Development Project, as it's been proposed, would that project, if built, meet that standard?
A. Yes, it would.
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Q. So, if Massachusetts were to adopt that standard, and this plant were built here in New Hampshire, it could qualify for RECs under the Massachusetts standard, is that correct?
A. Yes. Correct.
Q. Likewise, if other states, Rhode Island or Connecticut, were to adopt similar standards to what you've described to us as Massachusetts is considering, and CPD were to build its plant here in New Hampshire, it could also qualify potentially for those RECs under Massachusetts -- under Rhode Island or Connecticut's revised standards, is that correct?
A. Assuming they follow a similar model to the Massachusetts, yes.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Mr. Harrington -- I'm sorry. Mr. --
MR. HARRINGTON: I did have another question though.
(Laughter.)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr. Iacopino.
MR. IACOPINO: I just have a couple of quick questions, Mr. Gabler.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. If I understand your opinions correctly, well, tell if
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I do, is your opinions are based upon a conclusion that you've made that Laidlaw -- the Laidlaw Project that is proposed coming on line essentially is the straw that breaks the camel's back on the Coos Loop, is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And, your opinions are based upon your review of the various system studies that have been done for both Clean Power Development, for Laidlaw, for Granite Reliable, and other generators that are in the queue, correct?
A. Actually, it goes back, if I may, eight years ago, when I was on the House Science Technology Energy Committee, and was involved in passage of a bill calling for the state's first energy policy to be written, and actually served on the executive board of that energy policy and helped form it, subsequently working around the state in a variety of energy capacities. Most recently, yes, I have been involved with the North Country Transmission Commission since its inception, have been involved in all the hearings. I've had several multiple meetings with KEMA, the organization that's doing the North Country study, including spending a day with them in their D.C. office discussing the issues.
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So, I've had a pretty extensive, both political and variety, impact, as well as my background as an engineer and analyzing the reports.
Q. But it's your familiarity with the queue that gives you the ability -- or, not the "queue", the existing generators that gives you the ability to say that "this particular proposed project is the one that will exceed what the capacity of the Loop will be, once Granite Reliable and Clean Power come on line", correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, they're not the only -- Laidlaw's not the only new producer in the queue, are they? There are other people behind them --
A. Oh, correct.
Q. -- that will be in the queue for the Coos Loop, isn't that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Who else is out there?
A. There's a number of them being discussed. There's a wind project, $I$ forgot the name of it, 185 megawatt, from the northern Coos County. There's a small wind project been discussed for Dixville Notch. There was another small power generator being discussed for Colebrook. There have been a number of them discussed.
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Q. And, they have been assigned queue numbers?
A. Well, the only one that's got a queue number right now is the wind project in Coos County, which I think is --
Q. North Country Wind?
A. North Country Wind.
Q. If I understand correctly, everybody who is on the Coos County Loop right now came in under Minimum Interconnection Standards, is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. If Laidlaw didn't get a certificate, or for some other reason did not develop, the next person to come in on the queue would, I guess your -- is it true that your opinions about whether somebody else should come in on the queue would be the same for who's ever next?
A. My opinions would be the same. I will say, though, that I've talked with the developer for North Country Wind, and he does not anticipate coming on unless there are significant upgrades to allow everybody to operate.
Q. So, basically, I guess what undermines -- not "undermines", but underlies your opinion is that "well, we got into the queue before Laidlaw did, and, therefore, you know, the door's shut. And, now, it's up to Laidlaw to basically either revamp the entire loop or not come on line"?
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A. That's the way the system operates.
Q. So that the door just shut after your project, basically? That's your opinion?
A. Yes.

MR. IACOPINO: I have no further
questions.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Dr. Kent.
BY DR. KENT :
Q. I want to make sure I heard you correctly earlier. You said, for 125 million, you could upgrade the line to 400 megawatt?
A. The North Country Transmission Commission basis was 400 megawatts. PSNH's original estimate of the cost to do that was 150. They have downgraded that to 125, and have said it could even be a little cheaper, maybe pushing 100. So, yes. But, I'm just trying to say it's -- 125 is the number today, but it has been a moving target in the history -- in the past, and could well move again.
Q. So, if we're using the 125 million number, that would be prohibitive for any single project you believe?
A. I would think so.
Q. Is there anything to prevent all the generators in the area tied to that line or potentially tied to that line
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from pooling their resources and upgrading to 400 megawatts?
A. And, that's exactly the point of the KEMA study that's currently going on. KEMA's charge or charter was specifically to look at cost allocation methods that would allow that 125 million to be distributed such that no single or no generator would be inhibited, would be prohibited from development.
Q. So, this is a matter of -- not a matter of "we've outstripped the capacity of the line, and that's it." It's "the line needs an upgrade to increase capacity, but that's feasible, if people want to pony up the money"?
A. Correct.

DR. KENT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. HARRINGTON: Just one quick -CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yes. Mr. Harrington.

MR. HARRINGTON: Yes. Just a quick follow-up on two statements.

BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. You had said that, on the RECs, that, in Massachusetts, the combined heat and power would be a minimum of 60 percent efficiency required under what you assume is going to come out of the rules. You said "CPD would
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meet that 60 percent"?
A. Correct.
Q. And, that's -- it's not going to be on the power, obviously. So, it's going to be providing heat to --
A. The paper mill in Gorham, the -- used to be "Fraser", now "Great Wood" -- to be "Great North Woods Paper".
Q. And, is that a done deal? Is a contract signed that, if CPD is built, that that will, in fact, take place?
A. We have a -- we have such an agreement with Fraser. We're in the process of negotiating to transfer that agreement to North Woods Paper.
Q. And, I don't know, you might not want to even answer this question, but, since you've been here for the whole hearings, would you like to hazard a guess as to whether the Laidlaw plant would qualify for that minimum 60 percent efficiency?
A. It would not.
Q. Okay. You seem pretty confident of that?
A. As an engineer, it wouldn't, no.
Q. Okay. And, one, this last thing, you were responding to a question from Mr . Iacopino on his analogy on "the door is closing", and you said "well, that's the way the system operates", I think that's a direct quote. But, in fact, that's not the way the system operates.
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}

Under MIS, anybody is allowed to come in as long they don't exceed -- their single plant doesn't exceed the capacity of the line, because they model it with everybody else at zero output.
A. I took Mr. Iacopino's question to be more a rhetorical or positional statement, as opposed to a hard-and-fast "Thou shall not build a plant after ours."
Q. Because there is nothing --
A. Because --
Q. -- in the system operational rules that prevents anybody from coming in under MIS the way Laidlaw is proposing?
A. Correct.

MR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr. Iacopino.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman,
I meant to ask this before.
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. But the other thing I wanted to clear up, make sure I understand, is that, on an average day, okay, not a day when the wind's blowing to generate 99 megawatts out of Granite Reliable, but, on an average day, if -- there is enough room on the Coos Loop for Granite Reliable, for Clean Power Development, and for the Laidlaw
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Project, isn't that correct?
A. Adding the numbers in my head, yes.
Q. $33,27,57$, is $117 ?$
A. Yes. But, it's really -- remember, the "59" is really "64". So, --
Q. If they go back to ISO?
A. They have said they're going to. So, I'm -- yes. It will, on an average day, with 33 megawatts coming out of the Granite Reliable, if they were capped to that amount, yes.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Are there any other questions from the parties for this witness? You do have some questions?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. CHAIRMAN BURACK: All right.
(Court reporter interruption - brief off-the-record discussion ensued regarding a recess.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: I just want to get a sense, before we do break, if I may, Steve. I just want to get a sense as to what -- how much more time do you think you need with this witness, Mr. Needleman?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Five minutes.
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[WITNESS: GABLER]

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Five minutes. Mr.
Rodier, do you have questions for this witness?
MR. RODIER: I do, but --
CHAIRMAN BURACK: How much more time do you need?

MR. RODIER: Maybe not more than five, certainly not more than ten.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay.
MR. RODIER: I mean, I'm going to try to make it quick.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: That's fine. You don't think you have any further questions, Attorney Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: No.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Here's what I'm going to propose that we do here. We will take a break for lunch here momentarily. When we return, we will complete the cross-examination of this witness. I will tell you that I have, in the break we took earlier, I have reviewed in camera on the material subject to the motion that the Applicant made this morning. And, for reasons that $I$ will articulate in a written decision, $I$ am going to grant that motion of the Applicant, to treat that document as a confidential document.
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Having said that, $I$ am going to, following the completion of our questioning of Mr. Gabler, I will entertain a motion for us to enter into a confidential session pursuant to RSA 91-A, so that we can take testimony and ask questions about that particular confidential document. I do not expect that to be necessarily a very long confidential session. As soon as that has been completed, we will come back to our regular session, at which time $I$ would entertain closing arguments from any parties who wish to make closing arguments. And, on the understanding that presumably those closing arguments would be 15 minutes or so in length per party? Is that about what, Attorney Needleman, that's about what you had in mind?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Attorney Rodier, is that about what you had in mind?

MR. RODIER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Were you anticipating making any kind of a closing statement, Attorney Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: NO.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: No closing statement at all? Okay. And, then, $I$ just want to get confirmation that there are no other members of the public here who
\{SEC 2009-02\} [Day 6/AM Session only] \{09-10-10\}
would like to make public comment before the close? One person. Are there any others? Two who would like to make brief public comments before we close. Okay. We should be able to accomplish all of that in our time remaining together here.

Do parties think that we could keep ourselves to a 45-minute lunch break or do people need an hour?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: We can do this in 45
minutes? Let us then please do everything we can to be back here by 1:15. And, I thank you all very much.
(Whereupon the Day 6 Morning Session recessed for lunch at 12:30 p.m. The

Day 6 Afternoon Session to resume
under separate cover so designated.)
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| 12: 6 | curtailments (1) | definition (2) | 14;57: 2,18;60: 6,17; | 107: 2;111: 8;122: 5; |
| court (3) | 113: 1 | 22: 9;57: | 61:11;62: 1;65:22,22; | 130: 5 |
| 13: 9;46:10;139:17 | cut (10) | degrees (1) | 77: 4;89: 7,19;91: 1 ; | disingenuous (1) |
| Cousineau (8) | 22: 5,10,14,16,18; | 17:19 | 98:21;99: 3;101:17; | 69: 9 |
| 6:17;8: 4,24;9:22; | 23: 3;77:11;103:12; | delayed (2) | 102: 2,11;106:24; | disorder (1) |
| 14:24;15:20;16: 1,7 | 106:13,17 | 5:17;49: 6 | 108:11,15;109: 1 ; | 48: 8 |
| cover (1) | cutting (4) | deliveries (1) | 128:14;130:21;132: 9; | disorderly (4) |
| 142:16 | 23: 1,11,11;24:13 | 19:8 | 136: 8;138:24 | 60: 9,13;62:12,16 |
| covered (1) | cycle (2) | delivering (1) | Development's (2) | disoriented (1) |
| 110:10 | 100: 7,11 | 28:20 | 33:16;64:14 | 61:20 |
| CPD (18) | cycling (2) | demand (1) | device (2) | dispatch (18) |
| $9: 13 ; 46: 16,16,16,19$ $24: 51: 9: 52: 2 \cdot 56: 11 .$ | 100:10;126:13 | $120: 17$ | $100: 21 ; 101: 3$ | 71: 8;88: 8;89: 3; 90. 5.91: 2.96: 6,20. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24 ; 51: 9 ; 52: 2 ; 56: 11 ; \\ & 65: 18 ; 71: 16 ; 79: 13,24 \end{aligned}$ | D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { demonstrate (1) } \\ & 42: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { dictated (1) } \\ 63: 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 5 ; 91: 2 ; 96: 6,20 \\ & \text { 106:14;107:12;112: 8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 80:23;111:15;131: 9 ; |  | demonstrating (1) | difference (1) | 10;115: 5;123: 2, 3, 7; |
| 136:24;137: 8 | damage (3) | 45: 4 | 46:19 | 125: 7;126: 5, 7 |
| CPD's (2) | 21:18,19,19 | Department (1) | different (26) | dispatched (12) |
| 46: 7;78: 4 | danger (2) | 5:12 | 18:15;19: 6;20:22 | 94:18;103:15,16; |
| cranked (1) | 85:18,21 | depend (1) | 21: 5;35:12;45: 5;51:18, | 104:16;112: 9;122:17, |
| 124:11 | data (2) | 56:21 | 19;54:23;55:11;70:15; | 24;123:19,22;124:12; |
| create (7) | 76: 3;110:21 | dependent (2) | 73:13;74:13,13;87: 9,11, | 126: 5;127:12 |
| 15:14,21;16: 8,14 ; | dated (1) | 27:16;40:21 | 12;100: 9;112:12,12,13, | displace (3) |
| 61:23,24;62:16 | 7:10 | depending (1) | 24;113: 5;121: 6,21; | 72: 3;99:11,13 |
| created (3) | dates (1) | 89:12 | 124: 2 | disruption (3) |
| 15: 7;49:11;73:16 | 75: 2 | depressed (1) | difficult (3) | 37: 6,10,10 |
| creates (1) | day (18) | 120:15 | 23: 7;26:15;125:24 | dissect (1) |
| 63:18 | 48: 7;68:13,22;79:21; | depressing (1) | difficulty (1) | 61:2 |
| creating (2) | 83:13;90:15;93:11,13, | 83:18 | 16: 8 | dissuading (1) |
| 16:15;86:17 | 21;94:19;95:17;132:23; | depth (2) | digit (1) | 62:12 |
| Credit (3) | 138:20,20,22;139: 8; | 24:18,22 | 83:20 | distributed (3) |
| 83: 2;84: 5;86: 7 | 142:13,15 | deregulated (1) | direct (8) | 38: 3;118:15;136: 6 |
| Credits (6) | day-ahead (1) | 121:8 | 19:11;21: 4, 4;39:18; | distribution (2) |
| 61:16;62:23;83:19; | 71:5 | described (2) | 46:13;59: 9;66:18 | 66:23,23 |
| 86: 3;87: 3;117: 9 | days (2) | 126:11;131:8 | $137: 23$ | district (2) |
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| 13:21;19:3 | drawing (1) | 9:22 | 111:22;127:22 | Evaluation (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| disturbing (1) | 41:2 | eight (2) | enjoy (1) | 5: 5;65:20 |
| 18:19 | drive (4) | 129:22;132:12 | 121:17 | even (19) |
| diverse (1) | 35:19;116:20;127:15, | either (7) | enough (19) | 28: 2;62:24;82:14; |
| 118:15 | 18 | 57:16;68:22,22; | 14:20;25:24;31: 9; | 84: 9;86:11;87: 2;88: 4 ; |
| divulged (1) | driving (2) | 108: 1;116: 7;127: 3; | 34: 4;37: 2,13,15;43:13; | 95:16;98: 2;104:15; |
| 43:19 | 120:23;127:22 | 134:23 | 64:18;81:24;82: 9; | 105:10;107:12;113: 3; |
| Dixville (1) | dropped (2) | elbow (2) | 100: 7;104: 2;106:11; | 117: 1;120: 4;125:21; |
| 133:22 | 84:14;121:16 | 44: 2;59:23 | 116: 4,11,20;128:20; | 128:23;135:15;137:12 |
| Docket (1) | due (7) | Electric (12) | 138:23 | evening (1) |
| 5: 5 | 5:17;35: | 23:19;24: 4, 6, 8 | ensued (1) | 69:18 |
| document (8) | 80:12;82:22;107:11; | 42:17;64:22;95: 7; | 139:18 | event (1) |
| 6: 4;8:21;10:13;75:12; | 108:13 | 120:12,14,18,21;127:22 | ensure (2) | 9: 4 |
| 88: 4;140:24,24;141: 6 | duly (1) | electrical (3) | 62:19;70:1 | everybody (12) |
| DOER (4) | 46:9 | 30:19;40: 2;62:11 | entail (1) | 68: 6,23,23;70: 8; |
| 24: 5;83: 7 | dump (2) | electricity (5) | 130:10 | 104: 1;106: 7;113:19; |
| dollars (7) | 101: 5, 9 | 29:22;75:14;120:10; | enter (3) | 115:22;126:14;134: 6, |
| 25:12;64: 6, 7,10,11 | during (2) | 121:14,23 | 31:21,24;141:3 | 18;138: 4 |
| 83:20,20 | 27: 4;93:11 | eligibility (1) | entered (1) | everybody's (1) |
| done (23) | dynamics (1) | 129:21 | 31:17 | 69:18 |
| 9: 9;18: 3, 6;20: 2 | $73: 1$ | else (7) | entertain (6) | everyone (4) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23: 15,16 ; 28: 8 ; 38: 24 \\ & 42: 7,11 ; 47: 23 ; 49: 13,15 \end{aligned}$ | E | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:13,18;113:23; } \\ & \text { 117: 3;133:18;134:13; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 24 ; 11: 17 ; 33: 1 \\ & 107: 2 ; 141: 3,9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 23 ; 69: 1 ; 81: 12 \\ & 105: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 76:24;78:12;79:22; |  | 138: 4 | entire (2) | Everyone's (1) |
| 88:12;106:13;107: 4; | earlier (10) | else's (1) | 14: 2;134:23 | 126: 3 |
| 110:10,15;132: 8;137: 7 | 13:19;14: 7;69:24; | 28:14 | entities (1) | exact (1) |
| doom (1) | 82: 6;90: 9;121:21; | e-mail (1) | 20:22 | 108: 6 |
| 59: 1 | 126:12;129:13;135: 9; | 11:24 | environment (1) | exactly (5) |
| door (3) | 140:19 | employ (1) | 121:8 | 40:10;55:19;65:18; |
| 105:12;135: 2;137:22 | easily (1) | 31:13 | Environmental (1) | 71: 7;136: 3 |
| doors (1) | 104:11 | employed (2) | 5:12 | examination (3) |
| 32: 4 | economic (34) | 118:19;119: | equals (1) | 5:22;43: 3;46:13 |
| door's (1) | 44: 2;48: 9;51:22 | employee (1) | 75:22 | examined (1) |
| 134:22 | 52: 5;53: 1;54:16,24; | 31:14 | equate (1) | 59:12 |
| double (1) | 55:16;57: 3,18,21;59:22; | employees | 20:15 | example (7) |
| 68:19 | 61:10,24,24;62:15;64: 5, | 72:22;118:13 | equated (1) | 23: 3;58:10;62:10; |
| down (44) | 12;65:21;71:22;98:20; | employing (2) | 25:21 | 88:21;89:18;90:20; |
| 23: 4;24: 5;27: 1,11, | 106:14;107:11;108:11, | 59: 2;119:12 | equipment (1) | 116: 7 |
| 18;28: 1;48: 5, 7;52:10; | 15;111:14,20;115: 5; | employment (1) | 20: 9 | exceed (4) |
| 55:20;64: 6;67: 6, 9,12, | 123: 3, 7, 7;124:22; | 111:16 | erosion (1) | 20:12;133: 7;138: 2,2 |
| 13;68:22;70:16;71:20; | $126: 5,7$ | employs (1) | 23:23 | exceeded (1) |
| 72:21;76: 7;77:11; | economically (4) | 73:22 | escalates (1) | 26:11 |
| 78:16;83: 7;88:20;91: 9 , | 49:10;71: 8;74: 4 | end (3) | 108:13 | exceeds (4) |
| 16,18,19,20,20;93:18; | 128: 7 | 51:16;79:20;119:1 | espoused (1) | 98:17;112:11,23 |
| 96:10;98:17;103: 3; | economy (2) | ended (1) | 105:23 | 113: 3 |
| 105:11;114:10,23; | 27: 9;31:12 | 31:20 | essentially (8) | excellent (1) |
| 124:11,21,24;125:11; | effect (12) | energy (22) | 14:24;15: 6,14;54:17; | 20:14 |
| 128: 7, 9,24 | 6:13;14: 9;34:19; | 5: 8;18: 9;29: 4;31:19, | 63:15;79:21;85:20; | excess (2) |
| downgraded (1) | 37: 9;60:24;61: 1,10; | 20;54:19;61:16;62: 4, | 132: 3 | 101: 9;113:15 |
| 135:14 | 94:10;98:24;113: 9; | 23;83: 2,18;84: 5;86: 6; | establish (1) | excessive (1) |
| dozen (1) | 127:22,24 | 87: 3;88: 5;120:11,23; | 120: 8 | 98: 7 |
| 59: 1 | effectively (1) | 121: 5;132:13,15,16,18 | established (2) | exchange (2) |
| Dr (15) | 15:16 | engine (1) | 120: 3, 5 | 43: 6,15 |
| 42: 2;115:16,17,19; | effects (2) | 129: 7 | establishes ( | Excuse (3) |
| 117:19;119:15,16,17; | 59:16;118: | engineer (3) | 115:24 | 39:12;84:17;109: 3 |
| 121:24;127:10;129:13; | efficiency (7) | 76: 8;133: 3;137:19 | estimate (3) | executive (1) |
| 130:16;135: 7, 8;136:15 | 83: 3;86: 2;116:19; | engineer-anal (1) | 90: 2;104:10;135:13 | 132:16 |
| draft (1) | 117:10;130:13;136:23; | 74:24 | estimation (2) | exempt (1) |
| 49: 5 | 137:16 | England (16) | 58:15;85:22 | 7: 4 |
| dramatically (1) | efficient (4) | 19:17;27:20;28: 4; | ethical (2) | exercise (1) |
| 62:21 | 104:17;116:16,23; | 32: 2;36: 3;47:24;49:1 | 106: 4;107: | 8:19 |
| draw (3) | 127:11 | 66:24;78:13;96: 9; | ethically (1) | exhibit (23) |
| 8:13;37:17;53:21 | effort (1) | 100: 6,18;109: 5, 6 ; | 103: 1 | 6:12;41:14,16;45: 8 , |
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| 9;46:16;47:24;50:17, | 61: 9;65: 2 | feasibility (1) | 83:17 | fourth (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23;51: 1, 9;52:20,22; | extensive (2) | 96: 7 | flooding (1) | 36:11 |
| 53: 5;56: 6, 8, 9,11; | 100:17;133: | feasible | 83:13 | Fraser (2) |
| 65: 8;78: $2,3,4 ; 117: 24$ | extent (7) | 136:12 | floor (1) | 137: 5, 9 |
| exhibits (3) | 35:13;65:12;66: 4; | fee (1) | 21:18 | free (2) |
| 10:20;47: 6;52:17 | 68:24;81: 4;91: 3 ; | 28:15 | flowing (1) | 52:18;57: 5 |
| exist (6) | 121:11 | feed (2) | 93:20 | front (5) |
| 20: 1;26: 9;29:18; | extremely (2) | 38: 9, | folks (1) | 7:10;64:20;84:1 |
| 65:16;85: 2;112: 6 | 21:13,15 | feel (4) | 16:13 | 89: 4;104: 8 |
| existed (4) | F | 19:10;30:11;52:18 | follow (8) | fuel (44) |
| existing (35) |  | few (7) | 83:10;116:22;120:18; | $15: 1,5 ; 17: 14 ; 18: 2,3,7,$ |
| 26:14;29:16,24;32:20, | faces (1) | 13;10:23;38:17 | 129:12;131:13 | 19;19: 5,11;24:20;25:17, |
| 20,21;37: 6,12;40: 2; | 5:13 | 47:17;66:15;86:22,23 | following (3) | 19,24;26: 3, 4,19;27:17; |
| 44: 3;48: 3;55:16;57: 3, | facilities (22) | fewer (3) | 42: 2;68:22;141: | 28: 9;29:16;32: 8,10,11, |
| 10,12,15;58: 5;59:23; | 18:22,23;19: 1;25:21; | 86:17,18,20 | follows (1) | 12,12,13,16,18;40:21; |
| 71:19;72: 3;75:23;92: 1, | 27:20;32:20,22;35:20, | fight (1) | 43: 5 | 41: 2;45: 4;48:10;61:19, |
| 5;96: 8;99:10,15;100: 1; | 23;36:15;37:12,13;58: 8, | 14:12 | follow-up (6) | ;64:23;93:20;94:11, |
| 104: 3;107:11;111:21; | 21;65:17;66:20;71:19, | figure (2) | 24: 2;39: 9;44: 6; | 16;95: 4;118:17;128: 9 |
| 117:17;125: 6,10; | 20;116: 4, 5;117:13,15 | 104:14;115:10 | 127: 8;128:12;136:19 | fueled (2) |
| 130:17;133: 5 | Facility (28) | figures (4) | footprint (3) | 5: 8;26: 5 |
| exists (5) | 5: 7, 8;14:21;16: 7 | 88: 7;110:18,1 | 36:19;40: 5,13 | fuelwood (2) |
| 30:20;75:13,17 | 21: 5;31: 7,13,15,22; | 111: 2 | force (1) | 19:23;23: |
| 100:18;101:11 | 32: $1,6,10,14,16,17$; | file (2) | 32:19 | full (22) |
| expand (2) | 35:21;42:17,18;58:24; | 12: 5;17 | forced (2) | 51: 5;69:19;76:15 |
| 76:20,22 | 62:18;66: 2;67:17; | final (1) | 70:16;74: | 7: 2;84: 9,13,13;89:19; |
| expect (5) | 70:10;74: 1;86: 8; | 53: 8 | forecast (1) | 90:16;95:15;96:10; |
| 5:17;13:15;67:20 | 100:15;117: 1;119: 6 | financial | 101:17 | 103:24;104: 1;106: 1, 3, |
| 111:12;141: 6 | facing (1) | 7:5;125:17 | FORECO (1) | 7, 8, 9;107:10;111: 6, 9; |
| expectation (1) | 38:22 | financier (1) | 17:22 | 124: |
| 95:15 | fact (26) | 126: 1 | forest (15) | fully (3) |
| expected (3) | 14: 7;62:18;64:22; | financing | 19:19,20,22;21: 8,11, | 51:21;52: 1;111:19 |
| $42: 4 ; 102: 8 ; 111: 8$ | 65:17;68:18;71:18; | 125:24 | 18,19;22: 7,13,14,16,17; | fungible (1) |
| expensive (1) | 74: 6;75:16;82:12; | find (7) | 23: 3,22;118: 4 | 120:20 |
| 29:15 | 84:21;91: 1;92: 3,14; | 21: 2;24:21;96: 2 | Forester (5) | further (13) |
| experience (8) | 95: 1;97:16;100:23; | 99:21;112: 4,22;114:18 | 6: 8;17:17,21;18:20; | 32: 6, 9;39:21;42:22; |
| 28: 7,12;55: 7;70:15, | 102: 4, 9;110:11,15; | fine (3) | 21:13 | 44:10,13;52:10;77: 6 ; |
| 17,21,23;95:10 | 111: 9;113: 8,14;125:20; | 109:23;112:20;140:11 | foresters (3) | 83:18;90:18;99:22; |
| experiences (1) | 137: 8,24 | fire (1) | 21:24;22:24;24: 3 | 135: 5;140:12 |
| 70:18 | factor (5) | 26:22 | forestry (1) | future (5) |
| expert (1) | 71: 9;75: 7, 7;80:10; | fired (1) | 111:16 | 48: 8;57:17;83:11; |
| 97:12 | 89:12 | 130:17 | forests (5) | 84: 5;130:11 |
| expertise (2) <br> 47: 4; $81 \cdot 13$ | factors (1) | firm (4) 18:11; | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 19 ; 21: 14 ; 23: 11 ; \\ & 53: 11.12 \end{aligned}$ | G |
| experts (1) | fair (3) | firms (1) | forgot (4) |  |
| 43:11 | 8:16;80:15,19 | 19:16 | 41: 9;56: 3;130: 2 ; | Gabler (16) |
| expires (1) | fairly (4) | First (13) | 133:20 | 46: 8, 9,12,15;50: 6, |
| 70: 3 | 37:16;40:11,11;101: | 25: 3;26:19;33:16; | form (1) | 14,23;51: 2, 7;53:18; |
| explain (2) | fallen (1) | 35:21;42: 5;52:20; | 132:17 | 56: 3, 8;87:23;129:12; |
| 112:15;118:9 | 21:14 | 66:18;81: 6;82:17,22; | forma (1) | 131:22;141: 2 |
| explained (1) | familiar (4) | 125: 3;129:19;132:15 | 81:19 | Gabler's (1) |
| 93: 6 | 64:13,17;67:18 | Fish (1) | forth (1) | 45:22 |
| explanation (1) | 108:19 | 24:12 | 29:15 | Game (3) |
| 6: 6 | familiarity (1) | five (14) | forward (15) | 24:12;112:12;116:20 |
| explicitly (1) | 133: 4 | 18:22;19: 1;23: 5 | 13: 8;15: 7,15;16:16, | garner (1) |
| 48: 1 | far (8) | 25:11;28:17;45:21; | 23;30:24;35: 2;59:19; | 72:23 |
| export (5) | 26:11;35:17;36:18; | 67: 5, 6;73: 3;96:24; | 61:17;63: 4;74: 6;80:23; | gas (14) |
| 75:13,24;76: 9,11,15 | 82:13;85: 1, 4;87:13; | 104: 6;139:24;140: 1,6 | 82: 4;90:23;95: 3 | 101: 7;116:21;120: 6, |
| exported (1) | 91:11 | fix (1) | found (1) | 8,14,15,17,20;121:11, |
| 118:24 | farther (1) | 112: | 28:10 | 15,17,23;127:20;128: 3 |
| exports (1) | 91: 6 | flawed (1) | four (8) | gave (4) |
| 75:20 | favorable (2) | 25: 1 | 19:18,19;21:23,24; | 34:19;43:17;60:22; |
| expressed (2) | 39: 2;64: 2 | flood (1) | 72:17,22;73: 3,20 | 130: 9 |
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| general (8) | 92: 4, 6,12;93:13; | guess (11) | Harrington's (1) | ghly (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8: 7;12:15;13: 1,20 | ;95: 4 | 37: 3:53:21:90 | 43: 5 | 9:23 |
| 22:24;31: 5;121:13 | Gonz | 107: 7;123:13; | ha | hired (2) |
| 0: 9 | 109: 5 | 6:10;127:14;134:12, | 19:24;20: 2, 3, 5; | 18:12;130: |
| generalizat | Good | 19;137:14 | 21:12;23: 7,15;24: 7, 8 | historical |
| 68:10 | 5: 2;13: 5;16: 4,17,18, | guns (1) | hate (2) | 53:12 |
| generally | 19;22: 1;26:18;39:19; | 27: 9 | 53:16;73: | history (1) |
| 8: 8;16: 5;20 | 63:11;65 | guys (2) | haul (1) | 35:18 |
| 23:22;24: 1;25:11,14; | 106:17,18;118:10; | 106:17;116:21 | 27: 7 | Hmm (1) |
| 3;123:18 | 120. 1-123.11,14 |  | hauling ( | 10:16 |
| generate (7) | Gorham | H | 27: 7;35:11 | hold (2) |
| 31: 8;68: 1;86:11,22; | 137: 5 |  | hauls (1) | 17:18; |
| $90: 16 ; 114: 8 ; 138: 21$ | Governor | half | 27:10 | hole (1) |
| generated (7) | 130: 8 | ;2 | hazard (1) | 38:19 |
| 82:14;87: $1,1,5,8,8$ | Grafton | 79:1 | 137:14 | home (2) |
| 10 | 55:10 | 101:2 | head (4) | 119: 7, 9 |
| generating | Granite (25) | Hampshire (56 | 102:24;112: 3;130: 6; | homes (1) |
| $86: 17 ; 115: 21$ | 52: 3;68: 3;76:13,14; | $5: 5,9 ; 12: 2 ; 15: 19$ | 139: 2 | 31:10 |
| generation (23) | 77: 3;78:23;79: 4,10; | 16:18;17:18,20,23;18: 5, | hear (1) | honed (1) |
| $38: 18 ; 48: 3 ; 66: 23$ | 80: 7,10,15,21;89:22; | $6,24 ; 27: 3 ; 28: 2,24$ | $54: 3$ | 78:16 |
| $68: 4,19 ; 69: 2 ; 71: 12$ | 90:15;94: 9;96:14; | $29: 1 ; 30: 21 ; 31: 17 ; 36: 2,$ | heard (23) | honestly |
| 75:17,19,21,22;89: 3; | 100:20;105: 8;111:7; | 4, 9,19;37: 7,23;38:16; | 14:23;18:18;21:21 | 14: 5 |
| 90: 5;96: 8;98: 7,16,18; | 113:17;132: 9;133: 8; | 40: 6, 7, 9,13,15,20,21; | 22:22;23:14;24:20; | hook (1) |
| 100: 1;112:11,23;113: 2 ; | 138:22,23;139:9 | 41: 2, 4;48:21;49: 4; | 27: 6;28: 6;35: 9;43:10; | 112:18 |
| 121: 9,12 | grant (1) | 61:15;83:14,17,24 | 8:24;58: 2;67:15 | hope (2) |
| generator (14) | 40:23 | 84:24;85: 2,19,20;86:15; | 69:23;72:15,18;74: 2; | 5:21;82: |
| 48: 6;63:20;71: 6, 7 | granted | 108:10;117:13,17; | 79:19;102: 1;107:24; | horse (2) |
| 10;86: 5;97:20,20; | 79:19 | 118:12;119:13;120: 6, | 108: 1;118:19;135: 9 | 58:13,16 |
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| 81: 7;82: 2;84:22; | $81: 12$ | $119: 11 ; 120: 13,18$ | various (3) | weeks (2) |
| 107:13;125: $1 ; 134: 12$ | under (52) | 124:21;127:19;128: 1,5 ; | 44:24;56:20;132:8 | 83: 6, 6 |
| truly (2) | 7: 4;10:12;14:13; | 129: 3,12;134:23; | VAUGHN (1) | weight (1) |
| 9:23;125:11 | 31:15;67:24;68:11; | 136:12;138:19 | 7:14 | 54: 6 |
| try (8) | 70:11,20;71: 1;80:19; | upcoming (2) | verbal (3) | welcome (1) |
| 5:19;9:10;13:24; | 85: 1, 1;86:11,19;88:19, | 84: 1;85:18 | 33:11;41:20;44:1 | 13:11 |
| 22:20;53:20;73: 7; | 19;91:16;97:18,20;98: 7, | upgrade (11) | Vermont (10) | weren't (1) |
| 117: 2;140:9 | $9,13,15 ; 106: 13 ; 110: 10$ | $38: 13 ; 48: 14,15 ; 49: 1$ | $17: 23 ; 18: 24 ; 24: 3,11,$ | 103:19 |
| trying (21) | 111:10;112: 8,10,16,20; | $79: 2 ; 110: 11 ; 113: 18$ | 15;28: 2, 9;37:24;38: 6; | what's (3) |
| 9: 8;28: 9;37: 3;51:19; | $113: 7,11,20 ; 114: 2$ | 114:14;115: 3;135:10; | $118: 22$ | 29:23;36: 5;89: 5 |
| $58: 10,17 ; 63: 24 ; 69: 9$ | $115: 20 ; 117: 4 ; 122: 10$ | $136: 11$ | version (9) | whereas (1) |
| 74: 3;87:14;94:24; | 16;123:11;125:23; | upgrades (14) | 46:20,21;48:16;50:20; | 118:14 |
| 95:18;103:22;104:14; | 126: 2, 3, 4, 7;131: 3,10, | 38: 9,23;48:19;49:13, | 51: 6,11;52:11;84:12; | whereby (1) |
| 106: 6;108: 7, 8, 8,16; | 11;134: 7;136:23;138: 1 , | 15;78:12;98:23;99: 1,4, | 85: 8 | 35:16 |
| 115:10;135:16 | 11;142:16 | 7, 9;114: 7;125:19; | versus (2) | Whereupon (4) |
| turbine (2) | underlies (1) | 134:18 | 40:17;73:1 | 34:10;45:24;46: 9; |
| 93:19;100:22 | 134:20 | upgrading (2) | viability (1) | 142:13 |
| turn (3) | undermine (1) | 77:14;136: 1 | 58:19 | whip (2) |
| 44:22;58:12;101: 6 | 32: 7 | upon (19) | viable (6) | 58:13,16 |
| turned (1) | undermines (2) | 17: 2;30:23;35: 6; | 31:23;32: 1;58: 6,21; | Whitefield (15) |
| 103: 5 | 134:19,20 | 40:21;45: 5;55: 7;56:21; | 74: 4;128:8 | 48: 5;59: 7;67:10; |
| turning (1) | understood (2) | 57: 7;66: 1;75:16;76:22; | vibrant (1) | 68:16;69: 6;70: 2;88: 9; |
| 129: 7 | 55:21;121: 4 | 111: 3;121:10,11,12,23; | 49: 1 | 90:19;91: 2,20;92:20; |
| Twenty (1) | unequivocally (1) | 130: 8;132: 1, 7 | Vice (2) | 100:15;102:15;106: 3, 9 |
| 36: 6 | 93: 4 | upward (1) | 12:15;13:20 | whole (13) |
| Twenty-seven (1) | unfeasible (1) | 27:21 | vicinity (1) | $19: 23 ; 20: 4 ; 21: 12$ |
| 79:13 | 49:10 | use (10) | 49: 2 | 24: 8;27:16;38:15; |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:20;95:20;97: 9;99: 2; } \\ & \text { 112:11,24;137:14 } \\ & \text { wholesale (1) } \\ & \text { 95:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 37: 6,11,16,22;40:18; } \\ & \text { 43:10,13;58: 7;62:19; } \\ & \text { 64: 7;74: 6, 7;137: } 6 \\ & \text { wood-fired }(\mathbf{1}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { yesterday (1) } \\ 11: 24 \\ \text { young }(\mathbf{1}) \\ 22: 14 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| who's (4) 30:16;58:16;68:12; | $42: 12$ woods (3) | Z |
| 134:14 | 31:14;137: 6,11 |  |
| whose (1) | wood-to-energy (1) | zero (42) |
| 130: 6 | 31:7 | 62:24;67:19,20,24; |
| William (3) | woodyard (1) | 68: 6, 9,17,23;69: 6,12, |
| 46: 8, 9,12 | 16: 2 | 12,13,20;70: 2, 6, 6, 8; |
| willing (2) | word (1) | 88: 9,13,18;91:24;92: 4 , |
| 43:12;126:15 | 110:12 | 8,16;93: 8,11;94: 3,11, |
| win (1) | words (3) | 12,13,14,16;95:15,20, |
| 121: 1 | 38: 9;40:13;81: 7 | 21;104:11;105: 3; |
| Winchester (5) | work (8) | 106:10;115:22;124: 6, 9; |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 4 ; 37: 18 ; 62: 6 \\ & 107: 17,18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 9 ; 18: 1,23 ; 19: 9 \\ & 24: 3,12 ; 65: 24 ; 94: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 138: 4 \\ \text { zeros (2) } \end{array}$ |
| Wind (53) | worked (3) | 90:20;91:9 |
| 52: 3;68: 3;76:13,15; | 8:24;18: 8;25: 9 |  |
| 77: 3;78:23;79: 4;80:12, | working (5) |  |
| 16;89:22;90: 2, 7,15; | 28:13;49: 3;53:12; |  |
| 91:19;94: 4, 9,18;96:15; | 55: 9;132:17 |  |
| 100: 7,10,11,19,22; | works (2) |  |
| 101: 4,12,16,17,17,19; | 15:20;91:23 |  |
| 102: 3,12;103:11,11; | world (1) |  |
| 104: 1, 5, 5, 9;105: 6, 8 , | 98:14 |  |
| 8,12;106: 8,10;111: 7; | worried (1) |  |
| 113:18;126:13;128:15; | 113:16 |  |
| 133:20,21;134: 3, 4, 5,17 | worry (4) |  |
| winds (2) | 113:19,21,22,24 |  |
| 68: 2;102:10 | worth (2) |  |
| wind's (2) | 25:16;36:20 |  |
| 101:20;138:21 | wrapping (1) |  |
| wings (1) | 33:14 |  |
| 36:12 | wrench (1) |  |
| winter (3) | 15:20 |  |
| 120:12,13,16 | write (1) |  |
| wish (4) | 130: 8 |  |
| 11:18;17: 5;21:10; | written (13) |  |
| 141:10 | 7: 9;11:20;12: 3, 4; |  |
| within (9) | 13:11;30: 5;33: 3;57:14; |  |
| 5:18;16: 4;35: 7; | 84:18;103: 3;114:10; |  |
| 36:19;37:19;55: 9; | 132:15;140:22 |  |
| 64:24;118:17;120:10 | wrong (5) |  |
| without (2) | 22:23;23:12;55: 2 ; |  |
| 16: 9;47:14 | 67:16;127: 2 |  |
| witness (25) | wrote (1) |  |
| 34: 4;39:22;41:19; | 55:20 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 44:17,23;45:16;46: 5, 7, } \\ 7 ; 50: 5,23 ; 51: 2,7 \end{gathered}$ | Y |  |
| $56: 3,8 ; 61: 5 ; 82: 16$ <br> 86:10:109:18:115: 7.15; |  |  |
| 139:13,23;140: 2,18 | $\text { 16: } 7$ |  |
| witnesses (2) | year (5) |  |
| 5:22;33:17 | 24: 9;26: 3,24;31: 9,20 |  |
| wood (44) | years (21) |  |
| 13:23;14: 8,11,16; | 16:11;17:16;20: 1,24; |  |
| 15:12,13,18,22;16: 2, 3, | 21:17;23: 5, 5;25:10; |  |
| 6, 9,12;18: 7,19;19: 5, | 26: 3;28:17;31:17; |  |
| 11;20:21;24:24;25: 3,20, | 38:21;48:24;53: 2 ; |  |
| 24;26:15,20;34:21,23; | 55:10;84:23;97:19; |  |
| 35: 4, 6,10;36: 8,18 ; | 112: 6, 9;123:10;132:12 |  |
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