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> PROCEEDINGS
(Hearing resumed at 1:25 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Let's
resume. I'm going to ask Attorney Iacopino to mark some documents for the record.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr.
Chairman, the Applicant has presented one, two, three... an additional four exhibits for the record. I understand that, with the exception of the last one, which I'll discuss last, they've all been agreed to by the parties.

The first is marked as Laidlaw
Biopower Exhibit 74, or Applicant 74. It is an affidavit of Raymond Kusche, $K-U-S-C-H-E, ~ d a t e d$ September 10, 2010. That's Exhibit 74.

The next exhibit, which is
admitted under the same circumstances is Applicant Exhibit 75, Affidavit of Curt Richmond, R-I-C-H-M-O-N-D. This exhibit is dated September 9th, 2010. This one doesn't have a sticker on the copy, so you might want to mark that as Exhibit 75.

The next exhibit is Exhibit
76, and this is a stipulation between Laidlaw
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Berlin BioPower and Counsel for the Public. And it has attached to it a document entitled
"Laidlaw Berlin BioPower, LLC, Sustainability Conditions." It is signed by Barry Needleman, counsel for Laidlaw, and K. Allen Brooks and Peter Roth, Counsel for the Public. And that's Exhibit 76.

> And then finally, from the

Applicant we have the confidential exhibit, which the Chair granted the motion for confidentiality for, and that is marked as Exhibit 76-A. And again, this one doesn't have a number on it, so you may want to -- Members of the Committee may want to put 76-A.

And then, finally we have a new exhibit from Counsel for the Public, which is a letter dated September 20, 2007, from Michael J. Walls, Assistant Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Services to Peter G. Beeson, $B-E-E-S-O-N$, at Devine, Millimet \& Branch. And the letter concerns the Dummer Yard Leachate Agreement. And that's been marked as PC 5.

And those are the exhibits.
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Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
(Laidlaw Exhibits 74, 75, 76, 76-A marked for identification.) (Public Counsel Exhibit 5 marked for identification.)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. If we can, now I'd like to ask, Mr. Gabler, if you would please return to the witness stand. And we will do our best to, as expeditiously as we can, to complete our questioning of Mr. Gabler. Following that, $I$ think it may be helpful for us to have an opportunity for -- I believe Counsel for the Public wishes to make a statement regarding the stipulation which is Exhibit 76.

Attorney Needleman, I think it may be helpful potentially to put a witness on about this, depending what you and Counsel for the Public may have to say about this document. Once we have concluded any questioning relating to that document, then we will have a motion to go into confidential session to review the Cousineau draft fuel supply agreement and the amendment that we have been provided with today, which is now labeled as Confidential Exhibit 76-A
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[WITNESS: GABLER]
of the Applicant. Okay?
So, with that, Mr. Gabler, I
think Mr. Needleman has some additional questions for you.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. Mr. Gabler, just a couple of questions.

During Mr. Harrington's questioning, you said that CPD would cycle with the wind project and voluntarily curtail its output, if I've summarized that correctly. My question to you is, are you aware of any new biomass facilities anywhere that have agreed to do something like that and obtain financing?
A. No, I think we would have been the first. It was merely a proposal that we made and investigated the economic -- or the engineering and transmission viability of, and determined that it was viable, but then never integrated it into our economic proposal.
Q. Earlier today Mr. Brooks asked you a
\{SEC 2009-02\} (DAY 6-PUBLIC SESSION) \{9/10/10\}
question which was loosely along the lines of would it be a bad thing necessarily if new generation were to come into the market and displace older generation. And I wanted to pick up on that for a minute.

We heard public comment earlier today from a representative of Bridgewater. And part of those comments suggested that today, as we speak, that Bridgewater plant is having some problems, independent of anything that's going on with Laidlaw. And having in mind that it's your view that the Laidlaw plant would potentially cause facilities like Bridgewater and others to potentially go out of business, and assuming for the moment that that's even something that the Committee could regulate, can you explain to the Committee how you would propose they distinguish between plants that are currently having problems and may no longer operate, irrespective of whether Laidlaw comes online, from plants that you think Laidlaw will affect? How does the Committee draw that line today?
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[WITNESS: GABLER]
A. Well, let's go back to what I heard in Mr. O'Leary's testimony, that they are currently doing okay treading water, but not to the extent that they had been in the past, and that, in his estimation, as I recall his testimony, allowing Laidlaw to come online would be the straw that breaks his camel's back and could well end up resulting in a shutdown of his project. So that's my recollection of his testimony and what he was trying to say.

Going back to your question of how does the Committee address that, I don't know that you can, because you're talking about a very gray and almost unmanageable area as to whose books are okay now and whose aren't. And we're never going to have access to those books to make that determination.

The real determination that I think the Committee needs to make is, first of all, recognizing that in the estimation of a number of plant owners that we've enumerated in the past -- Bridgewater, Alexandria, Whitefield, Concord -- allowing Laidlaw to
\{SEC 2009-02\} (DAY 6-PUBLIC SESSION) \{9/10/10\}
go forward will have very significant, if not disastrous impact, on their projects. And the Committee needs to think about a way to come to grips with that issue.
Q. But just so we're clear on this, you have no way, as you sit here today, to distinguish whether any of those projects, separate from Laidlaw, are going to continue to operate going forward, do you?
A. I don't think any of us have a crystal ball to that extent.
Q. And you also have no way at all, adopting your view of things, to give the Committee something that it can use to draw a line between those that might otherwise not succeed and those that would be affected by Laidlaw, do you?
A. And I don't think that's -- in my estimation, that's not really a germane point. The real nexus of the issue is will Laidlaw have an impact on those plants? And we've heard a number of them say that it will, and potentially disastrous. As to how we differentiate, that's not the heart of
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[WITNESS: GABLER]
the issue here. The issue is that Laidlaw will have an impact. Some may have -- you know, they've operated 25 years already, and we would expect them to go forward as they are right now, as Bridgewater is, moving along, treading water. But with Laidlaw's impact, they may not.
Q. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Counsel for the Public, questions?
MR. BROOKS: No.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr. Rodier,
do you have anything further?
MR. RODIER: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. RODIER:
Q. Mr. Gabler, in your mind, is there a difference between a less efficient project being driven out of business by a new, more efficient project? That's one postulate, okay, a less efficient project. A new one comes along, more efficient, drives it out of business. I want you to hold that in
\{SEC 2009-02\} (DAY 6-PUBLIC SESSION) \{9/10/10\}
mind. Paradigm $A$ let's call it.
Paradigm B is that you get an existing project driven out of business by a new one coming along that's got the sort of PPA with a monopoly utility that you discussed this morning. See a difference between those two?
A. Clearly.
Q. What is it?
A. Well, let me address Paradigm A first. And this goes back to something that $I$ didn't get into earlier with Dr. Kent's question of efficiency.

There is no real change in efficiency between technologies and age unless you truly are combining heat and power. Most biomass plants operate at the range of 20 -, 22-percent efficiency, possibly 25. So a newer plant is going to be maybe 23 , where an old plant's going to be 21 on the margin, in terms of efficiency.

So the real paradigm, the only viable one, is Paradigm B, the only realistic one, where a plant can be run out of business.
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An older plant that doesn't have the backing of a PPA, such as what has been offered, could well be run out of business by a plant that's not any more efficient, but merely has deep-pocket backing.
Q. In the form of a PPA?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Now let's talk about Bridgewater. I guess they're not here so we can talk about them. But seriously, they said they've had deals. They had a 20-year deal with Public Service and that ran its course. Then they had three years with Constellation, and that ran its course. And so, right now, he said for six months they've tried mightily to get a new deal; they can't get one. So, all they can do is just can liquidate it on the ISO New England hourly market; right?
A. Yes.
Q. So that is -- not to put words in their mouth, but that's kind of like the only option at this point. Presumably, Public Service said, Hey, forget it. We've got a deal with Laidlaw here, and, you know, we're
[WITNESS: GABLER]
not going to deal with any of the other existing biomass producers. Let's assume that's the case. That's really kind of what Bridgewater's gripe is, is that that is going to muscle them out of business; right?
A. Very much so.
Q. Okay. And I think what you're saying, somebody's job's going to be to say whether that's going to be state policy or something's going to be done about it; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Mr. Gabler, you were asked about the change in law. Do you have a reference point for -- Public Service still pays Laidlaw for RECs, or what were RECs, that longer legally exist. Do you recall that discussion?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Do you recall -- you got a good memory, so I'll put this in front of you. And I don't want to use much time on this. But look at Section 1.57 of the PPA. Do you recall that being discussed earlier in this proceeding?
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[WITNESS: GABLER]
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Attorney
Rodier, if I could just interrupt. What's the exhibit number that this is from? Do you know? MR. RODIER: It's the PPA. which is -- very sorry. It's 40.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. MR. RODIER: It's Page 25 at the bottom, and it's Definition 1.57.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. BY MR. RODIER:
Q. So, do you remember that, Mr. Gabler?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that -- are you able to recall whether or not that change in law provision regarding renewable energy payments was kind of what you were referring to?
A. Yes, it clearly was.
Q. So, anybody from the Committee that's looking for some basis for your opinion on that could refer to that definition.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. I'll take that back.

You said that one of the things that
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was recurring, not just today, but before, is the whole issue of what happens if CPD is not built -- or what happens if Laidlaw comes online and CPD's not going to get built. This question has come up in various forms over the recent days of the hearing; has it not?
A. Correct.
Q. Would you agree with me that, if CPD had some kind of a PPA even remotely approaching what Laidlaw got out of Public Service, that it probably would be built, even if Laidlaw was in existence?
A. If we had the same or similar PPA, it would be built. We'd already be under construction and would be built, irregardless.
Q. All right. Well, is it true you got all your permits?
A. All the permits.
Q. What's the status of the financing?
A. Financing is lined up.
Q. Okay.
A. Equity financing and long-term financing all
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arranged, just waiting.
Q. Just got to wait for the picture to clear here on what's going to be the economic picture here and the price of wood; correct?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Okay. Final one is this calculus of existing jobs, new jobs. You were asked if you'd done a -- or do you know of any studies. I think your answer was, no, you don't know of any studies; right?
A. Correct.
Q. But earlier in your testimony, I thought you said somebody ought to study things like this. Did you not?
A. That somebody ought to study it?
Q. Yeah.
A. Yeah. Obviously, it's an issue that has been brought up by numerous parties, that there is no comparative neutral third-party analysis of economic impact. And, you know, for Schiller, and for other existing plants that could be used as an example, perhaps there should be a study to make that analysis.
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Q. Right. Now, Public Counsel asked you whether you had such a study. He could have had such a study done and sent the bill to Laidlaw; right?
A. It's my understanding, yes, it could have been done.
Q. Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Any further questions from the Subcommittee for this witness?
(No verbal response) CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay.

Anything further from the parties?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Very good.
Mr. Gabler, thank you very much.
(Witness Gabler excused.)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. I'd
like to now turn to exhibit -- let's see here. I believe this is Applicant Exhibit 76, which is entitled "Stipulation of Laidlaw Biopower, LLC and Counsel for the Public." Who would like to speak to this first? Attorney Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: He'll --
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure.
Exhibit 76, the top page is the executed stipulation between the Applicant and Laidlaw. Underneath is -- you originally had the sustainability condition, which was Exhibit 60. This is a revised version of that. It's the product of discussions that the Applicant and Cousineau had with Public Counsel and the state forester. We have worked through their suggestions and reached agreement on all of the changes, and what you now have before you is that revised document that is, in general, fairly close to the first version we provided. And in a moment, after Mr. Brooks speaks, we'll make Mr. Bravakis available again to answer any questions about changes and any other questions that the Committee may have. But that's essentially what this is.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Attorney Brooks.
MR. BROOKS: Thank you.
The only statement $I$ wanted to make is to clarify that this sustainability condition is an agreement reached between Public
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Counsel and the Applicant for this case. There was the involvement of the state forester who added a lot of value to that process and gave perspectives, and is familiar with it. But this does not reflect the statewide policy on sustainability and what sustainability should be. To the extent such policy is developed, it's going to have to involve a lot of stakeholder meetings, participation and decisions by the appropriate people. So I just wanted to make clear that this is an agreement reached between us for this project and does not represent a statewide policy.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Attorney Needleman, I think it may be helpful if you could put Mr. Bravakis up on the stand, just so if you want to walk him through this, or if you want me to do this. But we should have him describe for us what changes have been made from the original document that we saw, Document 60, and see if there's any questions from the parties.
(Whereupon, Mr. Bravakis resumes as Witness.)
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure. I think what may be easier for me to do is direct Mr. Bravakis to the changes and ask him to explain them to the Committee.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
That will be fine.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Mr. Bravakis, there's a small change in No. 1, I think at the end where we said -where we added that clause, "and that the standards are followed." Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Can you explain that briefly.
A. Yes. I think Attorney Roth suggested that when we had our meeting, and we agreed that that was a good addition to that section.
Q. In No. 2, that clause at the end which says, "comma, or from foresters that have been disciplined by a board of licensure or had their license revoked," could you explain that change.
A. Again, Public Counsel suggested that. We
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had "repeat offenders of the loggers." But they also suggested we would include a provision if there were foresters who were disciplined by a licensing board or had their license revoked, we would also not use them. And we agreed to that as well.
Q. And then I believe, and Public Counsel will correct me if I'm wrong, I think the next change occurs in No. 6, where we did a number of things. One of those is a cross-reference to the amended Cousineau contract, which I understand we'll discuss shortly. But there were also some other additions there, including, going over to the next page, adding $H$, which is the Good Forestry in the Granite State, and then breaking some of these others out in I and J. Can you just generally explain these changes in No. 6 to the Committee.
A. Yes. This resulted from numerous meetings we had with market participants and leaders, whether they were procurement people, foresters and others, organizations that we wanted to be inclusive with.
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To back up a little. Our intent originally was not to create the end-all and be-all of sustainability provisions, but to dovetail into existing programs and policies and guidelines that exist. So, as a result of that, we were -- it was suggested to us that we break No. F away from -- we had it combined with the SFI program. And this is to include any recognized trained logger -sources that come from trained logger programs in the states, that we -- not only New Hampshire, but other states that we expect to get fuel from.

We have also included "under the guidance of a licensed professional forester, or in accordance with a management plan" to try to include those properties and lands that might not be in third-party certification, but under some type of forestry guidance. And it was also brought to our attention, referred to as, quote, unquote, the Bible of Forestry in New Hampshire, is the Good Forestry Granite State Recommended Voluntary Forest Practices
for New Hampshire. That was done in 1997 by the New Hampshire Forest Sustainability Standards Work Team. We reviewed that document and thought that was an excellent addition to some of the conditions. And it was also recommended by a couple of foresters, that they use this as well. And then the state forester suggested that we would want to also include timber harvested from state and federal lands, which is also under management programs. We didn't want to have to exclude that as well.
Q. No. 7 is actually a new provision. Can you describe how that came about.
A. Yeah. We struggled trying to figure out how the whole -- again, to back up a little bit. This is a voluntary step forward on our part to try to create more carrots than sticks, if you will, with respect to fuel procurement. So we wanted to create opportunities for loggers to participate in our programs, and if they weren't in a certification program, rather than penalize them, we wanted to offer funding so they
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could enroll in logging programs or maintain membership in professional logging programs. And with respect to forestry, we wanted to -- it was suggested to us that perhaps one thing that might be beneficial is to set up an annual scholarship fund for individuals who wanted to pursue a career in forestry. And we agreed to do that, and that's how this came in. We call it the Laidlaw Forestry Scholarship Fund. We will award up to $\$ 5,000$ annually to one or more qualified applicants residing in New Hampshire. We're going to give a preference to applicants residing in Coos County. And again, from those that are familiar with this type of an outreach effort, it was suggested to us that this would get administered and disbursed by the Northeast Loggers Association, which already does that in some other areas. So we agreed to set up this scholarship fund.
Q. No. 8 was in the old version, and I believe the primary change here is that we just put a dollar amount in as to what the
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contribution will be to the annual fund. Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. No. 9 is a new addition relating to recordkeeping. Can you just briefly describe that.
A. Yeah. Is it 9? I thought it was in the original.
Q. Actually, it may have been re-ordered from the --
A. In any event, what we wanted to do -- the challenge here was, as I say, to create a standard that would accomplish two things -or I should better say not disrupt either our -- either the current marketplace or the ability -- or prohibit the ability for qualified suppliers to come to the facility, and also to understand the reality of how the wood moves and who's delivering it, et cetera, et cetera, but also to monitor that, what type of metrics were we going to use. And so it was suggested to us that something that would work would be what we call the records on-site delivery. So when the truck
comes in, there's going to be a protocol where they'll identify the supplier, the quantity of the delivery, the date of the delivery, the period, the state and -- the town and the state of production of where this product has come from. So those -every delivery will be tracked as it comes into the facility. And you have to understand that a lot of times, truckers just arrive at a piece of land and they're just moving product. So this is going to be some accounting that they're going to have to provide to us as part of their ability to sell to the project. And what we understand from our procurement personnel is that this can be done. So, a little bit more of a tracking mechanism, but it can be done without creating a burden on the truckers.
Q. And I believe the other two, which I can briefly summarize, are No. 10 we added in to address Public Counsel's concern that it be clear that, if Cousineau is ever not a supplier for some reason, that whoever the future suppliers are will be bound by this.
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And then in Section 1 of Reporting and Verification, I believe that first sentence was added to make clear that we will gather this information by conducting quarterly surveys; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. I think that was it.

Allen, did I miss any?
MR. BROOKS: No, I think
that's it.
Q. Okay. Is there anything you want to add, Mr. Bravakis?
A. Nothing that I don't think we've already stated in these proceedings. I just wanted to reiterate. This is -- we view this as a demonstration of our commitment to what we hear is a major concern around the state. And what I've heard, not only through the week of testimony, but through the four years of developing this project and talking to a lot of folks, that it's a question of, okay, you say you're going to get from sustainable sources. How do you do that? And then, on the other side of the spectrum,
from the suppliers: How do you do that without creating upset in the market? And the other biomass power plants: How do you do that without diminishing our ability to buy fuel? So this is truly a voluntary effort on our behalf to, as we've said in the past, dovetail with existing guidelines and programs. And to kind of echo what Counsel Brooks said, this is -- we view this as just a first step. And we fully expect and look forward to being one of the stakeholders as the state moves towards developing a statewide sustainability policy. But this is really a voluntary effort on our part. I don't -- I do not believe any other biomass plant has taken it to this level. And I just want the Committee to understand it from that perspective and also to understand some of the challenges that we had to deal with as we created this document.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think that's it, Mr. Chair. He's available to answer questions.
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CHAIRMAN BURACK: Very good. Thank you very much.

Attorney Rodier, do you have any questions on this document?

MR. RODIER: No. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Members of the Committee, any
questions? Dr. Kent.
INTERROGATORIES BY DR. KENT:
Q. Are you aware that Good Forestry in the Granite State was recently revised?
A. If it was, we'll put the -- we'll change the date. We'll put the current version in, if that's... I guess I wasn't aware of that.

Newer version since 1997?
Q. Yeah. We can make arrangements for it.

It's in production, but it's available online, to see the draft that's in production.
A. Because we did get it online. So $I$ guess --
Q. Did you?
A. -- we didn't get the draft copy. We'll correct that.
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Q. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Other questions from members of the Subcommittee? Commissioner Ignatius.

COMM. IGNATIUS: Thank you.
INTERROGATORIES BY COMM. IGNATIUS:
Q. On the new provision, Section 6J, Timber Harvested from State or Federal Lands, you said just now that that was included because there are already some standards in place for good harvesting on those lands; is that correct?
A. That's what $I$ understand, yes.
Q. So, I assume that provision that would make that one of the identified programs to be incented would be timber harvested from state or federal lands that's done in compliance with the standards on those lands.
A. Okay. We made an assumption that it would be. But we can add that if you --
Q. Okay. I just want to be sure. If someone were to say, well, this is the location and you can trace it back to a state or federal
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property, it's also that they complied with the standards in place.
A. Yeah. And without conferring with the state forester or another forester, my understanding, from my knowledge of this, when a timber sale is conducted on state or federal lands, it's done under a licensed manager -- under a licensed forester, and done in compliance with a management plan. So one would assume if it came from those lands, unless someone was breaking the law, that it was done in compliance with any management plan that's there. We certainly can add that, if you think that would add value here. I don't think we have a problem. The intent is certainly to do that.
Q. All right. Let me just ask a little bit more about the terms. And it may be that it's clear enough, and trying to write it down will make it less clear.

Are there any state or federal lands on which timbering is not allowed?
A. I would assume there might be. But I don't
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know. I would imagine there might be some set-aside land that is fragile, high elevation, protected because of ancient forests or something. So this was only on timberland that is managed for timber harvest at the state and federal level. We can expand upon it. I see what you're saying. Certainly, it's not our intent to send a logger up to some timberland and cut down an ancient forest and make it into chips and send it to the plant.
Q. Well, your last phrase, timber -- state lands that have a program for harvesting or something was maybe a clarification that would be useful. But $I$ wouldn't begin to know how to write that.
A. Okay.
Q. Thank you.
A. We can change that.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Anything
further, Commissioner Ignatius?
COMM. IGNATIUS: No.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Mr.
Harrington.
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MR. HARRINGTON: Just a quick question.

INTERROGATORIES BY MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. You made a comment that no other biomass plant has taken it to this level. Is it safe to assume that if your sale price of your electricity was based on the market rate or tied to the market rate, that you wouldn't be taking it to this level as well? Would you be able to do the same level of sustainability agreement and scholarships and all these other caveats in here if your rate was based on the market price for electricity?
A. A, it depends on when that market is. If it was four or five years ago or now, they're two different market prices, of course. But no. What I was trying to say, perhaps I didn't say it properly before, is that when we evolved this, we wanted to do it in a way that wouldn't put us in a competitive disadvantage to the marketplace, whatever that might be, on the wood side and the energy side. So, no. If you look through
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this, $I$ don't see where this places an undue burden on the project.

For example: \$7,500 annually for programs to help forestry students or loggers on a project like this is pretty insignificant. We're purchasing, we estimate, $\$ 25$ million a year in wood. So we looked at that and felt that these were provisions that we as an end consumer could live with. There were some, I will tell you, that suggested we act more like the landowner and do a lot more management upstream. But we felt that that was unrealistic, considering who we are. We're a purchaser of fuel. We're not an owner of woodland. I would say no.
Q. Okay. Thank you. But just to follow up then. Do you know of anyone else who has a similar agreement, any other wood biomass plant, not just restricted to New Hampshire, but other parts of --
A. Yeah. In Vermont, by state law, Ryegate and Burlington Electric have procurement plans. And I'm not that familiar with them. I know
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I've spoken with John Irving, the plant manager for Burlington Electric. They've been operating with those plans for 25, 30 years.
Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Other
questions? Director Muzzey.
INTERROGATORIES BY DIR. MUZZEY:
Q. In the previous draft of this document we've reviewed, at the end of No. 6, after the list of all the different programs, there was a statement that Laidlaw will encourage suppliers to enroll in these programs by creating an annual fund designated to help support suppliers in enrolling and/or maintaining enrollment in a program of their choice. And I'm having trouble finding that in this newer draft. And if it's not here, could you just explain why.
A. Well, I think --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: It's deleted.
MR. BRAVAKIS: Huh?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: We deleted it.
A. We deleted it, yeah. I think 7 and 8 were
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to replace that, the programs to provide financial incentives on the forestry and on the logging end of things. And I believe, if I recall, the evolution of these two sections, 7 and 8 , were a result of meetings with foresters, procurement folks, and people with, for example, New Hampshire Timber Owners Association, of what the reality is out there. So we deleted that and replaced it with 7 and 8 , which we thought made more sense.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And actually, just to clarify, I don't think it was replaced with 8 . I think 8 was already there and we flushed out the numbers. I think that we dropped that provision and replaced it with No. 7, with the scholarship program. And I think, my recollection was that in discussing the program that we had envisioned with more people, it sounded like making some money available to encourage people to enroll in these programs was not likely to incentivize too people to enroll because of the size of the wood lots at issue and the expense associated with developing management
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plans, even for, say, American Tree Farm Properties. So the input we got was that this might be a better way to make a contribution. DIR. MUZZEY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Other
questions?
INTERROGATORIES BY CHAIRMAN BURACK:
Q. Mr. Bravakis, couple of quick questions here. On Paragraph 8 here, this mentions creation of a Laidlaw Professional Logger Fund. But, unlike Paragraph 7, this does not indicate who will administer and disburse those funds. Has that been decided?
A. That would be administered from our procurement -- from our management team at the plant.
Q. Thank you. Next, under the Reporting and Verification section, the prior draft, your Exhibit 60, included a list of some eight different elements that would be reported on, looks like a calendar-year basis. This is now a list of four items, as opposed to
eight. What's not clear to me is whether some of those eight items under the original 60 are now to be incorporated under Paragraph 9. I'm wondering if you could just clarify for us what the intentions are, if you can, and why you would reduce that list.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I believe that that's correct. I believe that new Paragraph 9 was intended to capture some of those. But I don't know...
A. Yeah, we deleted that.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I mean, for example, it's being pointed out to me that at least two of them related to the paragraph that Director Muzzey just made reference to that were deleted, so they were no longer applicable. And I believe others were subsumed in 9, but I'm not positive.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay.

## BY CHAIRMAN BURACK:

Q. Did you, in your discussions with counsel for the public -- and I'm not sure if this is a question for you, Mr . Bravakis, or Mr .
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Needleman. Was there discussion of including any other broader parameters or broader indicators of what's happening on the forest overall, such as the FIA data that we've talked about in prior hearing sessions? Was there any discussion of including some of those data in these reports?
A. No.
Q. Is there a reason why you did not consider that?
A. It never came up. We didn't -- nobody brought it up. We didn't feel it was relevant for what we were trying to do here.
Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Any other questions?

COMM. IGNATIUS: Mr. Chairman.
INTERROGATORIES BY COMM. IGNATIUS:
Q. I'm sorry. I should have asked this before.

And I'm not asking you to go into any confidential information here. But I'm suddenly finding myself confused as to the relationship between the procurement
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personnel that you describe in Section 1 and the Cousineau people and how this document relates to the Cousineau agreement.
A. All right. This document will be an exhibit to the Cousineau agreement. They will need to adhere to these policies and conditions. We will have licensed -- well, I don't know about licensing. But we will have procurement personnel of our own in addition to Cousineau's personnel on site. So they will make sure that this is administered properly.
Q. And that was the case when it was still Exhibit 60; it was to be an attachment to the agreement with Cousineau?
A. That's correct.
Q. So, in the reference to LBB's procurement personnel being licensed foresters in Line 1 -- Item 1 -- excuse me -- is that referring only to the Laidlaw employees, none of the Cousineau people?
A. I would -- yeah, safe to say that, you know, Cousineau would be LBB's procurement personnel under contract. So they would
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have a licensed forester. I don't know at this point, because we haven't evolved the staff to that level, whether we would also have a licensed forester or just some experienced procurement folks probably, too. I would expect that probably one of them would be a licensed forester and another one would be an assistant.
Q. Well, forgive me for my ignorance. But procurement personnel sounds a little bit like sanitation engineer. Is it a -- it doesn't mean a logger, does it?
A. No. No, it means somebody who's going to go out and actually procure the wood, going to buy the wood. Basically buy the wood, set up the contracts, work on what the price it's going to come in at. So they're managing the procurement process. They're not making the wood chips.
Q. Okay.
A. They're not logging. They're buying it from the suppliers. In most parts, the suppliers would be the loggers, or perhaps truckers sometimes, or maybe other brokers.
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Q. I know I asked you this before. But the reach of that first sentence in No. 1 is how broad?
A. I'm not sure $I$ follow the question.
Q. LBB's procurement personnel shall be licensed foresters. And I'm asking you, is that the two or three people you may hire at Laidlaw? Is it those two or three people plus Cousineau and the people that Cousineau's organization identifies as procurement personnel?
A. Okay. I can say with certainty that the Cousineau personnel will have a licensed forester or foresters. I cannot say at this point whether our procurement team will also include a licensed forester. My sense is that we probably would have one as well. So the -- remember, Cousineau is going to have personnel that are dedicated and go to work at the site every day, at the project every day. So, by virtue of their contract and extension, they would -- through subcontract, they could be considered LBB procurement personnel. So there will be a
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licensed forester there. Whether or not we have an additional licensed forester, my sense is we probably will. But I don't want to misspeak. We haven't evolved our personnel docket to that degree yet. We have two places in there for procurement people, so --
Q. Well --
A. I don't know if I'm answering your question or not. Sounds like I'm not.
Q. Well, as $I$ would read it, once you execute this, they must be licensed foresters. You just said that they will be. So I guess I don't follow the uncertainty in your answer.
A. Yeah. I know the Cousineau folks who will work for us under subcontract will have a licensed forester. We will, in addition to that, who will also work for us, we will have personnel. Whether they need to be a licensed forester or not, we just have to see how the efficient use of the resources --

MR. KUSCHE: I can further
enlighten you, I hope, on that. My experience
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with biomass plant management goes back a couple decades. A smaller plant, but nevertheless.

I think we can safely state
that, either under contract or directly as an employee, we will have a licensed forester. And the reason I make that distinction is we may find it's more efficient for us to hire on a contract basis a professional forester, a licensed forester, for oversight of the Cousineau performance. But we will definitely want independent verification for us that they are complying. So, Lou's not directly involved in the operations side of things. But we will have oversight of Cousineau, and we will use a professional forester to do that. Whether it's on a contract basis or as an employee, we haven't made that decision yet.
Q. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Any further
questions? Attorney Iacopino.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Mr. Bravakis, do you know the name of the licensed forester who works for Cousineau?
A. I know his first name.
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MR. BRAVAKIS: What was his last name? John? The fellow that was at the meeting that day.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Oh, I don't remember his name.
A. I can get that for you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Very good. Thank you very much, Mr. Bravakis. You probably can stay in that seat because we may need you back here in a moment when we go into non-public session again.

Just to clarify for folks what we're going to do here, $I$ expect in a moment we will have a motion to enter into non-public session to review confidential materials, the amendment to the Cousineau fuel supply agreement.

Assuming that we have a majority of the Subcommittee voting to go into non-public session -- I'm sorry -- confidential session, we will do so. I do not expect that to be an extended period of time. We will ask all members of the public -- that would be everyone here
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other than the Subcommittee, the representatives of the Applicant and counsel for the public -- we would ask you all to please leave the room as expeditiously as you can. As soon as we've concluded that confidential session, we will come back into public session, and then we will hear closing arguments from the parties, followed by public comments from any other members of the public who would like to share comments with us on this matter today.

I will note that I have received today, a short a while ago, a statement or letter from Max Makaitis of the Androscoggin Valley Economic Development Program, which we will enter into the file as a public comment. And my earlier poll identified two individuals who wanted to make public comment to close. Just want to confirm that there's still two folks.

Mr. Makaitis, is that correct?
MR. MAKAITIS: Correct.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: And, sir,
your name is?
MR. CASEY: Joe Casey.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Joe Casey.
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Thank you. So we will take those gentlemen up in that order when we get to the public comment session.

Mr. Northrop, do you have a motion for us?

MR. NORTHROP: Yes, Mr.
Chairman. I move we enter into non-public session to discuss the content of material deemed confidential under RSA 91-A:5. The documents in question are Applicant Exhibit 62, Cousineau Draft Fuel Supply Agreement and Applicant 76-A, Amendment to the Cousineau Fuel Supply Agreement. As presiding officer, you have previously determined that these documents are exempted from the Right-To-Know Law under RSA 91-A:5, IV, as records pertaining to confidential, commercial and financial information, and have been provided to the Committee under seal.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Is there a second to this motion?

DIR. MUZZEY: Mr. Chairman, I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
We'll ask that a roll call vote be taken.
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[WITNESS: BRAVAKIS]
And it appears that all
members of the public have done so. Would you
please close the door. Thank you.
(PAGES 52 THROUGH 75 REGARDING THE
CONFIDENTIAL, NON-PUBLIC SESSION ARE
CONTAINED UNDER SEPARATE COVER.)
(HEARING RESUMES ON THE PUBLIC PORTION
OF THE RECORD.)
(PUBLIC HEARING RESUMED at 2:45 p.m.) CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. We are now back in public session. I'm going to ask Mr. Northrop if he has a motion for us. MR. NORTHROP: Yes, Mr.

Chairman. I move to seal the transcript of the non-public session because the contents of the transcript involve documents that have been found to be exempt from public disclosure, pursuant to RSA 91-A:5, IV, as confidential, commercial and financial documents.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you,
Mr. Northrop. Is there a second to that motion? MR. JANNELLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Second to that motion from Mr. Jannelle.

I see we're missing one of our members. But I think we can proceed to -- she's coming right now.

MR. IACOPINO: You want me to
call the roll?
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Yeah, go
ahead and call the roll, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Dr. Kent.
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public session.
While we were in non-public session, a question was asked, which I determined was more appropriately asked in public session, and so I'm going to ask Commissioner Ignatius if she wishes to ask a question of these gentlemen.

COMM. IGNATIUS: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
COMM. IGNATIUS: Mr. Bravakis,
I asked you about the relationship between the City of Berlin's agreement with Laidlaw to have a preference for local loggers supplying wood and how that might tie to the fuel supply agreement with Cousineau overall. Can you help explain how those two things fit together.

MR. BRAVAKIS: Yes. I responded that Cousineau would have to act in accordance with our -- with the conditions of our permit, which would be attached to the City's stipulations, which clearly gives preference to local loggers. But we took it one step further and said that we think it would be a good addition to the Cousineau supply agreement if we added this language directly. And I'll read it,
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if I may.
COMM. IGNATIUS: Please.
MR. BRAVAKIS: It's Section 8
in the stipulations with the City. I don't know what --

CHAIRMAN BURACK: This is City of Berlin Exhibit 5; is that correct?

MR. BRAVAKIS: I apologize. I
don't have a stamp on this.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Well, it is not stamped. We labeled it manually. But I believe you are referring to City of Berlin Exhibit 5.

MR. BRAVAKIS: Okay. Thank you.

And it says, "To the extent feasible, and economically reasonable, Laidlaw shall use its best effort to prioritize the purchase of wood fuel from local owner/operators, so long as the fuel is procured from timber harvests that adhere to Laidlaw's sustainability and procurement policies as..." you know, alluding to our Laidlaw Berlin BioPower, LLC sustainability conditions. So we will add that
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section to the wood supply agreement with Cousineau, in those exact words.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: If I can
clarify one point? I'm told it already has been added.

MR. BRAVAKIS: Oh, okay.
COMM. IGNATIUS: Thank you.
Sounds as though our Exhibit 62 has been amended with the Exhibit 76-A, and yet amended further as Mr. Needleman pointed out. So it sounds as though, for the record, if it hasn't already been submitted, the complete version of the fuel supply agreement be submitted both in confidential and redacted form.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: We can do
that.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.
Any questions at all from Attorney Rodier?
Anything on this? You all set?
MR. RODIER: Sure. Fine. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay? So you're ready to make a closing argument? MR. RODIER: I am. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Very
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good.
Let me just -- before we get to that, let me just review with folks how we will proceed here. What I'm going to ask the parties to do is to make their closing arguments in this order: We'll hear first from counsel for Clean Power Development; then, Counsel for the Public, if you wish to make a closing argument, you may do so; and then we'll ask the Applicant to make its closing arguments. Following those arguments, $I$ will hear from -- or we will hear from two members of the public who wish to make public comment. Again, I will ask those individuals to please keep your comments brief, if you can, five minutes or less. And anything you wish to submit to us in writing as a written statement we would be happy to receive. In fact, our record will remain open until we issue a final order in this, or a decision in this matter. But the sooner you're able to provide written statements, if you wish to do so, the better.

In terms of other scheduling,
I would ask that any other documents that were
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requested, or information that in testimony individuals indicated would be provided, that those be provided to the Committee not later than next Monday, if you could please, so that we have an opportunity to get those out to all the parties.

In addition, if there are going to be revised or new stipulations among or between any of the parties, I would ask those be provided to us certainly by next Friday, the 17 th , as well.

In addition, I had indicated when we closed our hearing, more than a week ago now, that we would ask that any closing memoranda be submitted to us by next Friday, the 17th. I am not going to ask folks to change that, but I would point out that you have been receiving copies of the transcripts. I believe you're probably up to date with all the transcripts for the sessions that we've held to date. And so I would ask you, if possible, if you can provide us with your closing memoranda sooner than this coming -- or sooner than Friday, the 17 th , certainly by the 16 th or sooner, that would be
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appreciated. But again, I'm not going to change that deadline on you without any prior notice. It would just be helpful to the Committee to have -- or the Subcommittee to have some time to review those memoranda before we actually sit down and begin our deliberations on Monday, the 20th. So those are the other scheduling items that $I$ have for you at this time.

Just for those who are not aware or were not present at our earlier sessions when we discussed this, the Subcommittee has set aside at least September 20, 21 and 22 for purposes of deliberation, possibly the 23rd. I don't necessarily expect that we will deliberate fully 9:00 to 5:00 on every single one of those days. We will let folks know a final schedule as soon as we're able to assess the availability of all the Subcommittee members. But most days we will probably convene starting at 9:00 here in this room. I do not yet know whether it will be necessary for us to deliberate at any time in confidential session. But if so, if that becomes necessary, we will do so. So that is our current intention and schedule.
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MR. IACOPINO: One of those days, and $I$ have forgotten which one it is, Mr . Chairman, we will actually not be deliberating in this room, but be in the small hearing room across the back hall here. And we'll make sure that everybody knows what day that is. PUC has a hearing scheduled in here I believe one of those days.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Just to be clear, we will deliberate for as long as it takes us to come to a final decision in this matter. That may entail all of those days, or it may require fewer than all of those days, just so that folks understand that's our plan for how we will proceed.

I might also point out here that Mr. Northrop may need to leave early. But he will be able to review the transcripts of the closing arguments, as well as the public comments. But I don't want anybody to be surprised if we see him having to leave to attend to a personal matter that he needs to address. So, with that, Attorney

Rodier, if you would please provide us with
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your --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr.
Chairman --
CHAIRMAN BURACK: I would certainly, yes, excuse these witnesses.
(Witnesses excused.)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Gentlemen,
thank you very much. I want to say thank you to all the witnesses for all of the parties for their participation in this process. It's very helpful to the Subcommittee, and we appreciate their efforts, just as we appreciate the efforts and the attention of all of the counsel and their assistants throughout this process. So, thank you all very much.

Attorney Rodier, please. CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. RODIER: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
In my experience, usually in
large -- I would say this was a large hearing -in the end it boiled down to a few conceptually, I think, simple issues, but are probably factually difficult. And I think, you know, what

I'm going to do here is address three or four issues that $I$ feel are determinative. I think there's a multitude of things you got to address in the order. But $I$ don't think there's too many that really are in the category, at this point, of being determinative. So that's what I'm going to focus on.

The first one is granting the certificate. It is CPD's view that a certificate can only be granted if the Applicant demonstrates that it is financially capable to construct and operate the plant. I think that's a pretty good paraphrase of the law. But there's another, I would say, pretty good summation of this point in Mr. Bartoszek's testimony, Page 4 in his prefiled testimony, where he says, "Under RSA 162-H:16, in order to obtain a certificate of site and facility, the Applicant must show it has adequate financial capability to construct and operate the project in order to obtain the certificate." That means you can't obtain a certificate if you can't show -- they have the burden of proof. They must show adequate financial capability. Without belaboring the record here, I think it's
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very clear from the record that there is no financial capability at this motion -- at this moment. It doesn't exist. And why is there no financial capability? Because the PPA is an essential element of their financial ability. And I think one of the Applicant's data responses that I referred to someplace says, "no PPA approved, no financing." What do they mean by "no PPA approved"? Well, it's over at the PUC now, as you all know. They're saying -- the Applicant is saying we need a final, unappealable order by November 14th. Presumably, that's a reference to the fact that not only does the PUC have to conduct hearings similar, if not greater in magnitude than we just went through here for the last nine months, but you've got to write out the motions for rehearings and any possible appeals. Just like this Committee, go back and see what a typical proceeding of this kind might take at the PUC, and it's going to take a year or it could take two years. So that's really the context that the Committee is operating under. I know very much that the

Committee wants to do its job. You want to
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render a decision within the statutory framework. But this project is at a dead stop unless and until the PUC and the courts sign off on that PPA. So that is really what my first point here is on the financing and on the so-called timeline in the context of these hearings.

Now, one other thing they told the PUC in their filing over at the PUC was that it's critical for the financing to have a decision by November 14th. Critical for the financing. It's got to be by November 14th. So, I think that's another thing in assessing the mandate here in 162-H:16.

Now, the Applicant has said in its filing, well, this is what we'll do: We'll take the same deal that the Committee gave to Granite Reliable. You get a certificate, but your construction can't start until Granite Reliable had to come back and show it had its financing in place. This is different. In the Granite Reliable proceeding, the Commission found that they were financially capable. But because of the current turmoil in the markets, they said, well, look we're going to award you the
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certificate. You can obtain the certificate, but you cannot commence construction. You have to come back, and we have to sign off on your financing package. So we disagree with the Applicant that the Granite Reliable decision in any way would set a precedent to be applied in this case.

The second matter that I want to address is another point of law, RSA 162-H:64. Now, this statutory provision requires that the Committee consider available alternatives in the context of the objectives of $162-\mathrm{H}$. Now, I would concede in prior decisions of this Committee, they have construed this provision to just ask the Applicant, Have you looked at alternative sites? Typically, they say, yeah, we looked at this and we looked at that. But the statute says the Committee must consider available alternatives. It doesn't just say sites. It says you must consider available alternatives to carry out the purposes of $162-\mathrm{H}$.

So, here we are. We've got
two projects. You're considering one. And we believe that, by law, you're required to consider
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available alternatives to that. Now, I don't think, in my mind, anyway, there's any question that if CPD somehow had the PPA with Public Service, that everybody in the North Country, you know, who's in favor of the Laidlaw project, would be supporting CPD, because that's what it's all about: It's the guy who has the deal with the PSNH.

You've got the record on the CPD project. CPD was in here in, I guess it was Docket 2009-03. So you have the information on that. You recently got some information today. For example, without getting into it, you heard today, CPD is a highly efficient plant, going to have much less impact on the neighboring projects and on the transmission limitations.

So that is our contention, that the law would require for the Committee to consider available alternatives to achieve state energy policy and to balance energy supply and demand I believe is one of the purposes of the statute.

Moving on. We get to this issue of -- I'm on the third of my four points,
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by the way, if anybody's following, the orderly development. You know, we think the proposed facility, the Applicant's proposed facility's going to interfere with the orderly development of the region. And the reason that we say that became apparent today. This is why we have hearings, by the way. Because, for example, if you consider Applicant's prefiled testimony on transmission, everyone was fine. There's no issues whatsoever, okay. Turns out there are issues, okay. How powerful the testimony you heard today is something that you're going to have to evaluate. But there are transmission issues that came to the floor today through Mr. Gabler's testimony. I don't have to repeat it. But there are going to be impacts on not just CPD, perhaps on Laidlaw itself, but also on these other plants, like the Brookfield Hydro project in Berlin, Whitefield and the Smith Hydro. Those are going to be real impacts. And again, there's a bigger picture here. The bigger picture is that the legislature's been laboring on all these issues for years. And I forget what somebody said earlier. I guess there's going to be -- the
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big report's going to come landing in probably right in the middle of your deliberations on how to allocate the cost of these needed transmission upgrades and to eliminate the constraints that are going to exist under this MIS system. With regard to biomass, you
know, Mr. Harrington really boiled it down well when he said we don't have to harp on a lot of this other stuff, like rules of thumb and some of these other things, because it really comes down to price. Availability of biomass comes at a price. I think both Mr. Liston and Mr. Richmond, they both conceded, yeah, you could build one of these plants in Boston if you're willing to pay for the wood. You know, you can get it -- if you can somehow pay for it, you had customers for your electricity, that you could get it done. So it's really about ability to pay. And, as we were discussing earlier today, what the difference here is, is that you got these other guys -- and I'll put CPD in that category. CPD, to some extent, has its nose up against the window as well. It doesn't have a PPA like this project has, okay. And not speaking for CPD, but
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I'm pretty sure these other guys -- I don't know. You're heard from four or five plants so far. You've also heard from Bob Berti of North Country Procurement. He's a very large organization in this state. He told me he's got a bigger operation than Cousineau. You know, you've heard these people are going to be put in jeopardy. It's not just because there's not enough wood, it's that -- Mr. Berti said this was a very, very large plant. It's too large. If you -- in and of itself, that's not the only factor here. It's the factor that they jumped into the pool with the 800-pound gorilla, okay. And if it raises the market price, it raises the market price for Schiller. But the Laidlaw project recoups their cost of fuel at whatever the cost of fuel is at Schiller.

By the way, $I$ remind you, it took a long time for the Laidlaw witness to surface this issue. We got to the point where $I$ had to get out the testimony filed with the PUC and have it read into the record before he'd even give some kind of concession about this index of the cost of what PSNH would pay Laidlaw, based
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upon the cost of fuel at Schiller. So, be mindful of that.
So, we really believe that
there's a good chance that jobs are going -- more jobs are going to be lost than are going to be created. Now, yeah, the jobs are going to be created in Berlin. So I think the people in Berlin -- and I would certainly, if I was out of work, you know, I'd say, Hey, I will take the job and I won't worry about the guy over in Whitefield or Bridgewater or Alexandria. You know, he's got to keep his own nose above water. That's kind of the way people think. I certainly can understand that. But you're supposed to be looking at what is the greater good here.

People asked CPD, Well, have you done any studies on this? And no. They don't have the burden of proof. It's not CPD's job to really do this. I think CPD has done a really good job surfacing the issue. It is somebody else's job to do this. And at this point, that somebody else should be the PUC. PUC has expertise, has resources, has the ability to study all these issues, it has a staff. It can
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tell PSNH to pay for such a study done by a consultant for the state. I think this is a critical issue here of whether or not the Laidlaw project is going to disrupt the public good or the orderly development of the region, which I say is another reason I would suggest the Committee say, well, nothing's going to happen until the PUC makes a decision, anyway. Let's let the PUC and its experts deal with the PPA and deal with the effect. They have jurisdiction over all these existing biomass producers. Somebody has said at one point, biomass facilities -- somebody said that right until the end none of these guys showed up. Why didn't they show up until now? Well, they didn't really know about these hearings. But beyond that, the PPA wasn't out in the open. Do you recall when the PPA was first filed with this Committee? It was subject to a motion for protective order. It wasn't until two weeks later that it was available on the PUC Web site. That's when everybody first got it and said, my God, look at the pass-through feature, the pricing power, the ability to set the market
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here, control the market on the price of wood that's going to result from this. That's when -and that was probably three weeks ago that this first became available, and that's why you're seeing people. I believe they would have intervened earlier, when they're coming out of the woodwork now. That, plus the fact that anybody who's still trying to get a deal out of Public Service at this point is not going to show their face over here and say something critical of what's going on here. What you're saying is the projects that are coming in here are the ones that are saying it's useless. We're not going to get any kind of a deal out of PSNH. We have nothing to lose now by going over and saying really how we feel about this thing and what it's going to do to us if it gets approved, if it gets constructed.

Finally, who should the
Applicant be? Now, we did have -- there's been a number of changes here at the eleventh hour. But beyond the eleventh hour, we have the so-called NewCo takeover on the eve of the hearings. You know, what happened here? NewCo did come in and
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take over this project. Kind of a risky thing to do on the eve of the hearings. Why did they do that? There was a very compelling reason to do that. I think they needed to have control at this point. But that's just my conjecture, trying to summarize the evidence.

But in any event, NewCo, they
own Aware Energy. Aware Energy turns around and owns the PJPD. PJPD is going to own the land and they're going to own the facility they're going to lease to Laidlaw. So you remember the chart that was on the screen there. NewCo owns a hundred percent of Aware. Aware owns a hundred percent of PJPD, the asset owner. The asset owner's, by the way, place of business is a house in Portsmouth. I don't think that should give you much comfort, really, about who you're dealing with here.

The Applicant described these all as bankruptcy-remote special-purpose entities. Do you know what those are? If things go wrong, you're serving a summons on a mailbox, parcel room or whatever it might be. That's really what special-purpose bankruptcy-remote
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entities are, to put firewalls in, in case anything goes wrong. You know, NewCo's got not just one entity. They can put a couple in there, which certainly I would understand gives their investors great comfort.

Now, in addition to that,
NewCo's going to own a hundred percent of LLB [sic]. And the same three gentlemen that are on the management board of NewCo are also the managing members of LLB. They are going to run LLB. So it's really NewCo. You strip away the special entities here that are in place as a firewall in case trouble comes up in the future, you really get to see -- behind the screen you really get to see NewCo.

Now, in addition, you'll
recall, maybe, when I cross-examined Mr. Strickler, I had one question. I pointed to his testimony and said, Look, Mr. Strickler, this says that Homeland, Carl Strickler, are going to report directly to NewCo, and you're in charge of construction and operation. He said that's right. A couple days later I see that the chart is different. You may recall I went back and I
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said -- asked him about this. I had to go up and show him his testimony and have him read it again. It was very clear his testimony was that, after the reorganization, Homeland was under contract to NewCo, not LLB. That, he said, subsequently, well, I'm trying to clarify, I think is what he said. The substance of it here is it's NewCo that is running the show, that's going to make all the decisions. And I don't think New Hampshire law, when it says, you know, construction of a project, it's the guy who's going to be in the construction of the project, that it has to mean it's LLB. LLB, in that 74 , by the way -- LBB? I'm sorry -- is now described as a development entity. It's not an owner and operator of power plants. It's a development entity. You're looking at the people who develop a project and sell it. That's typically what that model is, okay. So you have to ask yourself: Should we really be dealing with a development entity whose principals are going to be gone as soon as the dust clears; or should we be dealing with the real company that is really
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in charge of what's going on here, calling all the shots, and that is NewCo.

So, there you have it. Those
are what $I$ believe are the issues that are going to determine how you come out on this. And I am comforted by the fact that the way the hearings have been conducted, that you're going to do your job well and you're going to do it fairly and you're going to do it thoroughly.

And the last thing I got to say, I'm going to try to get something written in, you know, by September 19th maybe, 20. It's going to be similar to this. I hope you'll take a look at it. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you
very much. Attorney Rodier, just to clarify, again, in terms of what $I$ had indicated previously in terms of when we would like to see written closing arguments. I asked you -- I would ask you to get them to us by a week from today -- that is, the 17 th , not the 19 th .

MR. RODIER: Sorry. Yeah.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: No problem.
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I just want to make sure we're all clear in our understandings here. So that would be most helpful.

MR. RODIER: Right.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Again, thank
you very much, Mr. Rodier.
Attorney Brooks, do you have any closing statements?

MR. BROOKS: No, thank you.
CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Thank you very much. Attorney Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you, Mr.
Chair. One housekeeping matter before I do. We would ask at this point that all of our remaining exhibits that have not yet been admitted into the record now be moved in, please.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: We will do that. Is there any objection to that?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: No
objection? Okay. Hearing no objection, I'll grant that motion, and we will move all those exhibits into the record.
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## CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. I recognize that this has been a long process, and it is one that we initiated by filing this application. And I just want to acknowledge that I thank the Committee for their patience and their hard work in processing this application.

We have tried right from the beginning and through the course of this entire proceeding to focus our efforts on the statutory criteria and what it is we need to prove in order to receive the certificate of site and facility. And I want to address my closing comments in that context.

The first requirement is, as
Mr. Rodier said, that we demonstrate we have adequate financial, technical and managerial capability to assure construction and operation of the facility and continuing compliance with the terms and the conditions of the certificate. You heard extensive testimony. And there have been extensive documents put into the record from Mr. Bartoszek on the financial issues, and from Mr. Strickler and others on the managerial and
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technical issues. We maintain that the team that we have assembled and the information we have provided to you unequivocally demonstrates that we have the capability to do those things under the statute. And in the interest of brevity, I'm not going to go through all of the evidence. You've seen it all and heard it all and are well capable of sifting through it.

I will certainly note that I was somewhat surprised by Mr. Rodier's statement suggesting that CPD doesn't believe we have that capability. On Day 5, in the afternoon, Dr. Kent specifically asked Mr. Liston, quote, Are you suggesting that Laidlaw does not have adequate financial, technical or managerial capability to construct and operate a facility, close quote? Mr. Liston answered, No. So I thought from CPD's perspective that issue was off the table, and certainly CPD's sworn testimony suggests it's off the table.

I would also note with respect to the suggestion that an alternatives analysis needs to somehow include other facilities that are seeking to construct, that's simply not what
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the statute says. The statute requires this entity, this Applicant before you, to consider alternatives to the project it's proposing. That issue is specifically addressed and discussed by the Committee and is also contained in our materials.

I'm going to jump ahead for a minute here to the fourth criteria, because we can dispose of it quickly, which is the operation of the facility has to be consistent with the state energy policy. I actually don't believe we touched on that at all during the proceeding. But I will point out that we specifically addressed that issue in our application, and Mr. Kusche specifically addressed that issue with his prefiled testimony. And when the Committee deliberates, you have that material in front of you as well.
The third -- the next criteria
is that we will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region -- and I'm going to emphasize the next part -- with due consideration having been given to the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and
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municipal governing bodies. Well, we think that this project is entirely consistent with furthering the orderly development of the region. And frankly, we believe there's little question about that. It has very wide support in the North Country. And you've seen that in the various public officials that have come in and the ones that you need to give consideration to under the statute. You saw the Mayor of Berlin and the witness for the City come in and testify that it's consistent with orderly regional development. You saw the Chair of the Coos County Commissioners, Chairman Judd, come in and testify as much. You also heard Counselor Ray Burton come in and testify as much. We think that type of widespread, deep, strong political support is exactly the type of support that you need to be looking to in factoring when you make this determination under the statute about orderly regional development.
And I think it's also worth
asking the question, as you think about this:
Why does it have such strong political support?
And the reasons are obvious. This project is
\{SEC 2009-02\} (DAY 6-PUBLIC SESSION) \{9/10/10\}
going to infuse a great deal of construction money into the local economy. When it's up and operating, it's going to have 40 well-paying jobs. It will have annual purchases of fuel that -- I don't think we ever put a number on it -- will be, $I$ think, tens of millions of dollars annually. It's expected to be one of the largest taxpayers in Berlin. And then it's got all sorts of other benefits that are directly tied to the community, including the agreement with the Gorham mill and all of the important features that are contained in the stipulation that we negotiated and signed with the City.

Another essential feature of this that came out during the course of this proceeding, the New Market Tax Credits. These New Market Tax Credits are not something that is necessary for this project to be financed. What they do is they enhance the ability of the project to be financed. When we talk about deadlines and the need to get this project done quickly, we do it largely with that issue in mind, and we do it not only because will the New Market Tax Credits benefit this project, but they
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will provide enormous benefits to the city of Berlin. And you've heard about those benefits. And we would very much like to see the City as, our host community, get access to those benefits. Now, you've heard various adverse comments, and we've addressed those during the course of the proceeding. And I would only observe that certainly you are entitled and should consider those comments. But as I hope became clear with some of the questioning of Mr. Gabler and others, what we are hearing is largely an issue of competitive concern, an issue that certainly is understandable from the perspective of those competitors, including CPD, but one that ultimately is really not an issue that I think fits within the box of the notion of orderly regional development. It's one that $I$ think, in the end, as has been suggested in some cases, is really one best left to the market. And when I cited to you the Committee's order this morning, the Committee knows better than I do what it had in mind. But that order certainly suggests to me that these types of pricing discussions are ones that are beyond things that the Committee would
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be inclined to consider.
Now, when we go to the last
criteria -- it will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air, water quality, the natural environment, public health and safety -- I think it's fair to say that within that category, the one in particular that has unquestionably occupied most of the Committee's time is the question of fuel supply and sustainability. And I think it's also fair to say that right from the beginning we understood it was going to be an issue. And we worked very hard to try to address this in a way that, as been pointed out to you, is a voluntary effort, but, nonetheless, one we think is very significant, and really goes beyond anything that other facilities in the state have done. And we undertook that effort with a recognition that landowners in this state, and in other states who supply fuel, have a strong incentive to be good stewards of their land, just like farmers have good incentive to be good stewards of their lands. And they're already doing an excellent job of protecting resources in many cases. And I
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think that both Mr. Richmond and Mr. Stock, the president of the Timber Owners Association, did a very good job of describing those types of incentives. And what we wanted to do in coming up with this sustainability condition was to harness those incentives and to come up with a way that was going to encourage sustainable harvesting, but at the same time reflect what we think is a very important balance that we understood and came to understand better by talking to all of these various constituents.
And when I tell you that the sustainability condition that's been presented to you is the product of hours of conversation and seeking widespread input from a wide range of constituencies and represents our best effort at a very careful balancing act among all of these constituencies, I don't think I'm in any way overstating that. We're proud of that condition. We think that condition accomplishes a great deal and will serve as a great guide going forward for the state. And because we have worked so hard on it, and because it represents such a careful balancing in such a complex area, we are asking
that the Committee adopt that condition and make it part of the certificate as it is, without any further changes.

Let me just conclude by saying
that, in summary, I think that we have unequivocally met all of the criteria that entitle us to a certificate. You have an extensive record before you that I think now demonstrates that. And in light of that record, and in light of all the evidence you've heard and taken, we respectfully request that you issue that certificate to us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you
very much, Attorney Needleman.
Okay. I'm going to now take public comment. I understand there are two individuals who wish to do so. And I would ask those individuals if they would come sit in the seat behind Attorney Needleman here so we can use this microphone here. And please start by -- Mr. Makaitis, go ahead. Just start by introducing yourself and spelling your name for the record, please.
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PUBLIC COMMENT BY MAX MAKAITIS MR. MAKAITIS: I am Max

Makaitis. It's M-A-X, M-A-K-A-I-T-I-S. I'm the Androscoggin Valley Economic Development Director, and I represent AVER, which is the Androscoggin Valley Economic Recovery Corp. It's a non-profit 501 (c) (3) whose sole objective is economic development and job retention, job creation.

AVER has supported the project in question, the Laidlaw project, and we are doing that because of the bottom line. The bottom line is that, in this economy, what is needed is the creation of jobs, and the creation of jobs as soon as possible. That piece of the equation is what's important to us, because there are a lot of people that were here and represented and spoke, and a lot of people that weren't. And I think we represent the people who may not have been, and those are the people that are unemployed in Berlin. Those are the people in the regional area, the loggers and truckers that need jobs, that have difficulty paying their mortgage payments or maybe even losing their
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homes and putting their children through school. And that's why we want to advocate for this project.

And I want Mr. Chairman and the Subcommittee to know that if the situation were reversed, if Clean Power Development was sitting over here and Laidlaw was sitting over there, and Clean Power had the power purchase agreement, we would be advocating for Clean Power, because they also create jobs, provide logging jobs and provide additional excess power, excess heat potential to other businesses.

So we advocate for the
business -- for the industry and the development of a business that has the largest economic driver, which is biomass energy, for our region and creates employment. And what we're advocating for is a timely decision process because of the fact that there are $\$ 44$ million of New Market Tax Credit authority that have deadlines; there are two and a quarter million dollars of local community revolving loan funds that hinge on those New Market Tax Credits and supporting benefits related to borrowing that
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would be leveraged from those; there is a half-million dollars of direct economic benefit from those credits also for the city of Berlin, and $\$ 250,000$ of grants that would be available for jobs, equipment and safety and sustainable forestry training. So, the timing -- and I know that this has to be done in a process. I know that it's impossible sometimes to do. But I guess we advocate a decision be made as soon as possible, whether it's conditional, and what the conditions are. I think the issues that have been addressed satisfy the requirements of what is needed to justify and support a positive decision.

And we also advocate that the PUC hopefully will do the same and come to some decision -- yes, no, or, yes, conditionally -- in a timely manner so that these other benefits can be realized, and, most importantly, that these jobs can be created and put people to work as soon as possible. And I've provided a letter to that effect and thank you for the Comittee's time.

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you
\{SEC 2009-02\} (DAY 6-PUBLIC SESSION) \{9/10/10\}
very much, Mr. Makaitis. I'm not sure if you were in the room at the time I mentioned this, but we have received your letter which we will include as part of the public comment file in this proceeding. So, thank you very much. MR. MAKAITIS: You're welcome. CHAIRMAN BURACK: Sir, would you please introduce yourself.

PUBLIC COMMENT BY JOE CASEY
A. Good afternoon. My name is Joe Casey, $C-A-S-E-Y$, and I am the president of the New Hampshire Building and Construction Trades. I am an electrician by trade, and I have over 20 years in the construction industry. I actually worked at the Burgess site on numerous occasions for subcontractors. And now I am compensated to be the voice of the construction workers that $I$ represent.

Today, as we all have heard on numerous occasions, New Hampshire is doing very well in the employment -- in the unemployment in comparison to the rest of the country. That is right around a 6-percent unemployment rate. That's not the same in construction.
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Construction in the state of New Hampshire in July was right around 27 percent, and it has been this way for some time. And it is devastating to the people that work in the industry. And as we all know, no one's been hit harder than the North Country in Berlin.

In 2001, when Burgess first had a layoff, then Governor Shaheen reached out to me and, you know, asked if there was anything we could do to help these people. At the time, we were building two gas plants -- one in Newington and one in Londonderry -- and we were able to take a lot of these people and put them to work in the construction industry. A lot of them came into our apprenticeship programs and have learned the trade and are still with us today.

And I think it's important to know that Laidlaw has entered into an agreement with the New Hampshire Building Trades, a labor agreement, that will guarantee that the local people in that community will work on that project. It is the only way to
guarantee that local people will work on that project. The way we work is we exhaust our local resources before we search elsewhere for employees.

In yesterday's newspaper, they had a list of 850 employees working at the Manchester Elliot Hospital project. Of those 850, 120 of them were Berlin residents alone, not to mention Gorham and Whitefield and Groveton and the other communities up there that are really struggling. One hundred twenty are working over a hundred miles from their home. These people, they're resilient, I'll tell you. And they travel all over the place to work. But their home is Berlin, and that's where we want to live and that's where we want to work. And, you know, through a labor agreement with Laidlaw -- and it's really the high road, because it guarantees that these people will be making sustainable wages, with health insurance and retirement benefit, which is not the case in construction today. The last project that
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was going to help Berlin out was the federal prison that was recently built in Berlin. That was not done under a labor agreement. Essentially, a $\$ 220$ million was handed to a project manager who constructed the project and hired contractors and employees as he wished, and a lot of these people came from out of state; the contractors came from out of the state and brought in their own people. And I think if you ask around, Berlin really got the short end of the stick in that deal.

Laidlaw has decided to work with the community, with the local construction companies, with the local employees. And they're taking the high road. And they're going to pay substantial, livable wages, health insurance and pension. And that is very important to a community, because if you have employees working in a community that don't have those viable benefits, then they drain off of the community. They go to the hospital and they don't have insurance. You know, they have to be subsidized by the
state and other means. In today's market, for a developer to come in and commit to those conditions, when they know it's going to cost them additional money to construct -- but they also know they're going to get the skilled craftsman they need to construct their project. They're also going to help contribute to the training programs, where we can help train local residents from Berlin. We can start building the community.

The Building Trades is in support of all construction. We support everything and anything anybody wants to build. This is a 24- to 36-month project, which is -- this will be at the time, at the conclusion of the Bow Project, the biggest construction project in the state of New Hampshire. But since 2001, these people have been struggling. We've watched and followed and attended and participated in study committee after study committee, after study committee about what's going to happen to the loop, you know, where are these jobs going to come
from.
Here we are in 2010, almost 2011, and these people are still traveling all over the place. You know, I really want -- if you could all just put yourself into the shoes of a blue-collar worker who has to provide for his or her family, and the job is not in your community, what it does to you when you're not home at night. These guys come down and stay a week in Manchester and Portsmouth and Dover on couches of other construction workers. They're not at their kid's baseball games. They're not at their kid's -- in Berlin, it's hockey games, I should say. And they're not there. And it's a burden on them. And here's a project ready to go. And these people are ready to work it. And, you know, I'm proud to represent them. And, you know, I just -Laidlaw has stepped up to the plate. They're ready to pay the price. They're ready to come in and put people to work. And I hope we can support this in a timely manner. Thank you very much.
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CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Casey.

Again, we thank all the members of the public who have provided us with both written and oral comments in this proceeding. We will hold the public comment portion of the record open through the conclusion of this proceeding and issue a final document. But it will be most helpful if members of the public who do wish to submit written comments provide them within a week or so, and it would be helpful to have those by that time, if possible.

Any other housekeeping matters
from any of the parties?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN BURACK: All right.
Again, I would just ask the parties to please be in close communication with Attorney Iacopino as we pull together any remaining pieces that are expected to be submitted. Again, thank you all. And we will now adjourn this hearing portion of this proceeding.
(Hearing adjourned at 3:43 p.m.)
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| 26:1,2;30:8;32:15;36:4; | Public (52) | raises (2) | recognize | 42:3 |
| 37:11,13:38:1,21; | 6:1,6,16;7:4,13,18; | 93:13,14 | 102:3 | relating (2) |
| 115:16;118:9 | 9:6;12:10;14:11,22; | ran (2) | recognized (1) | 7:19;27:4 |
| prohibit (1) | 15:15;17:11;19:1,22; | 14:12,14 | 24:9 | relationship (2) |
| 27:16 | 20:8,24;22:24;23:7; | range (2) | recognizing (1) | 41:24;78:10 |
| project (45) | 28:21;40:23;47:24;48:2, | 13:17;109:1 | 10:21 | relevant (1) |
| 8:11;10:9;12:19,21, | 6,8,9,15,17;49:2;50:24; | rate (4) | recollection (2) | 41:14 |
| 22;13:3;21:12;28:14 | 51:2,7;76:1,3,9;78:1,4; | 35:8,8,13;114:24 | 10:10;38:18 | Reliable (4) |
| 29:20;36:2,5;44:20; | 81:8,12,13;84:19;90:3; | rather (1) | Recommended | 88:17,19,21;89 |
| 86:20;88:2;90:5,10; | 95:4;96:9;105:7;108:6; | 25:23 | 24:24;25:6 | remain (1) |
| 91:18;92:24;93:15;95:4; | 110:16;111:1;114:4,9; | Ray (1) | record (16) | 81:18 |
| 97:1;99:12,13,19;104:3; 105:2,24;106:18,20,21, | $120: 4,6,10$ <br> PUC (14) | $\begin{gathered} \text { 105:14 } \\ \text { Raymond (1) } \end{gathered}$ | 5:5,9;51:8;80:11; <br> 81:18:86:24:87:1:90.9. | remaining (2) 101:14;120:19 |
| 24;111:10,11;112:3; | 84:6;87:9,13,20;88:3, | $5: 14$ | 93:22;101:16,23; | remember (4) |
| 115:24;116:2,7,24; | 8,8;93:21;94:22,22;95:8, | reach (1) | 102:22;110:8,9,22;120:7 | 16:12;44:18;47:5; |
| 117:5,5;118:7,15,17,18; | 9,21;113:16 | 44:2 | recordkeeping (1) | 97:11 |


| remind (1) | 25:19;26:3;103:21 | Rodier (20) | screen (2) | Shaheen (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93:18 | respectfully (1) | 12:12,14,17;16:3,5,8, | 97:12;98:14 | 115:8 |
| remotely (1) | 110:11 | 11;31:3,5;80:18,20,23; | seal (2) | shall (2) |
| 17:10 | responded (1) | 84:24;85:16,18;100:17, | 49:18;76:6 | 44:5;79:18 |
| render (1) | 78:17 | 23;101:4,6;102:16 | sealed (1) | share (1) |
| 88:1 | response (4) | Rodier's (1) | 77:24 | 48:9 |
| renewable (1) | 19:11,14;101:19; | 103:10 | search (1) | shoes (1) |
| 16:16 | 120:15 | roll (3) | 116:3 | 119:6 |
| re-ordered (1) | responses (1) | 49:24;76:21,23 | seat (2) | short (2) |
| 27:9 | 87:6 | room (7) | 47:11;110:19 | 48:12;117:11 |
| reorganization (1) | rest (1) | 48:3;50:24;83:20; | second (6) | shortly (1) |
| 99:4 | 114:22 | 84:4,4;97:23;114:2 | 49:20,22;76:13,14,15; | 23:13 |
| repeat (2) | restricted (1) | Roth (2) | 89:8 | shots (1) |
| 23:1;91:15 | 36:20 | 6:6;22:16 | Section (8) | 100:2 |
| replace (1) | result (3) | RSA (5) | 15:23;22:18;29:1; | show (8) |
| 38:1 | 24:5;38:5;96:2 | 49:9,15;76:10;86:16; | 32:7;39:20;42:1;79:3; | 86:18,22,23;88:19; |
| replaced (3) | resulted (1) | 89:9 | 80:1 | 95:15;96:9;99:2,9 |
| 38:10,13,16 | 23:20 | rules (1) | sections (1) | showed (1) |
| report (1) | resulting (1) | 92:9 | 38:5 | 95:14 |
| 98:21 | 10:8 | run (3) | seeing (1) | shutdown (1) |
| reported (1) | resume (1) | 13:24;14:3;98:10 | 96:5 | 10:9 |
| 39:22 | 5:4 | running (1) | seeking (2) | side (4) |
| Reporting (2) | resumed (2) | 99:9 | 103:24;109:15 | 29:24;35:23,24;46:13 |
| 29:1;39:19 | 5:2;76:1 | Ryegate (1) | sell (2) | sifting (1) |
| reports (1) | resumes (2) | 36:22 | 28:14;99:19 | 103:8 |
| 41:8 | 21:23;51:7 |  | send (2) | sign (2) |
| report's (1) | retention (1) | S | 34:9,11 | 88:3;89:3 |
| 92:1 | 111:8 |  | sense (3) | signed (2) |
| represent (5) | retirement (1) | safe (2) | 38:11;44:16;45:3 | 6:4;106:13 |
| 21:12;111:5,19; | 116:22 | 35:6;42:22 | sent (1) | significant (2) |
| 114:18;119:19 | return (1) | safely (1) | 19:3 | 11:1;108:16 |
| representative (1) | 7:8 | 46:3 | sentence (2) | similar (4) |
| 9:7 | reversed (1) | safety (2) | 29:2;44:2 | 17:14;36:19;87:14; |
| representatives (1) | 112:6 | 108:6;113:5 | separate (2) | 100:13 |
| 48:1 | review (5) | sale (2) | 11:7;51:6 | simple (1) |
| represented (1) | 7:21;47:17;81:3;83:5; | 33:6;35:6 | September (5) | 85:23 |
| 111:18 | 84:18 | same (8) | 5:15,20;6:17;83:12; | simply (1) |
| represents (2) | reviewed (2) | 5:17;17:14;35:10; | 100:12 | 103:24 |
| 109:16,23 | 25:3;37:10 | 88:16;98:8;109:8; | seriously (1) | single (1) |
| request (1) | revised (4) | 113:16;114:24 | 14:10 | 83:15 |
| 110:11 | 20:6,12;31:12;82:8 | sanitation (1) | serve (1) | sit (3) |
| requested (1) | revoked (2) | 43:11 | 109:21 | 11:6;83:5;110:18 |
| 82:1 | 22:22;23:5 | satisfy (1) | Service (6) | site (6) |
| require (2) | revolving (1) | 113:12 | 14:12,23;15:15;17:11; | 42:10;44:20;86:17; |
| 84:13;90:18 | 112:22 | saw (3) | 90:4;96:9 | 95:21;102:12;114:15 |
| required (1) | Richmond (3) | 21:21;105:9,12 | Services (1) | sites (3) |
| 89:24 | 5:18;92:12;109:1 | saying (8) | 6:19 | 89:16,19;108:4 |
| requirement (1) | R-I-C-H-M-O-N-D (1) | 15:7;34:8;87:10,11; | serving (1) | sitting (2) |
| 102:15 | 5:19 | 96:11,13,15;110:4 | 97:22 | 112:7,7 |
| requirements (1) | right (24) | schedule (2) | session (17) | situation (1) |
| 113:12 | 12:5;14:14,18;15:5, | 83:16,24 | 7:21;47:13,17,21,21; | 112:5 |
| requires (2) | 11;17:18;18:10;19:1,4; | scheduled (1) | 48:5,6;49:3,8;50:23; | six (1) |
| 89:10;104:1 | 27:2;29:5;33:18;42:4; | 84:7 | 51:5;76:3,7;78:1,3,4; | 14:15 |
| residents (2) | 46:18;76:19;92:2;95:14; | scheduling (2) | 83:22 | size (1) |
| 116:8;118:10 | 98:23;101:4;102:8; | 81:23;83:7 | sessions (3) | 38:23 |
| residing (2) | 108:11;114:23;115:2; | Schiller (4) | 41:6;82:20;83:10 | skilled (1) |
| 26:12,14 | 120:16 | 18:21;93:15,17;94:1 | set (7) | 118:6 |
| resilient (1) | Right-To-Know (1) | scholarship (4) | 26:5,20;43:15;80:19; | small (2) |
| 116:14 | 49:15 | 26:6,10,21;38:17 | 83:11;89:6;95:24 | 22:9;84:4 |
| resources (4) | risky (1) | scholarships (1) | set-aside (1) | smaller (1) |
| 45:22;94:23;108:24; | 97:1 | 35:11 | 34:2 | 46:2 |
| $116: 3$ | road (2) | school (1) | SFI (1) | Smith (1) |
| respect (3) | 116:20;117:16 | 112:1 | 24:8 | 91:19 |
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { so-called (2) } \\ 88: 5 ; 96: 22 \\ \text { sole (1) } \\ 111: 7 \end{gathered}$ | ```stakeholders (1) 30:12 stamp (1)``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:8;115:17;119:3 } \\ & \text { stipulation (5) } \\ & \text { 5:24;7:14;19:21;20:3; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 8 ; 22: 16,24 ; 23: 2 \\ & 24: 6 ; 25: 8 ; 26: 4,17 ; \\ & 27: 22 ; 36: 11 ; 107: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 103: 19 \\ \text { system }(\mathbf{1}) \\ 92: 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| somebody (8) | stamped (1) | stipulations (3) | 103:11,14 | T |
| 18:13,15;43:13;91:23; | 79:11 | 78:20;79:4;82: | suggestion (1) |  |
| 94:21,22;95:12,13 | stand (2) | Stock (1) | 103:22 | table (2) |
| somebody's (1) | 7:8;21:17 | 109:1 | suggestions (1) | 103:18,20 |
| 15:8 | standard (1) | stop (1) | 20:10 | takeover (1) |
| somehow (3) | 27:13 | 88:2 | suggests (2) | 96:23 |
| 90:3;92:16;103:23 | standards (5) | straw (1) | 103:19;107:22 | talk (3) |
| someone (2) | 22:12;25:3;32:10,18; | 10:7 | summarize (2) | 14:8,9;106:20 |
| 32:22;33:11 | 33:2 | Strickler (4) | 28:20;97:6 | talked (1) |
| someplace (1) | start (4) | 98:18,19,20;102:24 | summarized (1) | 41:5 |
| 87:7 | 88:18;110:20,21; | strip (1) | 8:12 | talking (3) |
| something's (1) | 118:10 | 98:11 | summary (1) | 10:14;29:20;109:11 |
| 15:10 | starting (1) | strong (3) | 110:5 | Tax (5) |
| sometimes (2) | 83:19 | 105:16,23;108:20 | summation (1) | 106:16,17,24;112:20, |
| 43:24;113:8 | state (34) | struggled (1) | 86:14 | 23 |
| somewhat (1) | 15:9;20:8;21:2;23:16; | 25:15 | summons (1) | taxpayers (1) |
| 103:10 | 24:24;25:8,10;28:4,5; | struggling (2) | 97:22 | 106:8 |
| soon (6) | 29:17;30:12;31:12;32:8, | 116:11;118:20 | supplier (2) | Team (4) |
| 48:4;83:17;99:23; | 17,24;33:3,6,22;34:6,12; | students (1) | 28:2,23 | 25:3;39:17;44:15; |
| 111:15;113:9,21 | 36:22;46:3;90:19;93:5; | 36:4 | suppliers (7) | 103:1 |
| sooner (4) | 95:2;104:11;108:17,19; | studies (3) | 27:17;28:24;30:1; | technical (3) |
| 81:20;82:22,23,24 | 109:22;115:1;117:8,9; | 18:9,10;94:17 | 37:13,15;43:22,22 | 102:17;103:1,15 |
| sorry (5) | 118:1,18 | study (10) | supply (11) | technologies (1) |
| 16:6;41:20;47:21; | stated (1) | 18:13,15,23;19:2,3; | 7:22;47:18;49:11,12; | 13:15 |
| 99:15;100:23 | 29:14 | 94:24;95:1;118:21,22,22 | 78:13,23;80:1,13;90:20; | tens (1) |
| sort (1) | statement (6) | stuff (1) | 108:10,20 | 106:6 |
| 13:4 | 7:13;20:22;37:12; | 92:9 | supplying (1) | terms (6) |
| sorts (1) | 48:12;81:17;103:10 | Subcommittee (9) | 78:12 | 13:21;33:19;81:23; |
| 106:9 | statements (2) | 19:10;32:3;47:20; | support (9) | 100:18,19;102:20 |
| sounded (1) | 81:21;101:8 | 48:1;83:4,11,18;85:11; | 37:15;105:5,17,17,23; | testify (3) |
| 38:20 | states (3) | 112:5 | 113:13;118:12,13; | 105:10,14,15 |
| sounds (4) | 24:11,12;108:19 | subcontract (2) | 119:23 | testimony (18) |
| 43:10;45:10;80:8,10 | statewide (3) | 44:23;45:16 | supported (1) | 10:2,6,10;18:12 |
| sources (2) | 21:5,13;30:13 | subcontractors (1) | 111:10 | 29:19;82:1;86:15,16; |
| 24:10;29:23 | status (1) | 114:16 | supporting (2) | 91:8,11,15;93:21;98:19; |
| speak (2) | 17:21 | subject (1) | 90:6;112:24 | 99:2,3;102:21;103:19; |
| 9:9;19:23 | statute (7) | 95:19 | supposed (1) | 104:16 |
| speaking (1) | 89:17;90:22;103:5; | submit (2) | 94:14 | third (2) |
| 92:24 | 104:1,1;105:9,19 | 81:16;120:10 | Sure (11) | 90:24;104:19 |
| speaks (1) | statutory (3) | submitted (4) | 20:1;22:1;32:22; | third-party (2) |
| 20:14 | 88:1;89:10;102:10 | 80:12,13;82:15; | 40:23;42:11;44:4;80:20; | 18:19;24:18 |
| special (1) | stay (2) | 120:20 | 84:5;93:1;101:1;114:1 | thoroughly (1) |
| 98:12 | 47:11;119:10 | subsequently (1) | surface (1) | 100:9 |
| special-purpose (2) | step (3) | 99:6 | 93:20 | though (2) |
| 97:20,24 | 25:17;30:10;78:21 | subsidized (1) | surfacing (1) | 80:8,11 |
| specifically (4) | stepped (1) | 117:24 | 94:20 | thought (5) |
| 103:13;104:4,13,15 | 119:20 | substance (1) | surprised (2) | 18:12;25:4;27:7; |
| spectrum (1) | stewards (2) | 99:8 | 84:21;103:10 | 38:11;103:17 |
| 29:24 | 108:21,22 | substantial (1) | surveys (1) | three (7) |
| spelling (1) | Stewart (4) | 117:17 | 29:5 | 5:8;14:13;44:7,8;86:1; |
| 110:22 | 50:9,10;77:7,8 | subsumed (1) | Sustainability (14) | 96:3;98:8 |
| spoke (1) | stick (1) | 40:18 | 6:3;20:5,23;21:6,6; | throughout (1) |
| 111:18 | 117:11 | succeed (1) | 24:3;25:2;30:13;35:11; | 85:14 |
| spoken (1) | sticker (1) | 11:16 | 79:21,24;108:10;109:5, | thumb (1) |
| 37:1 | 5:21 | suddenly (1) | 13 | 92:9 |
| staff (2) | sticks (1) | 41:23 | sustainable (4) | tie (1) |
| 43:3;94:24 | 25:19 | suggest (1) | 29:23;109:7;113:5; | 78:13 |
| stakeholder (1) | still (6) | 95:6 | 116:21 | tied (2) |
| 21:8 | 15:15;42:13;48:18; | suggested (11) | sworn (1) | 35:8;106:10 |
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| timber (9) | traveling (1) | 5:17;17:15;24:14,19; | 34:15 | 6:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25:9;32:7,16;33:6; | 119:3 | 25:11;33:7,8;39:19; | useless (1) | wants (2) |
| 34:5,12;38:8;79:20, | treading (2) | 40:2,3;42:24;45:16; | 96:13 | 87:24;118:14 |
| 109:2 | 10:3;12:6 | 46:4;49:9,15,18;51:6; | usually (1) | watched (1) |
| timbering (1) | Tree (1) | 86:16;87:22;92:5;99:4; | 85:20 | 118:20 |
| 33:23 | 39:1 | 103:4;105:9,19;117:3 | utility (1) | water (4) |
| timberland (2) | tried (2) | Underneath (1) | 13:5 | 10:3;12:6;94:12;108:5 |
| 34:5,9 | 14:15;102:8 | 20:4 |  | way (19) |
| timeline (1) | trouble (2) | understandable (1) | V | 11:3,6,12;35:20;39:3; |
| 88:5 | 37:17;98:13 | 107:13 |  | 89:6;91:1,7;93:18; |
| timely (3) | truck (1) | understandings (1) | Valley (3) | 94:13;97:15;99:15; |
| 112:18;113:18;119:23 | 27:24 | 101:2 | 48:14;111:4,6 | 100:6;108:13;109:7,18; |
| times (1) | truckers (4) | understood (2) | value (2) | 115:3,24;116:2 |
| 28:9 | 28:9,18;43:23;111:22 | 108:12;109:10 | 21:3;33:15 | Web (1) |
| timing (1) | true (1) | undertook (1) | various (4) | 95:21 |
| 113:6 | 17:18 | 108:18 | 17:5;105:7;107:5; | week (5) |
| today (19) | truly (2) | undue (1) | 109:11 | 29:19;82:13;100:21; |
| 7:23;8:24;9:6,8,24; | 13:16;30:5 | 36:1 | verbal (4) | 119:10;120:11 |
| 11:6;17:1;48:10,12; | try (4) | unduly (1) | 19:11,14;101:19; | weeks (2) |
| 90:12,14;91:6,12,14; | 24:17;25:18;100:11; | 104:20 | 120:15 | 95:20;96:3 |
| 92:19;100:22;114:19; | 108:13 | unemployed (1) | Verification (3) | welcome (1) |
| 115:18;116:24 | trying (8) | 111:21 | 29:2;39:20;46:11 | 114:6 |
| today's (1) | 10:11;25:15;33:20; | unemployment (2) | Vermont (1) | well-paying (1) |
| 118:1 | 35:18;41:14;96:8;97:6; | 114:21,23 | 36:22 | 106:3 |
| together (2) | 99:6 | unequivocally (2) | version (6) | weren't (2) |
| 78:15;120:19 | turmoil (1) | 103:3;110:6 | 20:6,13;26:22;31:14, | 25:22;111:19 |
| told (3) | 88:23 | unless (3) | 16;80:12 | What's (9) |
| 80:4;88:7;93:5 | turn (1) | 13:15;33:11;88:2 | viability (1) | 16:3;17:21;18:3;40:1; |
| took (2) | 19:19 | unlike (1) | 8:20 | 41:3;96:11;100:1; |
| 78:21;93:19 | Turns (2) | 39:12 | viable (3) | 111:16;118:23 |
| top (1) | 91:10;97:8 | unmanageable (1) | 8:21;13:22;117:21 | whatsoever (1) |
| 20:2 | twenty (1) | 10:15 | view (5) | 91:10 |
| touched (1) | 116:12 | unquestionably (1) | 9:12;11:13;29:15; | Whereupon (1) |
| 104:12 | two (20) | 108:8 | 30:9;86:9 | 21:23 |
| towards (1) | 5:7;13:7;27:13;28:19; | unquote (1) | views (1) | Whitefield (4) |
| 30:12 | 35:17;38:4;40:15;44:7, | $24: 22$ | 104:23 | 10:24;91:19;94:11; |
| town (1) | 8;45:6;48:16,18;78:15; | unrealistic (1) | virtue (1) | 116:9 |
| 28:5 | 81:12;87:21;89:23; | 36:14 | 44:21 | whole (2) |
| trace (1) | 95:20;110:16;112:21; | unreasonable (1) | voice (1) | 17:2;25:16 |
| 32:24 | 115:11 | 108:3 | 114:17 | who's (5) |
| tracked (1) | two-thirds (1) | up (28) | voluntarily (1) | 27:19;43:13;90:5; |
| 28:7 | 77:23 | 9:5;10:8;17:5,22; | 8:11 | 96:8;99:12 |
| tracking (1) | type (5) | 18:18;21:16;24:1;25:16; | Voluntary (5) | whose (4) |
| 28:17 | 24:19;26:16;27:21; | 26:6,11,20;34:9;36:17; | $24: 24 ; 25: 17 ; 30: 5,14$ | 10:16,16;99:22;111:7 |
| trade (2) | 105:16,17 | 41:12,13;43:16;49:1; | $108: 14$ | wide (2) |
| 114:13;115:17 | types (2) | 82:19;92:22;95:14,15; | vote (2) | 105:5;109:15 |
| Trades (3) | 107:23;109:3 | 98:13;99:1;106:2;109:5, | 49:24;77:22 | widespread (2) |
| 114:12;115:21;118:12 | typical (1) | 6;116:10;119:20 | voted (2) | 105:16;109:15 |
| train (1) | 87:19 | upgrades (1) | 50:22;77:23 | willing (1) |
| 118:9 | Typically (2) | 92:4 | voting (1) | 92:14 |
| trained (2) | 89:16;99:19 | upon (2) | 47:20 | wind (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} 24: 9,10 \\ \text { training (2) } \end{gathered}$ | U | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 7 ; 94: 1 \\ & \text { upset (1) } \end{aligned}$ | W | $\begin{gathered} \text { 8:10 } \\ \text { window (1) } \end{gathered}$ |
| $113: 6 ; 118: 8$ | U | $30: 2$ | W | $92: 23$ |
| transcript (3) | ultimately (1) | upstream (1) | wages (2) | wish (6) |
| 76:6,8;77:24 | 107:15 | 36:13 | 116:22;117:17 | 81:8,12,16,21;110:17; |
| transcripts (3) | unanimous (3) | use (9) | wait (1) | 120:10 |
| 82:18,19;84:18 | 50:20;77:20,22 | 11:14;15:22;23:5; | 18:2 | wished (1) |
| transmission (5) | unappealable (1) | 25:7;27:21;45:21;46:14; | waiting (1) | 117:7 |
| 8:20;90:16;91:9,13; | 87:11 | 79:18;110:19 | 18:1 | wishes (2) |
| 92:3 | uncertainty (1) | used (1) | walk (1) | 7:13;78:6 |
| travel (1) | 45:14 | 18:22 | 21:17 | within (4) |
| 116:15 | under (25) | useful (1) | Walls (1) | 88:1;107:16;108:7; |

\{SEC 2009-02\}(DAY 6 PM- PUBLIC) - September 10, 2010

## LAIDLAW BERLIN BIOPOWER, LLC



