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PROCEEDINGS
(Applicant Exhibits 48, 49 marked.) CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. We're back on the record in Site Evaluation Committee Docket 2010-01 and turning to the direct testimony and cross-examination of Ms. Lewis. Mr. Buttolph, you're ready to proceed? MR. BUTTOLPH: Sure. (WHEREUPON, CHERYL LEWIS was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

CHERYL LEWIS, SWORN
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. BUTTOLPH:
Q. Good afternoon. Can I ask you to state your name for the record.
A. My name is Cheryl Lewis.
Q. And your state -- your place of employment, Cheryl?
A. It's Baker River Campground.
Q. Are you the same Cheryl Lewis who filed prefiled testimony on this docket?
A. I am.
Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or updates that you would like to articulate at this time?
A. I just have two slight additions.
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On October 18th, I sent an e-mail to Mr. Matt Gittell, who was the one who conducted the study, the economic study for the Applicant. And I was hoping to just ask him a few questions regarding his study, and I did not receive any response.

The second addition is, just for the record, I did bring in, $I$ believe it's Exhibit 45, if I'm correct -- I'm sorry, 35, which is the land lease from Iberdrola. Earlier this week, Chairman Getz had asked, when I had mentioned a gag order on one of the leases, asked if $I$ could bring in one if $I$ had seen it. And that is what that exhibit is. It is 35 .

And from my understanding, Heartland Wind, LLC is a subsidiary -- or was a subsidiary of PPM, which is now owned by Iberdrola.
Q. Is that all?
A. That's all.

MR. BUTTOLPH: We can release Ms.
Lewis for cross-examination at this time.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Let me, before we do that -- two things: So, I guess the first is just your e-mail was to Ross Gittell?

WITNESS LEWIS: I'm sorry. Ross. The other name was Matt. Yes, Ross Gittell.
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CHAIRMAN GETZ: And this Exhibit 35
that you -- that's been marked for identification, the so-called gag order, what section of this agreement would be the gag order provision?

WITNESS LEWIS: It was Page 24. 13.2 refers to the confidentiality of it.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you.
That's all I need for now.
Okay. So, Ms. Lewis is available for cross?

MR. BUTTOLPH: Yes, she's all set.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: So, Mr. Sinclair, any questions?

MR. SINCLAIR: None.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. And Mr.
Roth.
MR. ROTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just trying to read 13.2.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Lewis. Thank you for being here, and thank you for your participation in this proceeding and assisting in it being an orderly and efficient process as you promised at the time of your
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intervention.
I want to ask you about this exhibit that you just provided to us, No. 35. And you say that this was a lease between Heartland Wind, LLC, or a form of lease, perhaps, only prepared by Heartland Wind, LLC, and that Heartland was a subsidiary of some other company?
A. PPM.
Q. PPM. And that PPM was at some point acquired by Iberdrola Renewables; is that correct?
A. Correct. That's my understanding.
Q. Do you know whether this lease was created before or after that acquisition?
A. I don't know the exact date of the acquisition. I believe the lease was 2007.
Q. Can I turn your attention to Page 25 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the notice provision. There are addresses there for Heartland Wind, PPM. Do you know whether that address in Portland, Oregon, is the address of Iberdrola?
A. That I do not know.
Q. 1125 Northwest Couch, Suite 700, Portland, Oregon. Okay.

Or the telephone number, do you know whether that's Iberdrola's phone number?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay.
A. Quite honestly, $I$ just was able to find this last night. And we had had some technical difficulties, so I didn't have my computer for a few days, so that's why it was last night $I$ just found this.
Q. Okay. All right. Now turning to Paragraph 13.2. Have you read that?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Is there anything in here that suggests that, if there was something wrong with the turbines, that the landowner was prohibited from speaking publicly about it?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Where is that?
A. Well, it talks about methods of operation, methods of construction, power production or availability of wind power facilities, as well as financial terms or payments. So, I believe in the very beginning, the first two sentences, that it's clearly showing that, if something is not being done properly, that the landowner is under a gag order to discuss it.
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Q. All right. Now I want to turn to your business. You've been -- rather than the address in Portland, let's turn to your address in Rumney. What percentage of the campsites at your business are tenters?
A. Roughly half.
Q. Roughly 50 percent?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And how many tent sites is that?
A. Thirty.
Q. And do you have an estimate of what your occupancy or vacancy rate is over a typical season for those sites?
A. It's a little bit difficult to say for this particular summer. If we consider the summer being basically a 12-week period, from June through the end of August, we were completely full 11 of those 12 weeks on the weekends -- not during the week but on the weekends. However, we are open a little bit before and a little bit after that. We're open through -- Memorial Day through Columbus Day. So we're -- I'm sorry.
Q. How many days is your campground open?
A. Basically 152, somewhere in that area $I$ believe.
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Q. A hundred and fifty-two. And how many of those days are -- how many days of occupancy do you have for those tent sites?
A. That, $I$ don't have those figures off the top of my head. It varies quite a bit year to year, based on the weather. This year was a pretty good weather year for camping; whereas, you know, there certainly is a bit of variability for that. And I haven't had a chance to gather those numbers for this past camping season.
Q. Okay. Do you typically keep that kind of information?
A. Not particularly that, no.
Q. So you don't take the number of dates you're open times the number of sites that you have and then calculate how many days, sites you have filled?
A. I have not up until this point, because we have basically been trying to push hard on just growing the business, and at this point I have not made those calculations.
Q. Okay. And if this is confidential and proprietary information of yours, then you should not answer it, unless you get confidentiality agreements from the appropriate people. But how much money do you earn
per year from those campsites?
A. That would definitely be confidential. I would prefer not to discuss --
Q. Okay.
A. -- financials.
Q. All right. Let's look at it from a percentage basis then.

I think your testimony has been that you would expect to lose business in the tent sites --
A. Correct.
Q. -- because of the impacts from the project. And what percentage of an impact do you expect? Would it be something like 25 percent, as Mr. McCann suggested, or do you have another figure?
A. To be very honest, $I$ have absolutely no idea. I think it totally depends on the level of impact, as far as the level of sound --
Q. Okay.
A. -- which I know, as far as the sound, they testified that it could be somewhat more of a random event, which could be four nights of my entire camping season. But if those four nights happen to fall on a weekend night, and basically all my tenters cannot sleep and they tell their friends, who tell their
friends, who tell their friends that there's a wind farm there and it's not a place that you can sleep, then that can have a major impact on my future revenue, even if it's just for sporadic nights. So, I have a very difficult time quantifying any particular number because I truly just don't know.
Q. Okay. What direction do most of your tenters come from when they travel to your campground? Do they come up Route 25 from 93?
A. I would say at least half of them come from Canada. We have a large number of rock climbers, and that has grown significantly over the last two years. And the majority of the rock climbers, right now, anyway, we're seeing the increase coming from Canada. I'm not sure if that totally answered your question.
Q. No, that's not what $I$ was trying to get at. What route do they take to arrive?
A. Oh, I'm sorry.
Q. Do they come down 93 and up 25?
A. I'm sorry. Generally, yes. Some of them also come from Route 89. It depends on what part of Canada they're coming. The ones from Montreal tend to come directly from 93. The ones that are coming more towards -- from the Ontario area or through that way
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will come down 89 and across Route 118.
Q. Okay. Have you experienced, in the time that you've owned the campground, seasons where the road was under serious reconstruction or repair -- for example, the traffic circle or other projects of magnitude along Route 25 -- that might have caused traffic delays?
A. I have not since we've owned it.
Q. Okay. And when you bought it, did you have any understanding about impacts on the revenue of the campground in the event of a large construction project?
A. I know that prior to us buying it, they had redone the covered bridge, the Smith Covered Bridge. And I know that did impact a number of campers. I didn't get any definite, you know, percentages or anything from the former owner. But $I$ know, even from campers that are there, that come to us now, they have told us that it, you know, impacted them because it made their ride quite a bit longer to get to us.
Q. Do you expect your campers to shy away if the construction project at the project covers the season?
A. I think that it's a little bit hard to tell. I
think, without ever experiencing it and understanding the level of delays or the frequency of delays, it's hard to know. I think I would assume if some of the delays are significant, that it would impact it.
Q. Now turning to sort of the bigger picture.

You said you tried to get a hold of Professor Gittell. Did you review Professor Gittell's study?
A. I did a little bit. I won't say that I spent a lot of time going through it. But I did have some questions regarding the LBNL study, as well as Mike McCann. I was hoping to discuss the two points of view a little bit and just find out what his thoughts were on property value a little bit deeper.
Q. So you didn't contact the professor to talk about the economic study that he submitted?
A. Well, the economic study that he had submitted was based on the Baker River Valley. And I was hoping to have an opportunity to talk to him a little bit further on how he felt regarding property values and some of Michael McCann's viewpoints on the impacts of it, and just get a better understanding of if he had taken any of that into account when he produced his study.
Q. Okay. Going back to your campground again. Sorry if \{SEC 2010-01\} [DAY 5 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-5-10\}

I'm hoping around a little bit here. I guess this just moves into some of the noise issues a little bit.

Do your campers, when they're visiting your campground, run generators and air-conditioning units while they're there?
A. Not generally, no. In fact, the majority of our campsites don't have the ability to handle air conditioners. We're basically bare bones, back to nature kind of old-fashioned campground. We're not one of the newer RV resorts that have all the bells and whistles. And we have a few sites up top that are some of our seasonal sites that have 50 amps. But the majority of the rest of the sites that would handle RVs do not have the full amps. And we specifically state on our rules that people cannot run their ACs or their air conditioners off of the electric supply. Those that do have generators, it must be a very quiet generator, because we do try to keep the noise level, particularly at night, as quiet as possible. We've never had an issue with a generator being loud if anybody does run one.
Q. Do you have a posted quiet hour at the campground?
A. We do. It's 10 p.m. to 8 a.m.
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Q. And during quiet hours, are campers permitted to run generators?
A. They can if it's very quiet. The newer generators are very quiet, for the most part, and often you don't even know they're going. In my opinion, it's the older generators that are noisier. And in that case -- but quite honestly, being up in the mountains, there's not that many hot nights. I mean, we did have a hot spell this summer. But by and large, people are usually out in the river cooling off, and then at night it is cooler. So there's -for the most part, there's not usually a need for air conditioning at night.
Q. Have any of your tent campers ever complained about the noise produced by the RVs?
A. No. I think the only -- most of our tent campers would usually ask to be in areas that are more geared towards the tent campers. So they're not, generally speaking, right in the middle of the RVs, so it usually is not an issue. On a busy holiday weekend, you know, when we're really extra full, it might be a little different because they might be put in a place that, you know, is more in the middle of an RV area, so to speak.
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Q. But in the circumstance like that, have you had complaints from the tenters about the RVs being too noisy?
A. No. No.
Q. Have you ever ejected anybody from the campground from making too much noise?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. That must have been interesting.
A. With the help of the Rumney Police Department.
Q. And what kind of noise were they making?
A. Well, we've thrown out three groups in five years. And one was fairly -- it was a group of probably 20 young people. And they had too much to drink and were partying and had been warned and were told if they didn't quiet down, they would be leaving. And that's what happened.
Q. Okay. Now, the Baker River, there was some talk the other day about whether the Baker River volume produced noise when it was -- when the volume of the river was -- I don't mean volume of the noise, but the flow of the river was at greater levels. What's your experience with the kind of noise that the Baker River makes?
A. The Baker -- the area where our campground is, and I
believe for the most part where it runs through Rumney -- I believe further up towards the Wentworth area it may be a little rocky. But from Rumney down, the majority of it is sandy bottom, and that's why we have our beach area. And so it's quiet. You know, it's sand. So you don't get the noise of what you think of as a babbling brook or, you know, a river such as the Pemigewasset or some of the others where it's rockier and it's noisier.
Q. And would it be your understanding that sort of the overall length of the Baker River, the section going through Rumney is relatively, I don't want to call it level, but has -- does not experience a great difference in elevation from the upstream end to the downstream end?
A. Yeah. I would say it's -- I forget which class it is. But it's a much lower class river on the Rumney end compared to the Wentworth, which is a more -- is considered challenging for, say, kayakers and that kind of thing; whereas, the Rumney end of it, it may be moving fast if the river is fairly high, but, like you said, it is a bit more level. So as long as the river's not running super fast, it's perfect for people tubing or that kind of thing.
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Q. Okay. Now, if we were -- if this room were in your campground somewhere and we had the windows open, would we be able to hear the river?
A. No. Not in most places. I'll say there may be a few sites where there's rocks right up against, or if the river is really, really low and there's a rock sticking up on the edge. But it would be an occasional, not like a babbling of any sort. So, overall, $I$ would say 95 percent throughout the whole area of where the river goes along the campground you would not be able to hear anything.
Q. Does the Baker River freeze solid in the wintertime?
A. No, it does not.
Q. Do you know whether Halls Brook or Clark's Brook freezes over in the wintertime?
A. That $I$ do not know.
Q. All right. Now, in your testimony, you described some of the noises from the diner.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you hear the noises from the diner at your campground?
A. Occasionally I can. Particularly when they have -- I can't think of what you call it when they have the old-fashioned cars there.
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Q. Cruise Night?
A. Cruise Night. And when they have their Cruise Night, we can hear the loud speaker and people there, yes. And occasionally if large trucks stop there, occasionally we might be able to hear them.
Q. Okay. And I hope you have reviewed, and I take it you have reviewed Mr. Tocci's testimony. Did you see Mr. Tocci's two-prong approach to impact assessment?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you be satisfied if the Subcommittee adopted Mr. Tocci's two-prong approach in this case?
A. If you could refresh my memory a little bit?
Q. Well, they have the one prong was no sound from the project over 40 dB , if I remember correctly, and then determining the level of impact by how many dBs over background the sound of the project was.
A. Yes, $I$ would be satisfied with that.
Q. Okay. All right. Have you ever had opportunity outside of, you know, these formal settings, such as this hearing or the public meetings, to meet personally with Mr. Cherian?
A. You said outside of public meetings?
Q. Yeah. A private meeting to discuss your situation with your business or its impact.
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A. He had e-mailed me, asked me for that. And we had set up a time and a date. And when I told him the other intervenors would be there, he immediately cancelled the meeting.
Q. Okay. If Mr. Cherian were willing to meet with you and discuss some sort of mitigation for the sound impacts at your campground, would you be willing to do that?
A. I would consider it.
Q. Okay. Turning now to the questions that were raised in your testimony about the aquifer. And pardon my ignorance. I was unable to find a map of the aquifer online.

But the aquifer that there's a -- I take it you're concerned that the activity at the project site will somehow contaminate or otherwise harm the Town of Rumney aquifer. Is that your testimony?
A. That's correct. There is a very large map that $I$ do have. I believe we had reserved Exhibit 32 , if I'm correct, to enter the big map, if that would help.
Q. Do you have the map of the aquifer?
A. That's it.
Q. My question is, I've always understood that a river forms a hydraulic barrier to the transmission of
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groundwater flow. Is that not the case here? Because you're on the north side of the river; right?
A. I don't know that, quite honestly.
Q. Okay. Nice, pretty map.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Is this Buttolph 32
or --
MR. IACOPINO: Yeah, on the exhibit
list it's blank because they had taken the exhibit back and they were going to make pictures.

THE WITNESS: It didn't work. The writing was just too small.

MR. IACOPINO: They were going to reduce it for copies.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Before I ask you to tell me what this map says,
'cause there's a lot of pretty colors and stuff on here, can you tell me, is it your understanding that the -- sorry, I'll back off -- that the Rumney aquifer somehow goes under the Baker River and that you draw from it on the north side of the Baker River?
A. Yes. My understanding is it's on both sides.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. Does this map show that?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Can you tell us how this map demonstrates that? I always thought that a good-size river was a hydraulic barrier.
A. Basically, the light purple and dark purple that you see is the town aquifer all the way through here, all the way through here.
(Witness indicating.)
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. And so on that map, the Baker River sits kind of in the middle of it?
A. Yes. The blue that runs here is the Baker River. So it goes right here.
(Witness indicates.)
A. And the project site -- this is Groton Hollow Road right here.
(Witness indicates.)
A. You can see the aquifer starts on part of Groton Hollow Road. And this is where the project site is, over here.
(Witness indicates.)
A. So, my concern was with blasting that takes place in this area, if there's any potential -- or the muck
piles that were talked about this week, if there's any potential of contamination going into the aquifer, then basically the majority of the residents live on top of the aquifer, and their wells are drawing from it. So I just was concerned about overall contamination to anybody.

In addition, the new transmission line proposal will also go right over the aquifer, because that's going to go right through here, and it will run right across the aquifer as well. So if there needed to be any blasting done to put any of the new line in, that could potentially be a concern as well.
Q. Okay. Is your campground upstream or downstream of where Clark's Brook empties into the Baker River?
A. It would be downstream.
Q. So, you're downstream from that?
A. Hmm-hmm. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. And it's your understanding that groundwater in the aquifer flows through bedrock underneath the Baker River.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Roth, does it help you at all to know that the legend identifies those pink
things as a gravel aquifer?
MR. ROTH: It brings to mind another question.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. How deep is -- how deep are your drinking water wells at the campground? Are they in the gravel or are they in bedrock?
A. I believe it's in bedrock and it's very deep. I can't recall exactly what the paperwork was. But I believe it was -- I could provide that to the Committee if they wanted it. But if I remember correctly, it was over 250 feet.
Q. Okay. If the Applicant adheres to blasting standards from DES, do you think that that should resolve your concerns about the risk of harm to the aquifer?
A. Well, $I$ would hope so. But, again, my concern is just those things that happen outside of what is predicted. And I think, as Mr. Walker testified earlier this week, certainly the situation that happened on Interstate 93 , in which the entire town's drinking water supply wound up getting contaminated due to blasting and erosion issues there several years back, I just think there's potential. And that's where my fear is. I mean, I don't mean to
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[WITNESS: CHERYL LEWIS]
sound paranoid. I just think that it's things to consider, that's all.
Q. Okay. But you don't have an opinion about whether the best management practices for blasting that are in the Applicant's permit, if they're followed, of course, because that's -- I suppose the devil's in the details there -- but if they're followed, those should be protective?
A. If they're followed, I would hope so.
Q. Okay. Now, in your testimony, you recommended that the Committee review and apply the sound limits that were imposed upon the Deerfield project. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you provided a copy of the order for that. And you said that you thought that your tenters ought to be considered interior bedrooms with a 30-decibel unit. Is that --
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think that's really fair? I mean, think about that. I thought tenting was supposed to be a great outdoors kind of thing. And a tent isn't really a residence, though, is it?
A. Well, it is if you're tenting. That's where you're
sleeping for the weekend. And I think things should be to the level where it's not disrupting your sleep.
Q. Okay. So you think that if they were to adopt the Deerfield standard, it should say "30 decibel to an interior bedroom and tents"?
A. Yeah. I mean, based on the sound study coming back, that the level of ambient sound at my campground was 25, I do think that's appropriate.
Q. Are you -- have you ever heard of people who sleep on their porch in the summertime?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Nearly last question. Have you been out on the water at Loon Lake or Stinson Lake?
A. I have not on Loon Lake. At Stinson Lake, yes.
Q. And you were here the other day when there was testimony about the potential for the cross-section lines of sight. And do you remember Mr. Harrington asking about whether, if you redrew those cross-section lines of sight, there might be now an impact on the surface of Stinson Lake?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, do you think that a panoramic view of turbines on Stinson Lake would have a significant effect on the aesthetics of that lake?
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A. Absolutely.
Q. And the last question. I think you were here when we had a discussion about the FAA lighting on the turbines.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And do you have a view of those ridges from your campground?
A. We do at certain places, yes. Not the entire campground, but there are places we do.
Q. And from those places, approximately how many of the turbines do you think would be visible, based on the projections that have been made, anyway?
A. Well, that's difficult to say. Based on the topography and vegetation, $I$ believe it showed one to seven where we have a few campsites. However, my home may be significantly more, because my home is higher up than the campground.
Q. All right. So, from your home you'll be able to see some number more than seven of the turbines?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you concerned about the light --
A. Yes. Absolutely.
Q. -- at night?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
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Q. And you heard Mr. Hecklau talk about the thickness of trees and that 200 feet of trees is basically a solid wall. Isn't that what he said?
A. Yes.
Q. Viewing the project from your home, do you have a view that goes through 200 feet of trees? Or what is it? Or are they evergreens? I mean...
A. It's a combination I'd have to say. It's a combination. I guess, to be quite honest, the studies that have been done, $I$ find it difficult to fully believe that they're quantified. I guess the only way $I$ can explain it is based on the avian studies that we heard so much about, that how much of a correlation is there truly between pre-construction versus post construction. And I have those same concerns with all the other studies that have been done, whether it's visual, whether it's sound, that is it truly -- you know, how accurate are these modeling programs? Do we really know? Have there been any studies on those that show that, you know, the exact viewshed that was done in the modeling program for Lempster, did that come out 100 percent accurate when the final result was done? And to me, those are the types of studies that would be helpful
to the Committee in the future, because then they could look at this much easier and know that there is a level of accuracy with what the Applicant's consultants are saying, based on, you know, what does actually happen. And I think without having some of that, $I$ think it's difficult for us as the intervenors who have these concerns, that we'd like these concerns to be diminished. We're not here, you know, wanting to have a level of fear or a level of unknown. But without having adequate information, it's very difficult not to worry.
Q. I'm actually going to ask you one more question. This isn't my last question. Sorry.

But this next to last question is, do you believe -- or would you like to see the Applicant employ FAA-compliant lighting that is least likely to make a visual impact on your home or other places in Rumney?
A. Absolutely. I would like them to take every possible measure, if this is approved, every possible measure that there is to reduce the level of impact to every resident and every business in the surrounding area.
Q. Okay. My next question, last: Are you anti-wind?
A. No, I'm not. I'm not anti-renewable. I believe in
it. In fact, my husband and I have looked into solar for our campground. And it may be something we consider down the road. But I just feel that they need to be very appropriately sited when they're doing wind farms. And the more I've learned about it, the more concerns and the more unknowns I feel there are. And I guess, like Dr. Mazur, I don't want to personally be a guinea pig. I don't, you know, want my -- the equity that we've tried to build and everything that we have worked for I don't want to disappear. And I think there's just too many unknowns and too many possible impacts that may occur.
Q. Thank you. That's all my questions.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Patch.
MR. PATCH: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. Good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.

MR. PATCH: First of all, I just have one issue with, I believe it's Buttolph Exhibit 32, which we were not provided a copy of. We've not been able to
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review it. And I don't know if there's a way for them to vouch if it's the same information that was in Volume II, Appendix 1, Figure 8, 1 think it is.

WITNESS LEWIS: I'm sorry. Could you say that exhibit again?

MR. PATCH: I think it's Volume II, Appendix 1, which is our wetland application, and then Figure 8. There's a groundwater resources map in there.
(Witness reviews document.)
MR. ROTH: It doesn't appear to be the same picture.

MR. PATCH: Is it the same information, do we know, or --

WITNESS LEWIS: Are you saying from the map that we have?

MR. PATCH: Yeah.
WITNESS LEWIS: That map is from the Conservation Commission, as well as the Town of Rumney. We have two identical maps from the Town. This is the Town-supplied map.

MR. PATCH: Okay. We weren't provided a copy of it. So it's going to be kind of hard to ask questions about it. And I understand that it was probably difficult to copy that map. But even if it had been
\{SEC 2010-01\} [DAY 5 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-5-10\}
brought to the prehearing conference and we had a chance to look at it, it would have been good. I just want to point that out for the record.

WITNESS LEWIS: Can I just point out for the record that it was there at the technical session. I did bring that. And your consultants did go over it and look at it.

MR. PATCH: But if we knew it was going to be an exhibit -- it was not on your exhibit list last week. So I'm just pointing that out for the record, because I think it's unfortunate that we didn't have a chance to actually look at it.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, for the record, this map is entitled, "Water Resources GIS Mapping Analysis By the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests." In the top left-hand corner it says, "Town of Rumney, New Hampshire."

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. I mean, first of all, Ms. Lewis, I just want to point out one thing. You mentioned the FAA lights. And I want to direct your attention and the Committee's attention to Page 64 of our application. I believe it's Section I.1. It's right at the very end where \{SEC 2010-01\} [DAY 5 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-5-10\}
it says "Mitigation." And it says there that to mitigate for any potential visual effect, Groton Wind will use lights that pulse 20 times per minute and have a vertical beam spread of 3 degrees, which is the lowest amount allowed by the FEA -- FAA. Sorry.

Do you remember seeing that in the application?
A. I don't. And to be honest, I'm not an expert in this area. I just know there was testimony earlier this week that stated that there was some FAA-approved lighting that minimized the amount of shadow flicker and that, you know, and the lighting as well -- I'm sorry. I'm mistaken there. It would minimize the amount of light that would be seen at night. And all I'm asking, or would hope, is that that's the type of light that's used, is the one that would have the minimal impact on anybody.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, is Attorney Patch representing that that light that's featured in the application is that which is sort of maximally minimizing of visual impacts for turbine beacons that are

FAA-compliant?
MR. PATCH: Yes.
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. Okay. Ms. Lewis, I mean, you've already established \{SEC 2010-01\} [DAY 5 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-5-10\}
[WITNESS: CHERYL LEWIS]
that you're the owner of the campground. It might help, actually, if we could look at the map there and pinpoint for the Committee where the campground is. Not this map, but the one underneath it. And it's not really a map, it's a blow-up, actually. I mean, as I understand it --

MR. ROTH: You're blocking the map from all of us.

MR. PATCH: I know. I'm doing my
best.
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. As I understand it, you're directly across Route 25 on the north side of Route 25 from the Polar Caves; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. At this bend in the river.
(Counsel indicating.)
Q. It might be easier to look at our exhibit, which is the smaller version of this, Exhibit 8.

So it's right here at this bend in the river;
correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then, maybe just to pinpoint a couple other locations here that are -- this is a gravel pit;
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correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Right here.
(Counsel indicating.)
Q. This is, I believe, Plain Jane's Diner right up here?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'll try to be descriptive for the record. When I say "right up here," I mean west on Route 25. Hard to know the exact distance. But on the same side as the Polar Caves on the south side of Route 25 is where Plain Jane's is. And further up the road before you get to Groton Hollow Road is where the gravel pit is; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then there's a traffic circle down here on Route 25, which is down toward the right edge of the map. It's further beyond the traffic circle where the Wal*Mart is located; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And again, that's on the south side of Route 25. And the municipal airport, $I$ believe, is just over here on the edge of the map. You know, I think this is sort of the extension of the runway right here, if $I$ understand correctly. Do you know if that's the
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case?
A. I believe that's the farm. It may be at least one more field down here. Might be over here more.
(Witness indicates.)
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. But it's beyond the farm over here.
A. Yes.
Q. And in terms of the distance from here to here, it's my understanding that that's about 1.26 miles; is that correct?
A. That sounds about right.
Q. Sounds about right?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And then, Quincy Road, which was the road that the Applicant had originally said would run the distribution line down, is actually this line that runs from sort of the top right-hand corner down to the side diagonally; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. It's not this longer line that's a little more straight across?
A. That's the old railroad bed that runs straight across.
Q. Okay. Very good. Thank you.
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Now I would just direct your attention to Applicant's Exhibit 9, which, as I understand it, is basically a three-page packet of information about the campground; is that correct?
(Witness reviews document.)
A. No, that's not correct.
Q. Okay. Then explain.
A. The first two is -- usually it's front and back.
Q. Okay.
A. And that's what we give out to campers. This is a terrible copy. I think this was at the bottom of the pile when they came to do the sound study. But this is just a map of the campground we use to show people where their campsite is. And generally where the back side is, is the rules of the campground. The third page is what comes directly off the second page in our Web site.
Q. Okay. The first page of Applicant's Exhibit 9, though, is a rough map of the campground; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that appears to be Baker River, that sort of curvy line at the bottom --
A. Yes.
Q. -- just above where it says "beach" -- just below where it says "beach." Sorry.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And then it appears that these are campsites, in fact, numbered around the campground; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, you've talked a little bit about sort of tenters versus RVs. And you said you tried to group the tenters in certain locations. Could you maybe explain that again with this map in front of everybody?
A. Absolutely. If you see the campsites closer to the beach area?
Q. Yes.
A. Basically those are all tent sites. There are a couple of them that can handle pop-up campers. So, sometimes if we have pop-ups, that's where they may go, in one or two of those sites. But the majority down by that whole beach area do not have water and electric. There's just various spigots throughout that area that are shared by those. But there are a few that do have -- the way the roads are set up, it's difficult for -- it would be difficult for
larger travel trailers to get in there. So, generally speaking, there may occasionally be a pop-up; but otherwise, it's tenters in that area. There's also, if you look at Sites 23, 24 and 26, which are on the left side and then right along the river, those are also tent sites. And then, if you look across towards the right side of the page, Sites $29,30, A, B$ and $C$-- we no longer have Site D. That actually went into the river during a flooding event. But A, B and C is basically a group campsite. But that's also tenting. And the site directly across from it is Site 31 , and that's also a tent site.
Q. And when you say "a tent site," not exclusively; is that correct? I mean, if you had -- you said it's roughly 50/50, I think, in response to a question from Mr. Roth. But let's say some weekends you had, you know, 75 percent of your customers were RVs or, you know, pop-ups, or whatever it might be. Then you don't say, no, you can't go there because that's a tent site; is that true?
A. Well, no, that's actually not correct. Many of these sites -- this campground was built back in the '60s, way before the huge RVs that you see today, the motor
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homes and that kind of thing. So a lot of these campsites could not accommodate a full-size camper. There are a small few of them. And like I said, Site 1 and 2 down by the beach area do have electricity on those, but it's very low. So it would just be a pop-up that would go in there. It would not be a travel trailer.
Q. But they do have electricity down there you say.
A. No, the majority of those sites do not.
Q. I thought you said --
A. I said Sites 1 and 2 and 19 and 18 --
Q. Okay.
A. -- have electricity.
Q. Now --
A. And sometimes tenters like electricity, so we put them -- you know, if they ask for electricity, we would put them in those sites. But generally speaking, those are tenters in the sites that I -all the sites that $I$ mentioned.
Q. Now, the location of the nearest turbine from here is, obviously from this perspective on this map at least, sort of downwards, and it's approximately 8,000 feet to the nearest turbine; is that correct? Proposed turbine, I should say.
A. No, I don't believe so.
Q. What's your understanding?
A. Well, all I can do is go by, I believe on the visual study it had a 1.3-mile from where the photograph was taken, okay. And the photograph was taken at the very, very top, which is where it shows Birchview Lane at the very top of the map. That's where that photograph was taken.
Q. So you're saying 1.3 is about 8,000 feet, though; correct? You're just saying that it was somewhere up in that area, your understanding, about where the photograph was taken.
A. But 8,000 feet being way -- the entire length to where that Birchview Lane is. This is quite -- we own approximately 18 acres. So it's -- I don't want to say it's a huge distance. But it's not as if it's a stone's throw from where that picture was taken to --
Q. Okay. I understand.
A. -- these campsites that are right on the river.
Q. Yeah. But is it your understanding that, since the time that photograph was taken, that, in fact, the Applicant dropped what was the nearest turbine, which I think was $E 1 ?$ Is that fair to say?
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A. I believe it was N1, but --
Q. I'm sorry. N1.
A. But, yes, I do.
Q. So, in fact, the distance may have changed from when the photograph was taken, the distance to the nearest turbine.
A. Correct. But my estimate would be that where these tent sites are, if it's true that it was 1.3 miles up by Birchview Lane, then down by the river tent sites it would have had to be under a mile from the turbine, even at least with the original turbine of N1.
Q. Okay. But it's no longer there --
A. Correct.
Q. -- it's no longer proposed.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Let's stop there for a second, because I think the testimony, from the questions I asked the other day, it was the E1 that I understood to have been the turbine that was --

WITNESS LEWIS: Oh, that may be my mistake then. I thought it was N1.

MR. PATCH: I think that's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. IACOPINO: It is E1.
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## WITNESS LEWIS: It is E1.

BY MR. PATCH:
Q. I'm going to direct your attention here for a minute to some information that is included in Applicant's Exhibit No. 10. And this concerns the Plymouth Airport.

Do you have an understanding of how long that airport has been there?
A. I do not.
Q. On this particular, this three pages of information we presented to you, I believe there's an indication that it was 1947 that it originally opened.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And do you have any reason to think otherwise?
A. No, I do not.
Q. And as I understand it, it's owned by the Town of Plymouth; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And how often during the day do you hear flights going overhead? I'm particularly concerned about summertime, obviously, when you have campers there.
A. Very rarely.
Q. I don't know if you've had a chance to look at this information. But there is something in here that
\{SEC 2010-01\} [DAY 5 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-5-10\}
suggests that the frequency of use is -- and this is on Page 2 -- on average, about --

MR. ROTH: I'm sorry. Page 2 of what? MR. PATCH: Exhibit 10. Applicant's

Exhibit 10.
MR. ROTH: Okay.
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. That the frequency of occurrences is approximately 58 per week. I'm looking toward the bottom of the page, Page 2, about four lines up. It says, "Aircraft based on the field: 19. Aircraft operations: Average 58/week." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And is it your understanding that the airport operates at night?
A. No, I don't believe it does. And I'd also like to add to that, where you have "aircraft operations," they also do hot air balloons and I believe Ultralights. I mean, this is a tiny airport. This is not, you know, a full-scale airport. This is for very, very small planes. And I see more Ultralights or hot air balloons. And if those are included in that number, $I$ would be more apt to -- I still would be absolutely shocked if there's really 58 per week.
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They do have some -- I believe they have at least two, what they call "fly-ins" in the summer. In fact, we had some people camp with us that were going to a fly-in. And that was when they were learning -they were being trained to use the type of equipment, it was similar to an Ultralight, but it's not really called an Ultralight. I can't think of the name of it, offhand. But when they have those two fly-ins, they have a number of people there and a number of different people going up and down throughout the weekend. And even those, generally speaking, we don't even hear them when they have those fly-ins. And my guess is that that's -- if this average is correct, that it's included in those fly-ins. That figure is taking into account the number of flights that occur when they have those fly-ins and they have a much larger number of people there that are -- it's almost like a festival type of thing, where they have food and that type of thing.
Q. Now, with regard to the campground, the tree cover on the campground, is that primarily deciduous, or is it a mixture of evergreens and deciduous?
A. Probably more deciduous.
Q. More deciduous? Do you know if foliage on trees
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actually increases or decreases the ambient sound level?
A. That $I$ don't know because I'm not a sound expert.
Q. Well, would it surprise you to learn that, I believe it was included in testimony that's been offered previously in this docket, that, in fact, foliage increases ambient sound level?
A. Well, I just --

MR. ROTH: Excuse me. I'd ask Mr. Patch to find a reference to that. Because I recall from Lempster, that was a point of some discussion and dispute. And what $I$ had understood from that, was that it was minimal, and, in fact, utterly discounted by the modeling.

MR. PATCH: Well, I think I would dispute that. But $I$ don't have a reference handy right now. So I'd be happy to try to provide that to the Committee at a later date. It was really about this witness's understanding. But $I$ just don't have one handy. I apologize, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, can you formulate the question in a general way about her understanding of the issue?

MR. PATCH: Well, I think I've already asked that. So I'd be happy to withdraw that question and
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move on.
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. Now, are you familiar with the viewshed analysis that Mr. Hecklau did for the campground? And I believe this was provided during the technical session.
A. Yes.
Q. And this is part of Applicant's Exhibit 11. And there are two maps in there, two colored maps that have been provided to the Committee. And it is my understanding that the first one shows the analysis that Mr. Hecklau did of the area that includes the Baker River Campground. It's obviously larger than that; the first one being one without vegetation and the second one with. Is that your understanding as well?
A. Yes.
Q. And as I understand it, his analysis chose that when you -- on the second map, when you factor forest vegetation into the analysis, it eliminates potential project visibility for most of the campground due to the abundance of forest on that site. And the blue shading there, I believe, represents the area of potential visibility. Is that your understanding as well?
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A. Well, to be very honest with you, I'm very concerned about the accuracy of this. First of all, all of the labeling is incorrect. Birchview Lane does not go across the river. There's no bridge there. So I don't know why there's a road that continues across the river beyond our campground.

Fox Run Lane, which shows to the left, is totally incorrect. There's a Fox Run Lane, that if you look above where my campground is labeled in the middle, if you look straight above, you'll see that there's an area that looks to be a little bit open. And my guess is that that's probably actually Fox Run Lane right there, because that's where it comes off.

So I would have huge concerns believing any part of the viewshed, when the basic part of my campground is not even correct on here.
Q. Well, but that's just the lanes that were superimposed on it, from the way $I$ look at that map. Is that correct?
A. But if the lanes were superimposed, they must have come from GIS or something. And if the GIS is indicating that there's roads where there aren't roads, then perhaps they're indicating there's trees where there aren't trees.
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Q. Now, you had discussed, in response to $I$ think a few questions from Mr. Roth, hook-ups for RVs, air conditioners. I mean, as I understand it, in your campground in the summertime there are obviously various other sources of noise in the campground. There are RVs, there are appliances that would be used by RVs, there are radios, there are televisions. There are a lot of other forms of noise that could be taking place in your campground; is that fair to say?
A. That's true during the day. But if you look at our -- the exhibit that you had me read earlier, it shows no loud radios are allowed at any time. And it clearly states when quiet hours are. Now, that's not to say that there's never a time when after 10 p.m. it's not quiet or that an occasional issue will come up, because we're dealing with people. But we do our very best to address it as quickly as we possibly can. My husband and I are down there on weekends until midnight. We have a campfire going outside that anybody -- you know, that people tend to join us at. And we are down there until midnight. So we try to keep a close handle on what's going on at least until midnight. And, you know, for the most part, issues are addressed. We try to address them quickly
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and do the best we can.
Q. Have you ever heard the same logging noise that was testified to yesterday by the Mazurs?
A. I have not.
Q. And the kind of noises you're talking about controlling are sort of the abnormal noises from, you know, people partying or something like that. That's not sort of the normal, the generators that you said before. You said they had to be quiet generators. I don't know how you distinguish between a quiet and a non-quiet generator. But there are a number of sort of --
A. There are different generators. For RVs, there's inverters. And the new ones, probably within the last five to seven years, they're very quiet and you don't hear them at all. It's older RV generators that tend to be a bit on the noisier side. But like I previously testified to, there's very few nights where it's hot enough to the point where people really feel the need to have a generator.
Q. Now, in your prefiled testimony, you said that campers can hear traffic on Route 25 at times; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. But you said it doesn't affect their ability to sleep.
A. It hasn't been an issue. The traffic dies down significantly late at night. It's a pretty busy road during the day. But at night, it's quite quiet.
Q. And in response to a data request from Public Counsel that we've marked as our Exhibit 13, you indicated that when you've asked campers about traffic noise, their response has been that they're used to vehicular noise at home, and therefore did not even notice it; is that correct?
A. Yes. We do get a number of people that come from the city or whatever. Usually what $I$ do in the morning, the first thing I do, or when we get up in the morning on weekends, is we head down and clean up the bath houses, my husband and I. And there's usually a number of people in the bathrooms that are getting ready for their day. And I always ask everybody, "Did you sleep okay? Did you have any" -- you know, "Did you have a good night? Were there any issues?" And that's when a situation like that might come up, where I'd say, you know, if I knew somebody was right along the river, I might just mention, you know, "Was there any issue with traffic?" And I remember
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specifically one person saying this, and I think that's why I wrote it in there, that, you know, "Oh, there was a tiny bit of noise. But $I$ live in the city, so $I$ don't even notice it."
Q. In a response to a data request from the Applicant that was 1-7, I believe you indicated that you do not pay a view tax on your property; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, are you familiar with the alternative route for the line to Beebe River Substation that the Applicant proposed in the supplemental filing?
A. Well, I'm as familiar as I can be with it since we've just received it.
Q. Well, it was actually part of the supplemental application, the map that we pointed to during the course of the proceeding, you know, which was filed on October 12th; is that correct?
A. Right. But we haven't gotten -- I mean, the map that I have of that is not very large, and it's quite difficult to see exactly where it is.

So, yes, in that filing, from what information you can see from the map, I think I have an understanding of where it's going to be.
Q. And one of your concerns, at least that you put in a
response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 5, was with regard to putting the power lines on Quincy Road; is that fair to say?
A. I'm sorry. I lost -- could you repeat that question? Is there an exhibit that I can look at?
Q. There is Exhibit 12 , which is your response to Public Counsel's Data Request No. 5.
A. Okay. But it is your exhibit?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
Q. And I think it's in Public Counsel's set of exhibits, too, if it would be easier for you to find it.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Yeah, right here. Okay. Go ahead with your question.
Q. Fair to say that one of your concerns was with regard to putting the power lines on Quincy Road; is that fair to say?
A. Yes. I was concerned if the power lines were going on Quincy Road, that if there were -- if the majority of the poles had to be replaced, that in doing so there would be a number of delays on Quincy Road as all those poles got replaced.
Q. And so the alternative that has now been proposed as
part of this proceeding would eliminate at least that concern; is that fair to say?
A. That's true.
Q. Now, in response to at least one question from Mr. Roth, I believe you talked about an e-mail exchange that you had with Mr. Cherian with regard to a proposed visit from him; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And I have a copy of that e-mail exchange here. I didn't bring copies, and we didn't propose to submit it as an exhibit. But since it came up in response to questions from Mr . Roth, I'd be happy to provide a copy for the record if it would be appropriate. But I'll at least start by asking you questions about it. As I understand, Mr. Cherian sent an e-mail to you on Wednesday, August 11th. And it said, "Hi, Cheryl. I would like to come by your campground and take a look. This is not an SEC formal thing. I just want to personally get a better understanding of your business and location so I can better understand your concerns. If this is okay with you, maybe we can find a time next week. Best regards, Ed." Do you remember that --
A. I do.
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Q. -- e-mail? And then you responded on Wednesday, August 11th, same day, a little bit later in the day. His was 10:51 a.m. Let's see. You were a little bit later. You were at 13:13, which would be 1:13 in the afternoon.
"Hi, Ed. I would welcome you to come and take a visit. Perhaps it would help you better understand why I have the strong feelings I do. Monday or Tuesday would probably be the best days to meet if possible. Thank you, Cheryl." Does that fit with your recollection?
A. Correct.
Q. Later that day, again Mr. Cherian, on Wednesday, the 11th, sent an e-mail to you and said, "How about Tuesday at 10 a.m.?" Is that --
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And then you responded again on that day, "Tuesday at 10 a.m. would be just fine. See you then."

And then the next e-mail correspondence was three days later, on the 14th of August. "Dear Ed, a I had a chance to discuss your visit with my husband and the other intervenors I'm working with. I'm willing to show you our campground, but we're not sure why you would want to meet personally and \{SEC 2010-01\} [DAY 5 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-5-10\}
outside the SEC process. Can you send me a list of what you want to discuss while here? Also, I hope you will be prepared to take photographs that help simulate the view of the project from different positions around my property. I plan to ask the other intervenors I'm working with to attend and would like to extend an invitation to Peter Roth as well. Thank you, Cheryl Lewis." Does that sound consistent with --
A. That's correct.
Q. And then on the $15 \mathrm{th}, \mathrm{Mr}$. Cherian responded, "My thought was just to see your campground and viewshed so I can better understand your concerns. I have no plan to discuss anything. I'm not sure it would be useful if intervenors and Mr. Roth are invited. This is not an SEC, quote, site visit, end quote; again, just an attempt by me to better understand your business. Perhaps $I$ erred in asking to stop by. If there will be a bunch of parties from the SEC and an expectation of discussion, I will politely withdraw my request to visit your campground. Sorry for any misunderstanding. Ed."
A. Correct.
Q. And then you responded on Monday, the $16 t h$, "Okay.

Thanks. Sorry if I caused confusion or concern. I really just wanted to see your campground. Nothing more."

I'm sorry. You responded on the 16th. "Okay. I guess I will see you at the next SEC meeting, or perhaps a select board meeting."

And then Mr. Cherian after that, "Okay. Thanks. Sorry if I caused confusion or concern. I really just wanted to see your campground, nothing more."

So, is that consistent with your understanding of that e-mail exchange?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Questions from the Subcommittee? Dr. Kent.

INTERROGATORIES BY DR. KENT:
Q. You had said your -- you testified today that you'd probably be happy with -- if the Applicant met Mr. Tocci's recommendations for sound level criteria?
A. Correct.
Q. When we were talking to Mr. Tocci, when he was testifying during the cross, he said that he had -(Court Reporter interjects.)
Q. He acknowledged that he had the incorrect numbers in
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his table in his supplemental testimony.
A. Correct.
Q. Do you remember what number he agreed to?
A. I believe it brought it down to 33 decibels.
Q. And nobody's put forward numbers with the turbine removed, right, with the closest turbine removed?
A. No.
Q. Still working off the old configuration?
A. No. I'm sorry. I believe that would be with that turbine removed, because they had -- I believe there was supplemental testimony from Rob O'Neal that stated there wouldn't be a significant change, if I remember correctly.
Q. Were you ever able to pull together the dates and the times you were working at the campsite to avoid being flooded that corresponded with Mr. Tocci's analysis?
A. I guess to be honest, no. I had looked at the graph this week, and I forgot to go back. And just with the busyness of the week, I forgot to get the actual dates for that.

I do know that the weekend prior to when this study was removed there was a lot of moving up and down throughout the day, in the two days prior. And that would be right before you can see the huge
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increase on the graph of the flooding event.
Q. I was hoping you would be able to provide those dates and times so $I$ could figure it out myself from there.
A. Okay. I believe, if I can look at the graph real quick, I can tell you the date.
Q. How does the graph tell you what those dates were?
A. Well, the graph just showed the rise of the river. And as the river was rising, that's when we were in a panic moving everything. So it's the same date as when the river is rising. And I believe on the graph it shows it going to, if I remember... I believe it's one of the Applicant's...
(Witness reviews document.)
BY DR. KENT :
Q. Are you talking about the graphs in Mr. Tocci's supplemental testimony?
A. No. I'm sorry. I'm looking at -- the Applicant had produced some information from the... when $I$ see it, I'll know what it is.
Q. I don't want to send you on a big hunt here.
A. It will just take me a moment when $I$ see it.

MR. IACOPINO: Applicant 22.
A. Yeah, I believe it's 22.

DR. KENT: Is that just a stand-alone
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or --
MR. IACOPINO: Yeah, they're a
stand-alone. Applicant 20, 21, 22 are all Baker River flow data. 20 and 22 appear to be graphs.
A. Yeah. Actually, 20 was the one $I$ was looking at. Well, I believe on October 10th and 11th -- I'm sorry. It would have been... I believe the 10th was a Friday. So it would have been starting in the middle of the night, going into Friday, and going through until the 11th. So, between the 9 th and the 11th.
Q. Starting approximately what time?
A. On the 9th, well, it depends on what you're considering major traffic. I was actually working that day, and my two children were cleaning out our store and getting out whatever they possibly could between the two of them. And then my husband and I both arrived home from work approximately --
Q. I'm asking about --
A. Four o'clock in the afternoon is when we started, $I$ believe, on that date. Roughly 4:00.
Q. Right. I'm asking about the activity you referred to this week, where you were afraid you were going to be flooded out, so you were moving --
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(Court Reporter interjects.)
Q. -- you were moving pits and other equipment in the campground.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And what time might you have quit?
A. My husband and son, I believe, were still working until roughly between 2:00 and 3:00 in the morning and then stopped. And then I believe they did some more. By then it was raining heavy. And then we all worked again through part of that day, at least until, 1 would say, 1:00 or so that day. I don't remember the exact time that we stopped.
Q. On the 11th?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. All day on the 11th, as well as the 10th?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

Have your campers indicated they won't return if the wind project's constructed?
A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?
Q. Have your campers indicated to you that they wouldn't be interested in camping anymore with you if the wind project was constructed?
A. Well, the few campers that I have talked about --
talked to it about, they knew what my concerns were. So, you know, they basically were concerned as well. I'm not going to say they said they'd never come back. But they were concerned.
Q. Thank you for that. Did you ever talk --
A. Could I add to that?
Q. I thought you did, but you can answer more.
A. Okay. I just would like to add to that, that my concern is not about the people that talk to me regarding the wind turbines. My fear is about the people that don't talk to me and let me know that it kept them up at night. I think it's similar to a restaurant, where as a business owner you worry. You'd much rather have somebody say that something's an issue, because you can try to fix it. However, when it comes to a wind turbine, I have no control over that. But it's the people that you don't hear from that never come back again and tell other people. That's my larger concern.
Q. Any of your campers express interest in the wind project?
A. Well, no, I wouldn't say that. Towards the end of the summer $I$ was doing a lot of work in preparation for this. So, frequently on the weekends I'd have
paperwork, and campers would ask me what I was working on. Or they'd just come over to chat at our store, and we would get talking to them about it. I did have a few campers that were somewhat familiar with turbines because of where they lived. And those, in particular, had more concern than others. I know there's one in Newburyport, Mass. And I have somebody that's fairly close to that, and have friends that live very close to that who are very unhappy by the noise levels.
Q. Last question. Mr. Roth was asking you about what you've been calling a "gag order," the confidentiality statement.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. What is it you would imagine you would want released that you believe that section doesn't allow to be released?
A. No. I think my concern in a lot of the testimony that came out this week is we have felt that information from the people that are affected the most has not been able to get out to the public, and that's why I brought up the gag order. Because I believe it was Mr. Mihalik that I had asked about that specific question to. Because I think that
impacts the overall public by not having full ability to know what is going on with people that are very close to turbines. And if the majority of the people that are closest to it don't have the ability to talk about it, don't have the financial means to fight a major company in order to express how they feel, and so they're basically just being shut up and not able to say anything, I think that impacts the future of anybody's ability, including this Committee, on how to go forward and how to come up with
recommendations, if you don't have all the information and you're not allowed to have that information.
Q. And you read that confidentiality language as prohibiting people from talking about what? That's my question.
A. Well, the part of it that -- there was a part further down that talked about a cooperation agreement. I believe it was on the same page or the next page of that confidentiality aspect.

I guess the other thing I would like to state is this is quite a huge document for a landowner that lives in a rural area, which most of the wind turbines or many of the wind turbines are in. And I \{SEC 2010-01\} [DAY 5 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-5-10\}
think that, given this type of document, it's very difficult for people to understand it and know exactly what they're signing and know what rights they're giving away.

And I think my concerns are just, in general, that if the wind farm companies are doing everything appropriately and doing everything that they have testified to this board this week, then why should there be any need to have much of it confidential, including methods of operation, including if they're following best management practices. Those should just be a given. It shouldn't be a matter of somebody not being able to speak up because they're not doing something that they are supposed to be doing in the first place.
Q. I don't want to be a pain, so I'll try one more time.
A. Okay.
Q. What language do you see in here that prevents people from talking about issues about the wind turbine, other than proprietary issues? I remind you that you invoked your confidentiality earlier in your testimony when you didn't want to talk about your finances.
A. Correct.
Q. So what is it in this language that you find prevents people from discussing? That's what I'm trying to get at. I'm not sure what language you're referring to and what they can't say. The basis for your statement is?
A. Well, I guess I thought I had sort of answered that. Where it states that they can't talk about the methods of construction, the methods of operation.
Q. Can you imagine how methods of construction and operation might be proprietary and want to be shielded from your competitors?
A. Well, $I$ can also imagine how methods of construction, if they're not being done properly, would want to not be allowed out to the public knowledge or to DES or to anybody else if -- that's all.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. You're welcome.

## INTERROGATORIES BY CHAIRMAN GETZ:

Q. So let's follow-up on that, then.

So you're interpreting this, that it should be read so broadly, that someone who signed this agreement would not be permitted to make public a violation of the law that was -- that they were aware of that a wind developer was committing.
A. Absolutely. My thought would be, there would be threat of a lawsuit.
Q. Wait a second. That's your interpretation of this clause?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$. Correct.
Q. All right. Now, this -- are you -- with this particular agreement, are you saying that Groton Wind has signed such agreements with individuals in the Groton area, or in the Lempster area, for that matter?
A. Well, there were -- there was a confidentiality recently submitted.

WITNESS LEWIS: Do you know what exhibit it is?

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman,
Applicant's Exhibit --
MR. PATCH: I think it's 48, but I'm not sure if it was marked.

MR. IACOPINO: Yeah, I think it's 48 as well.

WITNESS LEWIS: No, 43 I have.
MR. IACOPINO: No. Actually, we're going to need to correct that, too. It may have been marked as 43, but it's actually going to be remarked as
\{SEC 2010-01\} [DAY 5 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-5-10\}

Exhibit 48. It was prepared -- it was provided by the Applicant in response to data requests from the Committee, and it is the confidential language that was requested. And it bears the same -- and this Exhibit 48, which some of you may have still marked as 43, is entitled "Excerpt from Groton Wind Landowner Lease: Confidentiality Provisions." And it's further explained. "Below excerpt is the complete confidentiality terms of this lease."

Did you need a copy, Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN GETZ: I have it.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I've got a couple extras here. You might want to just change it to 48. Anybody else need an extra copy? It should be 48. CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. I have the

Exhibit 48.
BY CHAIRMAN GETZ:
Q. And it appears that the confidentiality language is very similar. But $I$ think the issue comes down to what's the extent of this language. You take it to mean that it goes beyond proprietary information and means someone who signed this would not be permitted to even reveal a violation of the law. That's your position.
A. I think most non-lawyers may interpret it that way, I
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would say. Or people that are not familiar with legal documents may interpret it that way.
Q. Okay.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Anything else? Mr.
Dupee.
MR. DUPEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. DUPEE:
Q. One quick question. What's the closest campground to yours?
A. There's one on the other side of the river that is beyond the Plain Jane's Diner.
Q. Would they be in view of the turbines, do you think?
A. Yes.
Q. Have they talked to you about any concerns they might have?
A. They have not. That particular campground is what's considered an RV resort, and they gear towards large RVs.
Q. Have you spoken to them?
A. I have not.
Q. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Other questions?
Redirect, Mr. Buttolph?
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[WITNESS: CHERYL LEWIS]

MR. BUTTOLPH: I have no questions.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. All right.
Then the witness is excused. Thank you.
(WHEREUPON the Witness was excused.)
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, would now be an appropriate time to address another mismarked exhibit for the record?

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Sure.
MR. IACOPINO: If we look at Buttolph
Exhibits 30, 31 and 32, they are correctly identified in the revised exhibit list. However, the Buttolph 30 yesterday -- well, we had marked two Buttolph 30s earlier in the proceeding, one being the e-mail revisions that are now marked as Buttolph 31. So there's an exhibit entitled "July 17-18, 2010 Complaint Review; E-mail from Warren Brown to Becky Blais." You may recall that as involving the Vinalhaven Wind project. We may have referred to that earlier in the proceeding as Buttolph 30 . But that would have been an error, and it should be Buttolph 31.

And the other thing was that we did not have the description of Buttolph 32 on the exhibit list today, and that is the large map that included the depiction of the gravel aquifer. It's the large map that was on the board earlier. That is Buttolph Exhibit 32.
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[WITNESS: CHERYL LEWIS]

And that's all the corrections I have with regard to the exhibits that were marked.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. One thing I'd like to address before we move on to other issues.

Ms. Geiger, I'd like to see if I can get some understanding about the Appendix -- Applicant Exhibit 48, the confidentiality language --

MS. GEIGER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: -- and whether you can make an offer of proof or speak on behalf of your client with respect to what is an appropriate interpretation of that language. And is the language intended to be read that a landowner would be precluded from speaking about violations of law that they might be aware of? Or is this intended to be focused on proprietary information when it talks about financial terms, product design, methods of operation, methods of construction?

MS. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, I think this is an issue that $I$ have not studied very carefully. I've endeavored to act as quickly as I can to try to respond physically to requests for information. But I haven't studied the language carefully enough to respond to that question. I also haven't had a chance to consult with Mr. Cherian, or anyone else from the company to get
from them what their intent is in including this language in leases with landowners. So I'd prefer, if I could, to have either a little bit of time to answer that this afternoon; or, if you'd like, $I$ could take a record request and provide you with a written response to that question.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, I guess I have trouble with the idea of continuing record requests to fill in things like this. And I guess what I would suggest is I think that the language in this is pretty clear. This is what is out there that the Applicant has got in its landowner agreements. And I think it's a matter of interpretation. For example: You know, in the second part of this paragraph here, it refers to operational information not being available to be shared with news media, either about this facility or any other facility. You know, how a landowner interprets that, or even a former landowner interprets that, is, I think, really a question for argument and not necessarily, you know, whether the Applicant's view of that is a particular way. I'm not sure it really matters at this point. And I suggest that we just leave it as a matter of something to be argued in post-hearing memoranda.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: So you're saying
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what's relevant is what the landowner might think who signs this? I thought, if I recall correctly, you may be the one who raised the issue previous in this hearing about whether certain types of provisions might be void as a matter of public policy, to the extent that they required landowners to not speak about violations of law, which seems to be where Ms. Lewis is.

MR. ROTH: That was what I suggested.
And quite frankly, I mean, from my interpretation of this, I don't see anything that is -- on its face, would meet that definition. But I think there's an argument to be made, that a landowner might interpret the prohibition against discussing operational information, which could be anything that was a condition of a turbine that would otherwise be a violation of law, from making that public. And so on its face, $I$ don't see something here that the Committee ought to be concerned about, in terms of going against public policy. And that's why I suggest that this is really a matter for argument about what this means to the parties. I'm not sure I'm going to do anything with it at all at this point. But as I said at the beginning of my remarks, the idea of it being sort of a continuing, you know, supplementing the record I don't think is necessary, and we ought to just leave it to whatever the
parties want to do with it, in terms of argument in a post-hearing brief.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: So, to the extent that the Applicant wants to set that out and try to explain whether it's -- that it's not so nefarious, as some people might interpret that to be, that they make that clear in their brief?

MR. ROTH: Sure. And if somebody else wants to make it sound more nefarious, they're free to do so.

MS. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, all I was trying to do is be responsive to your question about more information about what the Applicant thinks or what their intent is about this document.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you.
It's quarter of four. I think what we need to do is address the issues we've been talking about for the last couple of days, Exhibit 44.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, before we get there, one other small housekeeping matter.

Yesterday, Mr. Lloyd-Evans spoke of an exhibit that he was looking at. And I have that exhibit, and I was just going to give it out as Public Counsel Exhibit 17.
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MR. IACOPINO: Peter, are they already marked?

MR. ROTH: Yeah, they're already marked.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. I think open items that we need to address, first off, is we had the debate over whether to admit Exhibit 44 into evidence, and then, depending on that, how we deal with the additional testimony from the panel. So why don't we start with the Applicant's position on how we should proceed with Exhibit 44.

MS. GEIGER: Great. Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, the Applicant had requested -basically, our request is to allow Exhibit 44 to come into the record. We made that request, and there was an objection from Public Counsel. And I view this as our opportunity to respond to that objection; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Please.
MS. GEIGER: Groton Wind would respectfully ask the Committee that it be allowed to submit Exhibit 44, which consists of Nancy Rendall's evaluations and analysis and conclusions concerning the alternative power line from the project site down to Route 25, which was described in the application's
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supplemental filing on October 12th.
The Applicant also respectfully asks that what's been marked as Exhibit 45, which is also from -- a memo from Ms. Rendall, indicating that there are no listed species on New Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau's data base within a one-mile radius of the alternative line to Route 25.

And the reason why we'd like to have this information come into the record, $I$ think it's pretty clear that all this week, all of the parties in this proceeding have been introducing documents as exhibits that were not premarked at the prehearing conference last Friday. By my count, Public Counsel has marked at least three such exhibits, and the Buttolph intervenor group has marked at least two more.

Second, Exhibit 44 was prepared by Ms.
Rendall on November 2nd in an effort to answer the Committee's questions and provide the parties with more information about the alternative power line route which will bring power, again, from the project site down to Route 25 onto the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative's poles there on Route 25, as an alternative to running the power line down Groton Hollow Road to Route 25. This alternative was recommended to the Applicant by the Co-Op.
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This isn't something that the Applicant elected on its own volition to do. The Applicant heard complaints from residents on Groton Hollow Road about that power line. And so, from a substantive merits position, we think that it's appropriate to be able to present that alternative to the Committee.

In addition, Mr. Buttolph's motion talked in his -- talked last week at the motion hearing we had about not having enough information about that power line. And so, in order to address the issues of lack of information, the Applicant put together the Exhibits 44 and 45 and are prepared to answer any and all questions from the Committee and the other parties about that information.

We respectfully submit that the alternative route to Route 25 is a minor change in the project's plans, which will ultimately be reviewed and approved by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, which would determine formally whether such a change is a minor modification. I think if you'll recall, one of the conditions in both the alteration of train permit decision issued by DES and the wetlands permit decision issued by DES on October 8th is that DES must review and approve, prior to construction, all of the

Applicant's construction plans. So, accordingly, DES will, in fact, have the final say about the location of this particular line.

In addition to that, we recognize, though, that the parties and the SEC may be interested in this information, even though DES is the final authority on that line and where it goes and its impacts.

So, in order to afford the parties more time to digest the information contained in Exhibit 44, we offer up a suggestion that we give the parties and the Committee a few days to review the information and then come back at a time that's mutually convenient for everyone to permit more examination of the Leo, Rendall and Walker panel. We're also willing, obviously, to make Mr. Cherian available at that time to address any additional questions that may have -- any additional questions from the Committee that may have arisen during the course of this week, and to present any additional information that may have become available from any other state agency during that time. We think that taking a recess at this point and allowing the parties time to look at Exhibit 44 and then reconvening to give everyone an opportunity to conduct cross-examination for a true and full disclosure of the facts is consistent with R.S.A.

541-A: 33 and will provide the Committee with a full and complete understanding of the project. And so that's what we would suggest to do about that.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Did you have a specific schedule in mind, in terms of timing or --

MS. GEIGER: We understand how
difficult it is to get several state officials together. So we would leave that up to the Committee to try to find a time in your schedules to come back, as well as, obviously, affording the other parties an opportunity to weigh in on their schedules as well.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. That addresses, I guess, what I would look at as to how to deal with the associated facilities issues. What about historic sites and the fact that we haven't seen anything from Fish and Game yet?

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, I'm holding a letter from Fish and Game that we just got. It was just e-mailed to us.

MS. GEIGER: And I haven't seen it.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Why don't we hand it out.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. ROTH: Nor have $I$, nor has --
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CHAIRMAN GETZ: I didn't expect so. MS. GEIGER: And I think that this further supports the idea that we should all have some time to review information provided by other state agencies and then perhaps come back at another day. And my client would suggest that perhaps in the next two weeks would be appropriate, assuming, again, of course, that that complies or somehow fits in with the Committee's scheduling issues.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let's just take a second while Mr. Iacopino hands out the Fish and Game letter.
(Pause in proceedings.)
MR. IACOPINO: And while you're on that, we also handed out earlier what we had marked as Applicant 49, which is an e-mail that we received from an Erika Mark from the United States Army Corps of Engineers, referencing a conference call held today with the New Hampshire Department of Historic Resources and representatives of the Granite [sic] Wind Farm project.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: And has that been provided to the parties?

MR. IACOPINO: Yes. I might be wrong, the way I quoted that. Between U.S. Corps of Army

Engineers and pertinent members of the Department of Historic Resource. Maybe there was not a representative of the Applicant there.

Mr. Chairman, should I ask the reporter to mark the Fish and Game letter as Applicant 50? CHAIRMAN GETZ: Please.
(Applicant Exhibit 50 marked.) CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Sinclair, do you have a position on the exhibits and the proposal by the Applicant, that we basically recess and come back in a couple of weeks to address the exhibits concerning the other transmission line and distribution line and the other outstanding information from Fish and Game?

MR. SINCLAIR: I do. I would support that position.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr.
Buttolph.
MR. BUTTOLPH: We have a position as well. Of course, as everyone knows, on October 27th, it was our group which filed the emergency motion to suspend the hearings that were scheduled to begin on November 1st. The Applicant at that point in time argued vehemently that the intervenors knew the schedule and should be compelled to perform to that schedule and that relief should be
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denied.
On October 29th, the Applicant's argument with this respect was sustained. Motion was denied. But as such, all parties were compelled to proceed on the original schedule.

We're gratified that the Chairman recognized there were some issues, serious issues, with respect to change in the plans from the Applicant: Specifically, the new transmission wire plan was brought upon us, all of us, at the last minute, with all due respect, with a whole host of issues that are presented. As a result, we have wetlands, environmental, historical impact perhaps, environmental issues, wildlife, even such basic plans as the location of the new transformer facility unknown at this time. And, of course, now we have information from Fish and Game, once again, late in the game.

And if that isn't sufficient reason to raise substantive concern, we've also been most recently notified of a letter from New Hampshire DES, dated 10/28/10. Now, this letter documented the following key points: Areas potentially disturbed by activities associated with connecting the wind farm to the existing grid have not yet been evaluated for archeology. Section
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106 review of above-ground resources has not progressed due to the cultural resource consultant's submission of insufficient work products.

DHR's project area form was submitted in July 2010 with substantive deficiencies. The text alone was revised and reviewed by DHR Division of Eligibility Committee on October 27, 2010, which determined that it did not meet New Hampshire DHR guidelines and was returned as insufficient. DHR contacted U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for assistance. Iberdrola was very much aware of these requirements, having met early in the process, March 16, 2010, in order to understand the project area form process in detail. They could have been working on a lot of these issues many, many, many months ago. So, clearly, the issues raised by DHR could take months to resolve, it would appear to us.

However, we are reminded that R.S.A. 162-H: 6 indicates that within 240 days of the acceptance of an application, the Subcommittee shall issue or deny a certificate for a renewable energy facility. In March, the SEC acknowledged receipt of the application of Groton Wind, LCC for a certificate of site and facility, starting the clock. We all have been marching to an agreed-to
schedule throughout the summer. Certainly the intervenors have expressed good faith in keeping up with this process. And while it may not matter from a legal perspective, certainly it has taken quite a toll on us personally. From the moment we became involved, we were constantly reminded that the schedule was not to be missed. This wasn't easy on any of us, particularly the intervenors, who must take time away from our gainful employment in order to exercise rights to participate in this process. However, now the Committee is placed in a very, very difficult spot. It's unfair for the parties to be placed in the position whereby the only way that a full and complete application can be evaluated is to miss the time frame that was clearly articulated in R.S.A. 162-H:6. A waiver of rules would be required to do so, invoking 202:15. But 202:15 requires not only that the waiver serve the public interest, but also that the waiver not disrupt the orderly and efficient resolution of matters before the Committee. Clearly, a delay for potentially months with respect to the historical issues would be highly disruptive, particularly considering that the adjudicative hearings are already underway.

So, for all of these reasons, it's the intervenor's position that the Committee is compelled to
move forward and to evaluate the incomplete application as it has been presented. Simultaneously, the Committee should be reminded that the Applicant has an obligation to meet the burden of proof, and it clearly has not done so. As such, it is the position of the intervenor group that the Committee has no alternative but to deny this application.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: So, do you take that position even if, I think at least under the proposal, as I hear it, if it could be done that way, and could still be done within the 240 days? Would that -- does that change your position?

MR. BUTTOLPH: Well, we understand that the DHR issues could take perhaps longer than that. I don't know how we can wrap this whole thing together in just a few days when we have that issue that's still outstanding. We also need to have --

CHAIRMAN GETZ: So, even if the associated facilities, distribution line, transmission line issue could be addressed, and now that we have the Fish and Game letter, the concern is that -- and again, I don't know quite what to make of Exhibit 49, this letter from Ms. Mark. But your expectation is that that's something that's not going to be able to be handled
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before, $I$ think December 24 is the 240 th day?
MR. IACOPINO: 22nd, I think.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: 22nd.
MR. IACOPINO: 22nd and 23rd.
MR. BUTTOLPH: I mean, there's an
issue of proper discovery. We need to properly vet all of this information. Like, for example, this Fish and Game. We're all speed-reading it here. It's been the way this whole thing has been going. It's just hard for me to understand, when they have the schedule way back when, that they couldn't get their homework done by now.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Who "they"? Fish and

## Game?

MR. BUTTOLPH: I'm sorry. The
Applicant. Throughout this entire process, they have had the opportunity to meet the schedule, and they haven't done so.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. But you weren't talking about -- were you talking about just as a general matter, or were you speaking --

MR. BUTTOLPH: I'm talking about the number of different issues that exist here. The historic information is certainly something that they had every capability and responsibility to address well before now.
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That's certainly an example of homework that's missed. CHAIRMAN GETZ: All right. Mr. Roth. MR. ROTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are at this point, as $I$ see it, at least four fairly significant unresolved issues in this case, ranging in level of significance.

And the first -- and in no particular order on my list here -- the first is the agreement with the Town of Groton over decommissioning. We still don't have a final signed agreement here, the last day, at 4:00 in the afternoon of the hearing. So we don't know what agreement with the Town of Groton will be reached over decommissioning, if any at all. And so at this point, a fairly key issue affecting the orderly development of the region is not fully developed in the record and is open.

We also have the DHR question, which is also not fully developed and not of record, in terms of where it ought to be at this stage.

And then we now lately have the Fish and Game letter regarding avian species, and I believe primarily bats, but I'm not sure. I haven't had an opportunity to speed-read it. Mr. Buttolph is ahead of me there.

And then, lastly, the interconnection
questions which involve a whole host of issues: Wetlands, historic resources, view impacts, orderly development of the region, wildlife impacts. And we just don't know, other than what I would describe as a hastily prepared Exhibit 44 and 45 to provide information about that.

I would refer the Committee to R.S.A. 162-H:7, which, in Paragraph 4, says, "Each application shall contain sufficient information to satisfy the application requirements of each state agency having jurisdiction under state or federal law to regulate any aspect of construction or operation of the proposed facility."

And then I would look at the Chair's
letter of April -- or order, I'm sorry -- the order dated April 26, 2010, where the Chair reviewed the application, which included in its features, in the first paragraph of background, a 34-kilovolt electrical collection system and 13 miles of 34.5 kilovolt electrical distribution line to the Beebe River Substation, and made a finding that the application was sufficient.

And I guess my sense of it now is that, given the changes that have been made, and given the sort of failure to progress on some of these issues, at least as far as the interconnection, that the application
isn't even really complete at this point, or it's just getting there. The application completeness, as I think we all understand, is sort of the first step for this fairly hyper process in order to get these projects done in a timely fashion and in a way that respects, I think, the urgency for -- that society feels for having alternative energy projects be developed in New Hampshire. CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let me stop you there for a second and see if we can talk about this issue.

So, an application can be complete to start the process. But then how do we deal with changed circumstances, where basically in this case I think what you're focusing on is the interconnection, and that is different than what was initially proposed because of some, it seems a couple of interactions, one with PSNH and one with the New Hampshire Electric Co-Op.

So, what is your suggestion there in this regard? That if there's any change in circumstances, we have to deem it no longer complete and start over? Or is there room in this process to accommodate changed circumstances? And then, also, let me work into this, because it's going to go into a couple of the other issues. If you can accommodate changed circumstances at
all, what's our standard? Because I think it's been indicated by Mr. Buttolph's remarks in some regard, and actually, I think two ways, almost like a strict liability approach: If anything changes, that's it, you're done. Or you look at fault: Should they have done something? Could they have done something? Or are we then going to have to get into, on the DHR issue, for example, where we've heard testimony where there may be allegations that, whether it was the Applicant, the Applicant's consultant, personnel at DMR, personnel as the Army Corps -- I mean, how do we figure out what's the standard to apply here?

MR. ROTH: I think it would not be a good use of anybody's resources to conduct an inquiry about fault or responsibility. I think we are where we are at this point. And at least speaking for my office, we're not sitting here taking the position that Mr .

Buttolph does, that, okay, today is the end of the line. They haven't met their burden. You know, game over.

I think that there are two options available here that $I$ think make sense. One of those options is the Applicant could withdraw the application and resubmit it with the record preserved, and those issues that are still unresolved dealt with in a revised application and a process that gets essentially agreed
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upon in another sort of case-structuring order, such as what we had back in June, and then go forward with the new information, so that the application completeness is sort of hop-scotched up forward and we start over again at least with those aspects of the application that have now been made complete.

The second option would be to, as Mr.
Buttolph originally requested, to suspend the deliberation, leave the record open and go through that same process again -- that is, leave the record as it is and in, and then set up a process going forward in the coming months. And I don't mean two weeks to look at Exhibit 44, but I mean enough time where the Applicant can do, you know, some of the things that the Committee asked. The Committee asked the Applicant to submit the design of the interconnection. You know, let's see the footprint of what you're going to build up there at Beebe River. For the Applicant to have surveyed routes and actual surveys and studies of whatever the impacts might be, including the visual and historic, on the interconnection route, so that the Applicant can actually get to a point where every one of these projects that I've worked on in the last six or seven years has been as of the date the hearing starts. You know, this is the first one of these that I've seen
where they come in, where the interconnection route essentially changes completely from the day the application is filed to the date of the hearing. That's just not happened in my experience. Now, I understand the Applicant has the -- doesn't control all the variables throughout. You know, where there are changes, you got to move a pole. In Lempster, there were things done to sort of adjust things a little bit. But the basic idea, the basic concept of the program -- of the project doesn't change in any significant way from start to finish. And here we have, I think, fairly significant missing pieces of information that will make it very difficult for the Committee to make a decision of whether the Applicant met its burden.

And I think the resolution isn't as Mr. Buttolph suggested, to dismiss the matter, but I think the resolution is to sort of put everything on hold and say, okay, let's let the Applicant further provide the analysis that it should have provided and then have some opportunity for the parties to again have our experts look at things, for us to look at things, have a tech session. I don't even think -- I'm not even suggesting we do a bunch of data requests again. But have a tech session, and then have another couple days of hearings sometime in
the springtime, after the two things have happened: The Applicant has produced enough information where we now understand what's actually going to happen, and it's going to stay that way; and, two, the parties have had an opportunity to evaluate and assess that information and be prepared, in a reasonable and due process fashion, to come in and conduct a hearing on it.

And the other thing I would point out is that we saw in testimony a couple days ago from one of the Applicant's officers who said, you know, if we don't get the certificate by the end of the year, that's not the end of the story for us. We're still going to be able to make the investment, and we're going to be able to still qualify, he believed, for the investment tax credits. So, the financial urgency is perhaps not there.

And I submit that the alternative that
I propose is far better than dismissing the application, which has been suggested by Mr. Buttolph, or denying the certificate, or the Applicant's alternative, which is, well, let's just kind of have a quick hearing on this wetlands issue and move on. I just don't think that that's a prudent approach at this point.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Well, Mr.
Buttolph, do you want to have a chance to respond to any
of that before I hear from the Applicant?
MR. BUTTOLPH: Well, I would just say that it would be disappointing, certainly for our group, to recognize that, having met all of the various dates that we were required to meet and participated in to the extent that we have, that now, because of these circumstances which appear to have been the burden placed upon the Applicant to meet these dates, that now we're going to be in the position of having to regroup, reconnect with our family and get the commitment that says we're going to continue to push forward into, what, the spring, whenever that might be, that that doesn't seem to be fair to us.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let me address one part of that: Going into the spring. I guess -- and I'm not speaking for the Committee. I'm just asking questions here. And based on experience that I've had, it seems like we could address in a sooner frame of time the issues of the associated facilities, the transmission line and the distribution line and the Fish and Game issue and the decommissioning issue. What $I$ really don't have a good feel for is how long it would take to get this historic resources issue sorted out. But at the same time, Mr. Buttolph, it seems like the general proposal
from Mr. Roth is consistent with what you were recommending a week ago, before the hearing started, that we take additional time to try to look at these undefined areas.

But having said all that, Ms. Geiger, do you have any reaction to the comments of Mr. Buttolph or Mr. Roth?

MS. GEIGER: Yes, I do. Thank You, Mr. Chairman. I think I'll just group these under major headings, if you will. The first one is the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative distribution line that runs along Route 25 to the Beebe River Substation.

As this Committee noted in the
Lempster Wind case in its order on the Town of Goshen's motion to intervene, it's important to note that the Committee is not considering an application to construct or upgrade a distribution line in this docket. The Committee is considering an application to construct a wind-powered electric generation facility. The distribution line, the one that runs from Route 25 to Beebe River, is not owned by the Applicant and is not situated in the footprint of the project set forth in the application; so, as the Committee noted correctly in the Lempster case, it was not certificating that
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interconnection line. And I think it's really important to bear that in mind. In the Lempster case, the Committee decided that, with respect to that line that ran along the existing utility corridor to the Newport Substation -- and here, the analogous situation is we've got a line running from Route 25 to the Beebe River Substation -- the Committee's responsibility on that line is to determine its effect on the orderly development of the region. It's not to determine all of the other impacts that apply to the wind plant project proper: Aesthetics, historic sites impacts on the natural environment, air and water quality, et cetera. So I think it's really important to remember that. The Applicant has complied with the SEC rules and provided information about that line, though. And Mr. Cherian would be happy to answer questions about that if he were allowed to come back at a future date. However, that line and any interconnection facilities, like the step-up transformer, et cetera, are not being certificated here; and, therefore, the precise details about those facilities need not be evaluated as part of this case, with the exception of how that line affects the orderly development of the region.

So we believe very strongly that the
Committee in this case should apply the same standard that
it applied in the Lempster case and only consider the interconnection lines' impact on the orderly development of the region. The applicant would submit on that score, by staying within an existing utility corridor and interconnecting with the grid at the Beebe River Substation or located near transmission facilities, that we are complying with the orderly development of the region because we're locating facilities near the grid. CHAIRMAN GETZ: But the distinction there, I believe, is that in the Lempster case, the lines you're talking about weren't considered an associated facility. Is that the distinction? Because if we're looking at the -- if I'm getting all this correct, the distribution line that's now an alternative to the line down Groton Hollow Road --

MS. GEIGER: Right. And I believe that line is jurisdictional, Mr. Chairman, and that's why I fully -- we fully concede that it would be appropriate to come back at a later time, after everyone's had an opportunity to look at that piece of the line, if you will, from the project site down to Route 25 , the one where Ms. Rendall submitted a memo about impacts on wetlands and so forth. Clearly, we understand the need for the parties to understand a little bit more about
that, and we'd be willing to come back and answer questions about Exhibit 44.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: And does that also include the piece that would be the new 115 interconnect? MS. GEIGER: No.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: You would include that
in --
MS. GEIGER: I would include that as the line that is interconnecting with -- obviously, that's part of the interconnection line that is being necessitated by studies that ISO New England and Northeast Utilities, the owner of the grid, if you will, or the grid facilities, have required the Applicant to review and change from its initially proposed route. And --

CHAIRMAN GETZ: So you wouldn't include that in under the definition of an associated facility with this. You would liken it to the distribution lines in the Lempster case.

MS. GEIGER: Exactly. And I think it's really important, even not just the Lempster case. I think it's really important to remember that, even in the Granite Reliable case, Industrial Wind Action Group had filed a motion for rehearing in that docket and had asked the Site Evaluation Committee to require the Applicant to
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submit the final system impact study, along with any interconnection and substation plans, prior to any construction activities. And the Committee said no. The Committee denied that request and found that the system impact study and the results were not within the mandate of the Subcommittee and that the Subcommittee had no authority or control over the ISO; and, therefore, it would not be appropriate for the decision or certificate to require the action requested by the Industrial Wind Action Group. So I think we have a recognition, at least in that order on Ms. Linowes's motion for rehearing in the Granite Reliable docket, that the Committee was not going to condition its permit or its certificate in that case on any results from ISO New England or any plans concerning the location of a substation.

So we take the same position here.
It's really -- it's the Co-Op's line. And again, we are at the mercy, really, of ISO New England and you, and the results of those studies, to know exactly, and with specificity, what kind of interconnection facilities we're going to need and where they're going to be placed.

I think it's important for the
Committee also to remember, and I'm sure you do, that under 162-H:16, VII, the Committee can condition its
permit on the results of required federal and state agency studies whose study period exceeds the SEC process period or the application period. And I would analogize the ISO New England interconnection study period to be similar to, for example, the Army Corps of Engineers study period, which, you know, in other cases that I've been involved with has exceeded this application process period. And, of course, the Committee always conditions the certificates on the Applicant's ability to satisfy all of the requirements of the Army Corps of Engineers, which include satisfying the Division of Historic Resources, which plays a consultative role in the Army Corps permitting process.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: See, I guess the concern that I have there with that specific issue about historic resources, we also have to make a finding that there's no unreasonable adverse effect on historic sites. And how would you bridge that gap?

MS. GEIGER: Well, I think the Committee's bridged it in the past. First, I would note that Historic Resources is not a state agency that has jurisdiction under state and federal law to regulate any aspect of the construction or operation of the proposed facility. So in that regard, it is different from DES,
which has to issue permits, and which did with conditions. So, you know, we view DHR in a different light. Moreover, even if DHR were a participating agency under the law, it was supposed to have made its determinations and filed its report with the Committee by October 25th. And it didn't do that. It issued a letter, instead, on October 28th. Now, we're not moving to strike that letter from the record, even though it is untimely. Our intent, really, is to work with the Division of Historical Resources to address their concerns. But, again, we're going to do that in the context of the Army Corps permitting process.

You know, my understanding is that the Army Corps and DHR have met recently about the project to discuss the information that was presented in the most recent letter from the Division of Historical Resources. And I believe that we've had marked this afternoon an e-mail that was sent to Attorney Iacopino, Exhibit 49, which indicates that the Army Corps held a conference call with the Division of Historic Resources to discuss the wind project, the Groton Wind project area form. And the Army Corps believes that, after this discussion, that with additional efforts on behalf of the Applicant, the project area form and the permitting process can move on to a successful resolution. That's pretty much what Dr. Luhman
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testified to as well. She felt that, in her professional experience and in her opinion, that the evaluative process on historic resources that is conducted in concert with the Army Corps will play out to a successful conclusion. And I'd like to remind the Committee that, for example, in the Lempster case, the Committee recognized that the discovery and identification of historic sites and cultural resources is, quote, unquote, a fluid process. And in that case, the Committee imposed as a condition of the certificate a requirement that the Applicant, No. 1, continue its consultations with the DHR and comply with all agreements and memos of understanding with that agency; No. 2, complete its Phase 1 archeological survey and provide copies to DHR and the Committee.

Now, we've done our Phase 1
archeological study. That's been submitted to DHR, and they're okay with that. So we're much further along here in this project than we were in the Lempster project. The last thing the Committee ordered in the Lempster case was to undertake a Phase 1B archeological survey in all archeologically sensitive areas and to file the results of the survey with DHR and the Committee. In this case, the Applicant has already completed the Phase 1A and Phase 1B
survey. So Groton Wind, again, is much further along in this case than it was in the Lempster case, when Lempster Wind received its certificate.

Another thing I think is important for the Committee to bear in mind is that the Applicant wants to work with DHR and believes that it can successfully work with DHR to address DHR's concerns and those of the Army Corps.

One thing I want to point out is that the -- we looked into DHR's processes a little bit to try to figure out what may have gone awry here. And since 1981, DHR has had rule-making authority, but has never adopted rules, or hasn't adopted rules that we could find. It has some guidelines. But as the Committee knows, guidelines do not have the force and effect of law unless they're promulgated under R.S.A. 541-A. And the rule-making process is important, because regulated parties will then know which agency directives are rules and what they must do to comply with them.

Here, we have a situation where the wind industry in New Hampshire is apparently being held to a separate standard by DHR. There are separate wind guidelines. And we're not aware that they have separate guidelines for other industries. So we're trying to
comply. Dr. Luhman testified that she submitted the same type of information to DHR in this case as she did in the Granite Reliable docket. However, we're in a different situation here, and we're trying to work with DHR to find out why. Again, this highlights the reasons why guidelines which have not been promulgated as rules really shouldn't be invoked as a reason to prohibit the project from moving forward. We're confident we can work with DHR and the Army Corps to address all of their concerns. And, again, we would accept conditions similar to those that were imposed in the Lempster project.

MR. BUTTOLPH: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of clarification points. You had asked us to -what our position might be, recognizing that our emergency motion was asking for a delay of the hearings, and here we're talking about exactly that. I'd like to point out that our motion was filed on the 27th of October. We're talking about this letter from DHR which came in on the 28th, which showed the degree and the extent to which we have additional outstanding actions here that need to be addressed. So, it certainly isn't an inconsistency on our part to be suggesting that perhaps we would have to consider the fact that there are more outstanding issues with respect to what our position ought to be with that,
and also looking at the DHR information, that it will take considerably longer to resolve.

It's also worthy to point out, I believe, that they started this application in the 2005 time frame. Now, this has been a long time that they've had to be looking at this whole process. They certainly could have been working on all of these issues literally for years; yet, here we are at the tail end where these issues are still outstanding.

With respect to impacts to others, looking at, for example, Mr. McCann, who helped us with helping everyone and the Committee with understanding potential real estate impacts. It's hard to know what's going to happen with respect to the DHR inputs that we finally do get back. There may be some additional impacts that we would need to look at or that would behoove us to look at with regard to real estate impacts, depending on how that all comes forward. So this is really just creating a very difficult position for all of us, and certainly for the Committee. We certainly understand that.

So, we stand by our previous position that says they've had a long time to get this right, and they certainly have not met the burden of proof at this
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point, in our view.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Roth, did you have something else?

MR. ROTH: Yes, I did. I can empathize completely with the intervenors's lack of desire to continue this process, you know, for any more than, like, five more minutes. But $I$ still think the answer is not to throw the baby out with the bath water. And I think the answer is, as I said before, to suspend deliberation, as Mr. Buttolph had requested.

I wanted to respond to a few things that were mentioned by Attorney Geiger. She compared this project to Lempster and to Granite Reliable Power, and particularly with respect to the interconnection.

I would point out that in both of those projects, as I did before, the interconnection was established, the feasibility of those interconnections routes was known and cleared. And I'm not saying through any fault of their own, although, I would point out that Mr. Cherian apparently knew as early as the beginning of July, end of June, when he was testifying at the public meeting that everything was fine, he knew then that there were problems with the interconnection feasibility, and he chose to ignore them. So, here we are.
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But the feasibility was resolved in
both cases. And it's different to say, okay, we don't know what the system impact study is going to prove from ISO, and you don't have any control over ISO, nor is there anything in your statute that gives you any control over ISO. So all you can do is say let's -- you know, you can't go on until ISO approves. And that's fairly self-evident. So, Granite Reliable was waiting for the system impact study. Feasibility was resolved.

I guess I also take issue with
Attorney Geiger's assertion that the only thing in question in Lempster was orderly development of the region. Now, maybe that's in the order. But I felt that there was a lot of attention paid by the parties in that case and, to a certain extent, Committee counsel, to the aesthetics of the lines down the road. Now, that wasn't part of the hearing because those things have been resolved. But the Town of Goshen intervened on that issue, and they were allowed to intervene and participate on that issue. And again, you know, the other difference is that the Lempster process did not include a step-up at the end. There was no 115 kV at the end.

And then, finally, even if it is only orderly development of the region, the only showing we
have of that is Attorney Geiger's say-so. I mean, there needs to be, I think, some fleshing out of that, but with the participation of the parties. And we're happy to do that on a more reasonable time frame, but certainly not in two weeks, as was suggested a moment ago.

Now, the DHR issue, you know, I
understand the problem that's based over DHR. And I'm looking at this e-mail that was received today which speaks of a conference call held today. And I note that this e-mail is not from the Army Corps. And there was testimony -- I'm sorry. The e-mail was from the Army Corps, but not from DHR. And there was testimony the other day and questions about whether -- I think fairly suggesting from the testimony by Ms. Luhman, that what the Applicant was trying to do was kind of do a work-around DHR by getting Army Corps. And that appears to be what's still going on. And, you know, if this e-mail were from DHR, or a letter from DHR saying, oh, by the way, don't -you know, disregard our earlier letter, things are back on track, I'd feel a lot better. But I don't see that here. And not to say that would resolve the issue for me. But this is only a part of the answer and I don't think resolves it.

MS. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman --
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MR. ROTH: With respect to DHR -please let me finish -- even this idea that DHR doesn't really matter because they're not jurisdictional, this body still has an independent duty to find no adverse impact on historic and cultural resources.

Historically, this body has used the
Department of Historical and Cultural Resources to help them make that determination. And I think what the Applicant is suggesting here is, rather than have any sort of certainty or assurance that that process is underway, let's just put it all into conditions and let it roll out. On that basis, you could do that with a lot of things in this case. You could just get the application and say, okay, if they get a wetlands certificate and they get DHR and the Army Corps, we're all set. We don't need to have hearings. We don't need to have intervenors and parties. We can just have conditions that say, satisfy all those agencies and you're all set. But that's not what it's about.

Finally, I guess, you know, I don't want to put too much on DHR, on the DHR issue. But, you know, we talked -- when I was cross-examining Ms. Luhman about, you know, this is final exam day, the term paper is due, what I heard was, and what I'm still hearing, is a
classic tardy student, which is, you know, I got a bad grade because the teacher wasn't fair. And so we're hearing another sort of blame the teacher excuse here. And I think the answer isn't -- you know, again, I don't want to get too much into blame. But the answer is the parties are entitled to have a reasonable and fair opportunity to test this evidence, have an opportunity to have a technical session, and have a -- prepare for hearing.

And this Fish and Game letter, you know, I'm not blaming anybody other than Fish and Game maybe. But, you know, I have an expert on avian species. He would like to review this, take some time to consider it. There are on the back of this letter 10 or 12 authorities. My expert would probably like to look at that and consider that and decide whether to file additional testimony on those issues, as he was entitled to do under the normal procedure.

So, I guess I think the more reasonable approach is not to try to put it all on conditions, which I think turns the Committee's jurisdiction and role on its head, and instead, let's have a suspension of the deliberation, and let's have another technical session and put in place some more process so we
can review the new information as it comes in and is finalized and finished, I mean, which brings me to my final -- it just reminds me.

This route that's been proposed is still not final. The feasibility study on that has not even been completed, as far as I know. And that's a proposed route. And it could change.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: Yes. And I apologize for interrupting, Attorney Roth.

But in terms of what the Applicant has or has not communicated to DHR, I think it's very important to understand -- and I didn't fully understand this until $I$ spoke with my client -- about the federal process.

The Applicant has to work through the
Army Corps with DHR. I think the Applicant has reached out to DHR. But really it's up to the Army Corps to consult with DHR. And I apologize if I'm not stating this correctly, but I'm not an expert on this process. The client is not trying to work around DHR by going to the Corps. The Corps is the lead federal agency in the federal permitting process. So the Applicant did speak with the Corps, and then the Corps, in turn, spoke with

DHR. In addition, the client has -- the Applicant has, in fact, reached out to DHR. And $I$ can make an offer of proof, based on representations made to me by my clients, that DHR indicated has, as I believe as of today, that they believe they are on track in reviewing the project and working with the Applicant to deal with any historic resources issues. Again, you know, the best $I$ can do is to remind the Committee that the study period for the Army Corps' permitting process goes beyond this application period, and there is an express provision in the statute that allows for conditions that, you know, in these circumstances, allows the Applicant to -- you know, if there is a condition that requires the Applicant satisfy permitting requirements of other federal agencies. So, you know, that takes care of that issue, it appears to me.

In addition, in Lempster, on the
decommissioning issue, the Lempster agreement with the Town of Lempster and Lempster Wind was reached. A draft agreement was filed with the Committee, and it dealt with decommissioning, among other things. I believe the final signed agreement with the Town was not actually -- it wasn't actually executed and submitted to the Committee until after the Committee had issued its decision. So, to suggest that the lack of a signed agreement with the Town
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of Groton on the issue of decommissioning should somehow hold up the process I think would be unfortunate. I think that the Applicant has made a commitment to, you know, adhere to certain decommissioning standards, and we're still waiting for the Town and the Applicant to sign off on that.

Again, we feel confident that we can work with DHR through the federal permitting process to address any historical resources concerns. We have, I believe, uncontroverted evidence from Dr. Luhman that, in her professional opinion, the project does not have an unreasonable adverse effect on historic resources. So, I believe that's the state of the record on that issue.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Let me just for a moment talk about where personally $I$ am on this issue. And I think what drives my thinking on this is I start with 162-H:1, the purpose of the statute, which in a lot of regards places on us a balancing test for a lot of considerations. The legislature found certain things in the public interest: Maintain a balance between the environment and the need for new energy facilities. And it lays out a number of considerations.

And I also think, in that context, that it requires us to balance the interest of applicants,
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the interest of parties, and to consider the public interest generally. And I also look at the time lines that are laid out in 162-H:6-a. And, you know, what was the purpose of the 240 days? What was the intent of the legislature dealing with that? And I observe one thing, is that we still have about 50 days or so within the 240-day time period. But the statute also provides us the ability, if we determine that it's in the public interest, to suspend deliberations.

So, taking all of those pieces of the statute in mind, personally, I would not be inclined to dismiss or deny the certificate at this time. But what $I$ would like -- two things that $I$ would like to do: One is to give the parties the opportunity to see if there's any meeting of the minds about what alternative procedural schedules might be, if you want to make a proposal in that regard or not. It sounded like the Applicant had greater optimism about how quickly things could proceed than Public Counsel did. But at least if they could take some time to see if there's some drawing together that could give us some opportunity to think about those and actually to provide that in writing sometime next week.

But there's another issue with respect to the Subcommittee. What I would like to do is to speak
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with counsel about what our procedural options are. Under R.S.A. 541-A -- or not -- excuse me, not 541-A -- 91-A, the Right To Know Law, we're permitted to go into session with counsel to speak about issues such as procedural options. And I'd like to take some time now to recess and to go into session with counsel to see if there are other issues or advice about procedures that would be useful for us to consider. Hopefully it won't take us more than 10 or 15 minutes before we come back. So, thank you.
(Recess was taken at 4:46 p.m. and the hearing resumed at 5:09 p.m.) CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. We're back on the record in SEC Docket 2010-01, and we've just completed a session with Public Counsel, talking -- or counsel to the Committee, not with Public Counsel -- talking about our procedural options. And I think the discussion was helpful to me in forming, I think, some steps that we need to take right now in figuring out what our next steps are. And I guess I would characterize the issues this way: I think the first motion we need to address is, effectively, Mr. Buttolph's motion to, I would characterize it as closing the hearings today and then moving on to deliberations, noting that our deliberations have to take place publicly. And we're certainly not in a position to
deliberate the matters of the application today. But as a procedural matter, the first issue we need to address is whether to grant the intervenor motion to end the hearings. And I'd just ask for a discussion.

Is there any agreement, any motion
from the Subcommittee members that we should grant that motion? Mr. Scott.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when I look at $162-\mathrm{H}$, there's many segments that talk about public interest. I try to look at that. When I look at Mr. Buttolph's motion to close the hearings, and ultimately I believe you'd like us to deny the application, I try to keep that in mind. What we've heard I think from the Applicant is, given some time frame, the end result of issues is there'll be more resolution. In my view, if we were to grant the motion to close the hearings and potentially deny, my view is, I would assume, from everything you've been through, we will then be starting the whole process again. And I fail to find how, for the intervenors, all the time they've spent, for the Public Counsel, for the Committee, how all we -- going through all this again would be in the public interest. So, with that, I'd be inclined, with the Committee, and I move that we deny the motion.
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CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Is there a
second?
DR. KENT: Second.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: We have a second from
Dr. Kent.
Further discussion about Mr. Scott's motion? Mr. Dupee.

MR. DUPEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note under R.S.A. $162-\mathrm{H}$ we have an obligation to look at the route. I'm not talking about the route from 25 to the Beebe River site, but, rather, the route down the mountain. And I don't think at this point $I$ have enough information in the record that $I$ would feel comfortable essentially making or reaching a decision based upon that. So I'm not sure how $I$ could vote for closing the hearing, knowing there's still information necessary, in my opinion, to gather before I could make that determination.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Anyone else? Well, I guess I would note, similar to some comments I made earlier, there are still about 50 days left in the 240-day time frame. There is a statutory option for us to suspend hearings. There have been changed circumstances that I think merit further consideration by us. So I would also support the motion to deny Mr . Buttolph's motion to close
\{SEC 2010-01\}[DAY 5 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-5-10\}
the hearings and move on to deliberations.
So if there's no other discussion on that issue, $I$ guess all those in favor of Mr. Scott's motion, please signify by saying "aye."
(Multiple members indicating "aye.")
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any opposed?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: None opposed. So I'd note for the record that the motion is unanimous. So that leaves us with this issue: How to deal with continued hearings in this regard. And I have to -- I think Mr. Roth characterized four issues that we need to consider, and that goes to: Town of the Groton and decommissioning, historic resources, the Fish and Game letter on I think largely the bat issues, and these associated facilities. Personally, I'm concerned, on the one hand, that the proposal by Ms. Geiger doesn't give us enough time to take care of all those issues. On the other hand, I'm concerned about the length of time that might be implicated by Mr. Roth's suggestion about what time would be involved. I would suggest that the parties submit to us in writing a recommendation about a procedural schedule. And I think we really need some definition to know if the procedural schedule is any good,
something more definitive about the historic resources issues and how soon that can be addressed, when we think something might come from DES on those associated facilities. I think it's important to get the information to us and that the other parties get a chance to review the information and to prepare for another hearing. I don't know that we need discovery and to the extent of time as was conducted previously, and there's a way of addressing some of these issues through prehearing conferences. But there has to be adequate opportunity for the intervenors and for Public Counsel to prepare. So I'd like you to take that into consideration.

But is it fair to expect -- and I turn to you, Ms. Geiger -- that we could get something solid by the end of next week on a proposed procedural schedule?

MS. GEIGER: I think so. I think that would be -- obviously, it would just be a recommendation to the Committee about how we think the rest of the process should play out.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: And obviously you would try to work with the other parties on this.

MS. GEIGER: Yes, we would try. But my understanding is that if we were not able to reach agreement, then we would each, or however many of us could
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reach agreement, would be submitting those recommendations to you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Yes.
Mr. Iacopino.
MR. IACOPINO: I just want to point out there's still a number of data requests from the Committee that are outstanding to the Applicant.

MS. GEIGER: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: And I believe there's one outstanding to one of either the intervenors or counsel for the Public. So we probably ought to set a date for those answers to be provided as well. I mean, those are all things that the parties said they could provide. Those are not subject to arguments over time frames.

MS. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to -- I apologize, Attorney Iacopino.

I just want to reflect a little bit more about next week. My understanding is that Thursday is a state holiday; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Yes.
MS. GEIGER: Okay. I'm not sure about other parties to the docket. I know that my office is open, but $I$ also know that neither Attorney Patch nor I
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will be available on Friday. So that means we will have to confer and reach agreement by Wednesday, close of business. And I think that might be very difficult for us to do.

MR. ROTH: I concur. Thursday is a
state holiday. And so that effectively, with Attorney Geiger's and Patch's schedule, that ends the week on Wednesday. My secretary told me I have an all-day-long conference call on Monday, which I find absolutely unbelievable. But... so it's going to be a short week. And I concur, that perhaps if we went to Wednesday of the following week that would make sense. MS. GEIGER: I agree.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I think there are competing considerations here. We think it's important to move as quickly as possible within certainly the 240 days and accomplish as much as we can and then determine whether we need to suspend the 240-day time frame. I recognize that the more time you have, the more information, the better your information about what's going on at DES and DHR. So let's say by a filing by two weeks from today, Friday the 17 th , recommendations about a procedural schedule.

MS. GEIGER: The 19th.
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CHAIRMAN GETZ: Fourteen plus five, yes, 19. It's been a long week.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, as I understand what you're asking for from the parties, though, just so that everybody understands, is that if they don't all come to an agreement, you want essentially not just a suggested schedule from each, but also the reasons underlying that schedule as well, so that you can -- so that the Committee knows what those arguments are coming in and any deliberation on that issue can be done promptly.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Yes. And I think that necessarily means we're going to have to schedule a date for deliberations sometime after the 19 th to -- again, because we have to deliberate in public on those, whatever those filings are. So --

MS. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, I think what would also be helpful before we leave today, I think I'm hearing from the bench that you want us to come to agreement on a process for providing more information or resolving the procedural issues around developing the record on four issues. And one of those four issues is associated facilities. And I don't want to leave here today without understanding exactly what is meant by
"associated facilities."
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I can tell
you --
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that there is still a data request outstanding. We've reserved Applicant's No. 35 for information regarding the newly proposed step-up transformer station and 115 kV connection, including the size, dimensions and possible locations. That was a data request that the Applicant indicated that they could, in fact, provide to us. So I would just point that out, that that's actually a pending data request. It's my understanding that's information that the Applicant was going to be able to provide to us. I think that with respect to associated facilities, that goes a long way to the type of information that's going to be in dispute in this phase of our deliberations.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: 'Cause I take it, based on our exchange earlier, there could be a difference of opinion about what constitutes an associated facility. And there's certainly agreement, $I$ think, as the lines that are being proposed as an alternative to Groton Hollow as an associated facility. But there are other pieces of this that you're arguing are not. And I'm not sure we're
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in a position here today to make that decision on whether the facilities along 125 owned by the Co-Op and/or the interconnect facilities for PSNH, the 115 kV -- which, remind me: Did you agree that the 115 kV interconnection owned by PSNH would be an associated facility?

MS. GEIGER: Well, I mean, I think it depends legally. To the extent that there's an argument that the associated facilities must be certificated, I'd say no. I mean, it is a facility that is related somewhat to the project. But it's not something we believe needs to be certificated and upon which the Committee needs to make all of the determinations that it needs to make about the wind turbines and those associated facilities. For example: You know, the substation is going to be a great distance, obviously, from the turbines. The question remains, you know -- from my perspective, I don't believe that the Applicant, because we're not certificating that particular facility or piece of equipment, $I$ don't believe the Applicant must show the aesthetics -- the impact on aesthetics, historic resources or things of that nature. I mean, the question is how much information -- certainly under the Committee's rules we understand we're obligated to provide you with information about the interconnection line. And we've done that. And obviously, on

October 12 th we provided you with additional information. But it's our position that the Co-Op, the line in the Co-Op's distribution corridor and the interconnection facilities do not have to be certificated; meaning, the Applicant does not have to demonstrate the impacts of those facilities on all of the other statutorily prescribed criteria.

What we do need to do, based on guidance I'm taking from the Lempster order, is demonstrate how those facilities affect the orderly development of the region.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Again, I think we're not going to be able to resolve that today. So I think that's going to have to be part of your filing to make those arguments on what you think is covered.

MS. GEIGER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: If other parties have opposite arguments to make, or the same arguments, but want to address the issues of what constitutes "associated facilities," then please make that part of the filing. MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, we'd be happy to do that. But I think, as Mr. Iacopino points out, it would be helpful to know what it is we're talking about and where it's going to be. And, you know, there's a data
request for a number of things. And I would, again, point out that these are -- this is information that is typically provided in the application at the beginning. And it would be nice to know what it is we're talking about, to put some meat on the argument.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I think it would be useful to have the detail. But I think -- and to the extent that that data request can be answered more quickly, maybe it informs. But I'm not sure how much detail is necessary to address the argument of what constitutes an associated facility when you have the general information.

But I just would say, Ms. Geiger, try to get the information to the other parties as quickly as possible and make your arguments based on that.

MR. ROTH: I think there was some question about whether they were going to build this facility within the PSNH Substation property or on some other location. And that may make a difference about whether it's theirs or PSNH's. I don't know. I mean, it would be nice to know where it's going to be.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: And I take it Ms. Geiger will try to answer that data request as soon as possible.
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MS. GEIGER: We will. Thank you. CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, then, let me make a motion, I guess, to --

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, are we going to set a date for -- I mean, there are several other data requests, too. And I don't know how many of those need to be provided by the Applicant before the parties can appropriately brief the issue that you've requested them to brief within the next two weeks.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Yeah, I didn't really think that that many of them were really necessary for the briefing. But how many are outstanding?

MR. IACOPINO: I don't know exactly.
I haven't kept them in order of what's outstanding. I can go backwards. We're waiting for the muck pile management, emergency procedures for emergencies on Groton Hollow Road. We're waiting for them to identify the bat groups that they worked with on their studies and projects, which really isn't relevant to those issues. The financial statements of the various entities, the re-drawn line-of-sight cross-sections, contrast information sheets, the information $I$ just referenced before about reserved Exhibit 35 for the newly proposed step-up transformer station. Information regarding Professor Gittell's
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payments --
MS. GEIGER: We submitted that.
MR. IACOPINO: Oh, did you? I
haven't -- okay. Did you submit the explanation of the calculation of the carbon offset as well?

MS. GEIGER: No.
MR. IACOPINO: I think everything before Exhibit 33 has probably been provided already. So those are -- that's a summary of the outstanding data requests that $I$ believe have not yet been provided.

MS. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, we're in the process of compiling that. As the Committee is probably aware, being in the hearings here all day, and we all obviously have other things to do in the evenings to catch up with our work, we're in the process of compiling that information. I'm confident we'll have a lot of it next week, if not all of it.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Is it possible by close of business Wednesday?

MS. GEIGER: We will do our best. I think the only piece that we may have difficulty with are the financials, because Ms. Goland will have to go back to Portland, Oregon, to confer with folks there. And we'll obviously have to file a motion for protective order for
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some of that information.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: And I don't think that information is particularly relevant to the next task before us.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, I think missing from Attorney Iacopino's list was our responsibility to provide errata sheets for Mr. Tocci's testimony.

MR. IACOPINO: I couldn't remember which -- what the other non-Applicant data request was.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, then, I would move that we continue the hearings and that we ask the parties to file memoranda by November 19 th proposing a schedule for conducting additional hearings in this proceeding.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, are you making a motion to continue the hearings to the call of the Chair so that there does not need to be further publication of our next set of hearings?

CHAIRMAN GETZ: I certainly am. Do we
have a second?
MR. DUPEE: Second.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any discussion?
MR. BOISVERT: If I may? Regarding
what will be delivered to us at that point in time, attorney for the Applicant noted that the Division of Historic Resources was reportedly late in giving their response on October 28 th to a document they received on October 21. I would like to have included in those considerations that they have coordinated with DHR. And make sure that there is sufficient time for review after having received the document, which I expect will be substantial. And I do not want to have a situation where an agency is forced to review in haste. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any other discussions?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: All those in favor of the motion signify by saying "aye."
(Multiple members indicating "aye.")
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any opposed?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: None opposed. Motion
is unanimous.
Is there anything else to address
before we close the hearings for today?
MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, maybe some of this has been all covered and I missed some of it. But Turbine No. E1, is that definitely not going to be built
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now as in those sites, or is that in question? MS. GEIGER: It's not part of the application.

MR. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN GETZ: Anything else?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Then we will close the hearing and await the filings of the parties. And then, in the meantime, we will set a date for deliberations on the filings by the parties. Thank you, everyone.
(WHEREUPON, the hearing ended at
5:31 p.m.)
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