

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

December 3, 2010 - 2:05 P.M.  
Public Utilities Commission  
21 South Fruit Street  
Suite 10  
Concord, New Hampshire

RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2010-01  
Application of Groton Wind, LLC,  
for a Certificate of Site and  
Facility for a 48 Megawatt Wind  
Energy Facility in Groton,  
Grafton County, New Hampshire.  
(Public Hearing for Discussion  
and Deliberations)

PRESENT:	SITE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE:
Chairman Thomas B. Getz (Presiding)	N.H. Public Utilities Comm.
Brook Dupee, Bureau Chief	Dept. of Health & Human Serv.
Richard Boisvert	N.H. Div. of Historical Res.
Stephen Perry, Chief	Inland Fisheries - N.H. F&G
Charles Hood, Admin.	Dept. of Transportation
Donald Kent, Admin.	Dept. of Resources & Econ. Dev.
Eric Steltzer	Office of Energy & Planning
Michael Harrington	Public Utilities Commission

\* \* \*

Counsel for the Committee: Michael Iacopino, Esq.

COURT REPORTER: Susan J. Robidas, LCR NO. 44

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**Counsel for the Applicant:** Susan S. Geiger, Esq.  
(Groton Wind, LLC) Douglas L. Patch, Esq.  
(Orr & Reno)

**Counsel for the Public:** Peter Roth, Esq.  
(Sr. Asst. Atty. General)  
Evan Mulholland, Esq.  
(Asst. Atty. General)

**Reptg. the Buttolph Group:** Cheryl Lewis, Intervenor

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. GETZ: Good afternoon everyone.  
3 I'm going to resume the hearings in Site Evaluation  
4 Committee Docket 2010-01. Today is a public meeting  
5 for the purpose of deliberations. And let's start on  
6 my right and have the Members of the Committee  
7 identify themselves for the record.

8 MR. STELTZER: Eric Steltzer with the  
9 New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning.

10 MR. PERRY: Stephen Perry with New  
11 Hampshire Fish and Game Department.

12 MR. DUPEE: Rick Dupee, Department of  
13 Health and Human Services.

14 MR. HOOD: Charlie Hood, New Hampshire  
15 Department of Transportation.

16 MR. HARRINGTON: Mike Harrington, New  
17 Hampshire PUC.

18 DR. KENT: Don Kent, Department of  
19 Resources and Economic Development.

20 CHAIRMAN GETZ: And I'm Tom Getz from  
21 the Public Utilities Commission. And I'll note that  
22 Dr. Boisvert and Mr. Scott are not available this  
23 afternoon, but we do have a quorum present to conduct  
24 deliberations.

1                   But before we turn to the issues in  
2                   the case, I want to recognize Mr. Steltzer for an  
3                   issue that he wanted to raise.

4                   MR. STELTZER: Yeah. Thank you. I  
5                   just wanted to make a disclosure that Matt Magnuson,  
6                   who helped work on the report that was done by UNH,  
7                   is a tenant of mine. I've had no ex parte  
8                   communications and don't feel that it has had any  
9                   sort of prejudgment of my decision, and I believe  
10                  that I can fairly judge on the matter here.

11                  CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. And I'll note  
12                  that that's consistent with the Site Evaluation  
13                  Committee's rules as laid out as cite 202.03 that  
14                  requires withdrawal if good cause exists. And such  
15                  good cause would be constituted if the member  
16                  believed he or she could not fairly judge the facts  
17                  of the case. And Mr. Steltzer indicated he believes  
18                  he can fairly judge the case, the facts of the case.  
19                  And I'll note, also, that the Committee's rule states  
20                  that mere knowledge of the issues, the parties or any  
21                  witness, shall not constitute good cause for  
22                  withdrawal. So, with that, let me address where we  
23                  are.

24                  At the end of the hearings on

1 November 5th, we denied a motion to close the  
2 hearings and deliberate the merits of the  
3 application. We indicated to the parties that we  
4 would like to see proposals about the conduct of  
5 further steps in this docket be filed with us by  
6 November 19th. And on November 19th we received a  
7 filing from the Applicant; one from Counsel for the  
8 Public; and one from the Buttolph/Lewis/Spring  
9 intervenor group; and we received a letter on, looks  
10 like December 1st, from Dr. Mazur. We issued a  
11 scheduling order on November 29th which set up this  
12 afternoon as the opportunity to deliberate these  
13 issues. And I guess let me just in a very general  
14 way summarize what the proposals are.

15 There was not a meeting of the minds  
16 of all the parties on how to proceed. And the  
17 Applicant has, you know, suggested a much -- a  
18 quicker turn-around on additional steps in this  
19 proceeding and, in fact, has submitted additional  
20 testimony from Mr. Cherian, Ms. Rendall and  
21 Mr. Walker, Ms. Luhman, Mr. Gravel and Mr. Hecklau.  
22 And they also lay out various arguments on why they  
23 do not believe substantial additional time is  
24 required for the conduct of this proceeding, and that

1 a lengthy delay would likely affect their ability to  
2 prepare bid documents, secure contracts and construct  
3 the project by the end of 2012, which they said would  
4 create serious financial harm.

5 On the other hand, we have from  
6 Counsel for the Public a proposal to grant an  
7 extension until at least May 1 of 2011 to review the  
8 issues in the proceeding. And there's further  
9 discussion of the issues related to the proposed  
10 interconnection route, the bird and bat survey  
11 finalized findings from Fish and Game, and findings  
12 of Historical Resources. And so, effectively, I  
13 guess I would summarize: Counsel for the Public's  
14 position is that it's going to take two to three  
15 additional months in addition to when we've gotten  
16 final information on a number of things. So that  
17 puts us out into the -- to mid, late spring, I would  
18 characterize it.

19 And then we also have the filing from  
20 the Buttolph/Lewis/Spring group that adopts the  
21 recommendations of Counsel from the Public and notes,  
22 as well, Counsel for the Public's statement that  
23 clearly there's no rush to get approval on the  
24 proposed project before the end of the year, and

1 endorses the request for an extension of time until  
2 at least May 1, 2011.

3 So, I know you all had an opportunity  
4 to read through these documents. So I guess with  
5 that, I just would open the floor for discussions. I  
6 don't think it's necessary at this time to have a  
7 motion. But let's see if there's any parts of this  
8 that folks would like to discuss.

9 MR. GETZ: Mr. Harrington.

10 MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. One of the  
11 issues I guess we wanted to discuss a little bit more  
12 is the consequence of the delay. There's a certain  
13 number of issues here that have not been resolved as  
14 of yet. And, you know, looking at the 11/19  
15 submittal by the Applicant, it says, talking about  
16 delay, "A lengthy delay such as that suggested by  
17 Counsel for the Public would likely affect the  
18 project's ability to prepare bid documents (which  
19 could not be done until final permits have been  
20 issued), secure building contracts and construct the  
21 project by the end of 2012." And then it says, "This  
22 would create serious financial harm for the  
23 project..."

24 Now, I'm not sure by saying that, is

1 that meaning because it's the end of 2010 where the  
2 federal money isn't available? But they don't  
3 specifically state that. That's what I'm trying to  
4 find out. Is there anything, any more implication on  
5 that? Because I just got the hearings this morning  
6 from the day I missed, and I haven't been able to  
7 read all 300-something pages yet. So I'm wondering  
8 whether anybody can shed any light on exactly what  
9 the issue is, where it says here "this would serious  
10 financial harm for the project, the economics of  
11 which depend upon meeting that deadline," which is  
12 construction of the project by the end of 2012. I  
13 thought the critical date was to start construction,  
14 or have, you know, purchase orders issued by the end  
15 of 2010 in order to be eligible for the financing for  
16 the 34 million money.

17 MR. GETZ: Yeah. Well, I'm not sure  
18 that any of us can be helpful --

19 MR. HARRINGTON: Okay. So there  
20 wasn't any further discussion on --

21 MR. GETZ: -- understanding what's in  
22 their mind. But if it would be helpful, you can  
23 inquire of counsel what they meant by it.

24 MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. Well, I think



1           you heard what I said. So --

2                       MS. GEIGER: Yes. Thank you, Mr.  
3           Harrington. I'd be happy to address the question  
4           directly. I'd also be happy to turn it over to Mr.  
5           Cherian, because he is the project manager and could  
6           speak specifically to the concerns that he has about  
7           a significant delay in this docket.

8                       MR. ROTH: I would object to that.  
9           This was called as an opportunity for deliberations  
10          and some argument, not for an evidentiary  
11          testimony-based hearing of Mr. Cherian.

12                      MS. GEIGER: Well, I'd be happy to  
13          make an offer of proof. But it's been my experience,  
14          you know, sitting in this chair, as well as your own,  
15          sometimes it's easier to hear directly from the  
16          horse's mouth the problems that would be encountered  
17          from the project and the Applicant if there is a  
18          delay. But I'd be happy to make an offer of proof.

19                      Basically, the time frame that we're  
20          under here is such that, if we were to fail to meet  
21          the established deadline under the statute, which is  
22          December 22nd at this point, Mr. Cherian expressed to  
23          me concern that any substantial delay beyond that  
24          time, say beyond the end of January, for example,

1 would create problems, because he's got to have a  
2 final order in hand -- a final order, meaning wait 30  
3 days to see whether there is an appeal and so  
4 forth -- before he can prepare bid documents. The  
5 company's not going to put the project components or  
6 tasks out to bid until they know that they have a  
7 permit, a non-appealable permit -- or a permit that  
8 is final, and perhaps subject to appeal but which has  
9 not been stayed, let's put it that way. It's been  
10 expressed to me by Mr. Cherian that, if the  
11 construction contracts -- or the bids, excuse me, are  
12 put out toward the end of February, there needs to be  
13 some time for responses to those bids. We then get  
14 into the fall season. And obviously, between the  
15 winter months, as well as mud season, there could be  
16 no construction from, say, the end of 2011 until  
17 probably spring of 2012. So, it's a construction  
18 season issue.

19 Well, let's put it in sequence: Final  
20 decision, bid -- RFPs putting out, contracts coming  
21 back in response, bids coming back in response, and  
22 then construction either beginning, or maybe not,  
23 until the spring of 2012. And my understanding is  
24 that, again, we need to get construction completed by

1 2012.

2 Correct?

3 (Discussion between counsel and Mr.  
4 Cherian.)

5 MR. GETZ: Well, yeah, I think this  
6 is, you know, for the purposes of deliberations.  
7 It's not for further testimony. And we noted in the  
8 scheduling order that the parties may be called upon  
9 for argument regarding the schedule or outstanding  
10 motions; however, the Subcommittee will not take  
11 testimony or public comment. So, I think so far as  
12 we've gone to inquire what was meant by that  
13 particular statement I think is fair, but I don't  
14 want to get into --

15 MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.

16 MR. GETZ: -- you know, to go further  
17 on that. And plus, I think it also raises an  
18 argument about what's the relevance to our decision  
19 on how to proceed with the procedures. So I guess I  
20 would kind of stay there on that issue.

21 MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, does that  
22 mean you would not entertain a brief, and I mean very  
23 brief, responsive comment from me about that point  
24 that was just made by Attorney Geiger?

1 MR. GETZ: Are you saying that she's  
2 made an argument that you need a counter argument on,  
3 or are you disputing the statement? I guess I'm --

4 MR. ROTH: Well, I'm not sure what it  
5 is exactly, but it may go to the relevance. Because  
6 there was plenty of testimony, and I think it's  
7 fairly self-evident that the things that are as yet  
8 incomplete may very well cause the same, a similar  
9 kind of delay in contracting that they are talking  
10 about. And in any event, Mr. Mihalik made it very  
11 clear that they were prepared to go forward without a  
12 certificate by the end of this year. That's all.

13 MR. GETZ: Okay. Are there other  
14 issues raised by the proposals that anyone would like  
15 to discuss? Dr. Kent.

16 DR. KENT: Yes. I am still seeking  
17 clarity on when the business with the state agencies  
18 will be complete.

19 MR. GETZ: Meaning, which state  
20 agencies?

21 DR. KENT: All of our -- well, we had  
22 had -- I believe we had to go back to DES and wait  
23 for a final opinion. I didn't understand if Fish and  
24 Game was going to review the project again with the

1 alteration that's been proposed. And my  
2 understanding is we were waiting for Historical  
3 Resources. And I'm not clear from the filings when  
4 we could reasonably expect those issues to be  
5 finished.

6 MR. GETZ: And I think that goes to  
7 the issue of what's the appropriate procedure, and  
8 that's why we're in the situation that we are. We  
9 concluded at the end of the last hearing that we --  
10 there was more information that was needed, and we  
11 wanted to work on a process to collect that  
12 information and to consider it. And I guess I would  
13 say I think I would interpret what you're saying is  
14 an argument for why adopting the Applicant's approach  
15 of trying to deal with this within the normal time  
16 frame by the end of December is not a preferred  
17 procedural alternative, that that's something we  
18 would have to incorporate into a longer procedure.  
19 Is that a fair conclusion on my part?

20 DR. KENT: Yeah. I'll be more direct  
21 this time. I would be uncomfortable having to reach  
22 a decision without the information from the state  
23 agencies being completed and presented. I'd be  
24 reluctant to issue a certificate if we're still

1 waiting on state agencies to determine whether  
2 impacts have been addressed. So, given that, I would  
3 be reluctant to begin hearings again unless there's a  
4 change in status on responses from those agencies.

5 MR. GETZ: Mr. Dupee.

6 MR. DUPEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
7 I echo some of those concerns because the proposed  
8 transmission route course was different as presented  
9 to us during the course of the discussion than was  
10 originally proposed. And there are certainly parts  
11 of our statute that call for us to look at  
12 environmental impacts when we make our final  
13 decision. So I guess I'm sort of in a dilemma of not  
14 knowing what that final route might be. And our  
15 experts in the state agencies --

16 (Court Reporter interjects.)

17 MR. DUPEE: -- unless they have  
18 reviewed, I'm sort of in a dilemma to know how I  
19 would approach that question as to determining  
20 whether or not environmental impacts are  
21 unnecessarily harsh or within the confines of the  
22 statute.

23 MR. GETZ: And that's where I'd say I  
24 would characterize what the Applicant is saying is,

1 with what they've said before, with their new  
2 testimony, and if you take an approach and a  
3 different definition of what "associated facilities"  
4 are, their argument is that we can go back to hearing  
5 right away, basically, and then make certain  
6 decisions on whether there's adverse -- unreasonable  
7 adverse effects, and/or certain things would be  
8 either put off, as they argue was done in other  
9 cases, and/or certain things would be outside of  
10 the -- outside of our jurisdiction because they're  
11 not associated facilities, as I understand the  
12 argument.

13 But I take what you're saying is you'd  
14 be uncomfortable with the shorter procedural schedule  
15 proposed by the Applicant and looking for  
16 something --

17 MR. DUPEE: Essentially, there's not  
18 enough information on which to base a decision under  
19 R.S.A 162-H, as far as environmental impact.

20 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Or the alternative is  
21 to say they haven't made their case.

22 MR. DUPEE: Correct.

23 MR. GETZ: Okay. Any other  
24 discussion? Mr. Harrington.

1                   MR. HARRINGTON: I guess I have to  
2                   join with what was said earlier. I'd feel pretty  
3                   uncomfortable -- I mean, we get to the point where  
4                   there seems to be a couple major issues here: We  
5                   have the new line, we have the Fish and Game review,  
6                   and then we have the historical -- whatever that  
7                   department is -- historical records, historical  
8                   resource issue. And putting that together, that  
9                   becomes a rather large part of a permit to simply  
10                  defer to someone else to look at down the line. I  
11                  mean, the purpose of this Committee is to look  
12                  collectively at all these things and assess the  
13                  cumulative effect of these various things, not to  
14                  just farm that out to individual departments and have  
15                  them look at it individually. So I'd be a little  
16                  uncomfortable going forward with issuing a  
17                  certificate with those types of conditions on it. We  
18                  put conditions on ones in the past, but it wasn't, I  
19                  think, to the extent of the unknowns associated with  
20                  this one.

21                  MR. GETZ: Okay. Mr. Steltzer.

22                  MR. STELTZER: Yeah, I definitely  
23                  think about the precedent and what has happened in  
24                  the past actions that the SEC has taken on in past



1 proposals. So that's something that is in the back  
2 of my head. And I'd like to have this information as  
3 well.

4 I also struggle with the word  
5 "significant" and how significant this change  
6 actually is. And the alternative track, I wonder if  
7 the SEC didn't approve of where the ISO New England  
8 was suggesting where the three-ring bus station  
9 needed to be located, whether we'd have any action to  
10 take, anyways. And it seems like it's a little bit  
11 out of our jurisdiction of whether to approve the  
12 location of where the bus station is actually being  
13 located at.

14 So I wonder how -- and so when I think  
15 about the schedule, my understanding from Public  
16 Counsel, as well as the Buttolph group, is that it  
17 should be prolonged into May. And that's largely  
18 based off of the fact that the ISO New England  
19 information isn't going to come about until March or  
20 April time frame. And I wonder if -- in my head, I'm  
21 trying to separate that issue out from the Division  
22 of Historical Resources, as well as Fish and Game,  
23 that maybe the DHR, as well as Fish and Game, could  
24 be rectified at an earlier point in time, then the

1 ISO New England solution would be later on in early  
2 spring.

3 MR. GETZ: Okay. Well, I think one  
4 thing that seems to be clear that's forming as the  
5 sentiment of the Committee is that the proposal by  
6 the Applicant for a procedure that would effectively  
7 move ahead within the 240 days originally  
8 contemplated is not going to work. Is that -- I  
9 think in that context, then, we should think about  
10 what -- a little more concretely about what the  
11 options are.

12 And Mr. Iacopino, the 240 days runs  
13 out on December --

14 MR. IACOPINO: December 22nd, I  
15 believe it was.

16 MR. GETZ: The 22nd. So that means if  
17 we're going to have additional consideration,  
18 additional steps or processes, that we're going to  
19 need to enlarge the time for deliberations. And I  
20 think that's, you know, permitted under 162-H:6-a,IX,  
21 that during our deliberations we can suspend those  
22 deliberations. So I think we have the authority --  
23 and we mentioned that before -- to lengthen the time  
24 for review. I guess there's a question of how long

1 would we lengthen it and what would we do to get us  
2 to an endpoint.

3 MR. HARRINGTON: Mr. Chairman, just as  
4 a follow-up to what was just said, I think there's  
5 quite a bit of validity in that, because if the ISO's  
6 determination, the finalization of it, isn't going to  
7 be out until, I guess, sometime the end of March or  
8 maybe April, but they would probably give us a  
9 pretty, almost an absolute idea of where the lines  
10 are going to run and the substation, and maybe some  
11 electrical things having to do with the overlapping  
12 impact studies and such that they have to run on this  
13 that may have to be still worked out, then I think  
14 that would extend the date for a longer period of  
15 time. But that really doesn't have too much bearing  
16 on this. Whether they put in a Transformer A or a  
17 Transformer B I don't think is really something the  
18 Site Evaluation Committee gets into. It's whether --  
19 where the location of the lines are going to be and  
20 if they're going to need a second building or  
21 something like that. I think those -- that  
22 information could probably be available much sooner  
23 than the final system impact station [sic] being  
24 done. So, maybe there's a possibility for some

1           compromise here, where we can pull the date -- push  
2           the date out beyond, but not all the way out to May  
3           whatever. Mr. Iacopino is raising his hand over  
4           there.

5                       MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, I would  
6           just point out that it's not a system impact study  
7           that they're waiting on. It's a feasibility study.

8                       MR. HARRINGTON: Feasibility study.  
9           I'm sorry.

10                      MR. IACOPINO: So I believe that's the  
11           first round in the ISO process. So, just to the  
12           extent that, because this Committee has dealt with  
13           feasibility studies versus impact studies versus  
14           final interconnection studies in the past, this is a  
15           feasibility study that has been resubmitted to ISO.

16                      MR. HARRINGTON: Well, I guess what  
17           I'm suggesting is maybe the Applicant could get back  
18           with ISO New England and come back to us with what  
19           date would they know the, with a higher degree of  
20           certainty, the physical layout of where the line was  
21           going to run and where the substation would be and so  
22           forth, because that's the type of stuff that this  
23           Committee is interested in, not exactly the size of  
24           the transformer that they're going to put in or if

1 they need to put in some other equipment downstream  
2 to accommodate the electrical output of this, which  
3 is really beyond the scope of the Committee, but  
4 nevertheless has to be done by the ISO.

5 MR. GETZ: And I think one way  
6 possibly to address that is maybe to do this in  
7 parts. We have testimony. What I'm also hearing, I  
8 think, is that testimony alone is not sufficient for  
9 our purposes in determining whether the application  
10 should be approved and that we would like some other  
11 information. Some of that information may come from  
12 Historic Resources, some may come from DES, some may  
13 come from Fish and Game, some may come from the ISO  
14 either directly or indirectly through the Applicant,  
15 or possibly Public Counsel or the parties, for all I  
16 know.

17 One way to move ahead might be to have  
18 a technical session to start discovery on the  
19 Applicant's testimony, which presumably, I mean, it's  
20 December 3rd, that that could start sometime this  
21 month, and then we could set out a step for the  
22 opportunity for responsive testimony from the  
23 parties. I think Counsel for the Public has already  
24 indicated that there may be something on the Fish and

1 Game issues from his witness. So we could start that  
2 process and then see if we hear something from  
3 Historic Resources that may clarify their position on  
4 some of these issues, whether indeed the Applicant  
5 and Historic Resources and the Army Corps are making  
6 progress, and then can form our decision on the  
7 historic sites. And then, also, if something is  
8 forthcoming from the ISO, then ultimately that could  
9 be fed into the process.

10 Now -- and then this is where in some  
11 respects I'm in the same place now that I was before.  
12 I think it's fair to have some additional process and  
13 to try to address some of these issues, whether  
14 they're a result of changed circumstances or why they  
15 came about. But it shouldn't be entirely open-ended,  
16 the process. So there has to be some balance in all  
17 of this. And if at some point we're not getting  
18 information from the ISO, and we think it's critical,  
19 then we'd be in a position of determining whether to  
20 proceed, whether conditions are a useful mechanism,  
21 or whether effectively it would be time to deny the  
22 certificate. But I don't think we know that today.  
23 And I think what we did conclude last time was it's  
24 appropriate to allow some additional time to see if

1 we can make a full judgment about the merits of this  
2 proceeding. So, I guess, any thoughts about -- and,  
3 then, actually, as well from Mr. Iacopino, about  
4 those particular processes I've thrown out there.

5 MR. IACOPINO: I think what you would  
6 need -- obviously, there's been several witnesses  
7 that have provided supplemental prefiled testimony.  
8 I think that, in order to be fair to all the parties,  
9 there ought to be a technical session or some form of  
10 process for the other parties to question those  
11 witnesses with respect to the supplemental testimony,  
12 either through data requests or through a technical  
13 session, and then a time frame for the other parties  
14 to set forth any responsive testimony from witnesses  
15 that they might have, and at that point, either data  
16 requests or a technical session with the -- where the  
17 Applicant has the opportunity to get information from  
18 any responsive witnesses. That's essentially the  
19 process that we have prior to beginning the  
20 adjudicatory hearings, and that would be essentially  
21 what I would recommend, as far as the process to be  
22 before we were to next meet, because I assume that  
23 members of the Committee will also have questions of  
24 these witnesses, now that they've filed supplemental

1 testimony. So that we will probably be back here, if  
2 I understand everybody's position correctly, to  
3 continue with the adjudicatory hearing, so that any  
4 questions that are left from the Committee members or  
5 other parties in the nature of cross-examination  
6 based on the new prefiled testimony can be asked. So  
7 that's the process that I would think would be used.

8 How you slice or dice what issues are  
9 going to be involved is really, I think, a policy  
10 decision for I think the Committee to make. There  
11 are still, as I see it, three issues outstanding.  
12 I'll just use the shorthand for the areas here: The  
13 alternative distribution line; the state agency  
14 reports, and that includes both Fish and Game and  
15 Historic Resources; and then the interconnection. So  
16 those are still the three issues where it appears  
17 that there is a dispute among the parties over  
18 whether or not -- two things: Whether or not the  
19 Committee actually has any authority over at least  
20 the interconnection, but also over the -- there  
21 appears to be a dispute amongst the parties about how  
22 much information they have and whether or not those  
23 three areas in dispute, whether or not there is in  
24 fact a basis for the Committee to grant or deny a



1 certificate when considering those issues.

2 So, the fact that the ISO issue may  
3 take longer for ISO to resolve than we might expect  
4 the state agencies' issues to get resolved in the  
5 state agencies, I don't know how you want to deal  
6 with that particular issue. But I do think that  
7 there will have to be an ability for the parties to  
8 get information about it prior to presenting their  
9 final cases to the Committee.

10 MR. GETZ: Did you have something?  
11 Dr. Kent.

12 DR. KENT: I'd be glad to give my  
13 perspective on how these issues separate themselves a  
14 bit. Let me start from the longest term issue, which  
15 is the ISO issue.

16 I'm not opposed to the Applicant  
17 choosing a route for the transmission and  
18 distribution on the expectation that ISO will come up  
19 with a positive feasibility study, conditioning any  
20 certificate on that particular route that was  
21 presented to us. If you get the feasibility and  
22 everything goes well with ISO, it's the same thing  
23 you presented to us, go forward; otherwise, you would  
24 have to come back. So, I don't necessarily feel

1 obligated to suspend hearings until ISO completes, as  
2 long as -- completes their feasibility study, as long  
3 as the final feasibility study addresses the same  
4 footprint corridor as was presented to us for  
5 evaluation. However, I do feel more strongly that  
6 time frame must include a time for the agencies in  
7 play here, the state agencies, to respond to the  
8 changes in the application. And if the Applicant  
9 wants to -- wants us to meet sooner rather than  
10 later, and we do not have the responses from the  
11 agencies, then it's at their risk that we determine  
12 there's insufficient information to vote a  
13 certificate.

14 MR. GETZ: Okay. Let me just address  
15 and make sure I understand one part about the  
16 suspension. I think we're going to need to enlarge  
17 the time if we're going to do anything. So that --  
18 so I think we need to go past the December 22nd. I  
19 guess it's a question of -- when you say not suspend,  
20 that's not what you meant, I take it?

21 DR. KENT: Perhaps not.

22 MR. GETZ: Okay.

23 (Mr. Boisvert joins proceedings.)

24 CHAIRMAN GETZ: So that if we enlarge

1 the time, I think what you're suggesting is that it  
2 would be a fairly discrete amount of time to do these  
3 additional processes and allow the other agencies to  
4 respond; and then, if we could deal with the  
5 interconnection piece as proposed, but to the extent  
6 there's a change, then that kind of just reopens  
7 these issues about not having a complete application.

8 DR. KENT: Yes. I won't use the word  
9 "suspend" again.

10 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay.

11 DR. KENT: I misunderstood what we  
12 were in. My druthers would be that we pick a date to  
13 begin the -- to revisit the adjudicatory hearings  
14 that corresponds with responses from the agencies and  
15 enough time for all parties to review those  
16 responses, and then we would bring the witnesses back  
17 for more questions. And if we're still waiting for  
18 ISO, then we can deal with that issue through  
19 conditions.

20 MR. GETZ: Okay. Mr. Steltzer.

21 MR. STELTZER: I would agree with that  
22 and recognize that from the testimony that was  
23 provided by the Applicant, there was a meeting on the  
24 29th of November with the DHR. You know, we don't

1 know what that status is. But it seems like things  
2 are moving fairly quickly there. As well as there's  
3 some testimony from Ms. Rendall, I believe, regarding  
4 information from DES on their initial ideas of the  
5 impact that the alternate route might have. So I do  
6 think that that could happen in a quicker time frame  
7 than late March or early/mid April.

8 MR. GETZ: Okay. Let me just note for  
9 the record that Dr. Boisvert is here.

10 DR. BOISVERT: My apologies. I was  
11 called away with some legal matters.

12 MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Chairman, I would  
13 just point out that, in terms of considering a  
14 schedule, you should also consider the fact that once  
15 you have heard whatever the new information is and  
16 after sufficient review by all the parties, we will  
17 still to need to schedule deliberations of the  
18 Committee. So if you're talking about something that  
19 occurs in March, late March, early April, I would  
20 recommend to the Committee that we suspend the  
21 deliberation process under the statute to at least  
22 the end of April in order to accommodate having  
23 deliberation hearings on the certificate and drafting  
24 an order.

1 MR. GETZ: Well, I guess there would  
2 be a certain logic, I guess, to April 26th. That  
3 would be the year -- is that the date, a year from  
4 the --

5 MR. IACOPINO: It's one year after  
6 acceptance.

7 MR. GETZ: After acceptance. And  
8 maybe that's a reasonable balance of the rights of  
9 the Applicant and the intervenors, and be a fair  
10 recognition of the public interest, that we at least  
11 at this point think about enlarging the time for this  
12 proceeding until April 26th. But then, I think we  
13 got to talk about what are the steps we would  
14 conduct -- what are the concrete steps we would  
15 conduct prior to that to -- before we get to a  
16 hearing. So --

17 MR. IACOPINO: And I would just point  
18 out, when I use the date to talk about deliberations,  
19 I think it is in the public interest for the public  
20 to have, for a complete deliberative hearing by this  
21 body after it's received all of the evidence, and  
22 also time to draft an order that will plainly explain  
23 to the public the reasons for the actions that the  
24 Committee is taking.

1 MR. GETZ: Well, let's try to break it  
2 into two parts then, whether to -- if there's any  
3 discussion about how long to enlarge the time, and  
4 then, if there's any discussion about what the  
5 concrete steps that we lay out to get to the end of  
6 the time frame.

7 So, anybody have any thoughts about --  
8 actually, I could do this formally. Why don't I do  
9 this. I'll move that we enlarge the time frame to  
10 April 26th, 2011, pursuant to R.S.A. 162-H:6-a IX,  
11 and see if there's a second, and then see if there's  
12 discussion.

13 MR. PERRY: I'll second.

14 CHAIRMAN GETZ: We have a second. Any  
15 discussion? Mr. Harrington.

16 MR. HARRINGTON: I have more of a  
17 question than anything else. I'm trying to -- I kind  
18 of got lost in the logic of that date, where it came  
19 from. I was going -- I kind of thought Dr. Kent's  
20 assumption made sense, that if the Applicant was  
21 willing to go along with it, they provide us with  
22 the -- this is where we think or we want you to base  
23 your judgment on as to the location of the connection  
24 line and the substation. And really, like I said

1 before, the electrical part of that, what's inside  
2 the substation and so forth, we don't have any  
3 jurisdiction on it, I don't think, or probably any  
4 interest in it. But where it's going to go and how  
5 it's going to affect the orderly development of the  
6 area, we do. But if we were to take that, then I'm  
7 not sure -- how did we get to April? Are we assuming  
8 that the Fish and Game and that the records are going  
9 to be -- I was under the impression that they would  
10 be a closer date, maybe in January or something.

11 MR. GETZ: Well, I think what we're  
12 trying to do is achieve a balance --

13 MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.

14 MR. GETZ: -- to recognize that we  
15 need more than a month to do the things that are  
16 necessary, but not to leave it so open-ended that  
17 we -- that we're out into hearings in May and briefs  
18 and deliberations and a decision in July, that there  
19 is a point where, you know, the balance in favor the  
20 of the Applicant is in conflict with the balance in  
21 favor of the intervenors. So there's no science to  
22 April 26th. It just happens to be one year from when  
23 the filing was.

24 MR. HARRINGTON: Well, maybe just --

1 at least the way I would work it would be, let's lay  
2 out what we need to accomplish first and then figure  
3 out what the date is we need to max that, rather than  
4 pick a date and try to back-fit what we need to do  
5 into the schedule. Seems to make more sense -- well,  
6 and I'm not sure what all the steps might be. Mr.  
7 Iacopino had mentioned a number of things that would  
8 need to be done to follow due process. But maybe we  
9 can get a list of those and see what was possible.  
10 That may or may not be April 26th. Maybe not be a  
11 good date to accommodate that.

12 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I think part of  
13 that is I think we can lay out some dates for the  
14 things we have; such as, we have the new testimony.  
15 We can set a date for technical session, prehearing  
16 conference, discovery on that testimony. We could  
17 set a date for responsive testimony and discovery on  
18 that responsive testimony. But that's dealing with  
19 the things we know. What we don't know is when are  
20 we going to hear from DHR. Possibly sooner rather  
21 than later. So, maybe that intersects with that  
22 process. And I'm thinking you could have discovery  
23 in January -- or in December on the latest testimony,  
24 and you could have responsive testimony in January,



1 with discovery after that. And maybe the DHR stuff  
2 fits in. Maybe the other agencies' stuff fits into  
3 that in a way that doesn't cause any harm to  
4 anybody's rights. What we don't know is when we'll  
5 get the ISO information.

6 And I think, also, in my mind,  
7 parallel to this, which I really haven't sorted out,  
8 is the arguments about what constitutes an associated  
9 facility. I haven't had the time to really look at  
10 the opinions in Lempster and the other cases to see  
11 at least what I think the answer is on the arguments  
12 about is this case more like those cases and we can  
13 handle this through a condition. So I'd like to have  
14 some time to think that through.

15 So I think, you know, we would  
16 probably be looking at a hearing in the February time  
17 frame, at best, and maybe something more than that.  
18 So we would have a date that's, you know, outside of  
19 the best date, you know, in terms of accommodating  
20 the briefs and deliberations and a written order.

21 MR. HARRINGTON: So we could always  
22 use the April 26th date. That would be sort of like  
23 looking at it as sort of hopefully the maximum amount  
24 needed. And if things clicked in and it all fell in

1 faster than we anticipate, maybe that can get pulled  
2 in.

3 MR. GETZ: Oh, correct. Yeah. I  
4 mean --

5 MR. HARRINGTON: All right.

6 MR. GETZ: -- we can always issue an  
7 order, and we can always move the hearing up and have  
8 the deliberations and issue an order sooner.

9 MR. HARRINGTON: Then I think that  
10 makes more sense to go with that date, rather than go  
11 through this process all over again two or three  
12 times.

13 MR. GETZ: I concur. Any other  
14 discussion?

15 MR. PERRY: Mr. Chairman, I just want  
16 to make sure I'm following the conversation that just  
17 occurred. By establishing an April 26th date, that's  
18 the date that a decision would be rendered by?

19 MR. GETZ: Unless we extended it  
20 again.

21 MR. PERRY: All right.

22 MR. GETZ: Theoretically --

23 MR. PERRY: So that option still  
24 remains. Because we established April 26th, 2011 as

1 our current date for rendering a decision by. That's  
2 what we're working towards.

3 MR. GETZ: Yes.

4 MR. PERRY: Okay.

5 MR. GETZ: Unless there was good cause  
6 for -- either good cause for extending it or if  
7 every -- as Mr. Harrington says, if all of the  
8 information comes in in a reasonable way, then we  
9 could actually act sooner than that.

10 Dr. Boisvert.

11 DR. BOISVERT: Yeah. I apologize for  
12 being late. Like I said, I was called out on  
13 something I had to go to.

14 What would be the weigh points along  
15 here, that if we're to, as I understand it, have a  
16 decision by April 26th? At what point would all the  
17 studies need to be finished so that we could have  
18 them brought before us and judge the information?

19 CHAIRMAN GETZ: So you're saying "all  
20 the studies," meaning the ISO studies or --

21 DR. BOISVERT: The DHR studies and the  
22 Fish and Game.

23 MR. GETZ: Well, I guess I'm not clear  
24 what would come in from DHR, if it's a study or a

1 letter or some agreement. I guess certainly you know  
2 more about what to expect from them. But I guess  
3 from my perspective, what I see is there's been  
4 testimony from the witness about historic effects.  
5 We've seen letters from the DHR that creates concerns  
6 in my mind about being able to make a conclusion  
7 about whether there's an unreasonable adverse effect  
8 on historic sites. So I would be hoping to see  
9 something from DHR -- I'm not sure what that would  
10 be -- or something among DHR, the Applicant and the  
11 Army Corps that resolves the large uncertainty that's  
12 sitting out there right now.

13 DR. BOISVERT: Right. And I see that  
14 there's a substantial amount that's uncertain. And I  
15 want to be sure there's sufficient time for the  
16 Applicant to address them all, so that we do not have  
17 a situation where it's only partway through and we're  
18 presented with a situation where they'll give  
19 assurances that they'll finish it by a certain date.  
20 I'd like to see it actually brought to fruition  
21 before we make our decision, so there's not a  
22 contingency condition we have to put on our finding.  
23 That's what I would like to see. And I just don't  
24 have a sense of what the Applicant sees as when they

1 will have the information completed and presented to  
2 DHR for their response.

3 MR. GETZ: And that's why I think one  
4 thing that we're going to have to give some time to  
5 see how it plays out and where it would be helpful to  
6 have a prehearing conference, technical session to  
7 see what information that they can share; and that,  
8 really, I would say for today we would do one  
9 concrete thing, in terms of setting a date for the --  
10 how long -- enlarging the time frame, but then maybe  
11 we do something more directive to Mr. Iacopino, to  
12 hold a prehearing conference, a technical session,  
13 and then perhaps delegate to me the authority to  
14 issue an order setting that date, rather than just  
15 picking dates without having an opportunity to speak  
16 to Counsel for the Public, all the intervenors and  
17 the Applicant as to what's the best date. But kind  
18 of set up a process to start discovery in January --  
19 in December, have another round of testimony in  
20 January. And then we'll figure out the details and  
21 hopefully be better informed once we have a tech  
22 session and a prehearing conference.

23 DR. BOISVERT: I just see it as  
24 logistical issues of whether -- getting people

1 together and working through the holiday season.  
2 Those are the kinds of delays that are common in many  
3 other projects. And I don't want to set too  
4 optimistic of a date for completion. I just want to  
5 make sure there is sufficient time so that we can  
6 have all the data before us for a decision.

7 MR. GETZ: Absolutely. I think that's  
8 fair. Mr. Harrington.

9 MR. HARRINGTON: Just a follow-up to  
10 Dr. Kent's suggestion, which I thought was a good  
11 one, on the idea of tying down the Applicant to a  
12 specific location for the interconnection. And I'm  
13 just not quite sure how that gets work out. I mean,  
14 that certainly can be discussed in a technical  
15 session. But I guess the Committee would at least  
16 have to show a sense that they would be willing to go  
17 that way. Because, otherwise, if we're going to wait  
18 until the feasibility study comes out, and that's not  
19 going to be available until, I'm hearing, maybe April  
20 or later, then we're not going to make that  
21 April 26th date. So we'd have to be willing to  
22 impose that on the Applicant, that you give us  
23 what -- where you think it's going to go so we can  
24 review it. And then we will -- if we issue a

1 certificate, it'd be under the condition that it's  
2 got to be like this when the ISO approves it;  
3 otherwise, the certificate isn't valid.

4 So, do we need to at least get a sense  
5 from the Committee that people find that acceptable  
6 and that it can be discussed in the tech session with  
7 the Applicant?

8 MR. GETZ: Well, I think we can have  
9 some proposals on that. I guess what -- I mean, I  
10 think that there's still a fundamental argument about  
11 whether we even have jurisdiction over those  
12 facilities as associated facilities and whether we  
13 could condition it in a condition approval in a  
14 reasonable way. I mean, I just don't know the answer  
15 to that, given the facts that we have. So I think it  
16 would be something -- that's why I think that  
17 particular issue needs to be explored further among  
18 the parties through technical sessions and through  
19 other conversations, and then for us to then see  
20 where -- what we think would be acceptable. You  
21 know, it may be that they can provide us with enough  
22 facts that we are comfortable to approve it, or that  
23 we could approve it in a conditional way. Or we just  
24 may say it's all too speculative, and we're not --

1 and we have jurisdiction and we're not -- we can't  
2 approve it.

3 MR. HARRINGTON: I was just wondering  
4 if one of the Committee members has a position that,  
5 look, until the feasibility study is approved, I don't  
6 even want to look at this stuff, because until it's  
7 approved -- we've already seen the initial one where  
8 they were going to run the 34.5 line, and then it got  
9 changed to somewhere along the line. We know these  
10 things are susceptible to change. If people have  
11 that position, then it clearly makes a difference on  
12 the scheduling, if we were to determine we're going  
13 to wait for the ISO to provide it. Or maybe we just  
14 see what happens in the technical session. Is that  
15 what you're proposing?

16 MR. GETZ: I would suggest that we do  
17 that through the technical session, because  
18 otherwise, I think you're in a position of saying  
19 we're not going to proceed any further until we hear  
20 something solid from the ISO. And we don't know when  
21 that will be, and I think it's too open-ended.

22 MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN GETZ: And I think that puts  
24 us in a position where I think it's compromising some



1 of the rights of the intervenor.

2 So, other discussion?

3 (No verbal response)

4 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, then at least  
5 let me call a vote on the motion to enlarge the time  
6 frame for consideration of this proceeding until  
7 April 26th, 2011.

8 So, all those in favor, please signify  
9 by saying "aye."

10 (Multiple members indicating "aye.")

11 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Opposed?

12 (No verbal response)

13 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Note for the record  
14 that the vote was unanimous in favor of extending the  
15 time frame.

16 So that, I guess, leaves the issue of  
17 next steps in terms of a procedural prehearing  
18 conference and/or technical session. And I think  
19 that makes the most sense, in terms of our  
20 procedures. And I guess what I'm thinking is we  
21 would give Mr. Iacopino the directive and, I guess,  
22 grant -- well, it would come out of this -- there's  
23 going to be an order out of this deliberation, that  
24 we would require a prehearing conference, technical

1 session to be presided over by Mr. Iacopino -- and if  
2 necessary I would be on call -- to begin the  
3 discovery and see if there can be agreement on the  
4 further schedule and collection of additional  
5 information from the Applicant to try and round out  
6 the procedures.

7 So, Mr. Iacopino, does that get us in  
8 the right direction, from your perspective?

9 MR. IACOPINO: Yes, it does.

10 MR. GETZ: Any discussion about  
11 setting up that prehearing conference, technical  
12 session as the next --

13 MR. IACOPINO: And that's not  
14 something that any of you would have to attend, so...

15 MR. HARRINGTON: You can note that the  
16 Committee all smiled.

17 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Dr. Kent.

18 DR. KENT: I want to make sure I  
19 understand you. You're going to research this issue  
20 of --

21 (Court Reporter interjects.)

22 DR. KENT: The Chairman will research  
23 the issue of the jurisdiction?

24 MR. GETZ: Well, I think that issue is

1 effectively in play, whether we have -- what our  
2 jurisdiction is over the associated facilities and  
3 the interconnection. I mean, I guess that does raise  
4 an issue of whether we should -- if it makes sense to  
5 make a decision on that issue at some point in  
6 advance of the hearings or to proceed and do that as  
7 part of our -- as part of the final deliberations. I  
8 guess there's a couple of different ways you can go  
9 on that, because it goes effectively to the scope of  
10 our jurisdiction.

11 Mr. Iacopino.

12 MR. IACOPINO: As part of the  
13 procedural schedule that comes out of the prehearing  
14 conference and technical sessions, we could certainly  
15 require the parties to brief that issue, so that as a  
16 Committee you all can make a determination when you  
17 deliberate.

18 DR. KENT: Okay.

19 MR. GETZ: Because that could play out  
20 in a number of different ways. If it's a long time  
21 coming that anything came out from the ISO, but we  
22 concluded that these were not jurisdictional  
23 facilities, then that wouldn't affect the timing; on  
24 the other hand, if we conclude that they are

1 jurisdictional facilities, and we're not getting  
2 useful information from the ISO, then we're still,  
3 you know, maybe at that position of kind of  
4 understanding whether we have enough information to  
5 make a final decision, and then we'd be in that  
6 position again. But I think that's one of the  
7 uncertainties here. But I think what Mr. Iacopino  
8 proposes may make some sense. Let us get some  
9 arguments in writing from the parties to help us make  
10 that determination.

11 DR. KENT: Can I offer some guidance  
12 in that --

13 MR. GETZ: Please.

14 DR. KENT: -- preparation?

15 I'm starting from a position that, if  
16 an action is occurring solely because of the proposed  
17 project, then that is part and parcel of that project  
18 and falls under our jurisdiction. So we'd be looking  
19 for arguments that we could be satisfied on this  
20 issue.

21 MR. GETZ: Understood. Any other  
22 discussion? Mr. Harrington.

23 MR. HARRINGTON: Yes. I would just  
24 restate my previous comment. I agree completely with

1           what Dr. Kent said, but I do believe that the  
2           engineering basis of what's being done in the  
3           interconnection study is really beyond the purview of  
4           this Committee.  It's how the physical lines are laid  
5           out and how it would impact that way.  So, I mean,  
6           there's certain things about the interconnection  
7           study or even a feasibility study that are going to be  
8           done downstream of this facility, where maybe someone  
9           has to put in another transformer or something,  
10          another substation 50 miles away.  But that really  
11          isn't anything that we need to worry about here.

12          So --

13                           CHAIRMAN GETZ:  Anything else?

14                           (No verbal response)

15                           CHAIRMAN GETZ:  Well, then I guess I  
16          would make this motion:  That we ask counsel to work  
17          with the parties to determine a date for a prehearing  
18          conference, technical session in December, and that  
19          would be communicated as part of the order coming out  
20          of these deliberations, and that we then proceed from  
21          there with trying to accommodate the extra steps and  
22          the procedures that we've discussed here today.  But  
23          the most immediate thing would be for -- to set up a  
24          prehearing conference and technical session and then

1 get proposals for further steps in the procedural  
2 schedule, that then he would, as counsel, submit to  
3 me in the normal course of the way we've conducted  
4 these procedural issues in the case up to this date,  
5 and then I would after that issue a scheduling order  
6 as the presiding officer. So moved.

7 MR. HARRINGTON: Second.

8 MR. GETZ: Any discussion?

9 (No verbal response)

10 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. All those in  
11 favor, please say "aye."

12 (Multiple members indicating "aye.")

13 MR. GETZ: Opposed?

14 (No verbal response)

15 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Note for the record  
16 that it was unanimous.

17 So, is there anything else that we  
18 need to discuss today? I guess there's one other  
19 outstanding motion.

20 MR. IACOPINO: The motion for  
21 confidentiality of exhibits.

22 MR. GETZ: Well, there's more than one  
23 motion.

24 MR. IACOPINO: Actually, there are two

1 motions. But there is a motion for confidentiality  
2 of the exhibits, of the Applicant's Exhibit --

3 MS. GEIGER: 33.

4 MR. IACOPINO: -- 40B and the exhibit  
5 with the profile, capacity factor profile. I believe  
6 those were the two -- 33. Thank you.

7 MR. GETZ: So there was the motion.  
8 But were there any objections?

9 MR. IACOPINO: There was an objection  
10 noted in the motion by the Buttolph group, I believe.  
11 But there was no -- I don't recall receiving any  
12 written objection from any of the parties. But I'll  
13 double-check that.

14 MR. GETZ: Mr. Roth, did you have a  
15 position on that motion for confidentiality?

16 MR. ROTH: I don't object to that  
17 motion. I assume I'll have the same access I've  
18 always had to confidential matters, concurrent with  
19 the Committee.

20 MS. GEIGER: You've already been  
21 provided with that information.

22 MR. ROTH: Okay.

23 MR. IACOPINO: I don't have anything.

24 MR. HARRINGTON: Just a question. One

1 was on the profile, the capacity profile. And what  
2 was the other exhibit on?

3 MR. IACOPINO: The Exhibit 40B is the  
4 way that they've phrased it in their supplemental  
5 filings. It's the financial information for the non-  
6 public entities, which are Groton Wind, LLC and one  
7 of the Iberdrola companies that is not a publicly  
8 held entity.

9 MR. HARRINGTON: Oh, okay. I remember  
10 that now. Thank you.

11 MR. IACOPINO: It's their current  
12 financial statements.

13 MR. GETZ: Okay. Well, it appears to  
14 me that it's confidential financial information that,  
15 you know, merits protection under R.S.A. 91-A. So I  
16 would move that we grant the motion for  
17 confidentiality.

18 MR. HARRINGTON: Second.

19 MR. GETZ: There's a second. Any  
20 discussion?

21 DR. KENT: For both or just one at a  
22 time?

23 MR. GETZ: Well, I was -- they were in  
24 the same motion, so I was -- correct?



1 MR. IACOPINO: Yeah, they're both part  
2 of the same motion that was filed on November 10th.

3 MR. GETZ: All those in favor, please  
4 signify by saying "aye."

5 (Multiple members indicating "aye.")

6 MR. GETZ: Opposed?

7 (No verbal response)

8 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Note for the record  
9 that the motion was granted unanimously.

10 We also had a motion of the intervenor  
11 group, the Buttolph/Lewis/Spring group motion  
12 directing Groton and Iberdrola to bear the costs of  
13 their consultant on the real estate issues. And we  
14 also had an objection and then -- a motion filed on  
15 November 17th, and we had an objection from the  
16 Applicant on the 23rd, and responsive comments filed  
17 on November 27th.

18 MR. IACOPINO: 27th.

19 MR. GETZ: And I think -- I don't know  
20 if folks have had opportunity to give consideration  
21 to this. I think the operative language comes in  
22 under R.S.A. 162-H:10,V. And in the statute it says  
23 that the Site Evaluation Committee and Counsel for  
24 the Public shall -- I'm not going to read the entire

1 thing, but it says shall jointly conduct such  
2 reasonable studies and investigations, et cetera, and  
3 the cost of which shall be borne by the Applicant in  
4 such amount as may be approved by the Committee. And  
5 I guess it's an issue of whether it's in furtherance  
6 of the duties imposed by this chapter.

7 I think we have two options here: I  
8 guess we can try to discuss this in some detail and  
9 see if we can reach a conclusion today, or we can  
10 defer consideration to another time. I'm just not  
11 sure if everybody's had an opportunity to read all of  
12 the filings and to give this matter some  
13 consideration. But I wanted to at least bring it up.  
14 So, is there any preference on how to proceed?

15 MR. HARRINGTON: Question, Mr.  
16 Chairman? Did the Public Counsel file any opinion on  
17 this, one way or the other? Counsel for the Public.

18 MR. GETZ: There's no motion or no  
19 response that I've seen. We could give Mr. Roth  
20 opportunity to respond.

21 MR. ROTH: I did not file anything in  
22 writing. I did have a suggestion to make about it  
23 that I would be happy to present if the Committee is  
24 interested.

1 MR. GETZ: Please.

2 MR. ROTH: It occurs to me that trying  
3 to put it into 162-H:10 --

4 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Roman five?

5 MR. ROTH: -- Roman five is kind of a  
6 tight fit. And I'm not sure I would buy that  
7 parachute. But what I think is possible that the  
8 Committee could do is -- and you could look at it one  
9 of two ways, and that would be to -- the Committee  
10 has the ability in issuing a certificate to impose  
11 conditions consistent with 162-H:10,IV. And  
12 respectfully, the Committee could impose a condition  
13 that required the Applicant to reimburse the cost of  
14 the expert. And when I said that you could do it one  
15 of two ways, you could just do it as a blanket matter  
16 and say this was valuable and interesting and  
17 important for our consideration, and therefore, we're  
18 going to impose that as a condition. And I think in  
19 Granite Reliable there were financial impositions  
20 upon the Applicant as part of the condition. But you  
21 could do it as simply as, yes, it was valuable and  
22 interesting and important, regardless of whether a  
23 condition comes out of it with respect to property  
24 values. Or you could make that kind of a condition,

1 if in fact there is a condition, that is selected  
2 with respect to property value issues. So, kind of a  
3 if for example -- I guess you look at it as if the  
4 Buttolph Group is sort of deemed to be successful  
5 with their -- with that evidence, part of that  
6 condition would be to reimburse the cost of bringing  
7 it.

8 MR. GETZ: So, effectively, using that  
9 approach, it would be premature.

10 MR. ROTH: That's correct.

11 Mr. Dupee.

12 MR. DUPEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
13 Just to make sure that I understand this correctly.  
14 So, the intervenor group chose to hire a consultant  
15 and not discuss the hiring of the consultant with the  
16 parties, but just chose of their volition to do so.  
17 Now the question might be who will pay for that?

18 MR. GETZ: Well, I don't know the  
19 answer to the second part about whether there was any  
20 discussion of that issue with Public Counsel or the  
21 Applicant. I guess I would --

22 Ms. Geiger, was there any discussion  
23 of that issue?

24 MS. GEIGER: No, Mr. Chairman, there

1 was no discussion. We obviously filed an objection  
2 to the motion, which I think is pretty clear. We  
3 think there's absolutely no authority for the  
4 Committee to order this. We think you'd be acting  
5 beyond the scope of the legislature's authority  
6 granted to you. And a condition would be totally  
7 inappropriate, as suggested by Public Council. Such  
8 a condition would set a very dangerous precedent, and  
9 I think would get the Committee and applicants on a  
10 slippery slope to all sorts of mischief. I would  
11 strongly oppose the suggestion made by Public  
12 Counsel. Seems to me if the intervenors -- they knew  
13 they were going to hire Mr. McCann. If they wanted  
14 the Applicant to pay for it, it seems to me that we  
15 should have hashed this issue out well in advance of  
16 Mr. McCann being hired. We strongly oppose the  
17 suggestion made by Public Counsel. There's no  
18 precedent for it, and there's no authority for it in  
19 the statute.

20 MR. GETZ: And Mr. Roth, just  
21 responding to Mr. Dupee's question, was there any  
22 discussion with Public Counsel about the engagement  
23 of Mr. McCann?

24 MR. ROTH: Not that I recall.

1                   MR. GETZ: All right. So, did you  
2 have some -- I just wanted to try to address that  
3 fact, because I didn't know the answer.

4                   MR. DUPEE: That's fine. Thank you,  
5 Mr. Chairman.

6                   CHAIRMAN GETZ: Did you have anything  
7 further on that?

8                   MR. DUPEE: No.

9                   CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Harrington.

10                  MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah, I guess I'd be  
11 very leery about granting this based on what the --  
12 the section that was read -- yeah, the Roman five of  
13 that section of the chapter -- because this, I think,  
14 talks more about the Committee and/or Public Counsel  
15 hiring outside experts. And the other intervenors  
16 had the opportunity to go to Public Counsel and  
17 request them to do this; and apparently, from what we  
18 just heard, they didn't do that. So I don't see any  
19 statutory authority for that. And I think it sets  
20 kind of a wide-open precedent thing where people hire  
21 whoever they wanted and bring them in and hope to get  
22 paid for it. So, as far as the Public Counsel's  
23 argument that if they do this and then it was found  
24 to bring value to the argument, I haven't given that

1 any thought. So I would have to look at that a  
2 little bit more. But I wouldn't be comfortable using  
3 that section, Roman five of the statute, to pay -- to  
4 have the Applicant pay for this.

5 MR. GETZ: Dr. Kent.

6 DR. KENT: Yeah. It's always risky to  
7 give a faux legal opinion. I don't see anything in  
8 our statute that allows us to, after the fact, grant  
9 relief to the intervenor. If the intervenor had  
10 approached us prior to his actions and convinced us  
11 that this was a necessary study to complete, we might  
12 have gone along with it. But to have it come after  
13 the fact, without any opportunity to decide whether  
14 this is a worthwhile venture or not, is  
15 inappropriate, and I don't see a mechanism in the  
16 statute.

17 MR. GETZ: Mr. Steltzer.

18 MR. STELTZER: Yeah, I agree with  
19 those comments. And from my understanding from the  
20 record, the Committee's position was that property  
21 values may be considered and were a component that  
22 should be looked at -- or not should, but may be  
23 considered underneath it. And there wasn't  
24 necessarily a definitive judgment of whether it

1           should be included into the record.  So, with that  
2           said, at this post date, you know, looking at  
3           reimbursements going back, you know, I have a hard  
4           time with it as well.

5                         MR. GETZ:  Dr. Kent.

6                         DR. KENT:  Just a follow-up.  I think  
7           there's two issues here:  One is, is the issue  
8           important to us; and the second one is, is the  
9           particular witness the right person to clarify the  
10          issue for us?  And I don't think the appropriate  
11          discussion took place at the appropriate time for us  
12          to defend the motion.

13                        MR. GETZ:  Okay.  Well, let me make  
14          this proposal at this point:  I think we've had a  
15          good discussion of some respects of the issue.  I  
16          think it's not clear to me that everybody's had a  
17          chance to read all of the filings.  I certainly  
18          hadn't given any consideration to the 162-H:10,IV  
19          argument.  The one that had, you know, posed itself  
20          to me as the most likely provision to review this  
21          under was five.  But I guess I would suggest that we  
22          give this some further consideration and make the  
23          determination at a later time.  Does anybody have any  
24          objection to proceeding in that way?



1 DR. KENT: I'm sorry. So you're  
2 proposing we take time to review the statute?

3 MR. GETZ: Yes, and consider the  
4 arguments and consider the filings and what I have  
5 heard for the first time today from Mr. Roth on this  
6 issue.

7 DR. KENT: So, deliberate on this, and  
8 we're going to consider Mr. Roth's suggestion as  
9 well?

10 MR. GETZ: Yes.

11 Mr. Steltzer.

12 MR. STELTZER: Is it -- if the  
13 Committee feels comfortable, if they've had an  
14 opportunity to at least review the filings that have  
15 happened to make a judgment whether at this time  
16 162-H:V should be applied or not, it would be in the  
17 best interest of the Buttolph Group, as well as Mr.  
18 McCann, to make a determination to that, and then at  
19 a later date to have the conversation about whether  
20 we use 162-H:IV, which requires a condition, and the  
21 cost for the condition to be had. I think that's the  
22 direction that I would seek to take, is that, you  
23 know, to take it in two separate determinations: One  
24 is applicability of V, of 162-H:V, and one is to take

1 a look at applicability of 162-H:IV.

2 MR. GETZ: So are you suggesting that  
3 we do that now or at some other time? That's what I  
4 wasn't following.

5 DR. KENT: I would suggest that we can  
6 make -- if the Committee has had ample opportunity to  
7 look at the motion that has been filed to warrant an  
8 award based off of 162-H:V, then I think it would be  
9 in the best interest of everyone involved to come to  
10 that determination today. As to whether there should  
11 be reimbursement to the -- by the Applicant to the  
12 Buttolph group made on a condition, I think that  
13 should happen at a later date.

14 MR. GETZ: Any other thoughts?

15 MR. HARRINGTON: Just a question. Are  
16 you suggesting, then, that we clear up the 162-H:10,V  
17 issue today and then would offer the Buttolph, et  
18 cetera group the opportunity to refile under the  
19 provision that Public Counsel mentioned?

20 MR. STELTZER: Yes. I think we can  
21 only rule on the motion that's been made. Granted,  
22 I'm not a lawyer either. But, you know, you can only  
23 be judging off the motion that's been made. And  
24 that's what's been presented to us. And if we feel

1 that we have enough time to review that material, I  
2 think it would be in the best interest of Mr. McCann,  
3 the Buttolph group, the Committee and the Applicant  
4 to make that decision.

5 MR. HARRINGTON: I'd be comfortable  
6 doing that, Mr. Chairman, today.

7 MR. GETZ: I'm sorry. You'd be  
8 comfortable ruling on --

9 MR. HARRINGTON: On the 162-H:10,V  
10 request today.

11 DR. KENT: It appears that the  
12 Buttolph's group motion is based solely on  
13 162-H:10,V; right? So --

14 MR. GETZ: That's how I take it.

15 DR. KENT: So I'm ready whenever the  
16 group is to make a decision on this. Given that, I'm  
17 not sure it's appropriate for Public Counsel or  
18 anybody else to say, well, maybe it doesn't qualify  
19 on that one, but maybe another one. It's hardly a  
20 motion or a -- I'm not sure what the mechanism is  
21 there for bringing that forward right now and asking  
22 us to take action.

23 MR. GETZ: Well, I mean, I think the  
24 mechanism was I asked Mr. Roth if he had an opinion

1 on this issue, and he gave us an opinion. So --

2 DR. KENT: Is he going to file a late  
3 brief in support of the Buttolph motion?

4 MR. GETZ: Well, I don't think it's  
5 necessary. I asked him for his opinion. So I think  
6 if we want more or we wanted to hear more explication  
7 about this issue, either on IV or V, or just on IV,  
8 or whether it could be conditioned as a general  
9 matter outside of this, then I think, you know, we've  
10 got the ability to do that.

11 MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, if I could  
12 clarify my position a little bit. I wouldn't have an  
13 objection to the Committee making a ruling and  
14 denying the motion under 162-H:10,V without prejudice  
15 to any party, offering as a condition to a  
16 certificate later on, obviously with the Applicant  
17 having the opportunity to oppose such a condition,  
18 that the certificate be conditioned upon whatever,  
19 including payment of -- reimbursement of the Buttolph  
20 group's fees for Mr. McCann.

21 MR. HARRINGTON: Just a procedural  
22 question. I guess the only motion we have in front  
23 of us is the one from the group that says they want  
24 to have reimbursement under 162-H:10,V. So if we

1 were to rule on that today, just for the sake of  
2 argument, say we would deny the petition, then there  
3 isn't anything in front of the Committee having to do  
4 with reimbursement. Would it then be up to the  
5 Buttolph group to file another petition requesting,  
6 if a certificate was granted, a condition of that  
7 certificate would be that they be reimbursed? But  
8 that would be an issue we'd address later on.

9 MR. GETZ: Correct.

10 DR. KENT: I would suggest the way to  
11 handle that is, as an intervenor they can impose  
12 conditions; correct?

13 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Correct. And I think  
14 that's --

15 DR. KENT: And they can propose a  
16 condition that says reimburse us, and the Committee  
17 could consider it.

18 MR. GETZ: And I think that's  
19 effectively what Mr. Harrington is saying. Whether  
20 it was a motion or a proposed --

21 DR. KENT: Then I agree with Mr.  
22 Harrington.

23 MR. STELTZER: Mr. Chair, I just might  
24 add that it be added in closing arguments, that that

1 would be an appropriate time to be added in. There  
2 doesn't necessarily need to be another motion made.

3 MR. GETZ: It could be a motion, could  
4 be part of a brief. Yeah, there's several vehicles  
5 where we could see this issue again.

6 MR. HARRINGTON: Speaking of a motion,  
7 I'd like to make one: A motion to deny the petition.  
8 I don't have the particular petition. To deny the  
9 motion of intervenor group Buttolph/Lewis/Spring for  
10 order directing Groton Wind, LLC and Iberdrola  
11 Renewables to bear the cost of an expert witness,  
12 dated November 17th, 2010.

13 MR. STELTZER: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any discussion?

15 (No verbal response)

16 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. All those in  
17 favor of the motion signify by saying "aye."

18 (Multiple members indicating "aye.")

19 MR. GETZ: Opposed?

20 (No verbal response)

21 CHAIRMAN GETZ: I'll note for the  
22 record that the motion was approved unanimously.

23 Mr. Iacopino, is there anything  
24 additional that we need to address this afternoon?

1 MR. IACOPINO: I don't believe so.

2 MR. GETZ: Anything further from the  
3 Committee?

4 (No verbal response)

5 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Hearing  
6 nothing, then we're adjourned.

7 MR. IACOPINO: I would ask that the  
8 parties stay here so that we can schedule a date for  
9 prehearing conference and tech session.

10 MR. GETZ: Thank you, everyone.

11 (Whereupon the hearing was adjourned  
12 at 3:37 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Susan J. Robidas, a Licensed  
Shorthand Court Reporter and Notary Public of  
the State of New Hampshire, do hereby  
certify that the foregoing is a true and  
accurate transcript of my stenographic notes  
of these proceedings taken at the place and  
on the date hereinbefore set forth, to the  
best of my skill and ability under the  
conditions present at the time.

I further certify that I am neither  
attorney or counsel for, nor related to or  
employed by any of the parties to the action;  
and further, that I am not a relative or  
employee of any attorney or counsel employed  
in this case, nor am I financially interested  
in this action.

---

Susan J. Robidas, LCR/RPR  
Licensed Shorthand Court Reporter  
Registered Professional Reporter  
N.H. LCR No. 44 (RSA 310-A:173)



SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC

	<b>49:17,18</b>	<b>31:12</b>	<b>18:7;21:17</b>	<b>5:3;21:9;26:8;27:7</b>
[	<b>29th (2)</b> 5:11;27:24	<b>act (1)</b> 35:9	<b>allow (2)</b> 22:24;27:3	<b>applied (1)</b> 57:16
[sic] (1) 19:23	<b>3</b>	<b>acting (1)</b> 53:4	<b>allows (1)</b> 55:8	<b>approach (4)</b> 13:14;14:19;15:2;52:9
<b>1</b>	<b>3:37 (1)</b> 63:12	<b>action (3)</b> 17:9;44:16;59:22	<b>almost (1)</b> 19:9	<b>approached (1)</b> 55:10
<b>1 (2)</b> 6:7;7:2	<b>30 (1)</b> 10:2	<b>actions (3)</b> 16:24;29:23;55:10	<b>alone (1)</b> 21:8	<b>appropriate (6)</b> 13:7;22:24;56:10,11; 59:17;62:1
<b>10th (1)</b> 49:2	<b>300-something (1)</b> 8:7	<b>actually (8)</b> 17:6,12;23:3;24:19; 30:8;35:9;36:20;46:24	<b>along (4)</b> 30:21;35:14;40:9; 55:12	<b>approval (2)</b> 6:23;39:13
<b>11/19 (1)</b> 7:14	<b>33 (2)</b> 47:3,6	<b>add (1)</b> 61:24	<b>alteration (1)</b> 13:1	<b>approve (5)</b> 17:7,11;39:22,23;40:2
<b>162-H (1)</b> 15:19	<b>34 (1)</b> 8:16	<b>added (2)</b> 61:24;62:1	<b>alternate (1)</b> 28:5	<b>approved (5)</b> 21:10;40:5,7;50:4; 62:22
<b>162-H10 (1)</b> 51:3	<b>34.5 (1)</b> 40:8	<b>addition (1)</b> 6:15	<b>alternative (4)</b> 13:17;15:20;17:6; 24:13	<b>approves (1)</b> 39:2
<b>162-H10IV (2)</b> 51:11;56:18	<b>3rd (1)</b> 21:20	<b>additional (11)</b> 5:18,19,23;6:15; 18:17,18;22:12,24;27:3; 42:4;62:24	<b>always (5)</b> 33:21;34:6,7;47:18; 55:6	<b>April (18)</b> 17:20;19:8;28:7,19, 22;29:2,12;30:10;31:7, 22;32:10;33:22;34:17, 24;35:16;38:19,21;41:7
<b>162-H10V (6)</b> 49:22;58:16;59:9,13; 60:14,24	<b>4</b>	<b>address (9)</b> 4:22;9:3;21:6;22:13; 26:14;36:16;54:2;61:8; 62:24	<b>among (3)</b> 24:17;36:10;39:17	<b>area (1)</b> 31:6
<b>162-H6-a (1)</b> 30:10	<b>40B (2)</b> 47:4;48:3	<b>addresses (1)</b> 14:2	<b>amongst (1)</b> 24:21	<b>areas (2)</b> 24:12,23
<b>162-H6-aIX (1)</b> 18:20	<b>5</b>	<b>addressed (1)</b> 14:2	<b>amount (4)</b> 27:2;33:23;36:14;50:4	<b>argue (1)</b> 15:8
<b>162-HIV (2)</b> 57:20;58:1	<b>50 (1)</b> 45:10	<b>addresses (1)</b> 26:3	<b>ample (1)</b> 58:6	<b>argument (13)</b> 9:10;11:9,18;12:2,2; 13:14;15:4,12;39:10; 54:23,24;56:19;61:2
<b>162-HV (3)</b> 57:16,24;58:8	<b>5th (1)</b> 5:1	<b>adjoined (2)</b> 63:6,11	<b>and/or (4)</b> 15:7,9;41:18;54:14	<b>arguments (7)</b> 5:22;33:8,11;44:9,19; 57:4;61:24
<b>17th (2)</b> 49:15;62:12	<b>9</b>	<b>adjudicatory (3)</b> 23:20;24:3;27:13	<b>anticipate (1)</b> 34:1	<b>Army (2)</b> 22:5;36:11
<b>19th (2)</b> 5:6,6	<b>91-A (1)</b> 48:15	<b>adopting (1)</b> 13:14	<b>anyways (1)</b> 17:10	<b>assess (1)</b> 16:12
<b>1st (1)</b> 5:10	<b>A</b>	<b>adopts (1)</b> 6:20	<b>apologies (1)</b> 28:10	<b>associated (6)</b> 15:3,11;16:19;33:8; 39:12;43:2
<b>2</b>		<b>advance (2)</b> 43:6;53:15	<b>apologize (1)</b> 35:11	<b>assume (2)</b> 23:22;47:17
<b>2010 (3)</b> 8:1,15;62:12	<b>ability (5)</b> 6:1;7:18;25:7;51:10; 60:10	<b>adverse (3)</b> 15:6,7;36:7	<b>apparently (1)</b> 54:17	<b>assuming (1)</b> 31:7
<b>2010-01 (1)</b> 3:4	<b>able (2)</b> 8:6;36:6	<b>affect (4)</b> 6:1;7:17;31:5;43:23	<b>appeal (2)</b> 10:3,8	<b>assurances (1)</b> 36:19
<b>2011 (6)</b> 6:7;7:2;10:16;30:10; 34:24;41:7	<b>absolute (1)</b> 19:9	<b>afternoon (4)</b> 3:2,23;5:12;62:24	<b>appears (4)</b> 24:16,21;48:13;59:11	<b>attend (1)</b> 42:14
<b>2012 (6)</b> 6:3;7:21;8:12;10:17, 23;11:1	<b>Absolutely (2)</b> 38:7;53:3	<b>again (8)</b> 10:24;12:24;14:3; 27:9;34:11,20;44:6;62:5	<b>applicability (2)</b> 57:24;58:1	<b>Attorney (1)</b> 11:24
<b>202.03 (1)</b> 4:13	<b>acceptable (2)</b> 39:5,20	<b>agencies (12)</b> 12:17,20;13:23;14:1, 4,15;25:5;26:6,7,11; 27:3,14	<b>Applicant (35)</b> 5:7,17;7:15;9:17; 14:24;15:15;18:6;20:17; 21:14;22:4;23:17;25:16; 26:8;27:23;29:9;30:20; 31:20;36:10,16,24; 37:17;38:11,22;39:7; 42:5;49:16;50:3;51:13, 20;52:21;53:14;55:4; 58:11;59:3;60:16	<b>authority (7)</b> 18:22;24:19;37:13; 53:3,5,18;54:19
<b>22nd (4)</b> 9:22;18:14,16;26:18	<b>acceptance (2)</b> 29:6,7	<b>agencies' (2)</b> 25:4;33:2	<b>applicants (1)</b> 53:9	<b>available (4)</b> 3:22;8:2;19:22;38:19
<b>23rd (1)</b> 49:16	<b>access (1)</b> 47:17	<b>agency (1)</b> 24:13	<b>Applicant's (3)</b> 13:14;21:19;47:2	<b>award (1)</b> 58:8
<b>240 (2)</b> 18:7,12	<b>accommodate (4)</b> 21:2;28:22;32:11; 45:21	<b>agree (4)</b> 27:21;44:24;55:18; 61:21	<b>application (4)</b>	
<b>26th (11)</b> 29:2,12;30:10;31:22; 32:10;33:22;34:17,24; 35:16;38:21;41:7	<b>accommodating (1)</b> 33:19	<b>agreement (2)</b> 36:1;42:3		
<b>27th (2)</b>	<b>accomplish (1)</b> 32:2	<b>ahead (2)</b>		
	<b>achieve (1)</b>			

SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC

<p><b>away (3)</b> 15:5;28:11;45:10</p> <p><b>aye (8)</b> 41:9,10;46:11,12; 49:4,5;62:17,18</p>	<p>35:10,11,21;36:13;37:23</p> <p><b>borne (1)</b> 50:3</p> <p><b>both (3)</b> 24:14;48:21;49:1</p> <p><b>break (1)</b> 30:1</p> <p><b>brief (5)</b> 11:22,23;43:15;60:3; 62:4</p> <p><b>briefs (2)</b> 31:17;33:20</p> <p><b>bring (4)</b> 27:16;50:13;54:21,24</p> <p><b>bringing (2)</b> 52:6;59:21</p> <p><b>brought (2)</b> 35:18;36:20</p> <p><b>building (2)</b> 7:20;19:20</p> <p><b>bus (2)</b> 17:8,12</p> <p><b>business (1)</b> 12:17</p> <p><b>Buttolph (10)</b> 17:16;47:10;52:4; 57:17;58:12,17;59:3; 60:3,19;61:5</p> <p><b>Buttolph/Lewis/Spring (4)</b> 5:8;6:20;49:11;62:9</p> <p><b>Buttolph's (1)</b> 59:12</p> <p><b>buy (1)</b> 51:6</p>	<p>7:12;15:5,7,9;29:2; 36:19;45:6</p> <p><b>certainly (5)</b> 14:10;36:1;38:14; 43:14;56:17</p> <p><b>certainty (1)</b> 20:20</p> <p><b>certificate (15)</b> 12:12;13:24;16:17; 22:22;25:1,20;26:13; 28:23;39:1,3;51:10; 60:16,18;61:6,7</p> <p><b>cetera (2)</b> 50:2;58:18</p> <p><b>chair (2)</b> 9:14;61:23</p> <p><b>CHAIRMAN (39)</b> 3:20;4:11;11:21;14:6; 15:20;19:3;20:5;26:24; 27:10;28:12;30:14; 32:12;34:15;35:19; 40:23;41:4,11,13;42:17, 22;45:13,15;46:10,15; 49:8;50:16;51:4;52:12, 24;54:5,6,9;59:6;60:11; 61:13;62:14,16,21;63:5</p> <p><b>chance (1)</b> 56:17</p> <p><b>change (4)</b> 14:4;17:5;27:6;40:10</p> <p><b>changed (2)</b> 22:14;40:9</p> <p><b>changes (1)</b> 26:8</p> <p><b>chapter (2)</b> 50:6;54:13</p> <p><b>characterize (2)</b> 6:18;14:24</p> <p><b>Charlie (1)</b> 3:14</p> <p><b>Cherian (6)</b> 5:20;9:5,11,22;10:10; 11:4</p> <p><b>choosing (1)</b> 25:17</p> <p><b>chose (2)</b> 52:14,16</p> <p><b>circumstances (1)</b> 22:14</p> <p><b>cite (1)</b> 4:13</p> <p><b>clarify (3)</b> 22:3;56:9;60:12</p> <p><b>clarity (1)</b> 12:17</p> <p><b>clear (7)</b> 12:11;13:3;18:4; 35:23;53:2;56:16;58:16</p> <p><b>clearly (2)</b> 6:23;40:11</p> <p><b>clicked (1)</b> 33:24</p> <p><b>close (1)</b></p>	<p>5:1</p> <p><b>closer (1)</b> 31:10</p> <p><b>closing (1)</b> 61:24</p> <p><b>collect (1)</b> 13:11</p> <p><b>collection (1)</b> 42:4</p> <p><b>collectively (1)</b> 16:12</p> <p><b>comfortable (5)</b> 39:22;55:2;57:13; 59:5,8</p> <p><b>coming (4)</b> 10:20,21;43:21;45:19</p> <p><b>comment (3)</b> 11:11,23;44:24</p> <p><b>comments (2)</b> 49:16;55:19</p> <p><b>Commission (1)</b> 3:21</p> <p><b>Committee (40)</b> 3:4,6;16:11;18:5; 19:18;20:12,23;21:3; 23:23;24:4,10,19,24; 25:9;28:18,20;29:24; 38:15;39:5;40:4;42:16; 43:16;45:4;47:19;49:23; 50:4,23;51:8,9,12;53:4, 9;54:14;57:13;58:6; 59:3;60:13;61:3,16;63:3</p> <p><b>Committee's (3)</b> 4:13,19;55:20</p> <p><b>common (1)</b> 38:2</p> <p><b>communicated (1)</b> 45:19</p> <p><b>communications (1)</b> 4:8</p> <p><b>companies (1)</b> 48:7</p> <p><b>company's (1)</b> 10:5</p> <p><b>complete (4)</b> 12:18;27:7;29:20; 55:11</p> <p><b>completed (3)</b> 10:24;13:23;37:1</p> <p><b>completely (1)</b> 44:24</p> <p><b>completes (2)</b> 26:1,2</p> <p><b>completion (1)</b> 38:4</p> <p><b>component (1)</b> 55:21</p> <p><b>components (1)</b> 10:5</p> <p><b>compromise (1)</b> 20:1</p> <p><b>compromising (1)</b> 40:24</p>	<p><b>concern (1)</b> 9:23</p> <p><b>concerns (3)</b> 9:6;14:7;36:5</p> <p><b>conclude (2)</b> 22:23;43:24</p> <p><b>concluded (2)</b> 13:9;43:22</p> <p><b>conclusion (3)</b> 13:19;36:6;50:9</p> <p><b>concrete (3)</b> 29:14;30:5;37:9</p> <p><b>concretely (1)</b> 18:10</p> <p><b>concur (1)</b> 34:13</p> <p><b>concurrent (1)</b> 47:18</p> <p><b>condition (21)</b> 33:13;36:22;39:1,13, 13;51:12,18,20,23,24; 52:1,6;53:6,8;57:20,21; 58:12;60:15,17;61:6,16</p> <p><b>conditional (1)</b> 39:23</p> <p><b>conditioned (2)</b> 60:8,18</p> <p><b>conditioning (1)</b> 25:19</p> <p><b>conditions (6)</b> 16:17,18;22:20;27:19; 51:11;61:12</p> <p><b>conduct (6)</b> 3:23;5:4,24;29:14,15; 50:1</p> <p><b>conducted (1)</b> 46:3</p> <p><b>conference (11)</b> 32:16;37:6,12,22; 41:18,24;42:11;43:14; 45:18,24;63:9</p> <p><b>confidential (2)</b> 47:18;48:14</p> <p><b>confidentiality (4)</b> 46:21;47:1,15;48:17</p> <p><b>confines (1)</b> 14:21</p> <p><b>conflict (1)</b> 31:20</p> <p><b>connection (1)</b> 30:23</p> <p><b>consequence (1)</b> 7:12</p> <p><b>consider (6)</b> 13:12;28:14;57:3,4,8; 61:17</p> <p><b>consideration (8)</b> 18:17;41:6;49:20; 50:10,13;51:17;56:18,22</p> <p><b>considered (2)</b> 55:21,23</p> <p><b>considering (2)</b> 25:1;28:13</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>B</b></p> <p><b>back (11)</b> 10:21,21;12:22;15:4; 17:1;20:17,18;24:1; 25:24;27:16;56:3</p> <p><b>back-fit (1)</b> 32:4</p> <p><b>balance (5)</b> 22:16;29:8;31:12,19, 20</p> <p><b>base (2)</b> 15:18;30:22</p> <p><b>based (5)</b> 17:18;24:6;54:11; 58:8;59:12</p> <p><b>Basically (2)</b> 9:19;15:5</p> <p><b>basis (2)</b> 24:24;45:2</p> <p><b>bat (1)</b> 6:10</p> <p><b>bear (2)</b> 49:12;62:11</p> <p><b>bearing (1)</b> 19:15</p> <p><b>becomes (1)</b> 16:9</p> <p><b>begin (3)</b> 14:3;27:13;42:2</p> <p><b>beginning (2)</b> 10:22;23:19</p> <p><b>believes (1)</b> 4:17</p> <p><b>best (6)</b> 33:17,19;37:17;57:17; 58:9;59:2</p> <p><b>better (1)</b> 37:21</p> <p><b>beyond (6)</b> 9:23,24;20:2;21:3; 45:3;53:5</p> <p><b>bid (5)</b> 6:2;7:18;10:4,6,20</p> <p><b>bids (3)</b> 10:11,13,21</p> <p><b>bird (1)</b> 6:10</p> <p><b>bit (6)</b> 7:11;17:10;19:5; 25:14;55:2;60:12</p> <p><b>blanket (1)</b> 51:15</p> <p><b>body (1)</b> 29:21</p> <p><b>Boisvert (9)</b> 3:22;26:23;28:9,10;</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>C</b></p> <p><b>call (3)</b> 14:11;41:5;42:2</p> <p><b>called (4)</b> 9:9;11:8;28:11;35:12</p> <p><b>came (3)</b> 22:15;30:18;43:21</p> <p><b>can (41)</b> 4:10,18;8:8,18,22; 10:4;15:4;18:21;20:1; 22:6;23:1;24:6;27:18; 32:9,13,15;33:12;34:1,6, 7;37:7;38:5,14,23;39:6, 8,21;42:3,15;43:8,16; 44:11;50:8,9,9;58:5,20, 22;61:11,15;63:8</p> <p><b>capacity (2)</b> 47:5;48:1</p> <p><b>case (7)</b> 4:2,17,18,18;15:21; 33:12;46:4</p> <p><b>cases (4)</b> 15:9;25:9;33:10,12</p> <p><b>cause (7)</b> 4:14,15,21;12:8;33:3; 35:5,6</p> <p><b>certain (7)</b></p>	<p><b>change (1)</b> 56:17</p> <p><b>change (4)</b> 14:4;17:5;27:6;40:10</p> <p><b>changed (2)</b> 22:14;40:9</p> <p><b>changes (1)</b> 26:8</p> <p><b>chapter (2)</b> 50:6;54:13</p> <p><b>characterize (2)</b> 6:18;14:24</p> <p><b>Charlie (1)</b> 3:14</p> <p><b>Cherian (6)</b> 5:20;9:5,11,22;10:10; 11:4</p> <p><b>choosing (1)</b> 25:17</p> <p><b>chose (2)</b> 52:14,16</p> <p><b>circumstances (1)</b> 22:14</p> <p><b>cite (1)</b> 4:13</p> <p><b>clarify (3)</b> 22:3;56:9;60:12</p> <p><b>clarity (1)</b> 12:17</p> <p><b>clear (7)</b> 12:11;13:3;18:4; 35:23;53:2;56:16;58:16</p> <p><b>clearly (2)</b> 6:23;40:11</p> <p><b>clicked (1)</b> 33:24</p> <p><b>close (1)</b></p>	<p><b>concern (1)</b> 9:23</p> <p><b>concerns (3)</b> 9:6;14:7;36:5</p> <p><b>conclude (2)</b> 22:23;43:24</p> <p><b>concluded (2)</b> 13:9;43:22</p> <p><b>conclusion (3)</b> 13:19;36:6;50:9</p> <p><b>concrete (3)</b> 29:14;30:5;37:9</p> <p><b>concretely (1)</b> 18:10</p> <p><b>concur (1)</b> 34:13</p> <p><b>concurrent (1)</b> 47:18</p> <p><b>condition (21)</b> 33:13;36:22;39:1,13, 13;51:12,18,20,23,24; 52:1,6;53:6,8;57:20,21; 58:12;60:15,17;61:6,16</p> <p><b>conditional (1)</b> 39:23</p> <p><b>conditioned (2)</b> 60:8,18</p> <p><b>conditioning (1)</b> 25:19</p> <p><b>conditions (6)</b> 16:17,18;22:20;27:19; 51:11;61:12</p> <p><b>conduct (6)</b> 3:23;5:4,24;29:14,15; 50:1</p> <p><b>conducted (1)</b> 46:3</p> <p><b>conference (11)</b> 32:16;37:6,12,22; 41:18,24;42:11;43:14; 45:18,24;63:9</p> <p><b>confidential (2)</b> 47:18;48:14</p> <p><b>confidentiality (4)</b> 46:21;47:1,15;48:17</p> <p><b>confines (1)</b> 14:21</p> <p><b>conflict (1)</b> 31:20</p> <p><b>connection (1)</b> 30:23</p> <p><b>consequence (1)</b> 7:12</p> <p><b>consider (6)</b> 13:12;28:14;57:3,4,8; 61:17</p> <p><b>consideration (8)</b> 18:17;41:6;49:20; 50:10,13;51:17;56:18,22</p> <p><b>considered (2)</b> 55:21,23</p> <p><b>considering (2)</b> 25:1;28:13</p>	

SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC

<p><b>consistent (2)</b> 4:12;51:11</p> <p><b>constitute (1)</b> 4:21</p> <p><b>constituted (1)</b> 4:15</p> <p><b>constitutes (1)</b> 33:8</p> <p><b>construct (2)</b> 6:2;7:20</p> <p><b>construction (7)</b> 8:12,13;10:11,16,17,22,24</p> <p><b>consultant (3)</b> 49:13;52:14,15</p> <p><b>contemplated (1)</b> 18:8</p> <p><b>context (1)</b> 18:9</p> <p><b>contingency (1)</b> 36:22</p> <p><b>continue (1)</b> 24:3</p> <p><b>contracting (1)</b> 12:9</p> <p><b>contracts (4)</b> 6:2;7:20;10:11,20</p> <p><b>conversation (2)</b> 34:16;57:19</p> <p><b>conversations (1)</b> 39:19</p> <p><b>convinced (1)</b> 55:10</p> <p><b>Corps (2)</b> 22:5;36:11</p> <p><b>correctly (2)</b> 24:2;52:13</p> <p><b>corresponds (1)</b> 27:14</p> <p><b>corridor (1)</b> 26:4</p> <p><b>cost (5)</b> 50:3;51:13;52:6;57:21;62:11</p> <p><b>costs (1)</b> 49:12</p> <p><b>Council (1)</b> 53:7</p> <p><b>Counsel (25)</b> 5:7;6:6,13,21,22;7:17;8:23;11:3;17:16;21:15,23;37:16;45:16;46:2;49:23;50:16,17;52:20;53:12,17,22;54:14,16;58:19;59:17</p> <p><b>Counsel's (1)</b> 54:22</p> <p><b>counter (1)</b> 12:2</p> <p><b>couple (2)</b> 16:4;43:8</p> <p><b>course (3)</b> 14:8,9;46:3</p>	<p><b>Court (2)</b> 14:16;42:21</p> <p><b>create (3)</b> 6:4;7:22;10:1</p> <p><b>creates (1)</b> 36:5</p> <p><b>critical (2)</b> 8:13;22:18</p> <p><b>cross-examination (1)</b> 24:5</p> <p><b>cumulative (1)</b> 16:13</p> <p><b>current (2)</b> 35:1;48:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>D</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>dangerous (1)</b> 53:8</p> <p><b>data (3)</b> 23:12,15;38:6</p> <p><b>date (34)</b> 8:13;19:14;20:1,2,19;27:12;29:3,18;30:18;31:10;32:3,4,11,15,17;33:18,19,22;34:10,17,18;35:1;36:19;37:9,14,17;38:4,21;45:17;46:4;56:2;57:19;58:13;63:8</p> <p><b>dated (1)</b> 62:12</p> <p><b>dates (2)</b> 32:13;37:15</p> <p><b>day (1)</b> 8:6</p> <p><b>days (3)</b> 10:3;18:7,12</p> <p><b>deadline (2)</b> 8:11;9:21</p> <p><b>deal (4)</b> 13:15;25:5;27:4,18</p> <p><b>dealing (1)</b> 32:18</p> <p><b>dealt (1)</b> 20:12</p> <p><b>December (10)</b> 5:10;9:22;13:16;18:13,14;21:20;26:18;32:23;37:19;45:18</p> <p><b>decide (1)</b> 55:13</p> <p><b>decision (18)</b> 4:9;10:20;11:18;13:22;14:13;15:18;22:6;24:10;31:18;34:18;35:1,16;36:21;38:6;43:5;44:5;59:4,16</p> <p><b>decisions (1)</b> 15:6</p> <p><b>deemed (1)</b> 52:4</p> <p><b>defend (1)</b> 56:12</p>	<p><b>defer (2)</b> 16:10;50:10</p> <p><b>definitely (1)</b> 16:22</p> <p><b>definition (1)</b> 15:3</p> <p><b>definitive (1)</b> 55:24</p> <p><b>degree (1)</b> 20:19</p> <p><b>delay (8)</b> 6:1;7:12,16,16;9:7,18,23;12:9</p> <p><b>delays (1)</b> 38:2</p> <p><b>delegate (1)</b> 37:13</p> <p><b>deliberate (4)</b> 5:2,12;43:17;57:7</p> <p><b>deliberation (3)</b> 28:21,23;41:23</p> <p><b>deliberations (14)</b> 3:5,24;9:9;11:6;18:19,21,22;28:17;29:18;31:18;33:20;34:8;43:7;45:20</p> <p><b>deliberative (1)</b> 29:20</p> <p><b>denied (1)</b> 5:1</p> <p><b>deny (5)</b> 22:21;24:24;61:2;62:7,8</p> <p><b>denying (1)</b> 60:14</p> <p><b>Department (5)</b> 3:11,12,15,18;16:7</p> <p><b>departments (1)</b> 16:14</p> <p><b>depend (1)</b> 8:11</p> <p><b>DES (3)</b> 12:22;21:12;28:4</p> <p><b>detail (1)</b> 50:8</p> <p><b>details (1)</b> 37:20</p> <p><b>determination (6)</b> 19:6;43:16;44:10;56:23;57:18;58:10</p> <p><b>determinations (1)</b> 57:23</p> <p><b>determine (4)</b> 14:1;26:11;40:12;45:17</p> <p><b>determining (3)</b> 14:19;21:9;22:19</p> <p><b>Development (2)</b> 3:19;31:5</p> <p><b>DHR (10)</b> 17:23;27:24;32:20;33:1;35:21,24;36:5,9,10;37:2</p>	<p><b>dice (1)</b> 24:8</p> <p><b>difference (1)</b> 40:11</p> <p><b>different (4)</b> 14:8;15:3;43:8,20</p> <p><b>dilemma (2)</b> 14:13,18</p> <p><b>direct (1)</b> 13:20</p> <p><b>directing (2)</b> 49:12;62:10</p> <p><b>direction (2)</b> 42:8;57:22</p> <p><b>directive (2)</b> 37:11;41:21</p> <p><b>directly (3)</b> 9:4,15;21:14</p> <p><b>disclosure (1)</b> 4:5</p> <p><b>discovery (7)</b> 21:18;32:16,17,22;33:1;37:18;42:3</p> <p><b>discrete (1)</b> 27:2</p> <p><b>discuss (6)</b> 7:8,11;12:15;46:18;50:8;52:15</p> <p><b>discussed (3)</b> 38:14;39:6;45:22</p> <p><b>discussion (22)</b> 6:9;8:20;11:3;14:9;15:24;30:3,4,12,15;34:14;41:2;42:10;44:22;46:8;48:20;52:20,22;53:1,22;56:11,15;62:14</p> <p><b>discussions (1)</b> 7:5</p> <p><b>dispute (3)</b> 24:17,21,23</p> <p><b>disputing (1)</b> 12:3</p> <p><b>distribution (2)</b> 24:13;25:18</p> <p><b>Division (1)</b> 17:21</p> <p><b>Docket (3)</b> 3:4;5:5;9:7</p> <p><b>documents (4)</b> 6:2;7:4,18;10:4</p> <p><b>Don (1)</b> 3:18</p> <p><b>done (8)</b> 4:6;7:19;15:8;19:24;21:4;32:8;45:2,8</p> <p><b>double-check (1)</b> 47:13</p> <p><b>down (2)</b> 16:10;38:11</p> <p><b>downstream (2)</b> 21:1;45:8</p> <p><b>DR (42)</b> 3:18,22;5:10;12:15,</p>	<p>16,21;13:20;25:11,12;26:21;27:8,11;28:9,10;30:19;35:10,11,21;36:13;37:23;38:10;42:17,18,22;43:18;44:11,14;45:1;48:21;55:5,6;56:5,6;57:1,7;58:5;59:11,15;60:2;61:10,15,21</p> <p><b>draft (1)</b> 29:22</p> <p><b>drafting (1)</b> 28:23</p> <p><b>druthers (1)</b> 27:12</p> <p><b>due (1)</b> 32:8</p> <p><b>Dupee (11)</b> 3:12,12;14:5,6,17;15:17,22;52:11,12;54:4,8</p> <p><b>Dupee's (1)</b> 53:21</p> <p><b>during (2)</b> 14:9;18:21</p> <p><b>duties (1)</b> 50:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>E</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>earlier (2)</b> 16:2;17:24</p> <p><b>early (2)</b> 18:1;28:19</p> <p><b>early/mid (1)</b> 28:7</p> <p><b>easier (1)</b> 9:15</p> <p><b>echo (1)</b> 14:7</p> <p><b>Economic (1)</b> 3:19</p> <p><b>economics (1)</b> 8:10</p> <p><b>effect (2)</b> 16:13;36:7</p> <p><b>effectively (7)</b> 6:12;18:6;22:21;43:1,9;52:8;61:19</p> <p><b>effects (2)</b> 15:7;36:4</p> <p><b>either (8)</b> 10:22;15:8;21:14;23:12,15;35:6;58:22;60:7</p> <p><b>electrical (3)</b> 19:11;21:2;31:1</p> <p><b>eligible (1)</b> 8:15</p> <p><b>else (5)</b> 16:10;30:17;45:13;46:17;59:18</p> <p><b>encountered (1)</b></p>
--	---	---	---	---

SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC

<p>9:16 <b>end (16)</b> 4:24;6:3,24;7:21;8:1, 12,14;9:24;10:12,16; 12:12;13:9,16;19:7; 28:22;30:5 <b>endorses (1)</b> 7:1 <b>endpoint (1)</b> 19:2 <b>Energy (1)</b> 3:9 <b>engagement (1)</b> 53:22 <b>engineering (1)</b> 45:2 <b>England (4)</b> 17:7,18;18:1;20:18 <b>enlarge (6)</b> 18:19;26:16,24;30:3, 9;41:5 <b>enlarging (2)</b> 29:11;37:10 <b>enough (5)</b> 15:18;27:15;39:21; 44:4;59:1 <b>entertain (1)</b> 11:22 <b>entire (1)</b> 49:24 <b>entirely (1)</b> 22:15 <b>entities (1)</b> 48:6 <b>entity (1)</b> 48:8 <b>environmental (3)</b> 14:12,20;15:19 <b>equipment (1)</b> 21:1 <b>Eric (1)</b> 3:8 <b>Essentially (3)</b> 15:17;23:18,20 <b>established (2)</b> 9:21;34:24 <b>establishing (1)</b> 34:17 <b>estate (1)</b> 49:13 <b>et (2)</b> 50:2;58:17 <b>Evaluation (5)</b> 3:3;4:12;19:18;26:5; 49:23 <b>even (3)</b> 39:11;40:6;45:7 <b>event (1)</b> 12:10 <b>everybody's (3)</b> 24:2;50:11;56:16 <b>everyone (3)</b> 3:2;58:9;63:10</p>	<p><b>evidence (2)</b> 29:21;52:5 <b>evidentiary (1)</b> 9:10 <b>ex (1)</b> 4:7 <b>exactly (3)</b> 8:8;12:5;20:23 <b>example (2)</b> 9:24;52:3 <b>excuse (1)</b> 10:11 <b>Exhibit (4)</b> 47:2,4;48:2,3 <b>exhibits (2)</b> 46:21;47:2 <b>exists (1)</b> 4:14 <b>expect (3)</b> 13:4;25:3;36:2 <b>expectation (1)</b> 25:18 <b>experience (1)</b> 9:13 <b>expert (2)</b> 51:14;62:11 <b>experts (2)</b> 14:15;54:15 <b>explain (1)</b> 29:22 <b>explication (1)</b> 60:6 <b>explored (1)</b> 39:17 <b>expressed (2)</b> 9:22;10:10 <b>extend (1)</b> 19:14 <b>extended (1)</b> 34:19 <b>extending (2)</b> 35:6;41:14 <b>extension (2)</b> 6:7;7:1 <b>extent (3)</b> 16:19;20:12;27:5 <b>extra (1)</b> 45:21</p>	<p>4:16,18;39:15,22 <b>fail (1)</b> 9:20 <b>fair (6)</b> 11:13;13:19;22:12; 23:8;29:9;38:8 <b>fairly (6)</b> 4:10,16,18;12:7;27:2; 28:2 <b>fall (1)</b> 10:14 <b>falls (1)</b> 44:18 <b>far (4)</b> 11:11;15:19;23:21; 54:22 <b>farm (1)</b> 16:14 <b>faster (1)</b> 34:1 <b>faux (1)</b> 55:7 <b>favor (7)</b> 31:19,21;41:8,14; 46:11;49:3;62:17 <b>feasibility (8)</b> 20:7,13,15;25:19,21; 26:2,3;38:18 <b>Feasibility (3)</b> 20:8;40:5;45:7 <b>February (2)</b> 10:12;33:16 <b>fed (1)</b> 22:9 <b>federal (1)</b> 8:2 <b>feel (5)</b> 4:8;16:2;25:24;26:5; 58:24 <b>feels (1)</b> 57:13 <b>fees (1)</b> 60:20 <b>fell (1)</b> 33:24 <b>figure (2)</b> 32:2;37:20 <b>file (4)</b> 50:16,21;60:2;61:5 <b>filed (7)</b> 5:5;23:24;49:2,14,16; 53:1;58:7 <b>filing (3)</b> 5:7;6:19;31:23 <b>filings (6)</b> 13:3;48:5;50:12; 56:17;57:4,14 <b>final (15)</b> 6:16;7:19;10:2,2,8,19; 12:23;14:12,14;19:23; 20:14;25:9;26:3;43:7; 44:5 <b>finalization (1)</b></p>	<p>19:6 <b>finalized (1)</b> 6:11 <b>financial (7)</b> 6:4;7:22;8:10;48:5,12, 14;51:19 <b>financing (1)</b> 8:15 <b>find (2)</b> 8:4;39:5 <b>finding (1)</b> 36:22 <b>findings (2)</b> 6:11,11 <b>fine (1)</b> 54:4 <b>finish (1)</b> 36:19 <b>finished (2)</b> 13:5;35:17 <b>first (3)</b> 20:11;32:2;57:5 <b>Fish (11)</b> 3:11;6:11;12:23;16:5; 17:22,23;21:13,24; 24:14;31:8;35:22 <b>fit (1)</b> 51:6 <b>fits (2)</b> 33:2,2 <b>five (5)</b> 51:4,5;54:12;55:3; 56:21 <b>floor (1)</b> 7:5 <b>folks (2)</b> 7:8;49:20 <b>follow (1)</b> 32:8 <b>following (2)</b> 34:16;58:4 <b>follow-up (3)</b> 19:4;38:9;56:6 <b>footprint (1)</b> 26:4 <b>form (2)</b> 22:6;23:9 <b>formally (1)</b> 30:8 <b>forming (1)</b> 18:4 <b>forth (4)</b> 10:4;20:22;23:14;31:2 <b>forthcoming (1)</b> 22:8 <b>forward (4)</b> 12:11;16:16;25:23; 59:21 <b>found (1)</b> 54:23 <b>frame (12)</b> 9:19;13:16;17:20; 23:13;26:6;28:6;30:6,9;</p>	<p>33:17;37:10;41:6,15 <b>front (2)</b> 60:22;61:3 <b>fruition (1)</b> 36:20 <b>full (1)</b> 23:1 <b>fundamental (1)</b> 39:10 <b>further (12)</b> 5:5;6:8;8:20;11:7,16; 39:17;40:19;42:4;46:1; 54:7;56:22;63:2 <b>furtherance (1)</b> 50:5</p>
<b>G</b>				
				<p><b>Game (11)</b> 3:11;6:11;12:24;16:5; 17:22,23;21:13;22:1; 24:14;31:8;35:22 <b>gave (1)</b> 60:1 <b>GEIGER (7)</b> 9:2,12;11:24;47:3,20; 52:22,24 <b>general (2)</b> 5:13;60:8 <b>gets (2)</b> 19:18;38:13 <b>GETZ (106)</b> 3:2,20,20;4:11;7:9; 8:17,21;11:5,16;12:1,13, 19;13:6;14:5,23;15:20, 23;16:21;18:3,16;21:5; 25:10;26:14,22,24; 27:10,20;28:8;29:1,7; 30:1,14;31:11,14;32:12; 34:3,6,13,19,22;35:3,5, 19,23;37:3;38:7;39:8; 40:16,23;41:4,11,13; 42:10,17,24;43:19; 44:13,21;45:13,15;46:8, 10,13,15,22;47:7,14; 48:13,19,23;49:3,6,8,19; 50:18;51:1,4;52:8,18; 53:20;54:1,6,9;55:5,17; 56:5,13;57:3,10;58:2,14; 59:7,14,23;60:4;61:9,13, 18;62:3,14,16,19,21; 63:2,5,10 <b>given (5)</b> 14:2;39:15;54:24; 56:18;59:16 <b>glad (1)</b> 25:12 <b>goes (3)</b> 13:6;25:22;43:9 <b>Good (9)</b> 3:2;4:14,15,21;32:11; 35:5,6;38:10;56:15 <b>Granite (1)</b></p>

SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC

<p>51:19 <b>grant (5)</b> 6:6;24:24;41:22; 48:16;55:8 <b>granted (4)</b> 49:9;53:6;58:21;61:6 <b>granting (1)</b> 54:11 <b>Gravel (1)</b> 5:21 <b>Groton (3)</b> 48:6;49:12;62:10 <b>group (17)</b> 5:9;6:20;17:16;47:10; 49:11,11;52:4,14;57:17; 58:12,18;59:3,12,16; 60:23;61:5;62:9 <b>group's (1)</b> 60:20 <b>guess (35)</b> 5:13;6:13;7:4,11; 11:19;12:3;13:12;14:13; 16:1;18:24;19:7;20:16; 23:2;26:19;29:1,2; 35:23;36:1,2;38:15; 39:9;41:16,20,21;43:3,8; 45:15;46:18;50:5,8; 52:3,21;54:10;56:21; 60:22 <b>guidance (1)</b> 44:11</p>	<p>59:5,9;60:21;61:19,22; 62:6 <b>harsh (1)</b> 14:21 <b>hashed (1)</b> 53:15 <b>head (2)</b> 17:2,20 <b>Health (1)</b> 3:13 <b>hear (5)</b> 9:15;22:2;32:20; 40:19;60:6 <b>heard (4)</b> 9:1;28:15;54:18;57:5 <b>hearing (12)</b> 9:11;13:9;15:4;21:7; 24:3;29:16,20;33:16; 34:7;38:19;63:5,11 <b>hearings (11)</b> 3:3;4:24;5:2;8:5;14:3; 23:20;26:1;27:13;28:23; 31:17;43:6 <b>Hecklau (1)</b> 5:21 <b>held (1)</b> 48:8 <b>help (1)</b> 44:9 <b>helped (1)</b> 4:6 <b>helpful (3)</b> 8:18,22;37:5 <b>higher (1)</b> 20:19 <b>hire (3)</b> 52:14;53:13;54:20 <b>hired (1)</b> 53:16 <b>hiring (2)</b> 52:15;54:15 <b>Historic (7)</b> 21:12;22:3,5,7;24:15; 36:4,8 <b>Historical (6)</b> 6:12;13:2;16:6,7,7; 17:22 <b>hold (1)</b> 37:12 <b>holiday (1)</b> 38:1 <b>HOOD (2)</b> 3:14,14 <b>hope (1)</b> 54:21 <b>hopefully (2)</b> 33:23;37:21 <b>hoping (1)</b> 36:8 <b>horse's (1)</b> 9:16 <b>Human (1)</b> 3:13</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>I</b></p> <p><b>Iacopino (32)</b> 18:12,14;20:3,5,10; 23:3,5;28:12;29:5,17; 32:7;37:11;41:21;42:1, 7,9,13;43:11,12;44:7; 46:20,24;47:4,9,23;48:3, 11;49:1,18;62:23;63:1,7 <b>Iberdrola (3)</b> 48:7;49:12;62:10 <b>idea (2)</b> 19:9;38:11 <b>ideas (1)</b> 28:4 <b>identify (1)</b> 3:7 <b>immediate (1)</b> 45:23 <b>impact (7)</b> 15:19;19:12,23;20:6, 13;28:5;45:5 <b>impacts (3)</b> 14:2,12,20 <b>implication (1)</b> 8:4 <b>important (3)</b> 51:17,22;56:8 <b>impose (5)</b> 38:22;51:10,12,18; 61:11 <b>imposed (1)</b> 50:6 <b>impositions (1)</b> 51:19 <b>impression (1)</b> 31:9 <b>inappropriate (2)</b> 53:7;55:15 <b>include (1)</b> 26:6 <b>included (1)</b> 56:1 <b>includes (1)</b> 24:14 <b>including (1)</b> 60:19 <b>incomplete (1)</b> 12:8 <b>incorporate (1)</b> 13:18 <b>indeed (1)</b> 22:4 <b>indicated (3)</b> 4:17;5:3;21:24 <b>indicating (4)</b> 41:10;46:12;49:5; 62:18 <b>indirectly (1)</b> 21:14 <b>individual (1)</b> 16:14</p>	<p><b>individually (1)</b> 16:15 <b>information (28)</b> 6:16;13:10,12,22; 15:18;17:2,19;19:22; 21:11,11;22:18;23:17; 24:22;25:8;26:12;28:4, 15;33:5;35:8,18;37:1,7; 42:5;44:2,4;47:21;48:5, 14 <b>informed (1)</b> 37:21 <b>initial (2)</b> 28:4;40:7 <b>inquire (2)</b> 8:23;11:12 <b>inside (1)</b> 31:1 <b>insufficient (1)</b> 26:12 <b>interconnection (9)</b> 6:10;20:14;24:15,20; 27:5;38:12;43:3;45:3,6 <b>interest (6)</b> 29:10,19;31:4;57:17; 58:9;59:2 <b>interested (2)</b> 20:23;50:24 <b>interesting (2)</b> 51:16,22 <b>interjects (2)</b> 14:16;42:21 <b>interpret (1)</b> 13:13 <b>intersects (1)</b> 32:21 <b>intervenor (8)</b> 5:9;41:1;49:10;52:14; 55:9,9;61:11;62:9 <b>intervenor's (5)</b> 29:9;31:21;37:16; 53:12;54:15 <b>into (13)</b> 6:17;10:14;11:14; 13:18;17:17;19:18;22:9; 30:2;31:17;32:5;33:2; 51:3;56:1 <b>investigations (1)</b> 50:2 <b>involved (2)</b> 24:9;58:9 <b>ISO (24)</b> 17:7,18;18:1;20:11, 15,18;21:4,13;22:8,18; 25:2,3,15,18,22;26:1; 27:18;33:5;35:20;39:2; 40:13,20;43:21;44:2 <b>ISO's (1)</b> 19:5 <b>issue (40)</b> 4:3;8:9;10:18;11:20; 13:7,24;16:8;17:21; 25:2,6,14,15;27:18;34:6,</p>	<p>8;37:14;38:24;39:17; 41:16;42:19,23,24;43:4, 5,15;44:20;46:5;50:5; 52:20,23;53:15;56:7,10, 15;57:6;58:17;60:1,7; 61:8;62:5 <b>issued (3)</b> 5:10;7:20;8:14 <b>issues (25)</b> 4:1,20;5:13;6:8,9; 7:11,13;12:14;13:4; 16:4;22:1,4,13;24:8,11, 16;25:1,4,13;27:7; 37:24;46:4;49:13;52:2; 56:7 <b>issuing (2)</b> 16:16;51:10 <b>IV (2)</b> 60:7,7 <b>IX (1)</b> 30:10</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p> <p><b>Hampshire (4)</b> 3:9,11,14,17 <b>hand (4)</b> 6:5;10:2;20:3;43:24 <b>handle (2)</b> 33:13;61:11 <b>happen (2)</b> 28:6;58:13 <b>happened (2)</b> 16:23;57:15 <b>happens (2)</b> 31:22;40:14 <b>happy (5)</b> 9:3,4,12,18;50:23 <b>hard (1)</b> 56:3 <b>hardly (1)</b> 59:19 <b>harm (4)</b> 6:4;7:22;8:10;33:3 <b>Harrington (42)</b> 3:16,16;7:9,10;8:19, 24;9:3;11:15;15:24; 16:1;19:3;20:8,16; 30:15,16;31:13,24; 33:21;34:5,9;35:7;38:8, 9;40:3,22;42:15;44:22, 23;46:7;47:24;48:9,18; 50:15;54:9,10;58:15;</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>J</b></p> <p><b>January (6)</b> 9:24;31:10;32:23,24; 37:18,20 <b>join (1)</b> 16:2 <b>joins (1)</b> 26:23 <b>jointly (1)</b> 50:1 <b>judge (4)</b> 4:10,16,18;35:18 <b>judging (1)</b> 58:23 <b>judgment (4)</b> 23:1;30:23;55:24; 57:15 <b>July (1)</b> 31:18 <b>jurisdiction (9)</b> 15:10;17:11;31:3; 39:11;40:1;42:23;43:2, 10;44:18 <b>jurisdictional (2)</b> 43:22;44:1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>K</b></p> <p><b>Kent (32)</b> 3:18,18;12:15,16,21; 13:20;25:11,12;26:21; 27:8,11;42:17,18,22; 43:18;44:11,14;45:1; 48:21;55:5,6;56:5,6; 57:1,7;58:5;59:11,15; 60:2;61:10,15,21 <b>Kent's (2)</b> 30:19;38:10 <b>kind (11)</b> 11:20;12:9;27:6;</p>		

SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC

30:17,19;37:17;44:3; 51:5,24;52:2;54:20 <b>kinds (1)</b> 38:2 <b>knew (1)</b> 53:12 <b>knowing (1)</b> 14:14 <b>knowledge (1)</b> 4:20	36:5 <b>light (1)</b> 8:8 <b>likely (3)</b> 6:1;7:17;56:20 <b>line (7)</b> 16:5,10;20:20;24:13; 30:24;40:8,9 <b>lines (3)</b> 19:9,19;45:4 <b>list (1)</b> 32:9 <b>little (6)</b> 7:11;16:15;17:10; 18:10;55:2;60:12 <b>LLC (2)</b> 48:6;62:10 <b>located (2)</b> 17:9,13 <b>location (4)</b> 17:12;19:19;30:23; 38:12 <b>logic (2)</b> 29:2;30:18 <b>logistical (1)</b> 37:24 <b>long (6)</b> 18:24;26:2,2;30:3; 37:10;43:20 <b>longer (3)</b> 13:18;19:14;25:3 <b>longest (1)</b> 25:14 <b>look (12)</b> 14:11;16:10,11,15; 33:9;40:5,6;51:8;52:3; 55:1;58:1,7 <b>looked (1)</b> 55:22 <b>looking (6)</b> 7:14;15:15;33:16,23; 44:18;56:2 <b>looks (1)</b> 5:9 <b>lost (1)</b> 30:18 <b>Luhman (1)</b> 5:21	38:2 <b>March (5)</b> 17:19;19:7;28:7,19,19 <b>material (1)</b> 59:1 <b>Matt (1)</b> 4:5 <b>matter (4)</b> 4:10;50:12;51:15;60:9 <b>matters (2)</b> 28:11;47:18 <b>max (1)</b> 32:3 <b>maximum (1)</b> 33:23 <b>May (24)</b> 6:7;7:2;11:8;12:5,8; 17:17;19:13;20:2;21:11, 12,12,13,24;22:3;25:2; 31:17;32:10,10;39:21, 24;44:8;50:4;55:21,22 <b>maybe (24)</b> 10:22;17:23;19:8,10, 24;20:17;21:6;29:8; 31:10,24;32:8,10,21; 33:1,2,17;34:1;37:10; 38:19;40:13;44:3;45:8; 59:18,19 <b>Mazur (1)</b> 5:10 <b>McCann (6)</b> 53:13,16,23;57:18; 59:2;60:20 <b>mean (12)</b> 11:22,22;16:3,11; 21:19;34:4;38:13;39:9, 14;43:3;45:5;59:23 <b>meaning (4)</b> 8:1;10:2;12:19;35:20 <b>means (1)</b> 18:16 <b>meant (3)</b> 8:23;11:12;26:20 <b>mechanism (4)</b> 22:20;55:15;59:20,24 <b>meet (3)</b> 9:20;23:22;26:9 <b>meeting (4)</b> 3:4;5:15;8:11;27:23 <b>member (1)</b> 4:15 <b>Members (8)</b> 3:6;23:23;24:4;40:4; 41:10;46:12;49:5;62:18 <b>mentioned (3)</b> 18:23;32:7;58:19 <b>mere (1)</b> 4:20 <b>merits (3)</b> 5:2;23:1;48:15 <b>mid (1)</b> 6:17 <b>might (9)</b>	14:14;21:17;23:15; 25:3;28:5;32:6;52:17; 55:11;61:23 <b>Mihalik (1)</b> 12:10 <b>Mike (1)</b> 3:16 <b>miles (1)</b> 45:10 <b>million (1)</b> 8:16 <b>mind (3)</b> 8:22;33:6;36:6 <b>minds (1)</b> 5:15 <b>mine (1)</b> 4:7 <b>mischievous (1)</b> 53:10 <b>missed (1)</b> 8:6 <b>misunderstood (1)</b> 27:11 <b>money (2)</b> 8:2,16 <b>month (2)</b> 21:21;31:15 <b>months (2)</b> 6:15;10:15 <b>more (20)</b> 7:11;8:4;13:10,20; 18:10;26:5;27:17;30:16; 31:15;32:5;33:12,17; 34:10;36:2;37:11;46:22; 54:14;55:2;60:6,6 <b>morning (1)</b> 8:5 <b>most (3)</b> 41:19;45:23;56:20 <b>motion (38)</b> 5:1;7:7;41:5;45:16; 46:19,20,23;47:1,7,10, 15,17;48:16,24;49:2,9, 10,11,14;50:18;53:2; 56:12;58:7,21,23;59:12, 20;60:3,14,22;61:20; 62:2,3,6,7,9,17,22 <b>motions (2)</b> 11:10;47:1 <b>mouth (1)</b> 9:16 <b>move (5)</b> 18:7;21:17;30:9;34:7; 48:16 <b>moved (1)</b> 46:6 <b>moving (1)</b> 28:2 <b>much (4)</b> 5:17;19:15,22;24:22 <b>mud (1)</b> 10:15 <b>Multiple (4)</b>	41:10;46:12;49:5; 62:18 <b>must (1)</b> 26:6
<b>L</b>			<b>N</b>	
<b>laid (2)</b> 4:13;45:4 <b>language (1)</b> 49:21 <b>large (2)</b> 16:9;36:11 <b>largely (1)</b> 17:17 <b>last (2)</b> 13:9;22:23 <b>late (5)</b> 6:17;28:7,19;35:12; 60:2 <b>later (9)</b> 18:1;26:10;32:21; 38:20;56:23;57:19; 58:13;60:16;61:8 <b>latest (1)</b> 32:23 <b>lawyer (1)</b> 58:22 <b>lay (4)</b> 5:22;30:5;32:1,13 <b>layout (1)</b> 20:20 <b>least (12)</b> 6:7;7:2;24:19;28:21; 29:10;32:1;33:11;38:15; 39:4;41:4;50:13;57:14 <b>leave (1)</b> 31:16 <b>leaves (1)</b> 41:16 <b>leery (1)</b> 54:11 <b>left (1)</b> 24:4 <b>legal (2)</b> 28:11;55:7 <b>legislature's (1)</b> 53:5 <b>Lempster (1)</b> 33:10 <b>lengthen (2)</b> 18:23;19:1 <b>lengthy (2)</b> 6:1;7:16 <b>letter (2)</b> 5:9;36:1 <b>letters (1)</b>	<b>M</b>			
	<b>Magnuson (1)</b> 4:5 <b>major (1)</b> 16:4 <b>makes (4)</b> 34:10;40:11;41:19; 43:4 <b>making (2)</b> 22:5;60:13 <b>manager (1)</b> 9:5 <b>many (1)</b>		<b>O</b>	
			<b>object (2)</b> 9:8;47:16 <b>objection (7)</b> 47:9,12;49:14,15; 53:1;56:24;60:13 <b>objections (1)</b> 47:8 <b>obligated (1)</b> 26:1	

SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC

<p><b>obviously (4)</b> 10:14;23:6;53:1;60:16</p> <p><b>occurred (1)</b> 34:17</p> <p><b>occurring (1)</b> 44:16</p> <p><b>occurs (2)</b> 28:19;51:2</p> <p><b>off (4)</b> 15:8;17:18;58:8,23</p> <p><b>offer (4)</b> 9:13,18;44:11;58:17</p> <p><b>offering (1)</b> 60:15</p> <p><b>Office (1)</b> 3:9</p> <p><b>officer (1)</b> 46:6</p> <p><b>once (2)</b> 28:14;37:21</p> <p><b>one (33)</b> 5:7,8;7:10;16:20;18:3; 21:5,17;26:15;29:5; 31:22;37:3,8;38:11; 40:4,7;44:6;46:18,22; 47:24;48:6,21;50:17; 51:8,14;56:7,8,19;57:23, 24;59:19,19;60:23;62:7</p> <p><b>ones (1)</b> 16:18</p> <p><b>only (4)</b> 36:17;58:21,22;60:22</p> <p><b>open (1)</b> 7:5</p> <p><b>open-ended (3)</b> 22:15;31:16;40:21</p> <p><b>operative (1)</b> 49:21</p> <p><b>opinion (6)</b> 12:23;50:16;55:7; 59:24;60:1,5</p> <p><b>opinions (1)</b> 33:10</p> <p><b>opportunity (15)</b> 5:12;7:3;9:9;21:22; 23:17;37:15;49:20; 50:11,20;54:16;55:13; 57:14;58:6,18;60:17</p> <p><b>oppose (3)</b> 53:11,16;60:17</p> <p><b>opposed (5)</b> 25:16;41:11;46:13; 49:6;62:19</p> <p><b>optimistic (1)</b> 38:4</p> <p><b>option (1)</b> 34:23</p> <p><b>options (2)</b> 18:11;50:7</p> <p><b>order (18)</b> 5:11;8:15;10:2,2;11:8; 23:8;28:22,24;29:22; 33:20;34:7,8;37:14;</p>	<p>41:23;45:19;46:5;53:4; 62:10</p> <p><b>orderly (1)</b> 31:5</p> <p><b>orders (1)</b> 8:14</p> <p><b>originally (2)</b> 14:10;18:7</p> <p><b>otherwise (4)</b> 25:23;38:17;39:3; 40:18</p> <p><b>ought (1)</b> 23:9</p> <p><b>out (42)</b> 4:13;5:22;6:17;8:4; 10:6,12,20;16:14;17:11, 21;18:13;19:7,13;20:2,2, 6;21:21;23:4;28:13; 29:18;30:5;31:17;32:2, 3,13;33:7;35:12;36:12; 37:5,20;38:13,18;41:22, 23;42:5;43:13,19,21; 45:5,19;51:23;53:15</p> <p><b>output (1)</b> 21:2</p> <p><b>outside (5)</b> 15:9,10;33:18;54:15; 60:9</p> <p><b>outstanding (3)</b> 11:9;24:11;46:19</p> <p><b>over (9)</b> 9:4;20:3;24:17,19,20; 34:11;39:11;42:1;43:2</p> <p><b>overlapping (1)</b> 19:11</p> <p><b>own (1)</b> 9:14</p>	<p>24:5,17,21;25:7;27:15; 28:16;39:18;43:15;44:9; 45:17;47:12;52:16;63:8</p> <p><b>parts (4)</b> 7:7;14:10;21:7;30:2</p> <p><b>partway (1)</b> 36:17</p> <p><b>party (1)</b> 60:15</p> <p><b>past (5)</b> 16:18,24,24;20:14; 26:18</p> <p><b>pay (4)</b> 52:17;53:14;55:3,4</p> <p><b>payment (1)</b> 60:19</p> <p><b>people (4)</b> 37:24;39:5;40:10; 54:20</p> <p><b>perhaps (3)</b> 10:8;26:21;37:13</p> <p><b>period (1)</b> 19:14</p> <p><b>permit (4)</b> 10:7,7,7;16:9</p> <p><b>permits (1)</b> 7:19</p> <p><b>permitted (1)</b> 18:20</p> <p><b>PERRY (7)</b> 3:10,10;30:13;34:15, 21,23;35:4</p> <p><b>person (1)</b> 56:9</p> <p><b>perspective (3)</b> 25:13;36:3;42:8</p> <p><b>petition (4)</b> 61:2,5;62:7,8</p> <p><b>phrased (1)</b> 48:4</p> <p><b>physical (2)</b> 20:20;45:4</p> <p><b>pick (2)</b> 27:12;32:4</p> <p><b>picking (1)</b> 37:15</p> <p><b>piece (1)</b> 27:5</p> <p><b>place (2)</b> 22:11;56:11</p> <p><b>plainly (1)</b> 29:22</p> <p><b>Planning (1)</b> 3:9</p> <p><b>play (3)</b> 26:7;43:1,19</p> <p><b>plays (1)</b> 37:5</p> <p><b>please (5)</b> 41:8;44:13;46:11; 49:3;51:1</p> <p><b>plenty (1)</b> 12:6</p>	<p><b>plus (1)</b> 11:17</p> <p><b>pm (1)</b> 63:12</p> <p><b>point (14)</b> 9:22;11:23;16:3; 17:24;20:6;22:17;23:15; 28:13;29:11,17;31:19; 35:16;43:5;56:14</p> <p><b>points (1)</b> 35:14</p> <p><b>policy (1)</b> 24:9</p> <p><b>posed (1)</b> 56:19</p> <p><b>position (14)</b> 6:14;22:3,19;24:2; 40:4,11,18,24;44:3,6,15; 47:15;55:20;60:12</p> <p><b>positive (1)</b> 25:19</p> <p><b>possibility (1)</b> 19:24</p> <p><b>possible (2)</b> 32:9;51:7</p> <p><b>possibly (3)</b> 21:6,15;32:20</p> <p><b>post (1)</b> 56:2</p> <p><b>precedent (4)</b> 16:23;53:8,18;54:20</p> <p><b>preference (1)</b> 50:14</p> <p><b>preferred (1)</b> 13:16</p> <p><b>prefiled (2)</b> 23:7;24:6</p> <p><b>prehearing (11)</b> 32:15;37:6,12,22; 41:17,24;42:11;43:13; 45:17,24;63:9</p> <p><b>prejudgment (1)</b> 4:9</p> <p><b>prejudice (1)</b> 60:14</p> <p><b>premature (1)</b> 52:9</p> <p><b>preparation (1)</b> 44:14</p> <p><b>prepare (3)</b> 6:2;7:18;10:4</p> <p><b>prepared (1)</b> 12:11</p> <p><b>present (2)</b> 3:23;50:23</p> <p><b>presented (8)</b> 13:23;14:8;25:21,23; 26:4;36:18;37:1;58:24</p> <p><b>presenting (1)</b> 25:8</p> <p><b>presided (1)</b> 42:1</p> <p><b>presiding (1)</b></p>	<p>46:6</p> <p><b>presumably (1)</b> 21:19</p> <p><b>pretty (3)</b> 16:2;19:9;53:2</p> <p><b>previous (1)</b> 44:24</p> <p><b>prior (4)</b> 23:19;25:8;29:15; 55:10</p> <p><b>probably (6)</b> 10:17;19:8,22;24:1; 31:3;33:16</p> <p><b>problems (2)</b> 9:16;10:1</p> <p><b>procedural (7)</b> 13:17;15:14;41:17; 43:13;46:1,4;60:21</p> <p><b>procedure (3)</b> 13:7,18;18:6</p> <p><b>procedures (4)</b> 11:19;41:20;42:6; 45:22</p> <p><b>proceed (7)</b> 5:16;11:19;22:20; 40:19;43:6;45:20;50:14</p> <p><b>proceeding (7)</b> 5:19,24;6:8;23:2; 29:12;41:6;56:24</p> <p><b>proceedings (1)</b> 26:23</p> <p><b>process (15)</b> 13:11;20:11;22:2,9, 12,16;23:10,19,21;24:7; 28:21;32:8,22;34:11; 37:18</p> <p><b>processes (3)</b> 18:18;23:4;27:3</p> <p><b>profile (4)</b> 47:5,5;48:1,1</p> <p><b>progress (1)</b> 22:6</p> <p><b>project (12)</b> 6:3,24;7:21,23;8:10, 12;9:5,17;10:5;12:24; 44:17,17</p> <p><b>projects (1)</b> 38:3</p> <p><b>project's (1)</b> 7:18</p> <p><b>prolonged (1)</b> 17:17</p> <p><b>proof (2)</b> 9:13,18</p> <p><b>property (3)</b> 51:23;52:2;55:20</p> <p><b>proposal (3)</b> 6:6;18:5;56:14</p> <p><b>proposals (6)</b> 5:4,14;12:14;17:1; 39:9;46:1</p> <p><b>propose (1)</b> 61:15</p>
	<b>P</b>			
	<p><b>pages (1)</b> 8:7</p> <p><b>paid (1)</b> 54:22</p> <p><b>parachute (1)</b> 51:7</p> <p><b>parallel (1)</b> 33:7</p> <p><b>parcel (1)</b> 44:17</p> <p><b>part (15)</b> 13:19;16:9;26:15; 31:1;32:12;43:7,7,12; 44:17;45:19;49:1;51:20; 52:5,19;62:4</p> <p><b>parte (1)</b> 4:7</p> <p><b>particular (7)</b> 11:13;23:4;25:6,20; 39:17;56:9;62:8</p> <p><b>parties (22)</b> 4:20;5:3,16;11:8; 21:15,23;23:8,10,13;</p>	<p><b>per (1)</b> 12:6</p>		

**SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC**

<p><b>proposed (9)</b> 6:9,24;13:1;14:7,10; 15:15;27:5;44:16;61:20</p> <p><b>proposes (1)</b> 44:8</p> <p><b>proposing (2)</b> 40:15;57:2</p> <p><b>protection (1)</b> 48:15</p> <p><b>provide (3)</b> 30:21;39:21;40:13</p> <p><b>provided (3)</b> 23:7;27:23;47:21</p> <p><b>provision (2)</b> 56:20;58:19</p> <p><b>public (29)</b> 3:4,21;5:8;6:6,21; 7:17;11:11;17:15;21:15; 23;29:10,19,19,23; 37:16;48:6;49:24;50:16; 17;52:20;53:7,11,17,22; 54:14,16,22;58:19;59:17</p> <p><b>publicly (1)</b> 48:7</p> <p><b>Public's (2)</b> 6:13,22</p> <p><b>PUC (1)</b> 3:17</p> <p><b>pull (1)</b> 20:1</p> <p><b>pulled (1)</b> 34:1</p> <p><b>purchase (1)</b> 8:14</p> <p><b>purpose (2)</b> 3:5;16:11</p> <p><b>purposes (2)</b> 11:6;21:9</p> <p><b>pursuant (1)</b> 30:10</p> <p><b>purview (1)</b> 45:3</p> <p><b>push (1)</b> 20:1</p> <p><b>put (12)</b> 10:5,9,12,19;15:8; 16:18;19:16;20:24;21:1; 36:22;45:9;51:3</p> <p><b>puts (2)</b> 6:17;40:23</p> <p><b>putting (2)</b> 10:20;16:8</p>	<p><b>quorum (1)</b> 3:23</p> <p align="center"><b>R</b></p> <p><b>raise (2)</b> 4:3;43:3</p> <p><b>raised (1)</b> 12:14</p> <p><b>raises (1)</b> 11:17</p> <p><b>raising (1)</b> 20:3</p> <p><b>rather (6)</b> 16:9;26:9;32:3,20; 34:10;37:14</p> <p><b>reach (2)</b> 13:21;50:9</p> <p><b>read (6)</b> 7:4;8:7;49:24;50:11; 54:12;56:17</p> <p><b>ready (1)</b> 59:15</p> <p><b>real (1)</b> 49:13</p> <p><b>really (10)</b> 19:15,17;21:3;24:9; 30:24;33:7,9;37:8;45:3, 10</p> <p><b>reasonable (4)</b> 29:8;35:8;39:14;50:2</p> <p><b>reasonably (1)</b> 13:4</p> <p><b>reasons (1)</b> 29:23</p> <p><b>recall (2)</b> 47:11;53:24</p> <p><b>received (3)</b> 5:6,9;29:21</p> <p><b>receiving (1)</b> 47:11</p> <p><b>recognition (1)</b> 29:10</p> <p><b>recognize (3)</b> 4:2;27:22;31:14</p> <p><b>recommend (2)</b> 23:21;28:20</p> <p><b>recommendations (1)</b> 6:21</p> <p><b>record (8)</b> 3:7;28:9;41:13;46:15; 49:8;55:20;56:1;62:22</p> <p><b>records (2)</b> 16:7;31:8</p> <p><b>rectified (1)</b> 17:24</p> <p><b>refile (1)</b> 58:18</p> <p><b>regarding (2)</b> 11:9;28:3</p> <p><b>regardless (1)</b> 51:22</p> <p><b>reimburse (3)</b></p>	<p>51:13;52:6;61:16</p> <p><b>reimbursed (1)</b> 61:7</p> <p><b>reimbursement (4)</b> 58:11;60:19,24;61:4</p> <p><b>reimbursements (1)</b> 56:3</p> <p><b>related (1)</b> 6:9</p> <p><b>relevance (2)</b> 11:18;12:5</p> <p><b>Reliable (1)</b> 51:19</p> <p><b>relief (1)</b> 55:9</p> <p><b>reluctant (2)</b> 13:24;14:3</p> <p><b>remains (1)</b> 34:24</p> <p><b>remember (1)</b> 48:9</p> <p><b>Rendall (2)</b> 5:20;28:3</p> <p><b>rendered (1)</b> 34:18</p> <p><b>rendering (1)</b> 35:1</p> <p><b>Renewables (1)</b> 62:11</p> <p><b>reopens (1)</b> 27:6</p> <p><b>report (1)</b> 4:6</p> <p><b>Reporter (2)</b> 14:16;42:21</p> <p><b>reports (1)</b> 24:14</p> <p><b>request (3)</b> 7:1;54:17;59:10</p> <p><b>requesting (1)</b> 61:5</p> <p><b>requests (2)</b> 23:12,16</p> <p><b>require (2)</b> 41:24;43:15</p> <p><b>required (2)</b> 5:24;51:13</p> <p><b>requires (2)</b> 4:14;57:20</p> <p><b>research (2)</b> 42:19,22</p> <p><b>resolve (1)</b> 25:3</p> <p><b>resolved (2)</b> 7:13;25:4</p> <p><b>resolves (1)</b> 36:11</p> <p><b>resource (1)</b> 16:8</p> <p><b>Resources (8)</b> 3:19;6:12;13:3;17:22; 21:12;22:3,5;24:15</p> <p><b>respect (3)</b></p>	<p>23:11;51:23;52:2</p> <p><b>respectfully (1)</b> 51:12</p> <p><b>respects (2)</b> 22:11;56:15</p> <p><b>respond (3)</b> 26:7;27:4;50:20</p> <p><b>responding (1)</b> 53:21</p> <p><b>response (13)</b> 10:21,21;37:2;41:3, 12;45:14;46:9,14;49:7; 50:19;62:15,20;63:4</p> <p><b>responses (5)</b> 10:13;14:4;26:10; 27:14,16</p> <p><b>responsive (8)</b> 11:23;21:22;23:14,18; 32:17,18,24;49:16</p> <p><b>restate (1)</b> 44:24</p> <p><b>resubmitted (1)</b> 20:15</p> <p><b>result (1)</b> 22:14</p> <p><b>resume (1)</b> 3:3</p> <p><b>review (11)</b> 6:7;12:24;16:5;18:24; 27:15;28:16;38:24; 56:20;57:2,14;59:1</p> <p><b>reviewed (1)</b> 14:18</p> <p><b>revisit (1)</b> 27:13</p> <p><b>RFPs (1)</b> 10:20</p> <p><b>Rick (1)</b> 3:12</p> <p><b>right (11)</b> 3:6;15:5;34:5,21; 36:12,13;42:8;54:1; 56:9;59:13,21</p> <p><b>rights (3)</b> 29:8;33:4;41:1</p> <p><b>risk (1)</b> 26:11</p> <p><b>risky (1)</b> 55:6</p> <p><b>Roman (4)</b> 51:4,5;54:12;55:3</p> <p><b>ROTH (16)</b> 9:8;11:21;12:4;47:14, 16,22;50:19,21;51:2,5; 52:10;53:20,24;57:5; 59:24;60:11</p> <p><b>Roth's (1)</b> 57:8</p> <p><b>round (3)</b> 20:11;37:19;42:5</p> <p><b>route (6)</b> 6:10;14:8,14;25:17, 20;28:5</p>	<p><b>RSA (4)</b> 15:19;30:10;48:15; 49:22</p> <p><b>rule (3)</b> 4:19;58:21;61:1</p> <p><b>rules (1)</b> 4:13</p> <p><b>ruling (2)</b> 59:8;60:13</p> <p><b>run (4)</b> 19:10,12;20:21;40:8</p> <p><b>runs (1)</b> 18:12</p> <p><b>rush (1)</b> 6:23</p> <p align="center"><b>S</b></p> <p><b>sake (1)</b> 61:1</p> <p><b>same (7)</b> 12:8;22:11;25:22; 26:3;47:17;48:24;49:2</p> <p><b>satisfied (1)</b> 44:19</p> <p><b>saying (11)</b> 7:24;12:1;13:13; 14:24;15:13;35:19; 40:18;41:9;49:4;61:19; 62:17</p> <p><b>schedule (10)</b> 11:9;15:14;17:15; 28:14,17;32:5;42:4; 43:13;46:2;63:8</p> <p><b>scheduling (4)</b> 5:11;11:8;40:12;46:5</p> <p><b>science (1)</b> 31:21</p> <p><b>scope (3)</b> 21:3;43:9;53:5</p> <p><b>Scott (1)</b> 3:22</p> <p><b>season (4)</b> 10:14,15,18;38:1</p> <p><b>SEC (2)</b> 16:24;17:7</p> <p><b>second (10)</b> 19:20;30:11,13,14; 46:7;48:18,19;52:19; 56:8;62:13</p> <p><b>section (3)</b> 54:12,13;55:3</p> <p><b>secure (2)</b> 6:2;7:20</p> <p><b>seek (1)</b> 57:22</p> <p><b>seeking (1)</b> 12:16</p> <p><b>seems (7)</b> 16:4;17:10;18:4;28:1; 32:5;53:12,14</p> <p><b>sees (1)</b> 36:24</p>
<p align="center"><b>Q</b></p> <p><b>qualify (1)</b> 59:18</p> <p><b>quicker (2)</b> 5:18;28:6</p> <p><b>quickly (1)</b> 28:2</p> <p><b>quite (2)</b> 19:5;38:13</p>	<p><b>qualify (1)</b> 59:18</p> <p><b>quicker (2)</b> 5:18;28:6</p> <p><b>quickly (1)</b> 28:2</p> <p><b>quite (2)</b> 19:5;38:13</p>			



**SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC**

<b>selected (1)</b> 52:1	<b>size (1)</b> 20:23	<b>station (3)</b> 17:8,12;19:23	<b>suggest (4)</b> 40:16;56:21;58:5; 61:10	28:3;32:14,16,17,18,23, 24;36:4;37:19
<b>self-evident (1)</b> 12:7	<b>slice (1)</b> 24:8	<b>status (2)</b> 14:4;28:1	<b>suggested (3)</b> 5:17;7:16;53:7	<b>testimony-based (1)</b> 9:11
<b>sense (9)</b> 30:20;32:5;34:10; 36:24;38:16;39:4;41:19; 43:4;44:8	<b>slippery (1)</b> 53:10	<b>statute (10)</b> 9:21;14:11,22;28:21; 49:22;53:19;55:3,8,16; 57:2	<b>suggesting (5)</b> 17:8;20:17;27:1;58:2, 16	<b>Theoretically (1)</b> 34:22
<b>sentiment (1)</b> 18:5	<b>slope (1)</b> 53:10	<b>statutory (1)</b> 54:19	<b>suggestion (5)</b> 38:10;50:22;53:11,17; 57:8	<b>therefore (1)</b> 51:17
<b>separate (3)</b> 17:21;25:13;57:23	<b>smiled (1)</b> 42:16	<b>stay (2)</b> 11:20;63:8	<b>summarize (2)</b> 5:14;6:13	<b>thinking (2)</b> 32:22;41:20
<b>sequence (1)</b> 10:19	<b>solely (2)</b> 44:16;59:12	<b>stayed (1)</b> 10:9	<b>supplemental (4)</b> 23:7,11,24;48:4	<b>thought (4)</b> 8:13;30:19;38:10;55:1
<b>serious (3)</b> 6:4;7:22;8:9	<b>solid (1)</b> 40:20	<b>Steltzer (16)</b> 3:8,8;4:2,4,17;16:21, 22;27:20,21;55:17,18; 57:11,12;58:20;61:23; 62:13	<b>support (1)</b> 60:3	<b>thoughts (3)</b> 23:2;30:7;58:14
<b>Services (1)</b> 3:13	<b>solution (1)</b> 18:1	<b>step (1)</b> 21:21	<b>sure (17)</b> 7:24;8:17;12:4;26:15; 31:7;32:6;34:16;36:9, 15;38:5,13;42:18;50:11; 51:6;52:13;59:17,20	<b>three (5)</b> 6:14;24:11,16,23; 34:11
<b>session (18)</b> 21:18;23:9,13,16; 32:15;37:6,12,22;38:15; 39:6;40:14,17,41;18; 42:1,12;45:18,24;63:9	<b>someone (2)</b> 16:10;45:8	<b>Stephen (1)</b> 3:10	<b>survey (1)</b> 6:10	<b>three-ring (1)</b> 17:8
<b>sessions (2)</b> 39:18;43:14	<b>sometime (2)</b> 19:7;21:20	<b>steps (10)</b> 5:5,18;18:18;29:13, 14;30:5;32:6;41:17; 45:21;46:1	<b>susceptible (1)</b> 40:10	<b>thrown (1)</b> 23:4
<b>set (9)</b> 5:11;21:21;23:14; 32:15,17;37:18;38:3; 45:23;53:8	<b>sometimes (1)</b> 9:15	<b>still (10)</b> 12:16;13:24;19:13; 24:11,16;27:17;28:17; 34:23;39:10;44:2	<b>suspend (5)</b> 18:21;26:1,19;27:9; 28:20	<b>tight (1)</b> 51:6
<b>sets (1)</b> 54:19	<b>somewhere (1)</b> 40:9	<b>strongly (3)</b> 26:5;53:11,16	<b>suspension (1)</b> 26:16	<b>times (1)</b> 34:12
<b>setting (3)</b> 37:9,14;42:11	<b>sooner (5)</b> 19:22;26:9;32:20; 34:8;35:9	<b>struggle (1)</b> 17:4	<b>system (2)</b> 19:23;20:6	<b>timing (1)</b> 43:23
<b>several (2)</b> 23:6;62:4	<b>sorry (3)</b> 20:9;57:1;59:7	<b>studies (9)</b> 19:12;20:13,13,14; 35:17,20,20,21;50:2	<b>T</b>	<b>Today (12)</b> 3:4;22:22;37:8;45:22; 46:18;50:9;57:5;58:10, 17;59:6,10;61:1
<b>shall (4)</b> 4:21;49:24;50:1,3	<b>sort (6)</b> 4:9;14:13,18;33:22, 23;52:4	<b>study (14)</b> 20:6,7,8,15;25:19; 26:2,3;35:24;38:18; 40:5;45:3,7,7;55:11	<b>talk (2)</b> 29:13,18	<b>together (2)</b> 16:8;38:1
<b>share (1)</b> 37:7	<b>sorted (1)</b> 33:7	<b>stuff (4)</b> 20:22;33:1,2;40:6	<b>talking (3)</b> 7:15;12:9;28:18	<b>Tom (1)</b> 3:20
<b>shed (1)</b> 8:8	<b>sorts (1)</b> 53:10	<b>Subcommittee (1)</b> 11:10	<b>talks (1)</b> 54:14	<b>took (1)</b> 56:11
<b>shorter (1)</b> 15:14	<b>speak (2)</b> 9:6;37:15	<b>subject (1)</b> 10:8	<b>tasks (1)</b> 10:6	<b>totally (1)</b> 53:6
<b>shorthand (1)</b> 24:12	<b>Speaking (1)</b> 62:6	<b>submit (1)</b> 46:2	<b>tech (3)</b> 37:21;39:6;63:9	<b>toward (1)</b> 10:12
<b>show (1)</b> 38:16	<b>specific (1)</b> 38:12	<b>submitted (1)</b> 5:19	<b>technical (17)</b> 21:18;23:9,12,16; 32:15;37:6,12;38:14; 39:18;40:14,17;41:18, 24;42:11;43:14;45:18, 24	<b>towards (1)</b> 35:2
<b>significant (3)</b> 9:7;17:5,5	<b>specifically (2)</b> 8:3;9:6	<b>subject (1)</b> 10:8	<b>tenant (1)</b> 4:7	<b>track (1)</b> 17:6
<b>signify (3)</b> 41:8;49:4;62:17	<b>speculative (1)</b> 39:24	<b>submit (1)</b> 46:2	<b>term (1)</b> 25:14	<b>Transformer (4)</b> 19:16,17;20:24;45:9
<b>similar (1)</b> 12:8	<b>spring (4)</b> 6:17;10:17,23;18:2	<b>submittal (1)</b> 7:15	<b>terms (5)</b> 28:13;33:19;37:9; 41:17,19	<b>transmission (2)</b> 14:8;25:17
<b>simply (2)</b> 16:9;51:21	<b>start (7)</b> 3:5;8:13;21:18,20; 22:1;25:14;37:18	<b>successful (1)</b> 52:4	<b>testimony (24)</b> 5:20;11:7,11;12:6; 15:2;21:7,8,19,22;23:7, 11,14;24:1,6;27:22;	<b>Transportation (1)</b> 3:15
<b>Site (4)</b> 3:3,4;12;19:18;49:23	<b>starting (1)</b> 44:15	<b>sufficient (4)</b> 21:8;28:16;36:15;38:5		<b>try (6)</b> 22:13;30:1;32:4;42:5; 50:8;54:2
<b>sites (2)</b> 22:7;36:8	<b>state (10)</b> 8:3;12:17,19;13:22; 14:1,15;24:13;25:4,5; 26:7			<b>trying (7)</b> 8:3;13:15;17:21; 30:17;31:12;45:21;51:2
<b>sitting (2)</b> 9:14;36:12	<b>statement (3)</b> 6:22;11:13;12:3			<b>turn (2)</b> 4:1;9:4
<b>situation (3)</b> 13:8;36:17,18	<b>statements (1)</b> 48:12			<b>turn-around (1)</b> 5:18
	<b>states (1)</b> 4:19			<b>two (11)</b> 6:14;24:18;30:2;

SEC 2010-01 PUBLIC HEARING - December 3, 2010  
GROTON WIND, LLC

<p>34:11;46:24;47:6;50:7; 51:9,15;56:7;57:23 <b>tying (1)</b> 38:11 <b>type (1)</b> 20:22 <b>types (1)</b> 16:17</p>	<p><b>V</b></p>	<p><b>Wind (2)</b> 48:6;62:10 <b>winter (1)</b> 10:15 <b>withdrawal (2)</b> 4:14,22 <b>within (3)</b> 13:15;14:21;18:7 <b>without (5)</b> 12:11;13:22;37:15; 55:13;60:14 <b>witness (5)</b> 4:21;22:1;36:4;56:9; 62:11 <b>witnesses (6)</b> 23:6,11,14,18,24; 27:16 <b>wonder (3)</b> 17:6,14,20 <b>wondering (2)</b> 8:7;40:3 <b>word (2)</b> 17:4;27:8 <b>work (6)</b> 4:6;13:11;18:8;32:1; 38:13;45:16 <b>worked (1)</b> 19:13 <b>working (2)</b> 35:2;38:1 <b>worry (1)</b> 45:11 <b>worthwhile (1)</b> 55:14 <b>writing (2)</b> 44:9;50:22 <b>written (2)</b> 33:20;47:12</p>		
<p><b>U</b></p>	<p><b>valid (1)</b> 39:3 <b>validity (1)</b> 19:5 <b>valuable (2)</b> 51:16,21 <b>value (2)</b> 52:2;54:24 <b>values (2)</b> 51:24;55:21 <b>various (2)</b> 5:22;16:13 <b>vehicles (1)</b> 62:4 <b>venture (1)</b> 55:14 <b>verbal (9)</b> 41:3,12;45:14;46:9, 14;49:7;62:15,20;63:4 <b>versus (2)</b> 20:13,13 <b>volition (1)</b> 52:16 <b>vote (3)</b> 26:12;41:5,14</p>	<p><b>Y</b></p> <p><b>year (6)</b> 6:24;12:12;29:3,3,5; 31:22</p>		
<p><b>ultimately (1)</b> 22:8 <b>unanimous (2)</b> 41:14;46:16 <b>unanimously (2)</b> 49:9;62:22 <b>uncertain (1)</b> 36:14 <b>uncertainties (1)</b> 44:7 <b>uncertainty (1)</b> 36:11 <b>uncomfortable (4)</b> 13:21;15:14;16:3,16 <b>under (14)</b> 9:20,21;15:18;18:20; 28:21;31:9;39:1;44:18; 48:15;49:22;56:21; 58:18;60:14,24 <b>underneath (1)</b> 55:23 <b>Understood (1)</b> 44:21 <b>UNH (1)</b> 4:6 <b>unknowns (1)</b> 16:19 <b>unless (4)</b> 14:3,17;34:19;35:5 <b>unnecessarily (1)</b> 14:21 <b>unreasonable (2)</b> 15:6;36:7 <b>up (10)</b> 5:11;25:18;34:7; 37:18;42:11;45:23;46:4; 50:13;58:16;61:4 <b>upon (4)</b> 8:11;11:8;51:20;60:18 <b>use (5)</b> 24:12;27:8;29:18; 33:22;57:20 <b>used (1)</b> 24:7 <b>useful (2)</b> 22:20;44:2 <b>using (2)</b> 52:8;55:2 <b>Utilities (1)</b> 3:21</p>	<p><b>W</b></p> <p><b>wait (4)</b> 10:2;12:22;38:17; 40:13 <b>waiting (4)</b> 13:2;14:1;20:7;27:17 <b>Walker (1)</b> 5:21 <b>wants (2)</b> 26:9,9 <b>warrant (1)</b> 58:7 <b>way (17)</b> 5:14;10:9;20:2;21:5, 17;32:1;33:3;35:8; 38:17;39:14,23;45:5; 46:3;48:4;50:17;56:24; 61:10 <b>ways (4)</b> 43:8,20;51:9,15 <b>weigh (1)</b> 35:14 <b>what's (7)</b> 8:21;11:18;13:7;31:1; 37:17;45:2;58:24 <b>whenever (1)</b> 59:15 <b>Whereupon (1)</b> 63:11 <b>wide-open (1)</b> 54:20 <b>willing (3)</b> 30:21;38:16,21</p>			