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[WITNESS: COLIN HIGH]
(Whereupon the hearing resumed after the lunch break at 1:27 p.m.)

MS. BAILEY: We're back on the record, and we are going to have the last applicant witness, Mr. Colin High.

You may proceed.
(WHEREUPON, COLIN HIGH was duly sworn by the Court Reporter.)

COLIN HIGH, SWORN
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. High. Can you please state your name and address for the record?
A. Good afternoon. My name's Colin High. My business address is Resource Systems Group, also known as RSG, Inc., at 55 Railroad Row, White River Junction, Vermont, 05001.
Q. Thank -- go ahead.
A. My employment qualifications are -- have been given before. But briefly, I'm one of the co-founders and a principal consultant for Resource Systems Group.
Q. What is your -- oh, go ahead.
A. And $I$ was formerly a member of the faculty at
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Dartmouth College and at Columbia University in New York, where $I$, in both cases, taught environmental sciences, including meteorology and matters related to climate change.
Q. What is your role in the Antrim Wind Project?
A. I have led a group that has analyzed the environmental, particularly air quality and greenhouse gas impacts of the operation of the wind farm and how it displaces generation at fossil fuel plants in the New England power market -- the ISO New England region.
Q. Does your report also include an analysis of water usage?
A. Yes. It also provides an evaluation of the amount of water consumption that will be avoided by the operation of this plant through the displacement of generation at fossil fuel facilities.
Q. Are you the same Colin High who submitted prefiled testimony in this docket which has been marked as Exhibit AWE 1?

MS. GOLDWASSER: And for the
Committee, that would be contained in Volume 1, Section 6.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
A. Yes.

BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. And did you also submit supplemental prefiled testimony in this docket which has been marked as Exhibit AWE 9?

MS. GOLDWASSER: And for
purposes of the Committee, that's Exhibit 9, the fourth supplement to the Application in Tab B6.
A. Yes.

BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to either your prefiled or your supplemental prefiled testimony?
A. No.
Q. Beginning -- excuse me.

If you were asked the same questions contained in Exhibit 1 and 9 today under oath, would your answers be the same as those contained in Exhibits 1 and 9?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you a few questions in response to supplemental testimony that was filed in this case on the same day that
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
you filed supplemental testimony. I'm going to refer you to Exhibit IWAG 2, which is Ms. Linowes' supplemental testimony dated October 11th, 2012.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Thank you. Now I have that document.
Q. Ms. Linowes, beginning on Page 3 of her testimony, provides an analysis regarding the ability of wind energy plants to offset demand in the New England market. Is there anything you would like to say in response to Ms. Linowes' testimony?
A. Yes. I feel that she misinterprets the information provided in that report, in the sense that she implies that the plants will have to be displaced in order to achieve environmental benefits.

And what actually happens is that the -when you generate electricity with wind, it will -- it becomes like a must run facility. It displaces those units which are on the margin of those hours when it's running. And as a result, it reduces the amount of fossil fuel burned and reduces greenhouse gases and
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
reduces conventional air pollutants, such as NOx, sulfur dioxide, et cetera.

And it also, because it reduces generation, it reduces the need for cooling water and other operational uses. So it reduces the consumption of water in the whole New England system when that's going on.

So it provides clear environmental
benefits. And these benefits are
attributed -- or should be attributed directly to the generation by wind. And it isn't necessary for a plant -- for a wind farm to actually cause a power plant to be closed down or retired in order to achieve these reductions. These reductions occur simply because the existing fossil-fuel dispatched plants are generating less.
Q. In the same supplemental testimony

Ms. Linowes testified about a report by the Department of Energy called the 20 percent Wind Energy by 2030" report. She indicates that that report supports her conclusions.

Have you reviewed that report?
A. Yes, I've reviewed at least those sections
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which are relevant.
Q. And does that report change any of the conclusions that you draw in your testimony, report and supplemental testimony?
A. No, it doesn't change it at all, nor does it change what I've just said a few minutes ago.
Q. In her same testimony, Ms. Linowes testifies that the New England Wind Integration Study supports her conclusions. Have you reviewed that report?
A. Yes.
Q. And does that report change any of the conclusions that you draw in your testimony, report, or supplemental testimony?
A. No, it doesn't.

MS. GOLDWASSER: The witness
is available for cross-examination.
MS. BAILEY: Thank you. So now I think we're going to start with Counsel for the Public. Is that correct? Oh, sorry. No, I'm one witness ahead.

Okay. Mr. Froling.
MR. FROLING: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Is Mr. Beblowski
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[WITNESS: COLIN HIGH]
here?
(No verbal response.) MS. BAILEY: Mr. Jones?
(No verbal response) MS. BAILEY: Ms. Sullivan?
(No verbal response) MS. BAILEY: Ms. Osler?
(No verbal response) MS. BAILEY: Ms. Longgood?
(No verbal response) MS. BAILEY: Mr. Stearns? MR. STEARNS: No questions. MS. BAILEY: Ms. Pinello or

Mr. Levesque?
(No verbal response)
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Manzelli? MS. MANZELLI: No questions.

Thank you.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Allen?
MS. ALLEN: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Mr. Block?
MR. BLOCK: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Appalachian
Mountain Club?
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MR. KIMBALL: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Would you like to state your name for the record?

MR. KIMBALL: Kenneth Kimball.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Linowes?
MS. LINOWES: Yes, Madam
Chair. Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Hello, Dr. High.
A. Hello, Ms. Linowes. It's nice to meet with you again.
Q. Okay. For the questions $I$ want to ask, I'm going to be referencing your prefiled direct testimony, AWE 1; your supplemental testimony, AWE 9; Appendix 10, which is AWE 3; your report; as well as three exhibits that I have submitted -- these will be IWAG-EM1, EM2 and EM3. And I may be making reference to Exhibit AWE 28, which is out of the "20 Percent Wind Energy by 2030" report just referenced by DOE, as well as Exhibit PC 17, which is a data request set. Is that okay?
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A. Yes. It looks like quite a list. I may need a little help in finding some of these, but we'll work through it.
Q. That sounds good.

Okay. On Page 3 of 9 in your supplemental testimony -- this would be from October, if we could turn to that.
A. Supplemental prefiled testimony on behalf of Antrim Wind, October 11th, 2012.
Q. Yes. Correct.
A. Yes.
Q. You have a table shown there. And I just want to make sure I'm clear what is going on there.

When you originally ran your report -ran your numbers or modeled the emission avoidance, you were basing that model on older EPA data. And then new data was made available, and you're showing the difference in terms of the fuel mix within New England; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So it's showing that there's a slight decrease in coal from 2007 to 2009, a fairly
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significant decrease in oil, and an increase in gas and increase in nuclear; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you state that there would be a modest change in emission reduction based on that -- based on the updated numbers.

Can you explain what that means, that there would be a -- how your emissions report or the results change?
A. Well, we re-ran the model for 2009 and compared the results with 2007, and that's how we got that. And we estimated what the change in emissions would be between those two years for each of these fuels. And the calculation is approximately a 4-percent decline averaged across all of these.
Q. So if $I$ were to look -- if I could direct your attention just momentarily -- we'll be going back to this again later. But on Page 6 of your report -- so, Page 6 of AWE 3 -there is a Table 5 there, Scenario B?
A. If you'll excuse me one moment. I think I printed -- I'm sorry. Excuse me one moment.
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(Pause in proceedings)
A. Go ahead.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. The 4-percent difference, if $I$ understand you correctly -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -- the numbers that you're saying that this project will avoid, in terms of CO2, NO2, et cetera, are -- all of these numbers across the board will be 4 percent less?
A. No. It's averaged across the board.
Q. So these numbers that we're looking at -- the 59,573, or 60,000 tons of CO2 emissions --
A. Just which -- could you tell me which page and line you're talking about?
Q. I'm on Page 6 of your report.
A. Yes.
Q. Table B -- Table 5, Scenario B.
A. I'm sorry. On Page 6 of my document there's a Table 3 and a Table 4 -- oh, and a Table 5. I'm sorry. Yes. Go ahead.
Q. Scenario B.
A. Yes.
Q. You have the avoided emissions from under the
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2007 data, and then you said that you up --re-ran the model. And now you have lower -so that the environmental benefit will be reduced; is that correct? It's not going to be the numbers that we see here?
(Witness reviews document.)
A. I'm saying that they will be reduced, yes --
Q. So --
A. -- by an average across all pollutants, about 4 percent.
Q. Do you know what the reduction will be on carbon?
A. I think that would be in the same -- I don't know. I'm saying it's about 4 percent across all of them.
Q. Okay. Now I would like to direct your attention to IWAG-EM3. Okay. And now this is a --
A. Just one moment. Let me -- IWAG...
Q. EM3. Specifically Slide 17.
A. EM...
Q. I have an extra copy.
A. I'm sorry. I think I've... yes.
Q. Slide 17.
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A. Is that Page 17?
Q. I'm not sure if the cover is -- it has a 17 in the lower right-hand corner.
A. Yes, it's entitled "Capacity and Energy Production in New England."
Q. That's correct.
A. Yes, I have that.
Q. Okay. Now, going back again to your table in your testimony on Page 3 of 9, your October testimony, what -- I want to compare now 2011 fuel mix in New England to the 2007 and '9 fuel mix that you have, okay.

Under 2011, according to the exhibit we're looking at, the IWAG-EM3, you can see coal, it's the fourth number up, is now 5.9 percent. This is in the last column. Coal represented is 5.9 percent of the fuel mix in 2011 versus 11.9 percent in 2009. Do you see that? (Witness reviews document.)
A. In my supplemental testimony, coal is -- in 2009, coal is 11.9 percent.
Q. Hmm-hmm. And on the exhibit that I provided you or that you're looking at, coal
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represents, in 2011 , 5.9 percent of the fuel mix? Do you see that?
A. On this table.
Q. Yes.
A. I mean on this bar chart.
Q. Yes.
A. I see that.
Q. Okay. And oil represented . 6 percent versus 1.5 percent. Do you see that?
A. Well, I see in my table that oil is 1.5 percent. And I see in the table numbered 17, I see 6.8 percent.
Q. It's the -- these numbers -- I'm sorry. Let me be more clear. This is not in color. But if you look on the legend on the right-hand side, it goes natural gas, oil, nuclear, reading up. It's the same reading up the chart. So natural gas was 51.3 percent, oil was . 6 percent. Can you see that?
A. Yeah. I see 5.9 and then 6.8 , which you're telling me coincides, if it was colored, with... you're saying 6.8 percent is oil. Is that what you're saying?
Q. No. I'm saying reading from bottom up,
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. 6 percent is oil. Natural gas is on the bottom, oil is next up, followed by nuclear, followed by coal, reading from the bottom up of that bar chart or stat chart.
A. 51.3 for natural gas.
Q. Correct.
A. Yes.
Q. And oil is . 6?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. Okay. And natural gas was 42 percent in 2009, according to your table, and was 51.3 percent in 2011 . Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So, in essence, we've had a 50-percent reduction in coal use in -- from 2009 to 2011, as well as roughly that of oil. Do you agree with that?
A. We've -- yes, approximately. Yes.
Q. And an increase in natural gas?
A. We've had an increase in natural gas, yes.
Q. So would you conclude that our air in 2011 is cleaner than it was even in 2009?
A. Well, with respect to that part of the total pollution load which comes from fossil
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fuel-fired generation, yes.
Q. Okay. So, if you were to -- if you had the numbers to run for 2011, would you conclude -- you're not able to run them, obviously, today. But based on the numbers of the fuel mix in 2011, would you -- would it be reasonable for you to conclude that, in fact, the avoidance -- emission avoidance would actually be even less?
A. I would expect the general trend to be down.
Q. Now, going back to your Scenario B, Table 5 on Page 6 of your report --
A. Table 5, yes.
Q. Yes. Okay. You state that the Antrim Wind Project will produce, based on the capacity factors that you were given, 102,725 megawatt hours a year; is that correct?
A. Can you just restate your question?
Q. Sure. Based on the capacity factors that you were given, annual capacity factors that you were provided, you state --
A. Let me clarify that. Capacity factors for the Antrim Wind Farm.
Q. Correct. You were showing an annual
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production of 102,725 megawatt hours.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, going back to that EM3 slide, slide 17 that we were looking at, do you see at the very bottom of that chart, that stat chart that we were looking at, the total energy production in gigawatt hours -- or megawatt hours, I'll say, for New England in 2011 was 120,612,000 [sic] megawatt hours? Do you see that? It's on the bottom --
(Court reporter interjects.)
A. I see 120,612 gigawatt hours shown for 2011.
Q. So, assuming my math is correct, on a yearly basis, the Antrim Wind Project, at a roughly 39-percent capacity factor -- or based on the numbers you have here, will be .085 percent of the generation in New England. Is that taking the 102 -- 102,000 divided by the 120 million?
A. I'll let you be responsible for your own math.
Q. Is the calculation right, though?
A. I don't have any way of -- I didn't bring a calculator. But I'll accept it as being
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right, subject to check, as I believe --
Q. If you divide -- but just asking the math, if you divide the number of megawatt hours that Antrim Wind will produce by the number of megawatt hours of generation in the New England region, that will be how you produce -- calculate the percentage; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, you had some questions -- or you were asked to comment before the cross-examination on a project displacing versus replacing fossil generation. And I have a question for you.

Are you -- do you know the difference between energy and capacity?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you explain what that is?
A. Capacity is the energy generation that is available and can be dispatched and is firm. Usually it's firm. Whereas generation is generation. Energy is what is generated, which is typically less than the capacity.
Q. And if you had to compare the definition of
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
"capacity" to "energy," which of those two would you say we rely on for most of our -to run our hospitals and our businesses and our homes?
A. I think that's not the right way of characterizing it. We run our businesses and our homes on electricity that is generated, and the total capacity in the system is greater than that which is generated. So I'm -- I don't think we rely on either of them -- or rather, I should say we rely on both of them, the energy which is actually generated, and also that which is firm capacity which enables us to plan and manage the system.
Q. If we could look at Slide 17 for just a second. You see that there are two columns: One set aside for capacity and one that talks about energy. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you look at the very top, it's a little bit hard to see. But this was from 2011. And I'm taking -- we don't have to reference it, but out of Mr . Magnusson's
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report, he did state at the end of 2011 New England had 396 megawatts of wind installed.

Now, at the very, very top there of energy on that column, you'll see for 2011 wind -- that's wind at the top, 760,000 megawatt hours -- or 760 gigawatt hours. You see that? Wind contributed .6 percent of the generation -- of energy on the grid. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. But on the capacity side, it was significantly -- it was very little. Do you see that? Of that 396 megawatts installed, how much was actually firm?
A. If I read this, I think it says .1 percent.
Q. Okay. So to what extent is New England relying on any wind for powering its economy?
A. Would you like to rephrase that question? Because powering its economy -- well, okay. Can you be more precise or specific?
Q. That's okay. We'll move on.

So I wanted to know -- talk a little bit
about ozone. On Page 5 of 9 in your
supplemental testimony -- this is the
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October 11 testimony -- on Line 15 you state, "Based on actual data from the site, which has been considered in the TMM model" -- your model -- "I have concluded that the project will reduce the occurrence of high ozone days in New England and Eastern Canada." Is that correct? Is that what it says?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now I'd like to draw your attention to Exhibit IWAG-EM1. And in particular, we're looking at again another Slide 17 or Page 17.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. IWAG-EM1, Environmental Update --
Q. That's correct.
A. -- dated October the 19th, 2012.
Q. That's right. Now, are you familiar with EPA's National Ambient Air-Quality Standards?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. Okay. Now, this chart shows ozone days in the six New England states that exceeded the 2008 ozone NAAQS, National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

MS. GOLDWASSER: Ms. Linowes,
just to clarify, you're on Page 17 of that
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presentation?
MS. LINOWES: Correct.
A. Just for clarification, the document that I'm looking at here is -- I should turn to Page 17.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. That's right.
A. Thank you.

This is -- Page 17 is titled "Number of Days Ozone Monitors in Each New England State Exceeded 2000" --
Q. Correct.
A. -- "Exceeded the 2008 Ozone NAAQS."
Q. That's exactly right.
A. Thank you.
Q. Now I want to look at -- each state is represented, going left to right, by year. So if you look at 2010, it appears that Vermont had no ozone days where it exceeded the standard. Do you see that?

MR. IACOPINO: What year are
you looking at?
MS. LINOWES: 2010.
A. It appears to be like that.
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BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. And in 2011, does it appear to you that Vermont may have had one day and New Hampshire may have had three days -- or two days?
A. Something close to that.
Q. So when you say this project will reduce the occurrence of high ozone days in New England, we don't -- what are -- are you talking partial days? I don't know what you're -we're pretty low down as it is 1 think from this table. I mean, what are you referring to?
A. I'm referring to the fact that when wind displaces generation from fossil fuel plants -- coal, gas and oil -- those coal, gas and oil plants are producing NOx; therefore, the concentration of NOx in the air will, all other things being equal, go down. And therefore, this facility will have the effect of reducing the number of high ozone days because the particular cutoffs that the producers of this table, you know, doesn't show that it's very large. But it
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doesn't alter the fact that it is reducing ozone and therefore reducing the number of high ozone days.
Q. Dr. High, do you disagree with the standard for high ozone days? Is that what you're saying, that you think that that standard should be lowered?
A. No, I'm not saying that.
Q. Okay. All right. Then $I$ want to now draw your attention to Slide 16 in that same report. It should be a slide that looks like this, if you can... do you have that?
A. Slide 16 in the same --
Q. I believe it is in the same --
A. Slide 16 that $I$ have is titled "Ozone Transport Commission" --
Q. Yes.
A. -- "Preliminary Eight-Hour Ozone Design

Hours."
Q. That's correct.

Now, if you look at this slide, it shows the monitoring areas and the -- if you look in the legend, you see the triangle shows less than 71 parts per billion. And if you
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were to look at this in color, those would be green.

Do you see that the ozone levels are in compliance throughout Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, much of New York, upstate New York, much of Massachusetts, much of Rhode Island? Do you see that?
A. Just give me a moment to...
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Certainly there's quite a lot of area that is in compliance, or appears to be in compliance, anyway.
Q. And would you agree, looking at that slide, that the largest area of non-compliance appears to be New York City, New Jersey, eastern Pennsylvania, Connecticut?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Isn't it true that pollution from cars, trucks, factories, paint, hairspray, power plants and a lot of other things contribute to the formation of ozone?
A. Yes.
Q. Will building this project reduce our use of cars, factories, hairspray in southwestern
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Connecticut, southeastern New York and other -- in those areas?
A. No.
Q. So the high level of ozone will still be there.

Okay. Now, I want to direct you to page --

MS. GOLDWASSER: Objection.
That was a statement not a question.
MS. LINOWES: Sorry. I could wait for him to confirm.
A. Please phrase your question.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. It's okay. I was merely asking --

MS. BAILEY: You're not
allowed to merely say your conclusions.
MS. LINOWES: I wasn't. I was
looking for a "Yes" or "No" answer, but I'm ready to move on.

MR. IACOPINO: Are you
withdrawing your question?
MS. LINOWES: I'll withdraw
the question.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
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BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Now I would like to direct your attention to Page 5 of your supplemental testimony, beginning on Line 19. This is just a little further down from where we were.
A. Page 5 --
Q. Correct.
A. -- of 9?
Q. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
A. Okay. Go ahead. Tell me. Yes. Go ahead.
Q. And you restate a sentence in my testimony that said, where I stated, "The State has already achieved its greenhouse gas reduction goals under RGGI." And then you make the statement that that is incorrect and not relevant to the consideration of the air emissions benefits of the project.

Now, Dr. High, if we look -- first look at the question of correctness in this statement, I would like to draw your attention to Exhibit IWAG-EM2.

Now, you have stated that I was incorrect in making this statement, that the State has already achieved its greenhouse gas
and emission reductions under RGGI.
A. Okay. So I'm looking at IWAG-EM2, a one-page document that is titled "Fewer Than Expected Bid for Cap and Trade Emission Permits."
Q. Correct.
A. Thank you.
Q. And you stated that $I$ was incorrect in making this statement, that the State has met its RGGI allowance -- RGGI limits.

Now, can you read the last paragraph of that page, that exhibit that starts "Power plants..."
A. "Power plants covered by RGGI emitted an average of just 126 million tons of carbon dioxide during RGGI's first three-year compliance period, well below the cap set at 180 million tons."
Q. So why is my statement, that the State has met its RGGI requirements, why is that incorrect?
A. Because the reason why I made that statement is that the requirements of RGGI extend beyond that period, and there are further reductions that will have to be made.
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Q. And Dr. High, do you know -- you do go into that on the next page in your testimony. On Line 2, you state, "RGGI will require further reductions."
A. We're speaking of Page 6?
Q. Yes, that's correct.

Dr. High, what is the obligation -- if you looked at all nine states that are participating in RGGI right now, what is the cap?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know what it was before New Jersey pulled out?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Okay. Then if you don't know, how is it you can make the statement it's wrong? It says in this sentence that you read, "Power plants covered by RGGI emitted an average of just 126 million tons of carbon dioxide during RGGI's first three-year compliance period, well below the cap set at 188 million tons."
A. It's because my interpretation of this was that we were -- I was explaining that there are further restrictions which are embodied
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in RGGI, and into the future there will be additional reductions.

This is in the context of the ongoing benefits which are achieved by reducing emissions in the New England area as a result of this wind project.
Q. When you're talking about the 10 -percent reduction that will occur after 2015 -- the progressive or $21 / 2$ percent reduction every year that you state --
A. I'm speaking of all future reduction targets, some of which have been specifically articulated and laid down in rules and others which will undoubtedly occur.
Q. That are goals beyond 2018? Is that what you're saying?
A. No, I'm saying that there are additional requirements which we placed on the region under RGGI that will be -- will need to be met. That is why there will be continuing benefits from the wind farms' reduction of pollutants from the operation of fossil fuel plants which are -- the generation for which is being avoided or displaced.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
Q. Okay. On the question of relevance then -so you also state that the sentence, the statement itself is not relevant.

Are you aware the project will result in the industrialization of an otherwise unindustrialized or undeveloped area?
A. I'm aware that a facility will be built. I would not characterize -- I would not want to characterize it in that way.
Q. Have you visited the site?
A. No.
Q. So you can't characterize it.
A. I don't want -- I'm not offering any opinion on that matter.
Q. Okay. Do you think that it's appropriate for the State of New Hampshire to examine the emissions benefit in the context of state policy and try to balance whether the emission benefit of the project outweighs the project's construction and ongoing operational impacts?
A. Are you asking me a legal question, or are you asking --
Q. No.
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A. -- for just my general opinion?
Q. General opinion.
A. I think that we should balance the effects of reductions and air emissions, which will contribute to the reduction in greenhouse gases first, because greenhouse gases, if they're continued to be emitted at present rates, will bring about severe climate disturbances, which will impact all aspects of the environment, including the survival of some of our iconic species, such as maples in this region. So it's an opinion based upon that -- those -- those considerations.
Q. I would like to direct you to Exhibit PC 17. This was a data request.

MS. LINOWES: Madam Chair, I'm
almost done. I only have three more questions.
A. I'm looking at a document labeled "PC 17, "State of New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee Docket No. 2012.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. You were asked to provide the total
percentage of global CO2 emissions that will
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be avoided by this proposed project; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was your answer in terms of percentage of estimated global CO2 emission reductions?
A. . 002 percent of the estimated global CO2 emissions.
Q. Is it not. 0002 ?
A. I'm sorry. I thought that's what I said. Three zeros two percent.
Q. Dr. High, is it your position that any wind project that is proposed to be built should be permitted and built?
A. That's -- I guess, could you just restate the question so I -- I'll try to answer it with a "Yes" or "No" answer.
Q. Is it your position that any wind project that is proposed should be permitted and built?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever refused to testify in favor of a wind project on the grounds that the emission reductions were not worth the other
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impacts?
A. Can you just clarify what you mean by "other impacts"?
Q. Are you aware that wind projects create impacts, environmental impacts and other societal and economic impacts? Are you aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. So is there any project in your -- that you have ever refused to testify on because you believed that the environmental, economic or social impacts of that project exceeded the environment -- the emission-reduction benefit that you believe to be brought forward?
A. I don't believe that I've ever refused to work on any wind project of any kind. I mean, all of the times that I've been requested to work, perform analysis and provide expert opinions on wind projects, I have always accepted that assignment.
Q. So if I could -- this is my last question.

On Page 9 of your report, the very last sentence -- and in fact, I believe it's the last sentence of your entire report for the
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appendices -- you state, "This important environmental benefit of avoided emissions should be considered in balancing other impacts of the Antrim Wind farm."

So you -- but you don't have any statement about what the impacts are. You're not making -- it is not your testimony at any point during this proceeding that you have looked at other impacts, only the emission avoidance; is that correct?
A. I have worked principally on impact avoidance in the areas of greenhouse gas emissions and other air emissions resulting from displacement of generation. In recent years, that's been principally what I have worked on. I have in the past worked on other aspects, but that is not the work that I'm doing at the present time.
Q. Thank you, Dr. High.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
Mr. Roth.
MR. ROTH: No questions.
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Thank you.
MS. BAILEY: Questions from
the Committee? Chairman Ignatius.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
INTERROGATORIES BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
Q. It may be in your testimony, I just have lost track of it.

Is there a reason why you weren't able to use more updated fuel-mix data in your analysis? Am I right that 2009 is the most recent data you were using for a 2012 project?
A. Yes, you're correct. 2009 is the most recent data that we used here. And at the time that we completed this work, 2009 was the most recent year for which we had a complete set of data available to us.

Principally, data collected by continuous emission monitors and generation information recorded by the U.S. EPA and reported to -- through their data system. And that's what we rely on, and most other people that are working in this field rely on this. It's just the standard data set. It's
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very hard to get any other data that is as reliable as that and that is more up to date.
Q. Doesn't ISO-New England produce a fuel-mix report annually?
A. It does, but it does not produce the unit-by-unit air emissions and fuel use that are provided by the EPA. So in that respect, it's not as good as EPA's data. And it would -- we would not be able to run a model as sophisticated and accurate if we were to use the more recent ISO-New England data.
Q. Since 2009, there's been a precipitous drop in the price of natural gas; isn't that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And so that the units that are being dispatched are really changing because of what's economic to run; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. By not having that data, isn't that leaving out a pretty big piece of the picture? I mean, you told Ms. Linowes you would agree that the trend would be downward for the amount of emissions with the change in the
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fuel mix from her numbers from 2011. I'm just surprised that you didn't want to even ballpark it, even come up with any kind of estimate, even if it wasn't as reliable as the numbers that you like to use. How do we get a full picture of the current situation without delving into the change in natural gas pricing?
A. Well, the model could be -- I mean, it's possible for the model to be adapted and brought up to a more recent -- I mean, more recent data. And I'm sure that would be -would show a continual decline -- reduction in the average air emissions by about -by -- of all the fossil fuel units, but most notably by the increase in the amount of generation which is brought about by the -by the low pricing and wide availability and fuel switching to natural gas. That is a nationwide phenomenon.

I don't think that it would alter in any way the fundamental conclusions of this study, which is that this wind farm will displace generation at coal, gas and oil
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plants, and it will reduce all those pollutants and greenhouse gases and water consumption as a result.

If we were to be able to do a more up-to-date study, say bringing the data up to 2010 -- I think would be the last year -- we would be looking at further declines. Based on the changes between 2007 and 2009, which we were able to document, I would expect a somewhat similar decline -- reduction in emissions avoidance as the overall mix gets cleaner, becomes more gas, less coal, less oil.

And so it's going to be a small reduction on a yearly basis, perhaps 2 to 4 percent might be a reasonable estimate. I don't think that would alter any of the conclusions, nor should it alter the -- any overall evaluation of the air quality and greenhouse gas benefits which result from the operation of the facility.
Q. Well, if $I$ understand you right, you may have a lesser amount of reduction, but it's still significant to have reductions in those
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pollutants.
A. Yes.
Q. As we become more dependent on natural gas, is there a benefit to developing other forms of generation as an offset to that dependence?
A. Yes, there are always benefits to having a range of alternatives of different technologies and so on. So there are benefits in having wind because it's not a complete alternative to natural gas, but at certain times it is an alternative to natural gas. And although natural gas is a cleaner fuel than coal or heavy oil, which we have -we have been and still are using, it nevertheless puts out greenhouse gases and some amount of NOx and other pollutants.

So, to the extent that we can build more wind, and $I$ should say solar as well, into the system, we would be improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gases.
Q. And the reason for the reduction in water usage with a displacement of some of those units to wind is what?
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A. Wind reduces the amount of generation at fossil fuel plants. Fossil fuel plants only use water for cooling purposes. And so, to the extent that those plants are turned down, or in some cases turned off completely when wind is blowing, then you get that reduction in water.
Q. Thank you. Nothing else. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. MS. BAILEY: Any further
questions from Committee Members?
Mr. Simpkins.
DIR. SIMPKINS: Yeah, just one follow-up.

INTERROGATORIES BY DIR. SIMPKINS:
Q. You mentioned about how natural gas is cleaner burning than the other fossil fuels and the avoided emissions would be reduced because of the switch we're seeing over to natural gas.

Could you give kind of a brief synopsis of what the magnitude of difference is between natural gas and the emissions, the COx, CO2 and NOx versus, say, coal and oil.
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A. Yes. Coal will produce the greatest amount of emissions of all pollutants. For carbon dioxide, it's approximately around 2,000 on average. It's around 2,000 pounds of CO2 per megawatt hour. And gas is the cleanest. Typically, for older units, around a thousand, approximately a half. But for the most efficient combined-cycle, gas plants which -- gas turbines which are -- which have heat recovery, those can drop down in CO2 emissions to maybe 8- or 900 pounds.

So the shift from coal -- sorry -- and I should say that heavy oil is somewhere halfway between the natural gas number and the emission rate for the coal, traditional coal plants.

There are some other benefits as well as greenhouse gases, because coal especially is producing mercury, large amounts of particulates, and is a much more serious health problem than natural gas.

So you are -- you are getting many benefits by this switch. But I think it's important to realize that wind is essentially
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zero carbon and near zero for all emissions, and all of the fossil fuels are still very significant and serious contributors to public health issues, and water pollution, too, acid rain especially, and toxic metals in the -- in lakes, which are a local problem for some.

DIR. SIMPKINS: Okay. Thank you.

INTERROGATORIES BY IACOPINO:
Q. Thank you, Dr. High.

Would it be correct to characterize the analysis that you did as an analysis that relies on all other things remaining equal?
A. Excuse me one moment.
(Pause in proceedings)
A. I think that's actually a very fair statement about our analysis. There are clearly a few things which are not equal, in that we are getting -- if you were to extrapolate from present into the future on a continuing basis, assuming this plant is going to operate for many years, there will be -- the avoided emissions will be smaller as the
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emission rate for the fossil fuel part of the fuel mix in New England shifts towards gas, in previous questions I've dealt with.
Q. But $I$ guess what $I$ was thinking is, as far as what if there were -- I mean, it's based on sort of an analysis of what the demand presently is; correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. So if there were some unexpected increase in demand in the future for electricity, it's possible that that demand would be met with the addition of both renewable energy plants and fossil fuel plants; is that correct?
A. Yes, it is. And we actually can expect models like the NEMS model, the Department of Energy's NEMS model, which predicts future use of energy on the grid, and other models, all tend to show a fairly substantial increase in the use of electricity. And one of those -- one of the big variables will be whether or not electric vehicles really gain traction and really take off in the marketplace. If they do, that will greatly increase demands for electricity. But even
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
[WITNESS: COLIN HIGH]
still, we should expect increased demand for electricity from the growth of data centers, IT and other technologies which are heavily demanding of electricity.

So that would -- that would increase the demand for electricity. I'll probably have all kinds, but to the extent the public policy provides incentives for low carbon renewables, such as wind, solar, et cetera, then we can expect even more change.
Q. So I guess what you're saying then is, if politically there's a trend towards favoring renewable energy, that what will happen is renewable energy will become a larger part of the mix and ultimately displace more and more dirtier fuels.
A. Yes.
Q. That part I get.

Now, in your particular analysis, you've determined that this project, this proposed project with Antrim Wind, is going to displace a certain -- I forget what the numbers are, but will displace some dirtier production of energy.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
A. Yes.
Q. Can you just maybe -- I understand conceptually what you're saying. But as a physical or practical matter, how does that actually happen? How does the amount of energy that will be produced by the Antrim Wind Project, if it's permitted, how is that going to reduce what's being produced either at, you know, Londonderry or Newington or even in Seabrook, for that matter?
A. So what happens is that the wind -- the nature of the contracts with wind are such that they will be priced in such a way that they will run, because the incremental cost of running a wind farm after you've built it and maintained it is very small. So that means that wind will run to the maximum extent possible for whatever the prevailing wind conditions are.

That generation then is going to enter the grid and takes precedence in a way over plants which are more expensive in some incremental cost of operation, notably the fossil fuels because they have high
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incremental costs.
So that's what causes us to -- what
causes the system, through the bidding structure, to push wind in and push coal, gas and oil out. And that's done automatically every day and -- through the bidding process and other controllers that the ISO uses. So that's what happens.

So what you're saying is wind will come in at a lower cost because of the way the system is set up than natural gas, which is the predominant fuel.
A. I don't want to say that it's at a lower cost.
Q. Lower price.
A. But it will come in because of the way the bidding structures are contracted. And that's a necessary part of the power purchase agreements and all of the other processes which have to be gone through in order to integrate a new unit into the system.

So it works. And this is pretty universal throughout the company -throughout the United States, anyway.
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Q. So if that market structure changes, though, then your analysis would have to change.
A. It would have some effect on our analysis if it was radically different. But I don't want to pretend that I'm an expert on the markets. But as far as I understand it, we're likely to see incremental rather than radical change.

MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
Redirect.
MS. GOLDWASSER: Can we have just a five-minute recess?

MS. BAILEY: Okay.
MS. GOLDWASSER: Thank you.
(Whereupon a brief recess was taken at 2:40 p.m., and the hearing resumed at 2:57 p.m.)

MS. BAILEY: We're back on the record.

Is there any redirect?
MS. GOLDWASSER: Yes, thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
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Q. The first area of redirect concerns that issue of ozone. Dr. High, can you please turn to your report at Page 3.

MS. GOLDWASSER: For the Committee, that is Appendix 10A in Volume 3. BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. Now, your report discusses displaced facilities. Do the facilities that a wind project displaces need to be in New Hampshire or even in northern New England?
A. No, they don't need to be, and they are not. We are part of the ISO-New England system, and wind farms in New Hampshire or Vermont can displace generation in Massachusetts and Connecticut. And that's where most of the large fossil fuel plants are that are being displaced.
Q. So if you look at the map on Page 3 in your report --

MR. ROTH: I'm going to object
here. We're now asking the witness to interpret his prefiled testimony and report as a matter of redirect. I've yet to hear what the connection is to a cross-examination
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issue.
MS. GOLDWASSER: I was going to have Dr. High compare this map to a map that Ms. Linowes provided cross-examination on in one of her exhibits and indicating the resulting ozone improvements as a result of the project.

MS. BAILEY: Okay.
MS. GOLDWASSER: Thank you.
BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. Dr. High, if you look at EM -- I believe it's EM1, IWAG-EM1, Page 16.
(Witness reviews document.)
Q. The title of the page I'm asking you to look at is "Ozone Transport Commission Preliminary Eight-Hour Ozone, 2010 to 2012 Design Values." Are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you read the third bullet down on that page? It starts with "Preliminary..."
A. "Preliminary 2012 ozone season data shows increases in poor air-quality episodes across southern New England, Connecticut, and Massachusetts."
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MS. BAILEY: Excuse me.
Dr. High, is your microphone turned on?
THE WITNESS: It was turned on, yes. And I believe it's -- I'm seeing a red light.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. Dr. High, does this map -- can you please explain to the Committee what this map and what that bullet indicates about ozone concentrations and air quality in southern New England?
A. Yes. This shows that ozone concentrations are higher in the southern New England area and also in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and areas down through the mid-Atlantic states.
Q. And can you explain any correlation between the map that's on Page 3 of your report and the conclusions that are drawn in IWAG-EM1 regarding ozone in southern New England?
A. You're referring to the number -- Slide No. 17?
Q. No. I'm sorry. I'm still on Slide No. 16.
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And just indicating the comparison between the increases in poor air quality in southern New England and the locations of the power plants which are indicated on Page 3 of your report.
A. Yes, I think we can -- what we would expect to have happen here is that displacement of fossil fuel generation by the Antrim Wind farm will reduce ozone concentrations not only in the northern part of the New England region, but also in the southern part of the New England region where the ozone problem is much more serious.
Q. Would you expect the reduction of use of the plants in southern New England to improve air quality in those areas?
A. Yes, there will be air-quality improvement in those areas. And indirectly, that will benefit New Hampshire, because there are some westerly air flows that bring pollution, particularly ozone precursors, into southern New Hampshire.
Q. Now, Dr. High, to change paths a little bit, there's been a lot of discussion this
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afternoon regarding natural gas and increases in natural gas in New England. I think you've testified that prices for natural gas has gone down. Can you explain why that is?
A. Yes. The most important reason why the price of natural gas has gone down is due to the increased availability, domestic availability of natural gas, especially from shale deposits in New York, Pennsylvania, and some other parts of the eastern and midwestern states.

Those shale gas deposits are not -don't produce gas in the same way that conventional and natural gas wells do, which are largely a by-product of oil drilling. But rather, the natural gas that is coming from the shale deposits is producing -MR. ROTH: Excuse me. I feel compelled to object at this point. I've yet to hear any establishment of this witness' qualifications to opine upon the mechanisms and technology, et cetera, for the production of shale gas, or any kind of gas.

MS. GOLDWASSER: This witness
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is an expert in the air emissions resulting from energy uses, which would include the life-cycle analysis of the energy use. And he is going to be testifying regarding the air-emissions impact of fracked gas, the shale gas that he's referenced, in comparison with conventional gas. It's well within his areas of expertise.

MS. BAILEY: I'm going to overrule the objection.

THE WITNESS: If I may be allowed to extol my qualifications. I have done a considerable amount of work, not only in the air pollution, but also the technologies and related air pollution associated with the development of fracked gas and other alternative fuels under contract to the U.S. Department of Energy. And so I am -- I am quite knowledgeable about this technology.

MR. ROTH: To have this be brought up at this point on redirect I think is highly irregular and objectionable. If he wants to talk about the emissions of fracked
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gas, I will withdraw my objection. But to the extent that he's going to make opinions and testimony on redirect, where this body has not given anybody the opportunity to recross, there has not been any opportunity to conduct discovery of this witness' qualifications or on his previous opinions about this stuff, I thinking it's really unfair. But for him to make opinions about the emissions, because that's the core of what his testimony is about, I don't have any objection. And I'd ask that the Chair limit his comments on emissions issues and not any other environmental issues associated with gas or fracked gas.

MS. BAILEY: Ms. Linowes?
MS. LINOWES: Yes, Madam
Chair. If I understand where this is going as well, he has modeled data -- he has modeled the reduction of emissions based on a certain fuel mix. If we're now going to introduce speculation as to what the future fuel mix will be based on traditional sources of natural gas versus frack and whether or
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not there's going to be a difference there, $I$ think we're way into an area of speculation, and I just think that it doesn't belong in this proceeding.

MS . GOLDWASSER: The cross-examination of Dr. High considered the question of increases in natural gas in comparison with other fuel sources. The question to Dr. High is why did this increase occur, and to some extent he's testified now that it's due to fracking. The next question I was going to ask him was, how would this impact carbon impacts on -- in his analysis. So how do you compare fracked gas with conventional gas? That's directly related to the question this Committee has been asking, which is what are the air-quality implications of a project of this sort.

MR. ROTH: I still think this goes way beyond his direct or the cross and takes him into a whole new area of opinion that should have been in his original report and in his original testimony, which all the parties would have had an opportunity to test
him on during the whole process. To have this all come out now, without any due process rights of preparing for cross-examination that would be adequate to this kind of thing I think is unfair an prejudicial.
(Discussion among Committee members.) MS. BAILEY: I think that it's fair to do redirect on the emissions based on the cross-examination about the increase in production of natural gas. So $I$ will just ask you to try to get to the point about emissions.

MR. ROTH: If I can just make sure that we understand what we're talking about in terms of emissions. If he's talking about emissions from the combustion of gas, then, as I said before, I really don't have any objection because that's core to his testimony, and I don't really have a problem with that.

But if he's going to delve into, you know, emissions that occur from the production of that fracked gas from wells in

New York and Pennsylvania or wherever it's coming from, I think that that's overreaching on the part of this witness, and I think that it should be very strictly limited, if not allowed at all.

MS. GOLDWASSER: I think I got a ruling from the bench. I'm not sure what I'm waiting for now.

MS. BAILEY: I think you should proceed.

BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. So, Dr. High, can you please explain the carbon impacts of fracked gas or shale gas versus conventional gas?

MR. ROTH: Again, the objection is -- the ruling was that he could speak about emissions, not about the carbon impacts of gas or fracked gas. And I think this is why this is really, I think, a tender area for him to tread in light of the non-availability of any of this testimony during the discovery phase of this case.

MS. GOLDWASSER: Are you
waiting for me to respond to that again?
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MS. BAILEY: I was.
MS. GOLDWASSER: Okay. Sorry. MS. BAILEY: I thought you were looking for something.

MS. GOLDWASSER: Yeah, I mean, I do have notes here. I don't know that this is in the record. But $I$ believe that Attorney Roth himself asked questions about embodied energy associated with wind projects. Surely if he asked that question, which is -- you know, he asked a question at a tech session regarding the life-cycle emissions associated with development of a wind project, if that was fair game for Dr. High, I don't see why this question, which is the product of questioning from the Bench and questioning from Ms. Linowes regarding the life-cycle costs of this new gas that's available on the market, is any different.

MR. ROTH: I might have asked Mr. High, you know, whether he had a nice trip to Concord during the tech session. I don't remember. And I'm not sure what she's
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referring to. But whether we brought a particular subject, I think the analogy is fairly strained.

But $I$ think as a matter of fairness to the parties here, you know, if he wants to talk about whether fracked gas combusts differently, I think that's a fair question. But if he's -- if the question that was asked was to speak about the carbon impacts of using fracked gas, whatever the whole universe of that might be, I think that that's something that is not fairly brought up in this proceeding at this point in this context.
(Discussion among Committee members.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Maybe I
can speak to this for a moment, since it was my question that's engendered all of this. And we were so excited to be making good progress, and then look what's happened.

It seems to me --
MR. ROTH: My apologies.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: No, it's
not you. I think it's just -- the question
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that I raised was why the data had not been updated in light of dropping natural gas prices. It was not about changes in the analysis of emissions. And it certainly wasn't what's your take on fracking and the future of natural gas markets, which I think is something that, in my view, would not be appropriate in redirect, was not at all addressed in direct testimony. And so I think it's sort of hard to know where this is going.

But if it's a response to my question about data and why was it not updated, then that's perfectly appropriate on redirect. But if it's -- I heard the word "natural gas," and that makes me think of fracking and all the things that that might raise, then that's obviously not appropriate.

And I'm not suggesting that,
Ms. Goldwasser, that's your question. But it seems to me those are the two extremes here. You know, we've got to stay limited to what the questioning was for redirect. The questioning about natural gas markets had to
[WITNESS: COLIN HIGH]
do with the drop in prices. And your question has been very broad. So it's hard to know if you're within that or not within that.

MS. GOLDWASSER: I think the reason that this is relevant is that the Bench asked several questions about how to project the future -- and this is associated with Ms. Linowes' line of questioning also -how to project the future when the source of energy is changing. Every year, you know, we have a different source of energy in New England.

And Dr. High's report is based on what the source of energy is. If coal goes up, then emissions go up and avoided emissions go up. If coal goes down, then there may be other consequences.

The consequence of a future reliance on additional shale gas is that production of shale gas is much, much dirtier than production of conventional gas.

MR. ROTH: I'm going to object to this. Now she's testifying about shale
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
gas.
MS. GOLDWASSER: Well, I was asked by the Chair to provide a proffer of why this was relevant. I'm providing the proffer so that a decision can be made by the Committee and we can move on.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, I think my concern is that your witness chose not to get into these sorts of projections about the future, was happy to live with testimony -- with the data from 2009. And so at this late date, $I$ have to agree that it's not appropriate to start from the stand and making projections about the future. And my question was to point that out. It wasn't to say let's start over again.

MS . GOLDWASSER: Okay.
BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. Moving on, Dr. High. You took a look at ISO-New England numbers regarding 2001 with Ms. Linowes which showed that there had been a decrease in coal -- reliance on coal and an increase in reliance on natural gas. And in response to questions, you indicated that
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there'd be reductions over time in emissions.
Are those reductions sort of forever at -- you know, forever and ever to be decreased at whatever percent every year or two, or is there a backstop there?
A. No, it -- no, it won't automatically decrease forever and ever because you need to have a certain amount of fossil fuel in the system as it's configured today. And so as I previously testified, we can expect that change to reflect a change in the fossil fuel mix, notably an increase of gas in the system. And that gas will come predominantly from fracked gas, as is most of the new gas that is already in the system. So it is, in my opinion, appropriate to consider the total emissions of fracked gas in the system. And that's what I would offer. And fracked gas --

MR. ROTH: Madam Chairman, there's already been a ruling on this, and now the witness is off on his own interjecting the testimony that has already been ruled as inappropriate.
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MS. BAILEY: All right. Can you ask the next question, please, Ms. Goldwasser?

MS. GOLDWASSER: Yeah.
BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. Is it possible that in the future gas will be replaced by a dirtier option? I'm not asking about fracking. But we've assumed going -the assumption that's been made in the questioning is that gas will continue to increase and that other sources of fossil fuels will continue to decrease. I'm merely asking if that's a foregone conclusion or not, because if other fossil fuel types were to increase, such as coal, then the emissions rates going forward would -- that were avoided would go up.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, to the extent it's appropriate, that wasn't my assumption in the question. It was just asking about current numbers, not projecting anything in the future.

MS. GOLDWASSER: I wasn't directing specifically to the Chair's
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question. There have been several questions about that.

MR. ROTH: And I'm going to make the same objection that $I$ made before. The witness is now being asked to sort of blandify this notion about fracked gas with now sort of the idea of dirtier sources of energy. I think that the Chair -Commissioner Ignatius has described it well. He's made a decision not to have an opinion based on predictions about the future, and now he's trying to, you know, readjust his opinion to account for this, and doing it from the stand. He has -- you know, he has to sort of live or die on the opinion that he already rendered. And I think for him to, at this point, you know, change the opinion or increase the opinion based on, you know, the fact that maybe it didn't hold up so well on cross is inappropriate.

MS. BAILEY: Ms. Goldwasser, can you just move on, please, to a different line?

MS. GOLDWASSER: Yes.
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BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. Dr. High, Ms. Linowes has pointed out that the impacts of this project are a very small percentage of the overall greenhouse gas emissions in the world and a very small percentage of the energy produced in New England. Do you have any response to that criticism of the project or of your report?
A. Yes. It is a small percentage. But when plants are compared with other facilities, relatively small, you know, compared with nuclear plants and very large coal plants. All are large in their unit size, typically a thousand megawatts or more in capacity.

Most wind farms are very, very much smaller than that. And therefore, every -in every proceeding that takes place, every inquiry or project that is evaluated, if you say that this only produces .0 percent or . 00 percent of the world and therefore it's inconsequential, then that same argument would apply to every wind farm that was going to be built, and therefore you would build no wind plants. And that would be --
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mischaracterize the benefits of building wind plants. And if we are to achieve significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants over the next two or three decades, we're going to need to build many, many relatively small wind farms and solar farms or arrays and hydro and biomass, all of which are very small. Any one of them would look insignificant if you used the kind of arguments that Ms. Linowes is putting forward.

MS. GOLDWASSER: Thank you.
We have no further questions.
MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
Thank you for your testimony,
Dr. High. You're excused.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MS. BAILEY: And I think now may be a good time to take a 10-minute break until 3:30, and then we will proceed with the Public Counsel's witnesses -- witness.
(Whereupon a brief recess was taken at 3:24 p.m., and the hearing was resumed at 3:37 p.m.)

MS. BAILEY: Okay. We're back on the record. And Mr. Roth, are you ready to proceed with your witness?

MR. ROTH: Yes. Yes, I am.
MS. BAILEY: Thank you. (WHEREUPON, TREVOR LLOYD-EVANS was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

TREVOR LLOYD-EVANS, SWORN
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Good afternoon, Trevor.
A. Good afternoon, Mr. Roth.
Q. Would you please tell the Committee and the reporter and the record your name and your title, if you will.
A. My name is Trevor Lloyd-Evans. I'm a senior staff biologist at the Manomet Center For Conservation Sciences in Manomet,

Massachusetts.
Q. And before you on the table are Public Counsel Exhibit, I believe it's 3 and 6?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Are those your prefiled testimonies in this
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
case?
A. They are.
Q. And could you first explain some -- or set forth some of your background, and then we'll get into the purpose of your testimony.
A. For a very long time, 40-plus years, I have worked on bird populations, bird migration in this country and also in Central America and in Europe. My background is in census techniques and assessing populations. And I believe this will be the third testimony for Counsel for the Public in New Hampshire. So I've testified on two other Site Evaluation Committee sites in New Hampshire.
Q. And what were those sites?
A. They were the Groton and Granite Reliable in Coos County.
Q. Thank you.

And what is the purpose of the testimony that was made by you in the two prefiled exhibits?
A. Well, $I$ was asked to review the data provided by the Applicant and to comment on the appropriateness of their techniques; the
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amount, the number of their studies, the duration of their studies, and also, particularly the Avian and Bat Protection Plan for the Antrim Wind Energy Project, and again, the appropriateness and duration.
Q. Okay. Is there anything in your testimony at this point that you believe you need to correct or amend?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. And if you were called upon to make the same testimony and answer the questions you were asked today, would you answer them the same way that you did when you wrote those?
A. I would.
Q. Okay. Now, before I release you to the cross-examination process, where you'll be pretty much on your own, I thought -- we have an opportunity for you to speak to, in rebuttal, some of the things that may have been said about your testimony on the record and in supplemental prefiled testimony.

Have you had an opportunity to -- you were present when Mr . Gravel spoke a couple
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of weeks ago; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you recall when he commented on the necessity of conducting additional data, as you had recommended in your supplemental prefiled testimony?
A. I do.
Q. And do you have any comment that you'd like to make about that, about his testimony on that issue?
A. This is in relation to the Avian and Bat Protection Plan that would follow construction -- post-construction mortality plan? Yes?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. Thank you.
Q. If I may, he said in his testimony that he thought one year was enough, with the adaptive management to follow.
A. Yes, precisely. I do disagree with that, having collected long-term data sets over many, many years. I think we all know how things vary. I noticed in the study of Arnett, et al, in 2010, that has been quoted
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by the proponent, where they did alter turbine speeds and do a very similar experiment. This was the first experiment. It was conducted over two years.

I noticed that in 2008 there was a 44-percent reduction of mortality in that study. They repeated it exactly in 2009, and there was a 93-percent reduction in mortality. This serves as an example, I think, of the fact that we have to look at more than one season's data to get a good idea of what is going on in terms of production of young, in terms of migration, in terms of different wind patterns. We find that cohorts of birds or bats vary from year to year, and so I think it would be appropriate to do a three-year study.
Q. Thank you.

And do you recall in Mr. Gravel's testimony where he spoke about your submission of the material from the Sheffield -- I believe it was Sheffield -the taking permit for the little brown bat issued by the State of Vermont?
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A. I do.
Q. And do you have any comment that you would like to make on whether -- on Mr. Gravel's statement that they weren't relevant?
A. I think Mr. Gravel was quite correct, in that there are not endangered species or threatened species for the State of New Hampshire in their studies. And I believe he was making that point.

However, again, from their own studies from the 2011 bat survey in the spring, I think there were 1,483 call sequences, 4.9 per detector night. And in the spring -- in the summer, there were 35,450 call sequences; that would be 52.4 per detector night.

And I note the species groups -- it's not necessarily possible to identify these detected calls to individual species -- where the myotis -- the little brown bats, the myotis group -- big brown, silver-haired group, hoary and eastern red tri-colored group in both seasons, and in New Hampshire, eastern red bat, hoary bat, northern long-haired bat, which is a myotis,
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
silver-haired bat and tri-colored bat are all species of special concern. And I would assume that the Committee would want to ascertain the -- the numbers of these and any possible mortality of these species that have already been shown to be present.

And so again, I think this calls for a thorough study, post-construction mortality, given that the Applicant essentially performed one year of pre-construction surveys. That, again, just seems appropriate to me and of concern with those particular species.
Q. And what about the idea of requiring a taking permit or something like that as a condition of the permit in this case?
A. That would be a legal requirement. I'm sure that New Hampshire Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife would be consulted in that. But that would be very much, I guess, up to the Committee to make that recommendation or not.
Q. Okay. Is there anything else that -- is there anything further that you would like to
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say about Mr. Gravel's testimony or the supplemental prefiled or the remarks that he made a couple weeks back?
A. No, I think that covers my main comments.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. ROTH: If you're ready,
the witness is available for
cross-examination by the other parties.
MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Froling.
MR. FROLING: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Mr. Beblowski
here?
(No verbal response)
MS. BAILEY: Mr. Jones?
(No verbal response)
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Sullivan?
(No verbal response)
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Longgood --
or Longwood. Sorry. Oh, Longgood.
(No verbal response)
MS. BAILEY: Mr. Stearns?
MR. STEARNS: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Pinello?
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MS. PINELLO: No questions. MS. BAILEY: Ms. Manzelli? MS. MANZELLI: No questions. Thank you. MS. BAILEY: Ms. Allen? MS. ALLEN: No questions. Thank you. MS. BAILEY: Mr. Block, Mrs. Block? MS. BLOCK: I have a couple. MS. BAILEY: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. BLOCK:
Q. Good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon, ma'am.
Q. When $I$ read through your testimony, I sense a great deal of concern for bats and White Nose Syndrome. And I'm wondering, are there specific geographic pockets that you have more concern for, for this condition?
A. I am not an expert on that particular syndrome. I have not worked with it in any sort of veterinary sense. As far as I know, it started in the Appalachians and has moved
up into New England. It's now been here for several years and is of concern. In Europe, it's quite widespread and does not [sic] cause mortality. So I think we are dealing with another example of a disease that may have come from abroad to populations within North America that had not been exposed to that disease, and this is why it's causing such mortality. But it is now spreading throughout the whole country.
Q. Does this give you -- I guess this is just from personal observation. I know there used to be large colonies of bats on Willard -- on the rocks on Willard Pond, and they don't appear to be there anymore. And I'm wondering, in an area that seems to have a presence of bats, is there more concern when you have a wind facility so close to that area? Would that pose a question?
A. I think it's a very legitimate concern, yes.
Q. I guess that's probably all the questions I have right now.
A. Thank you.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Kimball?
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}

MR. KIMBALL: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Linowes?
MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't have a lot of questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Mr. Lloyd-Evans, in reading the Avian Bat and Protection Plan -- Avian and Bat Protection Plan, the Applicant appears to be on -- take the position that he -- there is no -- he's not expecting a high mortality on bats. And do we have enough information about operating wind projects in New England and public information that's available to tell us that that is a conclusion that he can draw?
A. We do not have a tremendous amount of information on mortality caused by wind turbines because wind turbines have not been in operation for very many years in New England. From the proponent's first supplement to the revised Avian and Bat Protection Plan -- and I'm just quickly looking at the bat fatalities in the northeast, 2011, produced by Stantec --
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eastern red bat, 121; hoary bat, 462; northern long-haired bat, 2; silver-haired bat, 223; tri-color bat, 2.

A species of some concern to the state of New Hampshire right now is little brown bat because of the decrease recently, and I think there are 245 fatalities.

So those -- I'm quite sure that the proponent's figures are correct up to 2011, as far as we know. We really don't know, of course. But as far as we know, that seems like a fair summary. Seems like a lot of bats for this region.
Q. Do you know, or does he state in there the number -- break that down based on bats per megawatt or bats per turbine?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. The concern about bat mortality and the current situation with White Nose is that we are having decreasing populations; is that correct?
A. Apparently, yes.
Q. So it is reasonable to -- for this Committee and for the State of New Hampshire to be very
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protective of our current population that is remaining of all species of bat.
A. I would think so, yes.
Q. The Applicant seems to make several -- it does make several comments, that mitigation -- or at least the protection plan -- the mitigation plan should go so far as long as it is served to be economically beneficial to the -- or at least not detrimental to the Applicant. Do you recall reading that?
A. I recall reading a discussion about that point, yes.
Q. Okay. And then the project -- you're familiar with the Sheffield Wind Project in Vermont?
A. I have seen some of their correspondence, yes.
Q. And you submitted the incidental take permit that was issued for that project as part of your --
A. Yes, what $I$ thought was relevant.
Q. And that project is a similar -- I would say similarly sized. It's a 40-megawatt,
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16-turbine project. And this project is a 30-megawatt, 10-turbine project.
A. Yes.
Q. If you look at the capacity -- average capacity factors that were proposed for the Sheffield project, which is around 30 percent, and this project, which is closer to 40 percent, the actual production numbers, at least for an average production over the course of a year, would be about the same. Do you agree?
A. I take your word for it. Sounds good.
Q. Okay. Now, that Sheffield project, when it was permitted, it went -- it was required under the permit to have a mitigation plan in place. Are you aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware -- now, this -- are you familiar with the details of that mitigation plan, not since the incidental take permit was put in place, but from the point when it went operational?
A. Not in detail. I gather that there have been something on the order of -- is it 70 dead
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bats found at this site? Something of that order. And that would be just the sheer number. Once these figures are written up, two other factors are usually taken into concern: That would be the scavenger removal rate of bats and the detection rate of the observers who are looking for the bats under the turbines. So $I$ think those are sort of raw numbers.
Q. So actual bats found dead at the turbines was somewhere around 70 to 75?
A. Somewhere.
Q. But we don't know -- there's no public information available at this time as to the actual number -- the projected number of bats that were killed at that project because we have -- you're saying it has not taken into account scavenger effects and searcher efficiency; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So it could be many more turbines -- many more bats?
A. It wouldn't be less than that. It could be more, yes.
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## [WITNESS: TREVOR LLOYD-EVANS]

Q. It would not be less. Okay.

In the incidental permit that was
issued, it appears that the State of Vermont is requiring that every turbine, all 16 turbines, feather their blades up to 120 nights -- I'm reading this out of the permit that you submitted as part of the -- I don't know what the exhibit number is. This is part of your testimony, I believe, the supplemental testimony.
A. Yes, $I$ have it in front of me. That would be Condition I, yes.
Q. Yes.

MR. ROTH: That was Public
Counsel Exhibit 6.
MS. LINOWES: Thank you.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. It says, "The permittee shall feather the blades of the wind turbines for up to 120 nights" --

MR. ROTH: Just one second.
Do you have it?
THE WITNESS: I do, yes.
Thank you.
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MS. GEIGER: Could I have a page number, please?

MS. LINOWES: It is Page 5.
A. Page 5, and Condition Capital I.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Under a section called "Specific Conditions and Authorizations."

So that's 120 nights, which would be every night in a period from June 1 to September 30th. And the conditions are that ambient air temperature is greater than 49 degrees and wind speeds are under 6 meters per second; is that correct?
A. Yes, that would be the maximum. On windy nights when bats don't tend to fly so high, then that would not be a requirement. So that 6 meters per second, or 13.4 miles an hour, is the wind speed at which these conditions would cut in. So it could be up to 120 nights or less, assuming that there were windy nights.
Q. Okay. Now, when this project was permitted and went into operation, which was October of 2011, half of the turbines were required to
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follow that mitigation plan. Are you aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. And they had -- they found -- at least 70-plus took bats, which is what triggered this incidental take permit?
A. I'm not aware of exactly what triggered the incidental take permit. I think it was concern about those protected species in Vermont particularly.
Q. Okay. Now, if I look at the mitigation proposal, they don't go into a lot of details. This is the Applicant now. But I believe they do not establish a temperature on those nights. It's a different period of nights. They also state that the wind speed should be under 5 meters per second, and they -- the time of feathering would be a half-hour after sunset. And then I believe -- I don't know if there's any distinction as to a half-hour before or after sunrise. But those are subtle differences. And I'm wondering, if we know enough about this type of mitigation of feathering
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the blades during low wind conditions, whether there's a big difference between 5 meters per second and 6 meters per second, a big difference between --

MR. ROTH: Can you just cite one at a time, please?

MS. LINOWES: Sure.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. There are several conditions under which temperature --
A. Right. Five meters per second wind speed. I believe it was from the 15th of July through the 30th of September. Yes.
Q. As well as the time at which the mitigation would go into effect?
A. I was a little unclear about whether that was going to be a half-hour before sunset until sunrise or whether the witnesses for the Applicant changed that. But a half-hour before sunset until sunrise is sort of traditional for the three previous studies, anyway.
Q. Okay. Now, given that there might be some debate surrounding that, would it be
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prudent -- or what would your position be if -- with regard to our state next door to us having done work on an already existing project, should we change the parameters? Or would you recommend the State of New Hampshire adopt the parameters used in Vermont?
A. I would think this would be a model. The final details should be perhaps worked out by the people who know the area best. This would be New Hampshire Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife, along with the proponent's biologists who have taken the data so far. These seem to be the most appropriate people to work out the exact details. But we do have models, and it would seem sensible to follow those models.
Q. Would it be your recommendation that that plan be worked out independent -- excuse me -- independent of this proceeding? Or would it be your recommendation that the parties and the Committee be over -- at least the Committee overseeing that? Where do you -- where would you go with that?
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A. I think this is very clearly a question for the Committee. The Site Evaluation Committee in the state of New Hampshire can say yes or no to the entire permit, and they can say yes or no to the details and establish requirements if the permit is granted.

So I think this is very much a Committee responsibility. I'm sure they would want to take advice from the other people we mentioned.
Q. So if they -- is it sufficient that this Committee approve the project and -- subject to a mitigation plan being agreed to and then it's the end of it? Or do you think that the -- it should be the Committee's oversight ongoing as the mitigation is -- the effect of mitigation is evaluated?
A. I think there are precedents for the Committee requiring the details as a part of the permit. And so that would be -- that would be appropriate, that the details should be worked out first and presented to the Committee and then made part of the permit. That will avoid confusion.
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After that, then we have U.S. Fish and Wildlife, New Hampshire Fish and Game, and the proponent's biologists continuing with the projects and presumably adaptively managing as they go on, which they've proposed to do.

But again, it seems foolish to have just one year of data. And so a mandated three-year project would give the State of New Hampshire a very firm, scientific base to be able to continue with whatever mitigation they chose afterwards, whatever adaptation. With any luck, no bats are killed and everything is fine. But we don't know until we collect the data.
Q. When you say one year, are you talking about one year pre-construction?
A. Post-construction mortality I'm talking about.
Q. Post-mortality. Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, again, looking back at the incidental take permit, again, that was granted in Vermont. I'm now looking at letter $L$, which
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is a couple of paragraphs down from what we were reading.
A. Would that be $K$, Ms. Linowes?
Q. NO, L.
A. L?
Q. Under Mitigation.
A. Okay.
Q. It states, "The permittee shall participate in a research cooperative to conduct bat fatality monitoring as described in the avian" -- "'Evaluating Avian and Bat Post-Construction Impacts at the Sheffield Wind Farm,'" which is appended to this permit.

It says, "Such surveys include daily
searches at eight randomly selected turbines
from the 16 total available turbines from
April 1 to 31 and then from October 1 to 31
each year." But then it states, "All
turbines will be searched during the
operational mitigation study from June 1 to
September 30." So, every turbine searched.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you -- have you been involved with
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searcher -- post-construction search programs?
A. I did a test on a local turbine in Massachusetts this summer, as it happens. It was just a brief, one week, to determine the scavenger removal and the efficiency of the observer. We used a volunteer observer. And we found that the scavenger removal rate was not very great there. But even in a fairly ideal situation where the recently-tilled soil had been flattened out and seeded, it was a little bumpy. There were some stones, some clumps of earth, but essentially a flat situation. We found that the observer could only find a little less than 50 percent of the birds and bats that we had actually placed there at GPS points. So it's not easy, and it requires effort. And I think this is a good model. I would recommend it to the parties involved.
Q. That every turbine be searched during that period?
A. That probably would make sense. But again, this adaptive management would take place
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after the third year, ideally, and at that point it can be adapted to whatever is required. Some turbines may seem to have more mortality, some less. We don't know until we collect data.

So, merely sort of stressing that we should collect the data and make a thorough job of that before these decisions are made.
Q. Now, one last question. I was mentioning the production numbers from these two, that if we were to compare the Sheffield project to the Antrim Wind project. My question for you is: The developer of the Sheffield project clearly had the project built and is working closely with the State of Vermont and wants his project to continue to be operating. Is it reasonable -- I mean, would you expect that any developer who's seeking to get their project built, that if this Applicant -- the Sheffield Wind Project, if that developer is able to make that mitigation work, that a project of comparable size, at least in output capacity factor, would you expect a same kind of enthusiastic
response, or at least cooperative response?
A. I'm not quite sure how to answer that. But I'm sure that Antrim Wind Energy is equally eager to find the data. And I hope that they will do it in as efficient a manner.
Q. And would it -- in the -- I guess following that question, is it the State of New Hampshire's obligation to put its resources first in balance in the case of a declining bat population?
A. Yes. I think in these cases, and in our previous studies in New Hampshire, we have asked the site evaluation committees to be fairly detailed about the conditions for permits that were granted. And I'm sure that will continue in this case.
Q. Thank you.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. BAILEY: Ms. Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: Yes. Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr . Lloyd-Evans.
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A. Good afternoon, Ms. Geiger.
Q. Just following up on the last point that you made about, I believe you said "detailed conditions." Are you familiar with the Avian and Bat Protection Plan that the Applicant has put forth?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Would you agree that that's a fairly detailed plan, in that it's about 69 pages long?
A. It is fairly detailed.
Q. And isn't it true that that also contains, similar to the Vermont information that you were just reciting, a wildlife mortality monitoring program?
A. Yes. And it also has the 5 out of 10 turbines cut in and delineates the wind speeds at which that will happen. That part is very efficient.
Q. Do you think that's a fairly good and reasonable set of conditions for this Committee to impose on the Applicant?
A. I'd like a clarification of the half-hour before sunset until sunrise. I seem to
remember there was some discussion about
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that, and $I$ honestly don't know what the upshot was.
Q. And I'll have to defer to the transcript on that, because I don't want to muddy the record and speculate as to what the witnesses have said. So $I$ would respectfully decline to give you that at this point.
A. But the main problem I have with it is that $I$ think we need independent data, and I think we need at least three years of it. So it's the duration in particular.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. So it's fair to say that it's the -- the fact that the Applicant is saying that it will do one year of post-construction monitoring under this plan, and you're suggesting that there should be three years; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But isn't it true that the State of New Hampshire does not have any statute or rules that address post-construction avian and bat mortality monitoring studies, or any duration for them for wind projects?

MR. ROTH: I'm going to object
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to this question. This witness is not an attorney or licensed to practice law in New Hampshire, and it's a legal question.

MS. BAILEY: I'll ask you to answer the question if you know the answer.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Madam
Chair, but I do not know the answer of the detail, nor of New Hampshire. It would be foolish of me to attempt it.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. So you're not aware if the State -- and, sir, you're testifying, obviously, before the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee in making recommendations. But you don't know if the State of New Hampshire has any requirements for these avian and bat protection plans.
A. None that I know of.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines? And I believe Public Counsel has marked these as Exhibit PC 21.
A. Yes, I am somewhat familiar. I can't land my hands on them right now.

MR. ROTH: Susan, are you
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going to ask him to look at it?
MS. GEIGER: Not unless he -he said that he's somewhat familiar with it. And I'm not going to ask him specifically to read anything from it.
A. Yes, I've read through it.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. You have. Okay.

These are voluntary guidelines, not mandates; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So the federal government hasn't mandated any particular post-mortality avian and bat protection studies; is that correct?
A. Not mandated, to my knowledge.
Q. Okay. So would you agree that the purpose of these guidelines, these voluntary guidelines, is to provide guidance to wind energy developers with respect to avian and bat protection issues that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has concerns about?

MR. ROTH: I'm going to object to this question. The guidelines speak for themselves.
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MS. BAILEY: I think you can answer it, to the extent you know.
A. To the extent that $I$ know, yes.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Okay. Now, are you aware that Antrim Wind consulted with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service before conducting field studies in the development of its initial avian and bat protection plan that was submitted with the Application on January 31st?
A. Yes, I'm aware of it.
Q. And are you aware that Antrim Wind has updated that original ABPP -- I'll use that acronym, if that's okay -- as a result of going through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services Guidelines, Tier 1, 2 and 3 consultation processes?
A. Yes, that was revised 15th of June.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware that in applying the Tier 1, 2 and 3 assessments, that AWE, Antrim Wind, has concluded that the project's impacts to birds and bats are expected to be low?
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MR. ROTH: I'm going to -- I
let the first one go by, but what I'm seeing here is the witness is being asked to Characterize what Antrim Wind has done in meetings that it's had with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. There may have been testimony about that. But I think, you know, that testimony should speak for itself. And this witness, I don't believe he's testified that he was present at any of those meetings or any of those consultations. So I think it's a little bit unfair for Attorney Geiger to put words in his mouth about what happened at those meetings or what the result of those meetings was.

MS. GEIGER: And I'm just
laying the foundation for another question. And just to let Mr. Lloyd-Evans, and to refresh Attorney Roth's memory, the statement about the "low expectations" is contained in Mr. Valleau's and Mr. Gravel's supplemental prefiled testimony at Page 6. So that's something that's in the record here already, and I don't believe that's been challenged.
[WITNESS: TREVOR LLOYD-EVANS]

MR. ROTH: That's fine. I just don't want there to be any implication or intonation that Mr . Lloyd-Evans agrees with the truth of any of those statements that were made in Mr. Valleau's and Mr. Gravel's testimony.

MS. GEIGER: I'm not asking him to agree. I'm just asking him if he knows that that's what Antrim Wind has determined.
A. Yes.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Thank you.

And isn't it true that, under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Guidelines, if studies indicate low probability of significant adverse impacts, then the Tier 4 recommended duration of post-construction monitoring is just one year, not three years?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, are you aware that Sara Nystrom, the northern states' bald and golden eagle coordinator for the Northeastern Region of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, indicated in
an e-mail on October 26th, 2012, that, according to her review, Antrim Wind's Avian and Bat Protection Plan is consistent with U.S. Fish and Wildlife's Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines, and that she has no additional comments or suggested revisions to the plan at this time?

MR. ROTH: Is that an exhibit?
MS. GEIGER: Yes, I'd like to
refer the witness to what's been marked for identification as Antrim Wind Energy 43.
A. I have this in my hand.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Great.
A. Thank you.
Q. So you're aware of the information in the e-mail that $I$ just referenced?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And are you also aware -- I guess you would be aware if you looked at that e-mail, that Ms. Nystrom has also indicated that the ABPP for Antrim Wind, its adaptive management and phased consultation process will be sufficient to meet U.S. Fish and Wildlife
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Services' requirements for future consultation?
A. Yes. One of the phrases that struck me there was -- I don't have additional comments or suggestions at this time. And I assume that there will be further suggestions and comments as the bodies work together.

I also don't see anything saying one year, two years or three years in this letter. So I think that has yet to be determined.
Q. Right. But isn't it true that the ABPP, which is referenced in the e-mail, only requires -- or only sets forth a commitment for a one-year post-construction study? Is that correct?
A. Followed by adaptive management, yes.
Q. Correct. Followed by adaptive management.

So, in so far as you've just mentioned adaptive management, do you believe that a commitment by this Applicant to pursuing adaptive management to address any potential project impacts on avian and bat species is preferable to just simply doing multiple
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years of post-construction studies with no adaptive management?
A. Well, I think that to get a solid basis of information post-construction of mortality -in this case, of bats, although your client will also be looking at raptors and other bird species in the mortality study there -I really believe that you need multiple years because of the inherent variation that one sees in terms of population size and with the very dynamic situation we now have with bat populations in New Hampshire, which is not good. And it's not as if there are no bats present and your surveys have shown that there are many bats detections around the proposed area. So as a solid basis, I think, then, that would be the point at which to go on to adaptive management. And we're really only disagreeing about the one year versus the three years.
Q. Okay. Well, isn't it true -- speaking about the bat situation, isn't it true that neither New Hampshire Fish and Game nor U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have directed Antrim Wind to
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take any particular steps with respect to either the little brown bat or any other species of bat?

MR. ROTH: I'm going to object to that. There's no foundation for that.

MS. BAILEY: Ms. Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: Yeah, my response to that is that he said that he thought that there would be some concerns here in New Hampshire. And I was just, you know, trying to elicit from the witness his understanding of whether or not he understands that there have been no requests made of the Applicant to do anything in particular with respect to bat species.

MR. ROTH: That's not a foundation. That's an assertion that's unsupported by any foundation.

MS. GEIGER: No, I think if you read the record --

MS. BAILEY: I think it's a
fair question. It's cross-examination. You did bring it up.
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BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. In any event, we obviously agreed,

Mr. Lloyd-Evans, with the e-mail from Fish and Wildlife Services, that there is, at this time, nothing further that they required from this Applicant; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. MS. GEIGER: May I have a moment, please?

MS. BAILEY: Yes.
(Pause in proceedings)
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Mr. Lloyd-Evans, getting back to the Avian and Bat Protection Plan, $I$ believe that in response to questions from Ms. Linowes about what's going on in Vermont with this species taking permit that was issued to the Sheffield Project, you talked about -- or the permit talks about implementing a detection or a monitoring program, such that the folks that are out in the field are required to make reports of species that they find, and they're also required to go out and do
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structured mortality surveys; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware that under the Avian and Bat Protection Program that the Applicant has put forth, that there would be training provided to all of its personnel at the plant who would be responsible when they're out in the field for conducting similar activities?
A. I did read that, yes.
Q. Okay. In addition to that, I think there was a comment made very early in your testimony. And I apologize if I get this wrong. But the gist of it was that -- I think Ms. Linowes asked you that the -- whether the ABPP would somehow terminate if the Applicant found it to no longer be economically viable, or words to that effect. In other words, that if it were not -- the inference $I$ drew is that if it would cost the Applicant too much money, that it would no longer implement this ABPP. Is that what you understood her to be asking you?

MR. ROTH: I don't think
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that's a fair characterization of her question. I think she was referring to a particular adaptive management approach, not the entire ABPP, if I'm not mistaken. But I'll let Ms. Linowes speak to that. MS. GEIGER: Yeah, I'd like to hear it from Ms. Linowes instead of Mr. Roth on this.

MS. LINOWES: I wasn't speaking to the point of the adaptive management program being stopped if there was an economic impact on the developer. What I was stating was that there is -- it appeared that the Applicant was presenting a concern about economic impact, and to what extent that should be taken into consideration as part of the plan, and whether it -- and basically that's it.

MS. GEIGER: I guess, then, based on that, I guess the question I have for Mr. Lloyd-Evans is: Could you point to me someplace in the ABPP where it says what Ms. Linowes is suggesting?

MR. ROTH: I think you should
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ask Ms. Linowes that question.
MS. GEIGER: Well, he answered the question, and I think he agreed with Ms. Linowes. And so I'd like to know upon what basis he's agreeing with her assertion.

MS. BAILEY: I think it's a fair question, and then Ms. Linowes will have a chance to answer the question addressed in her testimony.

But can you answer the
question?
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
Could you repeat the question?
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Again, the question that $I$ had was a follow-up to a question that Ms. Linowes had posed to you about when the ABPP would conclude.
A. Right.
Q. I believe that. And I think she agreed -you agreed with the question that she posed to you.

MR. ROTH: Madam Chairman, again, I think she's mischaracterizing Ms.
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Linowes' question after Ms. Linowes actually clarified what the question was, and I think that's unfair to the witness.

MS. GEIGER: Maybe I -- I
apologize. The hour is late, and I think I need a little help from Ms. Linowes in understanding what her question was all about. Because I heard an agreement from this witness, and I believe his answer was that there is something in this Applicant's plan that supports his answer, which was in the affirmative to a question posed by Ms. Linowes. And I want to know where it is, because I can't find it.

MS. BAILEY: Can you answer
that question? Do you understand?
THE WITNESS: I don't believe
that -- I don't believe that there is anything specific in the plan. I don't think I was answering that question. But I apologize if I gave you the wrong impression. MS. LINOWES: Madam Chairman,

I could point to what $I$ was referring to if that would be helpful.
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MS. BAILEY: Ms. Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: Yes, that would be helpful.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. MS. LINOWES: I'm looking at, unless this changed, this is Page 53 of the ABPP, under Section 8.2, Additional Mitigation Actions for Bats.

THE WITNESS: Right.
MS. LINOWES: And it states in that first paragraph, under that section, last sentence, "AWE offers this mitigation [sic] action approach in lieu of committing to a multiple-year mortality study. AWE believes that such a multiple-year study is inappropriate because it will" -- and then proceeds to talk about cost. "Cost more than life-of-project curtailment to determine that fatality is low and that no mitigation is needed."

But the point I was making -the question $I$ was asking was: Does it appear that the Applicant is putting economic interests ahead of doing -- of the mitigation
[WITNESS: TREVOR LLOYD-EVANS]
plan?
THE WITNESS: I really can't answer what the Applicant meant by this -MS. BAILEY: Let's wait -THE WITNESS: -- but I do see your question about costs. Thank you. MS. BAILEY: Let's wait for a question from the Applicant.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Right. And so I guess I'll simply ask this question: On that same page, on Page 56 -is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So as Ms. Linowes indicated, the Applicant has said that a multiple-year study is inappropriate because it will either cost more than the life of project -- cost more than life of project curtailment to determine if fatality is biologically significant and mitigation is necessary.

But, you know, isn't it true that -- or would you agree that, if doing studies, in and of themselves which cost money, do not compel the Applicant to take any adaptive
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management -- in other words, just do three years of studies and nothing more -- do you believe that's better than doing the one year of study and then doing adaptive management, taking action?

MR. ROTH: I object to the question. It poses a false choice to the witness.

MS. BAILEY: I don't think it
does. I have the same question in my mind. So I'm going to ask it if you don't let her.
A. I believe you've presented this as an either/or situation. I assumed that there was as part of this plan, and it states in the plan that there would be consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife --
Q. Yes.
A. -- and New Hampshire Fish and Game at all stages, in all years.
Q. Right.
A. And so I would assume that if the SEC decided to ask for three years of biologists-controlled careful studies, that there would always be continual consultation
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with U.S. Fish and Wildlife and with New Hampshire Fish and Game.
Q. Right. But as you pointed out, there will be consultation during year one, right --
A. Yes.
Q. -- with Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the parties that you said to this Committee that they should take counsel from? Would you agree that, if during that one year -- after that one-year study, in consultation with those agencies, there is -they decide that there is some adaptive management, but no further need to study, wouldn't that result be preferable than just studying for three years and making no commitment to adaptive management? And I am posing an either/or.

MR. ROTH: I guess I don't even understand the question. I'm confused by the way it was set up. Could you make it --

MS. GEIGER: I apologize for
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that.
MR. ROTH: I know. I think we're all tired and stuff. But I didn't follow it.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. I guess what I'm posing is, we have an adaptive management. And if I understand it correctly, there will be one year of post-construction study; there will be consultation with the agencies I just mentioned; and then, if everyone agrees, there will be adaptive management. Is that right?
A. I believe that's your proposal, yes.
Q. Yes, that's the proposal.
A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. So that's one choice.
A. Right.
Q. The other choice is, as you've suggested, go out and do three years of post-construction study, period. Those are the two choices. Which one do you believe is preferable? MR. ROTH: I object. That was not -- that was not what Mr . Lloyd-Evans
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testified.
MS. BAILEY: Well, can he say that?

MR. ROTH: If I may finish.
His testimony was three years and then you do the adaptive management. That's what he said earlier right here on the stand this
afternoon. He didn't say just do three years worth of data and just sit there. He said three years, then adaptive management. So that's what I mean about the false choice. BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. But isn't it true, Mr. Lloyd-Evans, that in the Groton Wind case you only recommended three years of post-construction study, with no adaptive management?
A. Yes.

MS. GEIGER: Okay. I have no further questions.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
Redirect? Do you want a minute?
MR. ROTH: Yes.
MS. BAILEY: Okay. Oh, I'm
sorry. Wait, wait, Peter -- Mr. Roth.
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Committee questions before redirect.
MR. ROTH: Okay.
MS. BAILEY: Sorry. Who wants
to start?
Mr. Robinson.
MR. ROBINSON: I do have a
couple of questions.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. ROBINSON:
Q. My first question has to do with migrating common nighthawks.
A. Yes.
Q. During the Applicant's fall and spring avian surveys, they picked up very few migrating common nighthawks, in part because they weren't looking during the time frame when these birds typically migrate through the state. And I asked that question. And part of the answer was that the high topography of the proposed project area shouldn't result in migratory nighthawks coming through that area.

Would you agree with that, or do you think additional observations for migratory nighthawk populations should be considered?
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A. I would think it would be very sensible to have additional considerations. I think the nighthawk was not found during a particular survey, and so it wasn't necessarily expected. But migrating nighthawks certainly move in the daytime and move down to ridge lines. Yes, in to answer your question.
Q. Thank you. And I have one further question. As far as the studies post-construction, in your opinion, do you think the best scenario would be three years' worth of studies and the adaptive management approach?
A. Yes, sir. I really think you need three years to get a strong basis of numbers, and particularly with this study with bat species that are already of concern or of special concern, protected by the state. And particularly, I understand that the State is concerned about bat populations in New Hampshire declining rapidly because of White Nose Syndrome.

So this just seems a very sensible thing to do. We were not perhaps aware of the declining populations in previous years, in
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previous studies for previous developments. But in this case, three years will give a good basis, and adaptive management would obviously be the way to go afterwards. With any luck, there is little or no bat mortality and everything will be fine. But we should find out first.
Q. We've talked a lot about the bat mortality. But do you feel that three years' worth of study for the avian birds would be appropriate as well?
A. I think that would be part of the study. And, yes, absolutely.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. BAILEY: Anybody else?
Chairman Ignatius.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
INTERROGATORIES BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
Q. A moment ago you said -- and earlier this afternoon you had said that we should get the -- we should study -- we should get the information first. And yet, you're talking about post-construction studies; are you not?
A. Yes. This is post-construction mortality
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studies. The Applicant has essentially conducted one year of studies at this point, which is not a lot. And so the post-construction mortality study, with its adaptations and with its cut-in survey to see whether they could reduce mortality under those wind conditions and under those temperature conditions, seems like a very good way of approaching at this point.

Some data on whether animals, birds, or bats of interest to the State are being affected by this turbine once it's up -- and this is assuming that the permit is granted. So if you do go ahead and you do grant a permit, I think it would make sense then to have a good, solid data base of whether there is actual harm to these animals as opposed to what we can estimate from pre-construction.
Q. I found my scribbles here, and I wrote down that you had said we should collect the data before these decisions are made. So what are the decisions you're referring to that would benefit from the data?
A. I think the main decisions are how long there
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should be a detailed post-construction mortality study by biologists. And I think, really, the difference between the proponent's counsel and myself comes down to whether there should be one year or three years of data to estimate whether there is harm before adaptive management happens.
Q. All right. Well, I think I'm getting confused. We may be using words differently here.

You're asking for no more studies prior to construction. You are asking for studies -- no more data prior to construction, but that post-construction, there be three years of studies in order to inform decisions about adaptive management.
A. In one part of my testimony I did ask for more fall migration raptor studies. But we are dealing now with post-construction, and I think the -- I believe there was agreement that perhaps there would be more studies of the common nighthawk, since that has now appeared as a species, and obviously of concern to the State since it is protected.
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Q. But it's your view that the Committee has enough data to make a decision about whether to permit the facility. It's a question of whether there should be further data beyond the one year that's been proposed post-construction before making a decision about adaptive management strategies.
A. Yes. And I would hope that U.S. Fish and Wildlife and New Hampshire Fish and Game would provide information prior to the Committee making detailed commitments there.
Q. Does that mean that if after a year of study -- let's assume three years were required -- the project's permitted, it's built, and in the first year of post-construction studies you find a troublesome mortality record. Does that mean you'd still have to study for two more years before you'd require some adaptation?
A. Not at all.
Q. Your testimony referenced the change in the cut-in speeds and that that had a good effect in reducing mortality. But I didn't see that you were making that recommendation here. Is
[WITNESS: TREVOR LLOYD-EVANS]
that because you'd need to see the data of the study you're talking about before making any sort of recommendation about cut-in speeds, or did I misunderstand?
A. I believe the cut-in speed scenario has already been addressed by the Avian and Bat Protective Plan. So they were suggesting that for 5 of the 10 turbines, that they would do an experimental and presumably switch-around from time to time. And that that would be at 3.5 meters per second, I believe, going up to 5 meters per second in the experimental, and it would be under those conditions of temperature.

So it was at a time when bats, particularly, are likely to be flying around the turbines. This has proved effective in Pennsylvania, and so $I$ believe that it's pretty much detailed in the study.
Q. And you find those provisions in the Applicant's plan to be appropriate.
A. I would work with -- I would ask the Applicant to work with New Hampshire Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife and look at
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other studies, such as the one in Vermont which is ongoing now, and previous studies, such as Arnett, et al, in Somerset County, Pennsylvania and decide on detail. I think these are the people best able to decide on exact detail, and then present that to the Committee.
Q. But getting back to my same question, present to the Committee before we make a decision about permitting the facility, or present to the Committee after post-construction operations?
A. No, before. I think as a condition of permitting the facility is where these things are normally put. So this would be asking them to conduct a good study, a good science-based study, as well as has been done in the past, and that can be presented to the Applicant.

And then the post-construction
mortality, if the permit is granted would continuing afterwards to make sure that what we have tried to do as best we can was actually being effective on the ground.
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Q. So, forgive me for belaboring this, but you've lost me again.
A. I'm sorry.
Q. I go back to the -- what is the study you're suggesting should take place prior to a decision on permitting?
A. I'm merely suggesting that the exact details of which month, half an hour before dusk, at dusk, half an hour after dusk, these details be ironed out before the permit is granted, and that it be made a clear condition so that everyone knows where they are.
Q. So a possible revision to the plan's provisions for cut-in speeds after these other folks have had a chance to study it and comment?
A. Whatever they feel is appropriate. These are the experts in the local area. Yes.
Q. In your supplemental testimony, you made a reference to findings of -- not your own study, I don't believe -- but that you were aware of findings that facilities in the northeast, 19 out of 20 had found bat fatalities, and that included Lempster, and
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
[WITNESS: TREVOR LLOYD-EVANS]
in fact, the little brown bats being among the populations that had suffered mortalities. Do you know any more about the Lempster data?
A. I did not study Lempster for the state of New Hampshire, so I actually know very little more than that. That was taken from reports.
Q. All right. Thank you. Nothing else.
A. Thank you.

MS. BAILEY: I have a few questions.

INTERROGATORIES BY MS. BAILEY:
Q. This is the first time that I've sat on the Site Evaluation Committee to this degree, and so my questions are to get your expertise about the plan, the ABPP. And I guess I'll start with, on other projects with which you are familiar, has an Applicant ever been required to do three years of study and then a mitigation plan?
A. I believe in the -- excuse me one minute.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. In the Granite Reliable order, there was an order for three consecutive years'
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post-construction mortality with New Hampshire Fish and Game approving and reviewing, and for breeding bird surveys in years one, three and five post-construction.
Q. Approving and reviewing what?
A. The post-construction mortality study.
Q. So, was there any idea that Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife would sit down with that Applicant and change the way they do things if they found a high mortality rate?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's part of the -- your understanding is that's part of what that means?
A. Yes.
Q. I mean, it sounds to me when you read it -it sounded to me when you read it, and it was my impression from the testimony that we've heard before, is that they were just studying it and that those agencies would have input into how it was studied, but not change anything after the study was concluded.
A. I don't believe there was a formal -- as Attorney Geiger said, I don't believe there was a formal adaptive management study
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
[WITNESS: TREVOR LLOYD-EVANS]
thereafter written out, as far as I know. I believe --
Q. So we got data from those three to five years of study.

MR. ROTH: Not yet.
A. Not yet.

BY MS. BAILEY:
Q. Okay. Where are we on that?

THE WITNESS: Can you help me,
Attorney Roth?
Q. It's not --

MR. ROTH: Granite Reliable has just gone in operation in March or April, and Groton has still not constructed. And further to the point about whether adaptive management -- the Groton order requires consultation, annual reports submitted to and discussed with Fish and Game and Fish and Wildlife to serve as the basis for mitigation efforts. I would ask him that on redirect, but it seems -- you know, it's in the Commission's -- Committee's orders in both of those cases, so I'll spare the redirect.
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MS. GEIGER: And I would object to any characterization by Attorney Roth of what those orders say. I would respectfully ask that the Committee take official notice of the orders in both the Granite and the Groton cases, which the Committee is authorized to do under 541-A:33.

MR. ROTH: I would agree.
MS. GEIGER: Okay. Thank you.
MS. BAILEY: We will do that.
We will take official notice.
MS. GEIGER: And I think the orders speak for themselves. Thank you.

MS. BAILEY: Okay.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is there a reason why we're leaving Lempster out --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
MS. BAILEY: Should we take
official notice of Lempster as well?
MS. GEIGER: Absolutely. I think that that's probably the first one you should read.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. We will do that.
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MR. ROTH: I would just -- in terms of the taking official notice, in that case, nobody but the Applicant produced a witness to offer testimony about impacts on avian species.

The other two cases, Groton and Granite Reliable, both had Mr. Lloyd-Evans in addition to the Applicant's witnesses. They were very much contested, and a great deal of time spent, and the deliberations on those was also very intense.

BY MS. BAILEY:
Q. Okay. Mr. Lloyd-Evans, if the Applicant had offered in the ABPP a three-year study period and the adaptive management plan, would that have been better than the other two more recent --
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. It would. Okay.

So is the process on this sort of iterative, where, you know, we learn from the past and we just keep adding conditions to make it better? Is that what you're
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recommending here?
A. I think we are learning from the PAST. We have very little data from New England. But it is slowly mounting up. And I hope we learn from the past and make it better as we go.
Q. Well, we don't have any adaptive management plans in place yet. We have some provisions in the other two orders --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that we're going to figure out what they mean.
A. Yes.
Q. Is there -- so your testimony was that, if we did three years and an adaptive management plan, that would be the best that we've had so far?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there a magic significance to three years? Would two years be better than one year, or do we need three? Why do we need three?
A. Well, you're asking a biologist who has 45 years of data when he starts addressing questions. You know biologists, they always
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want more data. There is known variation in breeding success for any animal in any particular year across populations. There is known variation in numbers of animals on migration routes due to wind patterns. And there will be variations in weather conditions that may make it more or less dangerous for bats or birds at this particular site. We don't know yet.

And so, as in the Arnett study in
Pennsylvania, they found tremendous differences in two years. Three years will give you better data than two years. Two years will give you better data than one year. The Committee is, of course, quite able to make any number of years they wish.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. BAILEY: Are there any
other Committee questions?
Okay. Mr. Iacopino.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. IACOPINO:
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Mr. Lloyd-Evans, let me start off with the assertion on Page 56 in the ABPP that the
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three years is -- the cost of doing a three-year is more than the cost of life of project curtailment. Why shouldn't the Committee just order life of project curtailment?
A. You could.
Q. And what would your recommendation, if they were inclined to do that, be? What would the curtailment be?
A. Life of project curtailment at that temperature and those wind conditions you're referring to as mentioned in the ABPP.
Q. Okay. So their mitigation experiment plan that you're talking about, those conditions contained in there, where they were going to curtail the cut-in speeds of half of the units for a period of time under certain conditions? Are those --
A. Well, I suppose -- I mean, I'm obviously not an expert in the finances. So I have no idea how that would --
Q. Well, I'm not asking you to tell me what it would cost. They've asserted --
A. Right.
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Q. -- that it would cost more than life of project curtailment. And my question -which you said life of project curtailment would satisfy you. But I'm just trying to ask what type of curtailment over the life of the project would satisfy you?
A. The curtailment that has worked so far has been at either 5 meters per second or 6 meters per second, in that range. They're suggesting 5 here, which might be reasonable. If you went that way, then I suppose that would be the answer.
Q. And when you say five, though, what you're referring to is their plan -- the curtailment plan that is contained in the ABPP?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. Everybody keeps talking about post-construction studies, okay. Please tell us exactly what those studies are that you would anticipate if we were to go along with your recommendation for post-construction studies. Is it simply a mortality study?
A. There have been various studies looking at
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pre-construction estimates of migrating birds, how many are within the turbine-swept area, these sorts of things, and then comparing those in turbine areas and comparing those with post-construction mortality. And the record is not particularly good. I think largely we do the initial studies to find out what species are there which are of importance, at which times of year, and which are of State significance from a legal protection point of view. So I think that's why we do those.

And then if we go ahead with the Antrim Bat Protection Plan, more or less as it is, they will have biologists looking for raptors that may be killed. They will certainly have a very efficient survey of bats that have been killed. They will know the exact species. If you look at their impact study, you will find that very often these bat species are grouped because that's the best that technology can do for us nowadays. When you have a body in the hand, you know exactly what you're dealing with, and you're much
better able to assess the concern that the State would have for that species at that place, at that time. So I think you end up with hard data.

All I'm really saying is that three years of good hard data of those and possibly some extra studies of the two other points of concern that have been made, which are migrating nighthawks, which are certainly of State concern and rather caught us, I think, all by surprise. And also, there seems to be a moderate risk on bald eagles. And fall raptors are not inconsiderable at the -raptor migration is not inconsiderable at the Antrim Wind Energy area.

So those would seem to be the sensible groups to study, and that would give us real data.
Q. Let me take those groups one at a time, then, so that I understand.

The mortality studies that you're talking about, you want those to go on for three years; correct?
A. Yes.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
Q. And is the plan for those studies that is contained, even though they only -- even though they only ask for one year, is the plan as it is contained in the ABPP satisfactory to you -- in other words, the details of how those searches would be conducted, how those -- how mortality studies would be conducted?
A. Yes, I think it's a good plan. And I would like to see agreement by Fish and Game and by U.S. Fish and Wildlife. There might be some tweaking about exact times or --
Q. Okay. But my question is whether --
A. Yes.
Q. -- they satisfy you.
A. Yes.
Q. We have other evidence about Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife. But from your perspective, you find that to be a satisfactory plan; you just disagree over the length of time.
A. Yes, essentially.
Q. Okay. You mentioned fall migration raptor studies. You want that to be done
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post-construction as well?
A. I think the ideal time would be to do it now, but --
Q. Well, I don't think there's going to be a decision this fall.
A. It's not going to happen in 2012. So that could happen before construction.
Q. Okay. And do you -- in your opinion, should the certificate be conditioned on some kind of outcome of a fall migration raptor study?
A. We have one year of study so far. One thing that might come out of it might in fact be -I noticed in a U.S. Fish and Wildlife letter that we have all referred to, the service generally recommends the project with a risk assessment in the moderate category pursue a take permit under the bald eagle and golden eagle. We might find more information on that. Those would be the sort of outcomes. And a second year of data would show whether this is a much more significant or much less significant site than we thought from one year. One year's data is not good.
Q. I understand your position with that. But
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with respect to conditions that might generate out of this Committee if a certificate is determined to be issued, is there some result of a fall raptor migration study that should change the mind of the Committee that they shouldn't issue a certificate? In other words, if there's so many -- if there's a certain number of raptors that $f l y$ through the project area, do you have information for us as to what should cause the Committee such great concern that a certain number would be an unreasonable adverse impact on that species, those species?
A. I think for actual numbers, $I$ would defer to the experts on the ground, New Hampshire Fish and Game.
Q. Okay. And the issue with the common nighthawks, you indicated that this is a surprise to everybody. And that's because they are found to be migrating? Is that the surprise?
A. I think that they were not -- correct me if I'm wrong. But I think that they were not
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
found in any of the formal surveys. And I think they were, if $I$ may sort of put it simply, stumbled across, and then, oh, yes, there were nighthawks there. There has since been a nighthawk death at a different turbine.
Q. In Lempster.
A. In Lempster. Okay. And I think that raised the awareness of nighthawks. As the Committee member said, we do not have any information on the migration of the common nighthawk. And so that would make sense to collect that information.
Q. And with respect to that study of common nighthawks, what would you call that study? What would it be called?
A. Migration study during the migration period in New Hampshire, again with Fish and Game advice on what the exact period would be.
Q. And again, is that something that you would consider to be a -- something that should be done on a pre-construction basis or after construction?
A. I think that would be pre-construction,
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because this is a protected species in New Hampshire, and the sooner we have the information the better.
Q. And I'll ask you the same question about that study that $I$ did about the raptors. Is there some level where you believe that there's -that the project shouldn't be built?
A. I would not be able to put a number to it.
Q. You were asked, I think during Ms. Linowes' cross-examination of you, about the project in Sheffield, Vermont.
A. Yes.
Q. And she used some numbers about fatalities found at that particular project.

Are you familiar with that project? Is that one that you've worked on the studies or --
A. No, I've merely seen the correspondence that Attorney Roth passed on to me. I just know of the mortalities. And I have seen the State of Vermont permit.
Q. And are you familiar with the fatality -with fatalities, post-construction studies out of Lempster?
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A. No.
Q. You are not or you are?
A. No, that's not one of the areas that $I$ studied.
Q. Just as a biologist, do you think that -- as opposed to Lempster or Sheffield, which one of those projects would more approximate the same conditions that will be found on the ridge in Antrim?
A. That's a good question.
Q. Do you know?
A. I don't think anyone knows.
Q. Okay. I don't have any further questions.
A. Thank you, sir.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. Let's take a 10-minute break, and then we'll do redirect.

MR. ROTH: Probably only need five.

MS. BAILEY: Well, but I think the court reporter may need -- well, yes, I think the court reporter needs 10 minutes.

MR. ROTH: Okay.
MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
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(Whereupon recess was taken at
5:56 p.m., and the hearing resumed at 6:11 p.m.)

MS. BAILEY: We're back on record, and we're going to have redirect by Mr. Roth.

MR. ROTH: We're back. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. During your cross-examination, you were asked some questions about whether -- and I don't want to mischaracterize mischaracterizations. But in general, the problem was whether there was -- whether you agreed with the suggestion that something about the ABPP could be terminated because of economics. Do you remember that discussion and kerfuffle?
A. I was here when Mr. Gravel made that point in his testimony.
Q. And that's where I'm going. You were here when Mr. Gravel testified a couple weeks ago.
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to read from the transcript here and just refresh your recollection and see if
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 6 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-27-12\}
this is what may have influenced you.
He said -- and this is on Page 229 of the transcript. "The other part of it is that this is -- these studies are very labor-intensive. Everything comes down to money. So money is a big deal to all of us, I think. And we need to look at -- and also, in my situation here, the wildlife is also very important, in my opinion."

When you were asked the question about do we end the studies because it cost too much money, is that what you were thinking?
A. No, sir. We need to do the studies; otherwise, we will have no idea what mortality we are causing post-construction.
Q. Okay. During the, I believe it was the Committee questioning, there was a fair amount of discussion about the curtailment issue. And it came up in two areas. And the first one is, do you remember that Ms. Linowes asked you some questions about the curtailment that was proposed in the Vermont order?
A. Yes.
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Q. And then there was some questions about whether the curtailment was proposed in -- as proposed in the Applicant's ABPP.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have anything further that you want to say about what would be the best choice?
A. Well, the Vermont order has more detail. And I would -- it's very close to the ABPP. Of the two, since you asked, I think the Vermont order is more precise and has more details. So I would go with that, personally.
Q. Okay. And then also with respect to curtailment, there was a question from the Committee, I believe, about whether it would be, in your mind, appropriate to simply go with the curtailment order for the life of the project, and I think the implication was, and not do studies and adaptive management. Do you remember that?
A. Well, in that case, $I$ think $I$ gave the wrong impression.
Q. Okay. You want to clarify what you had in mind?
A. I really do want to clarify. Yes, we do need
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to do the studies. Exactly what happens after the studies depends on the studies. But if we don't have the data, we will not know what damage we are or are not doing should these turbines be built.
Q. And just so that we are clear, do you understand -- did you understand -- what you were trying to say is a choice between studies and curtailment versus studies and an undefined adaptive management plan?
A. Exactly.
Q. And which do you prefer of those two?
A. I think $I$ would do the studies, and then $I$ would make up my mind. And when I say "my," this would be, again, our trio of the Applicant and U.S. Fish and Wildlife and New Hampshire Fish and Game.

But at the end of the studies, we will know whether we need to continue curtailment or not. And I assumed that that was part of the adaptive management plan. I don't really see a lot of difference.
Q. Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.
A. Thank you.
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MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you for your testimony.

MS. GEIGER: Could I ask some questions on recross, please? They'll be limited to the scope of redirect.

MS. BAILEY: I'm told we don't usually do that.

MR. ROTH: And I realize I may have gotten the opportunity to do that maybe once in the last month, and I was shut down. And I have not even asked for it since then. So I'd respectfully suggest that it not be allowed in this case.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. No.
MS. GEIGER: All right.
Thanks.
MS. BAILEY: Thanks.
THE WITNESS: Thank you Madam
Chair. Thank you, Committee.
MR. ROTH: Thank you,
Mr. Lloyd-Evans.
MS. BAILEY: Okay. So,
earlier in the day somebody asked me to predict whether we would have time to start
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Ms. Vissering tonight. And I would really like to keep going if we could. But earlier in the day $I$ said, no, we'll never get to Ms. Vissering. And here we are 5:15, and I think we could go for a little bit longer. So when I realized an hour or two ago, probably at the last break, that maybe we would be finished in time to have another witness, I noticed that Dr. Kimball from the AMC is here. And I intended that everybody be asked if they would like to proceed with Dr.

Kimball today, and I'm not sure that the Applicant was notified of that.

MS. GEIGER: We were not.
MS. BAILEY: I apologize. So
I will leave it up to you, if you want to proceed with Dr. Kimball or if you want to just call it a day right now and -MS. GEIGER: Dr. Kimball is
scheduled, on the schedule that was circulated to the parties several weeks ago, to testify last on Friday.

MS . BAILEY: Right.
MS. GEIGER: And we planned
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accordingly.
MS. BAILEY: You're right.
MS. GEIGER: So we're not prepared, and I would object to having to go today. But if the Committee needs him to go, we'll go, and we'll do the best we can.

MS. BAILEY: No, that's --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
MR. IACOPINO: Madam Chair,
Dr. Kimball has since informed us that he cannot be here on Friday.

MS. BAILEY: Well, I think
it's a disadvantage to the Applicant. I was trying to move the schedule along because I thought that's what you wanted us to do.

MS. GEIGER: We were prepared to start cross-examination of Ms. Vissering.

MS. BAILEY: Right. And I
understand that. But we can't always --
MS. GEIGER: That's okay. If you need to put him on, put him on. We'll do the best we can.

MS. BAILEY: Okay.
Dr. Kimball, are you available tomorrow
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if we start you today?
MR. KIMBALL: Yes, I am.
MS. BAILEY: All right. So
why don't we at least do the direct and the cross of everybody else -- from everybody else. And then we'll see what time we are, and maybe you could cross him tomorrow -would that be all right -- before Ms. Vissering?

MS. GEIGER: Okay. All right.
MS. BAILEY: Well, I'm asking
you to tell me what you would like to do because I'm trying to accommodate your request to move this along.

MS. GEIGER: Right. And I appreciate that very much. And as I said, we'll do the best we can. If you need to put him on tonight, we'll put him on tonight and just keep going. I'd like to reserve the right to call him back, though, if we need to.

Like I said, we have a
schedule. We've had it for weeks. We planned accordingly. He was last on the
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schedule. We're not prepared to go forward today with him. But we'll do the best we can.

MS. BAILEY: Yeah, I think I would prefer, if you're not prepared to do direct, then everybody else said that they were prepared to ask their questions of him, and then we'll allow you to ask your questions tomorrow morning.

MS. GEIGER: Thank you very much. I think that would be a big help. Thank you.

MS. BAILEY: All right.
Dr. Kimball, I appreciate your willingness to accommodate us.

And I would also ask everybody to do -- make your best efforts, because we're going to keep moving through. And I don't know how many witnesses we're going to get through tomorrow. So we're going to try to do the best we can to keep this moving.

Could you swear the witness
in, please.
(WHEREUPON, KENNETH KIMBALL was duly
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sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

KENNETH KIMBALL, SWORN
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Dr. Kimball, since you don't have anybody here to take you through your very short direct exam, $I$ will do that on behalf of the Committee.

First of all, please state your name and business address.
A. Yes, I'm Kenneth Kimball. I'm the Director of Research for the Appalachian Mountain Club, and my office is in Gorham, New Hampshire.
Q. And are you the same Dr. Kimball that's filed prefiled testimony in this case on behalf of the Appalachian Mountain Club as an intervenor?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. And has that prefiled testimony been marked as AMC 4?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And you have that before you?
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A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you have any changes to make to that testimony?
A. No, I do not.
Q. If you were asked the same questions contained in that testimony today, would you give the same answers?
A. Yes, I would.
Q. And I think I also put in front of you AMC 5?
A. Yes, you did.
Q. And please tell the Committee what AMC 5 is.
A. AMC 5 is the terms of agreement that was worked out between the Appalachian Mountain Club and the Applicant.
Q. What does that agreement pertain to?
A. It pertains to dealing with the impacts of nighttime lighting.
Q. Did you have anything that you wanted to add to either your prefiled testimony or your -or about the agreement?
A. I do not.

MR. IACOPINO: The witness is
ready for cross-examination.
MS. BAILEY: Thank you. So,
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Mr. Roth, you go first; right?
MR. ROTH: I do?

MS. BAILEY: Well, "Witnesses for other parties shall be examined in the following order..."

MR. ROTH: Okay.
MS. BAILEY: Does he go next?
Yes, that's -- this is the prehearing conference report that we have.

MR. ROTH: Very well.
MS. BAILEY: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Dr. Kimball, in your prefiled testimony, I think you spoke about the need for a 10-mile viewshed impact?
A. That is correct.
Q. And I'm going to ask you to have a look at what has been marked as, I believe, PC 16.
A. Yes.
Q. And have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Okay. And can you identify it for the Committee?
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A. This is data response of July 12 th from the Applicant's visual expert.
Q. And what does it appear to be to you beyond simply a simple title?
A. It basically is giving a list of visual resources that could be impacted by the project.
Q. And that's within the 10 -mile viewshed?
A. Yes. From the 5 to 10 miles, yes. In the Application, there have been same sort of lists from zero to 5 miles.
Q. Okay. And with respect to the visual resources on that list, are there any that are of particular importance to the Appalachian Mountain Club?
A. Yes. I mean, we had actually requested that visual studies be done on areas like Pitcher Mountain.
Q. Okay. Any others on the list?
A. Yes. The Gregg Trail at the Crotched Mountain Center. And what we had worked out was that we wanted to see at least four additional sites, which they did provide to us.
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Q. What do you mean? I don't understand what your answer is.
A. Actually, there was two components to the visual study. One was an overall computer simulation of the areas that would be potentially impacted, and they had only supplied information up to 5 miles. We requested that to be brought out to 10 miles, which was more the norm in these types of studies.

And then there are specific sites that could be more sensitive or a higher value to the public. And those are usually analyzed using visual simulations as a tool. They're not the ultimate answer. And we had requested that several -- that four or more pictures be taken in that 5 - to $10-$ mile zone at least and supplement the visual analysis that came forward.
Q. Okay. So what you asked for and received from the Applicant was some more visual simulations?
A. That is correct.
Q. And in terms of the quality and approach of
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the visual impacts assessment or analysis -I'm not sure what you called it exactly -that was done by the Applicant's expert with respect to the 5-mile range, were you satisfied with that, that that was an appropriate report?
A. The methodology that they used was fairly standard, with the exception that it was a much shorter distance than we're accustomed to seeing. I think we -- well, I won't say I think. I know that we did have concerns about the interpretation of the data.
Q. And have they performed that work for you with respect to the 5 - to $10-$ mile range?
A. I would say that they performed it for everybody, not just us, because a number of other groups asked for that same type of data.
Q. But they used the same approach --
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And have you seen Ms. Vissering's report?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And do you think that is a -- how would you characterize that? Is that a satisfactory or
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a better approach? Or do you have anything you would say about that?
A. Well, I think Ms. Vissering went to the heart of the question here about the level of impact.
Q. Okay. And is that more useful to you? MS. GEIGER: I'm going to object to this question. I don't think Mr. Kimball has been offered up as a visual impact expert in this case. So I don't think he's qualified to make a judgment or answer questions concerning the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the visual impact studies that various witnesses have done. MR. ROTH: Well, two points. One, I didn't hear her objecting when he was assessing the visual impact study that was done by the Applicant's expert; and secondly, the witness did testify about visual impacts and the importance of them being properly assessed. So I think the question is appropriate.

MS. BAILEY: All right. I'm going to allow the question and give it the
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weight that it deserves.
A. Could you please restate the question? BY MR. ROTH:
Q. No, I probably couldn't.

Do you think that Ms. -- and this may be a different question, and I apologize if I'm shifting a little bit here.

But do you think that Ms. Vissering's approach provides you a -- or provides one, maybe that's you, a better understanding of the extent of the visual impacts at a particular location?
A. Yes, $I$ did take the step of trying to assess what the data really meant.
Q. Okay. And with respect to her conclusions about the Willard Pond and the Audubon Wildlife Refuge area, do you agree with her assessment that that is an unreasonable adverse impact?
A. I would not disagree with it.
Q. And do you think that Ms. Vissering's approach should be adopted and employed at some of these spots in the 5- to 10-mile range that you identified?
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A. Yes, we do.
Q. Okay. That's all. Thank you. MS. BAILEY: Thank you. Mr. Froling. MR. FROLING: No questions. MS. BAILEY: Mr. Beblowski, Mr. Jones, Ms. Sullivan, Ms. Longgood.
(No verbal response)
MS. BAILEY: Mr. Stearns.
MR. STEARNS: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Pinello.
MS. PINELLO: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Manzelli. MS. MANZELLI: No, thank you. MS. BAILEY: Ms. Allen. MS. ALLEN: No questions. MS. BAILEY: Mr. Block,

Mrs. Block.
MS. BLOCK: Yes, thank you. I
have a few questions for Dr. Kimball. And I'm sorry, because a lot of my notes are actually in my car, and I realized I'd get locked out if I went out to get them. But... CROSS-EXAMINATION
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BY MS. BLOCK:
Q. In terms of the radar-activated lighting, are you aware that this was something that had been promised all along to the people of Antrim?
A. I'm not aware that it was promised. But I believe it was actually part of the original application, which we were aware of.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And do you know -- and I'm sorry. I think we've talked about this before -- and I don't have that again -- the distance and altitude that aircraft actually trigger the lights?
A. It varies from the technology, and I'm not expert on all the fine details of the engineering. But these can detect planes up to 30 miles out and can detect planes up to approximately 20,000 feet high, based on their brochures.
Q. And do you know at what point it actually activates the lights?
A. That would be determined, in part, by how the FAA makes its final regulations, $I$ would
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assume. There's the capability of the technology, and then there's what the FAA would require.
Q. And do you have any idea when this may actually come into play, this technology, that it will be approved?
A. It is our understanding -- we've had communications with the FAA, and a sister organization that we worked with on similar issues recently contacted FAA again. And the most recent information that we've had is that they would possibly be putting out the final version of this sometime late this year or early next year, and then they would have to have the public hearing process is the last that I understood.
Q. Okay. And that's --
A. But as we all know, the FAA is going to go on its calendar.
Q. Have you actually researched the amount of air traffic? I mean, I'm just -- you know, I see that ridge all night long, and I always see a plane in my view. So I'm just curious how this is actually going to help.
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A. Well, getting to your question, if $I$ researched the number of air flights over that ridge, the answer is no.

I would want to clarify, though, that the intention of this technology, at least from our understanding, is really to not go after commercial air flight, which are typically flying much higher and not a concern because they're flying at 25-, 30,000 feet.

The normal use of this would be for lower flying aircraft, which typically would be non-commercial, though there may be some commercial, unless you were very close to an airport.
Q. It does seem like it's on a landing path.

So you don't actually know -- I think you said something about the lights kind of just come on. They wouldn't flash at that point? Was that -- am I remembering that correctly?
A. Our understanding of the technology is that, once it's been determined by the FAA as to what the trigger point would be necessary, as
they would determine for safety purposes, once it detects the plane, then it would turn the lighting on so that the plane could pick up that there was actually an obstruction in its pathway.
Q. Okay.
A. And at other times, once the plane has passed back out of that zone, then the lights would go back off.
Q. The AMC Quiet Water Canoe Guide, I think it is -- and I had a quote from this someplace, and I know it's in my testimony, actually -that talks about Willard Pond, are you aware of that?
A. I am aware that the AMC puts out still water paddling guidebooks, of which there are many from many different states. And I would not be surprised if Willard Pond would be in there.
Q. I believe -- and I'm paraphrasing because, I'm sorry, I don't have it -- that it talks about Willard as being "a gem." And I guess my question would be: This is helping at night, the activated lighting --
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A. That's correct.
Q. -- but not necessarily going to have any impact during the day.
A. I think, as we stated in our testimony, there is a visual impact during the day and there is a visual impact during the night. And we saw this as a solution to mitigate but not completely remove the nighttime pollution that's coming from these projects.
Q. I actually think that's the end of my questions. Thank you very much.

MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
Ms. Linowes.
MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. I only have a few questions for you, picking up on some of the questions that Ms. Block asked you. In your testimony on Page 4, Line 17, you state -- this is where you're talking about the likelihood of this technology being made available, approved by FAA. And actually, it's Line 24. You say that -- I'm
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sorry -- Line 27. You say that there's a high likelihood that the FAA will approve this technology in the near future as compared to the lifespan of the project. But you don't really know what "near" -- it could be 15 years out, or you think within a couple of years?
A. We're very hopeful it will be in a couple of years. There's a lot of pressure on FAA just because there's a lot of wind projects similar to this that have the same kind of pressure. So, obviously, I can't sit here and guaranty when FAA is going to make a decision, nor can anybody here.

But in the correspondence that we've had with them, they signaled to us that in the next year or so this could be approved.
Q. Okay. And do you know what this will add in terms of cost to the project? Do you have any idea? I know -- I understand that it's not your project. But do you have a sense of that?
A. I do not. There are -- I mean, I think what our observation is, is at first OCAS came
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out, and now -- and then there's the Heritage Detect System. And now there's even a third one that you can find on the Internet. And the cost of these initially could be less as you move forward because there would be more competition. And our understanding from FAA was that they were somewhat concerned originally because OCAS was the only system out there, and they were somewhat nervous about acquiring a product that was only produced by one manufacturer at that time. So competition could drop the price of these in the future.
Q. Do you have a sense of magnitude, though? Is it in the millions of dollars?
A. It is our understanding that the cost would be quite variable, depending upon the kind of project and the design of the project, because if it's a relatively condensed one, you may only need one radar. If it was a system that had turbines spread out over different ridges, you have to make sure that you've got 360 degrees. So the number of radar systems that you would need to set up
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is going to vary depending upon the layout of the project.
Q. Okay. But you don't know that now. To your knowledge, has anyone from one of the companies that manufactures this device or devices, has anyone actually visited the site or been given a copy of the plan with the terrain so that they can talk about what the effectiveness of it will be, or at least the size, scale?
A. I don't know whether somebody has been to the site or not.
Q. So it was sufficient for you, for AMC, to say we're fine with this, as long as you agree sometime in the future, when it's available; we will not raise any other objections to the project?
A. That is correct.
Q. On Page 8, Line 10 of your testimony, you mentioned Pitcher Mountain. And you say, "Pitcher Mountain in particular is a regionally significant viewpoint from which additional analyses is necessary."

Are you satisfied with the analysis
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that's been done so far now?
A. Yes, they did take the pictures from there.
Q. And, of course, the nighttime lights only, as Ms. Block said, only apply to nights. So during the daytime, do you believe -- or do you have any comment about whether or not the impact of -- visual impact on Pitcher Mountain will be unreasonably adverse?
A. This technology would not change the daytime impact. That is correct.
Q. So what is your --
A. There is -- in the future, there is the possibility of having these discussions with FAA. The tower coloration could be changed because of the use of this technology. But FAA was not willing to go there at this point.
Q. Do you have any comment about the characterization of the impact to Pitcher Mountain if this project is built, based on the simulations that you looked at?
A. Yes, it would add a second wind farm that would be visible from Pitcher Mountain, because you can see Lempster from there as
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well.
Q. Do you see that cumulative effect as going from -- is it adverse? Is it unreasonably adverse? Is it we don't care? Do you have any way of characterizing that?
A. I would not characterize it that we do not care. AMC has put a lot of time trying to get the State to develop the siting policy, and cumulative impacts is a serious concern and that we do care.
Q. Is it an unreasonably adverse effect if this project were built on Pitcher Mountain?
A. I'm going to probably dance around your question a little bit. But AMC, when we got in this, $I$ think we were pretty clear in our testimony that we have looked at impacts at local levels to local regions of the state, state regional to national, and we are -- as an organization, because of the large area that cover, which is from Washington, DC to Maine, cannot engage in every project.

And in this particular project, we engaged not so much that they were resources that were probably -- at least from where our
organization would come from, were from state to national-level impacts. However, there was a major change in technology here as the towers keep going higher and the addition of the extra turbine capacity that was going with these as well. And we felt that if the technology was going to be going in that direction, it was also essential that the technologies that are evolving to reduce the impacts should also be in play here.

So we did not enter this project trying to make a determination whether there was an unreasonable impact on resources that are local to local, regional, based on the way that we look at projects and resources that we have.
Q. So if this project were engaging a 400-foot tower with blades, as opposed to 495 feet or 492, would you have become involved?
A. Yes, we would, because we felt that it was really time to start requiring this technology to be required. That's the reason why we decided to engage in this project.
Q. In your testimony on -- you state that this
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is the only objection you're raising. But you are not making any statement or diminishing or commenting on anyone else -any of the other intervenors' concerns that they're raising, that they may well have merit. Do you remember saying that? I can find the specific location.
A. Yes, we did. I think we were very clear about that.
Q. If you engaged on more than one issue, would there be -- is there anything else that, after looking through the -- hearing any of the cross-examination, looking at any of the testimony, is there anything that stands out as problematic, even though you did not raise it as an objection or raise it as part of your testimony?
A. I think it's pretty clear, and it's the reasons why AMC engaged in a process that ended up being, in part, the product that you can see on the SEC's web site. But there's numerous issues that come up when a wind farm is developed, if I'm getting to your question. So --
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Q. Yeah, you are. Specific to this one, though. Do you --
A. We did not have the expertise nor the time to look in on issues like wildlife and so forth. But those are pretty common impacts that we're very familiar with. But do I have expertise on that or do we spend time studying those in detail? The answer is no.
Q. There was a specific issue that you had raised -- that AMC had raised as part of a Coos County project, and that was the layout of the roads or the construction of the roads to encourage better stormwater runoff, as I recall. Is that something that you've looked at? Is it considered as part of this project? Or is it something -- let me step back and rephrase that.

Is that something that you would generally recommend for all ridgeline wind energy projects?
A. Generally, yes. But wind projects are changing in nature considerably. I mean, we're in discussions with a developer in Maine right now where they would build a
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project that is not up on real steep slopes. Since you're referring to the Granite Reliable project, they were -- that project was going above 2700 feet. You were getting into subalpine soils, which are quite different, which was the primary reasons that we brought that case forward. This particular project does not have any subalpine soils.
Q. Okay. And then one last couple of questions, and it's specific to the radar-activated lighting. I did a quick check to see how many airports are in range within 50 miles of Antrim. And there are 50 of them, amazingly. But one in particular is very close. It's called the Hawthorne-Feather Airpark Airport.

To your knowledge -- well, are you aware that when the FAA identifies "no presumed hazard," it does not mean that the flying conditions stay the same pre- and post-construction? Are you aware of that?
A. I'm not an expert on all the FAA's fine print. But that would not surprise me, from what I have read.
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Q. So it is possible that pilots that $f l y$ over the ridge today using visual rather than instrumentation may have to change to now use their flight rules -- change the flight rules -- perhaps change their approach to this airport, perhaps change a number of things once these towers are up?
A. I'm not an expert in that.
Q. Then, to your knowledge, you have not -- in your investigations with FAA with regard to this radar-activated lighting, has anyone -has any pilot that you know of within Antrim, or any that use the airports within the vicinity of Antrim, raised concerns regarding whether or not now that area is going to be problematic with or without the radar activated? And to that extent, has FAA suggested, because of the proximity of nearby airports, it may be a problem to use the radar-activated lighting?
A. That is a possibility. I'm not sure that it's a big possibility. But we did not research every airport out there.

We did take into consideration whether
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there's a major commercial airport, such as Manchester, which is a little different. But we also made the assumption that a lot of the flights that are going to go on from these smaller airports would be daytime flights. It's not entirely true, but a lot of these smaller airports are not lit and so forth for nighttime flying.
Q. Okay. But it is -- you don't know, though.

When you spoke with the FAA, they hadn't -- to your knowledge, had they done any analysis with regard to radar-activated lighting in this area in proximity to nearby airports?
A. They have not done it, to our knowledge, at this particular site.
Q. And in your opinion, do you think that that should be something that should come forward to the Committee, to the extent that the Committee may have an obligation to protect the current flying conditions in that area and may want to take public input, if it turns out that the radar-activated lighting actually prohibits or makes it very difficult
for commercial -- or rather, recreational flying in that area?
A. I'm not sure I fully understood the question. So if you could just synthesize it down.
Q. Yes, I will. I'm sorry.

If it turns out, after the -- if the
Committee permits this project conditioned upon -- and also includes as part of it the agreement that you have signed, and the condition that radar-activated lighting be part of the project when available, if it turns out that, when FAA truly does its evaluation and finds that, yes, such activated lighting can be put in place, but there's going to be a changing in the flight rules in this area that may impact recreational pilots flying in the area, would it be reasonable for the Committee to take public input on that and decide whether or not it is better to preserve the flight up -flight patterns that are recreational opportunities today and not have the lighting go in -- radar-activated lighting go in effect?
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A. Well, I think it's always reasonable that the Committee here would take into consideration all societal issues, if I'm --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
A. I said it would be reasonable for the Committee to take into consideration all societal issues, if I'm interpreting your question correctly.
Q. So, but that might come after the fact. If the Committee permits this project and says if/when radar-activated lighting is available, it shall be put in place, when is the opportunity for the public to be heard?
A. I was assuming that that was part of this process.
Q. What was part of this process?
A. Well, this is the public process here. The Application has been modified relative to putting this lighting in, so --
Q. Would you think it was reasonable for the Committee today -- upon approval, that in fact this be left open pending -- that this particular element be left open pending a full evaluation by FAA on whether it would
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have impacts on recreational flights today? Is that reasonable?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
I'd like to go off the record and talk about the schedule for the rest of the week, and then $I$ think we're finished with cross-examination for today.
(Discussion off the record)
MS. BAILEY: Okay. We're back
on the record. So we've taken a short break to discuss the remainder of the witness order. And for tomorrow, Day 7, we're going to finish up with Dr. Kimball. And then
we're going to move on to Ms. Vissering, Mr. Tocci, Mr. James, then Mr. and Mrs. Block, if we have time.

And then do you want to go
through --
MR. IACOPINO: Following
them -- so then, the following -- well, let
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me start off by saying we reserve Friday morning for the panel of witnesses from the Audubon Society of New Hampshire: Carol Foss, Peter Nickerson and Paul Brown. And it's also my understanding that the Blocks will see if Ms. Morse can testify Friday as well.

The order after Mr. and Mrs.
Block testify, which is as far as the Chair went, is the panel of the remaining North Branch intervenors -- Ms. Voelcker, Mr. Cleland and Ms. Law -- followed by -originally it was going to be Susan Morse, but it looks like she's going to be Friday -followed by Jeffrey Jones from the Stoddard Conservation Commission, Peter Beblowski from the Antrim Conservation Commission, then the Edwards and Allen panel, followed by Ms. Pinello and Mr. Levesque from the Antrim Planning Board, followed by Ms. Linowes from Industrial Wind Action, followed by the abutters -- who are Janice Duly Longgood, Mr. Schaefer and Mr. Craig -- followed by Catherine Sullivan. And that will be the
conclusion of all the witnesses. MS. VOELKER: I was just thinking, $I$ don't know whether Annie Law or Mr. Sullivan could do it, but maybe it would be better for our panel to end up Wednesday night, because the Blocks are going to be a much more concentrated thing. And if she wants to go in the morning --

MR. IACOPINO: Are you
suggesting switching with --
MS. VOELKER: The Blocks.
MR. IACOPINO: I think we're going to have to see where we are tomorrow is probably the best way to answer that.

MS. VOELKER: Okay.
MS. BAILEY: So if everybody
can come prepared tomorrow to do cross-examination on Mr . and Mrs. Block and the Voelcker, Cleland, Law panel, that would be good. And we'll play that by ear, depending on the time.

Does anybody have anything
else?
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I just --
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let me add to what you were saying, that I think we all have to be prepared to take anything in any order we get to as we get to the end of this. And if it means swapping out and changing the order, so be it.

I think we're trying to accommodate people's travel schedules. And, you know, some of these are impossible, and we can't accommodate everything. But we've got to keep on and we've got to reach a conclusion.

And so I think, you know, everyone's flexibility will be greatly appreciated. I know that we've already been doing that, and we'll have to keep on being a little bit loose. We're sort of projecting a schedule here. But it may be that we have to swap in and out if we've got a short period of time and a short witness as opposed to a longer one or somebody who's got a last-minute change in their scheduling and can't be here at the time we were expecting. So I think it's sort of an aspirational rather than a set schedule.
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MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
Does anybody have anything
else for today?
(No verbal response)
MS. BAILEY: All right. Well,
I thank everybody. And we're going to start at 8:30 every day this week, and we'll go at least until 6:00.

MR. ROTH: So we'll resume tomorrow with Mr. Kimball?

MS. BAILEY: Yes.
(Whereupon the AFTERNOON SESSION hearing adjourned at 6:00 p.m.)
[WITNESS: KENNETH KIMBALL]
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| 23:17;88: | 101:19;103:1 | 170:16 | 55:22,24 | 142:19;144:2; |
| 17;90:17;91:3,3,11; | 105:24;110:4 | signed (1) | slight (1) | 159:10;186:16,23 |
| 127:11,12;138:8,9; | Services' (1) | 181:9 | 13:23 | sorts (2) |
| 142:20;173:22 | 107:1 | significa | slopes (1) | 67:9;139:3 |
| secondly (1) | session | 135:19;139:10 | 78: | sounded (1) |
| 162:18 | 63:12,23;187:12 | significant (9) | owly (1) | 131:16 |
| SEC's (1) | set (12) | 14:1;43:24;47 | 135: | sounds (3) |
| 176:21 | 12:23;23:18;32: | 72:2;105:16;116:19; | small (8) | 13:4;86:12;131:15 |
| Section | 33:21;40:16,24; | 142:21,22;172:22 | 43:14;50:16;71 | source (3) |
| 6:24;89:6; | 51:11;74:3;99:20 | significantly (1) | 5,9,11;72:6,8 | 66:10,12,15 |
| sections (1) | 118:22;171:24; | 24:12 | smaller (4) | sources (4) |
| 9:24 | 186:24 | silver-haired | 47:24;71:16;180:5, | 59:23;60:87 |
| seeded (1) | sets (2) | 78:20;79:1;84: | \% | 70:7 |
| 96:12 | :21 | simila | socia | southeastern (1) |
| seeing (4) | several (8) | 3:10;77:2;85:23 | - | 30:1 |
| 45:19;55 | P 7 | 99:12;111:9;166:9; | societal (3) | southern |
| 161:10 | 85:4,5;91:9;152 | 170: | 38:6;182:3,7 | 54:23;55:11,14 |
| seeking (1) | 160:16 | similarly | Society (1) | 56:2,11,15,21 |
| 97:18 | sev | 85:24 | 184:3 | southwestern (1) |
| seem (6) | 36:8 | Simpkins (4) | Soil (1) | 29:24 |
| 92:14,16;97:3; | shale (9) | 45:12,13,15;47:8 | 96:11 | spare (1) |
| 99:23;140:16;167:16 | 57:8,12,17, | simple (1) | soils (2) | 132:23 |
| seems (12) | 58:6;62:13;66:20,21, | 159:4 | 178:5,9 | speak (8) |

DAY 6 - AFTERNOON SESSION ONLY - November 27, 2012
SEC 2012-01 ANTRIM WIND ENERGY HEARING ON THE MERITS

| 62:17;64:9,17; | 25:17,22 | step (2) | $17 ; 129: 4,15,21$ | 90:19;91:17,20; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 75:19;102:23;104:8; | stands (1) | 63:13;177:16 | 19.131:6 | 99:23 |
| 112:5;133:13 | 176: | steps (1) | 4;132:4;134:1 | supplement (3) |
| SPEAKER (1) | Stantec (1) | 109:1 | 136:10;138:23; | 7:8;83:21;160:18 |
| 133:15 | 83:24 | still (10) | 139:19;140:17 | supplemental (20) |
| speaking (4) | start (12) | 30:4;43:23;44:15 | 142:10,11;143:5 | 7:3,13,23;8:1,3; |
| 33:5;34:11;108:21; | 10:19;67:13,16 | 47:2;49:1;55:24; | 144:14,15,17;145:5; | 9:18;10:4,14;12:15; |
| 112:10 | 121:4;130:17 | 60:19;126:18; | 160:4;162:17 | 13:6,8;17:21;24:24; |
| special (2) | 136:23;151:24 | 132:14;168:1 | studying (3) | 31:3;75:22;76:5; |
| 79:2;122:16 | 153:17;154:1; | Stoddard (1) | 118:17;131:18 | 80:2;88:10;104:21; |
| species (27) | 175:21;184:1;187 | 84:15 | 77:8 | 129:19 |
| 36:11;78:6,7,16, | started (1) | stones (1) | stuff (2) | supplied (1) |
| $18 ; 79: 2,5,13 ; 84: 4$ | 81:24 | 96:13 | 59:8;119:3 | 160:7 |
| 85:2;90:9;107:23; | starts (3) | stopped (1) | stumbled (1) | supports (3) |
| 108:7;109:3,15; | 32:11;54:20 | 112:11 | 144:3 | 9:22;10:9;114:11 |
| 110:17,23;122:15; | 135:23 | stormwat | subalpine (2) | suppose (2) |
| 125:23;134:5;139:8, | stat (2) | 177:13 | 178:5,9 | 137:19;138:11 |
| 19,21;140:2;143:13, | 19:4;2 | strained | subject (3) | sure (20) |
| 14;145:1 | state (53) | 64:3 | 22:1;64:2;93:12 | 13:13;17:2;20:19; |
| specific (9) | 5:13;12:3;14:5 | strategies (1) | submission (1) | 42:12;61:15;62:7; |
| 24:20;81:19;89:6 | 20:14,21;24:1;25:1; | 126:7 | 77:21 | 63:24;79:17;84:8; |
| 114:19;160:11; | 26:10,16;31:12,24; | stressing (1) | submit (1) | 91:7;93:8;98:2,3,15; |
| 176:7;177:1,9; | 32:8,18;33:3;34:10; | 97:6 | 7:3 | 128:22;152:12; |
| 178:11 | 35:2,16,17;36:20; | strictly (1) | submitted (6) | 161:2;171:22; |
| Specifically (4) | 39:1;77:24;78:7; | 62:4 | 6:19;12:18;85:19 | 179:21;181:3 |
| 16:20;34:12;69:24; | 84:4,14,24;88:3; | strong (1) | 88:7;103:9;132: | Surely (1) |
| 102:4 | 90:16;92:2,5;93:3 | 122:14 | substantial (1) | 63:10 |
| speculate (1) | 94:9;97:15;98:7; | struck (1) | 48:18 | surprise (4) |
| 100:5 | 100:19;101:11,15 | 107:3 | subtle (1) | 140:11;143:20,22; |
| speculation (2) | 121:17;122:17,18 | structure (2) | 90:22 | 178:23 |
| 59:22;60:2 | 124:11;125:24; | 51:4;52 | success (1) | surprised (2) |
| speed (4) | 130:5;139:10;140:2, | structured (1) | 136:2 | 42:2;168:18 |
| 89:18;90:16;91:11 | 10;145:21;156:10; | 111:1 | suffered (1) | surrounding (1) |
| 127:5 | 169:21;174:8,17,18; | structures (1) | 130:2 | 91:24 |
| speeds (7) | 175:1,24 | 51:17 | sufficient | survey (4) |
| 77:2;89:12;99:17; | stated (4) | studied (2) | 93:11;106:2 | $78: 11 ; 122: 4 ; 124: 5 ;$ |
| 126:22;127:4; | 31:12,22;32:7 | 131:20;146 | 172:13 | $139: 17$ |
| 129:14;137:16 | 169:4 | studies (5 | suggest (1) | surveys (7) |
| spend (1) | statement (14) | 75:1,2;78: | 151:12 | 79:11;95:15 |
| 177:7 | 30:9;31:15,20,23 | 91:21;98:12;100: | suggested (3) | 108:14;111:1; |
| spent (1) | 32:8,18,21;33:16; | 102:14;103:7; | 106:6;119:1 | 121:13;131:3;144:1 |
| 134:10 | 35:3;39:6;47:17; | 105:15;108:1 | 179:18 | survival (1) |
| spoke (4) | 78:4;104:19;176:2 | 116:22;117:2,23 | suggesting (8) | 36:10 |
| 75:24;77: | statements (1) | 122:9,11;123:1,23 | 65:19;100:16 | Susan (2) |
| 158:15;180:10 | 105:4 | 124:1,2;125:11,13 | 112:23;127:7;129:5, | 101:24;184:13 |
| spots (1) | states (10) | 15,18,21;126:16; | 7;138:10;185:10 | swap (1) |
| 163:23 | 25:20;33:8;51:24 | 128:1,2;138:18,19 | suggestion (1) | 186:18 |
| spread (1) | 55:17;57:11;95:8,19; | 22,24;139:8;140:7 | 147:14 | swapping (1) |
| 171:21 | 115:10;117:14; | 21;141:1,7,24; | suggestions (2) | 186:4 |
| spreading (1) | 168:17 | 145:16,23;148:4,11, | 107:5,6 | swear (1) |
| 82:9 | states' (1) | 13;149:18;150:1,2,2, | sulfur (1) | 155:22 |
| spring (3) | 105:22 | 9,9,13,18;159:17; | 9:2 | switch (2) |
| 78:11,13;121:12 | stating (1) | 160:10;162:14 | Sullivan (5) | 45:19;46:23 |
| staff (1) | 112:13 | Study (54) | 11:5;80:17;164:7; | switch-around (1) |
| 73:18 | statute (1) | 10:8;42:23;43:5 | 184:24;185:4 | 127:10 |
| stages (1) | 100:20 | 76:23;77:7,17;79:8; | summary (1) | switching (2) |
| 117:19 | stay (2) | 95:21;107:15;108:7; | 84:12 | 42:19;185:10 |
| stand (3) | 65:22;178:20 | 115:14,15;116:15 | summer (2) | sworn (6) |
| 67:13;70:14;120:7 | Stearns (6) | 117:4;118:12,15; | 78:14;96:4 | 5:7,9;73:7,9;156:1, |
| standard (5) | 11:11,12;80:22,23; | 119:9,21;120:15; | sunrise (4) | $3$ |
| 26:20;28:4,6; | 164:9,10 | 122:15;123:10,12,21; | 90:22;91:18,20 | Syndrome (3) |
| 40:24;161:8 | steep (1) | 124:4;125:2;126:13, | 99:23 | 81:18,22;122:21 |
| Standards (2) | 178:1 | 18;127:2,19;128:16, | sunset (4) | synopsis (1) |
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| 45:21 | 111:16 | third (4) | tomorrow (8) | tried (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| synthesize (1) | terminated (1) | 54:19;74:11;97:1; | 153:24;154:7; | 128:23 |
| 181:4 | 147:16 | 171:2 | 155:9,20;183:16; | trigger (2) |
| system (16) | terms (13) | thorough (2) | 185:13,17;187:10 | 165:13;167:24 |
| 9:7;23:8,15;40:21; | 13:20;15:8;37:4; | 79:8;97:7 | tonight (3) | triggered (2) |
| 44:20;51:3,10,21; | 61:16;77:12,13,14; | though (12) | 152:1;154:18,18 | 90:5,7 |
| 53:12;68:8,13,15,17; | 108:10;134:2; | 21:22;52:1;138:13; | tons (5) | trio (1) |
| 171:2,8,21 | 157:12;160:24; | 141:2,3;154:20; | 15:13;32:14,17; | 150:15 |
| Systems (3) | 165:2;170:19 | 167:4,13;171:14; | 33:19,21 | trip (1) |
| 5:15,22;171:24 | terrain (1) | 176:15;177:1;180:9 | took (2) | 63:23 |
|  | 172:8 | thought (8) | 67:19;90 | troublesome (1) |
| T | test (2) | 37:10;63:3;75:18 | tool (1) | 126:17 |
|  | 60:24;96:3 | 76:18;85:22;109:8 | 160:14 | trucks (1) |
| Tab (1) | testified (8) | 142:22;153:15 | top (3) | 29:19 |
| 7:9 | 9:19;57:3;60:10; | thousand (2) | 23:21;24:3,5 | true (10) |
| table (17) | 68:10;74:13;104:9; | 46:7;71:14 | topography (1) | 29:18;99:11; |
| 13:12;14:22;15:18, | 120:1;147:21 | threatened (1) | 121:18 | 100:19;105:14; |
| 18,20,20,20;17:8; | testifies (1) | 78:7 | total (6) | 107:12;108:21,22; |
| 18:3,10,11;19:11; | 10:7 | three (38) | 19:23;21:6;23:8; | 116:21;120:13;180:6 |
| 20:11,13;27:12,23; | testify (6) | 12:17;27:4;36:17; | 36:23;68:16;95:17 | truly (1) |
| 73:21 | 37:22;38:10; | 37:11;72:5;91:21; | towards (2) | 181:12 |
| talk (6) | 152:22;162:19; | 100:10,17;105:19; | 48:2;49:12 | truth (1) |
| $24: 22 ; 58: 24 ; 64: 6$ | 184:6,9 | 107:9;108:20;117:1, | tower (2) | 105:4 |
| $115: 17 ; 172: 8 ; 183: 8$ | testifying (3) | 22;118:17;119:20; | 173:14;175:18 | try (4) |
| talked (3) | 58:4;66:24;101:12 | 120:5,8,10,15; | towers (2) | 35:18;37:16;61:12; |
| 110:19;123:8; | testimonies (1) | 122:11,13;123:2,9; | 175:4;179:7 | 155:20 |
| 165:11 | 73:24 | 125:5,15;126:13; | toxic (1) | trying (10) |
| talking (13) | testimony (82) | 130:19,24;131:4; | 47:5 | 70:12;109:10; |
| $15: 15 ; 27: 9 ; 34: 7$ | 6:20;7:4,14,23;8:1, | 132:3;135:15,19,21, | track (1) | $138: 4 ; 150: 8 ; 153: 14$ |
| 61:15,16;94:16,18; | 3,8,12;9:18;10:3,4,7, | 21;136:12;137:1; | 40:7 | 154:13;163:13; |
| 123:22;127:2; | 13,14;12:15,16;13:6, | 140:5,23 | traction (1) | 174:7;175:11;186:6 |
| 137:14;138:17; | 8;17:9,10,21;24:24; | three-year (6) | 48:22 | turbine (10) |
| 140:22;169:21 | 25:1;31:3,11;33:2; | 32:15;33:20;77:17; | Trade (1) | 77:2;84:16;88:4; |
| talks (4) | 39:7;40:6;53:22; | 94:9;134:15;137:2 | 32:4 | 95:22;96:3,21; |
| 23:18;110:20; | 59:3,11;60:23;61:20; | throughout (4) | traditional (3) | 124:12;139:4;144:6; |
| 168:13,21 | 62:21;65:9;67:11; | 29:4;51:23,24; | 46:15;59:23;91:21 | 175:5 |
| targets (1) | 68:23;72:15;74:5,11, | 82:10 | traffic (1) | turbines (18) |
| 34:11 | 19;75:6,11,21,22; | Tier (3) | 166:21 | 46:9;83:18,18; |
| taught (1) | 76:6,9,17;77:20; | 103:16,21;105:17 | Trail (1) | 87:8,10,21;88:5,19; |
| 6:2 | 80:1;81:16;88:9,10; | times (5) | 159:20 | 89:24;95:16,17,20; |
| tech (2) | 104:7,8,22;105:6; | 38:17;44:12;139:9; | training (1) | 97:3;99:16;127:8,17; |
| 63:12,23 | 111:12;113:9;120:5; | 141:12;168:7 | 111:6 | 150:5;171:21 |
| techniques (2) | 125:17;126:21; | tired (1) | transcript (3) | turbine-swept (1) |
| 74:10,24 | 129:19;131:17; | 119:3 | 100:3;147:23; | 139:2 |
| technologies (4) | 134:4;135:14; | title (3) | 148:3 | turn (4) |
| $44: 9 ; 49: 3 ; 58: 15$ | 147:19;151:2; | 54:14;73:16;159:4 | Transport (2) | $13: 7 ; 26: 4 ; 53: 3 ;$ |
| 175:9 | 156:17,21;157:3,6, | titled (3) | 28:16;54:15 | 168:2 |
| technology (15) | 19;158:14;168:12; | 26:9;28:15;32:3 | travel (1) | turned (4) |
| 57:22;58:20; | 169:4,20;172:19; | TMM (1) | 186:7 | 45:4,5;55:2,3 |
| 139:22;165:15; | 174:16;175:24; | 25:3 | tread (1) | turns (3) |
| 166:2,5;167:5,22; | 176:14,17 | Tocci (1) | 62:20 | 180:23;181:6,12 |
| 169:22;170:3;173:9, | Thanks (2) | 183:19 | tremendous (2) | tweaking (1) |
| 15;175:3,7,22 | 151:16,17 | today (15) | 83:16;136:11 | 141:12 |
| telling (1) | thereafter (1) | 7:18;20:5;68:9; | trend (3) | two (30) |
| 18:21 | 132:1 | 75:12;152:12;153:5; | 20:10;41:23;49:12 | 14:15;23:1,17; |
| temperature (6) | there'd (1) | 154:1;155:2;157:6; | TREVOR (4) | $27: 4 ; 37: 11 ; 65: 21$ |
| 89:11;90:14;91:10; | 68:1 | 179:2;181:22; | 73:6,9,12,17 | 68:5;72:4;74:13,20; |
| 124:8;127:14;137:11 | therefore (6) | 182:21;183:1,11; | triangle (1) | 77:4;87:4;97:10; |
| tend (2) | 27:18,20;28:2; | 187:3 | 28:23 | 107:9;119:21; |
| 48:18;89:15 | 71:16,20,23 | together (1) | tri-color (1) | 126:18;134:6,17; |
| tender (1) | thinking (4) | 107:7 | 84:3 | 135:9,20;136:12,13, |
| 62:19 | 48:4;59:8;148:12; | told (2) | tri-colored (2) | 13;140:7;148:19; |
| terminate (1) | 185:3 | 41:22;151:6 | 78:21;79:1 | 149:9;150:12;152:6; |
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| $\begin{gathered} 160: 3 ; 162: 15 \\ \text { type }(\mathbf{3}) \\ 90: 24 ; 138: 5 ; \\ 161: 17 \\ \text { types }(\mathbf{2}) \\ 69: 14 ; 160: 9 \\ \text { typically }(\mathbf{6}) \\ 22: 23 ; 46: 6 ; 71: 13 ; \\ 121: 16 ; 167: 8,12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 102:2;115:6; } \\ \text { 167:14 } \\ \text { unreasonable }(3) \\ 143: 12 ; 163: 18 ; \\ \text { 175:13 } \\ \text { unreasonably }(3) \\ \text { 173:8;174:3,11 } \\ \text { unsupported (1) } \\ \text { 109:18 } \end{gathered}$ | Usually (4) | Vissering (6) | westerly (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 22:21;87:4;151:7; | 152:1,4;153:17; | 56:20 |
|  |  | 160:13 | 154:9;162:3;183:18 | what's (6) |
|  |  |  | Vissering's (3) | 41:18;50:8;64:20; |
|  |  | V | 161:21;163:8,21 | 65:5;106:10;110:17 |
|  |  |  | visual (18) | Whereas (1) |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Valleau's (2) } \\ & \text { 104:21;105:5 } \\ & \text { value (1) } \end{aligned}$ | 159:2,5,12,17 | 22:21 |
|  |  |  | 160:4,14,18,21; | Whereupon (8) |
|  |  |  | 161:1;162:9,13,17, | 5:1,7;52:15;72:22; |
|  | up (51) | 160:12 | 19;163:11;169:5,6; | 73:6;147:1;155:24; |
| $\mathbf{U}$ | 16:1;17:15;18:17, | Values (1) | 173:7;179:2 | 187:12 |
|  | 17,24;19:2,3;41:2; | 54:17 | Voelcker (2) | wherever (1) |
| ultimate (1) | 42:3,11;43:5;51:11; | variable (1) | 184:11;185:19 | 62:1 |
| 160:15 | 58:22;64:13;66:16, | 171:17 | VOELKER (3) | White (4) |
| ultimately (1) | 16,17;69:17;70:19; | variables (1) | 185:2,11,15 | 5:17;81:17;84:19; |
| 49:15 | 79:20;82:1;84:9; | 48:20 | Volume (2) | 122:20 |
| unclear (1) | 87:3;88:5,19;89:19; | variation (3) | 6:23;53:5 | whole (5) |
| 91:16 | 99:2;109:23;118:22; | 108:9;136:1,4 | voluntary (2) | 9:6;60:21;61:1; |
| undefined (1) | 121:13;124:12; | variations (1) | 102:9,17 | 64:11;82:10 |
| 150:10 | 127:12;135:4;140:3; | 136:6 | volunteer (1) | who's (2) |
| under (25) | 148:19;150:14; | varies (1) | $96: 7$ | 97:18;186:20 |
| 7:18;15:24;17:13; | 152:16;160:7;162:9; | 165:15 |  | wide (1) |
| 31:14;32:1;34:19; | 165:17,18;168:4; | various (2) | W | 42:18 |
| 58:17;86:15;87:7; | 169:19;171:24; | 138:24;162:1 |  | widespread (1) |
| 89:6,12;90:17;91:9; | 176:20,22;178:1; | vary (3) | wait (5) | 82:3 |
| 95:6;100:15;105:14; | 179:7;181:20; | 76:23;77:15;172: | 30:11;116:4,7; | Wildlife (28) |
| 111:4;115:7,11; | 183:17;185:5 | vehicles (1) | 120:24,24 | 79:19;92:12;94:2; |
| 124:6,7,127:13; | Update (1) | 48:21 | waiting (2) | 99:13;101:19; |
| 133:7;137:17;142:17 | 25:13 | verbal (12) | 62:8,24 | 102:21;103:6,15; |
| understands (1) | updated (5) | 11:2,4,6,8,10,15 | wants (5) | 104:6;105:15,24; |
| $109: 12$ | 14:7;40:9;65:2,1 | 80:14,16,18,21; | 58:24;64:6;97:15; | 106:24;108:24; |
| understood (3) | 103:13 | 164:8;187:4 | 121:3;185:8 | 110:4;117:16;118:1, |
| 111:22;166:16; | updates (1) | Vermont (20) | Washington (1) | 7;126:9;127:24; |
| 181:3 | 7:12 | 5:17;26:19;27:3; | 174:20 | 131:8;132:19; |
| undeveloped (1) | upon (8) | 29:5;53:13;77:24; | water (11) | 141:11,18;142:13; |
| 35:6 | 36:12;57:21;75:10; | 85:16;88:3;90:10; | 6:13,15;9:5,6;43:2; | 148:8;150:16; |
| undoubtedly (1) | 113:4;171:17;172:1; | 92:7;94:24;97:15; | 44:22;45:3,7;47:4; | 163:17;177:4 |
| 34:14 | 181:8;182:21 | 99:12;110:17;128:1; | 168:10,15 | Wildlife's (1) |
| unexpected (1) | upshot (1) | 145:11,21;148:23; | way (20) | 106:4 |
| 48:9 | 100:2 | 149:7,9 | 21:23;23:5;35:9; | Willard (6) |
| unfair (4) | upstate (1) | version (1) | 42:22;50:13,21; | 82:13,14;163:16; |
| 59:9;61:5;104:12; | 29:5 | 166:13 | 51:10,16;57:13;60:2, | 168:13,18,22 |
| 114:3 | up-to-date (1) | versus (8) | 20;75:13;118:22; | willing (1) |
| unindustrialized (1) | 43:5 | 17:18;18:8;22:13; | 123:4;124:9;131:9; | 173:16 |
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