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PROCEEDINGS
MS. BAILEY: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being here again this morning. I know it was a very short break, and hopefully it will pay off and we'll get through a lot today. My name is Kate Bailey. I work for the Public Utilities Commission, and the Chair has asked me to proceed today with the hearing. This is the eighth day of hearings in Antrim Wind Energy's Application for Certificate of Site and Facility. We will start by introductions of Committee members. And I note there are a few Committee members not present today, but they will be reading the transcript.

MS. LYONS: I'm Johanna Lyons.
I'm with the Department of Resources and Economic Development.

DIR. SIMPKINS: Brad Simpkins,
Department of Resources and Economic Development.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Amy
Ignatius, Public Utilities Commission.
MR. DUPEE: Brook Dupee, here
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on behalf of the Department of Health and Human Services.

DR. BOISVERT: Richard
Boisvert, New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources.

MS. BAILEY: And with us at the Committee table is our counsel, Mike Iacopino. Let's start by taking appearances.

MS. GEIGER: Yes. Good
morning. Susan Geiger, Douglas Patch and Rachel Goldwasser from Orr \& Reno, on behalf of the Applicant, Antrim Wind, LLC.

MS. BAILEY: Good morning.
MR. STEARNS: Good morning. I'm Galen Stearns, Town of Antrim. With me today is Mike Genest and John Robertson, selectmen.

MS. BAILEY: Good morning.
MR. CLELAND: I'm Robert Cleland, North Branch/Farmstead Road. I'm an intervenor representing myself.

MS. BAILEY: Good morning.
MS. LAW: Annie Law, North
Branch/Farmstead intervenor, representing
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myself.
MS. VOELCKER: Elsa Voelcker, North Branch intervenor, representing myself.

MS. PINELLO: Good morning, I'm Martha Pinello. And here with me is Charles Levesque.

MS. BAILEY: Good morning.
MS. MANZELLI: Amy Manzelli,
from BCM Environmental \& Land Law, here representing the intervenor, New Hampshire Audubon. And from New Hampshire Audubon, Francie Von Mertens is with me. Thank you.

MS. ALLEN: Mary Allen for the Allen/Edwards intervenors.

MR. BLOCK: Richard Block from the North Branch intervenors. And with me today is my wife, Loranne Carey Block.

MR. ROTH: Peter Roth, Counsel for the Public.

MS. BAILEY: Good morning. Do we have any preliminary matters to take up?

MS. GEIGER: The only
preliminary, Madam Presiding Officer, would be the fact that, in response to a question
\{SEC 2012-01\} \{DAY 8 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{11-29-12\}
posed by Chairman Ignatius at the first round of hearings back in October or November 1st area, the Applicant was asked to produce a map showing, within the state of New Hampshire, the ranking of wildlife habitat by ecological condition. And we've submitted that this morning and marked it as AWE 44, and we've distributed a copy to the parties. MS. BAILEY: Thank you.

MR. ROTH: Susan, can you --
there appears to be a New Hampshire Fish \& Game Department logo on here. Can you confirm that this is in fact the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department document, or is this something the Applicant put together?

MS. GEIGER: I'll let Attorney Goldwasser speak to that because she found it and reproduced it for us today.

MS. GOLDWASSER: The document
Came directly from the New Hampshire Fish and Game web site. I've not made any changes to it, other than having it printed in color, in the form that you see, and will provide an
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|  | 8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | electronic copy of that document to Mr. |
| 2 | Iacopino during the break. |
| 3 | MR. ROTH: Thank you. That's |
| 4 | all I wanted. |
| 5 | MR. IACOPINO: If I |
| 6 | understand, this is the full document of one |
| 7 | of the prior exhibits that you had blown up a |
| 8 | portion of; is that correct? |
| 9 | MS. GOLDWASSER: That is |
| 10 | correct. That shows all of the priority |
| 11 | wildlife areas that have been indicated by |
| 12 | the State. |
| 13 | MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. |
| 14 | MS. BAILEY: Okay. This |
| 15 | morning we're going to start with the North |
| 16 | Branch Intervenor Panel of Ms. Voelcker, |
| 17 | Ms. Law and Mr. Cleland. Would you like to |
| 18 | come up to the witness table, please. And |
| 19 | just so you guys know -- you can sit down -- |
| 20 | but you really have to use the microphone so |
| 21 | the reporter can hear you. So please pass he |
| 22 | mic around. |
| 23 | MS. MANZELLI: Madam Chair, I |
| 24 | wonder, if we're going to have multiple |
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[WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]
panelists up, if we might pause to add a microphone to the table to save time?

MS. BAILEY: I think we can
take some off the middle table.
(Pause in proceedings)
MS. BAILEY: It has to be near your mouth, so pull the mic near you.
(WHEREUPON, ELSA VOELCKER, ROBERT CLELAND AND ANNIE LAW were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

ELSA VOELCKER, SWORN
ROBERT CLELAND, SWORN
ANNIE LAW, SWORN

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Good morning.
A. (Witness Panel) Good morning.
Q. I'm going to ask you each to identify yourself, please.
A. (Law) Annie Law, North Branch Farmstead.
A. (Cleland) Robert Cleland, North Branch Farmstead.
Q. You might need to turn that mic on.
A. (Voelcker) Elsa Voelcker, 97 Old Pound Road,
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[WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]
a look at the document marked as NB 6. Is that your joint prefiled testimony?
A. (Law) Yes.
A. (Cleland) Yes, it is.
Q. And if you were asked the same questions contained in that document today as you were on July 31st, would you give the same answers today?
A. (Law) Yes.
A. (Cleland) Yes.
Q. Now let me back up to Ms. Voelcker.

Ms. Voelcker, since the time that you filed your prefiled testimony, there's been supplemental testimony filed by other parties. Do you have any new testimony in rebuttal to any specific testimony given by any other party to offer here this morning?
A. (Voelcker) In rebuttal, no.
Q. I'll get to your exhibit in a minute.

Okay. You did, I believe yesterday, file with the Committee, with the assent of the other parties, an exhibit; is that correct?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
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## [WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]

Q. And I'm going to show you what has been marked as NB 56. Is that the exhibit that you asked to file with the Committee?
A. (Voelcker) Yes, it is.
Q. And is there anything that you wanted to say about that exhibit before we move on to ask Ms. Law and Mr. Cleland if they have any rebuttal?
A. (Voelcker) I just felt it -- my exhibit proves that there are new technologies which are going to supersede wind energy, and certainly covering our ridgelines doesn't make sense.
Q. Okay. Mr. Cleland and Ms. Law, I'm going to ask you the same question I asked Ms. Voelcker. There's been subsequent supplemental testimony filed by other parties. Did you have any testimony specifically in response to any of those filings?
A. (Law) It is my understanding that a statement that Bob made in his testimony about a conversation he had with Jack Kenworthy was denied by Jack Kenworthy -- and that's
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totally wrong -- about what he had said about the property values in the event that this wind farm did go through, that our property values would take a hit. And he denied that, and that's totally wrong.
Q. As far as the substantive issue of whether or not the property values go up or down, did you have anything to add in rebuttal -- in other words, in response to what other parties have offered?
A. (Law) No.
Q. Okay.

MR. IACOPINO: At this point, the Panel is available for cross-examination.

MS. BAILEY: Thank you. Mr.
Froling is not here this morning. Mr.
Beblowski, Mr. Jones, Ms. Sullivan.
Ms. Longgood, do you have any
questions?
MS. BLOCK: I think she will,
but I can't -- I mean, can I ask them for her?

MS. BAILEY: Yeah. This
isn't -- yes, you may.
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MS. BLOCK: I'm sorry. They're part of my --

MS. BAILEY: Does anybody have -- does anybody object if she asks -- if Mrs. Block asks Ms. Longgood's questions?

MS. GOLDWASSER: Is she going to do it as part of her cross-examination?

MS. BAILEY: Well, this is the North Branch witnesses.

MS. GOLDWASSER: I think our only objection would be if Ms. Block asks Ms. Longgood's questions, and then Ms. Longgood comes in and asks more questions, that would probably be a problem.

MS. BAILEY: Why don't we wait until everybody else is finished, and if Ms. Longgood IS not here, then --

MS. BLOCK: Fine. Thank you.
MS. BAILEY: Mr. Stearns.
MR. STEARNS: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Pinello.
MS. PINELLO: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Manzelli.
MS. MANZELLI: No questions.
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Thank you.

> MS. BAILEY: Ms. Allen.
> MS. ALLEN: I do have one. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. ALLEN:
Q. This is directed to Ms. Law and Mr. Cleland.

On Page 2 of your testimony, you talk about the habitat -- at the bottom of that page and onto Page 3, you talk about your worries about the local habitat and the natural habitat having an impact. Can you more fully explain what your concerns are?
A. (Law) Yes. Since we've lived there, since we built our home there 24 years ago, we have been seeing, almost daily, sightings of not only birds, but wildlife. And we really don't want to lose that. We live there for that reason, because we are among nature. We are -- we value that more than anything, to be in a peaceful environment with wildlife and birds, owls, hawks, what have you. And we fear that if this wind farm is constructed, that we're going to lose that because the habitat will be destroyed. And
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we're very concerned about our environment, and especially our close environment, since it is the Rural Conservation District. And we value living there because of that, the Rural Conservation District being in place. And we feel that it will be destroyed in the event that the mountain tops will be blasted and destroy the habitat for these animals and birds, and we don't want to see that happen.
Q. Thank you. No further questions.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Kimball? Ms.
Linowes? Ms. Geiger or --
MR. ROTH: Don't I get to ask any questions?

MS. BAILEY: Well, you were supposed to be first. Go ahead, Mr. Roth. I'm sorry.

MR. ROTH: I don't mind not being first. I just don't want to be skipped altogether.

MS. BAILEY: Proceed, please. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Ms. Voelcker, good morning.
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A. (Voelcker) Good morning.
Q. I note from your testimony that you are a photographer.
A. (Voelcker) Yes, I am.
Q. And do you sell your images?
A. (Voelcker) I sell nature cards all over the state. Well, the bottom part of the state. Concord. If you go to Gibson's Bookstores in Concord, they carry my cards. All the Toadstool Bookstores.
Q. And how many -- if I were to go into

Gibson's, how many of your images would I see?
A. (Voelcker) Oh, probably 15 different cards.
Q. Okay. Do you include in your work any man-made objects?
A. (Voelcker) No. They're all taken on my walks in the morning.
Q. Okay. So, no stone walls or barns or anything like that?
A. (Voelcker) Oh, yeah, stone walls and barns.

You know, picturesque-type things and flowers.
Q. Have you seen, $I$ guess, in the -- generally
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in the photographic genre, images of wind turbines?
A. (Voelcker) Actually, I teach with somebody who paints pictures of wind turbines.
Q. But you haven't seen photographs of them?
A. (Voelcker) No, I haven't taken any. I've been over to see Lempster lots of times.
Q. Do you think that there might be a market for photographs of wind turbines?
A. (Voelcker) Very limited.
Q. Okay. So you wouldn't think about adding that to your work.
A. (Voelcker) No.

And I would point out, that map that was handed out this morning, there are not very many nice red spaces in the lower part of New Hampshire, like our little area in Antrim. It's a wildlife refuge. You know, five different towns, 40,000 acres have been put into conservation. And they're going to put this wind tower right across, like a fence, splitting it in two.
Q. I want to ask you about, in your testimony you indicate that you understand that you'll
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be experiencing 35 decibels where your house is located.
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. Where did you get that information?
A. (Voelcker) The map provided by Eolian or Antrim Wind, that says, you know, here it'll be 45, here it'll be 35 , here it'll be 30 , on the average.
Q. So, have you read Mr. O'Neal's report?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. And do you not find it persuasive?
A. (Voelcker) No. I was over in Lempster one day with low cloud cover, and I heard the windmills there. They sound like a jet plane that doesn't go away.
Q. How far away from them were you?
A. (Voelcker) $I$ was on 31 , right past Pillsbury Park. I think probably about what I'm going to be. A mile and a half, two miles maybe.
Q. And you're certain those were wind turbines and not some farm appliance or tractor or something?
A. (Voelcker) Yes. I'm in the middle of nowhere there.
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Q. Okay. Now, I'm looking at the first supplemental prefiled testimony of Greg Tocci, dated October 11, 2012. Are you familiar with his report?
A. (Voelker) I was here when he was speaking.
Q. Okay. Now, do you recall that he listed out -- and I believe also -- well, he listed out five locations where the Applicant's expert did some sound analysis, and then Mr . Tocci went out to Gregg Lake and Willard Pond. Do you remember that?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. Now, of these seven locations, which one of them is at or near your home?
A. (Voelcker) Well, probably Gregg Lake would be the closest.
Q. So the Gregg -- so your home is closest to Gregg Lake, not any of these others, like Salmon Brook Road or Loveren Mill Road?
A. (Voelcker) Well, I'm four miles from Loveren Mill. I think I'm only a mile from Gregg Lake.
Q. Okay. So the Location 5, Gregg Lake Road, is more like your location?
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A. (Voelcker) Yeah.
Q. How far from the beach are you?
A. (Voelcker) About a mile.
Q. And is --
A. (Voelcker) No. Probably more than that. It's five minutes for me to drive over to Gregg Lake.
Q. Okay. And which direction from the project is that?
A. (Voelcker) North.
Q. So you're --
A. (Voelcker) I think. No. South. It's south of where I live.

MR. ROTH: Susan, is there a board with a project map so that we can point out her house?

MS. GEIGER: There should be one behind. The other reference -- yeah, that's a good one.

MR. ROTH: This is the sound one?
(Mr. Roth displays map.)
A. (Voelcker) This is Old Pound Road. This is Old Carr Road. This is my house right here.
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## [WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]

Q. And could you point out where Gregg Lake is and the beach on Gregg Lake?
A. (Voelcker) So, go down here... this is Gregg Lake here.
Q. Okay. I understand.

Now, they have -- I believe both sound experts have concluded -- and I... now, I've showed you Page 20 of Mr. Tocci's report.
A. (Voelcker) Yeah. Yes.
Q. And it says "Gregg Lake." The baseline was 40 decibels, and then he did an insect-removal adjustment. So it came up with an adjusted baseline, insects removed, of 15 .
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. And then the predicted sound level is 30; correct?
A. (Voelcker) Correct.
Q. And the impact is 15 decibels above the 30 -or above the 15. Sorry.

Now, what this says here, what Mr. Tocci says, is that 25 percent of residents annoyed, 18 percent chance of very annoyed. Do you remember his testimony to that effect?
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A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. And do you remember what he said about it being self-reporting and kind of self-defined? Did you understand his testimony that way?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. Do you think that if you experienced this kind of sound level from the project at your residence, do you think you're going to be among the residents annoyed, very annoyed or simply not responding, or not annoyed?
A. Very annoyed and very -MS. GOLDWASSER: I'm going to
object to that question. I mean, it's a hypothetical question. This witness is not an expert in sound, in the sound issues. And she's hypothesizing based on someone else's report of what she might think. And she's projecting that, which is sort of without any basis at all, any foundation in her expertise in that, or anything like that, and especially based on the number of questions raised about that report in testimony yesterday.
\{SEC 2012-01\} \{DAY 8 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{11-29-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]

MR. ROTH: I don't think it requires any expertise at all to describe whether you're going to be annoyed or very annoyed and what that means to you. That's all I'm trying to do.

MS. GOLDWASSER: She doesn't have any expertise in what 30 dBA is going to be like for her. I mean, she can't possibly answer that question, except based on the theoretical implication, you know, the idea of what 30 dBA is.

MR. ROTH: That's not the question. The question is -- the question would be, if $I$ could ask it of her, "What does 'annoyed' or 'very annoyed' mean to you?"
(Discussion among Subcommittee members off the record.)

MS. BAILEY: I think you're asking her what her opinion of "annoyed" is, as the sound expert has defined it. And I think it's appropriate for you to ask her if she's going to be annoyed, and I think we all know the answer. But --
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MR. ROTH: Which she's already answered it. She said she's going to be very annoyed. And now I want to ask her what that means to her.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. What that means to her, but not what that means in terms of your witness's, Mr. Tocci's, definition of "annoyed" in that sound report. And if we continue with these questions, we will give it the weight it deserves.

MR. ROTH: Okay. So, just so
I'm -- I think, to make clear, I think Mr. Tocci's testimony was that these are self-identified "annoyed," "very annoyed," whatever that means to the person. I think he testified yesterday that, you know, the definition, if there is one, and I think he was not clear that there really was a definition, came from the Pedersen report from the Netherlands.

MS. BAILEY: Yes, but he also --

MR. ROTH: I think what he said was that there really was no definition
[WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]
for it.
MS. BAILEY: All right.
Overruled. Let's go.
MR. ROTH: I'm sorry?
MS. BAILEY: Overruled.
MR. ROTH: What's -- the
objection's overruled. Thank you.
MS. BAILEY: You can ask Ms.
Voelcker's understanding of "annoyed."
MR. ROTH: Thank you.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Ms. Voelcker, how would you personally
describe what it means to you to be "annoyed"
or "very annoyed"?
A. (Voelcker) Well, I would say that the heating system in this room is annoying.
Q. Well, $I$ would agree with you, because most of the time I'm freezing.
A. (Voelcker) The sound level of the air flow into this room is annoying. The sound of a jet flying over my house $I$ would find very annoying.
Q. Would a neighbor's dog barking be annoying?
A. (Voelcker) Yes, it is annoying. I call the
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neighbor and I say, "Would you let your dog in?"
Q. When you are very annoyed, what does that do to your experience of life?
A. (Voelcker) Oh, it makes life not so happy. You know, your adrenaline starts rushing. And if there's nothing you can do about it, it becomes a really self-destructive thing.
Q. Do you find it difficult to concentrate?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. Does it make you feel angry?
A. (Voelcker) I think it would. I've lived in my house almost 30 years. I moved there for the quiet. I could have lived on 202 and/or right in Antrim and never had ice storms, you know, disrupting my life, and life would have been easy. But that isn't where I chose to live. I live where I live because it's so beautiful and quiet. It's very quiet. I seldom hear noise from Route 9, even when I'm outside.
Q. What did you mean when you said "It's a very self-destructive thing"? What does that mean to you?
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A. (Voelcker) Well, having your adrenaline up all the time is not a good thing for your body to be going through. I'm worried that this wind tower will make me dizzy. I've read reports online that some people are affected by it. I talked -- spoke to my physician about it. And he said, "Well, if I were you, I'd move." He said he'd heard that down in Falmouth, that the wind towers -- the turbines changed the pressure and that some people feel like you need to clear your ears all the time, but you can't, because you can't. And I've had ear infections my whole life. I'm allergic to milk.
Q. Do you have -- is your home insulated?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. Do you have new windows, double, you know, thermal pane windows?
A. (Voelcker) No, not all of them.
Q. Do you --
A. (Voelcker) But I do weather stripping, and I use plastic on the inside.
Q. Do you have air conditioning?
A. (Voelcker) No.
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Q. Okay. Are you aware that the prevailing wind direction with respect to this project -- do you know what the prevailing wind direction is for the project?
A. (Voelcker) We get nor'easters. But a lot of times it's westerly.
Q. Meaning that it's blowing over the ridge towards your home? I never understand westerly, northerly. Does it mean the wind's coming from that direction or it's going towards it? I'm trying to understand --
A. (Voelcker) I don't really know. I'm not a weather person.
Q. Would you -- do you think it makes sense that the project is oriented up and down the ridge the way it is to take advantage of a wind blowing generally out of the northeast?

MS. GOLDWASSER: She's
testified that she doesn't know --
A. (Voelcker) I don't know.

MS. BAILEY: She just repeated
that answer. She doesn't know.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Okay. Are you aware that the project's
\{SEC 2012-01\} \{DAY 8 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{11-29-12\}

## [WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]


\{SEC 2012-01\} \{DAY 8 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{11-29-12\}

## [WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]

they live roughly the same distance I live from Lempster. And Lempster is shorter, and it's not -- they're talking about putting in the noisiest turbines.
Q. Now, you've -- were you here for Mr. O'Neal's testimony?
A. (Voelcker) Yesterday.
Q. No, a few weeks ago.
A. (Voelcker) I don't -- I think so.
Q. All right. Well, let me ask you this then: Are you familiar with the proposed condition that the Applicant wants, which is to set the limit at 55 decibels and, $I$ guess, what, 45 at night?

MR. ROTH: Am I getting that correct, 55 and 45?

MS. GOLDWASSER: It's 50 and 45.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Fifty and 45. So you're familiar with that condition they're proposing?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with what Mr. Tocci has proposed?
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A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. As between the two of them, which do you think would be -- would better serve you?
A. (Voelcker) I think the lower would serve me better.
Q. Okay. Now, I notice in your testimony that you say that the project will deprive Antrim of any other project development within earshot of the giant, noisy turbines. What do you mean by "any other development"?
A. (Voelcker) Well, I worked with the planning board, $I$ don't know 15, 20 years ago, on a strategic plan. And I was trying to get them to get more tourism in and, you know, develop Antrim as a place to come in the summer and enjoy Gregg Lake. And I don't think that that's going to happen once the wind towers are in.
Q. Okay. So tourism development is what you had in mind?
A. (Voelcker) yeah.
Q. So if somebody wanted to bring in a mail-order business or light manufacturing or something like that, do you think that that
would be prohibited by --
A. (Voelcker) Probably not.
Q. Okay. Last question. You say that installation of the wind turbines, with no form of restitution --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
Q. "Hundreds of houses will be directly affected by the installation of the wind turbines, with no form of restitution for their ruined homesteads." That was in your testimony?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. Do you believe that the granting of a permit by this board will essentially grant a license to commit a nuisance?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.

MS. GOLDWASSER: I'm sorry.
I'm going to object to the word "nuisance," to the extent it connotes a legal meaning. I don't have a problem with the witness providing a response, so long as it's clear that it's based on her understanding of the word "nuisance" and not any sort of legal definition.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Roth.
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MR. ROTH: Well, I'm not sure what, you know, what the objection is. I think it's a proper question.

MS. BAILEY: She's not an attorney. So are you asking her a legal question?

MR. ROTH: I asked her if she thought it was a license to commit a nuisance, and she can answer --

MS. BAILEY: What do you mean by "nuisance"?

MR. ROTH: What do I -- I'm trying to find out what she thinks of it.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. As long as it's clear that she is not giving a legal interpretation of "nuisance," we'll allow the question.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Do you know what a "nuisance" is?

MS. GOLDWASSER: Again, I'm going to restate my -- I mean, what a "nuisance" is, is different from, "From your perspective, will it create a nuisance?" What a "nuisance" is, is using a noun as if
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it's a legal term of art. Thank you. MS. BAILEY: Okay. Ms.

Voelcker, I'm asking you not to answer the question with any legal interpretation, just your understanding as a layperson of what a "nuisance" is.
A. (Voelcker) Okay. I would find looking at those wind towers and listening to them from any part of Gregg Lake and from where I live and from across the road a nuisance, yes, especially if it's going to give you 30 hours of flicker effect in a year.
Q. Okay. Now, based on your experience as a citizen of the state of New Hampshire for many years, do you think that if a person suffers some harm to their property because of the activities of their neighbors, they have a right to sue to stop that?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.

MS. GOLDWASSER: I'm going to object again for the same reason --

MR. ROTH: It's not a legal
question. That's asking a citizen of the state of New Hampshire, does she think that
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|  |  | 36 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | she has a right to sue a neighbor for |  |
|  | stopping a behavior of their neighbor. |  |
|  | MS. BAILEY: How's that's |  |
|  | relevant? |  |
|  | MR. ROTH: I'm getting to |  |
|  | that. It's relevant because, if she thinks |  |
|  | that this project is going to harm her |  |
|  | property, does she think she has a right to |  |
|  | sue the project. |  |
| 10 | MS. BAILEY: And that's -- |  |
| 11 | MR. IACOPINO: It's not |  |
| 12 | relevant. How will the answer to that |  |
| 13 | question be relevant to this proceeding? |  |
| 14 | MR. ROTH: She said in her |  |
| 15 | testimony that the installation of wind |  |
| 16 | turbines will provide no form of restitution |  |
| 17 | for neighbors with -- or for people with |  |
| 18 | ruined homesteads. I think it's in the -- |  |
| 19 | it's in her testimony. I have a right to |  |
| 20 | cross-examine her about it. |  |
| 21 | MS. BAILEY: But if she -- |  |
| 22 | what we're asking you is, how does that |  |
| 23 | inform our decision on this project, whether |  |
|  |  |  |

[WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]

MR. ROTH: Well, if she has a right -- if she has a right to sue, then people like her do have a form of restitution for their ruined homesteads. And if she doesn't, then that's something you should consider, whether people like Ms. Voelcker and other similarly situated are deprived of their rights to make a claim against the project if they feel like, in legal terms, a "nuisance" has been effected against them.

MR. IACOPINO: Right. And do you believe that this witness has the qualifications to make that determination, whether a cause action for nuisance from --

MR. ROTH: No.
(Court Reporter interjects.)
MR. IACOPINO: I guess that goes to the issue of relevance and her qualifications to answer the question, doesn't it?

MR. ROTH: I disagree. I think if -- she has testified, so I think it's relevant. It's in her testimony. She has testified that a hundred houses will be
\{SEC 2012-01\} \{DAY 8 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{11-29-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]
directly affected, with no form of restitution. You know, if it's irrelevant, then it shouldn't be in here at all. But it is in here, so $I$ have a right to cross-examine her. I think as a citizen and as a homeowner in a community, and one with considerable experience in this state, she has an understanding that, if a neighbor does something that annoys you or creates a nuisance, you have a right to sue them to make them stop that. Now I'm trying to find out what it is she thinks that means and whether she thinks that she's going to be deprived of that right by an order permitting the project.

MS. BAILEY: Ms. Goldwasser.
MS. GOLDWASSER: Mr. Roth just indicated to the witness what he thinks the answer should be. I agree with the questions from the Committee regarding the relevance of the line of testimony. There is a difference between Ms. Voelcker indicating that she believes there's going to be a harm to people and Mr. Iacopino -- excuse me -- Mr. Roth
[WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]
questioning regarding what the legal recourse would be, or should be.
(Discussion among Subcommittee Members off the record.)

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Let me
take a stab at this. I think we're trying to hear, genuinely, Ms. Voelcker's point of view. And all of this squabbling going on, which is what it is, is getting us away from being able to hear your point of view. So we're happy to have questions that elicit her point of view about what she feels about her community and the impacts of the wind farm. We are not going to hear her point of view about the law, because you're not here as a lawyer. That's not what your testimony was. You're not pretending you are, and so you shouldn't be put in that box. So let's continue with
questions about Ms. Voelcker's understanding as a community member and a neighbor, how she feels any recourse might be. It's her point of view. It's not an analysis of the law. It's not what is going to hold up in court.

That's not the point of the questioning. And anything you can do to help make that clear in your questioning, Mr. Roth, we'd appreciate. We need to keep this going, and we want to hear from community members about their point of view.

MR. ROTH: Thank you.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Ms. Voelcker, I'm going to try to ask the question in the spirit that was just expressed by Chairman Ignatius, and that is: Again, as a citizen of the town of Antrim and of the state of New Hampshire for many years, do you believe that the licensing of this project by this process will deprive you of rights to -- the ability to assert your rights, whatever they may be, against a neighbor that causes harm to your property?
A. (Voelcker) If a neighbor causes harm to my property, I go talk to my neighbor. When we moved in, our neighbor came right over and said, "This is where the property line is. You cut a tree on my property, it's \$100 a tree. Welcome to New Hampshire."
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[Laughter]
A. (Voelcker) And I've always believed in talking to people first. I don't call the police first when $I$ have a problem. I talk to my neighbors. I call them. I thought the ice storm was great because it got everybody out talking to each other. Suddenly, people knew who each other were.

The problem is, once the wind towers are in, I said to the Carricks, "Why don't you complain?"

He said, "Who am I going to sue?
Spain?"
People know that once you try to sue somebody, you're talking thousands of dollars that people don't have. And once the SEC says, fine, go up there, people are going to feel unempowered.

I know my neighbor down the street, who's been very sick and has a house that now is completely clean so that she can live there, is talking about suing Antrim, because Antrim is supposed to be protecting its people, and instead they're letting this
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thing happen. And if it ends up making me dizzy and I can't sell my house and I can't live there, $I$ will think about suing Antrim, because it's more available. It's right there. And it says they are supposed to be protecting us, not letting somebody come in and roll right over us.
Q. In respect to your answer just a moment ago, you said you had talked to your neighbor. Do you think that if you were experiencing sound levels in your house and in your property that were either annoying or very annoying to you, do you think that you could call Mr.

Kenworthy and talk to him?
A. (Voelcker) No.
Q. Why not?
A. (Voelcker) I don't know his number. I guess if I had his number, I'd call him for sure.
Q. He'd probably give it to you right now.
A. (Voelcker) I would call him every day that I was awakened in the middle of the night. I'd call him in the middle of the night.

I'm the kind of person that when I see
something $I$ can fix, $I$ get up and Ifix it.
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I don't look for somebody else to do it.
Q. So it --
A. (Voelcker) And so I am proactive and I will try to find out what my rights are and I will try to act on them.
Q. So why wouldn't you call Mr. Kenworthy and say, "Mr. Kenworthy, this is annoying or very annoying to me. Is there something you can do about it?"
A. (Voelcker) Well, because right now they're not up there yet.
Q. Right. But assuming it gets put up and --
A. (Voelcker) Mr. Kenworthy will sell this within a year of having it working --
Q. Okay.
A. (Voelcker) -- and so he will no longer give a darn.
Q. Let's assume that he does that. There will be somebody else; right?
A. (Voelcker) Right.
Q. Were you here when Mr. Segura-Coto was testifying?
A. (Voelcker) I don't remember.
Q. Are you aware that the project plan is to
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project, said, "Okay, we'll get you these things," would you find that an acceptable solution?
A. (Voelcker) No, because I spend a good 30 percent of my days outside. I have gorgeous gardens. I spend a lot of time gardening when I'm home in the summer, when $I$ don't have to teach.
Q. Okay. Thank you. That's all I have for you.
A. (Voelker) Thank you.
Q. All right. Now, I don't -- as between Ms. Law and Mr. Cleland, I guess either one of you can answer these questions as you choose.

I note that in your testimony you say you camped several times at Pillsbury State Park, close to Lempster, and could not sleep due to the whooshing sounds of the blades. Is that correct?
A. (Law) That's correct.
Q. When you were camping at Pillsbury, was the area around you otherwise still, as in no wind blowing?
A. (Law) Yeah.
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Q. Okay. And can you -- and this is sort of like a "Car Talk" moment. Are you familiar with "Car Talk"?
A. (Law) No.
Q. The radio show where people call in and describe the problems with their automobiles?
A. (Cleland) Yes, I am.
A. (Law) He listens to that. I don't.
Q. On Car Talk, they ask the person to describe what the noise that their car is making sounds like. So I'm going to ask you to attempt to make the sound that you heard of the wind turbines at Lempster, if you don't mind. I don't want to put you in an embarrassing situation. But is it possible for you to do that?
A. (Law) Yeah. I was trying to sleep, and I could hear, "phroom, phroom, phroom" sounds all night long, and I couldn't sleep. And I'm a really good sleeper. I can go to sleep and sleep through a hurricane. But this was really disturbing, and I could not get to sleep.
Q. And that wasn't somebody snoring?
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A. (Law) No.
Q. Okay. Because I've been to campgrounds where I could hear other people snoring.
A. (Law) No.
Q. Okay. Would you be surprised to learn that, when sound experts testified here in front of the Site Evaluation Committee about Lempster, they predicted you would not be able to hear the turbines inside the park at Pillsbury?
A. (Law) Well, they obviously haven't camped there.
Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Cleland, I guess you testified that you are a sound -- you have a home sound recording studio?
A. (Cleland) It's her.
Q. Oh, it's you? I'm sorry. For some reason I assumed that --
A. (Voelcker) Does he look like a rock star? [Laughter]
Q. Yeah, he does, actually. These days, rock stars have a lot of gray hair. So...

Is your sound studio insulated?
A. (Law) No.
Q. Okay. That's sort of a -- seems to me that
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that would be a natural thing to do if you're making sound recordings, that you would insulate the room to --
A. (Law) Well, the room is -- the house is insulated. But I record in my house for the acoustics, because it's -- there's a lot of wood, and I like the acoustics of the wood.
Q. Okay. When you're recording, do you occasionally get stray noises from outside that intrude on the recordings, like the neighbor's dog barking or --
A. (Law) We don't have neighbors. We live on top of the mountain.
Q. All right. Let's look at that picture over there again. Can you show me where your house is?
A. (Cleland) Do you want me to show them?
A. (Law) Yeah.
A. (Cleland) It's right up here at the top on Stacy Hill. Our house is -- well, it's actually a little bit above. It's not on this map, okay.
Q. But it's up there near that --
A. (Cleland) It's right near the top.
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Q. -- lavender ring?
A. (Cleland) Yes, right up there.
Q. Okay.
A. (Cleland) It's bordered in the back by the town of Windsor.
Q. Okay. Now, do you have in front of you there Mr. Tocci's report?
A. (Cleland) Yes, I do.
A. (Law) yes.
Q. Have you seen Mr. Tocci's report before?
A. (Law) No.
Q. Have you looked at Mr. O'Neal's report?
A. (Law) No.
Q. Okay. Now, looking at Mr. Tocci's report, you see that he lists a number of locations. One, two, three, four, five, and Gregg Lake and Willard Pond?
A. (Law) Yes.
A. (Cleland) Yes.
Q. Now, I'm assuming, based on where you pointed, that you're nowhere near Gregg Lake, Willard Pond or Gregg Lake Road -- and I'm not familiar enough with these other
locations. Is your house near to any of
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those other locations?
A. (Cleland) I'd say Location 2, Loveren Mill.
Q. Loveren Mill Road.
A. (Law) And Reed Carr Road, Location 4.
Q. And you said you're on top of a mountain?
A. (Law) Yes.
Q. Do you have sort of a direct view from your home to the top of Tuttle Ridge?
A. (Law) Oh, yeah.
Q. And they're predicting what for a sound power level at your home?

MS. GOLDWASSER: I'm going to
object. They haven't testified how close they are to either of those receptors or which sound level he's asking about. I just -- the question is confusing, and I don't know where they're going to get the answer from.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Do you know what sound level they're predicting at your house?
A. (Cleland) No.
A. (Law) No.

MR. ROTH: She said no.
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MS. GOLDWASSER: I'm asking who "they" is, Mr. Roth. Are you speaking about Mr. Tocci or Mr. O'Neal?

MR. ROTH: Well, the only one predicting a sound level of the project is the Applicant.
A. (Law) Well, they didn't do one at our house. But according to this Location 4, it's 39; and Location 2 is 35. MS. GOLDWASSER: And for the record, she's referencing to Mr. Tocci's --
A. (Law) We're not sound experts. We don't know.

MS. GOLDWASSER: I understand.
I'm just trying to -- I'm not trying to make a problem here. I'm trying to make sure the record is clear about which numbers you're referencing, whether you're referencing Mr . O'Neal's report or Mr. Tocci's report, that's all.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Roth, the witnesses testified that they hadn't reviewed either reports, so I think you can move through this pretty quickly.
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MR. ROTH: Right. Well, she's looking at it. So I was asking her about what she's looking at.
A. (Law) So is it in the Column "AWE Sound Level dBA"?
Q. That's the one, yes.
A. (Law) Okay. So Loveren Mill Road is not as close, I don't think, to us as Gregg Lake -I mean as Reed Carr Road. Reed Carr Road is right at the bottom of our mountain, or right across Route 9 from where we live. But it's at least a mile down.
Q. To Reed Carr Road?
A. (Law) Yeah. Then I would say Loveren Mill Road is about a mile west from where we live.
Q. Okay.
A. (Law) I would say. I don't know.
Q. All right. In terms of in your testimony you say that you've -- you enjoy your pristine environment and habitat for wild animals and birds, and you enjoy viewing it on a daily basis. And I assume that's up at your home on top of the mountain there?
A. (Law) That's correct. Makes my day.
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Q. Good. And what kind of animals do you see up there?
A. (Law) Everything. We see black bear. We see moose, a mama moose with twins. I've seen that on three different occasions, three different years, which I was blown away by. We see deer. We see hawks, owls, eagles, fisher cats, bob cats. It's amazing. I mean, it makes my day. Every time I see a wild animal or a wild bird, it just makes my day. It makes me feel really good. And I don't want to lose that, ever.
Q. Okay. Do you spend time on -- visiting, hiking on, however you want to describe it, on what is now the project site? Do you go over there?
A. (Law) Do we go over there? No, not very often.
Q. Okay.
A. (Law) We have our own mountain to climb.
Q. Sounds like. We all do, I suppose, in a way.

In your testimony, you describe a Live
Free or Die Party at the Windsor Mountain
International Camp. And one of you spoke
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with Mr. Kenworthy?
A. (Cleland) That is me. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And can you just perhaps give more detail about what he stated to you about the direct impact on your property?
A. (Cleland) Yes. It was an annual party in 2009, in September. When I arrived at the party, there was probably 40 people there. And at that time, Jack Kenworthy was out playing this game in a small field in front of the main dining hall. So I talked to some other people. And after he was done, a little while after, I had discussed with Mr. Kenworthy a mutual friend of ours who had just gotten job at a private school. So we discussed that for a little while. And then I asked Mr. Kenworthy about the wind project. I said, "Jack, how is this going to affect me?" because he knows where I live. And he looked at me, which upset me, and then he looked down to the ground, and he said, "It's going to be a direct impact." And basically I just looked at him, and that was the end of our conversation. There was other people
around.
Q. Okay. So you'd known Mr. Kenworthy before that date?
A. (Cleland) I'd say I've known Mr. Kenworthy maybe for about 14 years. He came to work as a counselor. I think he was still in college at that time.
Q. Have you known him to be a serious and responsible person throughout that time?
A. (Cleland) At that time, he was -- I think he was an outstanding counselor, and he followed through. I didn't spend a lot of time with him. But it's a really small community where I work, so you really know what's going on.
Q. Okay. Now moving on in your testimony. It says "we," so I guess you've both been involved in trying to protect the Rural Conservation District.
A. (Law) Yes.
Q. And can you describe -- were you here yesterday during Ms. Vissering's testimony?
A. (Law) Yes.
Q. And there was some discussion about a state initiative, such as the Quabbin-to-Cardigan
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and the Forest Legacy. Are you familiar with any other types of initiatives like that, that have been employed in Antrim with respect to the Rural Conservation District?
A. (Law) I'm not familiar with any other programs or initiatives similar to that.
A. (Cleland) I am. Loveren Mills down below, the Nature Conservancy. Also, part of Windsor Mountain is under easement with the Forest Society. So there's quite a bit on the north side of Route 9.
Q. Okay. So you're mostly familiar with the things on the north side.
A. (Cleland) No, I'm also familiar with the Harris Center. Willard Pond, I spend a lot of time on Willard Pond and Bald Mountain. And now that the other -- the Robb Reservoir is now open to the public, where you can go kayaking, I spend a lot of time in that area, out in the woods.
Q. I understand. What I'm trying to learn more about is whether you're familiar with programs that are either sponsored by or funded by the government or
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quasi-governmental -- not quasi-governmental, but, you know, private non-profits, to foster their conservation of land in the area.
A. (Cleland) Yeah. Well, that's Willard Pond; correct?
Q. Right. The Audubon Society.
A. (Cleland) Yeah.
Q. But you've heard about the Forest Legacy program; correct?
A. (Cleland) Yes.
Q. Are you familiar with any Forest Legacy activities around the project area?
A. (Cleland) Not at this time. Not outside the Forest Society.
Q. Okay. In your testimony, you also say that you won't be able to recoup what you've invested here with 10, 500-foot turbines on the ridgeline directly in your viewshed.
A. (Cleland) That's correct.
Q. "Who will pay us fair market value for our home?" Do you intend to move out of the area if the project is built?
A. (Cleland) It's a possibility.
Q. Is your home now for sale?
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A. (Cleland) No.
Q. Have you had your home appraised recently?
A. (Cleland) Yes.
Q. Okay. That's all the questions that $I$ have. Thank you.

MR. ROTH: Thank you very much.

MS. BAILEY: Thank you. Ms. Duley, would you like to ask questions? Would you like to ask questions of this panel on behalf of your sister?

MS. DULEY: I'm going to defer
to --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
MS. BAILEY: She said she's
going to defer to Loranne Block.
(Discussion off the record.)
MS. DULEY: All right. So I'm going to ask this question on behalf of my sister.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. DULEY:
Q. Similar to myself, you seem to have a great concern for your property values. Can you go
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further into your concerns?
A. (Law) Are you asking us or Elsa?
Q. Both of you.
A. (Law) Go ahead, Elsa.
A. (Voelcker) Well, I'm not going to be impacted to the extent that Janet would be impacted. I think Janet's -- Janet should be completely recompensed for her place, because she's going to have four of these turbines right around her house. And she's lived in total isolation there for 25 years. My impacts, I'm concerned about in the. You know, that house is all I have for my retirement. And I hope I can sell it. If the wind turbines go through, there's a good chance I'll be trying to sell it. And my concern would be that I'm, you know -- I've read studies where I'm going to lose at least 25 percent of the money that $I$ would usually normally get for my house.
Q. And may $I$ follow up and ask, does this differ from the testimony you've heard from Mr.

Magnusson?
A. (Voelcker) Yes. They're saying -- the
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testimony I've heard from people here is that it won't make any difference. But of course it will. It already has, because everybody knows that this is proposed, and they're waiting to see if it's going to go through.
Q. Also, may I ask, is there any activity that's taken place thus far that you think has already had an effect on your property or your property value?
A. (Voelcker) Well, they certainly did a lot of logging last year. And those logging trucks were going up and down my road all spring until mud season. I can't say directly whether's it's made an effect or not on my property.
Q. Can you say whether it's had an effect on your quality of life?
A. (Voelcker) Oh, yeah. I've been really upset by this. I don't know -- I'm sure that you people are more used to being here. But spending 10 days in a courtroom is not what $I$ call wonderful living. Before that, I've been to hearings in my town, almost every one of them. Probably at least 10 or 15 zoning
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board hearings, planning board hearings, the selectmen, and been shot down at most of them, you know, barely been able to speak. And it's really upset me for three years now. I thought I had the perfect place. My kids are finally out of college. I was going to live in my house and have a wonderful life. And now $I$ feel like, great, big business is going to roll us over. I got to go move somewhere.
Q. If I can infer from your comments, it sounds like you are not only extremely concerned about the property value, but this has caused you a significant amount of stress in your life. Is that correct?
A. (Voelker) That's correct.
Q. May I hear about your property-value situation?
A. (Law) Yes. We actually built that house ourselves, brick by brick, plank by plank. We've planned on living there for the rest of our lives. We love it there. It is beautiful, peaceful. It's uplifting. We just have to walk out of our house and into
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our backyard, and we're climbing a mountain or we're going down to Bagley Pond. We love it there. We never intended to ever move from there. However, this has totally disrupted our lives. We feel that, you know, people came in and divided our town and pitted neighbors against neighbors, even though we don't really have neighbors. I mean, we've finally gotten to know people in our town where we've lived for 24 years and really didn't know a lot of people. It's kind of brought some of us together. But then, it's really separated people that we did know who are not opposed to this. It has disrupted our lives. And we feel that, in the event that it does go through, we really can't live there anymore. We don't want to move. We don't want to have to sell our house for less than it's worth. But I don't believe that we're going to be able to, in the event that it does happen. So I'm pleading with the SEC to not let this happen, because it's going to ruin a lot of lives.

We've been there a long time. We've paid
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taxes to the Town of Antrim. What are our rights? Because somebody wants to come in and line their pockets and then split? It's just not fair. And we really feel it's not fair.
Q. Do you have any sense of the financial impact on your property values that this project would impose?

MS. GOLDWASSER: I'm just going to inject for the record. These folks aren't experts in property values, and they haven't provided any expert reports regarding that. Just want to put that on the record before their response.

MR. ROTH: I would just point out that $I$ think it's a basic rule of law in this state that every homeowner is qualified to opine about the value of their own property.
A. (Law) Well, I do real-estate investing, too, and I do know property values. And I believe that it will reduce the value of our property immensely.
Q. Can you quantify that in any range? In
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dollars, percent or anything?
A. (Law) I think we'll lose about 25 percent of the value of our property, at least.
Q. Thank you. I have no more questions. MS. BAILEY: Thank you. Ms. Goldwasser.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. GOLDWASSER:
Q. Good morning. My name is Rachel Goldwasser, here on behalf of the Applicant.

Ms. Voelcker, I'm just going to ask you some questions related to the questioning you received this morning. You indicated that you believe it's possible for wind to blow from all 10 turbines towards your house at the same time. I'm going to refer you to the map that's right behind you. Do you see where Turbine 1 is at the top?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. And you see where Turbine 10 is at the bottom?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
Q. And can you point to where your home is?
A. (Voelcker) Yes.
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Q. So do you believe it's possible for the wind to blow from Turbine 10 towards your house and from Turbine 1 towards your house at the same time?
A. (Voelcker) No.
Q. Okay. I just wanted to clarify that for the record.
A. (Voelcker) Could I ask you? Is it more noisy to hear from one or two of the turbines than it is to hear from all 10 of the turbines?
Q. I don't think that $I$ can answer a question like that.
A. (Voelcker) Then why are you asking it? If I'm listening to two of these, three of these turbines, that's going to be enough to be very annoying.

MS. BAILEY: Ms. Voelcker, I'm really sympathetic to how frustrated you are. But you have to ask their witnesses questions, and you had an opportunity for that. Now it's her turn to ask you questions. I'm sorry. You can't ask her questions, because she's not allowed to answer them. She's not a witness.
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# [WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW] 

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MS . VOELCKER: Okay. |
| 2 | MS. BAILEY: Thanks. |
| 3 | MS. VOELCKER: But I don't |
| 4 | understand the -- I don't understand that |
| 5 | question at all. |
| 6 | MS. BAILEY: Okay. Let's move |
| 7 | on to the next question, please. |
| 8 | BY MS. GOLDWASSER: |
| 9 | Q. You also stated that you've been to many |
| 10 | public hearings and meetings in Antrim; is |
| 11 | that correct? |
| 12 | A. (Voelker) That's correct. |
| 13 | Q. Do you recall Mr. Kenworthy ever giving out |
| 14 | his number at several of those meetings? |
| 15 | A. (Voelcker) No. |
| 16 | Q. You indicated in your testimony a concern |
| 17 | about not having a phone call -- a phone |
| 18 | number to call. Have you reviewed the town's |
| 19 | agreement with Antrim Wind Energy? |
| 20 | A. (Voelcker) Yes. |
| 21 | Q. I'm showing you what is Antrim Wind Energy |
| 22 | Exhibit 3, Appendix 17A, Paragraph 5.1. And |
| 23 | I'm going to read that to you, and you can |
| 24 | tell me if I've read that correctly. |
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|  |  | 67 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | "During construction and operation of |  |
| 2 | the wind farm, and continuing through |  |
| 3 | completion of decommissioning of the wind |  |
| 4 | farm, the Owner shall identify an |  |
| 5 | individual (s), including phone number, e-mail |  |
| 6 | address and mailing address, posted at the |  |
| 7 | town hall, who will be available for the |  |
| 8 | public to contact with inquiries and |  |
| 9 | complaints. The Owner shall make reasonable |  |
| 10 | efforts to respond to and address the |  |
| 11 | public's inquiries and complaints. This |  |
| 12 | process shall not preclude the Town from |  |
| 13 | acting on a complaint." Did I read that |  |
| 14 | correctly? |  |
| 15 | A. (Voelcker) Yes. |  |
| 16 | Q. Do any of you know how many people have |  |
| 17 | complained to the Site Evaluation Committee |  |
| 18 | about noise from the Lempster project? |  |
| 19 | A. (Voelcker) Well, I heard reported that only |  |
| 20 | three. |  |
| 21 | Q. Okay. Are you aware that, in fact, the |  |
| 22 | number is two, not three? |  |
| 23 | A. (Voelcker) No, I guess not. Two people. |  |
| 24 | Q. Are you aware that one of those people |  |
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[WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]
complained because they had a problem with their hearing aid and that was corrected and that complaint was withdrawn?
A. (Voelcker) I think a lot of people don't complain when they should, the Carricks being one of them. But they don't live in

Lempster. They live in Goshen.
Q. Does the paragraph that $I$ just read you from the Town agreement indicate that, if you don't live in Antrim, you can't complain?
A. (Voelcker) No. But people don't -- they're not proactive. And does it make me feel better that there will be a phone number I can call to complain? Not really.
Q. Do you know if the Town of Lempster has experienced a decrease in tourism since Lempster Wind was built?
A. (Voelcker) No, I don't.
Q. You referenced, in the context of nuisance, a concern about 30 hours of shadow flicker relating to the project. I believe that was you. Is that your memory as well?
A. (Voelcker) Just now I did, yes. That's what's predicted for Janice Longgood.
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[WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]
Q. I'm going to show you what's exhibit Antrim Wind Exhibit 3, Appendix 13B, Figure 2, which is Mr. O'Neal's shadow flicker -- I'm sorry -- Mr. Guariglia's shadow flicker analysis. Do you see that here?
A. (Voelcker) Yeah.
Q. Is your home on this map?
A. (Voelcker) No, $I$ don't believe it is.
Q. So it doesn't show up anywhere in the range --
A. (Voelcker) I don't expect to get a flicker effect.
Q. Okay. Is Gregg Lake on this map?
A. (Voelcker) The body of water here.
Q. This is the blue --
A. (Voelker) Oh, okay. It's way off.
Q. We're indicating an area of blue on the lower right-hand corner of the page. And that is not shaded. It seems to indicate it's less than two or no areas -- hours of shadow flicker; is that correct?
A. (Voelcker) Correct.
Q. All three of you expressed concerns regarding impacts to wildlife. Do you have any
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citations to studies of scientific evidence that those concerns will bear fruit?
A. (Cleland) No, we don't.
A. (Law) No. But if the habitat is destroyed, of course it's going to impact them.
Q. Ms. Voelcker?
A. (Voelcker) Well, we recorded -- Susan Morse recorded nighthawks, two different nighthawks up on Tuttle Hill. So it will have an impact. Plus, we know bald eagles are nesting on Willard Pond.
Q. I just asked if you had any citation of scientific studies which would indicate that --
A. (Voelcker) Well, the study that I heard was that each wind turbine will kill six to seven birds a year.
Q. Okay. Ms. Law, your home is 1.5 miles from the closest wind turbine; is that correct?
A. (Law) Yes.
Q. And you testified earlier that you had a recording studio at your house?
A. (Law) That's correct.
Q. I'm going to show you what's marked as AWE
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Exhibit 9, Tab 10, which is Mr. O'Neal's supplemental testimony. Is that what you see here?
A. (Law) Yes.
Q. Now I'm going to turn to Attachment RDO-B to that testimony. Do you see that here, marked RDO-B?
A. (Law) Yes.
Q. This a Data Request 1-41 that was propounded by Antrim Wind to Mr. James, who is an expert for the North Branch Intervenors; is that correct?
A. (Law) That's correct.
Q. And does Mr. James indicate -- actually, could you just read that, the first part of this sentence. It's the first sentence of the second paragraph in that response.
A. (Law) "The specific criteria calling for a setback distance of 1.25 miles has been adapted by the State of Victoria in Australia and is in the process of being adopted in New South Wales, Australia."
Q. And is that in response to the question, "Please provide the sound level limits you
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feel are necessary to ensure a compatible project in the community"?
A. (Law) Yes.
Q. So your sound expert indicates that a setback distance of 1.25 miles is appropriate, where your house is $1-1 / 2$ miles away from the project?
A. (Law) I'm guessing that our house is a mile and a half. It could be one closer. I don't know. I mean, I've never measured it.
A. (Cleland) I think it's different because there's nothing between us and the project. It's straight. There's no trees. There's no buildings, anything. And so sound is going to travel quite a bit more. That's my opinion.
Q. So you contest your own expert's testimony? A. (Law) No. No, we're not testing [sic] his testimony. What we're saying is we're not -you know, I mean, we don't -- we have never measured it physically, the exact distance. But what Bob is saying is that it's an open valley across from where Tuttle Hill is from our house. I mean, we can clearly see it.
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Q. When you were testifying earlier, Mr. Cleland, I think you showed on the map -- and I'd just like to ask you to go back to that map that's behind you.

And you indicated that -- I was just a little confused, because you indicated you weren't on the map, and then you were on the map. So --
A. (Cleland) Should be right above here.
Q. Okay. You're indicating just below the last lavender line to the top of the exhibit?
A. (Cleland) I'd say an inch and a quarter below it.
Q. And does that read "Exhibit 41"? Is that correct?
A. (Cleland) Yes.
Q. In the key box at the upper left-hand corner of that, can you tell me what the expected dBA level is for the area that your house is in? So you match the lavender with the lavender and --
A. (Cleland) Yeah.

MR. ROTH: I'm going to object to this question. I asked similar questions
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about whether they knew what the noise level was predicted for their home, and they said "No." And I think I even got objections from Ms. -- from counsel for the Applicant on this very issue. And so now they're asking the same questions that $I$ was told I couldn't ask and had stopped asking because they said they didn't know.

MS. BAILEY: My recollection
is they gave you a number from Mr. Tocci's testimony.

MS. GOLDWASSER: Yeah, I'm just asking to read the map that's there and has been in the record for months.

MR. ROTH: They gave me a number from Mr. Tocci's testimony for Loveren Mill Road, which they testified was like a mile away from their house.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. I'm going
to allow them to answer the question by looking at this picture. Your objection is overruled.
A. (Law) It's 30 to 35 .
Q. Thank you. Now, referring to Mr. Roth's
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questions, can you go back to that map and indicate where the Loveren Mill and Reed Carr locations are in relationship to where your home is?
A. (Cleland) Yes. Loveren Mills is here. Our house is here. Reed Carr is here. I'm not sure exactly where they did the test on Loveren Mills or Reed Carr.
Q. Okay. So, just to clarify for the record, for Loveren Mills, you're indicating the darker purple?
A. (Cleland) Hmm-hmm. Yes.
Q. You're indicating the darker purple near where it says "Alt 2"; is that correct?
A. (Law) Color-blind. He's color-blind.
Q. Oh, I apologize.
A. (Cleland) Yes, L2.
Q. Yes, right there. Okay. And Reed Carr, can you indicate to me where that is?
A. (Cleland) L4.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Law) It's true.
Q. I think that's something we don't have to dispute.
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A. (Law) He doesn't do colors.
A. (Cleland) No.
Q. I think you said at a tech session, Ms. Law, that you can sometimes hear traffic sounds from Route 9 from your house.
A. (Law) Very rarely.
Q. You also indicated that you liked to climb up a mountain and go to Bagley Pond from your home. Are those areas that will be directly impacted by the project? In other words, you won't be able to go to them or, you know, they're in the project area?
A. (Law) We'll be able to go to them.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. (Voelcker) But you'll hear "whoosh, whoosh, whoosh."
A. (Law) Yeah.

MS. GOLDWASSER: That
concludes my cross-examination.
MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
Committee questions? Dr. Boisvert.
INTERROGATORIES BY DR. BOISVERT:
Q. This is for Law/Cleland. As I listened to
your testimony about the impacts on your
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residence, you said that you might feel the need to move if the project is constructed.
A. (Law) That's correct.
A. (Cleland) That's correct.
Q. Is it your opinion that the effects that you anticipate cannot be mitigated -"mitigated," meaning made better for you so that it would be tolerable?
A. (Cleland) No, not for me.
A. (Law) How would it be made better if there are --
Q. That's my question to you.
A. (Law) No, I don't believe so.
A. (Cleland) No.
Q. So, from your point of view, your opinion, the only solution that this Committee could find would be a complete denial of the project.
A. (Law) That's correct.

MR. BOISVERT: Thank you.
MS. BAILEY: Chairman
Ignatius.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
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INTERROGATORIES BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
Q. Good morning everyone.
A. (Panel Members) Good morning.
Q. Either Ms. Law or Mr. Cleland, in your prefiled testimony you said that you were concerned about Eolian managing this project because they'd never seen anything through to fruition. What did you mean by that?
A. (Cleland) That this is their first project, and they don't have any past, basically.
Q. Okay. I didn't know if that meant, also, that you'd seen something started and failed. It was just that this is the first --
A. (Cleland) Exactly.
Q. And you referenced another project they'd done in the Bahamas, but it was a lot smaller; is that right?
A. (Cleland) Yes. That was at the Island School. I basically followed what Jack's been doing over the years, because we do have, you know, mutual friends.
Q. And your view is that their experience collectively just isn't adequate for this project?
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A. (Cleland) That's my opinion.
Q. All right.
A. (Law) I have to agree, from what I've seen so far in the last three years.
Q. What do you mean by that?
A. (Law) Well, I mean, everything that we've heard right from the beginning has changed. The met tower that we fought so hard to have them not erect was erected before it was allowed to be erected.
A. (Voelcker) Illegally.
A. (Law) Illegally. And they guaranteed it would be up for $2-1 / 2$ to 3 years. I thought -MS. GOLDWASSER: I have to object to that statement. It isn't a correct statement of fact. There isn't anything in the record to support the fact that the met tower was built without a proper permit. It was built with a building permit.
A. (Law) We had 30 days to appeal it. It was up before the 30 days. It was up within two weeks. I saw it the moment -- the morning I got up and --
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Q. I'm going to stop both of you. I know there's litigation on this. It's not an issue for us.
A. (Law) Okay.
Q. So I just want you to go ahead and explain your point of view. And it's not as to whether any of your view is the only view or explanation of these things. It's your point of view. So if we can just go ahead and finish that, please.
A. (Law) Okay. Since the beginning, the met tower was supposed to be up for $2-1 / 2$ to 3 years, and they have just asked for an extension. The three years is up at the end of this month, tomorrow. And it was supposed to be six wind turbines, and now it's ten. It was going to be 400 feet; now it's 500-foot wind towers. I mean, what are we supposed to believe? I don't believe any of it. So I don't -- I think there is no credibility there.
Q. Thank you. Nothing else.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Simpkins.
DIR. SIMPKINS: Yeah, I just
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had two quick questions for Ms. Voelcker. INTERROGATORIES BY DIR. SIMPKINS:
Q. Ms. Voelcker, in your testimony -- I want to go back to something that was discussed in your testimony and several questions that were asked by Attorney Roth.

The statement you made, that there are at least a hundred houses that will be directly affected by the installation of the wind turbines, with no form of restitution for their ruined homesteads, I'm just curious. Was there a particular form of restitution that you were thinking of or referring to when you made that statement? And in your opinion, is there any type of restitution you feel would be adequate if it was possible?
A. (Voelcker) Yes. I think in New York State, one county put in the provision that the wind company would have to buy out property owners who wished to be bought out, at regular prices, fair market price. And I think that would be fair. Sixty million dollars on this project. You know, you're just asking for
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another couple million to buy out people.
I think there are a lot of people on
Gregg Lake that are part-time owners.
They're not even here now, and they're not represented. And they're going to be very upset when this thing goes in and they're listening to them and they're looking right at them. White Birch Point has just declared themselves a historic site and applied to the Historical Society of New Hampshire. And nobody -- you know, there's one person that lives in White Birch Point around the year, year-round.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And my other question was just to clarify. Are you supportive of wind energy in general, but just feel this particular site is inappropriate or --
A. (Voelcker) No. After looking into wind energy, I'm not supportive of wind energy. It uses rare earth metals that have to be mined by people in China that are dying. You know, it takes two tons of concrete to put in one of these wind towers. They're going to
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have to blast granite off of Tuttle Hill and then pour this concrete in. It's too much. It's like, yeah, you can buy a Prius, but the amount of pre-things to making a brand new Prius amounts to more than if you bought a six year-old car. You'd be doing the earth a better service.

And I think, after listening to the talk on this new nuclear power system, which takes our old nuclear waste and burns it for another 70 years and will give us enough energy to run the whole earth, even accommodating more need over the 70 years, that it's ridiculous to be putting in more and more wind. I know Holland has stopped supporting putting in more wind. I know that it will affect our countryside. I read a report that says it increases -- the temperature in the area of a wind farm is increased by 2 degrees Fahrenheit. So it does affect the environment. You're going to see animals dying and moving out.
Q. Okay. Thank you. No further questions.

## [WITNESS PANEL: VOELCKER|CLELAND|LAW]

INTERROGATORIES BY MS. BAILEY:
Q. Ms. Voelcker, have you had your house appraised?
A. (Voelcker) I asked a realtor down the street, yes. She says --
Q. Did she give you an official document?
A. (Voelcker) No.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. BAILEY: Okay. Mr. Block,
do you have any redirect?
MR. BLOCK: Actually, no.
Thank you very much.
MS. BAILEY: All right. Thank you very much for your testimony. You're excused.

MS. LAW: (Law) Thank you.
MS. BAILEY: All right. It's
ten after ten. It's a little early for a break, but I'd like to see if we can get Mr. James. Do you know if he's available yet? Let's take a five-minute break to see if Mr. James is available.
(Recess taken at 10:10 a.m., and the
hearing resumed at 10:27 a.m.)
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MS. BAILEY: Okay. We're back on the record. We have Mr. James, the North Branch sound witness, on video conference in the hearing room. And we will proceed with the direct, but we need Mr . Iacopino to swear him in using the microphone. He cannot see us, but we can see him.
(WHEREUPON, RICHARD R. JAMES was duly sworn and cautioned by the Mr . Iacopino.) RICHARD R. JAMES, SWORN

MS. BAILEY: Okay, Mr. Block. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLOCK :
Q. Hello, can you hear me okay?
A. Yes, I can.
Q. Can you please state your name, business address and occupation?
A. My name is Richard R. James. Business address is P.O. Box 1129, Okemos, O-K-E-M-O-S, Michigan. And the Zip code is 48805.
Q. And your occupation and business?
A. My occupation, I am an acoustician, acoustical engineer.
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Q. Can you tell us a little bit about your general background and qualifications?
A. I started -- my background academically is as a mechanical engineer with a minor in acoustics from what's now called Kettering Institute; formerly it was General Motors Institute, primarily the school that -- you know, call it engineering school for people that were looking for a career in General Motors or other of the big automotive companies.

At the time I went to school, OSHA and EPA were just becoming issues. And so the school had started a special curriculum for environmental engineering, and I participated in that. As a result of the fact that $I$ had a background in acoustics at that time, that was fairly unique within the company. I got involved early in writing specifications, evaluating health and -- health-related, particularly hearing loss-related information, helped the company set up criteria.

In 1972, I left General Motors after
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graduating and started another firm called Total Environmental Systems. And the focus of that company was to develop software to allow computer modeling of both in-plant and community noise problems, both as a way to address compliance issues and for the design of new plants. That involved a lot of expert witness work on both EPA and OSHA work during the 1970s.

In the 1980 s we closed that company and started another company. My partner and I, Robert Anderson, formed James-Anderson \& Associates, which continued on until 2006, when we closed the firm due to economic situations. Our client base, General Motors, were having financial problems at that time. And we had developed a very large company, 45 employees, and didn't want to be exposed to that kind of cost structure if our clients were having problems.

So at that point, 2006, I started a new company, E-Coustic Solutions, and have been operating under that business name since 2006. The primary difference and focus at
[WITNESS: JAMES]
that time, rather than addressing both in-plant and community noise work, I started to address only community noise, partly due to medical situations, which is why I was at the doctor this morning.

During that era, $I$ also became a member of the Michigan State University Staff, in the Department of Speech and Communications Sciences, both as an instructor for audiologists and as an advisor for students working on their thesis. And recently I've become a professor at Central Michigan University, in the same department. So I have essentially spanned the issue of how noise affects people for my clients over my whole career.
Q. Thank you. Beyond your background and experience as an acoustician, can you describe your expertise in terms of the human response to turbine noise?
A. Well, this was of particular interest to me. When I formed my new company, one of the very first calls I had was from a person here in Michigan who was concerned about what a
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proposed wind turbine project would do to the community. And I had been exploring wind turbine noise in Europe and Ontario prior to that, and also on the East Coast, in the Mars Hill case. So I started at that point establishing contacts with medical professionals who had some experience in this region, both at Michigan State, the universities, and eventually formed a group of colleagues who worked with me. I shared my acoustical knowledge with them, and they shared their medical knowledge with me. That included people like Robert McMurtry, who was the former advisor to the Ontario Ministry of Health; and Dr. Nissenbaum, who, in Maine, has basically done most of the research on adverse health effects on wind turbines; Dr. Alec Salt, who's done research on the biological processes involved in both auditory and vestibular perception of low-frequency infrasound; Dr. Dan Shepherd in New Zealand, and a host of others. We have been sharing information through an ad hoc group called "Society for Wind Vigilance,"
which periodically meets to review papers, published journals, and conduct some symposiums to advance the state of understanding of how wind turbine noise affects the health of people who are living near the wind turbines.

In addition to that, $I$ have a number of clients. Beginning in 2008, I was asked by Dr. McMurtry to --

MR. PATCH: Madam Chair.
MS. BAILEY: Wait.
MR. PATCH: I'd just like to object. I think this is going far beyond the scope of direct examination, in terms of what was allowed with our witnesses. Seems to me we're getting into an awful lot more detail than we typically have. So I want to voice an objection to this.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Block, do you -- I think, you know, he's established his credibility. Are you okay with that?

MR. BLOCK: All right.
MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
BY MR. BLOCK:
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Q. We're comfortable with that, Rick.
A. Okay. Thank you.
Q. In addition to being an acoustician, do you consider yourself to have particular expert knowledge in the area of human response to low-frequency turbine noise?
A. That is an area which I have developed a considerable amount of experience with in the past six years, as $I$ was saying earlier, both through colleagues and through experience. I have a number of clients who are sensitive to wind turbine noise, and I have worked with them closely to find out why it is they're responding to sounds they can't hear, including staying in their homes and trying to experience things myself. So, both through my academic relationships with the universities, my colleagues and personal experience, I think I have a very solid understanding of the impact of wind turbine noise on people.
Q. Are you the same Richard James who submitted pre-filed testimonies in this case on July 30th, 2012 and October 11, 2012,
\{SEC 2012-01\} \{DAY 8 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{11-29-12\}
included in these proceedings as Exhibits NB 1 an NB 8?
A. (No response) Are there any errors you'd like to correct in your testimonies --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
A. Yeah, I am the same person who wrote those documents.

BY MR. BLOCK :
Q. Are there any errors you would like to correct in those testimonies at this time?
A. Not to my knowledge at this time.
Q. So if you were to prepare your testimony again today, it would remain unchanged?
A. In essence, yes.
Q. Okay. In his supplemental testimony, Mr .

O'Neal stated, on Page 2 and 3, that Annie Law, a musician whose home is 7900 feet from the nearest wind turbine site, would not have any problems with wind turbine noise affecting her home studio. Do you agree with that statement?
A. Let me -- excuse me. Let me take a look at it. That was what page?
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Q. Pages 2 and 3 of Mr . O'Neal's supplemental testimony.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Okay. I see the question now.
Q. Okay. The question was --
A. Yes.
Q. He claimed that she would not have any problems with turbine noise affecting her home recording studio. Do you agree with that statement?
A. I think that without knowing a lot more about how that studio was designed and what it is she's recording, that that would be impossible to make any definitive statement that it would not be affected. Wind turbine -- the low-frequency sound, particularly those frequencies below 100 hertz, are --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
MS. BAILEY: Wait a minute.
A. Yeah. I probably would have said
low-frequency sounds, particularly those
frequencies below 100 hertz --
Q. Okay. Continue.
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A. -- can propagate for great distances in particularly quiet areas. This could be a problem even at the kind of distances we're talking about here, a mile and a quarter. If the goal of the recording studio is to have a very low ambient sound level in the low frequencies, and the nature of the recording studio is that it doesn't have extensive acoustical treatment, there is a possibility there would be a problem.
Q. Thank you. In his supplemental testimony, on Pages 3 and 4, Mr. O'Neal discounts any concern about the ill-effects of wind turbine on wildlife. Can you comment on that?
A. Mr. O'Neal focuses in on several specific issues that he takes -- or that he addresses.

I think the larger question on wildlife is that we don't know what the impact is on them. However, some studies that have been done by the National Park Services and Forestry Services, both on the issue of wind turbine and other sources or anthropogenic noise, have opened up our heart to things like recreation or development for oil
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exploration, gas exploration. And the information coming back from these studies is that, when you change the sound levels, particularly increase them with nighttime noise, there is a large possibility that that can affect the wildlife in negative ways. So I think the answer that Mr. O'Neal gave was to pull a couple examples that he thought proved his point, but it's not those examples that are important. It's the larger questions that we do not have the answer for.
Q. All right. On Page 7 of his supplemental testimony, Mr. O'Neal mentioned a European study which linked the issues of turbine visibility and noise annoyance. This was referred to again by Mr. Tocci. Can you comment on that report?
A. I can comment on that report. When I first read it, I thought there was confusion, either through the translation from the original language into English, or just confusion by the people doing the study. If we were to say that the closer one moves to a wind turbine, the more it is
visually disturbing, that would be a true statement. If I were to say the closer one lives to a wind turbine, the more noise they will hear, that would be a true statement. But to attempt to conflate the similarity caused by distance to, let's say people's complaints about noise, are really a mask to visual disturbance, $I$ think that goes beyond what the data shows. All the data really showed was that the closer you are to wind turbines, the larger they appear; and therefore, there's more visual complaints. And the closer you are to wind turbines, the louder they are, and therefore, more complaints about noise. And I think that's all that that 2009 study really showed.
Q. Thank you. On Page 7 and Page 9 of his supplemental testimony, Mr. O'Neal challenges your findings that the predicted sound power level shown in the Epsilon report should be increased by up to 15 decibels, based on the research done by Van den Berg. Would you comment on Mr. O'Neal's statements.
A. Again, Mr. O'Neal takes a statement in my
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report that is based on a number of things, both my own experience and the Van den Berg paper from 2003 on through his work in 2006, the work of other acousticians, and attempts to claim there was a flaw in my logic by arguing one of the small points. He misses the bigger picture.

The bigger picture is that $I$ see standards that are used for measuring wind turbine noise to produce the sound power data that goes into the models represents the noise emitted during the daytime. The daytime noise is lower. It is lower in both absolute levels, dBA level, and also has less of the infrasounds because the winds during the daytime are better behaved. This is written into the IEC 61400 standards. That standard controls the weather, protesting to be moderate daytime weather. It controls the environment, so there's no turbulence caused by structures around the turbines. And these are ideal conditions for producing the least noise, not the worst noise. The 15 decibels has been identified a
number of times, not only in Dr. Van den Berg's work -- his 2002 paper was earlier, and his completed thesis was actually 2006. But it's also been observed in my own work on nighttime noise from wind turbines tends to be about 10 to 15 decibels higher than daytime, and in the work with many other acousticians. So I think the argument that Mr. O'Neal raises is one of a specific issue with how I might interpret -- or he might interpret a specific reference. But the basis for the need to increase the sound power level by 15 decibels, generally we argue five decibels because that's more reasonable; fifteen is an extreme case. It's the bigger picture that he misses.
Q. On Page 11 of his supplemental testimony, Mr .

O'Neal addresses your comments on his methodology of measuring background sound levels in the project area. Would you speak to his response there.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. I think -- yeah, I think this is, again, an example of focusing in on the details while
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missing the big picture.
Mr. O'Neal states, and I'll just quote this, "The sound level program for the Antrim Wind Project was conducted in accordance with the ANSI S12.9, 1998, titled, 'Quantities and Procedures for Description and Measurement of Environmental Sound, Part 1.'" He then goes on to quote the Forward or the Introduction to that standard by saying, "This standard is applicable to the description and measurement of community sounds for purposes of land-use planning, environment assessment and noise control." That leaves one with the impression that Part 1 provides procedures. But Part 1 of the ANSI 512.9 series -- of which there is a Part 1, Part 2, Part 3 and Part 4, and I believe even a Part 6 -- Part 1 has nothing with to do with procedures. It's the definitions. It states the working terminology. Part 2 and Part 3 define the procedures. And if Mr. O'Neal's response is that all they did was follow Part 1 , then all he's saying is the terminology they used met the definitions in Part 1. The procedure
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they used actually is called "long-term monitor monitoring," and it's covered in Part 2. The reason he probably did not address Part 2 is that that requires a larger number of samples laid out in a random pattern, multiple weeks of testing under different weather conditions, statistical analysis, and meeting certain tests for type of data clusters, in some cases requiring retesting. And it's really clear that the testing that Epsilon did was to pick five sites, one period of time, and it wasn't random. On that basis, the Part 2 procedures for unobserved measuring were not followed. Part 3 is for observed measuring, where you can pick your own test sites. But the test data from Epsilon says it was unobserved, so Part 3 doesn't apply. So what I see here is that Mr. O'Neal is basically saying they created their own procedure, and they've agreed to follow the definitions of ANSI S12.9 by either the observed or unobserved procedures, Parts 2 or 3. In other words, they made up their own
procedure.
Q. Thank you. On Pages 12 through 16 of his supplemental testimony, Mr. O'Neal discounts the effects of infrasound and low-frequency sound on human health and challenges your assertions that sounds in these frequency ranges are of concern. Can you comment on Mr. O'Neal's challenge?
A. Yes, I can. And again, Mr. O'Neal's focus on Pages 12 and 13, if we go through in detail, we can see that it is on the effects of infra and low-frequency sound processed through the auditory portion of the cochlea. When we look at how sound affects the cochlea, there are two ways. There is sound process through the auditory portion, which requires fairly high levels in order to be perceptible, but there's also sounds in that low-frequency range processed through the vestibular portion. And while we as acousticians have known for a long time, basically since the 1960s, in the beginning of what was called "Sick Building Syndrome," that inaudible levels of low-frequency sound can create
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symptoms that are very similar to motion sickness -- nausea, headaches, dizziness, sense of imbalance -- we never really understood the biological mechanism. In the last few years, however, the work of Dr. Alec Salt, an independent researcher in cochlear function, who's done a lot of work with the National Institute of Communicative Disorders and Speech Disorders on cochlear function, decided to explore how the vestibular organs respond to infrasound. He did this using samples, audio samples, that were taken at one of my client's homes. So he used audio samples of real-world wind turbine sounds, subjected those to the cochlea and observed that those sounds are processed at much lower levels, 60 dBG , than the auditory function, which is more like 90 dBG to 100 dBG . And Mr. O'Neal's argument here is that the sounds don't rise to the level of auditory
stimulation. But our argument -- or my position is we accept that it does rise, however, to the threshold of vestibular stimulation. As I said, we learned during
the 1960s forward that there's many cases where inaudible, impermeable frequency sound caused adverse health effects. That's not an auditory function. It's a vestibular function.
Q. Thank you. In reference to testimony submitted on or after October 11th to this Committee by any other parties, is there anything else in the record you'd like to respond to?
A. Yes, there is one other one, and that is in Mr. O'Neal's last section. And I'm looking here at Page 14. He says, "Mr. James mischaracterized the results... of his own paper," the 2011 Bray-James paper. Mr. O'Neal states that the paper says, "The purpose of the paper was to demonstrate that under these conditions that cause higher sound emissions, wind turbine infrasound can exceed the threshold of perception established for steady, pure tones." Now, this is actually found in the auditory function. While we do not specifically address adverse health effects
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in our paper, we did present data that's in the charts and graphs showing that the sounds we measured outside the home, of the Katz home in Michigan, exceeded the thresholds necessary for auditory perception. The fact that we did not put that in our conclusion was because the paper was to establish how to properly measure infra and low-frequency sounds for wind turbines, not to draw any correlations to the adverse health affects.
Q. Thank you, Mr. James.

MR. BLOCK: The witness is
available --
A. Yeah, I do have one more.
Q. Sorry.
A. At the bottom of that same page, Mr. O'Neal mentions that the Epsilon Noise Control Engineering Journal paper compared low-frequency wind turbines sounds to the ANSI S12.2:2008 low-frequency criteria. And to wrap up the story, they found no problem. The reason for that is that ANSI criteria is not appropriate for assessing human response to low-level, modulated infrasound. There
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are a number of papers that have been written on this. But the most relevant one was the 1997 paper by Dr. Geoff Leventhall and Kirsten Perrson Waye, which summarized the 30 years of study in the Sick Building Syndrome. And in that paper, they compared the use of the RNC Curves, which is what Mr. O'Neal is referring to here, the Revised Noise Criteria curves, to other criteria and concluded that the use of the RNC curves is not useful in anticipating whether or not there will be a human response to low-frequency sound. So the fact that they applied the procedure and found no problem is not because there is no problem; it is because the procedure doesn't apply to this type of adverse health effect.
Q. Thank you. Any further comments at this time?
A. That'll be enough.

MR. BLOCK: The witness is
available for cross-examination.
MS. BAILEY: Just one second off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
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[WITNESS: JAMES]

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Roth is the Public Counsel attorney, and he is the first person on the schedule to ask you cross-examination questions.

MR. ROTH: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Good morning, Mr. James.
A. Good morning.
Q. I have a few questions, probably not as many as you'll get from other parties this morning. But I'll proceed.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Roth, is your mic on?

MR. ROTH: Yes, it is.
A. I can hear you.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Okay. What is the purpose of conducting background sound measurements?
A. The purpose of conducting background sound measurements, in the context of anticipating a community's response to a new noise source, over years of work on new projects,
acoustical experts have identified that, as
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long as the new noise source does not increase the background sound levels, the background sound levels are those quiet times in between transient events or short-term sounds, like cars going by, airplanes flying over, insects, wind, all these other things that are temporary. You look for the quiet times between those events. And if the new noise source does not increase that level by more than about 5 decibels, the community will have no negative reaction to it. So the purpose of establishing a background test is to identify what are those quiet sound levels that our auditory system and our psychological system will then use as a basis for judging the noisiness of the new noise source. And that is why the focus here is on using techniques like the 90th percentile, the quietest 10 percent of the time, in order to say -- and at the time when the noise source would be operating. So if you have a machine that operates 4 hours a day, then you look for the quietest time of night and exclude all of those short-term
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events and use that number as the basis for 5 decibels greater being the limit for the new noise source.
Q. Okay. You answered my next question, which is good, which was: Should those measurements be taken during the quietest times? And you've explained that. Thank you.

What I don't understand, though, is in a case like this one, we have Mr. O'Neal goes out and does background sound measurements, but then the project proposes an absolute limit and simply says the project won't make more noise than 45 dB at night and 50 dB during the day. Why do we care about background sound level if, in fact, the only control on this is an absolute limit?

MR. PATCH: I'd just like to note for the record that the proposal from the Company -- actually, Mr. Roth has kind of mischaracterized it, because -- and maybe it's just a misunderstanding, but --

MR. ROTH: It's very possible.
I'm happy to have you set the record
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straight.
MR. PATCH: What the Company has agreed to with the Town, which is noted in the exhibit, 1 believe it's AWE 3 and then Appendix 17A, which is actually more stringent than what was done in either Lempster or Groton, is that the agreement between the Town and the Company here says that the sound from the wind farm during operations, at the exterior facades of homes, shall not exceed 50 dBA, or 5 dBA above ambient, whichever is greater during daytime, and 45 dBA , or 5 dBA above ambient, whichever is greater at night.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. I guess, Mr. James, maybe I'll ask you to comment on that. Based on what you just heard from Attorney Patch, does it still sound like the project could make 50 dBA noise in the daytime, or if ambient noise happens to be 55 dBA, it could make 60? Is that correct? Did I understand what he just said correctly?
A. That is how I understood it. Maybe he could
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|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | tell us whether it -- |
| 2 | (Court Reporter interjects.) |
| 3 | MS. BAILEY: He said "right or |
| 4 | wrong." |
| 5 | MR. PATCH: I don't think it's |
| 6 | appropriate to ask counsel questions. I read |
| 7 | the language of it and -- |
| 8 | BY MR. ROTH: |
| 9 | Q. But you understood it the same way I did? |
| 10 | Does that still sound like an absolute limit |
| 11 | to you? |
| 12 | A. That sounds like a permission to do whatever |
| 13 | they want. Let me -- |
| 14 | Q. Well, I guess that characterization is not |
| 15 | helpful. I asked you, does that sound like |
| 16 | an absolute noise limit to you? |
| 17 | A. No. No, it does not. |
| 18 | Q. Okay. What does it -- |
| 19 | A. And that is because, if they found the sound |
| 20 | level was exceeding 50, and then through |
| 21 | background testing identified that the |
| 22 | background test is 52, then they could bump |
| 23 | up their limit by 7. The normal way those |
| 24 | kinds of clauses are written is that you put |
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the upper limit, 50, as an upper limit, and then you say the criteria should be background plus 5, and never exceed 50 if the background level is higher. They're putting the cart before the horse, which allows a potential for a constantly increasing sound level.

The point of it is this: There is this argument over background sound levels. Seems to be very complex, but it's really very simple. Background sound levels in quiet rural areas late at night when there's no traffic on the roads will generally be in the low 20 dBA range. That is true in Antrim. That is true in every place I've tested. And it has been generally considered to be true by acoustical consultants who've done work in rural communities. There's a paper by George Hessler summarizing the work of over a hundred acoustical consultants, in which he said, "Rural communities have background sound levels that range between 26 and about 28 dBA." All of this stuff about where we locate microphones, whether the wind is
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affecting it, et cetera, are really just surrogates to get around the fact that rural communities are quiet at night, and that if you add 5 decibels to 28 dB , which would be an upper statement for rural background sound levels, that comes out to a number that would prevent the wind turbines being located; therefore, all of this other argument is to disguise the fact that for the industry putting wind turbines in that community, they have to find a way to bump up the background sound levels to come up somewhere near the 40 to 45 dB that they're looking at or predicting will be the sound level from the turbines at nearby homes. This would be very simple if it was all done just using a chart that says rural communities at 25 to 30 , which sets a limit at 35 for wind turbines; and if you can't meet 35 , don't build it here.
Q. Thank you. There was -- have you seen Mr. Tocci's testimony?
A. I listened to it and I reviewed it briefly.
Q. You've seen his report?
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. I listened to his testimony yesterday.
Q. Okay. And are you familiar with the concept that he has expressed in there, that he obtained, I believe, from the Pedersen report about proximity, background and noise production leading to people being annoyed or very annoyed?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What do you understand --
A. I was one of the peer reviewers of the 2009 Pedersen report --
Q. Okay.
A. -- for the journal.
Q. What do you -- how do you interpret "annoyed" and "very annoyed"? What does that mean to you as an acoustician?
A. Annoyed and very annoyed are -- first, there's a difference between how medical professionals, acousticians and other professionals who deal with human response to some kind of perception use the term
"annoyed" and the way the general public uses
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the term "annoyed". We're not talking here about the minor annoyances of life. We're talking about annoyances, where the questions may not even ask someone, "Were you annoyed?" They may say, "Was your sleep disturbed? Was your ability to use the outside patio disturbed?" And those are annoyances. So when we look at the Pedersen study and we see the category of "annoyed" and "very annoyed," we have to interpret it as something that has been designed to give us feedback about real annoyances and not petty annoyances. And I have also used that same chart in work that I've done, where I demonstrate that, instead of a contour map, for example, showing the decibel level, you could put in the percent of highly annoyed. And that would make it more useful and understandable to the boards and panels that are reviewing it. To say that it's 40 decibels outside someone's home is an abstract concept. If we said

28 percent of all people who have a home at this location from the wind turbines would be highly annoyed, that is something more
meaningful to people making the decision.
So I think that what Mr. Tocci did in that table was very good. I think it's very useful. You know, I have done it myself.
Q. And can you give some examples of what might happen to a person who experiences "annoyed" or "very annoyed"?
A. Well, I think the easy way to answer that is one of my medical colleagues, Dr. Sarah Laurie in Australia, has been doing studies of wind turbine noise in large projects. This included putting noise monitors in the yards of people, documenting when the turbines are running, and then taking cortisol tests. Cortisol is a hormone that is a stress indicator. And what they have found in this study is that when the wind turbines are running, they can detect increased cortisol, which is an indicator of annoyance or stress out distances of as far as 5 kilometers from wind turbines, even though the wind turbines at that distance are no longer audible; however, the sound level meters in the yards are still picking up the
very low-frequency sounds from the wind turbines. So, I mean, they've taken it out of the category of an abstract, "Are you annoyed?" and moved it over to a physiological test of cortisol levels and find that people as far as two miles, three miles from large projects show a correlation between when the turbines are running and their stress levels.
Q. Other than this hormone production -- because "annoyed" and "very annoyed" to me sounds like an emotional or behavioral response. And I don't know whether -- I'm not -- I have no medical training. But the question is: Are there emotional and behavioral sort of manifestations that might come as a result of being annoyed or very annoyed?
A. Yes, there are. In fact, let me see if I -in the document that was reviewed yesterday by -- let's see if I can get the number on it. I don't have the reference in the exhibits. But I believe it was an exhibit yesterday called, "Low-frequency Noise and Annoyance," by H.G. Leventhall, published in

Noise and Health back in 2004. Mr.
Leventhall summarized the World Health
Organizations --
Q. Just for the record, we're referring -- can I just stop you for a second?
A. Sure.
Q. We're referring to IWAG N4. Go ahead. I'm sorry.
A. In that document, he summarizes a number of different studies on annoyance. And there's a section called, "Annoyance - the Meaning of Annoyance." It says, "Annoyance has roots in a complex set [sic] of responses which are moderated by both [sic] personal and social characteristics of a complainant."

It's partly due to acoustic factors and partly due to social and personal variables, such as sensitivity to noise, a person's evaluation of the source and how much they have to cope in order to adjust to the noise.

For example: If you take coping as an indicator -- I have a client who lives 1400 feet from a turbine, and his family can't -- has not been able to deal with the
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low-frequency noise. They have vestibular responses. He is now sleeping in the basement of his home in order to mitigate the effect on himself and his family. That's a coping capacity. So when you're sleeping in the basement because of a noise source, you're annoyed -- probably in that case, highly annoyed. Noise annoyance -- it goes on. "Noise annoyance in the home is considered as leading to a long-term negative evaluation of living conditions," depending on past disturbances, et cetera. Dr. Nissenbaum's new paper published this October identified that within 4500 feet of a wind turbine project, very similar to what we're talking about here in Antrim -except that in Antrim the turbines are double the size -- 75 percent of all the people living within 4500 feet wanted to move. So those are the kinds of things that lead people to mark down "annoyed" or "highly annoyed." And it's spelled out in probably four pages of this article. It's not a simple matter, but it goes far beyond the
layperson's use of "annoyance" as a petty or a minor response to something.
Q. Is there a category that goes beyond "very annoyed" in this methodology? Something worse?
A. Well, in my experience of wind turbines, yes.
Q. But in terms of Pedersen's study.
A. No. They stop at "annoyed." But there is one level beyond that, and that's when people walk away from their home.
Q. Okay. But that's not -- in terms of the Pedersen criteria or the Pedersen standard, I'm not sure what to call it exactly, he uses "annoyed" and "very annoyed."
A. Yeah. Yes, we use "annoyed" and "very annoyed." And that's done at a lot of studies with acoustics. We try to classify our reaction to different sounds in some measure so we can relate what we see on our meters, our instruments, to human response.
Q. Okay.
A. Generally the two categories are "annoyed" and "highly annoyed."
Q. The description of "annoyance" and "very
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annoyed" that you gave and you said was based on the Leventhall low-frequency noise and annoyance, do those -- is there a different kind of annoyance that's associated with other than low-frequency noise? Because as I understand low frequency, low-frequency noise is something that's perhaps not audible. But for people who actually have an auditory experience, is there a different kind of annoyance or a "very" annoyance?
A. Well, yes. And, again, this comes down to coping. If the sound is sufficient to wake someone up at night, that's going to be "annoyance." If the sound is such that, let's say at night, in the evening, the family used to sit on the patio in their backyard listening to the natural sounds of nature, if now the backyard sounds like, a -well, to characterize the wind turbines on the top of the ridge, in many cases it sounds like a very busy highway at a distance. If that now covers up that natural sound that people wanted to enjoy on their patio, then they'll be annoyed. So when it becomes
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audible, a lot of times the coping mechanisms are -- what is it that they feel they have lost by no longer having the quiet natural sounds that have been replaced with the industrial sounds from the wind turbines?
Q. Okay. Now, you spoke a minute ago about a Nissenbaum paper?
A. Yes.
Q. Is this Nissenbaum, Aramini and Hanning?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay.

MR. ROTH: I just wanted to note for the record that that appears to be to NB 55.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Now, in terms of --
A. That is in the record? That's good. Yes, thank you.
Q. Yeah. In terms of the example you gave about people sitting on their patio and being annoyed by the sound of the wind turbines, I'm going to cite sort of a personal experience that doesn't have anything to do with wind turbines and see what you make of
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When I grew up, there were freight trains. And you could hear the freight trains something like a mile away. Now, I know a freight train is not as loud -- or is louder probably than a wind turbine, maybe. I don't know. But the point is this: After a while, the freight train became simply something that was just in the background. I didn't really notice it anymore. Is it possible that people who are -- have a new experience listening to a wind turbine might be annoyed with it at first and later on just get used to it and not even notice it anymore?
A. That's an interesting example. One of the things that we've noticed about noise sources and how people respond to them is that there is a potential for acclimating. But this is for noise sources that are not present all of the time. If the train that you're talking about is heard coming towards you, you know that in five minutes or ten minutes it will be gone and you'll be back to your normal
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environment. If that train was to park in your backyard and be present all night long, you might have a different reaction to it. That, I think, is the reason why wind turbines can't be associated or can't be compared directly to other common noise sources in the community. They are not a temporary noise source. They are there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Now, in Britain, back in, $I$ believe it was about six years ago, one of the British agencies took up this task. They did a study to find out, for people in communities where wind turbines had been present for a long time, had they become acclimated? And what they found in the study was that there was no acclimation. If anything, there was a higher level of hostility, because the people in most communities were frustrated that their local political leaders and other people to whom they would go to seek some kind of abatement or mitigation of a noise were refusing to do so. So instead of acclimating, there was actually higher levels
of annoyance, higher levels of anger, and there was no apparent acclimation. And like I said, I think this comes from the fact that the wind turbines aren't like other types of noise sources which are present for a while and then an airplane flies overhead and then it's gone. A train comes and it goes. A car comes and it goes. The other thing is, most of these do not happen for hour after hour during quiet nighttime periods when people are trying to sleep.
Q. In Mr. O'Neal's testimony a couple weeks ago -- were you here for that, or did you listen to it?
A. I was present for that, yes. I was present for one day of it, not the second day.
Q. Yeah. He described the 15- to 19-decibel limit -- or background, rather, that Mr . Tocci had calculated as "extremely, extremely rare." Do you agree with that?
A. No. I think for the last 40 years of my career, I've done a lot of work on community noise for my clients, large manufacturing firms. We never really put a new facility
into an area as rural as some of the areas where wind turbines are being proposed.

When I went out to do my first noise study in one of these rural areas, I was shocked to see how low the sound levels were. I expected levels in the 25 , maybe 35 range, and what $I$ got were levels below 20. This is very common in areas where the rural character is really almost wilderness, where there are no nearby highways, no nearby industrial sources. And in the literature, if we look at people who have done studies in these kind of quiet areas, many of them have recorded sound levels in the range of 18 to 22 decibels, particularly when those samples are done late at night.
Q. And going back to the quietest times question. Now, you probably observed that Mr. O'Neal conducted his measurements during pre-frost. I believe it was early autumn, I think last year. I'm not sure. It could have been -- at this point I lose track of time. It might have been two years ago. But he did it in the early autumn, as I recall,
or late summer. Does that sound about right to you?
A. That sounds right, yes.
Q. Now, what sort of additional sounds might he have picked up doing his measurements at that point that might have been avoided had he conducted those measurements in January or February?
A. In taking background readings in a quiet environment, there's really three types of -three things you have to worry about and try to exclude. One of them is insect noise. And there's two ways of doing that: One is to take data during the -- insect noise is mostly a problem in late July through August, prior to frost. Springtime, we don't have a lot of insects. Wintertime, we don't have a lot of insects. And so some acousticians actually try to do the background sound measurements during those periods. The second way of doing it is by collecting octave band, or one-third octave band data. It's very easy to exclude the insect noise, the way that Dr. Schomer did for the National

Park Services, by just excluding all the frequencies above 1,000 hertz. And it sounds like we're throwing out half the noise with 1,000 hertz on up to 20,000. But in most communities and most rural communities, the background sounds are ranging from the low frequency up to this 1,000 hertz octave band. So if you have the detailed data, it's very easy to just get rid of all the high-frequency end of it, recalculate your sound levels, and that will give you a very good estimate of the dBA levels minus the insects.

The second part of it is wind-induced noise, particularly during seasons when the leaves are beginning to get a little dry. You can pick up a lot of wind noise that is only there during the season when we have leaves blowing around that are not part of the natural background. So that's another one that we can address either through taking data at different seasons, or we can address it by carefully putting the instruments where we don't have any vegetation that might cause
leaf rustle.
And the third one, and this is the most problematic of all, is that as our instruments begin to test for quieter and quieter and quieter environments, we run into the problem that, as the wind moves over the microphone, we begin to induce artifact noise, pseudo noise, self-generated noise. There's a lot of terms for it. That has nothing to do with the environment around us, but it's a result of wind and turbulence moving across the microphone diaphram.
Q. Okay. But that sort of thing -- I was asking you about noise that would occur, sort of a seasonal thing. I'm not asking about the microphone problem.
A. Okay.
Q. But what about running water? I mean, in Mr . O'Neal's report, he indicated that there was running water in a couple of places. Is that something that you would not have a problem with if you did the measurements in January?
A. Well, it might be frozen at that time. But a better solution is to relocate your test site
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to someplace where there isn't audible running water. Putting a measuring location near running water is asking for the data to represent the sound of running water and not the community.
Q. Do you --
A. There's no reason to put it there. There are many other locations it could have been.
Q. Now, did you look at Mr. O'Neal's report?
A. I looked at it, but I need more specificity.
Q. In the text of his report, he reported that his background measurements in a couple places were influenced by sounds of water running and sticks snapping and that sort of thing. Do you remember that?
A. I remember something to that, yes. He described each of the test sites.
Q. Okay. And yesterday we had, I think it was Mr. Tocci, look at that and then looked at the data table, or $I$ guess it was a figure in the back of the report, and confirmed that there was no evidence in the data of what Mr. O'Neal reported in the report. Did you hear that?
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A. I remember that discussion, yes.
Q. Okay. Now, when you -- if you have Mr.

O'Neal's report, I believe the discussion was about Figure A-3 or 2, which was location L2 --
A. Figure A-3?
Q. Or A-2.
A. Yeah, I'm looking for Figure A-3. Okay.

Yeah, I see A-3.
Q. And in his report -- no, actually, 1 think it was A-3. So in his report where he described L3, he said, "Sound levels at the $L 3$ were influenced by flowing water from a nearby brook, aircraft, traffic noise, branches, birds..." Now, if you look at A-3, Figure A-3, which corresponds to Location L3, Mr. Tocci was asked whether there was any evidence in this figure of those influences.

Now, when you look at this figure, do you see any evidence of those influences in this figure? And I think --
A. When I look at graphs like this, I would assume that a steady source of noise, like flowing water, would represent the minimum
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levels, or it would be most noticeable when the sounds are at minimum level. And what I see here is at nighttime, usually about midnight through four or five in the morning, we drop down to 22 decibels, 24 decibels, maybe as high as 28 . So if running water was present, I would assume that it would be somewhere around 22 to 25 decibels, based upon this chart.

MS. BAILEY: Excuse me a minute. The court reporter missed something. Do you want to go back, or should we --

THE COURT REPORTER: I got it.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. So, looking at chart -- at Figure A-3, is there any -- is there anything on this figure that graphically shows the influence of running water?
A. It doesn't have the characteristics of having -- running water was not dominating the readings, unless the running water was 25 decibels or 23 decibels.
Q. Okay. Now going back to Mr. Tocci's report. There are a number of -- do you want to look
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back at the screen right now? All we can see is your ear.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Oh}$, sorry.
[Laughter]
Q. Okay. In Mr. Tocci's report, there are a number of computations that he performed to reach the information that he provided in the table on Page 20.
A. Okay. Let me see if I can pull up his report. Now, we're looking at his initial prefiled testimony or --
Q. His supplemental prefiled testimony of October 11th.
A. Can you give me a reference? I know where I can find that. Excuse me. I know where I can find that. Okay. I'm looking at his October 11th, 2012 paper.
Q. Okay. Now, if you look at Page 20 --
A. Getting there slowly. Page 19... okay. I see a table on that page.
Q. Okay. Have you previously had an opportunity to look at this table?
A. I did not review this in detail. I remember the discussion yesterday about it.
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Q. Okay. Do you have experience with or knowledge of Mr. Tocci?
A. I met him briefly when $I$ was at the hearing earlier this month. But other than that, I've had no experience, other than possibly some e-mail exchanges. And I sent him a few copies of the reports I've written on this issue.
Q. Okay. And in your review of this report, do you believe that Mr. Tocci employed acceptable, reasonable methodology in making his computations?
A. I think he used a reasonable method. I think it was much more complicated than I would have done. But in most cases, I think it was reasonable.
Q. Okay. Do you think that he made up numbers to reach any of these conclusions in the table?
A. No. No, I think this was the result of his analysis. Like I said, there are some of them, like Location 1, Location 5 possibly, where I might have come up with lower numbers. But $I$ think in general it's a
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reasonable approach. It's just much more complicated than I would have taken.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

In Mr. O'Neal's testimony, his original
testimony -- do you have that?
A. His original prefiled?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And if you turn to Page 10 of that --
A. I'm on Page 10 now.
Q. So, for the five locations there's a table there, Table 7-3. And he predicts for the five locations that the highest wind turbine sound level on that table is Location L3, at 42 dB -- dBA; correct?
A. That's correct. 42 at Location 3.
Q. Okay. And is it your understanding that this is a -- in using his methodology, this is a worst-case figure?
A. No, it's not a worst-case figure. And the explanation for that is long and complicated. But the short answer is: There have been a number of studies done, both in Ontario and here in the states, by people who are
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following up on complaints, in which they find that the predicted value at a property is lower than what they measure when they follow up on the complaint. So, I -- rather than going through a long explanation of why that could happen, what $I$ generally do is say that, if we know that the model predicts 5 decibels lower, potentially 20 decibels lower, but at least 5 decibels lower than what would be measured during a complaint at that location, we need to increase all of the predicted levels by at least 5 in order to account for this deviation. So what I see in this table is 42 at Salmon Brook Road. I would say that we would probably find 47 at Salmon Brook Road on a night when a complaint would be likely; 39 at Reed Carr Road would be more like 44 at night. And it could be as much as 5 to 20 decibels higher, depending upon the weather conditions.

When we say "predicted worst case," that is a very long stretch. If all of -- and let me back up this way. This model is no different than the models submitted for
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projects all around the world. All of them come up with numbers above at the same distances --
Q. Well, what -- Mr. James --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
A. If we didn't have complaints -- I mean, if these models were right, we wouldn't have complaints. We do have complaints. Those models are wrong.
Q. All right. Mr. James, it seems to me that Mr. O'Neal's objective here is to over-estimate the amount of noise that the wind turbines will produce. And I think you previously testified that they essentially create or provide a higher level of background noise to sort of justify that.

What would be Mr. O'Neal's incentive to underestimate the noise that the wind turbines make at a given location, if what in fact he was doing was setting himself up to fail in actual performance? Why would he do that?
A. Well, there's two answers to that. The first one is when you're presenting information to
\{SEC 2012-01\} \{DAY 8 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{11-29-12\}
a Committee for a decision on a permit, it really helps the argument for that permit if you can claim that the background levels are high, so high that the wind turbines will barely be noticed --
Q. Well, I understand that with background levels --
(Court Reporter interjects.)
MS. BAILEY: Can you stop a second, please?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Sorry. I had interrupted you, and that tossed off the record.

So you were commenting on the reason for using higher background levels. And I tried to object to you, because that's not what -that wasn't my question. And I guess I want to go back to my question, which was: Why would they have an incentive to understate the expected noise of the turbines? Because you've probably heard the expression, you know, "under-promise, over-deliver." Aren't they doing the opposite here, if what you're
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saying is true?
A. Not if the goal is to get a permit. They want the turbines to appear as quiet as possible. And that is what has been done.

Now, when we say 40 at Keene Road or 35 at Loveren Mill Road, arguably, those are average levels. Complaints don't get generated off of average levels. They get generated off of the extremes that occur under other weather conditions. But the goal here is to get a permit. And so why would they want to say at Keene Road it could be as high as 55 under some weather conditions? That's just likely to get the permit denied.
Q. I guess the problem that I'm having with this approach that you're suggesting is that they're proposing a limit, an absolute limit of 45, basically, at night. And what you're saying is that, if the 42 is 5 decibels higher, then they're going to be violating their own self-established limit.
A. That's right.
Q. And they don't care about that?
A. That's right. They're very close to the
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limit right here. And if they pointed out that this is a mean predicted level from optimum noise-emission conditions, that would work against their ultimate goal of getting the permit.
Q. If you were to propose an absolute limit for this project, what would it be?
A. Well, I have proposed an absolute limit for projects, and I'm consistent with that. So 35 dBA would be the absolute limit, based upon calculations for 1-1/2-megawatt wind turbines.
Q. Why does -- what's the relationship to 1-1/2-megawatt wind turbines? These are twice that size.
A. Well, the reason I say 1-1/2-megawatt turbines is those were the turbines available when George Kamperman and I prepared our 2008 document. And we went through the calculation to find out what would be the maximum level of a wind turbine that would still blend into the background in a rural community. And so our assumption was a rural community would be 40 decibels or quieter at
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night; 5 decibels over if that would be 35 decibels. Since that time, we have the work by Pedersen, which shows that annoyance seems to be minimal, with 10 percent annoyed at 35 decibels, and then rapidly increases as sound levels go up 35. And we have our experience from projects showing where people are exposed to levels of 35 real levels, measured levels at 35, we generally don't have complaints.

So what started as a calculation exercise in 2008 has now been corroborated by social studies of people living near wind turbines and by the experience of looking at projects where there was sufficient distance between homes and wind turbines to prevent levels going over 35. And so at this point, I believe 35 is a very solid number, and it is also being accepted and adopted by communities around the world.
Q. Okay. So, really, the 1-1/2-megawatt wind turbine is simply where you started --
A. Yes.
Q. -- but is not really a factor in relation to
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the 35 or not. You're saying --
A. That's right.
Q. You're saying it should be 35 , whether it's a 3-megawatt or a 1-1/2 or a 1/2.
A. Yes, with one caveat; and that is, as wind turbines get larger, they produce more low-frequency sound. And so a limit of just 35 dBA may give, for a larger wind turbine, the sense that it will not have excessive low-frequency noise. What we need in addition to the dBA criteria is a limit on the low-frequency sound.
Q. If you have $35 \mathrm{dBA}--$ let's say you got a turbine that is a 3-megawatt and it's producing 35, 40 dBA at a residence. Is it going to -- is there going to be low-frequency sound of sufficient power to make -- to be an issue at that residence that's experiencing 30 to 35 ?
A. Yes, and I base that on both studies. But the thing that really brought that home to me was a client $I$ have in Wisconsin, in a project called Shirley Wind. This is a home that is 3300 feet away from the nearest
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turbine. So it's comparable to many of the homes in the Antrim project. The sound levels outside that home are routinely in the 32 to 33 dBA range from the wind turbine. But the low-frequency sound from these turbines -- these are 2-1/2-megawatt turbines -- inside the home is enough that the air palpably shimmers at night. I have stayed overnight there, and I have experienced it myself. The people who live in that home left their home about two or three months after the project started and have not been back to it since.
Q. Other than the palpable shimmering --
A. So I have personal experience, that, yeah, larger turbines can produce more low-frequency sound while still meeting a 35 dBA criteria.
Q. Okay. Other than the palpable shimmering in that residence, did you measure the low-frequency sound in any way?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And what did you measure it at?
A. Low-frequency sounds inside the home
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generally range at a level of about 70 to 80 decibels.
Q. And because that's a low frequency, that's not audible?
A. It's absolutely inaudible to me. I couldn't hear it. I don't have a vestibular response to it. But I could actually feel the resonance in the -- inside the building.
Q. Okay. I'm going to move on to -- this is sort of a nice segue to my question, which is about audibility.

MS. BAILEY: Before you move
on, Mr. Roth, can $I$ just ask the reporter?
Are you okay, or do you -- I wouldn't be surprised if you need to take more frequent breaks.

MR. ROTH: I only have two more questions.

MS. BAILEY: Oh, two more questions? Okay.

MR. ROTH: I can't speak to everyone else, but that's all I've got.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q. In Mr. Tocci's testimony, he spoke about the
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audibility of the turbines on nature trails near Willard Pond. Did you see that in his report?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. And do you believe that while -- do you believe that audibility of turbine noise in a nature trail or similar natural
recreational setting would be a factor that might be found to be annoying, whether you use Pedersen's approach or not, but might annoy a hiker or a kayaker?
A. Well, I think the whole point of hiking or kayaking -- well, kayaking, you have river noise --
Q. Well, it's a still pond. So --
A. But people who are -- yeah, okay. Still pond. That's true. The point of being in a nature preserve is to listen to nature. The presence of wind turbine sounds that are 10 to 15 decibels louder than the nature sounds destroys the whole premise of why you want to be there.
Q. Okay. And then my last question --
A. People don't take hikes in industrial parks.
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|  |  |  | 145 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Let me put it that way. |  |
| 2 |  | [Laughter] |  |
| 3 | Q. | Well, 1 note in my own experience, when $I$ |  |
| 4 |  | hike in the White Mountains and I hear a |  |
| 5 |  | Harley on the highway, it tells me two |  |
| 6 |  | things. One, I'm almost out of the woods, |  |
| 7 |  | and I feel pretty good. But it also tells me |  |
| 8 |  | I can a hear the Harley, and that's |  |
| 9 |  | bothersome. Is that kind of what you're |  |
| 10 |  | talking about? |  |
| 11 | A. | That is exactly what I'm saying. It's a |  |
| 12 |  | sound that is not within the character of the |  |
| 13 |  | environment. |  |
| 14 | Q. | Thank you. In your experience doing these |  |
| 15 |  | kinds of -- working on these kinds of cases |  |
| 16 |  | and problems, have you experienced the wind |  |
| 17 |  | turbine manufacturer's noise guaranty? Have |  |
| 18 |  | you had any experience with that? |  |
| 19 | A. | Yes, I have. |  |
| 20 | 2. | Okay. Now, you may remember a question I |  |
| 21 |  | asked Mr. O'Neal about what happens when -- |  |
| 22 |  | with the guaranty. And I'll be more |  |
| 23 |  | specific. |  |
| 24 |  | I asked Mr. O'Neal -- I think I asked |  |
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Mr. O'Neal, and maybe it was in my imagination. But here's the question: If a wind turbine manufacturer models a particular noise level and makes a guaranty based upon that noise level, and then later goes and conducts tests of the actual turbine running and comes up with a higher number, is the guaranty that the manufacturer makes after those two things have happened, when a sale is made, going to apply to the model, or is it going to apply to the actual test number?
A. The guaranty is only applied to the test number. If there was a situation -- and this is a hypothetical because $I$ don't believe it's happened yet. If there was a situation where a project is installed using the manufacturer's data and you later find that the sound levels are much higher and someone says, well -- the utility operator says to the manufacturer, "You guaranteed me it would be $x$ decibels," the way the guaranty is worded would go into effect. And the guaranty only applies to tests of the wind turbine under the conditions defined in the
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IEC 6140400-11 procedure, which means we'd have to take the turbine off the ridge, move it to a flat area, test it during the daytime with low wind sheer. In other words, the guaranty only applies to the test reproducibility, not to what happens when we relocate that turbine into other areas where wind, turbulence, topography and many other factors could increase it. And so the guaranty is not a guaranty that the sounds will never be excessive in Antrim. It is only that the particular turbine, if tested, again, on a test bed, would still have the same sound levels within plus or minus two of what the test data derived.

Okay. Thank you. That's all the questions I have.

MS. BAILEY: Thank you. We're going to take a 15-minute break, and we will resume at 12:15 p.m..

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm going to just mute my mic and turn off the screen.

MS. BAILEY: Okay.
(Recess taken at 12:03 p.m., and the
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[WITNESS: JAMES]

|  | 148 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | hearing resumed at 12:20 p.m.) |
| 2 | MS. BAILEY: Okay, we're back |
| 3 | on the record. And next up for questions is |
| 4 | Mr. Froling. Do you have any, Mr. Froling? |
| 5 | MR. FROLING: No questions |
| 6 | today. Thank you. |
| 7 | MS. BAILEY: Mr. Beblowski. |
| 8 | MR. BEBLOWSKI: No questions. |
| 9 | MS. BAILEY: Mr. Jones. |
| 10 | MR. JONES: Not at the moment. |
| 11 | MS. BAILEY: Well, this is |
| 12 | your only moment, just so you know, for this |
| 13 | witness. |
| 14 | MR. JONES: Yeah. Right. |
| 15 | MS. BAILEY: So you don't have |
| 16 | any questions. |
| 17 | Katharine Sullivan. |
| 18 | (No verbal response) |
| 19 | MS. BAILEY: Ms. Longgood or |
| 20 | Ms. Duley. |
| 21 | MS. DULEY: Yes, I do have |
| 22 | some. Thank you. |
| 23 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 24 | BY MS. DULEY: |
|  | \{SEC 2012-01\} \{DAY 8 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{11-29-12\} |

Q. Mr. James, I'm speaking for Janice Duley Longgood. My name is Susan Duley. I am her sister. I'm very familiar with the home she's had in Antrim for many, many years. And I believe you met her when you were here. Her house will be within one mile of four turbines, the closest one being 3800 feet. There are a few different numbers for ambient levels: 24 for Mr. O'Neal, taken from Table 6-2, Appendix 1A, NB 57; and also 32/15 from Mr. Tocci, Page 20 in his supplemental. I'm trying to read her notes here.

I guess the question that I really have is: Are these numbers reasonable, based upon everything you have read, studied and commented on thus far, for us to -- or for her to consider as reasonable approximations of what will really happen? And I'd like you to note that she lives in a very quiet hollow. And the sound equipment -- her sound station was L3, Salmon Brook Road, and it was located above her house, about 800 feet further from the turbine site than her house.
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A. Okay. I see L3 on the map.
Q. If you were looking at that map, the square that is the closest to the -- I don't know what number turbines they are, but they're the middle group of turbines -- that is her house. And it's adjacent to a small beaver pond.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay.
A. So I think I have --
Q. So what we're trying to ask --
A. So your question is: Are the sound levels representing background sound, I believe you said in the high 20 s and low 30 s, representative?
Q. No. I said ambient levels of 24 for O'Neal and then 32 to 15 for Mr. Tocci. I'm trying to discern what is --
A. From 15 -- was Mr. Tocci's lowest number 15?
Q. Hold on. I'm getting some help. Just a moment.
(Pause in proceedings)
MS. BAILEY: Back on the
record, Ms. Duley.
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BY MS. DULEY:
Q. Excuse me. I'm going to start over. I've confused myself in asking the questions. So I've introduced myself. I'm Susan Duley. I'm Janice Duley Longgood's sister. I'm representing her at this hearing. And these questions are to ascertain how sound will affect her particular situation.

Her house is the one I noted earlier.
It's near Sound Tower L3, and it is the little square that is closest to the middle run of the turbines. So there are a few different numbers for ambient levels. Mr. O'Neal has cited an ambient level of 24. And that is taken from Table 6-2, Appendix 13A, Exhibit NB 57. And then also, Mr. Tocci mentioned that there's an ambient sound level of 32. And if you take the insect noise out of that, which was a minus 15, it yields an ambient level of 17 . Do you consider these numbers reasonable approximations of the impact of sound on this particular household, noting that it is in a very quiet hollow, and the sound equipment that measured these was
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above the house about 850 -- 800 feet further from the turbine site?
A. I think those numbers are very reasonable. But 24 through 17 are right in the range of what $I$ would expect.
Q. And if I look at the 17 here, adjusted number without the insects, and the Antrim Wind Energy sound, I calculate an impact of 26.

Does that sound reasonable?
A. The difference between the existing background and the predicted sound level is 26 decibels? That right there would lead to, as a general rule, a high degree of annoyance complaints. In similar cases where I've gone through the analysis, I would predict that that would be a situation that would lead to lawsuits, if not abandonment of the home.
Q. Can you comment at all on the impact of "high annoyance" or "annoyance," as you were discussing vis-a-vis cortisol levels, with any long-term health effects, given your studies done in conjunction with the medical community?
A. Well, the reason why Dr. Laurie is taking
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cortisol samples is because the long periods with high cortisol levels in the body lead to cardiovascular disease and other types of health effects that are driven by stress. And so, yes, it would lead to long-term effects. Whether direct or indirect may be argued. But high cortisol levels over long periods of time are known to cause adverse health effects.
Q. And in your experience, would these be exacerbated if someone maybe already had high blood pressure or if someone had a compromised immune system?
A. I have clients on Vinalhaven Island that were at similar distances from three wind turbines, whose doctor -- or a client whose doctor recommended that they leave their home on the island because it was beginning to show deterioration of heart function from the continuing stress.
Q. Thank you. Does the 15-decibel insect-noise reduction seem appropriate to you in terms of adjusting the figures that Mr. Tocci put forward?
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A. Well, you know, I would have had to have been there to hear how loud the turbines or the insects were. But the end result he got of 18 decibels to 17 decibels is what $I$ would expect for a very quiet area away from highways at night when there's very little human activity going on. Once you removed the insects, there's not much to be heard out in an area like that.
Q. Do you have experience with people living as close as my sister does to turbines that are so large, 3 megawatts?
A. Not 3 megawatts. That's a newer size. But 2-1/2 megawatts is the closest $I$ have come to that. However, the general trend we've seen is that the complaints about -- the complaints that are related to the low-frequency sound components tend to increase as the turbines get larger. And so my assumption is that my experience with the 2-1/2-megawatt turbines in places here in Michigan and Ohio, New York, Wisconsin, Illinois, will be comparable to or slightly worse when we go to the 3 -megawatt turbines.
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Q. So it's fair so assume there will be more low frequency noise --
A. Yes.
Q. -- rather than less.
A. Yes.
Q. And though it has been stated that the more modern wind turbines do not have this low-frequency noise, what has your experience been with the more modern turbines?
A. Well, that's a bit of sophistry. That statement about modern wind turbines don't produce the low-frequency noise that older wind turbines produce comes from the style of turbines that are now obsolete, where the blades were on the downwind side of the tower. So as the wind came towards the tower, we had kind of a dead air spot on the other side that the blades passed through, creating a very loud thump. And by moving the blades to the upwind side, we've reduced that thump. But there's still a wind. The wind slows down as it gets towards that tower. It's just the resistance as the air gets closer. So there is still a detectable
thump from that. Dr. Malcolm Swingbanks, in his 2012 paper for inner noise in New York City last August, demonstrated that there was sufficient energy to produce this thump, especially with modern wind turbines.

The point is, it's much lower. However, that's not the only source of infrasound. The infrasound that we're seeing and was measured in the paper by myself and Wade Bray is caused by what's called "in-flow turbulence." It's the little gusts and cross-winds and updrafts, et cetera, that are present in the air flowing into the blades, at the height of the blades. These little deviations in the airstream cause little bursts of infrasound. And this would have been a function that's just as true about the old downwind-style turbines as the new, modern turbines. The problem is, until recently, we didn't have instruments that could detect it. And that was the point of our paper, to demonstrate there are now instrumentation methods that can detect the small bursts of acoustic energy in the very
low-frequency ranges. And that was our 2011 paper. And those have nothing to do with the tower interaction. Those are entirely a function of turbulence in the air moving over the blades, causing little bursts of low-frequency noise. Very short ones, less than a tenth of a second. Very short little bursts.
Q. Do you have experience with people -- at what level -- what do people report when those noises are a part of the sound environment around a wind turbine?
A. Well, they report that they feel a number of symptoms. These persons get -- some people sense nausea like you would get with motion sickness. One of my Michigan clients described it as standing still while the moon spun her. Another person described it as the sense that the world was okay, but she was spinning. Very similar to the effect she described as when she was a young girl and used to spin rapidly in circles until the world would spin around her. Other people pick it up as pulsations in their chest.
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There's a wide variety of ways people perceive it. But as a general rule, they all are triggered not by the auditory response; they don't hear it. Let me put it that way. Most of my clients that describe the vestibular-related symptoms do not hear the wind turbines in their homes; they feel it. And they can do this repeatedly.

I have a client in Ontario who, while I was taking data outside, told me the turbines had stopped. There's no way he knew that, because he was sitting in a room that had no windows facing the turbines. And he had the TV on, so he couldn't have heard the turbines. And I went outside and looked at my meter. And just at the point he told me the turbines stopped, the sound level had dropped. I went inside, and about of half-hour later he said, "The turbines are running again, except now they've switched direction." I go outside, and indeed the turbines are running, they're in different direction, and my meters show the sound levels are back up. Now, how can he do this
if he's not perceiving it? We don't necessarily know everything about how people are perceiving it. But what we can say is there is a certain group of people -- whether it's 10 percent or 20 percent or 40 percent, we don't know -- whose sensitivity to the low-frequency sounds is sufficient to allow them to perceive the turbines operating. And for those people, this becomes an overwhelming problem, causing them to leave their homes. This particular family had their home bought by the operator because of the continuing complaints, along with five other families in that complex. And those homes were at distances of 2200 feet and greater.

We're still in the early part of understanding all the nuances. But there are so many complaints with such a well-defined set of symptoms, that $I$ don't believe at this time we can afford to ignore it any longer.
Q. Can you account for, or can you explain -let me back up a minute.

There's a lot of talk about Wind Turbine

Syndrome, vibroacoustic disease. We've gone over that. Yet, the wind industry, and even Mr. Tocci, seem to discount this. Can you -is there any reason for that? Can you account for these -- explain this discrepancy between your perspective and what we're hearing from Mr. Tocci?
A. Well, $I$ think the easy answer to that is, if Wind Turbine Syndrome had been described as "Low-Frequency Noise Syndrome," then there's a wealth of literature. The Journal of Low-Frequency Noise and Vibration, published by Geoff Leventhall, who's one of the wind industry experts, routinely has articles on how inaudible levels of low-frequency sounds cause problems. There's a whole class of symptoms related to this aspect. The term "Low-Frequency Noise Syndrome" is the larger category for what we call Wind Turbine Syndrome or Sick Building Syndrome or Truck Driver's Syndrome. People who are exposed to highly modulated, low-frequency sound, who have a vestibular sensitivity that is slightly greater than average, report the
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consistent a set of symptoms. And the only difference between Sick Building Syndrome and Wind Turbine Syndrome is, instead of office workers in an office, Sick Building Syndrome, we have homeowners in their homes, and we call it Wind Turbine Syndrome. Now, whether Mr. Tocci was involved in this over his career, I don't know. But I have dealt with -- I worked -- and I have a paper out on this called, "Warning Signs That Went Unheard," in a peer-review journal, both in science technology and society, that goes over the history of all of the clues from other types of noise sources causing these adverse health effects that should have been considered by politicians and medical experts when setting up criteria for wind turbines. And as the title says, these warning signs went unheard. So we're seeing the result of it now in projects all over the world, where people can't live in a home or are living in their home and complaining about these symptoms. But symptoms are the same, whether it's Low-Frequency Noise Syndrome, Wind

Turbine Syndrome or Sick Building Syndrome.
Q. Thank you. Are you familiar -- I know you're familiar with Dr. Nissenbaum's study. You've referenced it. Could you characterize how the people in Mars Hill and Vinalhaven would relate to my sister's situation on Salmon Brook Road? She's very concerned about not being able to sleep. Should she be concerned about that?
A. Well, that was -- I mean, it's very similar. There's two wind projects in Dr. Nissenbaum's paper. One of them was the Three Wind Turbine project on Vinalhaven Island, which really isn't that comparable to Antrim. But there's also Mars Hill, where we have, I think it was 19 wind turbines located on a ridge above a very quiet area. This ridge is right along -- it runs north and south along the Canadian border in Maine, such that you bump into the Canadian border 4500 feet from the base of the ridge. So there's only a limited strip where you can put homes. And there's nothing on that site because it's a border area.
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So you have a very quiet community. You have people within 4500 feet of wind turbines. He did a case control study. We have a control group from the other side of the ridge, several miles away. And he compared the symptoms of the people on the quiet side of the ridge to the people closer to the wind turbine, on what I'll call the "noisier side" of the ridge, and found that of the families who are on the -- within 4500 feet of the turbines, 75 percent of them wanted to sell their homes or leave their homes but were unable to because they couldn't get anyone to buy it. He found an increase in the number of sleep aids. He found an increase in the number of basically antidepressants, serotonin -- selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors used by those people. But the general finding was people within 4500 feet of wind turbines were showing a mix of coping mechanisms for both the audible sound and the inaudible sound. And his conclusion was that, if he had gone farther, if the Canadian border hadn't been
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so close to the ridge, he would have found similar problems extending out to probably distances of a mile and more. His conclusion was that, although we don't know for sure what the safe level is, it's going to be less than 40 decibels. Mars Hill is probably the most deeply studied wind project in the United States. There's been years' worth of study going on. We know what the sound levels were. The models have been redone and readjusted so that they're now fairly close to the way the measurements come out. And because of having that similarity to Antrim, it is very safe, $I$ believe to say, that the kind of responses that Dr. Nissenbaum found for people living on the wind turbine's noisy side of that ridge would be comparable to what would happen in Antrim.
Q. Thank you. She writes that -- and I'm quoting -- "I am horrified that Mr. Tocci said mitigation could be storm windows, insulation and indoor ventilation." She lives in this area in Antrim in order to be able to be outside her home, as well as
inside the home. Do you know of any other mitigation methods?
A. Well, first, I wouldn't necessarily say I'm horrified with the suggestions. But let's say this: That's a "blame the victim." In other words, there are some people who choose to live in quiet rural areas for a number of reasons. Maybe they don't cope well with noise. Maybe they just want to listen to the sounds of insects at night. We don't know what motivates them. But they have chosen this. When you then have a new noise come in, whether it be a highway or airport or a set of wind turbines, it disrupts the basis for why they made that decision. To tell them that the solution is that they now begin to live like urban people -- you put up extra insulation on your home; you live indoors instead of on your patio -- is a terrible imposition upon the whole premise that those who are there first have a priority. If wind turbines had been there and someone moved in, I think that's a whole different issue. But people have self-selected that community, and
the newcomer is the wind turbine project. And the newcomer needs to accommodate the character of the community and the desires of its citizens. And putting up storm windows is not accommodating. Accommodating them is either use a wind turbine that is quieter or locate them differently, or locate them somewhere else.
Q. Thank you. I have, I think, one other -- two other questions.

Given -- have you studied the topography of the ridge upon which these turbines will be erected? Are you familiar with it?
A. I'm familiar with it, in that $I$ have been in that area just long enough to see the ridge, to understand where the main highway was with respect to the ridge, and done a number of views using Google Earth to see how the ridge and the wind turbines would look from different homes around that area. But I don't have the in-depth personal experience been with that ridge that $I$ do with other projects.
Q. The reason I'm asking is, I wanted to ask if
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you have an opinion, based upon what you do know about the topography of the ridge and what you know about wind turbine behavior and what you know about weather coming down from Canada in the winter, as to whether the decibel ratings that are projected for this would be adequate, given the fact that we sometimes get some very severe winter storms and unusual wind patterns in this part of the country.
A. I think that Mars Hill -- again, the people who live along the base of Mars Hill -- of the ridge in Mars Hill say that the worst time of the year is wintertime, and it's because of those kind of situations. I would have assumed it was summertime when they wanted to use the outdoors. But I have families there that $I$ have communicated with who have told me that there are times during the winter when the sound in their homes from the wind turbines, the audible sounds, are the dominant sounds and that they have to turn up their television or talk louder around the dinner table. So I think that is
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what you could expect in Antrim. There will be times when the wind turbines are inaudible. There will be other times when it's the dominant noise source. And we don't see that in the prediction. The prediction just gives us an average level without looking at the higher and lower extremes that are going to be the basis for the complaints. Thank you. One more question, and that is that the Applicant wants to have a limit of 50 decibels during the day and 45 decibels at night. And you have talked about your clients experiencing both audible frequency responses to that as well as low-frequency or inaudible responses. Given those decibel levels, can you characterize what percent of the -- let's see. I think you said people within 4500 feet would experience high annoyance?
A. Well, let me -- yeah, 75 percent of the people within 4500 feet at Mars Hill wanted to sell their homes. I guess that's an indication of being highly annoyed.
Q. I'm sorry. I do have one last question.
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In your experience as an expert witness on sound, would you -- are you familiar with or would you recommend that there be any kind of accommodation in permitting for homes that are located within that sound range that you talk about, $I$ think it's 4500 feet, or exceeding a certain decibel level? By "accommodation," I mean that there be some recognition that their quality of life, if not the value of their home and their physical health, will be affected by living there?
A. I think that this is normally addressed with what we call "the property value guaranty." That's what we've done in Illinois and a number of cases. If the project is approved, and we recognize there are a number of people who will be adversely affected, then they should be allowed to get the value of the their property and go elsewhere. That should be built into the cost of the project.

Whether that's built into the cost by the Committee making it a requirement or the developer just offering it as a way to
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minimize future problems doesn't really matter.

But the real issue is, given this community, do the turbines belong there? And from what $I$ have seen, the community will have a negative impact. And the negative impact will be extreme for all the people within 4500 feet. And that includes people on both sides of the ridge. To say -declare an eminent domain situation and buy everybody up and add 25 percent to the value of their property just seems like uprooting an awful lot of people for a wind project that might have a happy home on another ridge elsewhere.
Q. Thank you, Mr. James. I have no more questions.

MS. BAILEY: All right. Mr.
Stearns.
MR. STEARNS: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Pinello?
MS. PINELLO: No questions.
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Manzelli?
MS. MANZELLI: No, thank you.
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> MS. BAILEY: Ms. Allen.
> MS. ALLEN: Yes, I have one question.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. ALLEN:
Q. Mr. James, my name is Mary Allen, and I'm a co-intervenor with Bob Edwards in this case. And I have one question for you.

Do you have any opinion or evidence about what happens to sound from wind turbines as they travel over a quiet water surface, such as a lake surface? And do you have any idea about when they might be perceived, in terms of distance from the turbine?
A. Well, sound traveling over a water surface is kind of an example of a worst-case situation. Sound travels -- because the surface is reflective, the sound will travel very clearly. I think many people have had the experience of sitting on one side of a lake during the quiet of the night and hearing people talk on the other side of the lake. If there had been equal distance to a forest,
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[WITNESS: JAMES]
we probably wouldn't have heard them. So it's a worst-case situation.
Q. Thank you very much. No further questions. MS. BAILEY: Mr. Kimball?
(No verbal response)
MS. BAILEY: Ms. Linowes, how
many -- how long do you have, do you think?
A. I have quite -- well, a lot of the questions were asked, so I'm doing great. But I probably have at least 40 minutes, I'm thinking, maybe a little more.

MS. BAILEY: All right. Let's
try to get started and go until about 1:15. Is that okay with you, Sue? THE COURT REPORTER: Yeah. MS. BAILEY: Thank you. Go ahead.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Hello, Mr. James. My name is Lisa Linowes. And a lot of the questions I had that I was going to ask you have been asked already. So I'm very happy about that. But I do want to cover some territory that was not touched
\{SEC 2012-01\} \{DAY 8 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{11-29-12\}

A. Yes.
Q. And you also heard Mr. Tocci. He read a paragraph out of a paper written by George Hessler. I referenced it in Paul Schomer's critique of another background study done at Cape Vincent. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you recall that the content of the paragraph, that he recommended that the intent was to find the lowest consistent background noise? I'm paraphrasing here. But is that your understanding?
A. That's my understanding. It's generally
accepted practice, yes.
Q. You recall that Mr. Tocci agreed that -- or admitted or stated that Mr. O'Neal did not follow that methodology that was recommended by Mr. Hessler?
A. That's correct.
Q. So if you, Mr. Schomer, Mr. Tocci and Mr. Hessler were all in the room together right now, and I asked each of you, "Did Mr. O'Neal follow the proper methodology for collecting background sound survey?" could you say that,
based on what you have heard and read, that you would all agree that Mr . O'Neal did not follow standard practices for collecting background noise?
A. Mr. O'Neal did not follow either of the two standardized methodologies, S12.9 Part 2 or S12.9 Part 3, in his background study. And he also focused not on the quietest times, but on times that in his table are described as "average" or "maximum." He also included Leq, which is one of the worst indicators for use in quiet rural areas for background noise. And as such, I could say that some of the data that Mr . O'Neal presented appears to be consistent with what I would have expected for a rural community, particularly one with wilderness characteristics. But the fact that it is mixed in with a lot of other data, that really is irrelevant and makes it hard for the reader to see what is important and what isn't important.
Q. Thank you. That gets to my next question. As I was listening to some of your testimony today, I looked again in Mr. O'Neal's report.
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And I would like to direct your attention to two pages, the first one being 5-5, and the second --
A. Okay. I have 5-5 here.
Q. Now, here he -- actually, the text begins on the prior page. But in any event, he's talking about Location 1 at the beginning of this Page 5-5. And he says that the continuous steady-state $L 90$ measurements range from 27 to 63 decibels, and then down to Location 2 he says it ranges from 21 to 68 decibels. Again, this is L90. And it continues for all of the locations. There's some large range there. So --
A. That's right.
Q. -- in looking at that, can you draw any conclusion as to what the background sound level is in Antrim?
A. Yes. If you just look at the first number, for L1, 27 L90; for L2, 21 L 90 ; for L3, 22, L90; for L4, 23 L 90 ; and for Location 5, 19 L90.
Q. Thank you. Now --
A. The other numbers, the Leq numbers, the
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higher numbers are irrelevant to the topic of anticipating community response to new noise.
Q. Now, Mr. James, if you could look on Page 6-3.
A. Okay.
Q. This table shows the ambient background L90 sound levels apparently during periods of high wind conditions -- or including some periods of high wind conditions, what he is calling "the worst case." Would you -- are these the -- are these numbers meaningful, or are they -- are we looking still at what you had said the L90s would be on Page 5-5?
A. These numbers are in line. I mean, if you take Table 6.2 and you cross out the last three columns -- the Maximum, Medium and Average -- and you just look at the minimum L90, you have a good characterization of the community. And it's right in the ballpark for what $I$ would expect in a quiet rural community at night.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Just bear with me. I'm...
(Pause in proceedings)
Q. Okay. Based on your examination of Mr .
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O'Neal's work then, you can determine -- or draw a conclusion as to what the L 90 is. So is that the number that you would recommend the Committee start with? So when we're -what would we call -- when we were saying there's a potential over-estimate of the long-term background level, in fact, you're saying that there is enough information in the report to draw a conclusion that the background sound survey is showing sound levels in the 20 -decibel to 29 -decibel range; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, I have some questions regarding the noise modeling, okay. They use the CadnaA software to predict the post-construction noise on an operating wind project. And the CadnaA software is based on a standard, the ISO -- that's based on the standard, the ISO 9613; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, in Mr. O'Neal's report, on Page 7-2 he states -- this is at the top of the first -- second full sentence on the top
of the page. He says the software was run with meteorology conditions of 10 degrees centigrade and 70-percent relative humidity. Do you see that?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Now, I had asked Mr. O'Neal, when he was on the witness stand, about the standard. And if I could direct your attention to Exhibit IWAG-N1.
A. Okay. Give me a second.
Q. Okay.
(Pause in proceedings)
A. That appears to be a copy of the ISO standard.
Q. I specifically asked him about the meteorological conditions that the ISO operates under, the ISO standard operates under. If you can look at the bottom of that first column there. And I read to Mr.

O'Neal, or pointed out the two conditions under which -- two meteorological conditions under which the ISO standard can work: The one being A, moderate downwind conditions of propagation or their equivalent, and the
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[WITNESS: JAMES]
second being a variety of meteorological conditions as they exist over months or years. And he stated that he used the first of the two; so, the letter $A$. You were in the room. Do you remember him saying that?
A. I remember something along those lines, yes.
Q. Now, in your testimony -- and let me just get to it. And this would be your report from July.

MS. LINOWES: I'm sorry,
Committee. I don't remember the -- I don't know the exhibit. It would be NB 9 maybe?

MR. IACOPINO: From July?
NB 1.
MS. LINOWES: NB 1?
A. NB 1. I might be able to get that. I already had it opened so I didn't have to go look at the exhibits.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. I want to refer you specifically to Page 6 of your study, in the bottom. You have a paragraph before the last. There's a
sentence that starts, "Meteorological
conditions..."
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A. Yes.
Q. Now, you state here -- if I understand this correctly, you're stating that the meteorological conditions that are referred to in the standard are limited to wind speeds of approximately 1 meter per second and 5 meters per second when measured at a height of 3 to 11 meters. Is that correct?
A. That's what would be considered as a moderate sound wind condition.
Q. So when you --
A. Go ahead.
Q. So when Mr. O'Neal conducted his modeling, was there any way for him to alter the meteorological conditions -- or is the model that he ran to produce the predictive noise based on wind speeds that are in the 1- to 5-meter-per-second range?
A. The model -- here's the part that's important, and it's a couple sentences earlier. The ISO model assumes that we're looking at ground-based noise sources. It's designed for road or rail traffic, industrial sources, construction activities, et cetera.
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It is not intended to model noise sources that are elevated high above the ground. When you put a wind turbine on a ridge and then have the blades on a 90-meter tower, this is definitely not a ground-based wind source. So that's where the issue of meteorological conditions comes in.

If we limit the model to ground-based noise sources, no height -- no taller than 30 meters, then, as a general rule, we can find a condition where there's calm winds at the ground, 1 meter per second or so. And that simplifies all the calculations about how wind interacts with noise, enough that we can have some degree of certainty that the model prediction will relate to what we would go out and measure. And that's where this plus or minus 3-decibel tolerance or competence comes in. When you violate that by either having wind speed at the hub -probably 9 meters per second, 10 meters per second at 20 miles an hour or so -- it's elevated, such that the sound has to travel through layers of wind that may change, such
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that by the time you get to the ground it's zero. The model just can't address that. The model is not designed to address that; therefore, any assumption that the plus or minus 3 dB confidence limits that apply when all of the assumptions are met can't be applied to this. The fact that we can run some numbers, we can put data in and we can take data out, but we don't know whether it's plus or minus 3, plus or minus 5, or plus or minus 15. And the fact of the matter is, when you look at data measurements for Mars Hill -- for example: They took measurements over the course of a year, and they found that the sound levels at the homes varied from as low as 35 decibels to as high as 52 decibels. The model predicted, let's say 42. So we see a huge range. So we can't say that the model is accurate, because the assumptions behind the model aren't met when you put wind turbines on a ridge. For that matter, they aren't met when you put wind turbines on a flat farmland in the city -- or state of Illinois. They are too tall, and
they operate in different weather conditions than the model can address. There are some models that can address different wind conditions. There's one called Nord2000. But it's not used by the wind industry in the United States. They tend to defer back to the ISO standard 9613.2.
Q. Thank you, Mr. James. Now I want to -- and I appreciate what you're saying. But I want to get to a related point. So if we argue for the moment, as Mr. O'Neal is saying, that the model works reasonably well, even though the standard says it does not apply, and we just look at the meteorological conditions under which it's operating, let's assume -- let's accept today, for the moment, that the height is not a problem for the noise source, even though it's well outside the range of how the model's been defined. If the meteorological conditions under which the standard is run are moderate -- which means, from your definition, from what you're saying, 1 meter per second to 5 meters per second -- if the model produced noise levels for those
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conditions, then what you said a moment ago, a wind turbine operating at full bore, maybe up at 10-meters-per-second wind speeds, what is that -- what would that do to the noise output? Do we have that information?
A. Well, the noise output -- the higher the wind speed at the noise source, the farther sounds can propagate, because the downwind condition pushes the sound down towards the ground. So the higher the wind speed, the more sound gets pushed down towards the ground. What it's going to lead to is the model underestimating what the real-world sound levels will be. And that's what we find when we go out and check it, is they tend to under-predict the sound levels, and this is why it appears on paper that the project can be compatible. But once it's operating, you get complaints from people living there.
Q. So, Mr. James, earlier today, Mr. Patch, the attorney for the Applicant, read the standard or the condition for wind -- for turbine noise, saying 50 decibels -- that would be dBA -- or 5 dBA above ambient during the
daytime, and 45 dBA or 5 dBA at night. Now, in questions under -- and Mr. Roth was asking you questions about that. Why would the Applicant model and demonstrate that the project is not going to have noises that would fit -- why would he said it would fit within that if in fact it's going to operate outside of that range? And I had -- my question for you is, if you can turn to Page 7-3 --

MR. IACOPINO: Of what?
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. I'm sorry. Of Mr. O'Neal's study.
A. And is that the table?
Q. Yes, it is. Table 7-2.
A. Okay.
Q. Now, what my eye is drawn to here is dBA. It's not max. It's not the maximum noise level, it's dBA. Is that correct?
A. The model of the -- what the model produces is a mean, an average sound level for the conditions it represents. My assumption is that the numbers in this table are the average sound levels that the model produced
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at each of these locations: At the trailer, at a commercial operation, at a house, et cetera. But they're the average levels, not the plus or minus confidence limit levels.
Q. Can you -- in looking at this, are you able to determine what the plus and minus might be?
A. Not from looking at this.
Q. Okay.
A. But looking at other people's studies of similar projects, they would easily be plus or minus 5 , with the possibility of as much as 10 or higher.
Q. Okay. So, just to reiterate, the conditions under which the wind turbines are operating, on some occasions it may well fit -- this average may be well representative of the sound level, and on other occasions it could be higher or lower; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you're saying, if I understand you correctly, it can be higher by as much as 5, 10, 15, and it could be lower by as much as some other amount?
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A. Yeah. Probably in terms of lower, probably won't be much lower than 5 below these numbers, because, I mean, at some point the only way to get it lower is to turn them off.
Q. And if you wanted to -- if you were to look at this information and you wanted to make a correction, based on your experience with post-modeling data, predictive sound levels and post-construction surveys of operating systems, would it be your recommendation to add 5 decibels to this dBA? Six? Ten? What would your recommendation be, so that we have a clearer understanding of the likely sound level?
A. I would say, if you were trying to anticipate complaints, we would add 5 decibels to all of those numbers. If we're trying to anticipate a true worst-case situation, you could add 10 to 15 to those numbers.
Q. So, Mr. James, when we talked about the background sound level as the current -- at the current location, without an operating system, operating project, if we are starting with a background noise level of 22 decibels,
and the average -- or the mean decibel level is going to be $40,39,35,37$, we're almost -- we're well over 10 decibels above the background noise level; is that correct?
A. You're almost 18 over the background sound levels. That would be in the area of "highly objectionable."
Q. I want to --

MS. BAILEY: Ms. Linowes, are
you at a transition point here?
MS. LINOWES: I am. I'm
actually almost done.
MS. BAILEY: Okay.
MS. LINOWES: I don't know if
you want -- if I could just finish --
MS. BAILEY: Yeah, that would
be great. Like almost five minutes or --
MS. LINOWES: I can't imagine
it being more than five minutes.
MS. BAILEY: All right.
MS. LINOWES: Thank you.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Mr. James, I was struck -- this was on

November 2nd. There was -- Chairman Ignatius
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had asked some questions of Mr. O'Neal. This was a day that you were not here. And this is -- I would like to read to you from the transcript what she said. And she wrote -she said, "There are concerns about high wind conditions, high power production operations and the sounds of the rotors" -- oops, sorry. I'm sorry. Let me start. I'm on the wrong page.

She goes, "I have to say, this is the area that's the most baffling to me as we sit in these cases, that there seems like such a disconnect from what some residents report in other facilities, and we get news clippings and letters and things... versus what the sound engineers tell us is going to be the reality of how people perceive these turbines." And --

MR. PATCH: Can we have a page?

MS. LINOWES: Yes, of course.
That would be Page 24 and 25 of the transcript.

BY MS. LINOWES:
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Q. Based on what you're hearing, what you know of Mr. O'Neal's testimony and of his report, and based on some of what you have discussed today, in terms of the background noise level and what the model noise levels are, is that the "disconnect" we're talking about, that really the background noise level is much lower than the sound engineer, Mr. O'Neal, has indicated, and the noise level of the turbine, even in his model level, is going to be considerably louder than the background noise? Is that the "disconnect"?
A. I believe that is. I mean, when you read these reports -- and I have probably read well over a hundred of them in last five years, they're almost like cookie cutters. The same report would be issued in Australia as in Britain, with some minor changes for local ordinances and the way the regulations are written. All of them tend to try to inflate the background sound level and deflate the predicted level. The consequence of this is that many projects have been granted permits, only to produce community
disturbances; community annoyance; and in some cases, on particular individuals, severe, call it "impact," in that it affects their health. It affects their ability to even use their property.

It would have been very simple. I mean, the assumption should be that the consultant for the developer is advising the developer about the worst-case situation. And if that -- and excluding how many times "worst case" appears in these reports, I would just cross all that out. Despite the fact that they're framed as "worst case," they are not worst case. They are the best argument that the consultant can put forward for why a permit should be granted. If the goal had been to only explain what the background level was, according to convention, meaning the $L 90$ values, and that the models were presented along with the rational explanation of what the assumptions meant, what the deviations between assumptions and real world could mean in terms of exceeding the predicted levels, these reports would be
three pages long and very simple to understand, but not necessarily very useful for getting permits when a wind project is near people. So I think a lot of the confusion is trying to give the appearance of a scientific report, while subtly masking the fact that the project may not be suitable for that community.

Thank you. And I have one last question for you, and I'm trying to find the exact sentence. I can't find it in Mr. O'Neal's report right now.

But in any event -- oh, it is on 8-2.
We have heard discussion about audible sound in high frequency; we've heard audible sound in low-frequency, and you've also talked about low-frequency sound that's inaudible. And Mr. O'Neal states in the last sentence on that page, he says, "Low-frequency sound from modern upwind wind turbines has been studied and is not an issue." Now, I don't really want go into a lot of detail on this. But is -- A, has it been studied; and B, is it not an issue? If you could just answer those
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two questions.
A. Okay. I'm going to need to get -- I'm looking at Page 8.2?
Q. 8-2.
A. And it has three bullet points. And I don't see the statements you've made on that.
Q. It's the last sentence.
A. Oh, I see it. Okay. I see it now. I was confused by the bullets. "Low-frequency sound from modern wind [sic] turbines has been studied and is not an issue." It has been studied. The purpose of the Bray-James paper was to demonstrate that the studies to date have used methods that are unable to identify, unable to resolve the rapid pulsations that occur in the infrasound range. This isn't because the instruments aren't any good. It's because the instruments are based upon filters, and the filters require that the sound be present for a certain period of time in order to get a reading. And in the infrasound range, the sound has to be present and steady for a period of a second to four seconds. So, if
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we're looking at pulses that are only a tenth of a second long, they don't get measured. They're not included. In fact, the bulk of the paper, the Bray-James paper, is trying to explain to people who have done the studies that Mr. O'Neal is referring to, including Mr. O'Neal himself, because they're one of the people who've done these studies, that the reason they can't find infrasound is because they're not using the right equipment, the right analytical methods. And we presented to them the correct analytical methods so that they would know how to find them. It isn't that it's not there; it's that they've been using the wrong instrument. Let's use this example: If we're looking for a plastic needle in the haystack with a magnet, you're not going to find it. That's what they're doing. They're using the wrong instrument to find something that is very faint, very difficult to find in the beginning. But it's the wrong instrument, and then they come to the conclusion there is no problem.
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Q. Nonetheless, physiologically, bodies are picking that sound up.
A. Our bodies are much better than any known instrument. In fact, this is the basis for a whole new field of acoustics that just got introduced in this last Acoustical Society of America Conference in Kansas City. And this new field is based upon instruments that have been used for what's called "sound quality," designing products that meet human perception needs. And the basis for this new field is going to be that we recognize that people -humans are better instruments than any instrument we have, and rather than discounting people's complaints about noise, we include it as one of the three methods for identifying qualitatively noises that interfere with human psychology, physiology, or just our activities in general. So we have come to the point where we now realize that the best instruments we have are not as good as people's auditory and vestibular functions, and we need to include that now in our studies.
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[WITNESS: JAMES]
Q. Thank you very much, Mr. James.

MS. LINOWES: I'm all set,
Madam Chair.
MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
We're going to take an hour for lunch. And when we get back, we're going to have cross-examination by the Applicant and then redirect by Mr. Block. Or no. First, we're going to have questions by the Committee and then redirect by Mr . Block.

So, Mr. James, could we maybe arrange to try to meet back here with the court reporter at ten after two so that we can --

THE WITNESS: Yes, we can.
MS. BAILEY: -- so you, he and
I can do some sound checks?
And then everybody else, we'll restart the hearing at 2:25. So I'll set up the conference bridge to reopen at $2: 10$.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(Whereupon the lunch recess was taken,
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[WITNESS: JAMES]
and the Morning Session ONLY ended at 1:28 p.m., and the hearing to resume in a transcript to be filed under separate cover so designated as "Afternoon Session ONLY".)
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| \$ | ```123:17;124:2 accommodate (1) 166:2 accommodating (3) 83:13;166:5,5 accommodation (2) 169:4,8 accordance (1)``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:11;188:11,16,18 } \\ & \text { adding (1) } \\ & \text { 18:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 159:21 } \\ \text { Afternoon (1) } \\ \text { 198:4 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:23;79:10;90:15; } \\ & \text { 169:19 } \\ & \text { allows (1) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| \$100 (1) |  |  | again (16) |  |
| 40:23 |  | 3; | 4:3;34:20;35:21; | almost (10) |
|  |  |  | 40:12;48:15;92:14; |  |
|  |  | 44:20;126:4 | ;96:24;98:23 | 5:9;145:6;189:3,5, |
|  |  | address (15) | 101:9;120:11; | , |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:6,6,10;85:17, } \\ & \text { 19;87:6;88:3;100:3; } \end{aligned}$ | 147:13;158:20; | along (6) |
| $41: 1 ; 47: 19 ; 132: 4$ | according (2) |  | 167:11;175:24 | 159:13;162:18,18; |
| $145: 2$ [sic] (4) | account | $183: 2,3 ; 184: 2,3$ | against (5) |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { [sic] (4) } \\ 72: 18 \end{array}$ | 135:13;159:22 | addressed (1) | 37:8,10;40:1 | 75:14 |
| 194:10 | 0:5 | 169:13 | 139:4 | Ite |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| A | 183:19 | 94:16;98:18 | 123 | although |
| A-2 (1) | 117:16;156:24 acoustical (7) | 88:1 <br> adequate (3) | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 14 ; 31: 8 ; 32: 12 \\ & 42: 8 ; 121: 6 ; 123: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | altogether (1) |
| $130: 7$ $\mathbf{A - 3}(8)$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:23;81:16;167:7 } \\ & \text { adjacent (1) } \end{aligned}$ |  | always (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 130: 4,6,8,9,11,15, \\ & 16 ; 131: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 124:13;125:23;185:1 agree (7) | 41:2 |
|  |  | 150:6 |  | amazing (1) |
| abandonment (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 196:6 } \\ & \text { acoustician (4) } \end{aligned}$ | 117:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 21 ; 93: 9 ; 124: 20 ; \\ & 175: 2 \end{aligned}$ | ambient (12) |
| 152:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 23 ; 88: 18 ; 91: 3 ; \\ & 113: 18 \end{aligned}$ | adjusted (2)22:13;152: | agreed (3) | 94:6;109:12,13,20; |
| $123: 22$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 113:18 } \\ \text { acousticians (5) } \end{array}$ |  | 100:21;109:3 | 149:9;150:16; |
| ability (3) | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 4 ; 98: 8 ; 101: 20 ; \\ & 113: 21 ; 126: 18 \end{aligned}$ | adjusting (1) | 174:15 | 151:13,14,17,20; |
| 40:16;114 | acoustics (6) | adjustment (1) | 66:19;68:9;109:7 | America (1) |
| able (12) | acoustics (6) $48: 6,7 ; 86: 5,17$ | adjustment (1) 22:12 | ahead (7) | America (1) 196:7 |
| $61: 3 ; 62: 20 ; 76: 11,1$ | 119:17;196:5 | admitted (1) | 16:16;59:4;80:5,9; | among (4) |
| $117: 24 ; 162: 8$ | acres (1) | 174:16 | 117:7;172:17;181:12 | 15:18;23:10;24:1 |
| $164: 24 ; 180: 16 ; 187: 5$ | $18: 19$ across (5) | adopted (2) | aid (1) | 39:3 |
| above (14) | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 21 ; 35: 10 ; 52: 11 ; \\ & 72: 23 ; 128: 12 \end{aligned}$ | adrenaline (2) | $\begin{gathered} 68: 2 \\ \text { aids (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $61: 14 ; 83: 4 ; 91:$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 22: 19,20 ; 48: 21 ; \\ & 73: 9 ; 109: 11,13 \end{aligned}$ |  | 27:6;28:1 | 163:15 | $136: 12 ; 187: 24$ |
| 127:2;136:2;149 | act (1) | advance (1) | air (7) | amounts (1) |
| 152:1;162:17;182:2; | $43: 5$ acting (1) | 90:3 | 26:19; $28: 23 ; 142: 8 ;$ $155 \cdot 17,23 \cdot 156 \cdot 13$ | $83: 5$ Amy (2) |
| 185:24;189:3 | acting (1) $67: 13$ | advantage 29:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 155: 17,23 ; 156: 13 ; \\ & 157: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Amy (2) } \\ 4: 22 ; 6: 8 \end{array}$ |
| bsolute (9) | action (1) | adverse (7) | $\begin{gathered} \text { aircraft (1 } \\ \text { 130:14 } \end{gathered}$ | analysis (6) |
| 110:10,16;138:17; | $37: 14$ activities | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 17 ; 103: 3,24 \\ & 104: 10 ; 105: 16 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:9;39:23;69:5; } \\ & \text { 100:7;133:21;152:15 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $139: 6,8,10$ | activities (4) |  | 130:14 <br> airplane |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { absolutely (1) } \\ & 143: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 17 ; 57: 12 ; \\ & 181: 24 ; 196: 19 \end{aligned}$ | adversely (1)$169: 18$ | $124: 6$ | 195:11,12 |
| abstract (2) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:24;196:19 } \\ & \text { activity (2) } \end{aligned}$ |  | airplanes (1) | and/or (1) |
|  | 60:6;154:7 | advising (1) | airport (1) |  |
| academic (1) | actual (3) | 192:8advisor (2) | 165:13 airstream | Anderson (1) |
| 91:17 |  |  | airstream (1) | 87:12 |
| academically (1) | Actually (19) 18:3;47:20;48 | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 10 ; 89: 14 \\ & \text { affect (5) } \end{aligned}$ | $156: 15$ <br> Alec (2) | anger (1) |
| 86:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 3 ; 47: 20 ; 48: 21 ; \\ & \text { 61:19;71:14;84:11; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 18 ; 83: 17,21 ; \\ & 95: 6 ; 151: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 89:18;102:5 | angry (1) |
| accept (3) $30: 11 ; 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 3 ; 100: 1 ; 103: 22 \\ & 108: 20 ; 109: 5 ; 120: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALLEN (9) } \\ & 6: 13,13 ; 15: 2,3,5 ; \end{aligned}$ | 27:11 |
| 184:16 |  | ```\5:6;151:8``` |  | animal (1) |
| acceptable (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 108: 20 ; 109: 5 ; 120: 8 \\ & 123: 24 ; 126: 19 \\ & 130: 10 ; 143: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  | 171:1,2,5,6 | $53: 10$ |
| 45:2;133:11 |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Allen/Edwards (1) } \\ 6: 14 \end{array}$ | animals (4) 16:8;52:20 |
| accepted (2) <br> 140:19;174 | ad (1) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \boldsymbol{a f f e c t i n g ~ ( 3 ) ~} \\ 92: 21 ; 93: 8 ; 112: 1 \end{array}$ | allergic (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 8 ; 7 \\ & 83: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| acclimated (1) | $\begin{gathered} 89: 23 \\ \text { adapted (1) } \end{gathered}$ |  | allow (4) | ANNIE (4) 9:9,13,20;92:17 |
| $123: 15$ |  | affects (6) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:9,13,20;92:17 } \\ & \text { annoy (1) } \end{aligned}$ |
| acclimating (2) | add (7) | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 15 ; 90: 5 ; 101: 14 ; \\ & 104: 10 ; 192: 3,4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 16 ; 74: 20 ; 87: 4 ; \\ & 159: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 122:19;123:24 <br> climation (2) |  | afford (1) | allowed (4) | 144:11 <br> annoyance (23) |
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| 95:15;115:20; | appeal (1) | 94:2;111:12;125:1,4, | 139:23;154:20; | 5,16;39:9; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 116:24;117:10,11,12, | 79:21 | 13;147:7;165:7; | 183:4;186:22;192:7 | :6;72:6;74:18 |
| 12;118:8,9;119:1,24; | appear (2) | 175:12 | assumptions (4) | 9:10;122: |
| 120:3,4,10,10,14; | 96:11;138:3 | arguably (1) | 183:6,20;192:21 | 141:24;154:5;163: |
| 124:1;140:3;152:13, | appearance (1) | 138:6 | 22 | AWE (4) |
| 19,19;168:19;192:1 | 193:5 | argue (2) | Attachment (1) | 7:7;52:4;70:24; |
| annoyances (5) | ap | 98:14;1 | 71:5 | 109 |
| 114:2,3,7,12,12 | 7:11;121: | argued | attempt (2) | A-weighted (1) |
| annoyed (56) | 175:14;179:13 | 153:7 | 46:12;96:5 | 173:20 |
| 22:23,23;23:10,10, | 185:17;192:11 | arguing (1) | attempts (1) | awful (2) |
| 11,12;24:3,4,20,23; | Appendix (5) | 97:6 | 97:4 | 90:16;170:13 |
| 25:3,8,14,14;26:9,13, | 66:22;69:2;109:5 | $\underset{\text { argument (7) }}{\text { a }}$ | attention (2) |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ |  | 98:8;102:19,21; | 79: | B |
| 9,9,17,24;115:6,7; | 19:21 | 192:14 | 7:17;34:5;81:6; | ack (26) |
| 116:4,11,11,17,17; | applicab | around (17) | 106:2;109:18;185:21 | 7:2;11:11;49:4; |
| 118:7,8,21,22;119:4, | 99:10 | 8:22;45:22;55: | audibility (3) | 73:3;75:1;81:4;85:1; |
| 8,14,14,15,16,22,23; | Applican | 57:12;59:10;82:12 | 143:11;144:1 | 95:2;117:1;122:24; |
| 120:1,24;121:21; | 7:3,15;31:12;51:6; | 97:21;112:2;127:19; | audible (10) | 123:10;125:17; |
| 122:13;140:4;168:23 | 64:10;74:4;168:10; | 128:10;131:8;136:1; | 115:23;120:7 | 129:21;131:12,23; |
| annoyed' (2) | 185:21;186:4;197:7 | 140:20;157:12,23; | 121:1;129:1;143: | 132:1;135:23; |
| 24:15,15 | Applicant's (1) | 166:20;167:24 | 163:22;167:21; | 137:19;142:13; |
| annoying (15) | 20:8 | arrange (1) | 168:13;193:14,15 | 148:2;150:23; |
| 26:16,20,22,23,24; | Application (1) | 197:12 | audio (2) | 158:24;159:23; |
| 42:12,12;43:7,8;44:8, | 4:11 | arrived (1) | 102:12,13 | 184:6;197:6,12 |
| 8,23,24;65:16;144:9 | applied (4) | 54:7 | audiologists (1) | background (56) |
| annoys (1) | 82:9;105:13 | art (1) | 88:10 | 86:2,3,17;88:17; |
| 38:9 | 146:12;183: | 35:1 | auditory (12) | 98:19;106:19,20; |
| annual (1) | applies (2) | article (1) | 89:20;101:13,16 | 107:2,3,13;108:11 |
| 54:6 | 146:23;147:5 | 118:23 | 102:17,20;103:4,23; | 16;110:21,22;111:3, |
| ANSI (5) | apply (6) | articles (1) | 104:5;107:14;120:8; | 4,9,11,21;112:5,11; |
| $99: 5,15 ; 100: 22$ | $100: 18 ; 105: 16$ | 160:14 | 158:3;196:22 | 113:7;122:9;124:18; |
| $104: 20,22$ | $146: 10,11 ; 183: 5$ | artifact (1) | Audubon (3) | 126:9,19;127:6,20; |
| answered (2) | 184:13 | 128:7 | 6:11,11;57:6 | 129:12;136:16; |
| 25:2;108:4 | appraised | ascertain (1) | August (2) | 137:3,6,16;139:22; |
| anthropogenic (1) | 58:2;84:3 | 151:7 | 126:15;156:3 | $150: 13 ; 152: 11$ |
| $94: 22$ | appreciate (2) | aspect (1) | Australia (4) | 173:19;174:5,11,24; |
| anticipate (3) | 40:4;184:9 | 160:17 | 71:20,22;115:10 | 175:4,7,12;176:17; |
| 77:6;188:15,17 | approach (3) | assent (1) | 191:17 | 177:6;178:7,10; |
| anticipating (3) | 134:1;138:16 | $11: 21$ | automobiles (1) | 188:21,24;189:4,5; |
| 105:11;106:21; | 144:10 | assert (1) | 46:6 | 191:4,7,11,21;192:17 |
| 177:2 | appropriate (5) | 40:16 | automotive (1) | backyard (4) |
| antidepressants | 24:22;72:5;104:23 | assertions | 86:10 | 62:1;120:17,18 |
| 163:17 | 110:6;153:22 | 101:6 | autumn (2) | 123:2 |
| Antrim (33) | approved (1) | assessing (1) | 125:20,24 | baffling (1) |
| 4:10;10:1;18:17; | 169:16 | 104:23 | available (8) | 190:11 |
| 19:6;27:15;32:7,15; | approximately (1) | assessment (1) | 13:14;42:4;67:7 | Bagley (2) |
| 40:12;41:22,23;42:3; | $181: 6$ | $99: 12$ | 84:20,22;104:13; | 62:2;76:8 |
| 56:3;63:1;66:10,19, | approximations (2) | associated (2) | 105:21;139:17 | Bahamas (1) |
| 21;68:10;69:1;71:10; | 149:18;151:21 | 120:4;123:5 | average (12) | 78:16 |
| 99:3;111:14;118:16, | Aramini (1) | Associates (1) | 19:8;138:7,8; | BAILEY (91) |
| 17;142:2;147:11; | 121:9 | 87:13 | 160:24;168:6; | 4:2,7;6:7,20;7:9 |
| 149:4;152:7;162:14; | area (25) | assume (6) | 175:10;177:17; | 8:14;9:3,6;13:15,23; |
| $164: 13,18,23 ; 168: 1$; $176 \cdot 18$ | 7:3;18:17;45:22; | 43:18;52:22; | 186:21,24;187:3,17; | 14:3,8,15,19,21,23; |
| 176:18 | 56:19;57:3,12,21; | 130:23;131:7;155:1; | 189:1 | 15:2;16:11,15,21; |
| anymore (3) | 69:17;73:19;76:12; | 184:15 | avoided (1) | 24:19;25:5,21;26:2,5, |
| 62:17;122:10,15 | 83:19;91:5,7;98:20; | assumed (2) | 126:6 | 8;29:21;33:24;34:4, |
| apologize (2) | 125:1;147:3;154:5,9; | 47:17;167:16 | awakened (1) | 10,14;35:2;36:3,10, |
| 75:16;173:9 | 162:17,24;164:23; | assumes (1) | 42:21 | 21;38:16;51:21;58:8, |
| apparent (1) | 166:15,20;189:6; | 181:21 | aware (7) | 15;64:5;65:17;66:2, |
| 124:2 | 190:11 | assuming (2) | $29: 1,24 ; 43: 24$ | 6;74:9,19;76:20; |
| apparently (1) | areas (12) | 43:12;49:20 | $67: 21,24 ; 173: 7,23$ | $77: 21 ; 80: 23 ; 84: 1,9,$ |
| 177:7 | 8:11;69:20;76:9; | assumption (5) | away (11) | 13,17;85:1,11;90:11, |
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| 19,23;93:20;105:22; | Beblowski (3) | 15:16,21;16:9; | 89:8,19;91:9,16; | built (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 106:1,13;110:3; | 13:17;148:7,8 | 52:21;70:17;130:15 | 94:21;97:2,13; | 15:14;57:22;61:19; |
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| ballpark (1) | 147:13 | blame (1) | 64:21;104:16; | 110:22;112:11; |
| 177:19 | begin (3) | 165:5 | 179:18;180:21 | 162:20 |
| band (4) | 128:4,7;165:16 | blast (1) | bought (3) | burns (1) |
| 126:22,22;127:7 | beginning (8) | 83:1 | 81:21;83:5;159:12 | 83:10 |
| 173:21 | 79:7;80:11;90:8; | blasted (1) | box (3) | bursts (4) |
| barely (2) | 101:22;127:16; | 16:7 | 39:18;73:17;85:19 | 156:16,24;157:5,8 |
| 61:3;137:5 | 153:18;176:7;195:22 | blend (1) | Brad (1) | business (6) |
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| 17:19,21 | 58:11,19;64:10 | 14:1,5,11,18;58:16; | 21;10:5;14:9;71:11; | 120:21 |
| base (4) | behaved (1) | 84:9,11;85:11,13; | 85:3 | buy (5) |
| 87:15;141:20; | 97:16 | 90:19,22,24;92:9; | branches (1) | 81:20;82:1;83:3; |
| 162:21;167:12 | behavior (2) | 104:12;105:20; | 130:14 | 163:14;170:10 |
| based (26) | 36:2;167:3 | 197:8,10 | brand (1) |  |
| 23:17,22;24:9; | behavioral (2) | blood (1) | 83:4 | C |
| 30:2;33:21;35:13; | 116:12,15 | 153:12 | Bray (1) |  |
| 49:20;96:21;97:1; | behind (4) | blow (2) | 156:9 | CadnaA (2) |
| 109:17;120:1;131:8; | 21:18;64:17;73:4; | 64:14;65:2 | Bray-James (3) | 178:16,18 |
| $139: 10 ; 146: 4$ | 183:20 | blowing (5) | 103:15;194:12; | calculate (1) |
| 149:15;167:1;175:1; | believes (1) | 29:7,17;30:3; | 195:4 | 152:8 |
| 177:24;178:18,19; | 38:23 | 45:23;127:19 | break (5) | calculated (1) |
| 181:17;188:7;191:1, | belong (1) | blown (2) | 4:5;8:2;84:19,21; | 124:19 |
| 3;194:19;196:8 | 170:4 | 8:7;53:6 | 147:19 | calculation (2) |
| baseline (2) | below (7) | blue (2) | breaks (1) | 139:20;140:11 |
| 22:10,13 | 56:7;73:10,12 | 69:15,17 | 143:16 | calculations (2) |
| basement (2) | 93:17,23;125:7 | board (5) | brick (2) | 139:11;182:13 |
| 118:3,6 | 188:2 | 21:15;32:12;33:13; | 61:20,20 | call (21) |
| basic (1) | Berg (2) | 61:1,1 | bridge (1) | 26:24;41:3,5; |
| 63:16 | 96:22;97:2 | boards (1) | 197:20 | 42:13,18,20,22;43:6; |
| basically (8) | Berg's (1) | 114:18 | briefly (2) | 46:5;60:22;66:17,18; |
| 54:22;78:10,19 | 98:2 | Bob (4) | 112:23;133:3 | 68:14;86:8;119:13; |
| 89:16;100:20; | best (2) | 12:22;53:8;72:22; | bring (1) | 160:19;161:6;163:8; |
| 101:21;138:18; | 192:14;196:21 | 171:7 | 32:22 | 169:14;178:5;192:3 |
| 163:16 | better (10) | bodies (2) | Britain (2) | called (12) |
| basis (10) | 32:3,5;68:13;77:7, | 196:1,3 | 123:10;191:18 | 86:5;87:1;89:24; |
| 23:20;52:22;98:12; | 10;83:7;97:16; | body (3) | British (1) | 100:1;101:22; |
| 100:13;107:16; | 128:24;196:3,13 | 28:3;69:14;153:2 | 123:11 | 116:23;117:11; |
| 108:1;165:14;168:8; | Beyond (6) | Boisvert (3) | Brook (7) | 141:23;156:10; |
| 196:4,11 | 88:17;90:13;96:8; | 76:21,22;77:20 | 4:24;20:19;130:14; | 161:10;184:4;196:9 |
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| 173:15 | big (3) | 17:8,10 | 162:7 | 71:18;177:10 |
| BCM (1) | 61:8;86:10;99:1 | border (4) | brought (2) | calls (1) |
| 6:9 | bigger (3) | 162:19,20,24 | 62:12;141:21 | 88:23 |
| beach (2) | 97:7,8;98:16 | 163:24 | build (1) | calm (1) |
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| 7:10,12;8:19,21; | carry (1) | CHAIRMAN (8) | City (3) | 72:9;95:23;96:2, |
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| 42:24;43:8;44:8; | cart (1) | challenge (1) | 37:8;97:5;137:3 | 149:7;150:3;151:11; |
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| 24;103:19;106:16; | 169:16;190:12;192:2 | character (3) | 41:21 | cochlear (2) |
| 115:5,18;116:20; | categories (1) | 125:9;145:12; | clear (8) | 102:6,9 |
| 117:4;119:19; | 119:22 | 166:3 | 25:12,18;28:11; | code (1) |
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| 160:3,4;162:22; | 30:21 | 120:19;162:4; | Cleland (58) | collected (1) |
| 168:16;173:10,12; | cause (6) | 168:16 | 8:17;9:8,12,21,21; | 173:20 |
| 176:16;178:1; | 37:14;103:18; | Charles (1) | 10:24;11:4,10;12:7, | collecting (3) |
| 179:18,22;182:10,15; | 127:24;153:8; | 6:6 | 14;15:6;45:12;46:7; | 126:21;174:23; |
| 183:7,8,8;184:2,3; | 156:15;160:16 | chart (4) | 47:12,15;48:17,19, | 175:3 |
| 185:8,17;186:9; | caused (5) | 112:16;114:13; | 24;49:2,4,8,19;50:2, | collectively (1) |
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| 153:3 | 179:3 | 27:17 | 158:5;168:13 | 91:1 |
| cards (3) | Central (1) | chosen (1) | client's (1) | coming (4) |
| 17:6,9,14 | 88:12 | 165:11 | 102:13 | 29:10;95:2;122:22; |
| care (2) | certain (5) | circles (1) | climb (2) | 167:4 |
| 108:15;138:23 | 19:20;100:8;159:4; | 157:22 | 53:20;76:7 | comment (7) |
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| cutters (1) | 30:24;31:13;96:21 | Department (6) | developer (3) | 196:15 |
| 191:16 | 97:24;98:6,13,14; | :17,20;7:12,1 | 169:24;192:8, | discounts (2) |
|  | 107:10;108:2;112 | 88:8,13 | Development (6) | 94:12;101:3 |
| D | 114:20;125:15; | depending | 4:18,21;32:8,10 | discrepancy (1) |
|  | $135 \cdot 8,8,9,19 \cdot 138$ | deprive (2) | deviation (1) | 160:5 |
| daily (2) | 135:8,8,9,19;138:1 | deprive (2) | deviation (1) | discussed (4) |
| 15:15;52: | 139:24;140:1,2,5 | 32:7;40:15 | 35:13 | 4:13,16;81 |
| Dan (1) | 143:2;144:20; | deprived (2) | deviations (2) | 191:3 |
| 89:21 | 146:21;152:12; | 37:7;38:1 | 156:15;192:22 | discussing (1) |
| darker (2) | 154:4,4;164:6; | derived (1) | diaphram (1) | 152:20 |
| 75:11,13 | 168:11,11;176:10,12; | 147:15 | 128:12 | Discussion (9) |
| darn (1) | 183:16,17;185:23; | describe (9) | Die (1) | 24:17;39:3;55:23 |
| 43:17 | 188:11,16,24;189:3 | 24:2;26:13;46:6 | 53:2 | 58:17;105:24;130: |
| Data (25) | decided (1) | 53:14,22;55:20; | died (1) | 3;132:24;193:14 |
| 71:9;96:9,9;97 | 102:10 | 88:19;158:5 | 173:15 | disease (2) |
| 100:8,16;104:1; | decision (4) | described (8) | differ (1) | 153:3;160:1 |
| 126:14,22;127:8,22; | 36:23;115:1;13 | 124:17;129:17 | 59:21 | disguise (1) |
| 129:3,20,22;146:17; | 165:15 | 130:11;157:17,18 | difference ( 6 | 112:9 |
| 147:15;158:10; | declare (1) | 160:9;175:9 | 38:21;60:2;87:24; | Disorders (2) |
| 173:20,21;175:14,18; | 170:10 | Description (3) | 113:20;152:10;161:2 | 102:8,9 |
| 183:8,9,12;188:8 | declared | 99:6,10;119:24 | different (22) | displays (1) |
| date (2) $55 \cdot 3 \cdot 194$ | 82:8 | deserves (1) | 17:14;18:19;34:22 | 21:22 |
| 55:3;194 | decomm | 25:10 | 53:5,6;70:8;72:11 | dispute (1) |
| dated (2) | 67:3 | design | 100:6;117:10; | 75:24 |
| 10:8;20:3 | decrea | 87:6 | 119:18;120:3,9, | disrupted |
| day (13) | 68:1 | designat | 123:3;127:22; | 62:5,15 |
| 4:10;19:13;42:20; | deeply (1) | 198:4 designed | $135: 24 ; 149: 8$ | disrupting (1) |
| 52:24;53:9,11; | 164:7 | designed (4) | $151: 13 ; 158: 22$ | $27: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:23;108:15; } \\ & \text { 123:9;124:16,16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { deer (1) } \\ 53: 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:12;114:11; } \\ & \text { 181:23;183:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:23;166:20; } \\ & 184: 1,3 \end{aligned}$ | $\boldsymbol{x}_{165: 14}^{\text {disrupts }} \mathbf{( 1 )}$ |
| $168: 11 ; 190: 2$ | defer (3) | designing (1) | differently (1) | distance (10) |
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| 31:1;71:19;72:5, | $28: 9 ; 29: 15 ; 41: 19$ | eagles (2) | 4 | 157:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21;96:6;115:22; | :12;54:21;56:7 | 53:7;70:10 | else (8) | Environmental (4) |
| 120:21;140:15; | :12;61:2;62:2; | ear | 14:16;43:1,19 | 6:9;86:15;87:2; |
| 171:14,24 | 21;120:11; | 3;132 | :22;103:9;143:22 | 99:7 |
| distances (7) | 1:5;155:22;167:4; | earlier (8) | 6:8;197:18 | environments (1) |
| 94:1,3;115 | 176:10;185:9,11 | 70:21;73:1;91: | else's (1) | 128:5 |
| 136:3;153:15; | downwind (3) | 8:2;133:4;151:9 | 23:17 | Eolian (2) |
| 159:15;164:3 | 155:15;179:23 | 81:21;185:20 | elsewhere | 19:5;78:6 |
| distributed (1) | 85:8 | early (5) | 69:20;170: | EPA (2) |
| 7:8 | downwind-style (1) | 84:18;86:19 | e-mail (2) | 86:13;87:8 |
| District (4) | 56:18 | 125:20,24;159:1 | 67:5;133: | Epsilon (4) |
| 16:3,5;55:18;56:4 | Dr (17) | ears (1) | embarrassing (1) | 96:20;100:11,17; |
| disturbance (1) | 76:21,22; | 28:11 | 46:15 | 104:17 |
| 96:8 | ;90:9;98:1;102:5; | earshot | eminent | equal (1) |
| disturbances (2) | 105:3;115:9;118:13; | 32:9 | 170:10 | 171:24 |
| 118:12;192:1 | 126:24;152:24; | earth (4) | emissions | equipment |
| disturbed (2) | 156:1;162:3,11 | 82:21;83:6,1 | 103:19 | 149:21;151:2 |
| 114:5,7 | 164:15 | 66:18 | emitted | 195:11 |
| disturbing (2) | draw (4) | easement | 7:12 | equivalen |
| 46:22;96:1 | 4:9;176:16 | 56:9 | emotional (2) | 179:24 |
| divided (1) | 178:2,9 | easily (1) | 16:12,1 | era (1) |
| 62:6 | drawn (1) | 187:11 | employed | 88:6 |
| dizziness | 86:17 | East (1) | 56:3;133:10 | erect (1) |
| 102:2 | drive (1) | 89:4 | employees (1) | 79:9 |
| dizzy (2) | 21:6 | easy (5) | 87:18 | erected (3) |
| 28:4;42:2 | driven | 27:17;115:8 | end (6) | 79:9,10;166:13 |
| doctor (3) | 153:4 | 126:23;127:9;160:8 | 54:23;80 | errors (2) |
| 88:5;153: | Driver's | ecological (1) | 127:10;154:3;173:5, | 92:4,10 |
| document (13) | 160:21 | 7:6 | 14 | especially |
| 7:14,20;8:1,6; | drop (1) | Economic (3) | ended | 16:2;23:22;3 |
| 10:11;11:1,6;84:6 | 1:5 | 4:18,20;87:1 | 198:1 | 156:5 |
| 93:3;98:22;116:19; | dropped | E-Coustic (1) | ends (1) | essence (1) |
| 117:9;139:19 | 158:18 | 87:22 | 42:1 | 92:15 |
| documenting (1) | drove (1) | Edwards | energy (10) | essentially (4) |
| 115:13 | 30:20 | 171:7 | 12:11;66:1 | 33:13;44:1;8 |
| documents | dr | effect (10) | 82:16,20,20;83:1 | 136:14 |
| 92:8 | 127:1 | 22:24;35:12; | 152:8;156:4,24 | establish (1) |
| dog | due (5) | 4,16;69:12;105:16; | Energy's (1) | 104:7 |
| 26:23;27:1;48:11 | 45:18;87:14;88:3 | 118:4;146:22;157:20 | 4:11 | established (2) |
| dollars (3) | 117:16,17 | effected (1) | engineer (3) | 90:20;103:21 |
| 41:15;64:1;81:23 | Duley (13) | 37:10 | 85:24;86:4;191:8 | establishing (2) |
| domain (1) | :9,12,18,22 | effects (11) | engineering (3) | 89:6;107:12 |
| 170:10 | 148:20,21,24;149:1, | 77:5;89:17;101:4 | 86:8,15;104:18 | estimate (1) |
| dominant (2) | 2;150:24;151:1,5,5 | 11;103:3,24;152:21; | engineers (1) | 127:12 |
| 167:22;168:4 | duly (2) | 153:4,6,9;161:15 | 190:16 | estimates (1) |
| dominating (1) | 9:9;85:8 | efforts (1) | English (1) | 30:12 |
| 131:20 | Dupee (2) | 67:10 | 95:21 | et (5) |
| done (26) | $4: 24,24$ | eighth (1) | enjoy (4) | 112:1;118:1 |
| 54:12;78:16;89:16 | during (25) | $4: 10$ | $32: 16 ; 52: 19,21$ | 156:12;181:24;187: |
| 18;94:20;96:22; | 8:2;55:21;67:1; | either (13) | $120: 23$ | Europe (1) |
| 102:7;109:6;111:17; | 87:8;88:6;97:12,15 | 42:12;45:12;50:14 | enough (8) | 89:3 |
| 112:16;114:14; | 102:24;108:6,15; | 51:23;56:23;78:4; | 49:23;65:15;83 | European (1) |
| 115:4;119:16; | 109:9,12;124:10; | 95:20;100:22;109:6; | 55:19;142:7 | 95:13 |
| 124:22;125:12,16 | 125:19;126:14,20; | 127:21;166:6;175:5; | 166:15;178:8;182:14 | evaluating (1) |
| 133:15;134:23; | 127:15,18;135:10; | 182:20 | ensure (1) | 86:20 |
| 138:4;152:22; | 147:3;167:19; | electronic | 72.1 | Evaluation (4) |
| $166: 17 ; 169: 15 ;$ $174 \cdot 5 \cdot 189 \cdot 12 \cdot 195 \cdot 5$ | 168:11;171:22; | vat | entir | 47:7;67:17;117 |
| 174:5;189:12;195:5, | ${ }_{\text {179 }}^{\text {177:7;185:24 (2) }}$ | elevat | en | 118:11 |
| 8 double (2) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { dying (2) } \\ 82: 22 ; 83: 22 \end{array}\right.$ | el | env | even |
| 28:17;118 |  | 39:1 | 52:20;83:21;9 | 22: |
| own (21) | E | Elsa (6) | 99:12;123:1;126:10; | 99:17;114:4;115:21; |
| 8:19;13:7;22:3; |  | 6:2;9:8,11,24;59:2, | 128:10;145:13; | 122:14;160:2; |
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| 184:12,17;191:10; | $10: 21 ; 11: 19,22$ | 89:2 | $81: 22,23 ; 155: 1$ | 106:10;133:6;149:8; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| evening (1) |  |  |  |  |
| 0:1 | 109:4;116:22 | 0: | 有 | 54:10;196:5,8, |
| event | 151:16;179:8;180:12 | expre | Falmo | fifteen (1) |
| 13:2;16:7;62:16 | exhibits | 40:11;69:23; | 28:9 | 98:15 |
| 176:6;193:13 | 8:7;92:1;116:2 | expression (1) | fam | ifty (1) |
| events (3) | 80:18 | 137:22 | 20:4;31:11,20 | 31:20 |
| 7:4,8;108: | exist | extend | 6:2;49:23;56:1,5,12, | Figure (13) |
| eventually | 180:2 | 64:2 | 14,22;57:11;113:4; | 69:2;129:20;1 |
| 89.9 | ex | Si | 49:3;162:2,3 | 6,8,15,18,19,2 |
| ever | 152:10 | :14 | 166:13,14;169 | 131:15,16;134:19,20 |
| 14:16;41:6;60:3 | expect (5) | extensiv | families (3) | figures (1) |
| 170:11;197:18 | 69:11; | 94:8 | 159:14;163:1 | 153:23 |
| everyone (3) | 8:1;17 | extent (2) | 7:18 | file (3) |
| 4:3;78:2;143 | expect | 3:18;5 | fami | 10:3;11:21;12 |
| evidence (5) | 18 | exterior | 117:23;118 | filed (4) |
| 70:1;129:2 | 137:21;175:15 | 109:10 | 120:16;159: | 11:13,14;12:1 |
| 130:18,20;17 | experience (33 | e | far (10) | 198:3 |
| exacerbated (1) | 27:4;35:13;38 | 5: | 13:6;19:1 | filings (1) |
| 153:11 | 78:22;88:18;89:7 | extrem | 60:7;79:4;90:13 | 12:20 |
| exact (2) | 91:8,10,16,19;97 |  | 115:20;116:6; | filters (2) |
| 72:21;193:1 | 119:6;120:9;121:23; | extremely (3) | 118:24;149:1 | 194:19,20 |
| exactly (4) | 122:12;133:1,5; | 1:12;124:1 | farm (9) | finally (2) |
| 75:7;78:1 | 140:6,14;142:1 | extrem | 3:3;1 | 61:6;62:9 |
| 145:11 | 145:3,14,18;153:10 | 138:9;168: | 39:13;44:6;67:2, | financial (2) |
| EXAMINATION (4) | 154:10,20;155:8; | (1) | 83:19;109:9 | 63:6;87:16 |
| 9:14;85:12;90:14; | 157:9;166:21; | 186:17 | farmland (1) | find (29) |
| 177:24 | 168:18;169:1 |  | 183:23 | 19:11;26:21;27:9 |
| examp | 171:21;188: | F | Farmstead | 4:13;35:7;38:11; |
| $98: 24 ; 114$ | experienced (4) |  | 9:20,22 | 43:4;45:2;77:17; |
| 117:21;121:19 | 23:7;68:16;142 |  | rther (2) | 91:13;112:11;116:6; |
| 122:16;171:17; | 145:16 | 109:10 | 163:24;185 | 123:13;132:15,16; |
| 183:13;195:16 | experienc | fa | ar (1) | 135:2,15;139:20 |
| examples (3) | 115:6 | 0:1 | 5:22 | 46:17;174:10; |
| 95:8,10;115 | experiencin | Facility (2) | Februar | 182:11;185:14 |
| exceed | 19:1;42:10;14 | 4:12;124: | 126:8 | 93:10,11;195 |
| 103:20;109: | 168:13 | facing (1) | edback | 18,20,21 |
| 111:3 | expert | 158:13 | 114:11 | finding (1) |
| exceeded | 20:9;23:16;24:2 | fact (24) | feel (20) | 163:19 |
| 104:4 | 63:12;71:10;72:4 | 6:24;7:13;67: | 16:6;27:1 | findings (1) |
| exceedin | 87:7;91:4;169:1 | 79:17,18;86:16 | 37:9;41:18;53:11 | 96:19 |
| 110:20;169:7 | expertise (4) | 104:5;105:13; | 61:8;62:5,15;63:4 | Fine (2) |
| 192:23 | 23:20;24:2,7;88:19 | 108:16;112:2 | 68:12;72:1;77:1; | 14:18;41:17 |
| except (3) | experts (7) | 116:18;124:3 | 81:16;82:17;121:2; | finish (2) |
| 24:9;118 | 22:7;47:6;51: | 136:20;167:7 | 143:7;145:7;157:13; | 80:10;189:15 |
| 158:20 | 63:11;106:24 | 175:17;178:7;183:7, | 158:7 | finished (1) |
| excessive | 160:14;161:16 | 11;186:7;192:12; | feels (2) | 14:16 |
| 141:9;147 | expert | 193:7;195:3;196: | 39:12,22 | firm (2) |
| exchange | 72:17 | factor (2) | et (18) | 87:1,14 |
| 133:6 | explain | 140:24;1 | 80:17;92: | firms (1) |
| exclude (3) | 15:12;80:5;159:22 | factors (2) | 117:23;118:14,19 | 124:24 |
| 107:24;126:12,2 | 160:5;192:17;195:5 | 117:16;147:9 | 141:24;149:8,23 | first (25) |
| excluding (2) | explained (1) | Fahrenheit (1) | 152:1;159:15; | $7: 1 ; 16:$ |
| 127:1;192:1 | 108:7 | 83:20 | 162:20;163:2,11,20 | 41:3,4;71:15,16;78:9 |
| excuse (5) | explanation (4) | fail (1) | 168:18,21;169:6; | 13;88:23;95:18; |
| 38:24;92:23 | 80:8;134:21;13 | 136:2 | 170:8 | 106:2;113:19; |
| 131:10;132:15;151:2 | 192:20 | failed (1) | felt (1) | 122:13;125:3; |
| excused (1) | explorati | 78:1 | 12:9 | 136:23;165:3,21 |
| 84:15 | 95:1,1 | faint (1) | fence (1) | 176:2,19;178:24 |
| exercise (1) | explore (1) | 195:21 | 18:21 | 179:19;180:3;197:8 |
| 12 | 102:10 | air (6) | w (7) | Fish (3) |
| exhibit (17) | exploring (1) | 57:20;63:4,5; | 4:14;31:8;102:5; | 7:11,14,21 |
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { fisher (1) } \\ 53: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 89: 14 \\ \text { formerly (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15:12 } \\ \text { function (9) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 157: 21 \\ \text { given (7) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { greater (5) } \\ & 108: 2 ; 109: 12,14 ; \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fit (3) | 86:6 | 102:7,9,17;103:4,5, | 11:16;136:19; | 159:16;160:24 |
| 186:6,6;187:16 | Forward (4) | 23;153:19;156:17; | 152:21;166:11; | Greg (1) |
| five (15) | 99:8;103:1;153:24; | 157:4 | 167:7;168:15;170:3 | 20:2 |
| 18:18;20:8;21:6; | 192:15 | functions (1) | gives (1) | Gregg (19) |
| 49:16;98:14;100:11; | foster (1) | 196:23 | 168:6 | 20:10,15,17,18,21, |
| 122:23;131:4; | 57:2 | funded (1) | giving (2) | 23;21:7;22:1,2,3,10; |
| 134:11,13;159:13; | fought (1) | 56:24 | 34:15;66:13 | 32:16;35:9;49:16,21, |
| 173:19;189:17,19; | 79:8 | further (7) | goal (5) | 22;52:8;69:13;82:3 |
| 191:15 | found (14) | 16:10;59:1;83:23; | 94:5;138:2,10; | grew (1) |
| five-minute (1) | 7:18;103:22; | 105:17;149:24; | 139:4;192:16 | 122:2 |
| 84:21 | 104:21;105:14; | 152:1;172:3 | goes (14) | Groton (1) |
| fix (2) | 110:19;115:17; | future (1) | 37:18;82:6;96:8; | 109:7 |
| 42:24,24 | 123:16;144:9;163:9, | 170:1 | 97:11;99:7;108:10; | ground (6) |
| flat (2) 147:3;183:23 | 14,16;164:1,15; 183:14 |  | $118: 8,24 ; 119: 3 ;$ $124: 7,8 ; 146: 5 ;$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 21 ; 182: 2,12 \\ & 183: 1 ; 185: 9,11 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} 147: 3 ; \\ \text { flaw (1) } \end{array}$ | 183:14 foundation (1) | G | $\begin{aligned} & 124: 7,8 ; 146: 5 ; \\ & 161: 12 ; 190: 10 \end{aligned}$ | ground-based (3) |
| 97:5 | 23:20 | Game (4) | Goldwasser (26) | 181:22;182:5,8 |
| flicker (6) | four (7) | 7:12,14,22;54:10 | 7:18,20;8:9;14:6, | Group (6) |
| 35:12;68:20;69:3, | 20:20;49:16;59:9; | gardening (1) | 10;23:13;24:6;29:18; | 10:6;89:9,24; |
| 4,11,21 | 118:23;131:4;149:7; | 45:7 | 31:17;33:16;34:20; | 150:5;159:4;163:4 |
| flies (1) | 194:24 | gardens (1) | 35:20;38:16,17; | guaranteed (2) |
| 124:6 | framed (1) | 45:6 | 50:12;51:1,10,14; | 79:12;146:20 |
| flow (1) | 192:13 | gas (1) | 63:9;64:6,8,9;66:8; | guaranty (11) |
| 26:19 | Francie (1) | 95:1 | 74:12;76:18;79:15 | 145:17,22;146:4,8, |
| flowers (1) | 6:12 | gave (5) | Good (29) | 12,21,23;147:5,10, |
| 17:23 | Free (1) | 74:10,15;95:8; | 4:2;6:4,7,20;9:16, | 10;169:14 |
| flowing (3) | 53:23 | 120:1;121:19 | 17;16:24;17:1;21:19; | Guariglia's (1) |
| 130:13,24;156:13 | freezing (1) | GEIGER (4) | 28:2;44:15;45:4; | 69:4 |
| flying (2) | 26:18 | 6:22;7:17;16:12; | 46:20;53:1,11;59:15; | guess (16) |
| 26:21;107:5 | freight (4) | 21:17 | 64:9;78:2,3;106:8,9; | 17:24;31:13;37:17; |
| focus (4) | 122:2,3,5,8 | general (14) | 108:5;115:3;121:17; | 42:17;44:12;45:12; |
| 87:2,24;101:9; | frequencies (4) | 82:17;86:2,6,9,24; | 127:12;145:7; | 47:12;55:16;67:23; |
| 107:17 | 93:17,23;94:7; | 87:15;113:24; | 177:18;194:18; | 109:16;110:14; |
| focused (1) | 127:2 | 133:24;152:13 | 196:22 | 129:20;137:18; |
| 175:8 | frequency (8) | 154:15;158:2; | Google (1) | 138:15;149:14; |
| focuses (1) | 101:6;103:2;120:6; | 163:19;182:10; | 166:18 | 168:22 |
| 94:15 | 127:7;143:3;155:2; | 196:19 | gorgeous (1) | guessing (1) |
| focusing (1) | 168:13;193:15 | generally (10) | 45:6 | 72:8 |
| 98:24 | frequent (1) | 17:24;29:17;98:13; | Goshen (1) | gusts (1) |
| folks (1) | 143:16 | 111:13,16;119:22; | 68:7 | 156:11 |
| 63:10 | friend (1) | 135:6;140:9;143:1; | government (1) | guys (1) |
| follow (8) | 54:14 | 174:13 | 56:24 | 8:19 |
| 59:21;99:22; | friends (1) | generated (2) | graduating (1) |  |
| 100:21;135:4; | 78:21 | 138:8,9 | 87:1 | H |
| 174:17,23; $175: 3,5$ followed (3) | Froling (4) | genre (1) | granite (1) |  |
| followed (3) | 13:16;148:4,4,5 | 18:1 | 83:1 | habitat (8) |
| 55:11;78:19; | front (3) | genuinely (1) | grant (1) | 7:5;15:8,10,11,24; |
| 100:14 | 47:6;49:6;54:10 | 39:7 | 33:13 | 16:8;52:20;70:4 |
| following (1) | frost (1) | Geoff (2) | granted (2) | hair (1) |
| 135:1 | 126:16 | 105:3;160:13 | 191:24;192:16 | 47:21 |
| Forest (6) | frozen (1) | George (3) | granting (1) | half (3) |
| 56:1,10;57:8,11, | 128:23 | 111:18;139:18; | 33:12 | 19:19;72:9;127:3 |
| 14;171:24 | fruit (1) | 174:3 | graphically (1) | half-hour (1) |
| Forestry (1) | 70:2 | gets (5) | 131:17 | 158:19 |
| 94:21 | fruition (1) | 43:12;155:22,24; | graphs (2) | hall (2) |
| form (8) | 78:8 | 175:22;185:11 | 104:2;130:22 | 54:11;67:7 |
| 7:24;33:5,9;36:16; | frustrated (2) | giant (1) | gray (1) | Hampshire (12) |
| 37:3;38:1;81:10,12 | 65:18;123:19 | 32:9 | 47:21 | 6:10,11;7:5,11,14, |
| formed (3) | full (3) | Gibson's (2) | great (6) | 21;18:17;35:14,24; |
| 87:12;88:22;89:9 | 8:6;178:24;185:2 | 17:8,12 |  | 40:13,24;82:10 |
| former (1) | fully (1) | girl (1) | $94: 1 ; 172: 9 ; 189: 17$ | handed (1) |
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| 18:15 | hearings (6) | 144:11 | 59:14 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hanning (1) | 4:10;7:2;60:23; | hikes (1) | hopefully (1) | I |
| 121:9 | 61:1,1;66:10 | 144:24 | 4:5 |  |
| happen (14) | heart (2) | hiking (2) | hormone (2) | Iacopino (14) |
| 16:9;30:7,15,17, | 94:23;153:19 | 53:14;144:12 | 115:15;116:10 | 8:2,5,13;9:15; |
| 18;32:17;42:1;62:21, | heating (1) | Hill (13) | horrified (2) | $13: 13 ; 36: 11 ; 37: 11$ |
| 22,115:6;124:9; $135 \cdot 6 \cdot 149 \cdot 19 \cdot 164: 18$ | 26:15 | 48:20;70:9;72:23; | 164:20;165:4 | 17;38:24;85:5,9; |
| 135:6;149:19;164:18 | height (4) | 83:1;89:5;162:5,15; | horse (1) | 173:10;180:13; |
| happened (2) | 156:14;181:7; | 164:6;167:11,12,13; | 111:5 | 186:11 |
| 146:9,15 | 182:9;184:16 | 168:21;183:13 | host (1) | ice (2) |
| happens (4) | Hello (2) | himself (3) | 89:22 | 27:15;41:6 |
| 109:21;145:21; | 85:14;172:20 | 118:4;136:20; | hostility (1) | idea (2) |
| 147:6;171:10 | help (2) | 195:7 | 123:18 | $24: 10 ; 171: 13$ |
| happy (5) | 40:2;150:20 | historic (1) | hour (4) | ideal (1) |
| 27:5;39:11;108:24; | helped (1) | $82: 9$ Historical (1) | $124: 9,9 ; 182: 22 ;$ 197.5 | 97:22 |
| 170:14;172:23 | 86:22 | Historical (1) | 197:5 | identified (4) |
| hard (2) | helpful (1) | 82:10 | hours (5) | 97:24;106:24; |
| 79:8;175:19 | 110:15 | history (1) | 35:11;68:20;69:20; | $110: 21 ; 118: 14$ |
| Harley (2) | helps (1) | 161:13 | 107:22;123:9 | identify (4) |
| 145:5,8 | 137:2 | hit (1) | house (45) | 9:18;67:4;107:13; |
| harm (5) | here's (2) | $13: 4$ | 19:1;21:16,24; | $194: 15$ |
| $35: 16 ; 36: 7 ; 38: 23 ;$ $40 \cdot 18,19$ | 146:2;181:19 | Hmm-hmm (1) | $26: 21 ; 27: 13 ; 30: 3,9$ | identifying (1) |
| 40:18,19 | hertz (5) | $75: 12$ | $12 ; 41: 20 ; 42: 2,11$ | 196:17 |
| Harris (1) | 93:18,23;127:2,4,7 | hoc (1) | 44:8;48:4,5,16,20; | IEC (2) |
| 56:15 | Hessler (4) | 89:23 | 49:24;50:21;51:7; | 97:17;147:1 |
| hawks (2) | 111:19;174:4,18, | hold (2) | 59:10,13,20;61:7,19, | IGNATIUS (9) |
| $15: 21 ; 53: 7$ | $21$ | 39:24;150:20 | 24;62:19;64:15;65:2, | $4: 22,23 ; 7: 1 ; 39: 5 ;$ |
| haystack (1) | HG (1) | Holland (1) | 3;70:22;72:6,8,24; | $40: 11 ; 77: 22,23 ; 78: 1$ |
| 195:17 | 116:24 | 83:15 | 73:19;74:18;75:6; | $189: 24$ |
| headaches (1) | high (19) | hollow (2) | 76:5;84:2;149:6,23, | ignore (1) |
| 102:2 | 101:17;131:6; | 149:21;151:23 | 24;150:6;151:9; | $159: 21$ |
| health (17) | 137:4,4;138:13; | home (48) | 152:1;187:2 | ill-effects (1) |
| 86:20;89:15,17; | 150:14;152:13,18; | 15:14;20:14,17; | household (1) | 94:13 |
| 90:5;101:5;103:3,24; $104 \cdot 10 \cdot 105 \cdot 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:2,7,11;168:18; } \\ & 177: 8.9: 182: 2 \text { : } \end{aligned}$ | 28:15;29:8;44:20; $45 \cdot 7 \cdot 47 \cdot 14 \cdot 50 \cdot 8,11$. | $151: 22$ | Illegally (2) |
| $104: 10 ; 105: 16 ;$ $117: 1,2 ; 152: 21 ;$ |  | 45:7;47:14;50:8,11; | houses (3) | 79:11,12 |
| 117:1,2;152:21; | 183:16;190:5,6; 193:15 | 52:22;57:21,24;58:2; | 33:7;37:24;81:8 | Illinois (3) |
| 169:11;192:4 | higher (19) | 74:2;75:4;76:9; | 36:3 | 154:23;169:15; |
| health-related (1) | 98:6;103:18;111:4; | 92:18,21;93:9;104:3, | hub (1) | images (3) |
| 86:20 | 123:17,24;124:1; | 4;114:20,22;118:3,9; | 182:20 | 17:5,12;18:1 |
| hear (26) | 135:19;136:15; | 119:10;141:21,23; | huge (1) | imagination (1) |
| 8:21;27:20;39:7, | 137:16;138:20; | 142:3,7,11,11,24; | 183:18 | $146: 2$ |
| 10,14;40:5;46:18; | 146:7,18;168:7; | 149:3;152:17; | human (10) | imagine (1) |
| 47:3,8;61:17;65:9, | 177:1;185:6,10; | 153:17;159:12; $161 \cdot 21,22 \cdot 164 \cdot 24$. | $88: 19 ; 91: 5 ; 101: 5 ;$ $104 \cdot 23 \cdot 105 \cdot 12$ | 189:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10 ; 76: 4,15 ; 85: 14 \\ & 91: 14 ; 96: 4 ; 106: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:13,19,22 } \\ & \text { highest (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:21,22;164:24; } \\ & \text { 165:1,18;169:10; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:23;105:12; } \\ & \text { 113:22;119:20; } \end{aligned}$ | imbalance (1) |
| 122:3;129:23;143:6; | 134:13 | 170:14 | 154:7;196:10,18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 102:3 } \\ \text { immensely (1) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 145:4,8;154:2;158:4, | high-frequency (1) | homeowner (2) | humans (1) | 63:23 |
| 6 | 127:10 | 38:6;63:17 | 196:13 | immune (1) |
| heard (19) ${ }^{\text {19 }}$ (13.28.8.46.12. | Highland (1) | homeowners (1) | humidity (1) | 153:13 |
| $19: 13 ; 28: 8 ; 46: 12 ;$ $57 \cdot 8 \cdot 59 \cdot 22 \cdot 60 \cdot 1$. | $30: 21$ highly (8) | 161:5 | 179:3 | impact (15) |
| 57:8;59:22;60:1; 67:19;70:15;79:7; | highly (8) | homes (18) | hundred (4) | 15:11;22:19;54:5, |
| 67:19;70:15;79:7; 109:18;122:22; | 114:17,24;118:8, | 91:15;102:13; | 37:24;81:8;111:20; | 22;63:6;70:5,10; |
| $\begin{aligned} & 109: 18 ; 122: 22 ; \\ & 137: 22 ; 154: 8 ; \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 ; 119: 23 ; 160: 22 ; \\ & 168: 23 ; 189: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:10;112:15; } \\ & \text { 140:16;142:2;158:7; } \end{aligned}$ | Hundreds | 91:20;94:18;151:22; |
| 158:14;172:1;174:2; | highway (4) | 159:11,15;161:5; | 33:7 | $192: 3$ |
| 175:1;193:14,15 | 120:21;145:5; | 162:22;163:12,13; | hurricane (1) | impacted (3) |
| hearing (13) | 165:13;166:16 | 166:20;167:20; | 46:21 | 59:5,6;76:10 |
| 4:9;68:2;84:24; | highways (2) | 168:22;169:4;183:15 | hypothesizing (1) | impacts (4) |
| $85: 4 ; 86: 21 ; 133: 3 ;$ $148 \cdot 1 \cdot 151 \cdot 6 \cdot 160 \cdot 7$. | 125:10;154:6 | homesteads (4) | $23: 17$ |  |
| 148:1;151:6;160:7; | hike (1) | 33:10;36:18;37:4; | hypothetical (2) | 76:24 |
| 171:22;191:1; | 145:4 | 81:11 | 23:15;146:14 | impermeable (1) |
| 197:19;198:2 | hiker (1) | hope (1) |  | 103:2 |
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| implication (1) | indication (1) | in-plant (2) | interfere (1) | issued (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24:10 | 168:23 | 87:4;88:2 | 196:18 | 191:17 |
| important (4) | indicator (3) | inquiries (2) | interjects (9) | issues (5) |
| 95:10;175:20,21; | 115:16,19;117:22 | 67:8,11 | 33:6;37:16;58:14; | 23:16;86:13;87:6; |
| 181:20 | indicators (1) | insect (4) | 92:6;93:19;110:2; | 94:16;95:14 |
| impose (1) | 175:11 | 126:12,14,23; | 136:5;137:8;173:8 | IWAG (1) |
| 63:8 | indirect (1) | 151:18 | International (1) | 117:7 |
| imposition (1) | 153:6 | insect-noise (1) | 53:24 | IWAG-N1 (1) |
| 165:20 | individuals (2) | 153:21 | interpret (4) | 179:9 |
| impossible (1) | 67:5;192:2 | insect-removal (1) | $98: 10,11 ; 113: 16$ | J |
| impression | indoor (1) | 22:12 |  | J |
| 99:14 | indoors (1) | 22:13;107:6; | 34:16;35:4 | Jack (4) |
| inappropriate (1) | 165:18 | 126:17,18;127:13; | INTERROGATORIES (4) | 12:23,24;54:9,18 |
| 82:18 | induce (1) | 152:7;154:3,8; | 76:22;78:1;81:2; | Jack's (1) |
| inaudible (8) | 128:7 | 165:10 | 84:1 | 78:19 |
| 101:23;103:2; | industrial (4) | inside (7) | interrupted (1) | James (26) |
| 143:5;160:15; | 121:5;125:11; | 28:22;47:9;142:7, | 137:13 | 71:10,14;84:20,22; |
| 163:22;168:3,15; | 144:24;181:23 | 24;143:8;158:18; | intervenor (3) | 85:2,8,10,18;91:22; |
| 193:17 | industry (4) | 165:1 | 6:3,10;8:16 | 103:13;104:11; |
| incentive (2) | 112:9;160:2,14 | installation (4) | intervenors (4) | 106:8;109:16;136:4, |
| 136:17;137:20 | 184:5 | 33:4,8;36:15;81:9 | 6:14,16;10:6;71:11 | 10;149:1;170:16; |
| inch (1) | infections (1) | installed (1) | into (20) | 171:6;172:20;177:3; |
| 73:12 | 28:13 | 146:16 | 17:11;18:20;26:20; | 184:8;185:20; |
| include (3) | infer (1) | instead (5) | 59:1;61:24;82:19; | 188:20;189:23; |
| 17:15;196:16,23 | 61:11 | 41:24;114:14 | 90:16;95:21;97:11, | 197:1,11 |
| included (5) | inflate (1) | 123:23;161:3;165:19 | 17;125:1;128:5; | James-Anderson (1) |
| 89:13;92:1;115:12; | 191:21 | Institute (3) | 139:22;146:22; | 87:12 |
| 175:10;195:3 | in-flow (1) | 86:6,7;102:8 | 147:7;156:13; | Janet (2) |
| includes (1) | 156:10 | instructor (1) | 162:20;169:21,22; | 59:6,7 |
| 170:8 | influence (1) | 88:9 | 193:22 | Janet's (1) |
| including (4) | 131:17 | instrument (5) | introduced (2) | 59:7 |
| 67:5;91:15;177:8; | influenced (2) | 195:15,20,22; | 151:4;196:6 | Janice (3) |
| 195:6 | 129:13;130:13 | 196:4,14 | Introduction (1) | 68:24;149:1;151:5 |
| increase (9) | influences (2) | instrumentation (1) | 99:8 | January (2) |
| 95:4;98:12;107:2, | 130:18,20 | 156:23 | introductions (1) | 126:7;128:22 |
| 9;135:11;147:9; | inform (1) | instruments (9) | . $4: 12$ | jet (2) |
| 154:19;163:15,16 | 36:23 | 119:20;127:23; | intrude (1) | 19:14;26:21 |
| increased (3) | information (9) | 128:4;156:20; | 48:10 | job (1) |
| 83:20;96:21; | 19:4;86:22;89:23; | 194:17,19;196:8,13, | invested (1) | 54:15 |
| 115:19 | 95:2;132:7;136:24; | 21 | 57:17 | Johanna (1) |
| increases (2) | 178:8;185:5;188:6 | insulate (1) | investing (1) | 4:16 |
| 83:18;140:5 | infra (2) | 48:3 | 63:20 | joint (1) |
| increasing (1) | 101:11;104:8 | insulated (4) | involved (5) | 11:2 |
| 111:6 | infrasound (11) | 28:15;44:19;47:22; | 55:17;86:19;87:7; | Jones (4) |
| indeed (1) | 89:21;101:4; | 48:5 | 89:19;161:7 | 13:17;148:9,10,14 |
| 158:21 | 102:11;103:19; | insulation (3) | irrelevant (3) | Journal (4) |
| independent (1) | 104:24;156:7,8,16; | 44:20;164:22; | 38:2;175:19;177:1 | 104:18;113:15; |
| 102:6 | 194:16,22;195:9 | 165:18 | Island (4) | 160:11;161:11 |
| in-depth (1) | infrasounds (1) | intend (1) | 78:18;153:14,18; | journals (1) |
| 166:21 | 97:15 | 57:21 | 162:13 | 90:2 |
| indicate (7) | inhibitors (1) | intended (2) | ISO (8) | judging (1) |
| 18:24;68:9;69:19; | 163:18 | 62:3;182:1 | 178:19,20;179:13, | 107:16 |
| 70:13;71:14;75:2,19 | initial (1) | intent (1) | 16,17,22;181:21; | July (6) |
| indicated (9) | 132:10 | 174:10 | 184:7 | 10:8;11:7;91:24; |
| 8:11;38:18;64:13; | initiative (1) | interaction (1) | isolation (1) | 126:15;180:9,13 |
| 66:16;73:5,6;76:7; $128: 19 \cdot 191: 9$ | 55:24 | 157:3 | 59:11 | justify (1) |
| 128:19,191:9 | initiatives (2) | interacts (1) | issue (15) | 136:16 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { indicates }(\mathbf{1}) \\ 72: 4 \end{gathered}$ | $56: 2,6$ inject (1) | $182: 14$ <br> interest (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:6;37:18;74:5; } \\ & \text { 80:3;88:14;94:21; } \end{aligned}$ | K |
| indicating (5) | $63: 10$ | $88: 21$ | $98: 9 ; 133: 8 ; 141: 18 ;$ | K |
| 38:22;69:17;73:10; | inner (1) | interesting (1) | 165:23;170:3;182:6; | Kamperman (1) |
| 75:10,13 | 156:2 | 122:16 | 193:21,24;194:11 | 139:18 |
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| Kansas (1) | 75:17;130:5; | 17;47:1,4,10,23;48:4, | less (6) | 28:14;60:17;61:7,15; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 196:7 | 176:20 | 12,18;49:9,11,13,18; | 62:19;69:19;97:14; | 114:2;169:9 |
| Kate (1) | L3 (8) | 50:4,6,9,23;51:7,12; | 155:4;157:6;164:5 | light (1) |
| 4:7 | 130:12,12,16; | 52:4,7,14,17,24;53:3, | letter (1) | 32:23 |
| Katharine (1) | 134:14;149:22; | 17,20;55:19,22;56:5; | 180:4 | liked (1) |
| 148:17 | 150:1;151:10;176:20 | 59:2,4;61:19;63:16, | letters (1) | 76:7 |
| Katz (1) | L4 (3) | 20;64:2;70:4,18,20, | 190:15 | likely (3) |
| 104:3 | 75:20;173:22; | 23;71:4,8,13,18;72:3, | letting (2) | 135:17;138:14; |
| kayaker (1) | 176:21 | 8,18;74:23;75:15,22; | 41:24;42:6 | 188:13 |
| 144:11 | L90 (11) | 76:1,3,6,13,17;77:3, | level (61) | limit (23) |
| kayaking (3) | 176:9,12,20,20,21, | 10,13,19;78:4;79:3,6, | 22:16;23:8;26:19; | 31:13;108:2,13,17; |
| 56:19;144:13,13 | 21,22;177:6,18; | 12,21;80:4,11;84:16, | 50:11,15,20;51:5; | 110:10,16,23;111:1, |
| Keene (2) | 178:2;192:19 | 16;92:18 | 52:4;71:24;73:19; | 1;112:18;124:18; |
| 138:5,12 | L90s (1) | Law/Cleland (1) | 74:1;94:6;96:20; | 138:17,17,21;139:1, |
| keep (1) | 177:13 | 76:23 | 97:14;98:13;99:3; | 6,8,10;141:7,11; |
| 40:4 | laid (1) | lawsuits (1) | 102:20;107:9; | 168:10;182:8;187:4 |
| Kenworthy (13) | 100:5 | 152:17 | 108:16;110:20; | limited (3) |
| 12:23,24;42:14; | Lake (21) | lawyer (1) | 111:4,7,112:14; | 18:10;162:22; |
| 43:6,7,13;54:1,9,14, | 20:10,15,18,22,23; | 39:16 | 114:16;115:23; | 181:5 |
| 17;55:2,4;66:13 | 21:7;22:1,2,4,10; | layers (1) | 119:9;123:18;131:2; | limits (2) |
| Kettering (1) | 32:16;35:9;49:16,21, | 182:24 | 134:14;136:15; | 71:24;183:5 |
| 86:5 | 22;52:8;69:13;82:3; | layperson (1) | 139:2,21;143:1; | line (5) |
| key (1) | 171:12,21,23 | 35:5 | 146:4,5;151:14,17, | 38:21;40:22;63:3; |
| 73:17 | Land (2) | layperson's (1) | 20;152:11;157:10; | 73:11;177:14 |
| kids (1) | 6:9;57:3 | 119:1 | 158:17;164:5;168:6; | lines (1) |
| 61:5 | land-use (1) | lead (6) | 169:7;176:18;178:7; | 180:6 |
| kill (1) | 99:11 | 118:20;152:12,16; | 186:19,21;187:18; | linked (1) |
| 70:16 | language (2) | 153:2,5;185:12 | 188:14,21,24;189:1, | 95:14 |
| kilometers (1) | 95:21;110:7 | leaders (1) | 4;191:4,7,9,10,21,22; | Linowes (19) |
| 115:21 | large (7) | 123:20 | 192:18 | 16:12;172:6,19,20; |
| Kimball (2) | 87:17;95:5;115 | leading (2) | levels (66) | 173:9,17;180:10,15, |
| 16:11;172:4 | 116:7;124:23; | 113:8;118:10 | 42:11;44:24;95:3; | 19;186:12;189:9,11, |
| kind (19) | 154:12;176:14 | leaf (1) | 97:14;98:20;101:17, | 14,18,21,22;190:21, |
| 23:3,8;42:23;53:1; | larger (9) | 128:1 | 24;102:17;107:2,3, | 24;197:2 |
| 62:12;87:19;94:3; | 94:17;95:10;96:11; | learn (2) | 14;111:9,11,22; | Lisa (1) |
| 108:20;113:23; | 100:4;141:6,8; | 47:5;56:21 | 112:6,12;116:5,9; | 172:20 |
| 120:4,9;123:21; | 142:16;154:19; | learned (1) | 123:24;124:1;125:5, | listed (2) |
| 125:13;145:9; | 160:18 | 102:24 | 6,7,14;127:11,12; | 20:6,7 |
| 155:17;164:15; | Last (19) | least (9) | 130:12;131:1; | listen (3) |
| 167:15;169:3;171:17 | 33:3;60:11;73:10; | 52:12;59:18;60:24; | 135:12;137:3,7,16; | 124:14;144:18; |
| kinds (4) | 79:4;102:5;103:12; | 64:3;81:8;97:22; | 138:7,8;140:6,8,8,9, | 165:9 |
| 110:24;118:20; | 124:21;125:21; | 135:9,12;172:10 | 17;142:3;146:18; | listened (4) |
| 145:15,15 | 144:23;156:3; | leave (3) | 147:14;149:9; | 76:23;112:23; |
| Kirsten (1) | 168:24;173:16; | 153:17;159:10; | 150:12,16;151:13; | 113:3;173:2 |
| 105:4 | 177:15;180:22; | 163:12 | 152:20;153:2,7; | listening (7) |
| knew (3) | 191:15;193:9,18; | leaves (3) | 158:24;160:15; | 35:8;65:14;82:7; |
| 41:8;74:1;158:11 | 194:7;196:6 | 99:13;127:16,19 | 164:10;168:16; | 83:8;120:17;122:12; |
| knowing (1) | late (4) | left (2) | 177:7;178:11; | 175:23 |
| 93:11 | 111:12;125:16; | 86:24;142:1 | 183:15;184:24; | listens (1) |
| knowledge (5) | 126:1,15 | left-hand (1) | 185:14,16;186:24; | 46:8 |
| 89:11,12;91:5; | later (4) | 73:17 | 187:3,4;188:8;189:6; | lists (1) |
| 92:12;133:2 | 122:13;146:5,17; | Legacy (3) | 191:5;192:24 | 49:15 |
| known (6) | 158:19 | 56:1;57:8,11 | Leventhall (5) | literature (2) |
| 55:2,4,8;101:21; | Laurie (2) | legal (9) | 105:3;116:24; | 125:11;160:11 |
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| 149:12,16;174:2; | recently | :18;98:11;103:6; | repeat (2) | 89:16,18;96: |
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| $8: 20 ; 15: 16 ; 25: 18$ | 24:18;39:4;48:5 | 89:8 | 17;193:6,12 | respond (4) |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| sent | shimmers | simplifies (1) | 129:14 | 105:12;106:19,20; |
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| 71:16,16; | 141:2 | 23:11;108: | social (3) | 15,19;111:6,9,11,22 |
| 180:23;193:11,18; | shocked | 122:8;140:2 | 117:14,17;140: | 112:5,12,14;115:23; |
| 194:7 | 25.5 | sister (5) | Society (7) | 120:12,14,22;121:21 |
| sentences | s | 11,20;149 | 56:10;57:6, | 125:5,14;126:1,19; |
| 181:20 | ;13 | 151:5;154:11 | 2:10;89:24;161:12; | 127:11;129:4; |
| separate | shorter | si | 196: | 130:12;134:14 |
| 198:3 | 1:2 | 62 | software | 140:5;141:7,12, |
| separated | short-term | sit (3) | 7:3;178:16,18 | 142:2,5,17,21; |
| 62:13 | 107:4,24 | :19;120 | 79: | 145:12;146:18 |
| Septembe | shot (1) | 190:11 | solid (2) | 147:14;149:21,21; |
| 54:7 | 1:2 | Site (12) | 91:19;140 | 150:12,13;151:7,10 |
| series (1) | show | 1:7 | solution (4) | 17,22,24;152:8,9,11 |
| 99:15 | 12:1;46: | 53:15;67:17;82:9,18; | 45:3;77:16;128:24; | 154:18;157:11; |
| serious | ;69:1,9;70:24 | :19;128:2 | 165:16 | 158:17,23;160:2 |
| 55:8 | 116:7;153:19;158:23 | 149:24;152:2;162:23 | Solutions | 163:22,22;164:9; |
| serotonin | showed (4) | sites (3) | 87:22 | 167:20;169:2,5 |
| 163:17, | 22:8;73:2; | 100:11, | somebod | 171:10,16,18,1 |
| serve (2) | showing (7) | sitting (3) | 18:3;32:22;41:1 | 173:19;174:24; |
| 32:3 | 7:4;66:21;104:2 | :20; | :6;43:1,19;46:2 | 176:17;177:7 |
| service | 4:15;140:7; | 1:21 | 63:2 | 178:10,10;181: |
| 83:7 | 163:21;178:1 | situated | someone (7) | 182:23;183:15 |
| Services | shown (1) | 37:7 | 23:17;114 | 185:9,10,13,16 |
| 94:20 | 96:20 | situation | 0:13;146:18 | 186:21,24;187:18 |
| session (3) | shows (5) | 46:15;61:1 | 153:11,12;165:22 | 188:8,13,21;189: |
| 76:3;198 | 10;96:9;13 | 6:13,15;15 | someone's (1) | 190:16;191:8,21; |
| set (9) | 140:3;177:6 | 6;162:6 | 114:20 | 193:14,15,17,19 |
| 31:12 | sick (7) | 0:10;171 | someplace | 194:10,20,23;19 |
| 108:24;1 | 41:20;101 | 172:2;188:18;192 | 129:1 | 9;197:17 |
| 159:20;161:1 | 105:5;160:20;161:2, | situations (3) | sometimes (2) | sounds (44) |
| 165:14;197:2, | 4;162:1 | 87:15;88:4; | 76:4;167:8 | 45:18;46:11, |
| setback (2) | sick | six (6) | somewhere (4) | 3:21;61:11;76:4 |
| 71:19;72: | 102:2;157 | 70:16 | 61:10;112:1 | 1:14;93:22;99:11; |
| sets (1) | side (11) | 91:9;123:11;188:1 | 131:8;166:8 | 101:6,18;102:14,16 |
| 112:18 | 6:11,13 | Sixty (1) | sophistry (1) | 9;104:2,9,19;107:5 |
| setting | 18,20;163:4,7,9 | 81:23 | 155:10 | 110:12;116:1,11; |
| 136:20; | 164:17;171:21,2 | size (3) | sorry (17) | 119:18;120:17,18,20 |
| 161:17 | sides (1) | 118:18;13 | $14 \cdot 1 \cdot 16 \cdot 1$ | 21:4,5;126:3,4; |
| seven | 0:9 | 154:13 | 26:4;33:16; | 127:2,6;129:13; |
| 20:13;70: | sighting | skipped (1) | 65:22;69:4;104:15 | 131:2;142:2 |
| several (5) | 15:15 | 16:19 | 117:8;132:3;137:13; | 144:19,20;147 |
| 45:16;66:14 | significa | sleep (10) | 68:24;180:10; | 59:7;160:15 |
| 94:15;163:5 | 61:14 | 45:17;4 | 186:13;190:7 | 165:10;167:21,2 |
| severe (2) | Signs (2) | 21,23;114:5;124:11; | sort (13) | 185:7;190:7 |
| 167:8;1 | 161:10 | 162:8;163:1 | 23:19;33 | source (15) |
| shaded | similar (12) | sleeper | 47:24;50:7;116:1 | 106.22.107 |
| 69:19 | 56:6;58:23 | 46:20 | 121:22;126: | 21;108:3;117:19; |
| shadow (4) | 102:1;118:15;144: | sleeping (2) | 128:13,14;129:1 | 18:6;123:8;130:23 |
| 68:20;69:3,4 | 152:14;153:15; | 118:2, | 136:16;143:10 | 156:7;168:4;182:6; |
| shall (4) | 157:20;162:10; | slightly (2) | sound (149) | 184:17;185 |
| 67:4,9,12;109:11 | 164:2;187:11 | 154:23;1 | 19.14.20 9 | sources (11) |
| hared (2) | similarity (2) | slowly (1) | 22:6,16;23:8,16,16; | $94: 22 ; 122: 1$ |
| 89:10,12 | 96:5;164:13 | 132:19 | 24:21;25:8;26:19,20; | $123: 7 ; 124: 5 ; 125: 1$ |
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| speaking (3) | 97:18;99:9,9; | Stearns (4) | 94:19;95:2;115:10; | 32:15;45:7;126:1 |
| 20:5;51:2;149:1 | 119:12;175:3; | 14:19,20;170:19, | 117:10;119:17; | summertime (1) |
| special (1) | 178:19,20;179:7,14, | 20 | 125:12;134:23; | 167:16 |
| 86:14 | 17,22;181:5;184:7, | sticks (1) | 140:13;141:20; | supersede (1) |
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