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PROCEEDINGS
(Exhibits NB 58 and NB 59 marked for identification.)

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning. I'd like to open the hearing. Ms. Bailey's been keeping track of the days. Are we on Day 10 at this point?

MS. BAILEY: We are.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: We're on Day 10 of the Docket 2012-01 Site Evaluation Committee's consideration of the Application of Antrim Wind Energy for a Certificate of Site and Facility.

We will first begin with identification of Members of the Committee and then take appearances.

My name is Amy Ignatius. I'm
Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission and also Vice-Chair of the Site Evaluation Committee, and Presiding Officer in this case.

DIR. STEWART: Harry Stewart,
Director of Water Division, Department of Environmental Services.

MS. LYONS: Johanna Lyons, Department
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of Resources and Economic Development.
DIR. SIMPKINS: Brad Simpkins,
Department of Resources and Economic Development.

MR. ROBINSON: Ed Robinson, New Hampshire Fish and Game Department. And I apologize for missing Thursday and Friday's sessions, but I assure you I will look at the transcripts and read them.

MS. BAILEY: Kate Bailey, Public
Utility Commission.
MR. DUPEE: Brook Dupee, Department
of Health and Human Services.
MR. GREEN: Craig Green, New
Hampshire Department of Transportation.
DR. BOISVERT: Richard Boisvert, New
Hampshire Division of Historical Resources.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you,
Committee Members. We have a full committee.
Clearly we have a quorum.
And appearances, Ms. Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: Yes. Good morning.
Susan Geiger, Douglas Patch and Rachel
Goldwasser from the law firm of Orr \& Reno,
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representing the Applicant, Antrim Wind Energy. Good morning.

MR. FROLING: Good morning, Stephen Froling, representing the Harris Center for Conservation Education.

MR. STEARNS: Good morning. Galen Stearns, Town of Antrim. With me today is Mike Genest, selectman.

MS. VON MERTENS: Francie Von
Mertens, New Hampshire Audubon.
MR. SIMMONS: Scott Simmons from the Stoddard Conservation Commission.

MS. BLOCK: Loranne Carey Block,
North Branch Intervenors.
MR. ROTH: Good morning. Peter Roth,
Counsel for the Public.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning, everyone, and welcome.

Our first witness is Ms. Morse. And
is there anything before we begin with taking
evidence that we should address?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I'm not seeing
anything.
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MR. IACOPINO: No. The only thing I had to report is resolved because Mr . Roth is here.

MR. ROTH: Thank you. I am.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Then we will begin with Ms. Morse.

Mr. Iacopino -- oh, no. I'm sorry. Sue, can you swear the witness. (WHEREUPON, SUSAN MORSE was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.) SUSAN MORSE, SWORN

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And I'll just note for the record that Ms. Pinello from the planning board and Ms. Allen are also here. Welcome.

So, Ms. Block.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. BLOCK:
Q. Good morning. Please state your name and address.
A. My name is Susan Morse, M-O-R-S-E. My address is 55A Bentley Lane, Jericho, Vermont, 05465.
Q. What is the name of your business?
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A. Morse \& Morse Forestry and Wildlife Consultants.
Q. What services do Morse \& Morse Forestry \& Wildlife Consultants provide?
A. We assist landowners, and in some cases NGOs, and aid public agencies with habitat analysis, so that it can be compatible with forest management practices and, in fact, be enhanced by them, and in some cases protected by avoiding such practices.
Q. Please provide information about your qualifications to the Committee that would be helpful.
A. I have submitted that in my prefiled testimony. And since then, we have two letters that have been provided us, for you to provide to the Committee. So I would ask that the Committee Members, as well as the Applicant, refer to those documents.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. And we don't need to go through all of your prefiled. So, thank you. We have that. And this is really just a summary of your -- in your direct presentation.
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We do have two letters that have just been marked as North Branch 58 and 59 -MS. BLOCK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: -- from a Mr. Johnson and Mr. Shaw; is that right?

WITNESS MORSE: Right.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Why don't you just describe briefly who those people are, what the letters are. You don't need to read all of them.

But go ahead, Ms. Block.
BY WITNESS MORSE:
A. Well, given the fact that I have the education $I$ do, which is kind of unique for what I'm now doing in life 49 years later, I felt it helpful to ask two of my senior colleagues, who are nationally known, to weigh in on my behalf, and that's what they've done. They know me and they know my work both here in New England and throughout the country. So...

Mr. Shaw is a senior mountain lion biologist. I started out all this studying cats and worked with him for over 20 years.
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And he's seen me both in the field and, as you say, behind the desk. So he knows what $I$ can do.

And Mr. Johnson is Vermont's former state naturalist. He's retired now. And, again, in my various capacities in Vermont, he's seen my work.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Was there any discussion among the parties about submission of these as late documents?

MS. GEIGER: No. I was -- may I address that?

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Yes, please.
MS. GEIGER: Thank you. I was just handed these two documents by Ms. Block this morning. The Applicant would respectfully object to them. They could have been marked much earlier in the process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms. Block?
MS. BLOCK: I did bring them to the last tech session. And when I talked to Mr. Iacopino, he thought it was better that they come in this morning with Ms. Morse. So that's why. I've been holding on to them for that
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much time.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Iacopino, do you want to address that?

MR. IACOPINO: I think --
MR. ROTH: I have no objection.
(Court Reporter interjects.)
MR. IACOPINO: Peter and I are talking at the same time.

MR. ROTH: Sorry. I have no objection.

MR. IACOPINO: I think she does correctly state the conversation that we had at the time. I did suggest that she bring them to the hearing.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, why don't we do this: Since you haven't had a chance -any of the parties haven't had a chance to read through it yet, do so. All of the identifications right now -- all the markings are for identification. And if, after reviewing it, you want to make a request that it not be admitted as a formal exhibit, we'll take that up later. Thank you.

All right. Please continue.
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BY MS. BLOCK:
Q. Ms. Morse, please respond to Antrim Wind Energy, LLC's rebuttal to your testimony's concerns about habitat fragmentation.

MS. BLOCK: For the benefit of the Site Evaluation Committee, the opinions offered by Mr. Valleau and Mr. Gravel are found on Pages 11 to 13 of their first supplemental prefiled testimony submitted on October 11th, 2012.
A. I'm only, in this case, going to ask the Committee's permission to read it. I am dyslexic. And so with my handicap, it's really important for me to be able to convey this information to you in as concise and exact a manner as I labored on. All other questions $I$ will endeavor to handle as is. So I'd like to take a moment to just read this brief answer.

BY MS. BLOCK:
Q. So this is -- what you're reading is a response to that question that you've written out.
A. Yes, I am.
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Q. Okay. That's fine.
A. UUfortunately, Mr. Valleau and Mr. Gravel have misinterpreted my comments about habitat fragmentation, and as a consequence have provided the Committee with information which is inaccurate and misleading. Nowhere in my testimony did I claim that the proposed Antrim Wind facility would result in a completely isolated habitat fragment. Instead, in keeping with how the scientific concept of 'island biogeography'... has become integrated into today's 'conservation biology,' my conclusions appropriately described concerns about localized 'edge effects'; the invasion of exotic plants, animals and pathogens, and altered wildlife behavior and consequent energy losses.

However, I also deliberately included brief mention of other acknowledged perturbations that exacerbate the stresses of fragmentation throughout a much larger matrix of surrounding habitats. These include disruption of plant and animal dispersal and colonization and the sustenance of
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landscape-scale ecosystem services and species diversity. No scientist using the term 'habitat fragmentation' today would limit its impacts to a particular habitat being impacted. Conservation scientists today recognize that habitat discontinuities collectively stress local species richness and resilience, as well as the functions and services of whole ecosystems. Throughout New Hampshire, New England, and worldwide, 'small incisions,' collectively diminish limited core and connective habitats, and as such, cumulatively compromise species diversity and resilience. Conservation scientists are in agreement that the preservation and restoration of core and connective habitats is crucial if we are to successfully endure the inevitable stresses that climate change will surely pose, severely challenging human and natural economies alike."
Q. Is this why you stressed the importance of considering cumulative effects assessment and its relevance to Antrim Wind, LLC's proposed industrial intrusion into an acknowledged
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core habitat?
A. Yes. Absolutely. I carefully prepared for the Site Evaluation Committee's consideration a description of "cumulative effects assessment," including brief mention of this growing science's deepening appreciation of the dynamic and cumulative nature of human-caused disturbances and their dangerous impacts on wildlife and habitats over time.
Q. Okay. Excuse me for just a second. Let me figure out where the notes go.

Do you have any further comments in rebutting Mr. Valleau's testimony?
A. No. I think the next series of questions that we're preparing to address are the ones that you and Rich have written.
Q. Okay.

MS. BLOCK: ExCuse me for just a second.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That's all right.
WITNESS MORSE: Can I come help you?
Is that all right?
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, let me ask what it is that -- what's the problem?
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WITNESS MORSE: As I see it, the problem is she's misplaced the paper that she should be reading from at this time with the questions that --

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. What I'm concerned about is something a little bit different, which is, what we normally do, and you wouldn't know this, not having been part of these hearings before, is we have very limited direct testimony. It's not a summary of -- or a restatement of everything in the prefiled.

WITNESS MORSE: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And we address anything in rebuttal, which I think you just did --

WITNESS MORSE: Well, I think that's what these questions are now going to do in particular. They're going to address --

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. I misunderstood the question, "Do you have anything else to add?" I thought that meant --

WITNESS MORSE: No.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, why don't you go ahead. If you can help sort out the
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papers, that would be fine.
(Pause in proceedings.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Sue, back on the record. Thank you.

BY MS. BLOCK:
Q. On Page 13, Line 8 , Mr . Valleau states, "The presence of species such as moose and black bear in a particular area can be considered to be an indication that large blocks of 'core' habitat are in the area. After project construction, the large blocks of habitat will remain, and it is unlikely that either species will be displaced to any significant degree by the project." Do you concur with this statement?
A. It feels a little out of context. Moose and bear and bobcat and numerous other species -in my prefiled testimony, I maintain that habitat fragmentation and all the things that go with that will influence these animals in a multitude of ways, not just in some cases displacing them; in some cases interrupting their migration; in some cases stressing them, such that their energy budgets are
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
challenged; in some cases causing them to flush and flee and use energy that they can't afford; in some cases causing them to forsake preferred habitats, either for feeding or nesting.

These are just a few of the examples that I gave in my prefiled testimony. So I think it's a little unfair to isolate one issue -- i.e., displacement -- and have it be thought that this facility won't impact wildlife in a much, much larger way. It will. And the science is certainly proving that.
Q. On the same page, on Line $13, \mathrm{Mr}$. Valleau states, "Disturbance caused by road use from vehicles will also be restricted to operations personnel and will be low in volume compared to a state or county road. Road footprints are narrow enough, that there will still be ample opportunity for wildlife to traverse the area unimpeded, similar to gravel logging roads."

Should the project access roads be compared to a state or county road? Do you
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believe that the access road will have an impact on wildlife?
A. Absolutely. Not so much because of its physical footprint, but it, in conjunction with the wind towers themselves, will cause all manner of problems, not the least of which is the fact that roads invite more people to visit an area. And people and pets are known to cause problems, even on hiking trails. There's just volumes of literature, unfortunately, pointing out that the minute we start intruding into a core habitat with a lot of regularity, a lot of visitations, we really cause all kinds of harm to wildlife, the likes of which I enumerated a moment ago. So, again, my testimony wasn't so much talking about the physical footprint of the road and its size and whether or not animals will cross it, so much as I was addressing the universally held concerns that biologists now have about the impacts on roads in core habitat.

Again, we're talking about a core
habitat here. We're not talking about a
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place where a road should be -- say, for example, a highway. This is a core habitat. Mr. Valleau continues on Page 13, Line 17, "...several large parcels of land will be conserved as part of the project, providing for protection to 685 acres of habitat that will not be developed. This habitat conservation effort coming directly from the project developers will ensure that a significant portion of this habitat block will remain intact."

Do you consider this conserved land to be sufficient mitigation for the project construction?
A. Well, as a biologist and practician in the field, so to speak, I will say I've never been a big fan of mitigation, quite honestly. To me, it's not appropriate to offer a bushel of apples to take the place of a bushel of potatoes. They're not the same thing. And as wonderful as these additional lands may be, I'm not convinced that they couldn't otherwise be conserved in time. And indeed, the whole wonderful process of the Super
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Sanctuary and other conservation measures in the community, and the wonderful position of the conservation commission, and the Town of Antrim itself, certainly points to the fact that conservation is in the blood of this community. So I think it's unfair to suggest that these lands wouldn't otherwise become conserved if it weren't for this deal, so to speak.

And last, but not least -- and I have papers which I am prepared to provide the Committee and the Applicant on this -- there are two new fields of inquiry in conservation biology that $I$ find fascinating, both of which point to the importance of higher elevation, topmost elevation within a given habitat. So, ranging from the highest summits of the High Sierras, or even the Himalayas, to the lower summits of our ridgelines here in Antrim, there is definitely a recognized appreciation for the wisdom of conserving these areas so as to capture a greater amount of biodiversity in a regional conservation planning effort.
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So, in one case it's called "land facets," which physically the higher topography of our ridgelines are key, according to Paul Beyer and his colleagues in the one paper. And then the other is fascinating, and that is the geophysical importance of conserving the mountain summits, just simply because of their geology which is different than the soils and geologic features that exist down-slope oftentimes.

So these are ways that scientists have figured out we can capture more effective conservation on the ground. It used to be, we conserved what we thought was beautiful and what we liked to hike in and walk our pets in. But now, conservationists are realizing that in order to save the fabric of life on this planet, we need to aggressively get on with conserving core and connective habitats. And these are just two elements within that, that are now recognized as important.

And again, I want to stress this is core
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habitat, and it deserves to be thought of as such.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Let me just mention something before we go on any further. We've been strict with other parties, and so I don't want to be interrupting too much. And I want to give as much assistance and leeway to a lay questioner, who's doing a fabulous job, by the way, all throughout this case. But we really -- on direct, it really should be direct response to statements made by others that couldn't have been addressed before. And so, as you remember, we were strict with others in really framing their questions to respond to specific testimony. And if you can do that in your responses as well, that would be appreciated. Then we'll move to cross-examination, and that's a little looser. WITNESS MORSE: Okay. Thank you.

BY MS. BLOCK:
Q. Continuing on, starting on the bottom of Page 14, Mr. Valleau challenges your position on the assessment of cumulative impacts to birds and bats. On the next page, on Line 5,
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he states that direct impacts to wildlife from construction and operation of the project are not expected to be significant and that birds and bats are at a low risk of collision with project wind turbines. Would you agree with this statement?
A. I would have to say, with all appropriate caution, no, because $I$ don't know the sources of their information. And I frankly don't have confidence in the mere collection of dead bodies at the bottom of turbines to adequately capture all of the negative impacts that are going to be had here. I mean, they go way beyond the mortalities of individual animals.

What I addressed in my testimony, which they apparently didn't understand, is a much, much bigger subject involving a much, much more complex array of life and life processes.
Q. On Page 15, Line $17, \mathrm{Mr}$. Valleau states, "Ms. Morse suggests that projects that create even low levels of mortality are unjustifiable because they add to the overall
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mortality... Applying Ms. Morse's logic would result in virtually no human development, which is untenable." Would you comment on this statement.
A. Well, first of all, again, it's totally out of context and totally misleading. My comments relevant to the unacceptability of mortality pertain to bat species, which in our region are either endangered or fast becoming endangered because of White Nose Syndrome. So there, it was simply an honest appraisal of the relative importance of not having any mortalities, that we would add to the one that already exists, which is a flatout pandemic. It's probably one of the most sincere -- severe wildlife disease epidemics in our country. So $I$ wasn't -- I guess enough said.
Q. In his conclusion to the section on Page 16, Line 10, Mr. Valleau says, "Thus, even if it were possible to quantify the project's cumulative impacts, the mitigation measures would still be appropriate." Do you feel that the potential mortality to birds and
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bats can be mitigated?
A. No. Again, that feels awfully arbitrary to me and unfair to the public. Just because an industrialist says that it is so doesn't necessarily mean it will be so. And that doesn't even begin to address the larger subject of cumulative effects assessment, which I introduced in my testimony.

In fact, parenthetically, 1 will say that I believe I am the first biologist in the region to bother to even comprehensively describe what "cumulative effects assessment" is. It's not something that New England biologists and agencies are on, for some reason. It's very much a science that other parts of the country are aware of. But for some reason, we're behind the times on that one.
Q. Ms. Morse, do you have any additional comments specific to the supplemental testimony that you would like to make?
A. At this time, no. But perhaps after all the other questions, on redirect or whatever, I may, yes.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}

MS. BLOCK: Thank you very much. The witness is now available for cross-examination.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. We'll begin with Mr. Roth.

MR. ROTH: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. Good morning, Ms. Morse.
A. Good morning.
Q. I think you have before you -- maybe not -AWE 15?

MR. IACOPINO: In the bucket.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That was AWE 15, if the people didn't hear it.
(Pause in proceedings)
BY MR. ROTH:
Q. I've just shown you AWE Exhibit 15. These are some photographs that were presented by the Applicant, and they represented that these photographs were taken at various wind projects. And can you -- have you seen these pictures before?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Okay. Can you take a moment to quickly flip
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through them. There are only nine pages, I think.
(Witness reviews documents.)
A. Okay.
Q. Would you agree with me that these pictures at least appear to be various species of local wildlife present at wind farm facilities?
A. I would, with the exception of Page 7 of 9 , the fox. I'm not seeing that fox in the context of the wind facility. It could be beside the highway we just came in on.
Q. Okay. Fair enough.

Do you have some explanation, in light of your testimony and your opinions? How do you explain the presence of these animals in what appears to be a fairly significantly impacted habitat right here at the turbine basis?
A. Yeah. Well, we know that moose, for example, might occasionally show up in downtown Burlington on their way to Lake Champlain and points west, the Adirondacks, I believe, which is now enjoying a growing population
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because of that phenomenon.
All these animals at one time or another will put themselves in stressful situations to either get somewhere or maybe even to feed. But what's interesting about these pictures is, for example, Page 4, that moose is -- if everybody will look at this picture -- that moose is the one at the bottom of Tower A10. That moose is in a decided stressed condition. Its whole mane is roached and erected, and its ears are back and head is down. It is clearly intimidated or angry -- I couldn't tell you which, maybe both -- by the circumstances in which it finds itself.

So, I guess what I emphasized in my testimony --
Q. If I can stop you there, because I want to ask about this. If you look at the picture before that, it looks like the same moose in the same place, perhaps a moment before or a moment after; we can't really tell. Does that moose look to be distressed?
A. No, that moose is probably curious about the
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photographer who's taking the picture.
Q. So is it possible that, by the picture on Page 4, the moose, assuming it's the same moose and it's a little bit later, was scared by the photographer?
A. Yeah, it's scared by the whole situation. It's -- you know, I think the point -- I'll just continue with what I started to say.

The point I tried to make in my testimony before is that cumulatively all these stresses that these animals will have to experience in a former core habitat in which they weren't disturbed in this way, or very infrequently, will cumulatively add up. And moose declines, for example, in the Northwest and parts of Canada are now being attributed to an ugly combination of stress factors associated with recreation and stress factors associated with global climate change and increased parasitism.

So, those three things are converging on these animals. Same thing with caribous in the north. So, like I say, this is -- go ahead.
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Q. Is it possible that all of those things that you just described could be happening, and yet the presence of wildlife at and using Tuttle Hill and the project site could continue pretty much as it does now?
A. No, because we're not measuring the stresses. We're not measuring all the times where an animal, a bird, an amphibian, a mammal choose not to use the ridgeline that they've always used because of the facility.

I mean, it's easy enough to gather a handful of pictures to prove that they use it. But how about the thousands of instances that we don't have photographs of?

I mean, again, $I$ want to emphasis that this is a core habitat. And we have an opportunity here to protect that core habitat, as we should for biodiversity conservation, and not intrude into it.
Q. Have you -- did you conduct a population study of this location?
A. No. The description of what $I$ did is in my testimony.
Q. Okay. Have you conducted population studies
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of any particular place in the past?
A. I have co-directed a 20-year-long track-and-science survey, which in part addresses some of the population indices in an area. But I wouldn't -- that's not my field of expertise. I'm a conservation biologist, and so I'm aware of the sciences. You know, conversation biology brings together numerous sciences. So no one person is all these things.
Q. Now, I understand from your testimony a moment ago that you don't think much of post-construction mortality surveys. Is that fair to say?
A. I -- yeah, that's fair to say.
Q. And so maybe I'll just ask you. Do you think that -- or have you ever done a post-construction mortality survey?
A. No, I haven't.
Q. Have you read any of the post-construction mortality surveys?
A. I'm aware of some of the conclusions that have been made in post-mortality construction surveys. But again, $I$ want to emphasize that
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I'm not just talking about mortality on site. I'm talking about mortality off site, and that's not being measured at all.
Q. How would we measure that?
A. Well, that's just -- that's the big conundrum, and that's why we should step back and conserve core connective habitats and not have to answer that.
Q. And I guess this is the -- another question similar to that. There's been a lot of testimony here about fragmentation, and now you have introduced this notion or concept of habitat discontinuity. Is there a way to -is there an accepted scientific definition for either fragmentation or habitat discontinuity?
A. Well, fragmentation is the introduction into wild lands or core habitats of roads and other human -- permanent human installations and visitations that cause a whole litany of changes, of which I have enumerated in my testimony, and then, for that matter, enumerated earlier this morning.

So, habitat fragmentation today has
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grown away from the mere notion, as was posited in 1967 by Wilson and MacArthur, that in island biogeography, what we're talking about, somehow is an island that features a population of animals that are isolated. That's not what conservation biologists today are simply dwelling on. What they're realizing has much, much broader implications. And so all the little slices and cuts and fissures and cracks collectively add up and influence wildlife in ways that we're beginning to appreciate are significant and cumulative.

Again, if you'll refer to my testimony, you'll read in detail, as concise as I could make it, a description of just what that is. It's big.
Q. Is there an accepted scientific definition for "habitat discontinuity"?
A. It's the same thing, really. It's synonymous.
Q. Is there -- if this Committee were to order the Applicant to do it, is there a way to design a study to determine the effects of
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fragmentation or habitat discontinuity on this project -- caused by this project?
A. Again, it's apples and oranges. On behalf of the intervenors, $I$ am not proposing that the Applicant design or redesign or even execute studies of what their impacts will be. I'm proposing that this is an inappropriate place for an industrial facility.
Q. I understand, but this is a different question.

If they were to require it, is there a way to design and conduct a study on the effects of fragmentation or discontinuity?
A. I'm sure that the Applicant could dive into the literature and seek to find such a thing. But the fundamental tenant of conservation biology is that core and connective habitats should be secured and conserved by us, not intruded in any way.
Q. Have you had an opportunity to review the Applicant's Avian and Bat Protection Plan?
A. No, I haven't.
Q. Okay.
A. And the reason for that, in the partition of
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all of our tasks here representing the Intervenors, it's my understanding that the folks at Audubon and other testifiers would be covering that.
Q. Thank you very much. I have no further questions.
A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
Mr. Froling, questions?
MR. FROLING: No questions of this witness. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Beblowski.
(No verbal response.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Jones.
(No verbal response.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well,
Mr. Simmons, is it?
MR. SIMMONS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Do you have questions?

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SIMMONS:
Q. I'm sorry. This is the first day I've been at these hearings, so I may be asking
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questions that have been asked before.
But Sue, can you tell me what you find unique about this particular core habitat that you may want to address?
A. Yeah. I was really floored by how rugged it was, especially with the glacial features and the botanical features that nestle themselves in and amongst all that. And I was, as was the Applicant's consultant, I was also impressed with the diversity of forest community types and habitats that one could see up there in a relatively finite area. It's very special. It should become a park.
Q. Speaking about the forest habitat, was there something you saw unique about the kind of forest habitat that was there that you would find surprising in this particular area?
A. I wouldn't say surprising. I mean, I was delighted to see the softwood habitat at the top, the spruce and fir.

What was neat about that, and I find this to be true in a lot of New Hampshire wild lands, is the tremendous potential for mass and habitat productivity at the same
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time that you have softwood cover, really thick higher-elevation softwood cover. So you have the oaks and cherry and all that right in amongst the spruce and fir. That was very special to me, and the shrubs as well. I believe I mentioned a lot of this in my testimony.
Q. Yes. Now, in terms of some of the damages that are difficult to see -- in other words, you were talking about just not only kind of birds on the ground or the bats on the ground, but once you put the turbines in there, are there some other impacts due to the sound, perhaps the low-pressure area that is created on the avian habitat that might exist?
A. Yes. Again --

MS. GEIGER: Excuse me. I apologize.
I'm going to object to this because I think this witness has covered this information in her prefiled testimony. I think the question is in the form of a direct question as opposed to a cross-examination question. So I think we're going to start developing some unduly
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repetitious information in the record.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Simmons, is there -- maybe narrow your question a little bit?

MR. SIMMONS: Not at this time.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay. Thank you. Anything else?

MR. SIMMONS: No, thanks.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
Ms. Sullivan.
(No verbal response).
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms. Longgood is not here. But Ms. Duley, questions?

MS. DULEY: Yes.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. DULEY:
Q. My question is rather naive. But I wondered if you could comment on or sort of talk about how the impact on wildlife is transmitted through the area -- i.e., high impact maybe right where the towers are proposed to go? But how wide-ranging would you anticipate the effects on wildlife to extend through the area?
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A. Well, this is one of the areas that scientists are very concerned about, because in each situation, in each assemblage of habitats and each assemblage of animals and, you know, insects and birds and everything, the answers are going to be different.

But a generalization that I feel comfortable making is, it's extensive, you know, certainly echo-system wide. And I would argue that throughout New England more of the same impacts across wild mountains will just really compound the problem.

You take moose, for example. We have global climate change. It's happening. Nobody can deny that today. Well, nobody knows that better than the moose with its dark coat and its adaptations for a somewhat colder climate, a boreal forest, technically -- boreal and subboreal habitats. Suddenly, now these animals are being confronted with a world that is warmer, that stresses them; a world that may offer more parasitism, that stresses them. And now, in core habitats where these things shouldn't
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be, there'll be all this human footprint of a variety of sorts, which I have enumerated in my testimony.

And so cumulatively, all these things working together are hammering moose populations. In North America, iconic populations in places like Minnesota are plummeting; places the Rockies are plummeting. And you can't point to one culprit. And the consensus is that these animals are succumbing to a complex, synergistic variety of stresses.

And so I'm going to boil it down to stress. And everybody here knows what that's like. We're under severe stress sometimes in what we do out there. And if you're an animal with a finite home to live in, the last thing you need is a constant number of stresses out there that don't need to be there. I mean, global climate change doesn't need to be there. We have to hope that we can do something meaningful about that. But we certainly don't need to introduce into core habitat any more stresses. There's
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already enough out there.
Q. And can I take that to infer or state that -and you may have said this before, so excuse me -- but what you are talking about is, quote, core habitats?
A. Yeah. Precisely. Core habitats and also connective habitats. I mean, I think in New England, some smaller ridgelines and mountains even close to town that might be subject to a similar industrial activity are really -- it's really well-minded to do it because they function as corridors and because they are part of what we know to be connective habitats, ridges and riparian areas are two sort of go-to places for preferred travel routes of animals and birds.
Q. And how should me as a layperson, how should I sort of think of ecosystem as it pertains to this project? Because I'm familiar with that word, but I'm familiar with it in a very broad sense or a very narrow terrarium world.
A. Exactly. Well, it's kind of a two-fold thing. And you're right. It has both a very finite meaning, but also a very expansive
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | meaning. |
| 2 | Yeah, "ecoregion" is a word I prefer for |
| 3 | the larger picture. And so that will include |
| 4 | many ecosystems. So I would say that we're |
| 5 | talking about an ecoregion here, one that, |
| 6 | you know, as I said in my prefiled testimony, |
| 7 | is really remarkable for its already laudable |
| 8 | achievements in conservation. So -- |
| 9 | Q. Thank you. No further questions. |
| 10 | A. Thank you. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Stearns. |
| 12 | MR. STEARNS: No questions. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms. Pinello. |
| 14 | MS. PINELLO: No questions. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: For Audubon, I |
| 16 | know Ms. Manzelli is not here. Ms. Von |
| 17 | Mertens. |
| 18 | MS. VON MERTENS: I do have a |
| 19 | question relating to the wildlife sanctuary. |
| 20 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 21 | BY MS. VON MERTENS: |
| 22 | Q. Willard Pond's Wildlife Sanctuary to the |
| 23 | south of the project area. Are you somewhat |
| 24 | familiar with that sanctuary? |

A. I've been there a couple of times through programs with the Harris Center.
Q. Oh, of course. Tracked in there. Goodhue Hill.
A. Yeah, right.
Q. I went there with you tracking. Silly question. Sorry.
A. No problem.
Q. Thank you.

Can you make a comment about wildlife impacts to that area? And I'm wonderfully happy to be reminded that you are familiar with it.
A. Yeah. Well, it's a wonderful jewel, you know, in a string of other wonderful jewels. And I think the whole region will be ill-served by an intrusion of this scale within the core habitat. You know, it can't help but affect the whole region. If you listen to the science and consider the concerns, there's no question in my mind that the whole region will be harmed by yet another slice in core habitats.
Q. This isn't a question. But the pictures
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there of Goodhue Hill on that map, "Sue Morse led the tracking area up to that specific area perhaps ten years ago, and her recommendation was that there be a re-establishment of habitat there." And I think you'll be pleased to see that that was done last year.
A. Oh, wonderful.
Q. Thank you. That's...

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Anything further?
MS. VON MERTENS: No, thank you.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
Ms. Allen.
MS. ALLEN: No questions.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Dr. Kimball.
(No verbal response.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms. Linowes.
MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Madam
Chairman. I do have some questions.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. To begin with, $I$ wanted to ask you to -- if
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you -- and I don't know if you have the Application in front of you. But I will -what I'd like to do is go down the list of wildlife studies that were conducted by the Applicant and ask you a couple of questions, at least in terms of the types of studies that were conducted. Okay?

MS. LINOWES: And for everyone here who has access to the Application, I'm looking at Section I.5.C of the actual Application. I believe that would be AWE 1. My apologies if I have that wrong.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. In that section, it lists the wildlife studies that they conducted. They were a breeding bird survey, diurnal raptor migration survey, radar studies for nocturnal avian migration, rare raptor nesting surveys, acoustic bat monitoring, and bat mist nesting survey.

Do you see here anything in that list of wildlife studies conducted that have to do with bear, moose, bobcat or any other game, large game or otherwise, that might be
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utilizing the project site?
A. I'm afraid I'm at a disadvantage because I don't have the list, and I haven't had it beforehand, such that I could be prepared to answer this. So my ability to re-auditorize here is challenged.
Q. You want me to give you the list?
A. On the top of it, I don't think so. But I will add that $I$ would expect all of those studies to have yielded wonderful information about the rich quality of habitat up there and its residents. All the more reason why that core habitat should not be fragmented.
Q. Ms. Morse, I would like to show you the list because it is an important answer.
A. Okay.
Q. If I may.

MR. IACOPINO: Could you tell us the section of the Application again?

MS. LINOWES: Yes. It's I.5.C, and it's on Page 81 of the original Application.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Before you begin, you can take a look at that, but we're still
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struggling. Our Page 81 of the Application is something different. So I don't think I'm there yet.

MS. LINOWES: It's not -- it's PDF Page 81. It's the actual page number, if that helps.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I bet it will. MR. IACOPINO: I believe it's Page 88 in the electronic version.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Yes, thank you.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. So, Ms. Morse, to repeat my question: Is there anything in that list that you can tell of what you know of studies that can be done to evaluate wildlife impacts? Do you see anything that looks like it contemplated impacts on -- or at least the utilization of the project site by moose, bobcat, bear or any other wildlife that you may expect to be resident in that area?
A. This list wouldn't, in my estimation, include activities that would monitor those species, no.
Q. So, absent pre-construction survey of current
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activities of such wildlife that I'm mentioning -- again, moose, bear -- can we know the effect of this project post-construction, at least some means of measuring the effect on wildlife after the project is constructed and operational?

MS. GEIGER: I'm going to object to this question because it assumes an erroneous fact. While it's true that Page 81 does not contain of Applicant's wildlife survey, the Applicant did, in fact, conduct a wildlife survey that was submitted in a supplement to the Application. So the premise of the question is faulty, and I'd object to it.

WITNESS MORSE: And I will add that I wasn't provided with any of that, so I guess my ability to comment is limited accordingly.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I think for the sake of the record it would be appropriate to identify if there are additional wildlife studies, so that we don't have questions based on a hypothetical that really isn't accurate.

MS. LINOWES: Yes. Well, I'm not
aware that another -- that a wildlife study was
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done supplemental to that. So I would like to come back on that after my -- I believe Mr. Roth is going to check that for me, and I will come back during my question period, if I may. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That's fine. BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. Now what I'd like to do --

MS. LINOWES: And again, for the Committee, I want to apologize. I do not have the exhibit numbers as they were -- I would like to direct the witness to Exhibit SM8A, which would be an exhibit that is now an NB exhibit.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Let's hold on here and try to figure out what that just meant. North Branch exhibit, and within the North Branch document it's SM8?

MS. LINOWES: SM8A.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: $O h$, as in Susan Morse?

MS. LINOWES: Yes.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I'm getting the code.

MR. IACOPINO: You're talking about
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an attachment to her testimony.
MS. LINOWES: Correct.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: $O h$, and these are the photographs; is that right?

MS. LINOWES: Yes, these are photographs of a walk that was taken through the project site.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
Ms. Morse, do you have that?
(Ms. Block handing document to witness.)
WITNESS MORSE: Yeah. Actually, my submissions in this original testimony pertain to another section of photographs, which is entitled "SM4." So I am prepared to address those questions.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. But you were on the -- you walked this site with other people --
A. Yes, I did.
Q. -- and observed the tree clearing that had taken place.
A. Yes.
Q. And now, Mr. Jones, Geoffrey Jones, was on the witness stand last week. And he had
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stated that what he observed, in spite of any characterization by the Applicant and the landowner, what he observed appeared to be unusual in terms of the clearing that had taken place; it appeared to be following a road.
A. Oh, yeah. True.
Q. Was that your observation?
A. Yes, definitely.
Q. Now, if you would look in some of those photographs, there was -- there are stakes marked along the road. You followed that road; is that correct?
A. Yeah. Correct.
Q. And some of those stakes are marked "WTG368"?
A. Oh, yes, I'm looking at that now. Yes.
Q. And do you know what the "WTG" stands for?
A. Wind tower something?
Q. Wind Turbine Generator?
A. Oh, good. Thank you.
Q. Now, would it be standard practice for someone who was timbering in that area to also place stakes and identify the location where they are going to put turbines?
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MS. GEIGER: I'd object to this question. I think it calls for speculation on the part of the witness. Furthermore, I don't think there's anything in the record that indicates what "WTG" stands for. So I'd object.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, let's -WITNESS MORSE: Well --

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Hold on. The question about speculation -- let me know where you're going with your question about would a logger mark things. What's the relevance of that question?

MS. LINOWES: The question is that, if somebody's going through the process of logging, we've -- I believe Mr. Jones, and now Ms. Morse, indicated that the form of cutting seemed unusual, in terms of what you would see in New England forested areas, and that it seemed to follow a road. In addition, we're seeing these stakes having been sited -- "WTG" meaning wind turbine generator.

I'm trying to understand why -- what is the purpose of -- what does it appear was
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happening, in spite of what we heard from a letter last week that said that the landowner undertook his own -- he made his own decision about where he was cutting.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. If you're going to go there, you're going to have to demonstrate some way that Ms. Morse would have any clue of what a landowner was doing or why things were cut in a certain way. And I'm not sure you're going to be able to make that link. But I'll let you give it a shot.

As to what "WTG" stands for, it may be as you say. I don't know if we have any evidence of that. But if there's some contrary evidence of what those letters stand for, we'll accept that upon further questioning.

MS. BLOCK: Madam Chair, may I make a statement? It's Loranne.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Yes.
MS. BLOCK: Ms. Morse is a licensed forester; so therefore, I do feel like Lisa's question is relevant to a relevant person.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, that's sort of along the lines $I$ was thinking. If you can
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make a basis for how she might have more than just a guess, but more informed speculation that would be useful here, I'm willing to let you head down that path and see where we go.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Madam Chair.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. So as a forester, as one who has consulted with landowners on forest practices, would that be -- well, let me just say, is that an accurate characterization of what you have done?
A. I have, yes, certainly done that.
Q. So what you observed, would you have advised a landowner to cut -- to implement tree cutting on his property that appears to be in an effort to clear for a road?
A. Yeah, I was there, and I certainly joined my colleagues that day in pondering what was going on. And we also saw
wetland-delineation flagging and other things that were clearly a footprint of the Applicant and not a traditional logging operation necessarily.

No, it felt to me like it was a road,
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and it was cut to be a road. And in conjunction with the stakes that were labeled W -- whatever it was, it felt to me like the road was put in place, even though the Applicant doesn't officially have permission to do this project.
Q. And Ms. Morse --
A. So, putting the cart before the horse.
Q. Ms. Morse, when a logger is laying out a road for tree cutting, is it typical that they would have wetland impacts, or would they do what they can to avoid wetland impacts?
A. Well, a good forester marking a cut and marking the delineation of roads, which the logger will interpret and perform, typically a good forester would certainly take all of that into consideration. And I'm sure you have -- and by the way, I should say, I'm not a licensed forester. Vermont doesn't have such an inspired system. I wish we did. New Hampshire does, and I regularly work with New Hampshire foresters in providing courses that they take for credit to help them maintain their licenses. But we don't have that in
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}

Vermont. So, c'est la vie.
We have in Vermont, and no doubt you have here in New Hampshire as well, best management practices with respect to wetlands protection and water-course protection, erosion prevention and things of this nature. So, yes, I would expect that that would definitely be embraced by a good forester and a logger. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So then, in addition, there are some photographs -- now, I'm going to jump now to Exhibit 8B, SM8B. And these are additional photographs from that visit.
(Witness reviews document.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And Ms. Linowes, help me out here. Those were not part of the same package. I take it, that came -- those were filed at a later date?

MS. LINOWES: I'm going to consult with Ms. Block, if I may.
A. Yeah, mine just goes from Exhibit SM8 to SM9. There is no SM8B in this particular document. BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. I'll be right with you on that.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
(Pause in proceedings.)
MS. LINOWES: I'll move on. I'll withdraw that question then.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Now I want to direct your attention to Appendix 12A of the Applicant's -- and this would be his breeding bird survey. Do you have a copy of that in front of you?
A. No, I don't. And I again want to defer to the questions pertaining to birds to the bird experts here in this -- in other words, there were several of us that did this reconnaissance together. So, it's my understanding that $I$ would not be addressing issues related to birds.
Q. Okay. Actually, I think my questions are simple. So if it's something that you cannot answer, then --
A. There may be simple answers. But go ahead.
Q. Okay. There was -- let me give you a copy of the document, if I may.
A. Sure .

MS. LINOWES: For everyone, I'm
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specifically looking at Appendix B of that appendix.

MR. IACOPINO: Just for the Committee's sake, I believe that we're in AWE 3, electronic Document 18. It's Appendix 12A. But I haven't gotten to the appendix to the appendix yet.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Hold on a minute, Ms. Morse.

WITNESS MORSE: Sure.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I think we start with Appendix AWE 3, which is the Volume 3 of the Application. Then, within that Document 18, which is Appendix 12A, Breeding Birds Survey -- oh, no. Wait a minute. That's a data response. I apologize. There it is.

MR. IACOPINO: Are you showing her the protocol, Ms. Linowes?

MS. LINOWES: I'm looking at the list -- this would be a table on Appendix B of that appendix that shows a list of birds that were located or observed at the project site.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Do you know what page of the document that was?
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BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Ms. Morse, $I$ don't think that has a page number on it.
A. It's Table 1 of Appendix B. And none of these have page numbers.

MR. IACOPINO: It's electronic Page 30 of the document, $I$ believe.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. Now, while you're looking at that table, $I$ would also like to draw your attention to your Exhibit SM7.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And these -- this is a listing of -- in SM7, it is a listing of birds that were either observed or heard at the time that you were on your visit, which would be July 10th of 2012. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. Now, I appreciate that you are not here as a bird expert, okay. I just wanted to ask you a couple of questions, though. There are several birds listed on your document or on your exhibit that do not
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appear in the table that are -- that is in the breeder list, specifically: The Pileated Woodpecker, Eastern Phoebe, the White-Breasted Nuthatch, the Black-Throated Green Warbler, the Pine Warbler, the Rufous-sided Towhee. And then going to the second page there were two: The Golden-Crowned Kinglet and the Brown Creeper?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And now, when you were on this visit, was your purpose to observe birds, or were these sightings or, you know, audio observations incidental to your visit? You were in tuned to it, but you were not specifically looking for birds?
A. We all were looking for everything. As naturalists and as professionals, lay and professional alike, we were all looking intently for anything that would be -- would reveal the biological richness of the place. But we had among us at least two people who are accomplished birders, Francine and Bruce Hedin. So I would defer particular questions about the birds themselves to them.
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Q. Okay.
A. But I will say that we were all thrilled to hear a nighthawk, not once but twice. And we actually managed to get a recording of that, which was quite special.
Q. So then, would it be fair to say that the table you see before you from the Applicant's Application, the appendix, is not comprehensive of what is actually resident at the birds -- at the project site?
A. Well, birds are not necessarily -- even some of our favorites are not necessarily all-season residents, anyway, No. 1; and No. 2, depending on the seasons during which surveys are conducted, one may expect to see different assemblages of birds. But yeah, it's curious that there are so many of the more common species that are mentioned here --
Q. Now --
A. -- for sure.
Q. Thank you. Sorry.

Now, their study was conducted on two days, June 7th and June 16th of 2011. So
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your visit was a year later on July 10.
Do you have -- I'll ask you. I don't know if you know the answer to this. But is there anything to say about early to mid-June versus mid-July, in terms of some of these species, that they might have been missed, or were they simply just missed?
A. Well, I can't speak for what they were able to see or not see. But I know in our case, we actually felt disadvantaged by coming as late as almost mid-July because a lot of the singing which would cue you to look for certain birds was pretty much a done deal by then. So, if anything, we should have expected to see less than what they did.
Q. Okay. So that -- thank you. That's very helpful.

Now, going back, one question in terms of the -- what you observed in terms of the road, what appeared to be a road. I don't know if you actually walked through, but there was some photograph that showed quite significant boulders.
A. Oh, yes, $I$ was very much there.
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Q. You were there, so you observed them. And based on what you observed, there appeared to be the track of where a road would go?
A. Well, the stakes and flagging would have us believe that that was where the road was proposed to go. I mean, understand a good part of the road had been built, you know, as a supposed logging project. And I don't mean to offer a parenthetical remark like that. But I did, so be it.

But part of it had not been built. And when we got there, we were floored by the beauty, the specialness of that area of great big boulders, erratics and rough talus and the like. And we immediately appreciated what a monumental task it would be to build a road there. One would have to blow all that up and, I guess, spread it on the ground and use it as a base of gravel. I don't know. But it would be terrible.
Q. Really? Okay. Thank you.

Now, I want to talk to you a little bit about habitats for bear. You observed bear-scarred beech trees.
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A. Yes.
Q. Do you have a sense of how many you observed?
A. I wasn't counting. But the normal amount. We didn't encounter a critical bear-feeding area. We didn't go through a beech stand of significance, such that we might have seen that. But we certainly saw what I believe is more important than that; and that is, throughout the whole of the habitat, we saw ample evidence of bird -- I mean of bear uses of the habitat in all seasons. I think this is one of the areas where we get into trouble, and especially with our agencies having to compartmentalize and really render measurable impacts, you know, for mitigation purposes or just documentation of avoidance purposes. We get into trouble when we talk about the critical feeding habitats, because, frankly, to my way of thinking, all the other places in a forest are just as critical to the bears who are eating in April, May and June and July, as well as obviously late summer and August and September when they're feeding on beechnuts. So I was delighted to
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see a diversity of mass-producing trees and shrubs throughout the habitat, certainly impressing me with the importance of it to bears in all seasons.

And then, of course, denning cover in higher elevations, in softwood stands, that seems to be the trend that we're still seeing. I can see the bears may change their ways with global climate change and who knows what, and with habituation, too. Deer are already doing that.

But for now, we do recognize throughout the Northeast that bears prefer remote locations for denning and softwood mixed-wood habitats so they can have concealment cover and also thermal cover for their den site.
Q. If I may, then, because you just gave, I think, a very good description of critical habitat for bear, $I$ would like to read you a description from -- this would be words of Dr. Kilpatrick from Vermont. Do you know Dr. Kilpatrick?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. His definition of "critical habitat of bear"
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is, as he states, "Critical habitat for black bear includes mass-producing forest stands" -- in parentheses he says "beech, hickory, cherry and oaks" -- "forest wetlands and extensive connectivity among forest habitats to allow for movements among patches of seasonally important foods. It also includes secluded habitat with suitable denning sites." That sounds like what you said.
A. Yeah, pretty much.
Q. Does that definition only apply to Vermont, or would it be --
A. $\quad \mathrm{Oh}$, no.
Q. -- a definition you would find in New Hampshire, Massachusetts?
A. You know, the specific trees and shrubs that offer the mass might change a little bit, depending on where you are in New Hampshire or Vermont, relatively speaking. But no, the principles are the same.
Q. Now $I$ want to read you a quote. This is from Forrest Hammond of Vermont's Agency of Natural Resources. Do you know Forrest
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Hammond?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And he is an expert on black bear?
A. Yes.
Q. He states this regarding beech trees and bear-scarred beech trees. He said there's a distinct -- he says, "Not all beech trees provide suitable habit [sic] for black bears in Vermont. There's a distinction between beech trees and bear-clawed or scarred beech trees as habitat for bears. Bear utilize beech trees that are remote in secure locations. Although beech is located throughout the state" -- in this case, Vermont -- I'm sorry, I'm going to jump down. "Bear behavior through clawing and scarring demonstrates where they feel secure feeding. Bear-clawed beech is important habitat for bears because it is only a small portion of the total beech available in the state, and bear feel secure feeding in that habitat." So, to that statement, would you agree -- or would you state that the fact that bear-scarred beech was identified at the
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
project site indicates, in fact, that is a very important area for bear that they've demonstrated themselves by utilizing those trees?
A. Yeah, I would certainly agree with that, although I would caution us against extrapolating too much from what Mr. Hammond has said. I don't completely agree with him, that bears are limiting themselves to certain trees because they feel comfortable there. I've seen bear at trees in the backyards of my neighbors in West Bolton. Now, mind you, it's a remote and very rural area. So, bears are dynamic creatures. And some of their habits are changing. But apropos to this Application, regardless of what Mr. Hammond says, I would say that the diversity and abundance of mass-producing trees and shrubs in a core habitat in which bears really can relax and be themselves is what is special and what should not be compromised by a project of this nature.

MS. LINOWES: Madam Chair, I just
have a few more questions and I'll be done.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
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standpoint, you know, I will prescribe for my customers, for example, that a minimum number of standing snags and recruitment snags, you know, dead snags, all kinds of snags be retained for the benefit of wildlife.
Q. I might be -- maybe we're not using the term correctly or the same way.

The snag study which was conducted -required in the Deerfield Wind Project in the state of Vermont entailed leaving markers where we can observe at least the presence of a bear through leaving patches of its hair in some wires that would be put in place.
A. Oh, hair snags.
Q. Yeah.
A. You left out the word "hair."
Q. Oh, I'm sorry.
A. If you said "hair," I would have known what you're talking about.

Okay. Yeah. Hair snags, often catching deliberately bear hair on barbed wire strands that are placed in front of an area. Yeah, I'm familiar with the science, yes.
Q. And is that one way of identifying the -- an
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area that is utilized by a bear and perhaps counting the size of the population -- or at least identifying the utilization of a space by the bear?
A. Yeah, again, this is my profession. I am who I am. I'm a nationally known tracker, in addition to being a biologist and a forester. And I will say that it's really a whole lot more simple than that. It's what we did that day. It's simply going in the right places and looking for scent-marking signs that bears leave and evidence of feeding that is lasting, because it's represented by scars on trees. And those two features, in and of themselves, with or without femoral tracks and scat, can tell you that bears are present.

But more importantly, scent marking can tell us that bears are present over time. And you can look at the ages of the scars associated with bear-scent marking and appreciate that it's an ongoing phenomenon.
Q. Okay. So then, maybe perhaps the Public Service Board of Vermont was overstressing a
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quantification of hair, looking for hair snags. But the goal -- if the goal is to identify pre-construction utilization of the site and then post-construction utilization of the site, what kind of
post-construction -- pre-construction and post-construction surveys should be done to identify if bear have been harmed -- or at least if they've lost their habitat? And I believe you identified what pre-construction would be, exactly what you did on that day. A. Well, much more of that probably. But yes.
Q. Much more of that?
A. Well, quantitatively, $I$ mean, to take one linear walk through a habitat on one day in one season in one year only gives you a snapshot of what's out there. I believe Bruce Hedin said that in his bird report. So, certainly for an Application of this nature, even if it were -- I mean, if it were assumed to be appropriate, which I don't believe it is, it would certainly want to do much, much more than that even and look at that habitat in all seasons and look at that
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
habitat multiple days in each season and have specialists on board who can recognize and detect a sign of multiple species using that resource of that habitat.
Q. Since the project is not built yet, would you say that there's still time to require studies to be done to identify the utilization of that site by bear?
A. I think it would be a waste of the Applicant's time. I personally feel that, fundamentally, industrial facilities do not belong in core habitat. So that would be my answer. My answer would be that the Applicant relocate and find another site.
Q. And I appreciate that, and I understand where you're coming from.

But if that ends up not being the case, if it ends up getting approved, as the Deerfield project was, is there still time to go through and understand better what the -at least what the size of the impact could be so that we can measure post-construction?
A. Yeah, we're not measuring cumulative effects and stresses. We're not measuring what
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happens to an underweight female because it was poor last year and she's going to go to bed in her den and she's been stressed 14 different times during the month of October and November before she goes to bed, causing her to -- do you see where I'm going? No studies are going to capture that, which is why we have to be conservative about what core habitat is and why we should avoid intruding into it.
Q. One last question for you then. If we do not do additional studies to identify -- to better quantify, or at least qualify the location for bear habitat, the project gets built and now we have a noise intrusion, we have spinning turbines, we have lots of things going on, it's a very active location where today it's quiet, what can we expect to happen with the bear?
A. No one knows. That's the thing. That's what I'm trying to say. I mean, we can expect that in hard years, additional stresses on all wildlife will cause their energy budgets to be challenged. How that will be measured
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by scientists in the field is just mind-numbing.
Q. Will they die off? Will they move on? Will they --
A. In the case of caribou and moose, we're seeing declines of populations, declines of recruitment. These are all known scientific causes of mortality, either long-term in population ecology or short-term in actual losses. So, again, the concept here is this is core habitat.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, ma'am. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Ms. Geiger. MS. GEIGER: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Good morning, Ms. Morse. I'm Susan Geiger, and I represent the Applicant, Antrim Wind Energy, LLC. And I'd like to ask you a few questions.

Could you please turn to the top of Page 4 of your prefiled testimony. Do you \{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
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have it?
A. I do, but it's not -- there aren't page numbers on it.
Q. I think if you look at the -- at least the copy I have, if you look at the very top of the page, there's some labeling there.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Oh}, \mathrm{I}$ see Page 4. Yeah.
Q. And it's dated July 31st, 2012; is that correct?
A. Yeah. Thank you.
Q. And there you've indicated that fragmentation results in habitat patches that are too small and too insular to provide adequate food and security for wildlife. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes, you did.
Q. Could you please take a look at the map contained under Tab 1 of your prefiled testimony.
A. The maps are -- were submitted by my colleagues, so I'm not familiar with where that is.
Q. Well, $I$ have $a \operatorname{Tab} 1$. And it's a map that has pink, yellow, green areas on it --
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A. Can I see the map?

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay. So this is SM1?

MS. GEIGER: Correct.
WITNESS MORSE: Can you work with me, Loranne, and provide me with these things? Yeah, this is not -- that was not part of my testimony. So I --

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Oh, so this is not part of your testimony?
A. The map? No.
Q. Oh. So you're not familiar with it?
A. My testimony includes the comments that were made in a couple of pages that you read from, plus the articles that $I$ submitted for the convenience of the Committee, plus a number of photographs, all of which are included in SM4, Photographs by Susan Morse.
Q. Hmm. So --

WITNESS MORSE: If you can get me what she's referring to? Well, here's the whole thing here.
(Ms. Block handing document to the witness.)
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BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. So let me -- maybe I can save some time and I'll show it to you.

Are you saying, Ms. Morse, that this map that was submitted with your prefiled testimony and marked as Exhibit SM1 was not submitted by you?
A. This was -- this whole testimony was submitted by a number of us. And I described that in my testimony, how -- the evolution of how we did our work. And so the local people rightly are the folks that are responsible for providing the local maps and so on. I don't live here.
Q. Okay. Well, even though you did not provide this map, could you demonstrate or show us where on that map that was submitted with your prefiled testimony you believe that habitat fragmentation will occur?
A. Well, as I said in my testimony, habitat fragmentation was one of several perturbations that I was listing in my testimony.
Q. I understand that. But I'm asking -- you
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used the term "habitat fragmentation" synonymously with "habitat disuse" or -Mr. Roth had a word for it.
A. Discontinuity.
Q. Discontinuity. Could you show me where on that map that you believe habitat fragmentation will occur?
A. Look, the entire corridor of the proposed wind facility will introduce into a core habitat what is now today known as a habitat fragmenting influence. I never said in my testimony that it would result in an island, however --

MR. ROTH: Madam Chairman, I don't -I'm sorry to interrupt. But we have, like, two people crowding the witness.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
Please proceed.
MS. GEIGER: If I could just ask the witness for an answer to my question, whether she can tell from the map that was provided with her testimony where habitat fragmentation will occur on that map?
A. I defined "habitat fragmentation" in my
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testimony to go way beyond "island biogeography," which is what your consultants zeroed in on as a flaw in my testimony, and it's not a flaw.
Q. So is your answer to my question --
A. If I can finish my answer.
(Court reporter interjects.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Please allow the witness to respond because she is trying to answer your question, Ms. Geiger.

MS. GEIGER: I apologize.
A. Yeah. It is not a flaw in my testimony, because if your consultants were aware of just how the science of conservation biology has evolved since 1967, they would be aware that conservation biologists today use the phrases "habitat fragmentation" and "habitat loss" concomitantly as we defined the whole phenomenon of our continual nibbling away at the edges and sometimes slicing into core habitats.

So we are today no longer trying to say, as they did in Wilson and MacArthur's treatise, that this is a problem of island
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biogeography, that there's somehow going to be an isolated remnant. No, I never said that, nor would $I$, because today it's now recognized to be much bigger than that.

And, in fact, a paper which I have copied for the Committee's convenience talks about how even national parks today, for lack of apex carnivores, which is a human-caused pertubation, are today fragmented, if you will, by that, that their biodiversity is compromised by that. And so even the whole Yellowstone ecosystem will not be completely -- of course, thank God it is today with the return of apex carnivores.

But do you see where I'm going? So these people are thinking landscape scale at how these things work.
Q. Ma'am, perhaps $I$ can help -- I can try to get at this a different way.

On the map that we just showed you that was submitted with your prefiled testimony and identified as SM1, can you identify where core habitat exists?
A. The whole place.
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Q. Are you saying the whole map is core habitat?
A. What was described in my testimony as "the region of conservation projects" -- again, not counting the town and the villages and the highways and all of the -- I mean, if you look at the land use map -- and again, I didn't submit this map, so I'm not familiar with it -- if you look at the land use map and you look at volume of conserved lands and forest cover and wetlands and ridgelines, including the Tuttle-Willard ridgeline, you're looking at a huge, wonderful block of core habitat, yes.
Q. Well, I guess I apologize. I'm still confused. Are you saying that the pink areas constitute core habitat?
A. I'm not -- I'm going to say that I don't know that map, and I don't -- I can't comment on it.
Q. Okay.
A. Perhaps we should ask another one of our witnesses.
Q. Who is the witness responsible? Maybe I'll ask Ms. Block that.
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MS. GEIGER: Who is the witness from the North Branch Intervenors that's responsible for answering questions about this map that was submitted with her testimony?

MS. BLOCK: You can ask those questions of either Richard or myself. We went over the characteristics with Susan and provided the map, as well as other things. I was not on the hike. Richard was on the hike. So there are other things from people on the hike, and that is described in Susan's testimony.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So the Blocks will be testifying on Thursday.

MS. GEIGER: Okay. Thank you.
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. While we're on the subject of the exhibits that were submitted with your prefiled testimony, could you please repeat for me which documents you're responsible for, in terms of exhibits?
A. Well, conceptually, you know, as Loranne has just mentioned, I certainly suggested to the Blocks that they include the State's maps of
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priority wildlife habitats, or whatever the term is, I forget. It varies from state to state. Why, I don't know. And I certainly was responsible for helping the Blocks choose the participants in the walks, such that we could have a distribution of experts there to help us look --
Q. Excuse me, Ms. Morse. I asked you a very simple question. Could you please go through the exhibits that were submitted with your prefiled testimony and tell me which ones you are familiar with and responsible for answering questions about.
A. Well, again, conceptually, I'm familiar with all of the things, except for the maps and so on, which I didn't assemble. But what I probably should address today is my testimony, which is -- that's my supplemental testimony. So, my written testimony and its accompanying exhibit, which I believe is called SM4.
Q. SM4. And that's the only one that you're responsible for; correct?
A. Yes.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
Q. Okay. So, earlier this morning you were answering some questions about photographs that were labeled SM8; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And so is it fair to say that you were not responsible for or did not take these photographs?
A. No. It's fair to say that I suggested that they be taken, because, as a biologist, I recognized that they would be important in this case. So in that sense, I certainly influenced their inclusion in this report, although I didn't physically take the pictures, no.
Q. Did you see the photographs after they were taken?
A. Oh, of course.
Q. Okay.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And I think Ms. Morse noted that when they were first being discussed. She said she hadn't taken those; she had taken the ones that are in SM4.

MS. GEIGER: Okay.
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BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. And do you know, in terms of some of the markers that you spoke about this morning, do you know who put them there?
A. I don't know who put them there, no.
Q. Okay. Now, at the top of Page 10 of your testimony -- could you please go there.
A. Okay.
Q. And there you've indicated that the Tuttle and Willard Mountain ridgeline should be conserved; correct? I believe you testified to that this morning.
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And are you aware of the project's intention to conserve 685 acres of land in and around the project area?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware that the Applicant intends to conserve 275 acres of the highest-ranked New Hampshire habitat?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
Q. And are you aware that the project itself is located in only 5.4 acres of the highest-ranked New Hampshire habitat?
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
A. I'm aware that it's a portion -- it's adjacent to it, yes.
Q. Are you aware that the Applicant intends to conserve 148.9 acres of highest-ranked habitat in the biological region?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
Q. And are you aware that the project itself is located in only 6.4 acres of the highest-ranked biological habitat in the region?
A. I remember reading that in supplemental testimony. I don't know that for a fact, but yes.
Q. Okay. In light of those conservation and habitat statistics, is it still your belief that the project will create habitat fragmentation?
A. Well, again, it's apples and oranges. In light of the Applicant's intention to conserve parcels of land outside of this area -- which could be conserved in other ways, I might add, and I think I addressed this earlier -- that still doesn't alter the fact that this is core habitat and it should
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not be intruded at all. And it should not be -- it should not feature an industrial development of any kind.
Q. If this Committee were to certificate this project, do you believe that the project would be better with conservation or without it?
A. Well, that's -- that's a little like asking me if I have a cut, do $I$ believe it will be better if I put a Band-Aid on it or not. I don't believe it's appropriate to have this project here. Unfortunately, if it is to happen, certainly the conservation will be a good thing. But I think the precedent that this will set throughout New England will be most regrettable.
Q. Are you aware of other wind projects that have been certificated by this Committee?
A. No, I'm not talking about this Committee. I'm talking about New England, other projects generally.
Q. Let's talk about the state of New Hampshire. Are you aware of any other wind projects that this Committee has approved?
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A. Again, $I$ don't know the politics of New Hampshire's -- no, I do not know the particulars of that. I'm talking in generalities here. I'm talking about, you know, if you close your eyes and you picture New England that we all know and love and that we all are immensely proud of when we drive along any of our roads and visit some of our rural areas, if you imagine, you know, what will probably be hundreds and hundreds of miles of proposed wind facilities on many mountains throughout New England, I just think that will be very, very devastating to --
Q. Do you know who is proposing all of those wind turbines in New England?
A. Several companies just like yours.
Q. Okay. And so when you say, "This will set a dangerous precedent," could you please explain what you mean by that. Let me withdraw that.

Are you aware that there are other wind farms that are -- that have been constructed and are operating in the state of New
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Hampshire?
A. I'm aware of that, yes.
Q. Now, you're saying, I believe, on Page 8 of your testimony, that the assumption that animals will adjust and possibly even benefit from these habitat modifications is utterly unfounded. Is that your testimony?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. So are you saying that it is implausible that moose, beer --

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: It's a little early for that I think, Ms. Geiger.

DIR. STEWART: That would be
Moosehead. Moosehead beer.
[Laughter]
MS. GEIGER: Thank you.
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Are you saying that it is implausible that moose beer -- moose, deer --
A. Bear.
Q. -- deer and bear -- thank you -- for example, will not adjust or become accustomed to areas in which wind turbines are operating?
A. I think it is dangerous to choose a few
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examples of animals that may become habituated to feeding beneath wind towers, for example, and extrapolate that to mean that all animals will benefit. That is not the case.
Q. I'm not asking about all animals. I just asked you about the moose, the bear and the deer. Is it implausible to think that they could adjust to a habitat in which wind turbines are introduced?
A. I think if you reread my testimony and you add up all the stressors which I believe are associated with an industrial footprint of this nature in a core habitat, you would have to conclude, generally speaking, most animals will not benefit; they will be harmed.
Q. What are the stressors that you just mentioned?
A. We're repeating my testimony. It's all there. Stress --
Q. Stress is a stressor?
A. Stress is a stressor.
Q. What else?
A. Stress affects an animal's energy budget,
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flight response, lack of fidelity to your nesting site if you're a bird, for example, forsaking a habitat to feed within because you're intimidated by all this. And it isn't just that. Add the wideness of the road. You're intimidated maybe by the people that are going to show up on their ATVs or bicycles or their skis.
Q. So are you -- can I ask you: Are you saying that any human activity in and around the project area is going to create stress on these animals?
A. Yeah. Of course.
Q. So do you believe the day that you went out on your tour of the project area, that you and your party created stress?
A. Undoubtedly. Undoubtedly.
Q. And you did it, anyway.
A. Well, we had to stop the bigger problem.
Q. Okay. I understand.
A. Or we had to work on defining why it should be stopped. There you go.
Q. Could you please turn to Tab 4 of the attachment to your prefiled testimony. I
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believe that's the one that you did assume some responsibility for earlier; is that correct?
A. Yeah, SM4 is my work, yes.
Q. Okay. And I'll just wait for you to get there.
A. Yeah. Bear with me. This is not -- SM5.

Okay. Getting there.
Q. The page I'm looking at has -- the very first page has three pictures on it, and the middle and the bottom pictures are -- the narrative next to them indicates that they are pictures of power poles; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So there you have two pictures that depict utility poles or power poles with markings by bear; is that correct?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Okay. Where were these photos taken?
A. They were taken below the project area, on the way up to it, along that power line corridor.
Q. So they're existing high-voltage transmission
lines in that power corridor, is that
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correct, where these photos were taken?
A. I don't know if these are high voltage, because I don't know what that is. But, yeah, these are power poles. That's as far as I'll go.
Q. Okay. And the text in the middle box there says, "Resident bears regularly set marks throughout their habitat"; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So, do these pictures show that bears reside in or have become accustomed to areas in which utility poles have been installed?
A. Yeah. And that's a known phenomenon all over. I mean, all over, any place I've been, curiously, bears appear to -- where power line corridors are found within or near wildlands, bear will scent-mark them, probably because of the creosote. And when they bite into the poles, they release still more of a powerful creosote scent, which, analogous to our flashing bulletin boards, announces to other bears the presence of a mark.
Q. So the installation of utility poles aren't
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going to affect bear use of the area, are they?
A. The which?
Q. The installation of utility poles, such as the ones depicted in your photograph.
A. It depends. In this case, no. But if we were to grid the habitat with utility corridors that would invite more people to use these corridors as trails or get to a summit for a view or picnic, you know, these things could become a problem cumulatively. Again, it's not one incident; it's over time.
Q. Okay. So you're saying the creation of hiking trails is also of concern to you?
A. Well, hiking trails that aren't well-sited. And, I mean, everybody here appreciates the importance of siting and how important that can be for properly doing anything it seems. But certainly hiking trails today that always want to go beside a wetland edge or always want to traverse the highest terrain, you know, the whole length, shouldn't be allowed. Not to say the trails that are already there and the trails that
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periodically take a view from the high country are a problem.

But certainly as we look at animal responses to global climate change and their need to move about the larger landscape and find where they're going to be able to live and how, we've got to do the best we can towards assuring them a private and safe means of traveling. You know, it's like asking your kindergartners to walk to school; you have a choice between a busy highway or a country road. And what I'm saying is, the busy highway doesn't belong in these wild habitats.
Q. Okay. Speaking of busy highways, have you studied -- I believe on Page 6 of your testimony you talk about concerns or possible concerns that the effects of wind turbine noise might have on wildlife; is that correct?
A. Yeah. I have to get there. Excuse me.
Q. Page 6.
A. Yes. Hmm-hmm.
Q. Have you studied the effect of sound on
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wildlife in Lempster, New Hampshire, from the Lempster project?
A. No, that's not what I do. All I did here -and I still am completely assured that this is of important utility to the Committee as they review this project. All I did here was I enunciated the issues that scientists have discovered as they relate to noise and their impacts on wildlife. And then I submitted SM2 and SM3, two papers that give examples of the degree to which this is a real deal here and that it's not something I'm conjuring up.
Q. Have you studied the effect of traffic noise from Route 9 in Antrim on the wildlife in that area?
A. Again, I don't -- that's not what $I$ do.
Q. Okay. Now, at the top of Page 11 of your testimony, you state that millions of wind energy units are being proposed nationwide; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you mean by "millions of wind energy units"?
A. Just that.
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Q. What's a "unit"? How do you define a "unit"?
A. Well, let me see where this is so I can read it in context. Where on the page?
Q. Top of Page 11.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Yeah. Maybe I meant "facilities." That's a good catch.
Q. So is your testimony that millions of wind energy facilities are being proposed nationwide?
A. Yeah.
Q. Meaning projects like the Antrim Wind Project?
A. Not all are ridgelines. Some may be out in the ocean or some may be on flat ground in a prairie or a desert. Yes.
Q. But it's your belief that the number of wind projects in the United States, or nationwide, is in the millions?
A. Yeah. I have to confess, I believe I read that statistic. And I would need to, with the Committee's permission, go back to my sources and see if I can find where I read that. In other words, I didn't read -- I
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didn't read the whole statement verbatim. I made the statement. But the phrase "millions of wind energy" I believe I read somewhere, yeah. I know there are hundreds and hundreds in New England alone. So I have to conclude that there probably are millions.
Q. Okay. And this is in the United States?
A. Yes.

MS. BLOCK: Madam Chair, may I
interrupt for a second?
I think there's a question there between "units" as a wind turbine versus wind farms. And I'm not sure that that's being differentiated.

WITNESS MORSE: Well, I won't use the word "wind farm" because I think that's an inappropriate term.

MS. GEIGER: I think the question that I asked is whether it was her statement or belief that there were -- or that she intended to say that there are "millions of projects like the Antrim wind project" --

WITNESS MORSE: No, I won't say that.
And I don't believe I did say that. I will say
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[WITNESS: SUSAN MORSE]
that with millions of wind energy facilities -I will make that word-choice change -- millions of wind energy facilities being proposed nationwide, the cumulative environmental effects may be considered -- must be considered. And I'm comfortable with that.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, this may not be necessary anymore. I was going to say, we're about to take a break soon. And if you wanted to check and see if it was "facilities" or "turbines" or "megawatts" or whatever it was --

WITNESS MORSE: You know, I wasn't prepared for questioning quite like that. So I don't have all my, literally, two file cabinets full of papers with me.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay. That's fine.

Ms. Geiger, how much more do you suspect you have?

MS. GEIGER: I have a few questions, at least probably 10 or 15 minutes.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Why don't you continue then.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}

MS. GEIGER: Thank you.
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Now, Ms. Morse, on Page 9 of your testimony, you state that professional forester, Geoffrey Jones, and yourself were both deeply moved by the impressive diversity of plant community types and habitat types which one encounters along the Tuttle-Willard ridgeline and adjacent habitats; correct?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware that the New Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau has indicated to this Committee that it has determined that it is unlikely that the project will impact any rare plant species or exemplary natural communities?
A. I'm not aware of that. But $I$ have two reactions to that. One --
Q. Excuse me. I just asked you the question if you were aware of it. You said "No"; is that correct?
A. I'm not -- ask the question again, and I'll
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try to follow you.
Q. I just need a "Yes" or a "No" answer to the question.

Are you aware that the New Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau has indicated to this Committee that it has determined, meaning the Natural Heritage Bureau, that it is unlikely that the project will impact rare plant species or exemplary natural communities in the project area?
A. I wasn't aware of that conclusion.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. However, if I may, I'd like to elucidate my point; and that is, it's been my experience as a field ecologist that, unless you're really in the field looking, you don't always find. And with no disrespect to the Natural Heritage Committee or the biologists and botanists involved, I'm sure they would agree with me if they were sitting here, that time sometimes doesn't permit our agencies the luxury of doing these things.
Q. Do you know whether the Natural Heritage Bureau went out into the field in this
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project?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Would it surprise you to learn that they did?
A. It might not surprise me that they made a brief visit, much as I did. But it would surprise me that there were no unusual plants and special features of that habitat that should be recognized as such. It would surprise me a great deal.
Q. Okay. So you disagree with the conclusions of the New Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau?
A. Well, what was the word they used?
"Unlikely"?
Q. Yes.
A. "Unlikely" is an ambiguous word.
Q. Okay. Is that your opinion?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Have you studied whether habitat fragmentation has been created by the Lempster Wind Project?
A. No.
Q. Have you studied whether habitat
fragmentation has been created by the Granite
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Reliable Wind Project?
A. No.
Q. And yet, you're stating that habitat fragmentation will, in fact, result by the Antrim Wind Project; is that correct?
A. Yes, and undoubtedly has a result of -habitat fragmentation and/or habitat destruction, again, if you re-read my testimony, there's a much, much bigger thing that $I$ was describing there, not just habitat fragmentation. Your consultant made that mistake, and I would beg you not to.
Q. I'm just asking you the question about fragmentation.

So, is it your position that any human development or any construction by human beings along the Willard-Tuttle Ridge would result in habitat fragmentation?
A. Precisely.
Q. And you're saying it should be avoided?
A. Precisely.
Q. Okay. I think you've also said something along the lines this morning -- I may not get this correctly, so please correct me if I'm
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wrong -- that we have to do something about global climate change?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Do you believe that reducing the consumption of fossil fuels is a good step toward addressing global climate change?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay.
A. And --
Q. Now, you said that -- now, I believe you said earlier that you had some -- that the biggest threat to the bat population here in New Hampshire is the White Nose Syndrome; is that correct?
A. Yes. Yes, it is.
Q. And so you're not necessarily saying that this project will, in fact, contribute to bat mortality, are you?
A. Oh, undoubtedly it will. It's certainly not to the proportions of the disease. But as I acknowledged in my report, any mortality of bats above and beyond the monstrous loss of bats due to the disease is what $I$ would call an "additive mortality." It really makes the
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overall crisis of bat population declines that much more severe.

So, whether it's killing bats in your attic because you don't like them and you think they're going to land in your hair or wind turbines killing a percentage of bats every year, it's all got to change. It's all -- we've got to get educated about bats in our homes and around our barns and farms and so on. And we certainly need to seize every opportunity we can to conserve core habitats so that the wild habitats these animals need is there for them. And if there's to be a recovery from a disease like that, it will spring from a population that somehow lives to tell about it.
Q. Is it your testimony that the Antrim Wind Project is proposed to be sited on core habitat for bats?
A. No. No, it's to be sited on core habitat. I'm not a bat expert.

MS. GEIGER: Okay. Just need a moment, please.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That's fine.
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(Pause in proceedings)
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Thank you, Ms. Morse. I don't have any further questions for you.
A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. This will be a time for a break then, and then we will return with some Committee questions. So let's resume in about ten minutes, at 10:45. Thank you.
(Whereupon a recess was taken at 10:34 a.m., and the hearing resumed at 10:55 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: We're back on the record after a break, and we now have questions of Ms. Morse from the Committee members. All right. Hands are going up. It's like an auction.

All right. Mr. Stewart.
DIR. STEWART: Thank you.
INTERROGATORIES BY DIR. STEWART:
Q. I'm going to try to pull this up to a higher level for a while, and then we'll get into specifics. And this is in the context of
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
we've got two of these -- three that are already approved in New Hampshire, of these wind energy facilities, a couple in Vermont, and Maine has them. So there's the question of impacts from these facilities.

So my first question is: Are there any ridgelines that are not core habitat, as you've defined it, where you think that these facilities would be acceptable?
A. I see where you're going, and I really respect that and would argue that that's the way we need to think.

I don't know that $I$ would want to limit it to ridgelines, because $I$ have an uneasiness about ridgelines, per se, because of their utility for wildlife or for movement corridors, preferred travel routes, migration and the like.

So, in general, not using ridgelines as a surrogate here. I would say we should be definitely looking for other more appropriate sites for wind. I'm not opposed to wind. I think wind, along with solar and, most of all, conservation, is the way we've got to
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go. But I'm just -- I'm just really, really very worried about the proliferation of these facilities on ridgelines anywhere.
Q. Okay. So, probably not is what you're suggesting.
A. Probably not if it's a ridgeline.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

I'm concerned about impact measurement. And again, this is -- I'm not prejudging this project, but we also have these other facilities that exist. And so I'm trying to understand, in the long term, how we measure the real impacts from these projects, in terms of, you know, pre- and post-construction studies. And again, it's not just for this project, but... so how do we do that? How do we measure the impacts going forward for the facilities that are constructed?
A. Well, my answer will, $I$ guess, be helpful in general, but it will really require that we, you, whomever, do the homework for the specifics.

I would recommend a thorough literature
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review for all of the sort of categories of stress and harm that are known to occur as a result of any human footprint of significance in a core habitat. And once I've enumerated all those things, and once I've done all that reading, which is going to be a significant exercise, $I$ would then work with professional biologists, perhaps a mix of private consultants and, you know, agency personnel to kind of come up with a post-construction protocol of measurements. It certainly wouldn't be just simply counting dead bodies at the bottom of turbines.

But I'll warn us all that some of this stuff is very complex and it unfolds over time. In other words, the whole point of cumulative effects assessment is that lots of separate, isolated events that happen to you over time can cause you to have a shorter lifespan. It can cause you to not make it through the winter. It can cause you to abort your fawns. It can cause you to give birth to underweight offspring. You know, you see where I'm going? It's all very hard
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to pin down and -- which is why conservation thinkers who are really, really good at what they do, people like Michael Soule and Paul Beyer and others, some of whose papers I've prepared for the Committee, they're really cautioning us against going into these places and destroying them in the first place. And that obviates the need to measure anything, because we're going to agree at some point that we're going to stay out, you know.

I just read a statistic the other day in preparation for this morning that, you know, 75 percent of the world is within earshot of industrial noise. That's -- or traffic, noise, human noise. You know, so that -they call it the "soundscape." And the purpose of this paper which I have provided the Committee members, and will give to you, is to simply say that even noise has an impact on wildlife. And of course, it does. The paper $I$ included in my report, "The Chronic Noise Paper," illustrates that. So I haven't really specifically
answered your question, except to suggest
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that what we haven't done well enough as we seek to judge the merits of these industrial applications in wild habitats is we haven't really come up with a comprehensive way of measuring what's out there beforehand and measuring what happens after. And so maybe the most appropriate way to deal with that is to have a moratorium on developments in core habitats until we do have such a protocol in place. And even then, I'd be uneasy with that, just knowing what $I$ know.
Q. I understand your recommendation. I'm trying to, as a regulator -- again, we have existing facilities and we have prospective facilities. I mean, is it possible, for example, to develop a committee of professionals to develop a protocol and analyze impacts for these projects? Or is it too squishy to do that? I'm an engineer as well as a regulator --
A. Yeah, yeah, yeah.
Q. -- so squishy is something I have trouble with sometimes.
A. Yeah, I do, too, unless they're soft and
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furry at the same time.
Q. I mean, how do we do this? How do we evaluate the impacts from the existing facilities? And then, if facilities were approved, how do we evaluate and set protocols for evaluating future approved facilities? I'm trying to understand what -so we get this right in the long term for the existing and prospective facilities, if any are approved.
A. Well, I'll take it as a twofold question. For existing facilities, again, the extensive literature review and the consultation with multiple scientists who can weigh in on the subject -- and I would suggest that to keep that objectivity foremost in the panel, you'll really need to draw from state and federal officials, as well as private consultants and university consultants to really get a mix of authorities there.

But then, here's the piece that you're not going to like. Here's the squishy piece: Really, really thoughtful research of this nature is by definition over space and time.
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It's very expensive, very complicated. And it's going to involve, you know, teams of university researchers and others doing a multitude of projects over time. It's not a quick and dirty. It can't be done, you know, within the time frame of a normal regulating board sometimes. So that's the first answer. The second answer is -- it's simple. For now, I think it was -- it was. It was Aldo Leopold who said, "The first rule in intelligent tinkering is to save all the pieces." And so the best way we can save all the pieces is to not fragment that plate and drop it on the ground and cause it to become fragmented. It just becomes that much more complicated to even have a baseline for what's out there. And we're still learning that. I mean, we've identified millions of species on the planet. But giants in the fields, like E. O. Wilson, who is my God, he tells us, and I believe him, that there could be, you know, many, many scores of millions of more species out there that we haven't even identified yet.
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Q. So, from your answer, I assume that there aren't any of these kinds of studies going on, you know, nationally or internationally that you're aware of that we could draw upon?
A. Well, you could certainly draw some inferences from some of the studies that are being done with some of the aspects of cumulative effects assessment; in particular, in the artic looking at impacts on caribou, that might be a start. That's why I say a literature review would be helpful. You know, there are numerous books and papers on cumulative effects assessment. There's a relatively new book, published by CRC Press, that I think just came out a couple of years ago. I have it in my library.

But those are just starting places. You really need to, because this -- you really need to pull it all together from your local expertise and whether or not you have the budget or the Applicant has the budget or the inclination to want to engage in such a thing. But it's really -- it's the price of doing business, I suppose, in core habitat.
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Of course, my reaction to that is no, we don't need to do this in core habitat. We need to stay out.
Q. Okay. With regard to, under an approval scenario -- again, it could be this project or it could be future projects -- again, I'm a regulator. The wetlands program is one of the programs that I manage under the Clean Water Act. Federal, there's "avoid, minimize, mitigate" as kind of the tiers. So if a project goes, at first you minimize and then mitigate.

So the question I've been pondering, and this is not just a question I've asked of you, is what is "adequate mitigation" for these kinds of projects? In this case, we've got, you know, 600-odd acres, and it has various values as proposed. And I don't know if that's adequate or not. It's 68 -- again, I'm an engineer -- 68 acres per turbine of various values. So I ask the question: What is adequate mitigation for these kinds of projects?
A. Well, you know, where wetlands are concerned,
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we sometimes have wetlands in situations where mitigation might be adequately used to compensate for their loss or degradation.

But whole habitats, like core habitats, I really shy away from that notion, because then we're really talking, you know, about replacing apples with oranges. And I've worried about that.

I understand this particular proposed conservation constellation of lands that the Applicant will conserve involves the very lands that the turbines are going to be sited on. And I wouldn't call that conserved lands. I would call that --
Q. The other lands is what I'm --
A. But even still, you know, core habitat is a finite thing. We don't have very much of it. And guess what? We're not going to make more. Well, maybe we could again if we all went away and the forestry grew back and so on. I don't mean to be glib, but... core habitat is so finite in our region, that we really need to take our cue from this and realize that, oh, wow, all of a sudden, in
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our lifetimes there's a major industrial footprint that wants to put itself on our mountains. Is that really a good thing? And I would argue, from a biological standpoint, it's not and that there is no mitigation that, you know, will take the place of that.

In higher elevation, ridgelines and even the highest summits, there's no substitute for them. They are those places where the land, you know, comes to the top. And so replacing them with downslope habitat has a nice ring to it, but it's not the same animal.
Q. Okay. I'm going to get lower now.
A. Okay.
Q. The glacial erratics, these provide habitat for, you know, various mammals --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- I assume?
A. Yeah, and insects.
Q. And I'm an engineer, so I don't know much about these things.
A. Yeah.
Q. Again, under an approval scenario, is there
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an appropriate buffer around these older fields for a road to ensure that the habitat is preserved?
A. If there is, I'm not aware of it. But I would just think, practically, if I put myself in the body of a bobcat seeking a den site or an escape habitat or a thermal habitat, or even a salamander seeking a thermal habitat, I would have to say that being anywhere near a road is not going to be good for me.
Q. What does "near" mean?
A. You know, I'm conservative on this. I'm going to take the position of the animals, I suppose. Somebody has to, you know. I don't -- core habitat is so limited, I would say nowhere near it. I would say nowhere near it. I would say put the wind facility --
Q. Well, again, that's not the scenario --
A. I know.
Q. -- I'm trying to elicit data on.
A. Well, sometimes we have answers that don't give us the answers we want, too. You know,
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and I'm not saying I'm God and I have all the answers. I certainly don't. But I'm saying that I would be extremely grateful to the Committee to really seriously ponder whether or not this particular proposal is the right thing for this wonderful exemplary piece of land. Simple as that.

DIR. STEWART: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Questions,
Mr. Robinson.
MR. ROBINSON: Thank you, Madam
Chair.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. ROBINSON:
Q. I have five questions. I'm going to try not to ask the same questions that other folks have asked, but there might be some similarities. My first question is actually a follow-up to one of Ms. Geiger's questions relative to habitat fragmentation.

Can you provide the Committee with any evidence of wildlife community changes due to habitat fragmentation that have occurred as a result of developed wind projects that are out there now? And part of the reason for me
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asking this is that, 30 or 40 years ago we were told that habitat fragmentation would cause the demise of the Pileated Woodpecker, and we haven't seen that. So I'm curious on your view on this, and if you actually have some evidence of community changes.
A. I would have to really have the privilege of thinking about this and looking in the literature. But I'll -- I will say, off the top of my head, not as a result of wind facilities, because, again, I'm not in business reviewing wind facilities on a day-to-day basis. So I don't -- I don't have all that literature at the tip of my fingers here. But I will say that I've read one instance recently where the edge effects associated with some development caused a lot of significant changes in the plant and animal community adjoining it -- communities I should say, plural.

I would really prefer to have the chance to research that and get an answer back to you, you know, because community changes is different than some of the other things I've
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been talking about.
I know it occurs. And I know that, for example, what happens with edge effect, which will certainly happen along this power line corridor -- or this turbine corridor, is temperature regimes, solar radiation, moisture, just to name three, will change. And as a consequence of those changes, the plant and animal communities, some of them in the vicinity of that will change. And in some parts of the world, some of those changes have been devastating. For example: There was a native ant species that got completely overwhelmed by an invasive ant species that was able to come in and exploit that edge habitat and basically displace the native, and that had reverberating effects in the ecosystem that these biologists were able to write about.
Q. I'm sorry. I guess my question is: You can't provide any evidence from your work that there have been community changes? Is that what I'm hearing?
A. Again, I'll use the same phrase: This is not
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what I do.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay.
Q. Thank you.
A. Sorry.
Q. My next question is: Would you agree that any wildlife study of three years in duration, particularly one that's going to be extrapolated out over time, would provide you a better dataset than a one-year study?
A. Oh, absolutely. Yeah. But I would also maintain that a study of many years, way more than three, might be necessary to elucidate some of these issues.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

My third question: You've talked a lot about cumulative impacts to wildlife. And I get that. I understand that. We've talked about cumulative impacts on offshore wind farms to quite a degree, probably more than onshore farms.

How do you measure cause and effect when it comes to cumulative impacts? Do you have any idea how we're going to measure that?
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A. Multiple studies over time. But even that will be an imperfect solution, because, as I said, you know, these things are very complex, and the multiple studies over time would be very expensive.
Q. I know we need to study it. But do you have any suggestions on even where you begin?
A. You start by conserving the core habitat, and you work to site industrial wind facilities where they will do a lot less harm. I mean, I think any wind facility, like anything we do out there -- I mean, I'm going to get in the car to go home; so hence, I'm going to do harm. So I'm not naive about these things. But relatively speaking, industrial wind, I think over time, can certainly have a place in our energy portfolio. I just don't believe it should be on top of mountains.
Q. Okay. My next question actually has a little bit to do with core habitat and home ranges. We've talked quite a bit about moose, bear, and to a degree, bobcat. And you understand that these species have large home ranges where they travel --
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A. Yes, I do.
Q. -- 10, 11, 12 miles --
A. Yes, I do.
Q. -- in the course of a day?

Okay. How would this particular project impact these species differently than existing roads, housing subdivisions and things of that nature that are nearby?
A. Okay. Well, let's be a bobcat for a minute. You know where your prey are in different seasons. So, with time and experience you become accomplished at being successful, and you get to live and you get to raise families and all that. Suddenly there's a big change in your world, and the mountaintop that you used to go to, the boulders that you used to find safety and shelter within are changed. There are stressors up there that you shun because, unlike other animals that can become accustomed to edge effects, you're not recognized to be one of them. You're timid in the face of some of these things. Not that bobcats couldn't change over time. But still, core habitat is what you know. It's
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what -- it's your home address, and it changes radically overnight? And yes, it will certainly affect you. Moose, the same. Bear, the same. Bear may decide to come and eat some of the green growth at the base of the power line corridor. I don't doubt that that won't happen. It appears that bears, along with deer and others, are sometimes habituated to becoming used to our presence.

But the question I'm asking on behalf of the intervenors is: Is this appropriate in a core habitat? Do we really need to keep taking away from wild nature? That's what we're talking about here. And it's so ironic and so full of paradox, really, that we're saying that, in order to minimize global climate change and minimize our carbon footprint on the planet, we're going to put a renewable energy facility in core habitat. Now, global climate change and our carbon footprint is devastating to millions of species on the plant, and will certainly be more so in the decades to come. And I think everybody in this room has an increasing
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appreciation of that sobering reality. So why would we justify injuring still more biodiversity in the name of minimizing these things, when, to my way of thinking, we haven't begun to do an adequate job of looking to ourselves and conserving energy and using less energy and finding productive ways in our communities to share rides and so on. I can't go to my park and ride place to ride with anybody because it's jammed full of cars, and they haven't added to it in all these years. They know it's important. But that's one thing that a community regulator or officer could recommend to happen, or state.

So, anyway, I don't mean to lecture to the choir here. But I've said enough I guess.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And my final question actually has to do with moose. You've talked a little bit about Minnesota's moose population and winter ticks and whatnot. You do know that it's pretty widely accepted that the demise of the
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Minnesota moose population is due to winter ticks and wolf predation? I mean, that's pretty well accepted. Are you aware of that?
A. You know, I'm not aware of that. But I don't know that I necessarily agree. And I go to Minnesota twice a year to track wolves and study wildlife. So, you know, you're talking about an area that $I$ have familiarity with. So there are two sides to that opinion, certainly. Wolves are coming in and impacting populations that are low enough to be impacted.
Q. That's correct.
A. But if you look at the Isle Royale studies, for example, over many, many decades before global climate change and before the winter tick problem, moose and wolves were in a dynamic equilibrium. In other words, the predator by itself did not cause moose populations to significantly decline, such that they couldn't recover. And that's the way it is with predators and prey. And I don't need to tell you that.

I think the thinking in Minnesota is the
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combination of global climate change and winter ticks is the ugly combination, and that moose are unnecessarily stressed by warmer temperature regimes which cause them to not be able to conserve their energy budget in ways in which they should.
Q. So I guess my question is, how would a wind turbine project have any effect on moose when winter ticks are caused by basically the lack of snow and a moose's inability to groom itself compared to a deer?
A. Yeah, mooses -- mooses -- moose don't -they're not obligate groomers like deer. So it's kind of a drag that they acquire as many ticks as they do.

But, well, let me answer your question this way: A moose calf going into its first winter that might acquire, say 70- to 100,000 ticks, is probably not going to make it because of the volume of ticks, because it might lose 40 to 50 percent of its blood volume just in the months of February and March alone.

A moose calf that goes into that same
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winter with only 40,000 ticks is at a tipping point. And if it experiences a lot of stresses and feels it has to run away more than it should in a natural habitat where it wouldn't, the cumulative stresses of all the situations it may find itself in associated with a wind tower facility could cause that animal to not be able to withstand the impacts of winter tick of a lighter infestation.
Q. I can appreciate that. But the fact is that winter tick loads are caused basically to lack of snow in certain years and a moose's inability to groom itself. Would you agree with that?
A. I think some of the science -- and I can certainly provide you with some of the literature on this. Some of the science is suggesting that it's a combination of other stresses that influence moose fitness in combination with the ticks. Yes, severe loads, no question. There are definitely more ticks out there because of climate change getting on moose in the fall and
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getting off successfully to lay their eggs in the early spring. But all the other stresses that add themselves -- I mean, one of the reasons why moose struggle with winter ticks in the first place is, because from an energetic standpoint, when they do finally have a whole bunch of adult ticks feeding on them, they're not eating as much; they're not resting successfully. So, from a stress standpoint, their energy budget is getting hammered, in addition to, you know, the blood loss and so on, although anemia is not necessarily zeroed in on this as an isolated problem. But it's a combination is what I've been saying.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you. I
have no further questions.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Other
Committee Member questions? Mr. Simpkins? DIR. SIMPKINS: Thank you. Just a few questions.

INTERROGATORIES BY DIR. SIMPKINS:
Q. In your exhibit, in Exhibit SM4, the
photographs in your testimony, you have a
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photo of a tracker, a Scott Simmons I believe is his name. And he's kneeling next to what you describe as a large, old-growth hemlock. I was just wondering if you could define what you mean by "old growth" and how you came to the conclusion that that tree was old growth.
A. That's a good one. I guess I'm not using "old growth" in the sense that we commonly hear about it out West with, you know, the old Douglas firs and the like. Here in the East, a tree that's, you know, 80 years old and older, especially in this context where it's literally surrounded by a much younger cohort of trees, that's why I used the term.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And you discuss forestry several times and that in Vermont foresters aren't licensed. I didn't see a resume or anything. Can you provide a real brief description of your forestry training and education?
A. Yeah. I studied forestry at Penn State for two years before I then moved on to study literature at the University of Vermont. But I hail from a family of four generations of
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foresters, starting with my great-grandfather, and I now run that business.
Q. Thank you.

And the last question $I$ had is kind of a follow-up to a question by Mr. Stewart and Mr. Robinson, but $I$ wanted to be a little bit more specific.

On Page 11 of your testimony, you discuss four specific areas where improved science is most needed to evaluate the impacts of wind energy. And I was just curious. Are you aware if any of these four areas are being researched on any existing wind projects in northern New England?
A. I'm not aware that they are. But I'm aware that the paper that I refer you to here certainly has underscored the significance of needing to do a much, much more comprehensive job of assessing these things, yeah. That's why I provided that paper with my testimony. Yeah, it was an eye-opener for me, the research priorities that -- I believe it's called that, "research priorities," and they
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are necessary.
And, for example, documenting lethal and sublethal effects at existing wind facilities, again, unless there's cumulative effects assessment going on somewhere that I don't know about, which is possible, I can't imagine that that's going on, on the scale that it should.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

DIR. SIMPKINS: No further questions.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms. Bailey.
INTERROGATORIES BY MS. BAILEY:
Q. Good morning. Can you give me a scientific definition for "core habitat"?
A. It's a large, unfragmented block of habitat that -- you know, I suppose there are different practitioners that might define it slightly differently. But in general, it's a habitat that is insulated enough from all the human stuff around, big enough in some respects and complex enough that it also is home to a select group of mammal species that are indicators of such habitats that really
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don't tolerate human-dominated landscapes to fulfill their life histories. Black bear and bobcat, for example, really need core habitats. They may be large or small, depending on the productivity of that habitat. Some are more productive in terms of food resources, and some are more complex in terms of vegetative structures. So habitats could be smaller or larger according to the habitat attributes they're in. Am I making sense?
Q. Sort of. Is it related to or is it specific to certain species?
A. It depends on where you are in the world and the country. You know, here in this region, acknowledged species that we associate with core habitats are bobcat and bear, for example, depending on the largeness of the habitat. Certainly animals that are what we call "area sensitive," so they're
ill-equipped to deal with a lot of human activities; animals that are wide-ranging, so that might include even something like river otter. River otter, as we all know, can swim
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through the rivers of town. But on the whole, river otters have to have a percentage of their habitat be private enough to fulfill other aspects of their life history that are important. They can't be in polluted waters, for example, because they biomagnify toxins in the food web and so on.

So there are different kinds of animals that are indicator species, flagship species, keystone species. So a suite of these animals will be chosen in a given region because they represent qualities of healthy habitat, larger core habitats. And if they're present there in breeding populations over time, then that helps us appreciate that, gee whiz, we really are looking at a core habitat.
Q. Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

So the New Hampshire -- we've seen some other exhibits that $I$ think part of which was copied into your testimony as the exhibit that you said you weren't responsible for, but I think it all comes from a map that talks about "highest-ranked habitat." Do you
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know how that's related to core habitat?
A. I believe I said in my testimony -- and I want to qualify something here. The questioning that I responded to earlier had me a bit confused. But I'm responsible as a senior biologist in the direction that this testimony took, in terms of trying to collect all of the various pieces about wildlife, including birds and forest ecology and so on. So, all of the participants in our outing that day contributed their parts of this. To keep cost down for my clients, which of course is a perfectly legitimate consideration, I relied upon them to provide the maps. But it was I who suggested that they avail themselves of the information that I knew existed. So, if that helps you.
Q. So, as a biologist, what's the difference between highest-ranked habitat and -- or is it the same thing as a core habitat?
A. No, not necessarily. You'd have to read their definition for what they -- I believe I addressed that in my report.

WITNESS MORSE: Yeah, help me out
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
here, Loranne, if you know where it is. Let me see here.

BY MS. BAILEY:
Q. Well, I think --
A. I just -- go ahead.
Q. I think the discussion about core habitat starts around Page 4.
A. Yeah, but what $I$ did was I listed what the State's criteria were. Yeah, here it is, on Page 2 of 11 , "What is the purpose of your testimony?"

And going right to the chase here, "Furthermore, my findings in the field have convinced me that development of an industrial wind project in this area would severely and negatively impact exemplary habitat which has been described by the State of New Hampshire as 'highest-ranked wildlife habitat by (as assessed by) ecological condition.' These highest-ranked habitats in New Hampshire were analyzed by professional biologists. Major considerations included the biological landscape, as well as human impact factors which could most affect a
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given landscape type. Biological factors," which is one of their terms, "included consideration of rare plant and animal species, as well as overall biodiversity. Landscape factors included the size of a given habitat and how close it is to other patches of habitat."

And the last descriptor is, "Human impact factors included measuring the density of roads around the habitat, as well as the relative presence of other anthropogenic influences, including dams, recreational use and pollution."

So, if I understand your question, no, these definitions aren't synonymous with "core habitat." They're descriptors of qualities that they were looking for in their ranking system.
Q. So is a highest-ranked habitat a subset of core habitat?
A. I'd have to think about that. It seems like it certainly can be most of the time. But there may be similar cases of exemplary habitat that are -- you know, that are
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isolated. I'm thinking in Vermont, we have a habitat type called the "sandplain" habitat type, with pitch pine and lots of sand. It's a very xeric habitat type. And it's not a core area anywhere. It's too fragmented by cities and towns and roads and gravel pits and the like. But nonetheless, there is a piece of it that is today cherished as an exemplary habitat and recognized by the state that, you know, it needs to be protected.

So if the same thinking is going into this, which I strongly suspect it is in some cases, no, it wouldn't always be synonymous with core habitat.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Other questions. Mr. Dupee?

MR. DUPEE: Thank you, Madam Chair. INTERROGATORIES BY MR. DUPEE:
Q. Good morning, Ms. Morse.
(Court Reporter interjects.)
By Mr. Dupee:
A. Good morning.
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
Q. Talking about ridge habitats, sounds like in most cases you'd consider that to be core habitat?
A. Not necessarily. Smaller ridgelines of tiny little hills overlooking a city or a town might not be core habitat simply because it isn't big enough and it doesn't support the complement of species that I talked about earlier. You know, it might be too isolated or, you know --
Q. So there might be ridgelines in the state that you would not object to there being wind power facilities built there because there wouldn't be the critical habitat that might be evidenced in other parts of the state?
A. Well, I'm uneasy about that, and I'll tell you why. Because as I said in my report, I'm even wanting to champion the small little, you know, over the rural -- I mean, over the urban edge hills because they're the last stand for wildlife. And who am I to say that a deer is any less important than black bear and bobcats, you know.

So, any pieces of wild nature that we
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still have left out there, large and small alike, we better think long and hard about destroying them. We don't have much left.
Q. So if you were to weigh that consideration against some earlier testimony you gave about the influence of global warming on just generally, ubiquitously cross species, and you were looking at whether one would introduce wind power, which is essentially a very clean form of energy, how would you assess that?
A. Well, I think, as I said earlier -- and I really do believe this, I think there definitely is room on the planet for wind at some point. But I think we need to do more research about how to do it well and minimize its impacts on the rest of life.

And this may sound like a cheap shot, but I question whether or not wind is necessarily as clean completely as we'd all like to think it is. I mean, for example: Where are these things made and how are they gotten here and how are they gotten from here to up there or wherever? And, you know,
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there's a tremendous energy footprint that goes along with installing wind facilities. And weighing that against other forms of energy, you know, $I$ don't know which is better. Again, I'm not an energy expert.

But then, philosophically, I'll also say that the time is decidedly now that we need our leaders to lead us into true conservation. We haven't gotten there yet, but we're going to have to.
Q. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

MR. DUPEE: No further questions.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
Dr. Boisvert.
INTERROGATORIES BY DR. BOISVERT:
Q. Going back to your expertise in forestry -or your experience, excuse me, in forestry, you made a field trip up to the ridge and you noted that it had been cut. Did you see cutting on that ridge that, in your opinion, went beyond -- literally, beyond what would be necessary for a road for a wind farm?
A. No, I didn't.
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Q. So that --
A. But then again, $I$ will say, with all sincerity, I'm not an expert on what would be necessary for a wind farm road either. But it felt to me like it was a huge footprint already, and it didn't feel to me like it was a legitimate, you know, exercise in silviculture or harvesting of trees, not to say that they didn't go downhill to a mill somewhere.
Q. That's all I have for now. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
Further questions?
I have some questions.
INTERROGATORIES BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
Q. When you were on that field visit, you said this morning that you observed wetlands delineation flagging. But $I$ couldn't tell if you also said you saw wetlands disturbance.

I just couldn't follow what you had said.
A. Yeah. I know my colleagues have addressed that issue. And yes, we all did. We certainly saw a seepage area that had been
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driven through, and, you know, there was no effort at even remediating that damage. And that was just one, you know, walk down the length of it. I wasn't there to quantify abuses of forest practice laws -- or not laws, but practices.
Q. All right. Sticking with the question of roads being put in, do you know the relationship between the proposed road and the glacial -- post-glacial boulders that you talked about in your testimony? I mean -let's back up.

You've talked about some impressive boulders. And you have some, I guess photographs of Mr. Block's in the back of your testimony.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Are those located on the ridgeline or at another place in the Antrim area?
A. Yeah, some are on the ridgeline, and some are after we kind of made a turn and went down through the forest a ways off the height of land, I believe. I mean, this is a stretch. But, yeah, I believe that's what I recall.
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Yes.
Q. Do you have any way to show on the map of the proposed road where those areas of these large boulders would be? We have a map of --
A. I don't have a way of doing that. But I certainly believe that Rich Block would, so I would defer that question to him. It was agreed among us that $I$ would handle the, you know, sweeping stuff, and they would handle the local stuff.
Q. All right. So in your testimony on the bottom of Page 9 and the top of Page 10, you talked about the concern that some of these post-glacial boulders will be blasted. Is that because you know they are in the path of the road, or you're just concerned that that will be taking place somewhere in the vicinity?
A. Both. Both. I mean, in some cases the flagging that we were following led us through there. In other cases, still more habitat spilling down below us and rising above us. I'm thinking of the area where we found the solitaire vireo, where we found the
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vireo nest. So, on both sides of this was extensive post-glacial boulder features that were gorgeous and, you know, will be impacted simply because of the disturbance that goes through there -- disturbances, for example, that are known to introduce invasive plants, which have no business in a place where there's some -- well, you know, they have no business anywhere, I suppose. But they're ubiquitous along our regularly used roads and gravel roads and even logging roads. But it would be ashame to introduce them in a place as special as that.
Q. Well, I'm just trying to understand from you. You've drawn a lot of conclusions. But then, when we look for the backup to how you get to that conclusion, there's -- it seems to me you step away a bit and say, "Well, I'm not sure. I wasn't the one who knew that."

You claim that those boulders will be blasted as part of the project, but you're not sure the pathway of where the blasting would be, I take it.
A. No, I can visualize it plain as day. But we,
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as a team preparing this testimony, agreed that we would divide the parts of it that we would address with you. And so I am referring you to the person who will precisely be able to show you that.
Q. All right. Thank you.
A. I mean, we agreed when we were there that these damages would occur. We were horrified, frankly.
Q. Also at Page 10, at the top of that page, you said that there would be -- there were rare plants that you observed that would be at risk. What rare plants were you referring to?
A. At the top of that page...
Q. It's the last line of the top paragraph. I'm sorry, I misstated. You didn't say that they would be disturbed. You said that it's an area that has --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- sort of treasures, including rare plants.
A. Yeah, that certainly should be studied.
Q. What rare plants are you referring to?
A. Well, I don't know. But that's what the
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conservation of that area would help us appreciate.
Q. Well, but this is a statement you made, that you observed that there were rare plants there. So I'm asking you what rare plants you observed.
A. No, I didn't -- let me -- if I may, with all due respect, let me read what $I$ wrote. "This natural area is too special and deserves much more study of its additional potential treasures, including unique geologic features and rare plants."

So what I'm saying -- and maybe that sentence structure is a little awkward. But what I'm saying there is that the area is special and deserves protection so that we could potentially discover unique geologic features, which I know we will, and possibly rare plants. I didn't specifically enumerate any plants that we found that -- I would have loved to have found some rare plants up there, but we didn't.
Q. All right. So it's really more, study it because there is a possibility that there
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could be rare plants.
A. Yes, yes. And history certainly has demonstrated that. In habitats like that, with all their little micro habitat regimes associated with the complexity of the topography, that, you know, I'll be a monkey's uncle if they don't find some rare plants there.
Q. You've described the moose population declines in Minnesota. Do you know the status of the moose population in New Hampshire?
A. Not as such, no. I know that, curiously, in our whole region, moose have not struggled as much with winter tick as they have in points out West or -- although in Maine, they're concerned about the possible ugly duo of winter ticks and lung worm having an impact, although moose populations don't appear to be declining there.

So, New England is pretty lucky in that regard. And my hypothesis for that, such as it is, take it or leave it, is that maybe one of the reasons why New England's moose
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population, relatively speaking, is not as pressured now -- I'm not going to speak to the future; I'm not going to say it's not going to happen -- is that we do have the topographical relief that moose can seek out, and we do have -- and certainly Minnesota has wetlands, so that's not the answer. But, you know, we do have the higher-elevation terrain where, at least in terms of summer stress, moose are not going to be as stressed as they are.

I've been in Minnesota in the boundary waters in the summer. And lately it's awfully hot, but they can't climb anywhere to, you know, get away from it. So that might be a safeguard for moose here. I hope it is.
Q. In your photographs in your Exhibit SM4, the second page of photographs, the last one in the text box next to it -- do you see where I am?
A. Second page. So it's this one (indicating)?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
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Q. So that bottom photograph in the middle of the text box says that excessive -- the signs of moose throughout indicated to you that moose numbers are perhaps too great for this region. Am I reading that accurately?
A. Yes, you are.
Q. So that, at least in this area, there was an abundance of moose, maybe more than it really can -- the area can sustain?
A. Yeah, although $I$ will qualify that by saying that, on the ridgeline where they are known to move -- you know, an animal movement in a given habitat is certainly random throughout most of it, but more concentrated along preferred travel routes, and of course, ridgelines function that way. So we know, for example, with white-tail deer and moose, browse pressure will be greater along those preferred travel routes and within those habitats where they concentrate themselves for periods of time.

And that's why I made that statement, because looking at the browse pressure there, it seemed excessive to me. I have seen that
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in Maine. It's nuts up there in northern Maine. I don't know how you recruit yourself if you're a balsam fir in some places.
Q. Actually, you used the word "recruit" a couple of times, and it's a meaning that $I$ don't get. So what do you mean when you talk about "recruitment" and "pressures on recruitment"? I think of the military, and I'm sure that's not what you mean.
A. No, it's the ability of the young of the species to become adults, to go out into the community and become adults and be part of the population; success of the young to survive.

And it isn't limited to animals. I mean, one of the papers that I'm going to give you that talks about the impacts of noise on wildlife looks at the ways in which noise has a proven deleterious impact on certain mammal species; normal inclinations to harvest seeds of Pinyon trees and carry them and cash them for eating and consumption, some of which don't get consumed and grow into trees. So they've noted a
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decline in Pinyon tree recruitment near these places in the West where they have these gas compressors and, you know, industrial noise in what is otherwise a wild place.
Q. Let me ask you. You just made a reference to studies you're going to get to us. What are you referring to?
A. Okay. I've said this a couple times, and forgive me if I've confused you. But in preparation for today, I expected that some of my comments -- for example, the one I'm now making -- would be of interest to you to read more, so to speak. So I took the time to Xerox four articles for you to have on various aspects of human disturbances and/or appropriate conservation planning. So there's two kinds of subject areas that I've prepared for you.

MS. GEIGER: And I apologize for the interruption, but I'm sure, as the chairperson can anticipate, I would object to introducing more material at this late stage of the proceedings. This witness filed testimony back in July. I think she could have appended, or
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her sponsors could have appended these reports to her prefiled testimony. I think they're coming in too late. I haven't had a chance to review them. I won't be able to cross-examine her about them. So I would object to furnishing any more supplemental information at this time which could have been provided earlier. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I'm inclined to agree with you. I think, you know, we are now at sort of the end of the testimony phase.

BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
Q. And is there any reason that those things couldn't have been provided earlier?
A. Well, with all due respect to this process, I have been sort of yanked around by this, because I was going to be testifying -WITNESS MORSE: When, Loranne?
A. And I was unable to because it wasn't -- it couldn't happen, given everybody's schedule. And the other reason is $I$ wasn't aware of this process. You know, like I said, I don't do this. I didn't even get the Applicant's supplemental testimony until just a month and
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a half ago or so. So...
Well, I'll tell you what. The reason why --
MR. ROTH: Madam Chairman.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Yes, Mr. Roth.
MR. ROTH: If I can just speak on this question just momentarily.

It seems to me that throughout this proceeding we've had a number of record requests of the Applicant to supplement the testimony and information that they've provided when it was suitable and useful to them. And I think it's the kind of process that we've always used in these cases, and I don't see any harm in providing a few more studies.

I mean, I look here at, for example, this pile of stuff that was provided by Audubon. And I have no idea why most of this stuff was put in here, but there it is. And I think it would be interesting and useful at least to have something that relates directly to someone's testimony and in support of the things that she's asserting.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, when there are some record requests, they tend to be
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individual facts that are to be run down by any party that the request is made of. To put in whole new studies when there's no opportunity for discovery, the reason it's a concern is that, in the normal course, people have a chance to ask questions, explore the materials on their own, get clarification through data requests and then have cross-examination. To do that at this stage, $I$ think it's too late, and so I'm not going to allow the additional materials.

WITNESS MORSE: Can I just make one --

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Yes.
WITNESS MORSE: -- comment?
On behalf of my clients, the whole schedule for this has been very hard to predict and fit into. That, coupled with my travels, which, you know, I apologize, but since I was supposed to be here in September, I've been in the Artic and Minnesota and Maine,
respectively, not to mention a few more local travels. So I apologize for not getting these papers to you. But the real answer is, I
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haven't, until real recently, known that $I$ even might be referencing these papers, and hence, might want you to have them until recently. So, chalk that up to my naiveté. I should have realized that $I$ wouldn't be able to give you these. But the only reason I feel motivated to want you to have them is that they are the background to some of the remarks that I've made today in response to the questions that you all answered [sic].

BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
Q. Thank you. I do want to ask you a couple of other questions about your background.

You had said today that you were a biologist. You referred to yourself as a "conservation biologist," and you referred to yourself as the "senior biologist" on the submission of materials, I think. So, do you have a degree in biology?
A. No. I actually acquired my title by E. O. Wilson, who called me a "biologist" and assured me that $I$ should stand tall with that descriptor because of my obvious knowledge and experience.
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What I really am is -- and this is, you know, solid and well accepted among my peers -- is I am a wildlife ecologist. I'm really more interested in the relationship between animals and their habitat. And yes, I'm also a tracker and a naturalist. And I'm proud of both of those things.

So $I$ bring all of these disciplines to my work, as well as a healthy appreciation of process. I work a lot and give a lot in my community as a member of boards and committees like yours. So I understand the awkwardness of these things.
Q. You also had said in your testimony that the introduction of the wind turbines will affect wildlife populations. When Mr. Robinson asked you about any evidence that you'd seen of a wind facility having that effect, you said you didn't know of any and couldn't give any specifics. Is that, again, like the other, the rare plants, that there may be impacts --
A. No.
Q. -- like there may be rare plants --
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A. No.
Q. -- or are you certain that there will be impacts of populations?
A. No. In my prefiled testimony, I did enumerate instances where wind facilities were known to impact wildlife negatively. And particularly as it relates to birds and bats, there were papers that I quoted.

And then the whole science of cumulative effects assessment, I know enough from my experience in the Artic to know that, you know, energy extraction and associated roads and development are having a devastating impact on caribou.

And so I have seen for myself how these things can play out. I have not studied them. I'm not a quantitative scientist. That's not what I do. But I'm merely imploring the Committee to really think about the implications of these things as you make a decision, because they are real. And the scientific literature is solidly, you know, full of references to it, though I personally have not participated in such studies.
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Q. You also said in your testimony, I think on Page 8, that cumulative effects need to be assessed and that you need long-term research to really be able to understand the impacts. Is it your view that there should be a moratorium on siting of these sorts of facilities until that research is done, or it's more case-by-case specific?
A. I would say where core habitat is concerned, yes. The answer is an un -- a decided yes, I think.
Q. Yes for a moratorium?
A. Yes for a moratorium.
Q. And how long do you mean when you say "long-term research" being needed?
A. That's up to the scientists that do that kind of work. And the nature of that research is so variable, that $I$ really would be reluctant to assign a number to it. But it's going to -- that's why it is expensive. And that's why, perhaps in some parts of the country, it's not being more embraced as a way of comprehensively addressing these things before we get into more trouble.
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Q. All right. Thank you. That's helpful.
A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Any other questions from Committee members?

Mr. Iacopino has some questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
INTERROGATORIES BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Good morning, Ms. Morse. You've -- well, I've heard during the course of this proceeding several different sort of breakdowns of what I always consider to be just "plain old biology." So let me go through them with you, and you tell me what they -- well, let me tell you what they are first.

I've heard a term that you've used and I believe other witnesses have used, "conservation biology." I've heard the term "wildlife biologist." I've now just recently heard you use the term "wildlife ecologist." And then in your written testimony you make reference to a "new applied environmental science called cumulative assessment." Are they all genuinely fields that are within the
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overarching field of biology?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Can you tell me what the difference between a conservation biologist and a wildlife biologist might be?
A. Hmm, that's a good one. Wild --
Q. If there is a difference.
A. Well, it's not -- they're not mutually exclusive. I think a wildlife biologist could also be a conservation biologist, you know, depending upon his or her inclination to do research and with the results of their work espouse certain levels of conservation planning.

A conservation biologist took the thinking in ecology and then island biogeography in the '60s, took it to some next levels, which more recently feature a science that is very multi-disciplinary by nature -- in other words, there's lots of participants. There's --
Q. Which field are you talking about?
A. Conservation biology. And that's also known as "conservation science." So those two
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terms are synonymous.
But conservation biology will include geneticists, population biologists, ecologists, to name just a few. And the one thing that's in common with all these people is that, where they are going with their work is they are seeking to influence what we call "conservation planning" -- in other words, the reserve design. How do we keep together and alive the fabric of life? And that's their shtick. That's what they do.

In the words of Michael Soule, who's the founder of the Society for American Conservation Biology -- or Society for Conservation Biology, and sort of the grand dean of the subject, he calls it "scientists in the face of crisis." I mean, they're really driven by their work because they see the urgency of species loss and extinction rates and habitat loss causing all that to happen in one way or another.
Q. And how would you define what you just told us you really are, which is a wildlife ecologist?
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
A. Yeah. I'm -- you might say I'm also a conservation biologist. But I'm kind of dumb on the math, and so $I$ don't participate in any applied research of any kind. So I really feel like $I$ can't participate in conservation biology, although I can espouse the outcomes of their knowledge. And I do. There isn't a day that goes by that $I$ don't underscore the importance of conservation planning.

But as a wildlife ecologist, I'm interested in wildlife. And I'm knowledgeable about the biology and ecology of the animals that $I$ study, certainly not all animals. But more importantly, I'm interested in their relationship with their habitat. So I have a strong background in forest ecology and so on, so $I$ kind of blend these things in what $I$ do.
Q. And then, finally, there is reference on Page 8 of your written testimony to this "cumulative assessment," which you describe as "a relatively new applied environmental service" -- "science which seeks to more
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
comprehensively measure and predict anthropogenic stresses which have negatively influenced wildlife in the past, are now occurring and will harmfully influence wildlife in the future."

I take it you do not consider yourself an expert in cumulative assessment?
A. I would say $I$ am -- by virtue of having written this in a comprehensive way, which -forgiving what might sound like my ego on parade -- might be plumped into a textbook on the subject, I have a healthy appreciation for what it is. I am not a practitioner. I don't do the field research or the analytical research, really, that goes with that, no.
Q. Well, that's my question. I mean, I might, you know, have a good feeling for the stars, you know, the night sky, but it doesn't necessarily make me an astronomer; correct?
A. No, but I -- there is no such thing as a cumulative effects specialist that I'm aware of. There is a science --
Q. Well, that was going to be my next question --
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
A. Yeah, okay.
Q. I mean, you describe this as "a new, sort of applied environmental science." And I guess my question is, how new is it?
A. Well, it's -- the term's been around since the '70s, but it's really kicking into high gear, you know, certainly in this century. Within the last decade especially it's showing up more and more in the literature. And as I say, there's a brand new text on the subject that was published by CRC Press. I don't know if I put that in my bibliography.
Q. Do you know who the author of that text might be?
A. There are two --
Q. Or is it one that's edited?
A. Yeah, they're edited. There are two editors. Lisa Harris and -- oh, for heaven's sake.

WITNESS MORSE: Ed, he's the -- he's the current president of the Wildlife Society. What's his name? He's out West. Do you know who I'm talking about? He's authored a kabajillion books.
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A. Anyway, I can get you his name.
Q. Further down on that same page where you're talking about cumulative effects assessment -- this is Page 8 of your prefiled testimony, and I'd say towards the bottom of that first paragraph -- you write, "To conclude, $I$ believe that cumulative effects assessment should be required of companies seeking to disturb New England's limited core habitat and the wild species that thrive there."

And I think some other folks have asked you this question as well, but I don't know if you were asked it directly: What are the studies that you would expect a company who is, as you say, "seeking to disturb the core habitat," to conduct with respect to cumulative effects assessment? I mean, what is it that a body like this should be looking for?
A. What I have prepared here for you for your consideration is really a synthesis of what the science is and what it offers to us as we grapple with issues like this, so that we
\{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
make the right choices.
I am not a practitioner of the field. But off the top of my head, I would think that a study, a long-term study, studying, you know, post-construction what happens to populations in and amongst these facilities might be a fruitful study; the impacts of noise on energy budgets and a whole wedge of studies having to do with energy budgets and stress would be in order; seek to measure ways in which we know animals respond to stresses and find it out there if it is. Those are just a couple of thoughts. Again, this isn't --
Q. To the best of your knowledge, have studies like that been done in other parts of the country for -- it doesn't have to be wind turbines -- for any type of use of core habitat?
A. Well, one of the papers I mentioned I prepared to give out to you is a paper dealing with noise and its impacts on -- not as it relates to wind, but in this case, of gas compressors -- but in a wild setting. In
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other words, I don't know if you've been out West, but there are lots of places where energy extraction is going on on public lands in the West of all types, oil and natural gas and the like.

So these scientists measure the impacts of noise in a very finite setting on a suite of mammal species and birds, and then, really, in particular, trying to get at ecosystem services, which is one of the things I've listed in this long description of cumulative effects that ecosystem serves, as pollination being one of them and dispersal being another. They found, curiously, that pollination actually had a positive correlation with noise. And there's a long, elaborate explanation for that. But they found where seed dispersal was concerned, as I mentioned earlier, there was a notable decline in the recruitment of Pinyon pine.
Q. So that's a study that was done of gas-compression plants out West.
A. Yeah.
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Q. Okay. Other than that, are you aware of any other -- I'm looking, trying to look for examples, and not necessarily examples that are generated by people who are doing academic research, but examples where what you're suggesting is required for a project like this has been required in -- whether it's a wind project, an energy project, or any type of project which is going to impact core habitat.
A. Where cumulative effects assessment has been undertaken, I'm sure there are bibliographies and case histories that have come out of that. I'm not familiar with any particular titles, but I'm sure they're out there.

What $I$ would first suggest, perhaps, is that -- and I can certainly get you the title of that book, and any others that $I$ have in my library that I --
Q. Well, you actually cite one in your testimony, Therivel and Ross, 2007.
A. Right. Well, that was in the book, cumulative -- yeah.
Q. Okay. So you do have -- you've cited us at
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least one text.
A. Yes.
Q. But I'm more interested in what has been required from a -- I'm more interested in the types of things that have been required from regulatory bodies such as this in this field, if in fact you know of any.
A. Yeah, I think that would be the first place I would look, is for the history of what's going on. There are a number of case histories that are described in that book. Different authors take on different parts of it, so -- and to be honest with you, they certainly get at the pluses and minuses of it, too. It's very expensive and it's very complex and it's very hard sometimes for regulatory bodies to work with.
Q. Would you say that your definition of "cumulative effects" that you gave us at the top of Page 8 of your paper -- of your testimony, saying it's "a relatively new applied environmental service [sic]," would you say that that's a statement that is generally accepted in the field of biology,
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whether it be conservation biology or biology in general?
A. My assessment of what cumulative effects assessment is?
Q. Yes.
A. To the degree to which biologists, which tend to be specialists in their field, are exposed to this stuff or avail themselves of the literature, I'm sure they would be aware of these influences.

Really, what I'm describing here is what cumulative effects is trying to grapple with and why.
Q. I guess my question is more, is this whole designation of this field of cumulative assessment or cumulative effects, is that something that's generally accepted amongst biologists?
A. As I said earlier -- if I may, as I said earlier, I'm a little perplexed that it's not more embraced here in New England. I've run across just a handful of people that understand what I'm talking about.

But a lot of biologists, especially
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agency biologists, work day to day, very hard, few hours -- many hours in a short day, doing an enormous job. And they may or may not have all the time in the world to spend in the library keeping up with every nuance of, you know --
Q. Can you name for me a university or a college that has a major area of study of cumulative effects assessment?
A. No, but I know the people that wrote the textbook, for example, that I refer to --
Q. Which you cited.
A. -- that I cited, teach at universities. And both, certainly, their classes are full. And, in fact, their text was intended to be a text, you know, that other professors could certainly use. Whether or not there's an academic program called "Cumulative Effects Assessment," I doubt. It probably would be more apt to be in conservation biology or something like that.
Q. Are you aware of whether the area of cumulative effects assessment is the focus of
a course, like an individual course in
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recognized programs in wildlife biology or conservation biology?
A. Oh, I'm certain there is. I'm sure that that's why Lisa Harris and her colleagues wrote that -- edited that book.
Q. Just so I understand, so if I were to find some college university catalogs that describe the courses, it's likely that I would find a cumulative effects assessment type of course being taught?
A. I don't know that you would here in New England. But I think if you started with the book I've mentioned and went to those universities, in that area. Some parts of the country are -- well, yeah. I mean, certainly there are universities out there somewhere that offer this as a field of learning.
Q. I have a couple housekeeping questions for you.

You attached to your testimony SM2, which is the article by Barker and Brooks about sound. And it was published in -looks like a journal entitled Trends in
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Ecology \& Evolution?
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Yes.
Q. To the best of your knowledge, is that journal a peer-reviewed journal?
A. Well, $I$ have to say $I$ don't know.
Q. Okay.
A. It would have to have been, but I don't know.
Q. Similarly with SM3, that's a paper that's written by, I think -- I forget the first name -- Ms. Sadlowski from the U.S. Forest Service, entitled, Effect of Noise, I believe, or something to that effect?
A. Yes.
Q. I know that she's apparently a U.S. Forest Service employee. But do you know if that paper received any type of peer review?
A. No, I do not. I don't know that it was or wasn't.
Q. Okay. And finally, $I$ just -- you know, there's been a lot of pictures of alleged cutting that occurred up on the Tuttle --Willard-Tuttle Ridge. Did you or any of the folks that you did your traverse with
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actually go down to the town to see if there were intent-to-cut permits at one point in time that might correlate with what you observed cut?
A. No, I didn't. You'd have to ask the people who live here if they did.
Q. What is your understanding of the present human uses of the Willard Tuttle Ridge?
A. Well, I'm assuming there's been a history of forest management and cutting there. The present -- other present human uses, I would have to say I'm not sure where you're going.
Q. I'm just asking what your understanding of the "human use" of that ridgeline is --
A. Well --
Q. -- at present.
A. At present? I would have to -- given that I've only been there once and really had a purpose which I described in my testimony, to do a field reconnaissance, my knowledge is limited accordingly. But I would say that there's no question that it's had a history of forest --
Q. So it's timber harvesting?
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A. Timber harvesting, yes.
Q. Did you see any recreational uses up there? Snowmobile paths? Hiking trails? Things like that?
A. Not as such. Not that it certainly couldn't be used that way. I mean, there weren't -there wasn't a trail system.

WITNESS MORSE: Was there a mountain biking trail at the bottom?
A. I don't -- you know, again --

MS. BLOCK: Is it okay for me to respond?

MR. IACOPINO: Not really. She has to answer the question. But I can ask you later.

MS. BLOCK: Okay.
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. I'll ask her later about the mountain biking trail. But just what you saw, what you observed.
A. No. I mean, I didn't see any signage that gave me to believe that $I$ was on a formal snowmobile trail. But certainly...

MR. IACOPINO: I don't have any other \{SEC 2012-01\} [MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{12-03-12\}
[WITNESS: SUSAN MORSE]
questions, Madam Chair.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
Anything else from the Committee?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: If not, then the next thing would be for some very limited redirect questions from Ms. Block to the witness, if there's anything that was brought out on the questioning from any of the parties or the Committee that you feel she needs to clarify. It's not to restate or reinforce any conclusions, but any factual things that you think need further clarification.

MS. BLOCK: Could I talk to her for a few minutes?

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Certainly. Let's go off the record for five minutes. Whereupon a recess was taken at 12:18 p.m., and the hearing resumed at 12:27 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. We're back on the record.

Ms. Block, do you have any redirect?
MS. BLOCK: Thank you, Madam Chair.
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I do.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

MS. BLOCK: If we look on Page 17 of the original Application, which is AWE 1, also known -- and this is not for you, Sue -- also known as PDF Page 25, you can look at the third paragraph, third sentence, and you'll see where the Applicant defines the term "WTG" to mean wind turbine generator.

BY MS. BLOCK:
Q. Now, I believe we've already discussed that -- or you've already discussed that. But therefore, where you saw those markers, "WTG1, 2, 3," et cetera, can you conclude, did these appear to be turbine sites?
A. Well, I'm not at all familiar with the Applicant's documents or terminology. But I know when we were there, the presence of a long, linear, complete forest cut culminating in a series of circular openings or that were demarked by flagging all around them and having these stakes with $W$ something $G$ on them was highly suggestive of the fact that they were, you know, delineating where the
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proposed towers might be. But that's about as far as $I$ could go. Certainly seemed logical to all of us. We all came to that conclusion.
Q. Thank you.

This might also seem a little redundant. But when you visited the project site, you stated that your very presence created stress for the wildlife. Isn't it true that that -is it true that that was a temporary stress?
A. Yes, although, in the cumulative effects scenario, depending on the animal's fitness and well-being, you know, what it all -- what it might have to confront in the months to come, it may be a stress that is harmful beyond the immediate effect of running away and/or being frightened or having one's heartbeat go up, et cetera. Yeah, I think that's a reasonable statement.
Q. Would you also feel that constructing this project is a far more long-term and permanent type of effect, especially if it means leveling the landscape and building roads?
A. Absolutely. But $I$ wouldn't limit it to
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leveling the landscape and building roads. Certainly the towers themselves and the noise associated with the generation of power will have an effect, absolutely, if I can believe the literature that $I$ have seen and availed myself of.

It's a permanent intrusion. I mean, there's a difference between the occasional hiker or deer hunter or snowmobiler and a permanent intrusion on the habitat. There is a very big, qualitative and quantitative difference in the hazards to wildlife.
Q. And I apologize that you haven't seen this. But with regard to pre- and post-construction, I would like to read to you an order issued by Vermont Public Service in reference to the Deerfield Wind proposal, which is a 30-megawatt project approved by the State, but unbuilt as yet.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Before you do that -MS. GEIGER: I'm going to object. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: -- can you tell me how is -- what is this rebuttal in response
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to? I'm sorry.
MS. BLOCK: Oh, sure. This is in response to the fact that she was asked about different kinds of studies. And this is actually a specific study given by a -- for a specific wind project.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, what was the -- what's the purpose of going into what the Vermont Public Service Board ordered that relates to the questioning of Ms. Morse beforehand?

MS. BLOCK: Well, just that she had been asked if there were studies, and just to give an example of a type of study.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So you're asking if she's familiar with the study?

MS. BLOCK: I wanted to ask her if this type of study would make sense.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms. Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: Yes, I think in her prefatory comments, Ms. Block told this witness that the witness had not seen the study yet. And I think the witness testified in questions from, I believe the Bench, that she wasn't
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aware of studies that required -- or orders that required certain types of studies. So I think we're getting a little bit far afield in the questioning, and I think what the -- what Ms. Block is trying to do is supplement the record rather than trying to refresh this witness' recollection with a study that she may not have recalled in her answer to questions from the Bench. So I would object on that basis.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, it strikes me as consistent with questions that Mr . Iacopino was asking, and he said he would get back to the Blocks when they were testifying on it. So perhaps that's a better way to go.

MS. BLOCK: Okay. That's fine. I can withdraw the question.

I do believe if I had told her about it, that she would say, "Oh, yes, I remember that one." So, anyway, thank you on that. And I do have one other question here.

BY MS. BLOCK:
Q. On the question of numbers of turbines or projects, whether the number is millions,
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hundreds of thousands or thousands, does the number truly matter? Is the bigger question the one of habitat core impact?
A. Would you repeat the last part of that?
Q. Well, maybe I --
A. Just the question itself.
Q. Okay. Is the larger question that of the impact to core habitat? I think I'm -- I'm dyslexic as well, and I think I reversed my words. I apologize.
A. Yeah, I mean, I think I remember where $I$ read the word "millions," and it was in a popular journal that wasn't necessarily peer-reviewed. Might have been Defenders of Wildlife, or something like that. I'll try and ferret that out.

But, yeah, I see where you're going with this. Yeah, whether it's thousands or hundreds of thousands, it's certainly one or the other of those figures, but probably hundreds of thousands.

Cumulatively, collectively -collectively, I'll say the destruction of that much core habitat in the face of North
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America would be devastating to what really little remains of our core connective habitats in our whole country. I mean, I really think -- I don't think. The science is solidly there. The conservation biologists, if you will, conservation scientists, are solidly in agreement that we need to identify these places and conserve them while we can, in the hopes that they will be able to function for wildlife in the years to come, which are going to be very difficult not just for us but for them.
Q. Thank you. Is that all that was -- that was my last question.
A. Well, if I --

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, hold on. This isn't really --

MS. BLOCK: Okay. I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: -- a chat about other topics time.

MS. BLOCK: I might have done it incorrectly. That was my last question. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay. Thank you.
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[WITNESS: SUSAN MORSE]

Then you're excused. Thank you very much, Ms. Morse.

WITNESS MORSE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: It's now 12:30. We should take a lunch break for an hour and resume at 1:30 with testimony from Ms. Linowes. Thank you.
(Whereupon the lunch recess was taken, and this MORNING SESSION ONLY ended at 12:30 p.m., with the hearing to resume in a transcript to be filed under separate cover so designated as "AFTERNOON SESSION ONLY".)
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SEC 2012-01 ANTRIM WIND ENERGY HEARING ON THE MERITS

|  | acknowledged (4) | adequate (5) | ago (6) | 147:8;160:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [ | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 19 ; 14: 24 ; \\ & 106: 21: 136: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 13 ; 117: 15,19, \\ & 22 ; 128: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 15 ; 32: 12 ; 45: 3 \\ & 116: 16 ; 122: 1 ; 157: 1 \end{aligned}$ | amongst (4) |
| [Laughter] (2) | acoustic (1) | adequately (2) | agree (11) | 4:17 |
| 70:8;91:15 | 46:19 | 24:12,118:2 | 24:6;28:5;68:23; | amount (2) |
| $[\mathrm{sic}](3)$ | acquire (2) | Adirondacks (1) | 69:5,8;103:19;112:9; | 21:23;65:3 |
| 68:8;159:10; | 130:14,18 | 28:2 | 124:6;129:5;131:14; | $\underset{31: 8}{\text { amphibian }}$ |
| 173:22 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { acquired (1 } \\ \text { 159:20 } \end{array}$ | adjacent (2) 88:2;102:9 | 156:10 <br> agreed (3) | $\begin{array}{\|c} 31: 8 \\ \text { ample (2) } \end{array}$ |
| A | acr | adjoining (1) | 147:8;149:1,7 | 18:20;65:10 |
|  | 7:15 |  | agreement (2) $14 \cdot 15 \cdot 187 \cdot 7$ | Amy (1 |
| A10 (1) | across (2) | $91: 5,22 ; 92: 9$ | ahead (5) | analogous (1) |
| ability (3) | 40:11;174:2 | admitted (1) | $9: 11 ; 16: 24 ; 30: 24$ | $95: 21$ |
| 47:5;49:17;154:10 | Act (1) | $11: 22$ | $58: 20 ; 139: 5$ | $\underset{8 \cdot 7}{\operatorname{analysis}(1)}$ |
| able (13) | active (1) | adult (1) 132:7 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { aid (1) } \\ 8: 6 \end{array}$ | analytical (1) |
| 97:6;123:15,18; | 75:17 | adults (2) | Aldo (1) | 167:14 |
| 130:5;131:8;149:5; | activities (3) | 154:11,12 | 115:10 | analyze (1) |
| 156:4;159:5;162:4; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:22;49:1;136:22 } \\ & \text { activity (2) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { advised (1 } \\ 55: 13 \end{gathered}$ | alike (3) <br> 14:20;61:18;143 | 113:18 <br> analyzed |
| $187: 10$ abort (1) | 42:10;93:10 | affect (5) | alive (1) | 139:21 |
| 111:22 | actual (3) | 44:19;96:1;127:3 | 165:10 | and/or (3) |
| above (2) | 46:10;48:5;76:9 | 139:24;160:15 | alleged (1) | 105:7;155:1 |
| 106:22;147:23 | Actually (16) | af | 177:21 | 182:17 |
| absent (1) | 51:11;58:17;62:4 $9.63 \cdot 10,21 \cdot 121: 17$ |  | Allen (3) | anemia (1) |
| 48:24 Absolutely (6) | $122: 5 ; 125: 19$ | $18: 3$ | allow (3) | $\begin{array}{r} 132: 12 \\ \text { angry (1) } \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Absolutely (6) } \\ & \text { 15:2;19:3;106:7; } \end{aligned}$ | $128: 20 ; 154: 4$ $159: 20: 171: 15$ | afield (1) | 67:6;81:8;158:10 | $29: 13$ |
| 124:11;182:24;183:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 159: 20 ; 171: 15 ; \\ & 172: 20 ; 178: 1 ; 184: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 185:3 <br> afraid | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \operatorname{allowed}(1) \\ 96: 23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \operatorname{animal}(10) \\ 13: 23 ; 31: 8 ; 2 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { abundance (2) } \\ 69: 18 ; 153: 8 \end{gathered}$ | adaptations (1) | 47:2 | all-season (1) | $97: 3 ; 119: 13 ; 122: 19$ |
| abuses (1) | $40: 17$ | AFTERNOON (1) | $62: 13$ | 123:9;131:8;140:3; |
| 146:5 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { add (11) } \\ 16: 21 ; 24: 24 ; 25: 13 ; \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 188: 12 \\ \text { again (44) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { almost (1) } \\ 63: 11 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 153:12 } \\ \text { animals (31) } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { academic (2) } \\ 172: 5 ; 175: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 21 ; 24: 24 ; 25: 13 ; \\ & 30: 14 ; 34: 11 ; 47: 9 ; \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { again (44) } \\ & 10: 6 ; 19: 16,23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 63: 11 \\ \text { alone (2) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { animals (31) } \\ 13: 16 ; 17: 20 ; 19: 18 ; \end{array}$ |
| accept (1) | 49:15;88:22;92:12; | 22:24;25:5;26:2; | 100:5;130:23 | 24:15;28:16;29:2; |
| $54: 16$ | 93:5;132:3 | 31:15;32:24;34:14; | along (14) | 30:11,22;34:5;40:4, |
| acceptable (1) | added (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 3 ; 38: 17 ; 47: 19 \\ & \text { 49:2;50:8;58:10; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 12 ; 54: 24 ; 90: 8 ; \\ & 94: 21 ; 102: 8 ; 105: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20;41:11;42:16;91:5; } \\ & \text { 92:1,4,6,15;93:12; } \end{aligned}$ |
| 109:9 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 128: 11 \\ \text { addition (4) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:2;50:8;58:10; } \\ & 72: 5 ; 76: 10 ; 83: 3,6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 94:21;102:8;105:17, } \\ & \text { 23;109:23;123:4; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:1,4,6,15;93:12; } \\ & \text { 107:13;120:14; } \end{aligned}$ |
| accepted (7) | 53:20;57:10;72:7; | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 5 ; 76: 10 ; 83: 3,6 \\ & 85: 14 ; 88: 18 ; 90: 1 ; \end{aligned}$ | 127:8;144:2;148:10; | 126:19;136:19,22; |
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| 125:10,14;157:14 | hence (2) | 187:16 | 48:8;50:24;59:3,17; | 90:7 |
| harmed (3) | 125:13;159: | holding (1) | 60:6;70:7;163:5,6,7; | impact (20) |
| 44:22;73:8;92:16 | here's (3) | 10:24 | 179:13,17,24;185:13 | 18:10;19:2;39:19, |
| harmful (1) | 78:21;114:21,22 | home (6) | iconic (1) | 20;74:21;102:16 |
| 182:15 | Heritage (6) | 41:17;125:13,20 | 41:6 | 103:8;110:8;112:20; |
| harmfully | 102:14;103:5,7 | 23;127:1;135:2 | idea (2) | 126:6;139:16,24; |
| 167:4 | 23;104:12 | homes (1) | 124:24;157:17 | 140:9;151:18; |
| Harris (4) | Hey (1) | 7:9 | identification (3) | 154:19;161:6,14; |
| 6:4;44:2;1 | 70:7 | homewor | 4:3,15;11:20 | 172:9;186:3,8 |
| 176:4 | hickory | 0:22 | identifications (1) | impacted (4) |
| Harry (1) | 67:4 | honest (2) | 11:19 | 14:5;28:18;129:1 |
| 4:21 | High (5) | 25:11;173:13 | identified (5) | 148:3 |
| harvest (1) | 21:18;39:20;95 | honestly (1) | 68:24;73:10;82:2 | impacting (1) |
| 154:21 | 97:1;168:6 | 20:17 | 115:18,24 | 129:11 |
| harvesting | higher (5) | hope (2) | identify (8) | impacts (36) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 145: 8 ; 178: 24 ; \\ & 170.1 \end{aligned}$ | 21:15;22:2;66: 108:22-119.7 | 41:21;15 | $49: 20 ; 52: 23 ; 73:$ | $14: 4 ; 15: 9 ; 19: 21 ;$ |
| hazards (1) | higher-elevation (2) | hopes $187: 9$ | 187:8 | $5: 6 ; 38: 13 ; 40: 1$ |
| 183:12 | 38:2;152:8 | horrified | identifying (2) | 4:11;48:15,17; |
| head (4) | highest (3) | 149:9 | 71:24;72:3 | 56:11,12;65:15;98:9 |
| 29:12;55:4;122:10; | 21:17;96:21;119:8 | horse (1) | ie (2) | 09:5;110:13,17; |
| 170:3 | highest-ranked (9) | 56:8 | 18:9;39:2 | 113:18;114:3;116:9 |
| Health (1) | 87:19,24;88:4,9; | hot (1) | IGNATIUS (105) | 124:17,19,23;131:9 |
| 5:13 | 137:24;138:19; | 152:14 | 4:4,9,17;5:18;6:17, | 134:12;143:17; |
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| hear (3) | high-v | 175:2,2 | 23;17:3;23:3;27:3, | imperfect (1) |
| 27:14;62:3;133:9 | 94:23 | housekeep | 13;36:8,12,14,16,19; | 125:2 |
| heard (6) | highway | 176:19 | 39:2,6,9,12;43:11,13, | implausible (3) |
| 54:1;60:16;163:9, | 20:2;28:12 | hous | 15;45:10,12,15,17; | 91:10,18;92:8 |
| 16,18,20 | 13 | 126: | 47:23;48:7,10;49:18; | implement (1) |
| hearing (6) | highwa | huge | 50:5,14,19,22;51:3,8; | 55:14 |
| 4:5;11:14;108:12 | 83:5;97: | 83:12;145: | 53:7,9;54:5,19,23; | implications (2) |
| 123:23;180:19; | hike (4) | Human (19) | 57:15;58:4;59:8,11, | 34:9;161:20 |
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| 13:18;78:17; | 24:9;38:20;39:1; | 108:21;121:13; | 80:12;81:1,24; | 138:12;165:9 |
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| inclusion (1) | inquiry (1) | 155:20 | 141:1;142:9 | killing (2) |
| $86: 12$ | 21:13 | Intervenors (5) | issue (2) | 107:3,6 |
| incorrectly (1) | insects (2) | 6:14;35:4;36:2; | $18: 9 ; 145: 23$ | Kilpatrick (2) |
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| 127:24 | 95:24;96:4 | 13:12;14:24;19:12; | 169:24 | 9:14;37:15;38:10; |
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| 20:23 | 33:19 | 41:23;56:17;65:12, | J | 111:10;117:10; |
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| 102:14;103:5;153:3 | installing (1) | 108:23;112:6; | 128:10 | 162:16;166:2,4,18 |
| indicates (3) | 144:2 | 130:17,24;137:21; | Jericho (1) | kindergartners (1) |
| 53:5;69:1;94:12 | instance (1) | 141:11;144:8; | 7:22 | 97:10 |
| indicating (1) | 122:16 | 154:11,24;158:18; | jewel (1) | kinds (8) |
| 152:22 | instances (2) | 162:24;167:11; | 44:14 | 19:14;71:4;116:2; |
| indication (1) | 31:13;161:5 | 168:6;184:8 | jewels (1) | 117:16,22;137:8; |
| 17:9 | Instead (1) | introduce (5) | 44:15 | 155:17;184:4 |
| indicator (1) | 13:10 | 41:23;80:9;143:9; | job (4) | Kinglet (1) |
| 137:9 | insular (1) | 148:6,12 | 23:8;128:5;134:20; | 61:8 |
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| 20:21;21:7;33:18; | 19:6;21:10;28:6; | likely (1) | 161:22;168:9;174:9; | 172:2;173:9;181:3,6 |
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| 173:12;176:14 | perma | 96:10 | $3: 8 ; 122: 18 ; 123: 9$ | population (17) |
| party (2) | 33:19;182:21 | picture | 127:22;140:3 | 28:24;31:20,2 |
| $93: 16 ; 158: 2$ | 183:7,10 | :8,19;30 | plants | 2:4;34:5;72:2;76:9 |
| past (2) | permiss | 43:3;90:5 | 13:15;104:7;148: | 106:12;107:1,15; |
| 32:1;167 | 12:12;56:5;99:22 | pictures (1 | 49:12,13,21,23 | 128:22;129:1;151:9 |
| Patch (1) | permit (1) | 27:22;28: | 50:4,5,12,19,20,21; | 11;152:1;154:13; |
| 5:23 | 03:2 | 4:24;86:1 | 1:1,8;160:21,24; | 165:3 |
| patches | permits | 4:10,11,12,15; | 171:23 | populations (10) |
| 67:6;71 | 178:2 | 95:10;177:21 | plate | 41:6,7;76:6; |
| 140:7 | pe | piece | 5:13 | 29:11,20;13 |
| path (2) | 74:20 | 14:21,22;121: | play | 51:19;160:1 |
| 55:4;147 | pe | 141:8 | 161:1 | 161:3;170:6 |
| pathogen | 32:9; |  | Please | portfolio (1) |
| 13:16 | personally | 5:12,1 | 7:19;8:11;10:1 | 125:17 |
| paths ( | 74:10;161:23 | 142:24 | :24;12:2;76:23 | portion (3) |
| 179:3 | personnel (2) | pile | 77:17;80:18;81:8 | 20:10;68:19 |
| pathway | 18:17;111: | 57:1 | :19;85:9;87:7 | pose (1) |
| 148:22 | pertain (2) | Pileated (2) | 90:19;93:23;105:24; | 14:19 |
| Paul (2) | 25:8;51: | 61:2;122:3 | 107:23 | posited (1) |
| 22:4;112 | pertaining |  | pleased | 34:2 |
| Pause (4) | 58:11 | 12: | 45:6 | position (4) |
| 17:2;27: | pertains | Pine (3) | plummet | 21:2;23:22;10 |
| $108: 1$ | $42: 18$ | 61:5;141:3;171:2 | $41: 8,9$ | $120: 1$ |
| PDF (2) | pertubat | Pinello (3) | plumped | positive (1) |
| 48:4; | $82: 9$ | 7:13;43: | 167:11 | $171: 16$ |
| peer | perturbat | pink (2) | plural (1) | possibility |
| 177:17 | 13:19;79:22 | 77:24;83 | 122:20 | 150:24 |
| peer-reviewed | Peter (2) | Pinyon (3) | plus (2) | possible (7) |
| 177:5;186:14 | 6:15;11: | 4:21;155 | 78:15, | 5.21.30.2 |
| peers (1) | pets (2) | 171:21 | pluses (1) | 97:17;11 |
| 160:3 | 19:8;22:17 | pitch (1) | 173:14 | $151: 17$ |
| Penn (1) | phase (1) | 141:3 | pm (3) | possibly (2) |
| 133:21 | 156:11 | pits (1) | 180:19 | 91:5;150:18 |
| people (20) | phenomenon (4) | 141:6 | point (11) | post-construction (12) |
| $9: 8 ; 19: 8,8 ; 27: 14$ | $29: 1 ; 72: 22 ; 81: 19$ | place (25) | $4: 7 ; 21: 15 ; 30: 7,9$ | $32: 13,18,20 ; 49: 4$ |
| $51: 18 ; 61: 21 ; 70: 18$ | $95: 13$ | $20: 1,19$ | 41:9;103:14;111:16; | $73: 4,6,7 ; 74: 22$ |
| 79:11;80:16;82:16; | philosophically (1) | 32:1;35:7;51:21; | 112:9;131:2;143:15; | 110:15;111:10; |
| 84:10;93:6;96:8 | 144:6 | 52:5,23;56:4;61:20 | 178 | 170:5;183:15 |
| 112:3;158:5;165:5 | Phoebe | 71:13;82:24;95:14; | pointin | post-glacial (3) |
| 172:4;174:22; | 61:3 | 112:7;113:10;119:6; | 19:1 | 146:10;147:1 |
| 175:10;178:5 | photo (1) | 125:16;128:9;132:5; | points (3) | 148:2 |
| per (2) | 133:1 | 146:19;147:17; | 21:4;28:23;151:15 | post-mortality (1) |
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| 32:23 | 49:13 | 100:6;101:22;110:4, | 18;100:21;110:13; | 4:18;5:10;6:16; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| potatoes (1) | preparation (2) | 124:20;130:19 | 13:18;115:4;117:6, | 8:6;26:3;72:23; |
| 20:20 | 112:12;155:10 | 175:19;186:20 | 6,23;121:23; | 171:3;183:16;184:9 |
| potential (3) | prepared (9) | problem (10) | 134:15;185:2 | published (3) |
| 25:24;37:23; | 15:2;21:11;47:4; | 15:24;16:2;40:12; | project's (2) | 116:14;168:11 |
| 150:10 | 51:14;101:14;112:5; | 44:8;81:24;93:19 | 25:21;87:15 | 176:23 |
| potentially (1) | 155:18;169:21; | 96:11;97:2;129:17 | proliferation (1) | pull (2) |
| 150:17 | 170:21 | 132:14 | 110:2 | 108:22;116:1 |
| power (11) | preparing (2) | problems (2) | properly (1) | purpose (7) |
| 94:13,16,21,24; | 15:15;149:1 | 19:6,9 | 96:18 | 53:24;61:11;70:14; |
| 95:4,15;123:4;127:6; | prescribe (1) | proceed (1) | property (1) | 112:17;139:10 |
| 142:13;143:9;183:3 | 71:1 | 80:18 | 55:15 | 178:19;184:8 |
| powerful (1) | presence (9) | proceeding (2) | proportions (1) | purposes (2) |
| 95:20 | 17:7;28:16;31:3; | 157:8;163:10 | 106:20 | 65:16,17 |
| practically (1) | 71:11;95:22;127:9; | proceedings (5) | proposal (2) | put (16) |
| 120:5 | 140:11;181:18;182:8 | 17:2;27:15;58:1 | 121:5;183:17 | 29:3;38:12;52:24; |
| practice (2) | present (9) | $108: 1 ; 155: 23$ | proposed (15) | $56: 4 ; 71: 13 ; 87: 4,5$ |
| 52:21;146:5 | 28:7;72:17,19; | process (7) | 13:7;14:23;39:21; | 89:10;119:2;120:5, |
| practices (5) | 137:14;178:7,11,11, | 10:18;20:24;53:15 | 64:6;80:8;90:11; | $18 ; 127: 18 ; 146: 8$ |
| 8:8,10;55:8;57:4; $146: 6$ | 16,17 | 156:15,22;157:12; | 98:19;99:9;101:3; | $157: 18 ; 158: 2 ; 168: 12$ |
| 146:6 | presentation (1) | 160:10 | 107:18;117:18; | putting (1) |
| practician |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ocesse } \\ & 24: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 182:1 |  |
| practitioner (2) | 27:18 | productive (2) | proposing (3) | Q |
| 167:13;170:2 | preservation (1) | 128:7;136:6 | 35:4,7;90:15 |  |
| practitioners (1) | 14:15 | productivity (2) | prospective (2) | qualifications (1) |
| 135:18 | preserved | 37:24;136:5 | 113:14;114:9 | 8:12 |
| prairie (1) | 120:3 | profession (1) | protect (1) | qualify (3) |
| 99:16 | president (1) | 72:5 | 31:17 | 75:13;138:3 |
| pre- (2) | 168:21 | professional (4) | protected (2) | 153:10 |
| 110:14;183:14 | Presiding (1) | 61:18;102:4;111:7 | 8:9;141:10 | qualitative (1) |
| precedent (2) | 4:20 | 139:21 | protection (5) | 183:11 |
| 89:14;90:19 | Press (2) | professionals (2) | 20:6;35:21;57:5,5; | qualities (2) |
| Precisely (4) | 116:14;168:12 | 61:17;113:17 | 150:16 | 137:12;140:17 |
| 42:6;105:19,21; | pressure (2) | professors (1) | protocol (4) | quality (1) |
| 149:5 | 153:18,23 | 175:16 | 59:18;111:11 | 47:11 |
| pre-construction (4) | pressured (1) | program (2) | 113:9,17 | quantification (1) |
| 48:24;73:3,6,10 | 152:2 | 117:7;175:18 | protocols (1) | 73:1 |
| predation (1) | pressures (1) | programs (3) | 114:6 | quantify (4) |
| 129:2 | 154:7 | 44:2;117:8;176:1 | proud (2) | 25:21;70:20;75:13; |
| predator (1) | pretty (6) | project (67) | 90:7;160:7 | 146:4 |
| 129:19 | 31:5;63:13;67:11; | 17:11,14;18:23 | prove (1) | quantitative (2) |
| predators (1) | 128:23;129:3;151:21 | 20:5,9,13;24:3,5; | 31:12 | 161:17;183:11 |
| 129:22 | prevention (1) | 31:4;35:2,2;42:19; | proven (1) | quantitatively (1) |
| predict (2) | 57:6 | 43:23;47:1;48:18; | 154:19 | 73:14 |
| 158:17;167:1 | prey (2) | 49:3,6;51:7;56:6; | provide (15) | questioner (1) |
| prefatory (1) | 126:10;129:2 | 59:22;62:10;64:8; | 8:4,11,17;21:11; | 23:8 |
| 184:21 | price (1) | 69:1,22;71:9;74:5, | 68:8;77:13;78:6; | quick (1) |
| prefer (3) | 116:23 | 19;75:14;87:16,22; | 79:15;119:16; | 115:5 |
| 43:2;66:13;122:21 | principles (1) | 88:7,16;89:5,5,12; | 121:20;123:21; | quickly (1) |
| preferred (5) | 67:21 | 93:11,15;94:20;98:2, | 124:9;131:17; | 27:24 |
| 18:4;42:16;109:17; | priorities (2) | 6;99:13;100:22; | 133:19;138:14 | quiet (1) |
| 153:15,19 | 134:23,24 | 102:16;103:8,10; | provided (11) | 75:18 |
| prefiled (19) | priority (1) | 104:1,21;105:1,5; | 8:16;13:5;49:16; | quite (6) |
| 8:14,22;12:9; | 85:1 | 106:17;107:18; | 80:21;84:8;112:17; | 20:17;62:5;63:22; |
| 16:11;17:18;18:7; | private (4) | 110:10,16;117:5,11; | 134:21;156:7,14; | 101:14;124:20; |
| 38:21;43:6;76:24; | 97:8;111:8;114:18; | 126:5;130:8;139:15; | 157:10,16 | 125:21 |
| 77:18;79:5,18;82:21; | 137:3 | 148:21;172:6,8,8,9; | providing (4) | quorum (1) |
| 84:18;85:11;93:24; | privilege | 182:7,21;183:18; | 20:5;56:22;79:13; | 5:20 |
| 156:2;161:4;169:4 | 122:7 | 184:6 | 157:14 | quote (2) |
| prejudging (1) | probably (14) | projects (18) | proving (1) | 42:5;67:22 |
| 110:9 | 25:15;29:24;73:12; | 24:22;27:21;83:3; | $18: 12$ | quoted (1) |
| premise (1) | 85:17;90:10;95:18; | 89:17,20,23;99:12, | Public (9) | 161:8 |
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|  | 8:23;12:14;19:14; | 58:14;178:20 | regional (1) | remarkable (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{R}$ | 23:10,10,14;29:22; | record (11) | 21:24 | 43:7 |
|  | 34:20;37:5;38:1; | 7:13;17:4;39:1; | (1) | remarks (1) |
| Rachel (1) | 40:12;42:11,11;43:7; | 49:19;53:4;108:15; | 89:16 | 159:8 |
| 5:23 | 49:22;64:21;65:14; | 7:8,24;180:17,22; | regularity (1) | remediating (1) |
| radar (1) | 69:20;72:8;103:16; $106 \cdot 24 \cdot 109 \cdot 10$ | 185:6 recording (1) | 19:13 regularly | 146:2 |
| 46:17 | 106:24;109:10; | recording (1) | regularly (3) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { remember (5) } \\ & 02 \cdot 12 \cdot 70 \cdot 6 \cdot 88 \cdot 11 . \end{aligned}$ |
| radiation (1) | 110:1,1,21;112:2,2,5, | 62:4 | 56:21;95:7;148:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 13 ; 70: 6 ; 88: 11 ; \\ & 185: 19: 186: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 123:6 radically (1) |  | recover (1) 129:21 | regulating <br> 115:6 | reminded |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { radically (1) } \\ 127: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $118: 5,6,23 ; 119: 3$ | recovery (1) | regulator (4) | $44: 12$ |
| raise (1) | 121:4;122:7,21; | 107:14 | 113:13,20;117:7; | remnant (1) |
| 126:13 | 127:12,15;135:24; | recreation (1) | 128:13 | 82:2 |
| random (1) | 136:3;137:16; | 30:18 | regulatory (2) | remote (3) |
| 153:13 | 143:13;150:23 | recreational (2) | 173:6,17 | 66:13;68:12;69:13 |
| ranges (2) | $153: 8 ; 160: 1,4 ;$ $161 \cdot 19 \cdot 162 \cdot 4,18$. | 140:12;179:2 | reinforce (1) | $\begin{gathered} \text { render (1) } \\ 65: 14 \end{gathered}$ |
| 125:20,23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:19;162:4,18; } \\ & \text { 165:18,23;166:5; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { recruit (2) } \\ 154: 2,4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 180: 11 \\ \text { relate (1) } \end{array}$ | 65:14 <br> renewable (1) |
| $\underset{21: 17}{\operatorname{ranging}(1)}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:18,23;166:5; } \\ & \text { 167:15;168:6; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 154:2,4 } \\ & \text { recruitment (6) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { relate (1) } \\ 98: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { renewable (1) } \\ 127: 19 \end{array}$ |
| ranking (1) | 169:22;171:9; | 71:3;76:7;154:7,8; | related (3) | Reno (1) |
| $140: 18$ | 174:11;178:18; 179:13•187:1,47 | 155:1;171:20 | 58:16; $136: 12 ;$ 138.1 | 5:24 |
| raptor (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 179: 13 ; 187: 1,4,17 \\ & \text { reason }(\mathbf{1 0}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { redesign (1) } \\ 35: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 138: 1 \\ \text { relates }(4) \end{gathered}$ | repeat (3) $48: 12 ; 84: 19 ; 186: 4$ |
| $46: 16,18$ rare (17) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reason (10) } \\ & 26: 15,17 ; 35: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 35:5 <br> redirect (4) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relates (4) } \\ & \quad 157: 20 ; 161: \end{aligned}$ | 48:12;84:19;186:4 repeating (1) |
| rare (17) $46: 18 ; 102: 1$ | 47:12;121:24; | 26:23;180:7,23 | 170:23;184:10 | 92:19 |
| 103:8;140:3;149:11, | 156:13,21;157:2 | 181:2 | relating (1) | repetitious (1) |
| 13,21,23;150:4,5,12, | 158:4;159:6 | reducing (1) | 43: | 39: |
| 19,21;151:1,7; | reasonable (1) | 106:4 | relationship (3) | replacing (2) |
| 160:21,24 | 182:19 | redundant (1) | 146:9;160:4; | 118:7;119:11 |
| rates (1) | reasons (2) | 182:6 | 166:16 | report (7) |
| 165:20 | 132:4;151:24 | re-establishment (1) | relative (3) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 7:2;73:18;86:12; |
| rather (2) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { re-auditorize (1) } \\ & 47: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45: 5 \\ \text { refer (4) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 12 ; 121: 19 \\ & 140: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106: 21 ; 112: 21 ; \\ & 138: 23 ; 142: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 39:17;185:6 <br> reaction (1) | rebuttal (3 | $8: 19 ; 34: 14 ; 134: 1^{\prime}$ | relatively | Reporter (4) |
| 117:1 | 12:3;16:14;183:24 | $175: 11$ | 37:12;67:20 | 7:10;11:6;81:7; |
| reactions (1) | rebutting (1) | reference (4) | 116:14;125:15; | 141:22 |
| 102:20 | 15:13 | 155:5;163:2 | 152:1;166:23;173:21 | reports (1) |
| read (24) | recall (1) | 6:20;183:1 | relax (1) | 56 |
| 5:9;9:9;11:17 | 146:24 | references (1) | 69:20 | represent (2) |
| 12:12,18;32:20; | recalled (1) | 161:23 | relaxing ( | 76:20;137:12 |
| 34:15;66:19;67:22; | 185:8 | referencing (1) | 70:3 | represented (2) |
| 77:14;78:14;99:2,20, | received (1) | 159:2 | release (1) | 27:19;72:13 |
| 23,24;100:1,3; | 177:17 | referred | 95:1 | representing (3) |
| 112:11;122:15; | recen |  | relevance (2) | $6: 1,4 ; 36: 1$ |
| 138:21;150:8; |  | $78: 21 ; 149: 4,13,2$ | relev | $\begin{gathered} \text { request (2) } \\ 11: 21 ; 158: 2 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 155:13;183:15; } \\ & \text { 186:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 163: 19 ; 1 \\ & \text { recess (3) } \end{aligned}$ | 155:7 | relevant (3) 25:7;54:22,22 | $11: 21 ; 158$ requests (3) |
| reading (5) | 108:11;180:18 | refresh (1) | Reliable (1) | 157:9,24;158:8 |
| 12:21;16:3;88:11; | 188:8 | 185:6 | 105:1 | require (3) |
| 111:6;153:5 | recognize (4) | regard (3) | relied (1) | 35:11;74:6;110:21 |
| real (6) | 14:6;60:18;66:12 | 117:4;151:22 | 138:14 | required (8) |
| 98:11;110:13; | 74:2 | 183:14 | relief (1) | 71:9;169:8;172:6, |
| 133:19;158:24; | recognized (8) | regarding (1) | 152:5 | 7;173:4,5;185:1,2 <br> reread (1) |
| 159:1;161:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 21 ; 22: 22 ; 82: 4 ; \\ & \text { 86:10;104:9;126:2 } \end{aligned}$ |  | relocate $74: 14$ | $\underset{0 \cdot 11}{\operatorname{reread}(1)}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { reality (1) } \\ 128: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $141: 9 ; 176: 1$ | 69:16 | reluctant (1) | re-read (1) |
| realize (1) | recollection (1) | regimes (3) | 62 | 105 |
| 118:24 | 185:7 | 123:6;130:4;151: | remain (2) | research (14) |
| realized (1) | $\begin{gathered} \text { recommend (2) } \\ 110: 24: 128: 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { region (13) } \\ & 25: 9 ; 26: 11 ; 44: 16, \end{aligned}$ | 17:12;20:11 remains (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 114: 23 ; 122: 22 \\ & 134: 23,24 ; 143: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| $159: 5$ realizing (2) | 110:24;128:14 <br> recommendation (2) | 25:9;26:11;44:16, <br> 19,22;83:3;88:5,10; | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { remains (1) } \\ 187: 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 134: 23,24 ; 143: 16 ; \\ & 162: 3,7,15,17 \end{aligned}$ |
| realizing (2) $22: 18 ; 34: 8$ | recommendation (2) | $118: 22 ; 136: 15$ | remark (1) | 164:12;166:4; |
| really (70) | reconnaissance (2) | 137:11;151:14;153:5 | 64:9 | 167:14,15;172:5 |
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| researched (1) | 105:4,6,18;111:3; | 101:23;108:6,17,19; | rugged (1) | 68:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 134:14 | 121:23;122:10 | 114:8;121:5;132:18; | 37:5 | scars (2) |
| researchers (1) | results (2) | 139:12;144:14; | rule (1) | 72:13,20 |
| 115:3 | 77:12;164:12 | 145:13;146:7; | 115:10 | scat (1) |
| reserve (1) | resume (4) | 147:11;149:6; | run (4) | 72:16 |
| 165:9 | 108:9;133:18; | 150:23;163:1;170:1; | 131:3;134:2;158:1; | scenario (4) |
| reside (1) | 188:6,10 | 172:22;180:21 | 174:21 | 117:5;119:24; |
| 95:10 | resumed (2) | rightly (1) | running (1) | 120:20;182:12 |
| resident (3) | 108:12;180:19 | 79:12 | 182:16 | scent (2) |
| 48:20;62:9;95:7 | retained (1) | ring (1) | rural (3) | 72:18;95:20 |
| residents (2) | 71:5 | 119:12 | 69:13;90:9;142:19 | scent-mark (1) |
| 47:12;62:13 | retired (1) | riparian (1) |  | 95:17 |
| resilience (2) | 10:5 | 42:14 | S | scent-marking (1) |
| 14:8,14 | return (2) | rising (1) |  | 72:11 |
| resolved (1) | 82:14;108:8 | 147:22 | Sadlowski (1) | schedule (2) |
| 7:2 | reveal (1) | risk (2) | 177:11 | 156:20;158:17 |
| resource (1) | 61:20 | 24:4;149:13 | safe (1) | school (1) |
| 74:4 | reverberating (1) | river (3) | 97:8 | 97:10 |
| Resources (5) | 123:17 | 136:23,24;137:2 | safeguard (1) | science (17) |
| 5:1,3,17;67:24; | reversed (1) | rivers (1) | 152:16 | 18:12;26:15;44:20; |
| 136:7 | 186:9 | 137:1 | safety (1) | 71:23;81:14;131:16, |
| respect (5) | review (7) | roached (1) | 126:17 | 18;134:11;161:9; |
| 57:4;109:11;150:8; | 35:20;98:6;111:1 | 29:11 | sake (3) | 163:23;164:19,24; |
| $156: 15 ; 169: 17$ | 114:13;116:11; | road (31) | 49:19;59:4;168:19 | $166: 24 ; 167: 22$ |
| respectfully (1) | 156:4;177:17 | 18:15,18,19,24; | salamander (1) | 168:3;169:23;187:4 |
| 10:16 | reviewing (2) | 19:1,18;20:1;52:6,12, | 120:8 | sciences (2) |
| respectively (1) | 11:21;122:12 | 13;53:20;55:16,24; | same (23) | 32:7,9 |
| 158:22 | reviews (4) | 56:1,4,9;63:20,20; | 11:8;18:14;20:20; | science's (1) |
| respects (1) | 28:3;57:14;99:5; | 64:3,5,7,17;93:5; | 29:20,21;30:3,22; | 15:6 |
| 135:22 | 177:2 | 97:12;120:2,10; | 34:20;37:24;40:11; | scientific (6) |
| respond (5) | Rich (3) | 144:23;145:4;146:9; | 57:17;67:21;71:7; | 13:10;33:14;34:18; |
| 12:2;23:14;81:9; | 15:16;47:11;147:6 | 147:3,16 | 114:1;119:12; | $76: 7 ; 135: 14 ; 161: 22$ |
| 170:11;179:12 | Richard (3) | roads (17) | 121:15;123:24; | scientist (2) |
| responded (1) | 5:16;84:6,9 | 18:22,23;19:7,21; | 127:3,4;130:24; | 14:2;161:17 |
| 138:4 | richness (2) | 33:18;56:14;90:8; | 138:20;141:11;169:2 | scientists (11) |
| response (13) | 14:7;61:20 | 126:7;140:10;141:6; | Sanctuary (4) | 14:5,14;22:12; |
| 6:22;12:22;23:11; | ride (2) | 146:8;148:11,11,12; | 21:1;43:19,22,24 | 40:2;76:1;98:7; |
| 36:13,15;39:11; | 128:9,10 | 161:12;182:23;183:1 | sand (1) | 114:14;162:16; |
| 45:16;59:16;93:1; | rides (1) | ROBINSON (8) | 141:3 | 165:16;171:6;187:7 |
| 159:9;180:4;183:24; | 128:8 | 5:5,5;121:10,11, | sandplain (1) | scores (1) |
| 184:3 | Ridge (6) | 13;132:16;134:7; | 141:2 | 115:22 |
| responses (2) | 105:17;142:1; | 160:16 | save (4) | Scott (2) |
| 23:16;97:4 | 144:19,21;177:23; | Rockies (1) | 22:18;79:2;115:11, | 6:11;133:1 |
| responsibility (1) | 178:8 | 41:8 | $12$ | se (1) |
| $94: 2$ | ridgeline (9) | room (2) | saw (8) | 109:15 |
| responsible (10) | 31:9;83:11;87:10; | 127:24;143:14 | 37:15;55:19;65:7, | season (2) |
| 79:12;83:23;84:2, | 102:8;110:6;146:18, | Ross (1) | 9;145:20,24;179:19; | 73:16;74:1 |
| 20;85:4,12,23;86:6; | 20;153:11;178:14 | 172:21 | 181:13 | seasonally (1) |
| 137:22;138:5 | ridgelines (14) | ROTH (16) | saying (19) | 67:7 |
| rest (1) | 21:20;22:3;42:8; | 6:15,15;7:2,4;11:5, | 79:4;83:1,15;91:3, | seasons (5) |
| 143:17 | 83:10;99:14;109:7, | 9;27:4,5,7,16;50:3; | 9,18;93:9;96:13; | 62:14;65:11;66:4; |
| restate (1) | 14,15,19;110:3; | 80:3,14;157:3,4,5 | 97:12;105:20; | 73:24;126:11 |
| 180:11 | 119:7;142:4,11; | rough (1) | 106:16;121:1,2; | secluded (1) |
| restatement (1) | 153:16 | 64:14 | 127:16;132:15; | 67:8 |
| 16:11 | ridges (1) | Route (1) | 150:13,15;153:10; | second (7) |
| resting (1) | 42:14 | 98:14 | 173:21 | 15:10,19;61:7; |
| 132:9 | right (41) | routes (4) | scale (3) | 100:10;115:8; |
| restoration (1) | $7: 5 ; 8: 20 ; 9: 5,6$ | 42:16;109:17; | $44: 17 ; 82: 16 ; 135: 7$ | 152:19,22 |
| 14:16 | 11:19,24;15:20,22; | $153: 15,19$ | scared (2) | section (5) |
| restricted (1) | 16:5,19;28:18;38:4; | Royale (1) | 30:4,6 | 25:19;46:10,14; |
| 18:16 | 39:9,21;42:23;44:5; | 129:14 | scarred (1) | 47:19;51:13 |
| result (9) | 51:4,8;54:5;57:24; | Rufous-sided (1) | 68:10 | secure (3) |
| 13:8;25:2;80:12; | 58:4;72:10;87:14; | 61:6 | scarring (1) | 68:12,17,21 |
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| secured (1) | 9;171:10 | 179:21 | size (4) | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35:18 | session (3) | significance (3) | 19:18;72:2;74:21; | soils (1) |
| security (1) | 10:21;188:9,12 | 65:6;111:3;134:18 | 140:5 | 22:9 |
| 77:14 | sessions (1) | significant (7) | skis (1) | solar (2) |
| seed (1) | 5:8 | 17:14;20:10;24:3; | 93:8 | 109:23;123:6 |
| 171:18 | set (4) | 34:12;63:23;111:6; | sky (1) | solid (1) |
| seeds (1) | 89:15;90:18;95:7; | 122:18 | 167:18 | 160:2 |
| 154:21 | 114:5 | significantly (2) | slice (1) | solidly (3) |
| seeing (5) | setting (2) | 28:17;129:20 | 44:23 | 161:22;187:5,7 |
| 6:23;28:10;53:21; | 170:24;171:7 | signs (2) | slices (1) | solitaire (1) |
| 66:8;76:6 | several (7) | 72:11;153:2 | 34:9 | 147:24 |
| seek (5) | 20:4;58:13;60:23; | Silly (1) | slicing (1) | solution (1) |
| 35:15;70:21;113:2; | 79:21;90:17;133:16; | 44:6 | 81:20 | 125:2 |
| 152:5;170:10 | 163:10 | silviculture (1) | slightly (1) | Somebody (1) |
| seeking (5) | severe (4) | 145:8 | 135:19 | 120:15 |
| 120:6,8;165:7; | 25:16;41:15;107:2; | similar (4) | SM1 (3) | somebody's (1) |
| 169:9,16 | 131:21 | 18:21;33:10;42:10; | 78:3;79:6;82:22 | 53:15 |
| seeks (1) | severely (2) | 140:23 | SM2 (2) | somehow (3) |
| 166:24 | 14:19;139:16 | similarities (1) | 98:10;176:21 | 34:4;82:1;107:16 |
| seem (1) | share (1) | 121:17 | SM3 (2) | someone (1) |
| 182:6 | 128:8 | Similarly (1) | 98:10;177:9 | 52:22 |
| seemed (4) | Shaw (2) | 177:9 | SM4 (8) | someone's (1) |
| 53:18,20;153:24; | 9:5,22 | SIMMONS (9) | 51:14;78:18;85:21, | 157:21 |
| 182:2 | shelter (1) | 6:11,11;36:17,18, | $22 ; 86: 22 ; 94: 4$ | sometimes (10) |
| seems (5) | 126:17 | 22;39:2,5,8;133:1 | 132:23;152:18 | 41:15;70:19;81:20; |
| 66:7;96:18;140:21; | short (1) | SIMPKINS (6) | SM5 (1) | 103:21;113:23; |
| 148:17;157:7 | 175:2 | 5:2,2;132:19,20, | 94:7 | 115:7;118:1;120:23; |
| seepage (1) | shorter (1) | 22;135:11 | SM7 (2) | 127:8;173:16 |
| 145:24 | 111:19 | simple (6) | 60:12,14 | somewhat (2) |
| seize (1) | short-term (1) | 58:18,20;72:9; | SM8 (3) | 40:17;43:23 |
| 107:10 | 76:9 | 85:9;115:8;121:7 | 50:17;57:21;86:3 | somewhere (6) |
| select (1) | shot (2) | simply (9) | SM8A (2) | 29:4;100:3;135:5; |
| 135:23 | 54:11;143:18 | 22:8;25:11;34:7; | 50:11,18 | 145:10;147:17; |
| selectman (1) | show (9) | 63:7;72:10;111:12; | SM8B (2) | 176:17 |
| 6:8 | 28:21;47:14;79:3, | 112:19;142:6;148:4 | 57:12,22 | soon (1) |
| send (1) | 16;80:5;93:7;95:10; | sincere (1) | SM9 (1) | 101:9 |
| 70:9 | 147:2;149:5 | 25:16 | 57:21 | sorry (13) |
| senior (4) | showed (2) | sincerity (1) | small (6) | 7:7;11:9;36:23; |
| 9:16,22;138:6; | 63:22;82:20 | 145:3 | 14:10;68:19;77:12 | $44: 7 ; 62: 22 ; 68: 15$ |
| 159:17 | showing (2) | singing (1) | 136:4;142:18;143:1 | 71:17;80:15;123:20; |
| sense (6) | 59:17;168:9 | 63:12 | smaller (3) | 124:5;149:17;184:1; |
| 42:21;65:2;86:11; | shown (1) | Site (24) | 42:8;136:9;142:4 | 187:18 |
| 133:8;136:11;184:18 | 27:17 | 4:10,12,19;12:6; | snag (3) | sort (13) |
| sensitive (1) | shows (1) | 15:3;31:4;33:1,2; | 70:12,15;71:8 | 16:24;39:18;42:15, |
| 136:20 | 59:21 | 47:1;48:18;51:7,18; | snags (8) | 18;54:23;111:1; |
| sentence (2) | shrubs (4) | 59:22;62:10;66:16; | 70:21;71:3,3,4,4, | 136:12;149:21; |
| 150:14;181:7 | 38:5;66:2;67:17; | 69:1;73:4,5;74:8,14; | 14,20;73:2 | 156:11,16;163:10; |
| separate (2) | 69:19 | 93:2;120:7;125:9; | snapshot (1) | 165:15;168:2 |
| 111:18;188:11 | shtick (1) | 182:7 | 73:17 | sorts (2) |
| September (2) | 165:11 | sited (4) | snow (2) | 41:2;162:6 |
| 65:23;158:20 | shun (1) | 53:21;107:18,20; | 130:10;131:13 | Soule (2) |
| series (2) | 126:18 | 118:12 | Snowmobile (2) | 112:3;165:12 |
| 15:14;181:20 | shy (1) | sites (3) | 179:3,23 | sound (5) |
| seriously (1) | 118:5 | 67:9;109:22 | snowmobiler (1) | 38:14;97:24; |
| 121:4 | sides (2) | 181:15 | 183:9 | 143:18;167:10; |
| serves (1) | 129:9;148:1 | siting (2) | sobering (1) | 176:23 |
| 171:12 | Sierras (1) | 96:17;162:6 | 128:1 | sounds (2) |
| Service (7) | 21:18 | sitting (1) | Society (3) | 67:9;142:1 |
| 72:24;166:24; | sightings (1) | 103:20 | 165:13,14;168:21 | soundscape (1) |
| 173:22;177:12,16; | 61:12 | situation (2) | soft (1) | 112:16 |
| 183:16;184:9 | sign (1) | 30:6;40:3 | 113:24 | sources (2) |
| Services (6) | 74:3 | situations (3) | softwood (5) | 24:8;99:23 |
| 4:23;5:13;8:3;14:1, | signage (1) | 29:3;118:1;131:6 | 37:19;38:1,2;66:6, | south (1) |
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| 43:23 | 113:19,22;114:22 | stay (2) | 141:12 | 17;82:21;84:4,18; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| space (2) | stage (2) | 2:10;117:3 | structurally (1) | 85:10;98: |
| 72:3;114:24 | 155:22;158: | STEARNS (4) | 70:23 | ubset (1) |
| speak (6) | stakes (7) | 6:6,7;43:11,12 | structure | 140:19 |
| 20:16;21:9;63:8 | 52:11,15,23;53:21 | step (3) | 150:14 | substitute (1) |
| 152:2;155:13;157:5 | 6:2;64:4;181:22 | 33:6;106:5;148:18 | structures (1) | 119:8 |
| Speaking (6) | stand (5) | Stephen (1) | 136:8 | success (1) |
| 37:14;67:20;92: | 51:24;54:15;65:5 | 6:3 | struggle (1) | 154:13 |
| 97:15;125:15;152:1 | 142:21;159:22 | STEWART (8) | 132:4 | successful ( |
| special (8) | st | 4:21,21;91:1 | struggled | 126:12 |
| 37:13;38: | 52:21 | 08:19,20,21;121:8; | 151:14 | successfully (3) |
| 69:21;104:8;148: | standing | 134:6 | struggling ( | 14:17;132:1,9 |
| 150:9,16 | 71.3 | Sticking ( | 48:1 | succumbing (1) |
| specialist (1) | standpoint (4) | 146:7 | studied (8) | 41:11 |
| 167:21 | 71:1;119:4;132:6 | still (18) | 97:16,24;9 | sudden (1) |
| specialists (2) | 0 | 18:20;25:2 | 04:19,23;133:2 | 118:24 |
| 74:2;174:7 | stands | 6:7;70:2;74:6,19; | 149:22;161:16 | Suddenly (2) |
| specialness (1) | 52:17;53:5;54:12 | 83:14;88:15,23; | studies (31) | 40:20;126:1 |
| 64:13 | 66:6;67:3 | 95:19;98:4;115:17; | 31:24;35:6;46:4 | Sue (5) |
| species (36) | stars (1) | 18:16;126:24; | 15,17,22;47:10; | 7:8;17:3;37:2 |
| 14:2,7,13;17:7,13, | 167:17 | 128:2;143:1;147:21 | $48: 14 ; 49: 21 ; 70: 12$ | 45:1;181:5 |
| 17;25:8;28:6;48:22 | start (5) | Stoddard (1) | 74:7;75:7,12;110:15; | sufficient (1) |
| 62:18;63:6;70:22; | 19:12;38:24;59 | 6:12 | 116:2,6;125:1,4; | 20:13 |
| 74:3;102:17;103:9; | 116:10;125:8 | stop (2) | 129:14;155:6; | suggest (5) |
| 115:19,23;123:13,15; | started (3) | 29:18;93: | 157:14;158:3 | 11:13;21:6;112:24; |
| 125:23;126:6; | 9:23;30:8; | stopped (1) | 161:24;169:15 | 114:15;172:1 |
| 127:22;135:23 | starting (3) | 93:22 | 170:9,15;184:4,1 | suggested (3) |
| 136:13,16;137:9,9 | 23:21;116 | strands | 185:1,2 | 84:23;86:8;138:15 |
| 10;140:4;142:8; | 34 | 71:21 | study (27) | suggesting (3) |
| 143:7;154:11,20; | starts (1) | stress (19) | 31:21;34:24;35:1 | 110:5;131:19 |
| 165:19;169:10;171:8 | 139:7 | 14:7;22:24;30:17 | 49:24;62:23;70:15 | 172:6 |
| specific (10) | state (24) | 18;41:14,15;92:20, | 71:8;124:7,10,12; | suggestions (1) |
| 23:15;26:20;45:2 | 7:19;10:5;11:12 | 21,22,24;93:11,16; | 125:6;129:7;133:22; | 125:7 |
| 67:17;134:8,10; | 18:18,24;42:2;68:14, | 111:2;132:9;152:9; | 150:10,23;166:14; | suggestive (1) |
| 136:12;162:8;184:5, | 20,23;71:10;85:2,3; | 170:10;182:8,10,15 | 170:4,4,7;171:22; | 181:23 |
| 6 | 89:22;90:24;98 | stressed | 175:8;184:5,14,16 | suggests (1) |
| specifically (5) | 102:4;114:17; | 14:21;29:10;7 | 18,22;185:7 | 24:22 |
| 59:1;61:2,14; | 128:15;133:2 | 130:3;152:10 | studying (2) | suitable (3) |
| 112:23;150:19 | 139:17;141:9; | stresses (17) | 9:23;170:4 | 67:8;68:8;157:1 |
| specifics (3) | 142:11,15;183: | 13:20;14:18 | stuff (7) | suite (2) |
| 108:24;110:23; | stated | 31:6;40:22,23;41:12, | 111:15;135:21 | 137:10;171:7 |
| 160:20 | 52:1;18 | 19,24;74:24;75:22; | 147:9,10;157:16,18; | Sullivan (1) |
| speculation (3) | statement (12) | 131:3,5,20;132:2; | 174:8 | 39:10 |
| 53:2,10;55:2 | 17:15;24:6;25:4 | 167:2;170:12 | subboreal | summary (2) |
| spend (1) | 54:18;68:22;100:1,2, | stressful (1) | 40:19 | 8:23;16:10 |
| 175:4 | 19;150:3;153:22 | 29:3 | subdivisi | summer (3) |
| spilling (1) | 173:23;182:19 | stressing | 126:7 | 65:23;152:9,1 |
| 147:22 | statements (1) | :23 | subject (9) | summit (1) |
| spinning | 23:11 | stressor (2) | 24:18;26 | 96:10 |
| 75:16 | state | 92:21,22 | -15 | summits (4) |
| spite (2) | 17.6,18.15,24.1, | stressors (3) | 155:17;165:16 | 21:18,19;22: |
| 52:1;54:1 | 21;67:1;68:5;99:18; | 92:12,17;126:18 | 167:12;168:11 | 119:8 |
| spoke (1) | 100:7 | stretch (1) | sublethal | Super (1) |
| 87:3 | State's | 146:23 | 135:3 | 20:24 |
| sponsors | 84:24;139: | strict (2) | submission (2) | supplement (3) |
| 156:1 | stating | 23:5,13 | 10:10;159:18 | 49:12;157:9;185 |
| spread (1) | 105:3 | strikes (1) | submissions (1) | supplemental (7) |
| 64:18 | statistic (2) | 185:1 | 51:12 | $12: 8 ; 26: 20 ; 50: 1$ |
| spring (2) | 99:21;112:11 | string | submit (1) | 85:18;88:11;156:6, |
| 107:15;132:2 | statisti | $44 \cdot 1$ | 83:7 | 24 |
| spruce (2) | 88:15 | strong (1) | submitted (14) | support (2) |
| 37:20;38:4 | status (1) | 166:17 | 8:14;12:9;49:12 | 142:7;157:21 |
| squishy (3) | 151:11 | strongly (1) | 77:20;78:15;79:5,7,9, | suppose (4) |
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| 116:24;120:15; | 169:22 | tend (2) | 167:11;175:11 | 151:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 135:17;148:9 | system (3) | 157:24;174:6 | thanks (1) | tiers (1) |
| supposed (2) | 56:20;140:18; | term (12) | 39:8 | 117:10 |
| 64:8;158:20 | 179:7 | 14:3;71:6;80:1; | therefore (2) | timber (2) |
| sure (18) |  | 85:2;100:17;110:12; | 54:21;181:13 | 178:24;179:1 |
| 35:14;54:10;56:17; | T | 114:8;133:14; | there'll (1) | timbering (1) |
| 58:23;59:10;62:21; |  | 163:16,18,20;181:8 | 41:1 | 52:22 |
| 100:13;103:19; | Tab (3) | terminology (1) | Therivel (1) | times (7) |
| 148:19,22;154:9; | 77:18,23;93:23 | 181:17 | 172:21 | 26:17;31:7;44: |
| 155:20;172:12,15; | table (5) | terms (17) | thermal (3) | 75:4;133:16;154:5; |
| 174:9;176:3;178:12; | 59:20;60:4,11 | 38:8;46:6;52:4 | 66:16;120:7,9 | 155:8 |
| 184:2 | $61: 1 ; 62: 7$ | $53: 18 ; 63: 5,18,19$ | thick (1) | timid (1) |
| surely (1) | talk (7) | 70:19;84:21;87:2; | 38:2 | 126:21 |
| 14:19 | 39:18;64:22;65:17; | 110:14;136:6,8; | thinkers (1) | tinkering (1) |
| surprise (4) | 89:22;97:17;154:6; | 138:7;140:2;152:9; | 112:2 | 115:11 |
| 104:3,5,7,10 | 180:14 | 165:1 | thinking (11) | tiny (1) |
| surprising (2) | talked (9) | term's (1) | 54:24;65:19;70:2; | 142:4 |
| 37:17,18 | 10:21;124:16,18; | 168:5 | 82:16;122:8;128:4; | tip (1) |
| surrogate (1) | 125:21;128:21; | terrain (2) | 129:24;141:1,11; | 122:14 |
| 109:20 | 142:8;146:11,13; | 96:21;152:8 | 147:23;164:16 | tipping (1) |
| surrounded (1) | 147:13 | terrarium (1) | third (3) | 131:1 |
| 133:13 | talking (25) | 42:21 | 124:16;181:6 | title (2) |
| surrounding (1) | 11:8;19:17,23,24; | terrible (1) | thorough (1) | 159:20;172:17 |
| 13:22 | 33:1,2;34:3;38:10; | 64:20 | 110:24 | titles (1) |
| survey (10) | 42:4;43:5;50:24; | testified (2) | though (4) | 172:15 |
| $32: 3,18 ; 46: 16,17,$ | 71:19;89:19,20;90:3, | 87:11;184:23 | 56:4;60:22;79:15; | today (20) |
| $20 ; 48: 24 ; 49: 10,12$ | 4;118:6;123:1; | testifiers (1) | 161:23 | 6:7;14:3,6;33:24; |
| 58:8;59:15 | 127:14;129:7;142:1; | 36:3 | thought (5) | 34:6;40:15;75:18; |
| surveys (6) | 164:22;168:23; | testifying (3) | 10:22;16:21;18:10; | 80:10;81:16,22;82:3, |
| 32:13,21,24;46:18; | 169:3;174:23 | 84:14;156:17 | 22:15;23:1 | 7,9,13;85:17;96:19; |
| 62:15;73:7 | talks (3) | 185:14 | thoughtful (1) | 141:8;155:10;159:9, |
| survive (1) | 82:6;137:24; | testimony (93) | 114:23 | 14 |
| 154:14 | 154:17 | 8:15;12:9;13:7; | thoughts (1) | today's (1) |
| Susan (8) | tall (1) | 15:13;16:10;17:18; | 170:13 | 13:12 |
| 5:23;7:9,11,21; | 159:22 | 18:7;19:16;23:15; | thousands (6) | together (5) |
| 50:19;76:19;78:18; | talus (1) | 24:16;26:8,21;28:15; | $31: 13 ; 186: 1,1,18 \text {, }$ | $32: 9 ; 41: 5 ; 58: 14$ |
| 84:7 | 64:14 | 29:17;30:10;31:23; | $19,21$ | 116:19;165:9 |
| Susan's (1) | task (1) | 32:11;33:11,22; | threat (1) | told (4) |
| 84:11 | 64:16 | 34:14;38:7,21;41:3; | 106:12 | 122:2;165:22; |
| suspect (2) | tasks (1) | 43:6;51:1,12;76:24; | three (6) | 184:21;185:18 |
| 101:20;141:12 | 36:1 | 77:19;78:8,10,13; | 30:21;94:10;109: | tolerate (1) |
| sustain (1) | taught (1) | 79:6,8,10,18,20,23; | 123:7;124:7,13 | 136:1 |
| 153:9 | 176:10 | 80:12,22;81:1,3,12; | thrilled (1) | took (4) |
| sustenance (1) | teach (1) | 82:21;83:2;84:4,12, | 62:2 | 138:7;155:13; |
| 13:24 | 175:13 | 19;85:11,18,19,19; | thrive (1) | 164:15,17 |
| swear (1) | team (1) | 87:7;88:12;91:4,7; | 169:10 | top (16) |
| 7:8 | 149:1 | 92:11,19;93:24; | throughout (16) | 37:20;47:8;76:23; |
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