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[WITNESS PANEL: WEITZNER|SHAW]


#### Abstract

P R O C E E D I N G S (Hearing resumed at 12:50 p.m.) PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Good afternoon. We'll start and reconvene here. I will say, just for expectations, we took an hour today. I talked to the Committee members. In the future, we'll probably try to keep our lunches to 45 minutes, just so you all can plan also. And again, the intent of that is not to short you your lunch hour, but to try to get these done in an orderly and fairly quick fashion.

So, with that, I think we're on with Ms. Linowes; is that not correct? MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MS. LINOWES: Q. Good afternoon. I want to ask a question out of the gates, very important. You had stated, Mr. Weitzner, today, this morning, that this project is going to be using the PTC. Your pro formas, both confidential and public, was based on the ITC. Has there been a change in the --
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or has a decision been made to go with PTCs on this project?
A. (Weitzner) No. When I said the PTC, in the U.S. Tax Code, any project that qualifies for the PTC can elect to use either the PTC or the ITC. I was using it generically.
Q. Okay. So, the pro forma that has been supplied publicly and also confidentially still applies today?
A. (Weitzner) We expect we'll be using the ITC, yes.
Q. Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Hold on a second.

MR. BOISVERT: I'm not familiar with these initials. What is an ITC versus PTC?

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
WITNESS WEITZNER: PTC stands for Production Tax Credit. A qualified renewable energy project can get tax credits that assist in their financial viability. Any project that qualifies for the Production Tax Credit can elect to use the Investment Tax Credit. The Production Tax Credit is, as it says, it is
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production-based. So you get roughly $\$ 24$ per megawatt hour of production as a tax credit. And so, if you have tax liabilities, you can offset the liabilities with that credit. That's the Production Tax Credit.

The Investment Tax Credit is a one -- sorry. The Production Tax Credit is for 10 years. So, you get 10 years of tax credits, \$24 per megawatt hour.

The Investment Tax Credit is a one-time credit for 30 percent of the qualified costs of the project.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Why don't you continue if you're ready.

MS. LINOWES: Okay. Thank you.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. So I just wanted to ask a question also before $I$ get into my main line of questioning.

You had stated that the 37 percent capacity factor for the Project took into account several factors, including bat mortality curtailment to reduce bat mortality. I just wanted to ask you what assumption was used when you -- when that was applied.
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 1/Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-13-16\}
A. (Weitzner) Curtailing. So the assumption is we curtail at 3.5 meters per second. One hour -sorry. Let me be clear.

If the wind is below 3.5 meters per second, we curtail the turbine -- so we don't allow them to spin at all -- one hour before sundown to one hour after sun-up.
Q. In the summer months or all months?
A. (Weitzner) In the summer months.
Q. And so not 6 meters per second?
A. (Weitzner) No.
Q. Okay. And would it be all turbines?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. So if it were raised to 6 meters per second as opposed to 3.5, have you done the calculus on that?
A. (Weitzner) No.
Q. Okay. And also, when it's in the summer months, would it be from May to September? Would it be June to October?
A. (Weitzner) I don't remember exactly the dates. They're somewhere in our application.
Q. Oh, it is in there?
A. (Weitzner) I believe so. If they're not,
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 1/Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-13-16\}

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | they're in the -- I'm pretty sure they're in |
| 2 |  | the Application. If they're not, in the Bird |
| 3 |  | and Bat Conservation. |
| 4 | Q. | Okay. Also with regard to market pricing, you |
| 5 |  | had said earlier today that there's not enough |
| 6 |  | wind in the New England grid region to -- the |
| 7 |  | grid system to have a market effect on energy |
| 8 |  | prices. And I just wanted to ask you if you |
| 9 |  | had accounted for negative pricing? |
| 10 | A. | (Weitzner) Again, seeing as we expect to have |
| 11 |  | the large majority of our revenue contracted |
| 2 |  | through a PPA, negative LMP pricing does not |
| 3 |  | affect us. |
| 14 | Q. | I understand that. But the question you were |
| 15 |  | being asked earlier today was the effect of |
| 16 |  | wind energy on market pricing. |
| 17 | A. | (Weitzner) It was a general statement. I |
| 18 |  | haven't done an analysis on wind energy |
| 19 |  | pricing. |
| 20 | Q. | And then, just another question with regard to |
| 21 |  | the PPA that you've already signed. And I'm |
| 22 |  | not sure if you'll be able to answer this in |
| 23 |  | public session, but I'll ask anyway. |
| 24 |  | Has the New England Electric Co-Op |
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accounted for negative pricing in the PPA?
A. (Weitzner) There are terms that cover negative pricing, yes.
Q. So I'll ask you in non-public, or can you tell us those now?
A. (Weitzner) I prefer in non-public, if that's all right.
Q. That's fine. Also, you had stated that the banks typically assess project viability based on the P99 as opposed to the P50. Can you just -- I don't know if everyone understands what those are, although they are explained in the Application. Can you explain the difference between those two and also tell us what the P99 and P50 are for this project?
A. (Weitzner) Yes. P50 stands for 50th percentile, and it is the energy that we expect the Project to produce from the wind, year in, year out. That's the P50. In other words, P50 means that 50 percent of the time the Project will produce more than our stated 37 percent capacity factor. P99 is shorthand for the 99th percentile, and it means that 99 percent of the time the Project will produce more than our P99
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capacity factor. Our P50 capacity factor, as we said in our application, is around -- is approximately 37 percent. Our P99 capacity factor, our one-year $P 99$ capacity factor is approximately 26 percent.
Q. Okay. And you said it was the P99 that mattered to the banks; is that correct?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. Okay. So, in Exhibit APP 33 -- and I believe that that is the full application of your -this would be Volume 1 , on Page 68 -- I don't know if you have it in front of you, but 1 can tell you that it states that the debt service coverage ratio on a P50 is 1.45. Can you explain what that is?
A. (Weitzner) So when $I$ said that that is sized by the $P 99$, that's really the main limiting factor. But there are two tests, as we describe in our application. The first test is the P50 test. And what that means is the Project must -- under the P50 scenario, the Project must generate 1.4 times more than it needs in order to pay all of the operating costs and service to debt. That's the P50, 1.4
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debt service coverage ratio.
Q. It actually says 1.45 .
A. (Weitzner) Okay. Excuse me. 1.45, yes.
Q. Also, then the next bullet item on that page says the debt service coverage ratio for a P99 test is 1.0?
A. Yes.
Q. And those numbers are actually restated again in -- again, this would be Exhibit APP 33, and this is Appendix 18B. This is the letter -did you get that, 18B? This would be a letter that you put into the record from, I believe it's pronounced "Barn LB."
A. (Weitzner) BLB.
Q. BLB. Okay.

On Page 2 of that letter, they identify also the $1.0 x$ for the $P 99$ and the 1.45 to $1.5 x$ for the P50 resource. So, do both of those have to be met?

MR. IACOPINO: Did you say Appendix
18B?
MS. LINOWES: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Is that a confidential
document?
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MS. LINOWES: It is not.
MR. IACOPINO: Just for the Committee members, $I$ think it didn't make it onto the jump drives that we gave you.

Go ahead. Sorry.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. So -- I'm sorry. So, both tests have to be met.
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. Now, $I$ want to... if I can look at your supplemental testimony -- this would be Exhibit APP 20 -- you reference -- this would be on Page 2, beginning on Line 15 -- 14 and 15. You reference three attachments that were included with your supplemental testimony. They are W/S-1, W/S-2 and W/S-3. And these are letters from BLB -- I'm sorry, not BLB -- State -- hold on. Let me just get that.
A. (Weitzner) I believe it's State Street, Citigroup and CCA Group.
Q. Yes. Thank you. Sorry. Correct.

And then these were added in addition to the LBN [sic] letter and the KeyBank letter. Each of those letters were submitted as part of
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the Application; is that correct?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, you say in your -- on Line 15, you say, "These letters of interest from some of the most reputable and active funding providers of the U.S. wind sector demonstrate AWE's extensive network of financing counterparts, their confidence in the Project's sponsors, the competitive economics of the Project relative to other U.S. wind projects, and speak to the ease with which AWE will be able to secure construction debt and tax equity"; correct?
A. (No response)
Q. Okay. So, my question, in looking at, say, the KeyBank letter -- this would be Appendix 18C -so, Exhibit APP 33, Volume 1, Appendix 18C -there's a paragraph in there -- it's the paragraph almost before the last, third from the last -- that says, "This letter is for discussion purposes only and is not an offer of financing or any commitment on our part, nor is it intended to be legally binding or to give rise to any legal or fiduciary relationship between KeyBank or its affiliates and any other
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person. Such a commitment, if any, will be delivered upon receipt of all requisite internal approvals and completion of due diligence." Do you see that?
A. (Weitzner) No, but I'm familiar with it.
Q. Yeah, okay. So, what has KeyBank been given in order to elicit this letter from you?
A. (Weitzner) It's been a while, so I don't exactly remember. I think the -- I know the person we're talking to at KeyBank is very familiar with the Project, very familiar with the Project returns, and has seen the wind report and has seen our pro forma.
Q. Okay.
A. (Weitzner) I believe.
Q. Now, this letter is fairly generic. He does not cite any of the information he received. Was that received after this letter, which is dated February 26th?
A. (Weitzner) I believe so, yes.
Q. Okay. And then, also, the letter from BLB contains a similar kind of wording. And this would again be Appendix 18B which we looked at a moment ago. The last paragraph, "This letter
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is intended as an expression of commercial interest in providing the debt... and does not constitute a binding agreement of any kind whatsoever with regard to the Project or to the credit facilities or otherwise."

And then, earlier it says, "Subject to our satisfactory due diligence, credit approval and documentation... Antrim Wind... could be financed." Is that as far as BLB is going to go today?
A. (Weitzner) I think it's important to understand that project finance in the U.S. -- this is how project financing in the U.S. works, and that no bank or tax equity provider will issue any kind of commitment until a project has a permit, because issuing that commitment represents a significant expenditure of time, energy and money. And so these LOIs are taken seriously by the industry, but as you correctly pointed out, they are not binding. A bank won't issue binding commitments until more conditioned precedence typical for financing are met.
Q. Okay. Thank you for that.
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And also looking at the State Street letter -- this would be attachment $W / S-2$, which was attached to your supplemental testimony, which is APP 20. That's not even on letterhead.
A. (Weitzner) I think it's actually Citibank maybe that's not on letterhead. Is it the State Street --
Q. State Street Bank's not on letterhead.
A. (Weitzner) If you want us to get it on letterhead, we can. It was just an oversight. But that is a -- our relationship with State Street is quite deep. They have done a significant amount of due diligence on the Project. They're familiar with the wind report, the pro forma. They have returned a -they have done their own pro forma on the Project. So they have done a fair amount of diligence on the Project already.
Q. Okay. And then, lastly, I want to look at Attachment W/S-3, also attached to your supplemental testimony. And this is from CCA Group. He does say that he reviewed the Project's financial pro forma, as you said.
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KeyBank may have as well.
Have all of these banks reviewed your pro forma?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. Is the pro forma that they reviewed the same pro forma that I received?
A. (Weitzner) I can't be certain it's identical. But it is in all material respects the same, yes.
Q. I don't know how to -- I'll ask that question again in non-public, then, because that doesn't tell me enough.
A. (Weitzner) Well, I'm saying in all material respects it's the same.
Q. Okay. So --
A. (Weitzner) There could be some small difference here and there, but --
Q. Can you name one?
A. (Weitzner) No. I just don't know.
Q. Do you have a copy of that pro form that was delivered to the bank?
A. (Weitzner) We would be able to find it, sure.
Q. Something that we could discuss in non-public?
A. (Weitzner) I would need time. I don't have it
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here.
Q. Well, okay. So let me just ask you very quickly, then: Does that pro form assume a PTC, ITC, or both? Did you do two?
A. (Weitzner) That pro forma assumes an ITC.
Q. Okay. Now, the signer of the CCA Group letter, Martin J. Pasqualini, wasn't he on contract with AWE back in 2012?
A. (Weitzner) Yes, he was.
Q. So, is he under contract now?
A. (Weitzner) No, he's not.
Q. Is he still considered an arm's length participant, or does he have a vested interest in this project at all?
A. (Weitzner) We have no contractual relationship with him right now.
Q. So, okay. So we should assume this letter is independently provided.
A. (Weitzner) It is independently provided. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. Then -- okay. So I guess I understand what you're saying about commitments. But one of the issues $I$ wanted to raise with you is that KeyBank letter. And I think I referenced
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[WITNESS PANEL: WEITZNER|SHAW]
this in my testimony, and I want to raise it here.

I have -- I did a Google search on some of the wording that's in the KeyBank letter and came up with two identical letters: One for a wind project in Maine, one for a wind project in Minnesota, signed by -- let's see -- signed by different people. But one of them was signed by the same gentleman that your letter is signed by. So, the sense is KeyBank gives these letters out like candy on Halloween. How serious do we take these letters?
A. (Weitzner) I take the letter very seriously. I don't think they give them out like candy on Halloween, by any means. I take them very seriously. But I also think it's -- yeah, I take it very seriously. But certainly it's not -- as I said, no bank will guarantee the funding until more key condition precedences are met, the biggest one being a permit.
Q. One of these letters was to First Wind, which is SunEdison --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. And they're bankrupt.
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A. (Weitzner) SunEdison went bankrupt at a corporate level. It was the corporation that went bankrupt. The project LLCs, from what I understand, have not defaulted or gone bankrupt, and they're still viable entities getting sold in bankruptcy court because SunEdison, the parent, the corporation, went bankrupt. So they didn't -- SunEdison didn't go bankrupt because KeyBank was lending them money. KeyBank doesn't lend money -- you know, this type of loan that KeyBank is proposing to us is project-financed. And so it's a loan against a project, and that has very different and much more conservative, solid economics than a corporation does.
Q. Just for the record, neither one of these projects -- the First Wind project nor the Minnesota project, which was a wind project called Comfry Wind -- was ever built. The first one was denied, and the Comfrey project, more to the point here, had its permit withheld because it couldn't get funding. Is that -they had the KeyBank letter, but they couldn't get funding. Immaterial?
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A. (Weitzner) Is that the question?
Q. What is the weight again? Does that letter from KeyBank have any meaning?
A. (Weitzner) Yes, I believe it does.
Q. Okay. All right. Let me -- then I'll go on to my next set of questions. Actually, I did want to ask you one more question with regard to the AWE back in 2012, when Mr. -- Joseph

Cocalisi(?) was involved, and Mr. Pasqualini.
At that time they submitted testimony and stated that $\$ 4$ million was made available to them through Westerly Wind to get the Project off the ground.

Is there anything like that in place on this project, a cap on, you know, spend this, get the Project up and running, then we'll talk?
A. (Weitzner) No. We have budgets of expected costs that we provide to our partner, RWE. But there are no caps. And in the budget is also included the assumption that we will be providing the project equity for Antrim Wind Energy.
Q. And that project equity, is that the
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\$11 million?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. Is there any more than that?
A. (Weitzner) What do you mean?
Q. That's the total amount that RWE is going to put in?
A. (Weitzner) No, not necessarily.
Q. Can you elaborate on that?
A. (Weitzner) If the Project needs more equity to get constructed, RWE will provide more equity to get the Project constructed.
Q. Then you make a statement on Page 3 of your testimony. This is APP 20, on Line 10. You said, as described in the Application -- let me go back. The full sentence starts on Line 9. "Walden will employ a traditional project financing structure for U.S. wind projects as described in our application, in which construction equity and construction debt will be sized to ensure the Project can always meet its operating costs and debt payments." Okay. So if you run out of cash at any point, for whatever reason -- the Project failed, you generated 37 percent capacity
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factor, operation and maintenance costs were higher than expected -- you're saying that RWE is standing by, ready to put in as much money to stay operational?
A. (Weitzner) No, I'm not necessarily saying that. I'm saying that the commitment to provide the equity to build the Project will come from RWE. We estimate that if it -- that it will be \$11 million. If it is more than that, then RWE is prepared to put in more. You're talking --
Q. I'm sorry.
A. (Weitzner) You're talking about -- so there's two separate things. There's the equity to build the Project -- so, the construction phase -- and then there's the operational phase. It's very hard to imagine a situation where in the operational phase the Project would not have enough cash flow to service the operational costs and the debt, again, as I've said, because of the very conservative nature of the revenue contracts, the operational contracts and the debt. So it's very hard to imagine a situation where the Project will need additional capital --
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Q. So you state --
A. (Weitzner) -- during operation. Sorry.
Q. On that same page, you state, on Line 4, that there will be sufficient capital to complete construction of the Project in a manner compliant with industry standards. So you're very confident that you're not -- there's -that your pro forma is conservative.
A. (Weitzner) Yes, I am. But -- yeah, I am.
Q. Okay. All right. So, okay. Then let's look at Supplemental Testimony on Page 6, Line 16. You take objection to a statement I had made in my prefiled testimony or supplement -- or prefiled testimony, where I say, "It is evident from AWE's application and testimonies that securing a long-term PPA is of singular import to the Project's viability." Okay. And then you go on to explain different means of meeting that separate from a PPA.

So, there's a PPA, you talk about a financial bank hedge, and then you talk about a synthetic PPA. Okay.

Now, in your own words on Page 7 of your testimony, you describe a "financial bank
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hedge" as replicating the financial component of a PPA. Is that your goal, though? In essence, a PPA would be the preferred route?
A. (Weitzner) PPA is preferred, yes.
Q. Okay. And, you know, just for that point, synthetic PPAs, if you were to go that route, they are typically not for 20 years; correct?
A. (Weitzner) Financial hedges are typically not for 20 years. The synthetic PPAs, such as a revenue swap, in some ways it is better than a PPA. It's -- they're trade-offs.
Q. But they're also risks, as you state in your testimony?
A. (Weitzner) I wouldn't call them "risks." They come at a price because, instead of just guaranteeing price, they guarantee the total revenue of the Project.
Q. But isn't it true that on a synthetic PPA, that usually doesn't involve every megawatt hour of generation? There is something established up front for the amount that it's going -- that will be covered.
A. (Weitzner) A financial hedge typically hedges less than the $P 50$ production. A synthetic PPA,
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when you're talking about a revenue swap -- the idea of a revenue swap is it's really like an insurance product, in that it guarantees a certain amount of revenue per year for the Project, regardless of where power prices are and regardless of how much the wind blows.
Q. I understand that. But at a 37 -- at a P50 of 37 percent?
A. (Weitzner) That would be a negotiation with the revenue -- with the provider of the revenue swap, how much revenue they will guarantee.
Q. Okay. And now I just wanted to address one point that you make in your supplemental testimony on Page 7 again. You state that approximately one third of the 4,800 megawatts of U.S. wind projects that came online in the early part of last year relied on financial hedges. That article that you were referencing is actually from 2015, not from 2016. So that would have been referring to 2014 production. Are you aware of that?
A. (Weitzner) That may be. If so, I apologize. I can tell you that still, right now, an enormous portion of the -- a similar portion of wind
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projects continue to rely on some form of a financial hedge rather than a PPA.
Q. Well, are you aware, also, that that same article stated that the vast majority of that wind [sic] that was under a hedge like that was in Texas?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. And when you say "many do," many wind projects that are installed today or 2015 and 2014, do you know of any that have been installed here in New England or in the Northeast under such a hedge?
A. (Weitzner) I can't say. I don't know. But for us, there are certainly some trade-offs doing a PPA. As I said, a PPA is better. The main reason a PPA is better is because, typically in a PPA you're hedging your P50 production. And in a financial hedge, you're hedging -- you're typically, but not always, hedging your P 99 production. So the hedge is a little bit less attractive to us, the equity. But still, a hedge still guarantees a significant portion of the revenue of the Project.
Q. So your objection to my statement would have
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been better if I had been a little bit more -less specific and said "securing a power off-take agreement as opposed to a PPA"?
A. (Weitzner) No. I think my objection was more specific than that. And I think maybe we didn't highlight it clearly enough in our application. But there was the implication in your testimony that, if we don't get a PPA, or even any kind of off-take, we're not financially viable, and that's not correct. The amount of secured cash flow that we generate through a PPA or financial hedge or however, that determines how much debt we can put on the Project. The more cash flow that we have secured, the more debt we can put on the project, and that means the less equity. As we have less cash flow secured, then we get less debt and we need to put in more equity. So, the financial viability isn't tied to having a PPA or not. It really just -- having a PPA or not, and what type of PPA and the price of the PPA and the tenor of the PPA, or the tenor of the off-take just determines how much equity we need to put in. So it's not of
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singular importance. We just need -- we just need to put in more equity.
Q. I understand that. And I guess I'm struggling, and perhaps it'll come out through this process. I'm struggling with this apparent "open check" that RWE is ready to put in, anywhere from $\$ 11$ million, from what you're saying today, to, what, $\$ 65$ million?
A. (Weitzner) Well, I don't think -- you know, I don't know. We haven't decided exactly how much equity we're willing to put in. But that's going to be a decision that is ultimately up to RWE and us about what makes financial sense for us. What makes financial sense for us has nothing to do with the financial viability of the Project. What $I$ was trying to get across is, once we have all of the construction financing in place, then the Project is financially viable.
Q. I understand. But that is a big question about how high RWE is going to go. And you're saying you don't know today?
A. (Shaw) I think what Mr. Weitzner is trying to say is he's trying to get as much secured cash
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flow on this project as he can, to raise as much debt as he can.

DR. WARD: Speak into the mic, please.

MR. SHAW: Yeah. Sorry.
A. (Shaw) And we haven't yet determined how much the final amount of secured cash flow is going to be; therefore, we haven't determined what the debt level is going to be, and therefore we don't know exactly what the equity ask is on this project. At RWE, we are not constrained in this order of magnitude with respect to how much equity we put in this deal.
Q. Okay. So, much will depend on, for the sake of simplicity, that secured revenue in the form of a PPA, or something that guarantees you some price on the -- let's keep it simple -- let's talk about PPAs -- some price on a megawatt hour sold or --
A. (Shaw) Not necessarily --
Q. Okay. Some guaranteed revenue stream. That's what you're looking for in the form of a contract or a hedge or something that will guarantee you, over a period of time, a revenue
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stream?
A. (Shaw) No --
Q. Okay. Then how --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: One at a time, please.
A. (Shaw) What $I$ was saying was, Henry and his team are out trying to secure as many contracts for the output from this project as possible. That will then determine how much debt they can raise against the Project and therefore back-calculate into how much equity we need to contribute to the Project.
A. (Weitzner) And if I could add something to that. We're very confident that we're going to get the overwhelming majority of this project cash-flow-contracted.
Q. Okay. So you're confident, then, you'll get it contracted, and you're confident the \$11 million is all RWE is going to have to put in.
A. (Weitzner) I think $\$ 11$ million is, yes, a very reasonable number. Could it be a little more? Yes. Could it be less? Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. So let me look on page --
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[WITNESS PANEL: WEITZNER|SHAW]
okay. On Page 13 of your testimony, I want to talk a little bit about the market pricing. In one of your objections to my analysis on future energy prices, it said -- I'm looking at an eight-year horizon on electricity prices. And you're saying the Project should be at least a 20-year, okay. Or, for that matter, perhaps coinciding with --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. -- coinciding with the project life. Then you provide a table of energy prices after 2015. And that would be on Page 14.

Okay. Now, you state multiple times in your testimony that you've been in the energy business for a long time and, you know, you know what you're talking about. And I take that at your word. And my question is: What historical basis do you have to show an ever-increasing energy price? What do you know about New England's energy prices for the last three decades that says prices will only go up?
A. (Weitzner) So, first of all, this is not saying that energy prices will only always go up. This is saying, using your numbers and your
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analysis and extending that out from 8 years to 20 years, that the numbers that I provide a final price on the right-hand side of that column is roughly where a person who is looking to price 20 -year energy would price it. That one -- that $\$ 1.50$ increase year over year doesn't necessarily represent an increase in energy prices in the future. It simply represents roughly a 2 -percent inflation rate, which is pretty standard. And if you look over not just where U.S. inflation over long periods of time has run, but also where someone likely to price this would assume for years going beyond 2025, where, you know, you don't have the CME prices to depend on. But the important thing here is that, while we're talking about forecasting energy in the future, that's not really relevant to our financial viability either. I think, as $I$ was saying with Dr. Ward, we're going to enter into some kind of arrangement to hedge the cash flows of this project now. So a forecast for what energy prices do in the future is irrelevant.
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Q. That's not what I'm getting at when I -- with regard to my testimony. The point is how willing are people -- the whole point is to discuss what was the market -- what is the market value of energy and wind energy in New England. And you seem to bypass that discussion entirely, saying we'll get a PPA, so it's irrelevant. But those PPAs are priced according to market value; isn't that true?
A. (Weitzner) Yes, and we know exactly where market value is because we're in conversation with many people who are interested in buying PPAs. We've already entered into one. So we have a very good idea where that person thinks long-term energy is. We have talked to two financial institutions that provide financial swaps. They've indicated where they're interested in. So we have a lot of knowledge about where the market is today to value this project, and our pro forma is based on the conversations we are having right now about where people are willing to buy power for this project.
Q. And you're saying they're all in the $\$ 80$ range.
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A. (Weitzner) No, I'm not saying that.
Q. Your pro forma assumes somewhere in the $\$ 80$ range.
A. (Weitzner) It does not.
Q. It does not?
A. (Weitzner) No. You've seen it.
Q. I have seen it.
A. (Weitzner) It's not 80.
Q. Okay. It's around 76, and then you -- or 75.
A. I thought it was -- is this confidential?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Are we talking
about --
MS. LINOWES: I'm sorry.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: -- the public
documents provided here?
MS. LINOWES: I'm sorry. I
apologize. I don't know what the number is. I was just -- I move to strike that.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: We'll
strike that.
MS. LINOWES: I apologize, Mr.
Chairman.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. So the -- we'll talk about that in
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non-public then.
And when you are looking at market pricing, what you're saying is that, regardless of whatever energy prices will do in the future, you're finding people that are interested in paying what you want --
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. -- sufficient to make your pro forma work.
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. Now, you also take objection to the REC market pricing that you have in there. And you state on -- this would be on Page 14 of your testimony --

MR. IACOPINO: Testimony or supplemental?

MS. LINOWES: Supplemental testimony, APP 20.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. You see this in the last line, "We can see that the price increases substantially over time" for RECs. Now, is that discussion also irrelevant to you, about where RECs are going?
A. (Weitzner) When I said, "prices increase substantially over time," I was actually
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referring to the broker sheet that you provided from ICAP that showed prices in 2016, prices for 2017, prices for 2018 increasing. I wasn't talking about where REC -- if it's not clear, I apologize. I wasn't talking about where REC prices will be in those future years. I'm referring to where ICAP is saying they are today for 2018, 2019, 2020, which is increasing. 2018 is higher than '17, and '19 is higher than '18, et cetera. It's sloping up.

But again, back to the same comment on the power prices. I disagree with your analysis on the REC market. But it is irrelevant to our financial viability and our financial analysis. We are basing our pro forma and our returns expectations on what we are seeing right now where we can get things done. And -- yup.
Q. On that New Hampshire Electric Co-op contract that you have signed, did the Electric Co-op go out to bid for a competitive bid, or did they just -- how did they arrive at whatever number is in there?
A. (Weitzner) I don't know how New Hampshire
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Electric Co-op arrived at that number. We had a tough and strenuous negotiating process. But I don't know what went on, on their side.
Q. Did they go out to competitive bid?
A. (Weitzner) I don't know. We weren't involved in a competitive process with them. But what they've done on the other side, I don't know. Okay. Then I'm all set. Thank you.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you. New Hampshire Audubon, do you have questions, and if so, how long?

MR. FROLING: No, we don't have any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.

So we'll go to Counsel for the Public. And if I understood the request earlier, you'll do public questions, and then we'll round back to a non-public session; correct?

MS. MALONEY: I believe so.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
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Please proceed.
MS. MALONEY: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. MALONEY:
Q. I'm just going to go back and forth between some questions, Mr. Weitzner. And I have some questions for you, Mr. Shaw. You've been fairly quiet here today.

Mr. Weitzner, when this project was first -- when the Application was first filed, RWE was involved, but the structure was slightly different; correct?
A. (Weitzner) The structure between Walden and Eolian was a little different, but not the structure between RWE and Walden.
Q. But as of March, isn't that when RWE became --
A. (Weitzner) No. March is when Walden Green Energy purchased Eolian. So the relationship between RWE and Walden hasn't changed.
Q. Okay. And are you equal partners in Walden Energy?
A. (Weitzner) With RWE?
Q. Correct.
A. (Weitzner) They are majority owner. They
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provide the majority equity. And the board is split 50/50 between Walden Green Energy and RWE.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms. Maloney, you think maybe you can move the mic a little bit closer?

MS. MALONEY: I will.
BY MS. MALONEY:
Q. You've indicated that RWE is going to provide the equity. And right now, you're saying it's \$11 million, but it could be more.
A. (Weitzner) It could be more, could be less.
Q. Okay. With respect to RWE -- now Mr. Shaw. You're the global head of Principal Investments for RWE Supply and Trading?
A. (Shaw) That's correct.
Q. And you also are the CEO of RWE Trading Americas; correct?
A. (Shaw) That's also correct.
Q. And all of these are wholly-owned subsidiaries of RWE?
A. (Shaw) Yes.
Q. And thus far, $I$ don't think we have a whole lot of information about RWE. You've indicated
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that it has a market capitalization of $\$ 12.9$ billion, assets of $\$ 104$ billion. I don't know if that's dollars or -- and operating revenues of $\$ 63.3$ billion. And that's -- those are really, really big numbers. But what I really don't -- you haven't provided anything more about, for example, your debt or your obligations or anything else that might be going on with the company presently.
A. (Shaw) Right. And I'm probably not the right person to answer those in detail. RWE is a large public company, so all of our financial statements and financial information is provided in the public domain for anybody to pull down. But $I$ can give you, you know, a sense for what it is.
Q. Well, the public -- you can certainly answer some of these questions. Trust me, I'm not going to get into the nitty gritty. But, you know, I became aware that as of 2011, I guess, Germany, as a result of Fukushima, issued -the government of Germany issued orders to shut down all nuclear plants by 2022. And that has caused a great deal of problems for RWE. And
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|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | then, since then, it's been sort of a slide, |
| 2 |  | and the company has lost about 70 percent of |
| 3 |  | its value. And actually, there are discussions |
| 4 |  | ongoing about bankruptcy. At least that's |
| 5 |  | what's going on in the public sector. Are you |
| 6 |  | familiar with that? |
| 7 | A. | (Shaw) I think there's probably speculation |
| 8 |  | about almost every public company. But the |
| 9 |  | fact is that RWE still remains a triple -- |
| 10 |  | (Court Reporter interrupts.) |
| 11 | A. | (Shaw) Remains an investment-grade credit-rated |
| 12 |  | entity. |
| 13 | Q. | Well -- |
| 14 | A. | (Shaw) There's certainly no doubt that there |
| 15 |  | have been challenges in the continental |
| 16 |  | European energy markets, you know, both from |
| 17 |  | the shutdown of nuclear and the rapid build of |
| 18 |  | renewables. And we participate in that market |
| 19 |  | and therefore are affected by it. |
| 20 | 2. | Well, if you don't mind, I'd like to discuss |
| 21 |  | that a little bit with you. |
| 22 |  | I've got a number of exhibits, starting |
| 23 |  | with No. CP2 through CP7 for identification |
| 24 |  | that I would like to circulate. |
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And these are not on the list; is that correct?

MS. MALONEY: They are not.
MR. IACOPINO: You should provide them to Barry first.

MS. MALONEY: I've got them for everybody.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Why don't we go off the record while we're sorting this out.
(The documents were herewith marked as Exhibits CFP 2 through 7 for identification.)
[Ms. Maloney distributing documents.]
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: We're back on the record.
Q. Just directing your attention to Counsel for the Public Exhibit 3 for identification, this was an article that appeared in The Economist on July [sic] 7th of 2014. That discusses essentially the beginning of the slide for RWE. First page, if you look at the second sentence, "Having overinvested in gas- and coal-fired plants before the financial crisis, the two
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largest" -- E.ON? I'm not sure how that's pronounced.
A. (Shaw) You can pronounce it "eon."
Q. "E.ON and RWE, ended up with excess capacity and the ensuing downturn, just as lavish subsidies to wind- and solar-power producers were bringing a host new competitors to market."

So, at that time, is it fair to say that RWE was primarily invested in the coal energy production and nuclear?
A. (Shaw) At that time, about the time of the financial downturn, $I$ think that would be an accurate statement.
Q. Okay. And later on it indicates that the German government decided that all nuclear plants in the country must close by 2022, bringing forward the huge cost of decommissioning them. And that would be placed on RWE's shoulders; correct?
A. Well, that's actually the subject of a very detailed negotiation between the German government and RWE at this point. But certainly part of it would be on our, RWE's
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shoulders.
Q. And it further indicates that the shares in the two power giants have fallen half in the past five years; so, basically, since the announcement. And further on, on Page 2 of the article, it indicates you also hope the courts will come to your aid.

So, currently, do you have lawsuits pending against the government of Germany?
A. (Shaw) I don't know, actually.
Q. If you'll refer to Page 2, the last paragraph there, it indicates that they have come late to the renewable energy business, and going big on wind and solar just when the government is trying to cut its subsidiaries may not be a wise move. Understanding -- and I think that reference is to RWE and E.ON. Understanding obviously that's Germany and not the United States -- we still have Production Tax Credit and Investment Tax Credit. But that was -that is sort of a perfect storm that was going on in Germany at the time in 2014; correct?
A. (Shaw). Yes, it's difficult to argue that the business conditions for RWE and E.ON in Germany
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have been ideal.
Q. Have been what?
A. (Shaw) Far less than ideal. Difficult to argue with the notion that --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Shaw) I was going to say that it has been a difficult market time for E.ON and RWE, which is what this article is telling you.

Right, in 2014. And if you reference CP3 for identification, this is an article from Reuters that appears on April 23rd, 2015. And I'll just touch upon it a little bit, because it looks like it's just continuing reporting on this slide. If you reference the first paragraph, it talks about Germany's largest power producer, RWE --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MS. MALONEY: I'm so sorry.
MR. RICHARDSON: We're going really
fast, and I don't even know if the witness has ever seen this. And I'm trying to follow, and it's challenging. I imagine for the witness as well --

MS. MALONEY: I think if the witness
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is having a problem, he can tell me.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: True. But for the transcriptionist, if you could slow down --

MS. MALONEY: I will.
MR. RICHARDSON: Just I'm having a problem as well.

MS. MALONEY: I'll slow down.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
BY MS. MALONEY:
Q. If you reference the first paragraph in that article on the second page, it says, April 23rd, "Germany's largest power producer, RWE, will explore a split of its businesses if the sector's crisis intensifies." And your chief executive officer, Peter Terium, was keeping the option of a drastic overhaul similar to $\mathrm{E} . \mathrm{ON}$. But we don't know what that was about, about future -- I'm sure you can explain that, or not.
A. (Shaw) Is that a question?
Q. Yes.
A. (Shaw) What's the question?
Q. If RWE had explored a split of its businesses.
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[WITNESS PANEL: WEITZNER|SHAW]
A. (Shaw) Oh, yeah, absolutely. And that's all well documented in the press as well. We have, as a company, without going into too much excruciating detail, but we've separated out our grid businesses and the biggest part of our renewables businesses, the sort of core of those businesses, into a company or a division of the company which is separate from the original or the conventional generation part of the business.
Q. Right. We can talk about that a little bit later. But in here, midway through the page, Mr. Terium indicates, "The crisis is far from over. Times will get harder." And you were familiar with that as this was happening; correct?
A. (Shaw) Yes, I'm familiar with the general market conditions that we face in Europe.
Q. And then it references that the crisis -- down in the third to the bottom of the page, "The crisis has also triggered fears over whether Germany's utilities will be able to survive the fundamental shift that is taking place in the power sector, but Terium said there was no risk
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of an insolvency in the short term."
A. (Shaw) That's what it says.
Q. Do you know what he meant by "short term"?
A. (Shaw) I don't know exactly what he was referring to when he was doing this particular interview, no.
Q. Okay. And then I'd like to direct your attention to CP4 for identification. This is an article in The Wall Street Journal that appeared on August 11th, 2015. And this indicated that RWE AG plans to cut its profit outlook for 2015 when it reports its first-half earnings on Thursday. Again, you're familiar with the ongoing decline of RWE at that time?
A. (Shaw) Yeah, this article is from last year. But, yes, I'm aware.
Q. And then CP5 for identification, again, another article from The Wall Street Journal. This is from February 17th of 2016. In this particular article, it indicated that your shares plummeted, essentially, I believe, as a result of RWE announcing that it was not giving any dividend at all to shareholders, I guess of common stock, in 2015; is that correct?
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A. (Shaw) I believe that's what this article is referring to, yes.
Q. And if you turn the page, Page 2 of 4, it indicated that shares in the Germany power company fell more than 13 percent after Chief Executive Peter Terium said RWE would suspend the payment of dividends on its ordinary shares and drastically reduce the payoff for holders of its preferred stock, raising worries about the state of the group's finances. RWE had a net debt of around 25.1 billion -- and I think that's euros -- 28.4 billion at the end of last year. So, the end of 2015.
A. (Shaw) Correct.
Q. So you're familiar with that as well?
A. (Shaw) I see what's on the page, yes.
Q. Well, I mean --
A. (Shaw) I mean, I think that's generally the number of net debt that's thrown around within the financial community.
Q. I think, if you look a couple paragraphs down, it talks -- it states -- "It also illustrates how a perfect storm of higher taxes, tougher regulations and low electricity prices in a
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market swamped by new supplies of subsidized renewable energy is still rumbling over the utilities sector in Germany" -- "in Europe, most intensely in Germany... a situation made worse by falling oil and gas prices."

Again, that is the situation in Germany. We have obviously lower gas and oil prices here in the United States. I don't think we'd call it a "perfect storm." But that is what was going on. That was what was impacting RWE at that time.
A. (Shaw) Hmm-hmm.
Q. That and Germany's regulations and the government orders that they shut down the nuclear facilities by 2022.
A. (Shaw) Correct.
Q. Further down, if you look at the bottom of that Page 2 of 4, it talks about Moody's placed its ratings of RWE and E.ON on review for downgrade. "The ratings agency cited the companies' significant exposure to declining commodity and power prices and limited financial flexibility."

So when you were talking about the
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[WITNESS PANEL: WEITZNER|SHAW]
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larger. The lower prices -- the next chart -and I don't think that's comparative to here. It talks about wind pushing out coal. But that's what was going on in Germany. The third chart, Page 2, talks about RWE's debt risk versus Iberdrola. That's the Spanish wind company. And then the last chart talks about the gloomy outlook. Again, on Page 2 of 4. There is some discussion about, the second paragraph -- well, actually, the first paragraph, under that first chart, it talks about the cost of insurance against the default at RWE was a near record in March. Do you know what that's in reference to?
A. (Shaw) I believe that's the price of the credit default swap, yes.
Q. And -- right. Next paragraph talks about Iberdrola's credit default swap is 41 percent cheaper.

The second paragraph talks about Germany's government negotiating with utilities to close coal plants, which along with nuclear shutdowns will cost 25,000 jobs.

Would that be just RWE? Do you know if
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you had any discussion at your level about loss of jobs as a result of that downturn?
A. (Shaw) Oh, there's discussions in every European utility about the potential loss of jobs from the massive challenges that are facing it with the rise of renewables. So, yes.
Q. Further on in that paragraph, it indicates that shutting coal-fired stations immediately after forcing nuclear shutdowns will incur large costs and might destroy a company like RWE, Germany's biggest power producer, and that RWE declined to comment on that.
A. (Shaw) Yeah. I mean, I don't think we would comment on that. I think you look at the financial markets for the prices of our debt, which are, in corporate bond terms, very, very low. All of these articles need to be taken in the proper context, I think.
Q. Okay. But you do have an opportunity to comment somewhere.
A. (Shaw) Okay. When you've gone through all your articles. I didn't want to interrupt your flow.
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Q. Okay. I just want to direct your attention again to CP7 for identification. This is from Global Edition of Handelsblatt, which identifies itself as "Germany's leading business and finance daily."
A. (Shaw) You can think of it as the The Wall Street Journal of Germany.
Q. That's what $I$ sort of thought. At least I could read this. It wasn't in German. There were several I couldn't read 'cause they were in German.

This is dated September 9th of this year. And it references that RWE, at the top of the page on the first page, is expected to start posting losses in two to three years' time from its conventional energy business due to low energy prices.

This references that there were a number of cost-cutting measures and also, I believe, references -- if you turn to Page 2, I think it's discussing -- and take your time to read it -- you were talking about an offshoot, a company that RWE was -- had formed to hold the renewables.
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A. (Shaw) Well, to hold a series of businesses. That includes the majority of the renewables business, yes.
Q. Is that company called Innogy?
A. (Shaw) Innogy. Correct.
Q. Is that the one referenced?

And here on Page 2 there's some reference to that company was formed to sort of "sell off the silverware" of the company. I think what they're -- the implication is that the rest of the company's going south and they're trying to --
A. I think --
Q. -- protect this one sector.
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Shaw) So I think that may be one of the points in the article. But you'll note that Peter Terium rejected the notion that we're "selling the silverware." I can walk you through, actually, what's going on here.
Q. Can $I$ just -- one more question about Innogy. Innogy, though, is sort of -- it actually goes for an IPO next month.
A. (Shaw) I believe that is the intention. But I
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don't know for sure.
Q. And there's actually quite a bit hanging on that, isn't there?
A. (Shaw) I don't know what that means.
Q. For the financial viability of RWE.
A. (Shaw) I think the plan that the company has to manage this transition to the new energy world is -- the pillar of it is in energy, yes.
Q. And $I$ guess the point of bringing up all of this, Mr. Shaw, is that, looking at what was presented here, we didn't really get a full snapshot of what RWE is. Granted, it is a large utility. But my concern as Counsel for the Public is that, you know, as the old saying goes, "The bigger they are, the bigger they fall."

So, my question is: You have money that I'm assuming is set aside for equity. But you also have contracts to draft, and you have banks that have to do due diligence and lend you money. And I'm assuming your contracts -isn't that correct?
A. (Shaw) Well, we have banks that need to lend the project money.
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A. (Weitzner) Let me interrupt and address that. I think Eric can definitely talk about the RWE side. But in terms of how the RWE name is received in the financial institution -financial markets, that's something we're -- in some ways, I'm better qualified to discuss.
A. (Shaw) Probably true.
A. (Weitzner) RWE has BBB- credit rating, which is investment grade. It has a substantial balance sheet. And what we are finding when we're talking to banks and entering into other contracts is that the RWE name is -- opens a lot of doors, and people are quite anxious and interested in lending money, you know, backed by the RWE name. That's what we're finding when we're talking to large and highly creditworthy institutions like Citibank BBB+, and State Street that has an A rating, et cetera.
A. (Shaw) Perhaps it's helpful to put some of these numbers in context when we're talking about $\$ 11$ million of equity for this project. RWE is undoubtedly in the midst of an energy transition from the old world to the new
world. It has been aggressively investing in wind power around the world in the last few years, and it continues that push. We operate now over 3,500 megawatts. That's

3,500 megawatts of wind power in various jurisdictions, both onshore and offshore. We have capital close to 6 billion euros in renewables worldwide. The equity check here, whether it's $\$ 11$ million or whether it grows from there, as was referred to earlier, is largely immaterial to that size of a company. RWE is 113 years old. It's been through any number of transitions, political and economic. I don't think there's any expectation, realistic expectation in the financial community, either from the equity or the debt side, that the company is in any peril of going bankrupt. I think you see that reflected in the absolute levels of the debt costs that we have been borrowing. And you also see it in our stock price, which has been rallying strongly over the last week on the expectations of the Innogy flotation that you refer to. We expect to raise somewhere between 2 and
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4 billion euros next month when we float Innogy. And a good chunk of that is going to go to investment in renewables.
Q. But isn't it true that RWE -- I understand the 11 million is not -- might be a drop in the bucket to you. I'd like to win a lottery ticket for 11 million.

But isn't it true that RWE has about 45 billion euros in long-term liabilities and only eight times the equity? I mean, isn't that accurate?
A. (Shaw) I think the relevant number is net debt, which is 25 billion, as you pointed out earlier. But all that information, not taken piecemeal, but in its totality, is wrapped up in the credit ratings that we're awarded by the credit rating agencies and the rates at which we're able to borrow debt at the corporate level. But again, these are discussions about sizes of numbers which far dwarf our obligations to this project. So the financial viability of this project needs to be considered in the context of how big an obligation it is to RWE.
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[WITNESS PANEL: WEITZNER|SHAW]
Q. And I appreciate that. What I'm concerned about is, you know, when I see headlines -- and I read a translation of a headline in a newspaper called Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, and it was unfortunately in German. But I did read enough of the English translation of the headline "The Last Days of RWE." That causes me some concern that -- and it actually goes into the detail about the financial problems of RWE. And I am concerned about a bankruptcy by RWE. And so I have to ask those questions and what implication that would have, seeing as the companies that you're the CEO and chair of, global head of fully-owned subsidiaries, and that you now have ownership in part of Walden and Antrim Wind.
A. (Shaw) Right. And --
Q. And I don't know bankruptcy law in Germany. I don't know anybody who does --
A. (Weitzner) So let me --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MR. RICHARDSON: Can I just object to the question, because the witnesses aren't being given the opportunity to respond to the
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 1/Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-13-16\}
statements. I just heard about an article that was allegedly -- and I'm not discounting that you did this. But, I mean, without being able to see the article or the translation, you're having someone say in the courtroom that it says this when the witness hasn't seen it. I mean, I'm looking at trying to assess what weight to give this. And I think the witness needs to be given a chance to respond to the evidence that's being presented, and I'm not seeing that happen right now. Right now, all I hear is that there are articles, and the only thing the witness has really said is that the words on the page are what the article says. But we're not hearing whether or not the conclusions in those articles are accurate. I think that is -- I mean, it makes for exciting transcripts, but we want to get to the truth of it.

MS. MALONEY: I do. We're talking about one article. I showed the witnesses all the other articles. And I don't --

BY MS. MALONEY:
Q. I imagine with a headline of that nature, you
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probably heard about it. Are you saying you didn't hear about that from the FAZ?
A. (Shaw) I'm not sure if I heard about that specific article. I certainly haven't read the translation of it, and I don't read German. But I will say, you know, it's not surprising to me that there's sensationalist headlines with these titles out there, given the scale of the change.

What I'm saying is, rather than picking a certain number of articles from the press, if you're truly trying to assess the financial future of RWE, you need to look to the financial markets and the ratings agencies and look to what they're telling you --
Q. Well --
A. (Shaw) I'm saying I personally believe there's not any material risk of any bankruptcy of any RWE entity for the foreseeable future. And we've been through this in detail internally. But I'm not objective on that subject --
Q. I appreciate that. But you don't dispute that the company's lost 70 percent of its value since 2011.
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A. (Shaw) I think that -- I'm not sure that's the right number. But it has lost quite a lot of equity value. There's no doubt.
Q. And you don't doubt there's repercussions in other countries, like England, with EnPower(?), where they've been laying off people and --
A. (Shaw) Correct. Yeah. But there is a transition going on, and we're re-deploying our investable capital. We're taking it away from the conventional generation world and we're putting it to the renewable energy world, and this project is part of that wave of investment.
Q. And this project is a small project --
A. (Shaw) Very. You know, as you said -PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: One at a time.
A. (Shaw) But it's caught up in this wave of investment that we're redirecting toward renewable energy.
Q. And that's what I'm concerned about, 'cause I've also looked at your financial statements and the losses from 2014 to 2015. And my concern I think is a very real one, that
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bankruptcy could be at risk. So my question is --
A. (Shaw) That's fine. I would also be concerned about that if $I$ were doing the same assessment you were. But I think all you can do is look to what the experts say about what the financial condition of this company is, because it's large, very complex --
Q. But you didn't --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. I appreciate that. But you didn't provide very much information about your company up front, and you filed supplemental testimony twice --
A. (Shaw) Right.
Q. -- and you didn't provide additional information about the company. And I think that we have a right to know what the debt situation is and what the future obligations are of the company as well --
A. (Shaw) Absolutely, and that's all publicly available --
Q. -- because, for example, what happens if RWE goes bankrupt --
A. Yeah --
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(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So, as to the witnesses, I appreciate you wanting to answer, and that's great. I'll say two things: Let Attorney Maloney finish and then, space, you can start so we get it on the record. And I got to assume, also, at redirect, your attorney will give you an opportunity to say what you needed to say also, okay. Thank you.
Q. That was my question.
A. (Weitzner) So, I think it's important to understand -- you were saying you don't know what bankruptcy laws in Germany are like and that that has somehow an influence on this. And I want to underline the fact that it does not have, or barely -- it's very difficult to draw a line between bankruptcy laws and the safe operation -- the safe construction, operation and decommissioning of the Antrim Wind Project. Ultimately, RWE's responsibility is going to be to provide the equity, the $\$ 11$ million, as soon as we get a permit to start construction. And after that, what you have is an independent project entity, as I've said in
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the past, that is based on extremely conservative assumptions about wind production and extremely conservative levels of debt. So, even if RWE were to go bankrupt -- and I couldn't agree with Mr. Shaw more, that it's almost an unimaginable situation, in spite of the sensationalist stuff in the press. Even if it were to go bankrupt, it doesn't matter. The Antrim Wind Energy, LLC is still a viable and profitable entity whether RWE is there or not.
Q. So, wouldn't it be one of RWE's assets, though?
A. (Weitzner) Yes. And as an asset it could get sold, sure. But that does not change the fact that it has an obligation to service its debt and its operating costs, which are sized in such a fashion that 99 years out of 100 they will be able to service that. And it doesn't get out of its obligation to issue a decommissioning irrevocable letter of credit or bond to ensure that at the end of its useful life, or if there are any problems, there is always the money to decommission the Project. An RWE bankruptcy doesn't change and can't change any of those requirements, precisely an
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irrevocable letter of credit or decommissioning bond and the sizing of the debt.
Q. Well, if it gets sold, $I$ mean, is it going to get sold for 100 cents on the dollar or. --
A. (Weitzner) Again, that doesn't matter. It doesn't affect the financial viability of the entity. It doesn't affect its ability to continue paying its CAPEX, and it certainly doesn't affect its requirements to have the decommissioning money available for a safe decommission.
Q. So your testimony is that it has no effect on your ability to get financing through the banks.
A. (Weitzner) Well, my testimony right now is, because RWE is a BBB- credit investment grade, that we're having absolutely no problem discussing and having financial conversations with the banks. And they're extremely happy to be lending money to the RWE name. Very happy. And that's also repeating what Mr. Shaw said, that the borrowing cost for RWE are still extremely low, and that's really the indication of the true market's assessment of its
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financial health.
Q. But if RWE were to go bankrupt next week, the week after, energy doesn't produce the way it's expected to produce, I mean, what then happens to your ratings?
A. (Weitzner) So, we don't have a credit rating. If RWE goes bankrupt tomorrow, then we don't have the $\$ 11$ million and the Project doesn't get built. But once the $\$ 11$ million is there and deployed, then, by nature of the very conservative construction of project financing in this country, what you have is a very viable, safe, conservative project entity that can continue operating safely for its operational life, 25, 30 years, whatever that is.
Q. And --
A. (Shaw) Let's be clear. We're talking about a company that maintains an investment-grade credit rating, okay. We're talking about a company that borrows money today at, I believe, less than 150 basis points over LIBOR, which is close to zero. So we borrow money for less than 2 percent, okay. That's what the
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financial markets are telling us about our financial health and our financial outlook. We are having hypotheticals about infinitesimally small probabilities here, in my opinion.
Q. So what you're saying, for example, the Town of Antrim should have no worries about its PILOT.
A. (Weitzner) About its what? Sorry.
Q. Its PILOT.
A. (Shaw) Who was that question for?
A. (Weitzner) For me. The PILOT is one of the operating expenses that a bank factors into its calculation of how much cash flow this project will generate and therefore how much debt it can service.
Q. And Mr. Shaw, you're assuring this committee that there is virtually no chance for RWE to go bankrupt prior to the completion of these proceedings.
A. (Shaw) What I'm telling you is that the financial markets are telling you that. To the best of my knowledge, that's my belief as well, personal belief. If there's information I don't have or $I$ don't know, then $I$ can't control for that. But absolutely, in my view,
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you're talking about an infinitesimally small probability.
Q. Well, I agree. But the financial markets have shown the company's lost 70 percent of its net worth, that you didn't issue shareholders dividends, that stock prices have dropped tremendously --
A. (Shaw) Yeah, we stipulated -- I mean, we've agreed that there's a massive energy transition going on in Europe. It's not just Germany and it's not just RWE. But there's a massive transformation happening. We're participating in that transformation, and the company is going to look different when it comes out the other side of that. That's the reason we split the company into two. That's the reason we're going forward with the Innogy flotation, which, by all accounts in the press this week, if you want to keep talking about the press, the flotation of Innogy will be wildly successful relative to expectations. And, yeah, in my opinion, there's no probability that RWE goes bankrupt in any near term.
Q. You indicated that if it were to go bankrupt,
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there would be no $\$ 11$ million, there would be no project; is that correct? And I assume there would be no financing either.
A. (Weitzner) I mean, if you want me to engage in this unbelievably wild hypothetical, we could find -- we would not have -- I can say we would not have a problem finding another person willing to put in the equity of a similar or higher credit rating.
Q. I might ask you a few questions, Mr. Weitzner, now, just a couple things.

With respect to your supplemental testimony where you are primarily critiquing Ms. Linowes, she did some research, and there's a chart in her testimony indicating, I guess, the net capacity factor -- or the actual production at, I think Granite Reliable and the other wind projects, was about 31 percent. Do you have any reason to dispute that? Because you didn't dispute it in your supplemental testimony.
A. (Weitzner) I have no knowledge of what Granite Reliable's capacity factor is. But I don't see how that has any relevance to Antrim Wind
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 1/Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-13-16\}

Energy's capacity factor that was arrived at after four years of wind collection, LIDAR campaign, and was calculated by a meteorological group that has done these calculations on many, many gigawatts, and I would say the industry has accepted as the highest quality.
Q. But are you aware that on those other projects they had come to this Committee with a higher net capacity factor?
A. (Weitzner) I'm not aware, no.
Q. Is it possible, though, I mean, that Antrim Wind could have a lower net capacity factor than 37 percent?
A. (Weitzner) It's certainly possible. I wouldn't expect that to happen. But two key things to keep in mind: For there to be any financial stress in the project, it would need to produce below 26 percent, because the banks calculate -- they look at what the expected locked-in revenues are, what the operating costs are, what the debt is, and they say, well, you may say -- it may be 37 percent, but the limiting factor on how much money they'll
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lend is that they assume it's going to produce 26 percent. So it's already an extremely conservative approach.

MS. MALONEY: Okay. I don't think I have anything else.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
So, before we go to non-public session, are there any questions from the Subcommittee for the panel? Commissioner Rose.

CMSR. ROSE: Just one quick question. The P99 that was referenced, is that the same as the 26 percent that the bank calculates off of their analysis?

WITNESS WEITZNER: Yes.
CMSR. ROSE: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Anybody else? Okay.

QUESTIONS BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Concerning the bank loans, are the banks lending to Antrim Wind Energy or to Walden or to RWE?
A. (Weitzner) They're lending to Antrim Wind Energy. So those loans are collateralized by the assets of Antrim Wind Energy, which
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includes the equipment, the PPAs, the lease contracts, et cetera.
Q. Are there any guaranties by any of the Walden entities to those -- to that debt financing?
A. (Weitzner) No. These are -- project financing in the U.S., typical is what are called "non-recourse loans." So the loans are secured against the assets of Antrim Wind Energy, and that's it.
Q. Thank you.

And concerning RWE, RWE is giving the $\$ 11$ million to Walden, who is then giving it to RWE? How is that flowing, and what is RWE getting in return?
A. (Weitzner) It is -- that is how it's flowing. We have a regular procedure in process for requisitioning funds from RWE. They get paid to Walden, and then Walden disburses those to our project entities. So it will flow like that: RWE to Walden to Antrim. And Antrim -excuse me -- Walden Green Energy is 100 percent owner of Antrim Wind Energy. RWE is majority owner in Walden. So they will be getting the majority of the profits from the Antrim Wind
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Energy flowing through Walden.
MS. WEATHERSBY: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Clifford. I think I need to give you my microphone.

MR. CLIFFORD: I just have one quick question, or actually two.

QUESTIONS BY MR. CLIFFORD:
Q. One was you talked about the limiting factor for essentially the bank financing, the production of roughly 26 percent. So, using that as a floor, have you done a break-even analysis, and would you care to share that percentage? In other words, for the Project itself, what percentage of capacity do you need to -- do you consistently need just to cover your bare bones costs, lending costs, capital costs, et cetera?
A. (Weitzner) That is that 26 percent. The 26 percent is a 1.0 debt service coverage ratio. That means, essentially, whatever the facility produces, first it goes to pay the operating costs to keep the utility producing, then it goes to service to debt, and then -- so
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in that case, there would be no money left over.
Q. And then the second question is --
A. (Weitzner) If I could just add one thing. That includes payments to the PILOT. That is an obligation. So it's all the operating costs, including the PILOT.
Q. Okay. And then the second question was, you talked in your testimony earlier about the MOUs, the letters. And aren't the language in those consistent with sort of the terms of -(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. Aren't the terms in those letters similar to the comfort letter and the IPO circular letter, where a formal letter isn't issued until the Project is actually green-lighted and set in motion?
A. (Weitzner) Exactly, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I have a couple questions also.

QUESTIONS BY PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT:
Q. Mr. Weitzner, going back to your discussion with Mr. Ward, you were talking about the Forward Capacity Market in ISO-New England.
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A. (Weitzner) Yup.
Q. I was intrigued, 'cause I follow some of this sometimes. What kind of assumptions did you make for the Forward Capacity Market? Were you projecting like a capacity-constrained market moving forward, or can you just characterize directionally?
A. (Weitzner) We didn't make any assumptions. We won a capacity allocation in FCA10. So we have seven years of capacity allocation. So we didn't make an assumption about whether it's constrained or not. Important to note: In our pro forma that we provided, all we do is -- the only thing we included in our pro forma is that seven years of capacity allocation that we know we will receive. We did not include a capacity allocation for years 8 through 20. I think that's a very conservative assumption. We believe there will be capacity auctions that we can participate in. I don't have a view on whether capacity prices are going up or down, so we just put in zeros for years 8 through 20.
Q. And inherent in your conversation, you talk about being penalized if you can't produce when
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you're asked to.
A. (Weitzner) Yeah.
Q. So that implies to me that you're obviously following the new changes that will come in effect in that time frame.
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. And again, to reiterate, you feel comfortable that that proposition is still there for you to take a capacity supply obligation.
A. (Weitzner) Yes. It's very attractive for wind projects. I think the new capacity design is very attractive, so we've taken advantage of it, yeah.
Q. Excellent. Piggybacking on Mr. Clifford's questions about the letters of intent, are you aware of any cases where these are withdrawn unless there's some significant changes to the conditions of the projects that they're being issued for?
A. (Weitzner) No, I'm not aware of any. Yeah, I'm not aware of any. I think it's important that, you know, our -- the reason we went out and got these letters of intent was twofold and was -No. 1 was to demonstrate to the Committee that
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banks take this project seriously. And I think those letters of intent clearly indicate they do. And then, equally important to us was to go to these banks that validate our opinion that this is a good and financially viable project. So we've had that confirmed, I would say, on both ends. I think we can state to the Committee that this is very viable, and we're confident ourselves that it's viable.
Q. So, process-wise, Mr. Needleman --

ADMIN. MONROE: Bob --
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: MORe
questions. I'm sorry. Mr. Boisvert.
QUESTIONS BY DR. BOISVERT:
Q. Going back to much earlier testimony in regard to decommissioning, you made the case that there will be bonding or irrevocable --
A. (Weitzner) Letter of credit.
Q. Right, letters of credit. I'm familiar with similar kinds of bonding requirements in the mining industry years ago. It was a program from the federal government, called the "Abandoned Mine Lands Program," where failed surface mining coal companies left behind
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environmental damage. They had bonded the reclamation that those bonding companies had gone out of business.

Is there some assurance that these irrevocable letters of credit or the bonding companies will, in fact, be there 30 or 40 years from now? Is there some mechanism that can provide a level of trust for those companies?
A.
(Weitzner) So I think the level of trust in those companies is really determined by their credit rating. And I think there is a requirement in our agreement with the Town that the credit rating be at least a BBB, which is one step above investment grade. Right now, the entities that we're talking to are BBB+ or better. So I think that the assurance should come from that, that they're highly creditworthy entities. And, you know, if those entities go bankrupt, then I expect, you know, in order to continue to satisfy our requirements under the SEC regulations, we would need to go out and find, for instance a new -- we would be required to find a new
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irrevocable letter of credit and make sure that that was established. We don't see it as we get a letter once and that's it. We're required to have that for the life of the Project so that the Project can fully be decommissioned.
Q. So if the company's bond rating dips below a certain amount, Antrim Wind would then look for a different company?
A. (Weitzner) We would be required to under the agreement with the Town I believe is what the -- is what is regulating that credit rating.
Q. My concern is that these credit ratings are more or less near-term kinds of evaluations compared against a 30- or 40-year reasonable expectation for application of this decommissioning. And I'm just a little -- I need some better reassurance beyond that it's just a good credit rating now.
A. (Weitzner) So I think it is a good credit rating now, and it must maintain that credit rating. If it doesn't maintain that credit rating, then we need -- it is our obligation to replace it with someone -- with an entity that
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meets the credit requirements of our agreement. And I don't think that's something that, you know, happens once every 10 years. If the credit rating dips below $B B B$, then we no longer have a valid financial decommissioning assurance under the SEC regulations and so we're in violation and so we need to fix that.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Commissioner
Rose.
CMSR. ROSE: Yes. Thank you.
QUESTIONS BY CMSR. ROSE:
Q. You demonstrated significant confidence in the Project's financial viability once constructed. And in your conversation that you had with Mr. Ward, you outlined that there were three revenue streams that help build that level of confidence, and you referenced it as the cost of the electricity, the renewable credits that you'll be receiving, as well as the capacity payments that you'll be receiving. And I was wondering if you could give a percentage or certainty as to the levels of predictability of those three streams. You referenced the
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 1/Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-13-16\}
capacity payments were a very modest component of that, but $I$ didn't have a real good scale of context as to what that meant in the overall revenue of the Project.
A. (Weitzner) So the capacity payments are going to be equal to, very roughly, 8 percent of the revenues, and the remaining 92 percent is energy plus RECs. And breaking up that

92 percent, 1 would say it's roughly 75,
80 percent energy, 20 percent RECs. So the capacity revenues are, as I said, quite small. CMSR. ROSE: I'm sorry. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Attorney Iacopino.

QUESTIONS BY ATTORNEY IACOPINO:
Q. Thank you. We've heard a lot about RWE here today. Can one of you just take us from Antrim Wind up to the parent corporation and what the layers of the corporate structure are?
A. (Weitzner) Yes. I think we have that in our application. But just walking through it, so if we start at the bottom, Antrim Wind Energy is the project LLC. For sort of structural reasons and convenience, there are two LLCs
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that own Antrim Wind Energy: One is called Walden Green Energy Northeast Wind, and the other one is called Walden Antrim, LLC. Both of those are 100 percent controlled by Walden Green Energy. Walden Green Energy is majority-owned by RWE --
Q. Is it RWE AG, or is it some other entity within RWE?
A. (Weitzner) It's RWE Principal Investments Walden $I$ believe is the full name. And so it's majority-owned by that entity. And the board is 50/50 Walden Founders, which is myself and George Manahilov and Sarah Valdovinos, and 50 percent RWE Principal Investments. And that's it.
Q. And where is RWE Principal Investments, Incorporated? Where is that subsidiary of RWE AG? Is it a U.S. company?
A. (Shaw) Yeah, I believe that's a Delaware LLC.
Q. So that's an LLC. And I take it there's still several layers between that entity and RWE AG?
A. (Shaw) Yeah, I don't have that information right with me now, but $I$ can get that to you.
Q. Let me ask you this: The entities that invest
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in Walden, in your organization, is this part of the Innogy spinoff that RWE is selling off in the coming weeks?
A. (Shaw) No, it's not.
Q. You discussed in some of your questions with Ms. Linowes and with Dr. Ward about the debt and equity structure of the company. And to me, it sounded as though basically you're saying, if we have to put in more equity, we'd put in more equity.

Do you have a goal as to what the debt/equity ratio for the company should be?
A. (Weitzner) I think the debt/equity ratio that we shared in our pro forma was that $\$ 11$ million of debt -- excuse me -- $\$ 11$ million of equity, and then the remaining $\$ 54 \mathrm{million}$ in debt and tax equity -- tax equity which acts like debt. That's our goal, and that's also fairly industry standard for wind projects in the U.S.
Q. So when you were testifying about, well, if we don't meet -- if we can't get enough debt, tax equity, I guess, we'll just substitute equity --
A. (Weitzner) Yup.
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Q. -- your goal is not to continue to substitute equity, it's to remain at a certain ratio; is that correct? Or as close to it as you can.
A. (Weitzner) Yes. We think that $\$ 11$ million is a very reasonable objective, and we expect we will meet it. And if something happens where we have to put more equity, you know, then what that does is it makes it a slightly less attractive project from a return basis. But there's still plenty of room to put more equity into the project and still make it a very attractive investment.
Q. So you and your fellow investors in Walden Green, that's the sweet spot for you and for the majority owners from RWE, or whatever entity of RWE it is?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
A. (Shaw) Yeah, I would agree.
Q. I want to switch gears now and talk about decommissioning as well.

When you talked about decommissioning, you made much of the fact that you will have, consistent with the Site Evaluation Committee rules, the provision of a financial assurance
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in the form of an irrevocable standby letter of credit and performance bond, surety bond for unconditional payment guaranty executed by the parent company. That's our rule. It's Site 301.08. And you made much of the fact that the Town of Antrim will be a partner with you, in that, if for some reason you're not there to decommission, Antrim will be the beneficiary, I suppose, of that financial instrument.
A. (Weitzner) Yeah.
Q. Is it the plan to just leave -- even at the end of your 40 years, is the plan to just leave and let the town take care of it?
A. (Weitzner) No. Absolutely not.
Q. So what is the plan?
A. (Weitzner) The plan is, at the end of the Project's useful life, to perform the decommissioning.
Q. As a company?
A. (Weitzner) Yes, yes.
Q. And during your testimony, Mr. Weitzner, you mentioned the New Hampshire Electric Co-op PPA. You also talked about having two other -- I forget the words that you used -- potential
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 1/Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-13-16\}
conversations and one probable conversation. Obviously, I don't want to get into anything that's confidential. But when you say -- can you tell us what you're describing there when you talk about, I think it was two "potential conversations" -- I assume this is either about a PPA or a hedge -- and one "probable"? Is "probable," in your definition, something that's closer to fruition than the other two? Is that -- just trying to understand what your testimony was. And if that needs to be addressed in the confidential session, just let us know.
A. (Weitzner) No. I think that I said there are two maybe or -- sorry if I'm slightly changing what I said. I don't know exactly what I said. But there are two "active" conversations --
Q. That may be the term.
A. (Weitzner) -- which I would say there's still some details to be ironed out, and we're still -- you know, we still have some questions, and nothing is done until it's signed. But I think that those two conversations could, if we want, very, very
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likely lead to a PPA for some portion of the Project. In one case it's a similar sort of 25-ish percent, and in another case it's a much larger percentage. It would be something that would almost complete the Project. So I think those are two conversations that I'm confident could lead to a PPA. And then we're also talking to two other entities, where I would say the conversation is at an earlier stage and we're still kind of feeling things out.

I just want to add, as a backstop, we also always have the financial market, the opportunity to do a financial swap. We're in constant touch with two banks, highly creditworthy, that would be, you know, happy to put a financial hedge on this project should we need it. But as I mentioned earlier with Ms. Linowes, that's less attractive to us, but still an option that's available.
Q. And I guess my last question is just about -you talked about curtailment in the calculation of your net capacity factor. I just want to make sure $I$ understood this correctly. Are you saying that there is no curtailment for --
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curtailment estimate for noise and shadow flicker that is calculated into your net capacity factor because of the rules?
A. (Weitzner) There is no curtailment for sound because we're very confident we will comfortably meet the regulations. There may need to be some curtailment for shadow flicker. I think we may violate the shadow flicker rules by a few hours a year. And so if you just imagine what a few hours per year of curtailment would mean for the net capacity factor, it is an absolute trivial amount.
Q. But do you know if that trivial amount is included in the present net capacity factor that you put before the Committee?
A. (Weitzner) It is not included.
Q. Okay.

MR. IACOPINO: I don't have any other questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Does any other Subcommittee member have any questions before I go on? Great.

So, Attorney Needleman, what I think I'd like to do, since we're still in the
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public session, is offer you a chance to do redirect and then go to the private session and do the same again. Does that work for you?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure. That's fine. Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Just a couple of questions. So, Mr. Weitzner, at one point, with respect to a conversation about RWE, you said, "Banks are happy to lend money when they see the RWE name." Do you recall that?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. So this Application was filed on October 2nd, 2015. And I think you said that since that time your relationship, AWE's relationship with RWE has not changed; is that right?
A. Walden's relationship with RWE has not changed. Correct.
Q. And as I look through the various articles that Ms. Maloney walked us through, the first one begins I think in July of 2014 -- so, at least a year before the Application was filed, and they run through fairly recently. And you've
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looked at all of them.
So, is it fair to say that, from the point the Application was filed up through today you have been having conversations with these various lending institutions that you referenced?
A. (Weitzner) Yes, numerous.
Q. And you've been having those conversations while your relationship with RWE has remained the same and while all of these issues have been public in the financial markets; is that right?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. And the three letters that you attached to your supplemental testimony are all dated in August of 2016. So could you characterize for me, if you can, what knowledge those potential lenders had of your relationship to RWE at those times?
A. (Weitzner) They have a clear knowledge and understanding of the financial relationship and the control relationship. It was in each case an item of due diligence for them to understand what our relationship with RWE is. And it has been a very strong benefit in those three
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conversations that we are backed by RWE.
Q. And how would you characterize the sophistication of those three potential lenders?
A. (Weitzner) So I think it's two potential lenders, and that would be Citibank, which is extraordinarily sophisticated, and State Street, which is both sophisticated and extremely conservative.
Q. In addition to the three in these letters, it sounds to me as though you've had other conversations with financial institutions about this project; is that right?
A. (Weitzner) Yes.
Q. And have those conversations been with sophisticated financial parties?
A. (Weitzner) Yes, all of them.
Q. And what has their reaction been to your relationship with RWE?
A. (Weitzner) Similar. They view the RWE name as a strong benefit to the Project, a strong credit support, and are eager and anxious to do business with RWE.
Q. Thank you.
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: Nothing further.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
We'll now go to private -- excuse me -confidential session.

Did you have something --
MS. MALONEY: I just want to --
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: -- Counsel
for the Public?
MS. MALONEY: I'm sorry. I just wanted to move to strike I.D.s and move to make the exhibits as full exhibits.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I thought we were going to do all of that at the end of the proceedings.

MR. IACOPINO: That's usually what we do.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Yeah, we'll do it at the end.

MS. MALONEY: Okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: But hold that thought.

MS. MALONEY: Made the motion.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So, again, we'll go into confidential session. And for
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any of those -- well, before I ask you to clear the room, again, how much time do you expect for the confidential side?

MS. MALONEY: I just have maybe a question or two.

MS. LINOWES: Probably about 30 minutes.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: SO, probably about 45 minutes by the time we're done. Maybe a tiny bit of redirect, depending on questions from the bench. Okay. So, again, roughly 45 minutes. We can't guarantee that. So if anybody wishes to come back -- but again, if you've not signed a non-disclosure agreement, we'll ask you to leave the room at this time.

DR. WARD: What do we pick up with
after the confidential session?
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Next on the agenda is the same as the order of presentation. So at that point we would start with the Technical and Managerial Capability Panel, which is Panel No. 2.

DR. WARD: And do you expect to do --
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Depends on the time. Maybe an hour.

DR. WARD: I have a wife who's running for office, and $I$ have to do some things. That's why I'm trying to figure -- in other words, you're probably going to have an hour after you finish the --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Well, does any of the Subcommittee have an issue if we go closer to 5:00? Well, we can take a break now while we're clearing the room. So, probably about an hour. So we'll go off the record and take a quick five-minute recess.
(Pages 100 through 156 of the transcript are contained under separate cover designated as "Confidential and Proprietary.")
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PUBLIC SESSION (CONT'D) (Hearing now resumes in the public redacted portion of the record.)

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Back on the record now.

So, while we're not done today, when we reconvene on Thursday, instead of 10:00 as noticed, we'll do 9:00 in order to hopefully not go as late for some people. Mr. Ward has indicated that he has a conflict, so he probably won't be able to be here until closer to 10:00. But we've agreed, as we'll probably be on Panel 2, that we'll -- if he's not back in time, we will go out of order so that he can still question the panel.

Okay. With that, we're now on Panel No. 2 regarding Technical and Managerial Capability. Mr. Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Weitzner, you've already been sworn in. We have your testimony. So I'll start with --
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A. (Stovall) Houston, Texas. That's our main U.S. office.
Q. And because you may not be familiar to most people in this room, could you just briefly describe the purpose of your testimony.
A. (Stovall) Yes. I'm here in the capacity as owner's engineer --

DR. WARD: Speak into the microphone, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Got to get real close to it.
A. (Stovall) I'm here in my capacity as owner's engineer, supporting the Project in various phases, which we'll be discussing the details about, I'm sure.
Q. You have your prefiled testimony in front of you?
A. (Stovall) Yes, I do.
Q. And do you have any changes to that testimony?
A. (Stovall) No changes.
Q. And do you adopt it and swear to it today?
A. (Stovall) Yes, I do.
Q. Let's go to Mr. Cavanagh. And if you could state your name for the record.
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A. (Cavanagh) Arthur Cavanagh.
Q. And where do you work?
A. (Cavanagh) I Work for Reed \& Reed.
2. And briefly state the purpose of your testimony.
A. (Cavanagh) I'm here to testify as a BOP contractor for the Antrim Wind Project.
Q. And your testimony is joint with Mr. Marcucci. Maybe we should have had you sitting next to each other to look at it. So if you could just look at it and tell me whether you have any changes to your portion.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. (Cavanagh) I do not.
Q. So do you adopt it and swear to it today?
A. (Cavanagh) Yes, I do.
Q. And if you can pass that down to Mr. Marcucci.

And then, finally, Mr. Marcucci, if you could state your name for the record, please.
A. (Marcucci) Donald Marcucci.
Q. And where do you work?
A. (Marcucci) Siemens Energy, Inc., out of Orlando, Florida.
Q. And briefly state the purpose of your
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testimony.
A. (Marcucci) My testimony is to talk about the experience of Siemens and its SWT-3.2-113 model wind turbine that Antrim has selected for this project.
Q. And do you have any changes to your prefiled testimony?
A. (Marcucci) Other than some of the numbers on the number of turbines installed which were submitted about a year ago have increased, no.
Q. What page on your testimony is that?
(Witness reviews document.)
A. (Marcucci) Somewhere in here it talked about 525 of these 3.2-113 turbines had been installed globally. That's now about 1,050.
Q. Okay. Other than that, do you have any other changes?
A. (Marcucci) No.
Q. And so, do you adopt that testimony and swear to it, subject to that one change?
A. (Marcucci) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: They're available for cross-examination, Mr. Chairman.
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank You.
I believe the Town of Antrim is next.
MR. RICHARDSON: The Town has no questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Is Mr.
Enman here?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. How
about Giffen-Pratt intervenors?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. The
Harris Center?
MR. FROLING: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Ward,
maybe you get to do this today.
DR. WARD: No chance.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: How about the abutting landowners?

MS. BERWICK: Yes, I do have
questions, but Mr. Ward could go first if that works out better.

DR. WARD: I only really have one question.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So you'd
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like to go now?
DR. WARD: I'd love to.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Any
objections?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Let's do that.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY DR. WARD:
Q. You talked, I think it was Mr. Weitzner or -UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Microphone.
Q. There was some testimony this morning about the met tower, and it became quite obvious in the testimony that your whole layout, your technical layout of how you're going to go it, in fact, whether it's even worthwhile, hinged on wind information from the met tower. So my question is: Do you know whether any of those things would have changed materially if the position of the met tower had been changed on the hill?
A. (Kenworthy) Sure, I'll take that question, Dr. Ward.

Certainly you're correct that wind data is
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important in design of a wind farm and the layout of a wind farm, and ultimately the performance of a wind farm. When we gather data from one or multiple points, that site data is then extrapolated using models for the entirety of the wind site and taking into account where that data was collected from. So, not being a meteorologist myself, my understanding is that, if that met tower had been moved slightly in one direction or another, or even if it had been over by Turbine 8 instead of Turbine 2 , we would have taken that into account. And it would be unlikely to have resulted in significant changes to the layout, which also are informed by a number of other factors, including the land we have available to us, environmental resources that are present on the site, and potentially constructability constraints and things of that nature.

The one other thing that $I$ will point out is that it's not just a single met tower that we have data from. We have a LIDAR that collected data over the course of a year from
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three different locations on the site, both at our met tower location by the location of Turbine 6, and by the location of the former Turbine 10. So we have representative data across the site.

DR. WARD: Thank you. I'm finished.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
Great.
DR. WARD: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
We'll go back to the abutting landowners.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. These questions are going to be addressed to you, Mr. Kenworthy. And if you feel someone else needs to answer them --
A. (Kenworthy) Sure.
Q. First of all, can you tell me, if you had a choice between one house with a constant noise level -- "whoop, whoop, whoop" -- hours of flicker and views of turbines versus the very same type of house in a very similar setting without these factors, which would you choose?
A. (Kenworthy) I think it's hard for me to really
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actually imagine a choice in a hypothetical in the manner that you're describing it. I think, as Mr. Weitzner stated earlier, it's certainly our belief that with the protections that the Site Evaluation Committee rules put in place for this project, particularly as it relates to sound and flicker, that the actual levels of impact that will be experienced by folks that are in close proximity are going to be quite low.
Q. So you don't think there would be any difference in the house that has the flicker and the noise versus the house that doesn't have the flicker and the noise?
A. (Kenworthy) I can't say that there would be zero difference. I think in some cases, certainly, yes, there will be changes. But I think those changes are not unreasonable changes.
Q. I just wonder how you can say there would be no reduction in our home values.
A. (Kenworthy) We make that statement based on data. And certainly, you know, I understand the concern that homeowners may have about what
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 1/Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-13-16\}
[CAVANAGH|STOVALL|KENWORTHY|WEITZNER|MARCUCCI]
changes could lead to, in terms of home values, and that there might be an expectation that some, you know, changes could lead to decreases. But we just have not seen that borne out by the data. We've cited a number of different national studies and some regional studies that have looked at tens of thousands of property transactions. We've also performed our own studies -- both in the area of Lempster and referenced other studies that were done in the city of Groton here in New Hampshire -that all support, $I$ think, our conclusion that property values will not be impacted.
Q. And you have eliminated from those studies any houses that were bought out by the wind companies before sales, haven't you?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, this panel is for technical and managerial capability. Mr. Kenworthy is also an orderly regional development witness, but that's a separate topic.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms. Berwick, if you can stay on topic.

MS. BERWICK: Okay, I'll wait. Thank
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you.
So, safety, would that come
under this?
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Again, this is technical and managerial capability of the Applicant.

MS. BERWICK: Well, managing. How they would manage their --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: If you stay on that tone. And again, to the extent you want to go to other areas, you can look at some of the other topics as you move on also. So, you can ask those questions, but they should be related to those topics, how they manage and their technical capability to do things.

MS. BERWICK: Okay.
BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. Can you tell me how wide the base is, or the platform that the turbines sit on?
A. (Kenworthy) Sorry. You're asking what the diameter of the base of the turbine tower is?
Q. I'll tell you why I'm asking and maybe you can answer it better. You gave documentation of how far our property line is from the turbines.
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It's 900-something feet. From what I understand in reading the reports, that's to the center of the base; is that correct?
A. (Kenworthy) I believe that is correct, yes.
Q. So what I'm really trying to find out is, the turbines come out from the center of the base. Like if I was to say how far this table is from that table, I would not do it from the center; I would do it from edge to edge. So I'm trying to find out the edge of your turbines, how close they are to our property line.
A. (Kenworthy) I don't have the precise figure in front of me. Maybe Mr. Marcucci does. My belief is that the base diameter of the tower is somewhere in the vicinity of 14 or 15 feet. So, that 900 and change of feet from the center of the tower to your property line could be reduced by 7 or 7-1/2 feet.
Q. I read in the Berlin Sun --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. I'm sorry.

I read in the Berlin Sun an article -- and I did not submit this, but I'm just going to have to question you because I think -- Vestas
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Wind Systems warns, "Do not stay within a radius of 1300 feet from the turbine unless it is necessary." And these are 400-foot turbines. Can you tell me what the safety radius for your highest turbines would be, how far away a person should be for a safety radius? Perhaps --
A. (Kenworthy) Well, maybe I'll speak about this generally, and then $I$ can ask if Mr. Marcucci has anything that he wants to add about Siemens' position.

I'm not familiar with that statement from Vestas. We certainly do know Vestas. We're aware of the company and their turbines. I mean, we do not have, to my knowledge, an established safety radius to which you should stay beyond. You know, generally speaking, I mean, these are machines. They move. And if you don't need to be up working underneath them, then you probably wouldn't be, necessarily.

But $I$ think as it relates to a matter of public safety, we look at very specific issues. And so, I think in that case, the way we have
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sited this position with the setbacks and property lines to public roads, to residences, all far exceed -- you know, meet or exceed the industry standards for public safety in those setbacks.
Q. Is there no safe distance that should be in case of icing?
A. (Kenworthy) So, we can talk about icing. I think, in general, you know, there's -- we've put a lot of testimony in about icing and the potential for ice throw from the turbines. And it's also addressed in my supplemental prefiled testimony.

Icing can occur on turbines, like it can on any structure that is in a cold climate that has moisture in the air and ice can form. Generally speaking, the turbines are equipped with a number of different mechanisms to ensure that there are not hazardous conditions that arise due to ice formation. We talk about those in our application. Primarily they have to do with the anemometer on the wind turbine that can ice up. And if that occurs, which typically is what happens first, then it shuts
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the turbine down until those conditions subside. Similarly, there is a turbine condition monitoring system that is integral to the Siemens turbines which detects imbalances or vibrations that could occur if there's any significant ice build-up on the blades and, again, either slows the turbine down or shuts it down until those conditions subside. So, as a result of all that, there really is, 1 think, a very small likelihood of any significant amount of ice shedding from these turbines. But certainly it can happen. And I think when it does, typically it's within about, you know -- the vast majority of those ice fragments fall within about 70 meters of a turbine, and I think out to a maximum -- and I may ask Mr. Stovall to weigh in on this as well -- about 250 meters. So, generally speaking, we see ice throw as a very small public safety risk.
Q. All right. Remind me. Two hundred fifty meters equals how many feet --

DR. WARD: Eight hundred.
A. (Kenworthy) About 800, yeah.
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Q. So there's no risk for us on our land that we're going to have ice coming from those turbines if we're walking up there.
A. (Kenworthy) No. I don't believe so at all. PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And again, if I could remind you that there will be a panel -- if you look at Panel No. 6, they'll be discussing public health and safety explicitly with those panel members there.

MS. BERWICK: Yes, but Ms. Linowes asked about that the last time we were here, and I thought that they said we should cover ice safety on this one. Am I wrong, Mike?

MR. IACOPINO: I don't know. I don't remember that.

BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. Jack, do you know?
A. (Kenworthy) Yeah, I can say that I think we're perfectly comfortable as a panel to handle questions that relate to, for example, ice throw, as it relates to turbine safety issues and construction, blasting. You know, any kind of catastrophic failure questions that people may have, we certainly do expect to answer
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those.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. So we may have some redundancy. So, go ahead then.

MS. BERWICK: What was said at the last meeting was the safety, when we come to it, was really the safety during construction and not safety after construction.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. Is there a reason that a visual assessment was never done from our property?
A. (Kenworthy) You likely would want to ask that question of our expert, David Raphael. But my answer, to the best of my knowledge, is that private property locations are not scenic resources under the SEC rules and therefore aren't evaluated in terms of assessing the aesthetic effects of a project. They did include a sampling of private property locations in response to the new rules that were adopted in December. And my understanding is that they used their professional judgment to select what they thought would be
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representative of private property locations. But that's really probably a better question for him.
Q. Can you explain if you have any plans to put fencing around the turbines?
A. (Kenworthy) No, we do not.
Q. Okay. Has the land that has been put in permanent conservation after decommissioning, has it already been purchased?
A. (Kenworthy) So, first of all, I would say the land is not going to be placed into conservation after decommissioning, but after commercial operation. So, subject to check, I don't have these agreements right in front of me, but I believe we have 180 days after the project reaches commercial operation to complete the purchase of the easements. There are six of them on site. And the agreements that bind us to make those purchases have all been executed. So we have binding letters of intent between ourselves and the Harris Center in five instances, with the Town of Antrim in one instance, and the six private landowners. So, all parties have signed those documents and
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negotiated the easements themselves. So it's just a function of within a certain period of time after COD that we will execute to purchase the easements.
Q. So, 180 at the completion of building turbines.
A. (Kenworthy) Yes, I believe it's 180 days after completion. But I can check that for you.
Q. What would be the penalty to Antrim Wind Energy if the property were never purchased?
A. (Kenworthy) Well, I presume any party to those contracts would have any recourse that's available to them as a party to those contracts. So, you know, they could sue us. But presumably these are going to become conditions of this certificate. So I think there would be enforceability under a Certificate of Site and Facility if the agreements were not ultimately put into place. But again, these are binding contracts. We've negotiated them. We stand by them, and we have every intention of purchasing those easements once the project goes forward.
Q. Are these submitted in the --
A. (Kenworthy) They are. They're actually a
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part -- the LOI and easements are a part of our Appendix 10. And I don't know what -- that's probably not its own exhibit. It's probably an appendix to the main Application.
Q. Okay. You wrote that Antrim Wind Energy's new application retains the many favorable components of the Project reviewed by the SEC in Docket 2012-01, while making significant and beneficial improvements to features of the facility that previously caused concern.

I looked up the definition of the "significant": Noteworthy, remarkable, important, serious, crucial. I can go on.

Would you say the reduction of 38 inches on an almost 500-foot tower is truly "significant"?
A. (Kenworthy) I would say that the changes that we've made between 2012 and now are significant. I stand by that statement. There are quite a variety of changes that we have made, including the full removal of Turbine 10, which is not only 10 percent, 10 full percent of the Project's turbines, but more importantly, I think was a turbine that was
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identified specifically as a concern at the Willard Pond location. It was on the tallest piece of land that was associated with the Project. And all of the infrastructure between Turbine 9 and 10, which was a fairly considerable amount of new road, all of that is gone. The significant reduction in height of Turbine 9, so that that tower and nacelle are no longer visible from Willard Pond, together with the --
Q. And that's the 38 inches?
A. Nope. That's 45 feet.
Q. Forty-five feet?
A. (By Kenworthy) Yup. And again, these were targeted changes that were made to respond to concerns that we were made aware of in the 2012 docket. The addition of -- when we initially filed, it was 685 acres of conservation; we now have 908 acres. And again, specifically, it was identified in that docket that there was a concern that 100 percent of the ridge line was not conserved; now it is. We've added vegetative screening around the substation area. That was in direct response to concern
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from the 2012 docket. We've entered into additional agreements with the Town of Antrim, such as the scholarship funding agreement. That's an additional benefit to the community. I think all of these things add up to, yes, what we believe are very significant changes in the Project.
Q. So you think that giving money to the Town of Antrim for brick laying and giving money to scholarships makes a significant change in the physical and visual features of the Antrim --
A. (Kenworthy) I think I've answered your question. I think that the changes between 2012 and 2015 are significant.
Q. All right. You state that the turbines will have an average 37 percent net capacity factor. In coming up with that figure, were the times that the turbines must be stopped to comply with flicker regulations, common nighthawk sightings, ice, wind, excess winds, taken into consideration in that 37 percent?
A. (Kenworthy) Let me maybe take those one at a time and you can tell me if I've missed any of them.
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So, with respect to shadow flicker, I think Mr. Weitzner answered this question earlier, which is no. Curtailment to be able to meet shadow flicker requirements of eight hours per year is not accounted for in that capacity factor. However -- and we can check this -- my expectation, as Mr. Weitzner stated, is the total expected amount of shadow flicker at any residence is a maximum of 13 hours and 48 minutes, if $I$ recall correctly, which is 5 hours and 48 minutes over the regulatory requirement. To be able to curtail one or two turbines for a maximum of five hours per year is going to have a negligible impact on net capacity factor. It's unlikely to change that percentage at all.

With respect to common nighthawk, we have no requirements to curtail the Project for common nighthawks. We have a bird and bat conservation strategy that we've worked out with the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. There are no nesting nighthawks on our site, so there will be no requirement to curtail for
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nighthawks. We have included the bat curtailment. And I think -- yes. So, bat curtailment is included in that analysis. I think it's conservative.

I may actually want to clarify a point Mr. Weitzner made earlier about what those curtailment levels are that I think may be a little different. It is 5 meters a second from July 15 to September 30. So, anything below 5 meters a second we curtail, and we do it for 5 out of the 9 turbines in year one. And if it leads to a meaningful impact in reduction of bat mortality, then we apply it to all nine turbines for the life of the Project. Our modeling pro forma for the net capacity factor already assumes we're applying it to all nine turbines for the life of the Project. So that's conservative.
Q. Are you only applying it to one turbine in the beginning?
A. (Kenworthy) Five of the nine turbines for one year, and then we evaluate the effectiveness of that curtailment strategy, together in consultation with New Hampshire Fish \& Game and
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U.S. Fish \& Wildlife. But the outcome of that, you know, will only result in a potential for what we've already modeled, which is all nine turbines for the life of the Project.

Other things -- icing, yes. Icing is accounted for in our model. And what were the other ones you listed?
Q. Nighthawk, icing, high winds and bats.
A. (Kenworthy) Yup. So, all of the wind speeds are obviously taken into account --
Q. Can you tell me what percentage of time the turbines would be on -- can you tell me what percentage of time the turbines would be on was used for the calculations for the 37 percent? Is there a percentage of time? I asked this before and $I$ was told to ask it again.
A. (Kenworthy) So I don't think I have a precise answer for you, if $I$ understand your question correctly. But let me try, and then we can see if you have some follow-ups.

It is our expectation that these turbines will be producing some amount of power roughly 90 percent of the time, maybe 94 percent of the time. So, obviously, there's a power curve.
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And these turbines cut in at 3 meters a second and cut out at 32 meters a second --

MR. MARCUCCI: Twenty-five.
A. (Kenworthy) Twenty-five. So, everywhere in between there, there is some amount of power that's being generated by these turbines. And so they will be operating and producing some amount of power. Again, I know this is not precise. I'm saying between 90 and 94 percent of the time. So, pretty often.

And the way the net capacity factor is calculated is a fraction that is the total estimated energy yield over the course of a year divided by the maximum theoretically possible energy if all turbines are producing 100 percent of power, 8,750 hours per year. Does that answer your question?
Q. Yes, it does.

In your testimony, you state, "Antrim residents have consistently demonstrated their support for commercial wind energy in town; A) in 2010, the Antrim Planning Board held a straw poll where 84 percent of respondents favored commercial wind energy."
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First, I want to ask you: Did everyone at that meeting vote in this straw poll?
A. (Kenworthy) You're asking about the 2010 -Q. Yes.
A. -- planning board straw poll?
Q. Yes. You submitted it.
A. (Kenworthy) Yeah, I just want to make sure I was clear on which one you're talking about. My understanding is there were somewhere around a hundred responses.
Q. So did everyone at the meeting respond -- vote?
A. (Kenworthy) I actually don't know the answer to that. I think it was a straw poll that was -I don't recall. I think it says on the poll itself.
Q. Okay. So I was going to ask you, do you have any idea how many -- you said a hundred?
A. (Kenworthy) That's my belief. I mean, I can pull it up or if --
Q. Do you have any idea how many residents there are in Antrim?
A. (Kenworthy) Twenty-five hundred, thereabouts.
Q. So you're trying to say that this was a scientifically conducted poll?
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A. (Kenworthy) No. I think we have articulated in a number of places our belief and the reasons for our belief that the Town of Antrim has been supportive of this project. And I can tell you that it is very, very consistent from 2009 through 2016. And the planning board straw poll, the select board straw poll, which had several hundred responses to it the following year, are consistent with the survey we conducted by the American Research Group, which was sent out all across Antrim --
Q. Was that sent to all the citizens in Antrim?
A. (Kenworthy) In fact, it was. I know there was a statement that was made during the technical session that perhaps some people had intentionally been left off of that survey. That's not true. We hired American Research Group, based in Manchester. They're a credible third-party survey company. And they used a combination, $I$ believe, of voter lists and taxpayer lists, and maybe one other source of data that they had, to come up with a master list. And they sent surveys to every household and Town of Antrim. I am not saying that every
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 1/Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-13-16\}
[CAVANAGH|STOVALL|KENWORTHY|WEITZNER|MARCUCCI]
household necessarily received them. We certainly -- there are returns. In these events, it's not a perfect system. But we also made available an online survey, so that anybody who did not receive a paper copy could participate in the poll. We had some -- again, I don't have the precise number, but it was close to 700 responses. Very, very high response rate. And again, roughly 80 percent, 77 percent supported the Project. So I think there's been a very long history here in Antrim of showing support.
Q. So your answer directly contradicts what was said during the other hearings, evidence -- the hearings that we had, the technical hearings.
A. (Kenworthy) I'm sorry. Which part of my answer are you referring to?
Q. That the survey was mailed to all residents. In the technical hearing, the selectmen said it was not mailed to all residents, and the other people said it was not mailed to all residents.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, it sounds
like we are again on orderly regional
development. Mr. Kenworthy is the right person
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to speak to this. I'm just not today is the day.

MS. BERWICK: Well, I'm --
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Maybe we can table that. You'll get to ask the same question of the same person, but why don't we --

MS. BERWICK: Okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: 'Cause
we're grouping these types of questions so they'll be a little more appropriate --

MS. BERWICK: All right. So you
don't want me --
MR. KENWORTHY: If it's helpful, I can just answer that question, which is, this is my testimony: It was mailed out by American Research Group to everybody that they were able to get addresses for, intended to be reached by every household in Antrim.

MS. BERWICK: Do you not want me to pursue the questions about surveys and Antrim's support?

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Again, I think it may be better if we can kind tailor
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out -- I'm not sure what else you have. So I don't want to --

MS. BERWICK: Okay. I will wait.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And again,
I don't want you to not ask questions --
MS. BERWICK: I understand.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: -- I just
want to put them in the right place.
BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. The conservation land that you entered into a letter of intent to donate land to the Town of Antrim, was this something the selectmen solicited from you?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I do think this is the same issue we just talked about.

MS. BERWICK: Same issue? Sorry.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms.
Linowes?
MS. LINOWES: Actually, I'm having some of the same difficulty understanding what the questions should be for this session versus others. I'm wondering if we could get clarification, because the titles may not be representative. Unless this has to do with --
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their testimony is even crossing over on different days and...

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Maybe I can look to Mr. Iacopino. You were at the structuring conference; right?

MS. MALONEY: Could I add something, too? It's sort of difficult to plan questions, too, in these boxes. And a lot of people aren't attorneys here and come up with a set of questions for one day and then a set of questions for another day. And I think it stifles what could be a cross-examination or questions to have for witnesses. I wish -- I understand there is an order here. But if there could be some leeway with this so that people can sort of follow the train of thought. I'm not sure that -- I mean, we had the financial this morning, and that was fairly clear. But the technical and managerial, there are certainly things that are about managerial that have to do with other aspects other than just capability. So that's sort of -- if we get to orderly development and somebody would be shut out because it was a managerial
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question, $I$ mean -- so that's where I'm sort of having problems.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And I do agree. I don't want to have these categories be used as a reason for questions not to be asked. So, again, I'm going to pick on Mr . Iacopino because I can.

MR. IACOPINO: I didn't think that there was a real -- any ambiguity. This is supposed to be -- this panel is on technical and managerial capability. We have individuals that can address those capabilities from both the Applicant itself and its vendors. So that's what I assume. I think the most important thing, Mr. Chairman, is that the Committee -- my concern is that the Committee get all the information that it needs and in an organized fashion so that the Committee can make the very important determinations that they have to make under the statute. So that's why it's organized this way. You're clearly authorized to give as much leeway as you want with respect to the questions. But the other thing that $I$ will point out is that we have
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 1/Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-13-16\}
[CAVANAGH|STOVALL|KENWORTHY|WEITZNER|MARCUCCI]
five witnesses up here, some of whom are not going to be here to talk about orderly development on September 23rd. And, you know, there is the matter of whether or not -- and they'll probably be here tomorrow as well. So there is the matter of are we wasting time not breaking it down into the panels that we've decided beforehand and that all parties knew about beforehand.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So what I think I would ask, though, before I go to Mr. Ward -- so I do want to -- some of your questions we're saying they would be better under orderly development. So what I want to do is make sure we're not taking any of your questions and putting them in a place where you never get to ask them.

MS. BERWICK: I'll get them asked. PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. So that's the most important thing in my mind.

MS. BERWICK: I really was just
unclear because of the way --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MS. BERWICK: I really was just
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unclear because of the description we had at our last session. I thought this was the place. But that's okay. I will ask later. PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. And I'd rather have this discussion than not, frankly. So if you're not sure, ask, and we'll have the discussion.

So, Mr. Ward?
DR. WARD: Yeah. I just have -- one of the few technical people here. I have a problem with the lawyer's definition of "technical." And so I would just support what Attorney Maloney said, that we need a little flexibility. That's all.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. DR. WARD: You don't have to react to it.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms.
Berwick.
BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. Okay. Mr. Kenworthy, can you explain why Antrim hired Wes Enman?
A. (Kenworthy) Sure. We hired him for roughly a year to provide support during our LIDAR
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campaign. LIDAR is a form of equipment that is paired with the met tower to collect wind data. It's a laser, so it takes quite a bit more power than the met tower does, which operates on one very small solar panel and a battery pack. This thing has a windshield wiper and a water pump and a laser. So it needs a power supply, and that power supply runs on propane. And so it needed to be fueled and occasionally checked and reset, and Wes performed that function for us.
Q. Are you continuing to pay Wes Enman?
A. (Kenworthy) No, we are not. We had roughly a one-year contract with him that ended several years ago.
Q. Is the Harris Center under a written contract demanding that they be neutral in exchange for the conservation easement land?
A. (Kenworthy) I believe I've provided information in my supplemental testimony. It is a letter from the Harris Center to me, dated August 10, 2016, that provides a number of clarifications around different pieces of testimony that have been entered in this docket. I think one of
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the things -- first of all, the terms of our agreements, other than the agreements we've already provided with the Harris Center, are confidential. But one of the things that this letter clarifies and that we have submitted here in the record is that the Harris Center has agreed, by virtue of entering into this series of settlements with us, not to oppose the Project. That's right. And that's right here in Attachment JK17 to my supplemental testimony.
Q. Did Antrim Wind Energy or any of its representatives contact Michael Ott, Charles Bean, Steve Cotran and the Whittemores to ask them to write letters stating that they would not put their land in conservation easements unless Antrim Wind Energy went through and also suggest to them that they would try to develop their land?
A. (Kenworthy) No. I would agree -- I would disagree with that characterization. You know, these landowners don't follow this docket as closely as we do. So we certainly made them aware of allegations made in the docket that
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this land would be available for conservation, even if this wind project did not go forward. And we asked them to share with us their opinions on whether or not that was the case. I happen to know, having negotiated all these conservation agreements with the landowners, what each of their positions is. So, yes, we did ask them to write letters, but we did not ask them to write letters in the manner that you've characterized it.
Q. Then you don't think it's quite coincidental that these four people wrote almost exactly the same thing on the same day?
A. (Kenworthy) I disagree with that statement entirely. I think the letters are all very different, and I think they came in at different times. I submitted them all together. But they came in at different times, and they're very different letters.
Q. Are you aware that these lots are restricted from development by the very zoning that you could not get overturned by Antrim voters?
A. (Kenworthy) I'm not sure I agree with part of the premise of your question, or actually, any
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of the premise of your question. I would acknowledge that there is zoning in Antrim and that that zoning contains within it certain regulations in every district in town. The rural conservation district is where most of the land that we lease is. The rural conservation district allows 3-acre subdivisions. So, theoretically, you could subdivide the 1800 acres that we lease into 600 lots. There's lots of development that can happen in this area.
Q. Are you aware of the physical characteristics of the land that would make it next to impossible to develop without a major source of money and zoning changes?
A. (Kenworthy) I'm not sure I understand your question.
Q. That land -- we own land going up the mountain, too. It is pretty -- it would take a lot of money to have anybody build anything in that land. Maybe one house. But those four letters were suggesting that they were going to do some major commercial building projects. And the land is pretty inhospitable to any major --
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plus, it's also zoned for rural conservation.
A. (Kenworthy) It's called the "rural conservation district." It is not zoned for rural conservation. The rural conservation district has numerous allowed uses, including residential subdivisions and 3-acre lots. It also includes a number of other uses that are allowed by rights that would require only site plan approval and subdivision approval, which would need to be granted in accordance with the town zoning laws.

Certainly I recognize there's some steep terrain in that area that may not be suitable for development. But there's a lot of terrain in that area that could be suitable for development. I can't speak for the landowners, but what $I$ can tell you is what they told me. And it's not uncommon that -- you know, wind energy is a form of economic development that provides revenue to landowners, that allows them to keep the remainder of that property undeveloped. And otherwise, you know, this is all private land. These are private landowners. They own the land there. And
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these are, you know, activities that they would like to see go forward. And if they were not to, I think what you've heard them say is that they would pursue other ways to generate revenue from those properties.
Q. Yes, I did hear -(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. Yes, I did hear them say it in letters, but at the same time with encouragement from Antrim Wind.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Oh, I would object to that characterization.

Again, Mr. Chairman, Mr.
Kenworthy is certainly the right person for this. But my concern is that Mr. Stovall has come from Texas and Mr. Marcucci came from Florida --

MS. BERWICK: I've only I got two more questions -- oh, no, I don't. I've got lots more.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm happy for people to ask questions. I just think we're going to create an issue if we don't stay on topic with the panels.
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MS. BERWICK: Okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And also, again, questions, not statements, please.

MS. BERWICK: Okay.
BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. Where at this moment does Antrim Wind stand on the FAA approval of the lights on the top of the towers that would only come on when airplanes came close?
A. (Kenworthy) The status is that we have filed with the FAA. And I apologize. I should have said this at the very beginning. We have filed with the FAA an application for the ADLS, the aircraft lighting detecting system, with a vendor that we've identified, called Laufer Wind. Laufer was originally a company that was based out of Bedford, New Hampshire. Their technology has been -- has met the approval of the FAA. And that application was filed with the FAA. I'd have to check the date, but sometime in the last couple weeks. And so, at this stage, it's for the FAA to now review the technical data that we've provided them and to hopefully, ultimately issue an approval for us
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to use that technology at this site.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms.
Berwick, how much more do you have, do you think?

MS. BERWICK: I think most of this is going to stay for the next time I guess I see Mr. Kenworthy. I only have a few more questions then.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Can you put a time frame on it? I'm not trying to rush you at all, but I'm just trying to decide whether we break now, 'cause I know some of our committee members have obligations, and I believe Mr. Ward does, too, actually.

MS. BERWICK: About two minutes.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I'll hold you to that.

BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. Okay. If you don't get those things on the top of the ones you were just talking about within six months of your construction, will you be putting them on at all?
A. (Kenworthy) Yes. If we ultimately get the approval, then yes. I think the -- again, I'd
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have to look. But I think what we've committed to is to install the system in accordance with the settlement agreement that we executed with the Appalachian Mountain Club, which, again, if I recall, stipulates that if we get the approval anytime within six months or so of, I can't remember if it was the commencement of construction or if it was some other date, that we would install the system simultaneous with the remainder of construction, but that if we were to receive that approval anytime thereafter, that we would install it and have it operational within one year of that approval.

BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. Okay. This is for when you are doing the blasting. What are the plans to ensure that landowners' wells are not impacted?
A. (Kenworthy) I'm going to speak very generally about that, and then I'm going to ask Mr. Cavanagh to talk a little bit more about blasting and how it occurs and what the process is.

We have -- one of the comments that DES
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made to us in -- I forget when it was.
Sometime in the spring they asked for some additional information, and they asked for information or a plan relating to well tests, in the event that we had more than 5,000 cubic yards of blasting, that we would have a testing program for any wells that were within 2,000 feet of any blasting activities. And we have informed them that we have no issue with that, and that, in fact, if we end up having that degree of blasting, we would develop such a plan. So that's what we've committed to with DES. And I think in terms of kind of how we go from when we issue a notice to proceed to our construction contractor to when the blasting actually occurs, I'd like to ask Mr. Cavanagh to talk a little bit more about that.
A. (Cavanagh) So when the blasting project moves forward, we'll develop a detailed, comprehensive blasting plan, and we'll hire a competent blaster that's licensed in the state and that follows all the state regulations. Typically, our blaster will go out, and is required to go out and survey any properties
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that are in close proximity, or any structures, including wells, that are in close proximity to the blasting operations. To date, you know, what we also do is monitor vibration of the blasting. And typically, the vibration of blasting, you know, we restrict the level of blast so that it creates a very small vibration the further you get away from the blast zone. And, you know, to limit -- what we're trying to limit is any cracking of any type of substrate. So, you know, we're -- even plaster or anything like that. So we'll document the condition of structures before blasting and then after blasting.
Q. All right. If this project gets approved, when would you start construction? And I'll tell you why I'm asking it so you can -- I'm concerned we have black bears on that mountain and if you start in October or November when they're just going into hibernation, what would happen.
A. (Cavanagh) I'm going to let Mr. Kenworthy address that.
Q. And that's my last question.
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A. (Kenworthy) I can't really speak to the black bear issue specifically. I think that would be a good question to ask Mr. Valleau and Mr. Gravel. But I think it's likely -- well, final construction timing is going to depend on a number of factors. Certainly it's going to depend on the timing of the issuance of the certificate. And once that certificate has been issued and any potential, you know, process that may ensue, then the close of financing. And, you know, our anticipated schedule now is that we would issue at least some type of notice to proceed either late this year or early next year so that we could at least start clearing work in the wintertime, because we're -- we've agreed in our Conversations with New Hampshire Fish and Game Department to limit clearing to between October 1 and March 31 to avoid potential impacts to ground-nesting birds. And so we want to try and hit that window and get clearing done ideally this winter so that it's not delayed to the following winter. I think with that schedule, which we think we can meet,
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then we would start construction shortly thereafter.

MS. BERWICK: All right. That's my last question.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you all. We will adjourn for the day and come back again at 9:00 on Thursday. We will pick up with the non-abutting property residents. I assume that's Mr. Block. Thank you all.
(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.)
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