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MS. LINOWES: Well, the purpose of the letter was to communicate that back on Day 1 of the hearings, there was some confusion as to whether or not there was confidential information discussed in a public session. And I wanted to clarify the record, that the information that $I$ did say was, in fact, not confidential, and it was acquired entirely through public resources, including one of the attached documents that $I$ sent was the public pro forma that the Applicant had made available to all of the parties through the discovery process. And also, $I$ included that and referenced that during Day 1 of the hearings. It turns out that on one of the -- on several of the pages, not the cover page, but several of the pages of that public pro forma, it does state "Proprietary and Confidential," something I never noticed or paid attention to. But that document was distributed to all of the intervenors by the Applicant through the discovery process. And I wanted to get some clarification today that that document, in fact, was a public document. In fact, that's
my first question, if $I$ can.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So you're asking the Applicant if that's a public document that you attached?

MS. LINOWES: Yes. Ms. Monroe, Pam Monroe, had e-mailed me expressing concern that I had distributed a proprietary and confidential document. And history I believe shows that it was not intended to be confidential and proprietary. There was a separate pro forma document supplied to me in hard copy form, and it's never been made available electronically. So that was the first thing. And I wanted to -- before this Committee will consider I believe the letter that I sent on Friday, that point has to be clarified about the treatment of that document that was attached.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Unless the
Applicant wants to make a motion, your document's in the record. So, unless Mr.

Needleman would like to add anything at this point, I'm not sure there's any additional action required.
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MS. LINOWES: Well, the reason I'm bringing it up is I am highly sensitive to being accused of distributing confidential and proprietary documentation, and I want the record to be clear, yes, it's in the record, absolutely it's in the record, but it was submitted into the record as a public document. And I'm sensitive about being accused of violating my obligations in terms of treating confidential documentation.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Well, you're in the transcript now. Unless Attorney Needleman would like to add something, we'll move on.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Just one thing. We're not going to make a motion at this point. We continue to be concerned about this issue. And I'm concerned, as well, that if Ms. Linowes wanted to clarify the record, we think it would have been appropriate to do so by filing a letter more narrowly on this issue and not to the entire service list. That continues to be an issue of concern to us. And at this point $I$ don't feel the need to address it any further.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
MS. LINOWES: I'm not sure I
understand that. Is it -- I don't understand that. Is it the letter that was submitted to the Committee and to the service list clarifying what happened on Day 1? Is that a violation -- I was trying to clarify the record that the information that $I$ was referencing on Day 1 was public information. I'm not sure why that's -- what the concern is.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I know as Presiding Officer my concern would be if you, as an intervenor, have a question on information that may be confidential from the Applicant's point of view, rather than broadcasting that information, you perhaps have a discussion about it and then move on. But $I$ think we're ready to move on with this issue and start the proceeding here.

MS. LINOWES: Okay. Then there's just one other issue. We were informed that -Attorney Maloney and I were informed on Friday that the turbine supply agreement and the maintenance agreements have been signed with
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Siemens, and the Applicant has -- we discussed this as being confidential information. And back in August, we had come to an agreement with the Applicant that $I$ would be given access to the confidential documents that were available at the time -- this was in August -and that we would -- when those documents became available, that we would discuss how I would have access to them. The Applicant is now is insisting -- at that time, in August, the Applicant was insisting that they be available, but only -- they wanted me to only be able to go to the Applicant's attorney's offices to view any of those documents. We've passed that impasse on the confidential documents and I did have access to. And the others were deemed to be voluminous and difficult to send, and so we said we'll pass that bridge when they're available. They're now available. The Applicant is now saying I have to go to the attorney's office to view the documents and not -- and be able to take notes. But beyond that, I cannot do anything more with them. And I'm willing to file a motion to get


PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: You were good about allowing others with more time constraints to go first. So I think the agreed-upon order of inquiry was to start with the Audubon Society.

MR. IACOPINO: Before we do that, we need to get his testimony --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I apologize.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Do you have your prefiled testimony with you?
A. I do have my prefiled testimony.
Q. And is it sitting in front of you?
A. It is.
Q. Do you adopt that testimony here today under oath?
A. I do.
Q. Are there any changes or additions you wish to make to it?
A. I do not.

MR. IACOPINO: With that, the witness
is ready for cross-examination.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
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Q. You submitted supplemental testimony to respond to statements made by Michael Bartlett, who was until recently the President of New Hampshire Audubon; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you began your supplemental testimony as follows: "Mr. Bartlett stated that in 2012 and 2016, cars from numerous states were observed in the parking area by resident caretakers." Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Of the 20 people you spoke with, two were from Rhode Island, two from Vermont, and one was from Cambridge; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And of the six parties that $M r$. Pratt spoke with, one was a family from Massachusetts, and one was a man from Maine?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. So you don't dispute Mr. Bartlett's statement that cars from numerous states visit Willard Pond, do you?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. How many times have you been to Willard Pond,
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roughly?
A. Thirty, 35 maybe.
Q. Okay. And when did you first learn that there is a year-round residential caretaker there?
A. During the tech sessions.
Q. In the beginning of your supplemental testimony, you also state, "Mr. Bartlett also stated that constant movement of turbine blades would be distracting to visitors scanning for birds or simply enjoying natural surroundings." So you and Mr. Pratt spoke with 26 people. Of the people you spoke with, you stated that, quote, Most supporters had experience or knowledge with some sort of alternative energy; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did the people you spoke with who were open to the Project tell you that they had no experience or knowledge of alternative energy?
A. No.
Q. With regard to the people who were opposed to the Project, you state, quote, The opponents from my survey were from Temple and were close to [sic] the natural [sic] gas pipeline. They
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were against any type of development.
Did these people actually say to you, "We are against any type of development"?
A. At the Willard Pond Sanctuary, yes.
Q. Those three people said that to you?
A. There were a husband and wife from Temple and their daughter from Baltimore visiting. They were the first couple that I spoke to. They were -- that husband and wife were against any kind of development. And the third person, I'm not sure where -- I can go back and look and see. But that wasn't -- the three people that you were mentioning were from different groups. So the first -- the couple from Temple was against any development at Willard Pond.
Q. Oh, at Willard Pond.
A. At Willard Pond. I'm sorry.
Q. Oh, okay. I read your statement as they were against any type of development.
A. No, at Willard Pond.
Q. Okay. And those weren't the only people that told you and Mr. Pratt that they were opposed to turbines overlooking Willard Pond, were they?
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A. There was one other in mind, and Mr. Pratt provided me with that information that said that he had, you know, other people that were -- a person that was opposed.
Q. So Mr. Pratt also had someone who was opposed. And didn't Mr. Pratt also have someone who was also undecided?
A. Yes.
Q. And you worked for Antrim Energy. I believe it was brought up earlier in this hearing.
A. Yes.
Q. Correct? And you collected wind data and maintained and moved the LIDAR equipment?
A. Correct.
Q. You were in favor of the 2012 version of the Project?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're obviously in favor of the current version.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, your handwritten survey notes attached to your supplemental testimony indicate that you asked the interviewees if the blades or turbines would affect the environment; is that
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correct?
A. Their enjoyment of the environment, $I$ believe.
Q. Okay. There's a discrepancy between your handwritten notes and what you said in your supplemental testimony, but --
A. Yeah, my handwritten notes say -- if you'll look at them, they are pretty much scribbled. But what I do is I take notes while I'm talking to people so that I can gather general awareness of the conversation that we had.
Q. Did you show any of the interviewees any photo simulations that have been done?
A. No. I didn't have those.
Q. You had access to them, though.
A. I did.
Q. Do you think, or do you know whether Mike Bartlett or other Audubon witnesses have viewed those photo simulations?
A. I would hope so.
Q. Did you ask any of the interviewees whether they were aware that in 2012 the SEC decided that that proposed project would have an unreasonably adverse affect on aesthetics?
A. No.
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Q. Did you discuss the SEC process with the interviewees?
A. Not the process. I explained that I was an intervenor and that $I$ was collecting data to bring forth to the SEC.
Q. Did you ask them whether the proposed project would have an unreasonable adverse affect on aesthetics?
A. Not in that exact verbiage.

MR. REIMERS: No further questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
Ms. Linowes.
MS. LINOWES: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Ward.
DR. WARD: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Levesque or Ms. Allen?
MR. LEVESQUE: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Jones.
I don't think I see Mr. Jones.
Okay. Mr. Block.
MR. BLOCK: Yes, just a few
questions.
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## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLOCK:
Q. Regarding your employment with Antrim Wind, can you describe what your duties were?
A. Absolutely. And I'll even give you a little bit more. Antrim Wind had LIDAR equipment that was being moved across the ridge line to collect data from the north to the south end of the projected wind site. And because they were located outside of Antrim, they came to me and asked me if $I$ would be interested in assisting them move that equipment and maintaining it. So we moved the LIDAR in all seasons from the north to the south side, and one in the center to collect that data.
Q. So, how frequent were your trips up to the ridge?
A. I would have to go back to my notebook. But we... frequent. I mean, we moved the system, I can't remember if it was every couple -- I think it was every three months. But actually, it had to be more than that because we were moving it summer/winter from the north to the south. So it tended to be every couple months.
Q. Did you travel up there to the ridge by yourself at times just to check on things?
A. I did make more trips than just to move the equipment, maintain and move the equipment, yes.
Q. Do you know, offhand, what the entire period of employment was from roughly when you started and when that ended?
A. It was 12 months, and I believe it was 2014. I would have to check the exact year. But I believe it was 2014. I believe so.
Q. During that time, or any time since then, has there been any discussion between you and Antrim Wind about any future possibilities of any kind of employment?
A. No.
Q. Can you tell me how much you were paid for your services?
A. It is in my testimony. I would have to dig it up. I think it was -- I don't remember if it was $\$ 4,000$ or $\$ 6,000$. I can't remember. But I mean, $I$ can find it. It is in the testimony.
Q. No, that's okay.

MR. BLOCK: No further questions.
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 9 - Morning Session Only] \{10-18-16\}

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank You. Ms. Berwick, any questions?

MS. BERWICK: Yes.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. Mr. Enman, you and Mr. Pratt completed the informal survey to get people's opinions on the possibilities of turbines. Were the survey questions written down on paper, or did you do the survey in a conversational format?
A. In my testimony, you'll see my handwritten notes. I had questions, specific questions that I did ask, but it was done informally.
Q. Isn't it very possible, just by the tone of your voice and your body language and the way that you ask questions, that you can lead a person towards the answer that you want?
A. I took that very much into consideration. And because I really wanted to not impart my views -- and in fact, one of the respondents asked whether I was a reporter or not because they were just trying to figure out, you know, why $I$ was there and asking those questions.
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But I tried to remain -- I think I remained completely impartial.
Q. Do you know that on Labor Day, Monday, I and three of my friends went to Willard Pond kayaking, and I talked to only two people -actually, I talked to three, but one $I$ just said hello to. One was a man from Connecticut that was fly fishing, and the other was a lady from Massachusetts. I asked them if they knew about the wind turbines and what their opinion was. And I will honestly swear on a bible that I tried to be absolutely non-leading in the way I asked my question. Both of them said they did not want the wind turbines to come. The lady from Massachusetts asked me for the address because she wanted to see if she could contact the SEC. She thought this issue had been settled. Does that informal survey prove anything to you?
A. Yours?
Q. Yes.
A. I wouldn't know because I wasn't there.
Q. All right. Mr. Block asked if you had been promised future compensation. But has there
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been -- alluding to any type of compensation in the future --
A. No.
Q. -- or future employment?
A. Never .
Q. Do you attend all the selectmen meetings?
A. No.
Q. Can I ask how many meetings you have attended in the past four months?
A. I believe two.
Q. On September 12th, a group of us met with the Antrim Selectmen to ask them to consider making an addendum to their contract, basically asking for Antrim Wind to consider a buyout agreement for us. We know that a reporter called up the selectmen before the meeting to ask their opinion about this. You were the only resident that was there that was not in favor of this proposal. How did you know about that meeting?
A. I was not the only resident that was there. And I was... oh, gosh. I'm trying to think. Prior, I want to say it was two weeks before that meeting, or at least a week before that meeting, I was informed that the Stoddard
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Select Board was going to be at that meeting, from a select board member. And when I heard that, I thought it was important that I show up to that meeting.
Q. There was no Stoddard Selectmen.
A. There was no Stoddard Select Board. I was shocked when I got there to find the Antrim group that was there and no Stoddard Select Board.

MS. BERWICK: All right. No further questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Anybody
from the Harris Center?
MR. NEWSOM: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you. Anybody from the Giffin Pratt intervenors have any questions?

MR. PRATT: None.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: The TOWN,
Mr. Richardson?
MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. I have a couple, two exhibits to hand out if I may. I have seven copies for submission.
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## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. RICHARDSON:
Q. While those are being handed out, let me ask you some questions about your testimony -PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Do you have any idea what numbers these would be if you want to mark --

MR. RICHARDSON: Oh, sure. There are two documents there. I gave the witness my copy. One is the NHDES Advisory Fact Sheet. And why don't we call that -- Antrim only has three exhibits. So we'll call that Antrim 4. And then I believe it's the $305(\mathrm{~b})$ or (d) report. It's just two pages from the report because it's a rather large document. And we'll call that Antrim 5.
(Antrim Exhibits 4, and 5 marked for identification.)

BY MR. RICHARDSON :
Q. So, Mr. Enman, you state in your prefiled testimony on Page 1, and I'll read it to you, "I've spent hours in Lempster interviewing past and current town officials. I've also spent many hours at the wind site observing the wind
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turbines and assessing the concerns brought by the impacted citizens of Antrim. I've been granted unlimited access to the site and have taken advantage of that privilege. I have witnessed variations in sound levels and shadow flicker." And that's in reference to the Lempster project I believe; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. How much time did you spend in total evaluating the Lempster project?
A. My visiting the Lempster project from Day 1 was to assess the impacts of wind turbines. When $I$ first became aware that Antrim Wind had a project proposed for Antrim, I immediately was onboard. And I had no experience with wind energy at all. And so when I heard of the potential impacts, I became painfully aware that I was ignorant to those concerns. And so the first trip that I made to Lempster was with the planning board. They had a field trip. And every subsequent trip that I've ever made to Lempster was to observe and assess the impacts that the wind turbines provide.
Q. So how many trips are we talking about? You
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say in your testimony "many hours." I'm trying to get a sense. Is that 4 hours or is that 50 or --
A. I spend anywhere from one to three hours every time I go to Lempster. I literally hit every turbine, all 12 turbines, when I go there. And since February of this year, I believe that I've made eight trips. So, since January, we're talking somewhere up to 20 hours.
Q. And that's just this year. So how many, just a rough estimate, in the past? Have you been 50 times, 10 times?
A. I haven't been 50 times. I've probably been 20 times.
Q. Okay. So, with that understanding, you're aware that with the Antrim Wind Project, the nearest resident is approximately 2800 feet?
A. Correct.
Q. And have you ever observed anything at that distance at the Lempster project that was unreasonable, in terms of sound levels or shadow flicker events?
A. To be fair, $I$ would say that's subjective. But at 2,000 feet, $I$ don't have issues.
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Q. Okay. But -- yeah, I guess there is a subjective element to it. But something like sound, either you can hear it or not. I'm wondering if you ever experienced a sound level, where you were like, Gosh, that's disproportionately loud and that really jumps out at me.
A. At 2800 feet, no. To give an example, $I$ was there, I want to say three weeks ago, and it was a very windy day. I was at tower -- I guess 1 call it Tower 2, but $I$ guess it's really Tower 9. And I could hear the turbines, and I could hear a diesel engine down in the valley that was actually louder than the wind turbines. And I was standing right underneath the wind turbine. So, at 2800 feet it sounds like light wind at best.
Q. Okay. You weren't present when Mr. Thurber testified, I assume?
A. I may have been. I'm not sure. I don't remember.
Q. I had it in my notes here. Although, it said yesterday you weren't present. But that's three weeks ago.
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So, Mr. Thurber, in his testimony, said, "As far as noise, the Lempster Wind Project has not had a significant adverse effect. Residents do not hear or notice the project at all under normal circumstances." And then he describes a situation. "For example, my daughter lives 3600 feet from three turbines, and [sic] the project can only be heard on occasion by standing perfectly still. If you move, you cannot hear the turbines at all." And then he says, "My residence is located around 2 miles away [sic] from the project, and it can only faintly be heard on rare occasions."
A. Yeah, I believe that was written testimony that he provided?
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah, I'm aware of that testimony.
Q. And is that testimony consistent with your observations?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. Now, are you aware that the Lempster project is built to a 45-dBA permit condition?
A. I was not aware of the actual dBA, but I knew
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 9 - Morning Session Only] \{10-18-16\}

determination that town residents believed that wind energy should not be allowed?
A. No.
Q. Why do you say that?
A. The ordinance -- there were several ordinances that were written. The early ordinance we believed was too restrictive. Site, sound and setback, that was where I -- were my concerns, and I believe everyone's concerns. There were residents that if the -- and bear with me because even I get confused with the ordinances that were done. But it was believed that if the ordinances were passed, that Antrim Wind would -- the first ordinance -- that they would not be able to construct a wind facility.
Q. Let me ask the question a different way. I believe I gave you BOS Attachment 3 to Antrim Wind -- excuse me -- Town of Antrim Exhibit 3, which is the Town's supplemental testimony. That should be a copy of the warrant with some votes from 2011 on it.
A. Yeah.
Q. And do you see on that document the proposed ordinance in November of 2011?
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A. Yes.
Q. That failed, I think by a margin of 309 to 501.
A. Correct.
Q. And that would be the regulation you just referred to that people believed to be too stringent?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to focus your attention to the article below, I believe the second zoning article on BOS Attachment 3 to Antrim Exhibit 3. And you see that the planning board actually recommended a zoning amendment that would prohibit wind entirely in the rural conservation district?
A. Yes.
Q. So was that known to be something that the planning board had proposed that would just prohibit this project?
A. I believe so.
Q. Yeah. And that failed by a margin of -- an even greater margin of 584 to 225?
A. Yes.
Q. I note that the planning board recommended that
article. Was it generally known or believed
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that the planning board was recommending articles that would prohibit Antrim Wind at the time?
A. I can't say what the planning board's intent was. But I believe when you look at those numbers, the residents were well aware and are still aware that the Antrim Wind Project is still viable. And that was a pretty resounding vote to allow wind to be allowed in that zone.
Q. Now, you say -- or I guess when you read that document, BOS Attachment 3, in both of those articles you see that it says "recommended by the planning board."
A. Correct.
Q. Were people aware that there was a motion made in 2011 to show that that article was a 4 to 3 split?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. But that article there just says "recommended." It gives no statement or gives the voter no information to say that this is not a unanimous decision.
A. It's true.
Q. Why do you think that is?
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A. I can't speak to the planning board's rules.
Q. So you --
A. I believe when the boards come up with a majority, that the rest of the board is asked to recommend.
Q. Would it surprise you that there was a motion to show the vote result and that that motion was denied by a vote of 4 to 3 as well?

MS. MALONEY: I think I'm going to object to this line of questioning. It sounds like Attorney Richardson is asking Mr. Enman a lot of questions that he doesn't have any basis of knowledge. It's complete speculation at this point. It's been going on for a few minutes now. But unless he can lay some kind of foundation as to where Mr. Enman gets this information, this is all pure speculation.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Richardson.
MR. RICHARDSON: I'm just only asking questions to find out what he knows. And this is not rehearsed, so I'm -- obviously, asking the question, that one was leading because I wanted to know if he knew that the votes to --
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the planning board each time had voted on an ordinance and it was split.

MS. MALONEY: Well, he just told me -- he just led him through that. But there's questions about what the planning board intended, there's questions about what the voters intended. There's no basis -- he's not asked him for any foundation as to why Mr. Enman would have any of this information. So I would object to this whole line of questioning.

MR. RICHARDSON: I think his testimony concerns support for the Project, so I'm asking him questions about that.

MS. MALONEY: He's given a lot of opinions, but he has no basis in fact for this.

MR. RICHARDSON: That's counsel's opinion. We should ask the witness that question. I don't intend on pursuing this line any further, so --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Why don't you move on.

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you.
BY MR. RICHARDSON:
Q. Do you have your data in front of you? What
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was the percentage, again, of the visitors that were generally supportive of wind energy when you were at Willard Pond?
A. The percentage was very high. If it was 26 people and three were against, I don't know what the numbers are, but it's way up there.
Q. Okay. Well, I want to ask you a question because you spoke to these residents. I wasn't there. I didn't know anything about it. But I want to first turn to your attention to the document we marked as Antrim Exhibit 4. And you see on the bottom of the first page there, this is the DES fact sheet.
A. Yes.
Q. It says "New Hampshire Fish Consumption Guidelines."
A. Yes.
Q. And I'll read it to you. You can follow along. It says, "Fish from several water bodies in New Hampshire have been shown to have higher than average mercury concentrations. For the water bodies identified below," and then it says in italics or bold, "women of childbearing age and young children should not" -- and then the
"not" is in bold -- "consume any fish; others may consume two meals per month." So I'm -MS. MALONEY: I'm going to object again. First of all, they're not really impeachment documents. And I don't know if the witness has any information about any of these documents whatsoever. So what -- they also, based on relevance --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Well, I'd like to hear the question first before $I$ rule. MR. RICHARDSON: Sure.

BY MR. RICHARDSON:
Q. So, I guess let me start by this: What percentage of the people that you observed were there to fish?
A. I'm not sure how many were actually fishing. A small percentage.
Q. A small, okay. And you got to interview those people?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you think the reaction of those people would be if they knew -- and let's complete the foundation for this. I'm looking at the list of ponds. And you see Ashuelot Pond in
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Washington?
MS. MALONEY: Objection. He's asking for speculation.

MR. RICHARDSON: No, I'm not. I'm trying to show him the ponds that DES has said contain high levels of mercury are all in the vicinity of Willard Pond. I'm not asking him to verify whether Willard Pond is or not. But I want to get his sense of how people would react if they were aware of this issue and this concern.

MS. MALONEY: I think that calls for speculation.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And is this part of his testimony anywhere? Did I miss that?

MR. RICHARDSON: Well, his testimony was surveys of residents. So I want to ask him how residents might have responded if they knew that in fact the Antrim Wind Project was intended to address, among other things, other forms of contaminants for fossil fuel, not merely carbon dioxide.

MS. MALONEY: Same objection.
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I'm going to sustain the objection.

MR. RICHARDSON: If I may, I'd like to try to rephrase the question then.

BY MR. RICHARDSON:
Q. Did you speak to people about their concerns about global warming?
A. Not particularly.
Q. Okay. Did that ever come up? I thought that in your testimony you said people were supportive of renewable energy that were visiting the sanctuary.
A. Yes. It was not necessarily, once again, the verbiage about global warming.
Q. Okay. What was their basis for their support of renewable energy then?
A. I believe, once again, I didn't ask the question specifically about climate change.
Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.

So, then, a concern about obviously
mercury levels would be consistent with something that people would also have wanted to see renewable energy address --

MS. MALONEY: Same objection.
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Q. -- is that fair?

MS. MALONEY: I'm going to object again. This is the same -- Mr. Enman has already testified that he didn't speak with them. He doesn't even know if people were fishing. I don't think there is any prefiled testimony or supplemental testimony that indicates anything about mercury.

MR. RICHARDSON: No, but he spoke with residents. I was just trying to find out how, in his view, people might have reacted. I didn't get to write his testimony. So this is my only chance to ask about it. The answers are whatever weight this Committee wants to give them. It's not a basis for objection merely because the witness might not be a hundred percent certain.

MS. MALONEY: Well, I think that Mr. Richardson had an opportunity to participate in the technical session. He could have done some discovery on this issue. No pun intended, but this is just a "fishing expedition."

MS. LINOWES: And if I may add, the same line of or similar line of questioning
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came up when Audubon was on the stand. There was information in the record to demonstrate that building this project will have a material effect on mercury levels, either way.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: SO I'm going to let Mr. Enman answer the question, and then I'm going to ask you to move on. Again, I didn't see this anywhere in his testimony. I understand your assertion that he asked questions of people there. But I don't want to extrapolate --

MR. RICHARDSON: Sure. And that's my last question on this exhibit.
A. Can you ask that question one more time, please?

BY MR. RICHARDSON :
Q. I'm sorry. So my question was simply this: Is a concern about mercury levels and impairment in the water quality consistent with the reasons that people supported renewable energy when you spoke to them?
A. Yes.

MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. Thank you. That's all I've got. I really have the last
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|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | exhibit is just the -- it's simply for the |
| 2 | record to note the source of the information |
| 3 | related to the state's water quality impairment |
| 4 | for mercury, and that's Antrim Exhibit 5. But |
| 5 | I think I've covered the ground already, so |
| 6 | I'll just end my questioning there. |
| 7 | PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Does the |
| 8 | Applicant have any questions? |
| 9 | MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, thank you. |
| 10 | PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Enman, |
| 11 | thank you -- |
| 12 | MS. MALONEY: Well, you didn't ask me |
| 13 | if I had any questions. I might just have a |
| 14 | few. |
| 15 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 16 | BY MS. MALONEY: |
| 17 | Q. I just wanted to ask, Mr. Enman, you didn't |
| 18 | show any of these people that you interviewed |
| 19 | simulations. |
| 20 | A. No, I did not. |
| 21 | Q. And did you indicate to them how many turbines |
| 22 | would be visible from Willard Pond? |
| 23 | A. I did. |
| 24 | Q. And did you tell them where they would be |
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visible?
A. I did.
Q. And what did you tell them?
A. I believe my exact words were, "Are you aware that there's a wind project proposed?" Most people said no. Then I asked if they could see turbines and blades from the pond, if that would detract from their enjoyment of the pond, and they overwhelmingly said no.
Q. And did you ask them if they had any experience with wind turbines before?
A. I didn't ask specifically, but some people volunteered information that said they did, and some didn't say anything.
Q. Okay. With respect to -- you had some opinions about some of the votes in the town. Is it fair to say that you didn't interview everybody who voted on various ordinances in the town?
A. I did not interview everyone, no.
Q. Not in 2011 or 2013.
A. No, I didn't interview them.
Q. And not in 2014.
A. No.
Q. I think you said -- and correct me if I'm
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wrong -- that when you first heard about Antrim Wind, the Project, that you were onboard?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's before you were aware of any of its impacts; correct?
A. Yes.

MS. MALONEY: Okay. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
You're all set, Counsel for the Public?
MS. MALONEY: Yup.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Enman, you're good to go.
WITNESS ENMAN: You guys don't have any questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Any
questions of the panel from the SEC? Go ahead. Mr. Boisvert, I'll start down the line here. QUESTIONS BY MR. BOISVERT:
Q. Mr. Enman, first question. You were asked how long you had been a resident in Antrim. You said you owned land for 34 years. Is that also the time of your residency for voting and paying taxes and so forth?
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A. I first moved to Antrim in 1976 and rented. But I did vote and I did pay and I registered my car in the town, and then $I$ subsequently moved and then moved back to Antrim. But I've been in my residence for 34 years.
Q. I see. What motivated you to do the survey at Willard Pond?
A. Realistically, in the tech sessions, New Hampshire Audubon had no information, which I was shocked that they had no information of the users of the facility. And quite frankly, I took that as an opportunity to go to the pond and find out why people used it and how they found it because it is not a place that you just drive down the road and know that it's there. It is an obscure location. And I wanted to know why people used it and if they thought the turbines would have an effect on their enjoyment, because that's what New Hampshire Audubon's testimony is, like this will ruin their enjoyment of Willard Pond. And once again, without any information, I wanted to prove or disapprove.
Q. I see. You did the survey on the Fourth of
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 9 - Morning Session Only] \{10-18-16\}

July?
A. I did.
Q. And that was the one time you did it?
A. Yes.
Q. And I gather there's 26 people that were interviewed, or 26 sets of interviews? Some might have been with one person, some might have been multiple.
A. With groups, yes. Mr. Pratt went subsequently. I can't remember the date. I believe it was the 20 -something. But he went on a weekend and did the same as I did, and he interviewed six people.
Q. And between these two surveys, how do you interpret the responses? What conclusion do you draw from the combined surveys?
A. That the overall effect of people that use Willard Pond really wouldn't care that the wind turbines would be visible. The people that I interviewed that went to Willard to use the water at Willard overwhelmingly were there because there were no motor boats. They wanted to kayak, swim, paddle board without motor boats. That's overwhelmingly why they went
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there. They did not want motorized boats. Bottom line.
Q. Are you familiar with the concepts of "sample size" and "representative sampling" for surveys?
A. Vaguely, yes. I tried to get as many people as I could in the amount of time that $I$ had to respond to the questions. I understand that if I went 25 times I would have much better data.
Q. Do you think that these 26 interviews are adequate to represent the public's perception of use and attitudes?
A. As I stated, I wish that I had more time and more -- I wish I had more time to gather more data. I think it would be better to have more data. But $I$ believe when you take the numbers that I have and you plug them in, I think it would be representative.
Q. When you interviewed people, did you tell them why you were interviewing them?
A. Specifically that $I$ was an intervenor and I was collecting data to provide to the SEC.
Q. Thank you.
A. You're welcome.
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And
Commissioner Rose.
QUESTIONS BY CMSR. ROSE:
Q. Good morning. I just had two questions. One is earlier in your remarks and during some of the questioning, you had used the phrase that you were "painfully negligent" to the impacts of wind turbines prior to your experience. I guess I was wondering exactly what you mean by that. I don't understand what you mean. Could you just expound on that?
A. Yeah. I had never been to a wind facility, so I truly had no personal experience of the effects of wind. I didn't -- the stories were "whomp, whomp, whomp," that's what you're going to hear when you're near them; they chop birds up. The shadow flicker I don't really believe. But it was going to be super loud and were going to chop up birds. And I was, like, oh, my God, if this is true, then I need to witness this. And so when the Antrim Planning Board put together a field trip to go to Lempster, I was there.

And let me also state that I sat through
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almost all of the planning board's deliberations when they were drafting the wind ordinance. I was there -- once I was aware that Antrim was putting together a wind ordinance, $I$ spent virtually -- I was at virtually every planning board meeting. So I was well aware of what the ordinance stated. And that's why I said site, sound and setback for me was important because I really wanted to know what those ramifications were.
Q. In your prefiled testimony, you made reference to Lempster and impacts on Lempster in the general vicinity. And you did reference in there the interview with the park ranger at Pillsbury State Park.
A. Yes.
Q. I was wondering if you could give me a perspective as to who it was that you spoke with and/or even what year. I wasn't sure what year it even was you had that conversation.
A. It was this year. I can't say the exact date. But I went to Lempster. I interviewed several people. And on my way out, I came down 31 and stopped at the park. And I didn't get -- it
was wasn't a head ranger. It was one of the employees that works there, and we just had a brief conversation. It was late in the afternoon, and I think they wanted to close the park early. And I gathered just quick information when $I$ was at the gate.

Well, I'm not sure $I$ like the idea of closing the park early, but...
A. They did, though.
Q. But did you ask whether or not -- what was the question that you asked them to get their perspectives as to the impact at the park as a result of the Lempster Wind Project?
A. I'm well aware that the turbines are visible from the water -- from several of the water bodies, and I just asked whether or not anyone had positively or negatively commented on the view of the turbines. And he stated that they had never gotten any negative response to the visual impact of the turbines, which is really what I was after.
Q. Okay. Fair enough.

CMSR. ROSE: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms.
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Weathersby.
MS. WEATHERSBY: Thank you.
QUESTIONS BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Mr. Enman, when you conducted the surveys at Willard Pond, did you stop everyone that you saw, or did you just select certain people?
A. It was July 4th. There were a lot of people at Willard. So what I tried to do was talk to as many people as I could completely randomly. I did not select -- you know, I didn't go, Oh, that looks like a person $I$ want to talk to. I literally talked to every person that was available at the time that $I$ was available. So if I was conducting an interview, if I was talking to some people, three other groups of individuals may have entered or exited the pond that $I$ didn't get a chance to interview. But when those people were gone, the next available group that I would -- that was there I would interview. There were some down times. And the nice woman from Hancock and New York was looking at me. She was an older woman, and she was, like, you know, what are you doing here? And because she'd seen me conduct many
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interviews, she volunteered. The same thing with the Antioch kids. They were -- they obviously saw what $I$ was doing and then came over and volunteered.

But to get to where you're going, it was not selected. It was literally anytime I was available, if there was a group that was coming by, I would ask the questions.
Q. Okay. And when you told people you were an intervenor, that you were gathering this information for the SEC, did you tell them you were an intervenor opposed to the Project, or did you tell them your stance concerning the Project?
A. At no time was anyone aware of whether I was a supporter or in opposition of the Project. I really tried to write my questions so that it was neutral. And I never asked or never tried to imply where I stood on the Project. I
wanted honest opinions. That was my goal is I wanted honest opinions. And that's why I say positive or negative, it wasn't -- I could have gone there and talked to 26 people that were opposed. That didn't happen.
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Q. Okay. And concerning Pillsbury State Park, you spoke with the ranger. But did you do any surveys there of visitors?
A. I did not.
Q. I still haven't been to Pillsbury State Park.
A. Got to go.
Q. But could you tell me roughly how the water bodies at Pillsbury compare with Willard Pond?
A. There are several. They're all connected, but they're kind of several individual water bodies. Very secluded, other than when you drive by you can see some of the water bodies from Route 31, and the dam right there. So there is access to some of the water bodies from Route 31 so you don't have to go into the park. But they are -- it's a secluded park. They do have campsites at Pillsbury. They are unimproved. So there is a box on the ground with no enclosure, and that's where, you know -- that's your facilities. But there's, you know, running water at the park headquarters. But once you're away from the headquarters, it is a -- boy, unimproved. It is unimproved. It's very rural.
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Q. So would you say that a visitor's experience is similar at Pillsbury to Willard? Or how would you describe the visitor's experience comparatively?
A. I mean, personally, $I$ think it's very similar. You go to Pillsbury to use the water, to camp. I think you go to Willard to use the water, to hike. But the user experience, I believe, I believe, is very similar. When I go, I go to fish; I go to paddle; I go to use the facilities that's there.
Q. And Pillsbury is also non-motorized?
A. Pillsbury is non-motorized.
Q. Okay. As part of your testimony today, you said you've been onboard with this project since you heard of it. Do you think that that initial inclination has biased your observations of the Lempster project or of your interviews, or do you think that you've been biased in any way with your observations?
A. No. And with my mailed questionnaire to the Lempster residents, to the questions that $I$ asked going to the town offices in Lempster, my entire reason for being here -- and it's stated
right with my initial letter for the application for intervenor, to be an intervenor -- was to show real-world impacts of this project.

You know, you go to the Lempster Town Offices and you talk to the people that are there and they go, Mr. Thurber, we haven't you know, they gave two abatements, okay. One of them was for Kevin Onella. I would have never given him an abatement. I'm sorry. That's my personal opinion. And I haven't yet confronted him about it because I haven't had the opportunity. But believe me, I will.

But the bottom line is: I drove around.
I saw these houses that are way closer than anybody lives in Antrim. I didn't get every response. And because $I$ did it completely anonymously, I can't tell you which ones I didn't receive back. But if you read those, there are -- and you've got it in their own handwriting. Some people didn't, like -- you know, it's like, nah, they're not so great, they're not so bad. Some people loved them. But that's real world. Does shadow flicker
affect you? No. Can you hear them? Yes. Does it affect you? No. Everything I -- I tried to be as objective as I can. That's why I'm here, because I don't believe that the overall impact is as devastating as may be projected.
Q. Thank you.

MS. WEATHERSBY: I have nothing further.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Clifford.
QUESTIONS BY MR. CLIFFORD:
Q. Can you hear me?
A. I can.
Q. I have a question on Page 1 of your prefiled testimony. You say the maximum measured sound -- I'm assuming this was Lempster -- was 52 decibels late this winter, with sustained winds of 30 miles per hour at the base of several towers. So, how far were you from the turbines when the 52-decibel measurement was taken, or was that at the base, if you recall?
A. Bear with -- my son downloaded -- my younger son had never been to the facility and so I
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 9 - Morning Session Only] \{10-18-16\}

took the opportunity to take him up. It was a nasty day. And he downloaded the decibel meter app for his phone, for his iPhone. So we took readings from various locations at, once again, every cell tower, or every turbine. And the highest reading that he got from either at the base or outside the gate was 52 on his iPhone. And that's -- as I say, it's not the best indicator, but it's an iPhone.
Q. So your testimony is you're not sure whether the 52 was at the base or some distance further?
A. I believe the 52 was, once again, at Tower 9, which I generally call Tower 2. It's the second tower in from Mountain Road. And I'm pretty sure that was where we got that. And I believe that we were really close to the base. I believe that we were maybe, well, certainly within the parking area, the base area that's excavated.
Q. So that measurement was with a 30-mile-an hour sustained wind present.
A. Correct. And that's, as I stated before, when I was up three weeks ago at the base, it was a
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breezy day. It was a beautiful day, but a breezy day. And standing at that same tower, I could hear a diesel engine -- I don't know what it was -- in the valley at that tower. And I would have assumed that I shouldn't have heard the diesel engine, but wind conditions or whatever...

MR. CLIFFORD: All right. No further questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Director Forbes.

DIR. FORBES: I have no questions.
QUESTIONS BY PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT:
Q. I have just one question. Can you remind the Committee of your location, where you reside? Where is that in relationship to the proposed project?
A. As the crow flies, $I$ believe I'm about 3 miles east of the Project. Don't have a view. Wish I did. But, yeah, I'm east of the Project.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Iacopino, do you have any questions?
MR. IACOPINO: I just have one
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question.
QUESTIONS BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. You mentioned this survey of Lempster residents --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- something that you mailed out. Which exhibit is that attached to? Or is it not?
A. It was a data request from Ms. Linowes during the tech sessions. And I would be more than happy to -- I believed when that information was asked for that it would be in the record, because I -- but if you don't have that information, $I$ would be more than happy to share that.

MR. IACOPINO: Do you know if that's something the Committee wants?
A. It's all electronic at this point. I can send it to Pam and she can --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Why don't you go ahead and do that. We'll make that a data request.
(Data Request by Subcommittee for survey sent to Lempster residents by Mr. Enman) WITNESS ENMAN: My pleasure.
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: I have no other questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Again, thank you for your patience. We'll swap the panels now. Our next panel is with the Abutting Landowners.

As you're swapping out, some housekeeping. So, Ms. Berwick, you had a motion to adopt Stephen Berwick's testimony. That's granted. We'll issue a written order also.

While I'm on housekeeping, Ms. Longgood also had a motion for Mr. James to present electronically to the Committee. That's granted also. That will be... tentatively, that will be tomorrow at 1:00. We'll try to accommodate Mr. James for tomorrow at 1:00. Again, we'll be at the PUC. And in theory, we'll have our functioning audio and everything there. So in theory, that may be actually a better way to accommodate that.

So with that, why don't we go off the record while we get the next panel set
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up.
(Pause in proceedings)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Back on the record.

So I've been reminded that at the last session I asked the group -- warned the group that I'd be asking for input on whether we should do oral closings or arguments or written briefs. I wanted to get the flavor from both the Committee and the Intervenors and the Applicant on that. So if anybody would like to start, I'd like to hear if anybody -first of all, I'd like to hear if there's any objections that people have to written briefs. If we're going to do briefs, I would like to stress the word "brief."

MR. NEEDLEMAN: If I could?
DR. WARD: This would be in place of oral arguments.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Go ahead.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: We would strongly
favor closing arguments over briefs for a couple reasons. First of all, certainly closing arguments are much more efficient in
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> terms of time. Second of all, I think that having the opportunity to sum up the evidence in a closing argument can frequently be much more efficient. And third, I think it's just -- my view is, based on the experience that I've had, that summing up the evidence in a closing argument can frequently be more helpful for the Committee. I'm not trying to put myself in the shoes of the Committee. But over the time that I've done this, it seems like that has worked better. I just worry about losing time waiting for transcripts, knowing that we're under a time crunch now and then having -- despite the urging of the Chair that these be brief, that rarely tends to be the case. And I think the Committee would then be inundated with a lot of additional paper that would consume even more time. So we would strongly favor arguments over briefs. PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: To quibble with you a little bit, you just said that we'd have -- there's a concern about waiting for transcripts. Wouldn't that be the case if we did oral arguments?
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: No. Actually, I think it's the opposite. I think if you're just going to ask the parties to make their closing arguments, we don't need to wait for the transcripts. My concern is that if people want to write briefs, they're going to ask to have all the transcripts first, and that will add additional delay.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Understood. Thank you.

Counsel for the Public.
MS. MALONEY: I would prefer to do briefs. And one of the main reasons I'd prefer to do briefs is because $I$ have a number of legal issues that $I$ would like to raise, and I would like to get that law in front of the Committee. When the jurisdictional order was issued, the chair at the time indicated that, with regard to specific issues related to res judicata, that they'd be taken up at this session -- at the adjudicatory hearing. And heretofore, there hasn't been an opportunity for us to raise that. So, anticipating that we would do this in closing, that's why I reserved
for that purpose. I think it's imperative to make that record.

And I also do think that from a time point of view, you know, they certainly did briefs last time in Antrim 1. And I think that they gave the parties like two weeks to do the briefs, and they managed to do that. I think that it's important for the record. I think that it's also important to just marshal all the various testimony that's been given. And we've been getting pretty timely copies of the transcripts, so that shouldn't be a problem. I understand what Attorney Needleman is saying about being time-efficient. But I think it's important to make the record. It's important to make the legal arguments. And I don't have -- up until this point, we really haven't had any structure for us to do that. So we've always anticipated doing that in a final memorandum, and I would ask the Committee to allow Counsel for the Public to do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Attorney Richardson.

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you, Mr.
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 9 - Morning Session Only] \{10-18-16\}

Chairman. The only thing $I$ would be concerned about with memoranda is, A), it is an additional cost. And then, also, I mean, at some point we kind of need to close the record. And my concern is that -- and this came to my mind hearing Counsel for Public's argument about potentially res judicata or other issues we haven't seen yet. If those come in the memoranda, then we almost need an opportunity to respond to them. And that's kind of the problem with memoranda sometimes is that things come up in the memoranda after the hearings are closed, and no one has an opportunity to address them unless there's an additional rebuttal opportunity, and then all of a sudden, you know, you really do extend this out.

For that reason, $I$ do like the idea of having a date certain where we do close the record during the hearings when everyone's in the room. If people want to bring a memoranda on that day and submit it, they certainly can. But at least at that point we would all be here at that moment and could decide what to do. If we decide a date, you
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And they were not considered in the jurisdictional phase, and the chair at that time said they would be considered in this phase.

So I know that both Attorney Richardson and Attorney Needleman are very capable and aware that these issues could be raised. The law is the law, and we just marshal the facts and submit the law. So they're perfectly capable of addressing those. There's no additional issues. There's no additional legal issues. But I certainly intend to raise them in this particular docket. We were told we could raise them, and I've made no secret about that throughout the proceedings. This is not coming out of left field. So they've been aware throughout the course of the docket that I was raising these issues.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, except, to be clear, first of all, $I$ don't know whether you're going to raise res judicata, which is claim preclusion; I don't know whether you're going to raise collateral estoppel, which is
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issue preclusion. If you're going to raise either one of those, I'm not sure which issues you're going to raise them to or which ones you might acknowledge cut the other way and would be precluded. And I understand your point, and I'm not claiming that we're surprised by it. I recognize that it was raised in a prior docket. What I'm saying is it's not reasonable to expect that we should guess on the context in which these are raised in and file simultaneous briefs hoping we got it right. That's my point.

MS. MALONEY: Well, what I would just suggest, then, is that if a response is required, that the Committee afford other parties the ability to respond. I mean, I think that's only fair. And I think that beyond that, you know, there's always something that can be raised by motion if the Committee sets out a schedule for filing final briefs. You know, if something comes out of left field, it's always -- you know, any adjudicatory body has the ability to accept additional documents by motion.
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Any other intervenors have concerns?

DR. WARD: I just have a quick comment. As far as meteorologists are concerned, by submitting a brief I could be sure that all five of us are on the same page. I think that might hold true for other groups that have to do it.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Block.
MR. BLOCK: Speaking personally, I would welcome an opportunity to just put in writing a summation of what $I$ see as the arguments. This hearing has been scattered across the calendar with a lot of gaps in there. I see a summation as exactly that, in my viewpoint, that it would be presenting information that's already been put forth here. But since it's been scattered so much, in my mind it would organize it nicely to be able to just A, B, C, put it down what I see, at least my prime arguments. And that makes sense. I don't personally see bringing or the need to bring anything new up. But it would just, I think, make it easier for the Committee and
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anybody reading this to see this is what I saw as the arguments. And it makes sense to me.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Levesque.
MR. LEVESQUE: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. First, I'd just like to thank you and the Committee and Mr . Iacopino for all the help and the patience you've given us non-attorneys in this process. And when it comes to oral arguments, I know I'm probably speaking for others of the non-attorney variety in the Intervenor sector here; we don't really know how to do that. But we have learned how to file briefs, and I think we're comfortable filing materials in writing. And so it really would facilitate this part of this process to sort of participate in that final part. So we would hope you would allow us to do that. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Audubon.
MS. VON MERTENS: Thank you.
Attorney Reimers isn't here. But throughout the proceedings we've had our discussions with our lawyer, and he said, yes, that's a point
that goes into the post-hearing brief. And my point, as someone who's been trying to absorb all of the Application from all the consultants, all the intervenors' prefiled supplemental, technical session, my brain is a mess. And I can't imagine what it's for you all that have full-time jobs and you're up there 9:00 to 5:00, a little bit later than that. And Jason has said, "Calm down, calm down, calm down. Post-hearing briefs. We will be brief. We will be succinct. They will read them with great care." And so that's what has been our -- similar to the 2012 docket, that's been our sense, that give us a short deadline, a deadline to be efficient. But to Audubon, I would say it's essential. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you. Anybody else?

MS. LONGGOOD: I would prefer a post-hearing brief as well to kind of sum up the point that $I$ would like to make since I've been unable to attend as regularly as $I$ did the last docket.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
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Mr. Jones, thank you for finding a microphone.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
The Stoddard Conservation Commission would welcome the opportunity to have a written summation just because it's been kind of a long, laborious point -- process. And during it, you know, I've kind of distilled some of my thoughts, and I think it would be most effective for us to be able to have a one- or two-page summary of the salient points that we really want to get across and we think are important to make this decision. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you. Seeing no one else, so what I'm going to do is I'm going to -- I'll let you speak in a second here. What I'm going to do is I'm going to consult with Attorney Iacopino probably over lunch break, and we'll readdress this. I definitely want to hear from the Committee, to the extent that what we're here for is to help the Committee make a decision. So I'm going to want to hear from them also.

But Mr. Needleman, before I move on to the panel --
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: If the Committee does decide it would like to get briefs, we would request that we get the opportunity to file ours some period of time after we see the others since we do have the burden of proof here. Seven days, something like that.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Linowes, I haven't heard from you yet, I guess.

MS. LINOWES: And I agree with those who are recommending a brief, although I would not agree to the Applicant having an opportunity to write a rebuttal. If I just heard, he would -- we would all file our briefs, and then they would write their brief. I would object to that. Write his brief. We all write our briefs. And then if he insists on a reply, fine. But we're not writing to the Applicant right now. We're writing to the Committee. And I think we're all on the same level at that point.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. So, again, $I$ will readdress this issue after the
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lunch break.
We're going to move on to the
Abutters panel now. So I'm looking to Ms.
Berwick as the leader of the panel, I guess.
So after you're sworn in -- so you have nobody
who's going to -- should we use Attorney
Iacopino to have you adopt your testimony? WITNESS BERWICK: Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Please
swear them in.
(WHEREUPON, BARBARA BERWICK, BRUCE
BERWICK, JANICE DULEY LONGGOOD, BRENDA
SCHAEFER, MARK SCHAEFER were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.) DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Why don't you each tell us your name so that that's in the record. Let's start with Mr.

Schaefer on the left-hand side.
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Mark Schaefer, abutting landowner.
Q. Mrs. Schaefer.
A. (Ms. Schaefer) Brenda Schaefer, abutting
landowner.
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Q. Ms. Longgood.
A. (Longgood) Janice Duley Longgood, abutting landowner.
Q. Mr. Berwick.
A. (Mr. Berwick) Bruce Berwick, abutting landowner.
A. (Ms. Berwick) And Barbara Berwick, abutting landowner.
Q. Let me go back to the left side again. Mr. Schaefer, did you file prefiled testimony in this matter?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) I did.
Q. And did you join in that prefiled testimony, Mrs. Schaefer?
A. (Ms. Schaefer) Yes.
Q. And do the both of you adopt that as your testimony here today?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Yes.
Q. Are there changes or additions that you wish to make to that testimony?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Plenty, but not today.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Do you know if that testimony was actually marked as an exhibit?
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A. (Mr. Schaefer) No, it was not. It's just anecdotal --
Q. We will have to --

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: Marked as an exhibit --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. When it was marked as an exhibit, was it given a number?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) I don't know.
Q. All right. We will have to straighten that out at a break, okay.

Ms. Longgood, did you file prefiled -- I'm sorry. Let me back up to the Schaefers.

Did you file any supplemental prefiled testimony?
A. (Ms. Schaefer) No.
Q. Okay. Ms. Longgood, did you file prefiled testimony in this case?
A. (Longgood) I did.
Q. And does that have an exhibit number?
A. (Longgood) I'm not certain I've seen it on the --

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: Yes, yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Is it Abutter No. 1?
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WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: Hold on.
MR. IACOPINO: That's okay, Mrs.
Berwick. I'm pretty sure it's Abutter No. 1, and there were attachments that were attached to it as Abutter Exhibit No. 2.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Is that correct, Ms. Longgood?
A. (Longgood) Yes.
Q. And do you adopt that as your testimony here today?
A. (Longgood) I do.
Q. Do you have any changes or additions to make to it?
A. (Longgood) No, I don't.
Q. Okay. And did you file any supplemental testimony?
A. (Longgood) No, I did not.
Q. Okay. Mr. Berwick, did you file testimony which has been marked as Abutter No. 9 in this matter?
A. (Mr. Berwick) Yes, I did.
Q. And do you adopt that as your testimony in this proceeding?
A. (Mr. Berwick) Yes, I do.
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Q. Are there any changes or additions you wish to make to that?
A. (Mr. Berwick) No.
Q. Did you file any supplemental testimony?
A. (Mr. Berwick) No.
Q. Mrs. Berwick, did you file testimony which has been marked as Abutter No. 8?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. And did you also adopt the testimony of your son, Stephen Berwick, which has been marked as Abutter No. 10?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. And did you file any supplemental testimony?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. And what was the exhibit number for that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Actually, I have Abutter 8 as supplemental testimony.
Q. That's correct.
A. (Ms. Berwick) And Abutter 7 is my addendum, which is also supplemental testimony.
Q. So, Abutter 7 and 8.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. And with respect to all of those exhibits, do you adopt them as your testimony here today?
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A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Do you have any changes or additions to make?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes. On my prefiled testimony, I have the wrong distance from the Monadnock Paper Mill.
Q. Okay. Let's take that one step at a time. So that's Abutter No. 9 -- Abutter No. 8. Is it your prefiled or your --
A. (Ms. Berwick) My prefiled testimony.
Q. Okay. So that would be Abutter No. 6. And do you know what page that is that you want to --
A. (Ms. Berwick) I tried to find it while $I$ was sitting there. When $I$ was at home and going through it, it was like, why did I write -- I think $I$ wrote 14 miles, and it's actually 5.81 miles.
Q. And this is the distance between what?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Between our house and the Monadnock Paper Mill.
Q. Any other changes to your testimony?
A. (Ms. Berwick) No.

MR. IACOPINO: They're available for cross-examination.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: SO, before
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we start, I know you're not all professionals at this. So, again, we have to get everything on the transcript. So when you do wish to talk, pull the microphone close to you, please, and make sure it's on. And you probably followed this. One at a time when you're speaking, and if you could speak clearly and relatively slowly for the transcriptionist. But the big thing is the audio. I think we're much better with the audio today than we were the last time we were here. So hopefully that'll be fine.

So, with that, we'll start with the Audubon Society.

MS. VON MERTENS: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
I'm blocked by -- there you are -- by a post in this room. It's a good room, but not ideal. Ms. Linowes.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. Good morning. I actually wanted to reference Mr. Craig's testimony, but I do not believe he has an exhibit number at this point either. And I'm wondering, can the Committee
[PANEL: Schaefer|Schaefer|Longgood\Berwick|Berwick]
get access to that? Clark Craig.
WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: I think I might have him in mine.

MS. LINOWES: And also, is he available today?

WITNESS MARK SCHAEFER: No, he is not.

MS. LINOWES: If we can't get access, he attached to his testimony a document that is also part of the wetlands permit. So I can bring you to the wetlands permit, if that... it would be -- should I go that route then?

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: That's fine.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. All right. So if we can look at APP 33, which is Application Appendix 2A, and Page 3, PDF Page 3, I believe that brings you to a map of all of the properties that are surrounding -the property lines of parcels that are adjacent to the Project --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Lisa, could you say that again where we find it?
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Q. Yes. Do you have Clark Craig's testimony in front of you?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Oh, I can find it.
Q. It would be the attached map. It would be the second -- it would be the attached map. Do you have that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I found it. I'll share this with everybody. Oh, attached map. It's not attached.
Q. It would be this file.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Did you give us it in here?
Q. It's not in there.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Why don't we go off the record while we're looking for it.
(Discussion off the record.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Back on the record.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. I'm going to -- many of my questions are directed at Ms. Berwick. But anyone who wants to pipe in, I'd really appreciate it if you can.

Now, all of you -- or Antrim Wind has
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stated many times in this proceeding that the Project turbines will be at least a half-mile from nearby residences. Do you recall hearing that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. And $I$ want to -- if you would look at that map that was attached to Mr. Craig's prefiled testimony and also part of the Applicant's wetlands permit, you can see where your properties are relative to the Project.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Ms. Berwick, yours is marked -- your property is 221-9; is that correct?
A. (Ms. Berwick) That is correct.
Q. Mr. Clark is not clear here. Can you confirm that he is 226-10, according to his testimony --
A. That's correct.
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. And Mr. Schaefer, are you 224-1?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Yes.
Q. Okay. And Ms. Longgood, you're 224-2?
A. (Longgood) Correct.
Q. Okay. I got everyone, right, that's up there?
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Okay. Good.
Now, if you can look at Exhibit WA-35x [renumbered as WA-41x], that's one of the exhibits I handed out this morning. There are four pages to this exhibit. This is taken directly from the Applicant's project plans. And those who want to view and validate those, these would be Appendix 7a, Plan Profile of the Application, APP 33, Appendix 7a, Plan Profile, Pages 1 through 9. The first two pages are from there. And then the second two pages are from Appendix 7a, Plan Profile, sheets Pages 10 through 18. So this first page that we're looking at is Page $\mathrm{C}-2$ out of the Project Plan.

And Ms. Berwick, what I wanted to point out to you is do you see the property line? It goes from the left-hand side of the page. You can see it as a stone wall marked there --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. -- marked "property line." And then it dips in and comes out and then proceeds going south. And that's actually south on the plan. Do you see that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
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Q. Okay. Your property, actually, 221-9, is directly east of --
A. (Ms. Berwick) I see it marked on there. I see somebody wrote it on there.
Q. Yes. Okay. Now, the project road -- what we're looking at is the project road. And then there is infrastructure associated with the road. Do you see that? There's --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Okay. And if you measured that -- actually, if you go to measure using the scale, that distance from the eastern-most part of the infrastructure of the road to your property line -- this is near where it says "CDWG-C3" --- that infrastructure right there, it's about 150 feet.
A. Okay. I'll believe you.
Q. Okay. Were you aware that the road is that close to you? Have you been --
A. Actually, I --
Q. -- able to get a measurement on your own?
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm going
to object at this point. There's no scale on
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the map. And what we're hearing from Ms. Linowes is inconsistent with everything that we've heard thus far about the scale. MS. LINOWES: Okay. Mr. Chairman, we'll go to the original scale -- the original map, then, instead looking at this.
A. (Ms. Berwick) I think I could answer the point because we have tried to find out distances using the Application. And until we had the site visit, $I$ did not even know how far our house was from a turbine. And I've wondered since then, looking at how close the road goes to our property, exactly how far the road is from our property line, because there are zoning regulations in Antrim that require a 24-foot setback. Like if I want to put a shed on my property, it's supposed to be 24 feet back from the property line. And I wondered if they were meeting them, but I had no way, no way at all of telling. That's my opinion.

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: Anyone
else?
[No verbal response]
MS. LINOWES: Okay. Mr. Chairman --
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thank you for that, Ms. Berwick.
In reference to the objection, I would like to then go to the original plan. I thought for convenience we could look at these slides. But if we can, let's look at Appendix 7a, Plan Profile, Pages 1-9 of the original Application.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Give us a minute to get there.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Say it again, Lisa, please.
Q. It is at APP 33, Appendix 7a, Plan Profile, Pages 1-9, and PDF Page 3 is the one I'm talking about.
A. (Ms. Berwick) There's 57-A. Which one did you say it was?
Q. The ones that are reduced in size.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Okay.
Q. Pages 1 through 9.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Okay. Thank you. MS. LINOWES: Has the Committee found
it yet?
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Give us another minute.
(Pause in proceedings)
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Why don't you go ahead.

MS. LINOWES: Go ahead? Okay.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Ms. Berwick and the rest of the members on the panel, before we look at the actual scales, I do want to ask you what is the scale of that document that was attached to Mr. Craig's prefiled testimony? Do you see that in the lower left corner of the legend, the scale?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I couldn't find --

DR. BOISVERT: Excuse me, Mr.
Chairman. I'm having difficulty catching up here. Could we have a moment, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Yeah, why don't you hold on.

DR. BOISVERT: Where again are you referring?

MS. LINOWES: In the Plan documents, there's a document called "Appendix 7a," and it's titled, "Plan Profile," Pages 1 through 9. Should be in a reduced file size.

DR. BOISVERT: Thank you.
MS. LINOWES: And there's another one
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that's 10 through 18 that we'll be looking at. PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: You all set? Go ahead.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Do you see -- before we look more closely at the plans, $I$ just want to ask you. That scale that's on the document that was attached to Mr. Clark's -- Mr. Craig's testimony and also Page 3 of the wetlands permit, do you see that the scale is small, like a quarter-mile?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Can I say I believe you, because I can't find that document.
Q. This document right here (indicating).
A. (Ms. Berwick) Oh, that one. Okay. (Witness reviews document.)
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Okay. So, a quarter-mile. So you see that. So that is the smallest you can measure on that scale.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Are you talking about this one?
Q. I am.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Is it a half-mile?
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Q. Yes, it's - -
A. (Ms. Berwick) Oh, the smallest is a quarter-mile. Yes. I'm sorry.
Q. Now, if you look at the plan - and $I$ don't know if you have it -- you have 7a, Appendix 7a in front of you, Pages 1 through 9?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Look at PDF Page 3, which is actually Page C-2. There's a scale now of 1 inch equals 50 .
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. See that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Now, obviously we're looking at screens, so measuring an inch is not easy to do. But using that, if you look at that -- I don't know how zoomed up you are -- can you guesstimate that the distance from the infrastructure $I$ was mentioning to your property line is about 150 feet?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to object again. Ms. Linowes is right; it's not only not easy to do, it's not accurate, because the scales are meant to be used on the 24-by-36-inch sheet. And I think
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if the Committee remembers, when Mr. Martin was testifying and people were asking him to make these judgments, he said he couldn't do it because he didn't have the proper scalable document. So it will not be accurate to do this on the computer screen.

MS. LINOWES: Well, obviously it would have to have -- if you're going to look at it with a certain scale. But it does not mean that you can't look at what's here and measure using your fingers to get a rough estimate. I may be off by 25 feet, but it's certainly measurable.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Why don't you try and let me -- give me an idea where you're going with this. What would be the question if I let you ask --

MS. LINOWES: The question I'm asking is was she aware that the road or infrastructure was within 150 feet of her property line.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Well, again, I think we've established the exact measurements are not something we're going to
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be able to do off this. So if you want to rephrase that, that's fine. MS. LINOWES: Okay.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. We can't know with certainty by looking at this that it's 150 feet. But can you get a sense of how close the road will be to your property line?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes. I could tell by looking at the plans that it came quite close. I did not know how far.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. And then if you look at the next page of the handout, WA-35X, this is actually Page C-5 of the appendix if you're looking at this. And that would be PDF Page 6. Now, that property -- do you see the infrastructure near the road going around a property line? And the property there is 211-4? Do you see that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Okay. And that is a property that we've
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discussed before. Do you recall in this hearing, that the turbine will be closest to that property line, that one of -- that Turbine 4 will be closest to that property line? Do you remember that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes, I do remember that.
Q. Do you see how close the road is to that property line?
A. (Ms. Berwick) It looks extremely close.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So would you agree that the Project, including roads and turbines, is actually much closer than a half-mile to adjacent properties?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Absolutely. It's also been one of my concerns that they only consider our house as being our property, where we own that land that goes back from our house quite a long ways, and the impacts on that land and our use of that land is not considered at all.

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: Anyone else want to say anything?

WITNESS MARK SCHAEFER: I concur.
WITNESS LONGGOOD: I concur as well.
With 50 acres, there's a lot of land up closer
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to the Project.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Now, so I think you established already that in reading the Application materials you have not been able to identify the distance of the Project to your property lines; correct?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Truthfully, until the question that you asked, and you asked I believe it was Mr. Kenworthy, to show the property lines, I had never found a document that showed our property lines in relationship to the Project. So I had their boundary lines, and I knew what the back of our property looked like. And I was kind of thinking that this must be us, but I wasn't sure. So, does that answer that question?
Q. Yes. Okay. Thank you.

Okay, now, also, do you recall when Mr. Cavanagh was on the stand -- this is when he was telephonically available -- and he had stated -- there was discussion about the amount of cubic yards and material that would be blasted? Do you recall that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
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Q. And it will be somewhere more than 5,000 cubic yards. Do you recall that?
A. (No response)
Q. Okay. And he also said that the blasting would be going on -- this is an exact quote out of the September 20th morning transcript. "The blasting is going to be over -- over a few months, three to four months." Do you recall hearing that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Okay. And so what $I$ would like to do now is have you look at Appendix 7a, Plan Profile Sheets 10 through 18. I have provided those, the two sheets I wanted you to look at. But if you're looking at the plan itself, it would be Appendix 7a, Plan Profile Sheets 10 through 18. And this would be page $\mathrm{C}-14$, which is PDF Page 6.
(Pause in proceedings)
Q. Now, Ms. Berwick, your property -- the road there, if you look on the page $I$ just handed out, you see station numbers along the bottom, 23+00, 24+00? This would be on the third page of the handout from Exhibit 35x?
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A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. That's approximately the location where the road will be at your property -- near your property line. And it continues on at the top of the sheet. If you're looking at C-14 on the screen, or it continues to $30+00$. Do you see that at the end of the page?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Now, what I wanted to point out to you -- and I don't know if you've ever read a project plan before --
A. (Ms. Berwick) No.
Q. Are you familiar -- okay. What $I$ want to show you is when you see that 12 percent number on the slope --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. -- and you see a dash line and solid line --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. -- okay. Now, if you look down, down below, let's say right where the percent sign is, the line immediately to the right of the percent sign, you see numbers 1305 and then 1318. See those?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
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Q. What that is telling you is that the road -the contour of the original land, which is the dashed line, will be raised by 13 feet.

So are you aware that the actual land -the actual road is going to be filled and built up 13 feet above your current grade? Are you aware -- right by your property line. Are you aware of that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I hadn't thought of it until you just said -- I was aware that they were going to do cut and fill. I hadn't thought that that means we're going to be, like -- yeah.
Q. And then let's go to the next page, because this portion from $30+00$ to about 33 or more, that's also part of your land, in the vicinity of your property line.

And look at 34+, that station 34. Do you see that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm going to object
for a moment. Could you please explain how you're relating those particular data points to her property line? It's not clear to me.

MS. LINOWES: Sure.
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MR. RICHARDSON: And Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to just object because what we're doing is Ms. Linowes is telling the witness something that she doesn't know. So she's effectively testifying. I mean, if there were issues about the grading, I mean, that's all stuff we put in prefiled testimony so that we can prepare for these hearings. But I'm -WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: Can I say something? I thought that Antrim's lawyer, not "we," had put it in as testimony. I thought Antrim's lawyer here was to represent Antrim and not Antrim Wind.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Well, first of all, Ms. Linowes, yes, so if you can ask questions, that would be helpful.

MS. LINOWES: Absolutely. I am. And
I have only one last question on this exhibit, and it was regarding -- I'm trying -- I was trying to get a sense from the witness of whether they were aware how much land moving and blasting was going to happen with their property line. So the last question here had to do with this one last piece, the $34+00$
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station.
But to Attorney Needleman's question, he was asking how did this relate to their property line. If we could go back to the first page, you can see the station numbers on that first page.

Mr. Needleman, do you see where it says $29+00$ on the road? This would be if you draw a straight line down from the 221-9 and look at the station numbers that are on the road themselves.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay. I see what you're saying. Thank you.

MS. LINOWES: Okay.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. So the last question $I$ have regarding this, this would be at Station 34+00. Do you see that and the road, the change in grade would be 1393 to 1378? In this case, are you aware that will be blasting 15 feet off the original line -- contour of the land?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Now I am.
Q. Okay. So are you aware that that much activity will be happening at your property, near your
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property line?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I was aware, and I wondered how it was -- how it met with the zoning regulations of Antrim.
Q. Okay.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Lisa, could you also clarify how you know that they'll be blasting in those locations as opposed to another method to do that?

MS. LINOWES: Yes. I had asked Mr. Cavanagh when he was on the phone whether or not he was going -- the question had come up, "Are you going to be blasting, or are you going to use some other means?"

And he said, "Well, you can remove this type of material through other means, but it's much more efficient through blasting." I don't -- that's 15 feet. I didn't ask him about this specific location.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That was my question.
So he didn't testify that there would be blasting in these locations. I don't remember.

MS. LINOWES: Right. No.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: All right.
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MS. LINOWES: The specific location we talked about at that time was near Route 9. BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. So now I want to talk to you about the sound assessment. If you could bring up the actual sound assessment, and this would be a APP 33, Attachment 9. Do you have that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I have the paper.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: One more time for the group, please.

MS. LINOWES: I'm sorry.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: One more time.

MS. LINOWES: Sure. It's APP 33, Attachment 9, PDF Page 6.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Is that Page 6 in the paper copy, too?

MS. LINOWES: No. No, it's
Figure 1-1.
DR. BOISVERT: ExCuse me. I
apologize. I'm having trouble finding which folder this attachment is in. We have many folders.

MS. LINOWES: This would be the
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updated -- oh, I don't know what your folders are.
A. (Ms. Berwick) I believe that I submitted this as an attachment, but I'm not --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Dr.
Boisvert, I'm showing it under the Supplemental folder, at least for my files here electronically --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Oh, no, I didn't because -PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: One at a time, please.

I don't know if you can find it.
Then going to Attachment 9, it says "Updated Noise Report." Does that help? Yes, I'm in the Application, Supplemental. If not, maybe Ms. Berwick could direct you to the same thing but in a different place here.

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: No, no. I
thought maybe I had attached -- I attached almost anything anybody ever did because I thought I had to in order to do any questioning. But I didn't put the Application in, so I apologize.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So let's go
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off the record while the Committee is finding this.
(Pause in proceedings)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So, for the record, Ms. Linowes, tell us what page --

MS. LINOWES: PDF Page 6.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: All right. We're on the record.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Do you have that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Now, so there you can see the project outline, the parcels that represent the Project. But you don't see your property lines; correct?
A. (Ms. Berwick) No.
Q. Okay. Now, $I$ just wanted to read from New Hampshire Site Rule $301.18(\mathrm{~b})(1)$. This has to do with the pre-construction sound report, which would be -- this report is. And it says under the rule, "Preconstruction sound reports shall include a map or diagram clearly showing the following..." And it says one of those items is the layout of the Project area, including topography, project boundary lines
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and property lines. So it appears they're property lines for the Project, but not your property lines; correct?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Absolutely correct.
Q. Now, you had asked -- this would be WA-36X. You had asked the Applicant in a data request, and I'll read the question.
"Abutting Landowner Intervenors Group would like the Applicant to identify all abutting properties with specific property owners, showing the property lines for shadow flicker studies and noise studies." Do you remember asking that question?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. And what did the Applicant say?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Well, it says they object to the question, as it requires the Applicant to develop additional data that is not presently in the possession of the Applicant and is outside the scope of the Applicant's responsibility in this docket.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And then, but they did provide you with three files; is that correct? Three maps? Do
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Q. Okay. So what I wanted you to now look at is Exhibit WA-38X.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Okay.
Q. Now, can you tell me what you see there, how it differs from 37X?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I see our property lines.
Q. Is your property line correctly denoted there?
A. (Ms. Berwick) It looks like it's correct.
Q. Okay. And Mr. Schaefer and Ms. Longgood, does it appear that your properties are properly denoted there?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Yes.
A. (Mrs. Schaefer) Yes.
Q. So if we can focus on WA-38. Those contours, those are the sound -- noise contours that came out of the noise study. And in the legend it says the green -- the blue line that you see is the point where noise will be 35 decibels, and as you move towards the green line it's going up to 40 decibels. Do you agree with that representation?
A. (Mr. Berwick) No. The green line is 40.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes, I understand what you're saying. Between the blue and the green it's
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going from 35 to 40, yes.
Q. Okay. And all of the blue dots or structures that are located near the Project do fall outside of the 40 decibel line. Do you agree with that?

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms.
Linowes, what blue dots are you talking about? MS. LINOWES: Oh, it's hard -- it's a little bit difficult to --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Well, outside --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Hold on a second, Ms. Berwick.

MS. LINOWES: Mr. Chairman, I will tell you. If you go to Attachment 9, the actual map that we're working from -- I'm sorry -- this map would be actually PDF Page 36 in Attachment 9, but it has the properties -property lines added.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So where did this come from? Is this their exhibit that you then overlaid something on it?

MS. LINOWES: Correct. This is their
exhibit. I'm sorry. This is a document --WA-37X is a document that was produced by the
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Applicant in response to a data request. And those blue dots -- those blue rectangles that are faint in the printout, those all represent buildings and structures, receptors. And they're more clearly denoted on the screen. So WA-37 was created by the Applicant.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So, again, help me. So WA-38, is this the first time we've seen this document?

MS. LINOWES: Yes. This document, 38X, is 37 X with the parties up here, their parcels imposed on it. And they validated that these appear to be their lots.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: All right.
Proceed.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. Now what $I$ wanted to point out -- and the whole purpose of this is to look at that green line which is 40 decibels.

Ms. Berwick, where is the green line on your property?
A. (Ms. Berwick) It appears at about halfway, a little bit less -- I mean a little bit more is in the louder zone than in the less loud zone
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because our property gets very narrow at the end.
Q. So -- go head.
A. (Ms. Berwick) I should say most of our property it appears is getting at least 40 decibels, and then some is getting 45 decibels by the looks of this. And then the part where our house is listed at 35 decibels or -- no, plus 35 decibels.
Q. And Ms. Longgood and Mr. Schaefer, would you say the same thing for your property?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Hmm-hmm.
A. (Ms. Longgood) Yes.
Q. Now $I$ want to read Site 301.14 -- this is from the New Hampshire SEC Rules -- (f) (2) (a). And I'm going to slightly paraphrase the rule because there's only one part that actual words matter. And the rule says that the facility shall not exceed 45 decibels during the daytime hours, 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., or 40 decibels at all other times during each day, quote, on property that is used in whole or in part for permanent or temporary residential purposes at a location between the nearest building on the property
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used for such purposes and the closest wind turbine.

So as it stands right now, you're saying that your home will not have noise levels that exceed 40 decibels. But if you were to park a camper towards the back end of your property, that would be in an area potentially that will get noise levels that exceed 40 decibels. Is that your understanding?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Absolutely. And in fact, I have a neighbor that hunts, and he actually sets up a tent right near the very edge of our property. I suppose the hunting won't be so good with the turbines there. But that's where he sets up his tent is near the actual road that they'll be -- that the Project would be built in.
Q. So you're saying today. But let's say in the future you choose to build a guest house, construct a new home, park a camper in the woods. Would it be your expectation that the Project would have to take steps to be in compliance with the rule?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I do believe so, based on the
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questioning that $I$ believe Mr . Rose asked, but not based on what the Applicant's Application said. Mr. Rose asked if there was new -WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: And Mr. Rose, if it was not you, I apologize.
A. (Ms. Berwick) -- but asked if there was new residences coming in, would it not be that they have to meet the shadow flicker and noise requirements for those new residents, too, and so that they would have to do some sort of noise suppression.

But this is definitely a good question because all of us have a lot of land here. And the idea that we can no longer subdivide our land to give a parcel to our children because it will not be land that would be really fit to live in with decibels that high -- and already I feel our land is probably not going to be fit to live in, so definitely back there would not be.
Q. All right. Thank you.

So then, your understanding -- or your expectation is that the rule would have -- the rule applies as changes happen with regard to
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properties around it.
A. (Ms. Berwick) My expectation -- my expectation is that $I$ didn't really understand how that rule applied, myself. And I believe that Antrim Wind did not expect it to apply to anything except for existing structures. My hope is that if -- my hope is that this project will not be approved. But if it is approved, that the Committee would make some sort of requirement that they do meet these expectations for any new structures that are put up.
Q. Thank you. I just have a couple more questions and then we can be done. This is to do with the safety.

Are you aware that since 2008 there have been eight separate catastrophic failures of turbines in the northeast?
A. (Ms. Berwick) No. I was aware that in 2013 there were two Siemens turbines that had blades that fell off of them. One was in Ocotillo, California. The other, $I$ can't remember. I think it was Ohio or something like that. Iowa maybe. And then I was aware that in 2015, that
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there was a fire in one of the Siemens Ocotillo's turbines. And in 2015, there was a complete failure of the nacelle, and all the blades fell off a turbine someplace. And actually, I was aware just this month there was a Siemens turbine failure where the nacelle and all the blades fell off, and that project was only two years old. But $I$ wasn't aware of the ones in New England.
Q. Okay. Thank you. So it has happened here in --
A. (Ms. Berwick) I had to get that in.
Q. So it has happened here in New England as well. I'm just reading from my own testimony. And this would be WA-01, Page 12 of 20 . There were --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms. Linowes, you're not going to testify yourself; right?

MS. LINOWES: No, no, no. I don't have to give the examples. It's just enough to say there were eight.

BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. Okay. So, then, also during the Granite
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Reliable Wind Energy facility, which is operating in Coos County, there is testimony of lightning strikes as well, quite a few. Are you aware of that testimony?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes. I've also read that because I thought that if you had a lightning protector that wouldn't be a problem. But I read something about -- I think it was Barron's -problems, and they believed that it was caused by excessive lightning strikes, which I don't really understand, to tell you the truth.
Q. Okay. And then in terms of ISO, I know there's been a lot of discussion about ISO. You raised some concerns about that, as I recall your questions.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. And Antrim Wind has stated that, anecdotally, the furthest that they are aware of ice being thrown is 250 meters, which is about, I believe, 820 feet. Do you recall that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes. I actually thought it was less. I thought that they really minimized it.
Q. They said a number other than 820 meters?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I can't remember what they said
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exactly. Did you say 800 feet?
Q. Eight hundred and twenty feet.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Okay.
Q. So what I would like you to do is look at WA-39X. And go to the -- these pages are not numbered, but it is the third page. Let's see. I'm sorry. Maybe the fourth page. Let me... yes, it's the fourth page, the first full paragraph there. This is testimony that a biologist from New Hampshire Fish \& Game had given to the State of Vermont in regards to an operating wind project that he was working with. I believe -- it doesn't say here, so I won't say which project it was, but...

The only point or statement I wanted to say is towards the bottom, the fourth line from the bottom. It says that one operator of a wind installation told me these machines would throw a 400-pound chunk of ice 1,000 feet. Do you see that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes. You know, I believe that. My son Stephen is an engineer. He majored in metallurgical engineering. I asked him to calculate the ice throw. And I wish he was
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here so he could, like, take out his calculator and just wow you. But he wowed me.

He said, oh, it's a simple formula. And he figured it out for on flat land. But there was some restrictions. There was -- like he was not considering certain things. And he came out with a number like 1,600 feet. And I do feel like Antrim Wind's response was anecdotally, however you say that, this is what we found, that it won't go further than 800 feet.

I work as a nurse, and I tell you that anecdotal stuff is just totally disregarded. You have to have research that supports it. If it's a simple formula that you can use to figure out -- and my son could whip out his calculator and just give me a number just like that. And we had the blade tip speed. When I went home that day that they gave us the blade tip speed, and I said, "Steve, can you tell me how far is it possible? And he drew this little figure and said, you know -- because it depends on the size of the thing. But basically their answer is based on, "Well, this
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is what we found, and there's never been any issues that we know of." That doesn't mean that the ice throw won't be much further.
Q. Thank you for that then. It continues to be a -- it will continue to be a concern for you then?
A. Absolutely.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
Mr. Ward.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY DR. WARD:
Q. I handed out an exhibit before we started, which is your answers to Antrim Wind for a data request. You have data -- this is data from the Jaffrey Airport. And the question is what was the point you were trying to make with getting this.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes. Well, this was in reply to a data request from Antrim Wind Energy in response to my, I don't know if it was my application or my supplemental application. I believe it was my application.
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But I have a calendar here. And when they were -- I have written on here the day that they came to set up the equipment was January 7th. The day that they removed the equipment was January 22nd. And during that time, because I was suspectful that the answer that we had received for the previous sound study was not correct, I wanted to keep track of what I thought were loud sounds. So, like, for instance, the day that $I$ spent all day breaking up the ice and shoveling off the deck, I wrote that down. That was the 10th. And when it was very, very windy, $I$ wrote it down. And I based it on what I was hearing inside my house because I wondered how that corresponded to their noise study. Did they take that into effect? At the time that they set up this equipment -- and this is the second time I still had not seen a single report. I didn't know how to get up to the site. I'd never seen any of Antrim Wind's assessments at all. And so I was suspicious, and I kept records myself. When we were going to go to the technical sessions, I realized that my writing "major
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wind all day" would mean absolutely nothing because it's not a measurement. It's only my assessment of what $I$ heard. So I went online and I put in to find out the Antrim weather, and what came up was the Jaffrey Airport. And when I looked, what corresponded to what I found -- to what $I$ wrote on my calendar corresponded to what $I$ was finding on the Jaffrey Airport data.

And I was really shocked at the technical session. I read that, according to their sound level study, Mr. O'Neal's sound level study, he wrote that at our location, which was L4, that the winds were generally light at less than 2 meters per second. He didn't say anything about all these extremely windy days. And if you look at the data from the Jaffrey Airport, you'll see that there's lots of days that had over -- I mean, like on the 19th, the wind was gusting over 37 or something like miles per hour. It was gusting every hour that they recorded. There was these major wind gusts; yet, these were not taken out. And according to the SEC rules, winds over 4 miles an hour
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are -- they're not supposed to count the noise levels during times that the wind is over 4 miles an hour; yet, according to Mr. O'Neal's own testimony, this these times were not taken out. So the gusts that I recorded were not taken out, and I was really quite shocked at that.

So I guess the point I'm trying to make is that wind assessment was -- that sound assessment couldn't be right if that's what they used was this -- they didn't use the gusts. He said he trusts his equipment. But I trust my ears. I only know that I heard the wind and saw the wind and felt the windows. I mean, I couldn't even sleep because of the wind. I knew it was windy all night. So, I mean, when you look at the data, it corresponds.

And I will say this, too, that they used the same Jaffrey Airport data when they did their sound study for 2011. If you look at it, they didn't have anenometers [sic] at every location. But they did have an anenometer in one location and then they used Jaffrey Airport
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wind data --
Q. Anemometer it's pronounced --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Okay. I'm not a meteorologist.

I do have a nephew that's one.
Q. Were there any other issues with the wind or the wind gusts? Any other inconsistencies that you found with their sound study?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes. I found quite a few inconsistencies. For one thing, when they came to put up the equipment, I asked that they set up the sound-level measuring equipment as far back as they could towards the stone wall, the first stone wall. We have several on our property. But I did that because I did not want the sound-level assessment to include every time the furnace came on and every time the door shut and all that kind of stuff. So I asked that. And after they set it up, it was very hard for them to do that because we had had snow and then rain. And it had frozen, so the ground was solid ice. It was just solid ice. And I felt a little bad. Only a little. I actually wanted to ask them to go further because we have a clearing past those trees.
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But I didn't do that, so $I$ was nice. Then they asked me if they could set up the anenometer -Q. Anemometer.
A. (Ms. Berwick) -- up by the top of the hill by the garden bed, and I put that -- I said yes, they could. I did not know that there was a ruling that the anenometer has to be close to the sound-level assessment. So it was actually about 70 feet away, and it was elevated about 12 feet high. Because you could see we have that huge hill there in our yard. So the sound-level equipment was 12-foot down from where the anenometer was and about 70 feet away. So that's the first thing is -- that, to me, that's not close proximity. But I don't know what the rules -- you know, whether that qualifies or not by the rules.

But then the frozen ground, it also says in the SEC rules that it has to be $7-1 / 2$ meters away from any reflective surface. So I would think that frozen snow -- hard, frozen ice would qualify as a reflective surface. And that stayed that way.

I wrote down here that the midday sound
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guy was coming on the 12 th . They came on that day, actually, because it was so windy the day before they wanted to check on their equipment. And on that day $I$ offered -- my husband has these clamping things that $I$ thought were for his shoes. I offered them to Mr. O'Neal's person that came out. It was not Mr. O'Neal, it was another man. I offered them to him, and he took them because it was so pure, solid ice still. You know, he tried to use them. And it turned out they were for my husband's crutches and not for his shoes. So they didn't work. But it was solid ice. At least from the time they set it up, which was the 7th, at least through to the 12th, and probably even longer -- I don't know when we had a little bit of melting that it became not solid ice. And that did happen sometime during that sound study. But there was no mention of that. So, the fact that --
Q. Let me interrupt with a question which I think will clarify this. You've walked around on your property a lot.
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A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. And have you observed substantial changes in wind between up and down and side and in trees and over hills and everything?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Substantial changes in wind speeds.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Well, yes and no. I mean, yes, if you're near the trees, it blocks it some. And if you're up on the hill, it doesn't block it as much. But you still get a lot of noise no matter where you are from the wind. You can walk on the road and you think there's a car coming because of the wind. We're getting to that season right now where we get these really, really windy days in October. And that's what it was like during that time.
Q. And the other question is: Do you have any understanding of why that restriction about a reflective surface, why that's in there, what the reason is that they say you shouldn't do that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I imagine it reflects the sound more and so it increases the sound.
Q. Would you suggest that it reflects sound?
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A. (Ms. Berwick) I would think so.
Q. I have another handout, and then $I$ want to ask you a question about were there differences between the data in the 2012 report and the current flicker shadow report. Were there differences?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Absolutely there was differences. In my --
Q. Hold on. Just answer yes or no. And would you then tell us --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Okay.

DR. WARD: And we'd like to have this handed out.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Why don't we go off the record while Mr. Ward hands out documents.
(Pause in proceedings)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Ward, before we continue, do you have a feel for what exhibit numbers these are for you?

DR. WARD: I don't.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes, there was quite a few differences in the flicker study report. And this is one of them that you show here, and
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that is that one of the points that they have to input is the wind direction. So if you have -- on one side you have the 2011 wind directions that were inputted into their wind program, and on the other side you have your 2016 or whatever this was. Maybe '15 that it was done. And there's huge differences. And I looked at this and I tried to see, well, okay, they eliminated one turbine and they reduced the size of others by 3 meters. Would that be enough? Does it statistically stay the same? But some of them hardly go down at all, and others of them increase greatly. I mean, others of them -- there's almost, like, double that thing. So I'm not a meteorologist, and I won't pretend that $I$ am one, but that's one difference.

Another difference was that Jan Longgood's house, in the 2011 report, had expected shadow flicker of between 20 and 30 hours. In the current report, her shadow flicker is 12 hours --
A. (Longgood) Twelve hours --
A. (Ms. Berwick) -- 12 hours and 5 minutes, I
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believe. Our expected shadow flicker in the 2011 report was 8 hours and something. I can't remember exactly. But now -- oh, no, I'm sorry, 9 hours and something, and now it's 8 hours and 21 minutes. It's almost exactly an hour difference, but not quite. So there was that.

There was some other differences. Let me think --

BY DR. WARD:
Q. Well, you're aware, aren't you, that there is a correction of the computation of the hours of shadow flicker depending on the wind rows, the hours here --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'd like to object at this point for two reasons: First of all, I don't believe any of these witnesses have any expertise in these issues; and second of all, Mr. O'Neal was questioned extensively about these issues. I think he answered some of these questions. And to the extent that there were questions that people had that he didn't answer, I think they should have been
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directed to him.
DR. WARD: But the issue with this exhibit is that there were two sets of wind rows data. And the only point I'm trying to make is $I$ don't know which one is right. I haven't checked it. But there's a big correction put in the calculation from the astronomical calculation to the actual one, which has to do with the number of hours of which the windmill would actually face in a certain direction. So, two different sets of things would lead you to obviously seeing two different conclusions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Well, I heard what you just said, but $I$ don't think this panel, first of all, is able to answer that question. Correct?

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: I think one point that he was trying to bring out was the fact that in this shadow flicker program, that one of the data points that Mr . O'Neal used was 94 percent of the flicker -- of the windmills running. I did ask him that question. I think you heard me ask that of multiple people: What
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was the percentage of time that you used? And by using 94 percent, that automatically cuts the amount of shadow flicker. Because I find it hard to believe that at 24 different locations that the windmills might not be running at a 100 percent per year at some location. So, by using 94 percent, which they keep on telling us everything is conservative, conservative, conservative, well, conservative would be to figure out what it would be with a 100 percent of the windmills running, not just 94 percent. I don't know if that's the point you were trying to get to or not.

BY DR. WARD:
Q. Well, let me move on to another question.

You've read Mr. O'Neal's report?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. He gives some numbers for shadow flicker.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. What do you read out of that as to how much shadow flicker you would get?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman, same objection.

DR. WARD: I'm just asking what she
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would get out of reading the report. Simple question.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: All right. We'll allow a little bit. Again, you got the wrong panel for this. But go ahead.
A. (Ms. Berwick) At my house, his projected amount of shadow flicker is 8 hours and 21 minutes. But what that really equates to is that, in January, on January 13th, we'll start getting shadow flicker of almost 20 minutes a day. I think it's 16 minutes according to his report. It will continue every day for 35 days. We'll have 13 days off, then it will start up again, I believe it's March 2nd, and go to March 15th. Then we have a break until September and it starts up again. And pretty much every day except for 13 days in that time from September to December 2nd or 3rd or something like that we have flicker. And it's in the evening. In September, I believe it's 5:30 or something like that. It's all in there. It's in his flicker study thing. I think that's called Attachment 6. Every evening. So, instead of having dinner on the deck, we'll be hiding our
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heads or doing something to prevent seeing this flicker.

So it doesn't sound like much. Eight hours doesn't sound like that much. But when you live it every day from January through March 13th, I think it is, January 2nd to March 13th, and then September 28th through December 2nd, somewhere around there, having flicker, 13 days' break in both of those, that is a significant impact on our life. And according to Mr. O'Neal, our expected amount of flicker is 8 hours and 21 minutes. So all he has to do with their never-before-used-or-tried-or-tested Siemens control flicker program is reduce it by 21 minutes. You still can see that our scenario of our lives will be significant.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to object again. With all due respect to Ms. Longgood, the way she was representing flicker is not correct --

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: I'm Ms.
Berwick.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm sorry, Ms.
Berwick. I apologize.
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WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: And actually I can show it to you --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: My point --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: One at a time.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: My point being, Mr. Chair, that we now have a group of people in the room debating the nuances of shadow flicker, and the expert who was here and can answer these questions and address these issues isn't here.

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: Can I say that in the shadow flicker analysis on -- we're at No. 56. And if you take this piece of paper -- you can all look at it -- it's Attachment 6. It's Page 7, but it's like in the first attachment. It's got these little colored circles that show you. And then on Page 9 of his Attachment C, I think it is, it gives the actual hours and times. That's why I can tell you exactly what day. Because I can't tell by this little circle that it starts on January whatever or stops on that day, but on
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his Page 9 it does. And I mean, I am not Mr. O'Neal. But $I$ also am able to read a chart and able to say that this is how it affects us. This is our lives being affected.

MS. LINOWES: And Mr. Chairman, if I could add to that. The point is the document has to stand on its own. It doesn't have to have to have a Mr. O'Neal attached to it. The expectation is that a layperson can read it.

What Ms. Berwick is reading is very straightforward if you look at it.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Ward, do you have more questions?

DR. WARD: Yeah, I just have one last question on this and then one question on another thing.

BY DR. WARD:
Q. Ms. Berwick, you are aware that -- and you were here when I questioned Mr. O'Neal on shadow flicker.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. And his answer to almost everything was that there was a model which is proprietary. And I've tried to ask questions about it. But
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there is a model, and it yields a shadow flicker wherever, your house or anything else. You are aware of that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. Is that the thing that you're referring to, that number from that model?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes, that model from -- that number from that model. And I will say that that model is a WindPRO, is made for the wind industry to measure shadow. So they already have that bias. But according to everything that I have read, their definition of shadow flicker is within a structure. And they can say they use a "greenhouse mode," and Mr. O'Neal says that in his report, a "greenhouse mode." And the greenhouse mode, from everything that I've read, and I've done a bit of research on it, is they consider it a structure to be 1 meter by 1 meter square with windows on all sides of 1 meter by 1 meter and that the I-height is at -- it ends up being 5 feet. They gave it in meters. I can't remember. But basically it's at 5 feet. But I cannot find where they consider the roof to be
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made of glass. It says a 1-meter-by-1-meter on all sides. So the very way that this shadow flicker program calculates their numbers is based on their definition of shadow flicker, which has to do with inside a structure. And it has to do with 20 percent of the blade blocks the sun. But certainly there's going to be shadow flicker, or at least changes in light intensity that my eye will detect at 10 percent or 15 percent of blade blockages. They might not be major shadows on the ground, but there certainly will be changes in light intensity. But even if you just want to consider the shadow -- if they use a model that does not use -- if they consider that there's a roof on it, then their definition of shadow flicker is not the same as New Hampshire's rules, which now, thank goodness, you see that being outside and having these shadow flickers would be just as annoying or probably more annoying than being inside the house. So I have issues with just even the program that's used.

And I think you make a good point, that everything's proprietary. Everything is
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proprietary. You can't get information. You've asked many questions about getting information. And basically, it's like "you just have to trust us." But we're trusting them for our lives.
Q. Thank you. I have one more set of questions and I have another handout.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. We'll go off the record while he's handing that out.

MR. IACOPINO: Actually, Mr.
Chairman, want to stay on the record and we will --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Yeah, so we'll go back on the record. So the first handout that Mr . Ward did, which was -- the top line was "Antrim Energy Docket 2015-2" and then says "Data Request," we believe that's MI-18. The second handout he had which was labeled at the top "Attachment 6, Table 4-2," we believe that's MI-19.

And the one that you're just
handing out now, Mr. Ward, we believe is MI-20.
(Exhibits MI-18, 19, 20 marked for
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## identification.)

DR. WARD: Okay. This exhibit, which is what?

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: This will be 20. Are you going to ask them about your calculation? Is that what I'm --

DR. WARD: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
BY DR. WARD:
Q. This is an exhibit which is from, I believe, Ms. Berwick, your son --
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes, it is.
Q. -- who's an engineer, related to ice throw.
A. (Ms. Berwick) This is a --
Q. Let me finish.
A. (Ms. Berwick) Okay.
Q. Can you explain it, please?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I really can't explain it because I never took physics. But this was his --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt. If Ms. Berwick can't explain this exhibit --

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: Okay. I
can explain it a little --
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(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MR. NEEDLEMAN: If the exhibit can't be explained, I don't believe that it should be considered.

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: I can explain it a little.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: "G" is for gravity, "D" is for distance, "T" is for time. This is what he did, just jotted down quickly to figure out the potential of ice throw with -- on flat ground with no air resistance. He said that there was other factors, but that putting it up on a hill would increase the distance, the size of the ice itself. But this was the figures that he did. And I asked Mr. Ward if he would introduce this specifically because this is something that we have not seen from Antrim Wind and -- this is evidently easy for people that are engineers or in physics to figure out what the potential of ice throw is, and we have not received that other than this is what my son figured out. And I wish he was here. We wanted him to be
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able to testify. He could have explained it much better, and he could have showed you the dynamics of it. I actually -- this is one piece of paper that I took pictures of to send to him when he was in Tennessee and he was going to be testifying by phone, and I said, just in case you need this. And I have not had a chance to question him since because he was home for one day and then he went to Guam and then Japan.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So the problem with this, again, is he's not here. I know you're adopting his testimony, and I allowed that.

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: There's no way for anybody to question the voracity. And I'm not saying he's not a good engineer. Don't misunderstand me. But there's no way for the Applicant or anybody else to question is this correct and is the methodology correct.

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: And I would
state that $I$ would not swear this is totally correct. But I would swear there is a way to
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calculate it and that it should be done.
DR. WARD: Mr. Chairman, may I just add one quick -- basically what it does is construct a parabola, which would be the parts -- part of the thing thrown. It calculates the initial thing. We know how much gravity is, and so it goes a certain distance -- it's basically a parabola, and it's pretty straightforward.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, it's
actually not straightforward. And as Ms. Berwick said, this does not account for air resistance. And my limited understanding is that air resistance is a very major component of a calculation like this, which is why not being able to examine the person who did this is a significant problem.

WITNESS BARBARA BERWICK: It's okay.
You can not have it as an exhibit.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Then
we'll --
DR. WARD: I have no more questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: All right.
So we'll move on to -- who's next here? Mr.
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Levesque or Ms. Allen?
MR. LEVESQUE: Thank you. Sorry.
Just took me a few seconds here.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. LEVESQUE:
Q. So these questions are really for you, Barbara. So, if I remember right, you were not involved in what we'll call "Antrim 1," the previous docket on this proposed project; is that correct?
A. (Ms. Berwick) That's correct.
Q. And why was that?
A. (Ms. Berwick) We were not involved because we really believed that the Town of Antrim -- the people of Antrim wanted the wind turbines. And we're kind of the type of people that if you want to run over us, just tell us where to lie down in the road. And truthfully, I didn't know anything about flicker or the sounds, and so we were only really thinking that we're going to have this big turbine in our back yard. We didn't want it, but we weren't going to fight it, because if it's going to help the majority of people in Antrim and it's going to
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reduce their taxes, who are we to say no.
We're really not the "not in your back yard" type of people. So that's why we didn't, because it did seem that the first two votes that were done were -- and then that survey that we heard about, it just seemed that the people of Antrim wanted it at that time.
Q. So you're here now. So, obviously you changed your mind about what you just described. So, why do you participate in this one?
A. The 2014 vote was overwhelmingly obvious that the people of Antrim had changed their mind. Because it was clear -- you know, the selectmen can say it wasn't clear. It was clear to everybody what we were voting on and that Antrim Wind needed that zoning change in order to build their project.

It was also known -- and I was not a part of any of these people. None of these people had anything to do with us because they thought we were for Antrim Wind. But it was known at that time that Antrim Wind had written that zoning proposal and submitted it through citizens petitioning, kind of pretending that
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it was citizen-written instead of theirs. And the feeling among all the people in town -- and I don't know -- no, I have not interviewed all the people in town. I'm just one person. But we get our feeling by the local papers and by talking to people. People were really disgusted with Antrim Wind and they felt like they couldn't be trusted. And they didn't want them anymore because they didn't want to have a big company that was dealing in shady-type behavior. So they had a lot of people change their mind. So now, instead of -- I don't feel like we're going against the majority of people of Antrim. I feel like we're supporting the majority of people of Antrim. They voted in 2014, and it was an overwhelming defeat for Antrim Wind. They did not get their proposal, their zoning change. They wanted it. It was definitely -- there was people standing outside with their signs. Everyone understood what they were voting for and what it meant. And they were defeated. So we're no longer being the one person standing up and making life difficult for the
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rest of the residents of Antrim. We're actually standing for Antrim. But also, now that I know what shadow flicker is and the noise, maybe we should have been involved last time.
Q. Thank you for that. Just one final question. I don't know if you were here when the selectmen were on the stand. Were you?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes, I was.
Q. During that part of the proceeding, I'm not sure who asked the question, but I know that Mr. Robertson, Selectman Robertson answered a question that was something to the effect of, you know, would you support a wind project downtown in Antrim. And he answered, if I remember right, something to the effect that, no, he couldn't support that because that would affect a lot of people. And so this panel here is a group of folks that will certainly be affected by the Project if it's built. So I'm wondering if you have a reaction to Selectman Robertson's question back then.
A. (Ms. Berwick) That actually was my question. I asked him. And I asked him if he would be
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willing to put a turbine downtown, and he immediately answered "No." And I asked him why, and he said "increased population density." And to me, that was just like slap you in the face, because why would you not be willing as a selectmen to put a wind turbine downtown, which is zoned a business zone already, already has an increased sound level over what we have, but you're willing to put it in a place that's zoned rural and rural conservation. I mean, why could you easily say yes to rural and rural conservation which is not business. This is a business that we're talking about going in, industrial wind turbines. And also to say that downtown people obviously are more important to him than the people on the outskirts of town. Because I asked all of them, was there a magic number of people you are willing to sacrifice their lives in order to bring this project in, and they answered -- I mean, I think it was Mr.

Robertson himself who answered "No." But with that answer to me, that said to me, yes, there is a magic number. And we all up here are the
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sacrificial lambs.
Q. Thank you.

MR. LEVESQUE: No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Jones, do you have any questions?

MR. JONES: All set.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Mr. Block?

MR. BLOCK: Yes, I have a few.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. BLOCK :
Q. Ms. Berwick, there's been a lot of talk about shadow flicker. Do you have worries about any actual health issues resulting from shadow flicker?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Absolutely. There's definitely health issues associated with shadow flicker. There's migraines, vertigo, nausea. And I think one of the things, as I said before, according to the definition of shadow flicker, for the WindPRO program, you have to block -the blade has to block 20 percent of the sun, or something like that, the solar disc. I
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could talk better if I was Fred. He's shaking his head there. But certainly at 15 percent, at 10 percent, at 5 percent, you're still going to have changes in light intensity if you have it going through the solar disc that's coming, and even at 20 percent.

The fact is that I myself, I put in my testimony how we had a fan in our house, one of those fans on the ceiling, and it had lights underneath it. And there was no visible movement and there was no visible shadows, and yet I got sick in that room. No one else did. Bruce used to think that $I$ was being difficult. I just got sick. I don't know why it affected me and no one else. But it did affect me, and I couldn't be in the room if both the fan and the lights were on. And same way when $I$ was in college. I didn't need to wear glasses. I have these stupid which are progressives, which really drive me nuts. But I didn't need to wear glasses until I was in my 50s because I've always been farsighted. But for two years when I was in college I had to wear reading glasses because they had these types of fluorescent
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lights. And these type of fluorescent lights have a little bit of a flicker. And the optometrist explained to me that your eye is constantly making adjustments for that amount of flicker. And because I was farsighted and reading under those fluorescent lights, my eyes were already having to work harder than a person that was nearsighted or 20/20, because when you're farsighted and you're reading close up, your muscles are working harder, and then to have that in addition was giving me headaches. That was just from a fluorescent light.

Having cycles of light, they know that changes in light intensity can cause seizures. That's a known fact. And, you know, Antrim Wind, as a lot of the wind people like to say, "only at these frequencies." But if you look at the epilepsy association's page, it will say the frequency varies per individual. There is a frequency where it happens more, but there's a lot of people that it happens at a lot less. And we actually have a nephew that has
light-induced seizures. So if you change the
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intensity and you have changes back and forth, he will have seizures. So if we have this come in, I have to say to my brother, "Don't come up during this time," because during January through March and September through December, please don't visit us, you know, because I don't want my nephew Craig to have a seizure simply because of the windmill flicker.

But on that same web page -- and I challenge all the Committee to go to that web page, the Epilepsy Association of America -the Epilepsy Foundation, I'm sorry -- they said that there are some people who will not have a seizure, but they will get headaches, nausea, vertigo. It's not true epilepsy, but it is related to the changes in light intensity, changing back and forth. Yes, your eyes change back and forth all the time. But having it be so cyclic and so much of a change really can cause health effects. Absolutely it can cause health effects.
Q. Just as an aside, you seem to know a lot about this. Are you a healthcare professional?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I'm a registered nurse, and I
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worked for six years at Crotched Mountain with brain-injured young adults and children. And I have taken care of -- I mean, we took care of seizures every single day with multiple people. And I can tell you that for some people, just one change of light intensity -- we had to cover up the lights that flash when you have a fire alarm because those would definitely do it. We had to be very careful about changes with our patients because they would trigger seizures easily.
Q. Couple minutes ago you talked about downtown has a higher noise level, you assumed, than out where you're living and all that. So a lot of people do live with sound levels that exceed what Antrim Wind is anticipating for your house. Why do you feel it should matter to the Committee that your sound levels will increase from what they currently are?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Well, people make decisions when they buy their property of what's important to them and what was -- you know, some people, it's do you have water and sewer and are you close to the stores and are you close to things
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that are convenient and do you have services. And for people like us up here on the panel, it was the rural area, the quietness, the peace and the seclusion. Those were important to us. So, to increase our sound levels -- and I believe that -- even though I believe that the sound assessment that was done by Mr. O'Neal is flawed, I do believe, if you look at the lowest levels, you'll get a good idea of what our sound really is.

So we're about 14 decibels at night.
Every three decibels you increase is double in the sound. So you go from 14 to 17, you've doubled the sound that we have. You go from 17 to 20, you've doubled that sound. You go from 20 to 23, you've doubled that sound. You go -I'm not going to continue and make you upset. But the point is you're not increasing our levels a little bit; you're increasing our levels a lot. You're changing our entire life. And even the deaf Lempster selectman described the sound as a "low drum beat" or a "plane flying overhead." So, whether or not we'll be able to continue to enjoy our places is really
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very much in doubt.
And can I say another thing? I was away for a month at my daughter's in Bellevue, Washington. It's a suburban area, not that noisy. I came home, it was 2 a.m. Bruce was asleep. The windows were open and the frogs were going like "rip," "rip," just that -- if anyone lives near a pond, you know exactly what I'm talking about. I was just filled -- my heart was just filled with light. I'm so glad that we live here in such a peaceful, wonderful environment, and I really hope it doesn't get ruined.
Q. Do you know what the required maximum limit is for sound decibels at night?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Well, my understanding from -- I keep on hearing 40 here. But when I look at those SEC rules, $I$ actually see that it says 40 or -- the greater of 40 or 5 decibels over the something residual, the 490 sound. So if those assessments that he does is wrong, then they can actually be higher than 40, or they could be 45. But that's my assessment.
Q. Well, according to -- I think we saw in the
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maps we were looking at earlier that your property looks like it would be just under 40 at night. Does that sound correct?
A. (Ms. Berwick) According to his estimated decibels, it's 38.5.
Q. Do you have any concerns that this is fine when the turbines first go up, but as the bearings wear down and parts get older, harmonics or heavy winds or so, do you have any concerns that the decibel level, that the actual decibel level might increase in the future?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Absolutely. I actually have concerns it won't be 38.5 in the present. But let's say per chance that it was. We heard testimony that it would be in Antrim Wind's best interest to keep -- financial interest to keep everything running smoothly. But let's face it, when you have a car that's reaching the end of its life, you don't fix every problem. And it would not be financially in their best interest to be spending money to fix a turbine that they know is near the end of its life if the amount that they have to invest is more than they're going to get out of it. And
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then, so how do we as homeowners prove that it's higher than the 38 or 40 ? How do we prove that? If we complain, how long will it take? I'm sure with their lawyers and with everything that we would have to go through, that it would be years, if anything, before we could get any type of resolution so that the sound would be reduced. And by that time, the turbines would probably be at the end of their life, so they would have won that war.
Q. When we visited your property, we saw you had a very nice deck out in the back. If you sit out there at night, is there any light pollution currently that blocks your view of the stars?
A. (Ms. Berwick) No. And it's actually one of my favorite activities. I actually invite people over to our house, especially with the meteor showers. It's like everyone is welcome to come and sit out on the rocking chairs and watch the meteor showers together. We turn off all the lights in the house. There's absolutely no lights that we see anywhere.
Q. Do you think that flashing lights right over on the ridge behind your house might affect that?
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A. (Ms. Berwick) Absolutely.
Q. You've adopted your son's testimony; is that correct?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes.
Q. I just looked at that, and it talked about members of his class who all were training to be engineers were assigned to look at different aspects relating to wind turbines. Can you give us some samples of what it is they looked at?
A. (Ms. Berwick) I can because he did explain this more to me. They divided -- the teacher -- and as I said, these are all engineers. They divided them into groups, and they each had to study an aspect, like mining, manufacturing, the capacity factors, the actual production. And they all came away saying that it's not the promised, you know, environmental, friendly, wonderful thing that everybody thinks it is. Because if you look at the whole process, and even the production, that it just isn't. It isn't that great. Even the fact -- he told me that places that have a lot of wind turbines still have to have what they call "hard energy
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production." And there's, like, two kinds of that. One is the type that's on all the time, and that type is they're burning fossil fuels or natural gas. The type that's on all the time uses the least amount of fuel. The type that they have to back up, that have to be able to come on quickly, because when wind is not available, they still need to be able to provide that same amount of electricity that they're providing to the people. That type uses more fuel than the hard type of things. He was telling me about Hawaii was one place that they have this issue, that even though they have a lot of windmills, they still have to have the traditional production of electricity as a backup source.
Q. So do you have any sense of what the general consensus was and whether or not --
A. (Ms. Berwick) The general consensus --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. Do you have any sense of what the general consensus was and whether or not in the end there was any significant overall benefit?
A. (Ms. Berwick) The general consensus was that
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windmills were not very good, that they were not the source that we should be looking to for renewable energy, and that they were destructive to the environment if you look at the overall process from the mining of the rare earth minerals through to trucking these things from overseas. They're mostly manufactured overseas. Getting them over here and getting them down to where they get put up, and even the destruction of the environment when they're putting them up.
Q. Is there something about Antrim Wind that you think the Committee should particularly note?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Yes, I think they should note that there is a pattern of deception. They had these meetings with the selectmen where they weren't public, and $I$ know that resulted in a lawsuit. In these meetings, it was very much not wanting to come out that this Siemens flicker or shadow flicker program was not even created yet. That only came out because the Committee members asked a Siemens person directly, and he answered honestly that it wasn't even created yet.
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When they did the site tour and they gave a map that showed the distance from our houses to the turbines and also the expected amount of flicker for both Janice's house and my house, it said 8 hours, even though Janice's expected amount of flicker is 12 hours and minutes and my -- and our house is 8 hours and 21 minutes. And it wasn't until $I$ said that's not right, and then Mr. Kenworthy said, "Oh, oh, yeah, yeah, that's with our shadow flicker control program. It will be controlled to be no more than 8 hours."

You know, I asked Mr. Kenworthy if he knew of any failures of Siemens, problems with Siemens, and he said no. And I really find that hard to believe if he's been in the industry and there's been these turbines fail. As I said, you know, even this month, one just failed. The whole nacelle and everything fell down. But there's been blade failures. There's been problems with bearings. There was a technician that was killed I think in 2015. To not know those things or to try to hide them is deception.
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I actually saw Mr. Kenworthy on Channel 9. He was on a business thing on Sunday morning. And behind him there was a chart, and it had all these facts about Antrim Wind Energy. And the chart said that the information was provided by Walden Green Energy. Well, nowhere in the report does it tell you that Walden Green Energy 100 percent owns Antrim Wind Energy. So, to a person looking at that, that's deceptive because it seems like some third party has provided you these wonderful facts, one of the facts being that it would provide 12 permanent full-time jobs, which I see they have that on their economic forecasts. I haven't actually really heard of where those 12 permanent full-time jobs are going to be.

But, you know, I just think that there's a pattern of deception. And you don't need to be deceptive if you're telling the truth.
Q. Is it your opinion that the presence of this project would affect the value of your property?
A. (Ms. Berwick) Absolutely.
Q. How?
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A. (Ms. Berwick) It will definitely decrease the value of our property. The people who buy property like us are looking for the peace and the quiet and the tranquility. And having flicker every day from January through March, September through December, and having the noise levels will definitely decrease the value of our property. I think anyone who thinks that our property that's out back, that's going to be right near those roads or right near the turbine is still going to be worth as much as it is now, $I$ mean, $I$ don't think there's a single person that could believe that.
Q. So if this project is approved, what do you think you'll do?
A. (Ms. Berwick) That's a really hard question. We don't want to move. We've invested our life here, our heart and our soul. You know, my son and I dug out one wall. We didn't have a basement. We dug out underneath the house, supported up one wall, dug it all out, and then realized we were in over our heads and called in reinforcements. But, you know, we've -- I was looking -- we have so much construction
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pictures because we're constantly building and changing. And I'm still working on that yard. You saw how I have a lot of brush there. I plan to make that a nice, gentle slope, put in fill. I have an apple tree that my daughter gave me when she was young. How do you replace those things?

And so I don't want to move. But I fear that if it's our health that's in jeopardy, then we'll have to move. It will all depend. I mean, if $I$ get sick, as I get sick from quite a few things, then we'll have to move. If we can stand it, we'll put up with a lot. But I don't know.
Q. Mr. Berwick, I remember when we visited your property. At that point you were a little unclear about how much of the met tower that you were able to see when it was standing. Do you have any clearer idea about that now?
A. (Mr. Berwick) I think that we could see almost half of it, which would be a 125 feet.
A. (Ms. Berwick) We actually have pictures.
Q. Okay. Is there any compensation -- I know you've put a lot of work into your property.
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Is there any compensation that would make up for the years of love and work that you've put into your place that you can think of?
A. (Mr. Berwick) No. No.
Q. Ms. Longgood, how long has your Salmon Brook property been in the Longgood family?
A. (Longgood) Over 40 years. Peggy and Bill Longgood owned it prior to our owning it.
Q. When your family acquired that, were there any covenants or anything like that that went along with the property deeds?
A. (Longgood) Yes, there were covenants, restrictions. All kinds of restriction and covenants that ran with the land, all of the land on Salmon Brook Road at that time.

They're over. They're not currently on the deed. But that is now covered by the rural conservation district.
Q. Do you know how many turbines would be within a mile of your home?
A. (Longgood) From the last docket I recall, and I understand this has a similar footprint, four turbines will be within a mile. And one of the turbines would be 1 mile and 280 feet, if I'm
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remembering correctly.
Q. I remember when we drove down as a group and visited your property, we came up to the front there. Do you have a cleared area anyplace else in the back?
A. (Longgood) I do. I actually consider where you drive into my home the back because all of the windows, the decks, the recreational area is on the other side of the house facing east over the beaver pond and up to the ridge. There's a big, cleared area. I have a deck, you know, several large windows, first and second floor, looking out over the beaver pond, a big garden. I have a field that has peach trees, apple trees, raspberries. And they were all purposefully cleared for the view. And we look over the beaver pond at pines which are about, I would say a white pine is probably what, about 120 to 140 feet. But I can imagine -- I cannot imagine not being able to have a visual of these massive turbines that will be on top of the ridge line at close to 500 feet. I know I've been told I might not see anything, but I have a very difficult time believing that to be
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true.
Q. I believe the Applicant's documents show that there would not be any visible turbines from your home. Do you agree with that?
A. (Longgood) No, I don't.
Q. Why not?
A. (Longgood) $I$ can't imagine being on the ridge looking from my home and not being able to see a 400-whatever-foot structure on the top of the hill with flashing lights and spinning blades when $I$ will be getting the noise pollution, the shadow flicker. It seems untenable to me.
Q. Do you ever sit outside your house at night?
A. (Longgood) All the time. I have a hot tub outside and a shower outside.
Q. Is there any light pollution right now that affects your view of the stars?
A. (Longgood) Absolutely none.
Q. Do you have concerns that flashing lights would change that?
A. (Longgood) It would ruin it for me. It would be horrible. I have a lot of hardship that we've endured living out there. I recall -and the Schaefers probably recall this. We
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were in The Boston Globe, "No joy in Antrim's Mudville." The road was impassible. That was about 30 years ago. I was pregnant with my oldest child. We had to hike up from Route 9 with groceries and backpacks up a mile through the mud. Roads have been much improved. But we chose to stay there despite having to drive everywhere, despite having to make sure I had an all-wheel-drive vehicle, always having to commute at least 40 minutes to work. It was a purposeful decision that would totally be obliterated by having an industrial project in such close proximity, with such major impacts on my enjoyment of the land.
Q. Have you been given any explanation that tells you why the 2012 application, in their shadow flicker documentation, stated that you might be subject to 20 to 30 hours of shadow flicker, but the current one states that your expected shadow flicker would be 12 hours and 5 minutes?
A. (Longgood) I don't understand the discrepancy, nor do $I$ have much faith in the 12 hours mitigated down to 8 .
Q. The Applicant states that you would receive
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37.5 decibels at your home. Your land continues up behind there, doesn't it?
A. (Longgood) Yes, it goes out quite a bit further behind.
Q. So if you hiked up to that back land, you expect that that sound level might increase?
A. (Ms.Longgood) Most assuredly it would increase.
Q. If you had complaints about the wind turbines in any form, such as sound or flicker, do you have any confidence that if you were to call on the selectmen, that they would respond fairly and quickly to any complaints?
A. (Ms.Longgood) Based upon their past concerns for us, I would certainly hope, moving forward, we have selectmen that might care a bit more about the people who don't live downtown. But to this point, the selectmen have not seemed to take into account any of the impacts on the North Branch residents.
Q. Is it your opinion that the presence of this project would affect the value of your property?
A. (Ms.Longgood) Yes, indeed. It would ruin it for me.
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Q. Is there any compensation that anybody could come up with that would make up for the years of work that you've put into your place?
A. (Ms.Longgood) There would be no compensation. But I would plead, if this project is accepted by the SEC, that they would put in and have AWE have a property value guaranty for those impacted individuals since they've overly stated that it's not going to impact the property value. Because I would not want to live in such close proximity to a project like that. This is my -- I'm a year away from retirement. And to have to go and start someplace new would be very difficult. But it imposes a very big burden on the property owners who have invested their entire adult lives in their property fixing their homes, fixing their land and improving. And I can't imagine any compensation -- the only thing that would make it minimally bearable would be that I would have a property value guaranty, that I could get out of there without losing my life's investment.
Q. So if this project is approved, do you have any
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idea what you would do?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Sue.
A. (Longgood) I don't want to live there. I don't know if I could sell my home. I have no idea. But I really, with the sacrifice -- I have to plow an 800-foot driveway all winter long. You went there. It's a long driveway. I keep an old Ford Explorer -- there's a lot of things I endure because I like living there so much. And I will not like living in an environ such as that with an enormous industrial facility surrounding my house, having four turbines within a mile. And they'll be right up to Willard Pond. We can hike up -- I'm at the end of the dirt road. You can kind of hike over to Gregg Lake, hike up to Willard Pond. All of that will be gone.
Q. Couple of questions for Mr. and Mrs. Schaefer. Either of you can answer these. Do you have experience with Willard Pond?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Yes.
Q. Would the presence of wind turbines around that pond change that experience you think?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Absolutely. A hundred percent.
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It would change everything about the experience.
Q. Do you feel this project, in essence, takes away any of your rights to use any of your personal property?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Oh, absolutely it does. My children each have a vested interest in our 40 acres up there. My son recently came back to New Hampshire, after you ruled against their first project, to put his little cabin on the back side of my land. My son has passed but... and if you approve this project and go against the SEC's first decision, go against every zoning regulation in Antrim, I mean, outrage would be a modest assessment of how I take this. This is -- you've gone through this once. These people have, knowing that was voted down, put it against your Committee again. I don't know why you even took it. There's no substantial difference. One tower missing is 90 percent. That's still an $A$ in my book. I'm sorry. This is -- for seven years I've been dealing with this, you know, and the process. You know, my son is gone. Now I'm
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dealing with this again. And the fact that these people can waltz in here with their high-paid lawyers and give it to somebody who has no interest in our land, our property -yes, I mean -- I'm sorry. You cannot approve this project. And read my testimony. It will sum up...
Q. How close is your home to any turbines, and how many do you think you'll be able to see?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Well, once the leaves are off the trees I'll be able to see most of the tops of all of them. I don't know exact distance. But Lisa Linowes, I think I had sent pictures of the ridge looking from our house. It's the whole ridge. I mean, we have a setback far enough, but...
Q. I'll ask you the same question I asked others: When you sit outside at night, is there any light pollution currently that blocks your view of the stars?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Not at the moment, unless there's a light in the house. But not at the moment. Only caveat to that is when Crotched Mountain is operating, you can see in the
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distance from Crotched Mountain Ski Area. But that's...
Q. Do you think lighting on the turbines would affect that?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Pardon?
Q. Do you think the lighting on the turbines would affect that?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Oh, the visual, yes. Night light, yeah.
Q. What's your opinion of the height of these turbines in relationship to the size of the ridge over your house?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Totally out of proportion. Totally against every Antrim zoning reg. Thirty-five feet above the tree line is a regulation in Antrim. They can put turbines up as long as they're not 35 feet above the top of the tree line. They can go for that. They could clear all the land and put solar panels in. But to put something that is out of proportion, 500 feet above a ridge line, that basically goes 500 feet from the sub, I mean -it's rural conservation zoning. The town has kept that into affect how long, you know. And
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to just wipe that off the map with one swoop of a pen for somebody's profit motive, forget it. Yeah, it'll -- totally out of proportion.
Q. Is it your opinion that the presence of this project would affect the value of your property?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Oh, absolutely. No doubt in my mind. And I agree with Jan. You know, there's no taking back the 32 years of taxes and toil to build, you know, what we have, modest as it is. But take that away, 32 years, combined with the 32 years of property taxes that we've paid, you know, it's just -- yeah, it absolutely will affect.
Q. So how long have you lived in that home?
A. Thirty-two years.
Q. Would you have purchased that house if there had been a wind turbine project present on the ridge over there?
A. (Mr. Schaefer) Absolutely not. Moved up there to get away from industrialization, not bring it into my back yard.
Q. If this project is approved, what do you two think you would do?
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A. (Mr. Schaefer) No comment. I would start with a lawsuit, for one, against the town selectmen.
A. (Mrs. Schaefer) I think we'd probably try to find somewhere -- somewhere further away, too.
A. (Mr. Schaefer) No, I... sorry.
Q. All right. No further questions. Thank you.
A. (Mr. Schaefer) I apologize for the...

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Does the
Harris Center have any questions?
MR. NEWSOM: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: What I think we'll do is take a 45-minute lunch and come back, and we'll start with Counsel for the Public. Does that work for you, Ms. Maloney? MS. MALONEY: Absolutely.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: All right.
So we'll be back in 45 minutes, please.
(Lunch recess taken at 12:30 p.m.
Day 9 Morning Session concluded.
Hearing to be continued under separate cover in transcript noted as "Day 9.

Afternoon Session ONLY".)
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