## In Re:

## SEC 2015-05 EVERSOURCE/NEP - MERRIMACK VALLEY TECHNICAL SESSION

## PUBLIC/REDACTED SESSION May 05, 2016

# SUSAN J. ROBIDAS, N.H. LCR 30 James Pollock Drive 

Manchester, New Hampshire 03102 (603) 622-0068 or (603) 540-2083 shortrptr@comcast.net


COUNSEL FOR THE PUBLIC:
Christopher G. Aslin, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
N.H. Dept. of Justice

ALSO NOTED AS PRESENT:
Virginia Costa
Chris Allwarden, Eversource Legal Elizabeth Maldonado, Eversource Legal Bonnie Kurylo, Eversource Outreach

I N D $\mathbf{E} \mathbf{X}$

WITNESS: Peg Huard

EXAMINATION
PAGE
By Mr. Needleman
(PAGES 58 THROUGH 68 OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE CONTAINED UNDER SEPARATE COVER DESIGNATED AS "CONFIDENTIAL AND PROPRIETARY.")

RECORD REQUESTS:

1) Request for reference material 20 re: effect of tree removal on wetlands and water levels
2) Request for documents re: Project 35 "causing alarm or electric shock and electrocution to humans and animals alike."
3) Request for bills in Legislature 38 re: rate recovery by energy projects
4) Request for information re: impact 56 of Project on erosion
5) Request for e-mails to/from Hudson 63 Fire Dept. and/or Fire Chief
6) Request for all other e-mails 64 re: January 2016 incident
7) Request for communication with 64
primary care doctor

Objection by Ms. Huard 65
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PROCEEDINGS
MS. MONROE: Good morning, everybody. My name is Pam Monroe, Administrator of the Site Evaluation Committee, and I'll be running this meeting today.

So, this is a technical session in the SEC Docket No. 2015-05. Why don't we just go around the room for the court reporter's purposes and introduce ourselves.

MS. COSTA: I'm Virginia Costa.
MS. HUARD: I'm Peggy Huard, the Intervenor.

MR. ASLIN: Chris Aslin, Counsel for the Public.

MS. DORE: Iryna Dore, Counsel for the Site Evaluation Committee.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Barry Needleman from McLane Middleton, representing the Joint Applicants.

MR. RIELLY: Mark Rielly, attorney for National Grid.

MR. DUMVILLE: Adam Dumville from McLane Middleton, representing the Joint Applicants.
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MS. KURYLO: Bonnie Kurylo, Eversource Outreach, Transmission.

MR. ALLWARDEN: Chris Allwarden, Eversource Legal Department. There's my card. MS. MONROE: Okay. So, back in, let me see... back on the 7th of December, the Presiding Officer in this matter, who's Anne Ross, issued a prehearing conference and procedural schedule. So, today we're here for a technical session for the Applicant to question the witnesses for the Intervenor. And you're the only witness, and you've prefiled testimony. That's available on the web site. So this is an informal session, although it's being recorded. The transcript of this proceeding will not be posted on the web site. The Applicant requested it, and it was granted by the Presiding Officer. So, to the extent there are data requests that need to be followed up on, we'll be putting together the report.

And so, without further ado, Attorney Needleman.
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Good morning, Ms. Huard.
A. Good morning. How are you today?
Q. So why don't we start with the issue of medical records.
A. Sure.
Q. We had requested medical records from you. I think that you indicated there were some records, but you considered them confidential. And I think you indicated that you were bringing them today, and you said you wanted to say something about that.
A. That's correct. Your original request asked for medical records associated with each of these alleged incidences. I have one report, which is a fire report from the Hudson Fire Department, which I am prepared to give you.

However, I do not see the relevance to my assertion, and I was wondering if you could actually explain what you hope to find in my medical records that would support my assertion.
Q. Well, you've made various assertions in this
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
docket that you --
A. Specifically --
Q. -- that you experienced health effects as a result of being in proximity to the lines. You must believe that they have some relevance to this proceeding because you're the one that made the assertion. And so in that context we would like to see what support you have for those assertions. And you indicated in our data response that you believe that the Hudson Fire Department report is supportive of your assertion, so it's something we would like to review.
A. That is correct. However, I have an existing motion on the table, and there has been no order filed. And your objection to my motion contradicts how I want my medical records to be treated. Are you prepared to sign a confidentiality agreement in exchange for the medical records?
Q. I'm not sure how it contradicts it. But I guess I would just say we have no intention of using your medical records for any purpose other than this proceeding. We have no desire
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
to make them public in any way. We're happy to treat them as confidential, as long as we can use them in the context of this proceeding.
A. Unfortunately, the context of this proceeding involves a public hearing where the public will be invited. In addition, the context of this proceeding involves being posted to the public docket. And I specifically requested those be limited in my motion; but yet, you did not agree to those in your objection.

MS. MONROE: Maybe I can hop in here and be helpful. I mean, we -- the Presiding Officer will be issuing an order relative to the pending motions. We just couldn't get it done yesterday because she wasn't here. But I believe the intention would be to keep any portion of those proceedings, as well as the records, confidential and not have them posted to the web site.

MS. HUARD: You believe, but there's no guaranty at this point.

MS. MONROE: I don't have -- we
haven't settled that yet.
MS. HUARD: Right. So there's no
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
guaranty at this point that they will not be smeared on the docket page, which medical records include a significant amount of confidential information that can be damaging to an individual.

MS. MONROE: Well, I just heard Attorney Needleman say that he has no intentions of --

MS. HUARD: You can --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MS. MONROE: He has no intention of using those in a public manner. And the data requests are between the parties, so the Committee doesn't receive the information on discovery.

MS. HUARD: That is correct. I heard
him say that also. But $I$ also heard him say that he would use it inside the docket, which includes --

So you're saying you will
absolutely not use them in a public context, regardless of whether it's inside the docket or not.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I want to assure you,
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
because I understand your concerns. I've been in your position trying to protect documents. And so we have no intention of using them outside of this proceeding. What the Committee typically does -- and if I'm speaking out of turn, the Committee can tell me. What they typically do when you have confidential documents, they treat them as confidential. They aren't posted for the public to see. And to the extent any party during the actual hearing has questions about those, they will ask the public to leave the room if the public does not have some right to be there, like if they're a party. And the portion of the transcript that deals with that confidential information will be sealed and not be made public. That's the typical procedure. So, if we had questions for you about documents that were confidential, they would be treated that way. And so I think the normal way that this is dealt with would address the concerns that you have.

MS. MONROE: That is also my understanding. Again, we don't have an order
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
because of the timing here, but --
MS. HUARD: Right. I only made five copies, so if you can pass it down to Attorney Needleman. . .
(Ms. Huard distributes documents.)
MS. MONROE: I don't want a copy.
MS. HUARD: Anybody else over there?
MR. RIELLY: A copy would be appreciated, yes.

MS. HUARD: I have two other copies. I'll just pass them down, and if you want to... MR. NEEDLEMAN: And if we could just go off the record for a few minutes so we have a chance to review these, that would probably make this go more quickly.

MS. MONROE: Okay, Sue, let's go off the record.
(Pause in proceedings) MS. MONROE: Go back on the record. BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. All right. Ms. Huard, so what $I$ want to do is ask you some questions about your prefiled testimony, some questions about the documents you've provided. Just some general questions.
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}

If at any point you don't understand something I'm asking you, please let me know so I can clarify it.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. So let me start out with your resume, which I think you provided to us as part of the document request. And am I correct that your professional training and professional experience is as a certified public accountant?
A. That is correct.

I do have a question on the relevance of my resume to my prefiled testimony. I filed my testimony as an individual intervenor, and $I$ do not use a designation of "CPA" anywhere in my prefiled testimony.
Q. That's fine. I want to run through some specific topic areas, and for each one of these topic areas I'd like you to tell me whether you have any formal education in any of these areas or any professional training or experience in any of these areas. And I won't repeat that question every time. It's the same question for each one of these.

So, the first one is with respect to
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
medicine.
A. Well, with respect to medicine, I have some defined professional education.

Unfortunately -- how do I answer this?
"Education" is a wide range of opportunities.
Formal education in a college is merely an overpaid -- I mean a paid professor spoon-feeding you a textbook.

My expertise in education is limited to
first aid, and I'm licensed in -- I'm not
licensed. I'm sorry. I was certified in CPR and just basic first aid through -- I was a Cub Scout leader for three years.
Q. Beyond first aid and CPR, any other experience or training in that --
A. I have a significant background in psychology. I started to pursue my psychology minor in college, and I have a significant amount of courses in psychology.
Q. Other than that, anything else?
A. I do treat myself. I am a naturalist as opposed to -- I do go to the doctor, but I do use a lot of natural remedies. So I'm very in tune with my body from head to toe through a
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number of resources that are available to people.
Q. Same question. Any professional experience, formal education or training with electrical engineering?
A. I would have to say, aside from what I've learned through this docket up until the literature and resources I've read with this docket, no.
Q. Same question with respect to civil engineering.
A. Same answer.
Q. Same question with respect to sound studies and sound analysis.
A. Same answer. But let me expand on that. As a CPA, since you brought that up, we are actually trained to learn about the nuances of every industry and every company that we work on, regardless of the engagement, so that we can obtain the knowledge as if we were working in that industry itself. So I have the skills to learn an industry as quickly as possible. While I'm not licensed to practice in that industry, $I$ am trained to obtain knowledge in
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
the proper manner and understand what I'm reading and weigh the quality of information that I'm reading.
Q. Do you have any professional training, formal education or experience with wetlands sciences?
A. With what?
Q. Wetlands sciences.
A. Again, the only -- not formal. Again, we studied our wetlands with the Boy Scouts, and we highly stressed the conservation efforts. And our wetlands, our immediate wetlands, I'm very familiar with our wetlands through my own education.
Q. Same question with respect to forestry.
A. Same thing, you know, self-education.
Q. Same question with respect to wildlife biology.
A. Same thing, self-education.
Q. Same question with respect to plant biology.
A. Self-education.
Q. Same question with respect to real-estate appraisal and property values.
A. Self-education.
Q. Same question with respect to aesthetics analysis.
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A. Self-education.
Q. Same question with respect to the properties of electric and magnetic fields.
A. Self-education.
Q. Same question with respect to climate science.
A. I don't have any.
Q. Same question with respect to air-quality analysis.
A. Self-education.
Q. And same question with respect to hydrogeology.
A. Self-education.
Q. Thank you.

Am I correct that you purchased your home in 2001?
A. That is correct.
Q. And at the time you purchased your home, is it correct that the transmission line corridor was already located there?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And is it also correct that the transmission lines that are in the corridor were also present there?
A. I'm not sure if all of them were present because $I$ wasn't in tune to the various
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
construction within that road up until this docket. I know there was some activity. So I don't know if anything was added. I only know that there were some there.
Q. At the time you purchased your home in 2001, was it a concern to you that the home was in proximity to that corridor or the transmission lines?
A. It wasn't a thought because the information wasn't presented to us.
Q. When you say "the information wasn't presented" to you, who would you have expected to present that information?
A. Either the realtor or the utility companies posting information on the poles or distributing information through the neighborhood.
Q. Do you have a copy of your prefiled testimony with you?
A. I do.
Q. If you could please look at it. And I wanted to start on Page 2, the third paragraph down, which is where -- or the fourth -- I'm sorry. There's a sentence that says, "There is a risk
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that the natural wildlife will be disturbed, frightened, leave and not return." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. So, our Data Request 2-A asked you to provide all of the documents that you possessed that you believe support that statement. And you did so; is that correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. Other than the documents you provided and the testimony you've provided here, do you have anything else to support that assertion?
A. I believe that your Sherrie Trefry actually touches on parts of it in her --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. Sherrie Trefry touches on some components of it. I don't have her testimony or her response to my discovery request. But she does talk about the wildlife leaving. She doesn't use the word "frightened" or "disturbed," but she does talk about the wildlife being disturbed and leaving the area.
Q. So, other than what Ms. Trefry has said and the documents you provided in your testimony here,
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are you relying on anything else to support your assertion?
A. I don't believe so. Just what I -- right. I had provided you with the various articles, impacts and noise on wildlife, and, you know, the psychological effects it would have on these, and common sense and logic when you take down 90 to 100 trees. So, that's pretty much it.
Q. Okay. At the bottom of that page, the last paragraph/sentence, it says, "The removal of this large amount of mature forest in and around wetlands and water bodies may increase and disperse water levels causing a disturbance to dry land."

Can you explain the basis for that assertion?
A. I can. Again, I believe it was Sherrie Trefry and Dennis [sic] Oakley that actually admit that the wetlands could -- the water level could do something. I don't remember the exact words. In addition to that -- you did not ask me for that in your discovery request -- I do have a significant amount of reference material
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showing what would happen if those trees were removed. I did also give you a chapter on deforestation with one of your other discovery questions. And I think in there it talks about the dispersement of the water table as you remove the trees.
Q. You just said that you have a "significant amount of materials" supporting this assertion.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. We would ask that, to the extent you haven't already provided it, you please provide that material.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Let's go to the top of Page 3. That first paragraph at the top of Page 3 says, "These trees also serve as an erosion buffer in many areas. The Project proposes leaving four-foot stumps in place to help with the erosion. While this may work for a short period of time, the risk of major erosion over time is great."

And with respect to that last sentence, we asked you in Data Request 3-B to provide all of these supporting materials you have, and I believe you did.
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A. I did.
Q. Is there anything else that you're relying upon aside from the materials you provided?
A. I could go through my vast amount of resources I read. But I believe I gave you a very credible deforestation. Talked about what would happen. I know I pulled some other things on erosion. So...
Q. Are you aware of the fact that there are state permitting programs that this project is subject to which deal with the control of erosion?
A. I'm aware of that.
Q. And is it your belief that those state permitting programs will not adequately protect the area against erosion?
A. That is correct.
Q. And why do you believe that those state permits will not effectively deal with this issue?
A. Well, common sense and logic and looking at what is proposed to happen, and what I've learned about erosion, first and foremost with the Cub Scouts. We did tests on erosion, and it doesn't make any common sense to me,
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especially in one particular area of concern, the Howard Brook area. The proposal proposed to remove 90 to 100 feet of trees on either side of that brook, which is actually an enlarged water body. It doesn't make any sense to me, based on what I've read and what I see, having lived in that environment.
Q. Have you reviewed any of the erosion analysis that DES has done up to this point with respect to this case?
A. Was it in the docket -- in the appendixes?
Q. I'm just asking you, have you reviewed any of that?
A. I don't recall reviewing anything specifically on erosion. I only remember seeing their proposed mitigation plans, which is very minimal at this point, because they actually hadn't issued any mitigation plan. And also, the subsequent plantings do not seem sufficient enough to replace the large amounts of trees that are going to be removed.
Q. Let's go to the bottom of Page 4 of your testimony, and the very last sentence, carrying over to the last page says, "I have experienced
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two shocks, one mild, and in January of 2016, one strong enough to cause cardiac arrest."?
A. Do you have my amended Page 5?
Q. I do.
A. Okay.
Q. Just going to take a minute to find that.

Now, going over to the middle of Page 5, you list three incidents --
A. I'm sorry. Are you on Page 5 of my amended Page 5?
Q. Well, let's do it on the amended Page 5. So, on amended Page 5, at the bottom you list three incidents.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. One in 2009/2010, one in 2012/2013, and then one in January 2016. I just wanted to be certain that on the old version, where you say you experienced two shocks, one mild, and then one in January of 2016, I want to understand how that relates to the three incidents. So, in other words, am I correct that the three incidents $I$ just referred to are the total number of incidents that you are asserting?
A. Well, there's two incidents that appear to be
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definite shocks. And the only reason I say two is the 2009/2010 and 2016 were clearly, in my opinion, shocks. The first one was a clear shock of holding the umbrella, and the January 2016 felt like a clear shock as I experienced it. The '12/'13 one was not necessarily a sensation of a shock, so I did not include that in my sentence with the two shocks. But those are three health effects and only two apparent shocks.
Q. Okay. I think I understand. But the total number of health effects that you're pointing to here are those three that are listed.?
A. In this testimony, yes.
Q. Okay. Are there any others that you're not referring to?
A. That's all I'm providing for this testimony.
Q. Okay. When you say that's all you're providing, that means that at no point later in the docket are you going to claim that there are any others; is that correct?
A. At no point in the docket will I claim there are others. But at some point in my life I will claim that there are others. I'm not
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
going to rehash the 15 years of my residence -Q. Okay.
A. -- in this docket.
Q. But just to be clear, for purposes of this docket, the only three health incidents we're talking about are the three listed at the bottom of Page 5.
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. So I want to talk about each one of those.

Now, with respect to the first two, the 2009/2010 and the 2012/2013, we, in Data Request No. 4, asked you to provide supporting documents with respect to those. And in your answer you said, "Neither the incident in 2009/2010, nor the pain experienced in 2012/2013 are formally documented." Is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. So, is it correct, then, that with respect to those first two incidents, there are no medical records that we can look at?
A. That is correct.
Q. And is it correct that there are no fire
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department call logs with respect to those incidents?
A. That is correct.
Q. Is there any non-medical expert opinion or assessment that you have that relates to those incidents?
A. You know, just my own.
Q. When you say your own, what do you mean?
A. Well, I mean, I experienced the shock. So I'm telling you, I mean, the umbrella was a definite shock. And I'm telling you it was a shock. There's no other way to describe it.
Q. Did you take any personal notes at the time or maintain any diaries that described these incidents?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Okay. Did you make any requests to any state or federal regulators at the time to investigate these incidents?
A. I was not aware of the process until this docket. No, I did not.
Q. So, is it fair to say that there are absolutely no documents anywhere that in any way refer to these incidents?
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A. I would have to say no.
Q. I think what I want to do is, I do want to ask you questions about the 2016 incident, but I'm going to put that to the end for now and we'll come back to it.
A. Okay.
Q. Now -- well, I'll ask you that at the end, too. Now, in your amended testimony -- they both say "Page 5," but I'm looking at the back of the page at this point --
A. Okay.
Q. -- you talk about a series of events unrelated to you. They seem to relate to other people in the area.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And you talk about -- let's see. I think it would probably just be easier if I read what you said here.
"In the past few years, three people have died that walked on a regular basis near or lived in close proximity to the HVTLs in the David Drive/Kienia" -- I don't know if I'm pronouncing that correctly, K-I-E-N-I-A -"Road area. My 37-year-old neighbor, a
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}

14-year-old girl and 59-year-old man, all seemingly died from the effects of living and walking near HVTLs." And then the next paragraph says, "My 37-year-old neighbor lived one property closer to the right-of-way. She also drove a school bus and parked it overnight at the right-of-way on the side of demarcation. Before she died, she started to have blackouts. She was in a one-car accident after the blackouts began." Did I read that all correctly?
A. You did.
Q. So I want to ask you some questions about that.

In Data Request No. 5, we asked you for
all of the documents that you possess that relate to any of these incidents. Do you recall that?
A. I do.
Q. And in response, you provided us with an obituary for Ms. Bergeron -- actually, you provided us with several obituaries. You provided us with some GIS mapping information showing where various people lived, and a Hudson fire log relating to the death of Ms.
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}

Bergeron; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. So, let me first begin by clarifying. So, all of the documents you possess that relate in any way to these incidents are the ones that you've now provided here?
A. That is correct.
Q. Have you ever seen any medical records for any of these people?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Have you ever seen any opinions from anyone that in any way talk about the cause of death with respect to any of these people?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Did you ever speak with any of the family members about the causes of death in these situations?
A. I did speak to -- when they died, it wasn't apparent to me. And since this docket has opened up, I have spoken to Nicole Jack's mother with my concerns. The other two, I don't believe I've mentioned it to them.
Q. And what was her reaction?
A. She's devastated, anyway. Nothing in
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particular.
Q. You say "all seemingly died from the effects of living and walking near HVTLs." Aside from the documents that you've provided here to us, do you have any other evidence to support that statement?
A. I don't. Just what I provided you.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So I want to go back to your original testimony now. And I am looking at the bottom of Page 7. It's the question that you were responding to regarding air quality. Do you see where I am?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And the second paragraph from the bottom, the very last sentence of that paragraph says, "The removal of these trees will increase the carbon footprint in a large area." Can you explain the basis for that statement?
A. Sure. Again, research material on the carbon cycle. And I believe that, at least Ms.

Trefry, and possibly Derek [sic] Oakley, touched on the carbon footprint. And that's basically it.
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Q. Have you done any analysis to quantify the increase in the carbon footprint?
A. Nothing formally.
Q. Do you have anything informal?
A. Just common sense.
Q. So when you say "it will increase the footprint," you have no way to say by how much?
A. Not by how much, no.
Q. In the next sentence you say, "The rust 'patina' from the self-weathering poles will be emitted into the air, adversely affecting the air quality as well." What's the basis of that assertion?
A. The two articles -- or the two resources that I referred to above, the one from Weathering Steel -- I'm sorry -- the one from, yeah, Weathering Steel and the other one Wikipedia on the self-weathering poles.
Q. Aside from those two articles, are you relying on anything else to support that assertion?
A. Nothing .
Q. So, now I'm on Page 8, and I am one, two, three, four, five, seven paragraphs down. So it's the paragraph that begins, "This will
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create an enormous opportunity..." Do you see that?
A. Hmm-hmm. Yeah.
Q. Rather than read that whole paragraph, I'm just going to ask you the same question: What is the basis for this assertion?
A. Well, again, we go back to the question you already asked me. And the information I'm going to provide you on the increase in water level is the increase in the water level that would actually cause major flooding. And we've already discussed -- I've already provided you information on erosion that I've read. Let's see. And then the part where it "may cause water levels to rise and spread --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. May cause the water levels to rise and spread into areas that were not wetlands before," again, based on the same information that I've read and am going to provide you. And actually living in the area, where we see wetlands rise and fall from season to season, the wetlands change very quickly. And sometimes your poles are on dry land, and sometimes they're on
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wetland. And I foresee, based on me living there for 15 years, the same thing happening.
Q. So you're saying that the additional material that we requested will provide support for this statement?
A. It will provide support that the water level will rise. I'm not really certain that it will provide an assertion that it will "rise and spread into areas that were not wetlands." I think that's an inference from the material that I read.
Q. Okay. By saying "inference" with respect to that portion of your assertion, you don't have any documents to support that.
A. I'll have to look at the material to see if it specifically says -- it does talk about dispersing. So if you put a pole next to an area that's going to spread, an inference would be that it's going to spread this way and the pole there is going to spread into an area that wasn't wetlands before. So I believe that the information I'm going to support -- provide you will support my assertion.
Q. Okay. I have the same questions about the next
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sentence, the paragraph that begins with, "The combination of increased and dispersed water levels into areas with transmission towers and poles is a dangerous mix, causing alarm for electric shock and electrocution to humans and animals alike."

My question is: What's the basis for that statement?
A. Well, again, this is an inference from what $I$ read. We all know that -- as a layperson, we all know that electricity and water do not mix. So if the areas that were meant to be dry are now wet, then it's going to increase an area that there's a greater risk for electric shock and electrocution.
Q. So you say "causing alarm." That's different from "a greater risk." So is it your assertion that, if this water spreads, it's going to increase the risk of shock and electrocution?
A. Well, "causing alarm" is causing concern. My point of my testimony was to bring these concerns up to the Applicant and the SEC to consider this because that is what I can see, based on what $I$ read and based on living there.
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}

We already undergo a significant increase in wetlands in the area in the spring, and at that time, you could unexpectedly be walking in areas that are normally dry.
Q. So $I$ think for a second record request we'd like it to be clear that we want all documents that you possess that support the statement at the end of this paragraph, "causing alarm for electric shock and electrocution to humans and animals alike."
A. Okay.
Q. And then the last sentence there -MS. MONROE: What page is that? MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's Page 8, second to last paragraph.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. And then the last sentence there says, "The rust-like 'patina' from self-weathering poles will contaminate the same bodies of water and wetlands noted above."

And our Data Request 7-A asked you for all documents that you possess supporting that assertion, and you provided those. I just want to confirm that you have nothing else that
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supports that assertion.
A. There's -- I mean, I gave you the path of the water bodies. I have duplicating -- like I gave you one source of the piping system. And I have another source of the piping source. But I gave you one source of the piping system.
Q. Let me ask it this way: If there's any documents that you're going to rely upon to support that assertion in this proceeding that you haven't already provided, we would like those.
A. Okay. No, I don't.
Q. Okay.
A. And if I do, I already have noted that if I change anything, that I'm supposed to give that to you, so...
Q. Okay. I'm now looking at Page 9, and I'm looking at the second question, and the first paragraph of that question. The second sentence says, "Currently, the New Hampshire Legislature is actively pursuing litigation limiting and prohibiting costs of projects such as the MVRP from being recovered from the ratepayers."
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}

Could you explain what that means? I don't understand that.
A. There is constant legislation going back and forth in the New Hampshire Legislature for all of the energy projects, all the numerous energy projects that have come through New Hampshire, including the MVRP.
Q. So you believe there's a bill in the legislature that's directed at this project?
A. Not directed at this project, just generally at the energy industry.
Q. And what's your understanding of what that bill would do that would affect the Project?
A. At this point, nothing. It was an example as to how fast -- what I say is --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MS. MONROE: Slow down.
MS. HUARD: I'm sorry.
A. I say, "While both applicants are financially strong, they are posing a large, unfair burden" --

MS. MONROE: Slow down. Ms. Huard, just slow down. Take a breath and --
A. "While both applicants are financially strong,
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they are posing a large, unfair burden for numerous, consecutive projects on the ratepayers." And the Legislature -- my understanding was there's numerous people trying to pass legislation not only -- just across the board with all energy projects to limit the amount of recovery that goes back to the ratepayers.
Q. When you use the word "litigation" here, I take it you don't mean a court proceeding; you mean bills in the Legislature.
A. Where do $I$ say -- oh, "actively pursing litigation..." Yes. I'm sorry. That must be the wrong word. Yeah.
Q. Can you identify by bill number any of these bills so we can look at them?
A. Not off the top of my head, but $I$ can get them to you.
Q. If you could, I'd appreciate that. And all we would want is references to the bill numbers that you claim support this statement.

Okay. So, now I'm over on Page 10, and I'm looking at the first question on the page about real estate markets. And in response to
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that question, you provided three paragraphs of answers. And in Data Request No. 8 with respect to this, we asked you to provide all of the information that you have that supports these assertions here for this question. Do you recall that?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And you provided us with one document, which is titled "2016 Sales of Londonderry Property." Can you explain to me how you believe this document supports those assertions?
A. Sure. Londonderry's been greatly affected by past build-outs, and they -- build-outs of your client's infrastructures. And they're also the end of the MVRP. And currently, there are significant homes being sold below market value in the area between -- in the area surrounding Scobie Pond, between Scobie Pond and Granite Ridge. And so $I$ believe it's an indication of what could happen and what will happen if you start digging through that side of Hudson and any other area.
Q. So it's your belief that any of the homes listed on here that sold below appraised value
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}

rights and ownership. And you make various assertions here questioning the transfer of the easements or the ownership of particular properties with respect to this project. And we asked you to provide all of the documents that you possess with respect to this issue, and you provided us with documents in Data Request No. 9. And there are a range of documents, a GIS map and then a lot of different deeds.

I guess my general question for you is: Can you explain how you believe the documents you've provided support the assertions here on the bottom of Page 10?
A. Sure. If I remember correctly, the documents $I$ provided you included GIS maps of the homes that are actually -- that your ROWs are actually on their property. And I also provided you with what you had provided me, the easement agreement and a picture. And the picture looks like it's fully developed. And I merely asked the question: "Do you have" -"Is it fully developed? Is the easement already fully developed?" I don't recall what
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else I provided to you, off the top of my head.
Q. I can show it to you if that would be helpful.
A. That would be great.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Right. I provided you a limited amount of deed transfers for the two immediate properties on David Drive, demonstrating that, although it's legal, the deeds do not specifically convey the easement. And so let's start with my first assertion. Eversource does not have -MS. MONROE: Slow down.
A. I'm sorry. Eversource does not have outright ownership of these two properties. That is supported by the deed and the map showing that they don't have ownership of it. They merely have -- and the easement -- they merely have easement rights. And I merely question: The easement is written in 1969 measurements of coordinates and stonewalls. And you can clearly see the difference between the map of the easement and the GIS maps, that the property is no longer the same, that it has been subdivided, developed, and now there's -they've been sold, and there are now people
[SEC 2015-05] \{Technical Session\} [05-05-16\}
living there. And the easement has not been clearly conveyed as the property has been transferred from owner to owner. You see that they are not clearly conveyed. I do not say "legally conveyed," I say "clearly conveyed." The easement is not -- does not appear on the face of the deed explicitly. Actually, on one of them it merely refers to the prior deed, and you have to go all the way back to find the easement.

Additionally, there is a drawing with the 1969 easement record that depicts the alleged ROW easement formed at that time. The current development of the ROW at David Drive already appears to have been developed to the full capacity intended by this 1969 easement.

Without myself going out and measuring, there's already four lines in this drawing for the easement and already four lines within the right-of-way. And without having -- going out and measuring all of the coordinates and stonewalls, I question whether you have the legal right. It says, "It appears to have been developed." I question whether it has been
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developed to full capacity. Much of the ROW proposed for MVRP is not already owned, is questionable if valid easements exist for all the residential properties that the Applicant proposes to place the MVRP on.

I gave you a limited schedule of what I had done. And I've gone back and looked at several of the spot checks, several of the homes along the right-of-way, and the same thing; these are not outright ownership. You have easement rights on a lot of this property. I think that goes on to the next page. That's it.
Q. So let me circle back to --
(Ms. Maldonado joins proceeding.)
MS. MONROE: Hold on a second. Could you just identify yourself?

MS. MALDONADO: Elizabeth Maldonado.
I'm with Eversource Energy.
MS. MONROE: Thank you.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So, first, these documents that you provided in response to Data Request No. 9, these are all the documents that you possess that you
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claim -- or that you believe support the assertions here at the bottom of Page 10; is that correct?
A. Well, I did also indicate that, while I may in the future look -- I may uncover other deeds, that you had the mutual opportunity to obtain those and that I wasn't going to provide you with further deeds. Other than that, yes.
Q. And as part of this analysis that you just walked through with us, have you ever consulted a real estate professional or a title examiner to get any input with respect to that analysis?
A. I didn't need to, based on my statement. I merely said that it has not clearly been conveyed.
Q. So that analysis is purely your own.
A. That is correct.
Q. And purely based just on these documents.?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. So, is it your view that when a property is subdivided, that the easements do not perpetuate to the subdivided properties?
A. That is not what $I$ said. I said that it's not clearly conveyed.
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Q. So is it your view that it must actually be conveyed in the subsequent documents to be effective?
A. No, I did not say that. I'm not questioning whether it was conveyed. I'm questioning whether it's been clearly conveyed. I'm not questioning -- the only -- I'm questioning whether you have developed it to full capacity. But as far as passing it on, I merely state that to remind you and to alert the SEC that many of these people were not aware that they even had a construction easement. So, to alert you of the limitations that the owners had when they purchased the home, or the limitation of understanding I guess is --
Q. I understand what you're saying, but I'm trying to get to the heart of what you're claiming here.

Is it your position, even if they were not contained when the property was subdivided, is it your position that they had to be contained?
A. No, it's not. No, I understand the law that you don't have to. And that's an unfortunate law. No -- yes, I understand the law that you
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don't have to fully disclose the easement on a deed.
Q. And then a related question not with respect to subdivided properties. But if a property is just one property being conveyed to somebody else, is it your contention that, if the easement is in the original deed, but it's not in the subsequent deed, is it your contention that the easement is not effective?
A. Not that it's not effective, that it wasn't communicated.
Q. Okay. And again, same question: Is it your understanding that the law requires it to be communicated?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Okay. So, now I'm looking at the bottom of Page 12 of your testimony. And there's a sentence about halfway down the page that says, "They claim that the EMFs are within the standard but never, ever take any readings." Do you see where I'm --
A. I do.
Q. Okay. What standard do you mean?
A. I guess within the industry standard.
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Q. Okay. Is there a particular reference you can give us that you have in mind?
A. Just the references that they make in their testimony. I'd have to be -- you know, go to the testimony to be more specific. Throughout the testimony of both of the doctors, I believe both of them discuss the standards that the EMFs are supposed to be within; yet, when I asked for readings, I was told that they never take any.
Q. Okay. So when you say the "standards" here, you're referring to the "standards" that our experts were referencing.?
A. That's correct. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And then, at the bottom of the page it says, "Far too much of their planning and analysis was done using computer software, hypothetical models and probabilities that have no concrete basis of reality."?
A. Correct.
Q. And I'd like you to explain that to me.
A. Sure.
Q. When you say "computer software, hypothetical
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models and probabilities," what exactly are you referring to?
A. Sure. I grouped all of the experts together in that one sentence. And if you look through, ranging from the aesthetics to the market value, to just basically coming up with the group study to begin with, you know, several -I can't... several of the other studies of the other experts as well talk about -- and I'd have to pull out every specific thing -- list their software, list their hypothetical models and their probabilities. And I was even told one of the reasons why they don't measure is they claim that, so long as they place the poles in a certain manner and the wires hang a certain way, that there is no concern.

However, living there, specifically the removal of trees and the aesthetics and claiming based on their computers that there's no change in aesthetics, there's no basis for reality. As a person that lives there, there's no way in heck that there's going to be no effect on aesthetics. So that's my comment, saying there's no basis for reality. They have not
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tested it against reality. And we actually live in the real confinements of what they're proposing.
Q. Okay. So I want to wrap up by going back to the 2016 incident.

MS. DORE: Because now you're going to confidential, if you don't mind --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, what I'm going to try to do is ask questions unrelated to the confidential information first and then only ask the confidential ones at the very end.

MS. DORE: Okay. I just want to make sure.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yeah.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So I'm looking at the amended testimony that you provided to us, and I'm looking at the bottom of that first page which talks about the 2016 January incident that you described. And in Data Request No. 4, we asked you to provide all of the information that you possess related to that incident. And you provided us with four documents, and three of them are public and one of them is confidential. I want to
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talk about the three public documents first. Document No. 2 are some pictures that you took; Document No. 3 is a table showing the effects of electric shock on the human body; and Document No. 4 is an aerial map of high-voltage, steel lattice DC towers with a sign.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. So, with respect to those three documents, can you explain how you believe they support your description of this January 2016 incident that you've described in the bottom of Page 5 of your amended testimony?
A. They show you where $I$ was and what $I$ was doing. That was my purpose for providing them. The pictures of the signs and the GIS map show you where $I$ was and what $I$ was doing. The level of electric shock shows you the symptoms that correlate with the symptoms that I have. I also provided you with three other supplements to that. Did you get that at all? Five, six and seven? That goes with four.
Q. Yup, we have those. I don't think seven relates to it. Looks like environmental
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documents.
A. Seven?
Q. Yeah.
A. What was...
(Witness reviews document.)
A. I sent one yesterday which was -- no, there's seven that -- no, I'm sorry. Not Data Request 7. It was Amendment 7 to go with Data Request 4, or supplements -- it was the BPA guide to working and living in close -- or working and living near high-voltage transmission lines. Did you get that one at all?

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. We did, yeah.

MS. HUARD: Are you getting anything yet? I tried.

MR. RIELLY: No, I know.
MS . HUARD: Sometimes I remember, sometimes I don't, but -BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So I'm going to circle back in the end to the confidential document.

Is it correct now that we possess all of the documents that you believe support these
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assertions regarding the January 2016 incident?
A. Well, those are the ones I selected that have the highest hierarchy and credibility. I've read a significant amount, volumes, to determine what has happened to me --
Q. Are you going -- sorry.
A. Go ahead.
Q. Are there any other documents that you possess, that you intend to rely upon to support these assertions which you haven't provided to us?
A. Not at this point. And again, if I decide to, they go to you.
Q. Now, with respect to this January 2016 incident, aside from the confidential document, are there any medical records that you possess with respect to this incident?
A. Not with respect to that day.
Q. Okay. Are there any medical records that you possess that you believe flow from that incident or are in any way connected to it?
A. Not that $I$ believe you have a right to.
Q. Well, I guess --
A. Not that pertain to -- not that pertain to that specific incident.
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Q. Okay. So there are no medical records that you possess or have access to that you are going to in any way rely upon to support the assertion here?
A. There will be no other medical records introduced into this docket.
Q. Okay. Do you have any opinions from any medical experts that support the assertions regarding the 2016 incident?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Do you have any opinions from any non-medical experts, EMF experts, any type of experts that support this?
A. Just the EMTs that saw me that day. They would have been the ones to see me immediately.
Q. All right. Then we will go to that in a minute. I don't want to talk about that yet. Actually, why don't we do that now. Why don't we, from this point forward, focus on the confidential document.

MS. DORE: Then I will interrupt you. Before we go to that, because I don't want to go back to the non-confidential discussion, I don't want to interrupt the transcript, $I$ just
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want to say what we have so far for non-confidential data requests so that we're on the same page --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MS. DORE: I just will list the data requests that we have so far that are not confidential so that we can issue the memo memorializing that, to know that we're all on the same page and we understand that, okay. So, so far I have documents showing effect of tree removal on wetlands and surface waters, including increasing water levels. That's No. 1.

No. 2 is all documents supporting the statement that the Project will "cause alarms about shock to people and animals." That's as good as I could get that. And the third one is references to the bill currently in pending in the Legislature that prohibits recovery costs of energy projects from ratepayers. Is that the one?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think that's right.
MS. MONROE: The specific bill
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number.
MS. HUARD: There was one more I was going to look for. Any more articles that I planned on using for erosion, that was the only other one.

MS. DORE: Well, okay. But you mentioned that you have that.

MS. HUARD: Right.
MS. DORE: You didn't request that. Do you want her to provide that?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think we did.
MS. HUARD: I had agreed to look to see if $I$ was going to use anything else. But I believe I had provided you with some fairly significant --

MS. DORE: So, any additional materials relating to the impact of the Project on erosion.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So, let me suggest this: Before we go into the confidential document, maybe we should take a quick break so I can talk to these folks and see if there's anything else that $I$ want to hit before we go and do that.
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(Hearing now resumes in the public portion of the record.)

MS. MONROE: Okay. Just a couple of procedural matters relative to...

MR. ASLIN: Put on the record that we're back in non-confidential --

MS. MONROE: Yes. Back on the record.

MR. ASLIN: Okay.
MS. MONROE: So the next -- so we've got the data requests that we went through. I would ask that the responses to those be submitted within a week. That would be May 12th. Just distribute it to the parties. The Committee doesn't need those responses. If there's any objection, then the party requesting the documents shall file a motion to compel by May 12th, and then any objections to that motion should be filed a week thereafter, which would be May $19 t h$.

MS. HUARD: That was May 19th?
MS. MONROE: That's any objections to motions to compel. So, in the event you don't supply the information, file a motion to
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request it. But it sounds like we have agreement on the four items we went through. And then, by May 20th, if there's any supplemental prefiled testimony from the parties, that's the deadline for that. If there are any Statements of Stipulated Facts or other stipulations, those are due by May $23 r d$.

And we'll be issuing an order by tomorrow, possibly, I hope, because I'm on vacation next week. May 31st, we're going to have the final structuring conference beginning at 9 a.m. And also in that notice, the final adjudicative hearing is scheduled for June 13th and 14th of 2016. In the event that we need more time than that, we'll have to reschedule to see if I get a quorum of the Committee. MS. HUARD: Approximate start time? MS. MONROE: 10:00 a.m., I think. MS. HUARD: Is there typically a $10 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. to 4:00 type of thing, or do we know? MS. MONROE: Do you need to end it at 4:00?

MS. HUARD: No, I do not. I need to
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plan, that's all. I need to make arrangements.
MS. MONROE: I think the
preference --
MS. HUARD: If it goes to 8:00, I need to make arrangements.

MS. MONROE: I can guarantee it won't go to 8:00.

MS. HUARD: So, approximately 10:00 to 4:00.

MS. MONROE: I mean, 5:30 at the latest.

MS. HUARD: Okay. And then the Statement of Stipulated Facts, is that just something we send to you? There's no formal meeting for that? That's just something we submit, correct, by e-mail?

MS . MONROE: Yeah.
MS. DORE: We also have a prefinal --
a final conference, structuring conference. We're going to discuss whether you're going to have any stipulations or anything like that. So, maybe as a result of that, if you can file some additional stipulations --

MS. HUARD: So the final structuring
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conference is before the Statement of Stipulated Facts are due, I thought. MS. MONROE: No. The final structuring conference is May 31st. MS. HUARD: Right. And the Statements of Stipulated Facts are due 5/23. MS. MONROE: May 23rd. MS. HUARD: Right. So the final structuring conference is after. MS . MONROE: Yes. MS. HUARD: Okay. MS. MONROE: Any other questions?
[No verbal response] MS. MONROE: Hearing none, we'll close this technical conference.
(Whereupon the Technical Session concluded at 11:00 a.m.)
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| $20: 2$ | concerns (4) | 11:3,10 | deadline (1) | 26:14 |
| chart (1) | 10:1,21;29:21; | copy (3) | 70:5 | died (5) |
| 40:19 | 34:22 | 11:6,8;17:18 | deal (2) | 27:20;28:2,8; |
| checks (1) | concluded (1) | correctly (3) | 21:11,19 | 29:18;30:2 |
| 44:8 | 72:17 | 27:23;28:11;41:15 | deals (1) | difference (1) |
| Chris (2) | concrete (1) | correlate (1) | 10:15 | 42:20 |
| 4:13;5:3 | 48:20 | 51:19 | dealt (1) | different (2) |
| circle (2) | conference (8) | corridor (3) | 10:21 | 34:16;41:10 |
| 44:14;52:21 | 5:8;70:12;71:19, | 16:17,21;17:7 | death (3) | digging (1) |
| civil (1) | 19;72:1,4,9,15 | COSTA (2) | 28:24;29:12,16 | 39:21 |
| 14:10 | confidential (18) | 4:10,10 | December (1) | directed (2) |
| claim (7) | 6:10;8:2,18;9:4; | costs (2) | 5:6 | 37:9,10 |
| 24:20,22,24;38:21; | 10:7,8,15,19;50:7,10, | 36:22;55:20 | decide (1) | disclose (1) |
| 45:1;47:19;49:14 | 11,24;52:22;53:14; | Counsel (2) | 53:11 | 47:1 |
| claiming (2) | 54:20;55:7;56:20; | 4:13,15 | deed (7) | discovery (4) |
| 46:17;49:18 | 57:5 | couple (1) | $42: 5,14 ; 43: 7,8$ | $9: 15 ; 18: 18 ; 19: 23$ |
| clarify (1) | CONFIDENTIAL] (11) | 69:3 | $47: 2,7,8$ | $20: 3$ |
| 12:3 | 58:12;59:12;60:12; | courses (1) | deeds (4) | discuss (2) |
| clarifying (1) | 61:12;62:12;63:12; | 13:19 | 41:10;42:8;45:5,8 | 48:7;71:20 |
| 29:3 | 64:12;65:12;66:12; | court (7) | defined (1) | discussed (1) |
| clear (4) | 67:12;68:12 | 4:8;9:10;18:15; | 13:3 | 32:12 |
| 24:3,5;25:4;35:6 | confidentiality (1) | 32:16;37:16;38:10; | definite (2) | discussion (1) |
| clearly (8) | 7:19 | 55:4 | 24:1;26:11 | 54:23 |
| 24:2;42:20;43:2,4, | confinements (1) | cover (1) | deforestation (2) | disperse (1) |
| 5;45:14,24;46:6 | 50:2 | 57:4 | 20:3;21:6 | 19:14 |
| client's (1) | confirm (1) | CPA (2) | demarcation (1) | dispersed (1) |
| 39:14 | 35:24 | 12:14;14:16 | 28:7 | 34:2 |
| climate (1) | connected (1) | CPR (2) | demonstrating (1) | dispersement (1) |
| 16:5 | 53:20 | 13:11,14 | 42:7 | 20:5 |
| close (3) | consecutive (1) | create (1) | Dennis (1) | dispersing (1) |
| 27:21;52:10;72:15 | 38:2 | 32:1 | 19:19 | 33:17 |
| closer (1) | conservation (1) | credibility (1) | Department (4) | distribute (1) |
| 28:5 | $15: 10$ | $53: 3$ | $5: 4 ; 6: 18 ; 7: 11 ; 26: 1$ | 69:14 |
| college (2) | consider (1) | credible (1) | depicts (1) | distributes (1) |
| $13: 6,18$ | 34:23 | 21:6 | 43:12 | 11:5 |
| combination (1) | considered (1) | Cub (2) | Derek (1) | distributing (1) |
| 34:2 | 6:10 | 13:12;21:23 | 30:22 | 17:16 |
| coming (1) | constant (1) | current (1) | DES (1) | disturbance (1) |


| 19:14 | 40:24;41:20,23; | enormous (1) | 48:13;49:3,9;54:8, | 25:11,21;29:3;36:18; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| disturbed (3) | 42:9,16,17,18,21; | 32:1 | 12,12,12 | 8:23;42:9;44:22; |
| 18:1,20,21 | 43:1,6,10, 12, 13, 16, | enough (2) | explain (8) | 50:10,18;51:1 |
| Docket (17) | 19;44:11;46:12;47:1, | 22:20;23:2 | 6:21;19:16;30:18; | five (3) |
| 4:7;7:1;8:8;9:2,18, | 7,9 | environment (1) | 37:1;39:10;41:12; | 11:2;31:23;51:21 |
| 22;14:7,9;17:2; | easements (3) | 22:7 | 48:22;51:10 | flooding (1) |
| 22:11;24:20,22;25:3, | 41:3;44:3;45:21 | environmental (1) | explicitly (1) | 32:11 |
| 5;26:21;29:19;54:6 | easier (1) | 51:24 | 43:7 | flow (1) |
| doctor (1) | 27:17 | erosion (13) | extent (3) | 53:19 |
| 13:22 | education | 20:16,18,20;21:8, | 5:18;10:10;20:10 | focus (1) |
| doctors | 12:19;13:3,5,6,9 | 12,16,22,23;22:8,15; |  | 54:19 |
| 48:6 | 14:4;15:5,13 | 32:13;56:4,18 | F | folks (1) |
| document (13) | effect (2) | especially (1) |  | $56: 22$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12: 7 ; 39: 8,11 ; 40: 4 \\ & 42: 4 ; 51: 2,3,5 ; 52: 5, \end{aligned}$ | effective (3) | $22: 1$ estate (4) | face (1) $43: 7$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { followed (1) } \\ 5: 20 \end{array}$ |
| 22;53:14;54:20; | 46:3;47:9,10 | 38:24;40:11,15 | fact (1) | footprint (4) |
| 56:21 | effectively (1) | 45:11 | 21:9 | 30:18,23;31:2,7 |
| documented (1) | 21:19 | Evaluation (2) | Facts (4) | foremost (1) |
| 25:17 | effects (7) | 4:4,16 | 70:7;71:13;72:2,6 | 21:22 |
| documents (36) | 7:3;19:6;24:9,12; | even (3) | fair (3) | foresee (1) |
| 10:2,8,18;11:5,23; | 28:2;30:2;51:4 | 46:12,19;49:12 | 26:22;40:18,20 | 33:1 |
| 18:6,10,24;25:14; | efforts (1) | event (2) | fairly (1) | forest (1) |
| 26:23;28:15;29:4; | 15:10 | 69:23;70:15 | 56:14 | 19:12 |
| 30:4;33:14;35:6,22; | Either (2) | events (1) | fall (1) | forestry (1) |
| 36:8;40:5;41:5,7,9, | 17:14;22:3 | 27:12 | 32:22 | 15:14 |
| 12,15;44:22,24; | electric (6) | Eversource (5) | familiar (1) | formal (6) |
| 45:18;46:2;50:23; | 16:3;34:5,14;35:9; | 5:2,4;42:10,12; | 15:12 | 12:19;13:6;14:4; |
| 51:1,9;52:1,24;53:8; | 51:4,18 | 44:19 | family (1) | 15:4,8;71:14 |
| 55:10,14;69:17 | electrical (1) | everybody (1) | 29:15 | formally (2) |
| done (5) | 14:4 | $4: 2$ | far (5) | 25:17;31:3 |
| 8:15;22:9;31:1 | electricity | evidence | 46:9;48:17;55:1,6, | formed (1) |
| 44:7;48:18 | 34:11 | 30:5 | 10 | 43:13 |
| DORE (11) | electrocution (4) | exact (1) | fast (1) | forth (1) |
| 4:15,15;50:6,12; | 34:5,15,19;35:9 | 19:21 | 37:15 | 37:4 |
| 54:21;55:5;56:6,9, | Elizabeth (1) | exactly (1) | federal (1) | forward (1) |
| 16;57:1;71:18 | 44:18 | 49:1 | 26:18 | 54:19 |
| down (10) | else (11) | EXAMINATION (1) | feet (1) | four (6) |
| $11: 3,11 ; 17: 22$ | $11: 7 ; 13: 20 ; 18: 12$ | $6: 1$ | 22:3 | $31: 23 ; 43: 18,19$ |
| 19:8;31:23;37:17,22, | 19:1;21:2;31:20; | examiner (1) | felt (1) | 50:23;51:22;70:2 |
| 23;42:11;47:18 | 35:24;42:1;47:6; | 45:11 | 24:5 | four-foot (1) |
| drawing (2) | 56:13,23 | example (1) | few (2) | 20:17 |
| 43:11,18 | e-mail (1) | 37:14 | 11:13;27:19 | fourth (1) |
| Drive (2) | 71:16 | exchange (1) | fields (1) | 17:23 |
| 42:7;43:14 | EMF (1) | 7:19 | 16:3 | frightened (2) |
| Drive/Kienia (1) | 54:12 | exist (1) | file (3) | 18:2,20 |
| 27:22 | EMFs (2) | 44:3 | 69:17,24;71:22 | full (3) |
| drove (1) | 47:19;48:8 | existing (1) | filed (3) | 43:15;44:1;46:8 |
| 28:6 | emitted (1) | 7:14 | 7:16;12:12;69:19 | fully (4) |
| dry (4) | 31:11 | expand (1) | final (6) | 41:21,23,24;47:1 |
| 19:15;32:24;34:12; | EMTs (1) | $14: 15$ | 70:12,13;71:19,24; | further (2) |
| $35: 4$ | 54:14 | expected (1) | $72: 3,8$ | $5: 22 ; 45: 8$ |
| due (3) | end (7) | 17:12 | financially (2) | future (1) |
| 70:8;72:2,6 | 27:4,7;35:8;39:15; | experience (5) | 37:19,24 | 45:5 |
| Dumville (2) | $50: 11 ; 52: 21 ; 70: 22$ energy (6) | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 9,20 ; 13: 14 \\ & 14: 3 ; 15: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { find (3) } \\ & 6: 21 ; 23: 6 ; 43: \end{aligned}$ | G |
| duplicating (1) | 37:5,5,11;38:6; | experienced (6) | fine (1) | G |
| 36:3 | $44: 19 ; 55: 21$ | $7: 3 ; 22: 24 ; 23: 18$ | $12: 16$ |  |
| during (1) | engagement (1) | $24: 6 ; 25: 16 ; 26: 9$ | fire (5) | $21: 5 ; 36: 2,4,6 ; 44: 6$ |
| 10:10 | 14:19 | expert (2) | 6:17,17;7:11 | general (2) |
| E | $\underset{14 \cdot 5,11}{\text { engineering (2) }}$ | 26:4;40:14 expertise (1) | 25:24;28:24 | $11: 24 ; 41: 11$ |
| E | 14:5,11 | expertise (1) | first (17) <br> 12:24•13:10,12,14. | generally (1) |
| easement (20) | $22: 5$ | $13: 9$ experts (7) | $20: 14 ; 21: 22 ; 24: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 10 \\ & \operatorname{girl}(\mathbf{1}) \end{aligned}$ |
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| 28:1 | 46:17 | immediate (2) | intend (1) | KURYLO (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GIS (5) | heck (1) | 15:11;42:6 | 53:9 | 5:1,1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 28: 22 ; 41: 9,16 ; \\ & 42 \cdot 21 \cdot 51 \cdot 16 \end{aligned}$ | 49:21 | immediately (1) | intended (1) 43.16 |  |
| 42:21;51:16 | help (1) | $\begin{gathered} 54: 15 \\ \text { impact (1) } \end{gathered}$ | 43:16 | L |
| 38:7;44:12;51:22; | helpful (2) | 56:17 | 7:22;8:16;9:11; | land (2) |
| 71:4 | 8:12;42:2 | impacts (1) | 10:3 | 19:15;32:24 |
| Good (5) | hierarchy (1) | 19:5 | intentions (1) | large (5) |
| 4:2;6:3,4;55:17; | 53:3 | impending (1) | 9:8 | 19:12;22:20;30:18; |
| 57:1 | highest (1) | 40:2 | interrupt (2) | 37:20;38:1 |
| Granite (1) | 53:3 | incidences (1) | 54:21,24 | last (8) |
| 39:18 | highly (1) | 6:16 | interrupts (5) | 19:10;20:21;22:23, |
| granted (1) | 15:10 | incident (12) | 9:10;18:15;32:16; | 24;30:16;35:12,15,17 |
| 5:17 | high-voltage (2) | 25:15;27:3;50:5, | 37:16;55:4 | later (1) |
| great (2) | 51:6;52:11 | 19,22;51:11;53:1,14, | Intervenor (3) | 24:19 |
| 20:20;42:3 | hit (1) | 16,20,24;54:9 | 4:12;5:11;12:13 | latest (1) |
| greater (2) | 56:23 | incidents (15) | into (7) | 71:11 |
| 34:14,17 | Hmm-hmm (9) | 23:8,13,20,22,23, | 31:11;32:18;33:9, | lattice (1) |
| greatly (1) | 12:4;20:9,13; | 24;25:5,21;26:2,6,15, | 20;34:3;54:6;56:20 | 51:6 |
| 39:12 | 23:14;27:15;30:14; | 19,24;28:16;29:5 | introduce (1) | law (4) |
| Grid (1) | 32:3;39:7;51:8 | include (2) | 4:9 | 46:22,24,24;47:13 |
| 4:21 | Hold (1) | 9:3;24:8 | introduced (1) | layperson (1) |
| group (1) | 44:16 | included (1) | 54:6 | 34:10 |
| 49:7 | holding (1) | 41:16 | investigate (1) | leader (1) |
| grouped (1) | 24:4 | includes (1) | 26:19 | 13:13 |
| 49:3 | home (5) | 9:19 | invited (1) | learn (2) |
| guarantee (1) | 16:13,16;17:5,6; | including (2) | 8:6 | 14:17,22 |
| 71:6 | 46:14 | 37:7;55:12 | involves (2) | learned (2) |
| guaranty (2) | homes (4) | increase (9) | 8:5,7 | 14:7;21:22 |
| 8:21;9:1 | 39:16,23;41:16; | 19:13;30:17;31:2, | Iryna (1) | least (1) |
| guess (5) | 44:9 | 6;32:9,10;34:13,19; | 4:15 | 30:21 |
| 7:22;41:11;46:15; | hop (1) | 35:1 | issue (4) | leave (2) |
| 47:24;53:22 | 8:11 | increased (1) | 6:5;21:19;41:6; | 10:12;18:2 |
| guide (1) | hope (2) | 34:2 | 55:7 | leaving (3) |
| 52:9 | 6:21;70:10 | increasing (1) | issued (2) | 18:19,22;20:17 |
| H | Howard (1) | 55:12 | 5:8;22:18 | Legal (3) |
| H | 2 :2 | indicate (1) | issuing (2) | 5:4;42:8;43:23 |
|  | Huard (30) | 45:4 | 8:13;70:9 | legally (1) |
| halfway (1) | 4:11,11;6:3;8:20, | indicated (3) | items (1) | 43:5 |
| 47:18 | 24;9:9,16;11:2,5,7, | 6:9,11;7:9 | 70:2 | legislation (2) |
| Hampshire (3) | 10,21;37:18,22; | indication (1) |  | 37:3;38:5 |
| 36:20;37:4,6 | 52:15,18;56:2,8,12; | 39:19 | J | Legislature (6) |
| hang (1) | 69:21;70:18,20,24; | individual (2) |  | 36:21;37:4,9;38:3, |
| 49:15 | 71:4,8,12,24;72:5,8, | 9:5;12:13 | Jack's (1) | 11;55:20 |
| happen (5) | 11 | industry (6) | 29:20 | level (5) |
| 20:1;21:7,21; | Hudson (4) | 14:18,21,22,24; | January (8) | 19:20;32:10,10; |
| 39:20,20 | 6:17;7:10;28:24; | 37:11;47:24 | 23:1,16,19;24:5; | 33:6;51:17 |
| happened (1) | 39:21 | inference (4) | 50:19;51:11;53:1,13 | levels (5) |
| 53:5 | human (1) | 33:10,12,18;34:9 | joins (1) | 19:14;32:15,17; |
| happening (1) | 51:4 | informal (2) | 44:15 | 34:3;55:13 |
| 33:2 | humans (2) | 5:14;31:4 | Joint (2) | licensed (3) |
| happy (1) | 34:5;35:9 | information (18) | 4:18,23 | 13:10,11;14:23 |
| 8:1 | HVTLs (3) | 9:4,14;10:16;15:2; | June (2) | life (1) |
| head (3) | 27:21;28:3;30:3 | 17:9,11,13,15,16; | 40:8;70:14 | 24:23 |
| 13:24;38:17;42:1 | hydrogeology (1) | 28:22;32:8,13,19; |  | limit (1) |
| health (4) | 16:10 | 33:22;39:4;50:10,21; | K | 38:7 |
| 7:3;24:9,12;25:5 | hypothetical (3) | 69:24 |  | limitation (1) |
| heard (3) | 48:19,24;49:11 | infrastructures (1) | keep (1) | 46:14 |
| 9:6,16,17 |  | 39:14 | 8:16 | limitations (1) |
| hearing (5) | I | input (1) | K-I-E-N-I-A (1) | 46:13 |
| 8:5;10:11;69:1; |  | 45:12 | 27:23 | limited (4) |
| 70:14;72:14 | identify (2) | inside (2) | knowledge (2) | 8:9;13:9;42:5;44:6 |
| heart (1) | 38:15;44:17 | 9:18,22 | 14:20,24 | limiting (1) |
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| 36:22 | major (2) | 13:1,2 | mutual (1) | 26:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| line (1) | 20:20;32:11 | meeting (2) | 45:6 | notice (1) |
| 16:17 | Maldonado (3) | 4:5;71:15 | MVRP (6) | 70:13 |
| lines (6) | 44:15,18,18 | members (1) | 36:23;37:7;39:15; | nuances (1) |
| 7:4;16:21;17:8; | man (1) | 29:16 | 40:2;44:2,5 | 14:17 |
| 43:18,19;52:11 | 28:1 | memo (1) | myself (2) | number (6) |
| list (5) | manner (3) | 55:7 | 13:21;43:17 | 14:1;23:23;24:12; |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:8,12;49:10,11; } \\ & 55: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 9:12;15:1;49:15 many (2) | memorializing (1) 55:8 | N | 38:15;40:18;56:1 |
| listed (3) | 20:16;46:11 | mentioned (2) |  | 38:20 |
| 24:13;25:6;39:24 | $\boldsymbol{m a p}(5)$ | 29:22;56:7 | name (1) | numerous (3) |
| literature (1) | 41:9;42:14,20; | merely (8) | 4:3 | 37:5;38:2,4 |
| 14:8 | 51:5,16 | 13:6;41:22;42:15, | National (1) |  |
| litigation (3) | mapping (1) | 16,17;43:8;45:14; | 4:21 | 0 |
| 36:21;38:9,13 | 28:22 | 46:9 | natural (2) |  |
| live (1) | maps (2) | middle (1) | 13:23;18:1 | Oakley (2) |
| 50:2 | 41:16;42:21 | 23:7 | naturalist (1) | 19:19;30:22 |
| lived (4) | Mark (1) | Middleton (2) | 13:21 | obituaries (1) |
| 22:7;27:21;28:4,23 | 4:20 | 4:18,23 | near (4) | 28:21 |
| lives (1) | market (4) | mild (2) | 27:20;28:3;30:3; | obituary (1) |
| 49:21 | 39:16;40:1,20;49:5 | 23:1,18 | 52:11 | 28:20 |
| living (9) | markets (1) | mind (2) | necessarily (1) | objection (3) |
| 28:2;30:3;32:21; | 38:24 | 48:2;50:7 | 24:7 | 7:16;8:10;69:16 |
| 33:1;34:24;43:1; | material (6) | minimal (1) | need (8) | objections (2) |
| 49:17;52:10,11 | 19:24;20:12;30:20; | 22:17 | 5:19;45:13;69:15; | 69:19,22 |
| located (1) | 33:3,10,15 | minor (1) | 70:15,22,24;71:1,5 | obtain (3) |
| 16:18 | materials (4) | 13:17 | Needleman (20) | 14:20,24;45:6 |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o g }}(1)$ | 20:8,23;21:3;56:17 | minute (2) | 4:17,17;5:23;6:2; | off (5) |
| 28:24 | matter (1) | 23:6;54:17 | 9:7,24;11:4,12,20; | 11:13,16;38:17; |
| logic (2) | 5:7 | minutes (1) | 35:14,16;44:21;50:8, | 42:1;57:2 |
| 19:7;21:20 | matters (1) | 11:13 | 14,15;52:13,20; | Officer (3) |
| logs (1) | 69:4 | mitigation (2) | 55:23;56:11,19 | 5:7,18;8:13 |
| 26:1 | mature (1) | 22:16,18 | neighbor (2) | old (1) |
| Londonderry (1) | 19:12 | mix (2) | 27:24;28:4 | 23:17 |
| 39:9 | may (15) | 34:4,11 | neighborhood (1) | one (36) |
| Londonderry's (1) | 19:13;20:19;32:14, | models (3) | $17: 17$ | 6:16;7:6;12:17,23, |
| 39:12 | 17;45:4,5;69:13,18, | 48:19;49:1,11 | Neither (1) | 24;20:3;22:1;23:1,2, |
| long (2) | 20,21;70:3,8,11;72:4, | MONROE (34) | 25:15 | 15,15,16,18,19;24:3, |
| 8:2;49:14 | 7 | 4:2,3;5:5;8:11,22; | New (3) | 6;25:9;28:5;31:15, |
| longer (1) | Maybe (3) | 9:6,11;10:23;11:6,16, | 36:20;37:4,6 | 16,17,22;36:4,6;39:8; |
| 42:22 | 8:11;56:21;71:22 | 19;35:13;37:17,22; | next (7) | 43:7;47:5;49:4,13; |
| look (8) | McLane (2) | 42:11;44:16,20; | 28:3;31:9;33:17, | 50:24;52:6,12;55:18, |
| 17:21;25:22;33:15; | 4:18,23 | 55:24;57:2;69:3,7,10, | 24;44:12;69:10; | 22;56:2,5 |
| 38:16;45:5;49:4; | mean (10) | 22;70:19,22;71:2,6, | 70:11 | one-car (1) |
| 56:3,12 | 8:12;13:7;26:8,9, | 10,17;72:3,7,10,12, | Nicole (1) | 28:9 |
| looked (1) | 10;36:2;38:10,10; | 14 | 29:20 | ones (4) |
| 44:7 | 47:23;71:10 | more (5) | noise (1) | 29:5;50:11;53:2; |
| looking (10) | means (2) | 11:15;48:5;56:2,3; | 19:5 | 54:15 |
| 21:20;27:9;30:10; | 24:19;37:1 | 70:16 | non-confidential (3) | only (12) |
| 36:17,18;38:23; | meant (1) | morning (3) | 54:23;55:2;69:6 | 5:12;11:2;15:8; |
| 40:23;47:16;50:16, | 34:12 | 4:2;6:3,4 | none (1) | 17:3;22:15;24:1,10; |
| 17 | measure (1) | mother (1) | 72:14 | 25:5;38:5;46:7; |
| looks (2) | 49:13 | 29:21 | non-medical (2) | 50:10;56:4 |
| 41:21;51:24 | measurements (1) | motion (6) | 26:4;54:11 | opened (1) |
| $\boldsymbol{l o t}(3)$ | 42:18 | 7:15,16;8:9;69:18, | nor (1) | 29:20 |
| 13:23;41:9;44:11 | measuring (2) | 19,24 | 25:16 | opinion (2) |
| M | $\begin{gathered} 43: 17,21 \\ \text { medical (15) } \end{gathered}$ | motions (2) $8: 14 ; 69: 23$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { normal (1) } \\ 10: 20 \end{gathered}$ | $24: 3 ; 26: 4$ |
|  | $6: 5,8,15,22 ; 7: 17,$ | much (5) | normally (1) | $29: 11 ; 54: 7,11$ |
| magnetic (1) | 20,23;9:2;25:21; | 19:8;31:7,8;44:1; | 35:4 | opportunities (1) |
| 16:3 | 29:8;53:15,18;54:1,5, | 48:17 | noted (2) | 13:5 |
| maintain (1) | 8 | must (3) | 35:20;36:14 | opportunity (2) |
| 26:14 | medicine (2) | 7:5;38:13;46:1 | notes (1) | 32:1;45:6 |
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| opposed (1) | paragraph/sentence (1) | planning (1) | 17:10,11 | Proprietary (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13:22 | 19:11 | 48:17 | Presiding (3) | 57:5 |
| order (4) | paragraphs (2) | plans (1) | 5:7,18;8:12 | protect (2) |
| 7:16;8:13;10:24; | 31:23;39:1 | 22:16 | pretty (1) | 10:2;21:15 |
| 70:9 | parked (1) | plant (1) | 19:8 | provide (15) |
| original (3) | 28:6 | 15:18 | prior (1) | 18:5;20:11,22; |
| 6:14;30:9;47:7 | part (3) | plantings (1) | 43:8 | 25:13;32:9,20;33:4,6, |
| others (4) | 12:6;32:14;45:9 | 22:19 | probabilities (3) | 8,22;39:3;41:5;45:7; |
| 24:15,21,23,24 | particular (4) | please (3) | 48:19;49:1,12 | 50:20;56:10 |
| ourselves (1) | 22:1;30:1;41:3; | 12:2;17:21;20:11 | probably (2) | provided (32) |
| 4:9 | 48:1 | point (13) | 11:14;27:17 | 11:24;12:6;18:10, |
| out (5) | parties (3) | 8:21;9:1;12:1;22:9, | procedural (2) | 11,24;19:4;20:11; |
| 10:5;12:5;43:17, | 9:13;69:14;70:5 | 17;24:19,22,23; | 5:9;69:4 | 21:3;28:19,21,22; |
| 20;49:10 | parts (1) | 27:10;34:21;37:14 | procedure (1) | 29:6;30:4,7;32:12; |
| Outreach (1) | 18:14 | 53:11;54:19 | 10:17 | 35:23;36:10;39:1,8; |
| 5:2 | party (3) | pointing (1) | proceeding (10) | 41:7,13,16,19,19; |
| outright (2) | 10:10,14;69:17 | 24:12 | 5:16;7:6,24;8:3,4, | 42:1,5;44:22;50:17, |
| 42:12;44:10 | pass (3) | pole (2) | 7;10:4;36:9;38:10; | 22;51:20;53:10; |
| outside (1) | 11:3,11;38:5 | 33:17,20 | 44:15 | 56:14 |
| 10:4 | passing (1) | poles (7) | proceedings (2) | providing (3) |
| over (5) | 46:9 | 17:15;31:10,18; | 8:17;11:18 | 24:17,19;51:15 |
| 11:7;20:20;22:24; | past (2) | 32:23;34:4;35:18 | process (1) | proximity (3) |
| 23:7;38:22 | 27:19;39:13 | 49:15 | 26:20 | 7:4;17:7;27:21 |
| overnight (1) | path (1) | Pond (2) | professional (8) | psychological (1) |
| 28:6 | 36:2 | 39:18,18 | 12:8,8,20;13:3; | 19:6 |
| overpaid (1) | patina' (2) | portion (4) | 14:3;15:4;40:11; | psychology (3) |
| 13:7 | 31:10;35:18 | 8:17;10:14;33:13; | 45:11 | 13:16,17,19 |
| own (4) | Pause (1) | 69:1 | professor (1) | Public (15) |
| 15:12;26:7,8;45:16 | 11:18 | posing (2) | 13:7 | $4: 14 ; 8: 1,5,5,7 ;$ |
| owned (1) | Peggy (1) | 37:20;38:1 | programs (2) | 9:12,21;10:9,12,12, |
| 44:2 | 4:11 | position (3) | 21:10,15 | 17;12:9;50:23;51:1; |
| owner (2) | pending (2) | 10:2;46:19,21 | prohibiting (1) | 69:1 |
| 43:3,3 | 8:14;55:19 | possess (12) | 36:22 | pull (1) |
| owners (1) | people (10) | 28:15;29:4;35:7, | prohibits (1) | 49:10 |
| 46:13 | 14:2;27:13,19; | 22;41:6;44:24;50:21; | 55:20 | pulled (1) |
| ownership (5) | 28:23;29:9,13;38:4; | 52:23;53:8,15,19; | Project (9) | 21:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 41: 1,3 ; 42: 13,15 ; \end{aligned}$ | $42: 24 ; 46: 11 ; 55: 16$ | 54:2 | $20: 17 ; 21: 10 ; 37: 9$ | purchased (4) |
| $44: 10$ | period (1) | possessed (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 10,13 ; 40: 2 ; 41: 4 ; \\ & 55: 15 ; 56: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $16: 13,16 ; 17: 5$ |
| P | permits (1) | possible (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 15 ; 56: 17 \\ & \text { projects (6) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 46:14 } \\ \text { purely }(2) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $21: 18$ | $14: 22 ; 40: 8$ | $36: 22 ; 37: 5,6 ; 38: 2,$ | $45: 16,18$ |
| page (34) | permitting (2) | possibly (2) | $6 ; 55: 21$ | purpose (2) |
| 9:2;17:22;19:10; | 21:10,15 | 30:22;70:10 | pronouncing (1) | 7:23;51:15 |
| 20:14,15;22:22,24; | perpetuate (1) | posted (4) | 27:23 | purposes (2) |
| 23:3,7,9,10,11,12; | 45:22 | 5:16;8:7,18;10:9 | proper (1) | 4:9;25:4 |
| 25:7;27:9,10;30:11; | person (1) | posting (1) | 15:1 | pursing (1) |
| 31:22;35:13,14; | 49:21 | 17:15 | properties (8) | 38:12 |
| 36:17;38:22,23; | personal (1) | practice (1) | 16:2;40:18;41:4; | pursue (1) |
| 40:23;41:14;44:12; | 26:13 | 14:23 | 42:6,13;44:4;45:22; | 13:17 |
| 45:2;47:17,18;48:16; | pertain (2) | preference (1) | 47:4 property | pursuing (1) |
| 50:18;51:12;55:3,9 | 53:23,23 | 71:3 | property (11) | 36:21 |
| Pages (1) | picture (2) | prefiled (6) | 15:21;28:5;39:9; | put (3) |
| 57:3 | 41:20,21 | 5:12;11:22;12:12, $15 \cdot 17 \cdot 18 \cdot 70: 4$ | 41:18;42:22;43:2; | 27:4;33:17;69:5 |
| paid (1) | pictures (2) 51:2,16 | 15;17:18;70:4 | $44: 11 ; 45: 20 ; 46: 20$ | putting (1) |
| $13: 7$ pain (1) | $\begin{array}{r} 51: 2,16 \\ \text { piping }(3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { prefinal (1) } \\ 71: 18 \end{array}$ | 47:4,5 <br> proposal (1) |  |
| 25:16 | 36:4,5,6 | prehearing (1) | $22: 2$ | Q |
| Pam (1) | place (3) | 5:8 | proposed (4) |  |
| 4:3 | 20:18;44:5;49:14 | prepared (2) | 21:21;22:2,16;44:2 |  |
| paragraph (11) | plan (2) | 6:18;7:18 | proposes (2) | $15: 2 ; 30: 12 ; 31: 12$ |
| $17: 22 ; 20: 15 ; 28: 4$ | $22: 18 ; 71: 1$ | present (3) | $20: 17 ; 44: 5$ | quantify (1) |
| 30:15,16;31:24;32:4; | planned (1) | $16: 22,23 ; 17: 12$ | proposing (1) | $31: 1$ |
| 34:1;35:8,15;36:19 | 56:4 | presented (2) | 50:3 | questionable (1) |


| 44:3 | 38:7;55:20 | 37:16;55:4 | 42:4;52:5 | 15:5,7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| quick (1) | refer (1) | reporter's (1) | Ridge (1) | Scobie (2) |
| 56:21 | 26:23 | 4:9 | 39:19 | 39:18,18 |
| quickly (3) | reference (2) | representing (2) | RIELLY (4) | Scout (1) |
| 11:15;14:22;32:23 | $19: 24 ; 48: 1$ | 4:18,23 | 4:20,20;11:8;52:17 | 13:13 |
| quorum (1) | references (3) | request (18) | Right (13) | Scouts (2) |
| 70:17 | 38:20;48:3;55:18 | 6:14;12:7;18:5,18; | 8:24;10:13;11:2, | 15:9;21:23 |
|  | referencing (1) | 19:23;20:22;25:13; | 21;19:3;42:5;43:23; | sealed (1) |
| $\mathbf{R}$ | $48: 13$ referred (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 14 ; 35: 5,21 ; 39: 2 \\ & 41: 8 ; 44: 23 ; 50: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 21 ; 54: 16 ; 55: 23 ; \\ & 56: 8 ; 72: 5,8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10: 16 \\ \text { season (2) } \end{gathered}$ |
| range (2) | referred (2) 23:22;31:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:8;44:23;50:20; } \\ & \text { 52:7,8;56:9;70:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 56:8;72:5,8 <br> right-of-way (4) | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \boldsymbol{\operatorname { s e a s o n }} \mathbf{( 2 )} \\ 32: 22,22 \end{array}$ |
| 13:5;41:8 | referring (3) | requested (4) | 28:5,7;43:20;44:9 | SEC (3) |
| ranging (1) | 24:16;48:12;49:2 | 5:17;6:8;8:8;33:4 | rights (3) | 4:7;34:22;46:10 |
| $49: 5$ | refers (1) | requesting (1) | $41: 1 ; 42: 17 ; 44: 11$ | second (6) |
| ratepayers (4) | 43:8 | 69:17 | rise (5) | 30:15;35:5,14; |
| 36:24;38:3,8;55:21 | regarding (3) | requests (6) | 32:15,17,21;33:7,8 | 36:18,19;44:16 |
| Rather (1) | 30:12;53:1;54:9 | 5:19;9:13;26:17; | risk (5) | seeing (1) |
| 32:4 | regardless (2) | 55:2,6;69:11 | 17:24;20:20;34:14, | 22:15 |
| reaction (1) | 9:22;14:19 | requires (1) | $17,19$ | seem (2) |
| 29:23 | regular (1) | 47:13 | road (2) | 22:19;27:13 |
| read (12) | 27:20 | reschedule (1) | 17:1;27:24 | seemingly (2) |
| 14:8;21:5;22:6; | regulators (1) | 70:16 | room (2) | 28:2;30:2 |
| 27:17;28:10;32:4,13, | 26:18 | research (1) | 4:8;10:12 | selected (1) |
| $20 ; 33: 11 ; 34: 10,24$ | rehash (1) | 30:20 | Ross (1) | $53: 2$ |
| 53:4 | 25:1 | residence (1) | 5:8 | self-education (8) |
| reading (2) | relate (3) | 25:1 | ROW (3) | 15:15,17,19,22; |
| 15:2,3 | 27:13;28:16;29:4 | residential (1) | 43:13,14;44:1 | $16: 1,4,9,11$ |
| readings (2) | related (2) | 44:4 | ROWs (1) | self-weathering (3) |
| 47:20;48:9 | $47: 3 ; 50: 21$ | resources (4) | 41:17 | $31: 10,18 ; 35: 18$ |
| real (5) | relates (3) | 14:1,8;21:4;31:14 | run (1) | sell (1) |
| $38: 24 ; 40: 11,15$ | $23: 20 ; 26: 5 ; 51: 24$ | respect (30) | $12: 16$ | 40:19 |
| $45: 11 ; 50: 2$ | relating (2) | $12: 24 ; 13: 2 ; 14: 10$ | running (1) | send (1) |
| real-estate (1) | 28:24;56:17 | $13 ; 15: 14,16,18,20,$ | $4: 4$ | $71: 14$ |
| $15: 20$ | relative (2) | $23 ; 16: 2,5,7,10 ; 20: 21$ | rust (1) | sensation (1) |
| reality (4) | 8:13;69:4 | 22:9;25:11,14,20; | 31:9 | 24:7 |
| 48:20;49:20,24; | relevance (3) | 26:1;29:13;33:12; | rust-like (1) | sense (5) |
| 50:1 | 6:19;7:5;12:11 | 39:3;41:4,6;45:12; | 35:18 | 19:7;21:20,24; |
| really (1) $33: 7$ | rely (3) 36:8;53:9 | 47:3;51:9;53:13,16, 17 | S | 22:5;31:5 sent (1) |
| $\begin{array}{r} 33: 7 \\ \text { realtor } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 36:8;53:9;54: } \\ & \text { relying (3) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ \text { respo } \end{gathered}$ | S | $\begin{gathered} \boldsymbol{\operatorname { s e n t }}(\mathbf{1}) \\ 52: 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| 17:14 | 19:1;21:2;31:19 | 30:12 | Sales (1) | sentence (12) |
| reason (1) | remedies (1) | response (5) | 39:9 | 17:24;20:21;22:23; |
| 24:1 | 13:23 | 7:10;18:17;28:19; | same (27) | 24:8;30:16;31:9; |
| reasons (1) | remember (4) | 38:24;44:23 | $12: 22 ; 14: 3,10,12$ | 34:1;35:12,17;36:20; |
| 49:13 | 19:21;22:15;41:15; | response] (1) | 13,15;15:14,15,16, | 47:18;49:4 |
| recall (4) | 52:18 | 72:13 | 17,18,20,23;16:2,5,7, | separate (1) |
| 22:14;28:17;39:6; | remind (1) | responses (2) | 10;32:5,19;33:2,24; | 57:4 |
| 41:24 | 46:10 | 69:12,15 | 35:19;42:22;44:9; | series (1) |
| receive (1) | removal (4) | result (2) | 47:12;55:3,9 | 27:12 |
| 9:14 | 19:11;30:17;49:17; | 7:4;71:22 | saw (1) | serve (1) |
| record (9) | 55:11 | resume (2) | 54:14 | 20:16 |
| 11:13,17,19;35:5; | remove (2) | 12:5,12 | saying (5) | session (4) |
| 43:12;57:2;69:2,5,8 | 20:6;22:3 | resumes (1) | 9:20;33:3,12; | 4:6;5:10,14;72:17 |
| recorded (1) | removed (2) | 69:1 | 46:16;49:23 | settled (1) |
| 5:15 | 20:2;22:21 | return (1) | schedule (2) | 8:23 |
| records (16) | repeat (1) | $18: 2$ | 5:9;44:6 | seven (5) |
| 6:6,8,10,15,22; | 12:21 | review (2) | scheduled (1) | 31:23;51:22,23; |
| 7:17,20,23;8:18;9:3; | replace (1) | 7:13;11:14 | 70:14 | 52:2,7 |
| 25:22;29:8;53:15,18; | 22:20 | reviewed (2) | school (1) | several (5) |
| 54:1,5 | report (4) | 22:8,12 | 28:6 | 28:21;44:8,8;49:7, |
| recovered (1) | 5:21;6:16,17;7:11 | reviewing (1) | science (1) | 8 |
| 36:23 | Reporter (5) | 22:14 | 16:5 | shall (1) |
| recovery (2) | 9:10;18:15;32:16; | reviews (2) | sciences (2) | 69:17 |


| Sherrie (3) | specific (5) | 46:20;47:4 | 21:6 | 18:14,16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18:13,16;19:18 | 12:17;48:5;49:10; | subject (1) | talking (1) | towers (2) |
| shock (13) | 53:24;55:24 | 21:11 | 25:6 | 34:3;51:6 |
| 24:4,5,7;26:9,11, | Specifically (6) | submit (1) | talks (2) | trained (2) |
| 12;34:5,14,19;35:9; | 7:2;8:8;22:14; | 71:16 | 20:4;50:18 | 14:17,24 |
| 51:4,18;55:16 | 33:16;42:8;49:17 | submitted (1) | technical (4) | training (5) |
| shocks (6) | spoken (3) | 69:13 | 4:6;5:10;72:15,17 | 12:8,20;13:15; |
| 23:1,18;24:1,3,9,10 | 29:20;40:10,14 | subsequent (3) | telling (2) | 14:4;15:4 |
| short (1) | spoon-feeding (1) | 22:19;46:2;47:8 | 26:10,11 | transcript (4) |
| 20:19 | 13:8 | Sue (1) | tested (1) | 5:15;10:15;54:24; |
| show (3) | spot (1) | 11:16 | 50:1 | 57:3 |
| 42:2;51:14,16 | 44:8 | sufficient (1) | testimony (22) | transfer (1) |
| showing (5) | spread (6) | 22:19 | 5:13;11:23;12:12, | 41:2 |
| $20: 1 ; 28: 23 ; 42: 14$ | 32:15,17;33:9,18, | $\underset{56: 19}{\text { suggest (1) }}$ | 13,15;17:18;18:11, | transferred (1) |
| 51:3;55:11 | 19,20 | 56:19 | 17,24;22:23;24:14, | 43:3 |
| shows (1) | spreads (1) | supplemental (1) | 17;27:8;30:10;34:21; | transfers (1) |
| 51:18 | 34:18 | 70:4 | 47:17;48:4,5,6; | 42:6 |
| side (3) | spring (1) | supplements (2) | 50:16;51:13;70:4 | Transmission (6) |
| 22:4;28:7;39:21 | 35:2 | 51:20;52:9 | tests (1) | 5:2;16:17,20;17:7; |
| sign (2) | standard (3) | supply (1) | 21:23 | 34:3;52:11 |
| 7:18;51:7 | 47:20,23,24 | 69:24 | textbook (1) | treat (3) |
| significant (9) | standards (3) | support (24) | 13:8 | 8:2;10:8;13:21 |
| 9:3;13:16,18; | 48:7,11,12 | 6:22;7:8;18:7,12; | thereafter (1) | treated (2) |
| 19:24;20:7;35:1; | start (6) | 19:1;30:5;31:20; | 69:20 | 7:18;10:19 |
| 39:16;53:4;56:15 | 6:5;12:5;17:22; | 33:4,6,14,22,23;35:7; | third (2) | tree (1) |
| signs (1) | 39:21;42:9;70:18 | 36:9;38:21;40:5; | 17:22;55:18 | 55:11 |
| 51:16 | started (2) | 41:13;45:1;51:10; | thought (2) | trees (8) |
| Site (5) | 13:17;28:8 | 52:24;53:9;54:3,8,13 | 17:9;72:2 | 19:8;20:1,6,16; |
| 4:4,16;5:13,16; | state (5) | supported (1) | three (16) | 22:3,20;30:17;49:18 |
| 8:19 | 21:9,14,18;26:17; | 42:14 | 13:13;23:8,12,20, | Trefry (5) |
| situations (1) | 46:9 | supporting (5) | 21;24:9,13;25:5,6; | $18: 13,16,23 ; 19: 18$ |
| 29:17 | statement (11) | $20: 8,23 ; 25: 13 ;$ | 27:19;31:23;39:1; | $30: 22$ |
| six (1) | 18:7;30:6,19;33:5; | 35:22;55:15 | 50:23;51:1,9,20 | tried (1) |
| 51:21 | 34:8;35:7;38:21; | supportive (1) | Throughout (1) | 52:16 |
| skills (1) | 45:13;55:15;71:13; | 7:11 | 48:5 | try (1) |
| 14:21 | 72:1 | supports (5) | timing (1) | 50:9 |
| Slow (4) | Statements (2) | 36:1;39:4,11; | 11:1 | trying (3) |
| 37:17,22,23;42:11 | 70:6;72:6 | 40:11,15 | title (1) | 10:2;38:5;46:16 |
| smeared (1) | Steel (3) | supposed (2) | 45:11 | tune (2) |
| 9:2 | 31:16,17;51:6 | 36:15;48:8 | titled (1) | 13:24;16:24 |
| software (3) | Stipulated (4) | Sure (9) | 39:9 | turn (1) |
| 48:18,24;49:11 | 70:7;71:13;72:2,6 | 6:7;7:21;16:23; | today (4) | 10:6 |
| sold (4) | stipulations (3) | 30:20;39:12;41:15; | 4:5;5:9;6:4,12 | two (16) |
| 39:16,24;40:1; | 70:7;71:21,23 | 48:23;49:3;50:13 | toe (1) | $11: 10 ; 23: 1,18,24$ |
| 42:24 | stonewalls (2) | surface (1) | 13:24 | 24:1,8,10;25:11,21; |
| somebody (1) | 42:19;43:22 | 55:12 | together (2) | 29:21;31:14,14,19, |
| 47:5 | stressed (1) | surrounding (1) | 5:20;49:3 | 22;42:6,13 |
| sometimes (4) | 15:10 | 39:17 | told (2) | type (2) |
| 32:23,24;52:18,19 | strong (3) | symptoms (2) | 48:9;49:12 | 54:12;70:21 |
| sorry (9) | 23:2;37:20,24 | 51:18,19 | tomorrow (1) | typical (1) |
| 13:11;17:23;23:9; | structuring (5) | system (2) | 70:10 | 10:17 |
| 31:16;37:18;38:13; | 70:12;71:19,24; | 36:4,6 | took (1) | typically (3) |
| 42:12;52:7;53:6 | 72:4,9 |  | 51:3 | 10:5,7;70:20 |
| sound (2) 14:13,14 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { studied (1) } \\ 15: 9 \end{array}$ | T | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \boldsymbol{t} \boldsymbol{t}(\mathbf{p}(4) \\ 20: 14,15 ; 38: \end{array}$ | U |
| Sounds (2) | studies (2) | table (3) | $42: 1$ | U |
| 57:1;70:1 | 14:13;49:8 | 7:15;20:5;51:3 | topic (2) | umbrella (2) |
| source (4) | study (1) | talk (11) | 12:17,18 | 24:4;26:10 |
| 36:4,5,5,6 | 49:7 | 18:18,21;25:9; | total (2) | uncover (1) |
| speak (2) | stumps (1) | 27:12,16;29:12; | 23:22;24:11 | 45:5 |
| 29:15,18 | 20:18 | $33: 16 ; 49: 9 ; 51: 1 ;$ | touched (1) | under (1) |
| speaking (2) | subdivided (5) | $54: 17 ; 56: 22$ | 30:23 | 57:4 |
| 10:5;40:10 | 42:23;45:21,22; | Talked (1) | touches (2) | undergo (1) |
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| 35:1 | 22:5;32:9,10,15,17; | 14:20;40:7;52:10, | 4:7 | 8 (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| unexpectedly (1) | 33:6;34:2,11,18; | 10 | 2016 (14) | 31:22;35:14;39:2 |
| 35:3 | 35:19;36:3;55:12 | wrap (1) | 23:1,16,19;24:2,5; | 8:00 (2) |
| unfair (2) | waters (1) | 50:4 | 27:3;39:9;50:5,19; | 71:4,7 |
| $37: 20 ; 38: 1$ | $55: 12$ way (16) | written (1) 42.18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:11;53:1,13;54:9; } \\ & 70: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 9 |
| $46: 23$ | 8:1;10:20,20; | wrong (1) | 20th (1) | 9 |
| Unfortunately (2) | 26:12,23;29:5,12; | 38:14 | 70:3 | 9 (4) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 8:4;13:4 } \\ \text { unrelated (2) } \end{gathered}$ | $31: 7 ; 33: 19 ; 36: 7$; 40:1;43:9;49:16,2 | Y | 23rd (2) $70: 8 ; 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 17 ; 41: 8 ; 44: 23 ; \\ & 70: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 27:12;50:9 | 53:20;54:3 |  | 2-A (1) | 90 (2) |
| up (9) | Weathering (2) | years (4) | 18:5 | 19:8;22:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5:20;14:7,16;17:1; } \\ & \text { 22:9;29:20;34:22; } \end{aligned}$ | 31:15,17 web (3) | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 13 ; 25: 1 ; 27: 19 \\ & 33: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 3 |  |
| 49:6;50:4 | 5:13,16;8:19 | yesterday (2) |  |  |
| upon (4) | week (3) | 8:15;52:6 | 3 (3) |  |
| 21:2;36:8;53:9; | 69:13,20;70:11 | Yup (1) | 20:14,15;51:3 |  |
| 54:3 | weigh (1) | 51:23 | 31st (2) |  |
| use (8) | 15:2 |  | 70:11;72:4 |  |
| 8:3;9:18,21;12:14; | wet (1) | 1 | 37-year-old (2) |  |
| 13:23;18:19;38:9; | 34:13 |  | 27:24;28:4 |  |
| 56:13 | wetland (1) | 1 (1) | 3-B (1) |  |
| using (5) | 33:1 | 55:13 | 20:22 |  |
| 7:23;9:12;10:3; | wetlands (16) | 10 (5) |  |  |
| 48:18;56:4 | 15:5,7,9,11,11,12; | 38:22;40:24;41:14; | 4 |  |
| utility (1) $17: 14$ | 19:13,20;32:18,21, 22;33:9,21;35:2,20; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:2;70:21 } \\ & \mathbf{1 0 : 0 0}(\mathbf{2}) \end{aligned}$ | 4 (5) |  |
|  | 55:11 | 70:19;71:8 | 22:22;25:13;50:20; |  |
| V | What's (3) | 100 (2) | 51:5;52:9 |  |
|  | 31:12;34:7;37:12 | 19:8;22:3 | 4:00 (3) |  |
| vacation (1) | Whereupon (1) | 11:00 (1) | 70:21,23;71:9 |  |
| $70: 11$ valid (1) | 72:17 | 72:18 |  |  |
| valid (1) | whole (1) | 12 (1) | 5 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 44: 3 \\ \text { value (6) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32: 4 \\ \text { who's (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47: 17 \\ \mathbf{1 2 / ' 1 3}(\mathbf{1}) \end{gathered}$ | 5 (10) |  |
| 39:16,24;40:1,19, | 5:7 | 24:6 | 23:3,7,9,10,11,12; |  |
| 20;49:6 | wide (1) | 12th (2) | 25:7;27:9;28:14; |  |
| values (2) | 13:5 | 69:14,18 | 51:12 |  |
| 15:21;40:15 | Wikipedia (1) | 13th (1) | 5/23 (1) |  |
| various (5) | 31:17 | 70:14 | 72:6 |  |
| 6:24;16:24;19:4; | wildlife (5) | 14th (1) | 5:30 (1) |  |
| 28:23;41:1 | 15:16;18:1,19,21; | 70:15 | 71:10 |  |
| vast (1) | 19:5 | 14-year-old (1) | 58 (1) |  |
| 21:4 | wires (1) | 28:1 | 57:3 |  |
| verbal (1) | 49:15 | 15 (2) | 59-year-old (1) |  |
| 72:13 | within (6) | 25:1;33:2 | 28:1 |  |
| version (1) | 17:1;43:19;47:19, | $1969 \text { (3) }$ |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 23: 17 \\ \text { view }(2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24;48:8;69:13 } \\ & \text { without (3) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:18;43:12,16 } \\ & \text { 19th (2) } \end{aligned}$ | 6 |  |
| 45:20;46:1 | 5:22;43:17,20 | 69:20,21 | 68 (1) |  |
| Virginia (1) | witness (3) |  | 57:3 |  |
| $4: 10$ | 5:12;42:4;52:5 | 2 | 7 |  |
| $53: 4$ | $5: 11$ | 2 (3) | 7 |  |
|  | wondering (1) | 17:22;51:2;55:14 | 7 (3) |  |
| W | 6:20 | 2001 (2) | 30:11;52:8,8 |  |
|  | word (3) | 16:14;17:5 | 7-A (1) |  |
| walked (2) | 18:20;38:9,14 | 2009/2010 (4) | 35:21 |  |
| 27:20;45:10 | words (2) | 23:15;24:2;25:12, | 7th (1) |  |
| walking (3) | 19:22;23:21 | 16 | 5:6 |  |
| 28:3;30:3;35:3 | work (2) | 2012/2013 (3) |  |  |
| water (16) | 14:18;20:19 | 23:15;25:12,17 | 8 |  |
| 19:13,14,20;20:5; | working (4) | 2015-05 (1) |  |  |

