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## AFTERNOON SESSION

(Resumed at 1:30 p.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right. We will go back on the record this afternoon. We were in the midst of Ms. Huard's cross-examination of the witnesses. But before we resume, $I$ understand there's a minor correction that needs to be made in the testimony, so let's do that now.

WITNESS SHAPIRO: Yes, thank you. For the record, Lisa Shapiro. I just wanted to correct the communication between Mr . Morrisey's testimony and my testimony.

The property taxes, there's four different types of property taxes that the Project will pay: Local municipal taxes, local education, county and the state. For Mr.

Morrisey's REMI analysis, I provided him with just the municipal, local education and county. That was what was included in his testimony, and his supplemental testimony is in fact correct. And that was the $\$ 678,850$. So, his supplemental testimony was correct and didn't
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need correcting. However, for the stipulation, point No. 51 on Page 8 of the stipulation, the total taxes paid in the first year, however, does include that state tax. So the corrected number, instead of $\$ 1,557,550$ is just rounded to $\$ 1.5$ million.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right.
Thank you for that.
MR. IACOPINO: Just for the record, the stipulation referenced by Dr. Shapiro is actually designated as Applicants' Exhibit No. 23.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Huard, you may continue.
MS. HUARD: I believe I was starting to ask Mr. Chalmers about the case study. CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONT'D)

BY MS. HUARD:
Q. And you have stated that three are corridors, and one of those corridors went from Littleton, New Hampshire to Pelham, New Hampshire; correct -- on the Mass. border; correct?
A. (Chalmers) That's correct.
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Q. And that is the one that the MVRP falls in; correct?
A. (Chalmers) Yes.
Q. And then the second corridor went from Dummer to Deerfield; correct?
A. (Chalmers) Correct.
Q. And is that the corridor proposed for the Northern Pass?
A. (Chalmers) Yes, it is.
Q. Thank you.

And is it correct that the third corridor of the case study represents the coastal areas of Southern New Hampshire, in and around Portsmouth?
A. (Chalmers) Yes.
Q. And is that the area proposed for the Seacoast Reliability Project?
A. (Chalmers) Yes, it is.
Q. Thank you.

How many sales that were identified in this case were from the towns affected by the MVRP?
A. (Chalmers) In the four towns, there were four case studies, I believe.
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Q. So, 4 out of 58 properties proposed for the MVRP?
A. (Chalmers) Correct.
Q. Thank you.

And Mr. Chalmers, do you recall claiming in your prefiled testimony that the HVTL corridors that were selected for the case study represented much of the state of New Hampshire?
A. (Chalmers) Yes.
Q. And is it correct that the case study did not consider any property that did not have an abutting or crossing HVTL?
A. (Chalmers) Yes.
Q. Is it correct that the case study did not consider the dangerous health effects of the new line?
A. (Chalmers) That's correct.
Q. And is it correct that the study did not extend more than 100 feet from the right-of-way proposed for the MVRP?
A. (Chalmers) No.
Q. Okay. So you have considered homes outside of that 100-foot area?
A. (Chalmers) Yes.
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Q. And in what area did you study those? Do you recall?
A. (Chalmers) The case study properties were all either crossed by or adjacent to the right-of-way. But some of them were 10-acre, 15-acre, 40-acre parcels on which the homes might be as much as a mile or, you know, some fraction of a mile from the boundary of the right-of-way.
Q. Okay. I see. Does the case study capture homes that were placed on the market and were unsuccessfully sold?
A. (Chalmers) No.
Q. And are you aware that, although the proposed MVRP would fall into the first corridor in the case study, the project has proposed not to go any further north in that corridor than Londonderry, New Hampshire, at Wiley Hill Road?
A. (Chalmers) Yes.
Q. And did the case study consider any sales on either side of the utility corridor that turns off from Corridor 1 at Wiley Hill Road and runs towards Scobie Pond?
A. (Chalmers) I don't believe so, no.
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Q. And did this case study consider any properties in close proximity to the final destination of the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project's Scobie Pond Substation?
A. (Chalmers) No. No, we were limited. We looked for every sale along the -- in terms of corridor, what we call Corridor No. 1, every sale that was adjacent to the corridor within which the Phase 1, Phase 2 lines were located.
Q. Okay. So, who chose those corridors?
A. (Chalmers) I'm sorry?
Q. Who chose those three corridors?
A. (Chalmers) I did.
Q. So you had the opportunity to study the area from Wiley Road [sic] to Scobie Pond? Is that your choice not to?
A. (Chalmers) Yeah, I'm not sure what the corridor configuration is there. That issue never arose.
Q. Okay. So that ROW actually separates from Corridor 1, which you did study.
A. (Chalmers) Correct.
Q. And you chose not to study the -- continue to study that corridor. You did no testing in
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that area; correct?
A. (Chalmers) That's correct.
Q. Thank you.

And Mr. Chalmers, do you recall claiming in your prefiled testimony that, based on the research, those properties that could potentially be affected are homes very close to the right-of-way that do not have clear visibility of existing lines, but will have clear visibility of existing -- new or relocated lines after the project is constructed, and the number of properties potentially affected is small?
A. (Chalmers) Yes.
Q. How many homes did you estimate that would have a change in visibility in the area from the point of demarcation in Hudson, New Hampshire, on David Drive, to the turn-off at Wiley Road in Londonderry?
A. (Chalmers) The number of homes within 100 feet of the -- the number of properties that had homes within 100 feet of the boundary of the right-of-way which would potentially have a change in visibility we estimated to be
[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]
approximately 40 percent of 52 , or about 20.
Q. And so, for these homes, even though they're a small portion of the town, the state, would you agree that, for those pieces of property, the potential for a potential buyer to view that property differently after the construction is great?
A. (Chalmers) No.
Q. There is no potential after the trees come down or a three-pole structure or two-pole structure? The views are exposed. You feel that there is no potential for a buyer to come along and view that property differently?
A. (Chalmers) I didn't say that.
Q. I'm asking you that question.
A. (Chalmers) It's certainly possible. It would depend on the facts of the property.
Q. But it is possible.
A. (Chalmers) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

Mr. Varney, do you recall making the conclusion in your prefiled testimony that the project will have little impact on local land use, tourism or property values, and that
positive impacts are anticipated for local, regional and state tax revenues and the economy?
A. (Varney) Yes.
Q. And did you review the land patterns, local master plans and zoning ordinances for Pelham, Hudson, Londonderry, Windham, New Hampshire, to assist you in making these conclusions?
A. (Varney) Yes.
Q. Do you recall reviewing the master plan for Hudson, New Hampshire?
A. (Varney) Yes, I do.
Q. And do you recall that in your summary, Appendix A1 [sic], you claimed that the project was consistent with the master plan for the Town of Hudson?
A. (Varney) Yes.
Q. And do you recall whether the project is consistent with all of the goals in the master plan for population, housing, natural resources, community facilities and future land use for Hudson, New Hampshire?
A. (Varney) Just a moment.
(Witness reviews document.)
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A. (Varney) In reviewing the master plan, the report notes on Page 17 of the appendix that the town wishes to encourage commercial growth in already developed areas, limited areas with adequate utility services, direct access to highways, utilizing already developed right-of-way. The project supports the town's desire to protect the town's open space and its goal to encourage growth in already developed areas. It does not interfere with implementation of the master plan implementation strategies.
Q. And did that opinion include the goal of natural resources, of preserving natural resources?
A. (Varney) I reviewed the goals and objectives for all of the chapters in the Town of Hudson Master Plan.
Q. Then why don't you have anything listed under Conservation Land or Natural Resources on Page 10 or 11 of Appendix AI for Hudson, New Hampshire?
(Witness reviews document.)
A. (Varney) Pages 10 and 11, there are -- there's
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[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]
a discussion under Conservation Lands and Outdoor Recreation for three parcels in the Town of Hudson.
Q. Do you have the watershed for Robinson Pond listed in there?
A. (Varney) No.
Q. Are you aware that a considerable piece of the -- a considerable portion of the right-of-way proposed for the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project runs through the watershed for Robinson Pond?
A. (Varney) I discussed in this land-use analysis a review of parcels that were along and adjacent to the project right-of-way.
Q. Right. And along that project right-of-way, and within that project right-of-way, are you aware that there are water bodies that feed a conservation piece of land that you don't have noted in your appendix -- in your analysis?
A. (Varney) There again, I want to reinforce that we reviewed parcels of land that were along the right-of-way. We didn't try to discuss every watershed. And there are various sizes of watersheds throughout the state of New
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]

Hampshire. We stuck to the guidance that is embedded in the state statute and administrative rules for the SEC, in terms of reviewing land-use impacts. And going well beyond the project area, as you've suggested, is, in my view, inappropriate and not a good use of time.
Q. So it's inappropriate to consider one of Hudson's finest pieces of conservation land?
A. (Varney) No. It's appropriate to consider that the project will be subject to state and federal permitting requirements which are designed to protect those resources, regardless of where they may be located.
Q. Do you recall claiming in Appendix AI that less than one percent of the Town of Hudson's total land area is affected by the project?
A. (Varney) I believe it indicates that less than one percent is part of the right-of-way for the project, the right-of-way for the transmission lines.
Q. Is that any reason to overlook and ignore the negative, detrimental effects for those in the one percent?
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[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]
A. (Varney) No, they're not ignored.
Q. Are you aware that a large portion of this mere one percent houses -- never mind.

Do you remember discussing the Robinson Pond watershed with the Town of Hudson?
A. (Varney) No.
Q. Did you discuss any of this with the Town of Hudson?
A. (Varney) Yes.
Q. And who did you discuss that with?
A. (Varney) The town's planning director.
Q. And who would that be?
A. (Varney) John Cashell.
Q. John Cashell. Does John Cashell hold a volunteer position within the town?
A. (Varney) He's a professional planner.
Q. Is he a volunteer?
A. (Varney) No.
Q. What is his position?
A. (Varney) I don't recall his exact title, but he's Planning and Community Development Director for the Town of Hudson.
Q. Does the Town of Hudson have the right to make a decision that will affect people's private \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]
property?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'll object. I think that's calling for a legal conclusion.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I'll sustain that objection.

BY MS. HUARD:
Q. Well, you claimed in your prefiled testimony that there would be no crossing of the Merrimack River designated corridor. Are you aware of the inter-connectivity between the bodies of water associated with this Robinson Pond watershed that $I$ discussed and the Merrimack River?
A. (Varney) My reference was to the
state-designated lower Merrimack River, which includes the river itself and an area on either side of the river. And this is three miles from the river, so it's well beyond the area that the state has designated as part of the area that would be covered by a river management plan by the lower Merrimack River Advisory Committee.
Q. Do you recall claiming that the project will not have an impact on tourism because there are \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
no tourist-related resources in or near the project area?
A. (Varney) Yes.
Q. And what would you consider to be "near the project corridor"?
A. (Varney) I actually looked broadly in the area using materials that were developed by the state office of travel and tourism, by the local chambers of commerce, by the towns, and also my own recognizance of the project area.
Q. Do you have a distance that you looked?
A. (Varney) No. I primarily focused on the area immediately adjacent to the right-of-way. But I also noted some that were in project area towns that were some distance away.
Q. And did you consider Robinson Pond at all?
A. (Varney) No. I'm very familiar with Robinson Pond, and it's not what I would consider to be a significant tourist attraction. And I didn't see it advertised by any of the chambers of commerce or state agencies.
Q. So, because a chamber doesn't advertise, are you -- would it satisfy you to know that Robinson Pond attracts tourism -- tourists from \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]
all over for various events, including ice fishing derbies and voting, and many cub scout events?
A. (Varney) My conclusion would be that this project will not interfere with or affect tourism if it is applied as you've suggested to Robinson Pond. I do not believe this project will have any effect on tourism in the area.
Q. Do you recall claiming that the operation -can you see the -- wait a second. Let me get my thoughts here.

Are you claiming that there is no evidence that the project will have a discernible effect on property values or marketing times in local or regional real estate markets? Did you make that determination on your own?
A. (Varney) I reviewed the report of Mr . Chalmers.
Q. And so you relied on his opinion?
A. (Varney) Yes.
Q. You had claimed in your prefiled testimony that the height of the proposed structures is consistent with the structures currently present. I guess Counsel for the Public has already addressed that with you.
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But to reiterate, that exhibit Counsel for the Public has shows structures to exceed anywhere between 20 and 50 feet above what's already there. How does that fall into this opinion?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think that's been asked and answered.

MS. HUARD: Not to my satisfaction.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Nevertheless, it's been asked and answered.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I'll allow the question. This witness can answer it again.
A. (Varney) The right-of-way for the Merrimack Valley Project is an existing transmission line right-of-way with several lines and structures within it. Many of those are what are -- there are various sizes, but they are -- they're significant structures. And these taller structures are within that right-of-way already, and there's no change in land use. It would continue as a right-of-way supporting transmission structures for reliability of the electric system.
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[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]
Q. Did I hear you correctly, that you're saying the taller structures are actually in the right-of-way -- did I hear that correctly -and that the one coming in is shorter? Did I misunderstand that?
A. (Varney) No.
Q. No. Okay.

So you looked at his exhibit. And do you -- do you honestly feel that you can actually claim that the height of the proposed structures are consistent and --

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I think that that question has definitely been asked and answered. We may need to take just a five-minute break here.

MS. HUARD: And I'm almost done. I
have --
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I'm sorry.
I just lost a Committee member.
MS. HUARD: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't know. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: We'll just give her a few minutes. Just take five. Thank you.
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(Whereupon a brief recess was taken at 1:52 p.m., and the hearing resumed at 2:00.)

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. We're back on the record. Sorry for the interruption.

MS. HUARD: I was just about to close. I didn't see her coughing.

BY MS. HUARD:
Q. So, Mr. Varney, you claimed that the project will have -- in your prefiled testimony, you claimed that your project will have positive impacts on employment and economy, locally, regional and statewide; correct?
A. (Varney) Yes.
Q. Would that be any reason to overlook other goals in the town master plan or other negative effects of the project for the small one percent that will be affected?
A. (Varney) I reviewed the entire master plan for each community.
Q. And would it be a reason to overlook the negative effects of the project for the small percent that will be affected?
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A. (Varney) I considered the entire master plan in each community.
Q. That master plan does not take into consideration the small percentage of homes that will be affected. Do you think that's appropriate to ignore that small percentage for the sake of positive growth and positive revenue for the state of Massachusetts and local taxes?
A. (Varney) The project -- my review of the project was reviewing the town master plans and zoning ordinances, as well as looking at the area along the proposed right-of-way.
Q. So, so long as you've done your work, then you feel that your conclusion is accurate, regardless of the small percent --
A. (Varney) I reviewed the reports of the other experts who are seated at this table, as well as their testimony, and all of the other information that's fully described in my testimony and in Appendix AI.
Q. So if there's the potential for even one person to die as a result of this project, is that acceptable?
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'll object to the form of the question.

MS. HUARD: I'm all set. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Your objection's sustained.

All right. We are now at the Committee for any questions for these witnesses.

BY CMSR. BAILEY:
Q. Mr. Chalmers, my first question is about something that you testified about and I've heard before, and that is that your case study doesn't include homes on the market that were never sold. Can you explain why that is and why it wouldn't be appropriate?
A. (Chalmers) Sure. The only real evidence with respect to market value requires a sale -- that is, you can't use -- if you're doing an appraisal, you can't use listing prices. You can't -- that would be, I suppose, the other possibility, to use listing prices. But, you know, there was no transaction consummated. So it's only when you actually have a transaction and conclude that that's a fair market sale
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that you can then compare that. If that's a sale next to a transmission line, you can compare that, then, to other sales uninfluenced by transmission lines and come to some conclusion as to whether the transmission lines had any impact on that transaction. But if there's no transaction that actually occurs, you don't have anything to -- you just don't know where you are. You don't have a point of comparison.
Q. What about time on market?
A. (Chalmers) We looked at time on market, and rather exhaustively for three years, 2013 -two years, 2013, 2014. And we divided -- we looked at every town through which Corridor 2 passed, okay, the proposed Northern Pass corridor, and divided the sales into sales that either abutted, okay, the way you used the term, that "abutted" the corridor, sales that were out to 500 feet, or sales that were 500 feet to a mile. And we didn't find any difference in days on market in those three distance groups, nor did we find any difference in sale price to list price ratios. Those are
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two indicators of market resistance, and we didn't find any.
Q. But did you include the houses that were on the market but not sold in the calculation of how long it took to sell them? I mean, my thought is, if it's impossible -- and this is hypothetical. But if somebody puts their house on the market, and it's so affected by the project that nobody's ever going to buy, it sits on the market forever, it doesn't impact either one of your calculations?
A. (Chalmers) No.
Q. Ms. Shapiro, your testimony is that the revenue from taxes to the municipalities and counties is providing a public interest or a public interest consideration for this project?
A. (Shapiro) Yes.
Q. And the same with the study on the REMI model? The jobs that -- your conclusion is that this project is in the public interest?
A. (Morrisey) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

CMSR. BAILEY: That's all I have.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Other
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members? Yes, go ahead.
CMSR. ROSE: Thank you.
BY CMSR. ROSE :
Q. I do have a question for Mr. Varney. I was curious as to whether or not you considered temporary impacts at all in your analysis in concluding that there was not going to be any adverse impact to the tourism industry.
A. (Varney) Yes, I did.
Q. And you still reached the conclusion that there would be no unreasonable adverse effect to the tourism industry?
A. (Varney) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right.
Seeing no further -- oh, I'm sorry.
BY MS . WEATHERSBY:
Q. Mr. Chalmers, seems that there's an agreement that there will be some properties that will be affected, the market value will be affected. Actually, about 20 properties is what you said will be affected by this new line going in. Does the utility company, as part of a mitigation strategy, attempt to compensate
those property owners in any way other than payment for the easement right itself, which may have been granted to an owner, perhaps several owners ago, you know, down the chain, but the present property owner who sees their market value decline? Is there any attempt to work with that property owner?
A. (Chalmers) Perhaps the Company would be better suited to answer that. However, I'm aware that there's no formal compensation arrangement. But there's certainly a willingness to entertain any discussion with a potentially affected property owner to investigate whether mitigation is possible, is feasible. But that would be the extent of arrangements that I'm aware of.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Any other questions? Yes.

MS. ROBERGE: My question is more of a clarification, and this goes to Mr. Chalmers. BY MS. ROBERGE:
Q. Of those properties that you looked at, did it come down to the fact that there may be visibility of the line now because proximity -\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
you only looked at properties that had proximity already, so it's just strictly the fact that the tree clearing may now -- they may have a view of the right-of-way now?
A. (Chalmers) Correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. I think that takes care of the Committee. Does the Applicant -- oh, sorry.

CMSR. BAILEY: I'm sorry.
BY CMSR. BAILEY:
Q. Sorry, Mr. Chalmers. Back to the point that -or the question that $I$ was asking before. So why isn't it reasonable to count the house that has not sold in the time on the market?
A. (Chalmers) Well, days on market, if it hasn't sold, if it's an open listing, we don't know what the days on the market are; right? It's a running clock, and maybe it's at 170 right now or maybe at just 30 . We wouldn't want to enter that into the analysis and assume it was 30 , because it may not sell until next month or the month after. So you have to have a closed period -- that is, you have to know what, in fact, the days on market were. And with an
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open listing, you wouldn't know what the days on the market are. Does that help?
Q. I'm having a hard time with -- I mean, if a house really will never sell --
A. (Chalmers) Well, that's a slightly different issue. I mean, people put their houses on the market and they don't sell in a given period of time and they take them off the market; right? And we don't have any way -- I mean, I guess one could try to identify those. But people take their houses off the market for all kinds of reasons. I don't know how one could -- what sort of information one could usefully get out of that exercise.
Q. Maybe if the houses were on the market -- you know, they were really close to the project, and they were on the market for longer than the average that you had calculated, then you may include those. But that may skew it the wrong way, too. I don't know. I have a hard time with that whole thing. MS. WHITAKER: Can I ask a
clarification question here?
BY MS. WHITAKER:
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Q. Is there a statistical analysis that you're doing with these numbers, with the data that you're collecting about houses having been on the market or sold at fair market value?
A. (Chalmers) Well, that's purely an average. It's statistical in that sense. But it's not -- nothing more than an average. So you're looking at -- I don't know exactly what the numbers are. But let's say there are 100 homes that have been listed and sold that are located either adjacent to or across a right-of-way. There are another 500 that are within 500 feet, but not across or adjacent, and then there are another 5,000 that are 500 to a mile. We simply calculated the average days on the market for each of those three distance groups for each quarter for 2013 and 2014 and graphed them. And there was no disadvantage for the more proximate categories as opposed to the more distant ones, in terms of days on market. You know, in other words, there didn't appear to be any market resistance in terms of higher days on market for the more proximate, or lower sales price or list price ratio, which is
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
another indicator of market resistance.
Q. So you were doing just a visual analysis of those graphs that you just described?
A. (Chalmers) Correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Mr. Chalmers, follow-up on Commissioner Bailey's question. In studying time on the market, why wouldn't it be appropriate to close the time period on the date that you close your research, so that if there's a house on the market during the time of your research for 100 days, that would be the time frame that you would use and include that property in your analysis?
A. (Chalmers) Because suppose a property were listed two days before the time period ended. We'd be comparing two days. That would imply a property that sold very quickly, and we'd be comparing that to other properties sold in 15 days, 30 days, 60 days. What we're asking is: What's the average days on market for properties that have sold? That's the only kind of way you can formulate the question.

Otherwise, you'd have apples and oranges that wouldn't be meaningful.
Q. Let me ask you another question. I would think that generally -- and I agree there's a number of different reasons why somebody would put their home on the market and then take it off. But if a home is on the market and is not commanding a price that is enough to cover the mortgage -- that's the situation that comes to mind first to me, and probably to most people -- and if the fair market value of the home is not going to cover the homeowner's mortgage -- which indicates that at least at the time the homeowner bought it, it was worth more, fair market value was higher -- is there not any way for you to capture that in your research, or any way to capture that in order to get a better assessment of whether there is any effect from transmission lines on proximate homes?
A. (Chalmers) Well, it certainty wouldn't be the first one, two, three or four ways we'd go about it. There's quite a bit of research in this area, and it's pretty standard in its
[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]
approach.
If you thought days on market was a really critical variable, and if it showed up in the analysis that $I$ just described, then maybe there would be a case for -- you know, if there was a sense that the market had been frozen and nothing was selling in certain areas, maybe some case-by-case analysis along those lines would be warranted. But it's never been suggested. There's nothing along those lines in the literature. And I've been thinking about this a lot for 35 years and never have gone after, you know, unsold properties. I mean, there are enough properties that sell next to the lines, and that really is the evidence that answers the question, which is: Do these lines have a negative impact on the market value of real estate? And generally the way you approach that is by comparing the price at which that property sold to otherwise similar properties that sold but were unaffected by transmission lines. And even though we pursue two or three different approaches, they all basically come down to
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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that. If you don't have a sale, I just don't know where you are, other than doing some kind Of an in-depth case study. And again, I think you'd only do that if there were some extenuating circumstances; namely, a situation in which no properties were selling. But there have been many, many properties that have sold along the lines.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. You and then you. You go first.

BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Mr. Chalmers, rather than looking at the sale of an affected, potentially affected property with the market as a whole in that geographic region, have you done analysis of the sale price of a property, just for that individual property? For example: Since the project was announced, have any of the identified affected properties, of the 20 or so, have those properties gone on the market? Have they sold? And if so, if they have sold, the percentage appreciation or depreciation in their sales price compared to what they purchased it, how
does that compare to the average in the community, looking at a property-by-property, specific analysis?
A. (Chalmers) Right. I have not in the New Hampshire context. There's been a little bit of work done along those lines in some context. But it's typically been statistical, where you have very large databases on sales and look at appreciation rates and properties that are differentially located relative to transmission lines. There's not a density of sales in New Hampshire to make that easy, particularly in the northern half of the state. Southern half of the state, I suppose you could do it, possibly.

The question of effects in the pre-project period, you say "announcement period," is generally not addressed because it's so fact-specific and so variable. The market is changing. The question typically before a licensing board is: What will be the effects of the project if built? And, you know, the whole period during which it's planned, announced and licensed, subject to all kinds of
vagaries, is simply, therefore, a period about which is very difficult to generalize.
Q. But since the project route has been finalized, no one's gone back and looked at -acknowledging there will be some properties that are affected, no one's gone back and looked at whether those properties have sold, and if so, whether the appreciation or depreciation is typical for the area?
A. (Chalmers) That's correct.
Q. BY DR. BOISVERT:
Q. I think my question is very similar, but I'm going to ask it anyway.

You've been in this profession for quite some time, have a lot of experience. Are you aware of any post-construction studies that have been done where there was a transmission line or similar kind of project, where someone has looked at the sales, days on market, sales prices, et cetera, along a given transmission line or whatever, to see what the pattern was before and after the transmission line?

Because what we're concerned with here is change is in the future to property values, to
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]
property tax collection, et cetera. And the embedded concern is that is's property may lose value; either they get a lower sale price or it takes much longer to get to it.

Are you aware of any studies that have gone to -- where they have looked at sales for a one-year or two-year or five-year period after that project was completed, so that data could be compared with other time periods before the construction or to other projects? Have there been full studies?
A. (Chalmers) Well, there are two studies in the literature, which are both referenced in my report. In the longer report, the 100 -page report or so that is submitted as part of the application, in the survey in the literature, one of those is in Las Vegas, where a 15-year period was studied four or five years prior to construction, four or five years after, and there weren't effects found in either case.
Q. What kind of project was this? Transmission line or --
A. (Chalmers) Yeah, it was a high-voltage transmission line. I don't recall the voltage,
but a large line in Las Vegas.
And there was another study, and I'm afraid $I$ don't recall the context. But it did identify an effect post-construction for two or three years which then disappeared. Those are the two studies I'm aware of. The work that I did would refer to the after period -- that is, once MVRP is built, the conclusions that I have offered, the opinions that I have offered would be relevant to the question of: Will MVRP, once built, have any impacts on property values? And it went out and studied existing transmission lines and sales of properties adjacent to it.
Q. So it might be reasonable for us to, as a condition of the permit, to request that there be this post-study to see what effects, if any, may have occurred? Do you think that might be a reasonable approach to at least provide data for future projects?
A. (Chalmers) That's something you'd have to think about. We've looked at an awful lot of data, you know, along this corridor. Again, that would be something you'd have to consider.
Q. Thank you.

BY MS. WHITAKER:
Q. Can you remind us which portion of the application your contribution is a part of that you just referenced?

MR. IACOPINO: It's Appendix AK.
MS. WHITAKER: Appendix AK? Thanks.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Any other
questions from the -- yes.
CMSR. ROSE: Thank you. I have a question for Mr. Morrisey.

BY CMSR. ROSE:
Q. The need of this project is identified through ISO-New England for improvement to the reliability in the transmission and capacity needs.

I was just curious, in your economic analysis, if there was a benefit to the region and/or state from an economic perspective, from improved reliability of that energy and potentially recruitment of any businesses to the region that are highly dependent upon reliable energy sources.
A. (Morrisey) That wasn't included in the REMI \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[MORRISEY/SHAPIRO/CHALMERS/VARNEY]
analysis. I mean, the project is precedented upon the need to maintain reliability and efficiency. And it's really avoiding the costs that we'd be faced with if we weren't able to accommodate load growth and/or if there was a degradation of reliability, which would be very costly to businesses and economic growth in the region.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right.
I think we've finished with the Committee questions. Is the Applicant going to do any redirect?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. Then these witnesses are excused, and we will call the next panel, which is on Public Safety -Public Health and Safety. That panel is going to be William Bailey and Gary Johnson.

MR. WALKER: Madam Commissioner, my name's Jeremy Walker. I'm at McLane, Middleton, and I'm counsel for the Applicant.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.
(WHEREUPON, WILLIAM BAILEY and GARY JOHNSON were duly sworn and cautioned by
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

## the Court Reporter.)

 DIRECT EXAMINATIONBY MR. WALKER:
Q. Mr. Bailey and Mr. Johnson, can you state your name for the record, and also explain to the Committee your occupation.
A. (Bailey) I'm William -- is that on? I'm William Bailey, and I am a principal scientist at Exponent. And the purpose of my testimony was to provide an evaluation of the electric and magnetic fields associated with the operation of the MVRP project with regard to public health and safety.
A. (Johnson) My name is Gary Johnson. I'm a senior managing scientist at Exponent. My role in these proceedings was to calculate the electrical environment, which includes EMF, audible noise and radio noise, and look at various aspects of the electrical environment for the proposed project.
Q. Thank you.

Starting with Mr. Bailey, did you submit prefiled testimony in this matter?
A. (Bailey) Yes, I did.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
Q. Do you have any changes to that testimony?
A. (Bailey) No, I do not.
Q. Do you adopt and swear to that prefiled testimony?
A. (Bailey) I do.
Q. Mr. Johnson, did you submit prefiled testimony in this matter?
A. (Johnson) Yes, I did.
Q. Do you have any changes to that prefiled testimony?
A. (Johnson) I have no changes to my prefiled testimony.
Q. Do you swear to and adopt the prefiled testimony?
A. (Johnson) I do.

MR. WALKER: Madam Commissioner, I submit them to cross-examination.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.
Counsel for the Public.
MR. ASLIN: Thank you.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Good afternoon. Doctors Bailey and Johnson, your opinions with regard to electric and \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
magnetic fields were based on a modeling effort; is that correct?
A. (Johnson) That's correct.
Q. In other words, this was a model that was developed based on the proposed design of the project and not based on actual field testing.
A. (Johnson) For this particular case, there was no actual field measurements performed. The modeling techniques and algorithms used have been well established over the past decades and have been used for a number of transmission lines to model the electric and magnetic fields. As part of some of that prior work in use early on, these techniques were checked against actual field studies, but not in this particular case.
Q. Thank you.

So, in the past there have been projects where there's been field testing? Is that what you just testified to?
A. (Johnson) Many decades ago, when these models were being developed, there was both the modeling being performed and along with that measurements being done. I've done, actually,
some of those measurements for both existing and test lines to confirm the validity of the models.
Q. And do you have an estimation of how frequent that field testing is a requirement for a transmission line project?
A. (Johnson) Not for any specific project, no.
Q. You stated a moment ago that it was common in the past, decades ago. Is it something that is still done in the current time frame?
A. (Johnson) I don't know that I would characterize it as "common" even in the past. When the models were first being developed a number of decades ago, you would see both field measurements and modeling. But then, basically it's just been the modeling. And the reason for that is because, when you go out in the field because of terrain features and nearby shrubs, different structures, a lot of your field measurements, electric field in particular, can be impacted. What this does is allow you to have a set condition and compare the lines that are there existing in a stable configuration and geometry with the proposed
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
configuration. So it's easy to do an apples-to-apples, oranges-to-oranges type of comparison.
Q. Thank you.

I believe you said that you've been involved in projects where there was field testing done. Is there a particular protocol for the type of testing or the sort of frequency or location of testing along a project like this that you've experienced in your past?
A. (Johnson) I guess it would depend on what you mean by "protocol." The IEEE, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, has basically guidelines or procedures for how you perform these measurements.
Q. Okay. But in terms of a project such as this, which is approximately 18 miles in New Hampshire, as I understand your answer to that prior question, the IEEE would give you a protocol for each individual field testing or test that you performed. But is there a methodology for testing various places or areas within that right-of-way or along the
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | right-of-way to understand whether the modeling |
| 2 |  | is accurate? |
| 3 | A. | (Johnson) In the sense that it would say you |
| 4 |  | would, if possible, do the measurements, say, |
| 5 |  | at mid-span, where the conductors are closest |
| 6 |  | to ground, and there you'd have your highest |
| 7 |  | electric and magnetic fields. |
| 8 | Q. | Along the same lines, if you were asked to |
| 9 |  | perform field testing to corroborate the model, |
| 10 |  | I assume you wouldn't need to do it at every |
| 11 |  | mid-span along the entire project? |
| 12 | A. | (Johnson) No. |
| 13 | Q. | So are there ways to devise a testing regime |
| 14 |  | that would cover the various portions of the |
| 15 |  | project that are similar without having to be |
| 16 |  | overly redundant? |
| 17 | A. | (Johnson) If I understand your question |
| 18 |  | correctly, it's not codified with specifics |
| 19 |  | where you would perform the measurements or how |
| 20 |  | often you would perform the measurements. What |
| 21 |  | you would typically do is take representative |
| 22 |  | line designs or cross-sections. Because of the |
| 23 |  | robustness of the modeling and the techniques, |
| 24 |  | typically even one section would give you a |

\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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|  |  | 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | good feeling about the validity of the |
| 2 |  | modeling. |
| 3 | Q. | Thank you. |
| 4 |  | And with regard to the type of field |
| 5 |  | testing that you would do if required, is it |
| 6 |  | different, significantly different for magnetic |
| 7 |  | field than electric field testing? |
| 8 | A. | (Johnson) You would have different |
| 9 |  | instrumentation. The general location, height |
| 10 |  | above ground would be similar. |
| 11 | Q. | Thank you. |
| 12 |  | And just to clarify, the modeling that's |
| 13 |  | been done was conducted for both the existing |
| 14 |  | condition and the proposed -- |
| 15 | A. | Correct. And that's to allow -- |
| 16 |  | (Court Reporter interrupts.) |
| 17 | Q. | -- condition after construction? |
| 18 | A. | (Johnson) And that's to allow, essentially, an |
| 19 |  | even comparison before and after. |
| 20 | Q. | Okay. |
| 21 |  | MR. ASLIN: Thank you. I have no |
| 22 |  | further questions. |
| 23 |  | PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Ms. Huard. |
| 24 |  | MS. HUARD: Thank you. |

\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. HUARD :
Q. Mr. Johnson, so you were engaged by both NEP and PSNH to calculate the electrical environment associated with the operation of the project in context to adjacent, existing overhead AC lines along the proposed route; correct?
A. (Johnson) Correct.
Q. As a result of this calculation, did you conclude that the electrical environment created by the operation of existing, constructed and relocated transmission lines will not cause any unreasonable adverse effect on public health and safety?
A. (Johnson) That's correct.
Q. And so to get an understanding of what the electrical environment is, I'd like to ask you
a few questions. Is it these transmission lines within the electric environment that carry power from one location to another?
A. (Johnson) It would be the transmission lines on the right-of-way, the power lines, yes.
Q. And what part of the transmission line becomes \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

|  |  | 52 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | energized with voltage and current? |
| 2 | A. | (Johnson) It would be the conductors that are |
| 3 |  | being supported by the overhead transmission |
| 4 |  | lines. Typically there are three bundles |
| 5 |  | associated with each energized circuit or line. |
| 6 |  | Along with that there are typically maybe one |
| 7 |  | or two sort of overhead or aerial ground wires |
| 8 |  | or static lines. They can be called any one of |
| 9 |  | those terms. But the portions that actually |
| 10 |  | become energized are the physical conductors on |
| 11 |  | the three groups of lines, or what are called |
| 12 |  | "phases." |
| 13 | Q. | And does the electric environment of a |
| 14 |  | transmission line consist of electric, magnetic |
| 15 |  | fields, audio noise and radio noise? |
| 16 | A. | (Johnson) Yes, those are typically what's |
| 17 |  | considered to be the electrical environment of |
| 18 |  | the high-voltage transmission lines. |
| 19 | Q. | Are these electric fields produced by the |
| 20 |  | voltage on the conductors as it moves the |
| 21 |  | electricity through the wires? |
| 22 | A. | (Johnson) The electric field is produced by the |
| 23 |  | voltage on the conductors. The magnetic field |
| 24 |  | is produced by the current that's flowing in |

\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
the conductors.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Johnson) Now, the audio noise and the radio noise are not affected by the current, but are affected by the voltage, as well as the size of the conductor.
Q. Thank you.

And is the electric field produced in a space surrounding the conductor?
A. (Johnson) That's correct.
Q. And would electric fields tend to be higher in areas of transmission lines where the voltage is higher?
A. (Johnson) It depends on the actual design and geometry or structure of the line, as well as the size of the conductor, its height above ground, and its distance from the other conductors. Those will determine the actual strength or level of the electric field.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And are objects such as trees and buildings able to block electric fields?
A. (Johnson) Structures, such as trees,
electric -- buildings, pretty much any
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
structure, physical structure, will shield or reduce the electric field around it or near it.
Q. Thank you.

And can this voltage -- so you said the voltage on conductors produce corona; correct?
A. (Johnson) Well, the voltage and the size of the conductor and -- the size of the conductor and the voltage on the conductor will both influence the electric field at the surface of the conductor, and the strength of that electric field at the surface of the conductor will determine whether or not there is corona.
Q. Okay. Is it correct that, as the demand for electricity increases, so does the current on the line, and therefore magnetic field levels?
A. (Johnson) Generally as the load on the line increases, the current will go up. And as the current goes up, the magnetic field also will go up.
Q. And are magnetic fields blocked by objects such as trees and buildings?
A. (Johnson) Trees and buildings in general will not block the magnetic field. Generally, reduction or changes in the magnetic field are \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
produced only by dense ferromagnetic objects.
Q. So, would you agree that both electric and magnetic fields are highest directly under the conductors of respective lines within the right-of-way?
A. (Johnson) In general, if there are multiple circuits on the corridor, that may not be directly the case. They may be shifted to one side or the other, depending on how the different conductors and lines interact. But in a very broad sense, the highest electric and magnetic fields would be expected somewhere in the general vicinity underneath the lines of the corridor.
Q. But there are potential for the outside of the corridor to actually deviate from the norm.
A. (Johnson) Well, both electric and magnetic fields will decrease as you go away from the line. But it's not uncommon for there to be some level of electric field or magnetic field at the edge of the right-of-way itself.
Q. Okay. And Dr. Johnson, in your prefiled testimony you indicated that compliance with the National Electric Safety Code protects the \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
public against shocks in high-voltage power lines; correct?
A. (Johnson) It protects the public safety and welfare, yes.
Q. So you would agree with -- would you agree that the National Electric Safety Code, considered to be an authoritative source -- is considered to be the authoritative source of industry standards on proper electrical engineering?
A. (Johnson) It's a set of guidelines and standards that have been used for a number of years to safely design and ground and operate electrical equipment.
Q. And would you agree that preventing electric shock and electrocution in the electric environment is a major underlying concern in these safety standards?
A. (Johnson) It's one of their concerns, yes.
Q. And would you agree that electric shock is the tingling sensation or muscular contraction that a person experiences when an electrical current passes through their body?

I'm sorry that would be directed to Dr.
Bailey. That's from your actual prefiled
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]

[BAILEY/JOHNSON]

|  | 58 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | front of you? |
| 2 | A. | (Bailey) I see what appears to be a wooden pole |
| 3 |  | with a sign on it that reads "Danger. High |
| 4 |  | Voltage Above. Keep off." |
| 5 | Q. | And can you see a company name on it? |
| 6 | A. | (Bailey) Looks like New England Power Company. |
| 7 | Q. | Thank you. |
| 8 |  | And do you see a picture on the sign? |
| 9 | A. | (Bailey) Yes. |
| 10 | Q. | And what is that picture warning the reading - |
| 11 |  | reader against? |
| 12 | A. | (Bailey) That is a warning symbol against |
| 13 |  | electric contact with electric conductors. |
| 14 | 2. | So would the average reader of that sign |
| 15 |  | believe that the danger of electrocution would |
| 16 |  | be caused by climbing or directly contacting |
| 17 |  | that pole? |
| 18 | A. | (Bailey) It would alert them that that's -- |
| 19 |  | that there was a danger from climbing the pole |
| 20 |  | and approaching closer to the energized |
| 21 |  | conductors. |
| 22 | Q. | So is it correct that there is a risk of |
| 23 |  | electric current flowing through your body that |
| 24 |  | may cause electric shock or electrocution if |
|  |  | \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\} |

you come in direct contact with the poles or the conductors from a high-voltage transmission line?
A. (Bailey) No. I mean, contact with the pole in a properly designed system would not be the source of concern. It would be contact with the energized conductor or becoming close enough to the energized conductor that there could be a flashover to the person.
Q. Okay. Why bother to put that sign on there if there's -- I mean, isn't that warning the reader of the potential?
A. (Bailey) I would expect the primary purpose of the sign would be to discourage people from attempting to climb the pole and gain access to the energized conductors above.
Q. For danger, out of danger. And the picture shows that that person can be electrocuted or sustain electric shock if they saw that; correct?
A. (Bailey) Correct.
Q. And would this risk exist if one came in contact, in direct contact -- Dr. Johnson, in your prefiled testimony, you claimed to have \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
evaluated power lines for their compliance with the NESC and estimated levels of current and voltage coupled onto vehicles near power lines; correct?
A. (Johnson) That's correct.
Q. And by "coupled," you mean that current and voltage can actually transfer to a vehicle near a power line; correct?
A. (Johnson) There can be a capacitive coupling through the air which will produce a certain level of short-circuit current or open-circuit voltage on the insulated object. If the object is well connected to ground, there would still be some capacitive current. But it's basic with the NESC to make sure that that capacitively coupled current voltage is within safe levels.
Q. But is it correct that certain objects merely near a high-voltage transmission line can become coupled with current and voltage under certain conditions without even touching the high-voltage transmission line?
A. (Johnson) That's essentially true of any objects in space near a line if there's voltage \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

|  |  | 61 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | conducting or energized or an object with |
| 2 |  | voltage on it. Any nearby object will have |
| 3 |  | some level of capacitively coupled voltage and |
| 4 |  | current. |
| 5 | Q. | So then, there is actual risk that a person can |
| 6 |  | become electrocuted or suffer from an electric |
| 7 |  | shock without ever actually touching the |
| 8 |  | transmission poles or wires? |
| 9 | A. | (Johnson) Theoretically, if one is close enough |
| 10 |  | and under the right conditions, that would |
| 11 |  | theoretically be possible. |
| 12 | Q. | And would that object have to be directly |
| 13 |  | inside an electric or magnetic field to become |
| 14 |  | coupled with current or voltage? |
| 15 | A. | (Johnson) Well, the electric and/or magnetic |
| 16 |  | field, depending on the specific conditions, |
| 17 |  | would have to be present. I'm not quite sure |
| 18 |  | what you mean by "inside" the field. |
| 19 | Q. | Well, if you take the conductor and the |
| 20 |  | electric field and the magnetic fields around |
| 21 |  | it, can you be merely next to those fields, or |
| 22 |  | do you have to be directly going through it or |
| 23 |  | inside it? You have to interact with an |
| 24 |  | electric field or be merely next to -- |

[^0][BAILEY/JOHNSON]
A. (Johnson) You will be present in the electric or magnetic field.
Q. Thank you.

And would tires on a vehicle help protect a vehicle from becoming coupled?
A. (Johnson) It will have an impact on how well coupled the vehicle is. Typically, older tires or -- and I think what you're trying to get at is insulation -- or insulating the vehicle.
Q. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
A. (Johnson) Older tires, actually, many decades ago, were better insulators than modern tires. What we found is typical debris or surface conditions on the tires provides some level of insulation but do not offer an extremely high degree of insulation.
Q. So the vehicle can actually build up a charge on it; correct?
A. (Johnson) If it's capacitively coupled, there will be a certain level of capacitively coupled current and voltage on the vehicle.
Q. And how quickly would this charge build up on the vehicle?
A. (Johnson) Because of the AC nature, the 60 \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
cycles of the power frequency, it basically would be within the cycle.
Q. So, within 60 seconds?
A. (Johnson) Less than a second. Microseconds.
Q. And at what level would the charge build up on a vehicle?
A. (Johnson) It depends on the vehicle, the strength of the electric field and its insulation.
Q. So it wouldn't be the fact -- if you had a field that was at 6 kilovolts, how would that transfer to the vehicle?
A. (Johnson) You would have a number of assumptions. If you assumed that the vehicle was completely insulated at a high degree of insulation, which typically is not the case, it would come to whatever potential the size of the vehicle, and the current it would collect would determine that level of both voltage and current. It literally depends on the situation.
Q. Thank you.

Do you recall in my discovery questions
you referred to "Bonneville Power
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

|  |  | 64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Administration's Guide to Living and Working |
| 2 |  | Safely Around High-Voltage Power Lines"? |
| 3 | A. | (Johnson) I generally remember a reference to |
| 4 |  | that document. |
| 5 | 2. | Thank you. |
| 6 |  | Are you well acquainted with this guide? |
| 7 | A. | (Johnson) I've looked at it. I'm not sure what |
| 8 |  | "well acquainted" is. |
| 9 | Q. | I'd like to refer to Exhibit 50. |
| 10 |  | (Witness reviews document.) |
| 11 | Q. | So you claim that you're not extremely -- |
| 12 |  | you're not -- you wouldn't say for sure that |
| 13 |  | you're well acquainted with it. I'd like to |
| 14 |  | address a few of the issues in it, and you can |
| 15 |  | tell me whether you do agree with it. |
| 16 |  | I'd like to first refer you to the section |
| 17 |  | on Page 7, under Vehicles. |
| 18 | A. | (Johnson) Okay. |
| 19 | Q. | So the statement, "Under some high-voltage |
| 20 |  | lines, vehicles can collect induced voltage. |
| 21 |  | This is particularly true if the vehicle is |
| 22 |  | parked on a non-conductive surface such as |
| 23 |  | asphalt or dry rock... The only way to be sure |
| 24 |  | that you won't get shocked is to park your car |

\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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away from the high-voltage transmission line." Is that correct?
A. (Johnson) If you parked away from the transmission line, that would be one way to assure you're not going to get shocked.

Whether or not you get shocked in a particular case will depend on the vehicle and the strength of the electric field and its insulation. So you could park the vehicle near a line and yet not get a shock.
Q. But there are conditions where your vehicle will conduct electricity.
A. (Johnson) I wouldn't use the phrase "conduct," but could "build up a charge."
Q. Build up a charge.
A. (Johnson) That you could receive a shock under certain conditions. And again, that would depend on the electric field, the particular design of the transmission line, any nearby objects to the car, how well the car is insulated from the surface. Like I said, a large number of things.
Q. And to your knowledge, are there any instructions or warnings to the public at road \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
crossings along the utility ROW that warn the public of this possibility and not to pull over and park their vehicles under the high-voltage transmission lines?
A. (Johnson) I would say, in general, I'm not aware of it routinely being done. But I do remember one at a road crossing recently. And it may be because there was construction activity going on at that particular crossing.
Q. And does the sign in Exhibit 24 warn the public not to pull over and park their vehicles there?
A. (Johnson) In Exhibit 24, there's no indication that parking would be prohibited.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Bailey) If I could jump in here. One of the aspects at road crossings, one is concerned about maintaining clearance from large vehicles that may be crossing underneath the line; so, therefore, the clearance above ground at road crossings is typically higher than it is on other parts of the route.
Q. Dr. Bailey, would that actually matter as far as --
A. (Bailey) That would reduce the possibility and
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
lower any induction effects because of the higher, greater distance of the conductors from a vehicle.
Q. There's still the potential that a car can become coupled with electricity even with those distances; correct?
A. (Bailey) Yes. But as Dr. Johnson mentioned, adherence to the National Electric Safety Code sets these clearances and reduced currents so that adverse levels are not reached.
Q. And do they use modeling as well, or do they actually test actual conditions?
A. (Bailey) For future lines, it would have to be modeling, of course.
Q. If a car [sic] were to park their vehicle overnight on the side of the road under a transmission lines, would there be a -- or could there be a considerable charge built up on it by the morning?
A. (Johnson) No, there would be no difference whether it had been parked there one minute or 10 hours.
Q. But it would conduct -- it could conduct electricity.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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A. (Johnson) There are conditions, depending on the field, the size of the vehicle, location.
Q. And how would the electric -- if it did conduct, if it did become coupled with voltage and current to the level that a person touched it and they could -- and they received an electric shock, how would that electric shock appear to the person that got into their vehicle in the morning after it had been parked under the transmission lines overnight?
A. (Johnson) I guess I'm not sure how to answer that. What do you mean, how would it appear?
Q. Well, what would -- if a person had parked their car overnight and it did in fact collect a voltage and current and they opened the door and got into it and started to away, what symptoms would they experience?
A. (Johnson) If they were in the car starting to drive away, there would be no shock. It would be only as you first contacted that vehicle on the outside, while you were well grounded and if the car was insulated. Again, it depends on the conditions of the grounding of the vehicle, how well the person is grounded, the size of
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
the vehicle, and again, the electric fields. For these particular lines, the electric fields that we're talking about, say at the edge of the right-of-way, are well below the -- in fact, even within the right-of-way are below the National Electric Safety Code requirements for safe levels of current.
Q. So, while sitting in the vehicle, if the vehicle had collected a current and you were to put your foot on the gas pedal or another object in the car, your steering wheel that might have conducted the current and voltage as well, that would not allow the person to sustain electric shock?
A. (Johnson) No, because you're inside the vehicle. Any shock at that point is due to something else going on in the car or in clothing, but it's not due to the external things like the transmission line.
Q. If the magnetic fields are not produced -- I mean not blocked by any object, can the magnetic fields come into the vehicle as you drive through it?
A. (Johnson) Well, most objects would not block \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
the magnetic field. Ferro -- ferrous heavy metal, dense metal objects can modify the magnetic field. Theoretically, with a car there could be some level of magnetic field inside the car. It would likely be reduced from what was external just because of the nature of the body of the car. And you may also have -- I've seen magnetic fields due to the metal of the car itself.
Q. I'd like to refer you to Exhibit 49. Can you describe what you see when you're looking at what's front of you?
A. (Johnson) It appears to be like an aerial topographic map.
Q. And can you -- can you see a roadway on it, a highway?
A. (Johnson) Correct.
Q. And what highway would that be?
A. (Johnson) It's labeled "I-93, north and southbound lanes."
Q. Can you see the yellow line running across I-93?
A. (Johnson) Oh, the -- okay. You're talking about the solid yellow line that appears to be \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
roughly in the middle, bordered on the outside by two red lines?
Q. Correct.
A. (Johnson) Okay. Yes.
Q. Now, are you aware of that this new line will be carrying 340 kilovolts of electricity?
A. (Johnson) I believe it's what's called a "345kV line."
Q. Hmm-hmm. Does that mean it's carrying 345 kilovolts of electricity?
A. (Johnson) It would be energized roughly to 345,000 volts, yes.
Q. Thank you.

Would a person that was standing under those voltage lines, say, or had to get out of their vehicle or broke down and had to get out of their vehicle, could they -- are they at risk for sustaining an electric shock, with the potential that the vehicle can become coupled with electric voltage and current?
A. (Johnson) Depending on the height of the line, there's a theoretical possibility that there would be some level of voltage or charge on a large enough vehicle. But this is a road
crossing. And it's indicated at road crossings your heights of the line typically are even more than is required by the NESC. But at the very least, the NESC sets the ruling level of the amount of induced current and voltage that can be developed.
Q. And how long can a person sit stopped in traffic? Is there any way while sitting stopped in traffic that the vehicle can be coupled with voltage and current?
A. (Johnson) If you assume that you're directly under the line, again, there would be some coupling to the vehicle. But the person sitting inside it would not notice it.
Q. I'd like to refer back to Exhibit 50. So, as you said earlier, there's a number of other objects that you can -- that can, under or near high-voltage transmission lines become coupled with current and voltage; is that correct?
A. (Johnson) Correct.
Q. Actually, let me refer you to Exhibit 21 first. Can you explain what you see in front of you?
A. (Johnson) Looks like an information sheet from \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]

National Grid, "Information for Landowners Along Our Transmission Lines."
Q. Thank you.

And would this be handed out to residents along the transmission lines, to your knowledge?
A. (Johnson) I don't really know. I'm not qualified to speak on that particular -So I'd like to read the paragraph, the highlighted paragraph under Trees and Transmission Lines, and then I'll ask you a couple questions about.
"Trees and transmission lines are not compatible. Trees that grow too close to electric transmission lines can conduct electricity and provide a path to ground potentially causing an interruption and other significant consequences. Trees do not have to physically touch an energized power line to be dangerous. Electricity can arc or jump from a power line to nearby vegetation. Electric current flowing through a tree can electrocute anyone in close proximity." Do you agree with this statement?
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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A. (Johnson) In broad, general terms, yes. The main thing is: How close is the tree? What's the voltage of the line, and what are the specific conditions? But in a broad, general sense, if a tree is in extremely close proximity to a line or touching it, can it be a danger? Yes. But that's why we have -there's vegetation management programs and why, in general, you try and keep high-growing trees or shrubs away from the energized conductors.
Q. And is water by nature conductive?
A. (Johnson) It depends on the nature of the water. In certain --
Q. No, is pure water by nature conductive?
A. (Johnson) Pure water?
Q. Yes.
A. (Johnson) No. Actually, it's used as an insulator for high-voltage equipment in certain pulse-power applications.
Q. So, what makes water conductive?
A. (Johnson) Generally, different elements or constituents within the water.
Q. Are you familiar with the self-weathering steel rust patina and the alleged contaminants that \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
will be leaching off the towers with runoff?
A. (Johnson) In general I know about self-weathering steel, yes.
Q. Are you aware that the runoff would contain oxidized iron?
A. (Johnson) This probably would be true to some extent with any iron or steel that's in the area. Plus, there's certain levels of iron, iron oxide, in soil and water generally.
Q. And if that were to get into the nearby wetlands, water bodies, would that typically make those more conductive to electricity?
A. (Johnson) I can't speak specifically for what levels there would be in the water bodies.
Q. If the right levels got into the water bodies, is there a potential for that to create a conductive surface to the water -- or conductive surface to the water?
A. (Johnson) It's outside my expertise. I'd have to know the exact level of conductivity and other questions.
Q. So now I'm going to go back to Exhibit 50. Page 6.
A. (Johnson) Pardon? You said six?
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
Q. Page 6, Underground Pipes, Telephone Cables and Electric Cables. I'm going to read a couple comments to you and ask if you agree with them.
"Heights and cables should not be installed closer than 50 feet to a BPA tower, any associated guy wires or grounding system."

Do you believe there's a standard outside Of BPAs -- is this the standard -- do you agree with this, and is this a standard precaution?
A. (Johnson) I think this may be -- I can't speak to a general level. But 50 feet, there could be situations where it could be closer. I think it would probably depend on the tower. This may be a statement -- I'm simply supposing that a statement by BPA ensures they're satisfied with it.
Q. So, then it states that "an unusual condition might cause electricity to arc from the high-voltage wire to the tower and then to the ground. This could produce a dangerous voltage on underground piping or cable system."

Do you agree, in the right conditions, this can, in fact, happen?
A. (Johnson) It states that "under unusual
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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conditions it might cause..." That's a fairly general statement. And yes, under unusual conditions there could be circumstances where it could occur.
Q. And would -- could the inverse of this be true as well? Should towers and guy wires not be installed closer than a certain distance to the pipes and cables? For instance, like the new MVRP going in, should there be a precaution that the towers and guy wires not be installed closer than a certain distance -- they're using 50 -- but a certain distance from the pipes and cables?
A. (Johnson) Well, this talks about BPAs conditions and requirements.
Q. Hmm-hmm. Do you believe that they're standard, or do you believe that they're just BPAs?
A. (Johnson) I wouldn't characterize them as "standard." I think this, again, a general way for BPA of causing people to have a heads-up and take a look at the situation.
Q. Except you referred to me this guide when $I$ asked you if there was anything that needed to be done specifically, if there were any
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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restrictions, and you referred me to this guide as a guide.
A. (Johnson) I referred you to this guide?
Q. You did refer me to this guide in discovery requests. Or one of you did.

Dr. Johnson, you referred me to this guide when I asked you if there was anything special or any precautions within living near the high-voltage transmission lines, and you referred me to this document.
A. (Johnson) If you followed the general guidelines in this document, you should be more than fine.
Q. Why did you refer me to BPA's document? Does PSNH and NEP not have their own?
A. (Johnson) More than likely they do. I can't speak specifically to that.
Q. So you picked this one out, though. And why did you --
A. (Johnson) I have worked with some of the people at BPA, and I know some of the people who put it together.
Q. So if you referred it to me, would you actually believe that these would be appropriate \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]

|  |  | 79 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | restrictions? |
| 2 | A. | (Johnson) They're appropriate, general |
| 3 |  | statements. If you follow them, you will be |
| 4 |  | more than safe. |
| 5 | 2. | Thank you. |
| 6 |  | If you could turn to Page 7 under |
| 7 |  | Buildings. This indicates that outside of |
| 8 |  | BPA's right-of-way -- again, because they |
| 9 |  | prohibit, just like the Applicants, buildings |
| 10 |  | within a right-of-way. "Buildings located off |
| 11 |  | BPA's right-of-way may collect an induced |
| 12 |  | voltage." And it does talk about how to ground |
| 13 |  | it. |
| 14 |  | But do you agree that in certain |
| 15 |  | situations, that a building that abuts the |
| 16 |  | right-of-way, if the right conditions were not |
| 17 |  | followed, that they could -- the building |
| 18 |  | could, in fact, collect an induced voltage? |
| 19 | A. | (Johnson) If it was not properly grounded. And |
| 20 |  | under the right conditions, it could have a |
| 21 |  | capacitively coupled voltage to it, yes. |
| 22 | Q. | On Page 8, under Fires, "Smoke and hot gases |
| 23 |  | from a large fire can create a conductive path |
| 24 |  | for electricity." Under the right conditions, |
|  |  | \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\} |

[BAILEY/JOHNSON]

|  |  | 80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | is this accurate? |
| 2 | A. | (Johnson) Under the right conditions, yes. |
| 3 | Q. | And would a campfire or bonfire on land |
| 4 |  | abutting the ROW be close enough -- the |
| 5 |  | right-of-way be close enough for the |
| 6 |  | electricity to arc from the wire to it? |
| 7 | A. | (Johnson) Again, it depends on specific |
| 8 |  | conditions, the size of the fire. A general |
| 9 |  | campfire, bonfire, that would be, I would say, |
| 10 |  | extremely unlikely. It's still, to be on the |
| 11 |  | ultra safe side, not a good idea. |
| 12 | Q. | So I'm going to spare you the rest of the |
| 13 |  | details of the exhibit. But would you agree |
| 14 |  | there are additional objects and activities |
| 15 |  | that pose a risk of electric shock if the |
| 16 |  | proper safety procedures are not followed? |
| 17 | A. | (Johnson) If the line is not designed properly |
| 18 |  | and general safe practices are not followed. |
| 19 | Q. | Even with the line designed properly, are there |
| 20 |  | still conditions that a person can come in |
| 21 |  | contact with it, such as directly touching it, |
| 22 |  | climbing a pole, that they could sustain an |
| 23 |  | electric shock, experience electric shock? |
| 24 | A. | (Johnson) If a person climbs the pole, puts up |
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a ladder to touch the conductor and contacts the conductor, yes, definitely there would be the chance of electric shock.
Q. And do you believe it's very important to communicate this to abutters and people that might walk by these poles?
A. (Johnson) I would -- some communication, some common sense. I would say climbing a tower that has a high voltage warning sign on it is communication. Putting a ladder up to the conductor, where it's not your conductor, I would say is not a good idea.
Q. Do you believe a sign, as in Exhibit 24, should be on all high-voltage transmission lines -- or all towers and poles?
A. (Johnson) That would have to be a personal opinion. And in terms of electrical engineering, it's probably outside of my purview.
Q. Okay. Dr. Bailey, you've indicated in your prefiled testimony that an electric field will induce oscillating charges on the surface of a conducting body that has been exposed to these fields. Is it correct that these oscillating
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
charges on the surface of a conducting body can induce current inside the body?
A. (Bailey) Yes.
Q. And will the presence of alternating magnetic field cause weak magnetic fields and currents to flow into the body by induction?
A. (Bailey) Yes.
Q. And is it correct, then, that these AC electric fields and currents at a high enough level may result in stimulation of excitable tissues, such as nerves and muscles?
A. (Bailey) Yes, as a practical consequence.

However, we don't have sources in our everyday environment where we could possibly achieve those exposures. And even workers in the electric utility industry would not, except under very unusual circumstances, encounter fields high enough to produce that stimulation of nerves and muscles.
Q. Really? I'd like to refer you to Exhibit 22. Are you familiar with the research of Charles Dalziel's on the human body's reaction to current?
A. (Bailey) I am.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
Q. Are you familiar with the standard chart developed from the research of Charles Dalziel used throughout the industry, presenting levels of electric shock and the human body's reaction to the current?
A. (Bailey) I've seen this and other versions of this chart in different places.
Q. So there are a few different versions. This is a standard chart developed from his work; correct?
A. (Bailey) It's one of the charts that is very similar to others I've seen.
Q. Okay. And according to the chart, what level of electric shock would excitable tissue, such as nerves and muscles, be stimulated?
A. (Bailey) In order to have a sensory perception of the field, this table is indicating it would occur in the range of .5 to 3 milliamps.
Q. And how many kilovolts would have -- would a field have to be to experience that level of electric shock?
A. (Bailey) It would depend upon a number of circumstances. And I'll ask Dr. Johnson to continue.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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A. (Johnson) To get to the .5 to 3 milliamps, again, it would depend on the particular individual and how well grounded, and in terms of also the electric field that they're in. For a person, say roughly of my height and build, oh, to get to even .5 milliamps would probably require somewhere in the ranges of 25 to 30 kV .
Q. Dr. Bailey, can you list the rest of the levels of electric shock in this chart, from lower to higher, with the corresponding symptoms and level of current?

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I'm going to ask what the relevance of this chart is. I mean, if we can -- are you suggesting that there's some location within the right-of-way where a person would be experiencing these milliamps?

MS. HUARD: Yeah, I'm actually going to go and -- I was going to try and work with Dr. Bailey to actually make a couple of conversions.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Because we can all read the charts. We can see the \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
symptoms.
MS. HUARD: Okay. So then I'll skip that, then. I was going to actually later refer to the exhibit -- Table 13 and ask him a few questions on it.

MR. IACOPINO: Which exhibit?
MS. HUARD: Later I'll be -- Exhibit 23. But right now I'll continue with some questions with this.

BY MS. HUARD:
Q. Would you agree that, according to Ohm's law, a current equals volts divided by resistance?
A. (Bailey) What you're displaying here in the table is, and what Dr. Johnson just commented on, is that practical relationship from Ohm's law, in terms of relating voltage and current in the body.
Q. Thank you.

That's what I'm trying to determine. So that is the inverse of what I had asked you. I had asked you if you can convert the milliamps to volts. And Ohm's law is actually the inverse; correct?
A. (Bailey) Ohm's law is not the -- simple version \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
of Ohm's law would not give you the proper conversion of the relationship between external field and current in the body. As Dr. Johnson testified, and if you look at the calculated fields under the existing lines and proposed lines, none of these levels of milliamps in the body would be achieved underneath the line.
Q. Okay. So would you agree, on the condition that was high enough that you could conduct these symptoms, would you agree that the resistance varies from person to person?
A. (Bailey) To some extent, yes.
Q. And would the effect of exercise in a person's resistance to an electric current -- I'm sorry.

What is the effect of exercise in a person's resistance on electric current? Would their resistance be higher or lower after exercise?
A. (Bailey) I know of no data on that particular circumstance.
Q. Okay.
A. (Bailey) But the variations in your body resistance under those conditions would be probably small enough so that it would not \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
bring you in any way into a conversion where any of these symptoms could be experienced underneath the proposed line.
Q. Now, given the level of voltage high enough that you could experience electric shock, would two different people experience a different level on this chart?

MR. WALKER: Object. Relevance.
There's been testimony that the project will not reach the levels, and now she's asking if it did reach the levels.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I'll sustain the objection. We already have testimony that it varies from one person to the next.

MS. HUARD: Okay.
BY MS. HUARD:
Q. Well, then I'll go to Table 13, and we'll look at the modeled measurements. And again, these are modeled measurements; correct?

MR. IACOPINO: And just for the record, this is Huard Exhibit 23.

MS. HUARD: Yes, I'm sorry, Exhibit 23.
A. (Bailey) And is that Table 13 --
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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Q. Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. WALKER: It's Page 91.
A. (Bailey) So this is Table 13 that appears on Page 91 of the application, and it's been labeled "Exhibit 23."
Q. Correct. So you have indicated that these are actually modeled measurements; correct?
A. (Bailey) These are calculations of the electric field from the existing lines. And the existing lines plus the proposed line were performed by Dr. Johnson.
Q. So if you have never taken readings, how would you possibly know whether there was an actual level under the power lines that can be high enough for a human being to sustain electric shock?
A. (Bailey) Well, as Dr. Johnson can further explain, the laws of physics are very precise. Our knowledge of the laws of physics is extensive and what allows us to send people to the moon and beyond. And that knowledge of physics is sufficient to be able to provide very accurate calculations of the electric and magnetic fields for given levels of voltage and \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
current flow and distances. And so these should be regarded as quite accurate calculations of those levels. And despite variation in persons and environmental factors, these levels would not be appreciably changed.
Q. Okay. So, would you -- so, the highest modeled calculation on this chart is 6.6 kilovolts; correct?
A. (Bailey) That's what's shown on Table 13.
Q. Yes, I'm sorry. Table 13.

And would agree that 1 kilovolt is equal to 1,000 volts?
A. (Bailey) Correct.
Q. And would you agree that 6 kilovolts is equal to 6,000 volts?
A. (Bailey) 6,600.
Q. I'm sorry. I'm looking at my -- 6, 600. I had done mine as 6 kilovolts.

And would you agree that 1 ampere is equal to 1,000 amperes?
A. (Bailey) I'm sorry. Could you say that again, please?
Q. One ampere is equal to 1,000 milliamperes?
A. (Bailey) One ampere is equal to 1,000
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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milliamperes, yes.
Q. And can you actually use the Ohm's law to convert this field into milliamps?
A. (Bailey) I already stated that that is not possible to use the simple version of Ohm's law to make that conversion.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Can you explain why we should be concerned about this conversion?

MS. HUARD: Well, absolutely, since you asked.

BY MS. HUARD:
Q. Would it concern you to know that a person -or that $I$ do believe that $I$ sustained electric shock while sitting under the high-voltage transmission lines taking a picture and --
A. (Bailey) All I know is that's what you've reported.
Q. That's what I've reported. And what you describe about the fields, that is what $I$ experienced.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I think that what you need to do, Ms. Huard, is phrase these as questions.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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MS. HUARD: I'm trying to do that.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: You'll have an opportunity to testify later in the hearing. MS. HUARD: Well, you asked.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: What I asked was what the reason for the conversion is, which actually --

MS. HUARD: I'm trying to understand how, if I look -- if a person has sustained these symptoms on this chart, I was trying to understand how that 6.6 kilovolts, if it could be converted using Ohm's law -- and he has indicated that it cannot, that it is not that easy.

BY MS. HUARD:
Q. So, Dr. Johnson, in your prefiled testimony, you've also claimed that at peaking load, when conductors are closest to the ground, the electric field within the ROW along the project route is actually 8.6 kilovolts per meter. At what time of day would you expect the transmission lines to be operating at peak loading?
A. (Johnson) That would be a question for the \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
operations people. It generally is just a short period during the overall year.

Also, that 8.6 kV per meter level is assuming that the lines are the closest approach to ground and also with a 5 percent over-voltage on the conductors. So it's a number of conservative assumptions to come up with that 8.6 kV per meter, and it would be present only at mid-span where the conductors are closest to the ground, not along the entire length between poles. And typically only for a few minutes or maybe a few hours per year would be my assumption.
Q. Thank you.

And Dr. Johnson, you claim that the EMF levels calculated for the project are below the normal limits provided by international agencies ICNIRP and ICES; correct?
A. (Johnson) Correct.
Q. Does the government, the United States Government, or the State of New Hampshire, have any standards of their own?
A. (Johnson) Not that I'm aware of for electric and magnetic fields.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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Q. And Dr. Bailey, you claimed in your prefiled testimony that the ICNIRP and ICES have derived basic limits to avoid neurostimulation of tissues at 4.17 kilovolts per meter and 5 kV per meter. Are you aware that many sections in Table 13 in peak calculations exceed those limits?
A. (Bailey) Those values you quoted are not the limits in those guidelines. Those are what are called "reference levels." If you -- if the exposure is measured or calculated to be below that, those limits, those organizations guarantee that you will comply with the basic restrictions. If the level is higher than that, then calculations are required in order to determine whether you complied with the basic restrictions.

If you go to Table 14 on Exhibit 23, it gives the levels of exposure to electric and magnetic fields that would have to be exceeded in order to cause the basic restrictions, which are the limits in these guidelines to be exceeded. And as you can see, these levels of electric field for ICES are 26.8 , .8 kV per
meter; and for the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection, it's 36.4 kV per meter. And so all the values in Table 13, or even that value of 8.6 kV per meter you discussed with Dr. Johnson, are well below the basic restrictions and limits recommended for public exposure.
Q. I'm a little puzzled with that response, because I pulled the prefiled testimony, and it says -- and maybe I'm reading it wrong -- "To identify exposure levels for the general public that would not cause these limits to exceed at 60 hertz, ICNIRP provided reference levels..." And you're saying that --
A. (Bailey) What $I$ say is that reference levels are not the same as the basic restrictions --
Q. Okay.
A. (Bailey) -- and that the underlying limit recommended by these organizations is the basic restriction.
Q. Okay. I have no further questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.
Questions from the Committee?
BY MS. ROBERGE:
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
Q. I just have a question on the models themselves. Who develops models or the model?
A. (Johnson) Are we talking about the modeling for the electric and magnetic fields, audible noise and radar noise?
Q. Yes.
A. (Johnson) That was developed, really, over a number of years by people both at Bonneville Power Administration, different researchers through the country and the world, and also the High-Voltage Transmission Research Facility. The two basic techniques that codified these issues were what's become known as the "BPA Cafe Program" or "Corona Audible Noise Fields" -- and what's the --
A. (Bailey) Field effects.
A. (Johnson) -- "Field Effects." That's right. Corona and field effects, and then the TL Work Station from the Electric Power Research Institute, which was done in collaboration with GE, the High-voltage Transmission Research Center, BPA and different researchers. Those have been the two sort of leading programs that calculate these levels. A lot of the
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
techniques that were developed are in every high-voltage transmission reference book which lists some of the equations.

And again, these were put into computer programs. As they were being developed, you had the basic calculation techniques, essentially going from first principles, physical principles, and then confirming that with actual physical measurements underneath various operating or test transmission lines, where you could easily control the voltage and the geometry.
Q. Would you say they've been updated over time, in terms of have they become more sophisticated?
A. (Johnson) There are various enhancements, I guess you could say, like three-dimensional modeling, or some marginal improvements in that respect. But the basic techniques have stayed the same for a good 50 years or more.
Q. And when you use these models, are they site-specific; meaning, do they take into account conditions at the site or, in this instance, along the corridor? Is there
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
information that's input into the model that's specific to the conditions that would exist as a result of this project?
A. (Johnson) Typically, and in the case of this project, the models are done very conservatively. So there are not, let's say, terrain features put in, because these would typically reduce the electric or magnetic fields or other quantities that they calculate. The assumptions or the situation that is used is flat, wide open terrain without shielding objects. And the lines are, as I said, typically minimum height, closest approach to ground, and with a 5 percent over-voltage in the applied voltage; basically, the highest expected voltage that might occur.
Q. So when you use the term "conservative," you mean that the results of the models are going to be worst case --
A. (Johnson) Yes.
Q. -- the highest level you might expect if you were standing there holding a monitor?
A. (Johnson) That -- yes, that would be a simple way of stating it. Conservative set of
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
assumptions so it would push you toward a worst-case situation. The actual measurements, because of terrain features, the actual line height at the moment you do it, the actual voltage on the line, all would combine to actually more than likely produce a lower field than what's listed for the various comparisons.
Q. And so, maybe going back to that Table 13, you might expect to see lower numbers than what was included in that? Am I understanding that correctly?
A. (Johnson) If you actually went out there in a specific situation and location, yes.
Q. Okay. And you spoke a little bit about the accuracy of the models and testing done. Is there a general understanding of accuracy of those, a generally accepted --
A. (Johnson) Ultimately it comes down to how well do you know the geometry and the voltage situation that you're measuring. And then the next factor that comes in is the general -- if you're comparing them, the measurements, the accuracy of the instrumentation that you're using and the ability of the person in the
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
field to use it. All that being said, the AC electric fields and magnetic fields have been shown to typically be within 5 percent.
Q. From the model results?
A. (Johnson) Measured to model results, if you know everything exactly as it is. There will be some variation, because when you're out there, the conductors will be moving slightly. That will change their height and position slightly; literally, in some cases, how the person holds the meter, how level it is. So, there's small subtleties, but generally a few percent.
Q. Obviously, the inputs to the model, the more accurate in terms of the terrain features and the configuration of the site would also play a role in that as well?
A. (Johnson) Yes. If you go into that level of sophistication where you're trying to model a specific site, then you could start adding things like terrain features, location of nearby buildings and shrubbery. That would tend to reduce the electric fields or their impacts.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
Q. And looking at the report, it looks as though you modeled different configurations along the line, based on certain sections of line; is that correct?
A. (Johnson) Yes. Where there were major changes in either the number of lines that were on that particular section of the corridor or the loading of the lines, where you would expect a noticeable change in the electric or magnetic field either because of the geometry and configuration of the lines or the design or the loading that would be on them.
Q. So the results that are presented are considered sort of worst-case scenario based on the different configurations of the corridor, of the line configurations along the entire line.
A. (Johnson) Yes. In fact, for this one, we provided both peak loading and average loading.
Q. Thank you.

MS. ROBERGE: I don't have any other questions.

BY CMSR. BAILEY:
Q. Good afternoon. In both of your testimonies,
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
you say that you've published scientific papers. Were those papers peer-reviewed?
A. (Bailey) Yes. Papers published in scientific journals are peer-reviewed. And in addition, we both have published technical reports that are peer-reviewed by organizations that have commissioned that work.
Q. Have your papers been published by IEEE, any of them?
A. (Johnson) Yes.
A. (Bailey) Yes.
Q. Could you tell me, in general terms, what the risk to a police officer, for example, standing in a right-of-way, perhaps under an energized transmission line in a road that's at the correct height, for the day directing traffic? Is there a risk to that police officer?
A. (Bailey) I think Dr. Johnson has already indicated that for a short-term period of time there is some very, very weak induction of fields and currents in the body. But they're so far below the thresholds for any kind of effect or stimulation, they would be imperceptible, in the same way that if you're
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
near appliances in your home. Those fields are imperceptible to you.

I think your question seems to be getting more about the length of time that the officer might be standing underneath the line in a particular location. And that gets to the question about potential effects of long-term exposure. As we pointed out in the testimony, the guidelines, our ceiling limits that is not to be exceeded, and that unlimited exposures times below those ceiling limits are permitted. And I would also point out, if you go to the section on our assessment of research, that despite the fact that we have been studying human populations and people and experimental conditions, and animals in experimental conditions, we have not identified that chronic exposure to electric and magnetic fields is a cause of any adverse effects on health. And this is a conclusion of the World Health Organization and other agencies that have reviewed this research.
Q. So the risk to a police officer standing under
a high-voltage transmission line directing
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
traffic for the day is very small on health. Small to none. You don't have any evidence that there are any --
A. (Bailey) In terms of direct interaction of the field with the body of the officer, I don't think that there's scientific evidence that would indicate that there, in fact, is a risk. In order to have a risk, you have to have a hazard. So you have to know that, for a particular condition, that something awful or harmful could happen. Having done 40 years of research on this, we haven't determined that these exposures, in fact, do have a health effect. Just because you can measure something and you can measure that exposure in the human body doesn't necessarily mean that effect is harmful. So we have the light here in this room as an electric magnetic field. And as we turn or eyes towards that light, we have a biological response to it, and the size of the pupil diminishes in size. That's a biological response to an electromagnetic field. And we can measure tiny, tiny currents. But when we go to look to see is that a level of exposure
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| 1 |  | sufficient to cause harmful effects, we don't |
| 2 |  | find in any of our community environments or |
| 3 |  | even occupational environments, so long as you |
| 4 |  | comply with these standards, any effects, |
| 5 |  | including the types of effects that Ms. Huard |
| 6 |  | discussed, in terms of neuro and muscular |
| 7 |  | stimulation. |
| 8 | 2. | Are there other biological -- and maybe you're |
| 9 |  | not qualified to answer this, but I'll ask you |
| 10 |  | anyway. |
| 11 |  | Are there other biological explanations |
| 12 |  | for tingling sensations in the body or muscle |
| 13 |  | contractions other than electric shock? |
| 14 | A. | (Bailey) Well, I'm not a physician, but we all |
| 15 |  | know that one can have tingling in the body and |
| 16 |  | a variety of sensations and perceptions without |
| 17 |  | any electrical source being nearby. And I'll |
| 18 |  | just leave it at that. |
| 19 | Q. | Thank you. |
| 20 |  | Yesterday we heard a member of the public |
| 21 |  | state that she observed blue sparks near the |
| 22 |  | power lines, the existing power lines. Do you |
| 23 |  | know anything about "blue sparks"? |
| 24 | A. | (Johnson) Okay. Assuming that there's no |

\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
objects or something else coming close to the conductors, with that amount of information, the best $I$ could guess at is at nighttime, under certain conditions, and with the 345 kV lines or if it was a higher line --
Q. A higher voltage line?
A. A higher voltage line, even 345, and depending on the size of the conductor, what might be being referred to is "corona discharge" on the line, because the small electrical discharge at the surface of the conductors. Because of the size of the conductor, contamination on the conductor can produce an extremely high electric field right at the surface, sufficient to cause like a little blue glow or spark. Other references that people might have heard of is like "St. Elmo's Fire," if it's like sort of an ancient history text. But it's -- again, in that case, it was reported, like in cemeteries, on the iron fences where they had very high points on the fences or on steeples on some buildings, again, with the very sharp points, the atmospheric electric field would get sufficiently high that it would
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
cause it to go into corona and get a blue glow. Typically it would be maybe a blue glow. It's very difficult to see under, but it would have to be under very dark conditions, with the eyes well adapted to the darkness. And that's the only thing I can think of that might come close to "blue sparks" that would be likely.
Q. And in your example of "St. Elmo's Fire," if somebody touched it with their fingers, would they get a shock?
A. (Johnson) Well, you're not going to be close enough, hopefully, that you would be touching it, because that would be the energized conductor. But in the -- like the more common references, like in electric fencing with the sharp points, actually, the sheer presence of your body would modify the electric field enough that it would probably drop out of corona and it would disappear.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Question for each of you concerning just the health aspects. Would you have any concerns or reservations if you or your loved ones resided \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
at the edge of the right-of-way?
A. (Bailey) Well, I think I'll answer that from a personal perspective.

As you can tell from my gray hair, I've been around for a long time. And when my wife and I moved out of New York City, we bought a home a baseball's throw away from the largest high-voltage transmission line corridor in the New York area that brings most of the electricity coming in from Canada into New York City. And I did not have -- I've been working in this area for some time, and I did not have concerns for my health or that of our children as they developed there.
A. (Johnson) Similar type of response. Our house isn't adjacent to a corridor, but I've worked at the High-voltage Transmission Research Center. And our house, there's probably a 345 kV line that goes, oh, maybe a quarter-mile, half-mile away. I know if we go hiking back into the woods, we go onto the corridor.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And then concerning the radio noise, does radio noise have any effect for homes at the
[BAILEY/JOHNSON]
edge of the right-of-way concerning devices within the home? Does it make the garage door go up and down, someone's pacemaker -- you know, that sort of thing?
A. (Johnson) The easiest answer is, if everything is working properly, no, there should be no effect. The radio noise for the AC lines is typically limited to foul weather. When you have a lot of raindrops on the conductor, you'll have more corona because of that. But even with that being said, the levels of radio noise will drop off as you go away from the conductors. The line has been designed according to the radio noise guidelines that were put together back in the '70s by IEEE and have been a good reference source. And they will also tend to drop off as you go up in frequency.

As far as any appliances in or around the home, I would not expect any problems with that, because the levels are similar to what would be -- well, typically what's there, just from atmospheric conditions and fair weather, by the time you're a few hundred feet away from
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
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| 1 | the line, even on the edges of the corridor, |
| 2 | they're very similar to what's already existing |
| 3 | along the corridors with the lines that are |
| 4 | there. So I would not expect anything |
| 5 | different than what's already there. And in |
| 6 | foul weather, the atmospheric conditions |
| 7 | typically will mask and are higher than what |
| 8 | the typical radio noise levels produced by the |
| 9 | lines are. |
| 10 | PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Any other |
| 11 | questions from the Committee? |
| 12 | [No verbal response] |
| 13 | PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Does the |
| 14 | Applicant wish to have any redirect? |
| 15 | MR. WALKER: No questions, Madam. |
| 16 | PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: In that |
| 17 | case, these witnesses are excused. I think we |
| 18 | will take a 15-minute break. So if we can come |
| 19 | back at ten after four, and then $I$ think we |
| 20 | have our final witness, Ms. Huard. |
| 21 | MR. NEEDLEMAN: Unless you want to |
| 22 | take five minutes to bring Mr. Plante back up |
| 23 | to answer Ms. Whitaker's question. |
| 24 | PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Oh, let's |
|  | \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\} |

take our break, and then we may do that right before we begin Ms. Huard after the break.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay.
(Whereupon a brief recess taken at 3:55 p.m. and the hearing resumed at 4:09 p.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right. We will go back on the record.
(WHEREUPON, DAVID PLANTE, who was previously duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter, returns to the witness table.)

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: We had some questions about the guy wire supports on the pole next to the brook. I forgot the name of the brook now.

MS. WHITAKER: Howard Brook.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: So if possible, let's do that now. And I think, Rachel, you were asking the question.

MS. WHITAKER: Want me to reask the question?

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Yes.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

## [PLANTE]
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BY MS. WHITAKER:
Q. So $I$ was curious about the anchoring system for those guy wires. I believe it was a triple-tower setup, and the guy wires looked like they were going to be in the Riparian zone. I was just curious about what the setup was for that anchoring system within that Riparian zone.
A. Okay. I can address that. Typically for guy anchoring in areas adjacent to wetlands, we choose the screw anchor method for anchoring. However, in this particular case, our Subsurface Exploration Program has identified that bedrock is fairly close to the surface, making use of a screw anchor not a good choice, as they require some significant depth. So, in the case of bedrock near the surface, we have opted to go with what we call a "rock anchor system," which consists of a steel rod with a nut on the end of it embedded in a hole that is cored into the ledge, into the bedrock. So it will be approximately at a 45-degree angle into the bedrock. The rod with the anchor nut on the end of it is inserted. And there's a
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

## [PLANTE]

spacer system that's also asserted to keep the rod centered in the hole. And then it is pressure-grouted with a high-performance, non-shrink grout, which is a cementitious mixture similar to concrete. Then it hardens, and we'll put a load test on it to make sure that it's sufficiently anchored into the bedrock before we actually load it with a guy anchor -- I mean with a guy wire.
Q. Once that anchor is in place, will vegetation be allowed to grow back around that anchor, or will it continue to be cleared for maintenance of that anchor?
A. Vegetation will -- appropriate vegetation will be allowed to grow. We tend to not like to have large brush and shrubs growing up around the anchors and guy wires, just for a variety of reasons. But, you know, low-growing things like junipers and grass, hay, that kind of stuff is perfectly acceptable.

MS. WHITAKER: Thank you very much.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I just have one question. How far below the surface is the bedrock there?
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

## [PLANTE]
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| 1 | WITNESS PLANTE: About five feet. |
| 2 | PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Any other |
| 3 | questions from the Committee? |
| 4 | [No verbal response] |
| 5 | PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. Thank |
| 6 | you. Any other questions -- I'm sorry. I |
| 7 | should probably ask the parties. |
| 8 | Questions from other parties? |
| 9 | MR. ASLIN: None for me, thank you. |
| 10 | MS. HUARD: None. |
| 1 | PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. Thank |
| 12 | you very much. |
| 13 | With that, I think Ms. Huard is |
| 4 | our final witness. |
| 15 | (Huard Exhibit Huard 52 marked for |
| 16 | identification.) |
| 17 |  |
| 18 | (WHEREUPON, MARGARET HUARD was duly sworn |
| 19 | and cautioned by the Court Reporter.) |
| 20 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 21 | BY MR. IACOPINO: |
| 22 | Q. Please tell us your full name and address. |
| 23 | A. Margaret Huard, 13 David Drive. |
| 24 | Q. And before you on the table is what's been |
|  | \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\} |

marked as Huard Exhibit 52. Do you see that document?
A. I do see it.
Q. And do you recognize that to be your prefiled testimony in this case?
A. I do.
Q. And is that prefiled testimony been amended by you?
A. Yes, it has.
Q. Please explain where the amendments are within that testimony.
A. Amended Page 5, under the question, "Have you ever questioned the safety of living, walking or commuting in such close proximity to high-voltage transmission lines?"

I amended the paragraph that starts with, "In January 2016," to expand my symptoms, where I had merely stated in my original one, that I had thought I had gone into cardiac arrest. In the amended one, I expand on the symptoms and discuss the symptoms I had.
Q. Please read the amended answer to us.
A. Sure .
Q. Slowly.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
A. The amended one. "In January, 2016, while taking pictures of a sign on a steel lattice tower for these docket proceedings, I experienced simultaneous symptoms that often precede cardiac arrest: Chest pain, leg pain, shortness of breath, dizziness and heart palpitations. According to standard charts on effect of electric currents on a human body, these symptoms are also standard signs of having come in contact with an electric current. I was in my car directly under transmission wires on the side of the road. There was no warning not to engage in this sort of activity. There are also numerous pictures taken near and around high-voltage transmission lines included with the Application, so I never would have thought that there would have been any danger."
Q. Are there any other amendments to your testimony?
A. Wherever that has been referenced... let me look for a minute. I believe that carries over somewhere else, but $I$ can't quite find it. It's only relating to that. So, no, I would
[HUARD]

[HUARD]

|  | 117 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | through everything. |
| 2 | A. | Sure . |
| 3 | Q. | So I'm going to ask you to turn your attention |
| 4 |  | to Page 12 of that transcript to start. And |
| 5 |  | I'm looking specifically beginning at Line 16. |
| 6 |  | Are you there? |
| 7 | A. | Yeah. |
| 8 | Q. | And when we had our technical session, I asked |
| 9 |  | you if you had any formal education, experience |
| 0 |  | or professional training in a series of |
| 1 |  | disciplines that related to your prefiled |
| 2 |  | testimony. Do you remember that? |
| 13 | A. | I do recall that. |
| 4 | Q. | And those questions run from Page 12 over to |
| 5 |  | Page 16 of this transcript. And what I was |
| 6 |  | hoping to do is just to get it on the record |
| 7 |  | today without going through every question. |
| 8 |  | But let me start by asking you, do you |
| 9 |  | have any formal training, any professional |
| 20 |  | training or experience in medicine? |
| 21 | A. | As I had indicated to you, my education in |
| 22 |  | medicine is limited to first aid. I was |
| 23 |  | previously licensed -- sorry -- certified in |
| 4 |  | CPR and basic first-aid training. I was a cub |
|  |  | \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\} |

scout leader, and I had to undergo training for first aid.
Q. And other than that, any other training in medicine?
A. Actually, I'm naturalist, and I refer to resources on a regular basis. And while I do go to a primary-care professional, I do actually -- I am in tune with how my body works, so I do treat myself naturally.
Q. Same question for electrical engineering.
A. Again, as I stated that day, my education is limited to self-education in many of these areas. So I'll just make a general comment, and I had made it that day. I'm a licensed certified public accountant. And as part of my training, I'm trained to study every single industry to gain knowledge sufficient enough to perform an engagement. So, to the level that $I$ am not licensed or degreed to work in that profession, I am trained to understand through self-education, through resources, and weigh the hierarchy of what I'm reading.

So, with direct reference to electrical
engineering, aside from the courses I've had in
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
high school, physics back then, it would have to be limited to the resources that I referred to, to get ready to ask questions for this docket.
Q. All right. What I'm going to do now is read a list of the remainder of those areas and ask you if the answer to every one of those is the same. If it's not, you can identify the particular one where it's not.
A. Sure.
Q. So the other areas I asked you about are on pages through Page 16 of the transcript are: Civil engineering, sound studies and sound analysis, wetlands science, forestry, wildlife biology, plant biology, real estate appraisal and property values, aesthetics analysis, properties of electric and magnetic fields, climate science, air-quality analysis and hydrogeology. And your answers were all the same with respect to those; is that right?
A. I would have to say -- I just want to emphasize something. It probably didn't come up in the discovery. With respect to real estate analysis, $I$ do believe that is a direct
[HUARD]
relationship to the knowledge I have as a CPA. That's an analysis that $I$ would do as a CPA, so I do believe I'm qualified to do that.

And as far as the environment and erosion, there are some badges that $I$ worked on with cub scouts that gave me basic knowledge to some of the environments and erosion areas.
Q. You purchased your home in 2001; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you are not a direct abutter to the corridor at issue here; is that correct?
A. I am not a direct abutter. That is correct.
Q. How many lots are between the corridor and your home?
A. Between the corridor and my home? Well, there's the direct abutter, the home, and then there's two small duplexes.
Q. So you are the fourth lot removed from the corridor.
A. I am the fourth lot removed from the corridor.
Q. At the time you purchased your home in 2001, the transmission corridor was present; is that right?
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
A. It was present, yes.
Q. And at the time you purchased your home in 2001, there were transmission lines in that corridor; is that correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. You indicated in your prefiled testimony that at the time you purchased your home, you could see transmission lines; isn't that correct?
A. I could see a pole, but I couldn't tell you every single transmission line that was in there because I didn't become aware of them until a few years ago, like fully aware of them. I know they were there, and I know when we bought the house you could see the top of a pole, and you could see another pole from my back yard. And then I had told you that in '13 they had moved a pole out closer to the road, and $I$ began to gain visibility of that from my front yard. But I couldn't tell you the makeup of the lines that were in there and when they came in.
Q. Without specifically describing makeup of the lines, you were aware that there were transmission lines --
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
A. Yes, there were --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. You were aware that there were transmission lines present in that corridor.
A. Yes. Correct.
Q. Could you turn to your prefiled testimony, please.
A. What page?
Q. I'm going to ask you questions about your amended testimony, so it would be amended Page 5.
A. Does amended Page 5 fall into the confidential?
Q. No, not yet.
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. On amended Page 5 -- and I'm going to take you to the very last part of that -- there are two paragraphs at the end. It's not numbered Page 6, but the two paragraphs at the end of the amendment. The first one begins, "In the past few years..." Do you see where I am?
A. Yes, I do.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And is the Committee following me, "In the past few years..."?
A. On the second page of the amended Page 5, \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
second page.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Right. So you have two paragraphs here where you describe supposed health and other impacts that you believe people in your neighborhood experienced with respect to the power lines; is that correct?
A. The paragraph where it claims that my neighbor had died -- a 14-year-old girl and 50-year-old man seemingly died from effects living and walking near high-voltage transmission lines? Is that the one you're referring to?
Q. That's the one.
A. Thank you.
Q. Second from the end.

And in this proceeding, we gave you a variety of data requests. And Data Request No. 5 asked you to produce all the documents that you possessed with respect to these incidents. Do you recall that?
A. I do recall that.
Q. And you provided certain documents to us. You remember that?
A. I do recall that.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
Q. And those are Applicants Exhibit No. 30. And do you recall what documents you provided to us?
A. Off the top of my head, I recall providing the obituaries for the three of -- I don't recall exactly. I recall providing obituaries, whether it was for three of them -- I think it was for the three of them. There was a fire log for Ms. Bergeron, showing that she had sustained or suffered from cardiac arrest. There was map locations of where their residences were and where Ms. Bergeron parked her bus under the high-voltage transmission line overnight. And I don't recall the rest of them, if there were any others.
Q. That was it. And do you recall that I asked you in the technical session whether these were all the documents you possessed with respect to these incidents?
A. I do recall that.
Q. And what was the answer to that question?
A. That was all I possessed.
Q. And have you ever seen any medical records associated with any of these incidents?
[HUARD]
A. No, I have not.
Q. Have you ever seen any opinions from any medical professionals associated with these incidents?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Have you ever seen any opinions from non-medical professionals associated with these incidents?
A. Well, $I$ guess aside from the evaluation in the fire log that she sustained -- or she experienced cardiac arrest, that would be the only opinion $I$ would have seen.
Q. Okay. And did that evaluation in any way link what that neighbor experienced to the presence of the transmission lines?
A. It could because cardiac arrest is a symptom of electric shock. And if you tie it to the fact that she parked her bus under the power lines overnight, it ties it somewhat. It's distant, but it ties it.
Q. I'm handing you a copy of Exhibit 30. Those are the documents you produced to us.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And I'll ask you to look at that fire log and \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
tell me if you see anything in there that links that incident to the transmission lines.
A. Well, it's a very -- you know, it's not a direct inference. But there is an indirect inference if you take the rest of the evidence and you understand that she's parked her bus under the power lines on the side of the road overnight and that cardiac arrest is a symptom of electric shock. It is an indirect inference, but not direct.
Q. On Page 30 of the transcript from the technical session, at Line 2 , 1 quoted what you said here, where, "all seemingly died from the effects of living and walking near HVTLs." And then I asked you, "Aside from the documents you've provided to us, do you have any other evidence to support that statement?"

And you said, "I don't. Just what I provided you." Is that still true today?
A. I just told you it was.
Q. Okay. Now, if you could go back to the first amended Page 5 of your testimony, the third paragraph down begins, "In 2009/2010..." do you see that?
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And that describes an alleged incident that you experienced in that time period while walking with an umbrella; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And then the next paragraph begins, "In 2012/2013..." and that also describes another incident that you allegedly experienced near the power lines; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Just taking those two incidents together, we asked you in Data Request No. 4 for all the documents that you possessed related to those incidents. Do you recall that?
A. I do recall that.
Q. And what was your answer to that question?
A. I do not have anything.
Q. You don't have any documents.
A. I do not.
Q. And then during the technical session I asked you whether there are any medical records associated with this incident. And what was the answer to that?
A. There are no medical records associated with \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
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| 1 |  | these incidents. |
| 2 | 2. | Are there any fire department call logs? |
| 3 | A. | No, there are not. |
| 4 | Q. | Are there any non-medical expert opinions other |
| 5 |  | than yours? |
| 6 | A. | Not other than mine. |
| 7 | Q. | Did you keep any personal notes from that time |
| 8 |  | period that would have recorded these |
| 9 |  | incidents? |
| 10 | A. | No, I did not. |
| 11 | Q. | Are there any requests to state or federal |
| 12 |  | regulators to review these incidents? |
| 13 | A. | No, there are not. |
| 14 | Q . | So there are absolutely no records at all of |
| 15 |  | these incidents other than what you have said |
| 16 |  | here; is that correct? |
| 17 | A. | Unfortunately, no, because I did not understand |
| 18 |  | what was happening back then. |
| 19 | Q. | Now let's turn to the January 2016 incident, |
| 20 |  | which is referred to at the bottom of your |
| 21 |  | amended testimony. And this is the incident |
| 22 |  | that we've already heard something about, where |
| 23 |  | you indicated that you believe you experienced |
| 24 |  | Some type of shock event while sitting in a car |
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[HUARD]
under the power lines; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And we also asked you for any documents that you might possess related to this in Data Request No. 4. Do you recall that?
A. I do recall that.
Q. You did provide us with some documents; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And what documents did you provide us with?
A. I provided you with a fire log that -- a billing log from the fire department that showed readings of vitals and a description of what -- my description of what had happened. And I also provided you with a series of research materials to support my feeling and allegations that these had been from electric shock.
Q. So you provided us some pictures. Do you recall that?
A. I do recall that. I provided you pictures of -- the picture I presented today of the sign on the power line and the poles, and I also provided you a map of the location.
[HUARD]
Q. And you provided a table that showed the effects of shock on the human body?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Is that the document we looked at earlier today?
A. It is, yes.
Q. And then you provided that fire department call log, which is a confidential document; is that right?
A. Yes, I would believe so, 'cause that is confidential.
Q. So, am I correct, then, that those are all the documents that you possess in connection with this incident?
A. Aside form the disputed e-mails, yes, that's it.
Q. Okay. Well, we'll come back to those in a little while.

So I asked you about these in the technical session as well, beginning on Page 53. Do you recall that?
A. Page 53 of the technical session?
Q. That's right.
(Witness reviews document.)
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
A. Yes, I recall that.
Q. And you confirmed for me at the time that these were all the records --
A. I did. I also say that they were the highest hierarchy of the -- talking about the research. I have other research materials. But I picked -- rather than give you the volumes of research material, I gave you the highest hierarchy. I didn't think you wanted the blogs that I read and all of that. So I gave you the highest hierarchy with the most credibility.
Q. And we went back and forth, but in the end, at the top of Page 54, we got to an endpoint, and I said to you, "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. That's correct.
Q. And your answer was, "There will be no other medical records introduced into this docket."
A. That is correct.
Q. And then I asked you if you had any opinions from any medical experts that support the assertions regarding the 2016 incident, and you \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
said you didn't. Is that still correct?
A. I have no other medical records that support my assertion. That is correct.
Q. I'm handing you a copy of Applicants' Exhibit 28.
A. Well, why would I give this to you if you already have it?
Q. You didn't give it to us.
A. Okay. I thought you -- okay.
Q. No. It's our exhibit.

Have you seen this document before?
A. I have.
Q. This is a March 21st, 2016, letter from National Grid to Randy Knepper at the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission; is that correct?
A. That is correct.

MS. HUARD: I'm going to object to using this or -- to using this exhibit. This exhibit is merely hearsay. Randy Knepper is not here to be cross-examined.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Randy Knepper doesn't need to here and cross-examined. This is a report submitted by National Grid to the New \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]

Hampshire Public Utilities Commission that is the result of an investigation into the alleged shock incident that Ms. Huard experienced on January 16th. It's a public record at the Public Utilities Commission.
(Committee members reviewing document.)
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: While we're waiting, just a question. Was this document submitted at some point earlier in this docket as part of the discovery process?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Do you recall?
MS. HUARD: No, it was not.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Ms. Huard received
it. It was sent to the Public Utilities Commission.

MS. HUARD: Oh, that's right.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: So Ms. Huard has seen it, then.

MS. HUARD: I have. Yes, that's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. I was just curious.

MS. HUARD: But it did not come to me
as part of the docket. It was given to me by
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]

Attorney Rielly.
(Pause in proceedings)
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sorry. We're waiting for you.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I'm sorry. So you objected. I apologize. I didn't hear your objection. You need to be closer to the mic.

MS. HUARD: I'm sorry. I objected on the basis that $I$ feel it's hearsay. Mr. Knepper's not here to cross-examine. And I would like an opportunity to cross-examine him.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Well, this is not Mr. Knepper's document. This is addressed to him --

MS. HUARD: To Mr. Knepper. But I would like the opportunity to cross-examine the author of this. I have never had the opportunity to ask questions about this, and I don't agree with the whole process as it's written here. I met -- Mr. Knepper came to my property. And none of that's noted. And there's other parts of the process that are not
[HUARD]
noted. So I would have liked to have the opportunity to cross-examine the author of this report.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, first of all, if I may, one of the principal features in this report are analyses by Exponent. And you just had the opportunity to question Exponent sitting here, and you didn't take advantage of that.

Second of all, it is a public document that's been filed with the Public Utilities Commission, and it's related directly to the allegations that you've made in this docket. So it's certainly relevant.

And third, the test of whether or not it's relevant and probative is not whether you have an opportunity to cross-examine here. I think a lot of documents have been introduced in this docket where people did not have the opportunity to cross-examine. So I think we're entitled to introduce this and ask questions about it.

MS. HUARD: The documents I produced
were all fact-based. This is opinion-based.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]

[HUARD]
going to be my next question --
MS. HUARD: Well, how can I --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: So when you received this, did you ask any questions about it?

MS. HUARD: I did not ask any questions about it. No, I did not.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. Well, in my opinion --

MS. HUARD: I don't have the liberty to just call Mr. Aronson. I did write a letter -- this is from National Grid. I have never met Chris Aronson. He's not one of the attorneys that have been present, so he's not part of the party list. I don't have his e-mail address. So, no, I never contacted him.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: SO I think what $I$ will rule right now is that it appears to be very relevant as it relates to your concerns about the incident on January 16th [sic]. And it is an evaluation of that particular location, so it's certainly relevant.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]

MS. HUARD: Okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And my only concern is whether or not you had sufficient notice of its existence and an opportunity to explore what it means. So, you received it around March 21st, and you received the report, I would assume, at that time, with all of the readings that were taken.

MS. HUARD: Yes, I did. The whole thing came together.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And since that time, have there been tech sessions or other meetings in this docket?

MS. HUARD: Concerning this document?
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: No, just tech sessions or meetings in this docket.

MS. HUARD: Not with Mr. Aronson present.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: That wasn't my question. My question is: Were there any technical sessions or meetings --

MS. HUARD: Yes, there were.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And so at any one of those you could have asked for \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
information about this report; correct?
MS. HUARD: The appropriate party wasn't there to ask questions of.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: The appropriate parties, it would seem, would be the parties preparing the report, who are... what's the name of the group?

MR. IACOPINO: Exponent.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Exponent.
MS. HUARD: I believe, if I'm not mistaken, the technical session probably happened before this. I'd have to check the dates, because I think if I had this in my hand, $I$ would included it in my questions. But I'm not certain. Because I think the technical sessions were the beginning of March, I'm pretty certain. But $I$ don't have a calendar in front of me.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: We're going to check that. Counsel is checking that.

So the report was prepared by
Exponent. And is Exponent present today in the hearing room?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: So, one thing we could do to make sure that Ms. Huard has an opportunity to ask questions would be to ask them to make themselves available for questions on the report today.

MS. HUARD: Is Benjamin Cotts here, the author of this report? The one that took the measurements is not here. So I do not have the opportunity to cross-examine the person that wrote the memorandum for Exponent.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Madam Chair, as I said before, this is a highly relevant document, and the Committee can give it whatever weight it wants once it's had an opportunity to review the document. I think whether or not the author of the document is here to cross-examine is not relevant and at issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Is there a witness here who's aware of the report and its preparation?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: We have our two Exponent witnesses here. I actually don't know to what extent they participated in this or
[HUARD]
could comment on it.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Why don't we take a five-minute break, and I will have -you can confer with your witnesses and see if they have enough knowledge to be able to answer questions from Ms. Huard on the report.

And Ms. Huard, in that time you can read it again slowly, and make a note of any issues you want to question. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Madam Chair, before we break, the technical session of the Applicants' witnesses occurred on March 1 and March 2, 2016. There was a subsequent technical session that involved Ms. Huard; she was the witness at the technical session on May 5th. So her opportunity to ask questions at the tech sessions occurred on March 1 and 2.

MS. HUARD: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: So let's take five minutes and we'll come back.
(Whereupon a brief recess was taken at 4:48 p.m., and the hearing resumed at 4:55 p.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]

We're back on the record. I've decided that this exhibit will be left marked only for identification and will not be admitted as an exhibit. That is the March 21st report. And that way, we won't need to have any questions from Ms. Huard on it.

Was there any further cross-examination that you wish to pursue? Should we bring Ms. Huard back up?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes, I have a couple more questions. And at this point, they all relate to the confidential document.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. In that case, we're going to need to have only people in the room who are able to view the confidential documents. Are there any people who are not --

MS. HUARD: I have given permission to my own to --

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right. Are there any other people who are not one of the parties --

MS. HUARD: I don't know. I see quite a few people that aren't privy to the \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
confidential section. It was supposed to be only admitted attorneys. I see several people that are not admitted attorneys.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't recall how it was defined.

MS. HUARD: I recall that it was admitted attorneys.

MR. IACOPINO: That is what the order said, so...

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: If you would wait in the lobby, we'll come get you as soon as we're finished. Actually, either that or maybe the room next door may be open now because it's late in the day. Sorry to disrupt your sitting area.

MR. IACOPINO: Madam Chair, before we get into that cross-examination, can we get an idea of which exhibits we're talking about that are the confidential ones? Is that -- 26 is a transcript of the confidential section. And what else is confidential? 27?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I'm not sure the Committee has copies of those, but let me
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
[HUARD]
(Pages 145 through 156 of the transcript are contained under separate cover designated as "Confidential and
see. Oh, thank you. Proprietary.")

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]

[HUARD]
(Hearing now resumes in the public portion of the record.)

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: We're just checking schedules with members before we decide what to do.

Ms. Huard, you may go back to your desk.

MS. HUARD: Lots of paper airplanes for my son.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: We're hoping to continue, but we've got one Committee member trying to juggle some child care arrangements. So just give us a few minutes while we wait to see if she can sort that out.
(Pause in proceedings)
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right.
I think we can go in whatever order you want. We can do exhibits first or we can do closings first and then exhibits. I will offer each party up to 10 minutes, and no more than 10 minutes for a closing summary, because we do want to deliberate. So we're not going to be asking you for any memos later after the
transcript is out. Would you like to move exhibits first or close first? It's really up to you all.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Why don't we start with exhibits.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: The only exhibit that I have already ruled on -- I want to make sure $I$ have this right -- is Applicants Exhibit 28, which will not be admitted. The rest of the exhibits, we're open to motions. And if the parties have agreed, that would make it even easier.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, I can start by saying we have no objection to Counsel for the Public Exhibit No. 1.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
Ms. Huard, do you?
MS. HUARD: I do not. I have an objection to Counsel for the Public Exhibit 1? Is that what you're asking?

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Yes.
MS. HUARD: No.
MR. ASLIN: In that case, I would
move for admission of Counsel for Public
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

Exhibit 1.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: That will be granted.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And we would ask for admission of all our remaining exhibits, but for the one you ruled on.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Are there any objections to the remaining exhibits of the Applicants?

MS. HUARD: Could you just summarize? Have I seen all of these exhibits?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Actually, let me clarify one. We didn't use Exhibit 29, so I don't see a need to move that into the record. So, excluding 28 and 29, you should have a list of those exhibits, Ms. Huard, in front of you. They were in a binder, I think.

MS. HUARD: Oh, I gave the binder back to -- I guess the exhibit -- data request responses from Peggy Huard, does that include every single data request, I'm assuming?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No.
MS. HUARD: Could you clarify which
data request you submitted and which exhibit?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. It's 4 and 5, the ones that we used in the cross-examination. MS. HUARD: Okay. Sure, I'm fine with that.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Any objections?

MR. ASLIN: No objection from Counsel for the Public.

MS. HUARD: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. Then Applicants exhibits, with the exception of Exhibits 28 and 29, are admitted.

MR. IACOPINO: We will mark 28 and 29 for I.D.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Yeah. And 27 is a confidential exhibit, so that will be -- will not be available in the public docket.

MR. IACOPINO: Actually, Exhibit 26 should be confidential, as well. I believe that's a confidential section of a transcript; is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Oh, okay. I
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
don't know. We didn't use that.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's correct.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And Ms.
Huard's exhibits, are there any objections to those being admitted?

MR. DUMVILLE: As to Ms. Huard's exhibits, Applicants would object to Exhibits 10, 11 and 14 and 15. Exhibit 10 and 11, those are the Wikipedia articles and the steel construction information provided from an unknown web site. We have no information on the reliability of either of those web sites. Wikipedia alone is inherently unreliable, and there's no corroboration nor any foundation set for either of those web sites. And 14 and 15, we received two different photographs relating to Robinson Pond. There's been no foundation set for those or authentication. They're just two screenshots on the computer with no information provided. And based on that, we'd respectfully request those be not allowed into the evidence.

MS. HUARD: May I comment on that?
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Yes, you
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
may.
MS. HUARD: With respect to 14 , that was more than a screenshot. That was actually a printout of a map from the New Hampshire DES web site. You can see it says "Watershed Land Use Summary," and it gives names and a date of completion. It was 2006 National Land Cover Database for the conterminous, United States, and says, "For larger image, contact New Hampshire DES." So I dispute [sic] the credibility of that document and would like to see that remain and admitted to evidence.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I would agree that the Wikipedia article should not be admitted as a full exhibit.

MS. HUARD: I'm not disputing that right now. I'm strictly disputing this one at the moment.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: To which one are you disputing?

MS. HUARD: Fourteen.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And I agree that 14 should be admitted. The other three do not --
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

MS. HUARD: I'm inclined to accept that. Does the testimony surrounding it go into --

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Of course. And you've already asked the witnesses whether they agree with the information.

MS. HUARD: Right. I'm inclined to accept that.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: So we will not admit Exhibit 10 or 11 or 15. The rest of Ms. Huard's exhibits, there are no objections to; correct?

MR. ASLIN: No objection from Counsel for Public.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: So they will be admitted as full exhibits. So we're excluding 10, 11 and 15.

I think that concludes the
exhibits. Have I missed any, or is there anyone else who's offered any exhibit that we have not moved in yet?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. So, typically, we allow the Applicant to close \{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}
last. And in this case, I would offer either Counsel for the Public or Ms. Huard the opportunity to close first.

All right. Counsel for the Public. Thank you. And please try to stay under 10 minutes.

MR. ASLIN: I can certainly do that. Thank you.

CLOSING STATEMENTS
MR. ASLIN: Members of the Committee, as you know, Counsel for the Public's role in these proceedings, pursuant to RSA 162-H:9 is to represent the public in seeking to protect the quality of the environment and in seeking to assure an adequate supply of energy; so, essentially, a two-part balancing test, to some extent, whereas most of the projects are in favor of a supply of energy and have some environmental impacts. So, it's largely a balancing test.

In this case, we're dealing with a reliability project which has been deemed to be necessary by the system operator, ISO-New England, for an adequate supply of energy and
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reliability of energy in the region. And that certainly weighs in favor of the project under that prong of Counsel for the Public's review. On the other hand, it's weighed against by what environmental impacts and other impacts the project may have. In this case, the environmental impacts are largely mitigated by the siting of the project within an existing right-of-way that has existing transmission facilities already. Testimony we've heard and that was submitted in this docket largely supports that there's a minimal impact to the environment as proposed, assuming that the project is constructed in accordance with all of the permits and conditions thereto.

Probably the largest impact is due to tree clearing. We've heard testimony about the 71 acres of tree clearing that will be part of this project. That tree clearing is within the right-of-way, but it will have some impacts, lesser extent to the environmental aspects, but a significant effect to visibility to abutters. That is a subject of the Public Interest test, which is now formally part of
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the SEC review.
Under Rules $301.16(\mathrm{~b})$, private property is a subset of the Public Interest test and something that is to be reviewed as part of consideration of any project.

In this instance, we've heard testimony that there will be some properties which will have potentially significant impact in terms of visibility, and an impact of perhaps unknown but not insignificant levels, in terms of market value impact to property. Those impacts account for -- are significant for those limited number of properties. However, given the scope of the project and the relatively small number of impacted properties, in terms of visibility and potential market value impacts, the balance of those impacts, looking at the project in the lens of the public at large and the context of a reliability project which is needed for adequate supply of energy and reliability in the region, Counsel for the Public finds that the balance swings in favor of the project in this circumstance.

There are some issues that I would recommend that the Committee consider in terms of conditions to be imposed if the Committee decides to grant a certificate to the project. The first has to do with cost containment.

As we heard, this project is subject to a FERC tariff. And the cost of the project will be at this point borne in part by New Hampshire ratepayers. And those costs -the recovery of those costs from ratepayers is somewhat regardless of what the cost ends up being. Is the cost exceeds the projected costs that have been set forward in the record, the increase in costs will be passed on to ratepayers, barring somewhat extraordinary measures by a third party to seek disapproval, but at the FERC level.

In order to keep the Committee apprised of potential cost overruns, I would recommend that there be a condition that requires a certificate holder to promptly notify the Committee if the certificate holder becomes aware that it will or that there's a
substantial likelihood that it will exceed the projected project costs by an amount greater than 15 percent. That would give the Committee information, and it can choose whether to do something with that information if it ever comes to pass.

With regard to decommissioning, we've heard some testimony about whether this project has an obligation to be decommissioned, and I believe that testimony is it does not currently. The Committee, as you know, granted a waiver of the requirement to submit a decommissioning plan as part of the application. However, there are possible future scenarios where decommissioning could become necessary. To that extent, I would again recommend consideration of a condition that would require the certificate holder to submit a report to the Committee every 10 years indicating any change in the need for the project to ensure the continued reliability of the regional bulk transmission system and that the certificate holder promptly notify the Committee of any retirement obligation that
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arises.
In addition, to the extent that a decommissioning obligation does arise, I recommend the consideration of a condition that requires the certificate holder to submit to the Committee a decommissioning plan in accordance with the then-applicable SEC rules upon any imposition of a decommissioning obligation, or prior to the retirement of any part of the facility.

The final area that $I$ would put forward to the Committee's consideration is with regard to public health and the electric and magnetic fields. We've heard testimony that the projected modeling of the project suggested it was well within safe levels. And Counsel for the Public is convinced by that modeling. However, to ensure the safety of the public, I would recommend consideration of a condition requiring that the certificate holder conduct field testing of the electric and magnetic field strength at representative sampling of locations along the project following construction and energizing of the
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| 1 | project, and submit those results to the |
| 2 | Committee. That would ensure that the |
| 3 | Committee has a sense that the project, after |
| 4 | construction, actually meets the model results |
| 5 | that have been presented. |
| 6 | With those three, or perhaps |
| 7 | four recommendations, I believe that the |
| 8 | project does meet the standards that are |
| 9 | required for approval of the certificate and |
| 10 | would suggest to the Committee that they |
| 11 | consider those conditions as part of any |
| 12 | certificate that is granted. Thank you very |
| 13 | much. |
| 14 | PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you. |
| 15 | Ms. Huard. |
| 16 | (Pause in proceedings) |
| 17 | MS. HUARD: As intervenor and |
| 18 | resident that lives in and around the area |
| 19 | proposed to be affected by the Merrimack Valley |
| 20 | Reliability Project, I am so disappointed in |
| 21 | the process and what I've heard and seen in the |
| 22 | last year. I can't begin to tell you how |
| 23 | disgusted I am with what I've heard from the |
| 24 | Applicants and their expert witnesses, and what |
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they indicate and conclude as to what this project will not cause to those that live there. I have lived there for 15 years. I have studied the environment that $I$ live in. And I'm disgusted that money is more important, that rare, precious and endangered species, plants and animals are more precious than human beings, and that scenes from -- that the aesthetics from scenic views are more important than the aesthetics from the homes that people live in every single day. I've heard inconsistencies that I cannot prove.

I do not agree that the New Hampshire SEC or the Committee does not have the responsibility to uncover this fraudulence in so many areas. The reliability and instability is undoubtedly false to me, and you refuse to let me present that. You claim that it's not your responsibility, that it's FERC's responsibility and the ISO's responsibility. The residents have undergone so much in the last year and a half because of this industry, because of the electric generation industry -the electric transmission and electric
industry. I can see so clearly what the real reason behind this is, and it is an aggressive, greedy grab for the natural gas industry to take over the generation of our electricity by closing down all of the coal plants and nuclear plants and replacing them with natural gas. There's so much evidence to that.

We will undoubtedly have a change in aesthetics. We will undoubtedly have a change in the perception that other people will view our home. We will undoubtedly have a change in our beautiful, natural environment. We will undoubtedly have an emotional upheaval by seeing the trees come down. You are going on people's property that don't even know you're coming.

I've listened to the testimony of the witnesses state that they have made accommodations to the people along the ROW and offered them landscaping. I have a neighbor with me who has never been approached. Another one of my neighbors has never been approached. I don't know how many other people are not being approached.
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I have a basic understanding of the law, and there are some laws being violated, in my opinion. The easement law, you are going onto people's private property and just telling them that you're coming. And there are people that do not want you there. So you are trespassing on their property, and you are going to create an undue burden for their piece of the land that they live on. There are other people, and they are my neighbors and my friends, and I have to care for their well-being. I go down and visit them. I have to be on their property. And you are leaving them on a small piece of livable land.

My son's bus stop is actually at the right-of-way. I used to bike around the circle there. I hike the trails at the tree farm. So, you're just changing the environment. You're failing to admit what you're going to do. And I look forward to see the lies unfold. That's all I have to say.

I still stand by my request that
you seriously consider the alternatives to
issuing the certificate.
PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you. Whenever you're ready.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Committee. We appreciate the time that you've all taken during the course of the last year or so to review this application.

You have before you, I think, a very full record which combines the application, all the testimony you've heard, all of the supporting documents. And we are quite confident that all of those materials collectively demonstrate that the Applicants have met all of the requirements under RSA 162-H, as well as your implementing regulations for the issuance of a certificate. I'm not going to bother to go through all those. You know them very well. I will make a couple points.

First of all, I think, as you've
heard during the course of these proceedings, the Applicants are quite aware that projects like this have different kinds of effects. And
the Applicants have worked very diligently to try to identify and mitigate all of those effects in various places, whether it's to cultural resources, environmental resources or project neighbors. And I think that they've done so very successfully. I would suggest, actually, that one indicator of the success that we have had mitigating those effects is the fact that the four host communities here are not present and have not expressed any concerns to the Committee about this project. I think it's probably very unusual in SEC practice that you don't see host communities here in the proceeding. And I do think that's a testament to the fact that there has been an enormous outreach effort, an outreach effort that has been directed at those host communities, at various public officials and planning bodies within those communities, at regional planning bodies, at other elected officials, and at neighbors and abutters, extensively. And I think that the fruits of those efforts you've heard about during the course of this proceeding.
\{SEC 2015-05\} [Day 2/Afternoon ONLY] \{06-14-16\}

And so I would summarize our views by saying that $I$ think we do meet all of the conditions laid out in the statute and regulations and would ask that you issue the certificate to us.

And then $I$ just wanted to briefly comment on the four conditions that Counsel for the Public asked for. Maybe working backwards, with respect to field testing for electric and magnetic fields after the project is constructed, we would have no objection to a condition like that, assuming that it was reasonably limited and designed to achieve a measurable outcome.

With respect to the decommissioning obligation, I think we've already agreed that, if at any point a need to decommission this project arises, we would submit a decommissioning plan to the Committee. So we have no concerns about that. With respect to whether or not a retirement obligation were to arise and asked that we promptly notify the Committee, we have no concerns about that. I would think we would,

Of course, do that in combination with decommissioning. I'm not sure that a report to the Committee every 10 years talking about the continued vitality of the line is something that would really be helpful.

And then with respect to the
15 percent cost overrun, I haven't had an opportunity to discuss it with my clients. I would be concerned about that because it's sometimes hard to measure in real time where costs are and when overruns might be occurring, and I would be very nervous about having some type of obligation imposed that perhaps would not be practical for us to comply with in real time. So I'm uneasy about that requirement. And with that, I will close and thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.
I think that concludes the hearing. The Committee will now deliberate. But I think we might take a quick break before we start. So we'll be back in 15 minutes. Thank you. (Whereupon a brief recess was taken at 5:40 p.m., and the hearing resumed at
6:07 p.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: We did receive a request from Counsel for the Public that he have an opportunity to clarify the conditions that he had described in his closing statement, and I believe he's received agreement from the other parties that he may do that. And so with that, go ahead.

MR. ASLIN: Thank you. Just in discussions with the Applicant, I wanted to clarify with regard to the recommended condition on cost overruns.

Based on the Applicants'
statement that there's some practical difficulties, $I$ would offer up that, if that's a condition that the Committee is interested in moving forward with, that the Applicants and Counsel for the Public would be willing to put together some proposed language to specify how that condition might be imposed. So I guess the request would be that, if the Committee wants to go to that condition, they can leave the language broad at this stage, with an expectation that the Applicants and Counsel for
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the Public could submit some more detailed language.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: What is the -- is it simply an issue of not being able to get the costs -- to have an accurate assessment of the costs in real time? Is that the problem?

MR. ASLIN: That's part of the problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. As long as we understand that's the issue, if we do take that condition up, we'll try to work with that.

MR. ASLIN: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Can I ask one question?

I just wanted to clarify one thing. With respect to Exhibit 23, the stipulation between Counsel for the Public and the Applicant, there was reference earlier to a change in Paragraph 51. My understanding is that paragraph is not changed; correct? That is the --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Is that costs?
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|  | accepted (1) | 101:4;169:2 | AFTERNOON (5) | allows (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 98:17 | additional (1) | $6: 1,5 ; 45: 23$ | 88:20 |
|  | access (3) | 80:14 | 00:24;180:11 | almost (1) |
| \$1,557,550 (2) | 15:5;59:15;131:15 | address (4) | again (20) | 23:16 |
| 7:5;180:1 | accommodate (1) | 64:14;111:9; | 16:20;22:13;37:3; | alone (1) |
| \$1.5 (2) | 43:5 | 113:22;137:17 | 41:23;65:17;68:22; | 161:13 |
| 7:6;180:5 | accommodation | addressed (3) | 69:1;72:12;77:19; | along (30) |
| $\$ 57,550(1)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 172:19 } \\ \text { accordance (2) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 24 ; 38: 18 ; \\ & 134: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 8 ; 80: 7 ; 84: 2 ; \\ & \text { 87:18;89:21;96:4; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:6;13:13;16:13, } \\ & \text { 15,21;25:13;36:8,10; } \end{aligned}$ |
| \$678,850 (1) | 165:14;169:7 | adequate (4) | 105:19,22;118:11; | 37:8;38:6;39:20; |
| 6:23 | according (4) | 15:5;164:15,24; | 141:8;168:17 | 41:23;46:23;48:9,24; |
| * | 108:14;115:7 | adherence (1) | 46:15;56:1;58:11, | 66:1;73:2,5;91:19; |
|  | account (2) | 67:8 | 12;165:4 | 92:10;96:24;100:2, |
| FIDENTIAL (12) | 96:23;166:12 | adjacent (10) | agencies (3) | 16;109:3;169:23; |
| $145: 11 ; 146: 11$ | accountant (1) | 10:4;11:8;16:14; | 20:21;92:18; | 172:19 |
| 147:11;148:11; | 118:15 | 20:13;33:11,13; | 102:21 | alternating (1) |
| 149:11;150:11; | accuracy (3) | 41:14;51:6;107:16; | aggressive (1) | 82:4 |
| 151:11;152:11; | 8:15,16,23 | 11:1 | 172: | alternatives (1) |
| 153:11;154:11; | $5: 49$ | adjourned <br> 180:12 | $\begin{gathered} \text { co (7 } \\ 30: \end{gathered}$ | although (1) |
| 155:11;156:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 15 ; 49: 2 ; 5: 9 ; \\ & 80: 1 ; 88: 23 ; 89: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Administration (1) | $14 ; 62: 12 ; 121: 12$ | $10: 14$ |
| [ | 9:15;179:5 | 95:9 | agree (2 | amended (13) |
|  | achieve (2) | Administration's (1) | 13:4;35:4;55:2; | 114:7,12,16,20,22; |
| [ No (3) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (109.12.113.4. | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 82:14;176:14 } \\ \text { achieved (1) } \end{array}$ | 64:1 <br> administrative (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:5,5,14,19;57:2,18; } \\ & \text { 64:15;73:23;76:3,8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115: 1 ; 122: 10,10,12 \\ & 15,24 ; 126: 22 ; 128: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 109: 12 ; 113: 4 ; \\ & 163: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { achieved (1) } \\ 86: 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { administrative (1) } \\ & \text { 17:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:15;73:23;76:3,8, } \\ & \text { 22;79:14;80:13; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,24 ; 126: 22 ; 128: 21 \\ & \text { amendment (1) } \end{aligned}$ |
| [sic] (5) | acknowledging (1) | admission (2) | 85:11;86:8,10;89:11, | 122:19 |
| 11:15;14:14;67:15; | 39:5 | 158:24;159:5 | 14,19;134:21;162:14, | amendments (2) |
| 137:22;162:10 | acquainted (3) | admit (2) 163.10•173 | $22 ; 163: 6 ; 171: 13$ | $114: 10 ; 115: 19$ |
| A | acres (1) | admitted (11) | 158:11;176:17 | 72:5;105:2;168:2 |
|  | 165:18 | 142:3;143:2,3,7; | agreement (2) | ampere (3) |
| A1 (1) | across (3) | 158:9;160:13;161:5; | 29:18;178:7 | 89:19,23,24 |
| 14:14 | 33:11,13;70:21 | 162:12,15,23;163:16 | ahead (2) | amperes (1) |
| ability (1) | activities (1) | adopt (2) | 29:1;178:8 | 89:20 |
| 98:24 | 80:14 | :3,13 | AI (3) | analyses (1) |
| able (6) | activity (2) $66 \cdot 9 \cdot 115$. | advantage (2) 135:8;136:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 21 \\ & \text { aid (2) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 135: 6 \\ \text { analysis (1 } \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:4;53:22;88:22; } \\ & \text { 141:5;142:15;179:4 } \end{aligned}$ | actual (13) | adverse (5) | $117: 22 ; 118: 2$ | $6: 19 ; 16: 12,19$ |
| above (6) | 46:6,8,15;53:14, | 29:8,11;51:14; | air (1) | 29:6;31:20;33:1; |
| 22:3;50:10;53:16; | 18;56:24;61:5;67:12; | 67:10;102:19 | $60: 10$ | 34:2,15;36:4,8; |
| 58:4;59:16;66:19 | 88:13;96:9;98:2,3,4 actually (42) | $\begin{gathered} \text { advertise (1) } \\ 20: 22 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{157: 9}{\text { airplanes }(1)}$ | 37:16;38:3;42:18; $43: 1 ; 119: 14,16,18,$ |
| absolutely (2) $90 \cdot 10 \cdot 128 \cdot 14$ | actually (42) <br> 7:11;11:20;20:6; | advertised (1) | air-quality (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:1;119:14,16,18, } \\ & 24 ; 120: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 90:10;128:14 } \\ & \text { abuts (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $23: 2,10 ; 26: 23 ; 27: 7$ | 20:20 | $119: 18$ | anchor (8) |
| 79:15 | 29:21;46:24;52:9; | Advisory (1) | AK (2) | 111:11,15,18,23; |
| abutted (2) | 55:16;60:7;61:7; | 19:22 | 42:6,7 | 112:9,10,11,13 |
| 27:18,19 | 62:11,17;66:22; | aeria | alert (1) | anchored (1) |
| abutter (3) | 67:12;72:21;74:17; $78 \cdot 23 \cdot 84 \cdot 19,21 \cdot 85 \cdot 3$, | $52: 7 ; 70: 13$ aesthetics (4) | $\stackrel{\text { 58:18 }}{ }$ | 112:7 |
| 120:11,13,17 | 78:23;84:19,21;85:3, 22;88:7;90:2;91:7, | aesthetics (4) <br> 119:16;171:9,10; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { algorithms (1) } \\ & 46: 9 \end{aligned}$ | anchoring (4) <br> 111:2,7,10,11 |
| abutters (3) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22;88:7;90:2;91:7, } \\ & \text { 20;98:6,12;106:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 119: 16 \\ & 172: 9 \end{aligned}$ | allegations (2) | $\begin{gathered} \text { 111:2,7,10,11 } \\ \text { anchors (1) } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 81: 5 ; 165: 23 ; \\ & 175: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 112:8;118:5,8; | affect (2) | 129:17;135:1 | 112:17 |
| abutting (2) | 140:23;143:12; | 18:24;21 | alleged (3) | ancient (1) |
| 9:12;80:4 | 159:12;160:20; | affected (19) | 74:24;127:2;133:2 | 105:18 |
| AC (5) | 162:3;170:4;173:16; | 8:21;12:7,13; | allegedly (1) | and/or (3) |
| 51:7;62:24;82:8; | 175:7 adapted (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:17;24:19,24;25:5; } \\ & \text { 28:8;29:20,20,22; } \end{aligned}$ | 127:8 | 42:19;43:5;61:15 |
| 99:1;108:7 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \operatorname{adapted}(\mathbf{1}) \\ 106: 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 8 ; 29: 20,20,22 \\ & 30: 13 ; 37: 14,14,19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { allow (6) } \\ 22: 11 ; 47: 22 ; 50: 15, \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Anderson (1) } \\ \text { 136:8 } \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { accept (2) } \\ 163: 1,8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 106:5 } \\ \text { adding (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 13 ; 37: 14,14,19 ; \\ & 39: 6 ; 53: 4,5 ; 170: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 11 ; 47: 22 ; 50: 15 \\ & 18 ; 69: 13 ; 163: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 136:8 } \\ \text { angle (1) } \end{gathered}$ |
| acceptable (2) | $99: 20$ | afraid (1) | allowed (3) | 111:22 |
| 25:24;112:20 | addition (2) | 41:3 | 112:11,15;161:21 | animals (2) |
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| $102: 16 ; 171: 7$ | 172:21,22,24 | 163:13;164:7,10; | 134:19;135:2; | Bailey's (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| announced (2) | approaches (1) | 178:9;179:8,14; | 140:7,16 | 34:8 |
| 37:19;38:24 | 36:24 | 180:10 | authoritative (2) | balance (2) |
| announcement (1) | approaching (1) | aspects (4) | 56:7,8 | 166:17,23 |
| 38:17 | 58:20 | 44:19;66:16; | available (3) | balancing (2) |
| answered (3) | appropriate (9) | 106:23;165:2 | 116:10;140:4; | 164:16,20 |
| $22: 7,10 ; 23: 14$ | 17:10;25:6;26:15; | asphalt (1) | 160:18 | barring (1) |
| anticipated (1) | 34:9;78:24;79:2; | 64:23 | average (8) | 167:16 |
| 14:1 | 112:14;139:2,5 | asserted (1) | 32:18;33:5,7,15; | baseball's (1) |
| apologize (1) | approval (1) | 112:1 | $34: 22 ; 38: 1 ; 58: 14$ | 107:7 |
| 134:7 | 170:9 | assertion (2) | 100:19 | based (8) |
| appear (3) | approximately (3) | 131:17;132:3 | avoid (1) | 12:5;46:1,5,6; |
| 33:21;68:8,12 | 13:1;48:18;111:22 | assertions (1) | 93:3 | 100:3,14;161:20; |
| appears (5) | arc (3) | 131:24 | avoiding (1) | 178:13 |
| $58: 2 ; 70: 13,24 ;$ | $73: 20 ; 76: 18 ; 80: 6$ | assessment (3) | $43: 3$ | basic (14) |
| 88:3;137:19 | area (26) | 35:18;102:13; | aware (22) | 60:14;93:3,13,17, |
| Appendix (8) | 8:16;9:23;10:1; | 179:6 | $10: 14 ; 16: 7,17$ | 21;94:6,16,19;95:12; |
| 14:14;15:2,21; | 11:14;12:1,16;17:5, | assist (1) | $18: 2 ; 19: 10 ; 30: 9,16$ | 96:6,19;117:24; |
| 16:19;17:15;25:21; | 17;19:16,18,20;20:2, | 14:8 | 39:16;40:5;41:6; | 120:6;173:1 |
| 42:6,7 | 6,10,12,14;21:8; | associated (10) | 66:6;71:5;75:4; | basically (5) |
| apples (1) | 25:13;35:24;39:9; | 19:11;44:11;51:5; | 92:23;93:5;121:11, | 36:24;47:15;48:15; |
| 35:1 | 75:8;107:9,12; | 52:5;76:6;124:24; | 12,23;122:3;140:20; | 63:1;97:15 |
| apples-to-apples (1) | 143:15;169:11; | 125:3,7;127:22,24 | 167:24;174:23 | basis (2) |
| 48:2 | 170:18 | assume (4) | away (11) | 118:6;134:11 |
| appliances (2) | areas (13) | 31:20;49:10;72:11; | $20: 15 ; 55: 18 ; 65: 1,$ | beautiful (1) |
| 102:1;108:19 | 8:12;15:4,4,10; | 138:7 | 3;68:16,19;74:10; | 172:12 |
| Applicant (8) | 36:7;48:23;53:12; | assumed (1) | 107:7,20;108:12,24 | become (12) |
| 31:8;43:11,21; | 111:10;118:13; | 63:14 | awful (2) | 52:10;60:20;61:6, |
| 109:14;116:12; | 119:6,11;120:7; | assuming (5) | 41:22;103:10 | 13;67:5;68:4;71:19; |
| $\begin{aligned} & 163: 24 ; 178: 10 ; \\ & 179: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 171: 16 \\ \text { arise (2) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 4 ; 104: 24 \\ & 159: 22 ; 165: 1 \end{aligned}$ | B | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 18 ; 95: 13 ; 96: 14 \\ & 121: 11 ; 168: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| Applicants (12) | arise (2) 169:3;176:22 | $176: 12$ | B | becomes (2) |
| 79:9;124:1;158:8; | arises (2) | assumption (1) | back (27) | 51:24;167:24 |
| 159:9;160:12;161:7; | 169:1;176:18 | $92: 13$ | $6: 5 ; 24: 5 ; 31: 11$ | becoming (2) |
| $170: 24 ; 174: 14,23$ | Aronson (5) | assumptions (4) | $39: 4,6 ; 72: 15 ; 75: 22$ | $59: 7 ; 62: 5$ |
| 175:1;178:17,24 | 136:9,13;137:12, | 63:14;92:7;97:10; | 98:8;107:20;108:15; | bedrock (6) |
| Applicants' (4) | 14;138:17 | $98: 1$ | $109: 19,22 ; 110: 8$ | $111: 14,17,21,23$ |
| 7:11;132:4;141:11; | arose (1) | assure (2) | 112:11;116:24; | $112: 8,24$ |
| 178:13 | 11:19 | $65: 5 ; 164: 15$ | 119:1;121:16; | began (1) |
| application (7) | around (13) | atmospheric (3) | 126:21;128:18; | $121: 18$ |
| 40:16;42:4;88:4; | 8:13;54:2;61:20; | 105:23;108:23; | 130:17;131:12; | begin (2) |
| 115:16;168:14; | 64:2;107:5;108:19; | 109:6 | $141: 20 ; 142: 1,9$ | 110:2;170:22 |
| 174:8,11 | 112:11,16;115:15; | attempt (2) | $157: 7 ; 159: 20 ; 177: 22$ | beginning (3) |
| applications (1) | 136:20;138:6; | 29:24;30:6 | backwards (1) | 117:5;130:20; |
| $74: 19$ | 170:18;173:17 | attempting (1) | 176:9 | 139:16 |
| applied (2) | arrangement (1) | 59:15 | badges (1) | begins (3) |
| 21:6;97:15 | $30: 10$ | attention (1) | 120:5 | 122:19;126:23; |
| apply (1) | arrangements (2) | $117: 3$ | BAILEY (71) | 127:6 |
| 57:14 | 30:15;157:13 | Attorney (3) | 26:9;28:23;31:9, | behind (1) |
| appraisal (2) | arrest (6) | 134:1;136:8,17 | 10;43:18,23;44:4,7,8, | 172:2 |
| 26:19;119:15 | 114:19;115:5; | attorneys (4) | 22,24;45:2,5,23; | beings (1) |
| appreciably (1) | 124:10;125:11, 16 ; | 137:15;143:2,3,7 attraction (1) | 56:24;57:6,14,21,24; | $171: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 89: 5 \\ & \text { appreciate (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $126: 8$ article (1) | attraction (1) 20:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 2,6,9,12,18 ; 59: 4, \\ & 13,21 ; 66: 15,22,24 \end{aligned}$ | belief (2) 116:6,7 |
| $174: 5$ | $162: 14$ | $\underset{\text { attracts (1) }}{ }$ | 67:7,13;81:20;82:3,7, | below (8) |
| appreciation (3) | articles (1) | 20:24 | 12,24;83:6,11,16,22; | 69:4,5;92:16; |
| 37:23;38:9;39:8 | 161:9 | audible (3) | 84:9,21;85:13,24; | 93:11;94:5;101:22; |
| apprised (1) | aside (4) | 44:18;95:4,1 | 86:12,19,22;87:24; | 102:11;112:23 |
| 167:20 | 118:24;125:9; | audio (2) | 88:3,8,17;89:9,13,16, | benefit (1) |
| approach (5) | 126:15;130:15 | 52:15;53:3 | 21,24;90:4,17;93:1,8; | 42:18 |
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| 169:24;170:4 | 54:5,12;95:14,18; |  |  | decide (1) |


| 157:6 | 21:2 | 25:23 | 133:10 | 95:20;97:5;98:15; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| decided (1) | derived (1) | died (3) | discuss (5) | 103:11;175 |
| 142:1 | 93:2 | 123:9,10;126:13 | 16:22;18:7,10; | door (3) |
| decides (1) | DES (2) | difference (3) | 114:21;177:8 | 68:15;108:2 |
| 167:4 | 162:4,10 | 27:22,23;67:20 | discussed (4) | 143:13 |
| decision (1) | describe (4) | different (22) | 16:12;19:12;94:5; | down (11) |
| 18:24 | 57:24;70:11;90:20 | 6:16;32:5;35:5; | 104:6 | 13:9;30:4,23; |
| decline (1) | 123:4 | 36:23;47:19;50:6,6, | discussing (1) | 36:24;71:16;98:18; |
| 30:6 | described (4) | 8;55:10;57:16;74:21; | 18:4 | 108:3;126:23;172:5, |
| decommission (1) | 25:20;34:3;36:4 | 83:7,8;87:6,6;95:9, | discussion (2) | 14;173:12 |
| 176:18 | 178:5 | 22;100:2,15;109:5; | 16:1;30:12 | Dr (22) |
| decommissioned (1) | describes (2) | 161:16;174:24 | discussions (1) | 7:10;39:11;55:22; |
| 168:9 | 127:2,7 | differentially (1) | 178:10 | 56:23;57:23;59:23; |
| decommissioning (9) | describing (1) | 38:10 | disgusted (2) | 66:22;67:7;78:6; |
| 168:7,13,15;169:3, | 121:22 | differently (2) | 170:23;171: | 81:20;83:23;84:9,21; |
| 6,8;176:16,19;177:2 | description (3) | 13:6,13 | displaying (1) | 85:14;86:3;88:11,17; |
| decrease (1) | 57:9;129:13,14 | difficult (2) | 85:13 | 91:16;92:15;93:1; |
| 55:18 | design (5) | 39:2;106:3 | dispute (1) | 94:5;101:18 |
| deemed (1) | 46:5;53:14;56:12; | difficulties (1) | 162:10 | Drive (4) |
| 164:22 | 65:19;100:11 | 178:15 | disputed (1) | 12:18;68:19;69:23; |
| Deerfield (1) | designated (4) | diligently (1) | 130:15 | 113:23 |
| 8:5 | 7:11;19:9,19;144:5 | 175:1 | disputing (3) | drop (3) |
| defined (1) | designed (6) | diminishes (1) | 162:16,17,20 | 106:18;108:12,17 |
| 143:5 | 17:13;59:5;80:17, | 103:21 | disrupt (1) | dry (1) |
| definitely (2) | 19;108:13;176:13 | dings (1) | 143:14 | 64:23 |
| 23:13;81:2 | designs (1) | 57:13 | distance (9) | due (4) |
| degradation (1) | $49: 22$ | direct (13) | $20: 11,15 ; 27: 23$ | 69:16,18;70:8; |
| 43:6 | desire (1) | 15:5;44:2;59:1,23; | $33: 16 ; 53: 17 ; 67: 2$ | 165:17 |
| degree (2) | 15:8 | 103:4;113:20; | 77:7,11,12 | duly (3) |
| 62:16;63:15 | desk (1) | 118:23;119:24; | distances (2) | 43:24;110:11; |
| degreed (1) | 157:8 | 120:11,13,17;126:4, | 67:6;89:1 | 113:18 |
| $118: 19$ | despite (2) | 10 | distant (2) | Dummer (1) |
| deliberate (2) | 89:3;102:14 | directed (2) | 33:20;125:19 | 8:4 |
| 157:23;177:20 | destination (1) | 56:23;175:17 | divided (3) | DUMVILLE (1) |
| demand (1) | 11:2 | directing (2) | 27:14,17;85:12 | 161:6 |
| 54:13 | detailed (1) | 101:16;102:24 | dizziness (1) | duplexes (1) |
| demarcation (1) | 179:1 | directly (10) | 115:6 | $120: 18$ |
| 12:17 | details (1) | 55:3,8;58:16; | docket (11) | during (7) |
| demonstrate (1) | $80: 13$ | 61:12,22;72:11; $80 \cdot 21 \cdot 115 \cdot 11$; | $115: 3 ; 119: 4$ $131: 20 \cdot 133 \cdot 9,24$. | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 12 ; 38: 23 ; 92: 2 \\ & 127 \cdot 20 \cdot 174 \cdot 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} 174: 14 \\ \text { dense }(2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { determination (1) } \\ & \text { 21:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 21 ; 115: 11 ; \\ & 135: 12 ; 136: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 131: 20 ; 133: 9,24 ; \\ & \text { 135:14,19;138:13,16; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 127: 20 ; 174: 6,22 ; \\ & 175: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $55: 1 ; 70: 2$ | determine (5) | director (2) | $160: 19 ; 165: 11$ |  |
| density (1) | 53:18;54:12;63:19; | 18:11,22 | Doctors (1) | E |
| $38: 11$ | 85:19;93:16 | disadvantage (1) | 45:23 |  |
| department (3) | determined (1) | 33:18 | document (22) | earlier (4) |
| 128:2;129:12; | 103:12 | disappear (1) | 14:24;15:23;64: | 72:16;130:4;133:9; |
| 130:7 | detrimental (1) | 106:19 | 10;78:10,12,14; | 179:20 |
| depend (7) | 17:23 | disappeared (1) | 114:2;130:4,8,24 | early (1) |
| $13: 17 ; 48: 12 ; 65: 7,$ | developed (14) | $41: 5$ | $132: 11 ; 133: 6,8$ | $46: 14$ |
| $18 ; 76: 13 ; 83: 22 ; 84: 2$ | 15:4,6,9;20:7;46:5, | disappointed (1) | $134: 15 ; 135: 11$ | easement (2) |
| dependent (1) | 22;47:13;72:6;83:2, | 170:20 | 138:14,140:13,15,16; | 30:2;173:3 |
| 42:22 | 9;95:7;96:1,5;107:14 | disapproval (1) | 142:12;162:11 | easier (1) |
| depending (5) | Development (1) | 167:17 | documents (16) | 158:12 |
| 55:9;61:16;68:1; | 18:21 | discernible (1) | 123:18,22;124:2, | easiest (1) |
| 71:21;105:7 | develops (1) | 21:13 | 18;125:22;126:15 | 108:5 |
| depends (6) | 95:2 | discharge (2) | 127:13,18;129:3,7, | easily (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 53: 14 ; 63: 7,20 ; \\ & 68: 22 ; 74: 12 ; 80: 7 \end{aligned}$ | deviate (1) 55.16 | $105: 9,10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 ; 130: 13 ; 135: 18, \\ & 2 \cdot 142 \cdot 16 \cdot 174 \cdot 12 \end{aligned}$ | $96: 11$ |
| depreciation (2) | devices (1) | 117:11 | done (18) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { easy (3) } \\ 38: 12 ; 48: 1 ; 91: 14 \end{array}$ |
| 37:23;39:9 | 108:1 | discourage (1) | 23:16;25:14;37:16; | economic (3) |
| depth (1) | devise (1) | 59:14 | 38:6;39:17;46:24,24; | 42:17,19;43:7 |
| 111:16 | 49:13 | discovery (4) | 47:10;48:7;50:13; | economy (2) |
| derbies (1) | die (1) | 63:23;78:4;119:23; | 66:6;77:24;89:18; | 14:3;24:13 |
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| edge (4) | 24;176:10 | 71:11;73:19;74:10; | erosion (2) | 82.10.83.14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55:21;69:3;107:1; | electrical (15) | 101:14;106:13 | 120:4,7 | excluding (2) |
| 108:1 | 44:17,19;48:14; | energizing (1) | essentially (4) | 159:15;163:17 |
| edges (1) | 51:4,11,18;52:17; | 169:24 | 50:18;60:23;96:7; | excused (2) |
| 109:1 | 56:9,13,21;81:17; | energy (7) | 64:16 | 43:15;109:1 |
| education (5) | 104:17;105:10; | 42:20,23;164:15 | established (1) | exercise (4) |
| 6:18,20;117:9,21; | 118:10,23 | 18,24;165:1;166:21 | 46:10 | 32:14;86:13,15,18 |
| 118:11 | electricity (15) | engage (1) | estate (4) | exhaustively (1) |
| effect (15) | 52:21;54:14;65:12; | 115:13 | 21:15;36:18 | 27:13 |
| 21:8,13;29:11 | 67:5,24;71:6,10; | engaged (1) | 119:15,23 | Exhibit (48) |
| 35:19;41:4;51:14; | 73:16,20;75:12; | 51:3 | estimate (1) | 7:11;22:1;23:8; |
| 86:13,15;101:23; | 76:18;79:24;80:6; | engagement (1) | 12:15 | 57:23;64:9;66:10,12; |
| 103:14,16;107:24; | 107:10;172:4 | 118:18 | estimated (2) | 70:10;72:15,21; |
| 108:7;115:8;165:22 | electrocute (1) | engineering (5) | 12:24;60:2 | 75:22;80:13;81:13; |
| effects (23) | 73:22 | 56:9;81:18;118:10, | estimation (1) | 82:20;85:4,6,7;87:21, |
| 9:15;17:23;24:18, | electrocuted (2) | 24;119:13 | 47:4 | 22;88:5;93:18; |
| 23;38:16,21;40:20; | 59:18;61:6 | Engineers (1) | et (2) | 113:15;114:1; |
| 41:17;67:1;95:16,17, | electrocution (3) | 48:14 | 39:20;40 | 116:19;124:1; |
| 18;102:7,19;104:1,4, | 56:15;58:15,24 | England (3) | evaluated (1) | 125:21;132:5,10,19, |
| 5;123:10;126:14; | electromagnetic (1) | 42:14;58:6;164:2 | 60:1 | 20;136:23;142:2,4; |
| 130:2;174:24;175:3, | 103:22 | enhancements (1) | evaluation (4) | 158:7,9,15,19;159:1, |
| 8 | Electronics (1) | 96:16 | 44:10;125:9,13 | 13,20;160:1,17,20; |
| efficiency (1) | 48:14 | enormous (1) | 137:22 | 161:8;162:15; |
| 43:3 | elements (1) | 175:16 | even (20) | 163:10,20;179:18 |
| effort (3) | 74:21 | enough (17) | 13:2;25:22;36:22 | exhibits (18) |
| 46:2;175:16,16 | Elmo's (2) | 35:8;36:14;59:8 | 47:12;49:24;50:19; | 143:18;157:19,20; |
| efforts (1) | 105:17;106:8 | 61:9;71:24;80:4,5 | 60:21;67:5;69:5; | 158:2,5,10;159:5,8, |
| 175:23 | else (5) | 82:9,18;86:9,24; | 72:2;80:19;82:15 | 11,16;160:12,13; |
| either (14) | 69:17;105:1 | 87:4;88:15;106:12, | 84:6;94:4;104:3; | 161:4,7,7;163:11,16, |
| 10:4,21;19:16; | 115:23;143:21; | 18;118:17;141:5 | 105:7;108:11;109:1; | 19 |
| 27:18;28:11;33:11; | 163:20 | ensure (3) | 158:12;172:15 | exist (2) |
| 40:3,20;100:6,10; | e-mail (1) | 168:21;169:18 | event (1) | 59:22;97:2 |
| 143:12;161:12,15; | 137:17 | 170:2 | 128:24 | existence (1) |
| 164:1 | e-mails (1) | ensures (1) | events (2) | 138:4 |
| elected (1) | 130:15 | 76:15 | 21:1,3 | existing (16) |
| 175:20 | embedded (3) | enter (1) | everyday (1) | 12:9,10;22:15; |
| electric (111) | 17:2;40:2;111:20 | 31:19 | 82:13 | 41:12;47:1,23;50:13; |
| 22:24;44:10;45:24; | EMF (2) | entertain (1) | evidence (10) | 51:6,12;86:5;88:9, |
| 46:12;47:20;49:7; | 44:17;92:15 | 30:12 | 21:12;26:16;36:16 | 10;104:22;109:2; |
| 50:7;51:20;52:13,14, | emotional (1) | entire (5) | 103:2,6;126:5,17; | 165:8,9 |
| 19,22;53:8,11,19,22, | 172:13 | 24:20;25:1;49:11 | 161:22;162:12;172:7 | expand (2) |
| 24;54:2,9,11;55:2,11, | emphasize (1) | 92:10;100:16 | exact (3) | 114:17,20 |
| 17,20,24;56:6,14,15, | 119:21 | entitled (1) | 18:20;75:20 | expect (7) |
| 19;57:2,4,6,10,17,18, | employment (1) | 135:21 | 136:21 | 59:13;91:21;97:21; |
| 19;58:13,13,23,24; | 24:13 | environment (16) | exactly (3) | 98:9;100:8;108:20; |
| 59:19;61:6,13,15,20, | encounter (1) | 44:17,19;51:5,11 | 33:8;99:6;124:6 | 109:4 |
| 24;62:1;63:8;65:8, | 82:17 | 18,20;52:13,17; | EXAMINATION (2) | expectation (1) |
| 18;67:8;68:3,7,7; | encourage (2) | 56:16;82:14;120:4; | 44:2;113:20 | 178:24 |
| 69:1,2,6,14;71:18,20; | 15:3,9 | 164:14;165:13; | example (3) | expected (2) |
| 73:15,21;76:2;80:15, | end (6) | 171:4;172:12;173:20 | 37:18;101:13 | 55:12;97:16 |
| 23,23;81:3,21;82:8, | 111:20,24;122:17, | environmental (6) | 106:8 | experience (8) |
| 16;83:4,14,21;84:4, | 18;123:15;131:12 | 89:4;164:19;165:5, | exceed (4) | 39:15;68:17;80:23; |
| 10;86:14,16;87:5; | endangered (1) | 7,21;175:4 | 22:2;93:6;94:12; | 83:20;87:5,6;117:9, |
| 88:8,15,23;90:14; | 171:6 | environments (3) | 168:1 | 20 |
| 91:19;92:23;93:19, | ended (1) | 104:2,3;120:7 | exceeded (3) | experienced (11) |
| 24;95:4,19;97:8; | 34:17 | equal (5) | 93:20,23;102:10 | 48:10;87:2;90:21; |
| 99:2,23;100:9; | endpoint (1) | 89:11,14,19,23,24 | exceeds (1) | 115:4;123:6;125:11, |
| 102:18;103:18; | 131:13 | equals (1) | 167:13 | 14;127:3,8;128:23; |
| 104:13;105:14,23; | ends (1) | 85:12 | Except (2) | 133:3 |
| 106:15,17;115:8,10; | 167:12 | equations (1) | 77:22;82:16 | experiences (2) |
| 119:17;125:17; | energized (13) | 96:3 | exception (1) | 56:21;57:4 |
| 126:9;129:17; | $52: 1,5,10 ; 58: 20$ | equipment (2) | $160: 12$ | experiencing (1) |
| $169: 13,21 ; 171: 23,24$ | $59: 7,8,16 ; 61: 1$ | $56: 13 ; 74: 18$ | excitable (2) | $84: 17$ |
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { experimental (2) } \\ 102: 15,16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24;63:10;68:14;69:5; } \\ & 76: 23 ; 79: 18 ; 100: 18 ; \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 167: 8,18 \\ \text { FERC's (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 10 ; 143: 12 \\ & \text { fire (11) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34: 24 \\ \text { forth (1) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| expert (2) | 102:14;103:7,13; | 171:19 | 79:23;80:8;105:17; | 131:12 |
| 128:4;170:24 | 125:17;175:9,15 | Ferro (1) | 106:8;124:8;125:10, | forward (4) |
| expertise (1) | fact-based (1) | 70:1 | 24;128:2;129:11,12; | 167:14;169:12; |
| 75:19 | 135:24 | ferromagnetic (1) | 130:7 | 173:21;178:17 |
| experts (2) | factor (1) | 55:1 | Fires (1) | foul (2) |
| 25:18;131:23 | 98:21 | ferrous (1) | 79:22 | 108:8;109:6 |
| explain (6) | factors (1) | 70:1 | first (24) | found (2) |
| 26:14;44:5;72:22; | 89:4 | few (14) | 7:3;10:15;26:10; | 40:20;62:13 |
| 88:18;90:8;114:10 | facts (1) | 23:23;51:19;64:14; | 35:10,22;37:11; | foundation (2) |
| explanations (1) | 13:17 | 83:8;85:5;92:12,12; | 47:13;64:16;68:20; | 161:14,17 |
| 104:11 | fact-specific (1) | 99:12;108:24; | 72:21;96:7;117:22; | four (10) |
| Exploration (1) | 38:19 | 121:12;122:20,23; | 118:2;122:19; | 6:15;8:23,23; |
| 111:13 | failing (1) | 142:24;157:14 | 126:21;135:4; | 35:22;40:18,19; |
| explore (1) | 173:20 | field (68) | 157:19,20;158:2,2; | 109:19;170:7;175:9; |
| 138:5 | fair (5) | 46:6,8,15,19;47:5, | 164:3;167:5;174:21; | 176:7 |
| Exponent (12) | 26:24;33:4;35:11, | 14,18,20,20;48:6,21; | 180:2 | Fourteen (1) |
| 44:9,15;135:6,7; | 15;108:23 | 49:9;50:4,7,7;52:22, | first-aid (1) | 162:21 |
| 136:2,3;139:8,9,22, | fairly (2) | 23;53:8,19;54:2,9,11, | 117:24 | fourth (2) |
| $22 ; 140: 10,23$ | 77:1;111:14 | 15,18,23,24;55:20, | fishing (1) | 120:19,21 |
| exposed (2) | fall (3) | 20;57:7;61:13,16,18, | 21:2 | fraction (1) |
| 13:11;81:23 | 10:15;22:4;122:12 | 20,24;62:2;63:8,11; | five (6) | 10:8 |
| exposure (8) | falls (1) | 65:8,18;68:2;70:1,3, | 23:23;40:18,19; | frame (2) |
| 93:11,19;94:7,11; | 8:1 | 4;81:21;82:5;83:17, | 109:22;113:1;141:20 | 34:13;47:10 |
| 102:8,18;103:15,24 | false (1) | 20;84:4;86:3;88:9; | five-minute (2) | fraudulence (1) |
| exposures (3) | 171:17 | 90:3;91:19;93:24; | 23:15;141:3 | 171:15 |
| 82:15;102:10; | familiar (4) | 95:16,17,18;98:6; | five-year (1) | frequency (3) |
| 103:13 | 20:17;74:23;82:21; | 99:1;100:10;103:5, | 40:7 | 48:9;63:1;108:18 |
| expressed (1) | 83:1 | 18,22;105:14,24; | flashover (1) | frequent (1) |
| 175:10 | far (6) | 106:17;169:21,22; | 59:9 | 47:4 |
| extend (1) | 66:22;101:22; | 176:9 | flat (1) | friends (1) |
| 9:18 | 108:19;112:23; | fields (40) | 97:11 | 173:11 |
| extensive (1) | 120:4;136:1 | 44:11;46:1,13; | flow (2) | front (7) |
| 88:20 | farm (1) | 49:7;52:15,19;53:11, | 82:6;89:1 | 58:1;70:12;72:22; |
| extensively (1) | 173:19 | 22;54:20;55:3,12,18; | flowing (3) | 121:19;136:5; |
| 175:22 | favor (3) | 61:20,21;69:1,2,20, | 52:24;58:23;73:22 | 139:18;159:17 |
| extent (8) | 164:18;165:2; | 22;70:8;81:24;82:5, | focused (1) | frozen (1) |
| 30:15;75:7;86:12; | 166:23 | 9,18;86:5;88:24; | 20:12 | 36:6 |
| 140:24;164:17; | feasible (1) | 90:20;92:24;93:20; | follow (1) | fruits (1) |
| 165:21;168:16;169:2 | 30:14 | 95:4,14;97:9;99:2,2, | 79:3 | 175:22 |
| extenuating (1) | features (6) | 23;101:21;102:1,18; | followed (4) | full (5) |
| 37:5 | 47:18;97:7;98:3; | 119:17;169:14; | 78:11;79:17;80:16, |  |
| external (3) | 99:15,21;135:5 | 176:10 | 18 | $162: 15 ; 163: 16$ |
| 69:18;70:6;86:2 | federal (2) | filed (1) | following (2) | 174:10 |
| extraordinary (1) | 17:12;128:11 | 135:11 | 122:23;169:24 | fully (2) |
| 167:16 | feed (1) | final (4) | follow-up (1) | 25:20;121:12 |
| extremely (5) | 16:17 | 11:2;109:20; | 34:7 | further (6) |
| 62:15;64:11;74:5; | feel (4) | 113:14;169:11 | foot (1) | 10:17;29:16;50:22; |
| 80:10;105:13 | 13:11;23:9;25:15; | finalized (1) | 69:10 | 88:17;94:21;142:7 |
| eyes (2) | 134:11 | 39:3 | forestry (1) | future (5) |
| 103:19;106:4 | feeling (2) | find (5) | 119:14 | 14:21;39:24;41:20; |
|  | 50:1;129:16 | 27:21,23;28:2; | forever (1) | 67:13;168:15 |
| F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { feet (12) } \\ & 9: 19 ; 12: 20,22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:2;115:23 } \\ & \text { finds }(\mathbf{1}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28: 10 \\ \text { forgot (1) } \end{gathered}$ | G |
| faced | 22:3;27:20,21;33:12; | 166:22 | 110:16 | G |
| 43:4 | 57:13;76:5,11; | fine (2) | form (2) | gain (3) |
| facilities (2) | 108:24;113:1 | 78:13;160:4 | 26:2;130:15 | 59:15;118:17; |
| 14:21;165:10 | fences (2) | finest (1) | frormal (3) | 121:18 |
| Facility (2) | 105:20,21 | 17:9 | 30:10;117:9,19 | garage (1) |
| 95:11;169:10 | fencing (1) | fingers (1) | formally (1) | 108:2 |
| fact (16) | 106:15 | 106:9 | 165:24 | Gary (3) |
| 6:22;30:23;31:3, | FERC (2) | finished (2) | formulate (1) | 43:18,23;44:14 |
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| gas (3) | graphed (1) | 107:4 | heavy (1) | hold (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 69:10;172:3,6 | 33:17 | half (3) | 70:1 | 18:14 |
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| 76:10,24;77:14,18; | 73:1 | 17:15,18;63:4 | 74:3,6;80:17,19; | live (4) |
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| 16;83:23;84:1;85:14; | landscaping (1) | letter (2) | 101:15;102:5,24; | 171:3 |
| 86:3;88:11,17;91:16, | 172:20 | 132:13;137:13 | 105:5,6,7,10;107:8, | lives (1) |
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| 18;100:5,18;101:10, | 70:20 | 62:14,20;63:5,19; | 129:23;177:4 | 123:10;126:14 |
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| journals (1) | large (9) | 82:9;83:13,20;84:12; | 17:21;22:16;27:4,5; | 112:6,8 |
| 101:4 | 18:2;38:8;41:1; | 87:4,7;88:14;92:3; | 35:19;36:8,10,15,17, | loading (5) |
| juggle (1) | 65:22;66:17;71:24; | 93:14;97:21;99:11, | 22;37:8;38:6,11; | $91: 23 ; 100: 8,12,19,$ |
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|  | Las (2) | 89:3,5;92:16;93:10, | 73:2,5,11,13,15;78:9; | locally (1) |
| Keep (5) | 40:17;41:1 | 19,23;94:11,13,15; | 81:14;86:5,6;88:9,10, | 24:13 |
| 58:4;74:9;112:1 | last (5) | 95:24;108:11,21; | 14;90:16;91:22;92:4; | located (5) |
| 128:7;167:19 | 122:16;164:1; | 109:8;166:10;169:16 | 96:10;97:12;100:6,8, | 11:9;17:14;33:10; |
| kilovolt (1) | 170:22;171:22;174:7 | liberty (1) | 11;104:22,22;105:5; | 38:10;79:10 |
| 89:11 | late (1) | 137:11 | 108:7;109:3,9; | location (10) |
| kilovolts (10) | 143:14 | licensed (4) | 114:15;115:16; | 48:9;50:9;51:21; |
| 63:11;71:6,10; | later (4) | 38:24;117:23; | 121:3,8,20,23,24; | 68:2;84:16;98:13; |
| 83:19;89:7,14,18; | 85:3,7;91:3;157:24 | 118:14,19 | 122:4;123:6,11; | 99:21;102:6;129:24; |
| 91:11,20;93:4 | lattice (1) | licensing (1) | 125:15,18;126:2,7; | 137:23 |
| kind (6) | 115:2 | 38:21 | 127:9;129:1 | locations (2) |
| 34:24;37:2;39:18; | law (10) | lies (1) | link (1) | 124:11;169:23 |
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| 174:24 | laws (3) | liked (1) | Lisa (1) | logs (1) |
| Knepper (5) | 88:18,19;173:2 | 135:1 | 6:12 | 128:2 |
| 132:14,20,22; | leaching (1) | likelihood (1) | list (7) | Londonderry (3) |
| 134:17,22 | 75:1 | 168:1 | 27:24;33:24;84:9; | $10: 18 ; 12: 19 ; 14: 7$ |
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| labeled (2) | 111:21 | 22;94:6,12;102:9,11 | 96:3 | 125:24;173:21 |
| 70:19;88:5 | left (1) | line (70) | literally (2) | looked (16) |
| ladder (2) | 142:2 | 9:16;22:15;27:2; | 63:20;99:10 | 11:5;20:6,11;23:8; |
| 81:1,10 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l e g }}$ (1) | 29:22;30:24;39:18, | literature (3) | 27:12,15;30:22;31:1; |
| laid (1) | 115:5 | 21,22;40:22,24;41:1; | 36:11;40:13,16 | 39:4,7,19;40:6; |
| 176:3 | legal (1) | 47:6;49:22;51:24; | little (6) | 41:22;64:7;111:4; |
| land (14) | 19:3 | 52:5,14;53:15;54:15, | 13:23;38:5;94:8; | 130:4 |
| 13:23;14:5,21; | length (2) | 16;55:19;59:3;60:8, | 98:14;105:15;130:18 | looking (9) |
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