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PROCEEDINGS
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This is the prehearing conference in the matter before the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee, known as the Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy, for a Certificate of Site and Facility. It is Site Evaluation Committee Docket No. 2015-06. Today we are here for a prehearing conference. There are agendas and there are handouts explaining the adjudicative process where you signed in. Again, I don't want anybody to get up now, but please make sure before you leave here today, if you have not signed in, to sign in on the sheets provided. And the reason for that is so that we can double-check your attendance. I am going to take appearances and go through a roll call here in just a minute, but just a couple of other ground rules for when you speak.

Identify yourself, please, every time that you speak, even if you speak a lot during the course of the day today. There are just a
lot of parties here, and we are making a record. The record is being made by the court reporters to my right, your left. And as you can see, there are some poles in this room. Sorry about that. But those poles will block the ability of myself, and the court reporters more importantly, to actually see on some occasions. So it's important that you identify yourself. They're not going to be able to see exactly where somebody is speaking from, so they're going to have to get your name from you speaking it.

So, with that, I'm going to start off by taking a roll call. And this is going to take a little while, so please bear with me. There are a lot of parties here, a lot of people here, but we do want to get everybody who's here into the record. I'm going to go through my list. If at the end I've forgotten any party or any individual who is an intervenor in this proceeding, please let me know, and we'll take your appearance at that time. I've done my best to narrow -- not to narrow down, but to put the list in order here. So I'm going to start off

[^0]with the Applicant. Mr. Needleman and Mr. Getz, if you could please tell us who is here on behalf of the Joint Applicants.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Good morning. Is that on? Good morning. Barry Needleman, on behalf of the Applicant, from McLane Middleton. Along with me is Tom Getz, also from McLane Middleton. And to my right from Eversource Legal is Marvin Bellis and Elizabeth Maldonado.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public.

MR. ROTH: Good morning, Mike. Peter Roth, Counsel for the Public. And with me is Tom Pappas and Eli Emerson from the Primmer law firm.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Then I'm going to turn to the group of towns that have been combined, which I've just called for shorthand "The Northern Towns," being Pittsburg, Clarksville, Stewartstown, Colebrook, Northumberland, Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem and Littleton. If somebody could raise their hand where that group is. Okay. And if you folks -- just start with the front table. Tell

```
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us who is here and who you represent.
MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen, Bethlehem Conservation Commission.

MR. CRAXTON: Edward Craxton, Dalton.
MR. TANGUAY: Shawn --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Speak
into that mic.
MR. TANGUAY: Shawn Tanguay,
representing Northumberland and the Town of Whitefield.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And Shawn, could you spell your last name for our court reporters, please.

MR. TANGUAY: $\mathbf{T}-\mathbf{A}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{U}-\mathbf{A}-\mathrm{Y}$. And as well as Christine Fillmore is with me today as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Anybody else from that group here?

MR. WHITLEY: Yes, sir. Steven
Whitley, from Mitchell Municipal Group, for the Town of Littleton.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Anybody
else here from that group?
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(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there anybody here from Pittsburg, Clarksville, Stewartstown or Colebrook?
(No verbal response)
MR. BAKER: If I might speak on that? My name's Alan Baker.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, Mr. Baker.

MR. BAKER: Steve Ellis is the representative of Pittsburg, a selectman. He was going to be here, but he broke his wrist. And he was going to speak on behalf of Stewartstown, Clarksville and Pittsburg, and he asked me to relay that to you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, Mr. Baker.

Okay. The next group of towns that I have, I'll just call them the "Middle Towns." Sugar Hill, Franklin, Easton, Woodstock and Plymouth. Where is that group? Okay. Let's start with the table in front here. If you could each identify yourself and which town you represent.

MR. GROTE: Yes. Peter Grote, G-R-O-T-E. And I've been asked by the select board to represent Franconia. Did this work?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It did work. If you could pass it down to Ms. Pastoriza.

MS. PASTORIZA: Kris Pastoriza, Easton Conservation Commission. Last name P-A-S-T-O-R-I-Z-A.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. And who's next in that group? There were other hands.

MR. TANGUAY: Shawn Tanguay, Gardner, Fulton \& Waugh, along with Christine Fillmore, representing the Towns of Sugar Hill, Franconia and Easton.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Anybody --- yes, sir.

MR. WHITLEY: Steven Whitley, Mitchell Municipal Group, the Town of Woodstock.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Anybody else in that group here?

MR. GROTE: Yes. Peter Grote again, representing Dr. Judy Jeffries for the Franconia 2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}

Conservation Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Is there anybody here from Plymouth? Yes, ma'am.

MS. SAFFO: Lara Saffo from the Grafton County Attorney's Office, representing Grafton, which would include Plymouth and all the towns -- not all the towns, but the towns in Grafton, and Martha Richards, one of the commissioners.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. But the Town of Plymouth itself has filed a Petition to Intervene. They were granted intervention and combined with these middle group of towns. So I just want to make sure there's nobody here from the Town of Plymouth itself.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
We'll get to the counties in a moment.
The next group I have is the Southern
Towns, including Holderness, Ashland,
Bridgewater, New Hampton, Bristol, Canterbury, Concord, Pembroke and Deerfield. And just before we get into that, these labels that I
have put on the towns don't mean anything other than a way to keep track of folks, and so don't read anything into them. It doesn't make any difference with respect to your position in this administrative proceeding.

So that group of towns that I've just read, are they located somewhere here in the room? Excellent. I'm going to start over on my far right, your far left, back near Mr. Kucman there. If you could introduce yourselves.

MR. KUCMAN: Yes. My name is Taras Kucman. I'm a resident of Concord abutting the Northern Pass right-of-way, and I'm here with my wife Martha.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
Wait. Mr. Kucman you raised your hand. Are you here on behalf of a town?

MR. KUCMAN: Not officially.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
We'll get to you in a minute. I was looking for the people who are here representing these municipalities that I've labeled as the "Southern Towns." So if you folks could raise your hands again because Mr. Kucman's brought me
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over in this direction. I expected you to be over here. Why don't we start at this table here, the gentleman in the red shirt, please. MR. TOTH: My name is Dave Toth, T-O-T-H, and I'm from the Ashland Water \& Sewer Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Go right down the table, please.

MR. BADGER: My name is Eli Badger.
I'm the chair of the Ashland Water \& Sewer Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MS. BADGER: Mardean Badger with the Ashland Water \& Sewer Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Go to the right of that, my left, your right of that table. Mr. Tanguay.

MR. TANGUAY: Shawn Tanguay of
Gardner, Fulton \& Waugh, along with Christine Fillmore, representing the Town of Bristol.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Other
folks in that group?
MR. WHITLEY: Steven Whitley, Mitchell
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Municipal Group, representing the Towns of Bridgewater and New Hampton.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Go ahead.
MS. PACIK: Danielle Pacik from the City of Concord's Legal Department, and with me is James Owers from the City of Concord Conservation Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Yes, sir, in the back.

MR. McGARRY: Fred McGarry, Town of Deerfield Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're going to have to repeat your name again because I don't think we got it.

MR. McGARRY: Okay. It's Fred McGarry.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right. Could you spell that, please, for our reporters?

MR. MCGARRY: M-C-G-A-R-R-Y.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank
you. Anybody else in that group of towns
representing the town or municipality?
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(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there anybody from the Town of Canterbury here?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there anybody from the Town of Pembroke here, either the board of selectmen or the conservation commission?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. City of Franklin, are they here?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I don't see them.

Okay. County Commissioners. I see Ms. Richards, and I know Ms. Saffo. If you want to start with the Grafton County Commissioners, please.

MS. SAFFO: County Attorney Lara Saffo and Commissioner Martha Richards.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

And Rick Samson from the Coos -- I see him just rolling in. Mr. Samson, spell your
name for the record and tell us who you represent.

MR. SAMSON: Rick Samson, $\mathbf{S - A}-\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}$, Coos County Commissioner for District 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Okay. We're going to get into the property owners now. Some are abutters and some are not. We're going to start with the group that we -- I'm sorry. Oh, I'm sorry, ma'am.

MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen from Bethlehem. I don't know whether I should have said that $I$ 'm also representing the Board of Selectmen from Bethlehem.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's good to know. Thank you.

I'm informed that I didn't keep my computer on long enough, so we'll deal with that in a minute. Let's finish going through the roll call.

Who am I looking for? Behind the pole. Okay. See if you can find a microphone so our court reporters can get this.

MS. HARTNETT: I'm sorry to be late.

I'm Kate Hartnett, representing the Town of Deerfield, and the conservation commission and planning board if I have to. I'm on both. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Is there anybody else from the towns?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. We're going to go to what $I$ have just referred to as the "Northern Abutting Property Owners," that at least to me appear to be between Clarksville and Dalton on the underground route. Start with Charles or Donna Jordan.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sally
Zankowski.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: JON or Lori Levesque.

MR. LEVESQUE: Here.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: If You could just tell us who you are and how to spell your last name.

MR. LEVESQUE: Jon Levesque,
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L-E-V-E-S-Q-U-E. We have a camp on Bear Rock Road in Stewartstown and --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're going to have to speak right into that microphone, sir. You can sit down. It's okay.

MR. LEVESQUE: We have a camp on Bear
Rock Road in Stewartstown.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And I
take it that's Lori?
MS. LEVESQUE: Lori Levesque,
L-E-V-E-S-Q-U-E.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. How about Roderick and Donna McAllaster?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Lynne
Placey?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Arlene
Placey?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Brad and
Daryl Thompson? Go ahead, sir. Tell us your name and where you're from.

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. THOMPSON: Bradley Thompson, |
| 2 | residence on Bear Rock Road, burial site looking |
| 3 | directly at Transition No. 4. |
| 4 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank |
| 5 | you. |
| 6 | I'm probably going to mess up this |
| 7 | last name. David Schrier, $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}$ ? |
| 8 | MR. BAKER: Alan Baker. I have an |
| 9 | appearance for Mr. Schrier. He has a residence |
| 10 | on Old County Road in Stewartstown. |
| 11 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank |
| 12 | you. |
| 13 | And Nancy L. Dodge? |
| 14 | (No verbal response) |
| 15 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. |
| 16 | I'm next going to go to what we have just |
| 17 | labeled as the "Northern Abutters" that appear |
| 18 | to live in Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, |
| 19 | Whitefield and Dalton. This is labeled as an |
| 20 | "overhead portion of the line." Start off with |
| 21 | R. Eric Jones and Margaret J. Jones. |
| 22 | (No verbal response) |
| 23 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: How about |
| 24 | Elmer Lupton and Claire Lupton? |
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(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mary
Boone Wellington?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Bruce or Sondra Brekke, $B-R-E-K-K-E$ ? All the way in the back. If you can make sure you have a mic, Mr . Brekke.

MR. BREKKE: My name is Bruce Brekke. I'm from Whitefield.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Elaine Olson?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry, Mr. Baker.

MR. BAKER: Alan Baker, representing Elaine Olson, Eric Olson and Joshua Olson, as trustees. They have property in Dummer on the -- abutting on the right-of-way of PSNH on the Coos Loop.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Kevin Spencer. Mr. Cunningham or Mr.


Heath?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: James and Judy Ramsdell?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Charles
and Cynthia Hatfield?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Donald
and Betty Gooden, $G-O-O-D-E-N ?$
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Tim or
Brigitte Whitefield?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
I'm going to move on to the next group. And like I said, these groups are in no meaningful order. This is the "Non-Abutting Property Owners," which we believe are between Clarksville and Bethlehem. We'll start off with Robert Martin.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
The following is a group that filed for
intervention together: Roderick "Rod" Moore, Joseph Dunlap, Shawn Brady and Christopher Thompson.

MR. BAKER: Alan Baker, representing the four that you just mentioned. They have property off of Heath Road, with a right-of-way under the proposed transmission line where Northern Pass wishes to erect towers.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the next group in this group have identified themselves as the "Dixville Notch-Harvey Swell Location Residents": Martin Kaufman, Brad Thompson, John Petrofsky and 44 other residents. Yes, sir.

MR. THOMPSON: Bradley Thompson, representing the Dixville Notch-Harvey Swell Group, of which 10 are direct abutters. All 44 have a direct view of the Heath Road towers, Big Diamond Pond Road area.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Next is Mark Orzek or Susan Orzek, O-R-Z-E-K.
(No verbal response)
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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: John Davidge, D-A-V-I-D-G-E, for Prospect Farm Lancaster, LLC.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Linda
Upham-Bornstein?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Rebecca
Weeks, Sherill Moore for Weeks Lancaster Trust.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Richard
M. McGinnis.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Frederic
P. Fitts.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Gerald or Vivian Roy.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Edward A. Piatek, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{K}$ ?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Frank or
Kate Lombardi?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Marsha
Lombardi?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Alexandra
Dannis and James Dannis?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: David Van
Houten.
MR. VAN HOUTEN: David Van Houten.
I'm a landowner in Bethlehem. I also recently purchased a piece of property across --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Start with, "I also recently purchased property..."

MR. VAN HOUTEN: I also recently
purchased a property adjacent to my home which will be crossed by the proposed power line. You have the spelling of my name? Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Wendy
Doran, $\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{N}$.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Andrew
Dodge.

MR. DODGE: Yup. Andrew Dodge. I own property in Bethlehem.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, good morning. Thank you, sir.

The next group of intervenors which has been consolidated by the Chair is what I call the "Middle Abutting Property Owner Group," that goes from Bethlehem to Plymouth.

Nigel Manley and Judy Ratzel, R-A-T-Z-E-L .
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Russell or Lydia Cumbee, $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{E}$.

MR. CUMBEE: Yes, Russell and Lydia Cumbee, abutters on Route 116 in Franconia.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Walter Palmer or Kathryn Ting?
MR. PAMLER: Yes. My name is Walter Palmer, $P-A-L-M-E-R$, and $I$ am the duly-appointed spokesperson for this group and representing all members of the group, including those who could not be present here today.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank
you, sir. I'm still going to go through the group, though, just so we have the record and folks can let us know.

Peter Grote.
MR. GROTE: Yes, Peter Grote, Easton Road in Franconia.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And is
Mary Grote here as well?
MR. GROTE: No, but I represent her. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Paul or Dana O'Hara?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Virginia Jeffreys.

MR. GROTE: Virginia Jeffreys could not be here today. I represent her. Peter Grote, G-R-O-T-E.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Carol Dwyer.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Gregory
and Lucille Wolf.
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(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Susan Schibanoff.

MS. SCHIBANOFF: Susan Schibanoff.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm
sorry.
MS. SCHIBANOFF: That's okay. I own national-registered property in Franconia on Route 116, which is the site of the proposed underground route. You need a spelling of that name?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That would be great.

MS. SCHIBANOFF: $S-C-H-I-B$, as in blue, $A-N-O-F-F$, as in Franklin.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. If I look a little wide-eyed up here, it's because sometimes when some of you are speaking, I don't know where you're speaking from. So I'm just listening, okay.

The next $I$ have is Ken and Linda Ford.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Dr.
Campbell McLaren?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Eric and Barbara Meyer?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Robert Thibault $T-H-I-B-A-U-L-T$. And I may have actually even spelled that wrong.
(No verbal response)
MR. THIBAULT: No, you spelled it correctly.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MR. THIBAULT: Bob Thibault, I live on Easton Valley Road in Easton, and I'm an abutter to the underground portion.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Dennis Ford? All right, sir.
MR. FORD: Dennis Ford, Easton. I'm an abutter on Route 116.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Carl Lakes and Barbara Lakes?
MR. LAKES: Yes, Carl Lakes. I'm here
for Barbara Lakes as well. I'm an abutter on Route 116.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Bruce Ahern?
MR. AHERN: Bruce Ahern, A-H-E-R-N.
Route 3 runs through my property south of Plymouth.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MR. AHERN: Representing myself and my wife Janet.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

And Frank Pinter?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
I'm now going to move to the next group that we have listed, which is the "Middle Non-Abutting Property Owners," which runs generally from Bethlehem to Plymouth. The first folks in this group, I have a Lee Sullivan and Steve Bizzell or Buzzell.
(No verbal response)
2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next group is Timothy and Rebecca Burbank; Edward Cenerizio, C-E-N-E-R-I-Z-I-O; Deborah Corey, C-O-R-E-Y; and Matthew Steele, individually and as owners of 41 Dyke Road, LLC. Anybody here from that group?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next group that I have is the "Southern Abutting Property Owners," and these run from Ashfield [sic] to Deerfield. We'll start with Carol Currier.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mary A. Lee?
(No verbal response)
MS. LEE: Oh, I'm here.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You can sit down and just speak into the microphone. Probably easier that way.

MS. LEE: I'm Mary Lee, representing Northfield as a landowner.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Craig or Corinne Pullen.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Anybody
from the McKenna's Purchase Unit Owners Association? Yes, ma'am.

MS. KLEINDIENST: Michelle
Kleindienst, $K-L-E-I-N-D-I-E-N-S-T$, representing McKenna's, who has an easement on the side of their property, along with...

MR. CHALOUX: Patrick Chaloux, $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{X}$, representing McKenna's Purchase, and also an abutter to the easement.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. Kucman.
MR. KUCMAN: My name is Taras Kucman.
I'm representing myself as a Concord resident.
MS. KUCMAN: Martha Kucman, East
Concord.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And you're from Concord as well, I take it. Okay.

Kelly Normandeau?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Laura
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Bonk.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Philip and Joan Bilodeau. I saw Mr. Bilodeau.

MR. BILODEAU: Philip Bilodeau, B-I-L-O-D-E-A-U, representing Philip and Joan Bilodeau, Deerfield, New Hampshire. We take exception to being associated with this group. We are not abutters to the power line. We are abutters to the ending 9-acre substation as presented by the Applicant at their many meetings. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Erick Berglund and Kathleen Berglund.
MR. BERGLUND: Erick Berglund, Deerfield, New Hampshire. And we are abutters on Nottingham Road for about 200 feet of right-of-way, and representing my wife Kathleen as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Rebecca Hutchinson.
(No verbal response)
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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Torin Judd and Brian Judd, J-U-D-D.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: JOAnne Bradbury.

MS. BRADBURY: I'm JoAnne Bradbury, spelled B, bravo, R-A, D, delta, B, bravo, U-R-Y. I'm from Deerfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Jeanne Menard. I saw her somewhere. MS. MENARD: Jeanne Menard, J-E-A-N-N-E, M-E-N-A-R-D. I'm representing the Menard Family Limited Partnership. It's a forestry partnership. Also an appearance with my brother, Peter Menard, and his wife, Anne Burnett.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Kevin and Lisa Cini, C-I-N-I. Yes, sir.

MR. CINI: Kevin Cini, $C-I-N-I$, representing myself and my wife Lisa, property owners on 20 Mountain Road.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You would think a guy named Iacopino would know how to say it correctly, right.

Bruce Adami and Robert Cote. Adami is spelled $A-D-A-M-I$.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Eric and Sandra Lahr, L-A-H-R.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Next intervenor, Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.

MS. MANZELLI: Good morning. Amy Manzelli and Jason Reimers from the law firm of BCM Environmental and Land Law, here with Wil Abbott from the Forest Society. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next combined group we have is what we've referred to as "Environmental NGOs." Appalachian Mountain Club.

MR. PLOUFFE: I'm William Plouffe, an attorney from Drummond Woodsum, representing the Appalachian Mountain Club. Here with me is Ken Kimball from the Appalachian Mountain Club.
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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Conservation Law Foundation.
MS. BICHARD: Hi. Thank you. Melissa
Birchard for Conservation Law Foundation.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sierra
Club, New Hampshire Chapter.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust.

MR. EVELYN: Douglas Evelyn, representing the Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MR. EVELYN: E-V-E-L-Y-N.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

The next combined group is what we've labeled as "Historic NGOs." Sugar Hill Historical Museum.

MS. WILLIAMSON: Hi. My name's Sharee Williamson. I'm actually with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. And I'll let you know that none of the other preservation
intervenors are here today. I'm here with my colleague, Betsy Merritt.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Cate Street Capital, City of Berlin?
MR. BOLDT: City of Berlin's here. Chris Boldt, Donahue, Tucker \& Ciandella, for the City of Berlin only.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Anybody from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, IBEW?

MR. RAFF: Alan Raff, Primary Legal Solutions, representing the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. And Alan Raff is $A-L-A-N, R-A-F-F$, as in french fry.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next intervenors, Coos Business and Employers Group. Yes, ma'am.

MS. WILLEY: Leigh Willey from -(Court Reporter interrupts.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're going to have to repeat and spell your name for us.

MS. WILLEY: L-E-I-G-H, W-I-L-L-E-Y.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And your law firm?

MS. WILLEY: Bianco Professional Association.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

North Country Chamber of Commerce.
MS. NANASI: Yvonne Nanasi,
N-A-N-A-S-I. I'm representing North Country Chamber of Commerce and am a member of the board of directors.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Dixville Capital and Balsams Resort.

MR. BELIVEAU: Attorney Mark Beliveau, B, as in boy, $E-L-I-V-E-A-U$, from the law firm of Pierce Atwood, representing Dixville Capital and Balsam Resort Holdings.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Wagner Forest Management.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee.

MR. STAMP: Max Stamp, Bristol,
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representing Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Now, is there anybody here who was granted intervenor --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: There's more.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. DRAPER: Barry Draper and Gretchen
Draper from the Local Advisory Council also.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: MY apologies.

MR. DRAPER: And we're from New Hampton.

MS. MENARD: Mr. Chairman, there's a southern --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Hold on.
You have to tell us your name first so they can --

MS. MENARD: Jeanne Menard,
M-E-N-A-R-D. There's a southern grouping of non-abutters that has been omitted.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, that's my fault. I must have just skipped over
that in my list.
So, Joanna and Robert Tuveson.
(No verbal response)
MR. TUVESON: Bob Tuveson, representing myself and my wife, from Holderness.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Nina and Elisha Gray.
MR. GRAY: Elisha Gray, representing myself and wife, Nina Gray, from New Hampton, New Hampshire.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Rodney and Laura Felgate.
MR. GRAY: This is Elisha Gray. They've asked me to represent them. We're neighbors.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The
Webster Family Group.
MS. MUMFORD: Margaret Mumford, representing the Webster Family, along with my cousin. We are property abutting the Pemigewasset River.

MS. TOWNSEND: I'm Heather Townsend, also representing the Webster Group.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Lawrence Phillips and Maxine Phillips.
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: How about
Lisa Wolford or Pamela Hanglin?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: F.
Maureen Quinn?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Madelyn
or Thomas Foulkes, $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{S}$ ?
MR. FOULKES: Thomas Foulkes,
26 Nottingham Road, Deerfield.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MS. FOULKES: Madelyn Foulkes,
26 Nottingham Road, Deerfield.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

And then, Ms. Menard, we've already
got you. But you're also here as a managing
member of the Pawtuckaway View, LLC?
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MS. MENARD: That is correct. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right. Is there any other person who was granted intervenor status that $I$ did not call or that missed the call? Yes, sir.

MR. WOLF: My name's Greg Wolf.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're going to have to find a microphone, Mr. Wolf.

MR. WOLF: My name is Greg Wolf. I live --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You have to speak right into that. We can't hear you up here.

MR. WOLF: My name is Greg Wolf. I'm here representing my wife, Lucille, and myself. We live in Franconia on 116.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Is there anybody else who was granted intervenor status who we did not go through?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}

MR. ROTH: This is Peter Roth, Counsel for the Public. Do you intend to create a score card, so to speak, with everybody's name and contact information based on the people who made an appearance today, or who otherwise somehow identified themselves as being a spokesperson for a particular one of the groups that have been created for them?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, something will be created once we have everything ironed out and our administrator is back from vacation. My guess is that we will have a list of the parties that will have both mailing and e-mail information. And my guess is we will also put together an e-mail distribution list that will be able to be copied from the web site and used for the parties during the course of the adjudicative portion of this proceeding. That's one of the reasons why we have the sign-up sheets, and it's one of the reasons why we go through the roll call is to see who is here and make sure we have a record of it. So I do expect there will be something. It won't be available tomorrow, but it will be available in
the short term.
MR. ROTH: As a follow-up, if I may. Do you expect there to be a date by which the grouped parties have to organize and determine who's going to speak for them?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It's on our agenda to discuss today, and we'll get to it. It's No. 3 on the agenda.

Before we get to that, I do want to point out what the purpose of this proceeding here is today. This is a prehearing conference. On the agenda that was passed out when you walked in -- I'm sorry. On the front side of that is a little quip from R.S.A. 541-A that explains what a prehearing conference is. That doesn't give you very much information. In essence, what we do at the Site Evaluation Committee with respect to prehearing conferences is we use this as an informal opportunity to address the issues that may come up during the course of this proceeding. As some of you are aware, we, at least in recent times, have never had a proceeding with this many parties in it. So we are working somewhat on a new template, if
you will. However, we do have to abide by the statutes and rules in all of our proceedings. So I have listed the typical things that a prehearing conference is used for, and that is -- they're on the front side of that agenda. Basically, it's to consider offers of settlement; simplification of issues; stipulations or admissions as to issues of fact or proof, by consent of the parties; limitations on the number of witnesses; changes to standard procedures desired during the hearing, and consented to by the parties; consolidation of examination of witnesses by the parties; and any other matters which aid in the disposition of the proceeding. Those identified areas are straight from the Administrative Procedures Act in New Hampshire, and they're also included within the Administrative Rules of the Site Evaluation Committee.

Given the size of this docket and the size and the number of parties involved, we may do things a little bit differently. But everything that we do is going to be done so that we can expand due process to the parties as 2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
opposed to constraining it.
Our process today is going to be somewhat informal. Just so you all know, this is not a hearing at which we take testimony. This is not an advocacy hearing, okay. This is a hearing at which we discuss the manner in which this proceeding is going to take place. I've tried to prepare an outline as best I could as to what $I$ believe an agenda should contain with respect to this proceeding. If you note, down at the bottom, No. 11, there's a spot there for any additional things. If you have something that is not contained in the first 10 chapters of the agenda, that's the time to discuss it. My guess is, though, by the time we get through this agenda, we will probably have addressed most of the issues that are of concern to folks.

As far as the process and procedure goes, I am not a member of the Site Evaluation Committee. I cannot make substantive decisions. I cannot rule on motions here today. What I will do is, at the end of the day, $I$ will prepare a report for the Committee of what
occurred in this prehearing conference. It is likely that the Chairman of the Committee will then issue a procedural schedule, based at least in part, if not in total, on what comes out of this prehearing conference here today. So that's the way that it works. I don't get to make the decision. I get to report what we discuss so that the Chairman of the Committee and the Committee itself, on some issues, has the ability to set forth a formal order with the procedure.

So that's what we're doing here today.
So please don't think of this as a place to advocate for your point of view on any particular issues because $I$ can't change anything. I just don't have the authority to change things. There will be opportunities to do that.

I'll give you an example. I know there are many people in this room who are dissatisfied with either their denial of intervention status or the manner in which they are grouped, okay. There is a process for that.

Some of you have already undertaken that
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process. But we will discuss that process in a couple of minutes. Now is not the time, for instance, to argue that you're grouped in the wrong group because $I$ can't change it. But now is the time for us to get a handle for how many people believe that they might be grouped incorrectly, and that would go into the report. So all of those issues can be addressed, but I don't have the final say on what occurs with them.

Again, ground rules for our hearing today: Please identify yourself. Please use the microphone. It's probably better if you sit at the table. I think the folks who have tried to stand, it hasn't worked as well. So you're fine to speak from a seated position. And if your name is not a common last name, please spell it for our court reporters.

So we've gotten through the first two agenda items, and we've been 46 minutes into it. The next agenda item is the organization of intervenor groups and the designation of temporary spokespeople. And I guess what I wanted to do, at least for today, was to
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understand who is -- if you can -- and we might want to take a few minutes. But for the intervenor groups, especially the larger ones, it would be most efficient if you could identify somebody to address for your group here today in this prehearing conference. It doesn't have to be the person who ultimately is going to speak for any particular intervenor group. It would just make today go easier. And with that, what I'm going to ask that we do is we take a 10-minute break for those intervenor groups to caucus. And then we'll come back from the 10-minute break and we'll see if you guys have had the ability to designate a temporary spokesperson for today, just to make it easier for everybody. It is not anything that is binding going forward, and it is not -- and by participating in this, you do not in any way lose your ability to file an appeal or ask for a review of your intervenor status. This is purely for the purpose of efficiency during today's hearing.

So it is 10:44. We'll come back at
10:54 -- 10:55. So let's take a break. And I'd
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ask that the intervenor groups please caucus and come up with somebody to -- yes, ma'am. Before we break, hold on.

MS. BICHARD: I'm sorry. Melissa
Birchard for Conservation Law Foundation. While I think everybody's happy to expedite the process here today, I'm concerned about our ability to develop consolidated positions on such short notice and without knowledge of the details of what's going to come up in the agenda.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, I
don't think anybody is asking you to come up with final positions with respect to anything with regard to the hearing. I mean, hopefully at end of the day we'll have an idea of perhaps some kind of broad schedule. But we're not asking for you to -- we're not asking for you to come to complete agreement with the members of your group on any particular issue. We're just trying to make this more efficient. There will be, as most of you are aware, a process for realignment, if that's found to be in the public interest by the Chair or by the Committee,
depending upon the filings. What I'm trying to do is just make today more efficient. Does that answer your question?

MS. BIRCHARD: Agreed, yes. And that's a great plan. I guess I would ask that in the event there is a difference of opinion, more than one spokesperson be allowed to -PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, absolutely. If there's something that folks just cannot agree on, or even somebody -- look, we've done this in virtually every Site Evaluation Committee proceeding that we've ever had. We've always had intervenors that have been grouped. They don't always agree with each other. If you note in the intervention order, it specifically pointed out that any intervenor can file their own prefiled testimony. And we'll get to that later in our agenda today. But you certainly have the opportunity to make your own individual views known. What we are trying to do is develop a process so that gets done in a more efficient manner, so that these things are -- I mean, the point is we can't have 160 parties. We just can't do it. So that's
the point here. Mr. Bilodeau.
MR. BILODEAU: I would also take exception to one spokesman for the group. We just found out on Friday, and today's Tuesday, in that period of time to even recognize and acknowledge who the other 16 people are in that group. Some people live in Ashland, some people live in Deerfield. How could we have ever gotten together to have a spokesperson?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's why we're taking a break and allowing you to caucus -- if I may finish, sir -- and come up with a temporary spokesperson. Thank you.

Yes, ma'am.
MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen, Bethlehem.
I have never been to one of these before. I don't know what a spokesperson will responsible for doing here today. I don't even know many of the people in the municipal group I'm in or where they are here today. And the other thing is, does that mean no one else from the group can ask questions? I'm just --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No, no, it does not. As I said before, we're trying to
just do it as efficiently as possible. We have a single spokesperson temporarily for each group for today. But if somebody disagrees or has a different viewpoint, or even has a new idea, everybody's got a microphone in front of them. We're going to allow that to happen. But we're just trying to allow you to -- that's why we're going to take a break to caucus with the folks you've been grouped with so that you can meet each other and perhaps address things on a more efficient basis.

Yes, sir.
MR. WHITLEY: Steven Whitley, Mitchell Municipal Group --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Steven Whitley, Mitchell Municipal Group.

MR. WHITLEY: Just going to suggest that we designate areas within this room where particular groups should designate to make the 10 minutes most efficient.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Good idea.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you. I would
suggest that the municipalities come to this side of the room, because selfishly I'm sitting over here. But if you have a better idea, that is certainly fine as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No, that is a good idea.

Yes, ma'am, in the back.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you very much for that idea, the geography question of where we should go.

But the second point is, what's the job description of the spokesperson? Is it legal? Is it technical? What's the job description?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It is merely for efficient communication at this proceeding today. That's all it is. Once there is a permanent spokesperson for each permanent group, that person will have the responsibility for the group, to get any motions that individual members of the group want to file filed; to get prefiled testimony for the group filed; if the group intends to hire any kind of expert witnesses or anything like that, they
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will handle that part of the proceeding and get what's filed -- get what needs to be filed on behalf of the group for that. When it gets down to the examination of witnesses during the actual trial or adjudicative hearings, that person will be the primary spokesperson for questions for the various witnesses that would be cross-examined during the adjudicative hearing.

Yes, ma'am.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just a follow-up observation. That permanent spokesperson sounds like an enormous job for volunteers. Do I have that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It is a big job. But there is a proceeding that is going to occur. And if a group wants to participate, it has to do all those things. So, having a spokesperson is actually somebody that you can funnel the -- there's nothing that stops you from collaborating in your group. But having a single voice actually helps you make a presentation at the time. There is no prohibition on any group hiring counsel, or any
individual hiring counsel for that matter. And we actually encourage folks who intervene before the SEC to do so.

There was another hand up here. Yes, sir.

MR. PLOUFFE: Bill Plouffe,
Appalachian Mountain Club. Following up on a comment just a minute ago with respect to this spokesperson conducting cross-examination, are you saying that the one spokesperson for the consolidated group -- we have four organizations in our group -- is the only person who can cross-examine all of the Applicant's witnesses? Or alternatively, as we would do in court, can we not split between attorneys each witness, but it can be different attorneys or spokespeople or persons examining different witnesses of the Applicant?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: In the past, the Site Evaluation Committee has allowed that to actually happen, and in fact has encouraged that, just what you said, where certain individuals within a group -- for instance, somebody is designated as a scenic
person, and they cross-examine the scenic witnesses; somebody is designated the environmental person. That is something that we have allowed. And I'm sure, although it hasn't been raised to the Committee yet, but I'm sure that's a process that will be allowed in this particular proceeding. However, the Committee has still required a spokesperson because it is always easier to have communications go through one particular party. Now, in that particular instance that the gentleman is speaking about, what's happened in the past is he would stand up and he would say, "Oh, the cross-examination for these visual impact experts is going to be Dr. Kimball," and then Dr. Kimball takes over. Appalachian Mountain Club has appeared in a number of our proceedings. They've seen it happen like that. And I don't think it would happen any differently in this proceeding.

MR. PLOUFFE: Will that be explained in the order?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It will be explained in an order at some point. I don't know if it will be in the initial procedural
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order. I don't know if it's going to get that detailed. But at some point those types of ground rules will be laid out for all the parties who are participating in this proceeding.

MR. PLOUFFE: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Way in the back there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: In terms of -PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: We need your name.

MS. MUMFORD: Margaret Mumford.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MS. MUMFORD: In terms of appointing the spokesperson and other rights, intervenors that are not here, have they lost their rights by not being here, other than participating in today's decisions?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No, absolutely not.

MS. MUMFORD: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Any other questions?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Going to ask that we take 10 minutes. Now it's 10:54. So why don't we come back at five past eleven, and hopefully we have somebody -- yes, sir.

MR. DODGE: Are you going to designate places? I mean, $I$ don't know any of the other intervenors in the group.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sure, I will do that. Okay. We're going to have the towns, whether you're northern, middle or southern, go to the far side of the room over by the water. Franklin's not here.

I guess the county commissioners and Mr. Samson, you guys have a table there. I think you can probably caucus right from there.

The abutting property owners from Clarksville to Dalton, why don't you come up in the upper -- your left-hand corner up here.

And then in the next set of seats where these folks are sitting over here, why don't we have the abutting property owners on the overhead portion of the northern route.

And then in the far corner to your left over there, I've got non-abutting property owners from Clarksville to Bethlehem.

And I notice some people holding signs up. I assume that's where you want to be. Okay. So hold those signs up. We've got southern abutters right here, southern non-abutters right behind them.

It looks like the historic and environmental groups are together near each other.

Okay. Who needs a place?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Northern abutters on the overhead route, right over there where she's holding up that placard. (Whereupon a brief recess was taken at 10:55 a.m. and the hearing resumed at 11:18 a.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It's now 11:18 a.m. We're going to start up again, okay. Thank you.

The first substantive issue that I'm going to ask us to sort of grapple with here is
something the Committee is well aware of. There is some dissatisfaction with both the rulings on petitions to intervene, as well as the groupings that were made by the order on intervention, that eventually there will be firm, designated groups. The order that has come out is the first attempt by the Chair of the Committee to do that. The manner in which it was done was we reviewed all of the petitions to intervene that were filed. There were approximately 160 of them. And we looked for -- and the Chairman looked for the manner in which to group them that tended to make sense, okay. Now, of course, every one of you who filed a motion to intervene probably wanted to be their own party and not be grouped with anybody else. That's just not realistic with this many people involved. However, it doesn't mean that the groupings that the Chair eventually did are the final result, and it doesn't mean that you're stuck with that. There is a process by which you can seek an appeal from the current ruling, and that is contained in R.S.A. 162, Section 4, Subsection $V$, which states that any party
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aggrieved by a decision on a petition to intervene may, within 10 calendar days, request that the Committee review such decision. What that means is that the full committee will be convened to review any, we call them "appeal," from this decision on the intervention for a full committee review. Some of you have already filed, either by e-mail or otherwise have already filed a request. I want to point a couple things out because I've read some of those things.

Please be very specific in what you want if you choose to request a review by the full committee. Many of you have been very polite in the e-mails that you've sent, but they don't really tell us what it is that you're looking to happen. We appreciate the politeness, but you also have to be direct and polite and tell us what it is that you want. There are other folks who have done it and made it exactly that way. Just so you know, if you have filed an e-mail or another filing with the Committee where you have suggested that you are -- well, first of all, if you were
improperly excluded from intervening, or if you were granted intervention but grouped with the wrong party, if there's even a hint of that, my recommendation to the Committee is we're going to consider that as a request for the full committee to review that. However, we do appreciate if you ask directly, okay, and give us the reasons why. Obviously, if you've been prohibited from intervening -- I don't know if there's very many public members here who have been prohibited from intervening -- obviously, you want to restate the reasons why you might want to intervene. If it's a matter of grouping, and you have a different idea for grouping, we're going to talk about a little bit about that in a minute. Put your idea in there and let us know what it is you're suggesting. And, of course, if you are suggesting that you should be a party all by yourself, make sure you make that clear in your e-mail or your motion, whatever you want to call it, your request for review by the Committee.

One of the difficulties with the Site
Evaluation Committee is that we are not
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permitted to go back in a room and sit down with all these motions. And, of course, obviously the Applicant will have an opportunity to object. But the Committee doesn't get a chance to go back into a room and sort of sift through all the paperwork and converse about it and make a decision that way. They have to hold a hearing that has to be public, has to be noticed under R.S.A. 91-A, and they have to do all their consideration in public. So that would be the next step. That step is going to occur because we do have folks who have already filed requests for review of their intervention status. And there will be a notice that will be published as to when that public hearing will occur. Whether or not there will be argument taken at that hearing has not yet been decided. And what I mean by that is this: There's two different ways the Site Evaluation Committee can operate with respect to these types of issues. They have to meet in public to decide anything. When they meet in public, however, they can simply start going over the paperwork that has been filed and not take any arguments from the public
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or from the folks who are seeking review; they can simply decide on the papers. Or the Chairman can decide as a procedural matter that he will hear argument from potential intervenors at that hearing. In other words, you'll get an opportunity to make a pitch, so to speak. And, of course, every party would have the opportunity to respond to that -- to your motion and to the request that you make at that hearing.

So that has not yet been decided.
However, it is clear that there will be a proceeding, all right. And there is a deadline in the statute for anybody who wishes to change their intervention status, and that is 10 days, 10 calendar days, not business days, 10 calendar days from the date of the decision, which was March 18th. So if you want to ask the full committee to either allow you to intervene if you've not been permitted to intervene, or to change the combination of groups or designation that you've been in, you need to file that in writing with the Committee before the end of business, which is 4:30 on March 28th. If you
have already filed something, whether you think we're going to consider it as a request for review, although some of them don't really request that -- some of the e-mails that we received basically asked the Chairman to reconsider. He's not going to do that. It will be the entire committee -- the Subcommittee in this case.

So, with that being said, and understanding that there is a level of dissatisfaction out there with respect to the combinations that have been taken, I have been asked by the Chair to canvas this group and ask you all -- and we've got to do this obviously in an orderly fashion -- if you think there's a better way in which intervenors can be grouped.

What I'm going to do is, I'm going to start on my far left and go through table by table back, and I'm going to end with Counsel for the Public and then the Applicant, okay. You don't have to have an opinion, just so you know. You don't have to speak here. But if somebody's got -- thinks they have a better idea for combinations, you know, let's hear it. And
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it may make a difference to the Committee ultimately.

So I'm going to start with the first table, with the IBEW. Obviously, you were granted full intervention status. I assume you don't have any position.

MR. RAFF: I do not. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Boldt.

MR. BOLDT: Chris Boldt, Donahue, Tucker \& Ciandella, for the City of Berlin. I'll leave it to greater minds than mine on how we herd these cats. Unfortunately, I do say that I will be filing an objection on our very minor grouping. But I've already spoken to Attorney Needleman.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Mr. Whitley, anything from your table there?

MR. WHITLEY: Yes, thank you. In the towns that $I$ represent -- again, it's Steven Whitley, Mitchell Municipal Group -- and those are the towns of Littleton, Woodstock, New

Hampton, Bridgewater -- we do feel that there's a better way to group the intervenors. We do plan on filing a motion to that effect before the SEC to consider.

But just to summarize it real quickly, we understand the desire to have this proceeding as efficiently as possible. This is obviously a large, large project, unprecedented in the state. So there's going to be some bumps in the road to get this all figured out. But we would recommend that within the municipal groups that there be established some sort of a committee where there's one representative from each municipality who would work with the other municipalities in the group to decide on discovery issues, questions proposed to the Applicant, or to request documents, things of that nature. Other than discovery, we would ask that the towns, the individual municipalities, be allowed to cross-examine and file pleadings and do everything else in an individual capacity, because within each group, even though the towns may geographically be in the same place, there's no guaranty that the overlapping
of interests is to the degree that everyone agrees on the questions to ask the Applicant's witness, to ask questions of the Applicant, the appropriate motions to file. And I think that -- I mean, I can only speak for the towns that I represent. We don't want to needlessly delay this process. So, to the extent there is some consistency, we would work together so that the Applicant and the SEC are not dealing with duplicative motions and duplicative questioning and those sorts of things. But I think that the individual towns need to have the option and the discretion to represent their residents and their interests before the SEC. And the current grouping in the intervention order I believe defeats that.

And the last thing I'll say about it is, ethically, it puts the counsel that are representing towns in a very difficult position because obviously we cannot represent the towns that we don't represent. And I think that it penalizes those towns that haven't hired counsel. And I understand the suggestion of the SEC is to obtain counsel. But it's obviously
not a requirement to do so. And so other than those comments, I don't think I've missed anything.

I don't know if you're going to be taking comments on other matters. I have a letter that I've been asked to read on behalf of the Towns of Pittsburg, Clarksville and Stewartstown which does speak to this issue. But I can read it into the record later on today if that's more appropriate.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Does it speak just to the issue of consolidation or --

MR. WHITLEY: I think that's primarily what it addresses.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: How long is it?

MR. WHITLEY: It is about a page and a half.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This is a prehearing conference. You can give that to our reporters, and we'll make sure that it gets posted in the record. But do you have any problems just summarizing it for everybody?

MR. WHITLEY: I will, with the caveat
that $I$ don't represent any of these towns, so I'm only doing it as the designated spokesperson of this group.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Why don't you just read it then. There's nobody from those three towns here; right?

MR. WHITLEY: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Why don't you just read it. Thank you. Slowly.

MR. WHITLEY: I'll do my best. This is from Steve Ellis, select person from Pittsburg, on behalf of the Towns of Pittsburg, Clarksville and Stewartstown.
"Dear Ms. Monroe: Pittsburg, Clarksville and Stewartstown authorized me, Steve Ellis, to communicate on their behalf at the SEC scheduling conference being held today. Unfortunately, my attendance at this meeting has been derailed by an accident that requires me to seek medical attention for a broken wrist.

Accordingly, $I$ ask this letter be read into the record. Our three towns would each like to have hard copies of all documents filed by the Applicants in this matter. We cannot download
many of the documents online, and some of our residents do not have Internet. We want to make hard copies available in our town offices for all residents. We also will need the hard copies to use in our preparation for the evidence phase of this proceeding. Please have the Applicants deliver hard copies to our three town offices as soon as practicable. Each town plans to offer evidence in this case, and we will also want to participate in discovery. It will take us substantial time to review and prepare for these activities, so we ask for as much time as possible to meet the deadlines, especially since our towns have been involuntarily grouped with other towns and we will need to meet to determine what action to take if the groupings are not altered. Frankly, we do not presently see how this grouping can be accommodated by volunteer selectmen, who each have many other obligations to employers, family and communities. For instance, it is an hour [sic] to hour-and-a-half drive from Pittsburg to Littleton. And our issues here in the North Country are totally different than those of the
intervenors who are south of us. For instance, we are the only municipal intervenors opposed to the Project whose towns would have brand new transmission corridors cut through them by the Applicant's proposed project. We fail to understand why the three of our towns were not made into one group with our own representative authorized to communicate with the SEC [sic]. We therefore, ask the SEC [sic] to review and reconsider the groupings... Thank you and the SEC [sic] for your cooperation and attention to these requests." And I'll come turn this in.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank
you. And actually, I've seen that letter. It came in yesterday or at some point before today. We have received it. But that's an example of review by the full committee. This letter, even though it doesn't specifically cite to that particular statute that's up on the screen right now, will be considered to be a request for review as $I$ discussed before. It's easier for the Committee staff and for the Committee itself, though, if you do cite the statute and do say, "I am requesting the Committee review
this pursuant to R.S.A. 162-H, Section 4, Roman Numeral V." But nonetheless, like I said, even though this doesn't specifically say that, this is the type of thing we will consider as a request for review.

Who's the group behind you there, Mr. Whitley? With respect to groupings, is anybody -- okay. To your left. Ms. Pacik.

MS. PACIK: Danielle Pacik from the City of Concord. I would note that as the attorney for the City of Concord, I could only represent the interest of the City of Concord. And being grouped with other municipalities does place us into a difficult position, especially if I was to be assigned spokesperson. I could not represent other communities. So what we would recommend is, while we're happy to try to coordinate discovery, we do want to be able to file our own pleadings, and we want to be able to do cross-examination on issues that are unique to Concord.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank
you. Was there another party at that table?
MS. PACIK: He's also from Concord.
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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. And how about -- which group is behind you there? I'm sorry. I can't see the placard, if there is one.

MR. TANGUAY: This is Shawn Tanguay, Gardner, Fulton \& Waugh, representing Municipal Group 2 as spokesman today, also representing several towns in each of the sections. We have no objection to the groupings of municipalities in the three groups. We just support what Attorney Whitley has indicated, that an executive committee or a steering committee makes more sense in terms of performing and conducting discovery. As you can well imagine, it's difficult for attorneys who have clients, but being in a group with other non-represented towns -- some of those towns don't even have town administrators -- it's going to be very difficult for us to work with non-represented towns, both ethically and practically speaking. So we would support some sort of a steering committee for each group. That would help to facilitate discovery; this way, there isn't 50 requests going to the Applicant instead of
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coming from the committee itself. It's sort of the same concept as the spokesperson who just -it helps alleviate some of our ethical issues, as well as I think it helps the burden being shouldered by multiple parties. This is a daunting task. It is a large project. There are a lot of groups, and a lot of different interests as well. So I think a committee makes much more sense for purposes of discovery. I'd also support the notion that any dispositive pleadings or examination of witnesses be done by the individual parties and not by a spokesperson on a committee. And that's essentially it.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there somebody who can -- is there anybody in your group, Mr. Tanguay, that wants to speak, that has something different to say or is of a different mind?

MR. TANGUAY: I don't believe there is. I'm looking in their direction. I don't see anybody --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PASTORIZA: I do.

MR. TANGUAY: There's one person. I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry. Ms. Pastoriza.

MS. PASTORIZA: Yup. Kris Pastoriza, P-A-S-T-O-R-I-Z-A.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Speak right into the microphone.

MS. PASTORIZA: I would suggest the grouping of Sugar Hill, Easton and Franconia for municipalities.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you.

What about from Municipal Group 3, that southern group? Is there somebody who can speak first for them?

MS. PACIK: Attorney Iacopino --
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, okay.
MS. PACIK: Concord actually is --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Hold on.
This is Danielle Pacik from Concord.
MS. PACIK: I'm from Concord. I was designated as the temporary spokesperson. I've
already given Concord's position. But I do know that other municipalities have their own concerns, so I would just defer to them.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's where I'm getting to. Others in that group? Yes. One at a time. You, way in the back first. Identify yourself, please.

MR. McGARRY: Fred McGarry, Town of Deerfield. Although we share the transmission lines in our town, as do many of the other communities, we have a rather unique position, in that we have a substation located in Deerfield. So we may -- I'd have to check with the members of the planning board and board of selectmen to see if they want to have a special status for Deerfield separate from the other groups.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You understand you'll have to file something within that 10-day timeframe, Mr. McGarry.

MR. McGARRY: Yes. Yes, I'm aware of that. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Ma'am.
MS. HARTNETT: Kate Hartnett, also
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from Deerfield Conservation Commission. I have four comments and a recommendation.

Deerfield has 4,000 people. We're a smaller town. We have a select board. We have a town administrator. We're all subject, as the SEC is, to 91-A, which means we've got a very slow process as well to deal with a lot of this decision-making within the select board, as Fred represented, and the planning board, and the conservation commission that $I$ represent. So I hear you saying about 91-A, but it's broader than just SEC, my point No. 1.

Secondly, this is a legal process, and many of us have no legal counsel available because we have no budget for legal counsel -(Court Reporter interrupts.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Can you raise your voice, please, ma'am?

MS. HARTNETT: I'm speaking right in the microphone. Do I need to repeat what I said?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You said you have no budget for legal counsel --

MS. HARTNETT: As a small town.

Correct. None of us have it in our budget. Point No. 3. And did you get the thing about 91-A?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yeah, we got that.

MS. HARTNETT: No. 3, the interests of the planning board are different than the conservation commission, or even than the select board -- and we are all volunteers just internally in our little town of 4,000 people -because our jobs are different as volunteers.

No. 4, as Fred mentioned, Deerfield is absolutely unique because of the terminus substation and perhaps another substation proposed in our town, which puts us in a unique standing, in my view, along the transmission corridor. But, you know, I'm not an attorney. But we are unique.

So, finally, it seems to me that if we can make recommendations -- and I've already heard comments about how inherently unfair this process is, especially for small towns, this SEC process -- is there any possibility of getting an appointed legal expert, at no cost to small
towns, to advise us on this process, and also allow the groupings to be much smaller and finer-grained so that like towns could be represented with like towns and like organizations with like organizations? Grouping's a great idea, but we think they're too macro. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Actually, just before -- which group are you with, sir, in the middle?

MR. BADGER: Eli Badger, Ashland Water and Sewer Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. BADGER: Group 3. We will be requesting a review by the Committee because -we all speak of "uniqueness" -- well, Eversource is putting 10 towers -- wants to put 10 towers through our water aquifer and next to our lagoons, which are right next to the Pemigewasset River. And that makes us unique, what damage it could cost. And we would like to be considered on a separate issue. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I was
going to go -- yes, sir. Are you from one of the towns?

MR. CRAXTON: Municipal Group 1.
Edward Craxton from Dalton. In addition to what our temporary spokesperson, Attorney Whitley, put forth, $I$ wanted to suggest a natural grouping of like towns, as was just mentioned, of Dalton, Whitefield, Bethlehem and Littleton. I understand we will have to file something to that regard, but I wanted that on the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: What's the commonality there that you're looking for?

MR. CRAXTON: It's certainly
geographic and the ability to get
representatives together to agree on discovery questions and whatever the issues might be. And there are some local geographic commonalities as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Yes, ma'am.

MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen from
Bethlehem. We think that the geographic groupings are far too broad as well.

Geographically, I mean, we're talking about one
of the towns, I think it was Pittsburg, saying that people up there don't even have Internet. And so we would go for a smaller grouping. Possibly Bethlehem, Dalton, Whitefield and Littleton. But also, Bethlehem is unique, in that we not only have transition lines -transmission lines, sorry, burial and a transition station. So I'm putting that out there, for what it's worth.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there anybody from any of those three town groups that wanted to speak up?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm going to go to the County Commissioners. We've got two counties represented back there. Speak right into that microphone, please.

MS. SAFFO: My name's Lara Saffo, and I'm the spokesperson for today only for Grafton and Coos Counties.

Grafton and Coos Counties are happy to work together; however, we think we should be separate groupings. Similar to what other towns have expressed, we have no interest in seeing
issues duplicated and so forth. But both Grafton and Coos County have over 1700 square miles to begin with, numerous towns, city and so forth. And putting us in one group puts 3400 square miles in one group. We don't feel that's appropriate. We think Grafton and Coos County should each be their own separate group. PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Let me ask you this: Have you given any thought to whether or not Grafton or Coos might want to, as a group, might want to participate with some of the municipal members that are in your counties?

MS. SAFFO: I think that's a possibility as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Do You have any ideas as to what that might be? MS. SAFFO: Yeah, I think we have to sit down with the towns and identify the issues and then look at the groupings after the issues are identified. And the reason why I think that's important is because, for example, Ashland clearly has a very unique issue, a very unique water and sewer issue that isn't the same issue in other towns. So $I$ think the towns
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should be separate and have the ability to be separate if they so desire. If towns want to be grouped together, if the town selectmen meet and decide they want to group, if Bethlehem, Littleton and Dalton decide they want to group together, I think that's fine. And maybe give everybody -- the Right To Know Law applies. So, give everybody as much time as we need to make sure we put a proper notice in the papers and so forth, and let the selectmen make the decisions as to whether or not they want to group. And then, that way, the towns that do have these really unique issues -- everybody's unique, to be clear there. But some towns might feel comfortable grouping and then some towns might not. Deerfield clearly is kind of in its own category. So I think we should actually maybe give everybody 21 days to decide if they want to group with the proposed groupings, see what people come up with, and then the Committee can decide whether that will work or not. Again, I'm kind of talking off the top of my head -PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I understand.

MS. SAFFO: -- but that's just one idea. And again, Grafton and Coos are more than happy to talk and make sure they're not duplicating issues. We just feel like just talking for 10 minutes, that we identified numerous different issues from the beginning. And so we sat there and said, jeez, we really don't think we can be one group for the purposes of the whole proceeding. For today, sure. But moving on, no.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Let me move on to the --

MS. SAFFO: One quick question.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sorry, Mr. Samson.

MR. SAMSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to also reiterate what she said and dispel one of the previous rumors. There are Internet connections in Pittsburg; however, they are dial-ups, so...
[Laughter]
MR. SAMSON: The Towns of Pittsburg, Stewartstown and Clarksville, before this notice, had formed a unit together, a grouping,
if you will. And as a county commissioner for that district, we have absolutely no transmission lines whatsoever in Coos County. So that's one -- probably the most unique situation of this whole proceeding. And I would agree that we are more than willing to work with Grafton County and appreciate their help and information. But $I$ do believe that we should be, as the Coos County representative said, feel we should be in our own group. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

I'm going to move on now to the Abutting Property Owners from Clarksville to Dalton, the Underground Group. That's the group that contains, amongst others, Mr . and Mrs. Jordan. Mr. and Mrs. Levesque I believe were over here. Have you guys got somebody to speak for you here?

MR. LEVESQUE: Yes, this gentleman over here.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Go ahead, sir. Tell us your name first.

MR. THOMPSON: Brad Thompson, Bear Rock Road in Stewartstown. There are seven or eight direct abutters of the roads in Stewartstown and Clarksville that at this point I'll be representing: The Levesques, Nancy Dodge, the Jordans, Rod McAllaster, Lynne Placey, Arlene Placey, myself and one more. Anyway, there are eight abutters.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. And is there dissatisfaction with that grouping?

MR. THOMPSON: That grouping is fine. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: How about the overhead portion in the areas from Clarksville to Dalton? That's the group that contains Mr. and Mrs. Jones, Mr. and Mrs.

Lupton, the Olsons. Is there somebody designated to speak for that group?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Mr. Chairman, Art Cunningham.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry. I just didn't see you back there, Art.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'm back here.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Speak
right into that microphone so that you're heard.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you. I've been retained to represent Kevin Spencer and Mark Lagasse. I do not represent the group. I don't know anybody that does. Let me express my concern for the record.

My hire by these clients was based on the fact that they have a substantial investment in the property --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're going to need to speak right into that mic because you're behind that pole and the court reporter can't see your lips.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Sorry, Mike.
So, my concern is that of a lawyer. If a group leader is appointed, and it's not a group leader that is answerable to me as an attorney, how can I effectively represent Mark Lagasse and Kevin Spencer if a group thing or group decision interferes with what my judgment is to effectively represent these folks? That will create seriously substantial difficulties for my ethical responsibilities for them and my advocacy responsibilities to them. So on their
behalf, I'm going to file a motion to have them separated so that the group or group thing or the group leader does not in any way impair my ability to effectively represent my clients.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Is there anybody -- I understand that, Mr . Cunningham. Obviously, it's not a decision that I can make. It's a decision that will, once you file, will fall to the full committee to make, and they will have to consider those concerns in making their decision. Obviously, your primary -- your only allegiance is to your own clients. No question about that. Whether or not there is a way to deal with that within a group is a different issue that the Committee will have to consider.

Is there anybody else from that group of intervenors who wishes to speak? Mr. Baker?

MR. BAKER: Yes. I happen to be in a position where my four clients have been grouped in three groups. I thought I was doing a favor to everyone by representing four, at great risk to conflict problems that could arise in the future. I'm very concerned about that issue
with respect to the groupings, and I have declined to represent any more clients in this process, other than the four that $I$ was retained by I think four and a half years ago. My bad. In any event, I'm here representing those four.

I have instructions from some of them to seek review so that they can stay together. They do have some common issues legally which I will spell out in the motion for review. And I will also spell out as best I can the ethical issues that I see. Perhaps there's a way for the Committee to help me resolve those. But I'm at the point where I'm filled up with clients and won't be representing any more than the four I've got.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And understand that just because you may be grouped -- or your clients may be grouped doesn't mean that the order is requiring any attorney to represent individuals who have not retained that attorney. It just means the group will be represented through the grouping for the various purposes of the Site Evaluation

Committee at whatever stage we're at at the
time. The order as it exists now, and any subsequent order I'm fairly sure, will not be requiring any counsel, any lawyer, to represent somebody who he or she has not been hired by. And I don't think that's the intent of the order as it exists today, just so that everybody understands that. I understand, however, that your clients may want different groupings. We welcome your petition for review by the full committee with respect to the groupings that exist today. It would be nice if everybody -if every lawyer had several clients and we could just do it by lawyer and group them that way, but unfortunately, as we know, it's not the case.

Anybody else in this group of
intervenors from the overhead portion of the Project from Dummer -- from Clarksville through Dalton that wanted to speak? Yes, sir, way in the back. And please make sure you speak into the microphone and tell us your name.

MR. BREKKE: Yes. My name is Bruce
Brekke. I'm from Whitefield, and I'm not an attorney. And I don't yet fully understand
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these proceedings. I'm learning a lot here. Many of our group are individuals that are not present today. And the question I have is how does one go about rounding up the 17 parties listed in the group to gather opinions and consensus for a true representation? I think that Committee appointment of a legal representative be assigned to coordinate the group should be considered.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Is there anybody else from that group?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I Can tell you -- and this isn't good news -- there is no right to the group to court-appointed counsel, so to speak. There is no right to anybody to have counsel appointed for them and not be paid for by themselves. So that's about as much as I can say about that at this point. It's not something that the Committee has traditionally done, nor has -- and the next question, I'm sure, is, "Why isn't the Applicant paying for my lawyer?" That's not something that has traditionally been done before the

Committee. The public's interests have generally been represented by Counsel for the Public. And folks who have chosen to intervene, who seek intervention and are allowed to intervene, generally have been required to hire their own lawyer if they wish to be represented by a lawyer. So I just point that out because it's the second time that somebody's mentioned court-appointed -- not court-appointed, but appointed counsel. And by the same token, it was mentioned by one of the municipalities as well; the same thing goes for municipalities. I do want to address the other part of your question, though, about getting in touch with people. Everybody who -- and this isn't going to be a popular statement either. But everybody who seeks to intervene has a responsibility as well to participate and to be involved. If you want to intervene, and you've gone through what I'm sure has been a hassle for most of you so far, there is a responsibility to proceed and to do that. And one way is by talking to other parties and talking to other people within your intervenor group and sharing 2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
the workload. That's one of the reasons why these groupings in other cases that we've had before the Site Evaluation Committee have worked fairly well. In the Antrim Wind docket of 2012 -- there's been several of them, but the one where the application was actually denied -the certificate was denied after an adjudicative hearing. There were, I believe, I think it was 17 grouped parties or something like that. Maybe it was 11. The hearing was 11 days and maybe there were 17 parties. And they were grouped. But they did a very nice job of working with each other, albeit a smaller geographic area. The town of Antrim is not quite Coos or Grafton County. It's not 192 miles long. But they did a very nice job, and it worked very well. And indeed, they also brought witnesses to the proceedings that were extremely helpful to the Subcommittee in that particular case.

So, you know, I understand this is a foreign process to many folks in the room today and somewhat scary, but it can work. But it does take the members of your group to work with
each other.
So the best answer that $I$ can give to the first part of your question is to get in touch with those folks either by e-mail or by phone, or by whatever other means is available to you, and try to meet with them and try to do the legwork that it takes to be a party to this proceeding, or any other proceeding, whether it's in a courtroom or before an administrative agency.

You had something to add. I'm sorry. I spoke too long.

MR. BREKKE: You covered it. I was just going to point out the geographic constraint, that from Dummer to Dalton is a lot different than just citizens that are --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And please understand that is not lost on the Chairman of the Committee or the Committee itself, okay. We understand that it is an immense project.

Was there anybody else from that group -- which is the Dummer, Stark,

Northumberland, Whitefield, Dalton -- Abutting

Property Owners Group, that wanted to speak with respect to this issue of consolidation?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
I'm going to move on to the Non-Abutting Owners from Clarksville to Bethlehem. That's the group that has Mr. Martin; Mr. Moore, Jr.; Mr.

Kaufman, the Orzeks. That group. Is there a spokesperson for that group somewhere, first off, from our caucusing? Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Brad Thompson again. We've been -- this is a very, very large group. And we have started communications, but we do not a spokesman at this point. I'm not sure how we feel about breaking the group down into tighter geographical areas, but we know we have until the $28 t h$ to respond.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I would encourage you to do the best you can to coordinate as much as you can with respect to that group.

I'm going to move on to Abutting
Property Owners from Bethlehem to Plymouth.
That's the group that includes Mr. Manley and
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Ms. Ratzel, the Cumbees, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Grote, Mr. Wolf, Ms. Schibanoff. Is there somebody, first, who can speak for that group? Yes, ma'am.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a question --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Your name, please.

MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen. Is there any way to have an extension of that 10 days to whatever it is to appeal these groupings? I mean, listening to what other people are saying also, I'm not sure if we want to get together with the other towns that we can just do it by e-mail. I guess we have to have a meeting. So I'm just throwing that out there.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: There is a way where you can make a procedural motion to the Chair of the Committee and ask for an extension of the deadline. I can't speak for what the Chair will do. Obviously, other parties in the proceeding, including the Applicant, have the right to object to that request.

And that actually goes to one of the issues that we have in the case. We do have statutory deadlines, and this case is supposed to be resolved within 365 days of acceptance. And the reason why is because one of the main purposes of RSA $162-\mathrm{H}$ is to provide a timely response, timely consideration of new energy facilities. And the legislature over the years has gone back and forth on how short or how long that timeframe should be. For this particular case, it's 365 days from the date of acceptance, which means that we have to complete this docket, including a written decision, which I expect will be well in excess of 100 pages, by December 18th, I believe it is, or something like that. And that's the timeframe that the Committee has to work within. We're going to talk a little bit about scheduling and timeframes in more detail in a little bit on the agenda. But as a general rule, that's what we are dealing with here is a one-year process. So I hope that answered your question.

Is there anybody from this group,
though --

MR. PALMER: Yes. My name is Walter Palmer. I'm the spokesman for this group. Our group hasn't had an opportunity -- our group has not had an adequate opportunity to consider this issue completely. However, several members of the group have already expressed to me that they feel the grouping is unworkable because of the size and the disparity of the issues faced by the members of the group. I know at least two members of the group intend to file petitions to the Committee for reconsideration of the grouping. One of them wishes to speak right now, Susan Schibanoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's fine. But before we go to Ms. Schibanoff, Mr. Palmer, is there any discussion -- I know you guys were back there talking for a while. Is there any discussion about any breakdown within the group?

MR. PALMER: Some ideas of maybe considering breaking down according to town, or perhaps breaking down according to separating abutters who are on the main street of a town from those abutters who are out in a rural area,
because people on main streets of towns face very different issues from the people who are out in the residential and rural areas.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Ms.
Schibanoff.
MS. SCHIBANOFF: Thank you. I believe
I have already filed this for review. But
listening to your comments --
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're going to need to speak into --

MS. SCHIBANOFF: I believe I have already filed this request for review. But listening to your comments today, I will reiterate this more clearly. I will request the creation of a group that, as far as I can tell, has not been recognized, does not exist. It will be abutters and non-abutters on the legally required alternative overhead route, Bethlehem to Ashland.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And who -- do you know from our list here which parties would be sort of shifted into that group?

MS. SCHIBANOFF: I know of at least
two people, I believe, who filed on these grounds and were denied. And I believe that there would be other people, if the group exists, who would now file late petitions. PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. All right. Well, they're certainly free to do that. But my question is, are there people already been granted intervention status and have been grouped, but would be, at least in your view, if this group is created, shifted into that particular group?

MS. SCHIBANOFF: I would be in both groups. I would be in the Middle Abutter Underground by virtue of nationally registered property that $I$ own along 116. I would be in the new group as well by virtue of property I own in Easton that was on the preferred route for five years until the new route was preferred; yet, that former preferred route remains an alternative in the SEC application.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there anybody else in the room who thinks that they would better fit into that group that Ms. Schibanoff just described? And we'll start with

Ms. Pastoriza.
And what's your name, sir?
Microphone, please.
MR. TUVESON: Bob Tuveson, Holderness.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank You, Ms. Schibanoff.

Is there anybody else from this group who wanted to address the grouping issues?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, one of the --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer, if you can say your name again and speak right into that microphone, please.

MR. PALMER: I'm sorry. This is
Walter Palmer. One other idea that came up during our discussion was separating the group and breaking it down according to those people who actually own land underneath the road right-of-way, separating those from people who own land right up to the edge of the right-of-way, because the people who own land underneath the right-of-way feel that their property rights are being infringed upon and
have different issues from those who do not -(Court Reporter interrupts.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're going to have to repeat that last part of your sentence. "From those who do not..."

MR. PALMER: People who own land under the right-of-way feel that they have an issue of having their property rights infringed upon, which is separate from the issues faced by people who do not own land underneath the right-of-way.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: If somebody is going to file a request with the Committee to do that, they need to be specific about who is who, okay, because that's one of the issues that is difficult to determine amongst the petitions to intervene that have been filed. So, just a word of advice. And it goes back to what $I$ said before about being as specific as possible.

Anybody else from this group?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
I'm going to move on, then, to the Non-Abutting

Property Owners from Bethlehem to Plymouth. This was the group that was a relatively small group that included Mr. Sullivan -- or I'm sorry -- Lee Sullivan, Stephen Buzzell, Tim and Rebecca Burbank, 41 Dyke Road, LLC. Is there somebody to speak for this particular group? (No verbal response)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Now for the Abutting Landowners from Ashland to Deerfield. Where is that group located here? Okay. Have you -- were you guys successful in pointing out a temporary spokesperson? Ms. Menard.

MS. MENARD: Yes, thank you. A few comments from our group.

We as a group respect Phil and Joan Bilodeau's request to seek individual standing in the process, and we support his efforts to do so.

Deerfield, we discussed the fact that Deerfield has a large number of intervenors, as does Michelle, representing McKenna's Purchase, and whether or not it would be an advantage to separate out those groups. We have not come
to -- we'd like further questions answered, however, before making formal subgroups. So they may be best served by forming a geographic grouping. But before deciding, we do recognize that there are several members of the group that are not present here today, so we would want to have their opinions weighed in on. If forming smaller groups for purposes of expediency limits us in any way, such as, you know, does it affect in any way our ability to request data, you know, during the SEC process, we would like to be advised of how forming smaller groups might affect us and have that discussion before making that final decision.

Similarly, one last comment. If grouping prohibits a single member or other members of one group from participating in discussion or issues of importance in other groups in any way, we would like to be advised of this reality. And I'll give an example. For instance, I might be very concerned about the Applicant's representation that they have a legal right to use the right-of-way. This is a hot topic, and maybe there's a group in the
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north that is very active and that is their primary concern. You know, how does one be allowed to, you know, separate out and join in that discussion? So there are a few questions that we would like to be advised on before formally, you know, splitting off into these geographic subgroups.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I can't give you legal advice, but 1 can tell you that the order that was issued does not limit any of the intervenor groups from weighing in on any particular subject. So the intervenor group that is the Non-Abutting Property Owners from Ashland to Deerfield, certainly at leat at this point in the proceeding, have the opportunity to address issues of right-of-ways in the North Country. There is -- the Chair is permitted under the Administrative Procedures Act to limit participation by issue like that. However, the current order that has been issued does not do that; it simply groups in combinations of individuals. That doesn't mean it's going to be that way all the way through. If things change and the chairperson believes that there's some
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reason to place limitations on issues, issue by issue, you know, he has that authority to do that under the Administrative Procedures Act. But right now, that's not what the order does. MS. MENARD: Okay. Thank you. I might add that our group may benefit from another short-term caucus, and we might have further discussion about the subgroups, Deerfield, McKenna's Purchase, and how that affects other groups if possible.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, I promised our court reporters that we would stop at 1:00 for lunch. So you'll have that opportunity over lunch, okay.

MS. MENARD: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next group is the Non-Abutters from Ashland to Deerfield. This is the group that includes -oh, I'm sorry. Back to the prior group.

I understand Ms. Menard was speaking on behalf of some folks from Deerfield. I understand there's some folks from Concord here, and I understand Mr. Bilodeau has a separate issue. Other than those -- other than Mr .

Bilodeau and Concord, is there anybody from that group -- okay, Ms. Lee. Okay. All right. I'm going to go with Mr. Bilodeau and then -- what town are you from, ma'am?

MS. LEE: Northfield.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Northfiel d. I'll go to you, and then I'll go to anybody from Concord that wants to address from this group.

Mr. Bilodeau.
MR. BILODEAU: Thank you, Mr.
Iacopino. I would just repeat the position of Joan and Phil Bilodeau and indicate that we have filed the appeal to request a reconsideration of the order for petition to intervene. Thank you. The letter's been sent.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr.
Bilodeau, one question. Is there anybody in proximity to your property that had moved to intervene, was granted intervention, that is in a similar position?

MR. BILODEAU: Not to my knowledge. I have not been able to find anyone in Deerfield. And I don't know if Franklin has anyone next to 2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
their structure. I do not know that, sir.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Lee from Northfield.
MS. LEE: I am alone in the list from Northfield, and some of the caucus conversation revolved around where is Northfield. Just to tell everybody, it was considered the "northern field" of Canterbury, and it was divided quite a while ago.

As an individual, $I$ don't know who the other people are in my group of abutting property owners from Ashfield [sic] to Deerfield. So our spokesperson, Jeanne Menard, did a good job in summarizing that we have to have another caucus and see where the interests lie. I find that the bullet points that she read off for the group in Deerfield don't exactly represent what $I$ would be concerned about, but they're close enough.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, work with her and that would be great.

Okay. And then I said I know there's
a fair number of folks from Concord in that
group as well. Did anybody want to speak from Concord or from any other town in that group? Okay. Let's start with McKenna's Purchase.

MS. KLEINDIENST: McKenna's Purchase, Michelle Kleindienst. We may or we may not stay within the grouping, and if we choose not to, we'll file the request with the SEC.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Mr. Kucman.

MR. KUCMAN: I have no objections to being a member of a group with my neighbors. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. There was somebody to my left. Yes, ma'am. MS. HARTNETT: I'm sorry. I was just doing my geography. Again, Kate Hartnett from Deerfield. Mr. Bilodeau actually shares being an abutter with the Town of Deerfield with a town/forest conservation easement. And I don't know if that was your question. I thought I would mention it. But that's adjacent to the substation.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
Thank you. The next group is the Non-Abutters
from Ashland to Deerfield. This is the group that includes the Tuvesons, the Grays, the Felgates, the Webster Family Group, the Foulkes. Where is -- is that group somewhere? Okay.

MS. MUMFORD: This is Margaret Mumford from the Webster Family Group. I'm --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You need to speak right in. You're not coming in over the loud speakers up here.

MS. MUMFORD: Margaret Mumford from the Webster Family Group, representing today this group as temporary spokesman.

First, I'd ask that the record, whenever "Ashfield" is stated, that that be entered into the record correctly as "Ashland," New Hampshire. And there have been several instances. So that's okay.

And I'd like to acknowledge that we appreciate the recognition of the impacts upon our properties that results in our intervenor status. We do have concerns about the geographic disparity and the different interests from Bridgewater especially down to the terminus down in Deerfield. But those of us that are
here for now are agreeable to our grouping. Note that we have several members that are not here.

We would also like to observe that, effectively, legal counsel as spokespeople is being discouraged in the current scenario due to the perceived ethical conflicts and conflicts of interest, and that would be unfortunate because they're much more well-spoken than folks like me.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, it's nobody from the Committee who is discouraging anybody from obtaining counsel. You are all encouraged to obtain counsel. The issue of the consolidation of groups for the purposes of appearing before administrative agencies is not a new issue for counsel. It's been addressed by lawyers many times. It is a process that is permitted. And there are ways that counsel can deal with the ethical issues that counsel face under those circumstances, just so you know. So if some lawyer is saying to you, "I don't want to do it because I don't want to be faced with these ethical issues,"
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well, I would keep shopping, because there are ways in which it can be done. Is it the normal course? No, it's not normal. But it can be accomplished, and it is accomplished very often in front of the SEC, in front of the PUC, in front of many state agencies where there is a combination of intervenors.

MS. MUMFORD: Thank you for addressing that concern.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I guess we move on to the NGOs. I'll turn over to the Forest Society. Did you want to weigh in at all on the groupings of intervenors?

MS. MANZELLI: No. Thank you, Mike.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The
Environmental NGOs, which include Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation Law Foundation, Sierra Club and Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust.

MS. BIRCHARD: Hi, Melissa Birchard.
I have to put on two hats. So, first of all, I'll put on my Conservation Law Foundation hat, and then I'll put on a hat that serves as spokesperson for the group here.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank
2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
you.
MS. BIRCHARD: First, Conservation Law Foundation does have great reservations about its consolidation in this matter, and it intends to file an objection to that effect.

Second hat. We're a little concerned that it may be inappropriate to collect input as to groupings before the parties have a more complete sense of what it means to be represented by a designated individual. That said, we do have some provisional suggestions.

We would suggest that the Committee designate two points of contact to convey written pleadings, without a requirement that all members of each group reach a consensus on all those pleadings. The benefit of two points of contact would be to share the burden, to allow for conflicts with vacations, among other benefits of two points of contact.

Secondly, all members of the groups should be able to participate individually at cross-examination and in technical sessions. I think you spoke earlier to cross-examine and confirmed that this would be the case. It would
also be advantageous to confirm this is the case as to technical sessions.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And just while you're on that issue, at technical sessions we've done that as well, where groups have shared so-called "spokesperson duties" at the technical session, in that one person took the load on, say the environmental issues, and another person, you know, carried the weight on the visual and things like. So there have been -- in the past, that's something we are used to and have done during technical sessions. For those of you who don't know what a technical session is, we're going to talk about that in a little bit. So we'll get to it. But Ms. Birchard is well familiar with them, so I wanted to let her know that we do indeed do that during the course of our technical sessions, and it has been done in many of our cases.

MS. BIRCHARD: That's the extent of our comments at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there anybody else from that particular group that wishes to weigh in? If not, I'm going to turn
to the Historical NGOs. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, where was that representative? Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMSON: Sharee Williamson,
National Trust for Historic Preservation. Currently our groups do not have a plan to file an objection to being grouped together, but that final decision hasn't been made. And I also would support the recommendations just made by Ms. Birchard, in terms of how to handle sharing the load for technical sessions, and also appointing possibly two points of contact, even if that might be, in our case, two people from National Trust, just for coverage in the sense for things like vacations as she mentioned. So, thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
I'm going to go down to the grouping -- this isn't a grouping, but the business organizations. I think we've already heard from the City of Berlin. I don't believe anybody's here from Cate Street Capital. We've already heard from IBEW.

Coos County Business Group? Is there
somebody here, and do they want to weigh in on those grouping issues?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: North
Country Chamber --
AUDIENCE MEMBER: ExCuse me.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, ma'am.

MS. WILLEY: Lee Willey, on behalf of the Coos County Business and Employers Group. We take no issue with the groupings.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you.

Ma'am, over here. Please repeat your name. We didn't get it.

MS. NANASI: Yvonne Nanasi, N-A-N-A-S-I, with the North Country Chamber of Commerce. We appreciate our current status and certainly hope to retain it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I don't believe anybody was -- oh, I'm sorry, Mark. Mark Beliveau. Any position with respect to the groupings on behalf of Dixville and Balsams?

MR. BELIVEAU: No, we have no comment.
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| 1 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And I |
| 2 | don't think we had a representative from Wagner |
| 3 | Forest here. Has that changed? |
| 4 | (No verbal response) |
| 5 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And then |
| 6 | the Pemi River Local Advisory. Any comments on |
| 7 | groupings? |
| 8 | MR. STAMP: At this stage of the |
| 9 | process, we're content with our position. Thank |
| 10 | you. |
| 11 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there |
| 12 | any group that I've missed? |
| 13 | (No verbal response) |
| 14 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I |
| 15 | will reiterate only one thing because I think |
| 16 | we've got an idea of what people are thinking. |
| 17 | One thing I'll reiterate is that I don't get to |
| 18 | make this decision. It's going to be made by |
| 19 | the full committee. And if you want a change in |
| 20 | your status or a change in the way you're |
| 21 | grouped, or if you have been denied intervention |
| 22 | and wish to appeal that to the full committee, |
| 23 | right now the deadline is the 28th, okay. So, |
| 24 | thank you all for participating. |
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I will tell you this seems a little stilted than the more typical type of prehearing conference that we have, where we have maybe only three or four or maybe five parties. This takes a little more of an informal way, and it's not as much of a turn-by-turn.

Ms. Menard, do you have a question? MS. MENARD: Yes, thank you. Jeanne Menard. If, for instance, a group of Deerfield intervenors decided to ask for separate intervenor status as a group, do we all do that individually, or can one motion be made on behalf of a group? What would be -- how do we handle something like that?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You Can do that either way. But I have to leave it to you to decide what best represents your interests. That would be legal advice. I can't give you that. But you --

MS. MENARD: Okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: YOu can do it either way.

MR. ROTH: Mike, if I may?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, sir.
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MR. ROTH: Peter Roth, Counsel for the Public.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry. I didn't ask you. What's your view, Peter?

MR. ROTH: There's only one thing that I wanted to speak to, and that was your suggestion that Counsel for the Public represents the public interests. And while that is true, I don't think -- and I think I've been very plain about this repeatedly in the public meetings where I've spoken on it. We don't represent any individual intervenors or any of the intervenor's interests. The approach that we take to a case may coincide or harmonize with a particular intervenor's needs or views, but we don't have a mission to represent those interests in any way and to protect them. So it's important that every intervenor not say, "Well, Counsel for the Public is looking out for us. We don't need to worry about it." They need to be vigilant for their own purposes. And I would recommend anybody in this process with a sane and sound mind retain counsel. And that
may drive their counsel to madness as well, but... I just wanted to make sure there's no misunderstanding about my role.

That said, I have been and will continue to be responsive to people who look for information about the process itself and how to participate in it. I cannot give legal advice to anybody. But I have been and will continue to be helpful to people who have particular questions about how this process works.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I
appreciate that. I second the advice that if you can employ a lawyer, employ a lawyer, and also to have a dialogue with Mr. Roth. He is very experienced in these matters. And although he can't represent individuals, he is a -- he's got a lot of information about the process that he can share with you and a lot of observations, I'm sure.

I want to turn to the Applicant -yes, Commissioner Samson.

MR. SAMSON: Yes, Mike. Rick Samson
again. I just have a question on the appeals timeframe. Would it be appropriate now, or
should I wait until No. 6?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: NOW would be the best time to ask the question. What's the question?

MR. SAMSON: Okay. The question, or thought, I guess, would be that I received this notice at 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, and four days have already gone by in the 10-day appeal time. So I would respectfully request that the Committee look at and possibly grant an extension, because $I$ believe that an extension would not cause any obstacle to the Applicant, but it does cause a significant hindrance to the intervenors. So I would respectfully ask that that be --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: As I said before, I'm not in a position to rule on anybody's motions. And that motion to be made actually has to be made in writing, so that if anybody is inclined to make such a motion, which is basically to extend that deadline, you will have to do it in writing, and it will be ruled on by the Chair of the Subcommittee.

MR. SAMSON: As a follow-up, Mike?
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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, sir.
MR. SAMSON: Would they consider a motion from each individual, or would they consider a number of those motions as a group? In other words, if $I$ was to apply for an extension, would they consider that an extension just for me, or would they consider it an extension for the entire group?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I suppose it depends on what you request in the motion and the way you request it. But I don't want anybody out there to get the wrong idea that they should not file their own motion if they believe they need the additional time, just so you know, because I wouldn't want anybody to get the wrong idea that somebody else is doing this and then it doesn't happen, if that's something somebody wants to do.

So the takeaway for everybody is, you know, this is an individual, not a group thing. You all filed motions to intervene. That's why you're here. If you need -- if you feel the need to appeal that for some reason, you do have to represent your own interests and file your
own motions with the Committee to represent your interests in whatever fashion you believe is necessary, whether that's filing and requesting an appeal of your grouping or seeking additional time to file something. You have to represent your own interests, and you should not rely on that somebody else might do it.

Yes, Ms. Mumford.
MS. MUMFORD: Yes. Is the question of the definition of "abutter" versus "non-abutter" status up for reconsideration during this process?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: YOu can certainly raise it in a motion. I mean, I think that's obviously the way that the Chair broke out the groups. If you think that's an inappropriate way to do it, or it wasn't accurate in terms of putting people who are truly abutters or not truly abutters in the same group, you're certainly free to raise that in your motion for review by the Committee. So, is it -- yes. I mean, it's something that you're free to raise.

Okay. I'll now turn to the Applicant
and ask them for their position. We've heard a roomful of positions with respect to the groupings and the manner in which intervenors should be combined. Does the Applicant take a position?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Just a couple of thoughts. I'm not going to address all of the different proposals that we've heard today. To the extent that we need to do that, we'd do that at the appropriate time. There are certainly some things we've heard that we agree with and there's some things we've heard that concern us. I would say that we think that obviously it's a significant challenge to figure all this out for the Committee, and we believe that the order that the Committee issued on Friday essentially got this right. There is substantial precedent in Committee practice for grouping parties. There is also significant precedent in other context, other administrative context in civil litigation, for these kinds of groupings.

We are also concerned that at this point we are at the outer bounds of the number of parties that a proceeding like this could
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accommodate and still really be handled in an orderly and efficient manner. And so, to the extent that this process were to result in a significant number of additional parties being created, that would be of grave concern to us. We very much appreciated some of the ideas that were raised here today. For example, I would say that Mr. Whitley's idea of some sort of discovery steering committee is attractive and worth exploring. In fact, anything that helps bring efficiency to this process is worth exploring. And I would say to every party in this room, as this process goes forward with the SEC, that the Applicant is happy to talk with them, is happy to try to work with them to make their participation in the process more efficient. If that means some type of informal sharing of information or other things that can make both of our lives easier, we're happy to explore that. We've already started to do that with some parties. Conversely, I would also say that anything that inhibits efficiency at this point -- and there are some things I heard today that I'm afraid do inhibit the efficiency -- are
things we would not be supportive of.
So, going forward, we would urge the Committee, as it thinks about it, to do what it's already done, which is to try as best to strike a balance between the needs of all the parties to participate in a reasonable manner and the requirements of the statute to make certain that the application is processed in an efficient and expeditious manner.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you.

I'm going to challenge everybody here for a moment. I'd like to move on to the next matter on the agenda, which I would like to resolve very quickly so that we can break at about 1:00. Here is the issue as I see it. And I'm the person who authored the agenda. Actually, let me just back up.

Again, if you're going to file a petition to appeal your intervention status, right now that date is the 28th, okay. And please follow the rules that are published on the web site in doing so, which means please make sure that when you file, you send a copy to
all the parties on the distribution list. If you're seeking an extension of time, you need to file a motion seeking that extension, and you probably need to do it sooner rather than later so that the Chair can rule on that. The Chair will rule on the procedural issues of any extension. The Committee will be ruling on the substantive issue of whether or not your particular intervention is going to be changed based upon your request. So that takes care of grouping and interventions.

What I'd like to do is, there's no secret that there have been two motions pending for a very long time in this docket. One is a motion for protective order and confidential treatment of what's been referred to, I believe it's Appendix 37, if I'm correct. It contains the economic report. And the other is the request for a waiver of rules of certain rules that has been filed by the Applicant on the date of their supplemental filing. Normally under our rules, when a motion is filed, such as a motion for protective order and confidential treatment, or a motion to waive a rule, there is 2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
a 10-day window in which to object -- in other words, you have to object within 10 days. And that is our general rule.

Understanding that many of you do not know what your status has been or will be, we are going to set a date right now for objections to those two motions filed by the Applicant. But before I do that, $I$ know one of the things that is -- and Barry, correct me if I am wrong here. But as I understand it, one of the considerations in the motion for confidential treatment is whether or not folks will be willing to sign a confidentiality agreement if an order allowing it is issued by the Committee. And I would like to just get a show of hands of those who would be agreeable. What that would mean is that you'd be signing an agreement saying that you're not going to share this with anybody else, other than the need to do so before the Committee in this proceeding. I mean, the reasons why they're seeking confidential treatment is in their motion. And I don't want to litigate it. Just trying to get an idea from the group, from the assembled
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group, how many folks would be inclined to sign a confidentiality agreement in that regard, at least with that concept. If you could raise your hand if you would be inclined to do so. MS. MANZELLI: Excuse me. Can I speak to that briefly?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Where are you?

MS. MANZELLI: We're over here. Amy Manzelli for the Forest Society. Before I put my hand up, it's the Forest Society's position that there's no reason that that exhibit -- or that appendix should be confidential. So our position is that it should not be confidential. If the Committee disagrees with that position, then we would be willing to sign a confidentiality agreement. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, of course, just so everybody knows, there would be no confidentiality agreement presented to you unless the Committee ruled that way. But I'm trying to get an idea, in terms of whether this is something there's going to be a great deal of cooperation on or not. So, again, I would just
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ask for a show of hands. And this does not bind you. This does not bind you. There is no -you can change your mind in five minutes if you'd like. I'm just trying to get a general idea. Yes, sir.

MR. BOLDT: One question for you. Chris Boldt, Donahue, Tucker \& Ciandella, for the City of Berlin. While generally we're very supportive of the concept of a confidentiality agreement as it facilitates the process, obviously we came in after this filing date -October 19th I believe was the date it was actually filed, and it is on the electronic docket -- depending upon its terms, and if there is a grouping, obviously that information is shared within the grouping and with any parties within this proceeding. It's outside of this proceeding that normally the confidentiality agreements are viewed as taking place.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I suspect that the confidentiality agreement would be to anybody who is going to review it, whether they're -- for instance, if somebody is going to review it and go over the protected document,
that they're going to agree not to take it out of the proceeding. For instance, if you have somebody in your group who agreed to sign and somebody who doesn't agree to sign, I'm assuming the Applicant's position -- and you can correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Needleman -- would be that it can't be shared with the person who will not sign the confidentiality agreement.

Is that a correct statement of your position?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think that's absolutely correct. And I think there's an additional level here, and we don't have to cross that bridge today. But I would say that, with respect to some of the information in that report, it's highly sensitive with respect to an ongoing competitive bid process. And to the extent that that particular information were to become public, even despite the presence of the confidentiality agreement, it would be significantly damaging, and there would really be no adequate remedy. And so we're going to -I think it's a little premature to discuss it now, because as Tom can explain in a moment, our
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hope is to submit a new, redacted version that dramatically pairs down the amount of material that's redacted. And perhaps that will satisfy some, maybe not all. But I think that's the proper departure point. And then if we get to a point where we need to talk about the confidentiality agreement, I think we would need to look at it on a party-by-party basis.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All
right. I'm going to back up then. I was hoping to maybe get a general consensus of what it looked like out there. And it sounds like I may be putting too many people on the spot doing that on both sides of the coin, so forget about the show of hands.

What I do want to do, though, is I
want to set -- there's still a motion pending for a protective order and confidential treatment, and there's still a request for waiver of the rules. I'm going to ask that all objections to either of those two motions be filed within 10 days of today, okay. As I say, you generally have just -- just a moment. Even if your objections -- obviously, most of you
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will have -- or some of you are going to have pending appeals on the grouping --

MR. ROTH: Mike, that's a Saturday.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: We'll get
to what the rule says about Saturdays.
But if your group doesn't agree, or you disagree with your group on that particular objection, feel free to file on your own. If you feel that you don't even want to discuss it with your group and you wish to object, feel free to file the objection on your own. Understand that, as I've said, these groups are not set in cement yet. But this is an issue that we do need to get resolved.

So, 10 days apparently falls on a Saturday. Under our rules, it's the following Monday.

MR. BOLDT: Mr. Chairman.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, sir.
MR. BOLDT: Could it possibly be based on the date Mr . Needleman files his amended motion?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there going to be a new motion for protective order?
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MR. BOLDT: That's what I thought he just said.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: NO, I think he's going to file something redacted, I understood, which was just going to be filed. It wasn't going to be subject to a protective order.

MR. GETZ: Mr. Iacopino, if I could report the status.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please do.

MR. GETZ: Tom Getz for the Applicant. With respect to Appendix 43 -- and this is the testimony and report of Julia Frayer from London Economics -- as we indicated in the motion filed back in October, we were prepared to file redacted versions of those documents. And we've prepared redacted versions and have provided it to Counsel for the Public. Our intent, as Mr. Needleman said, was to pare this back significantly and protect only that information that, if made public, would provide a business disadvantage to Northern Pass with respect to competitors. We want to point out that the
protection that we would request would only be consistent with the time to resolve the Clean Energy RFP process, which we hope will occur this summer. Counsel for the Public has reviewed the redacted versions that we've provided to them, made some recommendations. We expect either today, depending upon how this process goes, or tomorrow, to discuss some of those issues that may remain between us. And our goal would be to provide to the record early next week a redacted version that may -- it remains to be seen how much of that would be agreed to by Counsel for the Public. But we believe there is some agreement to what we're seeking to redact.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
But once you have a redacted document, whether Counsel for the Public agrees that it's redacted appropriately or not, and you file it, are you going to be asking for a further protective order with respect to that redacted document?

MR. GETZ: We would continue to seek protection of those portions of those two documents that are redacted. They'll be
redacted because we believe they are competitively sensitive.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I guess my question's a little bit more bottom-line. In other words, there would be a document -- now we have a piece of paper that says Appendix 37 -- or I'm sorry. I thought it was 40 [sic]. If I misspoke, I'm sorry. We actually have a document which would convey some information, even though some of the information contained in the document would be redacted.

MR. GETZ: That's correct.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And that would be fine for me to post on our web site.

MR. GETZ: Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. So you wouldn't be asking folks, in order to see that document, to sign any kind of confidentiality agreement.

MR. GETZ: NO.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You would
still require them if they wanted to see the entire document as filed originally.

Are you going to leave that motion in
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MR. GETZ: Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- with respect to the original filing?

Okay. So we still need objections to that then. I'm only trying to get through the process. I'm not trying to get -- we still need objections to that particular motion -- I mean a deadline for objections.

MR. GETZ: For the original motion?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The original, yes.

MR. GETZ: Well, I mean, we'll be submitting a redacted version, so there will be much more information publicly available.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: But let's say Ms. Manzelli is not happy with your -- let's say she doesn't want to see a redacted version. She either wants to see Appendix 40 [sic], or it should be stricken from the record, which is what $I$ think her position might be that she would take. I assume that you will oppose that and you would like a ruling on your original
motion.
MR. GETZ: Yes, to the extent that she's going to oppose outright any redaction. Correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: So what I'm saying, though, is we still need the assembled folks who are intervenors to let us know if they object to your original motion as well. I don't want them to be confused and think that they're going to get something and then they get a redacted document that they're not happy with and then the time to object to your original motion has expired. That's what I'm concerned about. I don't want anybody to think that they were duped here, okay. And I don't mean to suggest you were trying to do that. I just want to make it clear for everybody what the process is.

Just a minute, Mr. Baker. I'm going
to let them caucus for a second so --
MR. GETZ: Mr. Iacopino, let me try to
see if this is clear. So I think as an alternative we would be prepared -- I believe it was Mr. Whitley who proposed that any objections
would run from the date we provide the redacted version. I don't know if that helps you or hinders your process.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sure that... I don't have a problem with that. Is there anybody who would object to having that additional time to object?

Yes. You need to tell us your name and speak right into the microphone, Danielle. Thank you.

MS. PACIK: Danielle Pacik from the City of Concord. I would just ask that a firm deadline be provided where the redacted version be filed.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, here's the problem. I'm not in a position where I can actually do that. They filed a request -they filed a motion that seeks to have that particular portion of the Application subject to a protective order and confidential treatment. That's, you know --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mike, maybe I can help with this.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank
2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
you.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: We will file a redacted version on Monday --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: -- so people can then
have 10 days from Monday to take whatever position they want on the redacted version.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: SO I'm also going to give them 10 days from Monday to file any objections to the waiver request as well, only because it's -- they can get their work done together and do their homework all at one time.

Does anybody have any objection to that?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: SO there's going to be a redacted version of Appendix 40 [sic] filed on Monday. Stay tuned to your e-mail and the web site. And you will have 10 days from Monday, which -- who's my date keeper over here?

MR. PAPPAS: You're okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: So You'll
have 10 days from Monday to file objections to both the motion for confidential treatment and the request for waivers.

Now, there was a question a couple rows back.

MS. WILLIAMSON: Sharee Williamson, National Trust. You covered it.

MR. WHITLEY: Excuse me, Mike. Steven Whitley.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.
MR. WHITLEY: Clarification. Was the amended item filed yesterday, or is it to be filed this coming Monday?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: They're going to file it Monday is my understanding. It's a redacted Appendix 37.

MR. GETZ: 43.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: 43.
MR. WHITLEY: Thank you.
MR. GETZ: And the corresponding testimony.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And there's testimony that goes along with it that explains it.
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Okay. I think that that resolves that issue. And I guess the next one can be fairly simple. I don't know the answer, though. So I'm going to turn to the Applicant. In other dockets we have -- actually, even in this docket, during the course of the pending docket we have received either amendments or supplements to the Application. I know you filed a supplement based upon the new rules. Is there anticipation of any amendments or supplements to be filed to the Application at this point?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, we don't have any plans at this point to file any amendments or supplements.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. At this point in time then -- yes, ma'am. Right behind --

MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen from Bethlehem. I'm sorry to ask this question, but what is the request for waiver of rules about?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That was filed along with the supplemental information in February or March -- actually, it was filed in

February -- that the Applicant filed. And it seeks waiver of some of the application rules that we have. It's a pretty detailed motion. I would recommend that you look at it, and if you have any objections to it, you file your objection with the Committee. Or if your group intends to file a combined objection -- I'd prefer that. But obviously if the group is not going to do that, you're free to do it on your own. I really -- I mean, I can't tell you chapter and verse everything that they seek to have waived. But in our administrative rules which are posted on our web site, there is a provision that an applicant -- or any member of -- anybody in the docket can seek waiver of an existing rule. Of course, they have to demonstrate that it's appropriate to waive a particular rule. You can follow up.

MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen again. Is this the thing like the decommissioning, the waiver for decommissioning, that sort of thing? PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I
actually believe that that's part of what they have filed in this particular case.

MS. JENSEN: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.
MS. SCHIBANOFF: Susan Schibanoff.
Regarding that request for waiver of rules, if that is not posted to the SEC site, could it be, please? If it's drifting around as an e-mail still, it would be very helpful to have it up on the site. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I will check right now, and you'll all see it as I'm checking it. I believe it was posted, but... yes. It's Entry 261 on the web site, filed on February 26 th. So it is up there. It's in the box entitled "Application Updates Regarding New Rules."

MS. SCHIBANOFF: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, sir.
MR. CRAXTON: Edward Craxton, Dalton. I'm a little bit confused, and perhaps you can help me here. The motion for protective order and confidential treatment applied to Appendix 43. Are you now saying that that motion has been reapplied to a redacted version?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No,
they're going to file a redacted version. So in other words, you're going to get more information on Monday than you currently have in the public application today. If you open up the application today to that appendix, it's just a page that says "Report." I understand that on Monday they're going to file something that says more than that, and you'll have 10 days from Monday to file your objection to the original motion. Yes, sir.

MR. GRAY: Elisha Gray, New Hampton. Point of clarification. Is there a new objection date for the request of waiver of rules, and what is it?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, and that will be 10 days from Monday as well. We're going to keep those in tandem, okay.

And just for everybody's benefit, when motions are filed, whether they're filed by the Applicant, Counsel for the Public or an intervenor, the rest of the parties have 10 days in which to respond to the objection or file -respond to the motion or file an objection to the motion. That's our standard process, okay.

So keep that in mind. For instance, I believe Mr. Cunningham has a motion pending, and the Applicant has 10 days to object to that particular motion. So it goes both ways, and it is something that is one of our rules. I do encourage you all to read our rules. They are boring, but they are the rules by which we are supposed to play. And you can find those on our web site as well.

Is there any further discussion before
we take a lunch break?
(No verbal response)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
Hearing none, when we come back, I'm going to go over a little bit about what the adjudicative process entails. We're going to talk about scheduling, talk about discovery which I'll explain, and scheduling. And then --

MR. PAPPAS: When do you want us back?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: One hour.
It is 1:01. So, 2:00.
(Whereupon a lunch recess was taken at 1:01 and the hearing resumed at

2:11 p.m.)
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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. We'll go on the record. We are almost halfway through the agenda, as I prepared it, which actually is a good thing.

The next thing that we should take up is just a discussion, an explanation probably is more like it, of the overall timeframes and schedule requirements as they apply to the adjudicative proceeding. You all have -probably understand the various timeframes that are contained in RSA 162-H, which is the statute that governs the Site Evaluation Committee. But you may not actually know what happens in actual -- that part of the process that is considered to be the "adjudicative" process.

And, I've got a couple of slides here I'm just going to go over with you all, so that you understand sort of the -- and these are just -- the steps that I've laid out in these slides on the PowerPoint are -- I've simply gotten these from prior proceedings that we've had before the Committee. This is the way -the typical way in which the Site Evaluation Committee proceeds in the adjudicative phase of
our dockets. I have been quoted before as saying "there's nothing typical about this particular docket", but that's no reason to not, you know, understand what the process has been, because I think it will inform us going forward.

The first step in the adjudicative portion of the docket generally comes, and you won't find this in the statute anywhere, I mean, you'll find the authority for Counsel for the Public to hire experts, but you won't find any timing requirements. But, generally, that's the first step that the Site Evaluation Committee runs into, once we're sort of in the adjudicative phase.

Counsel for the Public will usually file a petition or a motion to hire experts or witnesses. In this case, he's already hired counsel for himself. But, as you know, there are, I think, 27 testimonies filed by the Applicant, along with their Application. And, I'm sure that Counsel for the Public will intend to enlist witnesses and hire witnesses. And, generally, there's a request filed with the Committee for the purposes of doing that.

That is entirely up to Counsel for the Public. We don't require him to do it, or we rarely prohibit him from doing it, but it's entirely up to him. And, that's usually the first thing that the Committee sees sort of in the adjudicative phase.

The next step in the adjudicative phase is usually a deadline for Counsel for the Public and the intervenors to submit data requests to the Applicant and the Applicant's witnesses. A data request is really nothing more than a written question. It can say something as simple as, you know, "where did you go to college?" Or, it can be a request for "please send to us, you know, your last 15 years tax returns." It can request documents, it can request information. There will be a deadline set, and we might have some idea at the end of our proceeding today about when that might be in this particular case.

There will be a deadline set for data requests to be issued by Counsel for the Public and by all of the intervenors to the Applicant. The Applicant then has a period of time in which
to prepare answers and to gather the data that has been requested, and then that data is provided and answers to the parties who requested it.

One rule about data requests, and this whole process of what we call "discovery", in other words, getting information from each other. The Subcommittee is not involved in it. You should not be copying Subcommittee members with your written questions to the Applicant, with your data requests, and they should not be being provided with documents or answers. There's a time during the process when, if you want to make that type of information part of the evidence in the case, there is a time to do that, but it's not during the discovery phase.

So, we will set a date for data requests to be submitted by the parties to the Applicants, and we'll set a date for when those requests have to be answered them by.

In a typical case, after data requests
have been answered, we have scheduled a technical session. In this case, it's going to require more than one technical session, because
there are numerous witnesses. But what a technical session is is an informal discovery method, whereby the witnesses who are responsible for the prefiled testimony and the counsel for the Applicant, in this particular case, will come into a room like this. They will sit at a larger table than I'm sitting at, and they will answer questions posed by the various parties. Again, those are oral questions. Presumably, they won't simply be a repetition of what was already provided in writing, and it doesn't have to be, just so you know. If you've already gotten the answers, you don't need to ask the questions at the technical sessions.

However, for the most part, the technical session is there for the purpose of clearing up any details that need to be cleared up. It is informal, there is no record kept. Generally, at the end of each technical session, there are leftover new data requests, requests that came up because of information received during the technical session. We usually will -- what will happen is myself, or whoever
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is presiding over the technical session, will make a list of what those requests are. Most of time they're requesting additional documents. We make a list of those.

And, the Applicant, in this case, in the first phase, will be required to provide answers to those. That's usually a much shorter timeframe. In the past, it's been seven or ten days. But, obviously, if we have 100 questions at the end of a technical session, answers like that aren't going to be provided in a very short timeframe.

So, that's sort of the first part of the adjudicative process. It involves Counsel for the Public obtaining experts under his authority to do that. During that period of time should also be the time that any independent parties, in other words, not state agencies, should be looking, if you are going to hire experts, should be looking at who you're going to hire, should be interviewing those people or taking -- doing whatever due diligence you feel is necessary to appropriately represent your position.

Because the next step, the ball is in your court. You will be required to designate who your witnesses are and your experts, as will Counsel for the Public. You will be required at that time to file prefiled testimony. You have an example of that, that's already been filed by the Applicant, along with the Application. And, it's, basically, you take what your witnesses have to say, you put it in a question-and-answer format, and you create what we call -- what lawyers call "direct testimony".

So, in other words, if you think about this as a trial, your witness is not going to testify on direct examination when we get to the trial session. Your witness is going to be put on the witness stand and subjected to cross-examination by the other parties, because they have already filed, in writing, their testimony. So, at the time that you designate who your witnesses and experts are, you're also going to be required to file their testimony. And, there will be a date that will be set, it will be in a Procedural Order, telling you when that has to be done by.

Once your prefiled testimony, and this is everybody, except the Applicant, at this point, but, once Counsel for the Public and all the intervenors have filed their prefiled testimony and identified their experts, the Applicant then has the opportunity to submit data requests, written questions, to the various parties and their witnesses. And, again, the parties and their witnesses will be required to answer those written questions, in writing, by a date certain. All of these dates will be set out in a Procedural Order.

Once the written responses to the data requests are received from Counsel to the Public and from the intervenors, we will have a technical session where your experts, and, when I say "yours", I mean Counsel for the Public and the intervenors, will sit and be questioned. And, the same rules apply as they did with the experts for the Applicant. If there are any questions, and that should be "Tech Session data requests", not "rata requests", which is a typo in the slide, but, if there are questions that are left at the end of that proceeding, they
will be written up and provided to those witnesses and to those parties, and they will be required to answer those questions by a date certain.

So, that's the second sort of phase. So, the first phase is obtaining information from the Applicant. The second phase is the Applicant obtaining from the other parties.

In most of our cases, after we've gone through that process, we set a deadline for the filing of supplemental testimony. Because, if you think about it, at the end of these technical sessions, your expert may have a change of view, or there might be something that he or she has not offered an opinion on that they now have an opinion on, based upon the information that was learned at the technical session.

I'm going to have to plug this in.
Hold on a second.
And, after the filing of the supplemental testimony, we will have another pretrial conference, similar to this one, except the idea at that pretrial conference will be a
lot more -- will dig down a lot more into exactly how many witnesses are testifying, who's going to ask questions of who. And, some of the issues that were raised with respect to the groups earlier, that I said "were not set in cement", will be -- thank you -- will be set in cement at that point in time.

The other thing that's very important to do by the time of the final pretrial conference is any piece of evidence that you want to enter as an exhibit before the Subcommittee will have to be presented at that final pretrial conference. We will have assistance there, and we will get all of the exhibits marked. So that, when we start the actual trial or the adjudicative hearing itself, everybody should have a copy of all of the exhibits that any party wishes to present, and we can refer to them by number, and make the proceeding work very efficiently.

The final pretrial conference is usually about a week to ten days before the start of the adjudicative hearing. The adjudicative hearing is what most of you would
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actually consider the "trial". We'll actually be in a hearing room, probably in a room very much like this. There will be a witness box. The witnesses will be subject to cross-examination by the others parties, and the entire Subcommittee will be there to hear that evidence. Exhibits will be entered into the record as part of that proceeding.

And, at the end of that process, once the record is closed and all the evidence is received, we will have deliberative sessions. And, as $I$ discussed before, that's basically the Subcommittee, in public, deliberating on all of the issues that are raised, from Pittsburg to Deerfield, you know, dealing with every issue that comes up in the proceeding.

And, I anticipate that the
adjudicative hearings alone will take between 20 and 30 total business days. And, I wouldn't be surprised if the deliberative hearings went 10 to 12 days.

Ultimately, during that deliberative session, the Committee will make a decision, one way or the other, on whether or not to grant the

Certificate of Site and Facility. And, if they choose to grant one, they will also make decisions about what conditions should be applied to it. And, they will turn to me and say "get us it in writing." And, then, ultimately, we will prepare for them a written decision that memorializes what they've said on the record, and goes into the issue -- the things that they have discussed on the record and what's the evidence in the record. And, there will be a final written decision that will be signed by a majority of the Subcommittee. And, that will be the final ruling in the case. So, that's sort of, in broad strokes, that's the process we go through in coming to a decision. And, that's the adjudicative process. That's the process that everybody here who has been granted intervention status has the opportunity to participate in.

You've probably all already seen this before, that process has to occur between today and December 19th, 2016. Along the way, there are a couple statutory timeframes that are going to be met, not so much by anybody in this room,
but by state agencies. By May 16th, they will submit what they call their "preliminary reports with draft conditions". And, then, by August 15th, the state agencies will be required to submit what's called their "final decisions". And, what those are, is those are their decisions with respect to that portion of the Application that applies to their particular area.

So, for instance, we all know that there's a Wetlands Application in this particular docket. The Department of Environmental Services will provide their final decision on whether or not that Wetlands Application meets their standards or not.

So, what has to happen, though, is, and this is the really difficult part for my Committee, is within that three months, between day 240 and day 365 , that's when we have to have the actual adjudicative hearing, that 20 or 30 business days that I've been talking about, as well as the deliberations.

So, for the Committee -- for you all,
a lot of the work is front-loaded. For the

Committee, a lot of their job is on the back-end, and in a very compressed timeframe. We didn't make these timeframes up. They came from the Legislature. We try our best to abide them.

It is no secret that there is a provision by which parties can move to suspend the timeframes, if they can demonstrate that it is in the public interest to do so. I know there's already been talk amongst you all about that.

However, for today's purposes, and for purposes going forward, until there is some other order from the Site Evaluation Committee, we have to proceed as though this matter will be concluded by December 19th, 2016. Otherwise, we would just be disregarding the statute, and we don't want to do that.

And, that's just our membership. I'm sure everyone in this room knows who's on the Subcommittee already.

Somebody before asked "where do I file things?" Or, "how do I get in touch with the Committee?" Pamela Monroe is our Administrator.
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If you file any motions or anything, they should be sent to that e-mail, pamela.monroe@sec.nh.gov.

The website, we've been pretty good, actually, it didn't start off that way, but lately we've been pretty good at getting stuff up on the website as it comes in. We do have some technical difficulties with the website that tend to reoccur. But we do our best to get all pleadings and orders on the website as quickly as we can. So, that should answer the question that somebody had about how to get in touch with the Committee. If anybody needs that, it's also on the handouts as well.

Did anybody -- does anybody have any questions? Do they need anything cleared up about this adjudicative process? Yes, sir, in the back.

MR. McGARRY: Fred McGarry, from Deerfield.
[Court reporter interruption.]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Get closer to that mike, sir. We cannot hear you up here.

MR. McGARRY: Fred McGarry, from Deerfield. Wondering about the -- whether the witnesses for both the Applicant and for the Counsel for the Public would be under oath at the time they have to have these technical sessions.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No. Their prefiled testimony is filed under oath. And, they are placed under oath at the time of the adjudicative proceeding. We do not put them under oath at the technical session.

Understand that technical sessions are not depositions. If anybody here has a background with civil practice and in courts, there's a thing called a "deposition", where witnesses can be called into a room similar to this, usually smaller than this, and asked questions under oath.

That's not the purpose here. The whole genesis of technical sessions has to do with experts being in the room. And, I highly recommend to all parties that, when you attend a technical session, so, let's say we're going to have a technical session tomorrow on visual
impact, and you've already done some discovery with the Applicant's visual impact expert. If you have visual impact expert, have that person there. Have that person provide questions. Because, when you're talking about technical issues, it's really those witnesses that have the technical expertise that are going to make the difference to the Committee members. And, I don't mean that, you know, that lay witnesses aren't going to have any persuasive ability at all. But I can tell you that, if you're talking about, well, you know, "what's the noise from this going to be 5 miles away? Or, even 500 feet away?" A sound engineer is probably the person who is best going to be able to answer that question. And, by having your sound engineer there, assuming you have one, to have that discussion with the sound engineer from the other side, whichever side you're own, is really the best way to approach technical sessions. And, that's the way that most of the folks that regularly appear before the Site Evaluation Committee do.

We recently had a -- I believe it was
a tech session in another case, where visual impact was a major thing, and both visual impact experts were there.

You know, it just makes -- it makes -does two things. It gets to the heart of the matters, number one, and it also educates folks who aren't the experts. But they're not under oath. It's more of an informal type of session. MR. MCGARRY: If I may have a follow-up?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: NO problem. Just speak into that microphone.

MR. MCGARRY: Okay. The other question was, will it be possible for the intervenors to be able to see the list of witnesses proposed by the Counsel for the Public, so that we may not be -- may be able to eliminate some duplication of witnesses?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It could be, if we schedule it that way. I've given you a broad overview of how our schedules usually go. And, there has been -- generally, Counsel for the Public and the intervenors are generally, in the past, required to submit on
the same day. And, you know, is it possible that they could be given different deadlines? They certainly could. And, that's something that we can discuss.

Obviously, that could have a tendency to lengthen the timeframe. And, I would be concerned about things that are going to lengthen our overall timeframe, because we are, at least today, working within this 365-day period.

So, -- but, yes, it could be scheduled that way. We'll get a little bit more into the details of scheduling, and I'll have questions for people about how they would like things scheduled in a few minutes. Okay?

But, right now, did anybody else have any questions or need any clarification regarding the overall process?

Yes, ma'am.
MS. BRADBURY: JoAnne Bradbury,
Deerfield. With respect to conditions on the project, do we have to submit filed testimony and expert testimony with respect to conditions before the adjudicative hearing?
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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It is highly recommended that you submit testimony with whatever conditions that you think might be, and I don't know what your position is with respect to the Application, but let me give you an example.

Somebody might say "Look, I'm opposed to this Application. I don't think this facility should be built. But, if it is built, you should make sure that no tower is over 100 feet tall." Okay? You should have your testimony or your expert's testimony that supports that condition filed at the time that you file your testimony.

Now, is it possible that conditions will come out of the hearing? So that we have the hearing, and, during the hearing, somebody says something that rings, say, for you or for some other party, and at the end of the hearing you want to suggest to the Subcommittee that "Hey, you know, so-and-so had a good idea, I think you ought to adopt that." There will be an opportunity for you to do that.

But, to the extent that you are saying
"there are certain conditions that we are going to recommend to the Committee", you should do that at the time that your testimony is filed. Okay?

Now, some conditions, like I say, may come up. But, for the most part, you want to get that done initially.

Peter.
MR. ROTH: Mike, on that point, historically, conditions have been included as part of the people's post-hearing memoranda, and, you know, obviously, could put them in the testimony. But, as I say, historically, it has come after the hearing, in the post-hearing memoranda.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes. And, what Peter is talking about is, in some dockets, we have had the ability, after the record has closed, but before deliberations occur, to file written arguments. Okay? And, he's right. And, often, you can put your conditions in those as well. Many times, though, conditions need support. And, if you haven't made a record for the conditions that
you're looking for, you're not going to be very persuasive to the Committee about why those conditions should be adopted.

But Peter is absolutely correct. In many of these cases, most, not all of them, but most of them, we have had an ability to file "post-hearing memoranda", is what they're called. And, they are -- actually, did I even have them --

MR. ROTH: You did.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes. I actually had it on the -- I must have overlooked it. Post-hearing memoranda, after -- between the adjudicative hearings and deliberative sessions. So, that would be the place where, if you want to be clear and very persuasive, where you list out all of your -- all of your conditions, in that memoranda that you file with the Committee.

Ms. Menard.
MS. MENARD: Yes. Jeannie Menard, Deerfield. In the discovery phase, in a effort to eliminate redundancy of questions, what will the mechanism be? Will we be filing via e-mail?

Or, how will we all know what other people have for questions, so that we're not asking the same questions within different groups?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: There is probably no way to avoid all duplication, just so you know, especially with this many parties. However, that was one of the reasons why we have the spokesperson procedure. Because, at least within the groups, you'll have one person who can at least collect the questions that you want to ask, and say "okay, you know, if it's a town group, you know, Fitzwilliam has these questions and Rindge has these questions. But, look, six of them are the same, so we only need to ask them once." That's sort of the thinking behind that.

You're certainly free to discuss with other intervenors and other intervenor groups what type of questions you might want to ask. And, to the extent groups want to group together and provide a single set of data requests, or a single set of data requests with respect to a particular issue, you're free to do that.

I will point out that there is in our
rules right now a limit on data requests of 50 per party. So that it may be very helpful to the various groups to get together and perhaps divvy things up by category. Or, you may not. It all depends on how you want to proceed, and I can't tell you how to do that. But there is a limitation on them.

And, again, as everybody knows, if that limitation is a problem, the way to seek relief is to file a motion with the Committee seeking relief from that. So, if, for some reason, somebody believes "I can't" -- "50 questions is simply not enough. I need to ask 60." You can file a motion to be allowed to do that, and the Chairperson will determine whether or not he wants to do that.

But, please remember, these rules were actually adopted, even though they're different than the rules that were in effect at the time of the filing, these rules were adopted by the Committee knowing that this filing and another very large filing were coming, so that that 50 was thought about as part of the process when our rules were adopted, or readopted, I should
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say.
Is there any other? Anybody else need clarification regarding the processes?

Yes, sir.
MR. BREKKE: Bruce Brekke, from
Whitefield. Is there a process to file an appeal of the final decision?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, there is. It's the typical appeal from any administrative agency. There is a requirement -- and, at the end of all of our decisions, we put this information at the end of the decision. There's a requirement, before you can file an appeal, you have to file a motion for rehearing. In that motion for rehearing, you have to point out every issue on which you believe that the Committee was wrong about, basically, to put it in layman's terms. If the Committee denies the motion for rehearing, you then file an appeal with the New Hampshire Supreme Court, in Concord. And, that appeal is 30 days from that final denial. You have to file a motion for rehearing within 30 days of the date of the written decision.
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And that -- you don't have to write this down, because you'll be reminded of this as we go through the process. But it's a two-step process. You must file a motion for rehearing. And, if that motion for rehearing is denied, you then file an appeal to the New Hampshire Supreme Court. There is no intermediate appellate court between us and the New Hampshire Supreme Court. We do not go to the Superior Court, we go directly to the Supreme Court.

How about in the front, and then in the back. Go ahead, sir. Speak right into that microphone.

MR. BERGLUND: Erick --
[Court reporter interruption.]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're going to have to repeat your name. It didn't come across.

MR. BERGLUND: Erick Berglund, Deerfield. $B-e-r-g-1-u-n-d$. You said there's a limit of 50 requests for data per party. Definition of "per party" is?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Group.
MR. BERGLUND: Group. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MUMFORD: Margaret Mumford, Bridgewater. How much of the discovery process becomes a part of public record? And, if so, what's the mechanism and the timeframe?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That discovery process does not become a part of our public record for the Site Evaluation Committee. You don't provide your discovery to the site Evaluation Committee. In fact, you'll hear repeatedly from me and from Ms. Monroe, don't send your data requests to us, don't send the answers to data requests to us. That is discovery, that goes amongst the parties. It's trading of information.

If there is a problem, for instance, somebody doesn't want to provide something, there is a method by which they can do something very similar to what the Applicant has done with respect to the economic report. They can file a motion for protective treatment, if that's the way they want to go. You can certainly do that. And, that would limit what people can do with
it. In that case, obviously, the Committee, the Chair of the Committee would have to be educated by you through the motion as to what exactly the issue is, because we don't have it in front of us.

But, during the discovery process, there may actually be the transfer of information from party to party that may not be ever introduced at the hearing. And, therefore, no reason for the Subcommittee to see that information. There may be information that's technically not admissible, for one reason or another, although that's very infrequent in administrative hearings. But that's why we don't provide the answers to the data requests and the data requests themselves to the Committee members.

If you receive a document in discovery that you believe the Committee members need to see, in their determination of the issues in this case, and sometimes it's all of them, you will mark it as an exhibit and present it at the time of the actual adjudicative hearing as an exhibit. And, at that point in time, it will be
reviewed by the Subcommittee during the course of their deliberations.

So, the answer is, don't send your discovery requests to the Committee, unless there's a dispute over them, and don't send the answers to the discovery requests to the committee. We want to keep them out of the fray until the actual hearing.

MR. BOLDT: Mr. Chair?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, sir.
MR. BOLDT: On that point -- Chris Boldt, Donahue, Tucker \& Ciandella, for the City of Berlin. On the point of keeping discovery and the pleadings separate, is it possible, in light of the size here and the desire to expedite lack of duplication, to have a subset of the e-mail service list created, so that we know who to give our responses to or requests to the Company, and they come then back, so that everybody has the information?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.
And, there's something like that that's already been started, I believe. If you look at the website, there is a distribution e-mail address
list. It was last revised on Saint Patrick's Day. Don't use that one. But there will be something similar to that. That one, I believe, has the Committee members on it. But we can create something like that that does not include the Committee members, and we'll make it easier for the parties involved in the docket.

MR. BOLDT: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I saw one other hand up. Yes. Yes, ma'am.

MS. PASTORIZA: Chris Pastoriza,
Easton. Is an alternate public member going to be appointed?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's up to the Governor. I don't know. I assume, at some point, there will be an appointment. I have no knowledge, one way or the other, about where that is in the process. They don't call me and ask me. So, the alternate public member position is a gubernatorial appointment, and has to be confirmed by the Executive Council. So, I hope there is. Not so much for this docket, I believe that -- well, $I$ don't know what will happen. That's going to be up to the Chair
about, if we get, $I$ suppose it depends, in part, when we receive a new alternate public member. And, quite frankly, the statute is kind of quiet about what happens if there's a change in the makeup of the Committee while a case is pending. Those are issues $I$ don't have the answer for you. They will require research. But, right now, our alternate public member is a member of this Subcommittee. And, unless the Governor appoints a new public member, and the research reveals that we have -- that that public member has to serve, instead of the alternate public member, which I don't know if that will be the conclusion or not, that might be the only change. Unfortunately, our statute is silent on that point.

Was there any other questions about this adjudicative process? The discovery process of anything that I've just talked about?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Good.
Because now we're going to talk about it in more detail.

Okay. I've just put up on the screen
the calendar that starts with today, our prehearing conference. The reason why I've done this, and this calendar goes through the end of the year, is just so that people can have an idea of what things look like. Excuse me. If, during this process, I write something down in this calendar does not mean that that's something that is a fait accompli at all. It just means that we're looking at something.

I'm going to point out one problem in the overall schedule first for you all to understand, because, although this is a very important docket, September 12th through the 23rd already has an adjudicative hearing in the pending Antrim Wind matter scheduled for those ten days. And, just so you all know, our last time that we handled an Antrim Wind proceeding, it took eleven days, and that does not count the deliberative time.

So, just so folks are aware. Although this docket is very important, it's not the only Case before the Site Evaluation Committee presently. And, it's not the only one that's sort of moved into the adjudicative phase. So,
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just thought I would point that out for you all. There is also the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, which is not on the calendar, $I$ don't know, $I$ don't have the dates in front of me, but that is also scheduled during this year as well. Although, we don't expect that one to take as long as Antrim Wind. I think it will probably be done within a week. So, the next item on our agenda is a "Discussion of Discovery Needs and Events". I've kind of gone over the events.

MR. ROTH: Before with you go there, Mike?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.
MR. ROTH: Does the Public Utilities Commission have items on its calendar that would interfere with this, since two of our members are Public Utilities Commission members?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I am pretty sure that they do, but I couldn't tell you what they are.

I do know, though, that the nice thing about the way that the statute is now set up is that the Chair of the Public Utilities

Commission, which is where we usually work, is also the Chair of our Committee now. So, we don't need the interagency communication that was sometimes hard to -- it's not hard, but just a little bit more of a pain to accomplish from when the Chair was over at DES. So, it's a little bit easier. And we have -- we actually have hearing rooms and stuff that we can poach from the Public Utilities Commission when we need to. Although, not a hearing room that's going to accommodate all of you. We will likely be meeting in rooms like this through most of this docket.

So, I was going to move on to Agenda
Item Number VII, the "Discussion of Discovery Needs and Events". I've sort of already gone over what the events are. Discovery needs is probably the next thing. And I'm not sure how far we can actually go, because what I'm going to do is actually turn to Counsel for the Public. Generally, in the past, this whole process sort of gets rolling with your requests for the Committee to approve witnesses. And, so, that's sort of where we get rolling.

$$
\text { 2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\} }
$$

So, I'm going to look to you to sort of get us rolling on this discussion, in terms of what you believe -- I understand you have a proposal for a timeframe, but just in general, the types of things that you're going to be looking for in discovery, if you put it in general groups. Understanding that you're still going to hire experts, who are also going to assist us you in determining that.

MR. ROTH: Well, --
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And you're not bound by any of this. This is just a discussion informally.

MR. ROTH: Yes. I guess I would start off by saying that maybe that the Committee and the Applicant are the only people who believe that this is going to be done in a year.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, just so you know, the Committee isn't here. This Staff member of the Committee is aware that, in the past, on some major installations, we've not been able to complete it within at the time it was a nine-month timeframe. So, there have been instances in the past when we've had
to find that it was in the public interest to exceed the calendar.

However, where we are right now is we do have a statute, we are required by law to follow the statute. We're going to work that way until the Committee -- until and unless the Committee is satisfied, "until" is the wrong word, unless the Committee is satisfied that it is in the public interest to suspend the timeframes and extend the hearing process.

MR. ROTH: And we intend to file a motion to that effect in the near future.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: When do you think you're going to file that?

MR. ROTH: Within ten days. And, so, this process today is a bit awkward, to put it mildly, given that our operating understanding is that we need, as we've disclosed in our schedule, something like 18 months from the date of the acceptance of the Application.

There are a number of problems, and
we'll get to them as they come along. But there's a resistence on our part to simply accepting that it must be done in that year.

That's where we're coming from, because this is a significant problem, and we're trying to deal with it as best we can.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I get it. MR. ROTH: Typically, the first thing that we do is, as you pointed out, retain -file motions to retain experts. And that has, in my experience, occurs something like 45 to 60 days after the prehearing conference.

We have been underway already, since the first of the year, really, at identifying, interviewing, and so far not yet, but selecting experts to provide evidence and testimony in a variety of different areas. So, we would expect that process to continue until probably June 1st. Although, what we expect to do is to, as soon as we have sort of cemented the deal, that is we understand what the experts' going to do, what their budget is, and we're prepared to hire them, we would submit the applications or motions with the Committee on a rolling basis when we're ready, with the understanding that they would all be done by June 1st, unless we come back and ask for more time. But we think

June 1st is very doable.
And, typically, what else I think you realize, that the discovery calendar sort of cues off of that, in that we found that it is most fruitful to conduct discovery with the assistance of the experts that we've retained. Typically, they would want some opportunity to review the Application materials before participating in the discovery process. But, generally, what we have found is that -- or, what $I$ found is that the experts are willing to and will have reviewed the Application and provide some assistance with discovery before the moment that they are actually retained, that is by an order.

And the process for retaining them, you know, as we have experienced it, is something like 30 days. You know, from the time -- you know, we file a motion, the applicant has an opportunity to object, and then the Committee needs some time to make a decision on that. And I think 30 days is about a -- is a reasonable amount of time to get all that done. Maybe the Committee needs more time to decide.

But, if we -- I would expect that the calendar would include a date or a timeframe within which the Committee would make the decision on any motion that gets filed.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Certainly , it's easier if you and the Applicant agree. So, I would encourage you to discuss with the Applicant those things. And, to the extent that the Applicant --

MR. ROTH: We have.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- agrees to the retention of those experts, and I would encourage you to be as willing as you can be to do that, it makes it easier for the Committee. It also gives you and your experts some comfort that, in fact, that decision is going to be made by the Committee and they can get working to review it.

MR. ROTH: We would certainly -- and we maintain an open dialogue with the applicant on most things, and we would certainly expect to continue that with respect to the retention of experts, and we've told them that.

I think it's essential that they at
least have an opportunity to look at what we're going to do before we file it, but -- and it's actually required by the rules. So, that dialogue would continue. And I don't know whether it will be fruitful or not, but we'll do it.

So, that's a 30-day process to get us to having the experts on the ground running. I don't know how much farther you want me to go. But, in terms of --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Why don't you stop right there, because I think there's a couple things that a lot of folks in the room don't know. And, let me just take them through it.

So far, we've received three proposed schedules in advance of this prehearing conference today. There's been a proposed schedule submitted by the Applicant; there's been a proposed schedule submitted by Counsel for the Public; and a proposed schedule submitted by the Forest Society.

Basically, the big story on each of those is the Applicant's schedule is within the
one-year timeframe set by the statute; Counsel for the Public essentially sets forth an 18-month statute -- timeframe, which would require that we exceed the statutory timeframe by six months; and the Forest Society has filed a proposed schedule that -- and I don't know if these are filed, they have been distributed, I guess -- has filed a proposed schedule that envisions a two-year period, which would require a suspension of the timeframe set for an additional year from the statutory requirement.

So, just so that folks know what we're talking about when we talk about these things, those are the scheduling proposals that at least I've seen. I've not seen one from any other parties up to this point.

I'm sorry, Peter. So, --
MR. ROTH: Well, we've -- just one other point about the discovery process, sort of leading us up to, basically, July 1st, from our perspective. Is that we would also, and we've had some conversation with the Applicant about this, begin sort of a first round of discovery prior to the completion of the Applicant -- or,

I'm sorry, prior to the completion of the expert retention process. So that we would get on it and get them some discovery sometime about for the middle of May.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Can you explain that in more detail for me, because that's one of the questions that I had? You have the first round of data requests, going from you and the intervenors, by May 15th. What's the thinking on that? What type of information is it that you're envisioning that that first round would include, if you don't have your experts in line until June?

MR. ROTH: Tom will answer that one.
MR. PAPPAS: There are a number of items that perhaps we could serve some discovery -- Tom Pappas for Counsel for the Public. In an effort to move this along, we had some discussions with the Applicant, and recognized the Applicant is going to get inundated with a lot of discovery requests. Some discovery requests may not require expert input. So, we could do some non-expert input discovery requests of the Applicant early, and
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do a second round of discovery that would require expert input. And, quite a few items are technical, and I suspect most items will require some expert input to make discovery meaningful. But there might be -- there are some I think we could probably request, particularly document requests, early, and get those out of the way, so that (a) we can move fast along the schedule, and (b) the Applicant can make production on a rolling basis, rather than be crushed with 26 requests at one time. And that's the thinking, is that non-expert stuff we could start early, recognizing that probably most of the discovery requests will require some expert input.

MR. ROTH: The other point that I think is relevant here is that we don't believe that the "50 data requests" limitation makes sense in this case for us. And, so, we will be filing a motion, perhaps at the same time as our extension motion, seeking to increase that number. And we haven't settled on that number yet, but it's going to be a fairly significant upgrade.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right. If the other party agrees, just send the data requests. File the motion, of course, but just start the process. Don't wait for an order from the Committee.

MR. ROTH: Okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay?
MR. ROTH: Fair enough.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, the same for the other way. If you guys have an agreement, when it's your turn to ask your data requests, this goes for all the parties, if there's an agreement, if you're submitting data requests to the Applicant, and you call the Applicant's lawyer up and you say "I've got 55 questions" or "I've got 60 questions", or whatever it is, "will you accept those?" Okay? You should file a motion to exceed with the Committee. But, if he agrees, don't wait for that motion to be acted on. Because the way the Committee generally acts, because everybody on the -- well, almost everybody on the Committee runs another state agency, is they wait till there's several things pending before you get an
order. And most of the orders you see midstream coming out of the Site Evaluation Committee is what we call "Order on Pending Motions", and usually resolves more than one thing.

So, if you have an agreement, that's the type of thing, it's between the parties, and this stuff is not being filed with the Committee in any event, just do it, if you can agree. And I encourage every person in this room, every party in this room, to keep an open dialogue with the Applicant about things like this, these process things. You don't have to agree with their Application, to call them up and say "I need some extra time, would you agree to it?" Or, "I'd like to ask more questions, would you agree to it?" And they shouldn't have to feel, because they want to build the project, they shouldn't feel any discomfort in calling any of you and asking -- or, sending an e-mail is usually the way things get done, sending an e-mail asking you all for similar types of courtesies.

MS. BIRCHARD: ExCuse me. I'm Melissa
Birchard, Conservation Law Foundation. I just
wanted to note that it sounds as though what's been proposed is an accommodation on the part of Counsel for the Public that hinges on their being granted additional questions. But the deadline in question appears to apply not only to Counsel for the Public but also the intervenors. So, it raises a broader question of whether that accommodation is something the intervenors can also be comfortable with, and whether they will be granted additional questions, similar to the Counsel for the Public.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The rules are no different for the intervenors than they are for Counsel for the Public. I don't know if there's been -- I mean, I'm --

MR. ROTH: We do not have an
accommodation between us and the Applicant with respect to the number of data requests at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: We were using that as an example. But, you know, if you want that kind of accommodation, ask for it from the party first. Okay?

MS. BIRCHARD: Right. I understand. PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: My only point is that, if it happens, don't wait for there to be an order from the Committee, do your discovery.

MS. BIRCHARD: Granted. I guess I'm simply expressing a concern that, well, you may not be as -- you and the Applicant, in general, there may be less willingness to grant additional questions to the entire room than there would be for Counsel for the Public. But, if our deadline hinges on what's been proposed, if the general intervenors are also subject to that deadline, I think they should be given the ability to test the deadline, if it's, you know, prior to our having retained experts to assist us prior to Counsel for the Public having retained experts.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: NO question that, if -- I guess what it boils down to is, if you can't meet the deadline for either identifying your experts or for getting data requests out, you would ask for additional time, you know.

But my only point was, and I'm sorry if I went too far off the reservation in my answer, is call the Applicant first and seek agreement on those types of things. Because I think, unlike what most people think, you may very well find that there will be an agreement there, or at least a partial agreement. I mean, I can't speak for the Applicant, but I do know that the Applicant has a desire to have this Application ruled on, and being contrary doesn't really advance the ball for them. So, I'm assuming that they will be somewhat cooperative. Will you?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. The short answer is, to the extent that people are making reasonable requests of us, we will cooperate. I can't say that that's a blanket agreement that, if everybody wants more than 50 , they're going to get that. They're going to have to explain to us why that's important.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sure.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: But, yes. I encourage people to try to work with us, because we have a strong interest in moving this forward.

And, I just want to circle back while we're on this topic before we get too far. What we have tried to do here in our draft schedule is come up with something that queues to the statutory deadlines, which we certainly believe is everyone's obligation at this point.

And, I understand what Counsel for the Public is saying about the need for more time. We're concerned about it, because it sounds like, right out of blocks, we are going to engage in a process that will essentially push those statutory deadlines away. And that's troubling to us, because it sounds like we're not even going to initially make an effort to comply with them.

I am very sympathetic to Counsel for the Public's need to bring experts on board, and I recognize that takes time. But I would also point out that their deadline that they have set is six and a half months after the completeness determination. And I take issue with what Peter said about it being customary that they get 45 to 60 days after the prehearing conference.

In the Antrim docket, for example,

Counsel for the Public filed their motion -MR. ROTH: Mike, can he save the argument for the motion?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, I
-- look, I let you speak. Go ahead, Barry.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: In the Antrim docket,
Counsel for the Public filed the motion on its expert 60 days after the completeness determination. Now, I understand that was a simpler docket, and I understand that was only one expert.

But we would hope that Counsel for the Public can start getting those motions filed immediately, and we will work with him to cooperate on those. And, if we don't have any disagreement with them, my guess is the Committee will be able to rule on them very quickly and we can get this process going. And, I think, if you look at the schedule that we provided, it accounts for that type of process. There's really -- Tom said something very helpful, which is "we can begin some discovery now on issues that are unrelated to experts". I think that's right, and I think we
should be doing that.
I think there's a second category, which is hopefully we can begin discovery very soon on experts that we understand they're probably close to retaining. And, if there are some other ones that need to come afterwards, so be it. That will take a little bit longer.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That raises a question for me that $I$ would ask you. So, you are anticipating that it might be necessary to have not just two sort of rounds of discovery, but more of a rolling thing? So that if -- and I'm only going to pull topics out of the air, but they -- Counsel for the Public and the intervenors have lined up noise experts and, say, wetlands experts, but they haven't yet gotten a visual expert, that there might be filings with respect to those for discovery, data requests and whatnot, and then another set of data requests after that. Is that what you're envisioning here?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, conceptually, yes. I wouldn't call it "rolling", I'd call it "phased", and the difference is important.

Because we don't want to be regularly hit with requests that we have to answer in the next period of time. We want two distinct periods, which we've accounted for in our schedule, by which Public Counsel and intervenors need to get requests to us, we answer. There are tech sessions connected with those. And, then, there is a second set of requests we answer, and there are more tech sessions.

There's two purposes to that. One purpose is to allow folks some additional time, where they're needed, to try to get that discovery prepared, at the same time that we do try to get this process going now. And, also, for the benefit of all of us, if it's spreads out a little bit, it will enhance our ability to respond to this stuff.

So, those sorts of two phases I think, which we provided for in our schedule, I think would benefit everyone.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm going
to look down to SPNHF, because they have also filed a written proposal. And ask Ms. Manzelli,

I guess, what your view on this, this particular
issue is, sort of creating a double phased, two-phase discovery process?

MS. MANZELLI: Thank you. That's
fine. I think it makes a lot of sense. I think a phased approach is going to be logical for the reasons Attorney Needleman stated.

Overall, I think it would be expedient, for this afternoon's purposes, to leave it to motions, which it sounds like will be filed regarding why it might be in the public interest for the SEC to decide to deviate from the statutory timeframes. So, I circulated the two-year long schedule that overall is my take at what is a realistic approach for the scheduling.

You know, as you mentioned earlier, the adjudicative hearing alone might take 20 to 30 days. I think that's, you know, two to three times longer than the longest proceeding that's ever happened at the Site Evaluation Committee. So, I think it's just reasonable to contemplate that we're going to be needing to extend those timeframes.

So, a phased approach to discovery is
fine. Thank you for the opportunity for the input. And I'll save any further argument for the motions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Historically, it might not be, because there was a place called "Seabrook" that had fairly extensive hearings, a very long time ago, before I was a lawyer.

Actually, before we get there, how many people out in the audience are now confused about scheduling, raise your hands?
[Show of hands.]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. And, I apologize for that. I realize that, as I was talking with the folks who have filed these proposals up here, has everybody seen the three written proposal that we have received? If you've not, raise your hands?
[Show of hands.]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
Well, let me see. I don't know if they're up on the website yet or not. Hold on one second.

MR. ROTH: I believe we emailed ours to everybody on the distribution list, but not
the Committee.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's good. I'm sorry?

MS. MANZELLI: I have -- I'm not sure if my microphone is on anymore.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You've got to just get close to it there.

MS. MANZELLI: I have 50 copies of it.
I can hand those around, if that's helpful?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sure, if you'd like.

MR. ROTH: We don't.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I know.
That's all right. In general, just a minute Ms. -- in general, you will get these, if you haven't already received them. I don't think there is any way today that, and what generally happens, in these pretrial conferences with respect to scheduling, is we actually come to an agreement, for the most part, with just a couple of loose ends about scheduling. I don't think that, today, with this group, in part, because of the size, but also, in part, because of the positions that folks are taking, that we're
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actually going to come to an agreement on the schedule.

So, I think maybe we should direct this discussion a little bit different. There will be a procedural schedule that will be issued by the Site Evaluation Committee. It will be issued by the Chairman of the Committee. I'm going to ask that -- what I'm going to suggest we do, instead of trying to go through each deadline that might be set, I'm going to ask that we have a deadline of ten days from Monday set, so that if anybody wants to weigh in and give their recommendation to the Committee about an appropriate schedule, that that be done within ten days of Monday, same time that the other two objections are due, and you weigh in by that point. And you should be able to see, before you do that, the three written proposals that are out there. The one submitted by the Applicant; the one submitted by Counsel for the Public; and the one submitted by the Forest Society; or you can recommend your own. But I think that that's the -- that's probably the best way that we will get input on the schedule.

I doubt going around this room and going deadline by deadline we're going to reach any kind of agreement. But, at least this way, the Chair will know what the positions of the parties are and can issue a procedural order based after reviewing those positions.

I may want to shorten that date, though. Let me just see something.

MS. MANZELLI: While you're checking on that, may $I$ ask a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I Can only do one thing at a time. Sorry.

I want to be fair to the Applicant. The ten days from Monday, so, Monday is the 28th, --

MR. PAPPAS: That's April 7th.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- is
April 7th. And, if I remember correctly, --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: April 11th.
MR. PAPPAS: Eleventh.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes. You asked for your process to start April 11th.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Can we shorten that
time period?
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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Can we shorten your time period?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's what I'm -- I think that that's fair to do.

MR. ROTH: Excuse me, Mike.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Just a minute. What I'm considering recommending to the Committee is to shorten the timeframe to weigh in in writing on the calendar, on the scheduling. And the reason why I'm doing that is the Applicant has submitted their proposal, which has April 11th as the is first day that something is due. And, if we wait for ten days after the $28 t h$, that would be -- we'd be butting up right against -- right against that. And, if that's what the Committee ordered, that wouldn't be fair to you all, who have to take the next step either. In an effort to be fair to everybody, I might need to shorten that date.

Somebody over here. Mr. Whitley.
MR. WHITLEY: Steven Whitley. I just
wanted to inquire, and you may not have the
answer to this, but it sounds like there are people that are going to object to their intervenor group and the restrictions that have been placed on them, and motions are going to be filed by the 28th. I'm assuming the Applicant is then going to have ten days to respond to those motions, that gets us to roughly April 8th. And, then, the SEC has to render a decision on that. And, I'm dubious that that's going to happen within two days of the motions coming out, or maybe it will.

But, under the Applicant's timeframe, the first data requests are supposed to come out on the 11th. And that just doesn't seem like a lot of time for the parties to file their objections to the intervenor order, the Applicants to respond, the SEC to make a ruling, and then for the fallout from that ruling to be put into effect, so that the groups can get together, coordinate, figure out what questions they want to ask.

So, I'm just wondering if you can speak to, I guess, the SEC's anticipated meeting schedule in the next couple of weeks to crank
out some of these decisions, because that seems to be a chock point for a lot of this going forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, first of all, what we're discussing right now, though, is not those issues. The issue is in terms of setting the schedule. Those issues we're going to be dealing with one way or another. And it may change after this round of hearing -- of motions and objections. It may change again down the road. You know, the intervenor groups, which are at the crux of that, can change over time, and they may very well. So, I'm little bit less concerned about that.

I'm more concerned about, if the Applicant is arguing for a certain proposed schedule, and other folks are arguing for a different proposed schedule, that the Committee have everybody weigh in in a timeframe that makes sense for them to issue a procedural order. That's where I see the difficulty is.

I mean, $I$ think you can -- if we can't get to the procedural schedule, then none of
those other issues are going to make a difference anyway.

MR. WHITLEY: I guess I feel like it's a little bit of a "chicken or the egg" thing. Because I think some of the intervenors need to know where the SEC if going to come down on the groupings and the limitations before they feel like they can weigh in on these discovery issues and the deadlines and those sorts of things.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: But, in reality, with this size of a proceeding, we're going to wind up with scrambled eggs.

So, I mean, that's the issue. And, so, I think that $I$ 'm still inclined to recommend that the weighing in on the schedules be done in a little bit shorter time.

Ms. Pacik, you had a question?
MS. PACIK: Thank you. Danielle Pacik, from the City of Concord.

What I would just ask is that any deadline for discovery requests be done in terms of a certain amount of days from a final decision on the grouping of the parties. So, rather than having it be May 15th or April 11th,
it be 45 days from the date of the decision by the SEC of which groups are going to be joined together for discovery purposes, and maybe within 60 days from that, because it will take time for people to get together.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Boldt.

MR. BOLDT: Chris Boldt, for the City of Berlin. One suggestion $I$ would make is to just have our responses on the schedule due at the same time we're filing our objections to the groupings, which would make it the $28 t h$, rather than ten days from the 28th.

MR. ROTH: Mike?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Just one minute, Peter. Ms. Schibanoff has been very patient back there.

MR. ROTH: Oh, I'm sorry.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And I missed her, and I'm very sorry.

MS. SCHIBANOFF: Susan Schibanoff.
When the discussions get going on people in the first row, could you please remember to identify yourself. We all don't know who you are back
here, and they're just disembodied voices. It would help to know who's speaking. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All
right. Thank you. Go ahead, Peter.
MR. ROTH: Mike -- Peter Roth, Counsel for the Public. In having a whispered discussion with my team, --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I saw that.

MR. ROTH: -- and based on my understanding of how the process for us is going, we do not think it is possible for us to file expert retention motions by April 11th, certainly not to be done with it. Maybe we could start the process at that point, but we would not be done with it by April 11th.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That being the date that's in Counsel for the Public's proposal -- I'm sorry, that would be in the Applicants' --

MR. ROTH: In the Applicants' proposal. And, that's the one you seemed to be worried about in terms of making the decisions.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No.
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Actually, what's causing me the concern is the other deadline, April 11th, which is propounding discovery requests upon the Applicant, that first round of discovery.

MR. ROTH: Right. So, that's the -PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's the one that's causing me the agita here.

MR. ROTH: Okay. Since you won't know who your intervenors are at that point.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And
Ms. Menard.
MS. MENARD: Jeanne Menard, Deerfield. The Applicant had mentioned the completedness date as kind of a starting point for the Applicant.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.
MS. MENARD: Would like the SEC to realize that, as an intervenor, for example, Appendix 46, which is a 1,700 page document, was not made available to be viewed on the SEC site until late February. So, we're starting -- due to the file size, it was not -- we just couldn't access it. So, --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Are you
referencing the supplemental filing?
MS. MENARD: No. This was in the Application itself. This particular document, which I needed and wanted to start reviewing back as soon as it was posted, regarding the real estate -- high voltage transmission line and real estate values. So, there may be other documents that other intervenors similarly, $I$ know our Conservation Commission was having trouble getting information. So, this information was posted, but we have a much later date of actually being able to access that information and start processing it, reading it and using it. So, our start date has been much later.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: If that is a continuing problem with anything -- I know we did get an e-mail from somebody just in the last couple of days saying they couldn't open a document. But, if that is a continuing problem, please don't -- please don't wait. Contact Pam Monroe or myself and let us know that you're not able to get to a document on our website. We'll do what we can. I know that we did reduce the
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size of some of them in the past. But please don't wait, because we won't know that that's a problem.

Because, I will tell you, I have -- I have the whole Application separately on my computer. And, even when I do go to the website, $I$ generally get on it pretty quick. But I have, you know, people have called and said there's a problem opening this or that, I tried to get it fixed right away. So, please, please let us know.

Now, as that pertains to scheduling, I understand that that might be a problem. And, you know, we will -- I think the Chairman will, obviously, take technical issues like that into consideration. But I don't -- I don't know what the result will be.

MS. MENARD: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Ms.
Pastoriza.
MS. PASTORIZA: I'm Kris Pastoriza,
Easton. Maybe you could date completeness from when the latest files were broken out by Pam, so people could access them?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, it depends what you mean by "date completeness". "Completeness" means something under the statute that we don't get to change. But I do understand that setting deadlines, understanding that the documents were not reduced, which is I believe what you're talking about, this is something that the Chair should consider. I think that's very similar to Ms. Menard's request.

MS. MANZELLI: Mike, Can I ask a question? Over to your right.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh. Hi, Amy .

MS. MANZELLI: Amy Manzelli, for the Forest Society.

Can you speak to whether you contemplate that the Chair alone will be making the procedural order or whether there will be no procedural order until after the SEC, as a group, you know, deliberates on motions to alter the timeline?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, it's actually two different questions. The
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Chair will make -- will issue the procedural schedule. Under RSA 162-H, Section 4, procedural decisions are made by the Chair.

The other question is "will that occur before the Committee sits and deliberates on the appeals from the intervention orders?" I don't know. That's really up to the Chair as to when he decides to issue the procedural order.

But what I'm trying to get to here is a date that's fair to, both the Applicant and to everybody else in the room, to have people weigh in on your schedule, Counsel for the Public's schedule, the Applicants' schedule, or if they have an alternate schedule that they would like to propose. That's really where I'm at. And, you know, I don't want any party to be excluded from their -- their proposal being considered simply because time has passed.

Does that answer your question?
MS. MANZELLI: It actually doesn't
answer it all the way. And, I apologize -PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'll do my best.

MS. MANZELLI: The duty to extend the
timeframes, can the Chair do that by himself or does the full Subcommittee need to decide that? PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: MY recollection is that is a Committee decision to be made.

MS. MANZELLI: So, I guess the question is, would the Chair issue a procedural order before the Subcommittee makes a decision to extend or to not extend?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Like I say, I don't know. That's entirely in the hands of the Chairman, and I don't know what he's thinking. So, you know, I will tell you that it's -- it's not a big deal if we issue, and this is for everybody's benefit, and Amy probably already knows this, it's not a big deal if we issue -- let's say we just adopted the Applicants' procedural schedule today. We can't do that, because the Committee is not here. Let's say Mr. Honigberg decided "this is the way I'm going to schedule this case", and he signed -- just signed this today. And, then, in two weeks, there's a hearing on the motion, or it would be actually in 24 days or something
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like that, there's a hearing on the motion for extension, and the Committee votes to extend the schedule, to suspend the timeframes and extend the schedule, there's likely to be, after that, another procedural order that will get issued.

So, I don't want anybody to think that one thing prohibits the other; it doesn't. There is -- I'm not sure it's going to happen that way. But, should it, it does not stop the Committee from doing what they vote to do. Yes, ma'am.

MS. DRAPER: Yes. I'm Gretchen Draper, from New Hampton. And I'm here on behalf of PRLAC, the Pemigewasset River Advisory Council.

I'm wondering if, right here and now, you know, we talk about keeping communication open with all of the groups, can we make a decision here to extend that April 11th deadline, with the Applicant's, you know, goodwill?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: There is no decision to have that deadline in the first place.

MS. DRAPER: Okay. So, --
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It's a proposal from them.

MS. DRAPER: Right. So, we could -PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public has a different proposal.

MS. DRAPER: Uh-huh.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: SPNHF has a different proposal.

MS. DRAPER: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And what
I am trying to discuss here is an opportunity for everybody else in the room, including your group, to weigh in either on those three -- on one or more of those three proposals, or some alternate altogether. And, really, all I'm trying to do is, because $I$ don't think we're going to get everybody in the room to agree on one proposal, is to set a date by which you all have the opportunity to weigh in on that, and then leave it up to the person who has to make the decision in any event, Mr. Honigberg, --

MS. DRAPER: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- to
2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
make that decision.
MS. DRAPER: So, I have heard people here saying that April 11th doesn't seem to work with their schedule. Can we take April 11th off the docket? Who do we -- do you need --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No. I think the problem with April 11th is what we were talking about, one of the deadlines we were discussing, --

MS. DRAPER: It's because the Applicant wants --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- it would be too close to the Applicant, --

MS. DRAPER: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- in other words, before you got an order, --

MS. DRAPER: Uh-huh.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- it would be too close to the commencement of the Applicants' schedule.

MS. DRAPER: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, of
course, the Applicant deserves the same consideration that every other party deserves,
to have their schedule fully considered.
MS. DRAPER: Right. Can we ask the Applicant right now if they would be willing to extend that for a week? Would Mr. --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Absolutely

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think the answer is, if you look at the entire schedule that we circulated to everyone, what we tried to do is come up with something that begins really as soon as possible from this date, and still gets us to an endpoint within the statutory deadlines.

And, as long as we -- our view is, as long as we can create a schedule together, that gets us to a statutory endpoint that respects those deadlines, we would be willing to listen to proposals.

I think the problem is, if we're not thinking about that holistically, and we're just starting to extend dates out, without thinking about the effect that it has on the dates that come afterward, that's where we think we can create a problem with achieving those statutory
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deadlines.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: But,
Mr. Needleman, though, there's only really one day. We're not going to -- we're not going to come -- we're not going to do like we've done in many other prehearing conferences, just because of the size here, we're not going to come up with a full schedule here today. It's pretty clear.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: SO,
there's only really one date that we're concerned about, and that is the date by which folks weigh in on the schedule, in writing, so the Chairman can make -- and, I think, is there any leeway in that April 11th date, with respect to that issue for you? Because, if we did allow the filings of those papers on the same day that we would -- that there's already objections to, on the waivers and on the protective order, that is -- I've lost the date -- that is ten days from Monday, I believe, was the -- when were you going to file your redacted?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Monday.
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|  | 222 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Monday, |
| 2 | the 28th. |
| 3 | MR. NEEDLEMAN: The 28th. |
| 4 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Right. |
| 5 | So, if we wait for ten days from that, we |
| 6 | are what, the 8th? I'm going to get a better |
| 7 | calendar next time. Oh, the sixth, if I've |
| 8 | counted correctly. |
| 9 | And, so, even if the -- |
| 10 | ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Seventh. |
| 11 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The 7th, |
| 12 | okay. So, even if the Committee was able to |
| 13 | rule on the 7th, which is unlikely, we're |
| 14 | talking three days before it would be -- before |
| 15 | everybody would be required under your schedule, |
| 16 | if that's what was adopted, to get data requests |
| 17 | to you. |
| 18 | MR. NEEDLEMAN: Right. So, you're |
| 19 | asking if we could slip that date -- |
| 20 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Right. |
| 21 | MR. NEEDLEMAN: I have no problem with |
| 22 | letting that slide and letting other dates slide |
| 23 | commensurately. I'm sure there's -- |
| 24 | PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, I'm |
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asking for a specific one, though. I'm asking to just make the date for weighing in on the schedule the same as the objection dates for the waivers, which is the 6th -- the 7 th of April. That's the only date that -- I'm not saying that --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- that, you know, I mean, because that does make -- I mean, I'll tell you, if the Chair is thinking about what he's doing, he's going to not be very crazy about setting a first date on the 11th, when his order is probably issued on the 11th, probably, if you look at it, it's a Thursday, Friday, --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: SO,
that's -- that's the issue that I see.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: So, which specific date are you asking about?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm
asking you, is it, from the Applicant's
standpoint, do you mind if folks have the same ten-day period after next Monday to weigh in on 2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
the schedule, which would give them to the 7 th? That would mean that there's no way, probably, I can't speak for the Chair, there's no way that first date of April 11th, in your proposed schedule, could ever be met. That would have to slide somehow. And it would have to probably be -- though, you could make a recommendation to the Chair, but it's probably going to have to slide. Most likely, the Chair is going to have to back it up, only because of the day on which he's actually considering the overall schedule.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Right. And, I guess what I'm not following is, why would we, since the proposed schedules have all been circulated, and we've talked about it a fair bit today, is there a reason why we couldn't ask people to weigh in on those proposed schedules within ten days from today?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's where $I$ was before. But I'm trying to get the question from over here answered. Her question was, "will the Applicant give at all on that type of thing?"

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I see. I
2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
misunderstood. I thought the question was "would we give on the schedule", not on its timing.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, I may have actually moved the discussion, because I'm - -
[Court reporter interruption.]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- I'm of a pretty full mind that we're not going to meet -- get agreement on a schedule today.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's sounds right.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: SO, I may have shifted her question a little bit on you. Sorry, ma'am. But that's my problem, I apologize. But that's sort of the question.

So, your position is, "why not ten days from today, not ten days from Monday?"

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Right. This seems to me to be a straightforward issue. I would assume folks in this room have a pretty clear sense of the position they're going to take. So, I think they should take those positions and get them to the Committee as soon as they can, so the Committee can start thinking about this.
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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Just wanted to suggest an update on my filing on Sunday. Art Cunningham, representing Mark Lagasse and Kevin Spencer. On Sunday, I entered a filing into the record that there be a deadline for dispositive motions. That this case should not proceed until such time as the Applicant establishes that it has a right to build this project on these old easements. I'm not going to argue that motion now. But, you know, this process is going to be lengthy, extensive, time-consuming not only for everybody involved here, but for the SEC, for the permitting agencies. And we intend to file a motion that dismiss this process, because the Applicants have not been able to prove that they have the right to build this project on the old easements that traverse most of New Hampshire.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Just in answer to your question. There's no need to argue it here today, because I can't resolve it. It's going to be resolved by either the Chair or
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the Subcommittee as a whole. But you filed your motion. There has been an objection. I believe that has been filed. There's still time for other parties to object, if they choose to do so. And the Chair will -- the Chair will rule on that motion, once the objection period has run.

And I assume that, if you prevail on that request, there will be, in the procedural order, the deadline that you requested. There will be, in all likelihood, some kind of the motion deadline in the procedural order in any event. Maybe not designed precisely for the type of motion that you intend to file, but generally, to make sure that most motions regarding what matters are going to be heard by the Committee are dealt with in advance.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, that $I$ set the date at May 20 , which would give this Applicant time to reach out to the easement owners to try to settle the issues with them, proposed resolution with them, in order to seek some kind of judicial relief.

Repeating myself, that is not the landowner's
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responsibility.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
But this isn't the time to argue that,
Mr. Cunningham.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: I understand.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This,
what we're trying to do right now, just is scheduling. But I do take your suggestion that there be a motion deadline contained in any procedural order. That will likely occur. It has in the past, it has traditionally been in the orders that come from the Site Evaluation Committee. Whether it will be precisely that deadline that you're looking for, I can't say, because I'm not the person who is going to rule on that. Okay?

Somebody else back there. Yes, sir. Please use the microphone and tell us your name.

MR. DODGE: Sure. Andrew [inaudible], Bethlehem.
[Court reporter interruption.]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please repeat yourself.

MR. DODGE: Andrew Dodge.
2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, Mr. Dodge. Speak right into that mike please.

MR. DODGE: So, with respect to the comments on the scheduling, I'm just confused as to -- sorry. Is that, if you're part of a group, is it supposed to be the spokesperson for the group that's supposed to file that, or each person?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes. It's supposed to be the spokesperson for the group. But, if your group is not of one mind, you protect your own interests.

MR. DODGE: Assuming that, so, like my group has got 17 people, and I don't think anyone else showed up today.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It sounds like you're of one mind.

MR. DODGE: So, how does that work, whether it's ten days or something, who's the spokesperson? Like, how --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I would suggest that you are the spokesperson today. But, if you don't -- if your group is not here,
or they don't want to -- they don't want to file something, they may not want to weigh in on the actual schedule, people intervene to varying degrees, okay?

MR. DODGE: Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: There are many intervenors here who have gone through the trouble of filing to intervene, were granted, yet they're not here. We don't wait for them. It's not -- this isn't a group ride where we wait at the next light. We keep going. And, if that means that you have to file to protect your own interests, you go ahead and file.

MR. DODGE: So, if I have that right then, we can all file individually, regardless of whether we're in a group?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I
seriously wish that you wouldn't, and that you do attempt to act as a group. Whether it be the group that the Committee has put you in, or if that group should change because of some of the discussions that were had here today, that you act with the group. But, if you cannot, and if this goes for everybody, if you cannot act with
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the group, you should let the Committee know that and file and protect your own interests.

MR. DODGE: And will they accept that, because there's kind of --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, they will.

MR. DODGE: Even though there's an order that says you have to have a spokesman?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: They will. I would advise you to make sure that you've explained -- and to explain why you're filing separately. For instance, if you were to file something right now, you could say "The 17 people in my group, $I$ am the only person who showed up. I think this needs to be resolved right now. Therefore, I am filing this. I do not know if my group agrees with me."

We prefer that you act as a group. And, I think, actually, as this process goes on, you all will see the benefits of acting as group as well, because it's going to be a lot easier to share the burden than to take it all on yourself.

Anyway, but I do want to get back to
2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
this issue of a deadline for weighing in on the schedules. Does anybody else have a question about that particular issue, or a comment or a suggestion?

Mr. Beliveau.
MR. BELIVEAU: Mike, Mark Beliveau, representing the Balsams. And, in just kind of listening to the conversation here today about the date by which folks should weigh in on the schedule, it seems to me that ten days from today makes a lot of sense. And the reason for that -- and I believe that date would be April 1st, although I don't have the calendar in front of me. And the reason why that makes a lot of sense to me is that today you, in a very methodical and careful manner, went through the process that the Committee will follow, and that this administrative hearing will follow, in terms of discovery. And that also there have been three proposed orders that have circulated. And, probably without any coordination, those three orders present three very different viewpoints. The Applicant has proposed that the starting place should be the statutory framework
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of 12 months. There's good logic and reason behind that. Another proposal has come in suggesting 18 months, I believe from Public Counsel, and Public Counsel has briefly spoken to that and the reasoning and logic behind their proposal. And I believe the Forest Society has proposed approximately 24 months.

So, there are some very different views that have been expressed, not only here today, but in writing. And, so, there's a lot of information out there on this very subject that will allow folks to be able to express and submit their, you know, proposal for a schedule. And, to be able to do that within ten days from today, I think is a very reasonable position and moves this issue forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, ma'am.

MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen, from
Bethlehem. That doesn't take into consideration having to have meetings with the group, like our Select board, our Planning Board. All of that has to be done publicly, as far as $I$ can tell.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Anybody
else wish to weigh in on this? Yes.
MR. ROTH: Mike, Peter Roth, Counsel for the Public. It seems to me we're talking about a difference of what, like four days, between ten days from now or ten days from Monday.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Six days.
MR. ROTH: And it's relative, six days on the calendar and four business days, I guess, right? Something like that? The Applicant has already said that it would be more than happy to be willing to be flexible and cooperative at the outset, as long as it doesn't lose its end date. And nothing about what's being talked about so far that's, at least with respect to this date, that's affecting its end date. And, instead we're hearing a quarrel over four or five days, which doesn't bode well for the idea of flexibility.

So, given the complexities of this case already, and the fact that we have dates set for objections on the ten days from Monday, it makes sense, it seems to me, to have everything sort of come in at once, and not have
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people sort of figure out how to do all those things. Maybe it's like walking and chewing gum at the same time, some of us are better at it than others. I, for one, would prefer to have it nice and simple. And, so, I think there's really nothing wrong with doing it ten days from Monday.

The other, you know, we've said we could have our motion in ten days from today, which $I$ was under the belief that that was like the end of next week. And maybe that's not quite true, but I think we could probably have it by the end of next week. Ten days from Monday would give people the benefit of looking at that motion before they weigh in on the calendar.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Anybody else wish to -- yes, ma'am.
[Court reporter interruption.]
MS. BRADBURY: JoAnne Bradbury,
Deerfield. And, if I may say, given the magnitude of what's about to happen to the State of New Hampshire if this project goes forward, what's the big rush?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, the answer to that question is that we do have a statute that does have an end date on it. Okay? So, it's not -- this isn't something that's made up. It exists. And the process, at least as it exists today, right now, is supposed to be accomplished by December 18th or December 19th. And that's -- it's not a rush, but that's the genesis of the discussion that we're having, okay?

I think people are being flexible here today. I think people are having a good discussion about things like what Mr. Roth just discussed, about things like Mr. Beliveau just discussed. That's the purpose of this proceeding. I don't think anybody is saying this has to be a "rush". But these are issues that we have to deal with. And, by the way, between now and the end of this docket, there will be many times that we sit in rooms like this and have discussions like this. So, I'm sorry, go ahead.

MS. BRADBURY: Well, it would be very helpful if you could set aside ten days from

Monday --
[Court reporter interruption.]
MR. JOHNSON: JoAnne Bradbury. And, if you could just say the actual date, because I'm not sure which Monday you're talking about?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, ten days from Monday will be April 7th, I believe we figured out. Monday is the 28th. So, ten days from Monday is -- one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten -- April 7th, which is a Thursday. And I'm sorry I don't have the best of calendars up on the screen, but -- so, that's ten days from Monday.

The other proposal is ten days from today, which would bring us to the 31 st.

So, that's the difference of what
we're talking about. Mr. Roth is right, basically six days, with the weekend included in there. So, I know it sounds like a small thing, but -- I've got to tell you, Barry, I'm inclined to just have them all file on the same day and recommend that. Only because I think that, at that point, at least we know everything that is coming in on that. We know we're going to get
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your filing and you're going to have to object to their motion. And I'm hoping, I cannot promise this, but I'm hoping to have a Committee meeting that week of the 11th. So, like I said before, $I$ don't know if, at that meeting, we will actually take oral argument from the parties who want their groupings changed or their decision on their intervention changed. That will -- that will be discussed in an order scheduling that.

The other thing that you should be aware, by the way, $I$ should have said this at the beginning, is, for all of you parties now, there are no further -- well, I should take that back. We'll get to that in a minute. For the most part, there will be no further public notices in the papers. As an intervenor, you're responsible for reviewing the materials that you get from the Committee, and that's where you will see scheduling. It will also be on the website. And it will also be posted at the Department of Environment Services and at the Public Utilities Commission. But we will not be publishing things in newspapers about future
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hearings before -- in the adjudicative phase, because the notices in the adjudicative phase go only to the participants in the adjudicative phase, with a couple of exceptions. There are going to be two more public hearings, as we've announced. They have not been scheduled yet. We will have those published, so that the public is aware of those. There also may very will be further site visits. I know that we have had requests for additional site visits. We usually notice those, like we do a public hearing, and those are likely to be in the paper as well.

But, with respect to the adjudicative phase, the notices that you receive will be received through the distribution list and will be posted at the website and at those two State offices, the Department of Environmental Services and the PUC.

So, at this point, we're going to have the objections to -- I'm sorry. The objections to the intervention order or the request for appeal are due the 28th. So, you should keep that in mind. And, on Monday, we're going to see a redacted -- Monday, the $28 t h$, we're going
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to see a redacted appendix with the economic report. And, ten days after that, objections to the confidentiality request, objections to the waivers request, and weighing in on the schedules all must be filed.

I don't think there's any scheduling other than that that we can do here today, that is likely to lead to any kind of agreement on things. I want to go back to the -- and I want to throw this out to everybody. We do have two public hearings scheduled. We don't have places for them yet. This is not something we have to discuss here. But, if anybody has a place in mind, I believe that the Chairman wished to have one, as we say, "north of the Notch" and one "south of the Notch", to try to get as many folks as we can out to them. These are hearings on the supplemental information that was filed, public hearings. They will be very similar to the ones that we have had so far. But, if anybody has suggestions of an appropriate venue, please let me know, either after this meeting or send me an e-mail or send an e-mail to, excuse me, to Pam Monroe. My guess is, it will be a
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couple of weeks before those actually get scheduled. We want to get into a little better weather for travel reasons.

The same thing with site visits. We have received, I forget from whom, but we have received a number of requests for additional site visits with specifics. And, of course, you can send those in as well. And, there are -there may be further site visits scheduled. Again, we'll probably -- I don't know when those will be scheduled. Your suggestions with respect to that are appreciated as well. I know there is some dispute about leaf on/leaf off and those types of things. But, ultimately, if this project is built, it's there all year. So, leaf on or leaf off may not be as important.

Yes, ma'am.
MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen, from Bethlehem. The two hearings you mentioned on the supplemental information, --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.
MS. JENSEN: -- are those different
from the previous two hearings you just
mentioned for that?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: They are additional public hearings that we have scheduled because of the -- and it's not the Applicant's fault, because of the way the rule change occurred, there is information that they had to file, which, under the old rules, they didn't have to file. And we'll give the public an opportunity to address that additional -those additional filings.

Now, is anybody going to be there saying "oh, wait a minute, you're talking about something that was filed in the original application, that wasn't there"? No. But, if there's something that's clearly not in the original, clearly was in the original Application, and somebody just wants to make a statement about it, my guess is you're going to be permitted to. It's not what we're having the hearings for, though. The hearings are really so folks can have the opportunity to review the supplemental filing, and can give the Subcommittee their views on that. You know, we've had five hearings on the original

Application. We've heard a lot of testimony --
it's not testimony, but a lot of public comment, and we continue to receive public comment in writing every day regarding this project. So, we would appreciate if the public and the members who attend those meetings would keep their comments to the new information that was filed on February 26th, I believe.

But does that mean that somebody is going to get cut off? Probably not. As you've seen in our meetings, we let people talk generally. And, if they talk for too long, we just ask them to come back at the end.

MS. JENSEN: Follow-up?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, ma'am.

MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen again. So, there will not be four more public hearings? You had mentioned like one "north of the Notch", one "south of the Notch", and then you mentioned "hearings on the supplemental". I'm just trying to figure out --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No, I'm sorry if I confused you. We have agreed to schedule two more public hearings, one north and
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one south.
MS. JENSEN: Okay. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: If that makes sense. If somebody has a suggestion why that doesn't make sense, and you want to come see me afterwards, that's fine. We're always open to suggestions. Doesn't mean we're going to take them, doesn't mean we're going to do it, but we're open to talking about it.

Somebody over here. Yes, sir.
Mr. Palmer, is it?
MR. PALMER: My name is Walter Palmer, from Franconia. The Applicant has filed an objection to Mr. Cunningham's motion. And the basis of the Applicant's objection is that Mr. Cunningham has no standing to (a) even enter a motion, because he is a member of an intervenor group, and is not the designated spokesman of that group. The Applicant themselves is starting -- is starting to claim that we do not need to even entertain anything from anybody unless they are actually a designated spokesman for the group.

And, now, you've just scheduled three
important decisions that the intervenors need to make, three important actions that we need to take, and the deadline for all of those actions are before the intervenor groups have even been finalized.

How can we -- how can we have a designated spokesman speaking for our groups before the groups have even been finalized? How can we follow this schedule? It definitely has the appearance that you're trying to rush this schedule, when you start to schedule deadlines before the intervenor groups have even been formed.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No. There are intervenor groups. My suggestion is that you act as an intervenor group in the group that you are currently classified in. One of the things that is pending is people who want to change that. But, right now, that is the situation.

The other thing that $I$ said is, if your intervenor group does not represent your interests, with respect to a particular issue, for instance, let's say your intervenor group
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all agree with Mr. Cunningham, but you do not, and you want to file an objection to Mr . Cunningham's motion, you should go ahead and do that.

MR. PALMER: And, then, the Applicant will file an objection to that, because I'm not a spokesman for the group.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: They may very well file an objection, and somebody with authority will rule on it.

MR. PALMER: Then, if the Applicant is going to take that position, then the Applicant should be satisfied to have his schedule pushed back until all the intervenor groups have been finally formed and the spokesmen have been designated.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sure the Applicant will take your suggestion and consider it, but they don't have to. That's, you know, you can't tell the Applicant what position they should take, sir. They have every right to be here, just as you do. They have the right to take the positions that that they have taken. And, you know, nobody here is telling
you what to do. Okay?
MR. PALMER: Well, --
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: We've allowed you the opportunity to seek changes. That's what we're doing. But, you know, that's -- unfortunately, it's a process that we have to go through.

Yes, ma'am.
MS. JENSEN: Cheryl Jensen again.
Sorry. But I thought that you said in the beginning that we were choosing the spokesperson just for today?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Correct.
MS. JENSEN: So, how can that spokesperson then file for us, since it's tomorrow?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: There's still an intervention order that is outstanding. The reason why we did that today in caucus was because we recognized that you only got that order on Friday, and would not have had the opportunity to actually decide upon a spokesperson. You will have that opportunity now. And, if the groups change, you'll have the 2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
opportunity again, assuming that the ruling is still to designate a spokesperson. We have heard some suggestions here today about steering committees and about more than one representative for particular groups. Those issues I'm sure will be resolved by the Chairman when -- actually, by the Committee, when there is an order on all of the appeals of the intervention order. It's a fluid process.

MS. JENSEN: I'm just worried about the deadlines we have to meet for Monday, and then April 7th.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You have no deadline for -- actually, if you are appealing your intervention, okay, if you're appealing that or your grouping, you have to file that appeal, I call it an "appeal", it's not technically an "appeal", but the request for review, by the 28th. And that's by statute, because that's ten days from the date that the order issued, okay?

The other things that are going to be filed, on the 28th, the Applicant is going to file a redacted version of the economic report.
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And, then, ten days after that, which I think we've resolved was the 27 th -- I'm sorry, April 7th, we need to have filed objections to the request for waivers, objections to the request for confidentiality, and people's inputs on the scheduling. So, it's April 7th is really the first time that there would need to be some weighing in by a group.

Yes, sir.
MR. DODGE: Andrew dodge again. Now,
I have to confess I'm a little confused. A minute ago, when I asked about, if you're in part of a group, if you need to file through the spokesperson or not, I thought, and maybe I misheard, but it's probably in the record somewhere, I thought that you said it was okay to file individually and that the Committee would accept that. But, then, just a minute ago it sounded like maybe they wouldn't, because the Applicant would object. So, I'm just not sure. Like, am $I$ just doing it for the heck of it?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: What I said -- what I said before was that, if your interests are not protected by the position that
your group takes, you should file on your own, protect your interests. That's what I said. Now, what happened was, there was a question raised because of an objection that was posited by the Applicant to a motion made by Mr. Cunningham. That objection has not been ruled on. There is no order from the Chair or from the Committee saying that "you'll be ruled out of out order and your motion will not be granted because you're not the spokesperson for your committee". No rulemaking like that has come from the Site Evaluation Committee.

MR. DODGE: Yes. But it sounds like maybe there's an objection that will result in a ruling?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It's something that -- it's something that the Applicant has argued for an objection. But it's not been ruled on.

MR. DODGE: We don't know the answer?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: What?
MR. DODGE: But we don't know the
answer?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well,
ultimately, it's the Chair who is going to make the decision on motions anyway, procedural motions. But I am telling you here, and I'm telling everybody, that, if your group does not represent your interest, you should protect that interest. And I doubt that anybody is going to be punished for protecting their interests.

MR. DODGE: But what if you don't know what the group's interests are --
[Court reporter interruption.]
MR. DODGE: Sorry. What if you don't know what the group's interests are, because you can't get ahold of them in the next ten days?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Then, when you file what you need to file, you put that in your filing. "I attempted to make contact with my group. Nobody is interested, nobody responded to me", whatever the circumstances are, and you alert the finder, who will be the Chair in that particular case, of that circumstance.

Yes, Mr. Brekke.
MS. BREKKE: Mr. Brekke, from
Whitefield again. A couple of quick questions.

The spokesman for the group, --
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.
MS. BREKKE: -- are we bound with that person or can they change during the course? PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No, they can change. And, you can also designate, as we indicated, during the hearings themselves, you may have one person question the witnesses about visual impacts, you may have another person do the questioning about environmental issues. But you can change. If your group decides, "hey, we don't" -- you know, "John didn't do a very good job as our spokesperson", you can change.

MS. BREKKE: Okay. And there won't --
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You could just notify us.

MS. BREKKE: All right. And there won't be an objection by anybody?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Anybody can object to anything. But I don't think an objection would get very far in that instance. The way that you -- the way that you act within your own group is really up to you all. MS. BREKKE: I'm trying to follow
these objections, because it sounds like -PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, since we've gotten way down into the weeds here, because of a reference to an objection that -to Mr. Cunningham's motion. So, you know, -MS. BREKKE: Excuse me for interrupting, but just a question on that. When do these objections get ruled on? Is there a deadline for that or is it as time goes on? PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, there's no objections without a motion first being filed. So, a motion gets filed. Somebody requests some kind of relief from the Committee. Anybody who disagrees with that motion has to file an objection within ten days, okay?

So, for instance, Mr. Cunningham has filed a motion asking the Subcommittee to set a date certain to file motions to dismiss, dispositive -- what lawyers call "dispositive motions". The Applicant has ten days to object to that motion. They have actually already objected, although I don't think the ten days has yet passed. So, anybody else in the room that wants to object could file an objection to
that motion within that ten-day period.
At some point after that objection is filed, the motion and the objection will be provided to the finder, in this case it's likely to be the Chairman of the Committee, who will then review them and write an order, either granting the motion or denying the motion, granting it in part, denying it in part, whatever he feels the ruling should be. And, then, that will get published. It will be sent out to everybody who is an intervenor and it will be published on the website.

MS. BREKKE: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I highly recommend -- and we do have rules that govern all this. I highly recommend you take a look at them. I agree, they're very, very boring, especially in certain areas. But the procedural rules you should all please take a look at, because that's where all of these "ten days" and things like that come from.

MR. ROTH: Mike, if I may just make one --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sure,

Peter.
MR. ROTH: On the rules, with respect to Mr. Cunningham's or Attorney Cunningham's motion, one of the rules is that parties seek or attempt to seek concurrence before filing such a thing. And I don't believe Attorney Cunningham did that in this case. And, obviously, I'm not going to be too much of a stickler for that kind of thing in every case. But $I$ think it's the kind of thing that everybody should be aware of and at least try to adhere to.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: We do have a rule that says, when you file a motion, you should first seek the concurrence of all of the other parties. It's going to be quite a chore in this particular case because of the number of parties. However, the way that people have dealt with that in other cases is by basically having an e-mail list, and just sending an advanced copy of that e-mail list and saying "can you tell me if you will object to this?" In my experience, some people will respond to you and say "No, I don't object. Fine. You can say $I$ assent to the motion."

Other people will say "I object". And some people won't answer. And what you should do is just basically give the tally of what you got in your motion, so that, when you file it, it says "I sought the assent of the remaining -- of the other parties. The following parties agree with the motion, the following parties objected to the motion."

And the reason why we do that, the reason why that rule exists, is so that the Chairman knows if there's any real dispute over the motion or not. If it's something that everybody agrees to, it's, obviously, more likely to be granted.

MR. ROTH: Mike, it's Peter. This is Peter Roth, Counsel for the Public. Mike, one of the things that the Applicants' attorneys and I discussed a few days ago was the possibility of working out sort of an additional set of kind of special rules for this case to deal with that kind of a situation. And, you know, we haven't -- we just talked about it conceptually. And I think, conceptually, there are ways that we could all probably work together and make
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stuff like that work better, in terms of objections and timing and motions. And that seems to me to be something that may require an additional meeting like this to finally nail down, or -- I'm not sure how we would go about doing it.

But at least, you know, the Applicant and I will attempt to put some of that down and get it in front of you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I mean, it's certainly welcome, if you can. I think that the best way to accomplish what you're talking about, though -- by the way, there will be other prehearing conferences, just so you all know. You will be invited. Maybe not to this room, but some room -- one room or another up here in Concord along the way. And one of the things that could be discussed is a set of ground rules, so to speak, for this docket alone. Ultimately, it would have to be approved by the Chair. So that, $I$ believe, this is only my own belief, there are probably different ways to skin the cat, but, if you have a -- the best way is, if you guys have a proposal, I mean, you
know, maybe you should invite other people to weigh in on it as well, but give it -- put it up as a proposal. It gives people something concrete that they can look at and understand what it is they're being asked to agree to or not agree to.

So, if you get a proposal, feel free to send it to me and to Pam, and let me know. And we'll see -- I don't know what method will work, maybe you file a motion to have it approved. But we'll see if we can get another prehearing conference together to discuss it.

MR. ROTH: And with respect to future prehearing conferences, given the number of people who are on volunteer boards and individuals, perhaps scheduling one for evening hours would be appropriate.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Perhaps.
I'm not opposed to it. I actually prefer it, because then I can get other work done during the day. I don't mind the long days. But, when you do do evenings, you are asking a lot of people that have worked all day to then come in in the evening and to travel. And that could be
in one direction or the other, wherever it's scheduled at, somebody's traveling. So, sometimes it's a problem. But we'll certainly keep that in consideration. And, so, --
[Court reporter interjection.]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. It's 4:15. We're going to take a ten-minute break. I've got Mr. Whitley, I've got Commissioner Samson, and Ms. Pacik. We're going to get to you. We're going to take a ten-minute break, because our court reporter needs it, and I don't blame him, because I'm sorry that I've kept you going for so long.

But Mr. Whitley and Ms. Pacik and Commissioner Samson, we'll get to your questions right after the break.
(Recess taken at 4:15 p.m. and the prehearing conference resumed at 4:34 p.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: My apologies to our court reporter for keeping him going for so long. Before the break -- we're back on the record now. Before the break, we had questions from Mr. Whitley and Ms. Pacik and

Commissioner Samson.
So, Mr. Whitley, did you have a question?

MR. WHITLEY: I actually don't have a question. So, you can skip right by me.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And how about your compatriot on your left?

MS. PACIK: Yes. Danielle Pacik, from the City of Concord.

I have two questions. One is under the common interest rule, where intervenors are being asked to communicate with each other. Is it safe to assume that any discussions would be privileged or will we need to be filing a motion?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Are you talking about for a lawyer?

MS. PACIK: I'm talking about in general, communications between the various intervenors who want to be ensured that the Applicant would not be seeking discovery about those communications.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I don't know the answer to your question. And I can't
give legal advice either. So, I'd be giving legal advice about something $I$ have nothing -that $I$ know nothing about.

Mr. Needleman, do you want to respond?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: All I can say is, I
can never remember -- I represent a lot of applicants. And I can never remember an applicant seeking that sort of discovery before, and certainly not anything that we're contemplating here.

MS. PACIK: Okay. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And I can tell you that, in my experience, I've been doing this for this Committee since 1998, and that that issue has never come up.

MS. PACIK: Okay. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Otherwise , I would have known what you were talking about.

MR. ROTH: And, I've had one occasion when somebody sought information -communications between me and people in the public, and I objected to it as privileged, and it stopped right there. There was no effort to
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get at it than that. And it wasn't Attorney Needleman's firm.

MS. PASTORIZA: Thank you. That's helpful.

The second question is, where there are going to be data responses that I assume are going to be rather large, $I$ know that, at least for the City, we have limits on the size of documents we could receive. And I was hoping that the Applicant or somebody could set up an FTP where the document responses could be uploaded.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: We've had that happen in the past. I don't know if Dropbox is considered an "FTP", but it's a very similar system. We've used that in the past.

Mr. Needleman, can the Applicant --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO
provide something like that, where the participants go to a particular site and download the documents?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: We will figure out a way to try to make that efficient. This is one
of those things that we were hoping would be covered by a case management order, is the management of this sort of nature.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the Committee went a different direction?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, no. No, I meant the case management order that Peter was talking about before.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, okay.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I thought you meant that, early on in this case, we were considering hiring a vendor to provide case management.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Issues like how to get documents filed and things like that.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, no. I meant the case management order we were contemplating.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Commissioner Samson.

COMMISSIONER SAMSON: Yes. Rick
Samson here. And I think you partially answered
this question, Mike. But what are the guidelines, procedures or rules that determine whether the Chair of the SEC, the Subcommittee, or the full Committee make the decisions here?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
The full Committee will have no part in this proceeding. In other words, the Committee -the full Committee as designated by the statute. The Subcommittee, which consists of the folks that I had up on the board before, is the committee for the purposes of this proceeding. And, they're up there. That's the Northern Pass Subcommittee. Okay? They will make all of the substantive decisions. The Chairman of that Subcommittee is also the Chairman of the entire Committee, but it's his Subcommittee chairmanship that makes him most important with respect to your question. He will rule on procedural matters. Okay?

So, procedural matters are ruled on by the Chair of the Committee. And substantive matters, you need a quorum of the Committee, and they need to vote and deliberate in public on the substantive issues.

COMMISSIONER SAMSON: Thank You.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, that's all contained in RSA 162-H, I believe it's Section 4, V.

COMMISSIONER SAMSON: Thank you very much .

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, sir.
MR. GRAY: Elisha Gray, New Hampton. Just a follow-up on that. On some of the procedural matters that the Chairman will rule on, does he occasionally confer with Subcommittee members or does he have to do that alone?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: He has the ability to do that, if you look at the last sentence in Section $V$, it says "Other procedural decisions may be reviewed by the committee at its discretion". And, so, it's really not necessarily the Chair saying "in my opinion, I need to review this with the Committee." It's the Committee saying to the Chair "we need to review this with you." Okay?

But, yes, that can occur. And, quite
frankly, when there are multiple issues on the
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table to be decided, those issues are often discussed amongst the Committee members in public, and the Chair sort of takes a straw poll of what the Committee's pleasure is, and then generally will rule that way. Although, I can't, you know, if it is truly procedural, it is up to him to make the decision.

I saw one other hand. Mr. Kucman. MR. KUCMAN: Yes. Mr. Iacopino, I was just wondering if going forward, we spent a lot of time taking a look at these schedules, which were just hard dates on a calendar. And I found schedules like that, they're obsolete before the ink is even dry. Would you consider or have the Committee consider making schedules on a Gantt or Milestone Chart on all the major tasks that need to happen? As a planning tool, it's great for letting people know what precedents, concurrence, when things begin after certain things end. And, when we take a look at it, you will see that a date has come and gone, something has not been completed, you can then see what has been encroached upon, and then make a reasonably, you know, timely response to the
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schedule as it needs to shift.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I think what you're talking about is like the thing like a construction manager would use in a project, that type of --

MR. KUCMAN: Exactly.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- of program?

MR. KUCMAN: It's a project management tool, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It's not the way we've ever done business, Mr. Kucman. I doubt that we're going to change things up in this -- especially in this proceeding, where there are so many parties. And it's something that would be totally new, both to the administration of the Committee and the Committee members themselves.

So, I -- certainly, it's a suggestion, I'll take note of it. But $I$ doubt that you're going to see that type of approach taken in this docket.

You know, in the future, it might be something we might try in a smaller docket, to
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see how it works out.
MR. KUCMAN: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Our system actually works pretty well, just so you.

MR. KUCMAN: I was purely talking from that standpoint of visualization and seeing how tasks intertwine with ours, and how to respond to it easily, but --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I understand.

MR. KUCMAN: -- I understand.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I don't see any other questions about where we're at. So, I'm going to move onto the next issue, which is "Discussion of Expected Motions". We've already discussed three motions that are filed, and then -- that is the Request for Waivers, that is the Motion for Protective Treatment, and that is Mr. Cunningham's motion to set in the procedural schedule a deadline for dispositive or motions to dismiss. And, I would also note that we've set a deadline -- well, there's a statutory deadline for folks to seek review of their intervention situation.
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Does anybody envision any other types of motions, especially those that might be out of the ordinary? And I say that for the folks who have been engaged in this process before.

Ms. Manzelli.
MS. MANZELLI: Thank you. Amy
Manzelli, for the Forest Society.
If it's not included in part of the anticipated second set of site visits, I might be filing some sort of request looking for a balloon test or something like that.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I'm sorry, I forgot to explain something. A motion -- I may have said this earlier in the proceeding, but some of you might not know what I was just saying. A motion is simply a request for some kind of relief from the Committee or the Chair of the Committee.

And, so, what Ms. Manzelli has just raised is, actually, some of you may have participated in putting a balloon up in -- I forget what town we were in, but up at the Rocks Estate. And sometimes, when parties want to demonstrate the height of something, a balloon
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is used to do that. We've had requests for that in the past in our Committee. In some cases, it's been accomplished; in some, it has not been.

But I understand. So, what you're saying is that, if it's not something that's already included in the order, you will probably make a request for it. Do you know where? Are there certain places that -- okay. My recommendation to you, and to anybody else who is going to do that, is to be as specific as possible as to where that you're seeking that in the site visits.

MS. MANZELLI: Yes. Understood. And we will, it's just premature at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Does anybody have any other expected motions? Any from Counsel for the Public?

MR. ROTH: Well, we've already mentioned a couple. And we'll have our motions for experts. But, other than that, I don't think we have anything in mind at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All
right. Anybody else in the room, before I get
to the Applicants?
Yes, ma'am.
MS. BRADBURY: JoAnne Bradbury, Deerfield. We will request a balloon test in Deerfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Anybody else?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: How about the Applicant? Any out-of-the-ordinary motions you expect?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Nothing that I can think of at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. That takes care of that agenda item.

The next one is, let's discuss what issues everybody can agree on.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Do you want me to take a stab at this?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Take a stab.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: All right. My guess is, as we sit here today, there's probably not very much. My hope is, like in the course of
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other dockets, as it proceeds and discovery goes along and we spend more time together issues narrow, it may be that, at least with some parties, we can come to agreements on some things, and maybe stipulate to those before you before the final hearing.

We've talked with Public Counsel about that. There's nothing on the table at this point. But, certainly, the concept has been discussed. And we're hopeful to be able to find a way to do that in some form.

And, then, the other thing that $I$
would just say for people who aren't familiar with this process, is that, in other dockets, very frequently the applicant will work with host communities to address issues of concern that they have. And those can become stipulations, which are submitted to the Committee.

I understand that, in this case, there are a large number of communities that remain opposed to the project. That doesn't mean that we still can't work on stipulations together. And, so, I would encourage towns to be thinking
about that as the proceed proceeds, and to know that the Applicant's open to that.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's good to know. And it is usually a recommendation that $I$ make at all of these prehearing conferences, regardless of the size of the project is, to the extent that there are things that you can agree on, and usually it's with the applicant, because, obviously, they're the ones who are attempting to build the project, if you believe that there are issues that you can stipulate to, and whether they be issues of the ultimate -- some ultimate part of the project, or whether they are something like some individual fact, you know, the more stipulations that are provided to the Committee, I selfishly note, the less work that the Committee actually has to do. So -- and this Committee is going to have a lot of work to do in this particular case.

So, to the extent that you can
stipulate as to facts, that are important, I mean, you're not going to stipulate to frivolous facts that make no difference, because, if
something is frivolous, they don't need to hear about it anyway. But, if there are important facts that you can stipulate to, that's great. Or, if there are conditions, in the event that your -- if you oppose the project, but you would want certain conditions imposed on a certain portion of the project or something, if the certificate is, in fact, granted, you should have those conversations with the Applicant. And, you know, and those could -- you don't have to agree that the certificate will be granted. You can make agreements that, "in the event a certificate is granted, the following conditions should apply", assuming that everybody agrees. MR. NEEDLEMAN: And, if I could just
$\qquad$
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: SO, that's just a little food for thought.

Go ahead, Barry.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I would encourage
towns to look at prior certificates that were issued that contained those sorts of stipulations between towns and applicants. It may give you some idea of the sorts of things
we're talking about. It could be things as mundane as hours of construction or not using certain roads at certain times of the year, things like that. And, like Mike said, it may well be that those are things that would interest towns in thinking about, even if they're not conceding on the ultimate issue. PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, Mr. Brekke.

MS. BREKKE: Where would we find those prior certificates?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: They -well, going back to approximately 1999, they are on our website. Quick little demonstration. You go to the "Projects". Actually, I guess they go back to 1985.

MR. ROTH: Not all the certificates are on there.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.
Some of these documents may not actually be certificates. Some of them are amendments to certificates. But, if you look at some of these things. They're are not many transmission lines, I'll tell you that, but there are other
projects. There is some pipelines, there are large gas plants, the gas plants in Londonderry and Newington. There's wind farms. A number of different kinds of projects are there. And, what you do is, you go to the "Projects" page, and then you can look by decade for what we have.

And, in addition, if you are aware of a project, for instance, there's been some talk about, during the public hearings, about the other Hydro-Quebec line that already exists. I believe that there is, in fact, a decision, a written decision on that, that is in the archives with the -- you could call Pam Monroe to try to find that, and she could help you. But there is plenty of stuff that is on the website, and you can find those final orders on there.

Yes, ma'am.
MS. MUMFORD: Margaret Mumford, Bridgewater. I'd like to ask a question of the Applicant.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're going to have to speak right into that 2015-06\} [PREHEARING CONFERENCE] \{03-22-16\}
microphone.
MS. MUMFORD: Margaret Mumford, Bridgewater. A question for the Applicant, regarding meetings with towns and town officials. Are they typically open to the public of that town or are they typically held in private session?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: My experience is it can happen either way. Very often, when you're talking about trying to negotiate things like stipulations, it tends to work better if it's a private session, where it would not necessarily be subject to the Right to Know law. And, then, based on that, you can take it to the town and have an open discussion afterwards. But, to try to negotiate these types of things in an open meeting like that, sometimes it's just too cumbersome.

MS. MUMFORD: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Ms.
Pastoriza.
MS. PASTORIZA: Kris Pastoriza. If a town has a stipulation with the applicant and the project goes through, and they do not live
up to that, who enforces that?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It
depends. It depends on whether the stipulation is part of the certificate. If it's part of the certificate, it could be enforced by the site Evaluation Committee. I think you saw some of that in the Groton Wind incident.

But, if it's not made part of the certificate, if the certificate is granted and it's not made a condition of it, then you would have your normal civil remedies, as you have on any contract.

MS. PASTORIZA: And, could give me an example of enforcement by the SEC in a previous project?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sure. In the Groton Wind Project, they built their O\&M building on the opposite side of a brook from where they indicated they were going to pay -where they were going to put it. And, as a result of that, we had extensive hearings. They eventually, I forget how much money they paid, they wound up paying a sum of money into a mitigation fund, although I don't think it was
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called a "mitigation fund", for the renovation of Franklin Falls, $I$ think was the name.

MR. ROTH: It was Livermore Falls.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Livermore Falls, I'm sorry.

MR. ROTH: Yes. It was $\$ 160,000$ that they gave to the state. And they purchased a number of houses that belonged to people that were near there, and agreed to some other conditions.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: So, we --
MR. ROTH: It took forever.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It did take forever, and it was very, very -- it was like pulling teeth.

But, in any event, that's one example.
We have not, quite frankly, had many examples of, or at least that's been brought to the attention of the Committee, of violations of certificates.

MS. PASTORIZA: So, have there ever been -- has there ever been enforcement by the SEC which ended up with the project stopping operations?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Not that I'm aware of. I mean, there may have been before my time. But $I$ don't think, since I've been doing this, which is like 1998, that there has been ever a stop production order or stop generating order.

I don't know. Peter, can you think of anything? I can't.

MR. ROTH: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Barry, I don't know if --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. ROTH: They were close in Groton.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: What's that?

MR. ROTH: I think they came close in Groton. The Fire Marshal was about to shut them down. They were within days of shutting them down.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right. Any other business that folks think should be brought up today, before we adjourn?

MS. MANZELLI: Mike, over here to your
right.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MS. MANZELLI: Amy Manzelli from the Forest Society.

Can you, before we adjourn today, could you just go over the deadlines that have been set over the course of our togetherness today?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You put that so sweetly.

MR. ROTH: Fellowship.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: A week from today -- I'm sorry, less than a week from today, next Monday, the 28th, the Applicant is going to file its redacted economic report. That is also the same day that statutorily anybody who is dissatisfied with their intervention status must file their request for review or an appeal by. So, you have to file it by that date. So, that's the first deadline date, and that's for two things: That's for the Applicant to file their redacted report, and to file appeals from the intervention decisions.

And, of course, that appeals to the full Committee.

April 7th is the date by which Counsel for the Public -- actually, Counsel for the Public already has, but any objections to the Request for Waivers that has been filed by the Committee -- by the Applicant must be filed. And any objections to the Request for Protective Treatment that was filed with the Application. Those objections must be filed by that day. And, also, on that day, we need the written position from each party with respect to the schedule. And you can urge us -- you can urge the Committee to adopt the Applicant's schedule, Counsel for the Public's schedule, the Forest Society schedule, or you can offer your own alternative.

Those are the deadlines that I have set.

MS. MANZELLI: Excuse me.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I
actually have one other one that's not on the calendar. Counsel for the Public was going to file a Motion to Extend -- or to Suspend the
timeframes within ten days, and then $I$ wrote down "March 31". So, I don't know if that's -MR. PAPPAS: I had "April 1". MR. ROTH: April 1.

MS. MANZELLI: Did you make -- excuse me, Amy Manzelli, for the Forest Society. Did you reference that tentatively there's a plan for the SEC to convene on the week of April 11th?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: There may be. I don't know yet. We have to -- the full Committee has to convene to determine the appeals from the intervention orders. So, that week was one of the weeks that I was looking at. It may be able to do it as early as April 4, I don't know. I have to find out, I have to Canvas my Committee members. But that would be -- the issue there would be on the issue of the interventions.

Any other business that anybody can think of that we need to address here?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I want to
say thank you to everybody in the room.
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Although we didn't come out of here with an agreed upon schedule, I think we accomplished a fair amount.

And, I will just remind you all to talk to each other. Usually, it's easier to resolve issues when folks have talked about them beforehand.

If any time anybody has any questions, you can contact us at the Site Evaluation Committee, at the e-mail that's on the screen. There's our phone number.

And, so, I guess we are adjourned. (Whereupon the prehearing conference was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.)
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