

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

**May 2, 2017** - 1:17 p.m. **DAY 7**  
49 Donovan Street **AFTERNOON SESSION ONLY**  
Concord, New Hampshire

*{Electronically filed with SEC 05-09-17}*

**IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-06**  
**NORTHERN PASS TRANSMISSION -**  
**EVERSOURCE; Joint Application of**  
**Northern Pass Transmission LLC and**  
**Public Service of New Hampshire d/b/a**  
**Eversource Energy for a**  
**Certificate of Site and Facility.**

**(Hearing on the Merits)**

**PRESENT FOR SUBCOMMITTEE/SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Chmn. Martin Honigberg</b><br><i>(Presiding Officer)</i>         | Public Utilities Comm.   |
| <b>Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey</b><br><b>Dir. Christopher Way, Des.</b> | Public Utilities Comm.<br>Dept. of Resources &<br>Economic Development |
| <b>Craig Wright, Designee</b>                                       | Dept. of Environmental<br>Services                                     |
| <b>William Oldenburg, Des.</b>                                      | Department of<br>Transportation  |
| <b>Patricia Weathersby</b>  | Public Member  |

**ALSO PRESENT FOR THE SEC:**

- Michael J. Iacopino, Esq. Counsel to the SEC  
Iryna Dore, Esq.  
*(Brennan, Caron, Lenehan & Iacopino)*
- Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator

**COURT REPORTER: Cynthia Foster, LCR No. 14**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

I N D E X

WITNESS PANEL            NATHAN SCOTT  
                                 LYNN FARRINGTON  
                                 SAMUEL JOHNSON  
                                 KENNETH BOWES  
                                 DERRICK BRADSTREET  
                                 JOHN KAYSER

*( Resumed )*

Cross-Examination by Ms. Pacik	3
Cross-Examination by Mr. Whitley	142

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**P R O C E E D I N G S**

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right.  
We are ready to resume. We're at the Municipal  
Groups. I think the first group is Municipal  
Group 1-North. Steve Ellis. Yes, no, maybe?

*(No verbal response.)*

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Then I think  
Mr. Whitley or Ms. Pacik. Who is going to go  
first?

MR. WHITLEY: Ms. Pacik will go first.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: And I know  
Ms. Fillmore also has plans, but she's not here  
today, and I think my understanding is you guys  
expect to fill the afternoon and continue  
tomorrow morning; is that right?

MR. WHITLEY: I believe so. Yes,  
Mr. Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Yes. Ms.  
Pacik. You may proceed.

**CROSS-EXAMINATION**

**BY MS. PACIK:**

Q Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Danielle  
Pacik. I represent the City of Concord and I'm

1           also the spokesperson for Municipal Group  
2           3-South. I do have what I've put together as  
3           one PDF which is marked as Joint Muni 193, and  
4           it's a compilation of some of the other exhibits  
5           that we've provided, but we will provide those  
6           to the parties at the conclusion of my  
7           cross-examination. Steven Whitley is going to  
8           be helping me out so hopefully this goes  
9           smoothly.

10           Starting, I'm not quite sure who to pose  
11           this question to, but I would like to do an  
12           overview briefly of the transmission corridor  
13           and how it passes through the City of Concord.  
14           And what I've put up is a map from Google Earth,  
15           and it shows 93 as you can see on the left-hand  
16           side of that photograph which is the northern  
17           part of the city. And above it, you can see the  
18           transmission corridor, which has the mouse on it  
19           and so who here is familiar with how the route  
20           passes through Concord?

21       A    (Bowes) So we do have available to us what we  
22           call One Touch which is a Google Earth  
23           representation of the line through Concord so we  
24           can call that up, and we could show you the

1 right-of-way, we could show you the structures  
2 on the right-of way, the heights, the wetlands  
3 impacts, all of that. So it might make it  
4 easier than going through these --

5 Q Actually, it won't just because I haven't seen  
6 that before so I'd rather rely on the documents  
7 that I've provided to you, but thank you for  
8 that offer. But I assume, Mr. Bowes, you would  
9 agree that this shows the corridor in Concord  
10 starting from the north? Attorney Whitley has  
11 got a hand over it. And you can see it goes to  
12 the south to 393, crosses 393, goes through  
13 what's the Heights, informally known as the  
14 Gateway Performance District. Goes north of the  
15 airport, and then into Pembroke; is that  
16 correct?

17 A (Bowes) Yes, it is.

18 Q Okay.

19 A (Bradstreet) One clarification. That's in  
20 Pembroke, but the mouse is contained to the  
21 Merrimack River. The product doesn't go far  
22 south.

23 Q And that's past Concord so I'll be focusing on  
24 Concord, but thank you.

1           Can you turn to the next -- before we turn,  
2           actually, it's 8.1 miles through Concord; is  
3           that correct?

4           A     (Bradstreet) Subject to check it sounds  
5           appropriate.

6           Q     Okay. I would like to start by talking about  
7           some properties in the northern part of the  
8           route which has the red box around it which is  
9           in the intersection near Hoyt Road and Mountain  
10          Road.

11                   Can you turn to the next slide, please?

12                   And the area, specifically, I'd like to  
13           focus on is called Brookwood Development, and it  
14           contains Brookwood Drive and Fox Run Drive. Is  
15           anybody on the panel familiar with the  
16           structures in that particular location?

17          A     (Bradstreet) Yes. I am.

18          Q     Okay. So Mr. Bradstreet, I'll pose these  
19           questions to you. Along the edge of the  
20           corridor, do you see those homes that are on  
21           that photograph?

22          A     (Bradstreet) Are you talking about in the red  
23           square the homes that are to the top of the  
24           screen?

1 Q Yes.

2 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

3 Q You'd agree that there's some tree buffer at  
4 least shown on this photograph that is between  
5 the homes and the right-of-way corridor?

6 A (Bradstreet) Yes, there is a vegetation buffer.

7 Q And these homes are pretty close to the  
8 right-of-way corridor; would you agree with  
9 that?

10 A (Bradstreet) I guess that's up for  
11 determination. Define close.

12 Q Okay.

13 Can we go to the next slide, please? Can  
14 you zoom in on that red box?

15 What I'm showing you is a document. It was  
16 provided by James Chalmers. Are you familiar  
17 with James Chalmers?

18 A (Bradstreet) I'm familiar that I believe he's  
19 written a study for the Project.

20 Q Yes. He's an expert hired by the Project, and  
21 he's provided testimony on impacts to property  
22 values, and he provided this document during his  
23 technical session, and he said he got the  
24 distances from Northern Pass. And the ones in

1 the red square are the ones that were in the  
2 vicinity of where we were just looking at which  
3 is Brookwood Drive and Fox Run Drive; and is  
4 anybody on the panel familiar with these  
5 distances in terms of who prepared the  
6 spreadsheet? I understand Mr. Chalmers got it  
7 from somebody on the Project.

8 A (Johnson) It wasn't me personally.

9 Q Okay. But I guess the question then would be if  
10 I ask you Mr. Bradstreet, you have no reason to  
11 disagree with the distances on this spreadsheet,  
12 do you?

13 A (Bradstreet) At this time I do not.

14 A (Bowes) Just to clarify, is this the distance  
15 from the house to the edge of the right-of-way?  
16 That's not clear on the description.

17 Q Yes. The distances from what he represented  
18 were from the residences to the edge of the  
19 right-of-way.

20 And so, according to this document which  
21 Mr. Chalmers provided, the houses to the edge of  
22 the right-of-way vary between 22.1 feet to 73.7  
23 feet as shown on this document; is that correct?

24 A (Bradstreet) Appears so.



1 Q Okay. And you would agree that that's -- we had  
2 a discussion earlier about whether that would be  
3 considered close to the edge of the  
4 right-of-way. Would you agree that that's  
5 pretty close to the edge of the right-of-way?

6 A (Bradstreet) The closest house is 22.1 feet  
7 away.

8 Q Okay. And I'm not going to measure the room.  
9 But how big do you think this room is from wall  
10 to wall? From where the Committee is to the  
11 other end of the wall?

12 A (Bradstreet) I would guess 50 to 100 feet.

13 Q Okay. So could you turn to the next slide,  
14 please? Can you blow up where the red box is?

15 What I'm showing on this exhibit is the  
16 area of Brookwood Drive and Fox Run, and this is  
17 the route map that was provided as part of the  
18 Application, and I think these questions would  
19 probably be best for Mr. Bradstreet in terms of  
20 where the structures are; is that correct?

21 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

22 Q Okay. Just to be clear, you can't really see  
23 them all, but there's yellow dots in that red  
24 box. And those yellow dots are people's homes,

1 right?

2 A (Bradstreet) I believe that's correct. Yes.

3 Q And then there's a couple red lines and the two  
4 red lines are the actual right-of-way; is that  
5 correct?

6 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

7 Q So you can see the yellow dots and how close  
8 they are to the edge of the right-of-way. And  
9 then there's three white -- actually, there's  
10 four white squares in that red box and the white  
11 squares with the Xs are the current 115 line  
12 that's going to be relocated, correct?

13 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

14 Q And the relocated one is coming closer to where  
15 the green squares are, right?

16 A (Bradstreet) That is correct.

17 Q And then the yellow line with the squares is  
18 going to be the new 345 kilovolt Northern Pass  
19 structure, right?

20 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

21 Q I think somebody's on the phone. I'll just hold  
22 on a second.

23 Okay. And then the purple boxes is a 115  
24 line that those are structures that are not

1 getting relocated?

2 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

3 Q So in terms of the 115 line with the white boxes  
4 that are coming closer to the homes, those are  
5 coming approximately 20 feet closer to the  
6 homes; is that right?

7 A (Bradstreet) I would have to look at the  
8 cross-section, but that seems reasonable.

9 Q Just so if you can keep in mind the numbers of  
10 the poles that we're looking at. For example,  
11 the green numbers F139-178 to 181, those are the  
12 numbers of the poles that are getting relocated,  
13 the 115 line. And then the yellow numbers  
14 above, 3132-81 to 83 is the Northern Pass line?

15 A (Bradstreet) That looks correct, yes.

16 Q Can you go to the next slide, please?

17 We had talked that some of the 115 lines  
18 are coming 20 feet closer to the right-of-way,  
19 and that if you look at Segment S1-2 that shows  
20 the existing 115 line that's currently 75 feet  
21 away from the edge of the right-of-way, and it's  
22 going to be relocated 20 feet closer. 55 feet  
23 from the edge of the right-of-way.

24 A (Bradstreet) I don't think I'm following you.

1           So the existing 115 kV line is dimensioned from  
2           the edge of right-of-way as 100 feet, not 75  
3           feet.

4       Q     Right here it says 75 feet, right?

5       A     (Bradstreet) That dimension is from the proposed  
6           345 kV line to the relocated 115 kV line. The  
7           gray, the dimension above that that says 100  
8           feet?

9       Q     Okay.

10      A     Is from the edge of right-of-way to the existing  
11           structure location.

12      Q     Okay. So the new structure is going to be 100  
13           feet from the right-of-way?

14      A     (Bradstreet) No. The existing structure is 100  
15           feet from the right-of-way, and the relocated  
16           structure is going to be that 30-foot dimension  
17           plus the 75-foot dimension from the edge of the  
18           roadway so it will be 55.

19      Q     So I'm not very good at math, but what I can  
20           tell, that's 45 feet closer?

21      A     (Bradstreet) Sounds correct.

22      Q     Okay. Thanks. And the height of what these  
23           poles are going to be, the 115 that's coming 45  
24           feet closer, those poles are going to be between

1 83.5 and 88 feet, right?

2 A (Bradstreet) Looks correct, yes.

3 Q And then the 345 line is going to be between 75  
4 and 80 feet?

5 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

6 Q Can you scroll down?

7 The numbers at the bottom are the current  
8 pole heights of that 115 line that I received in  
9 discovery, and it says that the current lines  
10 for that 115 line that's coming 45 feet closer  
11 are currently between 43 feet and 52 height is  
12 the current structure heights; is that right?

13 A (Bradstreet) Sounds accurate.

14 Q So they're going to be about twice as high and  
15 they're coming in about 45 feet closer, right?

16 A (Bradstreet) I mean, some will not be twice as  
17 high, but if you want to --

18 Q In general.

19 A (Bradstreet) -- call it twice, that's in general  
20 almost.

21 Q Can you turn to the next slide, please? Can you  
22 zoom in on the left box?

23 What I'm showing you is the wetlands map  
24 for this particular area, and this wetlands map

1           actually shows that in addition to having the  
2           poles come closer, there's also going to be a  
3           tree buffer removed in this vicinity. And I put  
4           the house numbers, 10, 8, I think depending on  
5           what map you look at, sometimes it's called 10  
6           Brookwood Drive or 8 Brookwood Drive, and then  
7           it's 12 Brookwood Drive, 14 Brookwood Drive and  
8           then 16 Brookwood Drive, and each of those have  
9           a green dotted line around the tree buffer, and  
10          that, according to this plan, is where there's a  
11          tree buffer removed; is that right?

12        A     (Bradstreet) That's the area we're looking to do  
13          some tree trimming, right.

14        Q     And then there's construction pads which you can  
15          see they're a yellow outline with sort of a  
16          pink-ish orange line inside of it; is that  
17          right? Those are construction pads?

18        A     (Bradstreet) Yes.

19        Q     And that black dotted line, that's the edge of  
20          the right-of-way?

21        A     (Bradstreet) That's correct.

22        Q     And you turn to the next box on the right of it?  
23          And these are houses near Fox Run which is 1 Fox  
24          Run and 6 Fox Run. And, again, that also shows

1 some tree clearing, correct? Or tree trimming?

2 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

3 Q Okay. And just to be clear, did you work on  
4 these plans?

5 A (Bradstreet) Specifically, what part of the  
6 plan?

7 Q In terms of which tree buffer would get removed?

8 A (Bradstreet) I was involved, yes.

9 Q And you didn't go out to the site when you were  
10 making that determination, did you?

11 A (Bradstreet) No. We used LIDAR survey to  
12 determine what the existing tree and vegetation  
13 buffer was and applied our clearance  
14 requirements to it to determine what needed to  
15 be potentially removed.

16 Q So you did that sitting in an office, fair to  
17 say?

18 A Using survey information. Yes.

19 Q Okay. So in terms of looking at this map, it's  
20 not actually that clear how much of the existing  
21 buffer and which particular trees are going to  
22 get removed, right?

23 A Yes. We have not gone through and selectively,  
24 I guess, flagged which trees would be removed or

1 trimmed. That's part of the construction  
2 process.

3 Q Okay. And that process is going to be done by  
4 Quanta, right?

5 A (Bradstreet) Clearing is under the PAR contract,  
6 correct.

7 Q So they're going to get plans and they're going  
8 to go out to these properties and they're going  
9 to determine which trees should be removed when  
10 they're on site.

11 A (Bradstreet) Generally, that's how it's done. I  
12 mean the Project, Eversource will more than  
13 likely have, I guess Sam or Ken, chime in if I'm  
14 wrong, but on a project like this, typically  
15 there's an arborist that goes along with the  
16 vegetation management team and determines which  
17 trees need to be removed versus trimmed versus  
18 cleared.

19 Q So there's going to an arborist at every single  
20 site where tree clearing is going on?

21 A (Bradstreet) I believe that is typical.

22 Q Okay.

23 A (Bowes) To identify the trees to be removed or  
24 trimmed, yes. That's accurate.



1 Q And the arborist and the people that are going  
2 to be trimming the trees are going to be using  
3 these plans, right?

4 A (Bradstreet) The basis of what the arborist  
5 looks to clear will be based off of the plans,  
6 yes.

7 Q Okay. These plans.

8 A (Bradstreet) I would assume the answer is yes.  
9 I don't know if there's a separate plan that  
10 would be created that's more defined for every  
11 location, but these plans are the basis of the  
12 vegetation clearing requirements.

13 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next page, please?

14 What I'm showing you is a photograph of 16  
15 Brookwood Drive which was one of the properties  
16 we just looked at, and according to  
17 Mr. Chalmers, 16 Brookwood Drive is, that house  
18 is 22 feet away from the edge of the  
19 right-of-way, and you can see that there's some  
20 trees in the backyard, right?

21 A (Bradstreet) Yes. I see some trees.

22 Q Okay. And those actually provide a pretty good  
23 buffer. You can see a little bit of the  
24 conductors through the trees right now, but

1           you'd agree that's their buffer to the corridor?

2       A       (Bradstreet) The trees are in between the house  
3           and the existing transmission line. Yes.

4       A       (Bowes) In this case, they're actually on the  
5           right-of-way though. They're not on the --

6       Q       Actually, I'm not asking you a question yet,  
7           Mr. Bowes. If you want to clarify, you can, but  
8           I think I was asking Mr. Bradstreet.

9           PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: You're  
10          addressing a panel right now, Ms. Pacik. If one  
11          of them has an answer to your question, they  
12          should provide it.

13          MS. PACIK: Okay.

14          PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Lest you be  
15          confused that you think you've got a complete  
16          answer, and you failed to ask the right person.  
17          So you're actually well served to understand  
18          that when you question a panel, you might get an  
19          answer from anyone who knows the answer to your  
20          question.

21                If you have a problem, if you think the  
22                statement made is not responsive to your  
23                question, that's a different problem.

24          MS. PACIK: Okay.

1 BY MS. PACIK:

2 Q So let's start with Mr. Bradstreet, and then Mr.  
3 Bowes, you can respond afterwards.

4 Mr. Bradstreet, we were talking about the  
5 trees and the tree clearing on the plan, and  
6 those trees, you understand, currently are  
7 between the house and the corridor, right?

8 A (Bradstreet) They are between the existing  
9 transmission line and the house, yes.

10 Q And Mr. Bowes, I think you were responding  
11 that -- do you know as you sit here today which  
12 of those trees are getting removed?

13 A (Bowes) I do not, but I do know that the ones  
14 listed there or shown there are within the  
15 corridor.

16 Q Okay. So some of those trees are going to get  
17 removed if they're within the corridor; is that  
18 what you're saying?

19 A (Bowes) Yes. That's true.

20 Q Okay. So 16 Brookwood Drive is going to lose  
21 some of their buffer, right?

22 A (Bowes) Yes.

23 Q Okay. Can you go to the next photograph,  
24 please?

1                   This is 14 Brookwood Drive, and, again,  
2                   that also shows some trees, and either Mr. Bowes  
3                   or Mr. Bradstreet, are those trees in the  
4                   corridor and getting removed?

5           A       (Bradstreet) I believe the answer is similar to  
6                   the other property, yes.

7           Q       And some are those are pretty mature tall trees,  
8                   right?

9           A       (Bowes) Actually, it's a little different than  
10                  what Derrick just said. Some of those trees,  
11                  about half of them are within the corridor and  
12                  about half are not.

13          Q       The tall mature pines that you can see in the  
14                  back, are those within the corridor?

15          A       (Bowes) Again, it looks about half of them are  
16                  and half of them are not. We have another view  
17                  from One Touch so that's what I'm using.

18          Q       Okay. And had that been made available that  
19                  would have been helpful but it hasn't so we're  
20                  going to use the photographs that we have.

21                         Can you turn to the next --

22          A       (Bowes) Those are also on the plan set drawings  
23                  so it's not just on One Touch.

24          A       (Johnson) The wetland drawing that you had shown

1           previously in your beginning statement where the  
2           numbers of each of the individual --

3       Q     The wetlands plan?

4       A     (Johnson) Yes. We can cross-reference that to  
5           do the same effect of what we're talking about  
6           right now.

7       Q     Okay. Here's another photograph of 14 Brookwood  
8           Drive, and that shows some trees that are the  
9           buffer between the house and the corridor. And  
10          those trees, do you know which ones are getting  
11          removed?

12      A     (Bowes) It looks like just some trimming on the  
13          other side of these trees. No extra removals.

14      Q     Okay. Can you turn to the next page, please?

15                 This is 12 Brookwood Drive, and 12  
16          Brookwood Drive is 33 feet away from the edge of  
17          the corridor, and as you can see, there's trees  
18          behind their house that are currently acting as  
19          a buffer to the corridor, and some of those  
20          trees are also getting removed?

21      A     (Bowes) No. It looks like just trimming again  
22          towards the corridor.

23      Q     When you say "just trimming towards the  
24          corridor," what's that mean?

1 A (Bowes) So I'm looking at a depiction that shows  
2 what actually has to be removed. And it shows  
3 that it's not even to the centerline of the tree  
4 itself to the trunk. So it's just actually the  
5 outside branches in this case.

6 Q Okay. So some branches. So you can actually  
7 see whether the trunk is getting removed or not?

8 A (Bowes) For this location I can, yes.

9 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

10 All right. This is 6 Fox Run, and this  
11 also has some trees in the backyard that in the  
12 wetlands map showed that some of their trees  
13 were getting removed, and just so you know, 6  
14 Fox Run, that house sits 34.1 feet away from the  
15 edge of the corridor, according to Mr. Chalmers,  
16 and their tree buffer, is some of that getting  
17 removed?

18 A (Bowes) I would say yes. Certainly some  
19 branches and maybe some trees. But there will  
20 be about a 30-foot buffer left.

21 Q 30-foot tree buffer?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. But some of those trees are getting  
24 removed?

1 A (Bowes) I would say probably, yes. It looks  
2 like 2 or 3 towards the right-of-way. You can't  
3 see it from this side, but it would be from the  
4 other side.

5 Q Okay. Do you know if that's going to open up a  
6 view of the corridor?

7 A (Bowes) It looks like there's a combination of  
8 both pine and deciduous so deciduous trees you  
9 probably have more view when the leaves are off  
10 the trees there.

11 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide? This is  
12 1 Fox Run and can't really see the house too  
13 well because of the bushes in the front, but  
14 this particular house is 25 feet from the edge  
15 of the corridor, and the wetlands maps also  
16 showed a tree buffer getting removed on this  
17 property. And, again, do you know which trees  
18 that we're looking at are going to get removed?

19 A (Bowes) I would say none that we're looking at,  
20 but, again, towards the inside of the  
21 right-of-way there may be a tree. There's  
22 definitely some trimming, but there will still  
23 be a buffer. Obviously, the 25 feet to the  
24 right-of-way and then about a 30-foot buffer on

1 the right-of-way.

2 Q But you don't know if there's 25 feet of trees  
3 between that house and the edge of the  
4 right-of-way, do you?

5 A (Bowes) Based on the picture I see, yes.

6 Q So the trees are right up against the house?

7 A (Bowes) Actually over the house. So I don't  
8 know where the trunks are, but in the back of  
9 the house the branches are over the roof.

10 Q Okay. Can you turn the next page, please?  
11 Actually, can you go back about 7 slides to the  
12 wetlands map?

13 Just going back to the wetlands map, if you  
14 look at the construction pads, the edge of the  
15 construction pads are, for example, looking at  
16 14 Brookwood Drive. How far away is the edge of  
17 the construction pad to the edge of the  
18 right-of-way?

19 A (Bradstreet) I believe when we were looking at  
20 the cross-section view earlier, the edge of  
21 proposed clearing was 35 feet from the edge of  
22 the right-of-way, if I remember correctly. That  
23 looks like the work pad would be roughly five  
24 feet further away so maybe 40 feet.



1 Q Okay. And that that house from the right-of-way  
2 according to the spreadsheet from Mr. Chalmers  
3 was 33 feet. So we're talking about 70, 75 feet  
4 between the house and the construction pad; is  
5 that right?

6 A (Bradstreet) I mean, I think Mr. Chalmers'  
7 measurement was from the closest part of that  
8 house which is not directly adjacent to the work  
9 pad.

10 Q So are we talking maybe 80, 90 feet?

11 A (Bradstreet) If we pulled up One Touch, we could  
12 measure it, and without measuring it, I can't  
13 give you a definitive answer.

14 A (Bowes) About 84 feet.

15 A (Bradstreet) About 84 feet.

16 Q All right. So, and just to be clear and I'm not  
17 going to go over all of the construction  
18 equipment that Attorney Pappas went through with  
19 you yesterday, but there's helicopters that are  
20 going to be used, right?

21 A (Bradstreet) To pull in stringing wire. Yes.

22 Q And there's some construction trucks to bring in  
23 concrete for the construction pads?

24 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

1 Q And there are other trucks that are bringing in  
2 other equipment, right?

3 A (Bradstreet) There will be.

4 Q Okay. Can you go about 8 slides forward? There  
5 you go. One back.

6 This slide shows, again, a box along the  
7 corridor of an area that I'd like to direct your  
8 attention to, and the area is on the corner of  
9 Hoyt Road and Route 132 which is also known as  
10 Mountain Road.

11 Can you go to the next slide?

12 And this shows 41 Hoyt Road which is a  
13 house at the corner of Hoyt Road and Route 132,  
14 and last week we reviewed this particular  
15 location with the Committee with the Health and  
16 Safety Plan. Were any of you here for that?

17 A (Bowes) I was not.

18 Q Okay. I'm not going to go over it all again,  
19 but are you aware that this house or part of it  
20 actually sits in the right-of-way?

21 A (Bowes) Yes, I am.

22 Q You are. Okay. And can you go to the next  
23 slide, please?

24 So this photograph is actually from Google

1 Earth, and it shows the poles and the  
2 conductors, and it shows the garage attached to  
3 the house and also there's a shed which is a  
4 white dot underneath the lines. Are you  
5 familiar with the fact that there's a shed right  
6 underneath the lines?

7 A (Bowes) Yes, I am.

8 Q And this photograph shows there's a tree buffer  
9 between the house and Route 132 currently,  
10 right?

11 A (Bowes) Yes.

12 Q And there's two poles; one of them is near that  
13 shed we were just looking at, kind of close to  
14 the corner; you see that?

15 A (Bowes) I do.

16 Q And that's the 115 line that's getting  
17 relocated?

18 A (Bowes) Yes.

19 Q And then there's another pole if you go north, I  
20 guess, northwest. And that's the other 115 line  
21 in the vicinity; is that right?

22 A (Bowes) Actually, the same line.

23 Q Same line and that's also, that structure is  
24 getting relocated?

1 A (Bowes) Yes.

2 Q Can you turn to the next slide?

3 And just looking at --

4 Can you go in a little bit closer?

5 So the F139-176 is the current 115 line or  
6 structure that we looked at which was near the  
7 shed, and that's coming closer to the house, and  
8 do you know how much closer to the house that's  
9 going to be relocated?

10 A (Bradstreet) It would be the same that, what did  
11 we say, 40 feet after we did the math last time?  
12 It's the same cross-section.

13 Q Okay. About 40 or 45 feet. And there's also  
14 F139-177 which is coming about 40, 45 feet  
15 closer?

16 A (Bradstreet) I mean, I guess I would say it's  
17 moving down on the drawing you provided. I  
18 don't know if it's necessarily moving 45 feet  
19 closer to the house.

20 Q Okay. Well, there's also a house, where it says  
21 7933, that's a yellow dot. That's a home, too,  
22 right?

23 A (Bradstreet) It appears to be, yes.

24 Q So looking at F139-176 --

1 Can you turn to the next slide?

2 I just want to talk about the height of  
3 that just for a moment. So it's coming 45 feet  
4 closer, and then it's, F139-176 was the one near  
5 the shed, and that's going to be 101.5 feet  
6 tall; is that right?

7 A (Bradstreet) Appears so. Yes.

8 Q And currently, that pole is, if you see below,  
9 the number that we were given is 52 feet. Is  
10 that right?

11 A (Bradstreet) Looks correct.

12 Q So it's almost twice as high as what it is  
13 currently?

14 A (Bradstreet) Same as before.

15 Q And it's going to be closer to the house. And  
16 then the 345 line, the Northern Pass line that's  
17 coming in, 3132-86 is the one that was closest  
18 to the home, and that's going to be 95 feet?

19 A (Bradstreet) I believe 87 was closer to the  
20 home.

21 Q Was 87 closer to the home? So that's going to  
22 be 100 feet, right?

23 A (Bradstreet) Oh. Sam corrected me. I guess it  
24 is 86. Sorry.

1 Q Okay. We can go back if you want to check.

2 A (Bradstreet) Up to you.

3 Q It's 86? Okay. So it's going to be 95 feet.

4 Can you go to the next slide?

5 And this is actually the wetlands map for  
6 this particular home, and it shows where the  
7 construction pads are going to be and the access  
8 roads and also some tree clearing. So can you  
9 zoom in on it just a little bit more? If  
10 possible? That's good.

11 All right. So it shows that red line,  
12 right where it says Hoyt Road, there's a red  
13 line, and that's going to be the access road to  
14 go into the construction pad. Is that right?

15 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

16 Q And there's trees there right now so all those  
17 trees are going to get removed, right?

18 A (Bradstreet) The trees would also be cleared for  
19 clearance requirements to the line, but yes.

20 Q Okay. And then where the construction pad is,  
21 3132-86, F139-176, all the trees in that  
22 vicinity which currently act as a buffer to  
23 Mountain Road for the home, those are getting  
24 removed, too, right?

1 A (Bradstreet) They would have to be removed for  
2 construction, yes.

3 Q And then there's another access road, it looks  
4 like, off 132, and that goes to another  
5 construction pad where 3132-85 and F139-177 are  
6 getting located? Right?

7 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

8 Q And there's some tree buffer removal. It's kind  
9 of hard to see because it's green on green, but  
10 you see that all of those trees are going to be  
11 removed, I assume, is that correct, for the  
12 construction pad and where the green line with  
13 the dots are?

14 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

15 Q We're talking about that area, right?

16 A (Bradstreet) The vegetation clearing line, yes.

17 Q Okay. So the construction pad for 41-139-176,  
18 how many feet is that away from the property  
19 from the garage? Do you know?

20 A (Bowes) 30 feet?

21 Q 30 feet from what edge to what edge, please?

22 A (Bowes) So I guess you'd call it the front  
23 corner of the garage to the corner of the small  
24 pad.

1 Q And do you know if that garage is used for  
2 horses or what it's used for?

3 A (Bowes) I do not.

4 Q Has anybody been out to that property?

5 A (Johnson) Yes, I have.

6 Q And do you know whether the -- so there is a  
7 garage there, right?

8 A (Johnson) that's correct.

9 Q And are you aware that part of that area is for  
10 living space?

11 A (Johnson) No. It's private property. I'm not  
12 allowed on it. It looks like a garage door.

13 Q So you haven't been on the property. You've  
14 been to the road?

15 A (Johnson) That's correct.

16 Q Okay. Has anybody talked to the property  
17 owners?

18 A (Johnson) I believe this house was sold. I need  
19 to verify that, but I believe this house was  
20 sold in the last four or five years. That's why  
21 my memory is a little vague on this, and we did  
22 talk to the people that purchased the house back  
23 then, but I need to research that to give you  
24 more details.



1 Q Okay. Since these plans have come out, has  
2 anybody talked to the property owners?

3 A (Johnson) No. I don't believe so.

4 Q Okay. So currently, they could come home one  
5 day and not have any tree buffer and potentially  
6 a 100-foot pole located about, what, 30 feet  
7 from their house?

8 A (Bradstreet) I think the pole would be further  
9 than that.

10 Q How far is the pole from the house?

11 A (Bowes) From the same corner of the garage, it's  
12 about 60 feet.

13 Q Which corner are you looking at?

14 A (Bowes) The one -- bottom right edge. Bottom  
15 front.

16 Q Okay. And when you say to the pole, you're  
17 talking about to F139-176?

18 A (Bowes) Yes.

19 Q You think it's 60 feet?

20 A (Bowes) Yes.

21 Q And how big, these monopoles, what's the width  
22 of the monopole? I think I've seen 8 feet or  
23 ten feet wide?

24 A (Bowes) At ground level, you mean the base?

1 Q Yes. What's the diameter of the base?

2 A (Bradstreet) For a 115 structure -- they're all  
3 going to be different. For a 115 kV structure,  
4 assuming this is a tandem structure, it's  
5 probably in the four to five-foot range.

6 Q Okay. Do you know when this house was built?

7 A (Bradstreet) I do not.

8 Q Can you turn to the next slide, please?

9 That's a picture of the garage. And it  
10 shows the tree buffer, and that tree buffer that  
11 we're looking at, I'll represent to you is the  
12 tree buffer between the house and Route 132 or  
13 Mountain Road, and that's the tree buffer you  
14 said was going to get removed?

15 A (Johnson) So I'm not sure the ornamental trees  
16 wouldn't be required to be removed because  
17 they're well below the clearance codes. I  
18 believe the access road goes behind those  
19 ornamental trees.

20 Q And the ornamental trees aren't acting as a  
21 buffer, are they?

22 A (Johnson) No. They're not.

23 Q So the buffer, though, between the house and  
24 Mountain Road, those trees that are acting as a

1 buffer are going to get removed, right?

2 A (Johnson) Yes. It looks like it.

3 Q Can you go to the next slide, please?

4 And this is the, those are the trees that  
5 are near the shed, and you can't really see it,  
6 but that 115 line that Mr. Bowes thinks is going  
7 to be 60 feet away from the garage, all those  
8 trees are getting removed, too, right?

9 A (Bowes) I would say probably, yes.

10 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

11 And we had talked just a moment ago about  
12 what year this property was built.

13 Can you zoom in to --

14 This is, just so you know, from the  
15 Assessing Department at the City of Concord, and  
16 it's the tax record, and according to this, if  
17 you zoom in, AYB is actual year built, that's  
18 1976 is when the home was built. Do you see  
19 that?

20 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

21 Q And if you go down where it's highlighted, it  
22 shows the year that the shed and the barn were  
23 built so the shed was built in 1990. So that  
24 was 27 years ago. Right? That shed we saw?

1 And are you guys removing this shed?

2 A (Bradstreet) Right now, I don't believe, I  
3 guess, I mean, it will be have to be modified  
4 for construction. It's right in the middle of  
5 the work pad.

6 Q So it's going to get moved?

7 A (Bradstreet) Or moved and moved back or removed,  
8 yes.

9 Q Okay. And then the barn that we saw was built  
10 in 1997. So that's been there for about 20  
11 years, right?

12 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

13 Q Okay. So this isn't anything new that's shown  
14 up on the property recently?

15 A (Bradstreet) Doesn't appear to be.

16 Q Can you turn to the next slide?

17 Anyone familiar with the fact that there's  
18 a Joint Use Agreement with the property owners  
19 to allow some of these structures in the  
20 right-of-way?

21 A (Bradstreet) Yes, I'm aware of it.

22 Q Okay. And you had mentioned earlier nobody's  
23 had a conversation about what the current  
24 proposal is with the property owners?

1 A (Johnson) Not directly.

2 Q Okay. Can you go to a few slides forward? And  
3 actually just the last page of this.

4 This Joint Use Agreement was signed in  
5 2008, right? I think it might be one more page  
6 over. Yes. There we go. February, well, it  
7 was signed February 2009. So it's been around  
8 for a while? Yes?

9 A (Bradstreet) Looks like 2009.

10 Q Okay. Great. Next slide, please.

11 So next property I want to talk to you  
12 about is 516 Mountain Road which is in the same  
13 intersection as Hoyt Road and Route 132. Mr.  
14 Bradstreet, are you familiar with this property?

15 A (Bradstreet) I guess nothing specific, but I'm  
16 familiar with the corridor.

17 Q Okay. So if you see the red dot where it says  
18 516 Mountain Road, you see the house along Route  
19 132?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And you see there's a pretty big tree buffer  
22 behind the house currently, blocking the  
23 transmission corridor?

24 A (Bradstreet) I see vegetation between the

1 existing transmission corridor and the house.

2 Q Has anybody been to this house to see what will  
3 happen if that vegetation is removed?

4 A (Bradstreet) I have not.

5 A (Johnson) Yes. The corridor will be visible  
6 from this house.

7 Q Okay. So let's turn to the next slide, please.

8 According to Mr. Chalmers' spreadsheet he  
9 gave us, 516 Mountain Road, the actual house is  
10 actually 6.7 feet from the edge of the  
11 right-of-way, right?

12 A (Bowes) Yes.

13 Q Okay. Can you go to the next slide? So zooming  
14 into, this is the route plans provided by the  
15 Northern Pass. We're working on it here.

16 All right. So the yellow dot that you see  
17 where it says 7963, that's the home, and you can  
18 see it's pretty much right on the edge of the  
19 corridor, very close to it. And the white, the  
20 current 115 line is F139-175, right?

21 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

22 Q That's the structure number? And that is  
23 getting removed, and it's coming closer to  
24 what's Route 139?

1 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

2 Q And again, is this the same segment where it's  
3 coming 45 feet closer?

4 A (Bradstreet) It should be, yes.

5 Q And then that yellow square is going to be the  
6 new structure which is 3132-87?

7 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

8 Q And that's coming closer to where that house is,  
9 right?

10 A (Bradstreet) Coming closer? Compared to what?

11 Q Currently, the 115 structure is farther away  
12 from the house from where the new 345 volt  
13 structure will be.

14 A (Bradstreet) Sure, yes.

15 Q All right. Can you go to the next slide?

16 Just in terms of the heights, the current  
17 structures --

18 I'm sorry. Go back one.

19 All right. So F139-175 is the 115 line  
20 that's getting relocated, right?

21 A (Bradstreet) In this, next to this parcel that  
22 you're discussing, yes.

23 Q Okay. So we'll go to the next slide again.

24 Sorry.

1 All right. So F139-175 that's going to be  
2 105 feet?

3 A (Bradstreet) Looks that way, yes.

4 Q And then the 3132-87 is the one that we looked  
5 at that was going to be in the proximity also of  
6 the home, and that's going to be 100 feet?

7 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

8 Q And it's currently, that F139-175 is 50 feet?

9 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

10 Q So it's going to be twice as large?

11 A (Bradstreet) Looks that way.

12 Q Can you go to the next slide?

13 And this is the area, another wetlands map  
14 which shows the proposed tree buffer that's  
15 going to get removed for the home at 516  
16 Mountain Road, and that shows that the entire  
17 tree buffer behind the home is getting removed,  
18 right?

19 A (Bowes) I would say yes.

20 Q So they're going to have a nice view of the  
21 structures? Maybe not nice, but they will have  
22 a view of the structures?

23 A (Bowes) So it looks like 3132-87, yes, and the  
24 existing 115 line they'll be able to see.



1 Q And there's the construction pads which are  
2 going to be located, how far away are the  
3 construction pads from the home?

4 A (Bowes) Just a second. About 95 feet to the  
5 bottom corner.

6 Q Okay. Has anybody had a conversation with these  
7 property owners?

8 A (Johnson) I have not.

9 Q No? Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

10 I think this is a question for  
11 Ms. Farrington. This slide is the wetlands map  
12 and also shows all the access route at the  
13 intersection of 132 and Hoyt Road, and it shows  
14 that there's three access routes proposed for  
15 this intersection, right? And they're all  
16 circled in blue for ease of reference.

17 A (Farrington) Yes.

18 Q And is this something that you designed or were  
19 involved with?

20 A (Farrington) No.

21 Q Okay. So would you be involved with that in  
22 terms of traffic flow and concerns for safety?

23 A (Farrington) I will likely assist in the  
24 driveway permit applications, yes.

1 Q Okay. And driveway permit applications, my  
2 understanding is you're not actually going to  
3 the City of Concord for a driveway permit  
4 application, are you?

5 A (Farrington) That's correct. It's with DOT.

6 Q And DOT, what jurisdiction do they have over  
7 Hoyt Road?

8 A (Farrington) That's, I believe, out of my range  
9 of expertise.

10 Q Hoyt Road is a local road, right? Locally  
11 maintained? You don't know?

12 A (Bowes) I believe it is, yes.

13 Q So DOT doesn't have any jurisdiction over Hoyt  
14 Road, does it?

15 A (Bowes) I believe that's correct.

16 Q So they're not going to be giving you a driveway  
17 permit for Hoyt Road.

18 A (Bowes) That's correct.

19 Q So you're not getting a driveway permit for the  
20 one that's getting the tree buffer removed going  
21 on to Hoyt Road.

22 A (Bowes) Only if we come to agreement with the  
23 City of Concord for an MOU for the construction.

24 Q Okay, and we've talked about that. There's no

1           guarantee that's going to happen, right?

2           A     (Bowes) That is true.

3           Q     Okay. So as it stands right now, you're not  
4           looking to get a driveway permit if from the  
5           City of Concord, and you're just going to be  
6           getting a driveway permit from DOT for the two  
7           that enter Route 132?

8           A     (Bowes) I believe that's accurate.

9           Q     So, Ms. Farrington, what research have you done  
10          on the potential hazards or safety issues  
11          represented to this intersection?

12          A     (Farrington) Again, I haven't been involved to  
13          date. The driveway permits have not been filed  
14          other than in draft form, but all of the safety  
15          aspects are covered within the DOT permit.

16          Q     Okay. Are you aware that this is an  
17          intersection that's prone to accidents?

18          A     (Farrington) Again, I haven't been involved and  
19          that's better directed to others.

20          Q     Does anybody here know about what the accident  
21          history is for this intersection?

22          A     (Bowes) I do not.

23          Q     Okay. Could you turn to the next slide? I  
24          mean, before we go to that, I assume nobody else

1 knows? On this panel?

2 A (Bradstreet) I do not.

3 A (Johnson) I do not.

4 Q Okay, I'll take that as a collective no.

5 This is a police department record which  
6 shows the number of accidents in this  
7 intersection in the last five years, and this  
8 says that there's been 14 accidents, but I  
9 assume nobody here on the panel could talk to  
10 that since you don't know the history, right?

11 A (Farrington) I could not talk to the details of  
12 the accidents. If you would like to go into a  
13 discussion about crash studies and crash rate  
14 factors and how it compares to AADT, we can  
15 certainly do that.

16 Q No. I just want to know if you knew the history  
17 of this particular intersection.

18 A (Farrington) As I said, I do not.

19 Q Okay. Can you go to the next slide, please?

20 So now I'd like to talk to you about, we're  
21 going a little south on the right-of-way to an  
22 area which is Sanborn Road. And Mr. Bradstreet,  
23 are you familiar with Sanborn Road area?

24 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

1 Q So can you go to the next slide, please?

2 This is a wetlands map which shows, you can  
3 see the horse farm which is, I'll represent to  
4 you, what you see in terms of the sand area and  
5 the building is a horse farm and, then across  
6 the street from that on Sanborn Road there's two  
7 red circles that I drew on this map. Do you see  
8 those?

9 A (Bradstreet) I see the red circles, yes.

10 Q And I'll represent to you those are the only two  
11 additions I made to this map were those two red  
12 circles. And those show that there's no homes  
13 on this map, right?

14 A (Bradstreet) It appears as if not.

15 Q Okay. Are you aware whether there's any homes  
16 in this area?

17 A (Bradstreet) I believe there has been some  
18 development.

19 Q Okay. Since this map was prepared -- what was  
20 the date of the map?

21 A (Bradstreet) Probably late 20, looks like  
22 February 2016 is when it was sealed.

23 Q Okay. So that was over a year ago. Since,  
24 you've developed new maps that you've submitted

1 to the Committee since February of 2016, right?

2 A (Bradstreet) I believe there have been some  
3 revisions, yes.

4 Q Okay. And none showing the houses on this  
5 particular area, right?

6 A (Bradstreet) Not that I'm aware of.

7 Q So as far as the Site Evaluation Committee is  
8 concerned, from the maps that you've provided  
9 them to date, they're not aware that there's  
10 actually houses in this particular location?

11 A (Bradstreet) I don't know if they are or not.

12 Q Well, you haven't provided them any maps that  
13 show houses in this particular location, have  
14 you?

15 A (Bradstreet) Our current map does not show  
16 houses.

17 Q Okay. Can you go to the next slide?

18 And this is a Google Earth overhead, and it  
19 shows those two new houses that I understand you  
20 were aware of, right?

21 A (Bradstreet) I'm not aware of the specifics, but  
22 I'm aware that there have been some houses built  
23 on Sanborn Road.

24 Q Okay. And you'd agree that based on this Google

1 Earth map those are the two houses?

2 A (Bradstreet) It appears as if, yes.

3 Q Can you go to the next slide?

4 And what I'm showing you is, you can only  
5 see a little bit of their garage, but this is  
6 the house at 61 Sanborn Road, and its proximity  
7 in the edge of the right-of-way corridor. Do  
8 you know how far that house is from the edge of  
9 the corridor?

10 A (Bradstreet) I don't believe we do, no.

11 Q And you probably wouldn't know if it wasn't on  
12 any of the maps, would you?

13 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

14 Q Okay. Next slide, please?

15 And this is from the City of Concord Code  
16 Department, and it shows when this house got  
17 final approval which was December 16th, 2015.  
18 So it was over a year and a half ago about,  
19 right?

20 A (Bradstreet) December of 2015 is a year and a  
21 half ago.

22 Q Okay. So it's been around for a while.

23 Next slide, please.

24 And this is the house at 67 Sanborn Road

1           which we saw on the other side of the edge of  
2           the corridor.  And has anybody seen that house?  
3           On the panel?

4           A     (Bowes) I have not.

5           A     (Johnson) I have not.

6           Q     And it would be fair to say that nobody knows  
7           the distance of that house from the edge of the  
8           corridor?

9           A     (Johnson) Correct.

10          Q     And the Site Evaluation Committee hasn't been  
11          notified about this house?

12          A     (Bradstreet) I do not believe so.

13          A     (Johnson) I think you're notifying them right  
14          now.

15          Q     I guess so.  All right.

16                         Next slide, please.

17                         Is it a municipality's obligation to notify  
18                         the Site Evaluation Committee about properties  
19                         along the route?  Or is it the Northern Pass's  
20                         obligation?  Does anyone know that?

21          A     (Bowes) I don't believe it's a municipality's.

22          Q     I didn't think so either.

23                         In terms of the date that this house got  
24                         final approval and final inspection, that was



1 January of 2016 according to this record, right?

2 A (Bradstreet) Appears so.

3 Q Okay. So this is also not a new construction,  
4 so to say? It's been around for about a year  
5 and a half also?

6 A (Bradstreet) Sounds right.

7 Q Okay. Next slide, please.

8 So I just want to talk a moment about the  
9 area in blue which is Sanborn Road that has the  
10 houses that we've been looking at, and,  
11 currently, F139-171 is the 115 line, and it's  
12 getting moved closer which is the green square.  
13 Do you know how many feet closer that pole is  
14 going to get moved to the home?

15 A (Bradstreet) Without the home shown, I do not,  
16 but I would also venture to say it probably is  
17 moving left on the page which might move it not  
18 as close as you make it seem.

19 Q But we can't really tell because we don't know  
20 where the house is?

21 A (Bradstreet) With this figure, correct.

22 Q Okay. And 3132-91 is going to be next to that  
23 115 line?

24 A (Bradstreet) Yes, ma'am.

1 Q Would it be fair to say when you made this route  
2 map you didn't take into consideration the  
3 location of the homes because they're not shown  
4 on the map? Right?

5 A (Bradstreet) I think that's a fair statement.

6 Q Okay. So to the extent you tried to put  
7 structures in a place where it might not have  
8 such a huge impact on a home, that wasn't done  
9 on this particular location?

10 A (Bradstreet) The information was not available.

11 Q Well, it was available at some point, wasn't it?

12 A (Bradstreet) It's not in our design information.

13 Q Okay. Can you go to the next slide, please?

14 So in terms of the heights of these poles,  
15 F-171 is going to be 97 feet, and then there's  
16 one going to be next to it F139-172, which is  
17 120 feet, right?

18 A (Bradstreet) That's what it shows, yes.

19 Q And the 3132-91 was the one that was closest to  
20 the road and the homes, that's goes to be 100  
21 feet?

22 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

23 Q And F139-171, that's the one that we were  
24 looking at that's closest to the homes. It's

1 going to be 97, but it's currently 43 feet?

2 A Correct.

3 Q So it getting taller and potentially closer to  
4 the edge of the right-of-way, right?

5 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

6 Q Okay. Can you do go to the next slide?

7 Now, what I want to talk to you about for  
8 just a moment is the horse farm on Sanborn Road.  
9 Is anybody here familiar with that horse farm?

10 A (Johnson) I have seen it from the road, yes.

11 Q Has anybody been on the property and talked to  
12 the owners of the farm?

13 A (Johnson) I have not, but we'd have to check the  
14 records to see if one of our Community Relations  
15 Specialists has.

16 Q Okay, but nobody on the panel?

17 A (Johnson) That's correct.

18 Q And are you familiar with whether the owners use  
19 the area underneath the right-of-way to have  
20 their horses graze?

21 A (Johnson) When I was there, there were no horses  
22 out, but that doesn't mean that they don't do  
23 that.

24 Q Okay. And the owners of the farm, they actually

1 own that land. Northern Pass has an easement or  
2 PSNH has an easement to it, but the farm can use  
3 the land underneath the right-of-way for their  
4 horses, right?

5 A (Bowes) I would say yes.

6 Q Okay. Can you go to the next slide, please?

7 And this shows a fence. Now, the  
8 right-of-way is going to be right through that  
9 fence to get to the construction pads, right?

10 A (Johnson) Yes.

11 A (Bradstreet) It appears, yes.

12 Q And so what are the plans in terms of working  
13 with the property owner to make sure that she  
14 has a place for her horses and that they're safe  
15 and that the fence doesn't allow the horses to  
16 get out if it's getting removed?

17 A (Bradstreet) We have standard construction  
18 details that show gates.

19 Q So you're going to put a gate back up? Every  
20 day?

21 A (Bradstreet) It will swing open and close and  
22 latch.

23 Q Okay. And fair to say, she's probably not going  
24 to be able to have her horses out there while

1           you're doing construction, right?

2       A     (Bradstreet) I would say during certain  
3           construction activities we would work with them  
4           to not have horses out.

5       Q     But as of this date nobody has reached out to  
6           that property owner?

7       A     (Bradstreet) Not that I'm aware.

8       A     (Johnson) I will offer that it's a little  
9           premature to talk about construction, specific  
10          construction activities. As we get more  
11          information on when the contractors will be  
12          there, what time of year, et cetera, I mean, for  
13          instance, we could do this area in the winter  
14          when the horses weren't out to pasture and were  
15          in their barns or moved elsewhere. So that kind  
16          of coordination activity would happen later on  
17          in the construction process as we lead up to the  
18          actual construction. In this area, I don't  
19          believe the construction activities are expected  
20          to start until some time in 2018.

21      Q     Okay.

22      A     (Johnson) So it's still a fair amount away.

23      Q     But it's not really premature because we're in  
24          trial right now and you're looking to get a

1 certificate and to prove that this is in the  
2 public interest.

3 A (Johnson) Correct.

4 Q Okay.

5 A (Johnson) I'm not disputing that.

6 Q Okay. I'll let it go, Mr. Chairman. I can see  
7 you wanting to jump in.

8 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: I sensed an  
9 argument about to happen which really wasn't  
10 going to be productive.

11 MS. PACIK: I would never argue. Never.

12 BY MS. PACIK:

13 Q Can you go to the next page, please?

14 All right. So moving down the route a  
15 little bit, I want to talk about an area near  
16 Snow Pond. Are you familiar with Snow Pond in  
17 Concord? Snow Pond Road is the road next to  
18 Snow Pond?

19 A (Johnson) Yes.

20 Q Can you go to the next slide, please?

21 So there's a home at 37 Snow Pond Road, and  
22 it's, actually, you can see from Snow Pond, you  
23 have to cross the right-of-way, it's in that red  
24 box, to get to the yellow dot, and the yellow

1 dot is somebody's home, and it's right near  
2 where the number is P145-153. Do you see that?

3 A (Bradstreet) I do.

4 Q So in this particular area, 3132-102 is the 345  
5 line. And that's from, it's proposed to be  
6 pretty much directly in front of the home; is  
7 that right?

8 A (Bradstreet) It looks to be mostly up in the  
9 drawing, yes.

10 Q Okay. And so the one closest to it is 3132-103.

11 A (Bradstreet) Closest to what?

12 Q I guess if you're going south --

13 A (Bradstreet) Um-hum.

14 Q -- on Snow Pond Road, 3132-103 is the next  
15 structure for the 345 line?

16 A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

17 Q So I'm a little confused. What consideration  
18 did you give when putting 3132-102 right in  
19 front of the home?

20 A (Bradstreet) I guess specifically what's your --  
21 are you asking if we looked at that home and its  
22 view to the Snow Pond?

23 Q Yes. I guess I'm confused why you would put a  
24 structure right in front of this person's house?

1 A (Bradstreet) I mean, I guess there's an existing  
2 distribution line that's between that house and  
3 our corridor today.

4 Q But the distribution line is not going to be 100  
5 feet tall, is it?

6 A (Bradstreet) No, it will not be 100 feet tall,  
7 no.

8 Q I mean, how tall is the current distribution  
9 line?

10 A (Bradstreet) I would say 40 to 50 feet.

11 Q At most, right?

12 A (Bradstreet) Probably at most, yes.

13 Q So we've got 31-102 which is right in front of  
14 the home, and P145-153 is coming closer to the  
15 edge of the right-of-way where that home is,  
16 right?

17 A (Bradstreet) You said P145-153? Yes.

18 Q Yes. Can you go to the next slide, please?

19 And we just talked about 3132-102 which is  
20 right in front of the home, that's going to be  
21 100 feet tall, and P145-152 is going to be 88  
22 feet tall, and according to the heights that we  
23 were provided, P145-152 is currently 43 feet  
24 tall, right?



1 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

2 Q So it's getting a lot taller or twice as tall,  
3 right?

4 A (Bradstreet) Approximately, yes.

5 Q Okay. Can you go to the next slide?

6 A (Johnson) It disappeared. We lost our screen.

7 Q You lost it? Great.

8 A (Johnson) It's back. Don't move.

9 Q So this is the wetlands map which shows the  
10 construction pads and the access roads, and in  
11 this you can see the driveway leading from Snow  
12 Pond Road up to the home, right?

13 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

14 Q And on that driveway, you're actually planning  
15 to use part of it as the access road to get to  
16 one of the construction pads, right?

17 A (Bradstreet) It looks like there's some overlap  
18 between our access road and what goes over to  
19 P145-153.

20 Q And you can see there's a construction pad which  
21 is, I'm not quite sure why, but it looks like  
22 part of it is on the driveway, too, right? For  
23 3132-102?

24 A (Bradstreet) The yellow line?

1 Q Yes.

2 A (Bradstreet) That's the limited disturbance. It  
3 looks like that might be where we have some  
4 environmental controls or something like that  
5 but yes.

6 Q So something is going on in their driveway in  
7 that area?

8 A (Bradstreet) It currently looks that way, yes.

9 Q Okay. And then there's the tree buffer that we  
10 can see the green dotted line in front of the  
11 home which is circled in blue. You can see that  
12 there's some trees that are getting removed in  
13 this area, too, right?

14 A (Bradstreet) There'll be some clearing, I think.  
15 It looks from this aerial like it might be  
16 trimming, but it's hard to tell.

17 Q It is hard to tell. And can you tell from this  
18 aerial view whether or not any of the mature  
19 trees that are currently acting as a buffer,  
20 whether the base of them are in that clearing  
21 area?

22 A (Bowes) I would say yes, there were a few.

23 Q So they're going to lose some of their buffer,  
24 right?

1 A (Bowes) Yes.

2 Q And then they're going to be looking at  
3 3132-102, the 100-foot structure?

4 A (Bowes) Possibly.

5 Q Okay. Can you turn the next page, please?

6 This shows, actually there's pretty good  
7 tree buffer right now, and this is a summer  
8 satellite image where the trees are in full  
9 foliage, and it shows that they have a good  
10 buffer, you'd agree, between their house and the  
11 edge of the right-of-way?

12 A (Bowes) Yes.

13 Q Can you turn the next page?

14 And this shows in the winter where you can  
15 see that without the foliage, it's actually a  
16 pretty thin line of trees that's creating that  
17 buffer, and you just said that some of those  
18 trees are getting removed?

19 A (Bowes) That is true.

20 Q Okay. And has anyone talked to these  
21 homeowners?

22 A (Johnson) Again, I have not personally, but I  
23 can check the records.

24 Q Okay. Well, according to the homeowners,

1           nobody's come to talk to them. Would you have  
2           any reason to disagree with them?

3           A     (Johnson) No.

4           Q     So, theoretically, they could come home one day  
5           and have no tree buffer and a 100-foot pole in  
6           their front yard, right?

7           A     (Johnson) They will have a tree buffer. No  
8           question.

9           Q     They will have lost some of their tree buffer.

10          A     (Johnson) As Mr. Bowes mentioned earlier, that  
11          could be selected trees, but there will still be  
12          a 20 to 40-foot tree buffer in their front  
13          property as it leads up to the right-of-way.

14          Q     So, wait. I'm a little confused because we just  
15          had a conversation, and you said that some of  
16          that tree buffer is definitely getting removed,  
17          I thought Mr. Bowes said.

18          A     (Bowes) Selected trees would be, yes.

19          A     (Johnson) We're talking five to ten trees at  
20          max.

21          Q     And from this picture, you can't really tell  
22          whether these trees that we're looking at are  
23          part of that five to ten feet because depending  
24          on where the trunk of those trees are, they

1           could be losing some of them.

2       A     (Johnson) That's correct. That's why Mr. Bowes  
3           said there could be one or two selective trees.  
4           Otherwise, it would be tree trimming, selective  
5           branches.

6       Q     All right. Next, please.

7                     This is an area I want to talk about next  
8           which is Turtle Pond. And I assume that some of  
9           the panel is familiar with the Turtle Pond area?

10      A     (Johnson) Yes.

11      A     (Bradstreet) Yes.

12      Q     Probably most of you? Except Mr. Scott maybe.

13      A     (Scott) No.

14      Q     Can you go to the next slide?

15                     So this is property that's on Oak Hill  
16           Road, and this particular location where it says  
17           8048, that doesn't show any house there, does  
18           it?

19      A     (Bradstreet) It does not, but I do know there is  
20           a house there.

21      Q     There is a house there. Yeah. So this map that  
22           you provided to the Site Evaluation Committee,  
23           though, does not show the house, and it shows  
24           some of the poles that are going to be relocated

1 and also introduced in this area so P145-134,  
2 that is a 115 pole that's currently pretty close  
3 to Oak Hill Road, and that's getting relocated,  
4 I believe you now know, closer to the person's  
5 home; is that right?

6 A (Bradstreet) It looks that way, yes.

7 Q And how many feet is that coming closer to the  
8 home? How many feet is that getting moved?

9 A (Johnson) Which structure are we talking about?

10 Q P145-134.

11 A (Johnson) About 130 feet.

12 Q Okay. And then we have P145-135 which is also  
13 getting moved closer to the home. Is that  
14 right?

15 A (Bradstreet) It looks that way, yes.

16 Q And then 313-112 is the 345 line structure  
17 that's on that property as well as the 3132-111?

18 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

19 Q Can you go to the next page?

20 So this is the wetlands map, and this was  
21 provided in, I believe, 2016. So this was  
22 provided February 2016. This also does not show  
23 the home? Right?

24 A (Bradstreet) It does not.

1 Q And, again, since this time you've submitted new  
2 maps to the Site Evaluation Committee but none  
3 of the maps you've submitted show the home, do  
4 they?

5 A (Bradstreet) They do not.

6 Q Okay. And they're actually, the driveway, see  
7 the access road on this wetlands map?

8 A (Bradstreet) Up Oak Hill Road?

9 Q Yes.

10 A (Bradstreet)

11 Q The access road? That's actually their  
12 driveway, isn't it?

13 A (Bradstreet) I believe so.

14 Q Okay. Can you go to the next slide?

15 And this is, it's kind of far away but that  
16 shows the home and the access road that you're  
17 planning to use part of, and that home is the  
18 one that we were talking about is on that  
19 property, right?

20 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

21 Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

22 And that's a closer-up of the home. And,  
23 again, you can see the road that leads up to it  
24 that you'll be using.

1 A (Bradstreet) It appears it's a current access  
2 road for this corridor also.

3 Q Okay. And it's also their driveway.

4 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

5 Q And you're not planning to come to the City of  
6 Concord to talk to them about getting any sort  
7 of driveway permit for this temporary access  
8 road?

9 A (Bowes) Only if we work out an agreement with  
10 the town.

11 Q So only if you work out an agreement, and,  
12 otherwise, you're just going to be using it?

13 A (Bowes) Correct.

14 Q Next page?

15 A (Bowes) As we do today though.

16 Q Well, it's a little use, isn't it?

17 A It's for PSNH transmission, yes.

18 Q I think it would be fair to say that using it  
19 for a temporary access road for construction is  
20 a little different than occasional maintenance  
21 of the right-of-way. You would agree with that.

22 A (Bowes) We rebuild and reconnector lines today  
23 so it would be very similar to that. As you  
24 know, we're doing a project in Concord right



1 now.

2 Q Okay. Well, I will let the Committee, I will  
3 leave it to the Committee to put whatever weight  
4 they want on that statement.

5 Going to this next slide, this shows that  
6 the owners of the home we just looked at which  
7 is located at 87 Oak Hill Road, they actually  
8 got a Certificate of Occupancy on April 16th,  
9 2012. That's five years ago? Is that right?  
10 Somebody? Anyone?

11 A (Bradstreet) That's what the certificate shows.

12 Q So why isn't this house shown on any of your  
13 maps?

14 A (Bradstreet) I mean, the answer is, it's not in  
15 the data.

16 Q You submitted your Application in October of  
17 2015, right?

18 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

19 Q And now we're in May of 2017, and there's been  
20 lots of opportunities for maps to be submitted  
21 and none of them show this home. Is that right?

22 A (Bradstreet) I believe that's correct.

23 Q So when you say it's not in the data, what do  
24 you mean?

1 A (Bradstreet) The survey data used for the line  
2 design was acquired before April of 2012. The  
3 Project began years ago.

4 Q There have been opportunities, though, to  
5 provide updates to the Committee since then. A  
6 lot of work has been done, right?

7 A (Bradstreet) I can't say that there hasn't been  
8 opportunities, but the data is not there to  
9 provide right now.

10 Q So we're relying on outdated data; is that fair  
11 to say?

12 A (Bradstreet) I don't know if I would call it  
13 outdated.

14 Q Can you go to the next page?

15 Just looking again, and we're not going, I  
16 don't want to spend a lot of time on this, but  
17 in terms of the structures in the vicinity of  
18 this home, it's 134 to 136 are the structure  
19 numbers for the 115 line, and 111 and 112 for  
20 the 345 line. And I just want to look at the  
21 heights of some of those structures on the next  
22 page.

23 So 134 to 136, the current heights of those  
24 are about 43 feet to 45.5 feet, and the proposed

1 heights of those go from 120 feet to 79. Right?

2 A (Bradstreet) That looks correct.

3 Q And 134, that's the one that you said was  
4 coming, what did you say? 100 feet closer to  
5 the home?

6 A (Bradstreet) I think I said, yes, around 100  
7 feet.

8 Q Around 100 feet. And it's going to be 120 feet  
9 tall. That's one of the taller size structures  
10 in Concord, isn't it?

11 A (Bradstreet) In the specific area, it is, yes.

12 Q Okay. And then for the 3132 line, those are  
13 going to be 80 to 100 feet tall?

14 A (Bradstreet) Looks correct.

15 Q All right.

16 A (Bradstreet) The existing -- I guess, can I  
17 point out one thing?

18 Q Sure.

19 A (Bradstreet) The existing line that's not being  
20 relocated is similar in height. It's not 120  
21 feet probably, but it's similar in height to the  
22 relocated 115 just as a data point.

23 Q I don't know what you mean by similar in height.  
24 120? I don't think anything out there is 120

1 feet, right?

2 A (Bradstreet) But the rest of it is 88, 79, 79,  
3 88.

4 Q That's a big difference between 88 and 120 feet,  
5 you'd agree?

6 A (Bradstreet) There's a difference, yes.

7 Q Okay. In fact, the current height of the 134 is  
8 45 feet and that's almost the difference. I'm  
9 not going to try to do math, but --

10 A (Bradstreet) I'm talking about the existing line  
11 that we're not rebuilding as part of the Project  
12 that's in the same corridor.

13 Q Right. And that's about 75, 80 feet height for  
14 some of those structures?

15 A (Bradstreet) Some of them could be taller. Some  
16 of them could be shorter.

17 Q And you don't have any specific heights as you  
18 sit here right now to show that any of them are  
19 taller than 80 feet.

20 A (Bradstreet) I believe we provided all of the  
21 existing structure heights as a data request.

22 Q You did not. You provided the ones that were  
23 getting relocated and the new ones.

24 A (Bradstreet) I may have misspoke.

1 Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

2 This I want to just talk about is an area  
3 near Jennifer Drive, and it's a housing  
4 development which is along Turtle Pond. Is  
5 anybody here familiar with the Jennifer Drive  
6 area?

7 A (Johnson) Yes.

8 A (Bowes) Yes.

9 Q And this also shows some tree buffer getting  
10 removed. And that's in blue and it's hard to  
11 see, but it's the green dotted line. Can you  
12 see that?

13 A (Bradstreet) Yes, I believe so. Yes. What  
14 where his hand is, yes.

15 Q Okay. Where the hand is, that's the tree buffer  
16 getting removed. Can you go to the next slide?

17 So there's two blue circles on this one.  
18 The one lower is more of the Jennifer Drive  
19 area, and it shows more of the tree buffer  
20 that's proposed to be removed, do you see that?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And then the other blue circle is for map block  
23 lot number 118-2-3. Are you aware whether  
24 there's a house there now?

1 A (Bradstreet) I believe there is.

2 Q And that's also not shown on this map, right?

3 A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

4 Q And it's a big house, isn't it?

5 A (Bradstreet) I don't know the specifics of the  
6 house.

7 Q Okay. We'll look and find out. Can you go to  
8 the next page?

9 So here we show, the two things on this is  
10 this is a satellite image of the property. But  
11 one of it shows the tree buffer, and that's in  
12 the same vicinity as on the wetlands map, the  
13 trees that we're going to get removed. And can  
14 you tell from what you're looking at whether or  
15 not that existing tree buffer between the homes  
16 and the corridor that we're looking at in the  
17 blue oval circle is going to get removed?

18 A (Bowes) For the Jennifer Drive would be trimming  
19 only.

20 Q And when you say trimming, what do you mean?

21 A (Bowes) Means that side of the area would need  
22 some trimming if the trees were tall enough to  
23 get into the wires.

24 Q So that means they're going to get cut, right?

1 A (Bowes) Trimmed, yes.

2 Q Maybe I'm not understanding the difference  
3 between trimmed and cut, but --

4 A (Bowes) Okay. So maybe I can clear it up.  
5 Doesn't appear to be any trees to be removed.  
6 Just branches.

7 Q Okay. But you can't tell, or can you, whether  
8 or not the base of any of those trees are going  
9 to get cut?

10 A (Bowes) It doesn't appear that the base or trunk  
11 of any trees will be cut.

12 Q When you say it doesn't appear, does that mean  
13 yes or no or maybe?

14 A (Bowes) Based on what I see on the One Touch  
15 screen, I would say none of the trunks will be  
16 removed.

17 Q Because some of these people may want a firm  
18 commitment one way or another as to whether or  
19 not their trees are getting removed, right?

20 A (Bowes) I would think they would, yes.

21 Q Okay. Going to the next circle, that's the  
22 house we talked about on Appleton Street, and  
23 that was not shown on the map?

24 A (Bradstreet) It was not.

1 Q Can we go to the next page? This is the  
2 Certificate of Occupancy for that home, and that  
3 was from August 14th, 2012. Also another home  
4 that was built about five years ago.

5 A (Bradstreet) Looks that way, yes.

6 Q And again, another home that's not shown on the  
7 maps.

8 A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

9 Q Next page. And actually before we go, we were  
10 talking about the size of that house. That's a  
11 3,918 square foot single family dwelling and a  
12 carriage house, right?

13 A (Bradstreet) That's what the Certificate says.

14 Q So when I mentioned it was a big house, 4000  
15 square feet, that's pretty big house?

16 A (Bradstreet) It's larger than mine.

17 Q Mine, too. All right.

18 Next page.

19 I just want to briefly review the poles and  
20 what's going on in the vicinity of Jennifer  
21 Drive and Appleton Street. So those poles, the  
22 145, the poles that we're looking at are 127 to  
23 132, and they're coming closer to the homes on  
24 Jennifer Drive. Right?



1 A (Bradstreet) It looks that way, yes.

2 Q And then the yellow line shows the 345 line and  
3 that's 114 to 117 are the structure numbers?

4 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

5 Q Can you go to the next page?

6 So we looked at what information you  
7 provided which was the current heights of the  
8 115 line, and those range from 43 feet as tall  
9 as 61, and the heights that we're looking at for  
10 the new structures that are coming closer to  
11 Jennifer Drive are going to be between 79, 88  
12 and as tall as 105 for the 115 line?

13 A (Bradstreet) Looks like 101.5 but yes.

14 Q 101.5. Thanks. Sorry. So some of those  
15 structures are going to be twice as tall, right?

16 A (Bradstreet) Looks that way, yes.

17 Q And then for the 3132 line, they range from 95  
18 feet to 110 feet?

19 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

20 Q And the 117, 3132-117, the one that's 110 feet,  
21 that's a structure that's going to be located  
22 near Appleton Street?

23 A (Bradstreet) I believe that was right, yes.

24 Q And so people driving back and forth to their

1 homes on Appleton Street will be able to see  
2 that 110-foot structure pretty visibly, right?

3 A (Bradstreet) I don't know how visible it will  
4 be, but it will be 110 feet close to Appleton  
5 Street.

6 Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

7 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik,  
8 any time in the next ten minutes.

9 MS. PACIK: It looks like we're moving  
10 along to the area near the Wal-Mart super center  
11 so if you'd like to take a break now, it's fine.

12 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: That's any  
13 time in the next ten minutes. That works for  
14 me. So we'll come back in 10 to 15 minutes.

15 (Recess taken 2:38 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.)

16 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik,  
17 you may continue.

18 BY MS. PACIK:

19 Q Thank you. The slide that we're looking at now  
20 continues down the right-of-way corridor south,  
21 and the area that I want to focus on with you is  
22 the vicinity of Portsmouth Street and Interstate  
23 393.

24 Can you turn to the next slide, please?

1           So this is a route map that you provided,  
2           and the red box shows the area of Portsmouth  
3           Street. And do you see where it says 8140 and  
4           this is probably for Mr. Bradstreet also and  
5           Mr. Bowes because it's a construction question,  
6           but 8140 is the vicinity, and you see the four  
7           yellow dots. Those are four homes, right?

8           A     (Bradstreet) I see the dots, yes.

9           Q     Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

10           So what I want to talk about first in this  
11           area is you can see the four homes that we were  
12           just looking at, and there's a tree buffer  
13           currently that's circled in red. And are you  
14           familiar with this tree buffer?

15           A     (Bradstreet) Yes. I guess, specifically what?

16           Q     The question is there's been some questions  
17           we've had in discovery about this tree buffer.  
18           Are you aware that there's an agreement with  
19           Unitil that they are not allowed to remove this  
20           tree buffer?

21           A     (Bowes) I do believe something came up in the  
22           tech sessions about this.

23           Q     Okay. Can you turn the next slide?

24           Whoa. Odd color. Okay. So the reason it

1           may have come up is this is a more recent  
2           satellite image, and you can see some of the  
3           construction activities going on, and that's for  
4           the Unitil substation for one of their  
5           Reliability Projects. And you're familiar with  
6           that construction over there, right?

7           A     (Bradstreet) I am, yes.

8           Q     Okay. So as part of the land negotiations to  
9           allow Unitil to have the substation in that  
10          vicinity, one requirement was that they retain  
11          that tree buffer by the homes on Portsmouth  
12          Street, and you can see in this where it's not  
13          during foliage the size of that tree buffer,  
14          right?

15          A     (Bowes) Yes.

16          Q     Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

17                 So the house closest to the tree buffer is  
18          253 Portsmouth Street, and according to the  
19          information provided by Mr. Chalmers, the house  
20          is 98.2 feet away from the right-of-way. Does  
21          that look correct?

22          A     (Bradstreet) Looks correct, yes.

23          Q     Can you turn to the next slide?

24                 This is a picture of the home, and you can

1 see the tree buffer behind the house. Do you  
2 know which of these trees are getting removed?

3 A (Bowes) We've lost the signal again.

4 Q Maybe if Dawn walks across the room again.

5 Thanks, Dawn. There it is. Magic. Amazing.

6 Thank you, Dawn.

7 All right. So now that you can see the  
8 trees, do you know which ones of those are going  
9 to be removed?

10 A (Bowes) So it looks like from what I'm looking  
11 at One Touch, the ones on the far right-hand  
12 side, the largest trees?

13 Q Yes.

14 A (Bowes) The two pine trees or two or three pine  
15 trees, that grove, that cluster, would come  
16 down. The remaining ones would be trimmed only.

17 Q And behind that cluster of trees, you can  
18 actually see one of the current structures,  
19 right?

20 A (Bowes) Yes, you can.

21 Q And that's the 115 line?

22 A (Bowes) Yes.

23 Q So that structure will be more visible once you  
24 remove those trees; is that fair to say?

1 A (Bowes) I think that structure gets replaced,  
2 but the new structure would be more visible.

3 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next side? This was  
4 the question when we had -- you probably are  
5 familiar with the tree buffer because we  
6 actually asked a data request about it, and what  
7 we asked was what part of the existing tree  
8 buffer will be removed, and you said you're not  
9 going to remove the entire tree buffer, but some  
10 vegetation clearing is required. So we weren't  
11 really clear from that answer what part was  
12 going to get removed, but what you're saying  
13 today is that just the trees that you identified  
14 a moment ago are going to get removed?

15 A (Bowes) From my view of the screen, that's what  
16 I think, yes.

17 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide? So this  
18 is the wetlands map that you provided as part of  
19 the Application, and if you zoom in, it shows  
20 the tree buffer again that's going to get  
21 removed, and it's the, again, it's hard to see  
22 because it's in the green dot, but you can see  
23 that kind of half of that tree and then going  
24 forward is going to get removed, and then

1           there's an area along Portsmouth Street, and  
2           Steven's going to move the mouse over there.  
3           That's all tree buffer that's also getting  
4           removed; is that correct?

5           A     (Bowes) Yes.

6           Q     And the pole that you said is going to get  
7           relocated, that's P145-101?

8           A     (Bowes) Yes.

9           Q     And then 3132-135 is also a new structure for  
10          the 345 line that's getting put in that area?

11          A     (Bradstreet) Yes.

12          Q     Okay. Can you turn the next slide?

13                 So going back to the route map and the  
14          structures in that location, I want to focus a  
15          little bit on the structures and the crossing of  
16          393 now, and that's what's shown in the red box.  
17          And 393, there's actually a bridge that goes  
18          over Portsmouth Street, right?

19          A     (Bradstreet) Correct.

20          Q     So the numbers that you can see P145-101 and  
21          P145-100, those are on each side of Interstate  
22          393 and on each side of that bridge, right?

23          A     (Bradstreet) Yes. Not sure where the bridge  
24          begins and ends, but yes.

1 Q The bridge is over Portsmouth Street.

2 A (Bradstreet) Okay.

3 Q So 101 and 100 are the two that are on each side  
4 of 393 and that's the P145 existing line. And  
5 then 3132-136 and 3132-135 are the new  
6 structures that would be put in that vicinity on  
7 each side of Interstate 393, right?

8 A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

9 Q Can you turn to the next slide? So according to  
10 the original information that you provided with  
11 your Application, the P145-101 line which I  
12 think is the structure that, that structure is  
13 the one that you said would become more visible,  
14 right, after you remove the tree?

15 A (Bowes) Yes.

16 Q Okay. And that's actually going to be 120 feet  
17 is what it was proposed originally, and I  
18 understand that things have changed, but  
19 originally it was 120 or 119.5?

20 A (Bowes) Yes.

21 Q And it's currently, the 101 is 47.5 feet?

22 A (Bradstreet) I think -- that's what I was just  
23 asking Sam about. I think that is incorrect. I  
24 believe the existing structure I had circled



1           though is closer to 75 feet.

2           A     (Johnson) If I might clarify, the reference to  
3           the existing P145-100 is farther down the line.  
4           Because we're removing some of these structures,  
5           this is actually structure P145-105 and 104  
6           which are both in the 70 to 75-foot range as we  
7           cross over the highway.

8           Q     But if you turn back to the slide before, that's  
9           not what was shown on the map, is it?

10          A     (Bradstreet) I don't think we've numbered the  
11          existing structures to be removed. Those maps  
12          only number the proposed structures. If we  
13          numbered everything, it would be illegible.

14          Q     So that white box that has a square in it that's  
15          in between 3132-135 and P145-101, that's not  
16          P145-101; is that what you're saying?

17          A     (Bradstreet) That's correct.

18          Q     You're saying that's P145-105?

19          A     (Johnson) That's correct. And 104 on the  
20          opposite side.

21          Q     And you think that they're how tall?

22          A     (Bradstreet) I believe one's 74 and a half. Is  
23          the other one 70? So 74 and a half nearest to  
24          P145-101 proposed and 70 foot for the one that's

1 closest to the P145-100 proposed.

2 Q Okay. So when we were looking at that structure  
3 behind the tree it was 74.5 feet.

4 A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

5 Q And currently, it was proposed according to this  
6 route map to be 119.5 originally?

7 A (Bradstreet) That's what it said, yes.

8 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

9 And just before we move on, 3132-135 and  
10 136 which were the other two, the 345 line on  
11 each side of Interstate 393, were originally  
12 proposed to be 105 and 115, right?

13 A (Bradstreet) I guess originally. What are you  
14 referring to as originally?

15 Q According to this plan that you originally  
16 submitted to the Site Evaluation Committee, that  
17 was what was proposed to be the height?

18 A (Bradstreet) The current proposed heights are  
19 105 and 115.

20 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

21 So we've had some communication, this is an  
22 email that I had with legal counsel for  
23 Eversource on what the current plan is for these  
24 structures based on communications with the

1 Department of Transportation. And the  
2 information that we received was 3132-135 and  
3 3132-136, which are the two on each side of  
4 Interstate 393, are now proposed to be 160 feet  
5 tall. Is that right?

6 A (Bradstreet) I guess -- I'll let Sam answer.

7 A (Johnson) The answer is no. The Application is  
8 still the same at 115 and 105. If you read the  
9 first sentence, it says two plan drawings  
10 showing possible design variations. So the DOT  
11 has approached us, and if you refer to one of  
12 the conditions that are in their SEC letter, it  
13 discusses that they do not want lines to be  
14 built over abutments of bridges so that when  
15 they do maintenance activities in the future,  
16 that there is no restrictions as far as overhead  
17 lines or overhead encumbrances, if you will. As  
18 you noted earlier, the existing lines go right  
19 over those abutments on -- is it Portsmouth  
20 Road?

21 And so what the DOT has asked us to do is  
22 to provide a couple plans of what are  
23 possibilities that could be done in the future.  
24 And as you know, we are still going through the

1 negotiations, if you will, with the DOT. This  
2 is one of the areas that is still under  
3 development with them. It's not only  
4 underground stuff. It's also overhead stuff  
5 that we're continuing to work with them on. But  
6 these have not been determined or have not been  
7 directed yet in any way by the Department of  
8 Transportation.

9 Q Okay. So you said that DOT asked for some  
10 proposals, and one of the proposals that you  
11 gave them, though, was to have 3132-135 and 136  
12 be 160 feet tall. Was there another proposal  
13 that you gave them that we haven't been informed  
14 about?

15 A (Johnson) At this time, no. We did look at  
16 other possibilities in obtaining different land  
17 rights, et cetera, but the DOT and ourselves  
18 also agreed that it would be rather difficult to  
19 do at this time.

20 Q Okay. So the only proposal out there then is  
21 the 160-foot-tall structures going over 393?

22 A (Johnson) That is correct.

23 Q And it hasn't been finalized, but at this point,  
24 the original proposed heights that were shown in

1 the Application, DOT is not going to approve  
2 that, right?

3 A (Johnson) They may. Again, we can seek a  
4 variance request and move forward.

5 Q Have you sought a variance request yet?

6 A (Johnson) It's under development right now.

7 Q Then currently, though, what you've proposed in  
8 response to their request was 160 feet for 135  
9 and 136, and then for the P145 lines, you've  
10 proposed to have both of those be 120 feet tall.

11 A (Johnson) Consistent with what they are today,  
12 yes.

13 Q And in addition to having the two structures for  
14 3132 be 160 feet tall, those also are going to  
15 need to have lights on them, right?

16 A (Bradstreet) I do not believe so.

17 A (Johnson) Not to my knowledge.

18 A (Bradstreet) Not to my knowledge.

19 Q They're not going to have to have red lights on  
20 them for the airport?

21 A (Johnson) Lights are only required when you're  
22 in the approach zones to runways.

23 A (Bradstreet) Or if they exceed 200 feet.

24 Q So they'll be 160 feet without lights under this

1 proposal?

2 A (Bradstreet) I believe so. Yes.

3 Q And this would be the tallest structure by far  
4 that you're proposing in Concord, right?

5 A (Bradstreet) They would be the tallest structure  
6 in Concord, and it would also be the tallest  
7 structure on the Project.

8 Q Okay. And this is right at 393, and it's also  
9 right near what we call the Gateway Performance  
10 District; is that right?

11 A (Bradstreet) It's in the vicinity, yes.

12 Q Can you turn to the next page?

13 I guess before we continue, when are we  
14 going to know what the plan is?

15 A (Bowes) So what we filed with the SEC is our  
16 current plan. If the DOT changes that, then  
17 that will be a revision.

18 Q And so are we going to come back here? Is that  
19 the plan? To have another day to discuss it?

20 A (Bowes) I'm not sure that that's part of the  
21 process, but that's for the lawyers to decide.

22 Q Okay. So this is the photograph that was  
23 provided to the City of Concord by counsel for  
24 Eversource which shows, and I circled them in

1 red, the lines that we're talking about. The  
2 current P145 line and where the proposed  
3 locations are that have been provided to DOT and  
4 also the structures for the 345 line going over  
5 393.

6 Can you turn to the next page? Can you go  
7 back?

8 The date on this was October 19th, 2016,  
9 right?

10 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

11 Q And so this has not yet been submitted, though,  
12 to the Site Evaluation Committee?

13 A (Johnson) It is not part of our proposed  
14 Application. So the answer is no, it is not.

15 Q Okay. But it is a proposal to the DOT.

16 A (Johnson) It is a conceptual drawing as was  
17 requested from us.

18 Q Okay. And it's the only conceptual drawing that  
19 you provided to the DOT?

20 A (Johnson) That is correct. This set of  
21 drawings.

22 Q Can you turn the next page?

23 And I don't want to spend a lot of time  
24 talking about this, but this shows that for

1 the --

2 Can you zoom in? There we go.

3 This shows the heights of some of the  
4 structures that are proposed. And for the 145,  
5 it says the height is 115 for each, but it  
6 actually is proposed to be 120. Is that right?

7 A (Bradstreet) I'm assuming if this shows 115 it's  
8 proposed to be 115.

9 Q Do you know why it says 115 if the email said  
10 120?

11 A (Bradstreet) I believe the email said  
12 approximately 120.

13 Q Oh, okay.

14 Next page, please.

15 And this is for the 3132 line and this  
16 height says 155. The email said 160, although  
17 it doesn't look like the pole goes all the way  
18 to the ground so that could be the extra five  
19 feet, is that right?

20 A (Bradstreet) So at the bottom of the information  
21 that's circled in red, it says height  
22 adjustment. So it's 155-foot structure with a  
23 ten-foot height adjustment.

24 Q What's that mean?



1 A (Bradstreet) That means the total structure  
2 height would be 165.

3 Q So 165 from the ground?

4 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

5 Q Okay. Next page, please.

6 Are you familiar with -- Unitil addressed  
7 the same issue with DOT getting over the bridge.  
8 Are you familiar with that?

9 A (Bradstreet) I'm aware that they've been working  
10 with the DOT to work on that project. I don't  
11 know the specific details.

12 Q Have you talked to them or asked them to get any  
13 of their plans so you could see how they address  
14 the issue?

15 A (Bradstreet) I have not been asked to do that.

16 Q Okay. So I'll represent to you, with the  
17 understanding that you have not seen this  
18 before, that they originally were looking at  
19 having poles go over the bridge which is the red  
20 lines, and, ultimately, what they proposed and  
21 agreed upon with DOT was to move the lines away  
22 from the bridge in order to have the poles or it  
23 resulted in the poles being lower. And you can  
24 see that the current proposal that they're

1 building right now is no longer over the bridge.  
2 Do you see that?

3 A (Bradstreet) It appears that way, yes.

4 Q Okay. So Unitil was actually able to work with  
5 DOT and gave them a proposal that avoided going  
6 over the bridge. Is that correct?

7 A (Bradstreet) It appears they had to purchase  
8 easement to do that, yes.

9 Q Do you know whether they actually had to pay any  
10 money for that easement?

11 A (Bradstreet) It's none of my business.

12 Q Okay. Have you talked to -- who did they obtain  
13 the easement from, are you aware?

14 A (Bradstreet) I'm not, I don't know if Ken maybe.  
15 I don't know.

16 A (Bowes) I do not know.

17 Q You're not aware that they worked with the owner  
18 of Alton Woods to be able to use some of the  
19 land and get an easement at Alton Woods?

20 A (Bradstreet) I did not, no.

21 Q Have you reached out to Alton Woods or anyone  
22 here to talk to Alton Woods about whether or not  
23 you could similarly put the lines over there by  
24 Alton Woods and move it?

1 A (Johnson) We have not.

2 Q Okay. And that would be a phone call that would  
3 need to be made, right?

4 A (Bradstreet) That's an option.

5 Q Okay. An option that has not been pursued?

6 A (Bradstreet) Not that I'm aware.

7 Q Can you go to the next page?

8 This is a closeup, well, little too close  
9 maybe. All right. There is a crossing view,  
10 and this again shows how Unitil got away from  
11 the bridge and worked with both DOT and the  
12 owners of Alton Woods to get the lines to the  
13 vicinity where you're looking to get to without  
14 going over the bridge and having 160-foot-tall  
15 structures. Right? You see that?

16 A (Bradstreet) I see it.

17 Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

18 And these are the heights of the structures  
19 that Unitil will be having. And I'll just maybe  
20 zoom in on some of the yellow circles that I put  
21 on this plan. But you can see that the pole  
22 heights that Unitil is proposing are, the first  
23 one is 59 feet above grade. The second one on  
24 the other side is 65 feet above grade. And

1 going along, there's a couple, one's 50 feet, 65  
2 feet, and then the last two that they're looking  
3 at are 59 feet and 65 feet. Do you see that?

4 A (Bradstreet) I do see that.

5 Q Are you aware that they were originally, if they  
6 had been over 393, the poles would have had to  
7 be 130 feet tall?

8 A (Bradstreet) Was not aware.

9 Q So they were able to drastically reduce the  
10 heights by working with the owners; is that fair  
11 to say?

12 A (Bradstreet) I believe they were looking for  
13 right-of-way but yes.

14 Q Seems like a reasonable way to deal with the  
15 situation is to call the owners of Alton Woods  
16 and see if they would be amenable to working  
17 with the utility company to get over 393, right?

18 A (Bradstreet) If you're looking for right-of-way.

19 Q And you're not looking for right-of-way?

20 A (Bradstreet) The Project as proposed is in an  
21 existing corridor.

22 Q So the Project is refusing to look at anything  
23 outside the right-of-way, even if it means  
24 reducing pole heights from 160 feet; is that

1 what you're saying?

2 A (Bradstreet) No. That's not what I'm saying.

3 Q Well, they are willing to?

4 A (Bowes) Yes.

5 Q But yet you have not made any efforts as of  
6 today to reach out to the owners of Alton Woods?

7 A (Bowes) That is correct.

8 Q Okay. This is the area near Alton Woods, and we  
9 did look at this last week so we're not going to  
10 spend a lot of time reviewing these particular  
11 plans, but this is the vicinity I just want to  
12 focus on for a moment.

13 Can you turn to the next page?

14 This is the wetland maps and I just had a  
15 couple questions about the proposal on this  
16 particular map, and I understand that the height  
17 of the structures are changing, but if you look  
18 at 3132-137, do you see that construction pad?

19 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

20 Q We lost it. There it is.

21 That construction pad, that's right over  
22 one of their roads that they use to get to a  
23 cell phone tower. Is that right?

24 A (Bradstreet) I believe that's correct.

1 Q So, and then P145-98. Do you see that  
2 construction pad?

3 A (Bradstreet) I do.

4 Q And that construction pad, that's right on top  
5 of where their playground is, isn't it?

6 A (Bradstreet) I can't tell from this, but if you  
7 say it is.

8 Q Did you ever go out to the site to look to see  
9 maybe what was underneath that proposed  
10 structure?

11 A (Johnson) Yes. We met with Alton Woods back in  
12 2014 and reviewed structure locations with them.

13 Q But since you've submitted these plans, you  
14 haven't met with Alton Woods, have you?

15 A (Johnson) No. Nor have they requested.

16 Q So they'd actually have to call you and say,  
17 hey, what are the final plans that you decided  
18 on to know that they're having a construction  
19 pad over one of their access roads and on top of  
20 their playground?

21 A (Johnson) The plans didn't change from our  
22 meeting.

23 Q You haven't actually sent anyone that's along  
24 the right-of-way the plans, though, that we're

1 looking at, have you?

2 A (Johnson) We sent them a notification that the  
3 plans had been filed, and we showed them the  
4 location of where those plans were.

5 Q Okay. So any property owner would have to know  
6 to go through the Application and dig through.  
7 Did you give them a link to where the wetland  
8 maps are for each particular location?

9 A (Johnson) I don't know. I'd have to go back and  
10 look.

11 Q Okay.

12 A (Johnson) But we certainly notified them that  
13 these plans were available.

14 Q Okay. So they would have had to go to the site  
15 and find the plans?

16 A (Johnson) Um-um.

17 Q Okay.

18 A (Bradstreet) One thing before we leave this,  
19 3132-137 is a good example of an improvement we  
20 could make working with the landowner. If we  
21 were to shift that pad or potentially shift the  
22 structure somewhat, we might have some  
23 flexibility to adjust it so it doesn't impact  
24 that road.

1 Q But when you did this plan, you could see it  
2 went right over the access road, but you still  
3 put the construction pad in that location,  
4 right?

5 A (Bradstreet) Right now it is. Yes.

6 Q Same thing with the playground?

7 A (Bradstreet) I don't see a playground, but --

8 Q Okay.

9 Can you turn the next page?

10 So moving southerly, I want to talk about a  
11 location after of Old Loudon Road, kind of near  
12 Loudon Road.

13 Can you turn to the next page?

14 And this is the property that I want to  
15 look at, and the house number in red that we're  
16 looking at is 5 and 7 Old Loudon Road. Are you  
17 familiar with this particular location, Mr.  
18 Bradstreet?

19 A (Bradstreet) Yes, I am.

20 Q So can you turn to the next?

21 You can see currently there's a tree buffer  
22 behind and around the people's home. Do you see  
23 that?

24 A (Bradstreet) I see trees adjacent to the



1 distribution line. Yes.

2 Q And there's actually a tree in somebody's front  
3 yard. Do you see that? I think we can get the  
4 mouse to point to it for you. There we go. You  
5 see that tree right there?

6 A (Bradstreet) I see a tree, yes.

7 Q Okay. Can you turn the next page?

8 So I want to look at the wetlands map  
9 because it shows some of the tree buffers that  
10 are getting removed. And so, basically, the  
11 buffer that we just looked at around these  
12 people's home, that's getting removed; do you  
13 see that?

14 A (Bradstreet) I see proposed tree clearing.

15 Q Okay. And so the majority of the buffer that's  
16 between their house and the right-of-way  
17 corridor will be removed; is that correct?

18 A (Bradstreet) There will be clearing, yes.

19 Q And then remember we looked at the tree just now  
20 in their front yard? Do you see that tree  
21 buffer removal right there? Do you know what  
22 that's for?

23 A (Bradstreet) Vegetation. I don't know if it's  
24 that specific tree.

1 A (Bowes) That would be trimming, not removal.

2 Q Have you been to this house?

3 A (Bradstreet) Not in a long time.

4 A (Bowes) No, I haven't.

5 Q Did you know that that's their tree in their  
6 front yard?

7 A (Bradstreet) I would assume it's their tree,  
8 yes.

9 Q Okay. Let's go to the next slide.

10 So the buffer, this is a Google Earth  
11 street view, but that showed the buffer that you  
12 said was going to get removed, right?

13 A (Bradstreet) Part of that will have some tree  
14 clearing, yes.

15 Q When you say part of it, which part are you  
16 talking about?

17 A (Bowes) Looks like the part directly under the  
18 lines.

19 Q The large part then? Would that be fair to say?

20 A (Bowes) Based on this angle, it's hard to tell,  
21 but I think there is substantial removals within  
22 the right-of-way, yes. Normally the buffer is  
23 outside the right-of-way.

24 Q Okay.

1 A (Bowes) All removals in this case are inside the  
2 right-of-way.

3 Q Right, but it's property they own, and it's  
4 currently blocking their view of the line,  
5 right?

6 A (Bowes) As we've done with other projects, this  
7 Project will during the construction phase look  
8 to replace vegetative screening and working with  
9 the landowner.

10 Q There's some mature trees, though, that are  
11 getting removed? Is that correct?

12 A (Bowes) Yes.

13 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next page?

14 There's their tree. So I'm a little  
15 confused. You're removing that tree according  
16 to the wetlands map, correct?

17 A (Bowes) I think we said we were trimming that  
18 tree.

19 Q Well, what do you mean by trimming it? Are you  
20 going to cut the top of the tree off?

21 A (Bowes) With a trained arborist, we would go out  
22 and assess the height and growth of the tree and  
23 remove branches.

24 Q But you don't know whether the entire tree is

1 going to come down.

2 A (Bowes) It is not.

3 Q And you don't know how much of the tree is going  
4 to come down.

5 A (Bowes) Maybe I should qualify. It is not for  
6 the transmission project. Obviously, it's  
7 growing into the distribution right-of-way here.

8 Q Well, it's on, you haven't cut it yet, right?  
9 It's still there.

10 A (Bowes) All I'm speaking to is the transmission  
11 portion. At some point it's going to be into  
12 the distribution line as well which is what  
13 we're seeing here.

14 Q Okay. Well, according to your wetlands map, it  
15 looks like the entire tree is coming down.

16 A (Bowes) That's not accurate.

17 Q Okay. And so part of it is.

18 A (Bowes) Trimming, yes.

19 Q Trimming. Okay.

20 Can you turn the next page?

21 Before we go on, has anyone reached out to  
22 that property owner and talked to them about the  
23 plans?

24 A (Johnson) I do not know.

1 Q Anyone know? I'll take that as a no. Okay.

2 The next set of plans I want to talk about  
3 are McKenna's Purchase and the tree buffer  
4 that's going to be removed there and the oval,  
5 McKenna's Purchase, first of all, are you  
6 familiar with that area?

7 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

8 Q And that's a condominium development in Concord?

9 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

10 Q And in the blue circle shows tree buffer to be  
11 removed. Right?

12 A (Bradstreet) The tree buffer indicator, the  
13 green dotted hashed line, I guess, is the area,  
14 not the entire blue circle, but yeah.

15 Q Right. My apologies. So the dotted green line  
16 within the blue circle is what is going to get  
17 removed?

18 A (Bradstreet) That's what's proposed, yes.

19 Q Is it still being proposed to be removed or has  
20 anything changed?

21 A (Bradstreet) I believe it's still being proposed  
22 to be removed.

23 Q Okay. And then that blue circle, before we move  
24 on, that doesn't -- and this is a fairly new

1 construction so I understand why it's not on the  
2 map, but that's a senior living facility? Are  
3 you familiar with that, that is being developed  
4 there right now?

5 A (Bradstreet) I'm not. I don't know if anybody  
6 else on the panel is.

7 A (Johnson) I'm aware of the development. I  
8 didn't know it was a senior facility.

9 Q Okay. So it would be fair to say there's a lot  
10 of residential properties on the map that we're  
11 looking at even though it's near a commercial  
12 zone; would you agree with that?

13 A (Bradstreet) There's definitely residential in  
14 this area.

15 Q Okay. So we asked in a discovery request what  
16 tree buffer abutting McKenna's Purchase would be  
17 cleared. And the response was that the buffer  
18 that exists, that runs along the western side of  
19 the transmission right-of-way will not be  
20 cleared but some localized clearing is planned  
21 near proposed structures 318-129 and 318-130.  
22 And that the limits, the clearing limits shown  
23 on the Project permit drawings, is slightly  
24 overstated in the area of McKenna's Purchase and

1 will be corrected. But at this point you just  
2 said it's not overstated and that it is correct.

3 A (Bradstreet) If this is the answer, I believe  
4 this answer is newer than the drawings. So I  
5 might be incorrect.

6 Q So how do I know? How do I find out?

7 A (Bradstreet) Go back to your drawing. Can you  
8 see the existing distribution line?

9 Q Sure.

10 A (Bradstreet) The existing distribution line  
11 should be the edge of the proposed clearing.

12 Q Which one is the existing distribution line?

13 A (Bradstreet) I don't know. I can't see it.

14 Q You can't see it on there?

15 A (Bradstreet) No.

16 Q Okay. But that does show tree clearing that's  
17 going to occur, and it's a little fuzzy, but if  
18 you look at the hand or the mouse, you can see  
19 it, right? Along the edge of the right-of-way?

20 A (Bradstreet) I can see what's flagged, but I  
21 think now that you've shown me that data request  
22 I remember looking at this, and there is a  
23 mistake on the drawing.

24 Q You know McKenna's Purchase is very concerned

1 about that tree buffer?

2 A (Bradstreet) Yes I do.

3 Q Okay. So it would probably be helpful for them  
4 to know what's going to be removed?

5 A (Bradstreet) I believe we're shown them very  
6 specific plans.

7 Q Can you turn to the next page?

8 So that the structures that you referenced  
9 are 318-129 and 318-130 right?

10 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

11 Q And you said that's where the clearing is going  
12 to occur?

13 A (Bradstreet) I believe that's where the select  
14 clearing will occur, yes.

15 Q Can you turn the next page?

16 So I was trying to find those two structure  
17 numbers on here and I could not find them  
18 anywhere. Do you see them?

19 A (Bradstreet) No, because the distribution line  
20 is not numbered. Or wait. Where is it at.  
21 Yeah. Two pinks dots. So if you look at your  
22 left circle, there's two pink dots. They're not  
23 numbered because it would clutter the drawing,  
24 but those are the two structures.



1 Q Okay. So that area is where there's going to be  
2 clearing?

3 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

4 Q And when you look at all the yellow circles  
5 along the edge of the right-of-way, those are  
6 all the homes, right?

7 A (Bradstreet) I believe those are the individual  
8 units, yes.

9 Q And so are any of the trees near those homes  
10 going to be removed?

11 A (Bradstreet) I don't believe, other than what  
12 we've indicated in the data request anything is  
13 going to be removed. There may be some  
14 clearing, some trimming that needs to be done.

15 Q You said in the data request that new plans were  
16 going to be submitted that clarified it. Have  
17 those plans been submitted yet?

18 A (Bradstreet) Not that I'm aware.

19 Q And we're now in trial, right? It's been a  
20 while since that data request was provided to  
21 us.

22 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

23 Q So no plans have been submitted. Are you  
24 planning on submitting new plans? Do you know?

1 A (Johnson) I believe we are at a  
2 yet-to-be-determined date.

3 Q Yeah, so I guess the question is when are they  
4 going to get provided?

5 A (Johnson) Some time in the future. It's not  
6 determined at this time.

7 Q Okay. Thanks. Can you go to the next page.  
8 Actually, we can skip that one. Thanks.

9 So these are more of the tree buffer which  
10 I don't think there's much point in going  
11 through so since we don't know what's going to  
12 get removed and we haven't received any plans  
13 yet, but that does show the thin tree buffer  
14 that we're looking at, right?

15 A (Bradstreet) It also shows the existing  
16 distribution line.

17 Q Yes.

18 A (Bradstreet) Which is why we would, based off of  
19 what we looked at with McKenna's Purchase is  
20 where we've looked at remaining buffer to  
21 remain, anything to the west of those two dots  
22 on the left side.

23 Q Okay. So we're going to need to clarify what  
24 two dots on the left side you're talking about.

1 A (Bradstreet) There's a dot next to U 58 and a  
2 dot next to U 70.

3 Q Okay. And those are getting removed? That tree  
4 buffer is going to stay or it's getting removed?

5 A (Bradstreet) Those structures are being  
6 relocated, and the tree buffer would remain.

7 Q So it will remain. And then what's getting  
8 removed? Everything above that green dot?

9 A (Bradstreet) No.

10 Q I'm sorry. That wasn't very clear, was it?  
11 When I say the green dot, it's the one that I  
12 have the mouse over.

13 A (Bradstreet) That buffer will still remain  
14 except for some vegetation that's near those  
15 proposed distribution structures that we just  
16 looked at on the previous drawing.

17 Q So the other distribution structures, are those  
18 at the top of this photograph where the mouse is  
19 right now near Shaw's?

20 A (Bradstreet) No.

21 Q Where are they? They're not shown on this?

22 A (Bradstreet) No.

23 Q Okay. So until we get new plans, we really  
24 don't know what's getting removed. Is that fair

1 to say?

2 A (Bradstreet) That's been summarized as the area  
3 near those two proposed structures which are  
4 shown on the Application drawings. I don't know  
5 what this drawing is from.

6 Q This is a GIS interest from the City of Concord  
7 which shows all utilities in Concord.

8 Okay. We can move on. Keep going.

9 A (Bowes) Actually, that last drawing we could  
10 probably show where the distribution line is.

11 Q Great. Let's go back to it.

12 So Mr. Bowes, you said that the tree buffer  
13 near the distribution line shown in this  
14 photograph is going to get removed. Where is  
15 it?

16 A (Bowes) So on the far left-hand side is the  
17 distribution circuit in the right-of-way, and  
18 you go towards where the top of the screen is,  
19 that's the area where there's going to be tree  
20 clearing.

21 A (Bradstreet) Underneath the lines.

22 A (Bowes) Right underneath that distribution area.

23 Q This area?

24 A (Bowes) Yes, right in through there.

1 Q So currently, the condominiums that you can see,  
2 they have a buffer between their homes and the  
3 distribution line, and you're going to be  
4 removing those trees?

5 A (Bradstreet) Directly under the line.

6 Q Okay. And have you been out there to see how  
7 thick those trees are? Because even though,  
8 I'll represent to you that even though it looks  
9 like it's a thick buffer right now, it's  
10 actually a very thin line of trees. Are you  
11 familiar with that?

12 A (Bowes) Yes, I am.

13 Q So have you gone out there to identify which  
14 trees are getting removed?

15 A (Bowes) Not specifically which trees, but I've  
16 been on the right-of-way, and I understand the  
17 general clearing that's going to be done. I  
18 have not been on the property to see what the  
19 view is.

20 Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

21 So there is an area off of Pembroke Road,  
22 and you can see in the red square that there's a  
23 home located near the right-of-way. Do you see  
24 that?

1 A (Bradstreet) I see the home yes.

2 Q Are you familiar with this home on Pembroke  
3 Road?

4 A (Bradstreet) Not specifically with this home, I  
5 don't believe.

6 Q Okay. This home is, it's 249 Pembroke Road.

7 Can you turn to the next page?

8 And this is the route map that you have of  
9 that vicinity, and it shows that the structure  
10 numbers closest to that home, it's actually  
11 P145-88. The 88 is over the yellow circle that  
12 is that person's home. Is that right?

13 A (Bradstreet) I believe so. Yes.

14 Q Okay. So P145-88 is getting moved closer to  
15 that home, right?

16 A (Bradstreet) Looks like somewhat, yes.

17 Q And then there's two other structures. C189-47  
18 and 3132-146, right?

19 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

20 Q And 3132-146 is the new 345 line. And then  
21 C189-47 is also a structure that's getting  
22 relocated?

23 A (Bradstreet) That's right.

24 Q To the other side of the line. Or the corridor?

1 A (Bradstreet) It's moving to the other edge, yes.

2 Q Okay. Can you turn the next page?

3 So the numbers that we just looked at,  
4 P145-88, that was the one that's getting moved  
5 closer to that person's home. And according to  
6 information you provided, it's currently 43  
7 feet, and it's going to be 110 feet when it gets  
8 moved, right?

9 A (Bradstreet) One second, please.

10 A (Bradstreet) So it looks like, again, because of  
11 the numbering, since we've changed structures,  
12 the existing structure number might not match  
13 exactly with the proposed structure number. So  
14 it looks like it's 47 and a half instead of 43.

15 Q Oh, okay. So it's 47 and a half and it's going  
16 to be 110 feet?

17 A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

18 Q And the Segment number is S1-8, and I'm a little  
19 confused because when I look at the Segment map  
20 which says S1-8, which is right here, it doesn't  
21 show anything getting relocated closer to the  
22 edge of the right-of-way, it doesn't show how  
23 many feet closer it's going to be. Is that  
24 wrong?

1 A (Bradstreet) Can you pan to the right a little  
2 bit? Yes. It looks like it might be in error.

3 Q So which map should I be looking at to figure it  
4 out? Because we know where 115 is coming closer  
5 to the home, but I'm not sure which segment  
6 illustrates that.

7 A (Bradstreet) You don't have the next sheet by  
8 chance, do you?

9 Q Probably not.

10 A (Bradstreet) I'd have to look and see if S1-9 is  
11 what it's supposed to be represented by, but  
12 without looking at it, I can't tell you. Looks  
13 like it's in error.

14 Q So do you know how many feet that 47 and a half  
15 115 line that's going to be 110 feet tall after  
16 you locate it, do you know how many feet closer  
17 to the home it's coming?

18 A (Bradstreet) Yes. One second. Ten feet.

19 Q Ten feet closer? Okay. And then we had looked  
20 at some of the heights of other poles in the  
21 vicinity of the home so the 3132-145 that you're  
22 putting in is also going to be 110 feet tall?

23 A (Bradstreet) I believe so. Yes.

24 Q And then the 31 -- sorry. The C189-47 is also



1 going to be 110 feet tall, right?

2 A (Bradstreet) Yes, it looks that way.

3 Q So this home is going to have be three 110-foot  
4 tall structures located next to it?

5 A (Bradstreet) Currently looks that way. Yes.

6 Q Can you turn to the next page?

7 This is the, this is the wetlands map, and  
8 it shows the proposed construction pads in the  
9 area circled in red, and you see the home, and  
10 it's close to the edge of the right-of-way,  
11 isn't it?

12 A (Bradstreet) What's that?

13 Q The home on --

14 A (Bradstreet) The parcel?

15 Q The actual home on 249 Pembroke Road. Do you  
16 see that?

17 A (Bradstreet) Yes. It looks like it's fairly  
18 close.

19 Q And then you've got the two construction pads,  
20 and how far away are the construction pads going  
21 to be from that home?

22 A (Bradstreet) One second. 70 feet.

23 Q 70 feet? Okay.

24 Can you turn the next page?

1           There's a picture of that home that we just  
2           determined is going to have three 110-foot  
3           structures located next to it, and there's going  
4           to be an access road going into that  
5           right-of-way, correct?

6   A    (Bradstreet) Yes.

7   Q    So some of those trees are going to get removed,  
8           but I assume not the mature ones in this  
9           person's front yard?

10  A    I believe those trees are on their property so  
11           let me double check. No removals.

12  Q    Can you turn to the next page?

13           So I just want to talk for a moment about  
14           some of the City of Concord's ordinances that we  
15           have, and the first one that I want to talk  
16           about is the noise ordinances in Concord. The  
17           proposal for this Project is 7 a.m. until 7 p.m.  
18           Monday through Saturday to do work. Right?

19  A    (Kayser) Yes. That's correct.

20  Q    So a lot of these properties in Concord we  
21           looked at are within 100 feet of these proposed  
22           construction pads?

23  A    (Kayser) Yes.

24  Q    So for somebody who is looking to have like a

1           barbecue in their backyard, that's going to be a  
2           little rugged, right? Might be a little noisy  
3           on a Saturday?

4       A     (Kayser) It would depend on the timing, but  
5           there could be construction on Saturdays, yes.

6       Q     And if you have a baby in the home? There could  
7           be construction going on at 7 a.m.

8       A     (Kayser) Yes.

9       Q     Okay. Can you turn the next page? Actually, I  
10          think we can skip a couple pages. This is just  
11          the -- okay.

12                 This is Concord's noise ordinance, and we  
13          do allow 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays, and then  
14          9 a.m. to 7 p.m. on Saturdays well as certain  
15          holidays. So it's your opinion, though, that  
16          you do not have to comply with the City of  
17          Concord's noise ordinance?

18       A     (Kayser) As Mr. Johnson had discussed, our plan  
19          is to work with the communities with the MOUs,  
20          but, ultimately, the Site Evaluation Committee  
21          would be the authority to give us the permission  
22          to construct the Project.

23       Q     So in the event that we can't come to some sort  
24          of agreement, the default would be 7 a.m. to 7

1 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and I also  
2 believe some night work as you deem necessary.

3 A (Kayser) The 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. as we've stated  
4 and night work would be in certain areas as we  
5 come to agreement with the communities is what  
6 we said on night work.

7 A (Bowes) So, for example, the night work in  
8 Concord could be that crossing for 393. The DOT  
9 may want us to string wire in the middle of the  
10 night so we would take a brief outage on that  
11 highway, say 2 a.m. for 10 or 15 minutes while  
12 we did the wire stringing.

13 Q Okay.

14 A (Bowes) Aside from that, I don't see a lot of  
15 night work needed for the overhead construction  
16 in Concord.

17 A (Kayser) Agreed.

18 Q But you wouldn't be consulting with the City of  
19 Concord with night work assuming we could not  
20 come to an agreement?

21 A (Bowes) Consulting, yes. Seeking permission,  
22 probably not.

23 Q Okay. So you would just be telling the City of  
24 Concord what you would be doing?

1 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm going to object. I  
2 think they've testified to this, and I think  
3 we're calling for legal conclusions now.

4 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Sustained.

5 MS. PACIK: Okay. Let's move on then.

6 BY MS. PACIK:

7 Q Can you go to the next page?

8 I was a little confused and I think this  
9 was also a question for Mr. -- is it Kayser?

10 A (Kayser) Kayser. Yes.

11 Q Thank you. Sorry. For Mr. Kayser in terms of  
12 blasting. So I understood yesterday that you  
13 had overstated in the Application how much  
14 blasting would be necessary, but in your  
15 Supplemental Prefiled testimony which was  
16 submitted April 17th, 2017, it did state that  
17 blasting would occur for some of the overhead  
18 areas, is that right?

19 A (Kayser) Yes. It is anticipated that some  
20 blasting will occur during the construction of  
21 the overhead. We don't know the extent of that  
22 yet as they haven't done the geotech. There  
23 could be some blasting for some of the work pads  
24 and the access roads.

1 Q Okay. And we looked at Concord, and there's a  
2 lot of, again, houses near the right-of-way, and  
3 I understand that you do not intend to seek  
4 blasting permits from the City of Concord; is  
5 that right?

6 A (Kayser) It would be similar to the answer on  
7 the other permits, yes.

8 Q So unless there's some sort of stipulation, you  
9 would not be obtaining blasting permits from the  
10 City of Concord.

11 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection.

12 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Actually,  
13 that one was just asked and answered. You could  
14 have gone with that, too.

15 MS. PACIK: I don't know if it was fully  
16 answered, but I do believe the answer would be  
17 no?

18 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think we just covered  
19 this.

20 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: I think you  
21 got an answer to your question.

22 MS. PACIK: Okay. Good. As long as we all  
23 know the answer.

24 BY MS. PACIK:

1 Q All right. Can you turn to the next page,  
2 please? You can keep going.

3 This is an area which is in the industrial  
4 zone in Concord, and are you familiar with --  
5 I'll represent to you that this is Phoenix  
6 Construction also known as Sabbow. Are you  
7 familiar with this location?

8 A (Bradstreet) I am, yes.

9 Q And this shows access roads and construction  
10 pads going through the middle of their yard. Is  
11 that right?

12 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

13 Q And you can see it's kind of hard to see  
14 underneath all of the construction pads, but  
15 that's actually where they currently store their  
16 product; is that right?

17 A (Bradstreet) Yes. There would have to be some  
18 coordination on construction.

19 Q Okay. And then there's going to be  
20 construction, there's going to be new structures  
21 in the middle of their yard, right?

22 A (Bradstreet) There will be some structures  
23 removed, and there will be some structures  
24 constructed.

1 Q Okay. Can you turn the next page?

2 And just to be clear, this shows the amount  
3 of product and what's going on at this property,  
4 right?

5 A (Bradstreet) At that time, yes.

6 Q And so when you -- I think we just lost our  
7 image. Oh, there we go.

8 So it's actually going to require quite a  
9 bit of coordination. Is that fair to say?

10 A (Bradstreet) Yes, and the Project has had, I  
11 guess Sam or somebody might be able to speak  
12 more to it, but we've had a lot of discussions  
13 with this property owner.

14 Q And are you aware that they submitted Prefiled  
15 Testimony on behalf of the City of Concord  
16 raising concerns about the proposal?

17 A (Johnson) We are.

18 Q Okay. And their concerns are not only about the  
19 disruption during construction but also the  
20 disruption because of the location of the  
21 proposed structures; is that right?

22 A (Johnson) Correct. And so their real concern  
23 was regarding the existing access roads that  
24 they have on their own property, if you will.



1           They believe that they have, for lack of a  
2           better thing, crushed those over the years of  
3           driving trucks with precast concrete on them,  
4           and they'd like to maintain those roads wherever  
5           possible.

6           We did meet with them and stake out where  
7           the new structures would be, where the existing  
8           structures would be removed and have provided  
9           detailed drawings to them so that they are fully  
10          aware of where our Project will be once we've  
11          completed construction.

12        Q    And you're aware that they're not satisfied,  
13            though, with what they've received to date?

14        A    (Johnson) We have provided them what they asked  
15            for, and we have heard nothing back.

16        Q    Okay. Can you turn to the next page?

17            Now, this is an area near the Soucook River  
18            and a crossing that's going to occur right  
19            before you get to Pembroke. And the Soucook  
20            River is the area that's in yellow with the pink  
21            dots. Do you see that?

22        A    (Bradstreet) Yes.

23        Q    And the structures, they're kind of hard to see,  
24            but they're on the left of that plan map?

1 A (Bradstreet) Right.

2 Q An you can see that one of the structures is  
3 white with an X, and that's getting removed.  
4 And then there's a new green structure, two new  
5 green structures that are coming in? Right?

6 A (Bradstreet) Green and a yellow. Yes.

7 Q So just to be clear, the 115 is getting  
8 relocated, and that's going to be the green  
9 square that's underneath it, and then the new  
10 structure is the 345 line which is yellow  
11 square, and then above it is the green, is  
12 another green square which is also a new  
13 structure going in.

14 A (Bradstreet) It's a relocated structure, yes.

15 Q Okay. So are you taking one structure out and  
16 putting two in? Is that why there's one white  
17 box with a square with an X and two green ones?

18 A (Bradstreet) I think we're not relocating. So  
19 C189-32, can you see that at the top?

20 A Yes.

21 Q That represents that top green square. And  
22 across the river you can see C189-31? I believe  
23 we're replacing those in place so you can't see  
24 the white square that sits on top of it.

1 Q So there's current structures and you're  
2 replacing them with new ones?

3 A (Bradstreet) In place, though, yes.

4 Q Same location.

5 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

6 Q Okay. Got it. Can you turn the next page?

7 This is the alteration of terrain map. And  
8 you can see the topographic lines are pretty  
9 tight together in this location, and that's  
10 because it's a steep bluff; is that correct?

11 A (Bradstreet) It is, yes.

12 Q And we just looked and there's going to be one  
13 pole coming out and four poles basically going  
14 in the ground that are new. Or two poles that  
15 are coming out and four poles going in?

16 A (Bradstreet) Right.

17 Q So there's going to be a lot of construction  
18 activity in this location; is that fair to say?

19 A (Bradstreet) There will be rebuilding two  
20 structures and adding a new.

21 Q Okay. Can you go to the next?

22 This is a photograph which shows the  
23 steepness of that particular location, and would  
24 you agree that it's a highly erodible bluff that

1 we're looking at?

2 A (Bradstreet) I guess I don't know if I'm the  
3 right person to say it's highly erodible, but  
4 the Project will have measures to make sure  
5 erosion doesn't occur.

6 Q Okay. And are you aware that the City of  
7 Concord has an ordinance that deals with bluffs  
8 and construction near bluffs?

9 A (Bradstreet) I'm specifically not aware of that,  
10 no.

11 Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

12 So this is a photograph which shows the  
13 corridor and between Appleton Street and  
14 Curtisville Road. And Appleton Street, I don't  
15 have an overhead, but that's the one where there  
16 was the new home that was near Turtle Pond. Do  
17 you remember that? Do you recall where Appleton  
18 Street is?

19 A (Bradstreet) I think so. Is Turtle Pond to the  
20 south?

21 Q If you were to go to the right of Appleton  
22 Street?

23 A (Bradstreet) One second, I can just look. Yes,  
24 I'm grounded.

1 Q All right. So the reason I have this photograph  
2 up is because there's going to be one access  
3 road between Appleton Street and Curtisville  
4 Road; is that right?

5 A (Bradstreet) I believe that's correct. Yes.

6 Q And the condition of that that you can kind of  
7 see a trail right now, and that's really what it  
8 is. It's a trail, right?

9 A (Bradstreet) It's an access road that is used, I  
10 guess, not frequently enough to make it look  
11 like a road, yes.

12 Q Okay. So that's going to require significant  
13 work to upgrade that right-of-way to get the  
14 trucks to go between Appleton Street and  
15 Curtisville Road in terms of an access road?

16 A (Bradstreet) I think we can say there will be  
17 access road improvements.

18 Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

19 Same thing here. I think there's one  
20 access road. So between Curtisville Road and  
21 Portsmouth Street, you're going to be using that  
22 path which is actually a hiking trail right now  
23 between Curtisville Road and Portsmouth Street  
24 for all of the construction activity?

1 A (Bradstreet) That's the plan, yes.

2 Q And you can't really tell from this photograph,  
3 but the terrain between Curtisville Road and  
4 Portsmouth Street, it's hilly, isn't it?

5 A (Bradstreet) I would assume it is, yes.

6 Q Can we go to the next page?

7 This just shows the access road that you're  
8 planning from Appleton Street, and you can see  
9 there's one entrance, and then going south which  
10 is to the right of this photograph.

11 A (Bradstreet) Looks like there's actually two  
12 entrances.

13 Q Both on Appleton Street, right?

14 A (Bradstreet) Yes.

15 Q Can you go to the next page?

16 And then that shows that one long access  
17 road that continues all the way to Curtisville  
18 Road; is that right?

19 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

20 Q Okay. So all of that is going to need to get  
21 upgraded?

22 A (Bradstreet) I'm sure there's areas that will  
23 need improvements and some areas may not.

24 Q Have you been out there to check?

1 A (Bradstreet) We've had constructability teams  
2 walk all these right-of ways to determine how  
3 we're going to access.

4 Q Anybody on the panel been out there to look at  
5 it?

6 A (Johnson) I have, yes.

7 Q You have? And what's your understanding of what  
8 type of upgrades are going to be necessary?

9 A (Johnson) There are some wetland areas in here  
10 that will require some matting. And there are  
11 improvements to the hiking path, if you will,  
12 that will require gravel to be placed such that  
13 the appropriate equipment for construction can  
14 be brought on site.

15 Q Okay. Can we go to the next page?

16 So this is, again, this is the area between  
17 Curtisville Road and Portsmouth Street. So I  
18 think we just talked about the fact that there  
19 is one long access road. Is that right?

20 A (Bradstreet) Yes. That's how they access the  
21 existing transmission line.

22 Q Okay. Next page, please.

23 That's the rest of it that goes all the way  
24 to Portsmouth Street. Is that right?

1 A (Bradstreet) Correct.

2 Q Can you go to the next page?

3 We've talked a lot about some of the  
4 properties and the notice that some of the  
5 property owners have received or the lack of  
6 notice. You understand that we requested  
7 information about which properties were visited  
8 by Northern Pass, and we were told that that  
9 information is confidential.

10 A (Johnson) That's correct.

11 Q So as we sit here today, we do not know which  
12 property owners you've spoken to and who has  
13 knowledge of or has specific knowledge of the  
14 plans?

15 A (Johnson) That's correct.

16 Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

17 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I want to interrupt for one  
18 minute. To clarify, the fact that we had  
19 contact is not confidential. I think it's the  
20 substance of the contacts that's confidential.  
21 I think we've provided an enormous amount of  
22 information about the contacts.

23 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Okay.

24 MS. PACIK: I think the document speaks for



1           itself. It says please provide a list of the  
2           owners, and that was objected to.

3           MR. NEEDLEMAN: It's in the record.

4           PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Yes, and I  
5           don't really know what Mr. Needleman was adding  
6           to the conversation you had with the witnesses.  
7           Are there other questions you have, Ms. Pacik,  
8           on this topic?

9           A     (Bowes) I might be able to help.

10          PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Help who?

11          A     (Bowes) Help her question around the contacts  
12          and the nature of them. In Mr. Johnson's  
13          Prefiled Testimony, each town has a list of  
14          contacts, and the nature of those contacts is in  
15          there. It does not list the names but, it  
16          lists, for example, Concord, the number of  
17          contacts that were made, the number of abutters  
18          that were contacted, and the type of inquiry it  
19          was. The whole page of it for Concord.

20          PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right.  
21          Ms. Pacik, do you have any further questions on  
22          this topic?

23          MS. PACIK: No.

24          BY MS. PACIK:

1 Q Can you turn the next page?

2 This, again, we asked for the list of the  
3 owners who responded to landowner letters that  
4 were sent out, and, again, we were not provided  
5 the identification of which property owners have  
6 spoken to you; is that right?

7 A (Johnson) That is correct. Again, the summary  
8 as Mr. Bowes has just stated is what we've  
9 provided.

10 Q Can you turn the next page?

11 I want to talk a little bit about some of  
12 the properties that have been acquired by  
13 Northern Pass, and this is addressed in  
14 Mr. Bowes' Prefiled Testimony. Renewable  
15 Properties is the company that was established  
16 to purchase properties along the right-of-way;  
17 is that right?

18 A (Bowes) As well as other properties, yes.

19 Q Okay. But it was Renewable Properties that was  
20 responsible for acquiring properties on behalf  
21 of Eversource?

22 A (Bowes) For Northern Pass Transmission. Yes.

23 Q And that company was established in 2001?

24 Can you turn to the next page?

1                   Sorry. 2011. Is that right?

2           A       (Bowes) Yes.

3           Q       Okay. Can you turn to the next page? Actually,  
4                   you can go one more.

5                   So I was a little curious about some of the  
6                   acquisitions by Renewable Properties. One of  
7                   them being one in Bethlehem which they purchased  
8                   from Bethlehem Ventures LLC. Are you familiar  
9                   with that company?

10          A       (Bowes) Not specifically. When you say not  
11                   specifically, what do you mean?

12          A       (Bowes) I mean I'm not familiar with it.

13          Q       Can you turn to the next page? So Bethlehem  
14                   Ventures was the member of the LLC that sold the  
15                   property to Renewable Energies. His name was  
16                   Michael Harlan. Do you know Michael Harlan?

17          A       I do not. And I believe it was Renewable  
18                   Properties.

19          Q       Renewable Properties. Sorry. But you do not  
20                   know Michael Harlan. Does anyone on the panel  
21                   know Michael Harlan? No?

22                   Can you turn to the next page?

23                   So what was curious about this was that the  
24                   property's appraised at \$110,000, and Bethlehem

1 Ventures purchased the property for \$265,000 on  
2 January 13th, 2015. Do you see that?

3 A (Bowes) Yes.

4 Q And then Renewable Properties purchased it 13  
5 days later from Bethlehem Ventures for \$363,933.  
6 That's a pretty good turnaround in 13 days,  
7 right?

8 A (Bowes) I would say that it is. Yes.

9 Q And nobody sitting here understands why  
10 Renewable Properties bought the property for  
11 over \$100,000 more 13 days later?

12 A (Bowes) I am not.

13 A (Johnson) I am not. I would say our interest in  
14 that property is for the transition station.  
15 That's the extent of our knowledge from the  
16 technical side.

17 Q Okay. Now, I remember from the technical  
18 session that somebody, I thought, on your panel  
19 said that you were purchasing the properties at  
20 fair market value; is that right?

21 A (Bowes) I do not recall saying that. No.

22 Q Okay. Can you turn to the next page?

23 That's actually a photograph from the  
24 assessing record of the house that was purchased

1 for \$363,000.

2 Can you turn to the next page?

3 And this is, you had mentioned, Mr.

4 Johnson, this property is now going to be used  
5 for Transition Station 5?

6 A (Johnson) That's correct. I recognize the  
7 address.

8 Q And some of the properties from Renewable  
9 Properties was purchased directly from the  
10 sellers, but this one was purchased from this  
11 company, Bethlehem Ventures. Right?

12 A (Bowes) Yes.

13 Q Can you turn to the next page?

14 And we had mentioned before, Michael Harlan  
15 was the member of it, and you don't know who he  
16 is, I understand?

17 A (Bowes) I do not.

18 Q Can you go to the next page? One more?

19 So this is another one that I was looking  
20 at that I was a little curious about which is  
21 Renewable Properties bought properties from this  
22 company called DWH Jenness LLC. And the date of  
23 that sale, I think, is shown on the next page.  
24 It's April 20th, 2015. And the manager of DWH

1           Jenness, Alejandro Capetillo. Does anyone know  
2           him?

3           A     (Bowes) I do not.

4           Q     Anyone on the panel? No. So April 20th, 2015.

5                     Can you turn to the next page?

6                     So this says that, and I think the date is  
7           a little wrong on this, but it looks like  
8           Jenness purchased it on February 20th, 2015, and  
9           I think the date of the deed we just looked at  
10          was April 2015. So actually three months later,  
11          not in August. But Jenness bought it for  
12          200,000 and then sold it to Renewable Properties  
13          for \$290,000. So it's a \$90,000 interest in  
14          about two months. Do you know why they would  
15          have paid an extra \$90,000 in two months?

16          A     (Bowes) I do not.

17          Q     Okay. And this was property that was assessed  
18          at \$130,000, right?

19          A     (Bowes) Yes. \$130,800.

20          Q     So somebody made a profit of 90,000, and we  
21          don't know who.

22                     Can you go to the next page? One more.

23          A     (Bowes) Well, I think we know who made the  
24          profit.

1 Q Well, Alejandro. We just don't know why.

2 A (Bowes) I don't know who he is.

3 Q Okay. You can go to the next page.

4 And this is the property that we're looking  
5 at. Are you familiar about the fact that this  
6 is the land that's now going to be used for  
7 Transition Station 6?

8 A (Johnson) I was not, but I see that that's  
9 Transition Station 6.

10 Q Okay. Can you go to the next page, please?

11 So this Alejandro Capetillo, this is the  
12 Certification of Formation in 2015, and it was  
13 February 2015, and this is when he formed DWH  
14 Jenness. Do you see that?

15 A (Bowes) Yes.

16 Q Can you go to the next page? One more?

17 And then the 2016 Annual Report is Michael  
18 Harlan again who is filing it for DWH Jenness,  
19 and he's out of 1300 Post Oak Boulevard,  
20 Houston, Texas. Is that right?

21 A (Bowes) That's what it says. Yes.

22 Q So my question before we go on is Quanta is in  
23 Texas, isn't it?

24 A (Bowes) They certainly have facilities in Texas.

1 I'm not sure if that's their headquarters or  
2 not.

3 Q They're actually based out of Houston, Texas.  
4 You didn't know that?

5 A (Bowes) No, I did not.

6 Q So Quanta is responsible for hiring all the  
7 subcontractors and building the Project in this  
8 case?

9 A (Bowes) For the most part, yes. There's a few  
10 contracts that they're assuming, and we talked  
11 about that I think earlier. The ABB contract  
12 provisions of that and some of the supply  
13 contracts that Eversource has.

14 Q And Quanta was chosen for a procurement process?

15 A (Bowes) They are doing some of the procurement  
16 as well, yes.

17 Q Well, I thought you went through a process where  
18 you actually chose Quanta to be the contractor,  
19 and that was in your Prefiled Testimony? I  
20 think you talked about it with Attorney Pappas  
21 yesterday?

22 A (Bowes) Yes. I was confusing procurement of  
23 materials with procurement of the original  
24 contract.



1 Q And that was announced in January of 2016 that  
2 Quanta was the chosen contractor?

3 A (Bowes) I think that's accurate, yes.

4 Q And you had mentioned yesterday that the first  
5 communications Northern Pass had with Quanta was  
6 in June and July of 2015, I thought you said?

7 A (Johnson) The Project went out to bid for  
8 services in about that time frame. Yes.

9 Q Okay. And we're going to be, you're going to be  
10 relying on Quanta to work with the property  
11 owners and the municipalities during the  
12 construction phase?

13 A (Bowes) Yes.

14 Q Okay.

15 A (Bowes) Or part, in this case.

16 Q So Quanta had no interest in this Project before  
17 January of 2016; is that fair to say?

18 A (Bowes) As far as I know, that's correct.

19 A (Johnson) Not officially, but, again, they were  
20 part of the bidding process so they were well  
21 aware of the Project probably a year earlier and  
22 participated in the bidding process.

23 Q And they had a bid, right?

24 A (Johnson) That's correct.

1 Q Can you turn the next page?

2 So I was hoping you'd be able to help me  
3 out and try to figure out why Renewable  
4 Properties was paying \$90,000, \$100,000 more for  
5 property within a pretty short time frame of it  
6 being acquired by companies owned by this person  
7 Michael Harlan. So Main Street Capital  
8 Corporation, that's also in Houston, Texas, on  
9 the same address as where Michael Harlan's  
10 address was, right? 1300 Post Oak Boulevard,  
11 Houston, Texas? Do you see that?

12 A (Bowes) I believe so. I can't remember what was  
13 on the past document.

14 Q Are you familiar with Main Street Capital  
15 Corporation? Anybody?

16 A (Bowes) I am not.

17 Q Nobody? Okay. Can you turn to the next page?  
18 So Alejandro, he works there, and that was also  
19 the same address that Michael Harlan was using,  
20 right?

21 A (Bowes) I believe so, yes. I can't keep track  
22 of all the documents you showed me.

23 Q That's all right. Anybody keeping track of it  
24 all? We can go back and look at some of them if

1           you need to. You want to go back a couple?

2           Remember Alejandro? He bought the Bridgewater  
3           property? And sold it?

4           A     (Bowes) So he's the manager.

5           Q     Yes.

6           A     (Bowes) There were LLCs that bought and sold the  
7           properties.

8           Q     So he was the manager of the LLC. You're right.  
9           Okay. Can you turn the next page?

10                    So the only, and maybe you don't know this,  
11           but it looks like Main Street Capital  
12           Corporation actually owns or was an investor in  
13           Quanta which is also in Houston, right?

14           A     (Bowes) That's what you indicated, yes.

15           Q     Do you know if Quanta was involved in the  
16           purchases of any of these properties back in  
17           2015?

18           A     (Bowes) I do not.

19           Q     Okay. Can you turn the next page?

20                    So are you familiar with 41 Haynes Road  
21           property in Deerfield?

22           A     (Bowes) Not specifically, no.

23           Q     When you say not specifically, what do you mean?

24           A     (Bowes) I don't have any specific knowledge of

1 this property.

2 Q Okay. So are you aware that Stephen and Gina  
3 Neily had a very difficult time selling this  
4 property because of the proposed Project?

5 A (Bowes) I am not.

6 Q Are you familiar with the Neilys?

7 A (Bowes) No. I'm not.

8 Q Are you aware that they were -- so you wouldn't  
9 be aware that they were vocal opponents of this  
10 Project? You don't have that information?

11 A (Bowes) I do not.

12 Q Okay. And they ended up selling their property  
13 to Haynes Road LLC?

14 Can you turn the page?

15 And they sold it in April 2015. Do you  
16 know who Haynes Road LLC is?

17 A (Bowes) I do not.

18 Q Anyone on the panel? No?

19 Can you turn the page?

20 And so this is, again, Michael Harlan as  
21 the member of Haynes Road LLC. Haynes Road, 41  
22 Haynes Road, that's not getting used for the  
23 Project, is it?

24 A (Bowes) Not that I'm aware of. I don't recall

1 that property on the list.

2 Q Are you aware that since Michael Harlan as the  
3 member purchased that property that it's been  
4 sitting vacant?

5 A (Bowes) I am not.

6 Q Okay. So I guess the question is probably no,  
7 but is anyone here aware whether or not the  
8 property owners that sold the 41 Haynes Road  
9 property were required to maintain confidential  
10 information about this sale?

11 A (Bowes) I have no knowledge of that, no.

12 Q Okay. So would it surprise you that one of the  
13 Intervenors in this case went to go talk to  
14 them, and they were told by the property owners  
15 that they could not talk about the sale of the  
16 property?

17 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm going to object to  
18 that. If there's any information, it should be  
19 presented.

20 MS. PACIK: Okay. It will be.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: The question  
22 was, were you aware, right?

23 MS. PACIK: Yes.

24 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: If anybody is

1           aware, you can answer the question.

2       A     (Bowes) I am not aware.

3       Q     Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.

4           PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley,  
5           are you up next?

6           MR. WHITLEY: I am, Mr. Chair, and I'm  
7           going to direct my questions from the podium so  
8           just give me a second and I'll --

9           PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Off the  
10          record.

11                           (Discussion off-the-record)

12          PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Why don't we  
13          take five minutes.

14                           (Recess taken)

15          PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley,  
16          you may proceed.

17          MR. WHITLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18                           **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

19       **BY MR. WHITLEY:**

20       Q     Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Steven  
21           Whitley. I'm an attorney for several  
22           communities along the line. New Hampton,  
23           Pembroke, Deerfield, Littleton and the Ashland  
24           Water & Sewer Department. I'm also the

1 spokesperson for two of the Municipal Groups.

2 And I'm going to start by asking,  
3 Mr. Scott, a question to you, and maybe you saw  
4 me test the ELMO and I saw you getting the plans  
5 ready, but I'm going to put this up on the ELMO,  
6 and I just want to ask you a couple questions  
7 about it. So just one second. See that?

8 A (Scott) Yes, I can.

9 Q This is SHEB C117, I believe, which is not  
10 visible but it's on the right-hand corner.

11 A (Scott) SHEB C117 shows the detail for the open  
12 cut trenching, and SHEB 013-1 shows the detail  
13 for the --

14 (Court reporter interruption)

15 A (Scott) So SHEB C117 shows the plan detail and  
16 the profile detail for the open cut trenching.  
17 SHEB 013-1 shows the detail for the trenchless  
18 design, and we've also given Exhibit 133 for  
19 additional detail for that trenchless design.

20 Q Correct. Thank you. So my question was,  
21 looking at the lower half of this diagram, which  
22 I believe is the profile view there, it  
23 indicates that the trenching is going to come in  
24 and then it's going to take a 90-degree turn and

1 go down about, what is that dimension there?  
2 30, 40 feet? And then go laterally for a  
3 distance of 250, 300 feet? And then take  
4 another 90 degree turn and go towards the  
5 surface, and then take another 90 degree turn  
6 and go just underneath the surface along a  
7 trench for a while. Do you see all that?

8 A (Scott) I see that. And that interception  
9 laterally of the open cut trenching installation  
10 is shown incorrectly.

11 Q That was my question, Mr. Scott, is whether or  
12 not that was still the current plan for this  
13 area.

14 A (Scott) Those comments have been provided to the  
15 design firm doing that design.

16 Q And what is the contemplated change?

17 A (Scott) The open cut trenching would be sloped  
18 down to intercept the bore depth installation.  
19 So open cut trenching would be occurring at an  
20 increased depth down to the trench or the  
21 trenchless installation depth.

22 Q So looking at the profile here, could you just  
23 very roughly just walk us through how that would  
24 change this profile drawing and what that would



1 mean?

2 A (Scott) Sure. So if you could move that drawing  
3 up just slightly?

4 Q Towards you?

5 A (Scott) Yes. Just so you can see the stationing  
6 along the bottom?

7 Q How's that?

8 A (Scott) Yes. And it's not quite that visible so  
9 if you could help me out and point at it. And I  
10 believe you may be working off an older drawing  
11 set, but it's close enough for this  
12 conversation.

13 At 297 plus 50, so the right-hand side  
14 there, of the bore?

15 Q Right there?

16 A Yes.

17 Q So approximately 100 to 150 feet is how long it  
18 would take to get from the depth shown to the  
19 installation depth.

20 Q So you're saying you would start about right  
21 here and go up at an angle; is that correct?

22 A (Scott) It would be closer to an S-bend.

23 Q Okay. Okay. I won't mimic it with my hand but  
24 yes.

1 A (Scott) Understood.

2 Q And on the other side, is it similarly angled?

3 A Correct.

4 Q So over here, angled up that way as well?

5 A (Scott) Yes, sir.

6 Q Is that one also an S angle?

7 A (Scott) Yes.

8 Q Okay. And the distance of both of those from --

9 PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Steve. No  
10 one can hear you. The folks in the back really  
11 can't hear you.

12 MR. WHITLEY: Sorry. Apologies.

13 BY MR. WHITLEY:

14 Q So Mr. Scott, we were just saying that from this  
15 depth here, it's going to go at an S angle  
16 roughly for a distance of a couple hundred feet  
17 to just below grade.

18 A (Scott) Correct.

19 Q And, similarly, on the other side an S angle for  
20 a couple hundred feet until just below grade?

21 A (Scott) Correct, and by a couple hundred feet,  
22 100 to 150 feet would be my estimation.

23 Q Okay. And the trenches right here and right  
24 here, what are the dimensions of those?

1 A (Scott) So those are, we've covered that  
2 previously with Mr. Pappas. Those are circular  
3 shafts, concrete shafts. The one on the north  
4 side of the river, the receiving side, was  
5 measured at approximately 20 feet in diameter  
6 and the ascending side approximately 25 feet in  
7 diameter.

8 Q Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. IACOPINO: Jason, can you read us the  
10 SHEB number?

11 MR. REIMERS: SHEB C117.

12 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

13 BY MR. WHITLEY:

14 Q One more question, Mr. Scott. You mentioned  
15 it's an S shape, and I just want to know if that  
16 shape is going to follow this path right here  
17 and similarly this path right here so it's going  
18 to be in the road?

19 A (Scott) Correct. It will follow the plan  
20 alignment.

21 Q Okay. Thank you.

22 I just want to chat now briefly about the  
23 claims submission form, and I believe we spoke  
24 about that yesterday, but, I apologize, I don't

1 recall who was responding to the questions, but  
2 I believe it was Mr. Bowes or Mr. Johnson.

3 A (Bowes) I think it was both. Yes.

4 Q And, obviously, if somebody else knows an  
5 answer, feel free to provide it.

6 The question that the panel had with  
7 Attorney Pappas was whether or not the Claim  
8 Submission Form would be available to a business  
9 entity that lost business revenue, do you recall  
10 that conversation?

11 A (Johnson) I do.

12 Q Okay. Would that process, the Claim Submission  
13 process, is that similarly available to a host  
14 community?

15 A (Johnson) In what manner would you be talking?

16 Q Well, I guess I'm thinking of a local  
17 municipality providing a police detail for  
18 construction or transport of construction  
19 materials.

20 A (Johnson) So that would be direct contracted to  
21 the contractor who would have to pay for those  
22 services.

23 Q Okay.

24 A (Bowes) But, for example, police protection,

1 flagging, traffic control would be a project  
2 cost so we would certainly reimburse the  
3 community for that.

4 Q Okay. So there be no need for the community to  
5 file or go through the process of the Claim  
6 Form.

7 A (Bowes) The normal process you use today with  
8 Eversource would be the same one followed for  
9 Northern Pass.

10 Q Okay. And to the extent that the municipality  
11 could show extra fuel costs associated with the  
12 detour that was required by construction impact,  
13 could they submit a claim for that cost through  
14 this Claim Form process?

15 A (Bowes) I'm not sure we'd have to go to that  
16 extent, but I think we could work out an  
17 agreement for those type of costs prior to  
18 construction.

19 Q Okay. Similarly, if the municipality could show  
20 extra time spent by hourly employees to perform  
21 their duties, and that extra time was  
22 necessitated by construction impacts and  
23 detours?

24 A (Bowes) So maybe you could be a little more

1 specific. Certainly police, that comes to mind  
2 very quickly. What other types of personnel and  
3 requirements are you thinking about?

4 Q I guess I was thinking of fire department  
5 personnel perhaps.

6 A (Bowes) Sure. Or EMS possibly. Yes.  
7 Definitely.

8 Q Okay. Similar line of questioning. To the  
9 extent the municipality would show additional  
10 wear and tear on their vehicles from having to  
11 go extra mileage because of a construction  
12 detour?

13 A (Bowes) So we could probably work out a mileage  
14 rate rather than a fuel rate that would cover  
15 that.

16 Q Okay. Similar line of questioning. Extra time  
17 and expense for the Road Agent to monitor local  
18 roads in town during the construction phase.

19 A (Bowes) So we're going to have at least two  
20 levels of inspection on the project already.  
21 Both with the constructor themselves. We're  
22 going to have independent monitors, and I'm sure  
23 the State DOT will be monitoring our activities  
24 as well. So I don't think our intention today

1 or for the future for the project is to pay  
2 municipal inspections.

3 Q But if a municipality because they're local  
4 roads and the municipality has an obligation and  
5 a responsibility to those roads, if they chose  
6 to have an inspector or a Road Agent go out and  
7 do those sorts of inspections, would that sort  
8 of thing be covered under this claims process?

9 A (Bowes) I don't believe it would, no.

10 Q I'm going to stick with you for a second,  
11 Mr. Bowes. And do you have your Supplemental  
12 Testimony with you?

13 A (Bowes) I do.

14 Q Okay. If you could please take that out, and  
15 that is, just for the Committee's information,  
16 Applicant's Exhibit 90. I'll put that up on the  
17 screen here. One second. I'm speaking of your  
18 Track 2 Supplemental.

19 A (Bowes) Yes, I have it.

20 Q Okay. If you could go to page 4, please. I  
21 want to ask you some questions about nonspecular  
22 conductors which we spoke about, I believe it  
23 was the other day, but you responded, in your  
24 testimony that is, you responded to a question

1 about nonspecular conductors, and I want to  
2 direct you to the paragraph from lines 14 to 19.  
3 Do you see that?

4 A (Bowes) Yes.

5 Q You say that that Eversource policy is that in  
6 comparison with new untreated conductors,  
7 Eversource policy is to use new untreated ones  
8 as opposed to nonspecular ones. Correct?

9 A (Bowes) Yes.

10 Q And one of the reasons for that is because the  
11 new untreated ones after a period of years, they  
12 lose some of their reflectivity, and so they, I  
13 guess, functionally obtain the same result that  
14 a nonspecular conductor would.

15 A (Bowes) That is accurate, yes.

16 Q So by that logic, there's a period of years  
17 where that untreated conductor has higher  
18 reflectivity and potentially higher visibility,  
19 correct?

20 A (Bowes) Higher than what?

21 Q Higher than a nonspecular conductor.

22 A (Bowes) That is true. Yes.

23 Q So that increased visibility is then acceptable  
24 for a period of years versus a nonspecular



1 conductor?

2 A (Bowes) We believe it is, yes.

3 Q And isn't it true that that increased  
4 reflectivity during those period of years could  
5 impact someone's perception of visual impact in  
6 that area?

7 A (Bowes) I think it's possible. Our experience  
8 has been that the use of the untreated  
9 conductors has not come with customer complaints  
10 about the conductors.

11 Q And Mr. Bowes, could you move the mike a little  
12 closer? When this is hard, it's hard to hear  
13 you.

14 A (Bowes) I sure can.

15 Q Thank you.

16 A (Bowes) Do you want me to repeat what I said?

17 Q Yes, if you don't mind.

18 A (Bowes) Our experience over many projects and  
19 many decades has been that we don't see customer  
20 complaints because of the newer conductors being  
21 put up.

22 Q And does the decision to use nonspecular versus  
23 new untreated, is there any cost element to that  
24 decision?

1 A (Bowes) There is.

2 Q And how much of a role does that play?

3 A (Bowes) I would say it has some factor into it.  
4 It's probably a half a million to a million  
5 dollar cost increase for this project.

6 Q Okay.

7 A (Bowes) But we have not used it for any of our  
8 projects across our service area.

9 Q I guess I'm wondering if from an engineering  
10 standpoint there's no detriment to using  
11 nonspecular and the cost component is fairly  
12 marginal, and it has the potential to impact  
13 visibility and how people perceive the project,  
14 why not just use nonspecular conductors?

15 A So extrapolate that to all of our service  
16 territory and all of our projects, it becomes  
17 quite a sizable impact to the ratepayer.

18 Q But you're here in front of the SEC for just  
19 this Project, right? And if I didn't say that  
20 in my question, then I apologize, but I mean in  
21 relation to this Project.

22 A (Bowes) So could you repeat the original  
23 question then?

24 Q Yes. Sure. So if from an engineering

1           standpoint in this project there's no drawback  
2           to using nonspecular conductors, and the cost to  
3           do so is fairly marginal, as you just said, then  
4           why not just utilize nonspecular conductors?

5       A     (Bowes) Because it would add up to a million  
6           dollars to the project cost.

7       Q     Okay. Okay. And the project team has deemed  
8           that increase not one they're willing to  
9           undergo?

10      A     (Bowes) So in our original list of mitigations  
11           we filed in February of 2016, we listed that as  
12           one we considered and did not go forward with.  
13           I have reaffirmed that decision in this Prefiled  
14           Testimony.

15      Q     If you could turn to the bottom of page 5. I'll  
16           get you there on the screen here.

17                   Bottom of page 5 into page 6 you discuss  
18           lattice structures versus monopole structures.  
19           Do you see that question and answer?

20      A     (Bowes) Yes, I do.

21      Q     And you talk about how the team evaluated  
22           replacing lattice with monopole in certain  
23           locations, correct?

24      A     (Bowes) Yes.

1 Q And at page 6, lines 5 through 9, you state that  
2 after the Application was filed, your  
3 multidisciplinary team evaluated some of these  
4 replacement options but that the Applicants  
5 determined that they're not warranted because,  
6 as proposed, the use of monopole would not have  
7 a significant effect on aesthetics at those  
8 locations. Is that correct?

9 A (Bowes) Yes.

10 Q Wouldn't you agree that anyone living at those  
11 various locations might disagree with that  
12 assessment?

13 A (Bowes) It's possible.

14 Q So although the use of monopole may not, in your  
15 opinion, significantly alleviate visual impact  
16 to the people at those locations, it would  
17 indeed be a significant change. A lessening of  
18 visual impact potentially.

19 A (Bowes) I'm probably not the person to ask about  
20 how an overhead transmission structure, the  
21 visual impact of it. I don't see the  
22 significant difference between the two, and  
23 that's probably the engineer versus the visual  
24 expert. So when you say significant, I say it's

1 possible.

2 Q Well, I use the word significant because those  
3 are your words. Lines 8 and 9, would not have a  
4 significant effect on aesthetics at those  
5 locations.

6 A (Bowes) Right. That's what we concluded.

7 Q But you're saying that you don't have a sense of  
8 how to define significance, I guess?

9 A (Bowes) I think that's probably accurate, yes.

10 Q So you took input from the visual experts that  
11 the team has hired and then, based on that  
12 input, made this decision that we're talking  
13 about here?

14 A (Bowes) Yes. So I can describe the process. It  
15 was both with Derrick for the engineering side,  
16 it was with our wetlands or environmental  
17 people, and it was also with the visual experts  
18 the project hired. So we collectively reviewed  
19 these locations and came up with a determination  
20 that's listed in my Prefiled.

21 Q The next question and answer on that page, still  
22 on page 6 here, you list out some specific  
23 locations where this was considered but  
24 ultimately rejected. Do you see that?

1 A (Bowes) Yes, I do.

2 Q And I'm looking at, let's see, it's lines 18  
3 through 20. And you cite Cross Country Road,  
4 which I believe is in Pembroke, Nottingham Road  
5 in Deerfield, and you say "would not provide  
6 significant benefits because those locations are  
7 not scenic resources." Do you see that?

8 A (Bowes) Yes, I do.

9 Q So is it your opinion then that if we're not  
10 dealing with a scenic resource, there's no  
11 benefit to reducing visual impact, even  
12 marginally?

13 A (Bowes) So I'm not saying that, but I'm not,  
14 what I did say was I'm not sure that I can say  
15 that a lattice structure has less visual impact  
16 than a monopole or a monopole less than a  
17 lattice structure. That's an assumption that's  
18 made by some but not all.

19 Q Again, safe to say that people in those  
20 locations, Cross Country Road, Nottingham Road,  
21 would disagree with that assessment?

22 A (Bowes) I have not had conversations with them  
23 so it's possible they would.

24 Q Isn't it generally better for the people of this

1 State to have less visual impact?

2 A (Bowes) So, again, you're making the assumption  
3 that monopole has less visual impact than a  
4 lattice structure. I'm not sure I agree with  
5 that.

6 Q Okay. Assuming that it does have less visual  
7 impact than a lattice structure, isn't it  
8 generally better for people in the State to have  
9 less visual impact from this project?

10 A (Bowes) So I think in the general terms, I would  
11 say yes, but I think each one of these becomes a  
12 specific location determination because you  
13 might have a less visual impact for the  
14 structure but it might have an environmental  
15 impact that is greater so those would have to be  
16 weighed.

17 Q Thank you. Mr. Johnson, I want to turn to you  
18 now. And ask you some questions about your  
19 Supplemental Testimony which I believe is  
20 Applicant's Exhibit 86.

21 A (Johnson) Correct.

22 Q Do you have that in front of you?

23 A (Johnson) I do.

24 Q And this will probably wrap us up, Mr. Chair.

1           Let me pull it up on the screen here, Mr.  
2           Johnson.

3           If I could turn you to pages 3 and 4,  
4           please, of your testimony.

5           A     (Johnson) Okay.

6           Q     In this portion of your testimony, you're  
7           talking about outreach to the municipalities,  
8           and one of the items that you describe is the  
9           Memorandum of Understanding. I believe it's  
10          around the middle of that response. Do you see  
11          that?

12          A     (Johnson) On line 12, yes.

13          Q     Yes, you're right. Line 12. And the only kind  
14          of example so far or success story in regards to  
15          that MOU is the City of Franklin, correct?

16          A     (Johnson) That's the only one that's been  
17          completed. There are 12 others or 11 others,  
18          I'm sorry, that are in various stages of  
19          negotiation.

20          Q     Okay. And the City of Franklin is one of the  
21          few municipalities that's hosting the project  
22          that is in favor of the Project, correct?

23          A     (Johnson) Correct. It's only natural for us to  
24          go there first to obtain an MOU.



1 Q The low hanging fruit maybe.

2 A (Johnson) Thirty more to go.

3 Q Is it your intent in this MOU public outreach  
4 process to satisfy local regulations or policies  
5 that a municipality may have?

6 A (Johnson) So I believe we stated our case pretty  
7 clearly that the approval of the Application  
8 overrides or provides the appropriate authority  
9 to do the Project. However, if the Project does  
10 find it amenable to work with local  
11 municipalities to follow up some of their  
12 ordinances, we certainly will include that.

13 Q To the extent that they don't conflict with the  
14 approval you get from the SEC, assuming you get  
15 approval.

16 A (Johnson) There could be instances where we go  
17 above and beyond. Again, it would be on a  
18 municipality by municipality basis.

19 Q Isn't there language in the MOU that says to the  
20 extent that the terms of the MOU are  
21 inconsistent with a certificate from the SEC  
22 that the certificate prevails?

23 A (Johnson) Correct.

24 Q That to me sounds different from what you just

1           said so I just want to make sure I'm  
2           understanding.

3       A     (Johnson) So if an MOU is signed and submitted  
4           to the SEC and the SEC includes that MOU as part  
5           of their decision, then that those requirements  
6           would become binding.

7       Q     This MOU process, isn't Northern Pass already  
8           engaged in that sort of outreach? I guess maybe  
9           a better way to put that question is, you don't  
10          need the MOU process to do that. I mean, you're  
11          engaged with the local municipalities and the  
12          local businesses and the local property owners  
13          anyways.

14      A     (Johnson) That's correct. It's a way to, if you  
15          will, formalize some of the communications so  
16          that there is an agreement on both sides as to  
17          what some of those communications may be,  
18          whether it's the tax pledge as Mr. Quinlan  
19          opined upon what seems like a long time ago now,  
20          or hours of operation as we've discussed in the  
21          last couple days.

22      Q     But again, you know, to the extent a  
23          municipality wants some agreement from the  
24          project in this MOU that is inconsistent with

1           what the SEC may rule on, the project is not  
2           going to agree to those sorts of terms.

3           A     (Johnson) Correct. It's why it's important to  
4           get these MOUs under negotiation such that it  
5           can be submitted if the Project agrees with the  
6           town. Then they become conditions of the  
7           Application.

8           Q     And do you believe it's good faith negotiating  
9           on the part of Northern Pass to have that in  
10          your back pocket, so to speak, when you're  
11          negotiating with municipalities?

12          A     (Johnson) Sure. I mean, we're certainly not  
13          here to not listen. Quite the contrary. We are  
14          here to listen. And if there are seasonality  
15          things we can do to arrange construction  
16          activities to be outside of, for instance, town  
17          fairs or in areas where you may have a festival  
18          going on, that's an easy example, we can  
19          certainly coordinate so that these activities  
20          are memorialized and then the contractor is well  
21          aware of them, and it becomes a condition of  
22          construction.

23          Q     Okay. Ms. Farrington, I'm going to end with you  
24          today so I guess I lied earlier. You have your

1 Supplemental Testimony in front of you?

2 A (Farrington) I do.

3 Q Which I believe is Applicant's Exhibit 91. If I  
4 could direct you to page 3 of that testimony,  
5 please.

6 A (Farrington) Okay.

7 Q You see that question in the middle of the page  
8 here? "What future work is planned under your  
9 contract with PAR?"

10 A (Farrington) Yes.

11 Q The second paragraph of your answer starting on  
12 line 10 says after, assuming that you get the  
13 certificate from the SEC, the Transportation  
14 Management Plan will be drafted.

15 A (Farrington) Yes.

16 Q And that is, again, after receipt of SEC  
17 approval.

18 A (Farrington) Yes. Correct.

19 Q And one of the reasons that you give for that is  
20 that by waiting that late in the process, your  
21 conversations with key personnel or of the  
22 various parties is much more recent in time so  
23 there's less turnover among those participants.

24 A (Farrington) Correct, and New Hampshire DOT

1 themselves made the recommendation that the  
2 waiting until closer to construction is  
3 advantageous.

4 Q To?

5 A (Farrington) But we can start the process any  
6 time. We just can't finalize it until just  
7 prior to construction.

8 Q When you say advantageous, advantageous to whom?

9 A (Farrington) I think everyone involved.

10 Q If for some reason a municipality agrees with  
11 the project and enters into an MOU, and then the  
12 Certificate is issued and a Transportation  
13 Management Plan is worked out, and there's a  
14 conflict between those two documents, is there  
15 one that has primacy over the other?

16 A (Farrington) I'm not sure that there would be a  
17 conflict just because the, our hope is that the  
18 town will be involved in creating both of these  
19 with us, but I would defer to --

20 A (Bowes) I would say obviously New Hampshire DOT  
21 is responsible for the public safety of the  
22 roads so they would have the jurisdiction over  
23 the TMP and would supercede any MOU that we had  
24 with a town for their portion of the project,

1 obviously, for the state roads.

2 Q Right. But if it was a non-state road, how does  
3 that change your answer, if at all?

4 A (Bowes) It would be the Town MOU then.

5 Q Ms. Farrington, if I could direct you to page 5  
6 of your testimony now. This is a position of  
7 your testimony where you're speaking about  
8 construction detours and how it may impact  
9 emergency response personnel. Do you see that?

10 A (Farrington) Yes.

11 Q And the response you give starting on line 5 and  
12 going down to 14, that's where you describe how  
13 you would work with local municipalities and  
14 their emergency personnel. Correct?

15 A (Farrington) Correct.

16 Q You would agree, however, that construction  
17 impacts or detours can result in a delay or a  
18 longer response time for those emergency  
19 personnel, correct?

20 A (Farrington) Yes. That's logical. Our goal is,  
21 of course, to mitigate that to any extent  
22 possible. For example, when the signalized  
23 construction zone sites are in place for like  
24 the HDD work zones, I anticipate that the

1 Project will supply emergency responders with  
2 preemption devices so that their vehicles will  
3 talk directly to the signals to make sure that  
4 the emergency response vehicles get the green  
5 light, so to say.

6 Q In your response there on 11, you state that, I  
7 think this speaks to what you were just  
8 responding with, emergency responders will be  
9 notified daily as to the location of the work  
10 zone and any detours that might be as a result  
11 of that work zone, correct?

12 A (Farrington) Correct.

13 Q You would agree, however, that notice of a  
14 detour is not the same thing as the quickest and  
15 most efficient access to those that need those  
16 Emergency Services, correct?

17 A (Farrington) I'm not sure I understand. I'm  
18 thinking of the example of Bear Rock Road. So  
19 if an emergency response service is located in  
20 Colebrook, by knowing the location of the detour  
21 route, they will also know the easiest or most  
22 efficient path to reach that home. Also --

23 Q Given the detour, though.

24 A (Farrington) Bear Rock Road is a different case.

1 I'm not explaining it well without a picture.  
2 But there will be ITS, Intelligent  
3 Transportation System boards, VMS boards,  
4 Variable Message Systems in town in Colebrook  
5 that as you start to drive out of town it will  
6 say house number 1 through 13, use eastern  
7 access route, and house number 14 through 80,  
8 use western access route. So we'll never send  
9 an emergency responder down the wrong path, so  
10 to speak.

11 Q And to be clear, I'm not suggesting that you  
12 would do that or that your systems would do  
13 that. I'm simply, I'm asking you if notice of  
14 the detours is as good as the emergency  
15 personnel getting there as fast as they possibly  
16 can, given the detours.

17 A (Farrington) Can I pull up a picture just to get  
18 through it? I think I understand what you're  
19 saying.

20 Okay. So, for instance, I'm looking at  
21 north TCP 6. The detour route is 2.7 miles.  
22 So --

23 Q If I may, in the absence of that detour route,  
24 though, the emergency responders would most



1           likely get there as fast as they possibly can,  
2           correct?

3       A     (Farrington) Correct. So depending on the  
4           location of the work zone, the emergency  
5           responders will either approach directly as they  
6           normally would or it could potentially add that  
7           2.7 miles of delay. Is that what you're --

8       Q     That's right. Yes.

9       A     (Farrington) Yes, I agree.

10      Q     Thank you. That's all I have.

11                   PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right.  
12           If there's nothing else we need to do today, and  
13           I sense that there's not, we'll adjourn and  
14           resume tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

15                   (Hearing recessed at 5:04 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

