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PROCEDINGS

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

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

A (Bowes) So we do have available to us what we call One Touch which is a Google Earth representation of the line through Concord so we can call that up, and we could show you the
right-of-way, we could show you the structures
on the right-of-way, the heights, the wetlands
impacts, all of that. So it might make it
easier than going through these --

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

A (Bowes) Yes, it is.

Q Okay.

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

Q And that's past Concord so I'll be focusing on
Concord, but thank you.
Can you turn to the next -- before we turn, actually, it's 8.1 miles through Concord; is that correct?

A (Bradstreet) Subject to check it sounds appropriate.

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

Can you turn to the next slide, please?

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes. I am.

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

A (Bradstreet) Are you talking about in the red square the homes that are to the top of the screen?
Q        Yes.
A        (Bradstreet) Yes.
Q        You'd agree that there's some tree buffer at least shown on this photograph that is between the homes and the right-of-way corridor?
A        (Bradstreet) Yes, there is a vegetation buffer.
Q        And these homes are pretty close to the right-of-way corridor; would you agree with that?
A        (Bradstreet) I guess that's up for determination. Define close.
Q        Okay.
         Can we go to the next slide, please? Can you zoom in on that red box?
         What I'm showing you is a document. It was provided by James Chalmers. Are you familiar with James Chalmers?
A        (Bradstreet) I'm familiar that I believe he's written a study for the Project.
Q        Yes. He's an expert hired by the Project, and he's provided testimony on impacts to property values, and he provided this document during his technical session, and he said he got the distances from Northern Pass. And the ones in
the red square are the ones that were in the vicinity of where we were just looking at which is Brookwood Drive and Fox Run Drive; and is anybody on the panel familiar with these distances in terms of who prepared the spreadsheet? I understand Mr. Chalmers got it from somebody on the Project.

A (Johnson) It wasn't me personally.

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

A (Bradstreet) At this time I do not.

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Appears so.
Q Okay. And you would agree that that's -- we had a discussion earlier about whether that would be considered close to the edge of the right-of-way. Would you agree that that's pretty close to the edge of the right-of-way?

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

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

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

Q Okay. So could you turn to the next slide, please? Can you blow up where the red box is? What I'm showing on this exhibit is the area of Brookwood Drive and Fox Run, and this is the route map that was provided as part of the Application, and I think these questions would probably be best for Mr. Bradstreet in terms of where the structures are; is that correct?

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) That is correct.

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

A (Bradstreet) Correct.

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

Okay. And then the purple boxes is a 115 line that those are structures that are not
getting relocated?

A (Bradstreet) Correct.

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) That looks correct, yes.

Q Can you go to the next slide, please?

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

A (Bradstreet) I don't think I'm following you.
So the existing 115 kV line is dimensioned from the edge of right-of-way as 100 feet, not 75 feet.

Q Right here it says 75 feet, right?

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

Q Okay.

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

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Sounds correct.

Q Okay. Thanks. And the height of what these poles are going to be, the 115 that's coming 45 feet closer, those poles are going to be between
83.5 and 88 feet, right?

A (Bradstreet) Looks correct, yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Correct.

Q Can you scroll down?

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

A (Bradstreet) Sounds accurate.

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

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

Q In general.

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

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

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

Q And you turn to the next box on the right of it? And these are houses near Fox Run which is 1 Fox Run and 6 Fox Run. And, again, that also shows
some tree clearing, correct? Or tree trimming?

A (Bradstreet) Correct.

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

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

Q In terms of which tree buffer would get removed?

A (Bradstreet) I was involved, yes.

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

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

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

A Using survey information. Yes.

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

A Yes. We have not gone through and selectively, I guess, flagged which trees would be removed or
trimmed. That's part of the construction process.

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

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

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) I believe that is typical.

Q Okay.

A (Bowes) To identify the trees to be removed or trimmed, yes. That's accurate.
Q And the arborist and the people that are going
to be trimming the trees are going to be using
these plans, right?

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

Q Okay. These plans.

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes. I see some trees.

Q Okay. And those actually provide a pretty good
buffer. You can see a little bit of the
conductors through the trees right now, but
you'd agree that's their buffer to the corridor?

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

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

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

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

MS. PACIK: Okay.

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

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

MS. PACIK: Okay.
BY MS. PACIK:

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

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

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

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

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

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

A (Bowes) Yes. That's true.

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

A (Bowes) Yes.

Q Okay. Can you go to the next photograph, please?
This is 14 Brookwood Drive, and, again, that also shows some trees, and either Mr. Bowes or Mr. Bradstreet, are those trees in the corridor and getting removed?

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

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

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

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

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

Q Okay. And had that been made available that would have been helpful but it hasn't so we're going to use the photographs that we have. Can you turn to the next --

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

A (Johnson) The wetland drawing that you had shown
previously in your beginning statement where the
numbers of each of the individual --

Q The wetlands plan?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q When you say "just trimming towards the
corridor," what's that mean?
A (Bowes) So I'm looking at a depiction that shows what actually has to be removed. And it shows that it's not even to the centerline of the tree itself to the trunk. So it's just actually the outside branches in this case.

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

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

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

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

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

Q 30-foot tree buffer?

A Yes.

Q Okay. But some of those trees are getting removed?
A (Bowes) I would say probably, yes. It looks like 2 or 3 towards the right-of-way. You can't see it from this side, but it would be from the other side.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q  So the trees are right up against the house?

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

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

A  Actually, can you go back about 7 slides to the
    wetlands map?

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

A  (Bradstreet) I believe when we were looking at
    the cross-section view earlier, the edge of
    proposed clearing was 35 feet from the edge of
    the right-of-way, if I remember correctly. That
    looks like the work pad would be roughly five
    feet further away so maybe 40 feet.
Q Okay. And that that house from the right-of-way according to the spreadsheet from Mr. Chalmers was 33 feet. So we're talking about 70, 75 feet between the house and the construction pad; is that right?

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

Q So are we talking maybe 80, 90 feet?

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

A (Bowes) About 84 feet.

A (Bradstreet) About 84 feet.

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.
Q And there are other trucks that are bringing in other equipment, right?

A (Bradstreet) There will be.

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

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

Can you go to the next slide?

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

A (Bowes) I was not.

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

A (Bowes) Yes, I am.

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

So this photograph is actually from Google
Earth, and it shows the poles and the
collectors, and it shows the garage attached to
the house and also there's a shed which is a
white dot underneath the lines. Are you
familiar with the fact that there's a shed right
underneath the lines?

A (Bowes) Yes, I am.

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

A (Bowes) Yes.

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

A (Bowes) I do.

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

A (Bowes) Yes.

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

A (Bowes) Actually, the same line.

Q Same line and that's also, that structure is
getting relocated?
A (Bowes) Yes.

Q Can you turn to the next slide?
    And just looking at --
    Can you go in a little bit closer?
    So the F139-176 is the current 115 line or
structure that we looked at which was near the
shed, and that's coming closer to the house, and
do you know how much closer to the house that's
going to be relocated?
A (Bradstreet) It would be the same that, what did
we say, 40 feet after we did the math last time?
It's the same cross-section.
Q Okay. About 40 or 45 feet. And there's also
F139-177 which is coming about 40, 45 feet
closer?
A (Bradstreet) I mean, I guess I would say it's
moving down on the drawing you provided. I
don't know if it's necessarily moving 45 feet
closer to the house.
Q Okay. Well, there's also a house, where it says
7933, that's a yellow dot. That's a home, too,
right?
A (Bradstreet) It appears to be, yes.
Q So looking at F139-176 --
Can you turn to the next slide?

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

(A (Bradstreet) Appears so. Yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Looks correct.

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

A (Bradstreet) Same as before.

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Oh. Sam corrected me. I guess it is 86. Sorry.
Okay. We can go back if you want to check.

(Bradstreet) Up to you.

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

Can you go to the next slide?

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

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

(Bradstreet) Yes.

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

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

Okay. And then where the construction pad is, 3132-86, F139-176, all the trees in that vicinity which currently act as a buffer to Mountain Road for the home, those are getting removed, too, right?
A (Bradstreet) They would have to be removed for construction, yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

Q We're talking about that area, right?

A (Bradstreet) The vegetation clearing line, yes.

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

A (Bowes) 30 feet?

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

A (Bowes) So I guess you'd call it the front corner of the garage to the corner of the small pad.
Q: And do you know if that garage is used for horses or what it's used for?
A: (Bowes) I do not.
Q: Has anybody been out to that property?
A: (Johnson) Yes, I have.
Q: And do you know whether the -- so there is a garage there, right?
A: (Johnson) that's correct.
Q: And are you aware that part of that area is for living space?
A: (Johnson) No. It's private property. I'm not allowed on it. It looks like a garage door.
Q: So you haven't been on the property. You've been to the road?
A: (Johnson) That's correct.
Q: Okay. Has anybody talked to the property owners?
A: (Johnson) I believe this house was sold. I need to verify that, but I believe this house was sold in the last four or five years. That's why my memory is a little vague on this, and we did talk to the people that purchased the house back then, but I need to research that to give you more details.
Q  Okay. Since these plans have come out, has
anybody talked to the property owners?
A  (Johnson) No. I don't believe so.
Q  Okay. So currently, they could come home one
day and not have any tree buffer and potentially
a 100-foot pole located about, what, 30 feet
from their house?
A  (Bradstreet) I think the pole would be further
than that.
Q  How far is the pole from the house?
A  (Bowes) From the same corner of the garage, it's
about 60 feet.
Q  Which corner are you looking at?
A  (Bowes) The one -- bottom right edge. Bottom
front.
Q  Okay. And when you say to the pole, you're
talking about to F139-176?
A  (Bowes) Yes.
Q  You think it's 60 feet?
A  (Bowes) Yes.
Q  And how big, these monopoles, what's the width
of the monopole? I think I've seen 8 feet or
ten feet wide?
A  (Bowes) At ground level, you mean the base?
Q Yes. What's the diameter of the base?
A (Bradstreet) For a 115 structure -- they're all going to be different. For a 115 kV structure, assuming this is a tandem structure, it's probably in the four to five-foot range.

Q Okay. Do you know when this house was built?
A (Bradstreet) I do not.
Q Can you turn to the next slide, please?

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

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

Q And the ornamental trees aren't acting as a buffer, are they?
A (Johnson) No. They're not.
Q So the buffer, though, between the house and Mountain Road, those trees that are acting as a
buffer are going to get removed, right?

A (Johnson) Yes. It looks like it.

Q Can you go to the next slide, please?

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

A (Bowes) I would say probably, yes.

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

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

Can you zoom in to --

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

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

Q So it's going to get moved?

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Doesn't appear to be.

Q Can you turn to the next slide?

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

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

Q Okay. And you had mentioned earlier nobody's had a conversation about what the current proposal is with the property owners?
A (Johnson) Not directly.

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Looks like 2009.

Q Okay. Great. Next slide, please.

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

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

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

A Yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) I see vegetation between the
existing transmission corridor and the house.

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

A (Bradstreet) I have not.

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

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

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

A (Bowes) Yes.

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

Q That's the structure number? And that is getting removed, and it's coming closer to what's Route 139?
Q And again, is this the same segment where it's coming 45 feet closer?
A (Bradstreet) It should be, yes.
Q And then that yellow square is going to be the new structure which is 3132-87?
A (Bradstreet) Correct.
Q And that's coming closer to where that house is, right?
A (Bradstreet) Coming closer? Compared to what?
Q Currently, the 115 structure is farther away from the house from where the new 345 volt structure will be.
A (Bradstreet) Sure, yes.
Q All right. Can you go to the next slide?
Just in terms of the heights, the current structures --
I'm sorry. Go back one.
All right. So F139-175 is the 115 line that's getting relocated, right?
A (Bradstreet) In this, next to this parcel that you're discussing, yes.
Q Okay. So we'll go to the next slide again.
Sorry.
All right. So F139-175 that's going to be 105 feet?

A (Bradstreet) Looks that way, yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Correct.

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Looks that way.

Q Can you go to the next slide?

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

A (Bowes) I would say yes.

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

A (Bowes) So it looks like 3132-87, yes, and the existing 115 line they'll be able to see.
And there's the construction pads which are going to be located, how far away are the construction pads from the home?

Just a second. About 95 feet to the bottom corner.

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

I have not.

No? Okay. Can you turn to the next slide? I think this is a question for

Ms. Farrington. This slide is the wetlands map and also shows all the access route at the intersection of 132 and Hoyt Road, and it shows that there's three access routes proposed for this intersection, right? And they're all circled in blue for ease of reference.

Yes.

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

No.

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

I will likely assist in the driveway permit applications, yes.
Q Okay. And driveway permit applications, my understanding is you're not actually going to the City of Concord for a driveway permit application, are you?
A (Farrington) That's correct. It's with DOT.
Q And DOT, what jurisdiction do they have over Hoyt Road?
A (Farrington) That's, I believe, out of my range of expertise.
Q Hoyt Road is a local road, right? Locally maintained? You don't know?
A (Bowes) I believe it is, yes.
Q So DOT doesn't have any jurisdiction over Hoyt Road, does it?
A (Bowes) I believe that's correct.
Q So they're not going to be giving you a driveway permit for Hoyt Road.
A (Bowes) That's correct.
Q So you're not getting a driveway permit for the one that's getting the tree buffer removed going on to Hoyt Road.
A (Bowes) Only if we come to agreement with the City of Concord for an MOU for the construction.
Q Okay, and we've talked about that. There's no
guarantee that's going to happen, right?

A  (Bowes) That is true.

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

A  (Bowes) I believe that's accurate.

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

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

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

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

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

A  (Bowes) I do not.

Q  Okay. Could you turn to the next slide? I mean, before we go to that, I assume nobody else
knows? On this panel?

A (Bradstreet) I do not.

A (Johnson) I do not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.
Q  So can you go to the next slide, please?

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

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

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

A  (Bradstreet) It appears as if not.

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

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

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

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

Q  Okay. So that was over a year ago. Since, you've developed new maps that you've submitted
to the Committee since February of 2016, right?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q  Okay. Can you go to the next slide?

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

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

Q  Okay. And you'd agree that based on this Google
Earth map those are the two houses?
A (Bradstreet) It appears as if, yes.
Q Can you go to the next slide?
   And what I'm showing you is, you can only see a little bit of their garage, but this is the house at 61 Sanborn Road, and its proximity in the edge of the right-of-way corridor. Do you know how far that house is from the edge of the corridor?
A (Bradstreet) I don't believe we do, no.
Q And you probably wouldn't know if it wasn't on any of the maps, would you?
A (Bradstreet) Correct.
Q Okay. Next slide, please?
   And this is from the City of Concord Code Department, and it shows when this house got final approval which was December 16th, 2015. So it was over a year and a half ago about, right?
A (Bradstreet) December of 2015 is a year and a half ago.
Q Okay. So it's been around for a while.
   Next slide, please.
   And this is the house at 67 Sanborn Road
which we saw on the other side of the edge of
the corridor. And has anybody seen that house?
On the panel?
A (Bowes) I have not.
A (Johnson) I have not.
Q And it would be fair to say that nobody knows
the distance of that house from the edge of the
corridor?
A (Johnson) Correct.
Q And the Site Evaluation Committee hasn't been
notified about this house?
A (Bradstreet) I do not believe so.
A (Johnson) I think you're notifying them right
now.
Q I guess so. All right.
Next slide, please.
Is it a municipality's obligation to notify
the Site Evaluation Committee about properties
along the route? Or is it the Northern Pass's
obligation? Does anyone know that?
A (Bowes) I don't believe it's a municipality's.
Q I didn't think so either.
In terms of the date that this house got
final approval and final inspection, that was
January of 2016 according to this record, right?
A (Bradstreet) Appears so.
Q Okay. So this is also not a new construction, so to say? It's been around for about a year and a half also?
A (Bradstreet) Sounds right.
Q Okay. Next slide, please.

So I just want to talk a moment about the area in blue which is Sanborn Road that has the houses that we've been looking at, and, currently, F139-171 is the 115 line, and it's getting moved closer which is the green square. Do you know how many feet closer that pole is going to get moved to the home?
A (Bradstreet) Without the home shown, I do not, but I would also venture to say it probably is moving left on the page which might move it not as close as you make it seem.
Q But we can't really tell because we don't know where the house is?
A (Bradstreet) With this figure, correct.
Q Okay. And 3132-91 is going to be next to that 115 line?
A (Bradstreet) Yes, ma'am.
Q  Would it be fair to say when you made this route
map you didn't take into consideration the
location of the homes because they're not shown
on the map?  Right?
A  (Bradstreet) I think that's a fair statement.
Q  Okay.  So to the extent you tried to put
structures in a place where it might not have
such a huge impact on a home, that wasn't done
on this particular location?
A  (Bradstreet) The information was not available.
Q  Well, it was available at some point, wasn't it?
A  (Bradstreet) It's not in our design information.
Q  Okay.  Can you go to the next slide, please?

So in terms of the heights of these poles,
F-171 is going to be 97 feet, and then there's
one going to be next to it F139-172, which is
120 feet, right?
A  (Bradstreet) That's what it shows, yes.
Q  And the 3132-91 was the one that was closest to
the road and the homes, that's goes to be 100
feet?
A  (Bradstreet) Yes.
Q  And F139-171, that's the one that we were
looking at that's closest to the homes.  It's
going to be 97, but it's currently 43 feet?
A Correct.
Q So it getting taller and potentially closer to the edge of the right-of-way, right?
A (Bradstreet) Correct.
Q Okay. Can you do go to the next slide?
Now, what I want to talk to you about for just a moment is the horse farm on Sanborn Road. Is anybody here familiar with that horse farm?
A (Johnson) I have seen it from the road, yes.
Q Has anybody been on the property and talked to the owners of the farm?
A (Johnson) I have not, but we'd have to check the records to see if one of our Community Relations Specialists has.
Q Okay, but nobody on the panel?
A (Johnson) That's correct.
Q And are you familiar with whether the owners use the area underneath the right-of-way to have their horses graze?
A (Johnson) When I was there, there were no horses out, but that doesn't mean that they don't do that.
Q Okay. And the owners of the farm, they actually
own that land. Northern Pass has an easement or PSNH has an easement to it, but the farm can use the land underneath the right-of-way for their horses, right?

A (Bowes) I would say yes.

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

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

A (Johnson) Yes.

A (Bradstreet) It appears, yes.

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

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

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

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

Q Okay. And fair to say, she's probably not going to be able to have her horses out there while
you're doing construction, right?

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Not that I'm aware.

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

Q Okay.

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

Q But it's not really premature because we're in trial right now and you're looking to get a
certificate and to prove that this is in the public interest.

A (Johnson) Correct.

Q Okay.

A (Johnson) I'm not disputing that.

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

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

MS. PACIK: I would never argue. Never.

BY MS. PACIK:

Q Can you go to the next page, please?

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

A (Johnson) Yes.

Q Can you go to the next slide, please?

So there's a home at 37 Snow Pond Road, and it's, actually, you can see from Snow Pond, you have to cross the right-of-way, it's in that red box, to get to the yellow dot, and the yellow
dot is somebody's home, and it's right near
where the number is P145-153. Do you see that?
A (Bradstreet) I do.
Q So in this particular area, 3132-102 is the 345
line. And that's from, it's proposed to be
pretty much directly in front of the home; is
that right?
A (Bradstreet) It looks to be mostly up in the
drawing, yes.
Q Okay. And so the one closest to it is 3132-103.
A (Bradstreet) Closest to what?
Q I guess if you're going south --
A (Bradstreet) Um-hum.
Q -- on Snow Pond Road, 3132-103 is the next
structure for the 345 line?
A (Bradstreet) That's correct.
Q So I'm a little confused. What consideration
did you give when putting 3132-102 right in
front of the home?
A (Bradstreet) I guess specifically what's your --
are you asking if we looked at that home and its
view to the Snow Pond?
Q Yes. I guess I'm confused why you would put a
structure right in front of this person's house?
A (Bradstreet) I mean, I guess there's an existing
distribution line that's between that house and
our corridor today.
Q But the distribution line is not going to be 100
feet tall, is it?
A (Bradstreet) No, it will not be 100 feet tall,
no.
Q I mean, how tall is the current distribution
line?
A (Bradstreet) I would say 40 to 50 feet.
Q At most, right?
A (Bradstreet) Probably at most, yes.
Q So we've got 31-102 which is right in front of
the home, and P145-153 is coming closer to the
edge of the right-of-way where that home is,
right?
A (Bradstreet) You said P145-153? Yes.
Q Yes. Can you go to the next slide, please?
And we just talked about 3132-102 which is
right in front of the home, that's going to be
100 feet tall, and P145-152 is going to be 88
feet tall, and according to the heights that we
were provided, P145-152 is currently 43 feet
tall, right?
A (Bradstreet) Correct.

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

A (Bradstreet) Approximately, yes.

Q Okay. Can you go to the next slide?

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

Q You lost it? Great.

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) The yellow line?
Q Yes.
A (Bradstreet) That's the limited disturbance. It looks like that might be where we have some environmental controls or something like that but yes.
Q So something is going on in their driveway in that area?
A (Bradstreet) It currently looks that way, yes.
Q Okay. And then there's the tree buffer that we can see the green dotted line in front of the home which is circled in blue. You can see that there's some trees that are getting removed in this area, too, right?
A (Bradstreet) There'll be some clearing, I think. It looks from this aerial like it might be trimming, but it's hard to tell.
Q It is hard to tell. And can you tell from this aerial view whether or not any of the mature trees that are currently acting as a buffer, whether the base of them are in that clearing area?
A (Bowes) I would say yes, there were a few.
Q So they're going to lose some of their buffer, right?
A (Bowes) Yes.

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

A (Bowes) Possibly.

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

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

A (Bowes) Yes.

Q Can you turn the next page?

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

A (Bowes) That is true.

Q Okay. And has anyone talked to these homeowners?

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

Q Okay. Well, according to the homeowners,
nobody's come to talk to them. Would you have any reason to disagree with them?

A  (Johnson) No.

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

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

Q  They will have lost some of their tree buffer.

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

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

A  (Bowes) Selected trees would be, yes.

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

Q  And from this picture, you can't really tell whether these trees that we're looking at are part of that five to ten feet because depending on where the trunk of those trees are, they
could be losing some of them.

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

Q All right. Next, please.

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

A (Johnson) Yes.

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

A (Scott) No.

Q Can you go to the next slide?

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

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

Q There is a house there. Yeah. So this map that you provided to the Site Evaluation Committee, though, does not show the house, and it shows some of the poles that are going to be relocated
and also introduced in this area so P145-134, that is a 115 pole that's currently pretty close to Oak Hill Road, and that's getting relocated, I believe you now know, closer to the person's home; is that right?

A (Bradstreet) It looks that way, yes.

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

A (Johnson) Which structure are we talking about?

Q P145-134.

A (Johnson) About 130 feet.

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

A (Bradstreet) It looks that way, yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Correct.

Q Can you go to the next page?

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

A (Bradstreet) It does not.
Q  And, again, since this time you've submitted new
maps to the Site Evaluation Committee but none
of the maps you've submitted show the home, do
they?
A  (Bradstreet) They do not.
Q  Okay. And they're actually, the driveway, see
the access road on this wetlands map?
A  (Bradstreet) Up Oak Hill Road?
Q  Yes.
A  (Bradstreet)
Q  The access road? That's actually their
driveway, isn't it?
A  (Bradstreet) I believe so.
Q  Okay. Can you go to the next slide?
And this is, it's kind of far away but that
shows the home and the access road that you're
planning to use part of, and that home is the
one that we were talking about is on that
property, right?
A  (Bradstreet) Yes.
Q  Okay. Can you go to the next page?
And that's a closer-up of the home. And,
again, you can see the road that leads up to it
that you'll be using.
A (Bradstreet) It appears it's a current access road for this corridor also.
Q Okay. And it's also their driveway.
A (Bradstreet) Correct.
Q And you're not planning to come to the City of Concord to talk to them about getting any sort of driveway permit for this temporary access road?
A (Bowes) Only if we work out an agreement with the town.
Q So only if you work out an agreement, and, otherwise, you're just going to be using it?
A (Bowes) Correct.
Q Next page?
A (Bowes) As we do today though.
Q Well, it's a little use, isn't it?
A It's for PSNH transmission, yes.
Q I think it would be fair to say that using it for a temporary access road for construction is a little different than occasional maintenance of the right-of-way. You would agree with that.
A (Bowes) We rebuild and reconductor lines today so it would be very similar to that. As you know, we're doing a project in Concord right
Okay. Well, I will let the Committee, I will leave it to the Committee to put whatever weight they want on that statement.

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

That's what the certificate shows.

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

I mean, the answer is, it's not in the data.

You submitted your Application in October of 2015, right?

Correct.

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

I believe that's correct.

So when you say it's not in the data, what do you mean?
A (Bradstreet) The survey data used for the line design was acquired before April of 2012. The Project began years ago.

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

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

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

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

Q Can you go to the next page?

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

So 134 to 136, the current heights of those are about 43 feet to 45.5 feet, and the proposed
heights of those go from 120 feet to 79. Right?
A (Bradstreet) That looks correct.
Q And 134, that's the one that you said was coming, what did you say? 100 feet closer to the home?
A (Bradstreet) I think I said, yes, around 100 feet.
Q Around 100 feet. And it's going to be 120 feet tall. That's one of the taller size structures in Concord, isn't it?
A (Bradstreet) In the specific area, it is, yes.
Q Okay. And then for the 3132 line, those are going to be 80 to 100 feet tall?
A (Bradstreet) Looks correct.
Q All right.
A (Bradstreet) The existing -- I guess, can I point out one thing?
Q Sure.
A (Bradstreet) The existing line that's not being relocated is similar in height. It's not 120 feet probably, but it's similar in height to the relocated 115 just as a data point.
Q I don't know what you mean by similar in height. 120? I don't think anything out there is 120
feet, right?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) I may have misspoke.
Okay. Can you go to the next page?

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

A (Johnson) Yes.

A (Bowes) Yes.

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

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

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

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

A Yes.

Q And then the other blue circle is for map block lot number 118-2-3. Are you aware whether there's a house there now?
A (Bradstreet) I believe there is.

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

A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q So that means they're going to get cut, right?
A (Bowes) Trimmed, yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) It was not.
Q Can we go to the next page? This is the Certificate of Occupancy for that home, and that was from August 14th, 2012. Also another home that was built about five years ago.

A (Bradstreet) Looks that way, yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) It's larger than mine.

Q Mine, too. All right.

Next page.

I just want to briefly review the poles and what's going on in the vicinity of Jennifer Drive and Appleton Street. So those poles, the 145, the poles that we're looking at are 127 to 132, and they're coming closer to the homes on Jennifer Drive. Right?
A (Bradstreet) It looks that way, yes.
Q And then the yellow line shows the 345 line and that's 114 to 117 are the structure numbers?
A (Bradstreet) Correct.
Q Can you go to the next page?
   So we looked at what information you provided which was the current heights of the 115 line, and those range from 43 feet as tall as 61, and the heights that we're looking at for the new structures that are coming closer to Jennifer Drive are going to be between 79, 88 and as tall as 105 for the 115 line?
A (Bradstreet) Looks like 101.5 but yes.
Q 101.5. Thanks. Sorry. So some of those structures are going to be twice as tall, right?
A (Bradstreet) Looks that way, yes.
Q And then for the 3132 line, they range from 95 feet to 110 feet?
A (Bradstreet) Correct.
Q And the 117, 3132-117, the one that's 110 feet, that's a structure that's going to be located near Appleton Street?
A (Bradstreet) I believe that was right, yes.
Q And so people driving back and forth to their
homes on Appleton Street will be able to see that 110-foot structure pretty visibly, right?

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

Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

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

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

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

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

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

BY MS. PACIK:

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

Can you turn to the next slide, please?
So this is a route map that you provided, and the red box shows the area of Portsmouth Street. And do you see where it says 8140 and this is probably for Mr. Bradstreet also and Mr. Bowes because it's a construction question, but 8140 is the vicinity, and you see the four yellow dots. Those are four homes, right?

A (Bradstreet) I see the dots, yes.

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

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

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

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

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

Q Okay. Can you turn the next slide?

Whoa. Odd color. Okay. So the reason it
may have come up is this is a more recent satellite image, and you can see some of the construction activities going on, and that's for the Unitil substation for one of their Reliability Projects. And you're familiar with that construction over there, right?

A (Bradstreet) I am, yes.

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

A (Bowes) Yes.

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

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

A (Bradstreet) Looks correct, yes.

Q Can you turn to the next slide?

This is a picture of the home, and you can
see the tree buffer behind the house. Do you know which of these trees are getting removed?

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

Q Maybe if Dawn walks across the room again.


Thank you, Dawn.

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

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

Q Yes.

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

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

A (Bowes) Yes, you can.

Q And that's the 115 line?

A (Bowes) Yes.

Q So that structure will be more visible once you remove those trees; is that fair to say?
A (Bowes) I think that structure gets replaced, but the new structure would be more visible.

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

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

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide? So this is the wetlands map that you provided as part of the Application, and if you zoom in, it shows the tree buffer again that's going to get removed, and it's the, again, it's hard to see because it's in the green dot, but you can see that kind of half of that tree and then going forward is going to get removed, and then
there's an area along Portsmouth Street, and
Steven's going to move the mouse over there.
That's all tree buffer that's also getting
removed; is that correct?
A (Bowes) Yes.
Q And the pole that you said is going to get
relocated, that's P145-101?
A (Bowes) Yes.
Q And then 3132-135 is also a new structure for
the 345 line that's getting put in that area?
A (Bradstreet) Yes.
Q Okay. Can you turn the next slide?
So going back to the route map and the
structures in that location, I want to focus a
little bit on the structures and the crossing of
393 now, and that's what's shown in the red box.
And 393, there's actually a bridge that goes
over Portsmouth Street, right?
A (Bradstreet) Correct.
Q So the numbers that you can see P145-101 and
P145-100, those are on each side of Interstate
393 and on each side of that bridge, right?
A (Bradstreet) Yes. Not sure where the bridge
begins and ends, but yes.
Q The bridge is over Portsmouth Street.
A (Bradstreet) Okay.

Q So 101 and 100 are the two that are on each side of 393 and that's the P145 existing line. And then 3132-136 and 3132-135 are the new structures that would be put in that vicinity on each side of Interstate 393, right?
A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

Q Can you turn to the next slide? So according to the original information that you provided with your Application, the P145-101 line which I think is the structure that, that structure is the one that you said would become more visible, right, after you remove the tree?
A (Bowes) Yes.

Q Okay. And that's actually going to be 120 feet is what it was proposed originally, and I understand that things have changed, but originally it was 120 or 119.5?
A (Bowes) Yes.

Q And it's currently, the 101 is 47.5 feet?
A (Bradstreet) I think -- that's what I was just asking Sam about. I think that is incorrect. I believe the existing structure I had circled
though is closer to 75 feet.

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

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

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

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

Q And you think that they're how tall?

A (Bradstreet) I believe one's 74 and a half. Is the other one 70? So 74 and a half nearest to P145-101 proposed and 70 foot for the one that's
closest to the P145-100 proposed.

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

A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

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

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

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

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

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

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

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

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next slide?

So we've had some communication, this is an email that I had with legal counsel for Eversource on what the current plan is for these structures based on communications with the
Department of Transportation. And the information that we received was 3132-135 and 3132-136, which are the two on each side of Interstate 393, are now proposed to be 160 feet tall. Is that right?

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

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

And so what the DOT has asked us to do is to provide a couple plans of what are possibilities that could be done in the future. And as you know, we are still going through the
negotiations, if you will, with the DOT. This is one of the areas that is still under development with them. It's not only underground stuff. It's also overhead stuff that we're continuing to work with them on. But these have not been determined or have not been directed yet in any way by the Department of Transportation.

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

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

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

A (Johnson) That is correct.

Q And it hasn't been finalized, but at this point, the original proposed heights that were shown in
the Application, DOT is not going to approve that, right?

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

Q  Have you sought a variance request yet?

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

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

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

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

A  (Bradstreet) I do not believe so.

A  (Johnson) Not to my knowledge.

A  (Bradstreet) Not to my knowledge.

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

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

A  (Bradstreet) Or if they exceed 200 feet.

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

A (Bradstreet) I believe so. Yes.

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

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

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

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

Q Can you turn to the next page?

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

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

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

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

Q Okay. So this is the photograph that was provided to the City of Concord by counsel for Eversource which shows, and I circled them in
red, the lines that we're talking about. The current P145 line and where the proposed locations are that have been provided to DOT and also the structures for the 345 line going over 393.

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

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

A (Bradstreet) Correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q Can you turn the next page?

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

Can you zoom in? There we go.

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

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

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

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

Q Oh, okay.

Next page, please.

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

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

Q What's that mean?
A: (Bradstreet) That means the total structure height would be 165.

Q: So 165 from the ground?

A: (Bradstreet) Yes.

Q: Okay. Next page, please.

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

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

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

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

Q: Okay. So I'll represent to you, with the understanding that you have not seen this before, that they originally were looking at having poles go over the bridge which is the red lines, and, ultimately, what they proposed and agreed upon with DOT was to move the lines away from the bridge in order to have the poles or it resulted in the poles being lower. And you can see that the current proposal that they're
building right now is no longer over the bridge. Do you see that?

A (Bradstreet) It appears that way, yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

A (Bowes) I do not know.

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

A (Bradstreet) I did not, no.

Q Have you reached out to Alton Woods or anyone here to talk to Alton Woods about whether or not you could similarly put the lines over there by Alton Woods and move it?
A (Johnson) We have not.

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

A (Bradstreet) That's an option.

Q Okay. An option that has not been pursued?

A (Bradstreet) Not that I'm aware.

Q Can you go to the next page?

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

A (Bradstreet) I see it.

Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

And these are the heights of the structures that Unitil will be having. And I'll just maybe zoom in on some of the yellow circles that I put on this plan. But you can see that the pole heights that Unitil is proposing are, the first one is 59 feet above grade. The second one on the other side is 65 feet above grade. And
going along, there's a couple, one's 50 feet, 65 feet, and then the last two that they're looking at are 59 feet and 65 feet. Do you see that?

A (Bradstreet) I do see that.

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

A (Bradstreet) Was not aware.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q So the Project is refusing to look at anything outside the right-of-way, even if it means reducing pole heights from 160 feet; is that
what you're saying?

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

Q Well, they are willing to?

A (Bowes) Yes.

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

A (Bowes) That is correct.

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

Can you turn to the next page?

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

Q We lost it. There it is.

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

A (Bradstreet) I believe that's correct.
Q So, and then P145-98. Do you see that construction pad?
A (Bradstreet) I do.
Q And that construction pad, that's right on top of where their playground is, isn't it?
A (Bradstreet) I can't tell from this, but if you say it is.
Q Did you ever go out to the site to look to see maybe what was underneath that proposed structure?
A (Johnson) Yes. We met with Alton Woods back in 2014 and reviewed structure locations with them.
Q But since you've submitted these plans, you haven't met with Alton Woods, have you?
A (Johnson) No. Nor have they requested.
Q So they'd actually have to call you and say, hey, what are the final plans that you decided on to know that they're having a construction pad over one of their access roads and on top of their playground?
A (Johnson) The plans didn't change from our meeting.
Q You haven't actually sent anyone that's along the right-of-way the plans, though, that we're
looking at, have you?

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

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

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

Q  Okay.

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

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

A  (Johnson) Um-um.

Q  Okay.

A  (Bradstreet) One thing before we leave this, 3132-137 is a good example of an improvement we could make working with the landowner. If we were to shift that pad or potentially shift the structure somewhat, we might have some flexibility to adjust it so it doesn't impact that road.
Q  But when you did this plan, you could see it went right over the access road, but you still put the construction pad in that location, right?
A  (Bradstreet) Right now it is. Yes.
Q  Same thing with the playground?
A  (Bradstreet) I don't see a playground, but --
Q  Okay.

Can you turn the next page?

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

Can you turn to the next page?

And this is the property that I want to look at, and the house number in red that we're looking at is 5 and 7 Old Loudon Road. Are you familiar with this particular location, Mr. Bradstreet?
A  (Bradstreet) Yes, I am.
Q  So can you turn to the next?

You can see currently there's a tree buffer behind and around the people's home. Do you see that?
A  (Bradstreet) I see trees adjacent to the
distribution line. Yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) I see a tree, yes.

Q Okay. Can you turn the next page?

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

A (Bradstreet) I see proposed tree clearing.

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

A (Bradstreet) There will be clearing, yes.

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

A (Bradstreet) Vegetation. I don't know if it's that specific tree.
Q Have you been to this house?
A (Bradstreet) Not in a long time.
A (Bowes) No, I haven't.
Q Did you know that that's their tree in their front yard?
A (Bradstreet) I would assume it's their tree, yes.
Q Okay. Let's go to the next slide.

So the buffer, this is a Google Earth street view, but that showed the buffer that you said was going to get removed, right?
A (Bradstreet) Part of that will have some tree clearing, yes.
Q When you say part of it, which part are you talking about?
A (Bowes) Looks like the part directly under the lines.
Q The large part then? Would that be fair to say?
A (Bowes) Based on this angle, it's hard to tell, but I think there is substantial removals within the right-of-way, yes. Normally the buffer is outside the right-of-way.
Q Okay.
A (Bowes) All removals in this case are inside the right-of-way.

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

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

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

A (Bowes) Yes.

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next page?

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

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

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

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

Q But you don't know whether the entire tree is
going to come down.

A (Bowes) It is not.

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

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

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

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

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

A (Bowes) That's not accurate.

Q Okay. And so part of it is.

A (Bowes) Trimming, yes.

Q Trimming. Okay.

Can you turn the next page?

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

A (Johnson) I do not know.
Q Anyone know? I'll take that as a no. Okay.

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

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

Q And that's a condominium development in Concord?

A (Bradstreet) Correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q Okay. And then that blue circle, before we move on, that doesn't -- and this is a fairly new
construction so I understand why it's not on the map, but that's a senior living facility? Are you familiar with that, that is being developed there right now?

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

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

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

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

Q Okay. So we asked in a discovery request what tree buffer abutting McKenna's Purchase would be cleared. And the response was that the buffer that exists, that runs along the western side of the transmission right-of-way will not be cleared but some localized clearing is planned near proposed structures 318-129 and 318-130. And that the limits, the clearing limits shown on the Project permit drawings, is slightly overstated in the area of McKenna's Purchase and
will be corrected. But at this point you just said it's not overstated and that it is correct.

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

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

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

Q Sure.

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

Q Which one is the existing distribution line?

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

Q You can't see it on there?

A (Bradstreet) No.

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

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

Q You know McKenna's Purchase is very concerned
about that tree buffer?

A (Bradstreet) Yes I do.

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

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

Q Can you turn to the next page? So that the structures that you referenced are 318-129 and 318-130 right?

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

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

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

Q Can you turn the next page? So I was trying to find those two structure numbers on here and I could not find them anywhere. Do you see them?

A (Bradstreet) No, because the distribution line is not numbered. Or wait. Where is it at. Yeah. Two pinks dots. So if you look at your left circle, there's two pink dots. They're not numbered because it would clutter the drawing, but those are the two structures.
Q Okay. So that area is where there's going to be clearing?
A (Bradstreet) Yes.
Q And when you look at all the yellow circles along the edge of the right-of-way, those are all the homes, right?
A (Bradstreet) I believe those are the individual units, yes.
Q And so are any of the trees near those homes going to be removed?
A (Bradstreet) I don't believe, other than what we've indicated in the data request anything is going to be removed. There may be some clearing, some trimming that needs to be done.
Q You said in the data request that new plans were going to be submitted that clarified it. Have those plans been submitted yet?
A (Bradstreet) Not that I'm aware.
Q And we're now in trial, right? It's been a while since that data request was provided to us.
A (Bradstreet) Correct.
Q So no plans have been submitted. Are you planning on submitting new plans? Do you know?
A (Johnson) I believe we are at a yet-to-be-determined date.

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

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

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

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

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

Q Yes.

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

Q Okay. So we're going to need to clarify what two dots on the left side you're talking about.
A (Bradstreet) There's a dot next to U 58 and a dot next to U 70.

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

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

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

A (Bradstreet) No.

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

A (Bradstreet) That buffer will still remain except for some vegetation that's near those proposed distribution structures that we just looked at on the previous drawing.

Q So the other distribution structures, are those at the top of this photograph where the mouse is right now near Shaw's?

A (Bradstreet) No.

Q Where are they? They're not shown on this?

A (Bradstreet) No.

Q Okay. So until we get new plans, we really don't know what's getting removed. Is that fair
to say?

A (Bradstreet) That's been summarized as the area near those two proposed structures which are shown on the Application drawings. I don't know what this drawing is from.

Q This is a GIS interest from the City of Concord which shows all utilities in Concord.

Okay. We can move on. Keep going.

A (Bowes) Actually, that last drawing we could probably show where the distribution line is.

Q Great. Let's go back to it.

So Mr. Bowes, you said that the tree buffer near the distribution line shown in this photograph is going to get removed. Where is it?

A (Bowes) So on the far left-hand side is the distribution circuit in the right-of-way, and you go towards where the top of the screen is, that's the area where there's going to be tree clearing.

A (Bradstreet) Underneath the lines.

A (Bowes) Right underneath that distribution area.

Q This area?

A (Bowes) Yes, right in through there.
Q. So currently, the condominiums that you can see, they have a buffer between their homes and the distribution line, and you're going to be removing those trees?

A. (Bradstreet) Directly under the line.

Q. Okay. And have you been out there to see how thick those trees are? Because even though, I'll represent to you that even though it looks like it's a thick buffer right now, it's actually a very thin line of trees. Are you familiar with that?

A. (Bowes) Yes, I am.

Q. So have you gone out there to identify which trees are getting removed?

A. (Bowes) Not specifically which trees, but I've been on the right-of-way, and I understand the general clearing that's going to be done. I have not been on the property to see what the view is.

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

So there is an area off of Pembroke Road, and you can see in the red square that there's a home located near the right-of-way. Do you see that?
A (Bradstreet) I see the home yes.
Q Are you familiar with this home on Pembroke Road?
A (Bradstreet) Not specifically with this home, I don't believe.
Q Okay. This home is, it's 249 Pembroke Road.
   Can you turn to the next page?
   And this is the route map that you have of that vicinity, and it shows that the structure numbers closest to that home, it's actually P145-88. The 88 is over the yellow circle that is that person's home. Is that right?
A (Bradstreet) I believe so. Yes.
Q Okay. So P145-88 is getting moved closer to that home, right?
A (Bradstreet) Looks like somewhat, yes.
Q And then there's two other structures. C189-47 and 3132-146, right?
A (Bradstreet) Correct.
Q And 3132-146 is the new 345 line. And then C189-47 is also a structure that's getting relocated?
A (Bradstreet) That's right.
Q To the other side of the line. Or the corridor?
A (Bradstreet) It's moving to the other edge, yes.

Q Okay. Can you turn the next page?

So the numbers that we just looked at, P145-88, that was the one that's getting moved closer to that person's home. And according to information you provided, it's currently 43 feet, and it's going to be 110 feet when it gets moved, right?

A (Bradstreet) One second, please.

A (Bradstreet) So it looks like, again, because of the numbering, since we've changed structures, the existing structure number might not match exactly with the proposed structure number. So it looks like it's 47 and a half instead of 43.

Q Oh, okay. So it's 47 and a half and it's going to be 110 feet?

A (Bradstreet) That's correct.

Q And the Segment number is S1-8, and I'm a little confused because when I look at the Segment map which says S1-8, which is right here, it doesn't show anything getting relocated closer to the edge of the right-of-way, it doesn't show how many feet closer it's going to be. Is that wrong?
A (Bradstreet) Can you pan to the right a little bit? Yes. It looks like it might be in error.

Q So which map should I be looking at to figure it out? Because we know where 115 is coming closer to the home, but I'm not sure which segment illustrates that.

A (Bradstreet) You don't have the next sheet by chance, do you?

Q Probably not.

A (Bradstreet) I'd have to look and see if S1-9 is what it's supposed to be represented by, but without looking at it, I can't tell you. Looks like it's in error.

Q So do you know how many feet that 47 and a half 115 line that's going to be 110 feet tall after you locate it, do you know how many feet closer to the home it's coming?

A (Bradstreet) Yes. One second. Ten feet.

Q Ten feet closer? Okay. And then we had looked at some of the heights of other poles in the vicinity of the home so the 3132-145 that you're putting in is also going to be 110 feet tall?

A (Bradstreet) I believe so. Yes.

Q And then the 31 -- sorry. The C189-47 is also
going to be 110 feet tall, right?
A (Bradstreet) Yes, it looks that way.
Q So this home is going to have be three 110-foot
tall structures located next to it?
A (Bradstreet) Currently looks that way. Yes.
Q Can you turn to the next page?
This is the, this is the wetlands map, and
it shows the proposed construction pads in the
area circled in red, and you see the home, and
it's close to the edge of the right-of-way,
Isn't it?
A (Bradstreet) What's that?
Q The home on --
A (Bradstreet) The parcel?
Q The actual home on 249 Pembroke Road. Do you
see that?
A (Bradstreet) Yes. It looks like it's fairly
close.
Q And then you've got the two construction pads,
and how far away are the construction pads going
to be from that home?
A (Bradstreet) One second. 70 feet.
Q 70 feet? Okay.
Can you turn the next page?
There's a picture of that home that we just determined is going to have three 110-foot structures located next to it, and there's going to be an access road going into that right-of-way, correct?

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

Q So some of those trees are going to get removed, but I assume not the mature ones in this person's front yard?

A I believe those trees are on their property so let me double check. No removals.

Q Can you turn to the next page?

So I just want to talk for a moment about some of the City of Concord's ordinances that we have, and the first one that I want to talk about is the noise ordinances in Concord. The proposal for this Project is 7 a.m. until 7 p.m. Monday through Saturday to do work. Right?

A (Kayser) Yes. That's correct.

Q So a lot of these properties in Concord we looked at are within 100 feet of these proposed construction pads?

A (Kayser) Yes.

Q So for somebody who is looking to have like a
A (Kayser) It would depend on the timing, but there could be construction on Saturdays, yes.

Q And if you have a baby in the home? There could be construction going on at 7 a.m.

A (Kayser) Yes.

Q Okay. Can you turn the next page? Actually, I think we can skip a couple pages. This is just the -- okay.

This is Concord's noise ordinance, and we do allow 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays, and then 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. on Saturdays well as certain holidays. So it's your opinion, though, that you do not have to comply with the City of Concord's noise ordinance?

A (Kayser) As Mr. Johnson had discussed, our plan is to work with the communities with the MOUs, but, ultimately, the Site Evaluation Committee would be the authority to give us the permission to construct the Project.

Q So in the event that we can't come to some sort of agreement, the default would be 7 a.m. to 7
p.m., Monday through Saturday, and I also believe some night work as you deem necessary.

A (Kayser) The 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. as we've stated and night work would be in certain areas as we come to agreement with the communities is what we said on night work.

A (Bowes) So, for example, the night work in Concord could be that crossing for 393. The DOT may want us to string wire in the middle of the night so we would take a brief outage on that highway, say 2 a.m. for 10 or 15 minutes while we did the wire stringing.

Q Okay.

A (Bowes) Aside from that, I don't see a lot of night work needed for the overhead construction in Concord.

A (Kayser) Agreed.

Q But you wouldn't be consulting with the City of Concord with night work assuming we could not come to an agreement?

A (Bowes) Consulting, yes. Seeking permission, probably not.

Q Okay. So you would just be telling the City of Concord what you would be doing?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm going to object. I think they've testified to this, and I think we're calling for legal conclusions now.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Sustained.

MS. PACIK: Okay. Let's move on then.

BY MS. PACIK:

Q Can you go to the next page?

I was a little confused and I think this was also a question for Mr. -- is it Kayser?

A (Kayser) Kayser. Yes.

Q Thank you. Sorry. For Mr. Kayser in terms of blasting. So I understood yesterday that you had overstated in the Application how much blasting would be necessary, but in your Supplemental Prefiled testimony which was submitted April 17th, 2017, it did state that blasting would occur for some of the overhead areas, is that right?

A (Kayser) Yes. It is anticipated that some blasting will occur during the construction of the overhead. We don't know the extent of that yet as they haven't done the geotech. There could be some blasting for some of the work pads and the access roads.
Okay. And we looked at Concord, and there's a lot of, again, houses near the right-of-way, and I understand that you do not intend to seek blasting permits from the City of Concord; is that right?

(A Kayser) It would be similar to the answer on the other permits, yes.

So unless there's some sort of stipulation, you would not be obtaining blasting permits from the City of Concord.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Actually, that one was just asked and answered. You could have gone with that, too.

MS. PACIK: I don't know if it was fully answered, but I do believe the answer would be no?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think we just covered this.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: I think you got an answer to your question.

MS. PACIK: Okay. Good. As long as we all know the answer.
All right. Can you turn to the next page, please? You can keep going.

This is an area which is in the industrial zone in Concord, and are you familiar with -- I'll represent to you that this is Phoenix Construction also known as Sabbow. Are you familiar with this location?

Bradstreet: I am, yes.

And this shows access roads and construction pads going through the middle of their yard. Is that right?

Bradstreet: Yes.

And you can see it's kind of hard to see underneath all of the construction pads, but that's actually where they currently store their product; is that right?

Bradstreet: Yes. There would have to be some coordination on construction.

Okay. And then there's going to be construction, there's going to be new structures in the middle of their yard, right?

Bradstreet: There will be some structures removed, and there will be some structures constructed.
Okay. Can you turn the next page?

And just to be clear, this shows the amount of product and what's going on at this property, right?

(A) At that time, yes.

And so when you -- I think we just lost our image. Oh, there we go.

So it's actually going to require quite a bit of coordination. Is that fair to say?

(A) Yes, and the Project has had, I guess Sam or somebody might be able to speak more to it, but we've had a lot of discussions with this property owner.

And are you aware that they submitted Prefiled Testimony on behalf of the City of Concord raising concerns about the proposal?

We are.

Okay. And their concerns are not only about the disruption during construction but also the disruption because of the location of the proposed structures; is that right?

Correct. And so their real concern was regarding the existing access roads that they have on their own property, if you will.
They believe that they have, for lack of a better thing, crushed those over the years of driving trucks with precast concrete on them, and they'd like to maintain those roads wherever possible.

We did meet with them and stake out where the new structures would be, where the existing structures would be removed and have provided detailed drawings to them so that they are fully aware of where our Project will be once we've completed construction.

Q And you're aware that they're not satisfied, though, with what they've received to date?
A (Johnson) We have provided them what they asked for, and we have heard nothing back.

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next page?

Now, this is an area near the Soucook River and a crossing that's going to occur right before you get to Pembroke. And the Soucook River is the area that's in yellow with the pink dots. Do you see that?
A (Bradstreet) Yes.
Q And the structures, they're kind of hard to see, but they're on the left of that plan map?
A (Bradstreet) Right.

Q An you can see that one of the structures is white with an X, and that's getting removed. And then there's a new green structure, two new green structures that are coming in? Right?

A (Bradstreet) Green and a yellow. Yes.

Q So just to be clear, the 115 is getting relocated, and that's going to be the green square that's underneath it, and then the new structure is the 345 line which is yellow square, and then above it is the green, is another green square which is also a new structure going in.

A (Bradstreet) It's a relocated structure, yes.

Q Okay. So are you taking one structure out and putting two in? Is that why there's one white box with a square with an X and two green ones?

A (Bradstreet) I think we're not relocating. So C189-32, can you see that at the top?

A Yes.

Q That represents that top green square. And across the river you can see C189-31? I believe we're replacing those in place so you can't see the white square that sits on top of it.
Q  So there's current structures and you're replacing them with new ones?
A  (Bradstreet) In place, though, yes.
Q  Same location.
A  (Bradstreet) Yes.
Q  Okay. Got it. Can you turn the next page?

This is the alteration of terrain map. And you can see the topographic lines are pretty tight together in this location, and that's because it's a steep bluff; is that correct?
A  (Bradstreet) It is, yes.
Q  And we just looked and there's going to be one pole coming out and four poles basically going in the ground that are new. Or two poles that are coming out and four poles going in?
A  (Bradstreet) Right.
Q  So there's going to be a lot of construction activity in this location; is that fair to say?
A  (Bradstreet) There will be rebuilding two structures and adding a new.
Q  Okay. Can you go to the next?

This is a photograph which shows the steepness of that particular location, and would you agree that it's a highly erodible bluff that
we're looking at?

A (Bradstreet) I guess I don't know if I'm the right person to say it's highly erodible, but the Project will have measures to make sure erosion doesn't occur.

Q Okay. And are you aware that the City of Concord has an ordinance that deals with bluffs and construction near bluffs?

A (Bradstreet) I'm specifically not aware of that, no.

Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

So this is a photograph which shows the corridor and between Appleton Street and Curtisville Road. And Appleton Street, I don't have an overhead, but that's the one where there was the new home that was near Turtle Pond. Do you remember that? Do you recall where Appleton Street is?

A (Bradstreet) I think so. Is Turtle Pond to the south?

Q If you were to go to the right of Appleton Street?

A (Bradstreet) One second, I can just look. Yes, I'm grounded.
Q All right. So the reason I have this photograph up is because there's going to be one access road between Appleton Street and Curtisville Road; is that right?

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

Q And the condition of that that you can kind of see a trail right now, and that's really what it is. It's a trail, right?

A (Bradstreet) It's an access road that is used, I guess, not frequently enough to make it look like a road, yes.

Q Okay. So that's going to require significant work to upgrade that right-of-way to get the trucks to go between Appleton Street and Curtisville Road in terms of an access road?

A (Bradstreet) I think we can say there will be access road improvements.

Q Okay. Can you go to the next page?

Same thing here. I think there's one access road. So between Curtisville Road and Portsmouth Street, you're going to be using that path which is actually a hiking trail right now between Curtisville Road and Portsmouth Street for all of the construction activity?
A (Bradstreet) That's the plan, yes.

Q And you can't really tell from this photograph, but the terrain between Curtisville Road and Portsmouth Street, it's hilly, isn't it?

A (Bradstreet) I would assume it is, yes.

Q Can we go to the next page?

This just shows the access road that you're planning from Appleton Street, and you can see there's one entrance, and then going south which is to the right of this photograph.

A (Bradstreet) Looks like there's actually two entrances.

Q Both on Appleton Street, right?

A (Bradstreet) Yes.

Q Can you go to the next page?

And then that shows that one long access road that continues all the way to Curtisville Road; is that right?

A (Bradstreet) Correct.

Q Okay. So all of that is going to need to get upgraded?

A (Bradstreet) I'm sure there's areas that will need improvements and some areas may not.

Q Have you been out there to check?
A (Bradstreet) We've had constructability teams walk all these right-of-ways to determine how we're going to access.

Q Anybody on the panel been out there to look at it?

A (Johnson) I have, yes.

Q You have? And what's your understanding of what type of upgrades are going to be necessary?

A (Johnson) There are some wetland areas in here that will require some matting. And there are improvements to the hiking path, if you will, that will require gravel to be placed such that the appropriate equipment for construction can be brought on site.

Q Okay. Can we go to the next page?

So this is, again, this is the area between Curtisville Road and Portsmouth Street. So I think we just talked about the fact that there is one long access road. Is that right?

A (Bradstreet) Yes. That's how they access the existing transmission line.

Q Okay. Next page, please.

That's the rest of it that goes all the way to Portsmouth Street. Is that right?
A: Correct.
Q: Can you go to the next page?

    We've talked a lot about some of the properties and the notice that some of the property owners have received or the lack of notice. You understand that we requested information about which properties were visited by Northern Pass, and we were told that that information is confidential.

A: That's correct.
Q: So as we sit here today, we do not know which property owners you've spoken to and who has knowledge of or has specific knowledge of the plans?

A: That's correct.
Q: Okay. Can you go to the next page?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I want to interrupt for one minute. To clarify, the fact that we had contact is not confidential. I think it's the substance of the contacts that's confidential. I think we've provided an enormous amount of information about the contacts.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Okay.

MS. PACIK: I think the document speaks for
itself. It says please provide a list of the owners, and that was objected to.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: It's in the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Yes, and I don't really know what Mr. Needleman was adding to the conversation you had with the witnesses. Are there other questions you have, Ms. Pacik, on this topic?

A (Bowes) I might be able to help.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Help who?

A (Bowes) Help her question around the contacts and the nature of them. In Mr. Johnson's Prefiled Testimony, each town has a list of contacts, and the nature of those contacts is in there. It does not list the names but, it lists, for example, Concord, the number of contacts that were made, the number of abutters that were contacted, and the type of inquiry it was. The whole page of it for Concord.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right. Ms. Pacik, do you have any further questions on this topic?

MS. PACIK: No.

BY MS. PACIK:
Q  Can you turn the next page?

    This, again, we asked for the list of the
owners who responded to landowner letters that
were sent out, and, again, we were not provided
the identification of which property owners have
spoken to you; is that right?
A  (Johnson) That is correct. Again, the summary
as Mr. Bowes has just stated is what we've
provided.

Q  Can you turn the next page?

    I want to talk a little bit about some of
the properties that have been acquired by
Northern Pass, and this is addressed in
Mr. Bowes' Prefiled Testimony. Renewable
Properties is the company that was established
to purchase properties along the right-of-way;
is that right?
A  (Bowes) As well as other properties, yes.
Q  Okay. But it was Renewable Properties that was
responsible for acquiring properties on behalf
of Eversource?
A  (Bowes) For Northern Pass Transmission. Yes.
Q  And that company was established in 2001?

Can you turn to the next page?
Sorry. 2011. Is that right?

A (Bowes) Yes.

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next page? Actually, you can go one more.

So I was a little curious about some of the acquisitions by Renewable Properties. One of them being one in Bethlehem which they purchased from Bethlehem Ventures LLC. Are you familiar with that company?

A (Bowes) Not specifically. When you say not specifically, what do you mean?

A (Bowes) I mean I'm not familiar with it.

Q Can you turn to the next page? So Bethlehem Ventures was the member of the LLC that sold the property to Renewable Energies. His name was Michael Harlan. Do you know Michael Harlan?

A I do not. And I believe it was Renewable Properties.


Can you turn to the next page?

So what was curious about this was that the property's appraised at $110,000, and Bethlehem
Ventures purchased the property for $265,000 on January 13th, 2015. Do you see that?

A (Bowes) Yes.

Q And then Renewable Properties purchased it 13 days later from Bethlehem Ventures for $363,933. That's a pretty good turnaround in 13 days, right?

A (Bowes) I would say that it is. Yes.

Q And nobody sitting here understands why Renewable Properties bought the property for over $100,000 more 13 days later?

A (Bowes) I am not.

A (Johnson) I am not. I would say our interest in that property is for the transition station. That's the extent of our knowledge from the technical side.

Q Okay. Now, I remember from the technical session that somebody, I thought, on your panel said that you were purchasing the properties at fair market value; is that right?

A (Bowes) I do not recall saying that. No.

Q Okay. Can you turn to the next page?

That's actually a photograph from the assessing record of the house that was purchased...
for $363,000.

Can you turn to the next page?

And this is, you had mentioned, Mr. Johnson, this property is now going to be used for Transition Station 5?

A (Johnson) That's correct. I recognize the address.

Q And some of the properties from Renewable Properties was purchased directly from the sellers, but this one was purchased from this company, Bethlehem Ventures. Right?

A (Bowes) Yes.

Q Can you turn to the next page?

And we had mentioned before, Michael Harlan was the member of it, and you don't know who he is, I understand?

A (Bowes) I do not.

Q Can you go to the next page? One more?

So this is another one that I was looking at that I was a little curious about which is Renewable Properties bought properties from this company called DWH Jenness LLC. And the date of that sale, I think, is shown on the next page. It's April 20th, 2015. And the manager of DWH
Jenness, Alejandro Capetillo. Does anyone know him?

A (Bowes) I do not.

Q Anyone on the panel? No. So April 20th, 2015. Can you turn to the next page?

So this says that, and I think the date is a little wrong on this, but it looks like Jenness purchased it on February 20th, 2015, and I think the date of the deed we just looked at was April 2015. So actually three months later, not in August. But Jenness bought it for 200,000 and then sold it to Renewable Properties for $290,000. So it's a $90,000 interest in about two months. Do you know why they would have paid an extra $90,000 in two months?

A (Bowes) I do not.

Q Okay. And this was property that was assessed at $130,000, right?

A (Bowes) Yes. $130,800.

Q So somebody made a profit of 90,000, and we don't know who.

Can you go to the next page? One more.

A (Bowes) Well, I think we know who made the profit.
Q Well, Alejandro. We just don't know why.
A (Bowes) I don't know who he is.
Q Okay. You can go to the next page.

And this is the property that we're looking at. Are you familiar about the fact that this is the land that's now going to be used for Transition Station 6?
A (Johnson) I was not, but I see that that's Transition Station 6.
Q Okay. Can you go to the next page, please?

So this Alejandro Capetillo, this is the Certification of Formation in 2015, and it was February 2015, and this is when he formed DWH Jenness. Do you see that?
A (Bowes) Yes.
Q Can you go to the next page? One more?

And then the 2016 Annual Report is Michael Harlan again who is filing it for DWH Jenness, and he's out of 1300 Post Oak Boulevard, Houston, Texas. Is that right?
A (Bowes) That's what it says. Yes.
Q So my question before we go on is Quanta is in Texas, isn't it?
A (Bowes) They certainly have facilities in Texas.
I'm not sure if that's their headquarters or not.

Q They're actually based out of Houston, Texas. You didn't know that?

A (Bowes) No, I did not.

Q So Quanta is responsible for hiring all the subcontractors and building the Project in this case?

A (Bowes) For the most part, yes. There's a few contracts that they're assuming, and we talked about that I think earlier. The ABB contract provisions of that and some of the supply contracts that Eversource has.

Q And Quanta was chosen for a procurement process?

A (Bowes) They are doing some of the procurement as well, yes.

Q Well, I thought you went through a process where you actually chose Quanta to be the contractor, and that was in your Prefiled Testimony? I think you talked about it with Attorney Pappas yesterday?

A (Bowes) Yes. I was confusing procurement of materials with procurement of the original contract.
Q And that was announced in January of 2016 that Quanta was the chosen contractor?
A (Bowes) I think that's accurate, yes.
Q And you had mentioned yesterday that the first communications Northern Pass had with Quanta was in June and July of 2015, I thought you said?
A (Johnson) The Project went out to bid for services in about that time frame. Yes.
Q Okay. And we're going to be, you're going to be relying on Quanta to work with the property owners and the municipalities during the construction phase?
A (Bowes) Yes.
Q Okay.
A (Bowes) Or part, in this case.
Q So Quanta had no interest in this Project before January of 2016; is that fair to say?
A (Bowes) As far as I know, that's correct.
A (Johnson) Not officially, but, again, they were part of the bidding process so they were well aware of the Project probably a year earlier and participated in the bidding process.
Q And they had a bid, right?
A (Johnson) That's correct.
Q Can you turn the next page?

So I was hoping you'd be able to help me out and try to figure out why Renewable Properties was paying $90,000, $100,000 more for property within a pretty short time frame of it being acquired by companies owned by this person Michael Harlan. So Main Street Capital Corporation, that's also in Houston, Texas, on the same address as where Michael Harlan's address was, right? 1300 Post Oak Boulevard, Houston, Texas? Do you see that?

A (Bowes) I believe so. I can't remember what was on the past document.

Q Are you familiar with Main Street Capital Corporation? Anybody?

A (Bowes) I am not.

Q Nobody? Okay. Can you turn to the next page? So Alejandro, he works there, and that was also the same address that Michael Harlan was using, right?

A (Bowes) I believe so, yes. I can't keep track of all the documents you showed me.

Q That's all right. Anybody keeping track of it all? We can go back and look at some of them if
you need to. You want to go back a couple?

Remember Alejandro? He bought the Bridgewater property? And sold it?

A (Bowes) So he's the manager.

Q Yes.

A (Bowes) There were LLCs that bought and sold the properties.

Q So he was the manager of the LLC. You're right. Okay. Can you turn the next page?

So the only, and maybe you don't know this, but it looks like Main Street Capital Corporation actually owns or was an investor in Quanta which is also in Houston, right?

A (Bowes) That's what you indicated, yes.

Q Do you know if Quanta was involved in the purchases of any of these properties back in 2015?

A (Bowes) I do not.

Q Okay. Can you turn the next page?

So are you familiar with 41 Haynes Road property in Deerfield?

A (Bowes) Not specifically, no.

Q When you say not specifically, what do you mean?

A (Bowes) I don't have any specific knowledge of
Okay. So are you aware that Stephen and Gina Neily had a very difficult time selling this property because of the proposed Project?

A (Bowes) I am not.

Q Are you familiar with the Neilys?

A (Bowes) No. I'm not.

Q Are you aware that they were -- so you wouldn't be aware that they were vocal opponents of this Project? You don't have that information?

A (Bowes) I do not.

Q Okay. And they ended up selling their property to Haynes Road LLC?

Can you turn the page?

And they sold it in April 2015. Do you know who Haynes Road LLC is?

A (Bowes) I do not.

Q Anyone on the panel? No?

Can you turn the page?

And so this is, again, Michael Harlan as the member of Haynes Road LLC. Haynes Road, 41 Haynes Road, that's not getting used for the Project, is it?

A (Bowes) Not that I'm aware of. I don't recall
that property on the list.

Q Are you aware that since Michael Harlan as the member purchased that property that it's been sitting vacant?

A (Bowes) I am not.

Q Okay. So I guess the question is probably no, but is anyone here aware whether or not the property owners that sold the 41 Haynes Road property were required to maintain confidential information about this sale?

A (Bowes) I have no knowledge of that, no.

Q Okay. So would it surprise you that one of the Intervenors in this case went to go talk to them, and they were told by the property owners that they could not talk about the sale of the property?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm going to object to that. If there's any information, it should be presented.

MS. PACIK: Okay. It will be.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: The question was, were you aware, right?

MS. PACIK: Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: If anybody is
aware, you can answer the question.

A (Bowes) I am not aware.

Q Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley, are you up next?

MR. WHITLEY: I am, Mr. Chair, and I'm going to direct my questions from the podium so just give me a second and I'll --

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Off the record.

(Discussion off-the-record)

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Why don't we take five minutes.

(Recess taken)

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley, you may proceed.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WHITLEY:

Q Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Steven Whitley. I'm an attorney for several communities along the line. New Hampton, Pembroke, Deerfield, Littleton and the Ashland Water & Sewer Department. I'm also the
spokesperson for two of the Municipal Groups.

And I'm going to start by asking,
Mr. Scott, a question to you, and maybe you saw
me test the ELMO and I saw you getting the plans
ready, but I'm going to put this up on the ELMO,
and I just want to ask you a couple questions
about it. So just one second. See that?

A (Scott) Yes, I can.

Q This is SHEB C117, I believe, which is not
visible but it's on the right-hand corner.

A (Scott) SHEB C117 shows the detail for the open
cut trenching, and SHEB 013-1 shows the detail
for the --

(Court reporter interruption)

A (Scott) So SHEB C117 shows the plan detail and
the profile detail for the open cut trenching.
SHEB 013-1 shows the detail for the trenchless
design, and we've also given Exhibit 133 for
additional detail for that trenchless design.

Q Correct. Thank you. So my question was,
looking at the lower half of this diagram, which
I believe is the profile view there, it
indicates that the trenching is going to come in
and then it's going to take a 90-degree turn and
go down about, what is that dimension there? 30, 40 feet? And then go laterally for a distance of 250, 300 feet? And then take another 90 degree turn and go towards the surface, and then take another 90 degree turn and go just underneath the surface along a trench for a while. Do you see all that?

A (Scott) I see that. And that interception laterally of the open cut trenching installation is shown incorrectly.

Q That was my question, Mr. Scott, is whether or not that was still the current plan for this area.

A (Scott) Those comments have been provided to the design firm doing that design.

Q And what is the contemplated change?

A (Scott) The open cut trenching would be sloped down to intercept the bore depth installation. So open cut trenching would be occurring at an increased depth down to the trench or the trenchless installation depth.

Q So looking at the profile here, could you just very roughly just walk us through how that would change this profile drawing and what that would
mean?

A (Scott) Sure. So if you could move that drawing up just slightly?

Q Towards you?

A (Scott) Yes. Just so you can see the stationing along the bottom?

Q How's that?

A (Scott) Yes. And it's not quite that visible so if you could help me out and point at it. And I believe you may be working off an older drawing set, but it's close enough for this conversation.

At 297 plus 50, so the right-hand side there, of the bore?

Q Right there?

A Yes.

Q So approximately 100 to 150 feet is how long it would take to get from the depth shown to the installation depth.

Q So you're saying you would start about right here and go up at an angle; is that correct?

A (Scott) It would be closer to an S-bend.

Q Okay. Okay. I won't mimic it with my hand but yes.
Q And on the other side, is it similarly angled?
A Correct.
Q So over here, angled up that way as well?
A (Scott) Yes, sir.
Q Is that one also an S angle?
A (Scott) Yes.
Q Okay. And the distance of both of those from --

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Steve. No
one can hear you. The folks in the back really
can't hear you.

MR. WHITLEY: Sorry. Apologies.

BY MR. WHITLEY:
Q So Mr. Scott, we were just saying that from this
depth here, it's going to go at an S angle
roughly for a distance of a couple hundred feet
to just below grade.
A (Scott) Correct.
Q And, similarly, on the other side an S angle for
a couple hundred feet until just below grade?
A (Scott) Correct, and by a couple hundred feet,
100 to 150 feet would be my estimation.
Q Okay. And the trenches right here and right
here, what are the dimensions of those?
A (Scott) So those are, we've covered that previously with Mr. Pappas. Those are circular shafts, concrete shafts. The one on the north side of the river, the receiving side, was measured at approximately 20 feet in diameter and the ascending side approximately 25 feet in diameter.

Q Okay. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Jason, can you read us the SHEB number?

MR. REIMERS: SHEB C117.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

BY MR. WHITLEY:

Q One more question, Mr. Scott. You mentioned it's an S shape, and I just want to know if that shape is going to follow this path right here and similarly this path right here so it's going to be in the road?

A (Scott) Correct. It will follow the plan alignment.

Q Okay. Thank you.

I just want to chat now briefly about the claims submission form, and I believe we spoke about that yesterday, but, I apologize, I don't
recall who was responding to the questions, but I believe it was Mr. Bowes or Mr. Johnson.

A (Bowes) I think it was both. Yes.

Q And, obviously, if somebody else knows an answer, feel free to provide it.

The question that the panel had with Attorney Pappas was whether or not the Claim Submission Form would be available to a business entity that lost business revenue, do you recall that conversation?

A (Johnson) I do.

Q Okay. Would that process, the Claim Submission process, is that similarly available to a host community?

A (Johnson) In what manner would you be talking?

Q Well, I guess I'm thinking of a local municipality providing a police detail for construction or transport of construction materials.

A (Johnson) So that would be direct contracted to the contractor who would have to pay for those services.

Q Okay.

A (Bowes) But, for example, police protection,
flagging, traffic control would be a project
cost so we would certainly reimburse the
community for that.

Q Okay. So there be no need for the community to
file or go through the process of the Claim
Form.

A (Bowes) The normal process you use today with
Eversource would be the same one followed for
Northern Pass.

Q Okay. And to the extent that the municipality
could show extra fuel costs associated with the
detour that was required by construction impact,
could they submit a claim for that cost through
this Claim Form process?

A (Bowes) I'm not sure we'd have to go to that
extent, but I think we could work out an
agreement for those type of costs prior to
construction.

Q Okay. Similarly, if the municipality could show
extra time spent by hourly employees to perform
their duties, and that extra time was
necessitated by construction impacts and
detours?

A (Bowes) So maybe you could be a little more
specific. Certainly police, that comes to mind very quickly. What other types of personnel and requirements are you thinking about?

Q I guess I was thinking of fire department personnel perhaps.


Q Okay. Similar line of questioning. To the extent the municipality would show additional wear and tear on their vehicles from having to go extra mileage because of a construction detour?

A (Bowes) So we could probably work out a mileage rate rather than a fuel rate that would cover that.

Q Okay. Similar line of questioning. Extra time and expense for the Road Agent to monitor local roads in town during the construction phase.

A (Bowes) So we're going to have at least two levels of inspection on the project already. Both with the constructor themselves. We're going to have independent monitors, and I'm sure the State DOT will be monitoring our activities as well. So I don't think our intention today
or for the future for the project is to pay municipal inspections.

Q But if a municipality because they're local roads and the municipality has an obligation and a responsibility to those roads, if they chose to have an inspector or a Road Agent go out and do those sorts of inspections, would that sort of thing be covered under this claims process?

A (Bowes) I don't believe it would, no.

Q I'm going to stick with you for a second, Mr. Bowes. And do you have your Supplemental Testimony with you?

A (Bowes) I do.

Q Okay. If you could please take that out, and that is, just for the Committee's information, Applicant's Exhibit 90. I'll put that up on the screen here. One second. I'm speaking of your Track 2 Supplemental.

A (Bowes) Yes, I have it.

Q Okay. If you could go to page 4, please. I want to ask you some questions about nonspecular conductors which we spoke about, I believe it was the other day, but you responded, in your testimony that is, you responded to a question
about nonspecular conductors, and I want to
direct you to the paragraph from lines 14 to 19.
Do you see that?
A  (Bowes) Yes.
Q  You say that that Eversource policy is that in
comparison with new untreated conductors,
Eversource policy is to use new untreated ones
as opposed to nonspecular ones. Correct?
A  (Bowes) Yes.
Q  And one of the reasons for that is because the
new untreated ones after a period of years, they
lose some of their reflectivity, and so they, I
guess, functionally obtain the same result that
a nonspecular conductor would.
A  (Bowes) That is accurate, yes.
Q  So by that logic, there's a period of years
where that untreated conductor has higher
reflectivity and potentially higher visibility,
correct?
A  (Bowes) Higher than what?
Q  Higher than a nonspecular conductor.
A  (Bowes) That is true. Yes.
Q  So that increased visibility is then acceptable
for a period of years versus a nonspecular
conductor?

A  (Bowes) We believe it is, yes.

Q  And isn't it true that that increased reflectivity during those period of years could impact someone's perception of visual impact in that area?

A  (Bowes) I think it's possible. Our experience has been that the use of the untreated conductors has not come with customer complaints about the conductors.

Q  And Mr. Bowes, could you move the mike a little closer? When this is hard, it's hard to hear you.

A  (Bowes) I sure can.

Q  Thank you.

A  (Bowes) Do you want me to repeat what I said?

Q  Yes, if you don't mind.

A  (Bowes) Our experience over many projects and many decades has been that we don't see customer complaints because of the newer conductors being put up.

Q  And does the decision to use nonspecular versus new untreated, is there any cost element to that decision?
A (Bowes) There is.
Q And how much of a role does that play?
A (Bowes) I would say it has some factor into it. It's probably a half a million to a million dollar cost increase for this project.
Q Okay.
A (Bowes) But we have not used it for any of our projects across our service area.
Q I guess I'm wondering if from an engineering standpoint there's no detriment to using nonspecular and the cost component is fairly marginal, and it has the potential to impact visibility and how people perceive the project, why not just use nonspecular conductors?
A So extrapolate that to all of our service territory and all of our projects, it becomes quite a sizable impact to the ratepayer.
Q But you're here in front of the SEC for just this Project, right? And if I didn't say that in my question, then I apologize, but I mean in relation to this Project.
A (Bowes) So could you repeat the original question then?
Q Yes. Sure. So if from an engineering
standpoint in this project there's no drawback to using nonspecular conductors, and the cost to do so is fairly marginal, as you just said, then why not just utilize nonspecular conductors?

A (Bowes) Because it would add up to a million dollars to the project cost.

Q Okay. Okay. And the project team has deemed that increase not one they're willing to undergo?

A (Bowes) So in our original list of mitigations we filed in February of 2016, we listed that as one we considered and did not go forward with. I have reaffirmed that decision in this Prefiled Testimony.

Q If you could turn to the bottom of page 5. I'll get you there on the screen here.

   Bottom of page 5 into page 6 you discuss lattice structures versus monopole structures. Do you see that question and answer?

A (Bowes) Yes, I do.

Q And you talk about how the team evaluated replacing lattice with monopole in certain locations, correct?

A (Bowes) Yes.
Q And at page 6, lines 5 through 9, you state that after the Application was filed, your multidisciplinary team evaluated some of these replacement options but that the Applicants determined that they're not warranted because, as proposed, the use of monopole would not have a significant effect on aesthetics at those locations. Is that correct?

A (Bowes) Yes.

Q Wouldn't you agree that anyone living at those various locations might disagree with that assessment?

A (Bowes) It's possible.

Q So although the use of monopole may not, in your opinion, significantly alleviate visual impact to the people at those locations, it would indeed be a significant change. A lessening of visual impact potentially.

A (Bowes) I'm probably not the person to ask about how an overhead transmission structure, the visual impact of it. I don't see the significant difference between the two, and that's probably the engineer versus the visual expert. So when you say significant, I say it's
Q Well, I use the word significant because those are your words. Lines 8 and 9, would not have a significant effect on aesthetics at those locations.

A (Bowes) Right. That's what we concluded.

Q But you're saying that you don't have a sense of how to define significance, I guess?

A (Bowes) I think that's probably accurate, yes.

Q So you took input from the visual experts that the team has hired and then, based on that input, made this decision that we're talking about here?

A (Bowes) Yes. So I can describe the process. It was both with Derrick for the engineering side, it was with our wetlands or environmental people, and it was also with the visual experts the project hired. So we collectively reviewed these locations and came up with a determination that's listed in my Prefiled.

Q The next question and answer on that page, still on page 6 here, you list out some specific locations where this was considered but ultimately rejected. Do you see that?
A (Bowes) Yes, I do.

Q And I'm looking at, let's see, it's lines 18 through 20. And you cite Cross Country Road, which I believe is in Pembroke, Nottingham Road in Deerfield, and you say "would not provide significant benefits because those locations are not scenic resources." Do you see that?

A (Bowes) Yes, I do.

Q So is it your opinion then that if we're not dealing with a scenic resource, there's no benefit to reducing visual impact, even marginally?

A (Bowes) So I'm not saying that, but I'm not, what I did say was I'm not sure that I can say that a lattice structure has less visual impact than a monopole or a monopole less than a lattice structure. That's an assumption that's made by some but not all.

Q Again, safe to say that people in those locations, Cross Country Road, Nottingham Road, would disagree with that assessment?

A (Bowes) I have not had conversations with them so it's possible they would.

Q Isn't it generally better for the people of this
State to have less visual impact?

A (Bowes) So, again, you're making the assumption that monopole has less visual impact than a lattice structure. I'm not sure I agree with that.

Q Okay. Assuming that it does have less visual impact than a lattice structure, isn't it generally better for people in the State to have less visual impact from this project?

A (Bowes) So I think in the general terms, I would say yes, but I think each one of these becomes a specific location determination because you might have a less visual impact for the structure but it might have an environmental impact that is greater so those would have to be weighed.

Q Thank you. Mr. Johnson, I want to turn to you now. And ask you some questions about your Supplemental Testimony which I believe is Applicant's Exhibit 86.

A (Johnson) Correct.

Q Do you have that in front of you?

A (Johnson) I do.

Q And this will probably wrap us up, Mr. Chair.
Let me pull it up on the screen here, Mr. Johnson.

If I could turn you to pages 3 and 4, please, of your testimony.

A (Johnson) Okay.

Q In this portion of your testimony, you're talking about outreach to the municipalities, and one of the items that you describe is the Memorandum of Understanding. I believe it's around the middle of that response. Do you see that?

A (Johnson) On line 12, yes.

Q Yes, you're right. Line 12. And the only kind of example so far or success story in regards to that MOU is the City of Franklin, correct?

A (Johnson) That's the only one that's been completed. There are 12 others or 11 others, I'm sorry, that are in various stages of negotiation.

Q Okay. And the City of Franklin is one of the few municipalities that's hosting the project that is in favor of the Project, correct?

A (Johnson) Correct. It's only natural for us to go there first to obtain an MOU.
Q The low hanging fruit maybe.
A (Johnson) Thirty more to go.
Q Is it your intent in this MOU public outreach process to satisfy local regulations or policies that a municipality may have?
A (Johnson) So I believe we stated our case pretty clearly that the approval of the Application overrides or provides the appropriate authority to do the Project. However, if the Project does find it amenable to work with local municipalities to follow up some of their ordinances, we certainly will include that.
Q To the extent that they don't conflict with the approval you get from the SEC, assuming you get approval.
A (Johnson) There could be instances where we go above and beyond. Again, it would be on a municipality by municipality basis.
Q Isn't there language in the MOU that says to the extent that the terms of the MOU are inconsistent with a certificate from the SEC that the certificate prevails?
A (Johnson) Correct.
Q That to me sounds different from what you just
said so I just want to make sure I'm understanding.

A (Johnson) So if an MOU is signed and submitted to the SEC and the SEC includes that MOU as part of their decision, then that those requirements would become binding.

Q This MOU process, isn't Northern Pass already engaged in that sort of outreach? I guess maybe a better way to put that question is, you don't need the MOU process to do that. I mean, you're engaged with the local municipalities and the local businesses and the local property owners anyways.

A (Johnson) That's correct. It's a way to, if you will, formalize some of the communications so that there is an agreement on both sides as to what some of those communications may be, whether it's the tax pledge as Mr. Quinlan opined upon what seems like a long time ago now, or hours of operation as we've discussed in the last couple days.

Q But again, you know, to the extent a municipality wants some agreement from the project in this MOU that is inconsistent with
what the SEC may rule on, the project is not
going to agree to those sorts of terms.

A (Johnson) Correct. It's why it's important to
get these MOUs under negotiation such that it
can be submitted if the Project agrees with the
town. Then they become conditions of the
Application.

Q And do you believe it's good faith negotiating
on the part of Northern Pass to have that in
your back pocket, so to speak, when you're
negotiating with municipalities?

A (Johnson) Sure. I mean, we're certainly not
here to not listen. Quite the contrary. We are
here to listen. And if there are seasonality
things we can do to arrange construction
activities to be outside of, for instance, town
fairs or in areas where you may have a festival
going on, that's an easy example, we can
certainly coordinate so that these activities
are memorialized and then the contractor is well
aware of them, and it becomes a condition of
construction.

Q Okay. Ms. Farrington, I'm going to end with you
today so I guess I lied earlier. You have your
Supplemental Testimony in front of you?

A (Farrington) I do.

Q Which I believe is Applicant's Exhibit 91. If I could direct you to page 3 of that testimony, please.

A (Farrington) Okay.

Q You see that question in the middle of the page here? "What future work is planned under your contract with PAR?"

A (Farrington) Yes.

Q The second paragraph of your answer starting on line 10 says after, assuming that you get the certificate from the SEC, the Transportation Management Plan will be drafted.

A (Farrington) Yes.

Q And that is, again, after receipt of SEC approval.

A (Farrington) Yes. Correct.

Q And one of the reasons that you give for that is that by waiting that late in the process, your conversations with key personnel or of the various parties is much more recent in time so there's less turnover among those participants.

A (Farrington) Correct, and New Hampshire DOT
themselves made the recommendation that waiting until closer to construction is advantageous.

Q To?
A (Farrington) But we can start the process any time. We just can't finalize it until just prior to construction.

Q When you say advantageous, advantageous to whom?
A (Farrington) I think everyone involved.

Q If for some reason a municipality agrees with the project and enters into an MOU, and then the Certificate is issued and a Transportation Management Plan is worked out, and there's a conflict between those two documents, is there one that has primacy over the other?
A (Farrington) I'm not sure that there would be a conflict just because the, our hope is that the town will be involved in creating both of these with us, but I would defer to --
A (Bowes) I would say obviously New Hampshire DOT is responsible for the public safety of the roads so they would have the jurisdiction over the TMP and would supercede any MOU that we had with a town for their portion of the project,
obviously, for the state roads.

Q  Right. But if it was a non-state road, how does that change your answer, if at all?

A  (Bowes) It would be the Town MOU then.

Q  Ms. Farrington, if I could direct you to page 5 of your testimony now. This is a position of your testimony where you're speaking about construction detours and how it may impact emergency response personnel. Do you see that?

A  (Farrington) Yes.

Q  And the response you give starting on line 5 and going down to 14, that's where you describe how you would work with local municipalities and their emergency personnel. Correct?

A  (Farrington) Correct.

Q  You would agree, however, that construction impacts or detours can result in a delay or a longer response time for those emergency personnel, correct?

A  (Farrington) Yes. That's logical. Our goal is, of course, to mitigate that to any extent possible. For example, when the signalized construction zone sites are in place for like the HDD work zones, I anticipate that the
Project will supply emergency responders with preemption devices so that their vehicles will talk directly to the signals to make sure that the emergency response vehicles get the green light, so to say.

Q In your response there on 11, you state that, I think this speaks to what you were just responding with, emergency responders will be notified daily as to the location of the work zone and any detours that might be as a result of that work zone, correct?

A (Farrington) Correct.

Q You would agree, however, that notice of a detour is not the same thing as the quickest and most efficient access to those that need those Emergency Services, correct?

A (Farrington) I'm not sure I understand. I'm thinking of the example of Bear Rock Road. So if an emergency response service is located in Colebrook, by knowing the location of the detour route, they will also know the easiest or most efficient path to reach that home. Also --

Q Given the detour, though.

A (Farrington) Bear Rock Road is a different case.
I'm not explaining it well without a picture. But there will be ITS, Intelligent Transportation System boards, VMS boards, Variable Message Systems in town in Colebrook that as you start to drive out of town it will say house number 1 through 13, use eastern access route, and house number 14 through 80, use western access route. So we'll never send an emergency responder down the wrong path, so to speak.

Q And to be clear, I'm not suggesting that you would do that or that your systems would do that. I'm simply, I'm asking you if notice of the detours is as good as the emergency personnel getting there as fast as they possibly can, given the detours.

A (Farrington) Can I pull up a picture just to get through it? I think I understand what you're saying.

Okay. So, for instance, I'm looking at north TCP 6. The detour route is 2.7 miles. So --

Q If I may, in the absence of that detour route, though, the emergency responders would most
likely get there as fast as they possibly can, correct?

A (Farrington) Correct. So depending on the location of the work zone, the emergency responders will either approach directly as they normally would or it could potentially add that 2.7 miles of delay. Is that what you're --

Q That's right. Yes.

A (Farrington) Yes, I agree.

Q Thank you. That's all I have.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right. If there's nothing else we need to do today, and I sense that there's not, we'll adjourn and resume tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

(Hearing recessed at 5:04 p.m.)
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