

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

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

August 1, 2017 - 2:05 p.m. DAY 25
49 Donovan Street Afternoon Session ONLY
Concord, NH

{Electronically filed with SEC on 08-14-17}

IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-06
Joint Application of Northern
Pass Transmission, LLC, and
Public Service Company of
New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource
Energy for a Certificate
of Site and Facility.
(Hearing on the merits)

PRESENT FOR SUBCOMMITTEE/SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:
Chrmn. Martin P. Honigberg Public Utilities Comm.
(Presiding as Presiding Officer)

Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey Public Utilities Comm.
Dir. Craig Wright, Designee Dept. of Environ. Serv.
Christopher Way, Designee Dept. of Resources &
Economic Development
William Oldenburg, Designee Dept. of Transportation
Patricia Weathersby Public Member
Rachel (Whitaker) Dandeneau Alternate Public Member

ALSO PRESENT FOR THE SEC:

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

(No Appearances Taken)

COURT REPORTER: Susan J. Robidas, NH LCR No. 44

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

I N D E X

WITNESS: JAMES CHALMERS

EXAMINATION	PAGE
Cross-examination by Mr. Whitney (resumed)	4
Cross-examination by Mr. Tanguay	46
Cross-examination by Ms. Pacik	51
Cross-examination by Mr. Baker	133

[WITNESS: JAMES CHALMERS]

EXHIBITS	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
JT MUNI 259	9/17/13 e-mail from Gina Neily	55
JT MUNI 252	Agreement and Consent to Joint Use re: 41 Hoit Road	61
JT MUNI 254	MLS Summary	63
JT MUNI 255	Concord/Penacook Tax Rates	68
JT MUNI 257	Concord Average Single- Family Home Values (2011-2016)	69
JT MUNI 251	7/25/17 Photograph of residence	74
JT MUNI 248	Property History Detail, 16 Brookwood Dr., Concord	79
JT MUNI 253	7/7/2008 Agreement and Consent to Joint Use re: 86 Oak Road, Concord	85
JT MUNI 256	Chalmers Spreadsheet for Case Study properties	87
JT MUNI 247	PUC Decision re: DSF-85-155	125
JT MUNI 260	Smith v. Wentworth BTLA decision	128
JT MUNI 258	Photograph of 81 Saunders Hill Road	32

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

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

AFTERNOON SESSION

(Hearing resumed at 2:05 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley
you may resume.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (resumed)

BY MR. WHITLEY:

Q. Hello again, Dr. Chalmers.

A. Hello.

Q. You talked earlier this morning and yesterday
about your process and your methodology to
come to the conclusions that you reached, and
I just wanted to step back for a second and
ask you a couple questions along those lines.

New Hampshire does not have enough
homogenous housing stock or sold properties
along the right-of-way to do any sort of a
statistical analysis. Would you agree with
that?

A. For the majority of the area that we're
concerned with here, I think if you wanted to
do something statistically in the Manchester,
Concord, Nashua area, you could, but that's a

1 small piece of the total issue here.

2 Q. And obviously the line doesn't run through
3 Manchester or Nashua.

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. Right. In the New Hampshire case studies
6 approach, that's what you relied on for your
7 conclusions, your ultimate conclusions.

8 A. That's right.

9 Q. And do you agree that property site
10 appraisals, where the appraiser has access to
11 the property, is probably a more reliable
12 approach to determine possible impacts from
13 Northern Pass?

14 A. As opposed to what?

15 Q. As opposed to the approach that you employed.

16 A. Well, appraisals were an integral part of
17 what we did. Now, they didn't involve
18 interior inspections, as we didn't get
19 permission to enter the homes. So we were
20 doing, you know, what can be referred to as
21 "windshield appraisals." These properties
22 had all been, to the best of my
23 recollection -- there may be one or two that
24 didn't go through MLS, but you would

1 generally have MLS interior photos. And so
2 those appraisals were an important component
3 of the case study approach. But, really,
4 equally important are, you know, the physical
5 orientation of the property to the line and
6 the interviews. Particularly relevant are
7 the interviews of the brokers.

8 Q. And I think my question was more focused on
9 the properties that are encumbered or
10 adjacent to the right-of-way as opposed to
11 the case study properties from other electric
12 transmission corridors.

13 A. Well, all of our case study properties were
14 adjacent or encumbered. Half of them were
15 along the Phase II line and half of them were
16 along the NPT line.

17 Q. And again, I think I'm -- maybe we're talking
18 past each other a little bit. I guess I'm
19 asking you whether you agree that
20 property-specific appraisals along the
21 proposed Northern Pass route where the
22 property had access to the property would be
23 a more reliable approach to determining a
24 possible impact.

1 A. Okay. So you're saying that if we have a
2 house right now in Concord that's adjacent to
3 the line, that if we want to understand
4 whether or not Northern Pass will impact that
5 property, that the best way to do that would
6 be to hire an appraiser to do an appraisal?

7 Q. I'm asking you --

8 A. Yeah. No, I'm just -- is that the question?

9 Q. That is the thrust of the question. Yes,
10 sir.

11 A. Yeah. I would say that's particularly --
12 it's a particularly limited use because the
13 property hasn't sold. I mean, the only way
14 we get an insight into -- the only way we can
15 get any leverage on the question which you're
16 wanting answered is to look at a property
17 that is in some way, we think, influenced by
18 the transmission line that is sold, okay.
19 Once it's sold, then we can go do a case
20 study or an appraisal and come to a
21 conclusion with respect to whether there's
22 impact. But if you lived adjacent to the
23 proposed line and wanted an opinion with
24 respect to your property, an appraiser isn't

1 going to be able to tell you anything very
2 useful, frankly. Your property won't have
3 sold. There's no data there. He'd just have
4 to go look at other properties that have
5 sold.

6 Q. So your opinion is that an appraisal absent a
7 sale would not be able to identify the
8 difference in value that could result from
9 the Northern Pass Project.

10 A. That's right.

11 Q. Okay. And just clarify for me, Dr. Chalmers.
12 The case study analysis that you did, that
13 really only afforded you some kind of general
14 conclusions from possible impact from utility
15 corridors.

16 A. Well, they're actually pretty specific. You
17 know, I reported the results, and the results
18 are, I think, quite specific.

19 Q. Was there any consideration given by
20 yourself, or were you involved in any
21 conversations discussing site-specific
22 appraisals along the proposed Northern Pass
23 route?

24 A. Outside the context of the case studies?

1 Q. Correct.

2 A. No.

3 Q. Okay.

4 MR. WHITLEY: Dawn, can I have
5 the Apple TV, please?

6 BY MR. WHITLEY:

7 Q. I'm putting something up on the screen, Dr.
8 Chalmers. In a second it should pop up.
9 While it does, it's the revised spreadsheet
10 that you discussed yesterday and that was
11 distributed last night. Do you see that up
12 there?

13 A. Yes, I've got it.

14 Q. Okay. And for the record, I believe the
15 Applicant has marked this as Applicant's
16 Exhibit 197.

17 But you see at the top left of the page,
18 that's the most current one that you were
19 referring to?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. And your list of these properties,
22 initially I think it was 94, and this one I
23 believe is 89. Your opinion was that
24 potential impacts due to project

1 visibility -- I'm sorry. Let me restate
2 that.

3 Your opinion is that the potential
4 impacts due to post-project visibility is a
5 result of the loss of vegetative buffer or
6 taller tower structures, such that the
7 visibility of the conductors or the
8 structures becomes more noticeable or
9 apparent. Is that a fair characterization?

10 A. Yeah, that the -- this is trying to identify
11 the number of properties, the order of
12 magnitude of properties for which there is a
13 likelihood of some effect due to the Project,
14 and that effect is driven by a change in
15 visibility.

16 Q. Okay. Thank you.

17 And you made that judgment on the
18 visibility component standing on a public
19 right-of-way as opposed to on private
20 property.

21 A. That's right.

22 Q. Okay. And I think you've testified earlier
23 that, in terms of documentation that you had
24 with you to aid in this process, you had the

1 revised project maps; is that correct?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. Okay. And that was the only documentation
4 that you had relating to the Project that you
5 used while doing this process.

6 A. That's right.

7 Q. Okay. I want to walk through now, Dr.
8 Chalmers, a couple of the locations you
9 visited and a couple of the towns that I
10 represent. So I'm going to start in New
11 Hampton, and I'm going to scroll down here
12 until we see New Hampton in the center of the
13 page. Do you see that there?

14 A. Yes, I do.

15 Q. And there's four properties there.

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. Okay. On the right-hand side of this page,
18 in that last column is where you indicated
19 whether or not there could be an impact to
20 value as a result of Northern Pass.

21 A. Yeah, where the likelihood of a value impact
22 would be changed by the Project.

23 Q. Okay. And for the New Hampton properties,
24 you've indicated that none of them have that

1 likelihood; correct?

2 A. That's right. Have a changed likelihood due
3 to the Project. Three of the four are
4 already there, and the other one is screened
5 now and will be screened in the future.

6 So...

7 Q. Correct. So I just want to pull up on the
8 revised project map where these are. And
9 just for the record, I'm going to be showing
10 pictures of two documents. One is the
11 revised project maps, and they are
12 Applicant's Exhibit 2, Attachment 2. And the
13 other thing I'm going to be pulling up is
14 some of the AOT or Alteration of Terrain
15 Plans, and those are Applicant's Exhibit 1,
16 Appendix 6c. So when I refer to sheets of
17 either of those, that's where they can be
18 found.

19 So, Dr. Chalmers, what I have here is an
20 area of New Hampton along Route 132 where
21 several of those New Hampton properties are
22 located. And let me just zoom out so you
23 have a sense of kind of where this is. Does
24 that give you a little sense of scale, sir?

1 A. A little bit.

2 Q. There you go. And I want to focus on three
3 of these properties in this area. And I'll
4 zoom back in. And the three that I wanted to
5 look at here, I'm going to refer to them by
6 their property designation given to them by
7 the Project. It's 615 -- 6115, which is over
8 here; 6117, which you can see right there;
9 and then the other one I wanted to chat with
10 you about was 6122 to the east of the line.
11 Do you see those three properties?

12 A. I do.

13 Q. Okay. And do you see the three new towers
14 that would be part of the Northern Pass
15 Project in this area?

16 A. I do.

17 Q. And I'm looking at DC 1124, 25 and 26;
18 correct?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And just to get a sense of the change in
21 structure height that's proposed, I'm going
22 to go up to the corresponding table here.
23 And you see that 24, 25 and 26 are listed in
24 that table?

1 A. I do.

2 Q. Twenty-four is going to have a structure
3 height of 95 feet, 25 is going to have
4 90 feet and 26 is going to have 75 feet; is
5 that correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. And you see that they have a
8 corresponding cross-section, which is C2-18;
9 correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. For all three of those towers.

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. And if we go to 32-18, we get a sense of how
14 tall the existing structures in that portion
15 of the right-of-way are, the typical height.
16 And you see there that the typical height of
17 those structures is 55 feet; is that correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. So now let's go back to these
20 properties. We're going to start with Lot
21 6115, which is right there in the center of
22 your screen, Dr. Chalmers. Do you see that?

23 A. Yup.

24 Q. Okay. So, based on your testimony about how

1 you did this analysis, you weren't able to
2 view the towers from the exact perspective of
3 the resident on this lot, were you?

4 A. That's right.

5 Q. Because you were limited to viewing it from
6 the public right-of-way.

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. In your spreadsheet, and I'll flip back there
9 for this property -- and this is 6115, which
10 is right there -- you listed for all of your
11 visibility categories "clearly" for all four
12 of those. Do you see a that?

13 A. I do.

14 Q. So, by that -- by those responses, your
15 opinion is that before and after the Project
16 there is going to be roughly the same
17 visibility of towers and conductors; is that
18 correct?

19 A. That's correct. It's going to be
20 unobstructed views of the structures in both
21 the before and after condition, yes.

22 Q. And didn't we just see from looking at the
23 tower heights from the revised project maps
24 that Tower 1124, which is the closest tower,

1 is going to be increasing by some 40 feet?

2 Would you like me to pull up the --

3 A. It's not going to be increasing by 40 feet.

4 It's going to be 90 feet; right?

5 Q. Well, there will be an additional tower at

6 that location --

7 A. Right.

8 Q. -- that will be some 40 feet taller than the

9 tower that is currently there.

10 A. Okay. That's not quite what you said, but --

11 Q. Is that accurate?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And this particular home, according to your

14 table, and I'll flip it back there again, is

15 3.9 feet from the right-of-way; correct?

16 A. That's right.

17 Q. And Tower 1124, and I'll go back to -- for

18 the record, this is Revised Project

19 Map 127 -- Tower 1124 is represented by this

20 red square; correct?

21 A. That's right.

22 Q. And it is going to be located closer to that

23 house than the existing line that's there

24 right now.

1 A. That's right.

2 Q. Wouldn't you agree, in addition to Tower
3 1124, this property has views of other
4 towers?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And would those towers -- those towers would
7 include 1123, which is to the west. Would
8 you agree with that?

9 A. I'm sorry. They have a view of that? I
10 don't know for certain, but they may well
11 have.

12 Q. Okay. Well, when you examined this property
13 as part of this process, did you make note of
14 your view of Tower 1123 in addition to
15 Tower 1124?

16 A. No.

17 Q. And similar question, Dr. Chalmers. For this
18 property, did you make note of a view of
19 Tower 1125 to the east in addition to
20 Tower 1124?

21 A. No. We would have been looking at the -- I
22 mean, I would be looking at the same map
23 you're looking at. I'd be aware of it, but
24 our formal focus was on the most visible

1 tower structure and the distance to the most
2 visible and the visibility of the most
3 visible structure.

4 Q. Okay. And that relates to my next question,
5 Dr. Chalmers. If the most visible structure
6 was the closest one, then you didn't consider
7 any other structures that might have also
8 been visible.

9 A. That's right.

10 Q. So, in situations where the most visible
11 structure was the nearest to the house, and
12 there were other structures that were also
13 visible, you didn't consider the cumulative
14 impact of viewing all of those structures.

15 A. That's right.

16 Q. Okay. I'm going to show you now, Dr.
17 Chalmers, the Alteration of Terrain Plans for
18 the same segment of the line. And just for
19 the record, this is AOT Plan Sheet 242. And
20 this is not -- just one second.

21 (Pause)

22 Q. Are you familiar with what an Alteration of
23 Terrain Plan Sheet is?

24 A. Generally, yes.

1 Q. And so generally it depicts some of the
2 disturbance that's going to take place within
3 the utility corridor; correct?

4 A. That's right.

5 Q. Okay. And it would include -- it does
6 include any removal of vegetation that is
7 contemplated. Are you aware of that?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And as you can see here, it also has some
10 topographic features within the corridor;
11 correct?

12 A. That's right.

13 Q. And you didn't have any AOT plans with you
14 when you did your analysis, did you?

15 A. No, I did not.

16 Q. Okay. So I'm going to go down to the bottom
17 here, Dr. Chalmers, and just let you see the
18 key that kind of explains to us what's being
19 depicted. You see there's a number of
20 different items that can be shown and
21 explanations. And I wanted to point your
22 attention to this one right here. Do you see
23 that?

24 A. I do.

1 Q. And you see it says "vegetation clearing
2 areas"?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. And you see it's indicated by, I will call it
5 turquoise, but I submit maybe you have a
6 better descriptor for that color. But it's
7 something like that and has little dots as
8 well. Do you see that?

9 A. I do.

10 Q. Okay. Now we're going to go back up to the
11 corridor. And I'll represent to you, Dr.
12 Chalmers, that this property, which is
13 indicated here by R20-16, is the same as
14 Lot 6115. Would you accept that?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. It's not labeled that way on this particular
17 plan, but that's what it is. And you see
18 that there's the rough outline of the house
19 right there, which as we just mentioned is
20 3.9 feet from the right-of-way; correct?

21 A. Yeah, that was the measurement we got.

22 Q. That's correct. And you see that there is
23 some planned vegetative clearing on this
24 property adjacent to this property associated

1 with this Tower 1124. Do you see that?

2 A. Yeah. Just point to the one you're looking
3 at.

4 Q. Sure. So there's a little bit right here,
5 right where this construction pad is. Do you
6 see that?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And then there's some more, a circle on the
9 property. Do you see that as well?

10 A. Yeah.

11 Q. Okay. It's on another map, but I now want to
12 show you AOT Plan Sheet 243. And it's
13 basically a continuation of the Project in a
14 southerly direction where this page leaves
15 off. So you see on the left-hand side there,
16 there's that circular removal we just talked
17 about. Do you see that?

18 A. Yes, I do.

19 Q. Okay. And as you go east across this road,
20 you see there's the next tower, which I
21 believe is Tower 1125, I believe. One
22 second. Yes, that's this tower right here.
23 Tower 1125, do you see that?

24 A. Yes.

1 Q. And you see here there's some additional
2 clearing of vegetation right before that
3 tower. Do you see that rectangle and
4 turquoise color?

5 A. I do.

6 Q. So you would agree, then, looking from 6115
7 towards Tower 1125, there's a potential for
8 removal of some of the vegetative screening
9 between the property and that tower.

10 A. That's right.

11 Q. I'm going to go back now to AOT Sheet 242,
12 which we were just on, which again is just
13 across the road. The maps are just split in
14 an inconvenient way for purposes of looking
15 at this property.

16 Okay. So, just to give us some
17 orientation, here's the property in question
18 again, 6115. And the tower immediately above
19 it is 1124. The one across the road on the
20 other sheet was 1125. And the one to the
21 west here is -- make sure I get that right.
22 I apologize. The one immediately in front of
23 the property is 1124. The one to the west is
24 1123. Do you see that?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And going back to AOT Sheet 242, do you see
3 the topography between that tower to the west
4 and the property in question? Do you see the
5 topo lines?

6 A. Yeah.

7 Q. So it appears from the topo lines that the
8 tower, or the base of the tower is going to
9 be below the subject property. Would you
10 agree with that?

11 A. Appears to be the case.

12 Q. Okay. And for your analysis, though, you
13 didn't consider any changes in topography,
14 did you?

15 A. Only as it would have related to the most
16 visible structure and the nearest structure.
17 Now, yeah, we clearly observed the topography
18 in many cases when you look at the property.

19 Q. Right.

20 A. But we didn't go beyond the structures that I
21 just mentioned.

22 Q. Okay. And again, for this property, because
23 the tower structure that I'm directing you to
24 is not the most visible one, it sounds like

1 you didn't consider the topography with
2 respect to a view from the property to that
3 tower structure; is that correct?

4 A. That's right.

5 Q. Okay. So, despite an almost doubling in
6 tower height from the existing line that's
7 there with the addition of the Northern Pass
8 Project, and that goes for two of the three
9 towers that are visible here, the fact that
10 there are three towers likely visible from
11 this property, the extremely close proximity
12 to the right-of-way, which I believe is a
13 little under 4 feet, and the Northern Pass
14 being built closer to the property than the
15 existing line, the lack of vegetative
16 screening toward Tower 1125 to the east, your
17 opinion is that there's not going to be any
18 impact to value from the Project.

19 A. That is my opinion, yes.

20 Q. And do I understand correctly that if a
21 property owner already has a view of
22 structures and wires, it could be doubled --
23 the number of structures could be doubled or
24 tripled, the amount of wires could be doubled

1 or tripled, and that increase in the
2 intensity of the use wouldn't have any impact
3 on the property value?

4 A. Oh, there's probably some, you know, sort of
5 logical limit to that argument. But the
6 essence of it, and it's not intuitive at
7 first -- I mean, this is a good question.

8 Q. I'll let you answer the question, Dr.
9 Chalmers, but can you just say "Yes" or "No"
10 whether I have that understanding correct and
11 then you can explain?

12 A. Yeah, that's the position that we're taking
13 right now. I don't have a basis to quantify
14 any possible effects at very high levels of
15 intensity. I would acknowledge that there's
16 something out there at some point.

17 But in kind of the relevant ranges of
18 intensity, you know, one, two, three lines,
19 50 feet, 60 feet, 90 feet, 110 feet, the
20 research indicates that the intensification
21 that occurs here will clearly be quite a big
22 deal for this particular resident. That's
23 going to be a dramatic change in their
24 immediate environment, okay.

1 Q. But a change that you've opined will not
2 result in a loss of value for them.

3 A. Okay, that's a totally different question.
4 So just let me go one step further.

5 So we acknowledge there's a big change
6 for the individual homeowner --

7 Q. Well, Dr. Chalmers --

8 A. -- but will there be a change in value? It's
9 our opinion that there won't.

10 Q. Okay. Now I want to turn your attention to
11 another property in this area, and we're
12 going to look now at 6117. And just to
13 orient us again, 6117 is across the road.
14 It's this property right here. Do you see
15 that?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And going back to your table, 6117 is right
18 here. And we looked at some of the
19 information for it. We see that it's
20 7.9 feet from the right-of-way; is that
21 correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And the visual interpretations that you
24 concluded were that the structures and

1 conductors were all clearly visible before
2 the Project, and after the Project nothing
3 would change; they would still be clearly
4 visible. And so because of the lack of
5 change, there was going to be no likelihood
6 of value impact.

7 A. Market value impact. Right.

8 Q. Is that -- okay. Thank you.

9 So, for this particular property, Dr.
10 Chalmers, you viewed it from the street. And
11 correct me if I'm wrong, but you were most
12 likely right behind the house or just to the
13 side of it?

14 A. Yeah, we would frequently drive up and down
15 the street to get different angles of
16 observation. But, yeah, I can't say just
17 looking at it here. But, yeah, we observed
18 it from the street.

19 Q. Okay. And similar to the last property, it
20 appears that DC1125 is the most immediate
21 structure to that house. Would you agree
22 with that?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And was it also the most visible to the

1 house?

2 A. I presume so.

3 Q. Okay. And so because of that, you didn't
4 give any consideration to seeing other tower
5 structures from this property; correct?

6 A. That's right.

7 Q. So, no consideration was given to DC1124 to
8 the west or DC1126 to the east; correct?

9 A. That's right.

10 Q. And it may technically be north and south.
11 So I'm sorry if I'm mixing up my directions,
12 but I think you understand the question.

13 You can see from where the Project is
14 going to be located that the Project
15 structures and wires are going to be closer
16 to that house; correct? Closer than the
17 existing line to the house.

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And we looked at it a second ago, and we can
20 go back and do it again. But I'll represent
21 to you that the tower heights for both 1125
22 and 1124 are about 40 feet taller than the
23 existing line that's there presently. Would
24 you agree with that?

1 A. I think that's -- that may well be. I'll
2 take your word for it.

3 Q. Okay. And for Tower 1126 -- now I have to
4 check because I want to make sure. Yeah, for
5 Tower 1126, it's going to be about 20 feet
6 taller than the line that's presently there;
7 correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay. And just for the record, I say that
10 because 1126 is at 75 feet, and I recall the
11 typical height of the towers in this section
12 of the corridor was about 55 feet. Correct?

13 A. Correct. Right.

14 Q. I want to turn back now to the Alteration of
15 Terrain Plans, Dr. Chalmers. We're going to
16 look back at AOT Sheet 243. But this time
17 we're going to look a little further along
18 the line, okay. So, right in the middle of
19 the page there, right below that dotted line,
20 that is 6117; correct?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Okay. And you see that the construction pad
23 for the tower immediately in front of it is
24 right there on your screen, and to the south

1 you see the pad for Tower 1126?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And you see in between the house there and
4 the pad for 1126 there's some areas of
5 vegetative clearing. Do you see that?

6 A. Yes, I do.

7 Q. Wouldn't you agree that, due to this
8 vegetative clearing there is a potential for
9 loss of screening of Tower 1126 from this
10 property?

11 A. Yes, certainly that potential.

12 Q. And do you see the topography in the area of
13 the property versus where 1126 is?

14 A. I see the topo lines. I'm not sure I'm
15 reading it easily, but I see the topographic
16 lines.

17 Q. Well, do you see that below, just to the left
18 of the subject property, there is a topo
19 elevation marking of 540? Do you see that?

20 A. Yes, I see it.

21 Q. And if we go up to the right-hand corner, we
22 get a topo marking of 590?

23 A. Right.

24 Q. So would it be fair to say that moving in

1 that direction from 540 to 590, you're
2 increasing in elevation?

3 A. Well, 540 to 590 is increasing. It's just
4 what's going on in between. Don't you have a
5 valley? Don't you have two hillsides that
6 are meeting down at the bottom?

7 Q. I'll move on, Dr. Chalmers. That's okay.

8 So, similar to the last property, here
9 we have three towers that are visible from
10 this property. Two of those towers are going
11 to be 40 feet taller than the line that's
12 presently there. The third tower is going to
13 be 20-foot higher. The Northern Pass line is
14 going to run closer to this house than the
15 currently existing line. There's going to be
16 loss of screening towards Tower 1126. Yet,
17 your opinion is there's not going to be any
18 back from the line on this property; correct?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. And I believe you just acknowledged that at
21 some point there's a change in intensity that
22 may trigger a loss in value. But you've not
23 opined on what that is; is that correct?

24 A. We just don't have any data on that. I mean,

1 if you got close to a generating station or
2 got close to a large substation or something,
3 you'd get an intensification. But in our
4 research, sort of dealing with the levels of
5 intensification, say between the Phase II and
6 the existing PSNH lines, we're not seeing any
7 differential effects.

8 Q. All right. I want to turn now to another New
9 Hampton property. This one is...

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley,
11 I'm sorry to interrupt. Could you humor me and
12 give me a road map here as to what the endpoint
13 of this line of questioning is?

14 MR. WHITLEY: I've got one more
15 property to do.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, no. I'm
17 interested in the point. What's the point?

18 MR. WHITLEY: I think the point,
19 Mr. Chair, is that Dr. Chalmers, in the
20 instances that I'm pointing out, has confined
21 his consideration to the tower structure that's
22 right in front of the property.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And that's
24 probably true everywhere; right?

1 MR. WHITLEY: It could be, yes.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And it's
3 possible that if you asked him if he did it
4 everywhere and he said yes --

5 MR. WHITLEY: We could move
6 along.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's
8 possible; right?

9 MR. WHITLEY: It is very
10 possible.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Just a
12 thought.

13 MR. WHITLEY: It's a good one.

14 BY MR. WHITLEY:

15 Q. Dr. Chalmers, the situation that we described
16 where the structure that's most immediate to
17 the house in question is the most visible, if
18 that was the case, then you didn't consider
19 any other structures that may have been
20 visible all along the line?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Okay. And I think you've already established
23 that you didn't consider topography or
24 vegetative clearing that was planned for --

1 A. No --

2 Q. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off.

3 A. -- that's not what I said. No. I mean,
4 obviously when we observed, we didn't take
5 that into consideration as it related to
6 other structures. We did, obviously, with
7 respect to the structures in question.

8 Q. Understood. And I think we're saying the
9 same thing. So with that, I will move to a
10 different point.

11 Let me to turn your attention now to the
12 Town of Pembroke. And I'm going to talk
13 about four properties that are in close
14 proximity to each other. This is a different
15 line of questioning, but kind of similar
16 setup. So let me just pull that up for one
17 second. We're going to be going to Revised
18 Project Map 169.

19 And Dr. Chalmers, this is where the line
20 passes through Pembroke and goes over the
21 river into, I believe it's Allenstown. But
22 it's the next municipality. And I have on
23 the screen here a portion of that project
24 map, and it's showing four properties that

1 you looked at for your examination. The
2 first one is 8927, and it's right here. Do
3 you see that?

4 A. I do.

5 Q. The house for this one is actually at the
6 other end of the property. It's up here. Do
7 you see that there?

8 A. Right. Yeah.

9 Q. And then the others here are 829, and there's
10 the house right there in relation to the
11 line. Do you see that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. And then down here, 82 -- excuse me.
14 Last one was 8928, and this one is now 8929.
15 And you see there the yellow dot there?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. And then the last one is 8947, which
18 is across the road to the south to where my
19 cursor is right there. It's a little, small
20 lot. Do you see that? I'll move it again.

21 A. Okay, I see it.

22 Q. Do you see that?

23 A. Yeah.

24 Q. So I'm going to turn your attention now to

1 your spreadsheet. And this is broken up into
2 two pages, so bear with me for a second.

3 You see 8927 at the very bottom of that
4 page. You can see that it's just under
5 14 feet from the right-of-way and no change
6 in the visibility from the Project. Do you
7 see that there?

8 A. I do.

9 Q. And we go on to the next page, and it
10 continues with the other three Pembroke
11 properties in this area. And you can see
12 that they vary in distance from the
13 right-of-way, ranging from about 80 feet to
14 under 40 feet. And you see that one of those
15 remaining properties, 8929, you did indicate
16 was going to have a change in value. Do you
17 see that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. And it looks like from this table that
20 your rationale for concluding there was going
21 to be a change is that the Northern Pass
22 Project would result in greater visibility of
23 structures. Is that a fair characterization?

24 A. Yes.

1 Q. Okay. But for all the other properties in
2 this area, they're all listed as "partial,"
3 and none of those designations change after
4 the Project is in place; correct?

5 A. That's right.

6 Q. Okay. So, looking at this area here, there's
7 two or three towers that are in the area.
8 And by that I mean going from the south, or
9 on the right-hand side, 31, 32, 218, and then
10 217 and then 216. Do you see those?

11 A. I do.

12 Q. And you see they're designated by the yellow
13 lines and the yellow squares?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. I'll represent to you, Dr. Chalmers, that --
16 and we can go through the schematics that are
17 associated with this plan sheet -- that 217
18 is going to have a height of 120 feet; 218 is
19 going to have a height of 130 feet, and 216
20 is going to have a height of 127 feet. Would
21 you agree with those, or would you accept
22 those?

23 A. I'll accept that.

24 Q. Okay. I'll also represent to you, Dr.

1 Chalmers, that in this portion of the line --
2 excuse me -- the right-of-way, the already
3 existing line has a typical tower height of
4 75 feet. Would you accept that?

5 A. Okay.

6 Q. And so for all three of these towers in this
7 area, the Northern Pass tower height is going
8 to be close to double of what's already
9 there.

10 A. Okay.

11 Q. I want to ask you now, Dr. Chalmers, about
12 where you were when you did -- where you were
13 viewing -- where you were standing to view
14 each of these properties. And it appears
15 from those four properties that for property
16 8947, which is this little one down here --

17 A. Right.

18 Q. -- other than that property, you weren't able
19 to mimic the view from each house to view the
20 tower structures; is that correct?

21 A. I wasn't able to?

22 Q. You weren't able to duplicate the view from
23 each house to the corresponding closest tower
24 structure.

1 A. I don't understand what you're asking.

2 Q. Well, I'm trying to do it in a way that saves
3 a little time. So I can do it this way: So,
4 for 8947, you were right on the road right
5 next to that house; is that correct?

6 A. Right.

7 Q. And the closest tower and the most visible
8 tower is 218, which is right next to it;
9 correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay. So, for that property you had a pretty
12 good representation of what the view of the
13 tower would be; correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Because you could stand on the road right in
16 between the property and the tower; correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. But for the other three properties
19 that I've asked you to think about in this
20 area, you couldn't do that; is that correct?

21 A. I don't think so, not looking at it here.

22 Q. You don't think so? You disagree or --

23 A. No, I don't think what you just said is
24 correct.

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. On 8927 I'd be on Route 28; right?

3 Q. Correct.

4 A. And I'd be walking up and down Route 28.

5 Q. So you'd be right around here where my cursor
6 is?

7 A. Yeah, exactly. Or south of it, because I
8 can't tell exactly what's going on there in
9 the photo.

10 Q. Okay. Okay. What about 8929 and 8928?

11 A. So, 8929... is there access off of Suncook?

12 Q. Well, the road is where the cursor is right
13 here.

14 A. Right. So, I mean, we would operate off of
15 whatever road was the access road. It looks
16 like the driveway comes in from Suncook
17 there.

18 Q. I think that's correct.

19 A. You know, that would be our starting point.
20 And again, we would walk up and down the
21 road. Occasionally, depending on the
22 relationship of the property to the
23 right-of-way, the right-of-way would be handy
24 and we'd walk out in the right-of-way and get

1 a vantage point in that manner.

2 Q. And did you do that for 8928 and 8929?

3 A. I just don't -- I wouldn't have any way of
4 remembering. But it was -- I would think we
5 would have had reasonable visibility on 8929.
6 What's the fourth one?

7 Q. Well, it's 8929 and 8928. So the one right
8 above it, on the other side of the line.

9 A. Okay, okay. Yeah, on that, too, we would
10 have started from the highway -- or from the
11 road and might possibly have, given how close
12 those structures are to the road, we might
13 have walked in the 50 feet or 100 feet and
14 seen what kind of a line of sight we had to
15 the house.

16 Q. Wouldn't you agree that all these properties,
17 the four that we've just mentioned, are
18 immediately abutting each other or adjacent
19 to one another?

20 A. No. They're close by. I don't know -- I
21 wouldn't say they're -- they're all close by.
22 They're all in the same neighborhood.

23 Q. Okay. So if you determined that 8929 would
24 see an impact due to increased visibility,

1 doesn't that mean that those other three
2 properties would be similarly impacted?

3 A. No, it's pretty site-specific, depending on
4 the vegetation on the site. Some of these
5 houses are right up against -- a lot of it
6 has to do with the angle between the house
7 and the vegetation. And in many cases the
8 houses were right up against heavy
9 vegetation, and so their line of sight would
10 go over the top of even quite tall towers.

11 Q. And is your conclusion or your opinion that
12 these other three properties are not going to
13 have an impact in value, is that based on
14 your testimony just earlier, that if you
15 increase the intensity of the visibility,
16 there's not going to be an impact in value?

17 A. No, it's based on the fact that there is no
18 change in the visibility of, in this case,
19 the most visible structure.

20 Q. And I think we're saying the same thing but
21 differently. But that's what I meant by
22 "intensity." Not an increase of -- not
23 additional visibility that wasn't there
24 previously, but an increase in the visibility

1 that was there presently, which is a very
2 muddled way of saying it probably. Did you
3 want to respond to that?

4 A. A change. Right. Just a change in
5 visibility due to the Project.

6 Q. Okay. So let's just take two of these
7 properties, and then I think that we'll have
8 gone down this road far enough.

9 Let's take 8947, which is that little
10 property right here. Do you see that again?

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. You would agree that that property is closer
13 to the right-of-way than 8929, which remember
14 is right here?

15 A. Yeah, 8929 is essentially 80 feet, and 8947
16 is --

17 Q. I believe you said it was 70 feet.

18 A. -- is 70 feet. So they're about the same
19 distance.

20 Q. Well, one's 10-foot closer than the other.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. And 8947 and 8929, your analysis for both
23 those properties was based on the same tower
24 structure, 218; is that correct?

1 A. I believe so, yes.

2 Q. Okay. And so, again, how is it possible that
3 8947 has a different end result than 8929?

4 A. It's my assessment of the change in
5 visibility on the one is different than on
6 the other, which would have to do with
7 screening on the Project as best I could
8 observe. Again, not representing this as,
9 you know, a detailed site-specific visual
10 examination, but an attempt to get my arms
11 around kind of an order-of-magnitude estimate
12 of the number of properties that would
13 experience a change in visibility due to the
14 Project.

15 Q. I'm going to put up now the AOT Plan Sheet
16 for this area, which is AOT 322. And so
17 here, Dr. Chalmers, is Property 8929. And
18 that's the one that you said would have an
19 impact, or was likely to have an impact due
20 to the change in visibility. Do you agree
21 with that?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. And the one I'm asking you about is
24 across Batchelder Road and is located right

1 here. And that's 8947. Do you see that?

2 A. Yeah.

3 Q. And you see this AOT Plan Sheet depicts some
4 vegetative clearing all along here. Do you
5 see that?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. So you just mentioned that the
8 difference between 8947 and 8929 could be
9 some visual screening; correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And this AOT plan indicates that some of that
12 visual screening is likely to go away; does
13 it not?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Okay. But you didn't consider the visual
16 screening being removed when you considered
17 the impact on 8949, which again is the little
18 one over here.

19 A. Yeah. Given the change in the height of the
20 towers, the relevant screening is going to be
21 the screening immediately around the house,
22 not the screening in the corridor. If you're
23 at the corridor, if you can see the tops of
24 those trees being cleared in the corridor,

1 you're going to be able to see the taller
2 structure. But it would be -- some of these
3 houses are in a little cocoon of vegetation,
4 and they may have either no visibility or
5 they may have partial visibility. But
6 despite the fact that the structures are
7 taller, there won't be any material change in
8 the visibility of those structures.

9 (Pause)

10 BY MR. WHITLEY:

11 Q. That's all I have, Dr. Chalmers. Thank you.

12 A. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who is going
14 to be next? Mr. Tanguay?

15 MR. TANGUAY: Yes, it is, Mr.
16 Chairman. And I will thankfully be brief.

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. TANGUAY:

19 Q. Mr. Chalmers, my name is Shawn Tanguay. I'm
20 with the law firm Gardner, Fulton & Waugh. I
21 represent a number of municipalities that are
22 intervenors in this case and who are located
23 along the route of the Northern Pass.

24 I'd like to start off with some

1 clarification from yesterday. I believe
2 under cross-examination from Attorney Pappas
3 you stated that you were not an expert in New
4 Hampshire property valuation. Was that and
5 is that your testimony, sir?

6 A. I'm sorry. I lost the last couple words
7 there.

8 Q. Was that and is that your testimony?

9 A. What's that?

10 Q. That you are not an expert in property
11 valuation?

12 A. I still didn't get the last couple words.

13 Q. Is it your testimony, sir, that you are not
14 an expert in New Hampshire property
15 valuation?

16 A. Yeah, I wouldn't represent myself as an
17 expert in New Hampshire property valuation,
18 no.

19 Q. And in your June 30th, 2015 report, that's
20 not what we would consider to be a New
21 Hampshire -- a real estate appraisal report;
22 correct, sir?

23 A. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. If you could just
24 repeat. It harder for me when you're seated.

1 Q. Your June 30th, 2015, report, would you
2 consider that to be a real estate appraisal
3 report?

4 A. No.

5 Q. So if I were to describe your report, it's
6 essentially a compilation of case studies and
7 your analysis from that data; correct?

8 A. Well, some are literature, case studies,
9 subdivision studies, market activity
10 analysis, and then the conclusions I drew
11 from that.

12 Q. And the report is not site-specific in regard
13 to the current proposed project of Northern
14 Pass; correct?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. And this June 5th, 2015 report serves as the
17 basis of your prefiled testimony and your
18 testimony before the Committee this week;
19 correct?

20 A. That's right.

21 Q. So if testimony or evidence were to be
22 submitted to this Committee that established
23 an adverse impact to property values by the
24 Northern Pass Project in a particular area of

1 the Project, there's nothing in your report
2 that would repudiate that testimony or
3 evidence; correct?

4 A. Well, there is no evidence -- I mean, there
5 can be no evidence. The Project hasn't been
6 built yet. So I don't quite understand your
7 question. Subsequent to the Project being
8 built, it's possible someone could develop
9 evidence of one sort of another that would
10 conflict with the opinions that I've offered
11 prospectively of the impacts of the Project.
12 But I don't -- there's no evidence that could
13 be offered now that would repudiate my
14 conclusion, my opinions with respect to the
15 prospective impact to the Project.

16 Q. But if there was evidence submitted that
17 there is going to be some sort of impact to a
18 particular property along the route, there's
19 nothing in your report that would reject that
20 theory or evidence; correct?

21 A. No, I couldn't agree with that.

22 Q. In your report, you basically have admitted
23 to the fact that the HVTL does have some
24 impact on property values, depending upon the

1 condition of the property; correct?

2 A. That's right.

3 Q. Okay. Given your testimony under my
4 examination, isn't it true that there are
5 limitations that your report has in terms of
6 determining if the Project poses adverse
7 impacts to properties along the route?

8 A. I'm sorry. One more time.

9 Q. Given what you've testified, isn't it true
10 that there are limitations that your report
11 has in terms of determining if the Project
12 poses adverse impacts to the properties along
13 the proposed route?

14 A. I don't know, really, what you're inferring
15 by "limitations." We all have limitations, I
16 suppose. But there are no limitations
17 that -- I mean, I wouldn't mind having, you
18 know, better comps, or I wouldn't mind having
19 more sales. But I'm not aware of any
20 limitations in my work relative to what could
21 have been done.

22 Q. Would an appraisal report of the exact
23 proposed project route been more effective
24 than a case study?

1 A. I'm sorry?

2 Q. Would an appraisal report have been more
3 effective than a case study?

4 A. No.

5 MR. TANGUAY: Nothing further,
6 Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik.

8 MS. PACIK: Steve Whitley is
9 going to help me with my exhibits.

10 Dawn, can we get the Apple TV,
11 please?

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY MS. PACIK:

14 Q. Mr. Chalmers, good afternoon. My name's
15 Danielle Pacik. I am the attorney for the
16 City of Concord, and I am also the
17 spokesperson for Municipal Group 3 South. I
18 just want to start with a follow-up on some
19 questions that you received this morning from
20 Ms. Menard about 41 Haynes Road in Deerfield.

21 In your supplemental testimony, which we
22 have up above on the screen, if you turn to
23 Page 17, Line 8 --

24 MS. PACIK: We just have to go

1 one page up, please.

2 BY MS. PACIK:

3 Q. On Line 8 you start talking about 41 Haynes
4 Road, and you state that it was actively
5 marketed over the period between 2011 and
6 2015 and that it sold in April of 2015 for
7 \$275,000, or \$119 a square foot, which was
8 consistent with market data for similar
9 properties in Deerfield, and then you recite
10 Attachment 7.1.

11 I believe you went over this with Ms.
12 Menard. But would you agree that when you
13 wrote this statement, "41 Haynes Road was
14 actively marketed over the period between
15 2011 and 2015," that leaves the reader with
16 the impression that it was actively marketed
17 for four years?

18 A. I agree that's the impression that's created.

19 Q. And I believe this was went over. Correct me
20 if I'm wrong. But in actuality, the property
21 was taken off the market in 2011; is that
22 right?

23 A. The end of 2011. That appears to be the
24 case, yes.

1 Q. Okay. And I know you had a discussion with
2 Ms. Menard about whether or not this
3 transaction was an arm's length transaction,
4 and you disputed that terminology with her.
5 But I'd like to turn to your prefiled
6 testimony, which was Applicant's Exhibit 30.
7 And if you turn to Page 4 and scroll down a
8 little bit, it might be highlighted. Oh, it
9 is highlighted. Excellent. On Line 24, I'm
10 just going to read to you what you wrote.
11 And this is in your prefiled testimony. "The
12 universe of sales" -- and this is in
13 reference to the case study -- "was then
14 filtered to eliminate sales that did not meet
15 the definition of a 'fair market sale,'
16 defined as an arm's length transaction
17 between knowledgeable and typically motivated
18 parties." And then you gave an example.
19 "The sales most frequently eliminated
20 included foreclosures, short sales,
21 liquidation sales and sales between related
22 parties"; correct?

23 A. That's right.

24 Q. So in terms of the use of the word "arm's

1 length transaction," it's between
2 knowledgeable and typically motivated
3 parties; correct?

4 A. That's right.

5 Q. In terms of your report and your reference to
6 41 Haynes Road in your supplemental
7 testimony, you would agree that it would
8 leave the impression to the reader that there
9 was an arm's length transaction.

10 A. That's right.

11 Q. And you were shown testimony by Ms. Menard
12 relative to a transcript when she asked, I
13 believe it was Mr. Bowes, questions about the
14 41 Haynes Road. Do you recall that?

15 A. I do.

16 Q. And I can put it up if I need to. I do have
17 it available. But in that transcript, it was
18 identified that Eversource was actually
19 involved in that purchase of the property; is
20 that right?

21 A. Apparently that's the case. I only became
22 aware of that. Frankly, first time I've seen
23 that piece of paper, seen that transcript.

24 Q. So prior to today, you were not aware that

1 Eversource was involved in that transaction.

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. Okay. In terms of the transcript, and you
4 may recall this -- and again, I can point to
5 it if need be -- it stated that they
6 purchased the property to deal with a, quote,
7 concerned customer. Do you remember reading
8 that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And I'd like to put up Joint Muni 259.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik,
12 while that's happening, a couple times you've
13 asked to have documents pulled up and made
14 specific page references where the PDF page and
15 testimony page were different. It was Page 5 of
16 the PDF, Page 4 of the testimony. If you can be
17 more specific, that you want Page 4 of the
18 testimony and Page 5 of the PDF, we'll all get
19 there faster.

20 MS. PACIK: My apologies. I will
21 definitely try to do that. Thank you.

22 BY MS. PACIK:

23 Q. What we have now in front of us is Joint
24 Muni 259, and it is an e-mail from Gina

1 Neily, who I'll represent to you was the
2 seller of the property in Deerfield at
3 41 Haynes Road from September 17, 2013. And
4 it deals with intervenor status. And I will
5 read to you what I have highlighted. If you
6 want to read the entire e-mail, just let me
7 know and we can take some time. But what it
8 says is, "We had our home on the market for
9 two years, and though we had lots of
10 showings, the consensus was, quote, nice
11 home, too bad it's on the path of Northern
12 Pass, end quote." Do you see that?

13 A. I do.

14 Q. Okay. And you understand this is the
15 concerned customer that sold their property
16 to Eversource; right?

17 A. Apparently.

18 Q. Okay.

19 A. I don't know anything beyond what I saw this
20 morning.

21 Q. And I understand that. And I want to ask you
22 about that. You had mentioned to Attorney
23 Steve Judge that, prior to submitting your
24 supplemental testimony, you gave a copy to

1 Northern Pass to review; is that right?

2 A. Yeah, it was -- I discussed it with my
3 attorney friends here.

4 Q. Okay. And so they had an opportunity to look
5 at it, and they knew that you were submitting
6 supplemental testimony relative to 41 Haynes
7 Road; is that right?

8 A. They would have been aware of that, yes.
9 Sure.

10 Q. And we discussed already that at no time did
11 they ever notify you that Eversource was
12 actually involved in that transaction.

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. That information would have been helpful;
15 wouldn't you agree?

16 A. I mean, it bears on the issue of fair market
17 sale.

18 Q. And we talked earlier that when you read your
19 report, it leaves the impression to the Site
20 Evaluation Committee that the sale of
21 41 Haynes Road was an arm's length
22 transaction; is that right?

23 A. That's right. The fact that Eversource, or
24 whoever it was, if they were involved,

1 purchased it, doesn't necessarily mean that
2 it wasn't representative of the market at
3 that time. I mean, this isn't kind of a
4 bright-line issue. But if you did know that,
5 you'd want to look at it carefully. And you
6 might decide to include it, or you might
7 decide to exclude it on that basis. You
8 know, there are a lot of companies that buy
9 and sell property for a variety of reasons,
10 and there's no reason to suspect it's not a
11 fair market sale, that they're not
12 essentially buying it for, you know, a market
13 price. But it would be something that you'd
14 want to look into in this case.

15 Q. Okay. And are you aware that the property's
16 been left vacant since it's been purchased?

17 A. I don't believe so. I know it's had some
18 vacancy, but I really don't have any
19 information on its current status.

20 Q. Okay. And I anticipate further testimony in
21 this case on this. But you're not aware of
22 that information?

23 A. I'm sorry?

24 Q. You're not aware of that information, as you

1 sit here now?

2 A. As I sit here now, I don't know anything
3 about its occupancy status at the current
4 time.

5 Q. Okay. I'd like to now go to the case studies
6 that you did in Concord. And actually, I
7 should probably clarify. That was the case
8 studies that Brian Underwood had performed;
9 is that right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And I understand that there were 50 case
12 studies; is that correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And they were attached as Applicant's
15 Exhibit 1 in Appendix 46. And I want to
16 focus on the four properties that involved
17 Concord, New Hampshire. The first was Case
18 Study No. 44, and it's 41 Hoit Road. And I
19 will try to get the correct page number. I
20 believe it's Page 1256 of the PDF. And the
21 report number is Page 1122, if that works.
22 Actually, it's Page 1121 of the report and
23 1256 of the PDF. This is 41 Hoit Road. Are
24 you familiar with this property, Dr.

1 Chalmers?

2 A. I visited it. And in looking at the picture
3 of it, I don't have a clear recollection of
4 it. But I'm familiar with the information on
5 it, yes.

6 Q. Okay. If you scroll down a little bit on
7 this page, it states that the distance from
8 the house to the right-of-way is 7 feet.
9 That's not accurate, is it?

10 (Witness reviews document.)

11 A. It's 7.6.

12 Q. Are you aware that the house is actually in
13 the right-of-way?

14 A. Well, you know, we didn't get -- we didn't
15 survey the properties. We did it off of
16 aerial imagery and in position of the
17 right-of-way boundaries based on a variety of
18 methods. So, yeah, it could be plus or minus
19 a few feet. Our estimate -- you know, these
20 would all be estimates. There's a graphic in
21 the case study that's been prepared as
22 carefully as is possible, really --

23 Q. Did you look at --

24 A. -- and we got 7.6 feet. But, you know, it

1 could conceivably be in the right-of-way.

2 Q. Did you look at the plan submitted by
3 Northern Pass when you made the determination
4 that it was 7 feet?

5 A. No, I don't believe so. We would have been
6 working off of property records, tax maps and
7 aerial imagery.

8 Q. Are you aware that 441 Haynes Road -- my
9 apologies -- for 41 Hoit Road, that there is
10 a Joint Use Agreement entered into between
11 the property owners and PSNH?

12 A. No.

13 Q. And I'll turn to Joint Muni 252. We'll just
14 blow this up so we can all see it. But I'll
15 represent to you that this is an Agreement
16 and Consent to Joint Use entered into between
17 PSNH and the former owners of 41 Hoit Road.
18 And if you turn to paragraph, I think
19 Page 7 --

20 MS. PACIK: Actually, we can go
21 up a bit.

22 BY MS. PACIK:

23 Q. Paragraph 7, excuse me, of Page 3 of this
24 document. It has an agreement that the

1 owners agree to cover the full reasonable
2 costs to PSNH for such interference or damage
3 as a result of its construction and/or
4 maintenance activities within the easement.
5 And if you scroll down, this document applies
6 to successors of the property. And that's on
7 Paragraph 17. It states, "This agreement
8 shall be binding upon and inure to the
9 benefit of the parties and their heirs,
10 administrators, successors and assigns." Do
11 you see that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And you understand that this document was
14 recorded in the Merrimack County Registry of
15 Deeds?

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. Would you agree that a Joint Use Agreement
18 such as this might have an impact on the
19 property value?

20 A. Could well have, yes.

21 Q. And this was not referenced in the case
22 study, was it?

23 A. It was not.

24 Q. Now, if we go back to the case study, under

1 Marketing History, it states that the
2 property was originally listed for \$219,000
3 and reduced to \$199,900; is that right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And the sale price of the property was
6 \$180,000.

7 A. Right.

8 Q. And above where it says Marketing Period, it
9 says 106 days; is that right?

10 A. Right.

11 Q. Which is higher than the average on the
12 market, which was 78 days?

13 A. That's right.

14 Q. Now, there's no reference in this case study
15 to the fact that this house had previously
16 been listed before, is there?

17 A. Not that I'm seeing, no.

18 Q. And if we turn to Exhibit 254 --

19 A. Just one second. I was just looking in the
20 appraisal to see. Sometimes in the listing
21 history, a more extensive summary listing
22 history is in the appraisal. But this picks
23 up with the 219 listing in July of 2012.

24 Q. Okay. What I'm showing you is some MLS

1 history that we marked as Joint Muni 254.
2 And this actually shows a year prior to that,
3 on June 18th, 2011, it was actually listed
4 for \$249,900. Do you see that?

5 A. I do.

6 Q. So that is \$79,000 more than what it sold
7 for; is that right?

8 A. Yes. Forty-nine plus 20 is 69.

9 Q. Oh, 69. I'm not very good at math. Thank
10 you for the correction.

11 MS. PACIK: If we can go down to
12 the next page. One more.

13 BY MS. PACIK:

14 Q. This is a more detailed view of the history
15 of the listing, which you had just mentioned
16 was not referenced anywhere in the case
17 study. And it shows that on June 18th, 2011,
18 it was listed for \$259,900, and then it went
19 down \$10,000 and expired on December 19th,
20 2011. Do you see that?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And then it was re-listed July 16th, 2012,
23 for \$219,000.

24 A. Correct.

1 Q. And it was ultimately sold, we established,
2 in about I believe it was November 2012 is
3 when there was a purchase-and-sale agreement,
4 and that was for \$180,000.

5 (Witness reviews document.)

6 A. I don't know that we have a date on the
7 purchase-and-sale agreement.

8 Q. Oh, it actually sold on October 30th, 2012,
9 for \$180,000. Is that what your records
10 show?

11 A. No. We've got the sale date of March 15th.

12 Q. March 15th. Okay.

13 A. Of 2013.

14 MS. PACIK: Can you go back to
15 the case study, please?

16 BY MS. PACIK:

17 Q. So, under the case study for Conclusions,
18 which is on the next page, the appraiser says
19 that he believed that the property was
20 appraised at \$209,000 and that there was a 10
21 percent impact on the sale price. And he
22 concluded -- and this is under Appraised
23 Value/Sale Price/Marketing Period, the last
24 sentence -- that the marketing period was 106

1 days, which is 35.9 percent higher than the
2 average days on market for all other
3 properties in the town during the same
4 period. That does not reference the earlier
5 listing that we just looked at; is that
6 right?

7 A. I'm sorry. I can't agree with that because I
8 don't understand it.

9 Q. Okay. So we looked and we saw that
10 originally the property was listed for
11 \$259,000 in 2011.

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. And then it was taken off the market.

14 A. Right.

15 Q. And it was put back on the market in 2012,
16 and at that time it was marketed for 106 days
17 before it sold at \$180,000; right?

18 A. Right.

19 Q. And so what you see here doesn't have any
20 reference to the fact that the marketing
21 period may have been longer than 106 days
22 because there was an expired listing in 2011.

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. Now, he says the appraiser concluded that the

1 property was valued at \$209,000, which he
2 determined was a 10 percent impact on the
3 sale price.

4 A. No, no. You're misinterpreting -- that was
5 the -- the 10 percent was the broker's
6 opinion.

7 Q. Oh, okay. You're right. So the appraiser
8 thought it was \$209,000; is that right?

9 A. That was his opinion of value.

10 Q. Yes. I apologize. And that's 13.9 percent
11 above the sale price of \$180,000; is that
12 right?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. Okay. So I want to look at that \$209,000 and
15 whether or not that's accurate. And I'd like
16 to look at the sales grid, which is on PDF
17 Page 1266 or report Page 1131. So the first
18 column is the subject property, which is
19 41 Hoit Road. And I believe there's a typo
20 because it says "5 View Street"; is that
21 right?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. So that should say 41 Hoit Road under
24 Item/Subject?

1 A. Yeah.

2 Q. Okay. So the next, the first comparable he
3 used was 5 View Street. Are you aware that
4 5 View Street is in Penacook, New Hampshire?

5 A. Is in where?

6 Q. Penacook.

7 A. No. I mean, I took the address literally, as
8 indicated here, that was in Concord.

9 Q. And Penacook is part of Concord, New
10 Hampshire, but it's a separate section of
11 Concord. Are you aware of that?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Okay. And are you aware that Penacook has a
14 different tax rate from the rest of Concord?

15 A. No, I'm not.

16 Q. If you can turn to Joint Muni 255, this shows
17 our tax rates in Concord. And the first one
18 shows Concord, which is \$27.67, at least this
19 year. And for Penacook it shows it's higher;
20 it's \$33.34. Do you see that?

21 A. Uh-huh.

22 Q. And would you agree that a different tax rate
23 might have an impact on the fair market value
24 of a property?

1 A. Sure.

2 Q. Okay. And are you aware that Penacook
3 actually sends their children to a different
4 school system than Concord?

5 A. No, I'm not.

6 Q. Would you agree that a different school
7 system might also have impact on property
8 value that would need an adjustment?

9 A. Sure. That would be a consideration for a
10 lot of people.

11 Q. And are you aware that the price of homes
12 sold in Penacook are generally lower than the
13 price of homes in the rest of Concord?

14 A. Yeah, I don't have any information on that
15 one way or another.

16 Q. We can show you. It's marked as Joint
17 Muni 257. Bear with me for one moment.

18 (Pause)

19 BY MS. PACIK:

20 Q. Sorry for the delay. There's a few exhibits
21 we had. Here we go. Dr. Chalmers, I'll
22 represent to you that this is a chart that
23 was put together by the City of Concord's
24 Real Estate Assessing Department, and it

1 shows -- and this is all public information.
2 But it's a chart which shows the difference
3 in the average single-family home between
4 2011 and 2016 for Concord and Penacook.
5 You'll see that in 2011 there was a
6 30 percent difference, and it's been about 26
7 to 30 percent for all six years. Do you see
8 that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And so you would agree that if the property
11 values in Concord are lower -- or are higher
12 in general than Penacook, an adjustment would
13 need to be made on the sales grid for the
14 comparables; is that right?

15 A. Not necessarily.

16 Q. For location, you would not make an
17 adjustment?

18 A. You know, I'd rely -- this is a call that a
19 local residential real estate appraiser has
20 got to make. And Correnti is a competent,
21 experienced local real estate appraiser. The
22 averages, you know, certainly raise the
23 issue. But I'm not in a position to
24 second-guess Correnti at this point without

1 having looked at it in detail myself.

2 Q. Other than these appraisals in this case,
3 have you ever seen an appraisal for a
4 residential single-family property in Concord
5 before and whether or not most appraisers
6 make adjustments for location for properties
7 between Concord and Penacook?

8 A. I don't have any experience with respect to
9 how appraisers make that adjustment or don't
10 make it, no.

11 MS. PACIK: You can turn back to
12 the case study on the sales grid.

13 BY MS. PACIK:

14 Q. You'll see that 5 View Street, if you scroll
15 down, has the lowest adjusted sale price at
16 \$202,000 of all the properties. Do you see
17 that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. And if you turn to Column 3, which
20 is -- or sorry -- Sales Comparison 3, that's
21 actually \$226,450 after adjustments were
22 made. And a number of adjustments were made.
23 You can see that the gross adjustments for
24 that property were 24.9 percent; is that

1 right?

2 A. Right.

3 Q. And if you scroll up, this is on Winterberry
4 Lane. Are you aware that Winterberry Lane
5 also is in Penacook?

6 A. No.

7 Q. And on this sales grid there are no
8 adjustments for a location between Penacook
9 and Concord; is that right?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. Okay. I'd like to turn to Case Study No. 45.
12 And this is 500. And this is 569 mountain
13 road.

14 A. Is this a case? Can you give me a case study
15 number?

16 Q. Yes. It's Case Study No. 45, and I'm just
17 trying to find the page number for you right
18 now. I believe it might be 1280, which is
19 the PDF number. So the first page of Case
20 Study No. 45 is PDF 1278, and the page number
21 of that is 1143 of the report. And this is a
22 property at 569 Mountain Road. And you
23 described this -- is this you or Mr.
24 Underwood that determined it was partially

1 visible, clearly visible or not visible?

2 A. That would have been Mr. Underwood.

3 Q. And did he use the same methodology as you?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So that was if you could see part of the
6 line, it was partially visible?

7 A. Part of the structure, principally.

8 Q. Okay. So you need to see part of the
9 structure and part of the line?

10 A. Not necessarily. The focus here, in
11 summarizing this, would have been on the
12 structure visibility.

13 Q. Okay. Under Interview Data on this case
14 study, for Transaction Interview, this a
15 discussion Mr. Underwood had with the listing
16 broker. It says, "The HVTL could not be seen
17 from the house or from outside," and then he
18 has in quotes [sic], "this is contrary to the
19 exterior inspection. There is heavy tree
20 growth and buffer between the house and the
21 right-of-way." So the realtor thought that
22 you could not see the transmission line; is
23 that right?

24 A. Yes, that's how I interpret this.

1 Q. Okay. Have you ever been to this property?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And are you aware of whether the line is
4 visible?

5 A. I would have made an observation with respect
6 to consistency of Mr. Underwood's
7 observations here, so I would have concurred
8 that it was partially visible based on my
9 visit.

10 Q. And you never actually went to the house, did
11 you? You went to the road?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. So when the broker said that the house --
14 that the line could not be seen from the
15 house or from the outside, at least from the
16 house you don't know whether that line could
17 be seen from it, do you?

18 A. You know, sometimes I think you can tell at a
19 pretty high level of certainty and other
20 times you can't.

21 MS. PACIK: Okay. Can we turn to
22 Joint Muni 251.

23 BY MS. PACIK:

24 Q. This is a picture that was just taken about

1 five days ago, July 25th, 2017, of the
2 property. Do you see any structures in this
3 property behind the property?

4 (Witness reviews document.)

5 A. What am I looking for? I'm looking for two
6 wood H-frames, I guess?

7 Q. I'm not quite sure. I don't see them.

8 A. Well, it helps if you know what you're
9 looking for. You know, nothing jumps out at
10 me. There's one... I've spent of lot of
11 time looking through the trees trying to find
12 structures, and there's one pretty vertical
13 element over kind of the left-hand garage
14 door. But that seems a little too tall. So
15 there's nothing obvious that jumps out as a
16 structure, no.

17 Q. And the driveway you can see is, I don't know
18 if you'd call it long, but there is a
19 driveway between the road and the house;
20 right?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And you never went up to the house to see
23 whether or not any structures were visible
24 from the house.

1 A. That's right.

2 MS. PACIK: Now, can we go back
3 to the case study for a moment? And if we go a
4 couple pages forward there's another photograph
5 of the house. And if you go another page
6 down...

7 A. Where is that?

8 BY MS. PACIK:

9 Q. This actually shows the house and the
10 proximity to the right-of-way and the closest
11 structure. And according to this map, it
12 says that the house is 269 feet from the
13 right-of-way and 407 feet to the closest
14 structure; is that right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. So, at most, when you say that this is
17 partially visible, we weren't able to see any
18 structures from the road, but you think that
19 something might have been able to be seen
20 through the trees?

21 A. No, that's not the correct interpretation
22 here. The broker reported that neither --
23 that there were no structures visible from
24 the house or otherwise. But this is contrary

1 to the exterior inspection. This is contrary
2 to what we observed. If you go back to that
3 photo, go back two pages from this, I think I
4 saw the structure in the trees.

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. I may be wrong, but what this implies is that
7 we concluded -- see right over that shutter
8 on the bay window, the right-hand shutter on
9 the bay window? I don't know. This
10 obviously isn't conclusive and may be my
11 imagination, but -- yeah, I think I'm just
12 seeing trees.

13 But in any event, this comment is
14 explicit, that we contradicted, or that Brian
15 contradicted the broker based on his personal
16 inspection, which means that he was able to
17 see the structure partially through the
18 trees.

19 Q. Okay. Let's turn to the next case study,
20 which is Case Study No. 46. And this is on
21 page, well, PDF -- hold on. I want to make
22 sure I'm giving you the right one. It's on
23 Page 1168 of your report. I'm not quite sure
24 what PDF number it is. I believe it might

1 be -- did you find it? PDF No. 1303. And
2 this is Case Study No. 46, 16 Brookwood
3 Drive. And it starts off by saying it's a
4 one-story, single-family home. And it states
5 that the house was built in 1965 and it's in
6 average condition. And then if we go to the
7 next page, under Improvements and Visibility,
8 it says it's a one-and-a-half-family home.
9 Do you see that?

10 (Witness reviews document.)

11 Q. It's highlighted?

12 A. Oh.

13 Q. Do you see where it says --

14 A. Yeah, yeah, I see it. I'm just trying to
15 understand the... but in any event, yeah,
16 that's inconsistent with what's said on the
17 first page.

18 Q. And then if you go to the next page, there's
19 a picture of the house, and it shows a
20 two-story home; is that right?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Okay. So we can all agree it's a two-story
23 home.

24 A. Yeah. Sometimes they do a one and

1 three-quarters. I'm just not sure about the
2 local...

3 (Witness reviews document.)

4 A. But anyway, it looks like a full second
5 story.

6 Q. Okay. And it had said that it was a
7 three-bedroom on the case study; is that
8 right?

9 A. The Improvements are described as three
10 bedrooms. Right.

11 Q. Okay. And going back to that first page, it
12 states that it was on the market for 105
13 days, which was pretty close to the average
14 for the city, which was 96 days, and that the
15 property was originally listed for \$239,900
16 on July 25th, 2011, and it sold for \$237,000.
17 So the reader of this case study would be
18 under the impression that it sold for \$2,900
19 less than what it was originally listed for;
20 is that right?

21 A. Correct.

22 MS. PACIK: Okay. I'd like to go
23 to Joint Muni 248.

24 BY MS. PACIK:

1 Q. And this is the listing history of the
2 property. Are you aware that February 10th,
3 2010, it was actually put on the market for
4 \$285,000?

5 A. Okay.

6 Q. That's a lot more than what it was listed for
7 in July of 2011, which was \$239,900; right?

8 A. Right. That's pretty common.

9 Q. And it was then taken off the market after
10 about eight months, on November 1st, 2010; is
11 that right?

12 A. Apparently.

13 Q. So in terms of that marketing time frame,
14 that extra eight months, it's not referenced
15 anywhere in the case study, is it?

16 A. That's right. This refers to the current
17 listing.

18 MS. PACIK: Okay. Can we go back
19 to the case study?

20 BY MS. PACIK:

21 Q. If you look under Transaction Interview, he
22 wrote, according to Mr. Underwood, under
23 Transaction Interview it says, "According to
24 the listing broker, there was an impact on

1 the property's marketing period due to the
2 HVTL. The broker indicated that the HVTL was
3 visible from inside and outside the house.
4 There was no comment on impact on value."
5 And if you go to the next page, under
6 Summary, again it says, "The broker indicated
7 an impact on marketing period, but the days
8 on market for the transaction were very
9 similar to the city average." And this is
10 Mr. Underwood's statement. There's no
11 reference here to that extra eight months
12 that this property was on the market and that
13 listing expired, is there?

14 A. No, there isn't.

15 Q. When he concluded that there was only a
16 possible adverse effect of the HVTL on the
17 marketing period, again, that doesn't discuss
18 that extra eight months, does it?

19 A. No, it doesn't.

20 MS. PACIK: Can we go to Case
21 Study No. 47.

22 BY MS. PACIK:

23 Q. This is Page 1327 of the PDF, or the report
24 is Page 1192. Dr. Chalmers, No. 47 is 86 Oak

1 Hill Road. And this is a house near Turtle
2 Pond. Are you familiar with that?

3 A. I think that's one that I have looked at a
4 couple of times. Well, yeah, I mean, I
5 visited. I don't recollect a lot of the
6 details, but I'm generally familiar with the
7 write-up on it.

8 Q. Okay. And this is a house that is a small
9 house along the water. And it sold,
10 according to the case study, if we scroll
11 down, it sold for \$115,000. Do you see that?

12 A. Yeah.

13 Q. And \$115,000 is low compared to the average
14 sales price in Concord; is that right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. The average price in Concord, according to
17 the case study, is \$196,900; is that right?
18 You have to say "Yes" or "No."

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. Or I presume it is.

22 Q. It's on Page 1335 of your report -- or
23 actually Page 1200 of your report, if you
24 have that in front of you, under Market Area.

1 Do you see that?

2 (Witness reviews document.)

3 A. No. What page numbers are you using there?

4 Q. So if you go -- let's just show you on the
5 screen. Page 1335 of the report, the average
6 price in Concord --

7 A. Okay. Yeah.

8 Q. -- in 2011 was \$196,900.

9 A. Okay. Yeah, I didn't know where you were
10 referring to.

11 Q. So, \$115,000 is much lower than the average
12 price in Concord; correct?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. If we go back to the first page of that case
15 study, this is a property where Mr. Underwood
16 determined that there was no impact of the
17 high-voltage transmission line on the
18 property; although, the realtor explained
19 under Transaction Interview that there was
20 minimal impact on the property's marketing
21 period and sale price, but it was due to the
22 price point of the property and the overall
23 size of the house. Do you see that?

24 A. I see that, yes.

1 Q. Okay. And basically, there were a few
2 potential buyers that rejected the property,
3 but at the price point there were other
4 buyers unaffected. Do you see that?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. So this house, you'd agree, was priced to
7 sell.

8 A. Well, it was a very, very small house, too.
9 I mean, it was priced appropriately, yeah.
10 It was apparently priced at its market value.

11 Q. Well, that's what Mr. Underwood determined;
12 right?

13 A. Right. And it -- yeah.

14 Q. Okay. Now, in terms of the analysis that Mr.
15 Underwood did, there's no reference in this
16 case study to a Joint Use Agreement between
17 this property owner and PSNH, is there?

18 A. Not to my knowledge.

19 Q. Okay. And we already discussed this with
20 41 Hoit Road. But you agreed that if there's
21 a Joint Use Agreement, that could very well
22 impact the market value of a property; right?

23 A. It could.

24 Q. Okay. And that's something that you would

1 probably want to have referenced in the case
2 study; correct?

3 A. Yeah, if you're aware of it.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik.

5 MS. PACIK: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We need to
7 break sometime in the next ten minutes or so.

8 MS. PACIK: Okay. I'll just
9 finish this one up. If we can turn to Joint
10 Muni 253.

11 BY MS. PACIK:

12 Q. This is an Agreement and Consent to Joint
13 Use, similar to the one that we saw for 41
14 Hoit Road, and this is for 86 Oak Hill Road.
15 Do you see that?

16 A. I do.

17 MS. PACIK: And again, can we
18 scroll down, I believe it's a couple pages.
19 There we go.

20 BY MS. PACIK:

21 Q. On this particular Joint Use Agreement, it
22 says that Ms. Brubaker agrees that if PSNH
23 needs to conduct additional transmission
24 lines or upgrade current lines within the

1 easement, she will cover in advance the full
2 reasonable increased costs to PSNH as a
3 result of its use of the easement. And I'll
4 represent to you that the use of the easement
5 amount in this particular agreement deals
6 with a septic system.

7 A. Okay.

8 Q. And again, this could impact value; correct?

9 A. Sure.

10 Q. Based on the location of the transmission
11 line on the property. Agreed?

12 A. Yeah, the location of the corridor on the --
13 yeah, the combined, the easement and whatever
14 is in it, right.

15 Q. Okay. And again, just so we're clear, this
16 particular agreement was recorded with the
17 Merrimack County Registry of Deeds. And if
18 you look at the top of that page, you can see
19 the book and page number. Do you see that?

20 A. Yes, I do.

21 Q. And this agreement is also binding on all of
22 the heirs, administrators, successors and
23 assigns. And that's in Paragraph 19. Do you
24 see that?

1 A. Yes.

2 MS. PACIK: I think now would be
3 a good time to take a break.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We'll break
5 for 10 minutes, maybe 15.

6 (Recess taken at 3:52 p.m., and the
7 hearing resumed at 4:11 p.m.)

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
9 Ms. Pacik, you may resume.

10 MS. PACIK: Thank you.

11 BY MS. PACIK:

12 Q. Dr. Chalmers, I'd like to now review the
13 spreadsheet that you prepared and that was
14 provided to the parties yesterday as
15 Applicant's Exhibit 197. And I want to focus
16 on just the properties that you looked at in
17 Concord. And I marked the documents that I'm
18 going to review with you as Joint Muni 256,
19 and I will provide that after your testimony
20 today.

21 The first properties that I want to look
22 at with you are in the Brookwood Drive area
23 and Fox Run Drive area. Are you familiar
24 with that area in Concord?

1 A. In the context of these properties, yes.

2 MS. PACIK: Okay. If we could
3 turn to Page 2 of Joint Muni 256.

4 BY MS. PACIK:

5 Q. And as you can see, this is an overhead
6 Google Earth photo which has a red square
7 showing where Brookwood Drive and Fox Run
8 Drive are located in Concord. Do you see
9 that?

10 A. Yes, I do.

11 Q. It's off of Hoit Road; correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. Now, I understand that, similar to what we
14 looked at in the case studies, when you went
15 out and you looked at the properties and
16 whether you thought there might be any
17 property impact because of the new
18 transmission line, you made a determination
19 of whether the current existing line is
20 clearly visible, partially visible or not
21 visible at all; is that right?

22 A. That's right.

23 Q. And the first property I want to look at with
24 you is the property at 14 Brookwood Drive.

1 And if we go to the next page, I have it
2 highlighted for you. And according to your
3 spreadsheet, it states that the home is
4 33.7 feet from the right-of-way and that the
5 current line is partially visible; is that
6 right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And you state that after the new transmission
9 line that's proposed, if it is built, that
10 there would be continued partial visibility
11 and no impact on value; right?

12 A. That's right.

13 Q. If we go to the next page, which is Page 4 of
14 the package, it shows a photograph of
15 14 Brookwood Drive. Do you see that?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. You can see there's a tree buffer behind the
18 home; right?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And this is a home that you decided or you
21 determined that the line is partially visible
22 at; right?

23 A. That's right.

24 Q. If we go to the next picture, this shows

1 another photograph of the home. And you
2 determined that at least somewhere along the
3 way you would be able to see a structure; is
4 that right?

5 A. Yes, I was able to see one. Hmm-hmm.

6 Q. Okay. You can't see them in these
7 photographs. Is that -- would you agree with
8 that?

9 A. I haven't seen one yet.

10 Q. Okay. So when you say that it's partially
11 visible, will you agree that there might just
12 be a small section of a structure that's
13 visible somewhere through the trees? Is that
14 what you're determining as partially visible?

15 A. Yeah. The partially visible category is a
16 very broad one, but it falls in between none,
17 can't see anything anywhere, and clearly
18 visible, which means that above the tree line
19 you can see the full portion of the structure
20 to which the conductors are attached. So,
21 partial can range from seeing most of the
22 structure, but not quite all of it, to just
23 being able to catch a hint of a structure
24 through winter foliage.

1 Q. And this property might be one of those where
2 you could just catch a hint; right?

3 A. Could well be.

4 Q. If you go to the next page, this shows some
5 of the tree clearing on a plan. And I'll
6 represent to you that during the construction
7 panel we were at least notified that there
8 would be just tree trimming and no trees, no
9 mature trees at 14 Brookwood Drive removed.

10 And I understand when you went out to
11 these properties and you made an assessment
12 as to whether or not the line would be more
13 visible if it's constructed, you didn't look
14 at this particular map that showed the
15 proposed tree clearing area, did you?

16 A. I did not have this map, no.

17 Q. Okay. The next page shows the property where
18 the new poles are going to be located. And
19 if we blow it up a little bit, what I tried
20 to do is draw a red arrow showing the
21 property that we're looking at, which is
22 14 Brookwood Drive. Do you see that red
23 arrow?

24 A. Yes.

1 Q. Okay. And the identifying number that's been
2 used by Northern Pass is 7905 for this
3 property; right?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. Okay. And for this particular property, you
6 see that there's one existing structure.
7 It's a purple square. That's at the other
8 end of the right-of-way corridor from the
9 home; correct?

10 A. That's right.

11 Q. And the home is that yellow circle in that
12 square on the parcel?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Okay. And you can see that -- oops. Bear
15 with me for a second while we get this back
16 up.

17 (Pause)

18 Q. So, currently the 115 line is actually on --
19 is behind the neighbor's house. Do you see
20 that on the white square at Parcel 7904?

21 A. Right.

22 Q. And that's getting relocated 45 feet closer
23 to the home on 14 Brookwood Drive, and a new
24 line is actually also being added. Do you

1 see that?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And the numbers of these particular poles are
4 3132-81 and F139.181.

5 And you did have this map when you went
6 out to the property?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And you made a determination that there would
9 be no impact on the property value because
10 currently there's something partially
11 visible, and after the new transmission line
12 is constructed, if it is approved, it would
13 still be partially visible; right?

14 A. That's right.

15 Q. And you didn't give any consideration to the
16 fact that two poles were actually getting
17 constructed in this person's back yard.

18 A. Right. There's just one correction that I
19 would make. You've been saying that there
20 would be no impact on property value. Again,
21 what we're talking about here is a change in
22 the likelihood or the probability of value.
23 We're not saying if there is a change, there
24 will be a change in value, or if there isn't

1 a change, there won't be. We're talking
2 about the likelihood or probability. And in
3 particular, if there's a change, the
4 probability of effect goes up from very low
5 to maybe 50/50. But we're not saying that
6 there will be an effect. We're simply saying
7 there are properties considerably more
8 vulnerable to effect should they be sold.
9 It's a minor point that's important.

10 MS. PACIK: Let's go to the next
11 page.

12 BY MS. PACIK:

13 Q. And I just want to quickly review this. But
14 those two poles that we just saw that are
15 going to be relocated, the one on the neighbor's
16 property that's currently over there, the 115
17 line, is 43 feet, and the new ones will be 75
18 and 83.5 feet. Do you see that?

19 A. Yes.

20 MS. PACIK: Let's go to the next
21 page. Can you zoom out?

22 BY MS. PACIK:

23 Q. So when you say -- we had just a discussion
24 about change. And on your spreadsheet it

1 says, "Change, Yes or No." Do you see that?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And so when I see "Change, Yes or No," I
4 think most of us probably assume that means
5 is there going to be a change or potential
6 impact in the property value; right? And
7 you're saying that now it's just more likely
8 than not that there will not be a change, a
9 50/50 chance?

10 A. No. I think the way you've got to interpret
11 this column is it's simply summarizing
12 whether or not there's a change in visibility
13 of structures in the category of visibility
14 of structures due to the Project. I mean,
15 that's -- don't take it any further than
16 that.

17 Q. Then why --

18 A. Well, let me just add one more sentence,
19 okay. But my opinion, then, is that if there
20 is a change in the category of visibility,
21 then there is a significant change in the
22 probability of a property value impact should
23 the property be sold, and that increase in
24 probability increases from something that's

1 very small to something that's on the order
2 of 50 percent. Okay? So this is certainly
3 associated with an increased probability of
4 effect, but it's literally, simply a
5 calculation or a rendering of the difference
6 between what's in Column 1 and what's in
7 Column 3 there, the structure visibility sort
8 of before and after. And if it says
9 "clearly/clearly," then there's a "No," and
10 if it says "partial/clearly," then there's a
11 "Yes," or "none/partial," there's a "Yes."

12 Q. The next property I'd like to look at is
13 12 Brookwood Drive. And this is a property
14 that's 39.2 feet. And you say it's clearly
15 visible currently. It's clearly visible if
16 this transmission line as proposed is
17 constructed. And the probability of impact
18 on value when it's sold is "No"; is that
19 right?

20 A. Right.

21 Q. Okay. So let's go to the next page and look
22 at 12 Brookwood Drive. And this is a
23 property which you state is clearly visible
24 in terms of the conductors. And from this

1 angle, at least, you would agree you don't
2 see any; is that right?

3 A. I don't see any, no.

4 Q. And the next photograph that we have, which
5 is on Page 11 of the PDF, actually shows some
6 lines behind the shed. Do you see that?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Okay. And this is -- is this why you
9 determined that it's clearly visible is
10 because of this angle of the line from the
11 house?

12 A. I can't... I wouldn't say necessarily it's
13 that angle. A good deal of this work was
14 done when leaves were off. But "clearly
15 visible" has a very specific meaning. So we
16 were able, when this property was being
17 inspected, to see the structure, and it was
18 our impression that the structure could be
19 seen from the house and that there was an
20 unobstructed view of the portion of the
21 structure to which the conductors are
22 attached. Again, the photography doesn't
23 help us much here but... but that was a
24 definitive conclusion and wouldn't have been

1 offered here unless there was good evidence
2 for it.

3 Q. Okay. So let's go to the next page. This
4 shows the current plan for the new line. And
5 it shows that right now there's one structure
6 behind this house, the one you can see an
7 arrow pointing to it. And that's the 115
8 line that's getting removed. You can see two
9 structures are going to get relocated; that
10 115 line is going to come 45 feet closer to
11 the home, and then the new yellow square is
12 the new transmission line kind of near the
13 edge of the property. Do you see that?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. And the picture that we saw, the one above,
16 actually was viewing that angle; is that
17 right? The edge of the property line near
18 the shed of that house, or the garage?

19 A. Right, off the right-hand side of the
20 property as you're looking at it. Right.

21 Q. So if the poles are located in that area,
22 would you agree that it's more -- it's likely
23 that they'll be more visible after the line
24 is constructed in that area?

1 A. That they will be clearly visible both before
2 and after. I don't know that they'd be more
3 visible, but they'll be clearly visible in
4 both cases.

5 Q. Well, you're going to have two new poles in
6 the area where there's some clearing, and the
7 poles are both going to be taller than the
8 current ones; right?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. All right. So let's go to the next page.
11 Next property I want to look at is on Hoit
12 Road. It's 37 Hoit Road. In this one you
13 state it's 67.3 feet from the road. And for
14 partial visibility, the structure is
15 partially visible and the conductor you state
16 is clearly visible. And the conductor are
17 the wires; right?

18 A. That's right.

19 Q. And then after the proposed plan you write
20 that it's partial and clearly; right?

21 A. That's right.

22 Q. And that there's no change.

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. And this is based on your review of plans

1 that did not show any tree buffers getting
2 removed; is that right?

3 A. That's right.

4 Q. If you go to the next page, this is just an
5 overhead of 37 Hoit Road, just to give you a
6 perspective as to where it is. And it's near
7 the corner of Hoit Road and Mountain Road.
8 And that's Page 14 of Joint Muni 456. And if
9 you go the to next page -- 256. My
10 apologies. If you go to the next page, that
11 shows the home from the street. Do you see
12 that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And I understand that different angles might
15 show different items. But at least from here
16 you don't really see any wires or poles in
17 this picture, do you?

18 A. I don't believe so.

19 Q. Okay. Let's go to the next page. This is
20 the proposed plan. And you can see there's
21 an arrow, a red arrow showing where that home
22 on 37 Hoit Road is. Do you see that?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Okay. And you can see that there are going

1 to be two structures located behind the home,
2 3132-86 and F1391-77. Do you see that?

3 A. Right.

4 Q. And then at the corner Hoit Road, actually on
5 the neighbor's property, which is 41 Hoit
6 Road, you can see two other structures that
7 are proposed; right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Do you know how tall those structures are
10 proposed to be?

11 A. No, I'd have to look at the chart.

12 Q. All right. If you go to the next page, we
13 have them highlighted. And they're between
14 92 and 101.5 feet. Do you see that?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And the current heights of them are 52 and
17 56.5 feet. Do you see that?

18 A. Okay.

19 Q. If we go to the next page, this shows the
20 tree clearing behind the house. And you were
21 not aware that there was clearing proposed
22 behind this home at 37 Hoit Road?

23 A. Not the specific plan on a site-specific
24 basis, no.

1 Q. Okay. But that doesn't change your opinion
2 as to how much of the conductor or the wires
3 will be visible because you had stated that
4 the conductors were only partially visible.
5 But if there is clearing, it might actually
6 be clearly visible; right?

7 A. Yeah, that's possible. But as I indicated
8 earlier, the focus -- although the conductor
9 visibility was recorded subsequently, that it
10 turned out that that was just too difficult
11 and ambiguous I think for some of the reasons
12 you're suggesting, that we really just
13 focused on structure visibility.

14 Q. Okay. But in terms of structure visibility,
15 when you made that latter determination, you
16 didn't have this plan in front of you, did
17 you?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. Okay. So in your spreadsheet that you have,
20 that ROW with the before and after conductor
21 visibility, should we just ignore that?

22 A. That's what I've done subsequently.

23 Q. If you go to the next page, the next property
24 I want to look at just briefly is 41 Hoit

1 Road. We've already spent some time talking
2 about that particular property this morning.
3 Do you recall that?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And on this spreadsheet it doesn't say 7 feet
6 to the right-of-way; it actually says
7 36.1 feet. Do you see that?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. So that's a different number than what you
10 had provided in the case study?

11 A. Correct. This is -- right.

12 Q. Okay. And if we go to the next page, do you
13 see that black line in the red box?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. That's the edge of the right-of-way,
16 isn't it?

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. And do you see the home in the right-of-way
19 there?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. So that 37.5 number that we just saw, that's
22 wrong, wouldn't you agree, from this
23 overhead?

24 A. Certainly appears to be.

1 Q. I don't want to spend a lot of time on this,
2 but in terms of the proposal for this
3 particular home and the new line, if we go to
4 the next page -- actually, let's take -- so
5 these are photographs of 41 Hoit Road. Do
6 you see this?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. You can see one of the poles in its back yard
9 there; right?

10 A. Right.

11 Q. And we looked -- we established earlier that
12 was about 50 feet high?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. And it's going to be about 100 feet high
15 after it's reconstructed?

16 A. Right.

17 Q. And if you go to the next page, you can again
18 see one of the poles in the back yard. And I
19 believe that's actually one of the lines
20 that's not getting removed. It's 75 feet; is
21 that right?

22 A. I'd have to look at the maps to be sure.

23 Q. Okay. Go to the next page. That again shows
24 the pole that's about 45 to 50 feet high

1 that's getting -- will be about 100 feet
2 high; is that right?

3 A. Yeah, I think so. Again, I --

4 Q. We'll go back to the plans in a moment. So
5 let's go back to the next page. And this is
6 Page 24. And in this vicinity you see a
7 shed; right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And there's a pole in this particular area
10 that we can see on the plan, but you can't
11 see this currently in this photograph, do
12 you?

13 (Witness reviews document.)

14 A. Is that in the tree line there? Again,
15 there's some vertical -- it's certainly not
16 clear.

17 MS. PACIK: Okay. Let's go to
18 the next page. Actually, we're going to have to
19 go back a few pages to the plan. I apologize.
20 Go back one more. Keep going.

21 BY MS. PACIK:

22 Q. All right. So we're back on Page 16 of the
23 PDF. And this actually shows where the new
24 poles are going to get located. And you can

1 see that white one, the white 115 square that
2 the cursor is over is F 1391-76. You see
3 that's getting moved 45 feet closer to the
4 right-of-way. Do you see that?

5 A. Okay.

6 Q. And we had looked at that picture of the
7 trees a moment ago, where you weren't sure
8 whether you could see a pole in that, and
9 that's in that vicinity. Are you aware of
10 that?

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. Okay. So when this pole is moved and it
13 doubles in size, the home will basically be
14 in the shadow of that pole; is that right?

15 A. It'll be close to it, yes.

16 Q. I'd like to go now to look at 516 Mountain
17 Road. So this property is actually the only
18 one in Concord that you concluded might -- or
19 will probably have an impact on value when it
20 sells. And this property is 6.7 feet from
21 the edge of the right-of-way. Currently the
22 conductor is partially visible, and you state
23 that it will be clearly visible after the
24 transmission line is constructed, if it is

1 approved; is that right?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. If we go to the next page, this is an
4 overhead that shows 516. And you can see the
5 tree buffer behind that home; right?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And if you go to the next page --

8 MS. PACIK: Actually, we'll skip
9 this one. Skip that one, too.

10 BY MS. PACIK:

11 Q. So, Page 29 of Joint Muni 256 shows the tree
12 clearing. And were you aware that all of the
13 trees behind this home were going to get
14 removed?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Okay. But this is a situation where you
17 would agree that there's a probability that
18 there's going to be a property value impact
19 to this house; right?

20 A. Yeah, that's what we assumed in any event.
21 Yeah, that's what we assumed, that there
22 would be a change in structure visibility
23 and, therefore, the probability of an impact
24 should the property be sold would increase.

1 Q. Where would you have -- now, from the home I
2 don't believe you can see any of the
3 structures. Where would you have to stand to
4 see the structures on this particular
5 property for purposes of making your
6 spreadsheet?

7 A. Again, there are a couple of possibilities.
8 Given the access to the corridor from the
9 right-of-way, in some cases we walked up the
10 right-of-way. We certainly would have walked
11 up and down the frontage in front of the home
12 and --

13 Q. So when you say it's partially visible
14 currently, it could be because it's partially
15 visible at the edge of the people's property?

16 A. No. We tried to assess it as it would be
17 seen from the house.

18 Q. But you didn't go up to the house, did you?

19 A. No.

20 Q. So you had to make an assumption as to
21 whether or not you could see it from the
22 house?

23 A. Yeah, made a judgment based on the situation.
24 Frequently you could tell. I mean, you have

1 a pretty good idea, you feel pretty
2 confident. In some cases it was difficult,
3 and that's why, again, I'd be careful to
4 represent that this is -- the purpose of this
5 is important. It's not to make a definitive
6 statement with respect to this property, but
7 it's to try to come to some kind of
8 order-of-magnitude estimate so we can talk
9 about whether or not there are going to be
10 discernible effects on local and regional
11 real estate markets. So it had a -- and the
12 level of detail we could achieve to meet that
13 objective I think was just fine. I feel very
14 comfortable with that conclusion. But the
15 conclusion on any given property with respect
16 to the particular clearing, the particular
17 structures, a definitive assessment for any
18 given property would obviously require a lot
19 of -- all of these maps and a careful on-site
20 inspection, and very careful definition of
21 the points from which the visibility was
22 being assessed. And we didn't do that, and
23 that wasn't our objective.

24 Q. Okay. Let's go to the next page. So when

1 you made a determination as to whether or not
2 there would be regional effects and whether
3 there'd be any sort of impact on property,
4 what you did is looked at all of the pages of
5 the spreadsheet and you added up the "Yeses";
6 right?

7 A. That's right.

8 Q. So, whether or not something was categorized
9 as partial or clearly, it didn't make any
10 difference at the end of the day in terms of
11 what you were adding up, in terms of the
12 "Yeses"; right?

13 A. Yeah, the issue was change. The "Yes"
14 represent change, and it didn't matter
15 whether it was none to partial or partial to
16 clearly. The yeses designate the number of
17 cases in which there was a change in
18 visibility of structures.

19 Q. Okay. So, setting that aside for a moment, I
20 had a question because you go from Mountain
21 Road to Oak Hill, and I was confused about
22 why Sanborn Road did not appear on your list.
23 And are you aware whether or not there are
24 homes on Sanborn Road that are within 100

1 feet of the right-of-way?

2 A. There are, but they were built too recently.
3 Those are 215 construction, I think. And
4 they simply missed the date at which this
5 list was originally compiled.

6 Q. But you just updated this list in March,
7 didn't you?

8 A. Yeah, but we didn't update the -- we didn't
9 go out and do new measurements based on new
10 development.

11 Q. Didn't you add 41 Haynes Road to this list?

12 A. Yeah, there were edits to that, but that
13 didn't have to do with new construction.

14 Q. Well, new construction in 2015 before the
15 Application was submitted isn't really new
16 construction, is it?

17 A. Well, I think that's the reason -- I'm just
18 explaining to you my understanding of the
19 reason that I didn't -- that those two
20 properties were not included on the list,
21 because they're clearly within 100 feet,
22 they're very close, is that they simply
23 didn't show up at the time these runs were
24 made by the engineers.

1 Q. When you did your site visit, did you
2 actually see those homes?

3 A. Which site visit?

4 Q. Well, you had mentioned that you did visits
5 to all of these properties to make your
6 assessment as to whether there was clear,
7 partial or no visibility.

8 A. Right.

9 Q. When you did the drive, did you see the homes
10 on Sanborn Drive?

11 A. I had no reason to go to Sanborn Drive.

12 Q. Okay. Let's go to the next page. I don't
13 want to spend a lot of time on this because I
14 think we've already discussed that they're
15 not there, and we know why now. But if we go
16 to the next page, this actually shows the two
17 homes on Sanborn Drive which you agree are
18 both within 100 feet of the right-of-way;
19 correct?

20 A. Yeah, they're -- yes.

21 MS. PACIK: Okay. Can you go to
22 the next page.

23 BY MS. PACIK:

24 Q. And these are just photographs, I'll

1 represent to you, of the homes. This is 61
2 Sanborn Road. Do you see that?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay. If you go to the next page, that is
5 67 Sanborn Road. Do you see that?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. So you made no evaluation as to whether or
8 not there would be an impact on these
9 particular properties on your spreadsheet;
10 correct?

11 A. Yeah, I can -- I have looked at the aerial
12 photography because apparently these two
13 properties came up in a prior session of some
14 sort. And they both have total clear
15 visibility of the existing. They're right on
16 top of the corridor, and they have clear
17 visibility of the existing corridor. The
18 driveway to one goes right down the
19 right-of-way under or beside the lines, I
20 guess not directly under the lines. So there
21 won't be any change in visibility for these
22 two properties.

23 MS. PACIK: Let's go to the next
24 page.

1 BY MS. PACIK:

2 Q. This is an area by Interstate 393 that I want
3 to look at for a moment, and it's -- the home
4 that I want to talk to you about is on
5 Portsmouth Street. And if we go to the next
6 page, it's highlighted in yellow. And the
7 house is 253 Portsmouth Street. And
8 according to your chart, the home is
9 98.2 feet from the right-of-way. And you
10 state that it's clearly visible -- the
11 structures are clearly visible now. They
12 will be clearly visible after the
13 transmission line is built, if it's approved
14 and constructed, and that there's no change
15 in the probability of having a property value
16 impact if it's sold; is that right?

17 A. Correct.

18 Q. Okay. So on the next page I just want to
19 take a quick look at the house. Do you see
20 the home? You can see the structure behind
21 that tree buffer; correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And I'll represent to you that that is
24 253 Portsmouth Street. Are you familiar with

1 this particular location?

2 A. I've visited it once.

3 Q. So I'll represent to you that during the
4 testimony of the construction panel, that
5 pole that you see behind that tree, we were
6 told that it's 74.5 feet high. Does that
7 sound correct to you?

8 A. It could be. Yeah, I don't have any reason
9 to think it isn't true, it isn't accurate.
10 Which pole are you talking about?

11 Q. Well, we just lost it. Steven Whitley's
12 going to bring it back. There, he's got it
13 again. Do you see --

14 A. Well, which one? The one on the far
15 right-hand side or the one in the background?

16 Q. Yes, the one on the far right. My apologies.
17 Are you aware that Eversource had
18 submitted a proposal to the Department of
19 Transportation? It's a design concept which
20 would increase the height of that pole to 165
21 feet from its current height of 74.5.

22 A. No.

23 Q. This is the first you're hearing of this?

24 A. Is that not what's represented on the maps?

1 Q. It's a design concept that was submitted to
2 the Department of Transportation to address
3 concerns about crossing Interstate 393, and
4 that was discussed during the construction
5 panel's testimony.

6 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm going to
7 object to that. With respect to the
8 construction issue, it was not to increase this
9 pole; it was a change in the plans with respect
10 to the proposed structures. I think that needs
11 to be clear to Mr. Chalmers.

12 CMSR. BAILEY: Ms. Pacik?

13 MS. PACIK: My apologies. Let me
14 clarify that.

15 BY MS. PACIK:

16 Q. This particular pole is 74.5. It's P145-101.
17 And I believe it's proposed to be 120 feet
18 tall. Are you aware of that?

19 A. No, not as I sit here. No.

20 Q. And then there's another pole that will be
21 added to it, which is the new proposed
22 Northern Pass Transmission Line, which would
23 be potentially 165 feet tall. Are you aware
24 of that information?

1 A. Not as I sit here, no.

2 Q. Okay. And the fact that there might be a
3 165-foot pole in the vicinity of this home,
4 does that impact your opinion as to whether
5 or not there's any potential impact on value
6 if this house is sold?

7 A. No. Our conclusion here is that there would
8 be -- that there are structures visible now,
9 and clearly visible, and they would be
10 clearly visible in the after-condition as
11 well.

12 Q. So it doesn't matter how high it is.

13 A. That's right.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. Once it's visible.

16 Q. And the fact that this home might be in the
17 shadow of a pole, that doesn't make a
18 difference to you in terms of your
19 methodology and your opinion; is that right?

20 A. That's right.

21 Q. The next property I want to look at is on Old
22 Loudon Road, and I just have a couple more I
23 want to quickly go through.

24 Just so you're aware, Dr. Chalmers,

1 Page 40 of Exhibit 256 is the reference to
2 the height of the poles. And I'll just
3 represent to you that during the testimony,
4 where it says 160 feet tall, we were told
5 it's actually 165 feet, which is in the
6 design concept. But you did not have that
7 information; correct?

8 A. No, I don't know what the -- how recent this
9 information is. I know, you know, there are
10 design changes that have been going on pretty
11 much on a continuous basis. And I don't --
12 I'm not tracking that or revising these or
13 revisiting the field in light of these
14 changes that are occurring now.

15 MS. PACIK: Okay. So let's go to
16 the next page. Keep going.

17 BY MS. PACIK:

18 Q. So the next one that I want to look at with
19 you is 5-7 Old Loudon Road. And this home is
20 14.4 feet from the right-of-way. And it
21 states that it's clearly visible in terms of
22 the structures now, and it will be clearly
23 visible if this line is built.

24 And if you go to the next page, which is

1 43 of the PDF, this is an overhead of the
2 home that we're discussing. Do you see that?

3 A. I do.

4 Q. Are you familiar with the house at 5-7 Old
5 Loudon Road?

6 A. If I see a photo of it. But I only visited
7 once.

8 Q. Okay. And if you go to the next page, this
9 shows the tree clearing behind that home. Do
10 you see that? And are you familiar with what
11 lines show tree clearing on these maps, or do
12 I need to explain that to you?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Yes, you need explanation?

15 A. No. No, I am familiar with it.

16 Q. Okay. So the green dotted line is all the
17 area of tree clearing. Do you see that?

18 A. Right.

19 Q. And if you go to the next page -- I was just
20 told it's turquoise, but I see green. This
21 actually shows the structures that you're
22 talking about; is that right?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. And you say that they're clearly visible?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. And after those trees are gone, they'll be
3 even more clearly visible; right?

4 A. Well, the way we define "clearly," there's
5 not less and more clearly, there's just
6 clearly.

7 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the fact that in
8 this vicinity 125-foot poles are being
9 proposed?

10 A. Not as I sit here, no.

11 Q. If you go to the next page, this is just
12 another photograph that shows the tree line
13 behind the house that is proposed to be
14 removed. Do you see that on the right-hand
15 side by the car?

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. And you were not before today familiar with
18 the fact that those trees were proposed to be
19 removed?

20 A. That's correct.

21 MS. PACIK: Can you go to the
22 next page?

23 BY MS. PACIK:

24 Q. Do you see the yellow highlights?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. That shows the proposed heights in this
3 vicinity. And you'll see that there's two
4 numbers, 106, which is a 106-foot structure,
5 and 125, which is the height of the other
6 structure.

7 A. Right.

8 Q. Okay. The last property I want to look at
9 with you is Pembroke Road, and it's
10 149 Pembroke Road. And this home is
11 13.8 feet from the right-of-way. Do you see
12 that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Okay. It says the property -- the structures
15 are clearly visible now, and they will
16 continue to be clearly visible. If we go to
17 the next page, I believe there's a photograph
18 of this home. This is an overhead of
19 Pembroke Road. Do you see that?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And are you familiar with the height of the
22 proposed structures in this area?

23 A. Not as I sit here, no.

24 Q. Okay. If we go to the next page, the numbers

1 of the poles that you'll see there are in
2 red. You see there's two white squares,
3 C189-47 and P145-88, that have Xs in them?

4 A. Eighty-three, right.

5 Q. Okay. And those are getting relocated. And
6 one of them is going to get relocated closer
7 to the home. And then the new line is
8 3132-146. Do you see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. If we go to the next page, we have
11 those highlighted. And those three
12 structures, the range of them is 110 feet.
13 Do you see that?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Okay. So next to this home there's going to
16 be three 110-foot poles.

17 If we go to the next page, this is a
18 photograph of the home from a street view of
19 Google Earth. Are you familiar with that
20 home?

21 A. Again, I've seen it.

22 Q. Have you seen the photo simulations of what
23 this property might look like after the poles
24 are constructed?

1 A. No, I don't believe so.

2 Q. If you go to the next page, this is a photo
3 simulation that was submitted with the
4 Department of Energy's Visual Impact Study.
5 This is the current structures. Do you see
6 that?

7 A. Okay.

8 Q. And you can see the pole behind the home.
9 That's the one that's going to get relocated,
10 and it is approximately 45 feet currently.
11 Do you see that pole behind that home?

12 A. I do.

13 Q. Okay. And if we go to the next page, this
14 shows at least two of the poles after they're
15 constructed, which are going to be 110 feet,
16 and then there's a third one which you don't
17 see in this photo simulation. And according
18 to your opinion, there is no impact on
19 property value here.

20 A. The impact on -- the probability of an
21 effect, there is no impact on the probability
22 of an effect of property value impact.

23 Q. And this home also will be in the shadow of
24 the poles; is that right?

1 A. It's close to them.

2 Q. I'd like to talk about your supplemental
3 testimony for a moment, which is marked as
4 Applicant's Exhibit 104. In terms of this
5 whole methodology that you've been using, you
6 talk about this in your supplemental
7 testimony, and you talk about a prior case
8 before the Site Evaluation Committee, which
9 was a 1985 case dealing with Hydro-Quebec
10 Phase II; correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Now, Hydro-Quebec Phase II was somewhat
13 similar in terms of the construction, which
14 is, it took an existing corridor with an
15 existing line and added a new line in it; is
16 that right?

17 A. Added -- well, I know what's in it now. I'm
18 not sure when Hydro-Quebec was added. Again,
19 I'm not sure whether the two 230 kV lines
20 were both in there before the Hydro-Quebec
21 line was added. But in any event, there are
22 three in there now.

23 Q. But when Hydro-Quebec Phase II was
24 constructed, there was already an existing

1 line in the corridor; right?

2 A. At least one. What I'm saying is I'm not
3 sure whether there were one or two existing
4 in the corridor at that time.

5 Q. Okay. And in your supplemental testimony, if
6 we scroll down a little bit, we can see --
7 and this is Page 14 of your supplemental
8 testimony. On Line 21 you stated that Mr.
9 Lamprey's conclusion, based on his research,
10 was that, quote, The presence of HVTL does
11 not affect sale price or marketability of
12 nearby properties, although it may have some
13 effect on depth of market, unquote; correct?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. And you reference certain pages of the Site
16 Evaluation Committee's decision, the cover
17 page and Pages 12 to 17.

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. You did not submit the entire decision?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. And if we look at the entire decision, which
22 is marked as Joint Muni 247, and if you go to
23 Page 7 of this decision, in terms of the SEC
24 findings in this case, by way of background

1 on Page 7, it explains who was actually
2 involved in the proceeding. And according to
3 this, there was Counsel for the Public and
4 only one intervenor, the Powerline Awareness
5 Campaign. Were you aware that only one
6 intervenor was involved in that proceeding?

7 A. I had in fact reviewed the entire summary,
8 and, yes, I remember that.

9 Q. Okay. And the next paragraph that's
10 highlighted talks about what witnesses were
11 called. So, the Hydro-Quebec, or the
12 Applicant, had witnesses. And then in terms
13 of other witnesses in the case, the only
14 other witnesses who testified were witnesses
15 called by the Site Evaluation Committee. One
16 was Dr. Michael Bissell, who talked about
17 health effects, and another witness was Roy
18 Barbour, who was from PSNH. And other than
19 that, there were no other witnesses, correct,
20 for either the intervenors or Counsel for the
21 Public?

22 A. I guess that's right. There are 14 witnesses
23 testifying on behalf of the Project, right,
24 in the preceding paragraph, and then this

1 paragraph you've got highlighted shows just
2 these additional two, I guess; right?

3 Q. So, in terms of witnesses who might
4 contradict the testimony of Mr. Stewart,
5 there were none.

6 A. Apparently, who did -- there were no
7 witnesses who addressed his findings at the
8 hearing.

9 Q. Okay. If you go to Page 15 of the decision,
10 the order actually notes that no
11 contradictory evidence was introduced to
12 rebut Mr. Lamprey's testimony. Do you see
13 that?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. Now, yesterday and today you were asked about
16 whether a property line -- a new transmission
17 line could reduce the property value by
18 50 percent; right?

19 A. Whether it could reduce it by 5-0 percent?

20 Q. Fifty percent.

21 A. In what context was I asked that?

22 Q. I believe Attorney Pappas asked you a
23 question about a reduction of property value
24 and whether or not you could foresee

1 property, because of a new transmission line,
2 ever being reduced by 50 percent. And I
3 believe your response was, "It would be very
4 unlikely, and maybe if the structure was in
5 the bay window." Do you recall that
6 discussion?

7 A. Okay. Yeah, we were having a discussion
8 about a hypothetical; could I imagine a
9 situation that would be so bad that a
10 property would be impacted to that extent.
11 Yes, I remember that discussion.

12 Q. Okay. And today I know you were talking
13 condominiums, which is a little bit
14 different. But you also had a similar
15 discussion about whether or not a condominium
16 could have a property value reduced by
17 50 percent, and I believe you said it wasn't
18 even a remote possibility; is that right?

19 A. That's right.

20 Q. Now I'd like to turn to what we've marked as
21 Joint Muni 260, and this is a decision by the
22 Board of Tax and Land Appeals dealing with an
23 abatement request for the Hydro-Quebec Phase
24 II line. Are you familiar with this

1 decision?

2 A. I think so. What's the property? What's the
3 address or the property description?

4 Q. It's on Saunders Hill Road in Wentworth, New
5 Hampshire.

6 A. Yeah, I believe I've seen this.

7 Q. And you're aware that in this case the
8 property owners asked for an abatement on
9 their 1989 and 1990 assessment, and the
10 property had been assessed at \$133,800. Do
11 you see that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And the arguments that the taxpayers made
14 were that they purchased it for \$135,000, but
15 since that date the new line and towers were
16 in the right-of-way; that they ended up with
17 less than a half-acre of usable land; they
18 believed the property was unmarketable at any
19 price, and they paid too much for the
20 property. They stated that there was issues
21 with wetness in topography in their back
22 yard, and the drinking water was taken from a
23 brook. Do you see all that?

24 A. Yup.

1 Q. Okay. And the Town actually argued that the
2 assessment was proper, and they tried to
3 defend their assessment. And they stated
4 that the power line easement was there at the
5 time of purchase and it was visible. And on
6 the next page they talk about the fact that
7 Hydro-Quebec was constructed after 1990 and
8 that the location of the new towers were
9 flagged in 1988. And are you aware that the
10 BTLA actually ordered a 50 percent reduction
11 on the property value in this case down to
12 \$66,900?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And the reasons they gave were not because of
15 the topography of the land or the fact that
16 the drinking water was from a brook, but they
17 stated that the taxpayers paid too much and
18 it shouldn't go unadjusted, even if they were
19 ignorant when they bought the land about the
20 expansion. Under No. 2, they stated that the
21 knowledge of impending construction of
22 Hydro-Quebec would have a significant
23 chilling effect on the value dwelling, and in
24 general the property, because it was in such

1 proximity due to its visual effect and the
2 uncertainty of health concerns raised by
3 electromagnetic radiation. And then the
4 third item, which I think is a typo because
5 it says "two," they said that because of the
6 close proximity, which is the house was
7 within 50 feet of the right-of-way and that
8 the house would be in the very shadow of the
9 tower, they were going to apply a 50 percent
10 reduction. Do you see that?

11 A. I do.

12 Q. And we just looked at other homes that are in
13 the very shadow of the tower, right, or that
14 might be if this project is approved?

15 A. Yeah, there certainly would be homes that
16 would be very close to it.

17 Q. And the Town actually tried to defend this
18 abatement appeal, and they lost in this case;
19 right?

20 A. Apparently.

21 Q. And I just want to show a photograph of this
22 home we're talking about. It might be -- I
23 just need to find the exhibit number I gave
24 it. Just bear with me one moment.

1 (Pause)

2 Q. This is the property that we're referencing.
3 And we've marked it as Joint Muni 258 and
4 it's 81 Saunders Hill Road. And this is
5 information obtained from the Town of
6 Wentworth. And you can see here this is the
7 tax map. And if you blow it up quite a bit,
8 at the top you can see a little square with
9 an arrow at it. And do you see that square
10 next to the right-of-way, Dr. Chalmers?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Okay. And if we go to the next page, this is
13 a map from, I believe, Bing Maps. And you
14 can see the home in proximity to the
15 right-of-way line. Do you see it there?

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. And you can actually see there's a tree
18 buffer; correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And even so, there was a 50 percent reduction
21 given by the BTLA to this home; correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. I have nothing further.

24 CMSR. BAILEY: All right. Thank

1 you.

2 Ms. Manzelli, you're up next.

3 Do you want to get started?

4 MS. MANZELLI: I think it would
5 be better if we wait. I don't have anybody to
6 help me with my exhibits right now, but I will
7 tomorrow morning.

8 CMSR. BAILEY: Okay. How about
9 Mr. Thompson?

10 MR. THOMPSON: I'm all set. No
11 questions.

12 CMSR. BAILEY: No questions?
13 Mr. Baker?

14 CROSS-EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. BAKER:

16 Q. Good afternoon. I'll try that again. Good
17 afternoon.

18 A. Good afternoon.

19 Q. In 2012, you did a study that's referenced in
20 your resume that's on file here of Montana
21 real estate in connection with a proposed
22 power line project there. And you were asked
23 about that by Counsel for the Public, who had
24 Exhibit 380 as one of the exhibits that

1 refers to that. It's a publication by
2 Headwater Economics, entitled "Transmission
3 Lines and Property Value Impacts."

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. You're familiar with that?

6 A. I am.

7 Q. If we go to page 20 of that report, there's a
8 letter that purports to have been authored by
9 you responding to criticism from a Mr. Pierce
10 who was critiquing your Montana study. Do
11 you have any memory of that?

12 A. I really don't, tell you the truth.

13 Q. I'll put that on ELMO to refresh your
14 recollection.

15 A. Thank you.

16 Q. But it is also in evidence, without objection
17 apparently, as Counsel for the Public
18 Exhibit 380.

19 (Pause)

20 Q. Does that refresh your recollection, Dr.
21 Chalmers?

22 A. Yeah. Just scroll up to the top for a
23 second. Let me just see the...

24 (Witness reviews document.)

1 A. And then if we could go to the bottom. And
2 is it signed? I'm just wondering.

3 Q. There is a second page. And it doesn't have
4 your signature, but it purports to have your
5 name typed at the bottom.

6 A. Okay. Yeah, I was just wondering. The way
7 it was worded in the beginning, it almost
8 sounded like it might have been something
9 that my client prepared. But okay.
10 Anyway...

11 Q. In responding to Mr. Pierce's criticism, you
12 stated that he was wrong in understanding
13 your report and that, in fact, you had found
14 two areas of land in Montana that were
15 impacted by, or at least the data indicated
16 that they would be impacted by transmission
17 lines. This would be a high-voltage
18 transmission line. And you were working at
19 the time for the proposed developer of a
20 transmission line; is that correct?

21 A. That's right.

22 Q. What were the two types of property that you
23 found an impact on in responding to Mr.
24 Pierce's criticism?

1 A. Well, I'm trying to get the context back
2 here. There was a -- if I can establish the
3 context for a second here and then we'll get
4 directly to your question.

5 Northwestern Energy was considering a
6 project, this MSTI project -- "Misty" they
7 called it. And I think that project was the
8 underlying motivation for my study, for the
9 study they commissioned with us. But the
10 published study was, similar to our research
11 report in this study, was a general study.
12 It didn't make any reference to MSTI
13 whatsoever. And it was a general study
14 along, really, a single transmission line
15 that spans Montana, and that's the 500 kV
16 line that runs from the Colstrip generating
17 plant right straight across the middle of
18 Montana to Thompson Falls, which is getting
19 close to the Idaho border, okay. So, again,
20 it was a research report that was intended to
21 be the foundation that they could use to
22 apply to the MSTI Project if they so choose.
23 Turns out they ultimately abandoned the
24 project, so that never happened.

1 So this was just a report on research,
2 and it was a report on research as it related
3 to all the various property types along this
4 500 kV, much of which, you know, ranch
5 country, ag country, rural subdivisions,
6 large tracts, cabin tracts --

7 Q. I understand that. What were the two types
8 of property where you found an impact,
9 potential property loss as a result of a
10 transmission line being built in Montana?

11 A. Okay. It was one residential property at
12 Avery Acres, a lot sale. There was the Aspen
13 Valley Ranches, which was a 150-lot rural
14 subdivision. And then there were some other
15 lot subdivisions, recreational lots along the
16 Clark Fork River outside Thompson Falls,
17 where you had 20 or 30 or 40 lots lined up on
18 the side of the river, and the transmission
19 line would run perpendicularly across the
20 river, and so a couple of lots in the middle
21 of that string of lots would be impacted.
22 And we looked at the price and timing of the
23 sale of those impacted lots relative to the
24 others, and we found some in that category as

1 well.

2 Q. You did indeed. And the Aspen Valley
3 Ranches, you examined 183 sales, correct,
4 approximately?

5 A. Yeah, I don't remember exactly, but --

6 Q. Yeah, and your statistical analysis there
7 indicated that an average discount of
8 15 percent of the sales price for the lots
9 within a 1,000 feet of the center line of
10 that transmission line would be warranted;
11 correct?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. Now, also in response to Dr. Pierce, in the
14 paragraph that I have hastily underlined --
15 and I apologize. I hope you can read that --
16 you talked about the need to do more than
17 just take your report, but rather, to go and
18 look and do a site-specific appraisal of each
19 property in order to have any assurance that
20 there would or would not be a problem from
21 the construction of a transmission line. Do
22 you see that?

23 A. Yeah, site-specific investigation, not
24 necessarily an appraisal. But again, you

1 couldn't apply these results wholesale to
2 other properties without taking into account
3 their particular characteristics.

4 Q. And you would stand by that today with
5 respect to the work that you brought before
6 the SEC?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Okay. Now, just a couple more questions.

9 On your working for Northern Pass or its
10 attorneys, what is your hourly rate
11 currently?

12 A. Five hundred dollars an hour.

13 Q. And how much does the State of New Hampshire
14 charge to renew a general appraisal license
15 for a year?

16 A. I don't know, off the top of my head. I
17 suspect it's in the \$400 range.

18 Q. That's exactly what it is, \$400, according to
19 the web site I looked at last night. So, for
20 an hour's worth of your work, you certainly
21 could have afforded to renew your license;
22 correct?

23 A. I explained that wasn't the issue I had. It
24 wasn't a monetary issue. It was a continuing

1 education issue. To keep it valid, you have
2 to have 28 hours of continuing education
3 credit. And although they would accept the
4 reciprocal agreement with Arizona to issue
5 the license, they wouldn't accept the
6 continuing education credits from Arizona.
7 So the implication was I had to come to New
8 Hampshire and sit in a classroom for 28
9 hours. And that simply didn't seem
10 necessary, given the fact that it turns out
11 that I wasn't doing any appraisals in this
12 matter. So it just wasn't worth renewing it.

13 Q. Did anyone suggest to you during the course
14 of your engagement, or prior to your
15 agreement to do the engagement, that you
16 should become a licensed general appraiser in
17 New Hampshire?

18 A. No.

19 Q. That was your own idea?

20 A. Yeah. It's something I generally do at the
21 beginning of an engagement, a large
22 engagement, just 'cause I don't know how it's
23 going to develop and what I might be doing.
24 But that was at my initiative.

1 Q. Didn't you know when you filed your paperwork
2 to become a general licensed appraiser in New
3 Hampshire that there was a continuing legal
4 education requirement?

5 A. Of course.

6 Q. And so you changed your mind based on
7 something you knew when you filed; is that
8 correct?

9 A. No, no. It was the fact that in most states
10 the education requirements are reciprocal
11 with the state of the original license. So
12 my continuing education requirements are all
13 up to date in Arizona. And most states,
14 that's sufficient to then renew a license
15 that was obtained under a reciprocity
16 agreement. New Hampshire said no dice.
17 You've got to meet our -- you've got to take
18 courses that we have identified as qualifying
19 for a continuing education credit. So that
20 was a curve ball. And given my role in this
21 project, it just didn't seem necessary.

22 Q. When did you start your engagement in this
23 project?

24 A. Late spring of 2013.

1 Q. And when did you file paperwork with the
2 State of New Hampshire? Or when did you
3 become a licensed general appraiser in the
4 state of New Hampshire?

5 A. I'd have to check the records. But my
6 suspicion -- yeah. Yeah, I don't know.
7 Somehow 2014 sort of sticks in my mind. But
8 it would have been early in the project. I
9 would suspect that I may have applied in late
10 2013 and been licensed in 2014. Could have
11 been '15. It was only for, I believe, for
12 one year.

13 Q. Yes, it was for the one-year period that
14 bracketed the time period when you filed your
15 prefiled testimony in this case, wasn't it?

16 A. I don't have any recollection exactly what
17 the dates were, no.

18 Q. Okay. Would it refresh your recollection if
19 I put in front of you the New Hampshire
20 online licensing for James A. Chalmers?

21 A. That would.

22 MR. BAKER: I'm just using this
23 to refresh his recollection. I don't intend to
24 make it an exhibit because he's going to testify

1 these are the correct dates or not.

2 BY MR. BAKER:

3 Q. Can you tell us the dates when you were
4 licensed in New Hampshire?

5 A. Okay. Apparently it became effective on
6 December 17th, 2014, for a little more than a
7 year; it expired on 1/31/2016.

8 Q. And so you let -- did you file any paperwork
9 with the State to let them know you weren't
10 renewing, or did you just let it lapse?

11 A. I just let it lapse.

12 Q. Okay. And your first prefiled testimony in
13 this case was filed on October 16th, 2015.
14 That's the date on the cover of your prefiled
15 testimony, Applicant's Exhibit 1.

16 A. That's correct.

17 Q. Does that sound right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And then again on April 17th, 2017, you filed
20 your supplemental prefiled testimony?

21 A. That's right.

22 Q. And that would be after the date of the lapse
23 by more than a year; correct?

24 A. Correct.

1 Q. All right. Now, in your original prefiled
2 testimony, you filed an attachment to that
3 which was your complete resume?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. And in the first page of that attachment --
6 or the first page of that prefiled testimony,
7 you stated that you were licensed as a
8 general appraiser in several states. Do you
9 recall that?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Now, Attachment A to your prefiled testimony
12 listed a certification that you were a New
13 Hampshire-certified general appraiser, and it
14 gave your appraiser number. Do you recall
15 that?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And that was what you represented to this
18 Committee on October 17th, 2015. And it was
19 accurate at that time.

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. When you filed your prefiled supplemental
22 testimony in April of this year, it was not
23 accurate, was it?

24 A. The resume wasn't submitted with my

1 supplemental testimony.

2 Q. No, it wasn't. But you affirmed in your
3 supplemental testimony that everything in
4 your original prefiled testimony was
5 accurate, except for about four or five minor
6 things that you changed on the first page.

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. When was the first time you told your client
9 or any representative of your client that you
10 were no longer licensed in New Hampshire?

11 A. You know, I don't recall when I decided --
12 the expiration date -- I would have received
13 materials probably from the State in the fall
14 of 2015 saying that my license was going to
15 expire and with the forms to reapply. And I
16 began that process because, as you indicated,
17 it's not a terribly large fee and I just kind
18 of do it as a matter of practice. No
19 particular reason to do it in this case, but
20 particularly in litigation matters it
21 sometimes makes sense. And then I don't know
22 exactly when I learned that New Hampshire
23 wouldn't accept the continuing education from
24 Arizona, but somewhere along the line then,

1 in late 2015, I learned that they wouldn't
2 accept the Arizona continuing education
3 credits. And I presume at some point that I
4 spoke to Mr. Bisbee or his colleagues and
5 mentioned that. But it was not a -- it
6 wasn't an issue. It was nothing that I would
7 have called any attention to. It simply
8 really had become kind of a matter of
9 convenience. If it was convenient to do, I
10 would have done it. But it was going to be
11 quite inconvenient and so I didn't do it.

12 Q. Let me summarize then. You filed your
13 prefiled testimony in this case and
14 represented that you were a licensed general
15 appraiser in New Hampshire to this Committee.
16 At some point you decided that you no longer
17 wanted to be a licensed general appraiser,
18 and you just let it go.

19 A. That's right.

20 Q. And you didn't tell anyone other than
21 Mr. Bisbee, or someone at that law firm. And
22 if you had not been asked about it by Counsel
23 for the Public, did you have any plans to
24 wave your arms in the air and say, Wait a

1 minute, I have to correct something. I'm not
2 a licensed general appraiser in New
3 Hampshire?

4 A. No. Frankly, that didn't occur to me.

5 Q. Okay. Last question. I think this will only
6 take about four minutes. I'm hoping.

7 In your prefiled testimony, you went
8 into, at some length, a concern with the
9 property value analysis contained in the
10 Draft EIS, Environment Impact Statement.

11 A. I did.

12 Q. And you stated, among other things, that the
13 Draft Environmental Impact Statement both
14 misrepresents the published literature and
15 addresses the wrong issue. Do you recall
16 that?

17 A. I do.

18 Q. I don't want to go into all the detail of
19 that, but on Page 15, Lines 1 through 4, I'd
20 like to ask you about the meaning of the
21 phrase that I'm going to put on ELMO here.
22 And if you need context for that and would
23 like to see the beginning of your answer, we
24 can flip the page back. Do you see that?

1 A. Yeah. Yes, I do.

2 Q. Now, I'd like to ask you about the -- are
3 you -- oh, you're going to look at that.
4 Okay.

5 (Witness reviews document.)

6 Q. And then if we could flip back, I just want
7 to ask about that phrase that's been
8 underlined in yellow. What does it mean?

9 (Witness reviews document.)

10 A. Well, the basic point that's being made in
11 this sentence is that the DEIS is addressing
12 the issue as if this is a new transmission
13 line, not a -- in a new corridor, not an
14 increment to a transmission line in a -- or
15 an increment to a corridor in which there are
16 already transmission lines. So that's the
17 basic point that's being made. But that's
18 obviously not true for the 32 miles of
19 overhead line in the North Country, in the
20 far North Country. And that's what this
21 underlined section is, is qualifying that
22 statement.

23 Q. You didn't mean to suggest that in that
24 32 miles of North Country where there is no

1 existing corridor, that there would be an
2 absence of property loss or property damage
3 by the presence of a new line there, did you?

4 A. Basically the answer would be in the
5 affirmative there, that that is the
6 implication, that there is no proximate -- or
7 there's very scattered residential
8 development in relationship to that 32 miles.
9 And in fact, none, I think, within 500 feet,
10 and certainly none within a 100 feet.
11 Therefore, based on the analysis that I've
12 described in my testimony, there wouldn't be
13 any adverse impact on residential property
14 values anticipated with that section of the
15 line, and that's the one section that's not
16 in an existing corridor.

17 Q. So what should I tell my client who has
18 bought undeveloped property and wishes to
19 subdivide it and is concerned with the impact
20 of this project on that property? Should I
21 tell him that your opinion is that there's no
22 damage to his property and he should just go
23 ahead and subdivide it and put money into it?

24 A. Depends on -- well, first of all, there's a

1 whole set of market conditions that would
2 relate to whether that would make sense to
3 pursue. But as it relates to other things
4 equal, as it relates to the transmission
5 line, it would be my opinion that it would
6 depend on the location of the subdivision
7 relative to this 32-mile segment.

8 Q. What should I tell Mr. Thompson, who looks
9 out on a forested view of Bare Rock right
10 now, but who will be looking at, if this
11 project is built, a 100-foot tower on top of
12 a transition station surrounded by a
13 barbed-wire fence? Should I tell him that
14 your opinion is that because he lives in an
15 undeveloped area, that there is no damage to
16 his property possible?

17 A. No. I think from his point of view it may be
18 a major change, and there may be significant
19 damage to his property. But from a market
20 value perspective, there may be a change or
21 may not. I don't know anything about the
22 circumstances of that property. But this
23 research might imply there could be a market
24 value effect or it may imply there wouldn't

1 be.

2 Q. What should we tell all the people that live
3 north of the Vermont border on Hall Stream
4 Road, who currently live in an unmolested
5 valley, with no commercial development
6 whatsoever, who, if this project is built,
7 will have to drive under a brand new,
8 high-voltage, direct-current transmission
9 line every time they want to leave their home
10 and every time they want to come in? Should
11 I tell them that their property going to be
12 unlikely to be damaged by the presence of
13 that new transmission line?

14 A. I really don't know what the specifics of
15 those circumstances are. I wouldn't have
16 anything to offer, as I sit here.

17 Q. Have you been to Pittsburg, New Hampshire at
18 all?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. When and how many times?

21 A. Perhaps only once.

22 Q. I have no further questions.

23 CMSR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.

24 I think we'll -- Ms. Pacik.

1 MS. PACIK: My apologies. I just
2 need to clear the record before we close it
3 today.

4 CMSR. BAILEY: Okay.

5 MS. PACIK: In cross-examination,
6 when discussing Case Study No. 44, I represented
7 that View Street and Winterberry Lane were in
8 Penacook. I just received information, and I
9 want to clarify for the record, that only
10 Winterberry Lane is in Penacook, and View Street
11 is in Concord.

12 CMSR. BAILEY: Okay.

13 MS. PACIK: Thank you.

14 CMSR. BAILEY: We're going to
15 take a break for the evening, and we'll resume
16 with Ms. Manzelli at 9:00. Thank you.

17 (Hearing concluded at 5:31 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Susan J. Robidas, a Licensed
Shorthand Court Reporter and Notary Public
of the State of New Hampshire, do hereby
certify that the foregoing is a true and
accurate transcript of my stenographic
notes of these proceedings taken at the
place and on the date hereinbefore set
forth, to the best of my skill and ability
under the conditions present at the time.

I further certify that I am neither
attorney or counsel for, nor related to or
employed by any of the parties to the
action; and further, that I am not a
relative or employee of any attorney or
counsel employed in this case, nor am I
financially interested in this action.

Susan J. Robidas, LCR/RPR
Licensed Shorthand Court Reporter
Registered Professional Reporter
N.H. LCR No. 44 (RSA 310-A:173)

	136:23	92:18,24;93:16;97:5;	137:5	among (1)
\$	abatement (3)	98:16;101:4;102:5;	again (35)	147:12
\$10,000 (1)	128:23;129:8;	103:6;104:4,19;	4:9;6:17;16:14;	amount (2)
64:19	131:18	105:18,23;106:17;	22:12,18;23:22;	24:24;86:5
\$115,000 (3)	able (14)	107:8;112:2,16;	26:13;28:20;35:20;	analysis (12)
82:11,13;83:11	8:1,7;15:1;38:18,	118:5;119:21;126:1;	40:20;43:10;44:2,8;	4:19;8:12;15:1;
\$119 (1)	21,22;46:1;76:17,19;	127:10;130:1,10;	45:17;55:4;81:6,17;	19:14;23:12;43:22;
52:7	77:16;90:3,5,23;	131:17;132:17	85:17;86:8,15;93:20;	48:7,10;84:14;138:6;
\$133,800 (1)	97:16	add (2)	97:22;104:17,23;	147:9;149:11
129:10	above (7)	95:18;111:11	105:3,14;108:7;	and/or (1)
\$135,000 (1)	22:18;41:8;51:22;	added (7)	109:3;115:13;	62:3
129:14	63:8;67:11;90:18;	92:24;110:5;	122:21;124:18;	angle (5)
\$180,000 (5)	98:15	116:21;124:15,17,18,	133:16;136:19;	42:6;97:1,10,13;
63:6;65:4,9;66:17;	absence (1)	21	138:24;143:19	98:16
67:11	149:2	adding (1)	against (2)	angles (2)
\$196,900 (2)	absent (1)	110:11	42:5,8	27:15;100:14
82:17;83:8	8:6	addition (4)	ago (3)	answered (1)
\$199,900 (1)	abutting (1)	17:2,14,19;24:7	28:19;75:1;106:7	7:16
63:3	41:18	additional (5)	agree (34)	anticipate (1)
\$2,900 (1)	accept (8)	16:5;22:1;42:23;	4:19;5:9;6:19;17:2,	58:20
79:18	20:14;37:21,23;	85:23;127:2	8;22:6;23:10;27:21;	anticipated (1)
\$202,000 (1)	38:4;140:3,5;145:23;	address (3)	28:24;30:7;37:21;	149:14
71:16	146:2	68:7;116:2;129:3	41:16;43:12;44:20;	AOT (11)
\$209,000 (4)	access (5)	addressed (1)	49:21;52:12,18;54:7;	12:14;18:19;19:13;
65:20;67:1,8,14	5:10;6:22;40:11,	127:7	57:15;62:1,17;66:7;	21:12;22:11;23:2;
\$219,000 (2)	15;108:8	addresses (1)	68:22;69:6;70:10;	29:16;44:15,16;45:3,
63:2;64:23	according (11)	147:15	78:22;84:6;90:7,11;	11
\$226,450 (1)	16:13;76:11;80:22,	addressing (1)	97:1;98:22;103:22;	apologies (6)
71:21	23;82:10,16;89:2;	148:11	107:17;112:17	55:20;61:9;100:10;
\$237,000 (1)	114:8;123:17;126:2;	adjacent (6)	agreed (2)	115:16;116:13;152:1
79:16	139:18	6:10,14;7:2,22;	84:20;86:11	apologize (4)
\$239,900 (2)	account (1)	20:24;41:18	Agreement (17)	22:22;67:10;
79:15;80:7	139:2	adjusted (1)	61:10,15,24;62:7,	105:19;138:15
\$249,900 (1)	accurate (7)	71:15	17;65:3,7;84:16,21;	apparent (1)
64:4	16:11;60:9;67:15;	adjustment (4)	85:12,21;86:5,16,21;	10:9
\$259,000 (1)	115:9;144:19,23;	69:8;70:12,17;71:9	140:4,15;141:16	Apparently (9)
66:11	145:5	adjustments (5)	agrees (1)	54:21;56:17;80:12;
\$259,900 (1)	achieve (1)	71:6,21,22,23;72:8	85:22	84:10;113:12;127:6;
64:18	109:12	administrators (2)	ahead (1)	131:20;134:17;143:5
\$27.67 (1)	acknowledge (2)	62:10;86:22	149:23	appeal (1)
68:18	25:15;26:5	admitted (1)	aid (1)	131:18
\$275,000 (1)	acknowledged (1)	49:22	10:24	Appeals (1)
52:7	31:20	advance (1)	air (1)	128:22
\$285,000 (1)	Acres (1)	86:1	146:24	appear (1)
80:4	137:12	adverse (5)	Allenstown (1)	110:22
\$33.34 (1)	across (8)	48:23;50:6,12;	34:21	appears (6)
68:20	21:19;22:13,19;	81:16;149:13	almost (2)	23:7,11;27:20;
\$400 (2)	26:13;35:18;44:24;	aerial (3)	24:5;135:7	38:14;52:23;103:24
139:17,18	136:17;137:19	60:16;61:7;113:11	along (21)	Appendix (2)
\$66,900 (1)	actively (3)	affect (1)	4:15,18;6:15,16,	12:16;59:15
130:12	52:4,14,16	125:11	20;8:22;12:20;29:17;	Apple (2)
\$79,000 (1)	activities (1)	affirmative (1)	33:6,20;45:4;46:23;	9:5;51:10
64:6	62:4	149:5	49:18;50:7,12;82:9;	Applicant (2)
[activity (1)	affirmed (1)	90:2;136:14;137:3,	9:15;126:12
[sic] (1)	48:9	145:2	15;145:24	Applicant's (8)
73:18	actuality (1)	afforded (2)	Alteration (4)	9:15;12:12,15;
A	52:20	8:13;139:21	12:14;18:17,22;	53:6;59:14;87:15;
abandoned (1)	actually (41)	after-condition (1)	29:14	124:4;143:15
	8:16;35:5;54:18;	117:10	although (4)	Application (1)
	57:12;59:6,22;60:12;	AFTERNOON (5)	83:18;102:8;	111:15
	61:20;64:2,3;65:8;	4:1;51:14;133:16,	125:12;140:3	applied (1)
	69:3;71:21;74:10;	17,18	ambiguous (1)	142:9
	76:9;80:3;82:23;	ag (1)	102:11	applies (1)

<p>62:5 apply (3) 131:9;136:22; 139:1 appraisal (13) 7:6,20;8:6;47:21; 48:2;50:22;51:2; 63:20,22;71:3; 138:18,24;139:14 appraisals (8) 5:10,16,21;6:2,20; 8:22;71:2;140:11 appraised (2) 65:20,22 appraiser (17) 5:10;7:6,24;65:18; 66:24;67:7;70:19,21; 140:16;141:2;142:3; 144:8,13,14;146:15, 17;147:2 appraisers (2) 71:5,9 approach (5) 5:6,12,15;6:3,23 appropriately (1) 84:9 approved (4) 93:12;107:1; 114:13;131:14 approximately (2) 123:10;138:4 April (3) 52:6;143:19; 144:22 area (28) 4:21,24;12:20; 13:3,15;26:11;30:12; 36:11;37:2,6,7;38:7; 39:20;44:16;48:24; 82:24;87:22,23,24; 91:15;98:21,24;99:6; 105:9;114:2;119:17; 121:22;150:15 areas (3) 20:2;30:4;135:14 argued (1) 130:1 argument (1) 25:5 arguments (1) 129:13 Arizona (5) 140:4,6;141:13; 145:24;146:2 arms (2) 44:10;146:24 arm's (5) 53:3,16,24;54:9; 57:21 around (3) 40:5;44:11;45:21 arrow (6) 91:20,23;98:7;</p>	<p>100:21,21;132:9 aside (1) 110:19 Aspen (2) 137:12;138:2 assess (1) 108:16 assessed (2) 109:22;129:10 Assessing (1) 69:24 assessment (7) 44:4;91:11;109:17; 112:6;129:9;130:2,3 assigns (2) 62:10;86:23 associated (3) 20:24;37:17;96:3 assume (1) 95:4 assumed (2) 107:20,21 assumption (1) 108:20 assurance (1) 138:19 attached (3) 59:14;90:20;97:22 Attachment (5) 12:12;52:10;144:2, 5,11 attempt (1) 44:10 attention (5) 19:22;26:10;34:11; 35:24;146:7 Attorney (5) 47:2;51:15;56:22; 57:3;127:22 attorneys (1) 139:10 authored (1) 134:8 available (1) 54:17 average (11) 63:11;66:2;70:3; 78:6;79:13;81:9; 82:13,16;83:5,11; 138:7 averages (1) 70:22 Avery (1) 137:12 aware (31) 17:23;19:7;50:19; 54:22,24;57:8;58:15, 21,24;60:12;61:8; 68:3,11,13;69:2,11; 72:4;74:3;80:2;85:3; 101:21;106:9; 107:12;110:23; 115:17;116:18,23;</p>	<p>117:24;126:5;129:7; 130:9 Awareness (1) 126:4 away (1) 45:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>back (38) 4:14;13:4;14:19; 15:8;16:14,17;20:10; 22:11;23:2;26:17; 28:20;29:14,16; 31:18;62:24;65:14; 66:15;71:11;76:2; 77:2,3;79:11;80:18; 83:14;92:15;93:17; 104:8,18;105:4,5,19, 20,22;115:12; 129:21;136:1; 147:24;148:6 background (2) 115:15;125:24 bad (2) 56:11;128:9 BAILEY (8) 116:12;132:24; 133:8,12;151:23; 152:4,12,14 Baker (4) 133:13,15;142:22; 143:2 ball (1) 141:20 barbed-wire (1) 150:13 Barbour (1) 126:18 Bare (1) 150:9 base (1) 23:8 based (14) 14:24;42:13,17; 43:23;60:17;74:8; 77:15;86:10;99:24; 108:23;111:9;125:9; 141:6;149:11 basic (2) 148:10,17 basically (5) 21:13;49:22;84:1; 106:13;149:4 basis (5) 25:13;48:17;58:7; 101:24;118:11 Batchelder (1) 44:24 bay (3) 77:8,9;128:5 bear (4) 36:2;69:17;92:14;</p>	<p>131:24 bears (1) 57:16 became (2) 54:21;143:5 become (4) 140:16;141:2; 142:3;146:8 becomes (1) 10:8 bedrooms (1) 79:10 began (1) 145:16 beginning (3) 135:7;140:21; 147:23 behalf (1) 126:23 behind (17) 27:12;75:3;89:17; 92:19;97:6;98:6; 101:1,20,22;107:5, 13;114:20;115:5; 119:9;120:13;123:8, 11 below (3) 23:9;29:19;30:17 benefit (1) 62:9 beside (1) 113:19 best (3) 5:22;7:5;44:7 better (3) 20:6;50:18;133:5 beyond (2) 23:20;56:19 big (2) 25:21;26:5 binding (2) 62:8;86:21 Bing (1) 132:13 Bisbee (2) 146:4,21 Bissell (1) 126:16 bit (10) 6:18;13:1;21:4; 53:8;60:6;61:21; 91:19;125:6;128:13; 132:7 black (1) 103:13 blow (3) 61:14;91:19;132:7 Board (1) 128:22 book (1) 86:19 border (2) 136:19;151:3</p>	<p>both (10) 15:20;28:21;43:22; 99:1,4,7;112:18; 113:14;124:20; 147:13 bottom (5) 19:16;31:6;36:3; 135:1,5 bought (2) 130:19;149:18 boundaries (1) 60:17 Bowes (1) 54:13 box (1) 103:13 bracketed (1) 142:14 brand (1) 151:7 break (4) 85:7;87:3,4;152:15 Brian (2) 59:8;77:14 brief (1) 46:16 briefly (1) 102:24 bright-line (1) 58:4 bring (1) 115:12 broad (1) 90:16 broken (1) 36:1 broker (7) 73:16;74:13;76:22; 77:15;80:24;81:2,6 brokers (1) 6:7 broker's (1) 67:5 brook (2) 129:23;130:16 Brookwood (10) 78:2;87:22;88:7, 24;89:15;91:9,22; 92:23;96:13,22 brought (1) 139:5 Brubaker (1) 85:22 BTLA (2) 130:10;132:21 buffer (6) 10:5;73:20;89:17; 107:5;114:21;132:18 buffers (1) 100:1 built (11) 24:14;49:6,8;78:5; 89:9;111:2;114:13;</p>
--	---	---	--	--

118:23;137:10; 150:11;151:6 buy (1) 58:8 buyers (2) 84:2,4 buying (1) 58:12	21;59:5,7,11,17; 60:21;62:21,24; 63:14;64:16;65:15, 17;71:2,12;72:11,14, 14,16,19;73:13;76:3; 77:19,20;78:2;79:7, 17;80:15,19;81:20; 82:10,17;83:14; 84:16;85:1;88:14; 103:10;124:7,9; 125:24;126:13; 129:7;130:11; 131:18;142:15; 143:13;145:19; 146:13;152:6	change (45) 10:14;13:20;25:23; 26:1,5,8;27:3,5; 31:21;36:5,16,21; 37:3;42:18;43:4,4; 44:4,13,20;45:19; 46:7;93:21,23,24; 94:1,3,24;95:1,3,5,8, 12,20,21;99:22; 102:1;107:22; 110:13,14,17;113:21; 114:14;116:9; 150:18,20 changed (4) 11:22;12:2;141:6; 145:6 changes (3) 23:13;118:10,14 characteristics (1) 139:3 characterization (2) 10:9;36:23 charge (1) 139:14 chart (4) 69:22;70:2;101:11; 114:8 chat (1) 13:9 check (2) 29:4;142:5 children (1) 69:3 chilling (1) 130:23 choose (1) 136:22 circle (2) 21:8;92:11 circular (1) 21:16 circumstances (2) 150:22;151:15 City (4) 51:16;69:23;79:14; 81:9 clarification (1) 47:1 clarify (4) 8:11;59:7;116:14; 152:9 Clark (1) 137:16 classroom (1) 140:8 clear (8) 60:3;86:15;105:16; 112:6;113:14,16; 116:11;152:2 cleared (1) 45:24 clearing (18) 20:1,23;22:2;30:5,	8;33:24;45:4;91:5, 15;99:6;101:20,21; 102:5;107:12; 109:16;119:9,11,17 clearly (36) 15:11;23:17;25:21; 27:1,3;73:1;88:20; 90:17;96:14,15,23; 97:9,14;99:1,3,16,20; 102:6;106:23;110:9, 16;111:21;114:10,11, 12;117:9,10;118:21, 22;119:24;120:3,4,5, 6;121:15,16 clearly/clearly (1) 96:9 client (4) 135:9;145:8,9; 149:17 close (16) 24:11;32:1,2; 34:13;38:8;41:11,20, 21;79:13;106:15; 111:22;124:1;131:6, 16;136:19;152:2 closer (11) 16:22;24:14;28:15, 16;31:14;43:12,20; 92:22;98:10;106:3; 122:6 closest (6) 15:24;18:6;38:23; 39:7;76:10,13 CMSR (8) 116:12;132:24; 133:8,12;151:23; 152:4,12,14 cocoon (1) 46:3 colleagues (1) 146:4 color (2) 20:6;22:4 Colstrip (1) 136:16 column (6) 11:18;67:18;71:19; 95:11;96:6,7 combined (1) 86:13 comfortable (1) 109:14 comment (2) 77:13;81:4 commercial (1) 151:5 commissioned (1) 136:9 Committee (7) 48:18,22;57:20; 124:8;126:15; 144:18;146:15 Committee's (1)	125:16 common (1) 80:8 companies (1) 58:8 comparable (1) 68:2 comparables (1) 70:14 compared (1) 82:13 Comparison (1) 71:20 competent (1) 70:20 compilation (1) 48:6 compiled (1) 111:5 complete (1) 144:3 component (2) 6:2;10:18 comps (1) 50:18 conceivably (1) 61:1 concept (3) 115:19;116:1; 118:6 concern (1) 147:8 concerned (4) 4:22;55:7;56:15; 149:19 concerns (2) 116:3;131:2 concluded (7) 26:24;65:22;66:24; 77:7;81:15;106:18; 152:17 concluding (1) 36:20 conclusion (8) 7:21;42:11;49:14; 97:24;109:14,15; 117:7;125:9 conclusions (6) 4:13;5:7,7;8:14; 48:10;65:17 conclusive (1) 77:10 Concord (27) 4:24;7:2;51:16; 59:6,17;68:8,9,11,14, 17,18;69:4,13;70:4, 11;71:4,7;72:9; 82:14,16;83:6,12; 87:17,24;88:8; 106:18;152:11 Concord's (1) 69:23 concurrred (1)
C				
C189-47 (1) 122:3 C2-18 (1) 14:8 cabin (1) 137:6 calculation (1) 96:5 call (3) 20:4;70:18;75:18 called (4) 126:11,15;136:7; 146:7 came (1) 113:13 Campaign (1) 126:5 can (74) 5:20;7:14,19;9:4; 12:17;13:8;19:9,20; 25:9,11;28:13,19; 36:4,11;37:16;39:3; 45:23;49:5;51:10; 54:16;55:4,16;56:7; 61:14,20;64:11; 65:14;68:16;69:16; 71:11,23;72:14; 74:18,21;75:17;76:2; 78:22;80:18;81:20; 85:9,17;86:18;88:5; 89:17;90:19,21; 92:14;94:21;98:6,8; 100:20,24;101:6; 104:8,17;105:10,24; 107:4;108:2;109:8; 112:21;113:11; 114:20;120:21; 123:8;125:6;132:6,8, 14,17;136:2;138:15; 143:3;147:24 car (1) 120:15 careful (3) 109:3,19,20 carefully (2) 58:5;60:22 case (67) 5:5;6:3,11,13;7:19; 8:12,24;23:11;33:18; 42:18;46:22;48:6,8; 50:24;51:3;52:24; 53:13;54:21;58:14,	cases (6) 23:18;42:7;99:4; 108:9;109:2;110:17 catch (2) 90:23;91:2 categories (1) 15:11 categorized (1) 110:8 category (4) 90:15;95:13,20; 137:24 cause (1) 140:22 center (3) 11:12;14:21;138:9 certain (2) 17:10;125:15 certainly (9) 30:11;70:22;96:2; 103:24;105:15; 108:10;131:15; 139:20;149:10 certainty (1) 74:19 certification (1) 144:12 Chair (1) 32:19 CHAIRMAN (17) 4:3,6;32:10,16,23; 33:2,7,11;46:13,16; 51:6,7;55:11;85:4,6, 87:4,8 Chalmers (35) 4:9;8:11;9:8;11:8; 12:19;14:22;17:17; 18:5,17;19:17;20:12; 25:9;26:7;27:10; 29:15;31:7;32:19; 33:15;34:19;37:15; 38:1,11;44:17;46:11, 19;51:14;60:1;69:21; 81:24;87:12;116:11; 117:24;132:10; 134:21;142:20 chance (1) 95:9	change (45) 10:14;13:20;25:23; 26:1,5,8;27:3,5; 31:21;36:5,16,21; 37:3;42:18;43:4,4; 44:4,13,20;45:19; 46:7;93:21,23,24; 94:1,3,24;95:1,3,5,8, 12,20,21;99:22; 102:1;107:22; 110:13,14,17;113:21; 114:14;116:9; 150:18,20 changed (4) 11:22;12:2;141:6; 145:6 changes (3) 23:13;118:10,14 characteristics (1) 139:3 characterization (2) 10:9;36:23 charge (1) 139:14 chart (4) 69:22;70:2;101:11; 114:8 chat (1) 13:9 check (2) 29:4;142:5 children (1) 69:3 chilling (1) 130:23 choose (1) 136:22 circle (2) 21:8;92:11 circular (1) 21:16 circumstances (2) 150:22;151:15 City (4) 51:16;69:23;79:14; 81:9 clarification (1) 47:1 clarify (4) 8:11;59:7;116:14; 152:9 Clark (1) 137:16 classroom (1) 140:8 clear (8) 60:3;86:15;105:16; 112:6;113:14,16; 116:11;152:2 cleared (1) 45:24 clearing (18) 20:1,23;22:2;30:5,	8;33:24;45:4;91:5, 15;99:6;101:20,21; 102:5;107:12; 109:16;119:9,11,17 clearly (36) 15:11;23:17;25:21; 27:1,3;73:1;88:20; 90:17;96:14,15,23; 97:9,14;99:1,3,16,20; 102:6;106:23;110:9, 16;111:21;114:10,11, 12;117:9,10;118:21, 22;119:24;120:3,4,5, 6;121:15,16 clearly/clearly (1) 96:9 client (4) 135:9;145:8,9; 149:17 close (16) 24:11;32:1,2; 34:13;38:8;41:11,20, 21;79:13;106:15; 111:22;124:1;131:6, 16;136:19;152:2 closer (11) 16:22;24:14;28:15, 16;31:14;43:12,20; 92:22;98:10;106:3; 122:6 closest (6) 15:24;18:6;38:23; 39:7;76:10,13 CMSR (8) 116:12;132:24; 133:8,12;151:23; 152:4,12,14 cocoon (1) 46:3 colleagues (1) 146:4 color (2) 20:6;22:4 Colstrip (1) 136:16 column (6) 11:18;67:18;71:19; 95:11;96:6,7 combined (1) 86:13 comfortable (1) 109:14 comment (2) 77:13;81:4 commercial (1) 151:5 commissioned (1) 136:9 Committee (7) 48:18,22;57:20; 124:8;126:15; 144:18;146:15 Committee's (1)	125:16 common (1) 80:8 companies (1) 58:8 comparable (1) 68:2 comparables (1) 70:14 compared (1) 82:13 Comparison (1) 71:20 competent (1) 70:20 compilation (1) 48:6 compiled (1) 111:5 complete (1) 144:3 component (2) 6:2;10:18 comps (1) 50:18 conceivably (1) 61:1 concept (3) 115:19;116:1; 118:6 concern (1) 147:8 concerned (4) 4:22;55:7;56:15; 149:19 concerns (2) 116:3;131:2 concluded (7) 26:24;65:22;66:24; 77:7;81:15;106:18; 152:17 concluding (1) 36:20 conclusion (8) 7:21;42:11;49:14; 97:24;109:14,15; 117:7;125:9 conclusions (6) 4:13;5:7,7;8:14; 48:10;65:17 conclusive (1) 77:10 Concord (27) 4:24;7:2;51:16; 59:6,17;68:8,9,11,14, 17,18;69:4,13;70:4, 11;71:4,7;72:9; 82:14,16;83:6,12; 87:17,24;88:8; 106:18;152:11 Concord's (1) 69:23 concurrred (1)

74:7 condition (3) 15:21;50:1;78:6 conditions (1) 150:1 condominium (1) 128:15 condominiums (1) 128:13 conduct (1) 85:23 conductor (6) 99:15,16;102:2,8, 20;106:22 conductors (7) 10:7;15:17;27:1; 90:20;96:24;97:21; 102:4 confident (1) 109:2 confined (1) 32:20 conflict (1) 49:10 confused (1) 110:21 connection (1) 133:21 consensus (1) 56:10 Consent (2) 61:16;85:12 consider (9) 18:6,13;23:13; 24:1;33:18,23;45:15; 47:20;48:2 considerably (1) 94:7 consideration (7) 8:19;28:4,7;32:21; 34:5;69:9;93:15 considered (1) 45:16 considering (1) 136:5 consistency (1) 74:6 consistent (1) 52:8 constructed (11) 91:13;93:12,17; 96:17;98:24;106:24; 114:14;122:24; 123:15;124:24;130:7 construction (14) 21:5;29:22;62:3; 91:6;111:3,13,14,16; 115:4;116:4,8; 124:13;130:21; 138:21 contained (1) 147:9 contemplated (1)	19:7 context (6) 8:24;88:1;127:21; 136:1,3;147:22 continuation (1) 21:13 continue (1) 121:16 continued (1) 89:10 continues (1) 36:10 continuing (8) 139:24;140:2,6; 141:3,12,19;145:23; 146:2 continuous (1) 118:11 contradict (1) 127:4 contradicted (2) 77:14,15 contradictory (1) 127:11 contrary (3) 73:18;76:24;77:1 convenience (1) 146:9 convenient (1) 146:9 conversations (1) 8:21 copy (1) 56:24 corner (3) 30:21;100:7;101:4 correction (2) 64:10;93:18 correctly (1) 24:20 Correnti (2) 70:20,24 corresponding (3) 13:22;14:8;38:23 corridor (19) 19:3,10;20:11; 29:12;45:22,23,24; 86:12;92:8;108:8; 113:16,17;124:14; 125:1,4;148:13,15; 149:1,16 corridors (2) 6:12;8:15 costs (2) 62:2;86:2 Counsel (5) 126:3,20;133:23; 134:17;146:22 country (5) 137:5,5;148:19,20, 24 County (2) 62:14;86:17	couple (13) 4:15;11:8,9;47:6, 12;55:12;76:4;82:4; 85:18;108:7;117:22; 137:20;139:8 course (2) 140:13;141:5 courses (1) 141:18 cover (4) 62:1;86:1;125:16; 143:14 created (1) 52:18 credit (2) 140:3;141:19 credits (2) 140:6;146:3 criticism (3) 134:9;135:11,24 critiquing (1) 134:10 CROSS-EXAMINATION (6) 4:7;46:17;47:2; 51:12;133:14;152:5 crossing (1) 116:3 cross-section (1) 14:8 cumulative (1) 18:13 current (13) 9:18;48:13;58:19; 59:3;80:16;85:24; 88:19;89:5;98:4; 99:8;101:16;115:21; 123:5 currently (12) 16:9;31:15;92:18; 93:10;94:16;96:15; 105:11;106:21; 108:14;123:10; 139:11;151:4 cursor (4) 35:19;40:5,12; 106:2 curve (1) 141:20 customer (2) 55:7;56:15 cut (1) 34:2	8:3;31:24;48:7; 52:8;73:13;135:15 date (8) 65:6,11;111:4; 129:15;141:13; 143:14,22;145:12 dates (3) 142:17;143:1,3 Dawn (2) 9:4;51:10 day (1) 110:10 days (10) 63:9,12;66:1,2,16, 21;75:1;79:13,14; 81:7 DC (1) 13:17 DC1124 (1) 28:7 DC1125 (1) 27:20 DC1126 (1) 28:8 deal (3) 25:22;55:6;97:13 dealing (3) 32:4;124:9;128:22 deals (2) 56:4;86:5 December (2) 64:19;143:6 decide (2) 58:6,7 decided (3) 89:20;145:11; 146:16 decision (7) 125:16,19,21,23; 127:9;128:21;129:1 Deeds (2) 62:15;86:17 Deerfield (3) 51:20;52:9;56:2 defend (2) 130:3;131:17 define (1) 120:4 defined (1) 53:16 definitely (1) 55:21 definition (2) 53:15;109:20 definitive (3) 97:24;109:5,17 DEIS (1) 148:11 delay (1) 69:20 Department (4) 69:24;115:18; 116:2;123:4	depend (1) 150:6 depending (3) 40:21;42:3;49:24 Depends (1) 149:24 depicted (1) 19:19 depicts (2) 19:1;45:3 depth (1) 125:13 describe (1) 48:5 described (4) 33:15;72:23;79:9; 149:12 description (1) 129:3 descriptor (1) 20:6 design (4) 115:19;116:1; 118:6,10 designate (1) 110:16 designated (1) 37:12 designation (1) 13:6 designations (1) 37:3 despite (2) 24:5;46:6 detail (3) 71:1;109:12; 147:18 detailed (2) 44:9;64:14 details (1) 82:6 determination (5) 61:3;88:18;93:8; 102:15;110:1 determine (1) 5:12 determined (8) 41:23;67:2;72:24; 83:16;84:11;89:21; 90:2;97:9 determining (4) 6:23;50:6,11;90:14 develop (2) 49:8;140:23 developer (1) 135:19 development (3) 111:10;149:8; 151:5 dice (1) 141:16 difference (7) 8:8;45:8;70:2,6;
		D		
		damage (5) 62:2;149:2,22; 150:15,19 damaged (1) 151:12 Danielle (1) 51:15 data (6)		

<p>96:5;110:10;117:18 different (16) 19:20;26:3;27:15; 34:10,14;44:3,5; 55:15;68:14,22;69:3, 6;100:14,15;103:9; 128:14 differential (1) 32:7 differently (1) 42:21 difficult (2) 102:10;109:2 direct-current (1) 151:8 directing (1) 23:23 direction (2) 21:14;31:1 directions (1) 28:11 directly (2) 113:20;136:4 disagree (1) 39:22 discernible (1) 109:10 discount (1) 138:7 discuss (1) 81:17 discussed (6) 9:10;57:2,10; 84:19;112:14;116:4 discussing (3) 8:21;119:2;152:6 discussion (7) 53:1;73:15;94:23; 128:6,7,11,15 disputed (1) 53:4 distance (4) 18:1;36:12;43:19; 60:7 distributed (1) 9:11 disturbance (1) 19:2 document (13) 60:10;61:24;62:5, 13;65:5;75:4;78:10; 79:3;83:2;105:13; 134:24;148:5,9 documentation (2) 10:23;11:3 documents (3) 12:10;55:13;87:17 dollars (1) 139:12 done (4) 50:21;97:14; 102:22;146:10 door (1)</p>	<p>75:14 dot (1) 35:15 dots (1) 20:7 dotted (2) 29:19;119:16 double (1) 38:8 doubled (3) 24:22,23,24 doubles (1) 106:13 doubling (1) 24:5 down (22) 11:11;19:16;27:14; 31:6;35:13;38:16; 40:4,20;43:8;53:7; 60:6;62:5;64:11,19; 71:15;76:6;82:11; 85:18;108:11; 113:18;125:6;130:11 Dr (33) 4:9;8:11;9:7;11:7; 12:19;14:22;17:17; 18:5,16;19:17;20:11; 25:8;26:7;27:9; 29:15;31:7;32:19; 33:15;34:19;37:15, 24;38:11;44:17; 46:11;59:24;69:21; 81:24;87:12;117:24; 126:16;132:10; 134:20;138:13 Draft (2) 147:10,13 dramatic (1) 25:23 draw (1) 91:20 drew (1) 48:10 drinking (2) 129:22;130:16 drive (18) 27:14;78:3;87:22, 23;88:7,8,24;89:15; 91:9,22;92:23;96:13, 22;112:9,10,11,17; 151:7 driven (1) 10:14 driveway (4) 40:16;75:17,19; 113:18 due (13) 9:24;10:4,13;12:2; 30:7;41:24;43:5; 44:13,19;81:1;83:21; 95:14;131:1 duplicate (1) 38:22</p>	<p>during (6) 66:3;91:6;115:3; 116:4;118:3;140:13 dwelling (1) 130:23</p> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <p>earlier (7) 4:11;10:22;42:14; 57:18;66:4;102:8; 104:11 early (1) 142:8 Earth (2) 88:6;122:19 easement (6) 62:4;86:1,3,4,13; 130:4 easily (1) 30:15 east (5) 13:10;17:19;21:19; 24:16;28:8 Economics (1) 134:2 edge (5) 98:13,17;103:15; 106:21;108:15 edits (1) 111:12 education (9) 140:1,2,6;141:4,10, 12,19;145:23;146:2 effect (13) 10:13,14;81:16; 94:4,6,8;96:4;123:21, 22;125:13;130:23; 131:1;150:24 effective (3) 50:23;51:3;143:5 effects (5) 25:14;32:7;109:10; 110:2;126:17 eight (4) 80:10,14;81:11,18 Eighty-three (1) 122:4 EIS (1) 147:10 either (3) 12:17;46:4;126:20 electric (1) 6:11 electromagnetic (1) 131:3 element (1) 75:13 elevation (2) 30:19;31:2 eliminate (1) 53:14 eliminated (1)</p>	<p>53:19 ELMO (2) 134:13;147:21 e-mail (2) 55:24;56:6 employed (1) 5:15 encumbered (2) 6:9,14 end (6) 35:6;44:3;52:23; 56:12;92:8;110:10 ended (1) 129:16 endpoint (1) 32:12 Energy (1) 136:5 Energy's (1) 123:4 engagement (5) 140:14,15,21,22; 141:22 engineers (1) 111:24 enough (2) 4:16;43:8 enter (1) 5:19 entered (2) 61:10,16 entire (4) 56:6;125:19,21; 126:7 entitled (1) 134:2 environment (2) 25:24;147:10 Environmental (1) 147:13 equal (1) 150:4 equally (1) 6:4 essence (1) 25:6 essentially (3) 43:15;48:6;58:12 establish (1) 136:2 established (4) 33:22;48:22;65:1; 104:11 estate (7) 47:21;48:2;69:24; 70:19,21;109:11; 133:21 estimate (3) 44:11;60:19;109:8 estimates (1) 60:20 Evaluation (5) 57:20;113:7;124:8;</p>	<p>125:16;126:15 even (5) 42:10;120:3; 128:18;130:18; 132:20 evening (1) 152:15 event (4) 77:13;78:15; 107:20;124:21 Eversource (6) 54:18;55:1;56:16; 57:11,23;115:17 everywhere (2) 32:24;33:4 evidence (11) 48:21;49:3,4,5,9, 12,16,20;98:1; 127:11;134:16 exact (2) 15:2;50:22 exactly (6) 40:7,8;138:5; 139:18;142:16; 145:22 examination (3) 35:1;44:10;50:4 examined (2) 17:12;138:3 example (1) 53:18 Excellent (1) 53:9 except (1) 145:5 exclude (1) 58:7 excuse (3) 35:13;38:2;61:23 Exhibit (14) 9:16;12:12,15; 53:6;59:15;63:18; 87:15;118:1;124:4; 131:23;133:24; 134:18;142:24; 143:15 exhibits (4) 51:9;69:20;133:6, 24 existing (19) 14:14;16:23;24:6, 15;28:17,23;31:15; 32:6;38:3;88:19; 92:6;113:15,17; 124:14,15,24;125:3; 149:1,16 expansion (1) 130:20 experience (2) 44:13;71:8 experienced (1) 70:21 expert (4)</p>
---	--	--	--	--

47:3,10,14,17 expiration (1) 145:12 expire (1) 145:15 expired (4) 64:19;66:22;81:13; 143:7 explain (2) 25:11;119:12 explained (2) 83:18;139:23 explaining (1) 111:18 explains (2) 19:18;126:1 explanation (1) 119:14 explanations (1) 19:21 explicit (1) 77:14 extensive (1) 63:21 extent (1) 128:10 exterior (2) 73:19;77:1 extra (3) 80:14;81:11,18 extremely (1) 24:11	148:20 faster (1) 55:19 features (1) 19:10 February (1) 80:2 fee (1) 145:17 feel (2) 109:1,13 feet (76) 14:3,4,4,17;16:1,3, 4,8,15;20:20;24:13; 25:19,19,19,19; 26:20;28:22;29:5,10, 12;31:11;36:5,13,14; 37:18,19,20;38:4; 41:13,13;43:15,17, 18;60:8,19,24;61:4; 76:12,13;89:4;92:22; 94:17,18;96:14; 98:10;99:13;101:14, 17;103:5,7;104:12, 14,20,24;105:1; 106:3,20;111:1,21; 112:18;114:9;115:6, 21;116:17,23;118:4, 5,20;121:11;122:12; 123:10,15;131:7; 138:9;149:9,10 fence (1) 150:13 few (4) 60:19;69:20;84:1; 105:19 field (1) 118:13 Fifty (1) 127:20 file (3) 133:20;142:1; 143:8 filed (8) 141:1,7;142:14; 143:13,19;144:2,21; 146:12 filtered (1) 53:14 find (4) 72:17;75:11;78:1; 131:23 findings (2) 125:24;127:7 fine (1) 109:13 finish (1) 85:9 firm (2) 46:20;146:21 first (20) 25:7;35:2;54:22; 59:17;67:17;68:2,17;	72:19;78:17;79:11; 83:14;87:21;88:23; 115:23;143:12; 144:5,6;145:6,8; 149:24 five (3) 75:1;139:12;145:5 flagged (1) 130:9 flip (4) 15:8;16:14;147:24; 148:6 focus (6) 13:2;17:24;59:16; 73:10;87:15;102:8 focused (2) 6:8;102:13 foliage (1) 90:24 follow-up (1) 51:18 foot (1) 52:7 foreclosures (1) 53:20 foresee (1) 127:24 forested (1) 150:9 Fork (1) 137:16 formal (1) 17:24 former (1) 61:17 forms (1) 145:15 Forty-nine (1) 64:8 forward (1) 76:4 found (5) 12:18;135:13,23; 137:8,24 foundation (1) 136:21 four (11) 11:15;12:3;15:11; 34:13,24;38:15; 41:17;52:17;59:16; 145:5;147:6 fourth (1) 41:6 Fox (2) 87:23;88:7 frame (1) 80:13 frankly (3) 8:2;54:22;147:4 frequently (3) 27:14;53:19; 108:24 friends (1)	57:3 front (8) 22:22;29:23;32:22; 55:23;82:24;102:16; 108:11;142:19 frontage (1) 108:11 full (4) 62:1;79:4;86:1; 90:19 Fulton (1) 46:20 further (7) 26:4;29:17;51:5; 58:20;95:15;132:23; 151:22 future (1) 12:5	36:22 green (2) 119:16,20 grid (4) 67:16;70:13;71:12; 72:7 gross (1) 71:23 Group (1) 51:17 growth (1) 73:20 guess (5) 6:18;75:6;113:20; 126:22;127:2
F		G		H
F139.181 (1) 93:4 F1391-77 (1) 101:2 fact (19) 24:9;42:17;46:6; 49:23;57:23;63:15; 66:20;93:16;117:2, 16;120:7,18;126:7; 130:6,15;135:13; 140:10;141:9;149:9 fair (7) 10:9;30:24;36:23; 53:15;57:16;58:11; 68:23 fall (1) 145:13 falls (3) 90:16;136:18; 137:16 familiar (16) 18:22;59:24;60:4; 82:2,6;87:23;114:24; 119:4,10,15;120:7, 17;121:21;122:19; 128:24;134:5 far (4) 43:8;115:14,16;	Half (2) 6:14,15 half-acre (1) 129:17 Hall (1) 151:3 Hampshire (24) 4:16;5:5;47:4,14, 17,21;59:17;68:4,10; 129:5;139:13;140:8, 17;141:3,16;142:2,4, 19;143:4;145:10,22; 146:15;147:3;151:17 Hampshire-certified (1) 144:13 Hampton (6) 11:11,12,23;12:20, 21;32:9 handy (1) 40:23 happened (1) 136:24 happening (1) 55:12 harder (1) 47:24 hastily (1) 138:14 Haynes (10) 51:20;52:3,13; 54:6,14;56:3;57:6, 21;61:8;111:11 head (1) 139:16 Headwater (1) 134:2 health (2) 126:17;131:2 Hearing (5) 4:2;87:7;115:23; 127:8;152:17 heavy (2) 42:8;73:19 height (17) 13:21;14:3,15,16;			

24:6;29:11;37:18,19, 20;38:3,7;45:19; 115:20,21;118:2; 121:5,21 heights (4) 15:23;28:21; 101:16;121:2 heirs (2) 62:9;86:22 Hello (2) 4:9,10 help (3) 51:9;97:23;133:6 helpful (1) 57:14 helps (1) 75:8 here's (1) 22:17 H-frames (1) 75:6 high (8) 25:14;74:19; 104:12,14,24;105:2; 115:6;117:12 higher (5) 31:13;63:11;66:1; 68:19;70:11 highlighted (10) 53:8,9;56:5;78:11; 89:2;101:13;114:6; 122:11;126:10;127:1 highlights (1) 120:24 high-voltage (3) 83:17;135:17; 151:8 highway (1) 41:10 Hill (5) 82:1;85:14;110:21; 129:4;132:4 hillsides (1) 31:5 hint (2) 90:23;91:2 hire (1) 7:6 History (6) 63:1,21,22;64:1, 14;80:1 Hmm-hmm (1) 90:5 Hoit (19) 59:18,23;61:9,17; 67:19,23;84:20; 85:14;88:11;99:11, 12;100:5,7,22;101:4, 5,22;102:24;104:5 hold (1) 77:21 home (48) 16:13;56:8,11;	70:3;78:4,8,20,23; 89:3,18,20;90:1;92:9, 11,23;98:11;100:11, 21;101:1,22;103:18; 104:3;106:13;107:5, 13;108:1,11;114:3,8, 20;117:3,16;118:19; 119:2,9;121:10,18; 122:7,15,18,20; 123:8,11,23;131:22; 132:14,21;151:9 homeowner (1) 26:6 homes (10) 5:19;69:11,13; 110:24;112:2,9,17; 113:1;131:12,15 homogenous (1) 4:17 HONIGBERG (14) 4:3;32:10,16,23; 33:2,7,11;46:13; 51:7;55:11;85:4,6; 87:4,8 hope (1) 138:15 hoping (1) 147:6 hour (1) 139:12 hourly (1) 139:10 hours (2) 140:2,9 hour's (1) 139:20 house (62) 7:2;16:23;18:11; 20:18;27:12,21;28:1, 16,17;30:3;31:14; 33:17;35:5,10;38:19, 23;39:5;41:15;42:6; 45:21;60:8,12;63:15; 73:17,20;74:10,13, 15,16;75:19,22,24; 76:5,9,12,24;78:5,19; 81:3;82:1,8,9;83:23; 84:6,8;92:19;97:11, 19;98:6,18;101:20; 107:19;108:17,18,22; 114:7,19;117:6; 119:4;120:13;131:6, 8 houses (3) 42:5,8;46:3 housing (1) 4:17 humor (1) 32:11 hundred (1) 139:12 HVTL (6) 49:23;73:16;81:2,	2,16;125:10 Hydro-Quebec (9) 124:9,12,18,20,23; 126:11;128:23; 130:7,22 hypothetical (1) 128:8 I Idaho (1) 136:19 idea (2) 109:1;140:19 identified (2) 54:18;141:18 identify (2) 8:7;10:10 identifying (1) 92:1 ignorant (1) 130:19 ignore (1) 102:21 II (6) 6:15;32:5;124:10, 12,23;128:24 imagery (2) 60:16;61:7 imagination (1) 77:11 imagine (1) 128:8 immediate (3) 25:24;27:20;33:16 immediately (5) 22:18,22;29:23; 41:18;45:21 impact (59) 6:24;7:4,22;8:14; 11:19,21;18:14; 24:18;25:2;27:6,7; 41:24;42:13,16; 44:19,19;45:17; 48:23;49:15,17,24; 62:18;65:21;67:2; 68:23;69:7;80:24; 81:4,7;83:16,20; 84:22;86:8;88:17; 89:11;93:9,20;95:6, 22;96:17;106:19; 107:18,23;110:3; 113:8;114:16;117:4, 5;123:4,18,20,21,22; 135:23;137:8; 147:10,13;149:13,19 impacted (6) 42:2;128:10; 135:15,16;137:21,23 impacts (7) 5:12;9:24;10:4; 49:11;50:7,12;134:3 impending (1)	130:21 implication (2) 140:7;149:6 implies (1) 77:6 imply (2) 150:23,24 important (4) 6:2,4;94:9;109:5 impression (6) 52:16,18;54:8; 57:19;79:18;97:18 Improvements (2) 78:7;79:9 include (4) 17:7;19:5,6;58:6 included (2) 53:20;111:20 inconsistent (1) 78:16 inconvenient (2) 22:14;146:11 increase (8) 25:1;42:15,22,24; 95:23;107:24; 115:20;116:8 increased (3) 41:24;86:2;96:3 increases (1) 95:24 increasing (4) 16:1,3;31:2,3 increment (2) 148:14,15 indeed (1) 138:2 indicate (1) 36:15 indicated (11) 11:18,24;20:4,13; 68:8;81:2,6;102:7; 135:15;138:7;145:16 indicates (2) 25:20;45:11 individual (1) 26:6 inferring (1) 50:14 influenced (1) 7:17 information (13) 26:19;57:14;58:19, 22,24;60:4;69:14; 70:1;116:24;118:7,9; 132:5;152:8 initially (1) 9:22 initiative (1) 140:24 inside (1) 81:3 insight (1) 7:14	inspected (1) 97:17 inspection (4) 73:19;77:1,16; 109:20 inspections (1) 5:18 instances (1) 32:20 integral (1) 5:16 intend (1) 142:23 intended (1) 136:20 intensification (3) 25:20;32:3,5 intensity (6) 25:2,15,18;31:21; 42:15,22 interested (1) 32:17 interference (1) 62:2 interior (2) 5:18;6:1 interpret (2) 73:24;95:10 interpretation (1) 76:21 interpretations (1) 26:23 interrupt (1) 32:11 Interstate (2) 114:2;116:3 intervenor (3) 56:4;126:4,6 intervenor's (2) 46:22;126:20 Interview (5) 73:13,14;80:21,23; 83:19 interviews (2) 6:6,7 into (11) 7:14;34:5,21;36:1; 58:14;61:10,16; 139:2;147:8,18; 149:23 introduced (1) 127:11 intuitive (1) 25:6 inure (1) 62:8 investigation (1) 138:23 involve (1) 5:17 involved (8) 8:20;54:19;55:1; 57:12,24;59:16;
--	--	--	--	--

<p>126:2,6 issue (13) 5:1;57:16;58:4; 70:23;110:13;116:8; 139:23,24;140:1,4; 146:6;147:15;148:12 issues (1) 129:20 item (1) 131:4 Item/Subject (1) 67:24 items (2) 19:20;100:15</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p>labeled (1) 20:16 lack (2) 24:15;27:4 Lamprey's (2) 125:9;127:12 Land (5) 128:22;129:17; 130:15,19;135:14 Lane (4) 72:4,4;152:7,10 lapse (3) 143:10,11,22 large (4) 32:2;137:6;140:21; 145:17 last (12) 9:11;11:18;27:19; 31:8;35:14,17;47:6, 12;65:23;121:8; 139:19;147:5 Late (3) 141:24;142:9; 146:1 latter (1) 102:15 law (2) 46:20;146:21 learned (2) 145:22;146:1 least (9) 68:18;74:15;90:2; 91:7;97:1;100:15; 123:14;125:2;135:15 leave (2) 54:8;151:9 leaves (4) 21:14;52:15;57:19; 97:14 left (3) 9:17;30:17;58:16 left-hand (2) 21:15;75:13 legal (1) 141:3 length (6) 53:3,16;54:1,9; 57:21;147:8 less (3) 79:19;120:5; 129:17 letter (1) 134:8 level (2) 74:19;109:12 levels (2) 25:14;32:4 leverage (1) 7:15 license (6)</p>	<p>139:14,21;140:5; 141:11,14;145:14 licensed (10) 140:16;141:2; 142:3,10;143:4; 144:7;145:10; 146:14,17;147:2 licensing (1) 142:20 light (1) 118:13 likelihood (7) 10:13;11:21;12:1, 2;27:5;93:22;94:2 likely (6) 24:10;27:12;44:19; 45:12;95:7;98:22 limit (1) 25:5 limitations (6) 50:5,10,15,15,16, 20 limited (2) 7:12;15:5 line (102) 5:2;6:5,15,16;7:3, 18,23;13:10;16:23; 18:18;24:6,15;28:17, 23;29:6,18,19;31:11, 13,15,18;32:13; 33:20;34:15,19; 35:11;38:1,3;41:8, 14;42:9;51:23;52:3; 53:9;73:6,9,22;74:3, 14,16;83:17;86:11; 88:18,19;89:5,9,21; 90:18;91:12;92:18, 24;93:11;94:17; 96:16;97:10;98:4,8, 10,12,17,23;103:13; 104:3;105:14; 106:24;114:13; 116:22;118:23; 119:16;120:12; 122:7;124:15,15,21; 125:1,8;127:16,17; 128:1,24;129:15; 130:4;132:15; 133:22;135:18,20; 136:14,16;137:10,19; 138:9,10,21;145:24; 148:13,14,19;149:3, 15;150:5;151:9,13 lined (1) 137:17 lines (20) 4:15;23:5,7;25:18; 30:14,16;32:6;37:13; 85:24,24;97:6; 104:19;113:19,20; 119:11;124:19; 134:3;135:17; 147:19;148:16</p>	<p>liquidation (1) 53:21 list (6) 9:21;110:22;111:5, 6,11,20 listed (12) 13:23;15:10;37:2; 63:2,16;64:3,18; 66:10;79:15,19;80:6; 144:12 listing (11) 63:20,21,23;64:15; 66:5,22;73:15;80:1, 17,24;81:13 literally (2) 68:7;96:4 literature (2) 48:8;147:14 litigation (1) 145:20 little (21) 6:18;12:24;13:1; 20:7;21:4;24:13; 29:17;35:19;38:16; 39:3;43:9;45:17; 46:3;53:8;60:6; 75:14;91:19;125:6; 128:13;132:8;143:6 live (2) 151:2,4 lived (1) 7:22 lives (1) 150:14 local (4) 70:19,21;79:2; 109:10 located (10) 12:22;16:22;28:14; 44:24;46:22;88:8; 91:18;98:21;101:1; 105:24 location (9) 16:6;70:16;71:6; 72:8;86:10,12;115:1; 130:8;150:6 locations (1) 11:8 logical (1) 25:5 long (1) 75:18 longer (3) 66:21;145:10; 146:16 look (35) 7:16;8:4;13:5; 23:18;26:12;29:16, 17;57:4;58:5,14; 60:23;61:2;67:14,16; 80:21;86:18;87:21; 88:23;91:13;96:12, 21;99:11;101:11;</p>	<p>102:24;104:22; 106:16;114:3,19; 117:21;118:18; 121:8;122:23; 125:21;138:18;148:3 looked (17) 26:18;28:19;35:1; 66:5,9;71:1;82:3; 87:16;88:14,15; 104:11;106:6;110:4; 113:11;131:12; 137:22;139:19 looking (20) 13:17;15:22;17:21, 22,23;21:2;22:6,14; 27:17;37:6;39:21; 60:2;63:19;75:5,5,9, 11;91:21;98:20; 150:10 looks (4) 36:19;40:15;79:4; 150:8 loss (7) 10:5;26:2;30:9; 31:16,22;137:9; 149:2 lost (3) 47:6;115:11; 131:18 Lot (15) 14:20;15:3;20:14; 35:20;42:5;58:8; 69:10;75:10;80:6; 82:5;104:1;109:18; 112:13;137:12,15 lots (7) 56:9;137:15,17,20, 21,23;138:8 Loudon (3) 117:22;118:19; 119:5 low (2) 82:13;94:4 lower (3) 69:12;70:11;83:11 lowest (1) 71:15</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">K</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">M</p>		
<p>Keep (3) 105:20;118:16; 140:1 key (1) 19:18 kind (13) 8:13;12:23;19:18; 25:17;34:15;41:14; 44:11;58:3;75:13; 98:12;109:7;145:17; 146:8 knew (2) 57:5;141:7 knowledge (2) 84:18;130:21 knowledgeable (2) 53:17;54:2 kV (3) 124:19;136:15; 137:4</p>	<p>leaves (4) 21:14;52:15;57:19; 97:14 left (3) 9:17;30:17;58:16 left-hand (2) 21:15;75:13 legal (1) 141:3 length (6) 53:3,16;54:1,9; 57:21;147:8 less (3) 79:19;120:5; 129:17 letter (1) 134:8 level (2) 74:19;109:12 levels (2) 25:14;32:4 leverage (1) 7:15 license (6)</p>	<p>lined (1) 137:17 lines (20) 4:15;23:5,7;25:18; 30:14,16;32:6;37:13; 85:24,24;97:6; 104:19;113:19,20; 119:11;124:19; 134:3;135:17; 147:19;148:16</p>	<p>logical (1) 25:5 long (1) 75:18 longer (3) 66:21;145:10; 146:16 look (35) 7:16;8:4;13:5; 23:18;26:12;29:16, 17;57:4;58:5,14; 60:23;61:2;67:14,16; 80:21;86:18;87:21; 88:23;91:13;96:12, 21;99:11;101:11;</p>	<p>magnitude (1) 10:12 maintenance (1) 62:4 major (1) 150:18 majority (1) 4:21 makes (1) 145:21 making (1) 108:5 Manchester (2)</p>

<p>4:23;5:3 manner (1) 41:1 many (3) 23:18;42:7;151:20 Manzelli (3) 133:2,4;152:16 map (13) 12:8;16:19;17:22; 21:11;32:12;34:18, 24;76:11;91:14,16; 93:5;132:7,13 maps (10) 11:1;12:11;15:23; 22:13;61:6;104:22; 109:19;115:24; 119:11;132:13 March (3) 65:11,12;111:6 marked (8) 9:15;64:1;69:16; 87:17;124:3;125:22; 128:20;132:3 Market (27) 27:7;48:9;52:8,21; 53:15;56:8;57:16; 58:2,11,12;63:12; 66:2,13,15;68:23; 79:12;80:3,9;81:8, 12;82:24;84:10,22; 125:13;150:1,19,23 marketability (1) 125:11 marketed (4) 52:5,14,16;66:16 Marketing (9) 63:1,8;65:24; 66:20;80:13;81:1,7, 17;83:20 markets (1) 109:11 marking (2) 30:19,22 material (1) 46:7 materials (1) 145:13 math (1) 64:9 matter (5) 110:14;117:12; 140:12;145:18;146:8 matters (1) 145:20 mature (1) 91:9 may (21) 4:4;5:23;17:10; 28:10;29:1;31:22; 33:19;46:4,5;55:4; 66:21;77:6,10;87:9; 125:12;142:9; 150:17,18,20,21,24</p>	<p>maybe (5) 6:17;20:5;87:5; 94:5;128:4 mean (21) 7:13;17:22;25:7; 31:24;34:2,3;37:8; 40:14;42:1;49:4; 50:17;57:16;58:1,3; 68:7;82:4;84:9; 95:14;108:24;148:8, 23 meaning (2) 97:15;147:20 means (3) 77:16;90:18;95:4 meant (1) 42:21 measurement (1) 20:21 measurements (1) 111:9 meet (3) 53:14;109:12; 141:17 meeting (1) 31:6 memory (1) 134:11 Menard (4) 51:20;52:12;53:2; 54:11 mentioned (8) 20:19;23:21;41:17; 45:7;56:22;64:15; 112:4;146:5 Merrimack (2) 62:14;86:17 methodology (4) 4:12;73:3;117:19; 124:5 methods (1) 60:18 Michael (1) 126:16 middle (3) 29:18;136:17; 137:20 might (27) 18:7;41:11,12; 53:8;58:6,6;62:18; 68:23;69:7;72:18; 76:19;77:24;88:16; 90:11;91:1;100:14; 102:5;106:18;117:2, 16;122:23;127:3; 131:14,22;135:8; 140:23;150:23 miles (3) 148:18,24;149:8 mimic (1) 38:19 mind (4) 50:17,18;141:6;</p>	<p>142:7 minimal (1) 83:20 minor (2) 94:9;145:5 minus (1) 60:18 minute (1) 147:1 minutes (3) 85:7;87:5;147:6 misinterpreting (1) 67:4 misrepresents (1) 147:14 missed (1) 111:4 Misty (1) 136:6 mixing (1) 28:11 MLS (3) 5:24;6:1;63:24 moment (8) 69:17;76:3;105:4; 106:7;110:19;114:3; 124:3;131:24 monetary (1) 139:24 money (1) 149:23 Montana (6) 133:20;134:10; 135:14;136:15,18; 137:10 months (4) 80:10,14;81:11,18 more (31) 5:11;6:8,23;10:8; 21:8;32:14;50:8,19, 23;51:2;55:17;63:21; 64:6,12,14;80:6; 91:12;94:7;95:7,18; 98:22,23;99:2; 105:20;117:22; 120:3,5;138:16; 139:8;143:6,23 morning (5) 4:11;51:19;56:20; 103:2;133:7 most (22) 9:18;17:24;18:1,2, 5,10;23:15,24;27:11, 20,24;33:16,17;39:7; 42:19;53:19;71:5; 76:16;90:21;95:4; 141:9,13 motivated (2) 53:17;54:2 motivation (1) 136:8 mountain (5) 72:12,22;100:7;</p>	<p>106:16;110:20 move (4) 31:7;33:5;34:9; 35:20 moved (2) 106:3,12 moving (1) 30:24 MSTI (3) 136:6,12,22 much (8) 83:11;97:23;102:2; 118:11;129:19; 130:17;137:4;139:13 muddled (1) 43:2 Muni (16) 55:10,24;61:13; 64:1;68:16;69:17; 74:22;79:23;85:10; 87:18;88:3;100:8; 107:11;125:22; 128:21;132:3 Municipal (1) 51:17 municipalities (1) 46:21 municipality (1) 34:22 myself (2) 47:16;71:1</p>	<p>neighbor's (3) 92:19;94:15;101:5 Neily (1) 56:1 neither (1) 76:22 New (61) 4:16;5:5;11:10,12, 23;12:20,21;13:13; 32:8;47:3,14,17,20; 59:17;68:4,9;88:17; 89:8;91:18;92:23; 93:11;94:17;98:4,11, 12;99:5;104:3; 105:23;111:9,9,13, 14,15;116:21;122:7; 124:15;127:16; 128:1;129:4,15; 130:8;139:13;140:7, 17;141:2,16;142:2,4, 19;143:4;144:12; 145:10,22;146:15; 147:2;148:12,13; 149:3;151:7,13,17 next (72) 18:4;21:20;34:22; 36:9;39:5,8;46:14; 64:12;65:18;68:2; 77:19;78:7,18;81:5; 85:7;89:1,13,24;91:4, 17;94:10,20;96:12, 21;97:4;98:3;99:10, 11;100:4,9,10,19; 101:12,19;102:23,23; 103:12;104:4,17,23; 105:5,18;107:3,7; 109:24;112:12,16,22; 113:4,23;114:5,18; 117:21;118:16,18,24; 119:8,19;120:11,22; 121:17,24;122:10,15, 17;123:2,13;126:9; 130:6;132:10,12; 133:2 nice (1) 56:10 night (2) 9:11;139:19 none (7) 11:24;37:3;90:16; 110:15;127:5;149:9, 10 none/partial (1) 96:11 north (5) 28:10;148:19,20, 24;151:3 Northern (21) 5:13;6:21;7:4;8:9, 22;11:20;13:14;24:7, 13;31:13;36:21;38:7; 46:23;48:13,24; 56:11;57:1;61:3;</p>
N				
			<p>name (2) 46:19;135:5 name's (1) 51:14 Nashua (2) 4:24;5:3 near (4) 82:1;98:12,17; 100:6 nearby (1) 125:12 nearest (2) 18:11;23:16 necessarily (5) 58:1;70:15;73:10; 97:12;138:24 necessary (2) 140:10;141:21 need (12) 54:16;55:5;69:8; 70:13;73:8;85:6; 119:12,14;131:23; 138:16;147:22;152:2 NEEDLEMAN (1) 116:6 needs (2) 85:23;116:10 neighborhood (1) 41:22</p>	

<p>92:2;116:22;139:9 Northwestern (1) 136:5 note (2) 17:13,18 notes (1) 127:10 noticeable (1) 10:8 notified (1) 91:7 notify (1) 57:11 November (2) 65:2;80:10 NPT (1) 6:16 number (20) 10:11;19:19;24:23; 44:12;46:21;59:19, 21;71:22;72:15,17, 19,20;77:24;86:19; 92:1;103:9,21; 110:16;131:23; 144:14 numbers (4) 83:3;93:3;121:4,24</p>	<p>occurs (1) 25:21 October (3) 65:8;143:13; 144:18 off (15) 21:15;34:2;40:11, 14;46:24;52:21; 60:15;61:6;66:13; 78:3;80:9;88:11; 97:14;98:19;139:16 offer (1) 151:16 offered (3) 49:10,13;98:1 Old (3) 117:21;118:19; 119:4 Once (5) 7:19;115:2;117:15; 119:7;151:21 one (90) 5:23;9:18,22;12:4, 10;13:9;18:6,20; 19:22;21:2,21;22:19, 20,22,23;23:24; 25:18;26:4;32:9,14; 33:13;34:16;35:2,5, 14,14,17;36:14; 38:16;41:6,7,19;44:5, 18,23;45:18;49:9; 50:8;52:1;63:19; 64:12;68:17;69:15, 17;75:10,12;77:22; 78:24;82:3;85:9,13; 90:5,9,16;91:1;92:6; 93:18;94:15;95:18; 98:5,6,15;99:12; 104:8,18,19;105:20; 106:1,18;107:9,9; 113:18;115:14,14,15, 16;118:18;122:6; 123:9,16;125:2,3; 126:4,5,15;131:24; 133:24;137:11; 142:12;149:15 one-and-a-half-family (1) 78:8 ones (2) 94:17;99:8 one's (1) 43:20 one-story (1) 78:4 one-year (1) 142:13 online (1) 142:20 only (17) 7:13,14;8:13;11:3; 23:15;54:21;81:15; 102:4;106:17;119:6; 126:4,5,13;142:11;</p>	<p>147:5;151:21;152:9 on-site (1) 109:19 oops (1) 92:14 operate (1) 40:14 opined (2) 26:1;31:23 opinion (20) 7:23;8:6;9:23; 10:3;15:15;24:17,19; 26:9;31:17;42:11; 67:6,9;95:19;102:1; 117:4,19;123:18; 149:21;150:5,14 opinions (2) 49:10,14 opportunity (1) 57:4 opposed (4) 5:14,15;6:10;10:19 order (4) 10:11;96:1;127:10; 138:19 ordered (1) 130:10 order-of-magnitude (2) 44:11;109:8 orient (1) 26:13 orientation (2) 6:5;22:17 original (3) 141:11;144:1; 145:4 originally (5) 63:2;66:10;79:15, 19;111:5 others (2) 35:9;137:24 otherwise (1) 76:24 out (15) 12:22;25:16;32:20; 40:24;75:9,15;88:15; 91:10;93:6;94:21; 102:10;111:9; 136:23;140:10;150:9 outline (1) 20:18 Outline (5) 8:24;73:17;74:15; 81:3;137:16 over (12) 13:7;34:20;42:10; 45:18;52:5,11,14,19; 75:13;77:7;94:16; 106:2 overall (1) 83:22 overhead (7) 88:5;100:5;103:23;</p>	<p>107:4;119:1;121:18; 148:19 own (1) 140:19 owner (2) 24:21;84:17 owners (4) 61:11,17;62:1; 129:8 <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> P145-101 (1) 116:16 P145-88 (1) 122:3 Pacik (63) 51:7,8,13,15,24; 52:2;55:11,20,22; 61:20,22;64:11,13; 65:14,16;69:19; 71:11,13;74:21,23; 76:2,8;79:22,24; 80:18,20;81:20,22; 85:4,5,8,11,17,20; 87:2,9,10,11;88:2,4; 94:10,12,20,22; 105:17,21;107:8,10; 112:21,23;113:23; 114:1;116:12,13,15; 118:15,17;120:21,23; 151:24;152:1,5,13 package (1) 89:14 pad (4) 21:5;29:22;30:1,4 page (114) 9:17;11:13,17; 21:14;29:19;36:4,9; 51:23;52:1;53:7; 55:14,14,15,15,16,17, 18;59:19,20,21,22; 60:7;61:19,23;64:12; 65:18;67:17,17; 72:17,19,20;76:5; 77:21,23;78:7,17,18; 79:11;81:5,23,24; 82:22,23;83:3,5,14; 86:18,19;88:3;89:1, 13,13;91:4,17;94:11, 21;96:21;97:5;98:3; 99:10;100:4,8,9,10, 19;101:12,19; 102:23;103:12; 104:4,17,23;105:5,6, 18,22;107:3,7,11; 109:24;112:12,16,22; 113:4,24;114:6,18; 118:1,16,24;119:8, 19;120:11,22;121:17, 24;122:10,17;123:2, 13;125:7,17,23; 126:1;127:9;130:6;</p>	<p>132:12;134:7;135:3; 144:5,6;145:6; 147:19,24 pages (8) 36:2;76:4;77:3; 85:18;105:19;110:4; 125:15,17 paid (2) 129:19;130:17 panel (2) 91:7;115:4 panel's (1) 116:5 paper (1) 54:23 paperwork (3) 141:1;142:1;143:8 Pappas (2) 47:2;127:22 paragraph (8) 61:18,23;62:7; 86:23;126:9,24; 127:1;138:14 parcel (2) 92:12,20 part (8) 5:16;13:14;17:13; 68:9;73:5,7,8,9 partial (10) 37:2;46:5;89:10; 90:21;99:14,20; 110:9,15,15;112:7 partial/clearly (1) 96:10 partially (18) 72:24;73:6;74:8; 76:17;77:17;88:20; 89:5,21;90:10,14,15; 93:10,13;99:15; 102:4;106:22; 108:13,14 particular (24) 16:13;20:16;25:22; 27:9;48:24;49:18; 85:21;86:5,16;91:14; 92:5;93:3;94:3; 103:2;104:3;105:9; 108:4;109:16,16; 113:9;115:1;116:16; 139:3;145:19 Particularly (4) 6:6;7:11,12;145:20 parties (5) 53:18,22;54:3; 62:9;87:14 Pass (21) 5:13;6:21;7:4;8:9, 22;11:20;13:14;24:7, 13;31:13;36:21;38:7; 46:23;48:14,24; 56:12;57:1;61:3; 92:2;116:22;139:9 passes (1)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <p>Oak (3) 81:24;85:14; 110:21 object (1) 116:7 objection (1) 134:16 objective (2) 109:13,23 observation (2) 27:16;74:5 observations (1) 74:7 observe (1) 44:8 observed (4) 23:17;27:17;34:4; 77:2 obtained (2) 132:5;141:15 obvious (1) 75:15 obviously (6) 5:2;34:4,6;77:10; 109:18;148:18 Occasionally (1) 40:21 occupancy (1) 59:3 occur (1) 147:4 occurring (1) 118:14</p>				

<p>34:20 past (1) 6:18 path (1) 56:11 Pause (6) 18:21;46:9;69:18; 92:17;132:1;134:19 PDF (15) 55:14,16,18,59;20, 23;67:16;72:19,20; 77:21,24;78:1;81:23; 97:5;105:23;119:1 Pembroke (6) 34:12,20;36:10; 121:9,10,19 Penacook (14) 68:4,6,9,13,19; 69:2,12;70:4,12; 71:7;72:5,8;152:8,10 people (2) 69:10;151:2 people's (1) 108:15 percent (18) 65:21;66:1;67:2,5, 10;70:6,7;71:24; 96:2;127:18,19,20; 128:2,17;130:10; 131:9;132:20;138:8 performed (1) 59:8 Perhaps (1) 151:21 period (13) 52:5,14;63:8; 65:23,24;66:4,21; 81:1,7,17;83:21; 142:13,14 permission (1) 5:19 perpendicularly (1) 137:19 personal (1) 77:15 person's (1) 93:17 perspective (3) 15:2;100:6;150:20 Phase (6) 6:15;32:5;124:10, 12,23;128:23 photo (7) 40:9;77:3;88:6; 119:6;122:22;123:2, 17 photograph (9) 76:4;89:14;90:1; 97:4;105:11;120:12; 121:17;122:18; 131:21 photographs (3) 90:7;104:5;112:24</p>	<p>photography (2) 97:22;113:12 photos (1) 6:1 phrase (2) 147:21;148:7 physical (1) 6:4 picks (1) 63:22 picture (7) 60:2;74:24;78:19; 89:24;98:15;100:17; 106:6 pictures (1) 12:10 piece (2) 5:1;54:23 Pierce (2) 134:9;138:13 Pierce's (2) 135:11,24 Pittsburg (1) 151:17 place (2) 19:2;37:4 Plan (17) 18:19,23;20:17; 21:12;37:17;44:15; 45:3,11;61:2;91:5; 98:4;99:19;100:20; 101:23;102:16; 105:10,19 planned (2) 20:23;33:24 Plans (8) 12:15;18:17;19:13; 29:15;99:24;105:4; 116:9;146:23 plant (1) 136:17 please (4) 9:5;51:11;52:1; 65:15 plus (2) 60:18;64:8 pm (4) 4:2;87:6,7;152:17 point (20) 19:21;21:2;25:16; 31:21;32:17,17,18; 34:10;40:19;41:1; 55:4;70:24;83:22; 84:3;94:9;146:3,16; 148:10,17;150:17 pointing (2) 32:20;98:7 points (1) 109:21 pole (15) 104:24;105:9; 106:8,12,14;115:5, 10,20;116:9,16,20;</p>	<p>117:3,17;123:8,11 poles (18) 91:18;93:3,16; 94:14;98:21;99:5,7; 100:16;104:8,18; 105:24;118:2;120:8; 122:1,16,23;123:14, 24 Pond (1) 82:2 pop (1) 9:8 portion (5) 14:14;34:23;38:1; 90:19;97:20 Portsmouth (3) 114:5,7,24 poses (2) 50:6,12 position (3) 25:12;60:16;70:23 possibilities (1) 108:7 possibility (1) 128:18 possible (13) 5:12;6:24;8:14; 25:14;33:3,8,10; 44:2;49:8;60:22; 81:16;102:7;150:16 possibly (1) 41:11 post-project (1) 10:4 potential (9) 9:24;10:3;22:7; 30:8,11;84:2;95:5; 117:5;137:9 potentially (1) 116:23 power (2) 130:4;133:22 Powerline (1) 126:4 practice (1) 145:18 preceding (1) 126:24 prefiled (14) 48:17;53:5,11; 142:15;143:12,14,20; 144:1,6,11,21;145:4; 146:13;147:7 prepared (3) 60:21;87:13;135:9 presence (3) 125:10;149:3; 151:12 presently (4) 28:23;29:6;31:12; 43:1 presume (3) 28:2;82:21;146:3</p>	<p>pretty (10) 8:16;39:11;42:3; 74:19;75:12;79:13; 80:8;109:1,1;118:10 previously (2) 42:24;63:15 price (19) 58:13;63:5;65:21; 67:3,11;69:11,13; 71:15;82:14,16;83:6, 12,21,22;84:3; 125:11;129:19; 137:22;138:8 Price/Marketing (1) 65:23 priced (3) 84:6,9,10 principally (1) 73:7 prior (6) 54:24;56:23;64:2; 113:13;124:7;140:14 private (1) 10:19 probability (12) 93:22;94:2,4; 95:22,24;96:3,17; 107:17,23;114:15; 123:20,21 probably (9) 5:11;25:4;32:24; 43:2;59:7;85:1;95:4; 106:19;145:13 problem (1) 138:20 proceeding (2) 126:2,6 process (5) 4:12;10:24;11:5; 17:13;145:16 Project (54) 8:9;9:24;10:13; 11:1,4,22;12:3,8,11; 13:7,15;15:15,23; 16:18;21:13;24:8,18; 27:2,2;28:13,14; 34:18,23;36:6,22; 37:4;43:5;44:7,14; 48:13,24;49:1,5,7,11, 15;50:6,11,23;95:14; 126:23;131:14; 133:22;136:6,6,7,22, 24;141:21,23;142:8; 149:20;150:11;151:6 proper (1) 130:2 properties (50) 4:17;5:21;6:9,11, 13;8:4;9:21;10:11, 12;11:15,23;12:21; 13:3,11;14:20;34:13, 24;36:11,15;37:1; 38:14,15;39:18;</p>	<p>41:16;42:2,12;43:7, 23;44:12;50:7,12; 52:9;59:16;60:15; 66:3;71:6,16;87:16, 21;88:1,15;91:11; 94:7;111:20;112:5; 113:9,13,22;125:12; 139:2 property (177) 5:9,11;6:5,22,22; 7:5,13,16,24;8:2; 10:20;13:6;15:9; 17:3,12,18;20:12,24, 24;21:9;22:9,15,17, 23;23:4,9,18,22;24:2, 11,14,21;25:3;26:11, 14;27:9,19;28:5; 30:10,13,18;31:8,10, 18;32:9,15,22;35:6; 38:15,18;39:11,16; 40:22;43:10,12; 44:17;47:4,10,14,17; 48:23;49:18,24;50:1; 52:20;54:19;55:6; 56:2,15;58:9;59:24; 61:6,11;62:6,19;63:2, 5;65:19;66:10;67:1, 18;68:24;69:7;70:10; 71:4,24;72:22;74:1; 75:2,3,3;79:15;80:2; 81:12;83:15,18,22; 84:2,17,22;86:11; 88:17,23,24;91:1,17, 21;92:3,5;93:6,9,20; 94:16;95:6,22,23; 96:12,13,23;97:16; 98:13,17,20;99:11; 101:5;102:23;103:2; 106:17,20;107:18,24; 108:5,15;109:6,15, 18;110:3;114:15; 117:21;121:8,14; 122:23;123:19,22; 127:16,17,23;128:1, 10,16;129:2,3,8,10, 18,20;130:11,24; 132:2;134:3;135:22; 137:3,8,9,11;138:19; 147:9;149:2,2,13,18, 20,22;150:16,19,22; 151:11 property's (3) 58:15;81:1;83:20 property-specific (1) 6:20 proposal (2) 104:2;115:18 proposed (25) 6:21;7:23;8:22; 13:21;48:13;50:13, 23;89:9;91:15;96:16; 99:19;100:20;101:7; 10,21;116:10,17,21;</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>120:9,13,18;121:2, 22;133:21;135:19 prospective (1) 49:15 prospectively (1) 49:11 provide (1) 87:19 provided (2) 87:14;103:10 proximate (1) 149:6 proximity (6) 24:11;34:14;76:10; 131:1,6;132:14 PSNH (8) 32:6;61:11,17; 62:2;84:17;85:22; 86:2;126:18 public (8) 10:18;15:6;70:1; 126:3,21;133:23; 134:17;146:23 publication (1) 134:1 published (2) 136:10;147:14 pull (3) 12:7;16:2;34:16 pulled (1) 55:13 pulling (1) 12:13 purchase (2) 54:19;130:5 purchase-and-sale (2) 65:3,7 purchased (4) 55:6;58:1,16; 129:14 purple (1) 92:7 purports (2) 134:8;135:4 purpose (1) 109:4 purposes (2) 22:14;108:5 pursue (1) 150:3 put (10) 44:15;54:16;55:10; 66:15;69:23;80:3; 134:13;142:19; 147:21;149:23 putting (1) 9:7</p>	<p>25:13 quick (1) 114:19 quickly (2) 94:13;117:23 quite (10) 8:18;16:10;25:21; 42:10;49:6;75:7; 77:23;90:22;132:7; 146:11 quote (4) 55:6;56:10,12; 125:10 quotes (1) 73:18</p>	<p>146:8;151:14 realtor (2) 73:21;83:18 reapply (1) 145:15 reason (6) 58:10;111:17,19; 112:11;115:8;145:19 reasonable (3) 41:5;62:1;86:2 reasons (3) 58:9;102:11; 130:14 rebut (1) 127:12 recall (9) 29:10;54:14;55:4; 103:3;128:5;144:9, 14;145:11;147:15 received (3) 51:19;145:12; 152:8 recent (1) 118:8 recently (1) 111:2 Recess (1) 87:6 reciprocal (2) 140:4;141:10 reciprocity (1) 141:15 recite (1) 52:9 recollect (1) 82:5 recollection (7) 5:23;60:3;134:14, 20;142:16,18,23 reconstructed (1) 104:15 record (7) 9:14;12:9;16:18; 18:19;29:9;152:2,9 recorded (3) 62:14;86:16;102:9 records (3) 61:6;65:9;142:5 recreational (1) 137:15 rectangle (1) 22:3 red (7) 16:20;88:6;91:20, 22;100:21;103:13; 122:2 reduce (2) 127:17,19 reduced (3) 63:3;128:2,16 reduction (4) 127:23;130:10; 131:10;132:20</p>	<p>refer (2) 12:16;13:5 reference (10) 53:13;54:5;63:14; 66:4,20;81:11;84:15; 118:1;125:15;136:12 referenced (5) 62:21;64:16;80:14; 85:1;133:19 references (1) 55:14 referencing (1) 132:2 referred (1) 5:20 referring (2) 9:19;83:10 refers (2) 80:16;134:1 refresh (4) 134:13,20;142:18, 23 regard (1) 48:12 regional (2) 109:10;110:2 Registry (2) 62:14;86:17 reject (1) 49:19 rejected (1) 84:2 relate (1) 150:2 related (4) 23:15;34:5;53:21; 137:2 relates (3) 18:4;150:3,4 relating (1) 11:4 relation (1) 35:10 relationship (2) 40:22;149:8 relative (5) 50:20;54:12;57:6; 137:23;150:7 relevant (3) 6:6;25:17;45:20 reliable (2) 5:11;6:23 relied (1) 5:6 re-listed (1) 64:22 relocated (6) 92:22;94:15;98:9; 122:5,6;123:9 rely (1) 70:18 remaining (1) 36:15</p>	<p>remember (5) 43:13;55:7;126:8; 128:11;138:5 remembering (1) 41:4 remote (1) 128:18 removal (3) 19:6;21:16;22:8 removed (8) 45:16;91:9;98:8; 100:2;104:20; 107:14;120:14,19 rendering (1) 96:5 renew (3) 139:14,21;141:14 renewing (2) 140:12;143:10 repeat (1) 47:24 report (32) 47:19,21;48:1,3,5, 12,16;49:1,19,22; 50:5,10,22;51:2; 54:5;57:19;59:21,22; 67:17;72:21;77:23; 81:23;82:22,23;83:5; 134:7;135:13; 136:11,20;137:1,2; 138:17 reported (2) 8:17;76:22 represent (18) 11:10;20:11;28:20; 37:15,24;46:21; 47:16;56:1;61:15; 69:22;86:4;91:6; 109:4;110:14;113:1; 114:23;115:3;118:3 representation (1) 39:12 representative (2) 58:2;145:9 represented (5) 16:19;115:24; 144:17;146:14;152:6 representing (1) 44:8 repudiate (2) 49:2,13 request (1) 128:23 require (1) 109:18 requirement (1) 141:4 requirements (2) 141:10,12 research (8) 25:20;32:4;125:9; 136:10,20;137:1,2; 150:23</p>
Q	R			
<p>qualifying (2) 141:18;148:21 quantify (1)</p>	<p>R20-16 (1) 20:13 radiation (1) 131:3 raise (1) 70:22 raised (1) 131:2 ranch (1) 137:4 Ranches (2) 137:13;138:3 range (3) 90:21;122:12; 139:17 ranges (1) 25:17 ranging (1) 36:13 rate (3) 68:14,22;139:10 rates (1) 68:17 rather (1) 138:17 rationale (1) 36:20 reached (1) 4:13 read (5) 53:10;56:5,6; 57:18;138:15 reader (3) 52:15;54:8;79:17 reading (2) 30:15;55:7 real (7) 47:21;48:2;69:24; 70:19,21;109:11; 133:21 really (12) 6:3;8:13;50:14; 58:18;60:22;100:16; 102:12;111:15; 134:12;136:14;</p>			

<p>resident (2) 15:3;25:22</p> <p>residential (5) 70:19;71:4;137:11; 149:7,13</p> <p>respect (12) 7:21,24;24:2;34:7; 49:14;71:8;74:5; 109:6,15;116:7,9; 139:5</p> <p>respond (1) 43:3</p> <p>responding (3) 134:9;135:11,23</p> <p>response (2) 128:3;138:13</p> <p>responses (1) 15:14</p> <p>rest (2) 68:14;69:13</p> <p>restate (1) 10:1</p> <p>result (9) 8:8;10:5;11:20; 26:2;36:22;44:3; 62:3;86:3;137:9</p> <p>results (3) 8:17,17;139:1</p> <p>resume (6) 4:4;87:9;133:20; 144:3,24;152:15</p> <p>resumed (3) 4:2,7;87:7</p> <p>review (5) 57:1;87:12,18; 94:13;99:24</p> <p>reviewed (1) 126:7</p> <p>reviews (10) 60:10;65:5;75:4; 78:10;79:3;83:2; 105:13;134:24; 148:5,9</p> <p>revised (7) 9:9;11:1;12:8,11; 15:23;16:18;34:17</p> <p>revising (1) 118:12</p> <p>revisiting (1) 118:13</p> <p>Right (206) 5:5,8;7:2,8;10; 10:21;11:6;12:2; 13:8;14:21;15:4,10; 16:4,7,16,21,24;17:1; 18:9,15;19:4,12,22; 20:19;21:4,5,22;22:2, 10,21;23:19;24:4; 25:13;26:14,17;27:7, 12;28:6,9;29:13,18, 19,24;30:23;32:8,22, 24;33:8;35:2,8,10,19; 37:5;38:17;39:4,4,6,</p>	<p>8,15;40:2,5,12,14; 41:7;42:5,8;43:4,10, 14;44:24;48:20;50:2; 52:22;53:23;54:4,10, 20;56:16;57:1,7,22, 23;59:9;63:3,7,9,10, 13;64:7;66:6,14,17, 18;67:7,8,12,21; 70:14;72:1,2,9,17; 73:23;75:20;76:1,14; 77:7,22;78:20;79:8, 10,20;80:7,8,11,16; 82:14,17;84:12,13, 22;86:14;87:8;88:21, 22;89:6,11,12,18,22, 23;90:4;91:2;92:3, 10,21;93:13,14,18; 95:6;96:19,20;97:2; 98:5,17,19,20;99:8, 10,17,18,20,21; 100:2,3;101:3,7,12; 102:6;103:11;104:9, 10,16,21;105:2,7,22; 106:14;107:1,5,19; 110:6,7,12;112:8; 113:15,18;114:16; 115:16;117:13,19,20; 119:18,22;120:3; 121:7;122:4;123:24; 124:16;125:1; 126:22,23;127:2,18; 128:18,19;131:13,19; 132:24;133:6; 135:21;136:17; 143:17,21;144:1; 146:19;150:9</p> <p>right-hand (7) 11:17;30:21;37:9; 77:8;98:19;115:15; 120:14</p> <p>right-of-way (42) 4:18;6:10;10:19; 14:15;15:6;16:15; 20:20;24:12;26:20; 36:5,13;38:2;40:23, 23,24;43:13;60:8,13, 17;61:1;73:21;76:10, 13;89:4;92:8;103:6, 15,18;106:4,21; 108:9,10;111:1; 112:18;113:19; 114:9;118:20; 121:11;129:16; 131:7;132:10,15</p> <p>river (4) 34:21;137:16,18, 20</p> <p>road (69) 21:19;22:13,19; 26:13;32:12;35:18; 39:4,15;40:12,15,15, 21;41:11,12;43:8; 44:24;51:20;52:4,13;</p>	<p>54:6,14;56:3;57:7, 21;59:18,23;61:8,9, 17;67:19,23;72:13, 22;74:11;75:19; 76:18;82:1;84:20; 85:14,14;88:11; 99:12,12,13;100:5,7, 7,22;101:4,6,22; 103:1;104:5;106:17; 110:21,22,24;111:11; 113:2,5;117:22; 118:19;119:5;121:9, 10,19;129:4;132:4; 151:4</p> <p>Rock (1) 150:9</p> <p>role (1) 141:20</p> <p>rough (1) 20:18</p> <p>roughly (1) 15:16</p> <p>route (10) 6:21;8:23;12:20; 40:2,4;46:23;49:18; 50:7,13,23</p> <p>ROW (1) 102:20</p> <p>Roy (1) 126:17</p> <p>run (5) 5:2;31:14;87:23; 88:7;137:19</p> <p>runs (2) 111:23;136:16</p> <p>rural (2) 137:5,13</p>	<p>39:2</p> <p>saw (7) 56:19;66:9;77:4; 85:13;94:14;98:15; 103:21</p> <p>saying (12) 7:1;34:8;42:20; 43:2;78:3;93:19,23; 94:5,6;95:7;125:2; 145:14</p> <p>scale (1) 12:24</p> <p>scattered (1) 149:7</p> <p>schematics (1) 37:16</p> <p>school (2) 69:4,6</p> <p>screen (6) 9:7;14:22;29:24; 34:23;51:22;83:5</p> <p>screened (2) 12:4,5</p> <p>screening (11) 22:8;24:16;30:9; 31:16;44:7;45:9,12, 16,20,21,22</p> <p>scroll (10) 11:11;53:7;60:6; 62:5;71:14;72:3; 82:10;85:18;125:6; 134:22</p> <p>seated (1) 47:24</p> <p>SEC (2) 125:23;139:6</p> <p>second (13) 4:14;9:8;18:20; 21:22;28:19;34:17; 36:2;63:19;79:4; 92:15;134:23;135:3; 136:3</p> <p>second-guess (1) 70:24</p> <p>section (6) 29:11;68:10;90:12; 148:21;149:14,15</p> <p>seeing (5) 28:4;32:6;63:17; 77:12;90:21</p> <p>seem (2) 140:9;141:21</p> <p>seems (1) 75:14</p> <p>segment (2) 18:18;150:7</p> <p>sell (2) 58:9;84:7</p> <p>seller (1) 56:2</p> <p>sells (1) 106:20</p> <p>sends (1)</p>	<p>69:3</p> <p>sense (6) 12:23,24;13:20; 14:13;145:21;150:2</p> <p>sentence (3) 65:24;95:18; 148:11</p> <p>separate (1) 68:10</p> <p>September (1) 56:3</p> <p>septic (1) 86:6</p> <p>serves (1) 48:16</p> <p>SESSION (2) 4:1;113:13</p> <p>set (2) 133:10;150:1</p> <p>setting (1) 110:19</p> <p>setup (1) 34:16</p> <p>several (2) 12:21;144:8</p> <p>shadow (5) 106:14;117:17; 123:23;131:8,13</p> <p>shall (1) 62:8</p> <p>Shawn (1) 46:19</p> <p>shed (3) 97:6;98:18;105:7</p> <p>Sheet (10) 18:19,23;21:12; 22:11,20;23:2;29:16; 37:17;44:15;45:3</p> <p>sheets (1) 12:16</p> <p>short (1) 53:20</p> <p>show (10) 18:16;21:12;65:10; 69:16;83:4;100:1,15; 111:23;119:11; 131:21</p> <p>showed (1) 91:14</p> <p>showing (6) 12:9;34:24;63:24; 88:7;91:20;100:21</p> <p>showings (1) 56:10</p> <p>shown (2) 19:20;54:11</p> <p>shows (29) 64:2,17;68:16,18, 19;70:1,2;76:9; 78:19;89:14,24;91:4, 17;97:5;98:4,5; 100:11;101:19; 104:23;105:23;</p>
--	---	---	---	--

S

107:4,11;112:16; 119:9,21;120:12; 121:2;123:14;127:1 shutter (2) 77:7,8 side (9) 11:17;21:15;27:13; 37:9;41:8;98:19; 115:15;120:15; 137:18 sight (2) 41:14;42:9 signature (1) 135:4 signed (1) 135:2 significant (3) 95:21;130:22; 150:18 similar (11) 17:17;27:19;31:8; 34:15;52:8;81:9; 85:13;88:13;124:13; 128:14;136:10 similarly (1) 42:2 simply (7) 94:6;95:11;96:4; 111:4,22;140:9; 146:7 simulation (2) 123:3,17 simulations (1) 122:22 single (1) 136:14 single-family (3) 70:3;71:4;78:4 sit (8) 59:1,2;116:19; 117:1;120:10; 121:23;140:8;151:16 site (9) 5:9;42:4;57:19; 112:1,3;124:8; 125:15;126:15; 139:19 site-specific (7) 8:21;42:3;44:9; 48:12;101:23; 138:18,23 situation (4) 33:15;107:16; 108:23;128:9 situations (1) 18:10 six (1) 70:7 size (2) 83:23;106:13 skip (2) 107:8,9 small (6)	5:1;35:19;82:8; 84:8;90:12;96:1 sold (23) 4:17;7:13,18,19; 8:3,5;52:6;56:15; 64:6;65:1,8;66:17; 69:12;79:16,18;82:9, 11;94:8;95:23;96:18; 107:24;114:16;117:6 Somehow (1) 142:7 someone (2) 49:8;146:21 sometime (1) 85:7 Sometimes (4) 63:20;74:18;78:24; 145:21 somewhat (1) 124:12 somewhere (3) 90:2,13;145:24 sorry (14) 10:1;17:9;28:11; 32:11;34:2;47:6,23, 23;50:8;51:1;58:23; 66:7;69:20;71:20 sort (9) 4:18;25:4;32:4; 49:9,17;96:7;110:3; 113:14;142:7 sound (2) 115:7;143:17 sounded (1) 135:8 sounds (1) 23:24 south (6) 28:10;29:24;35:18; 37:8;40:7;51:17 southerly (1) 21:14 spans (1) 136:15 specific (6) 8:16,18;55:14,17; 97:15;101:23 specifics (1) 151:14 spend (2) 104:1;112:13 spent (2) 75:10;103:1 split (1) 22:13 spoke (1) 146:4 spokesperson (1) 51:17 spreadsheet (11) 9:9;15:8;36:1; 87:13;89:3;94:24; 102:19;103:5;108:6;	110:5;113:9 spring (1) 141:24 square (10) 16:20;52:7;88:6; 92:7,12,20;98:11; 106:1;132:8,9 squares (2) 37:13;122:2 stand (3) 39:15;108:3;139:4 standing (2) 10:18;38:13 start (6) 11:10;14:20;46:24; 51:18;52:3;141:22 started (2) 41:10;133:3 starting (1) 40:19 starts (1) 78:3 state (13) 52:4;89:8;96:23; 99:13,15;106:22; 114:10;139:13; 141:11;142:2,4; 143:9;145:13 stated (11) 47:3;55:5;102:3; 125:8;129:20;130:3, 17,20;135:12;144:7; 147:12 statement (6) 52:13;81:10;109:6; 147:10,13;148:22 states (10) 60:7;62:7;63:1; 78:4;79:12;89:3; 118:21;141:9,13; 144:8 station (2) 32:1;150:12 statistical (2) 4:19;138:6 statistically (1) 4:23 status (3) 56:4;58:19;59:3 step (2) 4:14;26:4 Steve (2) 51:8;56:23 Steven (1) 115:11 Stewart (1) 127:4 sticks (1) 142:7 still (3) 27:3;47:12;93:13 stock (1) 4:17	story (1) 79:5 straight (1) 136:17 Stream (1) 151:3 street (14) 27:10,15,18;67:20; 68:3,4;71:14;100:11; 114:5,7,24;122:18; 152:7,10 string (1) 137:21 structure (44) 13:21;14:2;18:1,3, 5,11;23:16,16,23; 24:3;27:21;32:21; 33:16;38:24;42:19; 43:24;46:2;73:7,9, 12;75:16;76:11,14; 77:4,17;90:3,12,19, 22,23;92:6;96:7; 97:17,18,21;98:5; 99:14;102:13,14; 107:22;114:20; 121:4,6;128:4 structures (46) 10:6,8;14:14,17; 15:20;18:7,12,14; 23:20;24:22,23; 26:24;28:5,15;33:19; 34:6,7;36:23;38:20; 41:12;46:6,8;75:2,12, 23;76:18,23;95:13, 14;98:9;101:1,6,9; 108:3,4;109:17; 110:18;114:11; 116:10;117:8; 118:22;119:21; 121:14,22;122:12; 123:5 studies (9) 5:5;8:24;48:6,8,9; 59:5,8,12;88:14 study (47) 6:3,11,13;7:20; 8:12;50:24;51:3; 53:13;59:18;60:21; 62:22,24;63:14; 64:17;65:15,17; 71:12;72:11,14,16, 20;73:14;76:3;77:19, 20;78:2;79:7,17; 80:15,19;81:21; 82:10,17;83:15; 84:16;85:2;103:10; 123:4;133:19; 134:10;136:8,9,10, 11,11,13;152:6 subdivide (2) 149:19,23 subdivision (3) 48:9;137:14;150:6	subdivisions (2) 137:5,15 subject (3) 23:9;30:18;67:18 submit (2) 20:5;125:19 submitted (8) 48:22;49:16;61:2; 111:15;115:18; 116:1;123:3;144:24 submitting (2) 56:23;57:5 Subsequent (1) 49:7 subsequently (2) 102:9,22 substation (1) 32:2 successors (3) 62:6,10;86:22 sufficient (1) 141:14 suggest (2) 140:13;148:23 suggesting (1) 102:12 summarize (1) 146:12 summarizing (2) 73:11;95:11 summary (3) 63:21;81:6;126:7 Suncook (2) 40:11,16 supplemental (12) 51:21;54:6;56:24; 57:6;124:2,6;125:5, 7;143:20;144:21; 145:1,3 suppose (1) 50:16 Sure (17) 21:4;22:21;29:4; 30:14;57:9;69:1,9; 75:7;77:22,23;79:1; 86:9;104:22;106:7; 124:18,19;125:3 surrounded (1) 150:12 survey (1) 60:15 suspect (3) 58:10;139:17; 142:9 suspicion (1) 142:6 system (3) 69:4,7;86:6
T				
table (5) 13:22,24;16:14;				

26:17;36:19 talk (7) 34:12;109:8;114:4; 124:2,6,7;130:6 talked (5) 4:11;21:16;57:18; 126:16;138:16 talking (9) 6:17;52:3;93:21; 94:1;103:1;115:10; 119:22;128:12; 131:22 talks (1) 126:10 tall (7) 14:14;42:10;75:14; 101:9;116:18,23; 118:4 taller (8) 10:6;16:8;28:22; 29:6;31:11;46:1,7; 99:7 Tanguay (5) 46:14,15,18,19; 51:5 tax (6) 61:6;68:14,17,22; 128:22;132:7 taxpayers (2) 129:13;130:17 technically (1) 28:10 ten (1) 85:7 terminology (1) 53:4 terms (20) 10:23;50:5,11; 53:24;54:5;55:3; 80:13;84:14;96:24; 102:14;104:2; 110:10,11;117:18; 118:21;124:4,13; 125:23;126:12;127:3 Terrain (4) 12:14;18:17,23; 29:15 terribly (1) 145:17 testified (3) 10:22;50:9;126:14 testify (1) 142:24 testifying (1) 126:23 testimony (45) 14:24;42:14;47:5, 8,13;48:17,18,21; 49:2;50:3;51:21; 53:6,11;54:7,11; 55:15,16,18;56:24; 57:6;58:20;87:19; 115:4;116:5;118:3;	124:3,7;125:5,8; 127:4,12;142:15; 143:12,15,20;144:2, 6,11,22;145:1,3,4; 146:13;147:7;149:12 thankfully (1) 46:16 theory (1) 49:20 there'd (1) 110:3 therefore (2) 107:23;149:11 third (3) 31:12;123:16; 131:4 Thompson (5) 133:9,10;136:18; 137:16;150:8 though (2) 23:12;56:9 thought (4) 33:12;67:8;73:21; 88:16 Three (20) 12:3;13:2,4,11,13; 14:11;24:8,10;25:18; 31:9;36:10;37:7; 38:6;39:18;42:1,12; 79:9;122:11,16; 124:22 three-bedroom (1) 79:7 three-quarters (1) 79:1 thrust (1) 7:9 times (4) 55:12;74:20;82:4; 151:20 timing (1) 137:22 today (7) 54:24;87:20; 120:17;127:15; 128:12;139:4;152:3 together (1) 69:23 told (4) 115:6;118:4; 119:20;145:8 tomorrow (1) 133:7 took (2) 68:7;124:14 top (8) 9:17;42:10;86:18; 113:16;132:8; 134:22;139:16; 150:11 topo (5) 23:5,7;30:14,18,22 topographic (2)	19:10;30:15 topography (8) 23:3,13,17;24:1; 30:12;33:23;129:21; 130:15 tops (1) 45:23 total (2) 5:1;113:14 totally (1) 26:3 toward (1) 24:16 towards (2) 22:7;31:16 tower (52) 10:6;15:23,24,24; 16:5,9,17,19;17:2,14, 15,19,20;18:1;21:1, 20,21,22,23;22:3,7,9, 18;23:3,8,8,23;24:3, 6,16;28:4,21;29:3,5, 23;30:1,9;31:12,16; 32:21;38:3,7,20,23; 39:7,8,13,16;43:23; 131:9,13;150:11 towers (18) 13:13;14:11;15:2, 17;17:4,6,6;24:9,10; 29:11;31:9,10;37:7; 38:6;42:10;45:20; 129:15;130:8 Town (5) 34:12;66:3;130:1; 131:17;132:5 towns (1) 11:9 tracking (1) 118:12 tracts (2) 137:6,6 transaction (13) 53:3,3,16;54:1,9; 55:1;57:12,22;73:14; 80:21,23;81:8;83:19 transcript (4) 54:12,17,23;55:3 transition (1) 150:12 transmission (31) 6:12;7:18;73:22; 83:17;85:23;86:10; 88:18;89:8;93:11; 96:16;98:12;106:24; 114:13;116:22; 127:16;128:1;134:2; 135:16,18,20;136:14; 137:10,18;138:10,21; 148:12,14,16;150:4; 151:8,13 Transportation (2) 115:19;116:2 tree (18)	73:19;89:17;90:18; 91:5,8,15;100:1; 101:20;105:14; 107:5,11;114:21; 115:5;119:9,11,17; 120:12;132:17 trees (13) 45:24;75:11;76:20; 77:4,12,18;90:13; 91:8,9;106:7;107:13; 120:2,18 tried (4) 91:19;108:16; 130:2;131:17 trigger (1) 31:22 trimming (1) 91:8 tripled (2) 24:24;25:1 true (5) 32:24;50:4,9; 115:9;148:18 truth (1) 134:12 try (4) 55:21;59:19;109:7; 133:16 trying (6) 10:10;39:2;72:17; 75:11;78:14;136:1 turn (20) 26:10;29:14;32:8; 34:11;35:24;51:22; 53:5,7;61:13,18; 63:18;68:16;71:11, 19;72:11;74:21; 77:19;85:9;88:3; 128:20 turned (1) 102:10 Turns (2) 136:23;140:10 turquoise (3) 20:5;22:4;119:20 Turtle (1) 82:1 TV (2) 9:5;51:10 Twenty-four (1) 14:2 two (32) 5:23;12:10;24:8; 25:18;31:5,10;36:2; 37:7;43:6;56:9;75:5; 77:3;93:16;94:14; 98:8;99:5;101:1,6; 111:19;112:16; 113:12,22;121:3; 122:2;123:14; 124:19;125:3;127:2; 131:5;135:14,22; 137:7	two-story (2) 78:20,22 typed (1) 135:5 types (3) 135:22;137:3,7 typical (4) 14:15,16;29:11; 38:3 typically (2) 53:17;54:2 typo (2) 67:19;131:4 <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> ultimate (1) 5:7 ultimately (2) 65:1;136:23 unadjusted (1) 130:18 unaffected (1) 84:4 uncertainty (1) 131:2 under (22) 24:13;36:4,14; 47:2;50:3;62:24; 65:17,22;67:23; 73:13;78:7;79:18; 80:21,22;81:5;82:24; 83:19;113:19,20; 130:20;141:15;151:7 underlined (3) 138:14;148:8,21 underlying (1) 136:8 Understood (1) 34:8 Underwood (8) 59:8;72:24;73:2, 15;80:22;83:15; 84:11,15 Underwood's (2) 74:6;81:10 undeveloped (2) 149:18;150:15 universe (1) 53:12 unless (1) 98:1 unlikely (2) 128:4;151:12 unmarketable (1) 129:18 unmolested (1) 151:4 unobstructed (2) 15:20;97:20 unquote (1) 125:13 up (46)
--	--	--	--	---

<p>9:7,8,11;12:7,13; 13:22;16:2;20:10; 27:14;28:11;30:21; 34:16;35:6;36:1; 40:4,20;42:5,8; 44:15;51:22;52:1; 54:16;55:10,13; 61:14,21;63:23;72:3; 75:22;85:9;91:19; 92:16;94:4;108:9,11, 18;110:5,11;111:23; 113:13;129:16; 132:7;133:2;134:22; 137:17;141:13</p> <p>update (1) 111:8</p> <p>updated (1) 111:6</p> <p>upgrade (1) 85:24</p> <p>upon (2) 49:24;62:8</p> <p>usable (1) 129:17</p> <p>use (14) 7:12;25:2;53:24; 61:10,16;62:17;73:3; 84:16,21;85:13,21; 86:3,4;136:21</p> <p>used (3) 11:5;68:3;92:2</p> <p>useful (1) 8:2</p> <p>using (3) 83:3;124:5;142:22</p> <p>utility (2) 8:14;19:3</p>	<p>130:11,23;134:3; 147:9;150:20,24</p> <p>Value/Sale (1) 65:23</p> <p>valued (1) 67:1</p> <p>values (4) 48:23;49:24;70:11; 149:14</p> <p>vantage (1) 41:1</p> <p>variety (2) 58:9;60:17</p> <p>various (1) 137:3</p> <p>vary (1) 36:12</p> <p>vegetation (7) 19:6;20:1;22:2; 42:4,7,9;46:3</p> <p>vegetative (8) 10:5;20:23;22:8; 24:15;30:5,8;33:24; 45:4</p> <p>Vermont (1) 151:3</p> <p>versus (1) 30:13</p> <p>vertical (2) 75:12;105:15</p> <p>vicinity (5) 105:6;106:9;117:3; 120:8;121:3</p> <p>view (22) 15:2;17:9,14,18; 24:2,21;38:13,19,19, 22;39:12;64:14; 67:20;68:3,4;71:14; 97:20;122:18;150:9, 17;152:7,10</p> <p>viewed (1) 27:10</p> <p>viewing (4) 15:5;18:14;38:13; 98:16</p> <p>views (2) 15:20;17:3</p> <p>visibility (42) 10:1,4,7,15,18; 15:11,17;18:2;36:6, 22;41:5,24;42:15,18, 23,24;43:5;44:5,13, 20;46:4,5,8;73:12; 78:7;89:10;95:12,13, 20;96:7;99:14;102:9, 13,14,21;107:22; 109:21;110:18; 112:7;113:15,17,21</p> <p>visible (74) 17:24;18:2,3,5,8, 10,13;23:16,24;24:9, 10;27:1,4,24;31:9; 33:17,20;39:7;42:19;</p>	<p>73:1,1,1,6;74:4,8; 75:23;76:17,23;81:3; 88:20,20,21;89:5,21; 90:11,13,14,15,18; 91:13;93:11,13; 96:15,15,23;97:9,15; 98:23;99:1,3,3,15,16; 102:3,4,6;106:22,23; 108:13,15;114:10,11, 12;117:8,9,10,15; 118:21,23;119:24; 120:3;121:15,16; 130:5</p> <p>visit (3) 74:9;112:1,3</p> <p>visited (5) 11:9;60:2;82:5; 115:2;119:6</p> <p>visits (1) 112:4</p> <p>visual (7) 26:23;44:9;45:9, 12,15;123:4;131:1</p> <p>vulnerable (1) 94:8</p>	<p>wetness (1) 129:21</p> <p>what's (14) 19:18;31:4;32:17; 38:8;40:8;41:6;47:9; 78:16;96:6,6;115:24; 124:17;129:2,2</p> <p>whatsoever (2) 136:13;151:6</p> <p>white (4) 92:20;106:1,1; 122:2</p> <p>Whitley (15) 4:3,5,8;9:4,6; 32:10,14,18;33:1,5,9, 13,14;46:10;51:8</p> <p>Whitley's (1) 115:11</p> <p>whole (2) 124:5;150:1</p> <p>wholesale (1) 139:1</p> <p>window (3) 77:8,9;128:5</p> <p>windshield (1) 5:21</p> <p>winter (1) 90:24</p> <p>Winterberry (4) 72:3,4;152:7,10</p> <p>wires (6) 24:22,24;28:15; 99:17;100:16;102:2</p> <p>wishes (1) 149:18</p> <p>within (11) 19:2,10;62:4; 85:24;110:24; 111:21;112:18; 131:7;138:9;149:9, 10</p> <p>without (3) 70:24;134:16; 139:2</p> <p>Witness (11) 60:10;65:5;75:4; 78:10;79:3;83:2; 105:13;126:17; 134:24;148:5,9</p> <p>witnesses (9) 126:10,12,13,14, 14,19,22;127:3,7</p> <p>wondering (2) 135:2,6</p> <p>wood (1) 75:6</p> <p>word (2) 29:2;53:24</p> <p>worded (1) 135:7</p> <p>words (2) 47:6,12</p> <p>work (4)</p>	<p>50:20;97:13;139:5, 20</p> <p>working (3) 61:6;135:18;139:9</p> <p>works (1) 59:21</p> <p>worth (2) 139:20;140:12</p> <p>write (1) 99:19</p> <p>write-up (1) 82:7</p> <p>wrong (6) 27:11;52:20;77:6; 103:22;135:12; 147:15</p> <p>wrote (3) 52:13;53:10;80:22</p>
X				
Xs (1) 122:3				
Y				
yard (4) 93:17;104:8,18; 129:22				
year (7) 64:2;68:19;139:15; 142:12;143:7,23; 144:22				
years (3) 52:17;56:9;70:7				
yellow (8) 35:15;37:12,13; 92:11;98:11;114:6; 120:24;148:8				
Yeses (3) 110:5,12,16				
yesterday (5) 4:11;9:10;47:1; 87:14;127:15				
Yup (2) 14:23;129:24				
Z				
zoom (3) 12:22;13:4;94:21				
1				
1 (5) 12:15;59:15;96:6; 143:15;147:19				
1,000 (1) 138:9				
1/31/2016 (1) 143:7				
10 (4) 65:20;67:2,5;87:5				

<p>100 (7) 41:13;104:14; 105:1;110:24; 111:21;112:18; 149:10 100-foot (1) 150:11 101.5 (1) 101:14 104 (1) 124:4 105 (1) 79:12 106 (5) 63:9;65:24;66:16, 21;121:4 106-foot (1) 121:4 10-foot (1) 43:20 10th (1) 80:2 11 (1) 97:5 110 (3) 25:19;122:12; 123:15 110-foot (1) 122:16 1121 (1) 59:22 1122 (1) 59:21 1123 (3) 17:7,14;22:24 1124 (11) 13:17;15:24;16:17, 19;17:3,15,20;21:1; 22:19,23;28:22 1125 (7) 17:19;21:21,23; 22:7,20;24:16;28:21 1126 (8) 29:3,5,10;30:1,4,9, 13;31:16 1131 (1) 67:17 1143 (1) 72:21 115 (5) 92:18;94:16;98:7, 10;106:1 1168 (1) 77:23 1192 (1) 81:24 12 (3) 96:13,22;125:17 120 (2) 37:18;116:17 1200 (1) 82:23 125 (1)</p>	<p>121:5 1256 (2) 59:20,23 125-foot (1) 120:8 1266 (1) 67:17 127 (2) 16:19;37:20 1278 (1) 72:20 1280 (1) 72:18 13.8 (1) 121:11 13.9 (1) 67:10 130 (1) 37:19 1303 (1) 78:1 132 (1) 12:20 1327 (1) 81:23 1335 (2) 82:22;83:5 1391-76 (1) 106:2 14 (9) 36:5;88:24;89:15; 91:9,22;92:23;100:8; 125:7;126:22 14.4 (1) 118:20 149 (1) 121:10 15 (5) 87:5;127:9;138:8; 142:11;147:19 150-lot (1) 137:13 15th (2) 65:11,12 16 (2) 78:2;105:22 160 (1) 118:4 165 (3) 115:20;116:23; 118:5 165-foot (1) 117:3 169 (1) 34:18 16th (2) 64:22;143:13 17 (4) 51:23;56:3;62:7; 125:17 17th (3) 143:6,19;144:18 183 (1)</p>	<p>138:3 18th (2) 64:3,17 19 (1) 86:23 1965 (1) 78:5 197 (2) 9:16;87:15 1985 (1) 124:9 1988 (1) 130:9 1989 (1) 129:9 1990 (2) 129:9;130:7 19th (1) 64:19 1st (1) 80:10</p>	<p>2</p> <p>2 (4) 12:12,12;88:3; 130:20 2:05 (1) 4:2 20 (4) 29:5;64:8;134:7; 137:17 2010 (2) 80:3,10 2011 (14) 52:5,15,21,23;64:3, 17,20;66:11,22;70:4, 5;79:16;80:7;83:8 2012 (6) 63:23;64:22;65:2, 8;66:15;133:19 2013 (4) 56:3;65:13;141:24; 142:10 2014 (3) 142:7,10;143:6 2015 (11) 47:19;48:1,16; 52:6,6,15;111:14; 143:13;144:18; 145:14;146:1 2016 (1) 70:4 2017 (2) 75:1;143:19 20-foot (1) 31:13 21 (1) 125:8 215 (1) 111:3 216 (2) 37:10,19</p>	<p>217 (2) 37:10,17 218 (4) 37:9,18;39:8;43:24 219 (1) 63:23 230 (1) 124:19 24 (3) 13:23;53:9;105:6 24.9 (1) 71:24 242 (3) 18:19;22:11;23:2 243 (2) 21:12;29:16 247 (1) 125:22 248 (1) 79:23 25 (3) 13:17,23;14:3 251 (1) 74:22 252 (1) 61:13 253 (3) 85:10;114:7,24 254 (2) 63:18;64:1 255 (1) 68:16 256 (5) 87:18;88:3;100:9; 107:11;118:1 257 (1) 69:17 258 (1) 132:3 259 (2) 55:10,24 25th (2) 75:1;79:16 26 (4) 13:17,23;14:4;70:6 260 (1) 128:21 269 (1) 76:12 28 (4) 40:2,4;140:2,8 29 (1) 107:11</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3 (5) 51:17;61:23;71:19, 20;96:7 3.9 (2) 16:15;20:20 3:52 (1) 87:6</p>	<p>30 (4) 53:6;70:6,7;137:17 30th (3) 47:19;48:1;65:8 31 (1) 37:9 3132-146 (1) 122:8 3132-81 (1) 93:4 3132-86 (1) 101:2 32 (4) 37:9;148:18,24; 149:8 32-18 (1) 14:13 322 (1) 44:16 32-mile (1) 150:7 33.7 (1) 89:4 35.9 (1) 66:1 36.1 (1) 103:7 37 (4) 99:12;100:5,22; 101:22 37.5 (1) 103:21 380 (2) 133:24;134:18 39.2 (1) 96:14 393 (2) 114:2;116:3</p>	<p>4</p> <p>4 (6) 24:13;53:7;55:16, 17;89:13;147:19 4:11 (1) 87:7 40 (8) 16:1,3,8;28:22; 31:11;36:14;118:1; 137:17 407 (1) 76:13 41 (20) 51:20;52:3,13; 54:6,14;56:3;57:6, 21;59:18,23;61:9,17; 67:19,23;84:20; 85:13;101:5;102:24; 104:5;111:11 43 (2) 94:17;119:1 44 (2) 59:18;152:6</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--	---	---

<p>441 (1) 61:8 45 (8) 72:11,16,20;92:22; 98:10;104:24;106:3; 123:10 456 (1) 100:8 46 (3) 59:15;77:20;78:2 47 (2) 81:21,24</p>	<p>6117 (5) 13:8;26:12,13,17; 29:20 6122 (1) 13:10 615 (1) 13:7 67 (1) 113:5 67.3 (1) 99:13 69 (2) 64:8,9 6c (1) 12:16</p>	<p>8929 (14) 35:14;36:15;40:10, 11;41:2,5,7,23;43:13, 15,22;44:3,17;45:8 8947 (9) 35:17;38:16;39:4; 43:9,15,22;44:3;45:1, 8 8949 (1) 45:17</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>		<p>9</p>		
<p>5 (6) 55:15,18;67:20; 68:3,4;71:14 5:31 (1) 152:17 50 (13) 25:19;41:13;59:11; 96:2;104:12,24; 127:18;128:2,17; 130:10;131:7,9; 132:20 5-0 (1) 127:19 50/50 (2) 94:5;95:9 500 (4) 72:12;136:15; 137:4;149:9 516 (2) 106:16;107:4 52 (1) 101:16 540 (3) 30:19;31:1,3 55 (2) 14:17;29:12 56.5 (1) 101:17 569 (2) 72:12,22 5-7 (2) 118:19;119:4 590 (3) 30:22;31:1,3 5th (1) 48:16</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>7 (7) 60:8;61:4,19,23; 103:5;125:23;126:1 7.1 (1) 52:10 7.6 (2) 60:11,24 7.9 (1) 26:20 70 (2) 43:17,18 74.5 (3) 115:6,21;116:16 75 (5) 14:4;29:10;38:4; 94:17;104:20 78 (1) 63:12 7904 (1) 92:20 7905 (1) 92:2</p>	<p>9:00 (1) 152:16 90 (3) 14:4;16:4;25:19 92 (1) 101:14 94 (1) 9:22 95 (1) 14:3 96 (1) 79:14 98.2 (1) 114:9</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">6</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>8 (2) 51:23;52:3 80 (2) 36:13;43:15 81 (1) 132:4 82 (1) 35:13 829 (1) 35:9 83.5 (1) 94:18 86 (2) 81:24;85:14 89 (1) 9:23 8927 (3) 35:2;36:3;40:2 8928 (4) 35:14;40:10;41:2,7</p>		
<p>6.7 (1) 106:20 60 (1) 25:19 61 (1) 113:1 6115 (6) 13:7;14:21;15:9; 20:14;22:6,18</p>				