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P R O C E E D I N G S

(Hearing resumed at 9:00 a.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right. Good morning, everyone. Before we resume with the witnesses, I understand the parties have had some discussion about the confidentiality issue that came up yesterday. Mr. Bisbee, you want to grab the microphone here?

MR. BISBEE: I can kick it off. I don't think this will take long. As the Applicants have raised with the Committee in a couple of motions, there is a concern between the SEC process and the DOE Section 106 process about treating certain documents confidentially. The order, Mr. Chair, that you issued a couple of weeks back recognized that tension between 106 and the SEC.

The Applicants have been trying to find that middle ground to be respectful of the DOE process where they have asked. It's not a dictate. But they have asked that the documents provided in the 106 process be treated confidentially. That's why the request was made to have those documents be made available
through the DHR offices. DOE agreed with that approach.

Certain parties have accessed the documents at DHR, and they have them now, and I think the question before the Committee is how you want to treat these documents before these hearings. The Applicants continue to be respectful of the DOE in this, but we also understand that the SEC needs to follow dictates of state law and treat the documents in a way that's consistent with state law confidentiality. There's no state law confidential concern with respect to the aboveground documents. Those would be inventory forms and effects tables. That's different from the archeological reports which are, in fact, confidential under both state and federal law.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Anyone else have anything they want to offer on this? Ms. Boepple?

MS. BOEPPLE: Thank you, Chair. Yes. Beth Boepple for the Forest Society. The position that we're taking, and I believe it's consistent with the other Intervenors is that DHR is not treating these as confidential documents, and
that, therefore, they should not be subject to any kind of confidential order under the SEC.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Mr. Iacopino?

MR. IACOPINO: Do I understand that DHR has been providing those documents to the public upon request?

MS. BOEPPLE: That's correct. In fact, this stack right here is representative of those documents.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: It seems then that if DHR is not treating it as confidential, then it's not confidential for our purposes.

MR. ROTH: It's been my understanding, and I am a consulting party on the 106 process, but none of the information I've been using was obtained through the 106 process. I got it either from the Applicants through exhibits that they filed in this case or with respect to the Large-Scale Project Area Forms. I went over to DHR and obtained copies that way.

I had thought that there were redacted stuff in the Large-Scale Project Area Forms that were submitted to the Committee, and that if the idea was if you wanted to see the unredacted
one, you had to go to DHR. I don't intend to put the unredacted Project Area Forms on the record or even to display them or certainly not talk about any of the redacted material.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Okay. Anyone else on this topic? Yes. Mr. Whitley.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to put on the record that I concur with Attorney Boepple's opinion that if DHR is treating these as available to the public, then I think that's the way the Committee should do as well, for the aboveground records at least.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Okay. Anyone else?

MR. ROTH: I would urge anybody who's using the Large-Scale Project Area Forms to respect the redactions and not reveal that information.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Seems reasonable. And, I assume, Mr. Bisbee, you're paying close attention to what gets posted and used?

MR. BISBEE: Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right.

Mr. Roth, are you ready to go?
MR. ROTH: Ready as I'll ever be.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: We'll be picking up Day 27. Mr. Roth, you may proceed.

MR. ROTH: Thank you.

CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROTH:

Q Good morning, Ms. Widell, again.

A (Widell) Good morning, Mr. Roth.

Q And, again, Ms. Bunker, you're not being detained. You're free to go.

MS. BUNKER: Thank you.

MR. ROTH: Although the policeman in the back may feel differently about that.

Q I'm going to start this morning with a little bit about the definition of historic sites, and in particular, the definition that is extant in the Site Evaluation Committee rules. I assume from our conversation yesterday that you are familiar with the SEC rule, and, in particular, Site 102.23?

A (Widell) Yes, I am.

Q Okay. And you indicate in your Supplemental Testimony and probably in your Original Prefiled that the only example of a historic site is
what's National Register eligible, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And you take from that that, therefore, the Site Evaluation Committee rules should be limited in terms of defining historic sites to those that are National Register eligible, correct?

A (Widell) What the Site Evaluation Committee does with its definition is its judgment. I interpret it as the example is National Register eligible, and that is what we followed.

Q Okay. So it's your interpretation of Site 102.23 that it's limited to National Register eligible?

A (Widell) That is the only example we're given. That's quite comprehensive.

Q I understand that was your testimony, but my question for you is is it, therefore, your interpretation that 102.23 only applies to National Register eligible?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Okay. And isn't it true that you and the Preservation Company essentially reviewed all of the historic resources that are in the report of October 2015 for National Register eligibility?
Q And if it wasn't National Register eligible, you would then, therefore, not go on and do an effects analysis, correct?

A (Widell) No. Not exactly. I would clarify. We included anything that appeared potentially eligible. The agency that's responsible for determining eligibility is DHR.

Q Okay. I appreciate that. That's an important distinction, and I didn't mean to overlook it, but I did. So you did treat if they were potentially eligible?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q But if it was not potentially eligible or in fact eligible, you didn't treat it any further?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Okay. But isn't the plain meaning of 102.23 much broader than that?

A (Widell) It's different.

Q Different?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q In what respect?

A (Widell) It's a different definition than the definition for historic properties under Section
106 for properties that are eligible or listed on the National Register.

Q Okay.

A But I would say that the definition encompasses most everything I can think of that would be eligible for the National Register.

Q Okay. So you add this extra gloss because that's within your, the extra gloss of potentially eligible or eligible because that's your experience and your judgment, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Okay. And 102.23 says any building, structure, object, district area or site that is significant in the history, architecture, archeology or culture of the state, its communities and the nation, then it says, "and includes National Register eligible," correct? Did I read that right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Are you saying that the word "includes" essentially means to you exclusively?

A (Widell) Exclusively? Can you clarify that, Mr. Roth?

Q Are you saying that the word includes means that
it must be exclusively National Register eligible?

A (Widell) We considered anything that might potentially be historic property. We started with anything that was built prior to 1966.

Q But in terms of interpreting 102.23, your interpretation of is 102.23 is that it must be National Register eligible, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And so the word "includes" you're essentially saying means exclusively National Register eligible, isn't that correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Okay. Isn't that actually the opposite of what the rest of the provision seems to intend?

A (Widell) I would say no. I think there's an understanding generally that properties on or eligible for the National Register or nationally significant, and that is not the case. Most properties eligible or listed on the National Register have local significance, and that's certainly the case in the Northern Pass Project. We know that from the green sheets that are developed by the DHR for review of these
properties where it is actually checked either locally, state or nationally significant.

Q But that's simply part of it being National Register eligible, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. But if it was not National Register eligible, but otherwise was significant in the history, architecture, archeology of the state, you wouldn't include that, would you?
A No. That's not true. Let me explain. I would, we would look at comprehensively and that would include things that were eligible for the National Register.
Q But I thought you said that you would only do an assessment of things that were potentially eligible or actually eligible. Now you're saying that you would assess things that were not potentially eligible or eligible?
A (Widell) Those sorts of things would be eligible for the National Register.
Q Right. But what if they're not? What if, let's say, for example, a property doesn't, isn't potentially eligible, but it still has, it's still significant in the history of New
Hampshire? Or the history of the town of Lancaster?

A (Widell) We took in all information on properties for consideration under eligibility.

Q Did you actually exclude properties that you didn't consider to be potentially National Register eligible?

A (Widell) Sitting here, I cannot think of an example.

Q Do you believe that you did? I'm not asking for a specific example, but do you think that you did?

A (Widell) Our review was very comprehensive, and I can't think of an example.

Q Okay. I didn't ask you for a specific example. My question was do you think that you excluded properties that were not potentially eligible for the National Register?

A (Widell) Yes. Because basically we were looking for eligible properties and what we were doing was fully compliant with Section 106.

Q Okay. Under Site 102.23, do you see anything in there that indicates that the Committee ought to apply or must apply this 50-year guideline that
you mentioned?

A (Widell) No. There's no mention of the 50-year guideline in this definition.

Q And it's not really a rule, is it? It's just a guideline, correct?

A (Widell) The 50 -- help me understand your question.

Q This 50-year parameter, let's call it, is not actually a federal rule. It's simply a guideline.

A (Widell) Yes. It's a guideline. Yes. Properties that are less than 50 years are eligible for the National Register under something called Criterion G.

Q Okay.

A (Widell) And we kept that in mind in review.

Q Now, in your Supplemental Testimony, you indicated that if the SEC rule requires analysis of an extraordinary number of properties, that's beyond reason. Do you remember that?

A (Widell) No. I do not. Can you --

Q On page 6 starting on line, I guess it starts on line 3. You were criticizing Ms. O'Donnell's testimony about the 12,904 resources that she
identified, and you said, "Based on my experience, this is an extraordinary number of properties to suggest for review under Section 106, and in my opinion, it is beyond reason to imply that this is required under 106 and the SEC rules," correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Now, are you saying that simply because there's a lot of them? Should a project escape review because it's too big?

A (Widell) No.

Q So why is it beyond reason if we're looking at the plain meaning of Site 102.23?

A (Widell) I think it's important to talk about the properties that Ms. O'Donnell is implying should be considered. They are basically a list of different types of properties, most of which are current use parcels that are over 10,000 of the 13,000 properties that have, may be significant, may be eligible for the National Register. But for the most part, they are -- she listed them as being, should be considered because they were current use parcels and no other reason.
Q And you don't think conservation is an important aspect of its potential eligibility for the National Register?

A (Widell) Conservation is definitely one of the areas of significance, and it was taken into consideration, but the conservation would, once again, normally be something that was a part of its significance for at least 50 years, and I believe the current use parcel law dates to approximately 1973. So none of those properties would have been part of the conservation, historic conservation movement in New Hampshire that I'm aware of.

Q But you've already agreed that the 50-year guideline is not present in the SEC rules, right? And you've already agreed to it's just a guideline, not a rule, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Okay. Do you agree that open space and conservation are important to the culture in communities and the State of New Hampshire?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Do you think that they are, as the rule says, significant in the culture of this state?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. Have you heard the expression "money talks"?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And doesn't it mean that if something is important, people should invest their money in it to show that?
A (Widell) I guess. Yes. I don't know the definition exactly but I'll take your word for it.
Q Certainly people invest things, invest money in things that aren't terribly important all the time, but this is, it's my understanding that current use is a way for the community to put its money where its mouth is, correct?
A (Widell) I guess. Yes.
Q And because there's a tax break that goes with that; is that correct?
A (Widell) That is my understanding. Yes.
Q Okay. And you also seem to disagree that by designating resources as important to them at the workshops that I held last summer that people in those communities are showing that those resources are important to them culturally...
and historically. Am I understanding you correctly?

A I'm sorry. Could you repeat that? Especially the first part of that question.

Q In your Supplemental Testimony, you take issue with the identification of resources by community members at the workshops I held last summer. Do you remember that?

A I don't think I took issue to the identification of resources by local community members. Could you clarify that?

Q I think you described it as misguided.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Isn't that taking issue with it?

A (Widell) Could you show me precisely because I don't want to take my words out of context.

Q These are your own words.

A Yes.

Q So page 7, line 14. So the purpose of the workshops as I recall them last summer was to elicit from community members what they thought was important in their community. Is that your understanding as well?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q  Do you believe, do you disagree that -- well, let me phrase this question differently because maybe you don't disagree.

Do you agree with me that by designating resources as important to them at those workshops that people in those communities were showing to us that those resources were significant to them, to their community, culturally and historically?

A  Yes. They were showing that they believed these properties had significance to them within their community.

Q  Okay. Thank you. You didn't attend any of those sessions, did you?

A  (Widell) I did not.

Q  Were you in New Hampshire when any of them were happening?

A  (Widell) I'm not sure. I may well have been.

Q  Okay. So you don't have any basis for saying in your testimony that the attendees were Intervenors or representatives of Intervenors, do you?

A  (Widell) Sitting here, no. I cannot say that.

I have looked at the list of community
properties that were suggested at those workshops, and I have seen maps of their locations, but no, I don't know precisely the individuals mentioned.

Q Okay. Because in your testimony, you said the attendees, many of them Intervenors or representatives of Intervenors, et cetera. You don't know that. And so this statement in your testimony on line 5 and 6 is just not true, is it?

A (Widell) I'm not sure of that.

Q You don't have any basis for saying it, do you?

A (Widell) I may have -- no, I'm not sure of that.

Q Okay. Thank you.

So I'm showing you Counsel for the Public Exhibit 397 which is National Register Bulletin 15, if I'm not mistaken. Have I gotten the right document?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Thank you.

A Thank you.

Q That's good to know. Isn't the National Park Service criteria that's described in this bulletin limited to National Register
eligibility?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Okay. That's what it's all about, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And I think we already covered this, but your definition of a cultural landscape would also require it to be eligible for listing in the National Register, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Doesn't that mean then that any other landscape that might otherwise be important to and significant and valuable in a community under the Site Evaluation Committee rules would not be considered if it didn't meet National Register eligibility?

A (Widell) Would not be considered for listing on the National Register?

Q No. Would not be considered by you for an effects analysis.

A (Widell) Yes. That's true.

Q Now, in your testimony you mentioned that you did look at some cultural landscapes, and you specifically mentioned the North Road and the Weeks State Park, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q And did you consider any others that you can recall?

A Sitting here, I cannot recall them right now. I believe we did, but those are two that I distinctly remember.

Q And isn't it true that North Road isn't really a cultural landscape? It's a historic district or an agricultural district?

A (Widell) No. Let me explain though. The National Park Service talks about cultural landscapes, but for National Register they use historic districts, rural historic districts as the way to define them because cultural landscapes are not listed as a type of property that could be listed on the National Register. And so that's why North Road is a rural historic district, and so that's how you would define it as a resource that's eligible for the National Register.

Q It's my understanding that at the moment the Applicants and DHR and DOE are working on 11 cultural landscapes, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. Technically, it's 10. One was
Deerfield which has been determined not to have a culture landscape after the study. So yes.

Q And is North Road one of those?
A (Widell) North Road is part of the Upper Ammonoosuc River cultural landscape.

Q So is it fair to say that cultural landscapes tend to be considered on a much larger scale than simply a historic district like North Road or Weeks State Park?
A (Widell) No, not necessarily. Rural historic districts can be very large. They can be a thousand acres or more. So, but yes, generally, the term tends to include larger areas but not always.

Q And North Road is over 1000 acres, correct?
A (Widell) No. Not North Road itself is not. When we identified it as a historic district more than a thousand acres -- I'm sorry. Excuse me. I have made an error in that. I was talking about -- there is Northside Road, and there is North Road, and I have just in my head confused the two. Northside Road is part of the Upper Ammonoosuc cultural landscape. North Road is part of the North Road and Lost Nation Road
cultural landscape that's been identified so --

Q Okay. Thank you for that clarification. That's helpful.

A (Widell) Thank you. And yes, North Road is more than a thousand acres. Yes.

Q Thank you. You assert that resources you considered are locally significant, and I think we -- strike that. You already answered that.

We don't really have any nationally significant places along the route, do we?

A (Widell) No. That's not true. The Daniel Webster Farm is a National Historic Landmark that is along the route.

Q And that's near the converter terminal in Franklin?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Thank you. And that's the only one?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q All right. Your memory is better than mine. I had forgotten that.

Did you include in your analysis that was submitted in 2015 any places that had traditional cultural significance?

A No.
Q  Or Native American? I guess that would be traditional cultural?
A  (Widell) Yes. But no, I did not. We did not include any.
Q  Okay. I want to go back a little bit to the identification of resources, and I know we covered this some yesterday, and I think we established that identifying them is the first thing that you do, correct?
A  (Widell) Yes.
Q  And then once you've identified them, then you do a significance and integrity analysis, correct?
A  (Widell) Yes.
Q  For determining National Register eligibility?
A  Yes. In answering your question, that's generally what you would do for a survey. We would also look at the viewshed mapping to determine whether there is any possibility for an effect.
Q  And so in looking at your testimony, you indicate that it's -- the way you did it is, in terms of the identification, is you looked to see whether a resource had a, quote, "sufficient
visual relationship." Is that correct?
A  Certainly. For relationship to the Project, but that does not relate to significance or integrity.
Q  Understood.
A  Okay.
Q  But we're still talking about identification again.
A  (Widell) Yes.
Q  So in terms of identifying you've got to your APE, and you've already screened on the 50-year guideline, and then the next thing you do is you look for the sufficient visual relationship?
A  (Widell) Yes.
Q  Or do you do that first?
A  No. You look for significant visual relationship.
Q  Is first? Or 50 years first?
A  (Widell) 50 years first. The broad -- and in our case we had 1284 properties that we identified that were within the APE. And then which ones, they were plotted on a map with the associated parcels, and then used the viewshed mapping to determine whether those properties
might possibly be affected visually by the Project.

Q Okay.

A (Widell) And then you look at significance and integrity.

Q So you started out at 1284, and after you applied the sufficient visual relationship test, how many did you have left?

A (Widell) 194.

Q 194. Okay. And then after the 194, you end up at 12, correct? In terms of having an adverse effect?

A (Widell) Yes. There's quite a bit of work in between --

Q Oh, I understand.

A (Widell) -- those two numbers.

Q I'm just trying to keep track of the accounting here.

A Yes. That's correct. Now, that is in my original testimony, but that number has changed.

Q Okay. And we'll get to that, I think. So the 1284 to the 194, that looks to me like something like just over a thousand resources drops out, right?
Q And that was done based on the computer model?
A (Widell) No. It was done by the process that I just described to you which may -- the viewshed mapping may eliminate a number. If there is no possibility of a view within the property or its associated parcels, then those were removed from the list as well unless there was any possibility for a direct effect.
Q Okay. So how many dropped out for no possibility of a view?
A (Widell) I can't tell you that right here. It is on the database.
Q Okay.
A (Widell) Each one of those properties, there is a very thorough database that records precisely the process that I'm talking about.
Q But you don't know that number. How many dropped out?
A (Widell) No.
Q So is no possibility of a view the only viewshed or I should say sufficient visual relationship factor that you applied or was there another one?
A (Widell) No. It may have been distance or very, very minimal.

Q So distance or a very minimal?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And was that done by the computer model or was that done by you?

A That was done onsite.

Q Onsite meaning you went out there and looked at a thousand or more properties and said this one has only minimal or distant views?

A (Widell) No. Remember, we're beginning with the viewshed mapping, and if, according to the viewshed mapping there, is no area which is indicated in purple on these forms of any view of the Project, then those were eliminated.

Q Okay.

A (Widell) So that is computer-aided, yes. If that's what you were referring to.

Q Yes.

A (Widell) Okay.

Q So you dropped out a bunch, but you don't know the number?

A That's correct.

Q Based on no possibility of a view, correct?
A (Widell) Correct.

Q How many did you actually go out and look at to determine whether the view was very minimal or distant?

A (Widell) All of those that might have shown some viewshed mapping, but we would have proceeded if there was any indication that you could see it visually. Once again, if the Project was visible now, then with increased heights it's likely to have visibility. So those then move to our computer modeling as well.

Q I guess I'm a little confused, and maybe it was because I was thinking ahead. But so you don't know the number of the ones you went out and visited, correct?

A (Widell) We visited all 194.

Q So I guess I don't want to sound like, you know, who's on first, what's on second, but so the 1284 drops to 194 under the sufficient visual relationship test, correct?

A (Widell) And also significance and integrity.

Q We're going to talk about that in a minute, but the 1248 to 194 is based -- is it based primarily on the sufficient visual relationship?
A (Widell) The 1284 to the 194 is based on those two things. Significant visual relationship and significance and integrity.

Q So it's significant visual relationship. Or I think the way you corrected your testimony yesterday was substantial?

A (Widell) No. That was specifically related to discussion of, I believe, Weeks State Park.

Q Okay.

A (Widell) We could check that.

Q So it's not a sufficient visual relationship. It's a significant visual relationship.

A (Widell) Well, you have, whether there is any visual relationship at all, and that is minimal or no visual relationship, and then you're looking at whether there is a significant visual relationship because only if there is one can it diminish the features that make the property significant and eligible for the National Register.

Q If all you're considering is a direct visual analysis, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q So I'm probably going to move on from this
because I don't feel like I'm understanding it. So we go from 1284, you applied the sufficient visual relationship test which has some elements of significance and integrity mixed into it, and then you get to 194. But you don't know how many were lost in terms of no possibility of view, correct?

A (Widell) That would be recorded on the database very clearly.

Q And then you said you applied a distance and very minimal view test, and you don't know how many that was either.

A (Widell) That, too, is on the database so that would be able to be determined.

Q As I understand the way the analysis works, maybe I'm wrong about this, I thought that the question of integrity and significance comes up after you've identified the resource. And those are the two steps to determining National Register eligibility. So you start with identification, and I understand you applied this sufficient or significant or maybe it's possibility or maybe it's minimal or not minimal visual relationship. And then you go, then you
should go to whether it has significance and integrity. Isn't that the way that the process actually works?

A (Widell) No. If I can just do a brief explanation, and if you need more, I'll be happy to go into it more, but you separate --

Q You disagree with me. So it's my understanding that once you've determined that it's National Register eligible, that's when the visual relationship comes in to determine what the effect is on that National Register eligible property. Isn't that correct?

A (Widell) Not exactly. You have to determine the significance of the property because if there is no significance related to visual importance, its setting, the landscape, viewsheds from perhaps a summer cottage, if it is only significant for its architecture, then it doesn't have, it has no possibility of being affected by a visual adverse effect.

Q But in the analysis that you and the Preservation Company did prior to October 2015, you didn't do the research to determine whether a property had significance or integrity before
you made that screening, did you?

A (Widell) No. I would disagree with that statement. In looking at the individual historic properties and doing basic research which is available on line which is what was done for these properties, a professional that meets the National Park Service standards is trained in how to apply the significance criteria to determine whether it's recreation or tourism or whatever or whether the architecture has picture windows or a porch that looks out over a view of the mountains. Those are what we call character defining features, but basically they're the things that show you how the building or property is significant.

Q And I want to go back to Mr. Boisvert's letter of December 2nd, 2015. And can you give me Page 3?

Mr. Boisvert said, "The application notes that little historic research was completed for the project area, for individual properties, or for potential historic districts. Conclusions as to whether a property was considered historic were based upon a visual assessment and the
consultant's judgment, rather than on an understanding of a property's history and an analysis of its significance within the larger contexts of architectural or historic patterns of development in the community." That's what he said, right?

A (Widell) That's what he said.

Q Do you consider Mr. Boisvert to be an expert on these kinds of things?

A Yes.

Q And so if he concluded that the work that was done by you and the Preservation Company prior to October 2015 was not based on research and was instead based on a visual assessment and judgment, why should we look at this any differently?

A (Widell) Because we depended on the Project Area Forms at the time that were being completed by the Department of Energy for the Section 106 process. Project Area Forms give you context for each of the four regions through which the Northern Pass corridor Project is going, and so that greatly informs anyone that is looking at historic properties and why they are
significant.

Further, Preservation Company has been doing architectural inventories in the State of New Hampshire for at least 30 years and has done extensive amounts of work for other Projects in many of the communities that are touched by the Project. We did basic research, we did some title searches on some of these properties because that's very now possible online. We used ancestry.com and other online materials to do basic background research.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Roth, what's the date of that Exhibit 420?

MR. ROTH: December 2nd, 2015. And I misspoke about the author of this letter. The author of the letter was not Director Boisvert. It was Edna Feighner.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

BY MR. ROTH:

Q Is it fair to say that regardless of all that work and expertise and everything that you just described, you haven't persuaded Ms. Feighner and DHR that this was done the right way?

A (Widell) They categorized it as not having done
enough document research.

Q And so my question to you earlier about this not being based on research, and instead being based only on a visual relationship and now you've added judgment, I think, there's some basis for that. It's not just me making an interpretation. This comes from DHR, doesn't it?

A (Widell) I disagree with the statement. It does come from DHR, but I disagree with that finding completely because --

Q I understand. You've explained that already. Thank you.

A (Widell) -- the Project Area Forms are critical to --

Q Ms. Widell, you've already made your explanation. Thank you.

So in order to determine this visual relationship, you didn't use a bare earth analysis, did you?

A (Widell) No.

Q Instead you assumed that vegetative screening was fully and permanently effective, correct?

A (Widell) I don't think we assumed that it was
permanently in place. No.

Q But for purposes of you're analysis, you treated it like it was a brick wall, correct?

A No. We took it into consideration in our analysis.

Q So if it screened the Project today, your assumption is it's always going to screen the Project; isn't that true?

A (Widell) No. We did not make any assumptions. Our responsibility was to assess effects now.

Q Okay. But you didn't make any opinion about whether the trees will or will not stay; is that what you're saying?

A (Widell) That's correct.

Q So I'm coming back to the determination of minimal or more than minimal views of the Project. That was sort of your, is that kind of your breakpoint for whether you included a property for further analysis?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q When you went from 1284 to 194?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q If I'm getting the numbers right. Could another expert go out and come up
with that same result?
A (Widell) Experts may disagree.
Q But if they went out with, say, your forms or your database, could they go out there and repeat that result with any precision?
A (Widell) With some precision, yes, because it was based on the viewshed mapping and whether you were able to see more than minimal views of the existing transmission line from a public place on the property.
Q From a public place on the property?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q So that's an additional criteria that you applied.
A (Widell) Yes. That was the only place we were able to visit at that point.
Q So if a property had an important view from the back porch, you wouldn't have taken that into account. That property would have gone off?
A That's not true. We weren't able to take that account into view right on the property, but with the 3D modeling through Google Earth, we were able to look at views from throughout the property.
And how many did you do that for? All 1284?

No. That is the computer 3D modeling testified that I discussed in my testimony.

Okay. So the computer then did that.

Yes.

Okay. And so if somebody, if another expert didn't have the same computer model that you had, they wouldn't have been able to reproduce that result, would they?

I can't speak to that.

So once you identified what you were going to include, and I assume this takes us down to the 194 number? Maybe I'm misremembering it.

Yes. 194. Then you screened it. Which did you do first? Did you screen for integrity first or significance first or which order did you do it?

It would always be significance first.

So you did significance first and then integrity?

Yes.

So let's talk about significance. Back to 397. Okay. Can you blow up the criteria for the evaluation? A, B, C, D?
So I take it from this, this is, can you see this?

A  (Widell) Yes. I can. Thank you.

Q  So this is from Counsel for the Public Exhibit 397. This is the National Register Bulletin 15. And this describes the criteria for significance, correct? This particular, that I'm showing you?

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  And that is associated with events that made a significant contribution, associated with lives of significant persons, correct?

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  And embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, et cetera, or D, that have yielded or may likely yield information important?

A  (Widell) Correct.

Q  Correct?

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  And those are the famous four Criterion, correct?

A  (Widell) Yes. They are.

Q  And when the Preservation Company did their
analysis up to October 2015, they didn't employ those Criterion, did they?

A (Widell) That's not true. These are exactly the Criterion that we applied.

Q Their reports say that they looked at significance and integrity, but the Criterion were not explored in their report, were they?

A (Widell) That's not true.

Q Instead they used a shorthand method to discuss significance, correct?

A (Widell) I do not understand what you mean by a shorthand method.

Q Can you give me Applicant 14831. So in their discussion of significance, this is what they used in every case to determine significance, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q This standard.

A (Widell) Um-hum.

Q And this standard doesn't include any reference to any of the Criterion, does it?

A (Widell) Not exactly. But let me explain. The criteria for A which is broad patterns of history, as we generally talk about, that refers
to large historical events, and they wouldn't necessarily just be like a battle or something. They are, for example, in New Hampshire it would be tourism or forestry.

In this case, these particular areas actually have been identified as the areas that fall under Criterion A and would have a possible viewshed or landscape or setting that would be related to things that are visually important for the historic property.

So agriculture, certainly, because a farm is sitting in a set of fields and may have views of the mountains. Community planning and development would usually be a town. Conservation we talked about. Landscape architecture or recreation. Those take their significance perhaps from a visual component. So it's very important to identify that early on in evaluating why a historic property is important. So this is a refinement of Criterion A.

Q So this is a distillation perhaps of one of the Criterion, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
But it doesn't directly reference any of the four Criterion, does it?

It doesn't mention Criterion A precisely, but any professional working in our field would understand that that is the Criterion that it's related to.

Okay. But at best, from what you've just said, all it does is reference Criterion A. It doesn't mention B or C or D, does it?

That's true.

And on its face it, at least, it doesn't seem to reference any of them, does it?

It doesn't mention A, B, C or D.

It doesn't mention the word Criterion either, does it?

It mentions the word significance which is if you're evaluating for National Register, you're always looking at whether it meets Criterion A, B, C or D.

And is it true, I showed you one example here, and I will concede and admit that at least in the analysis of this, can you unbold that and go down to the next square?

In this case, and I'm not going to ask you
to analyze this case, they actually did mention one of the Criterion in their discussion, but in terms of the standard they applied, they didn't mention any of the criterion in the standard, correct?

A (Widell) Can I read this just a second? Excuse me. (Reading document)

Q A moment ago you said Criterion A is the one that's related to visual components.

A Yes.

Q But isn't it last true that in some instances Criterion C is visual as well?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q So I didn't want you to feel like I misled you, but is it fair to say that, is it accurate that in all of the many, many reports that the Preservation Company did and presumably with your oversight and concurrence, this definition of significance is what they worked with, correct?

A (Widell) I do not agree. No. I do not agree that it is a definition of significance. These are precise examples which apply to the context of the significance found with cultural
resources in New Hampshire in the area of potential effect.

Q But every one of the, every one of these separate resource analyses done by you and the Preservation Company uses the same shorthand rubric, doesn't it?

A (Widell) Every single one of the assessment forms in the assessment report that was done in October 2015 does, yes.

Q Yes. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Roth, can you just identify the document that's now on the screen which is the page 14831 that you had called up?

MR. ROTH: This is Application Appendix 18.

MS. MERRIGAN: It's Applicant's Exhibit 1.

MR. ROTH: And I'll be referring to that a number of times today.

BY MR. ROTH:

Q Now let's talk about the integrity factors. So go back to that document.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, may I take a bio break?

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Absolutely.

Take ten minutes.
A Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Understood.

Mr. Roth, you may continue.

MR. ROTH: Thank you.

BY MR. ROTH:

Q So the next step that the Preservation Company did in its evaluation of these various properties is they looked at integrity, correct?

A (Widell) Correct.

Q And in this instance, it appears that they actually identified in their analysis and in each of these reports that they did the 7 aspects of integrity, and we're going to show them to everybody. And those 7 aspects of integrity are design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, location, association.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And just as an aside, when you're learning this stuff in school do they give you one of those little memory devices so you know them all?

A (Widell) No. Not exactly. You really learn this field by looking at building and building and resource after resource and describing them.
And that is how you learn to apply the --

Q Through repetition.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And according to -- can you give me 397 again?

So I'm showing you again Counsel for the Public Exhibit 397 which is the National Register Bulletin. Our old friend. And on page 45 of it, it says -- bear with me a moment. It says over here on the right-hand column assessing integrity in properties, you see that?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q It says integrity is based on significance. Why, where and when a property is important, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And only after you've established significance, can you proceed to the issue of integrity, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And ultimately, the question of integrity is answered by whether or not the property retains the identity for which it is significant.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And you agree with that?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q And given the short-shrift in my view that Preservation Company gave to significance, how is it possible to reach an appropriate result on integrity?

A (Widell) I do not agree that Preservation Company and I was involved in looking and helping to describe the resources made short-shrift of significance.

Q So in your Prefiled Testimony, you identified 12 properties out of the 1280 or whatever the number was, what was the number again, the big number?

A (Widell) 1284.

Q 1284. I'll write that down so I won't forget it. Out of the 1284 properties that you started with, using your one-mile APE?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q You came up with 12 properties that you believed made it through all the screens and were adversely affected, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And that's attached to your Prefiled Testimony, your Original Prefiled Testimony, I believe, as
Exhibit B.

A Yes. No. Attachment B.

Q Attachment B to your Original Prefiled, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q Original Prefiled, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q So this is Attachment B to your Original Prefiled which is a list of the 12 properties that made it through all this screening as of October 2015, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q And has this list changed? Is this still the 12?
A (Widell) The list has changed in my Supplemental Testimony I submitted that we now have determined there would be 6 adverse effects.

Q So the list is now reduced by a half?
A (Widell) Yes. It is.

Q Okay. So which one of these, which ones of these are no longer on the list?
A (Widell) Would you like me to go through each one and describe how or why they are no longer there?

Q No. I just want you to tell me which ones are
A (Widell) Quimby-Fife house, in Deerfield is no longer on the list. Montminy Farm and Country Store is no longer on the list. Locke Neighborhood and Jeffers Farm Neck technically are no longer on the list, but they have renamed and combined together as the Peaked Hill Historic District. Baker Brook Cabins and Motor Inn area are no longer on the list. They have been demolished.

Q The entire thing?

A (Widell) Enough to lose its integrity.

Q So just, it's my understanding that all that was demolished has not yet been demolished and that's the ranch house, correct?

A (Widell) In my most recent visit to this site, the ranch house did still exist, but much of the cabins on that side of the road had been demolished.

Q Okay. Well, that's interesting. All right. So that's gone. One more?

A (Widell) The Northside Road Agricultural Area and Leighton Farm are not on the list. They have, they are part of the Upper Ammonoosuc
River Cultural Landscape Study Area.

Q So they could as a cultural landscape come back?
A (Widell) Correct.

Q And similarly with Peaked Hill or Peaked Hill, I guess, is the way they say it.
A (Widell) No. Actually Peaked Hill is on the list of 6 in my Supplemental Testimony. The one that could come back is Montminy Farm and Country Store which is the Suncook Valley cultural landscape.

Q I guess I'm confused about Peaked Hill and Jeffers Farm. Are they on the list or are they off the list or are they combined?
A (Widell) The Locke Neighborhood and Jeffers Farm are on the list of six. They are combined in one resource named the Peaked Hill Historic District.

Q Okay. So if we count down the list again, we have the Lindsay Menard cabin, Maple View Farm, Peaked Hill, Weeks State Park, North Road, and Dummer Pond Sporting Club?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q And the Northside and Leighton could come back as a cultural landscape?
Q And Montminy could come back in the cultural landscape, right?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q Now I want to go through some of these properties and we'll start with the Quimby-Fife House, even though you say it's off the list, because I want to look at some of the analysis that was done in terms of finding National Register eligibility and adverse effect.

If you look at the adverse effect analysis of Montminy or Quimby Farm which is Applicant's Exhibit 1 Appendix 18 on page 14930 we have some boxes checked and showing an adverse effect.

A (Widell) Sorry. I don't see that page on my screen.

Q My mistake. Sorry. We're going to look at integrity first, and the analysis of integrity.

A (Widell) Okay.

Q So if you look at 14929, under B, there are some boxes checked there; design, setting, workmanship, feeling, and then one sentence of analysis, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Does that seem rather conclusory in summary to you?

A (Widell) No. I think it's pretty comprehensive.

Q So it doesn't talk about anything about the setting, does it?

A (Widell) Yes. It states very clearly that the integrity of the setting is intact. The box is checked for that.

Q Right. But the analysis and the discussion of that particular box check doesn't even mention the word setting, does it?

A (Widell) The box check is setting. I would also refer back to the discussion of the boundaries and the statement of significance for the property which would talk about the setting of the property. That's where you would find, you wouldn't find a discussion of the character-defining features in a discussion of integrity. You would find that in the discussion of significance of the property.

Q If you can back up to, if you look at the discussion of significance, I don't see the word setting in there either so I'm just, I guess the point I'm trying to make and I'm surprised you
don't agree, that this one sentence of analysis
of integrity is rather conclusory and summary,
isn't it?

A (Widell) No. The evaluation of each of those
Criterion under integrity is an excellent way of
evaluating the existence of integrity for each
of those areas which as you saw in the National
Register guidance, it is incumbent upon the
professional that is doing this form to
understand what each of those Criterion means
and apply that in the field.

Q I don't doubt that Ms. Monroe who is not a
witness here understands what the aspects of
integrity are. What I'm suggesting to you and
I'm asking you is do you think that this one
sentence of discussion of integrity actually is
anything more than conclusory or summary?

A (Widell) I think it supports the evaluation of
each of those elements of integrity because it
specifically goes to discussion of the
architecture and why --

Q Let's look at the next one at 14985. This is
the Deerfield 138 which is the Lindsay Menard
Cabin which I believe agree still has an adverse
impact. And here again in the integrity
discussion, we have now three sentences, but it
does not provide anything more than summary or
conclusory information about that integrity
analysis, does it?

A (Widell) I think it conveys sufficient
information related to the integrity of the
setting, design and all of the other Criterion
in integrity. Once again, there is so much more
information that has also been added to this.
We have an entire survey form, inventory form,
which is used by DHR.

Q Yes.

A And has even more information.

Q That's great, but --

A (Widell) So that information has also factored
into my review.

Q No, it didn't. Because that information didn't
exist when you made your review in October of
2015, did it?

A No, it did not. Not the inventory forms.

Q So in here, looking at the integrity of the
Lindsay Menard Cabin, I don't see any reference
to design, workmanship, feeling, location, or
association.

A (Widell) Every single --

Q Nothing.

A (Widell) I'm sorry. I have to disagree. Every single one of those Criterion are listed on the form and checked.

Q A box checked.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Yes. Okay.

I'll go to Pembroke 37, 15131. Now we're looking at same Appendix 18 of Applicant's Exhibit 1. Page 15131. And this is the Montminy Store which you said continues to, you said is off the list but is now in the Suncook cultural landscape.

A Yes.

Q Correct? And when are we going to finally see the cultural landscape assessments?

A (Widell) There have been two submitted to DHR at this point. They have mostly been completed, and I do not know the final date for submission, but I believe it will be very shortly completed because I have seen drafts of all of the materials.
Okay. Do you think it would make sense for the Site Evaluation Committee to consider all those 10 cultural landscape assessments and have another opportunity to talk to you about them?

I think it would be very important for DHR to see the materials.

Not DHR. The Site Evaluation Committee.

I believe that would be up to them, but my understanding is that they depend on DHR as their expert for their expertise in the field of cultural resource.

So you don't think it would be worthwhile for you to come back and talk to the SEC about those 10 landscape forms when they're polished up?

I would be happy to come back and speak to the SEC if anything in my expertise would be beneficial to them in their decision making.

We're looking at 15131, and this is with respect to the Montminy property which includes the little store and a farmhouse and such, right?

Yes.

And, again, with respect to integrity, there seems to be a little bit more analysis of integrity, but I would, I submit to you, do you
not still believe that this is summary and conclusory?

A (Widell) No. I think there's quite a bit of information in this describing specifics related to the barn, the setting.

Q And in light of its being, in light of the information?

A (Widell) -- subdivision, the surrounding setting as well.

Q In light of the importance of the Criterion for significance, it doesn't mention any of those Criterion for significance in this analysis, does it?

A That's not true. The significance would be on the previous page so in order to see how those two are related to one another, it would be important to also look at significance. I'm sure they talk about the setting. And in this particular property, what is interesting about it is it moved from a 19th century farm through the tourism industry into the 21st century with a store right there. So that discussion of significance is visible on the landscape, on the setting, which is very, very interesting. It's
almost like having physical footnotes on the setting to tell you the story of a place. I'm sure that they would refer -- being very familiar with this property, I'm sure that that, there is a relationship in that.

Q That's a wonderful expression of significance and integrity, but it's not here in this writeup in this report, is it?

A (Widell) If we go to the page on significance, I'm sure that you would find that information because I reviewed this form and was involved in the discussions about the significance of this property.

Q In Bulletin 15, the National Park Service says ultimately, the question of integrity is answered by whether or not the property retains the identity for which it is significant, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q So how can you analyze integrity without actually discussing significance at the same time, and that's not done here, is it?

A (Widell) Significance is discussed in a different part of the same form.
Q Okay.
A (Widell) As even you mentioned, you first must establish significance. And then the integrity talks about how that significance is expressed on the landscape. So they must relate, absolutely they must relate.

Q No question. But the analysis that's provided on that property in that box for integrity doesn't discuss significance. It just assumes it because of the previous discussion, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q All right. Now let's look at Maple View Farm. 15231. Now we're still in Applicant's Exhibit 1, Appendix 18, Page 15231, and we have the discussion here again, it goes over to 32, the discussion of integrity. Again, do you agree with me that this discussion is conclusory in summary and form?
A (Widell) No, I do not.

Q Okay.
A (Widell) I think it covers the necessary elements to convey the site visit to the property.

Q It mentions setting. That's good. And it does
mention significance, but there's three sentences of analysis here, four maybe?

Now let's look at 15732. And this is, it was called originally by the Preservation Company Locke Neighborhood Historic District, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And in fact, it's the Peaked Hill Historic District, isn't that correct?

A (Widell) It is now incorporated in what has been established as a Peaked Hill Historic District.

Yes.

Q So is there such a thing as the Locke Neighborhood Historic District or is it actually the Peaked Hill Historic District?

A (Widell) It has been expanded and renamed. There certainly is a Locke neighborhood. Yes.

Q But is there actually a thing or an entity, if you will, called the Locke Neighborhood Historic District? Is that a distinct entity from the Peaked Hill Historic District?

A (Widell) Yes. The collection of buildings that are just in the Locke Neighborhood is a distinct collection of properties.
Q Now, I understand from this writeup that this area was home of the Muzzey family and the Worthen family. Correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q In the 19th century?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And do you know whether those Muzzeys are related to Elizabeth Muzzey who works for DHR?
A (Widell) I do not know.
Q So this one as I understand it also is a 214-acre district with a number of significant buildings and landscapes, isn't it?
A At the time that we reviewed it, that was what was incorporated in the study, yes.
Q Okay. And if we look at 32 and the discussion of integrity, again, I submit and apparently you will disagree, won't you, that this is summary and conclusory?
A (Widell) No. I do not agree with that statement.
Q And now let's look at BRIS51 which is 15831. This is the Jeffers Farm in Bristol which you now say is part of the Peaked Hill Historic District?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And here we have a number of boxes checked again, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And a few sentences of summary and conclusory analysis. Do you agree?
A (Widell) No. I do not agree.
Q Now, the Baker Brook Cabins which you said have been destroyed. Historic Resources have a troubling way of doing that, disappearing in mid-analysis, don't they?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q This isn't the only one that I found in this work that between the time the work began and the analysis was completed that something disappeared.
A (Widell) That is true.
Q And I wasn't aware that these cabins were destroyed. Having seen it a number of times, I'm not entirely surprised. Now, again on page 16145, we have boxes checked, and a few sentences of summary and conclusory analysis, and I assume that you disagree that that's the case?
A Yes. I disagree.

Q Now we're going to look at Weeks State Park which is Appendix or Applicant's Exhibit 1, Appendix 18, at page 16666. Now, this is a rather large and interesting property and one that's clearly very important to the people of the State of New Hampshire, do you agree with that?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And here, again, we have your integrity which has a few boxes checked and a fairly summary and conclusory analysis, do you agree?

A (Widell) Yes. There is a difference with this property because it is listed on the National Register. So we have quite a thorough bit of information related to all of its aspects of significance and integrity which we depended upon.

Q So you didn't need to do any of this at all in fact because of that National Register listing, correct?

A (Widell) That's not true. This is not only an identification of historic properties that might be affected by the Project, but also an
assessment of potential effects, visual effects from the Project.

Q  But in terms of going through the exercise of determining whether it's eligible, that's a foregone conclusion.

A  (Widell) That is true.

Q  You didn't --

A  (Widell) I would add one thing. We did not just include the National Register property which is approximately 2.9 acres or so. We also included the entire over 400-acre State Park which is the setting for the National Register listed property.

Q  Okay.

A  (Widell) So we included that as well upon visiting the site and realizing that all of the significance and integrity was probably not talked about in just the National Register nomination so we evaluated over 400 acres which is the entire State Park.

Q  But 400-acre State Park and a National Register listed property, and your discussion of integrity contains no mention of any of the Criterion on which it's significant, correct?
A (Widell) No. The statement of significance is in this same form on a previous page.

Q I understand that, but in the discussion of integrity, there's no mention of the Criterion and the way the integrity relates to the Criterion?

A (Widell) All 7 of the Criterion are listed there and there is reference to that.

Q No. Those are the aspects of integrity. The Criterion for significance are different. Correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Okay. But this discussion of integrity despite the fact that the National Park Service bulletin says you've got to consider the Criterion in addition while you're analyzing integrity, you didn't do that when you discussed this 400-acre State Park and National Register listed place.

A (Widell) No. That's not true. You are always cognizant of the significance of the property when you are evaluating the integrity.

Q But those Criterion are not discussed in this discussion of integrity.

A (Widell) The significance Criterion are not
discussed specifically A, B, C, D in that.

Q Okay. Thank you.

I'm looking at 16763. Now here we actually have a discussion that looks more than summary and conclusory, but I still don't, I don't believe it mentions any of the Criterion on which the North Road Agricultural Historic District was believed to be eligible. Does it?

A (Widell) No, I disagree with you on that, and in this one particularly it talks about farming and the importance of farming, and the significance is under A and C for the North Road Agricultural District. So there is discussion of both farming and --

Q But there's no mention in this discussion of integrity of Criterion A, B, C or D, correct?

A (Widell) That's true.

Q Okay. Now we're going to look at 16921, and I'm still in Applicant's Exhibit 1, Appendix 18, and we're at page 16921 and 22. And we're here walking about the Northside Road agricultural area as it's described in here, and this was one of your ones that you originally had identified as having an adverse effect, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q And now you believe that's going to be melded with the Leighton Farm into a cultural landscape.

A It is within the study area. Yes.

Q Okay. And, again here, we have the discussion of integrity, and at least in this one, if you look at the bottom there of the box, it mentions Criterion C. That's a first, isn't it?

A (Widell) Perhaps from the ones we looked at today.

Q Correct. Let me ask you this. Comparing this to the writeups of integrity in the inventory forms, would you agree with me that the writeups of integrity in the inventory forms are far more comprehensive than what is shown up in any of these descriptions that we've looked at today?

A (Widell) In order to do that, I'd have, I'd want to compare the two side-by-side.

Q Well, you've looked at all these documents already.

A (Widell) I have.

Q In your opinion, are the writeups of integrity a lot more comprehensive?
(WITNESS PANEL: WIDELL, BUNKER)

A (Widell) I'm sorry. Sitting here, I can't state that precisely. You've been asking me whether they stated whether Criterion A, B, C or D. I cannot sit here and remember whether those are mentioned in the discussion of integrity.

Q That's not the question I asked you. The question I asked you is are the writeups in the individual inventory forms or the area inventory forms in general more comprehensive than what you see in any of the things we've looked at here today when they discuss integrity.

A (Widell) I would want to look at them. Sitting here, I can't state that.

Q So did you actually review all those forms and help prepare them?

A I absolutely did, yes.

Q And right now you can't remember whether they have comprehensive discussions of integrity?

A (Widell) I'm sure they have comprehensive discussions of integrity, yes.

Q Do you think that they're more comprehensive than what we've seen in any of these?

A (Widell) I can't speak to that without referring back to them. I'm sorry. Sometimes setting and
other things are more discussed in significance. It depends on the author of the form as well.

Q Okay. Now we're going to move to the same exhibit, page 16967. Again, we have some boxes checked of the various aspects of integrity and a brief analysis, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And you would disagree with me that this is summary and conclusory.

A (Widell) There's some specifics in here related to especially the barn. The materials that were used.

Q And it doesn't mention any of the Criterion on which its significance is based, does it?

A (Widell) It does not.

Q And then the last one of this group is the same Exhibit, 17047. And again, we have a discussion of integrity with some boxes checked, and four short sentences which make no mention of its significance or any of the Criterion on which it was found significance, is that correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And you would, you don't agree or you disagree with me that this is summary and conclusory?
A  This is more summary.
Q  I'm making some progress. Back to 14780.
    Now, in Ms. Monroe's report, and explain to
    me again why we don't have Ms. Monroe as a
    witness here?
A  I can't speak to that.
Q  1478 -- let's see.
A  (Widell) Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this but I
    have to --

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG:  Understood.
We'll take 5 minutes.
A  (Widell) Thank you.
(Recess taken 10:43 - 10:46 a.m.)
PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG:  Mr. Roth, you
    may continue.
MR. ROTH:  Thank you.

BY MR. ROTH:
Q  Now looking at page 10 of Ms. Monroe's report,
    this is Applicant's Exhibit 1, Appendix 18, page
    14780. And if you would highlight that last
    paragraph above the word analysis.
    Okay. I assume you're familiar with the
    sentence as you have worked on this for some
    time. Is it true that this is the sum and
substance of Ms. Monroe's discussion in her report of how to apply integrity to the various properties that she analyzed?

A (Widell) Are you asking me if this is the only mention of it in the methodology? Of the report?

Q Yes. Is this her explanation of applying in her methodology of integrity?

A (Widell) I can't answer that. I'm not sure. I don't know. I certainly read and participated in the creation of the methodology, but I cannot remember precisely if we mentioned integrity elsewhere, but by referring to National Register Evaluation Criteria, it is discussing as we have discussed elsewhere in the methodology the directing documents from the Park Service that teach you how to apply different aspects of integrity, significance, boundaries, whatever.

Q So by incorporating by reference the National Register Bulletin 15, she's saying yes, we did all that, correct?

A That is where we got our direction from, yes.

Q But as far as her discussion of what they actually did in terms of analyzing integrity,
and how they applied Bulletin 15 with respect to any given property that was analyzed or assessed, this sentence is all there is in this report that describes that process, isn't it?

A (Widell) As I said, I'm not sure. I can't speak to that here right now.

Q So other than this sentence, you're not aware of any other discussion in here?

A (Widell) Not that I can think of right now. No.

Q So this is, again, your original list of properties that are, that you thought at that time would have a potential adverse effect. Correct?

A Yes.

Q And these are the 12 instances out of the 1294 that you started with that you and the Preservation Company found an adverse effect?

A (Widell) We don't find the adverse effect. The adverse effect is found in consultation between the lead federal agency and DHR in the Section 106 process.

Q But you didn't do that process when you went through and prepared the report prior to October of 2015.
A (Widell) That is right. That is why we said potentially adverse effect.

Q And you didn't make any determination of your own about whether any of these particular properties would experience an unreasonable adverse effect or potentially experience an unreasonable adverse effect either, did you?

A (Widell) For an individual site, no.

Q No. So, if, for example, the North Road Agricultural District would be unreasonably affected, you'd make no opinion about that one way or the other?

A (Widell) No.

Q Okay. Would you agree with me that without going through the other, and I'm not sure how many there are because it's a little bit murky in terms of the modeling and the fact that you don't know what all the screening numbers led you to, but if we went through all the other properties that were screened on integrity and significance by you and the Preservation Company, the analysis of integrity would be provided in these reports with a similar level of detail and attention. Is that fair to say?
A (Widell) Let me rephrase your question so that I make sure I understand it.
Q Let me rephrase it for you since I'm not clear.
A (Widell) Okay.
Q In the many assessments that were done, and I don't know how many of them there are, you made and the Preservation Company made an assessment of integrity, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And we just talked about 12 of them?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And you heard me say on each occasion that I thought, and you disagreed with me, but I said those were summary and conclusory, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q Is there anything that you're aware of at this point that would suggest that all of other ones would, that if we went, if we took the next four days and went through every one of them, would we find anything different with the rest of them?
A Sitting here I don't think so. No. I think they would be very similar.
Q All right. Thank you. When you and
Preservation Company analyzed for effects, you focused only on visual impacts, correct?

A (Widell) No. We also included direct effects. We mentioned that. In the underground portion.

Q Let's look at that page 10 again. This, again, is Ms. Monroe's report and this is Appendix 18 of Applicant's Exhibit 1 and we're at page 14780. And this says E, analysis of potential visual effects. And you said for those properties that we considered to have potential National Register integrity and significance under visual areas of significance we made assessments of potential visual effect of the Project on the historic property, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q So other than visual areas of significance and potential visual effect, what analysis or what effects did you analyze with respect to, with respect to any of the properties?

A (Widell) There is a part of the methodology that discusses how we identified the location of historic properties along the underground. It's a very brief discussion.

Q Didn't you, in fact, in your Supplemental
Testimony claim that the undergrounding was in fact a way of the Project minimizing and that there wouldn't be effects of the Project on the resources along the underground?

A (Widell) Yes. That is true. I believe that they determined at least 200 properties would, historic properties that might have been visually affected would not be visually affected by the underground portion of the Northern Pass.

Q You said that there's a discussion in here about direct effects caused by the undergrounding in Ms. Monroe's report, and I can't find it.

A (Widell) No. I did not say direct effects. I mentioned that we identified, we discussed how we identified historic properties that potentially could be affected by the underground, and it was a very summary discussion about that.

Q But for the rest of the properties, the only thing that you analyzed was in terms of effects was visual?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Okay. In doing so you said you relied on the Virginia and Vermont guidelines.
A (Widell) No. Let me clarify that. The Virginia and Vermont Guidance Document is a tool that assists you in applying the 36 C.F.R. 800 which is the federal regulations for determining an adverse effect on historic properties under the Section 106 process.

Q Okay. I'm going to look at the Vermont Guidelines and go through them with you a little bit. Can you pull up 416?

So I'm showing you Counsel for the Public Exhibit 416 which I understand is the Vermont Guidelines that we're talking about. Is that your understanding or do I have that correct?

A (Widell) I believe so. The ones that I'm most familiar with have the Vermont on there, but I will -- yes. They look very similar.

Q This document is called Criteria for Evaluating the Effect of Proposed Telecommunications Facilities, Transmission Lines and Wind Power Facilities on Historic Resources.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Did I read that right? Don't these guidelines also tell you to look for direct impacts relating to construction?
Q Did you or the Preservation Company do any analysis of direct construction related impacts other than the teardown of the Baker Brook ranch house?

A (Widell) No, but my colleague in archeology certainly looked for direct impacts.

Q But we're talking about the aboveground resources, correct?

A (Widell) That's correct.

Q All right. And in assessing the indirect impacts you focused on four of these criteria. Primary public views visible from the resource, Project distracting focal point, and Project isolates resource from setting. Aren't those the four criteria that you assessed properties for indirect impact?

A (Widell) Visual.

Q Yes.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q So there are just those four, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q But the Vermont guidelines have several other criteria, don't they, that you didn't apply.
Let's look at them. If you see under Indirect Impact, that second portion of it, it says, for example, and the first one looks like one maybe you and the Preservation Company probably applied. Important public views kind of a thing, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q But number two, a significant intrusion into a hillside backdrop of an important historic building or group. You didn't apply that one, did you?

A (Widell) Not precisely in those language, no.

Q And number 3, looks like maybe you did apply that. A focal point, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q But number 4, whether it creates an intrusion in the setting of a National Historic Landmark?

A (Widell) Yes. We definitely took that into consideration.

Q Do we have any -- we only have one National Historic Landmark on the route, yes?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q So you did that for that one property?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. Do you know whether there are any National Historic Landmark outside the APE and within three miles?

A (Widell) No. I don't know.

Q So if there were, you wouldn't have applied this criteria to it because you excluded it as being outside the APE, correct?

A (Widell) I'm not sure what you mean by that. If it were, if they were a National Historic Landmark within three miles of the Project and not within the APE? No. We probably would not.

Q Okay. Good. Thank you. I know my questions sometimes are little convoluted. I apologize for that.

Number 5 you applied, right? No. 5, you did not apply. Significant intrusion on a rural historic district or historic landscape with a high degree of integrity?

A (Widell) I think we definitely did apply that. It may not be in that four that you mentioned, but I think the North Road Agricultural District would be a perfect example of applying that.

Q Number 6. That's the next page. Would it significantly impair a vista or a viewshed from
a historic resource that's a significant component of the character? Did you apply that one?

A (Widell) It isn't one of the four, but certainly it is part of what we took into consideration.

Q Right. It's not among the four that were actually stated in all of the analyses, correct?

A Yes. That's true.

Q And number 8? Whether the Project would introduce a structure that would be dramatically out of scale and would visually overwhelm the resource. That wasn't among the four criteria that you applied either, right?

A (Widell) No.

Q Would you agree with me that among all the properties that you analyzed, and we don't know how many of them there are, and that you found were potentially eligible and had potential visual effects but no adverse effect was found, that is everything other than the 12, right? Do you believe that additional analysis based on all of the Vermont factors could show additional adverse effects?

A (Widell) No. I do not.
Q Is it conceivable to you that if these other criteria were used in addition to the four that you chose, some of the first, some of these properties, the cumulative effect might go from being adverse to being unreasonably adverse?

A No.

Q Is there any set of circumstances that you believe that a particular property along this route might have, might experience an unreasonably adverse effect?

A (Widell) A particular property? I did not apply unreasonable adverse effect to an individual property. I applied it to the entire route and the adverse effects that were found that would be caused by the Project.

Q So you went and found 12 of them had an adverse effect, and you stopped there. I'm not going to look and think about whether any of them might be unreasonable.

A (Widell) I looked at it in its entirety based on the criteria that are in the SEC rules.

Q But as we went over yesterday, there's nothing in those rules that says you should apply the unreasonable test to the Project as a whole and
not to individual resources; isn't that correct?

Q What guidance?

A -- directs you -- the rules for determining unreasonable adverse effect. The total number of resources that are in the area, historic resources; the total number of adverse effects that are found; the size, nature and duration of those adverse effects; the size and scale of the Project; the findings of the Section 106 process and then the mitigation and avoidance and minimization practical measures that are being put forward by the Project proponent. I took all of those into consideration in determining that there is no unreasonable adverse effect.

Q You didn't apply any of that stuff to any particular resource along the way?

A That's correct. It would be difficult, I think, to do that.

Q Of course. It would be very difficult. Because there's a lot of them, right?

A No. I looked at every single property for adverse effect.
Q But you just decided you weren't going to go the next step and decide whether they're unreasonable. Did the lawyers tell you to do that?

A (Widell) No. Actually, the criteria is not unlike what a State Historic Preservation Officer as I was in California would do to look at a large Project. To determine really what comprehensively the adverse effects are causing to a collection of important historic properties. So applying those criteria was not something totally unfamiliar because they are similar in some ways to exactly what I would do if I were looking at a large Project at a state level.

Q But forgive me if I missed the answer to my question. The lawyers didn't tell you to not apply the undue standard to each individual property?

A (Widell) The lawyers definitely had a discussion with me about it, but I was free to apply it the way that I saw fit.

Q Now, the Department of Historic Resources or the Division of Historic Resources, they weren't
satisfied with the way you used or even using the Vermont criteria, were they?

A  (Widell) No.

Q  And as we went over yesterday in their letter that she said that format hadn't been adopted in New Hampshire.

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  Okay. And they said you should have used 36 C.F.R. 800.5, right?

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  So let's put that up. This is Counsel for the Public Exhibit 439. This is a printout as current as I can get it, I suppose, of 36 C.F.R. 800.5. In this provision it says an adverse effect is found when an undertaking might directly or indirectly alter the characteristics that qualify the property for National Register eligibility, correct?

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  And that's as to diminish its integrity.

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  And that's the 7 aspects of integrity, right?

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  And then they provide a list of examples. And
those are listed here, one under 800.5(a)(2),
include physical destruction of the property;
change of its use or physical features in its
setting; visual atmospheric or audible elements
that diminish its integrity; neglect or
deterioration; transfer out of federal
ownership. Obviously, that one is not at issue
because we don't have federal ownership or
that's not one of the problems. These general
categories in 800.5 might encompass some of what
you and the Preservation Company did, but it
doesn't really track them, does it?

A  (Widell) What do you mean by track?

Q  Well, you didn't actually in your assessment
with respect to the individual properties and
the impact, you didn't go through and mention
each of these examples and find out whether the
Project had that sort of effect on that
particular resource.

A  (Widell) No. That's not exactly true. We
certainly referenced this in our methodology.
The definition of an adverse effect is identical
to what we used for applying whether there was
an adverse effect. We looked at visual impacts
and the possibility of direct impacts in the underground section. We did not see whether there would be a transfer or a lease or demolition or rehab or any of those other examples.

Q Right. So you didn't.

A So we did not -- correct. We did not apply those. That's true. Yes.

Q Okay. Thank you. When you applied the criteria that you did, isn't it true that in each of the discussions that you wrote for each affected resource, you minimized those effects by counting existing vegetation, including that on other properties, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And, for example, we talked about Bristol Central Square yesterday, and that was dismissed because it was a quarter mile too far away, and the view would be blocked by buildings in the foreground and surrounding trees.

A (Widell) Yes. That's according to the database. Yes.

Q Let's look at Applicant's exhibit or APP 15674. This is Hill Village. Actually this is New
Hill Village. The Original Hill Village, of course, is underneath the impoundment, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And this is at 15674. This village is eligible for the National Register, right?

A (Widell) I believe, yes. Now DHR has identified it on the green sheet as eligible, and it has been fully inventoried in the current completion of the inventory norms being done.

Q And it's within your APE, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q But according to you and the Preservation Company won't have any adverse effect because the views are modeled as being blocked by trees, is that correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q If we look at 15675. If you blow up the bottom box. Second paragraph of it.

It cuts across the hillside, but it's separated by over a 10th of a mile of dense mixed forest of with tall pines, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. That's what it says. Yes.

Q And if we look at 15686. Now, this is a photo simulation that Mr. DeWan did and what he did
here is show where the Project is in sort of a ghost fashion, if I may. Whereas it's not actually going to be visible like this, but he is suggesting that if these trees weren't here, this is where those elements of the Project would be, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q So if these trees were to die or be cut, the view from this resource, this Veterans Memorial Park in Hill would be of these structures on these lines, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Do you believe if those trees weren't there providing that screen that there would be an adverse effect on Hill Village?

A (Widell) I'd have to take a look at it, but it would appear that there would be, yes.

Q And I assume based on your previous testimony, you would not make any determination about whether that would be unreasonable.

A (Widell) That is correct.

Q Okay. Now, you assert in your testimony in the Supplemental that the Project avoided resources by using the existing right-of-way, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q I'm sure you're aware that in many places along the existing right-of-way, new taller structures are being added, correct?
A Yes.
Q And you're aware that in many places along the existing right-of-way the existing structures are being relocated to make more room for the new line, right?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And you're aware that those existing lines that are being relocated are going to go on, in many instances, taller structures, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And that you're also aware that in relocating the structures or in installing the new line that those structures in many instances are going to be located closer to resources like people's homes and barns and fields, roads, that are along the right-of-way, correct?
A (Widell) Yes. In some instances.
Q Okay. Is it truly avoided and minimized if in fact the existing right-of-way infrastructure is made larger and new larger structure is actually
A (Widell) Yes. Now larger structure is being added.

Q Right. But is it actually being avoided and minimized if you're taking something small and making it a lot bigger and closer?

A (Widell) Is it being avoided and minimized. My statement related to using the existing corridor is which we have which is 90 miles long. It's also almost 90 years old. And so what I don't think many people realize, we actually looked historically at the transmission line corridor and found that it was primarily located in bottom lands and has considerable tree coverage and is in often in lower areas, and so that is one of the primary reasons that throughout the corridor you do not see it affecting very many historic properties. That's one of the principal reasons. It has been there, and there has not been a lot of development around it.

Q So I guess I'm not sure how that relates to the question I asked, but are you saying that, in your testimony, are you suggesting that it avoids and minimizes by using the existing
right-of-way simply because the Project isn't
cutting a new right-of-way somewhere?
A  Yes. Definitely.
Q  Are you aware that Eversource is not able to get
a new right-of-way?
A  (Widell) No. I am not aware.
Q  Okay. And are you aware that Eversource, if it
wanted to have a new right-of-way, it would have
to spend a lot of money to buy parcels of
property for 192 miles, right?
A  I don't know that for a fact.
Q  So isn't this avoidance/minimization that you
suggest sort of like saying well, they could
have built it somewhere else, but they didn't?
A  (Widell) Not at all. It is not just the fact
that the transmission corridor is there, but
where the placement of it throughout the State
of New Hampshire is very important to the
discussion of why there are so few adverse
effects. It is because the existing corridor is
on low bottom land and topography. So even
adding additional height, in many places it is
still not visible.
Q  Okay. But in many places it is, isn't it?
Q Okay. In fact, doesn't the Preservation Company recognize that in many instances the existing infrastructure is actually part of, and I think you already said that, the landscape, but that the new, the introduction of the new structures and raising the existing ones is going to be substantially different and have a significantly different effect?

A And that is exactly what we considered in our visual impact analysis of historic properties.

Q Is the Project truly avoiding and minimizing if the equipment in the right-of-way is being placed closer to the various sorts of resources that exist along the right-of-way?

A It really depends. Because visual effects if you move something in a particular direction, it can actually avoid and minimize a visual adverse effect, yes.

Q But you said yesterday you don't have any expertise on visual analysis, didn't you?

A I have participated in using and looking at the movement of different structures and how that
avoids and minimizes effects to historic properties, and I would say yes, I know a fair amount about that from this particular Project.

Q Okay. From this particular Project.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q But you're not an expert on it.

A (Widell) I'm not an expert on visual -- what did you call it?

Q Visual impact analysis.

A (Widell) Visual impact analysis. No. My expertise is in determining adverse effects to cultural resources and, visual adverse effects is part of that analysis.

Q By placing it underground in the 60 some miles that they underground it, I assume what you're saying there is, again, by placing it underground they're not putting it through a new right-of-way or an existing right-of-way in the White Mountains, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Isn't that really just a different route? I mean, how is it avoidance and minimization if all of it is a different route?

A (Widell) It's going under existing pavement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Do you agree that the underground work can have direct effects on historic structures?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(Widell) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>And how does that happen? Through removal, alteration of adjacent features such as roadside trees, stone walls, yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Topography?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(Widell) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Structural damage caused by vibration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(Widell) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>And if the underground route includes a buried splice vault in the right-of-way, are you familiar with the splice vaults?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(Widell) No. Not really.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>So you haven't looked at whether a splice vault the size of a 20 by 30 by 8, something like that, a big box buried in the front yard of a historic property, do you think that that would have an effect on the properties' integrity or significance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>It might. Based on exactly what you talked about. It might affect stone walls or other types of walls or topography or vegetation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q And if the underground route includes a manhole cover for a grounding link box, might that affect the characteristics that make it eligible?

A (Widell) It depends. It depends.

Q And if the underground construction requires removal of a stone wall, might that affect the eligibility by diminishing integrity?

A Yes. It might. Yes.

Q Does removing and replacing an old stone wall because I believe the Project has said yeah, you're going to take these stone walls if we have to, and then we'll put it back, right? If they can? Right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And do you have experience with assessing stone walls?

A (Widell) I have -- no, not precisely stone walls. I, my expertise would be in features similar to it that have been protected through avoidance, minimization and mitigation that is part of a historic properties work program. Normally memorialized in a programmatic agreement under the Section 106 process. It's
not uncommon to have very precise direction for such effects that you can't precisely identify before the Project begins. And then how you handle that is through the programmatic agreement in the Section 106 process.

Q This isn't a 106 process here, is it?
A (Widell) What?
Q This. Where we are right now. This isn't a 106 process.
A (Widell) The SEC in my understanding of looking at previous decisions on issuance of certificate often depend on the programmatic agreement through the Section 106 process.
Q But you don't see any federal officials sitting here, do you?
A (Widell) No, but --
Q So this isn't a 106 process. That's the question.
A (Widell) It's not the 106 process, but my understanding is SEC uses the Section 106 process to memorialize the roles of those in the agreement document for work that needs to be done past the time when the permit is issued.
Q Yes. I understand that's your -- I accept that
that's your understanding. I believe you
tested to that effect.

Is this the first case you've done in New
England? The first Project you've done in New
England.

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  Okay. And going back to stone walls which is
where we started, have you had experience where
you had to oversee the removal and replacement
of a stone wall?

A  (Widell) No.

Q  And would you, do you believe notwithstanding
that lack of experience with it that removing
and replacing a stone wall could diminish its
aspects of integrity?

A  (Widell) Yes. I said that previously. Yes.

Q  Okay. And if the underground construction
requires removal of mature trees or bushes,
might that affect its eligibility by diminishing
aspects of integrity or have an impact?

A  (Widell) Yes. It would be unusual if a tree
cause it no longer to be eligible for the
National Register, but it is possible.

Q  Aren't there historic trees in New Hampshire?
A (Widell) Yes. There are historic trees throughout the country. Yes.

Q And don't mature trees and lilac bushes and other landscaping features like that contribute to a property's setting and feel?

A Yes. Definitely.

Q (Widell) So those clearly would be related to its integrity, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Does regrading the slopes or removing ledge along the route along the underground route, might that affect its eligibility by diminishing aspects of integrity for a have an impact?

A (Widell) It might.

Q If it requires a transition station to be constructed that is visible at or from a particular location that's being assessed, might that affect its eligibility by diminishing aspects of integrity?

Could I have that page 34?

Are you familiar with what a transition station is?

A (Widell) Yes. I couldn't draw one for you though.
Q Well, you don't have to. We have helpfully provided one here. There is a photo simulation done by T.J. Boyle. This is Counsel for the Public, this is found in Counsel for the Public Exhibit 138, and I believe, if I'm not mistaken, this is a photo simulation of Transition Station Number 3. And I believe this is in Stewartstown or Clarksville. Are you familiar with that location?

A (Widell) Not precisely, no.

Q Do you think that a construction of a piece of equipment like this within the viewshed or proximate to a historic resource might affect its aspects of integrity?

A It might depending on its significance and how it affected the property.

Q Have you reviewed the plan sets for the buried route?

A (Widell) No. I have not.

Q And do you know, regardless of whether you've read them, do you know whether those plan sets are complete at this point and final?

A (Widell) No. I do not.

Q Are you still confident that without having seen
those plan sets and knowing what they're going
to do along the buried route, are you still
confident that the Project avoided and minimized
by going down the buried route?

A (Widell) Could you repeat that? I'm sorry.

Q You haven't seen the plan sets.

A (Widell) Correct.

Q And I assume you have not done any analysis to
determine whether the Project will have adverse
aspects on historic properties along the buried
route; is that correct?

A (Widell) No. We looked at the historic
properties along the buried route and now survey
forms are being completed as well.

Q Okay. But at the time you did your testimony in
October 2015, you hadn't done that, right?

A (Widell) No. No forms had been done along the
buried route, but we did look at the existence
of historic properties along the underground
route.

Q But you haven't, at the time of October of 2015,
did you do any analysis about whether historic
properties along the buried route would suffer
any of these direct impacts that we just
discussed?

A (Widell) No. I did not.

Q Okay. Now we're going to look at Exhibit 113. Applicant's Exhibit 113.

I'm showing you Applicant's Exhibit 113 which I will represent to you is one of these monthly reports that was prepared by somebody having to do with the Applicant to be submitted to DHR. Did you prepare this report?

A (Widell) I did not.

Q Okay. If you look at it, this is, I believe this is October 2016, but it's not dated. Correct?

A (Widell) No. It just says it's October.

Q Right. But it references the December 2015 MOU so it can't be October of 2015.

A (Widell) Yes. That's a good assumption.

Q Proof of life, right? So it says in the bottom paragraph here, "Engineering plans for the underground section of the route are currently being refined. Once sufficiently developed, these plans will inform our recommendations to the DHR on which of the resources along the underground portion of the route identified by
the DHR should be inventoried."

Did I get that right?

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  And then it says on the next page, "We plan to
proactively begin documentation of these
resources that were identified in the DHR green
sheets once Project engineering has been
sufficiently developed unless it has been
determined that Project impacts do not warrant
evaluation despite the fact that inventory of
many of these resources may end up being
unnecessary."

I think when they say may end up being
unnecessary, I think that's suggesting that or
referring to the uncertainty of the precise
buried route, correct?

A  (Widell) Yes.

Q  And that uncertainty is really based on whether
the buried route goes along the left side of the
road or the right side of the road; is that fair
to say?

A  (Widell) I believe it is supposed to go through
the center, but it may need to go in other
portions of the road. The direct APE for the
underground is 20 feet on either side of the pavement.

Q Okay. So you don't know, in fact, what we all learned here painfully over the last few months that the Project is not going to go under the center of the road, it's going to go on one side or the other, correct?

A (Widell) I've heard that, but I do not, I have not looked at any plans. I don't believe there are completed plans yet at this point.

Q And that in many cases, the plans in fact, at least the last ones we saw, show the Project on one side of the road or the other, occasionally crossing the road to get from one side to the other, but in general, DOT doesn't want the Project buried in the middle. You're not aware of that?

A (Widell) No. I'm not.

Q Okay. And in either case, aren't some of these effects such as vibration, wouldn't they occur no matter where the Project is with respect to the road?

A (Widell) Likely. Yes.

Q Blasting?
MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, this is a spot where I'm about to embark upon a somewhat lengthy series of questions. I would like to take a break.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right. I don't think we're going to take our lunch break at this time, however. It's a little too early for that. So let's take ten minutes and then we'll plan to for about 45 minutes to the lunch break. Sound good?

MR. ROTH: That sounds good.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right.

(Recess taken 11:32 - 11:45 a.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: You may continue.
MR. ROTH: Thank you.

Q I want to revisit for a moment the topic we were on before the break and just ask a couple of final questions about that.

And that you haven't seen the final plans, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. That's correct.

Q And you don't know to what extent there will be trees removed along that route, correct?

A (Widell) Correct.

Q And you don't know to what extent any stone walls may be removed and/or replaced, correct?

A (Widell) Correct.

Q And you don't know to what extent there's going to be ledge removal, blasting, that sort of thing?

A (Widell) Correct.

Q And you don't know whether the roadside where the Project is going to be buried is going to be regraded, the topography changed, correct?

A (Widell) Correct.

Q And you also don't know the extent to which historic property may experience vibration, correct?
A (Widell) Correct.

Q Or dust?

A (Widell) Correct.

Q Or noise?

A (Widell) Correct.

Q Okay. Now, in response to a Data Request during the discovery part of this case, you provided us a table showing 18 locations where you stated you had discussed with the Project team various issues and mitigation, do you remember that?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Let's look at the table. This is Counsel for the Public Exhibit 396. Does this look familiar to you?

A (Widell) It is not the one that is in the methodology.

Q Did you prepare this table?

A Preservation Company and I identify the properties where there might be opportunities for an avoidance and minimization so I did not prepare this specific table. No. I did not.

Q Okay. So we asked the question in discovery, provide a list of the specific areas of potential effect where Ms. Widell consulted with
Northern Pass and the Project design changes that were made as a result of this consultation, if any. Include the specific recommendations that were made and whether they were accepted or rejected. And this table is what we were given as part of the response. And you say you did not prepare this table.

A (Widell) I did not prepare this table.

Q Okay. We're going to ask you questions about it anyway because you were identified as the person answering that question as near as I can tell.

The first property on this list, remember we mentioned earlier about this historic resources have a way of disappearing?

A Yes.

Q The James Barn as I understand it was removed or destroyed or sold to West Virginia or something, right?

A (Widell) Yes, and thank you for reminding me of that because I was trying to recall that and yes, I'm familiar with that property in Deerfield, yes, and it was, yes, removed from the property.

Q Okay. And in any event, the issue as was
identified by, presumably, you was that the land
is expansive open fields between the resource
and the existing line, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And the Project is significantly visible in the
main public view.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And the effect was close view of the resource.
Correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And that the focal, Project was going to create
a focal point that distracts from the historic
resource, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And the possible mitigation? Nothing. Right?

A (Widell) I participated in discussion, and it
was changing the lattice structures to monopoles
in that location.

Q Okay. But this table doesn't reflect that, does
it?

A It does not.

Q Okay. Now the next one is the Hillcrest Farm,
also in Deerfield. And in this one at the top
of this first property description the
Preservation Company indicated that this property has historically significant views in all directions, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Includes a house from the 18th century?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And is approximately just under a half a mile from the Project. Does that sound familiar?

A (Widell) It would be in the rest of the form. As you can see, there's ten pages of the form.

Q Let's look at 14897. And here you say in the analysis concluding that it's going to have an adverse effect that it's four tenths of a mile, correct? I read that as .4 and that's just under half a mile.

A (Widell) I don't see that on this page of the form.

Q 14897?

A (Widell) Thanks.

Q It also says here the effect of the introduction of the new structures has been minimized by the change from the use of lattice structures to the use of weathering steel monopoles which will be far less visible against the background of the
trees on the hillside, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q But in your table, let's go back to the table, the recommendation was reduce the height of the structures, question mark. Correct?
A (Widell) That's what it says.
Q And has that happened? In terms of the design?
A (Widell) I cannot tell you sitting here. I cannot remember that.
Q Do you know if it will happen?
A (Widell) I cannot tell you that. I can tell you that now in the inventory forms that are being done, I believe, I believe, that this one was not, was considered not having aspects of its character that are related to visual. Visual importance. That is it is just architecturally significant. This chart, of course, is two years ago, and we've continued to look at ways to avoid and minimize any adverse effects and also we know much more about these properties and their significance. I'd have to look at the list of our survey and inventory forms that have been submitted to DHR to know if this is one of them.
Q This chart was prepared and provided to us in discovery last fall, wasn't it?
A (Widell) I don't know that for a fact.
Q That's not two years ago. This was just last fall.
A (Widell) This work and consideration of avoidance and minimization was done before last fall.
Q So when you made this reduced height of the structures recommendation or possible mitigation, had you already taken into account that according to this writeup in the report that there would be monopoles and not lattice?
A If there were, they were considered as part of the visual impact effects.
Q So were you suggesting then that the monopoles be reduced in height?
A (Widell) Perhaps.
Q Okay. Let's go to Pembroke 37. Montminy. Actually back to the chart.

So this, again, is the Montminy Farm and Country Store in Pembroke. And here your issue was the line is close and is significantly visible in the main public views of the historic
resource. That there were two tall proposed 345 kV lattice structures visible at the edges of the field. One will be directly behind the house and store when viewed from the road. New line will rise above the trees that are now in the background at the top of the hill. And then you describe it as having a close view of the resource, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And then this is a bit curious. I don't quite know what this means. I think I do, but maybe you can explain it. Model differences in impact from other types of structures. What does that mean? That was your mitigation possibility.

A (Widell) What it means to me is that there are existing structures there that are lattice and the consideration of use of weathering monopoles, whether that given the close proximity of the structures, whether that would indeed make a visual difference in minimizing the visual effect. This was considered an adverse effect at the time.

Q Okay. And do you know whether that recommendation or I guess that consideration for
A (Widell) Yes, it was.

Q Okay. In this one, we're looking at 621 Fourth Range Road in Pembroke, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And the chart shows that this is a circa 1950 Colonial Revival Cape, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Let's look at this house a little bit.

And can you go to APP 15060? Actually, 15066.

So this is described here in this text as a 1950s capacity, and it's determined to be eligible for listing in this writeup, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And this goes to show that it doesn't have to a quaint old New England farmhouse in order to be historic; isn't that right?

A (Widell) Right. Or nationally significant.

Q Right. And if you go to 15069. In this analysis, it seems to me, and maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong, the Preservation Company thinks this property wasn't going to be adversely affected because the Project views
aren't considered likely significant.

Have I distilled that analysis right?

Q Okay. Now, in your chart though, let me go back to the chart.

You said the line is close and will be significantly visible in the main public views of the historic resource, correct?

A (Widell) I didn't say that.

Q Well, this is -- somebody did.

A (Widell) Somebody did.

Q You're here speaking for the Preservation Company, aren't you?

A (Widell) I cannot speak for the Preservation Company. I'm happy and proud to speak for our work together.

Q Because they're not here to testify about this, and this was offered by the Applicants as essentially the answer to the question we posed to you.

A (Widell) I don't know. I didn't write this.

Q Okay. Well, the Preservation Company then or somebody, we don't know who exactly, said the line is close and will be significantly visible...
in the main public views. And then it says the
type of effect is a close view of the resource.
And in this one you recommended shift location
of structure to be less visible, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And has that been done?

A I believe that it was done.

Q Okay. Let's go back to 14789 of APP. APP
14789.

So this is Applicant's Exhibit 1, Appendix
18, this is the Preservation Company's report,
and they provided a table in the report on pages
19 and 20 of the report indicating design
changes that were made for historic purposes,
correct? Is that what we're looking at?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q If you look down at the table on this page you
see PEMB01?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And it says plantings on the land between the
Project and the house will be designed to screen
it from view and will eliminate an adverse
effect to the Property. Is that what the says?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q  So it doesn't look like they're going to shift
the location of the structure to make it less
visible, does it?
A  (Widell) No.
Q  So you were just, you just didn't remember right
or you're just wrong about that point?
A  (Widell) Perhaps I did not remember it. I
believed it had been done.
Q  Now we're going to look at the Maple View Farm.
    And can you give me APP 15320.
    Do you recall that the Preservation Company
found this eligible, correct?
A  (Widell) Potentially eligible.
Q  Yes, and having an adverse impact, correct?
A  (Widell) Yes.
Q  Okay. In your chart, can I have the chart,
please?
    Says "highly visible across the farm's
field from historically significant views from
resources (buildings, barnyard) and creating a
focal point," correct?
A  (Widell) Yes.
Q  And the road crossing creates a focal point,
too, right?
A (Widell) Yes. Where the Project crosses the road, yes.

Q And the close view of the resource and a close view from the resource, right?

A (Widell) Yes, correct.

Q You suggested here or whoever wrote this suggested different structure types might reduce impact.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Do you know whether that was done?

A (Widell) Can we go back to the assessment report?

Q Well --

A (Widell) With the listing?

Q Do you remember offhand?

A (Widell) I would refer back to that chart in the assessment report.

Q Without being too clumsy about it, I will represent to you that this property does not appear on the design changes chart on pages 19 and 20.

A (Widell) Okay.

Q Okay?

A (Widell) Um-hum.
Q So do you know otherwise whether different structure types were deployed to minimize or avoid effects on the Maple View Farm?

A (Widell) I could answer that by looking at the current effects tables that have been submitted to DHR on Maple View and tell you precisely the structures that are planned to go there.

Q But you can't answer that question otherwise without looking at that?

A (Widell) No, I can't, sitting here, recall precisely.

Q Have you --

A (Widell) It is still considered an adverse effect on my list of adverse effects.

Q Um-hum. So this recommendation that different types might reduce impact, have you or the Preservation Company to your knowledge done an analysis to determine whether in fact a different structure type might reduce the impact at this location?

A (Widell) At Maple View.

Q Yes.

A I cannot recall looking at monopoles, and as I said, we may have. We looked at a number of
different properties, and unless I look
precisely at the materials related to the
current effects tables that have been completed,
I can't tell you precisely what is going in that
location.

Q So you don't remember whether you or -- do you
remember whether you performed an analysis about
this particular location to determine whether
monopoles might make a difference?

A (Widell) I cannot recall doing that.

Q Okay. And I assume, therefore, you also don't
recall whether the Preservation Company did an
analysis to determine whether monopoles might
make a difference at this location?

A (Widell) No. I can't speak for what the
Preservation Company may have done.

Q You're working with them on preparing all these
documents.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q You might have some familiarity with what
they're up to.

A (Widell) In all likelihood, that would have
taken place with me, but --

Q Now we're going to talk about the Franklin Falls
Dam recreation area, and this is a portion on your chart, and let's look now at Applicant's 15610. And in Applicant's Exhibit 1, Appendix 18, APP 15610 begins the writeup of the Franklin Falls Dam recreation area, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And in this analysis, 15612, can you give me that?

The Preservation Company said, "Similarly, most of the new structures will be distant and seen against trees. However, it appears that one new Project structure will be partially silhouetted against the sky," correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And this is a recreation area that's roughly slightly under half a mile from the Project, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And in the chart you point out that this is going to have, says the "viewing area has 365-degree views, though primary views would be upriver and downriver. The line is distant but is substantially visible in historically views from a historic resource," correct?
A (Widell) That's what it says.

Q And then you indicate or somebody indicates "monopoles will be substituted in this location based on DeWan review on what portion of site. Will likely not eliminate visual impact on the historic resource." Isn't that what it says?

A (Widell) That's what it says.

Q So even though DeWan says put in monopoles, you're saying or somebody is saying it's not going to make any difference, right?

A (Widell) That's what it says.

Q Okay. Thank you. Is there anything else that you can think of to recommend at this location to make a difference, that would make a difference?

A (Widell) No.

Q The next property is what you were calling the Locke Neighborhood initially and is now being treated as the Peaked Hill Road Rural Historic District, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Can I have 15733?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Now we're going to look at Applicant's Exhibit 1, Appendix 18, page 15733, and this is...
the discussion of the assessment of the Locke Neighborhood Historic District, and here on this page on the assessment under III it says, "The Project will be substantially visible in the main public view. The Project will create a focal point that distracts from the appreciation of the historic resources. The Project will be substantially visible in historically significant views, and the Project appears to have an adverse effect on the area or district," correct?

A Yes.

Q And you didn't do anything to determine whether that was going to be an unreasonable effect as we discovered earlier, right?

A (Widell) That's correct.

Q Can I have Counsel for the Public 398?

So we now have an Area Form for this. This is part of the 106 process, correct?

A Yes.

Q But you didn't rely on this when you did your testimony in 2015, right?

A (Widell) Yes. This form was not completed at that time.
Q: So now it's being called the Peaked Hill Road Historic District, not Locke Neighborhood, right?
A: (Widell) Yes.
Q: And in determining its eligibility, the Preservation Company noted, let's go to 180742. Criterion A noted that the Peaked Hill Rural Historic District is an identified local neighborhood with a significant concentration of intact resources, united visually, historically and by physical development.
   That's what they said?
A: (Widell) Yes.
Q: Do you agree with that assessment?
A: Yes, I do.
Q: And then the next page, please? And highlight Criterion C.
   And here they said it's a notable collection of farmhouses, relatively modest in size and detail with detached barns and clusters of smaller outbuildings, right?
A: (Widell) Yes.
Q: And do you agree with that?
A: (Widell) Yes.
Q And in looking at these two pages where they
discuss significance, you can see a nice
discussion of the Criterion. Criterion A, B, C
and D, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And none of that was provided in the assessment
forms that were done by the Preservation Company
and submitted to the SEC, was it?

A (Widell) No. That's not entirely accurate. We
identified areas of significance. We did not
lay them out in an identical way, and I would
point out that Preservation Company did this
inventory form as well.

Q That's great, but they didn't, when they did
the -- can you go back to APP 15732?

This was where they made their significance
analysis, if you can call it that, with respect
to the same property, and they don't mention any
of the Criterion, do they? And they
certainly -- is that the case?

A (Widell) They do not mention A, B, C or D, yes.
That's true. On this page. I would point out
that this form is 20 pages long, and we're just
looking at page 3. So I can't be absolutely
sure, but I would want to look at the entire form to confirm that there is no mention of A, B, C or D.

Q This is the discussion, this is where you would think you would see it in the discussion of its significance, right? Isn't it?

A (Widell) No. Actually, this is kind of a refinement of that because what they've done is they've identified under Criterion A the types of resources that would meet that significance, meaning recreation or agricultural or tourism so this is even a refinement to the statement of a particular A, B, C or D goes into it in identifying the relationship to a visual character-defining feature.

Q Let's go back to the 398. This is the first part of the statement of integrity which goes on to half of the next page. And it says it has integrity from the 19th to early 20th century, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q No historic properties have been lost in the last 50 years.

A (Widell) Yes.
Q All of the houses and all but a single
outbuilding in the district retain the ability
to contribute to it?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q All of the buildings have integrity of location?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And when they say the contributing to it, as I
understand that, what that means is that it's a
property within the grouping that would be
essentially eligible, correct? So if in the
middle of the Peaked Hill Rural Historic
District somebody in 1989 built a vinyl villa
because they got a deal on a piece of land from
a desperate farmer, that would be a
noncontributing structure, right?
A (Widell) Yes. That's actually true, but that
was a very interesting question. Are individual
buildings in a Historic District necessarily
eligible for the National Register. That
depends. But we do, when we look at a Historic
District, Peaked Hill or whatever, there are
contributing and noncontributing buildings. So
you illustrated that better than I did so thank
you.
Q Is it fair to say that this particular one, Peaked Hill has a relatively intact grouping that has few noncontributing structures within it?

A (Widell) That's exactly right. Yes.

Q On the next page -- highlight the second paragraph.

Here the Preservation Company says that the District has a high degree of integrity of association with trends in farming and summer homes in Bristol, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q 15733. In its comments about the, its analysis in the original assessment, the 2015 assessment, the Preservation Company said it would be visible, the Project will be visible and historically significant views of and from the historic resources. Correct?

A (Widell) Um-hum. Yes.

Q And you agree with that assessment?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And it says further, I believe it's probably on the next page. Yeah, it is. 34. The Project may create a focal point which distracts from
historic resources diminishing its integrity of setting, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q You agree with that?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Do you believe that such a diminishment of integrity of setting could make the District become ineligible?

A (Widell) No. Primarily because the transmission line has gone through that neighborhood and it states that in this form. If I look further, if you, I could tell you precisely, it certainly has been there since the 1950s, and we found repeatedly that it was there since 1928 and 1929, and it is a modern intrusion. It doesn't contribute in any way to the significance of the District, but it has been there a very long time. 60 to 90 years.

Q Yes, and I think in this page it says that 1928 distribution line was part of rural electrification efforts, and it's been in place for over 60 years, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And that they're wooden single poles and double
pole H-Frames all lower in height than trees in the vicinity.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And the new structures are going to be significantly larger and taller, aren't they?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And do you think that the introduction of the new structures where we're going to have impacts on the Peaked Hill Historic District that are unreasonably adverse?

A (Widell) No. Not unreasonably adverse, because I apply that to the entire Project, but they are definitely an adverse effect and it is included on my list, both lists of adverse effects. First as the Locke area neighborhood and now as Peaked Hill Road Historic District.

Q So you don't think that the effects of the Project going through Peaked Hill are going to create an unreasonable adverse effect on Peaked Hill.

A (Widell) I don't apply it to an original site like that.

Q Okay. Let's go back to the chart.

Here on the chart you or whoever did this
said "no mitigation possible except underground," and then a question. "Would different types of structures or placement reduce impact," right?

A That's what they said.

Q So no mitigation possible except underground. Has anybody done a analysis about whether it's possible to underground through the Peaked Hill Historic District?

A (Widell) Not to my knowledge.

Q Has anybody done a analysis about whether different structures or placement might reduce impact?

A (Widell) I believe we did look at monopoles in this area. Yes.

Q Did you determine that whether or not monopoles would or would not have a beneficial impact or a result in terms of mitigating and minimizing?

A I do not believe that decision has been made. There's consideration of the use of monopoles in this area that has been presented to Northern Pass.

Q Okay.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, is this a place to
take a break?

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: It is right on. So we'll take our break, and we'll come back at 1:30.

A (Widell) Thank you.

(Lunch recess taken at 12:24 p.m. and concludes the **Day 27 Morning Session**. The hearing continues under separate cover in the transcript noted as **Day 27 Afternoon Session ONLY**.)
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