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MR. IACOPINO: Okay, folks. We're going to get going. We're here today in Docket No. 2015-06, the Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire doing business as Eversource Energy for a Certificate of Site and Facility for the Project commonly referred to as the Northern Pass Transmission Project.

This is our third Prehearing Conference in the course of the adjudicative phase of this proceeding. The purpose of this Prehearing Conference is essentially to discuss scheduling going forward. We did issue a Notice of this Prehearing Conference with the issues that are to be addressed, this agenda that I've passed around and it is also up on the electronic evidence presenter.

So that's the goal of our Prehearing Conference today is to basically do some scheduling work. We like to get a sense of what the participants in the proceeding want to do, how they want to present their witnesses, and
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the length of time that each witness is going to take on cross-examination. If you have not signed in, there is a sign-in sheet at the back of the room. There's also some paper copies of that agenda. I'm going to start off by going around and taking appearances. I am looking to identify people who are parties to the proceeding. That means the Applicant, Counsel for the Public or Intervenors, and as I go around I'm going to call, go by party and ask that the spokesperson actually identify themselves as well. The spokesperson should be answering to this roll call.

First let's start with the Applicant. Mr. Needleman?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Barry Needleman from McLane Middleton representing the Joint Applicants. To my right is Marvin Bellis from Eversource Legal, and to his right is Tom Getz, also from McLane Middleton.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. The next party that I have in our list is the Business Groups that include Cate Street Capital, the IBEW, the Coos County Business and Employers Group, North

Country Chamber of Commerce, Dixville Capital, LLC, and Balsams Resort Holdings. Who's here for that group today?

MR. RAFF: Alan Raff, Primary Legal Solutions. I'm the attorney for the IBEW or the attorney for the Business Intervenor Group, and to my left is Jason Dennis for the Coos County Business and Employers Group.

MR. IACOPINO: So Mr. Beliveau, too?
MR. BELIVEAU: Mark Beliveau, Pierce Atwood, for the Balsams and Dixville Capital.

MR. IACOPINO: The third party that I have on my list is the group of the Cities of Franklin and Berlin.

MR. BOLDT: Chris Boldt, Donahue Tucker Ciandella, for the Cities of Berlin and Franklin.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. We go in this order because this is the way that we have kind of scheduled things as far as parties that support the Application and those who an opposed to it, but our next party is Counsel for the Public.

MR. PAPPAS: Tom Pappas from the Primmer firm for Counsel for the Public.

MR. IACOPINO: First is Municipal Group 1 North. Is anybody here for Municipal Group 1 North? Okay. Next one is Municipal Group 1 South.

MR. WHITLEY: Steven Whitley from Mitchell Municipal Group, spokesperson for Municipal Group 1 South.

MR. IACOPINO: And Municipal Group 2?
MR. WHITLEY: That is Attorney Fillmore or Attorney Tanguay. Attorney Tanguay is here, but he stepped out to have a conference with his clients.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Municipal Group 3 North.

MR. WHITLEY: Steven Whitley from Mitchell Municipal Group, spokesperson.

MR. IACOPINO: Municipal Group 3 South?
MS. PACIK: Danielle Pacik, legal counsel for the City of Concord and spokesperson.

MR. IACOPINO: Grafton County
Commissioners. Is anybody here for Grafton County? Hi, Lara.

MS. SAFFO: Lara Saffo on behalf of the Grafton County Commissioners.
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MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Just for everybody's sake, you've got to flip the button for your microphone to go on, and we do appreciate it if you use the microphones.

Number 11 on my list is the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests?

MS. MANZELLI: Good morning. Amy Manzelli, and to my left Stephen Wagner, from the law firm of BCM Environmental \& Land Law. Also here from the Forest Society two to my left is Will Abbott .

MR. IACOPINO: Next group that $I$ have on my list is what we've been referring to as the NGOs. That's Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation Law Foundation and the Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust.

MS. BIRCHARD: Yes. Good morning. Melissa Birchard, designated spokesperson, also representing Conservation Law Foundation. And to my right is Bill Plouffe representing Appalachian Mountain Club.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Next I have Abutting Property Owners for the Underground portion, Clarksville -- and by the way, this
list may have changed so correct me if I've got it wrong. Abutting Property Owners on the Underground Portion from Clarksville to Stewartstown.

MR. THOMPSON: Brad Thompson, spokesman for the Abutters and Non-Abutters, Pittsburg, Clarksville and Stewartstown.

MR. IACOPINO: Next I have the Abutting Property Owners for the Overhead Portion for Dummer, Stark and Northumberland.

MR. JONES: My name is Eric Jones, and my wife is here beside me. We are Intervenors. Our spokesperson, Susan Percy, said she would be here, and I don't see her. So I don't know what to say.

MR. IACOPINO: Art, do you know anything about Susan?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Mike, yes. I expect her to get here. She has a long way to come. So I look for her.

MR. IACOPINO: Your clients are in that group as well?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: They are.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Kevin Spencer, Mark Legasse. Art Cunningham, attorney.

MR. IACOPINO: The next group that I have the Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead Portion, Whitefield, Dalton, and Bethlehem?

MR. BREKKE: Good morning. My name is Bruce Brekke. I'm representing the group today. David Van Houten, our spokesman, could not make it.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Next group is Abutting Property Owners, Underground, Bethlehem to Plymouth.

MR. PALMER: My name is Walt Palmer. I'm the spokesperson for the Abutting Property Owners, Bethlehem to Plymouth. We have 7 other members of our group here with me.

MR. IACOPINO: If you want to identify them, that's fine.

MR. PALMER: Okay. Barbara Meyer, Bob Thibault, Carl Lakes, Campbell McLaren, Peter Grote, and Bruce Ahern and Janice Ahern.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Our next group on my list is the Abutting Property Owners for the Overhead Portion, Ashland, Northfield,

Canterbury, Allenstown and Concord.
MR. JUDGE: Steve Judge, Wadleigh, Starr \& Peters, and I'm here for McKenna's Purchase.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. They are part of that group. And Ms. Lee?

MS. LEE: Hi. Mary Lee from Northfield, and I'm part of the Allenstown, excuse me, the Ashland to Allenstown group. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Number 18 that I have on my list is the Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead Portion of the route in Deerfield.

MS. MENARD: Good morning. Jeanne Menard, spokesperson for Deerfield Abutters. And to my left is Bob Cote, also a member of that group.

MR. IACOPINO: Next one $I$ have is number 19 is Phillip and Joan Bilodeau. They were an individual party. I don't see anybody present.

Number 20 on my list is a Non-Abutting Property Owners for the Overhead, Clarksville and Stewartstown; is that Mr. Thompson again?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. I've got those separated on this sheet.
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MR. BAKER: And Bob Baker. Mike, I represent two property owners in Stewartstown, Mr. Schrier and a group led by Mr. Moore.

MR. IACOPINO: Spelling of Moore, please? M O ORE?

MR. BAKER: Yes, it is. Rod Moore, Jr.
MR. IACOPINO: I know we have another Moore spelled a different way.

Okay. So then I have number 21, Non-Abutting Property Owners, Overhead Portion, Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem. Okay. That's Ms. Becky More. I didn't want to confuse myself with my own notes, but we understand she's not here.

We have the Non-Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead Portion, Ashland to Deerfield. MS. CRANE: Charlotte Crane representing the Webster Family Group and spokesperson for this Intervenor Group. Also here today is Maureen Quinn. I understand Tom Foulkes should be here soon.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. And the next one I have on my list is the Pemigewassett River Local Advisory Committee.
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MR. STAMP: Good morning. Max Stamp, Pemi River Local Advisory Committee. On my right is Gretchen Draper. Immediately behind her is Barry Draper.

MR. IACOPINO: Do we have any wildlife today, Mr. Draper?

MR. DRAPER: I do, but $I$ won't mention it.
MR. IACOPINO: Yes, Ms. Crane?
MS. CRANE: I failed to mention that Jeanne Menard for the Pawtuckaway Properties is also a member of this group and present today.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. Did I miss anybody?

MR. BAKER: Yes, Mike. Bob Baker, again. I have two other clients that are in the Dummer to Northumberland Abutters Group, Eric and Joshua Olson, and Rodrigue Beland.

MR. IACOPINO: That's the same group with Mr. Cunningham?

MR. BAKER: Yes. Our spokesperson is, I'm not sure if she's here yet, was not here before when you called. Also I'd like to report on Municipal Group 1. As recently as Friday I was visiting, actually, no, it's earlier in the week
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I was visiting in the hospital Steve Ellis who I think is one of the representatives you've dealt with on Municipal Group 1. I think he's back home now, but $I$ know that he would not be able to make this trip at this time.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. Was there somebody else?

MS. SCHIBANOFF: Non-Abutting Property Owners, Bethlehem to Plymouth. Susan Schibanoff, I'm the spokesperson.

MR. IACOPINO: And then is there a representative from the Historic Group?

MS. MARTLAND: Yes. Good morning. Nancy Martland from the Sugar Hill Historical Museum. Our spokesperson, Sharee Williamson, won't be here today.

MR. IACOPINO: And NEPGA?
MR. MONAHAN: Jim Monahan for the New England Power Generators Association.

MR. IACOPINO: And Wagner Forest. I should have called them in the first couple of -MR. NOVELLO: Mike Novello here for Wagner Forest.

MR. IACOPINO: I knew we had 27 but my list
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only had 23 so -- is there anybody else who thinks we have not called your group?

MS. LEE: Can I include Taras in that list?
MR. IACOPINO: We know that Taras is part of your group.

MS. LEE: Okay. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: And here comes Mr. Bilodeau now so we'll mark him as present as well.

MR. BILODEAU: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. What I would like to turn to now is we have done 27 days of hearings so far, and most of them have been absolutely full days, and we still have some Applicant witnesses left to go. We are presently in the process of cross-examination of a panel consisting of Ms. Widell and Ms. Bunker with the Historical and Archeological Panel. We have a good idea from our previous conversations about how long we will be going with them.

That leaves to my understanding one Witness Panel left for the Applicant, that being Terry DeWan and Jessica Kimball; and Mr. Needleman, am I wrong?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. We also have to
finish with Bob Varney in Orderly Regional Development.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. What I would like to do at this point in time is get an estimate from the parties as to how long they expect to spend with each of those Panels. And you are putting DeWan and Kimball together on a Panel, correct?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: They are the Aesthetics experts, and Mr. Varney is, amongst other things, Orderly Development. So what I'm going to do is just going to go through the list that I just went through. It's not necessarily the list of what the order of examination is. My guess is when we get to that, we'll probably follow the same order that we've been following with the exception of moving once we get into the Counsel for the Public, we'll probably move the Applicant to last, and we'll move City of Franklin and Berlin and the Business Groups towards the bottom so that we have parties that oppose the Project go first with their cross-examination, followed by those who support and, of course, that would start with Counsel
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for the Public's witnesses.
But right now $I$ just want to discuss the two Panels that are left for the Applicant or two sets of witnesses, DeWan and Kimball, the Aesthetics, and Bob Varney on the Orderly Development. So let me go to Business Groups. Do you anticipate any cross-examination for DeWan and Kimball?

MR. RAFF: No. We do not at this time. MR. IACOPINO: How about for Mr. Varney? MR. RAFF: No.

MR. IACOPINO: City of Franklin and Berlin?
MR. BOLDT: None for either.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: On the Aesthetic Group, probably a day and a half. For Mr. Varney, three to maybe four hours.

MR. IACOPINO: Nobody's here for Municipal Group 1. Municipal Group 1 South. Are you guys planning on grouping again?

MR. WHITLEY: We'll probably continue to do it as we have so far which is work together so we're not duplicative. I can say for myself, for my Group, I anticipate an hour for the
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Aesthetics Panel and probably an hour for Mr. Varney. And that goes for the two groups that I'm a spokesman for.

MR. IACOPINO: Municipal Group 2?
MR. TANGUAY: Most likely probably two hours for Bob Varney and possibly an hour for Aesthetics, but again, that's a total guess.

MR. IACOPINO: I understand that these are estimates. I hope they're not guesses. I certainly hope they're not total guesses because one of the things that's goes to happen as a result of this proceeding today is we're going to be scheduling and we're going to be relying upon your estimates to determine how many days need to be scheduled, first of all, to determine if we do need to schedule any more days and if we do to determine how many days need to be scheduled. So let's make these estimates not total guesses, okay? Municipal Group 3 North.

MR. WHITLEY: That's me again, Mike, and in my times I included the questions for Group 3 North.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes. I understand. That's my fault. And Ms. Pacik, Group 3 South?
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MS. PACIK: For DeWan and Kimball, two hours and for Varney one hour.

MR. IACOPINO: Grafton County
Commissioners?
MS. SAFFO: Aesthetics, we have 45 minutes; and for Mr. Varney, an hour and a half, and a lot depends on what other people ask which is why it's hard to guess.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Manzelli? Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests?

MS. MANZELLI: For the Aesthetics Panel, three hours; for Mr. Varney, two hours.

MR. IACOPINO: NGOs for DeWan and Kimball and then for Mr. Varney.

MS. BIRCHARD: For the Aesthetics Panel, one hour; and for Mr. Varney, 15 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: 15 minutes, did you say?
MS. BIRCHARD: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Bill, does that include anything you would have as well?

MR. PLOUFFE: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Abutting Property Owners for the Underground Portion from Clarksville and Stewartstown, and I guess that would be Abutters
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and Non-Abutters, Mr. Thompson?
MR. THOMPSON: For Aesthetics, 15, 20 minutes; and nothing for Mr. Varney.

MR. IACOPINO: Abutting Property Owners Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, the Overhead Portion, I think this is Ms. Perry's group.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I know she has questions. I don't think she's here yet.

MR. IACOPINO: Are you going to have separate questions?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No. I have no questions for either, but I'm sure Susan does. Say an hour for DeWan and just reserve 15 minutes for Varney.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Baker, are you going to have any questions, you think?

MR. BAKER: Yes. I will, Mike. One hour total for all remaining Applicant's witnesses except I guess we've got the Panel that's on now.

MR. IACOPINO: We're not talking about them.

MR. BAKER: Right. One hour total for the remaining Panels to be called.
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MR. IACOPINO: Do you know how much of that hour will be in Aesthetics and how much will be Mr. Varney?

MR. BAKER: I would split it in half and much will depend on other questions that are asked by other Intervenors that go first.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Abutting Property Owners Whitefield, Overhead, Mr. Brekke?

MR. BREKKE: We had in a previous Preconference Hearing submitted an estimate for these two Panels. I don't have that information with me.

MR. IACOPINO: Has it changed?
MR. BREKKE: It hasn't changed. So if you have a record of that, that's what it is.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Underground Bethlehem to Plymouth. Mr. Palmer.

MR. PALMER: We'd like to reserve 30 minutes for the Bob Varney Group, and 30 minutes for the Aesthetics Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Do you know if you're going to be breaking up this questioning like you have during the course of the proceedings?

MR. PALMER: Yes, we will be.
MR. IACOPINO: Do you know how you're going to be breaking it up?

MR. PALMER: We don't know at this point.
MR. IACOPINO: At your earliest possible convenience, it would be great if you could give the Chair a breakdown of that, and when $I$ say as early as possible, once we reconvene, which isn't until the 29th, but if you could once we reconvene provide us with just what that breakdown of that 30 minutes is going to be.

MR. PALMER: Thank you very much. I will do that.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you very much. Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Ashland, Northfield, Canterbury, Allenstown and Concord. This was the group that has Ms. Lee and Mr. Judge.

MR. JUDGE: None for McKenna's Purchase.
MR. IACOPINO: For either?
MR. JUDGE: For either.
MS. LEE: I'm going to reserve 15 minutes for both.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Menard, the

Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead Portion in Deerfield.

MS. MENARD: Two hours for Aesthetics and one hour for Mr. Varney.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Bilodeau?
MR. BILODEAU: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Non-Abutting Property Owners. Actually, Mr. Thompson, you already answered for them. So we go to Non-Abutting Property Owners, Overhead Portion, in Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem. There's no one here representing them yet. Is that still the case? I think that's Ms. More. So she's not coming. Okay.

And then number 22. Non-Abutting Property Owners, Ashland to Deerfield. Professor Crane?

MS. CRANE: An hour and a quarter for Aesthetics, 15 minutes for Orderly Development. And we will probably break up the Aesthetics so that the people most familiar with the regions involved can be doing the questioning.

MR. IACOPINO: So, again, to you as well, if you could as soon as you can once we're reconvened on the $29 t h$ just provide us with,
just give it to Ms. Monroe, just a breakdown of who the questioners will be.

MS. CRANE: Yes. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. I know I'm out of order, but number 23 I have the Pemigewassett River Local Advisory Committee. Mr. Stamp?

MR. STAMP: 45 minutes for Aesthetics, and we'll split that up pretty evenly between the three of us.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. STAMP: 35 minutes for Mr. Varney. Equally split again.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 30 minutes for each, please.

MR. IACOPINO: The Historic Groups, Ms. Martland?

MS. MARTLAND: Three hours for Mr. DeWan. It will be divided between two questioners.

MR. IACOPINO: You said three hours, two questioners?

MS. MARTLAND: Yes. And nothing for Mr. Varney.

MR. IACOPINO: Nobody is here from NEPGA.
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Wagner Forest. Mr. Novello, I apologize.
MR. NOVELLO: No offense taken. We won't have any questions.

MR. IACOPINO: For either one of them?
MR. NOVELLO: That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: And now about NEPGA.
MR. MONAHAN: We have no questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Ms. Monroe is going to go over what we have for the Historic, for the remainder of the Historic Panel so if anybody has any changes to what she tells you, we'll need to know.

MS. MONROE: So for Counsel for the Public, I had 30 minutes left. SPNHF, Ms. Boepple asked for 2.5 hours. The Municipal Groups together, Ms. Pacik and Mr. Whitley, asked for one hour total between the two. Clarksville to Stewartstown Group, Mr. Baker on behalf of his clients asked for 30 minutes. I see a nodding head. The Dummer to Northumberland Group, Ms. Percy who isn't here yet had asked for 30 minutes. Ms. More who isn't here has asked for 30 minutes. She has contacted me via email, and she was here at the prior hearing. The
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Deerfield Group, Ms. Menard had asked for two hours. And the Ashland to Concord Group, Ms. Quinn or Ms. Townsend had asked for 15 minutes. Is that correct, Ms. Crane?

MS. CRANE: Yes.
MR. IACOPIINO: And Ms. Martland approached me today and because they weren't on the list, nor do I believe they were present, they may have been at the last but she asked for how long, Ms. Martland?

MS. MARTLAND: 60 to 90 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And you had asked for some consideration for when who's coming?

MS. MARTLAND: Betty Merritt, Elizabeth Merritt.

MR. IACOPINO: When Ms. Merritt might go?
MS. MARTLAND: Yes. She is constrained by how much time she has if she might go in a different order.

MR. IACOPINO: So I asked if you could talk with the parties to see if you can work that out and let me know.

MS. MARTLAND: Yes. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: So 60 to 90 minutes for your group.

MS. MARTLAND: Yes. Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: One thing I would say that $I$ think all of parties have been very flexible with each other over the last 27 days of hearings, and when it's been necessary to rearrange witnesses or rearrange the order, everybody's been very cooperative with each other, and we really appreciate that. But please remember to let us know if there is sort of a consensus that there's going to a change in the order. So thank you.

MS. BIRCHARD: Yes. So the NGO Intervenors would like to reserve 15 minutes for that Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: For the Historic Panel. Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Okay.
MS. BIRCHARD: Thank you.
MS. MANZELLI: I'd like to revise up my estimation for cross-examination of the Aesthetics Panel from 3 hours to 4.5 hours. Sorry about that.

MR. IACOPINO: Did you miss a couple pages there?

MS. MANZELLI: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Now you make me have to read my own handwriting. So noted.

So that concludes pretty much discussion regarding at least the scheduling, length of time we expect to continue to proceed with the Applicant's witnesses.

Let's move on and talk about the witnesses from the rest of the parties. That includes Counsel for the Public and all our Intervenors. Now, we have some Intervenors that we have generally grouped as being in support of the Project, and I'd like to start off with them. I'm going to start with Wagner Forest. Was there a Prefiled Testimony on Wagner Forest?

MS. WAGNER: No. We did not have anyone.
MR. IACOPINO: So there's no witnesses from Wagner Forest. So we're going to move on to the Business Organizations. My list says that we have Prefiled Testimony from -- I'm going to mess up his name. But Mr. Allen Bouthillier, we have Prefiled Testimony, and Prefiled Testimony from Mr. Casey and Mr. Eaton for IBEW and then Prefiled Testimony from Mr. Otten.
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MR. RAFF: That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Do you intend to present all of those witnesses?

MR. RAFF: We do.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Let's talk about how you're going to do that. Do you intend to put them up as a single panel or do you intend to call them individually? I note that both the group, Mr. Bouthillier and Mr. Casey and Mr. Eaton all seemed -- and actually part of Mr. Otten's testimony all seems to address Orderly Development. Seems that it would make sense to call them as a Panel, but obviously they're your witnesses so --

MR. RAFF: If that's what you think would be easier, we'd be happy to put them together.

MR. IACOPINO: I don't want to tell you how to put on your case. I'm just saying to me, I mean, I've gone through the various prefiled testimonies, and I've tried, I don't always get it right so I do have Mr. Otten also speaking about public interest as well.

MR. RAFF: After further discussion, we're going to do them separate. Joe and Tiler will
be one Panel and Allen will be another one and then Mr. Otten.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. City of Franklin and Berlin. I have two witnesses from that group. Mayor Grenier and Elizabeth Dragon. There has been a substitute, I think?

MR. BOLDT: There will be a substitute. I checked with the spokesperson for the group. I checked with Paul Fitzgerald who is the spokesperson for the City of Franklin. Ms. Dragon is about to transfer to the City of Keene, and they have yet to designate who will adopt her testimony, but they do anticipate that adoption will take place fairly soon.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And what's your pleasure in terms of how you're going to present your witnesses, Mr. Boldt?

MR. BOLDT: I would anticipate that they would be separate, but it is one where it's the pleasure of the Committee.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, I'll tell everybody I think the Committee would prefer as many Panels as possible because $I$ think things tend to go smoother when we have Panels, and they take less
time. But, again, the Committee has allowed the Applicant to present its case in the manner in which it saw fit, and we're going to extend that same courtesy to you all, but if you're concerned about what the Committee thinks, the Committee would prefer Panels.

MR. BOLDT: Frankly, it's a question of how much cross-examination there would be of these two. Hopefully it will be brief, but we'll see. MR. IACOPINO: I do have that their testimonies overlap on Orderly Development. So it's up to you though.

MR. BOLDT: I'm fine. Paul and I have not discussed that aspect of it, and to speed things along we'll agree that a Panel is probably a good idea.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Okay. Counsel for the Public. Wait a minute. Did I miss any of the groups that are generally supportive of the Application? I don't think I did, did I? Okay. Mr. Pappas. What's your plan?

MR. PAPPAS: I sent an email around, I believe, on Friday. You should have gotten a copy of it, but if not --

MR. IACOPINO: I didn't get one. Although in about two hours on Friday I got 109 emails so --

MR. PAPPAS: Mine was 108.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm talking they all came in at one time.

MR. PAPPAS: Our current thinking is that we're going to start with our Construction Panel and it will be a Panel, even though the testimony was split between overhead and underground. I think it's more efficient to put them together. So the Construction Panel will be three gentlemen from Dewberry: Mr. Taylor, Mr. Zysk and Mr. Alexander and plus Mr. Bascom who focuses on underground.

We would then put on our Local Economics Panel which are the two gentlemen from Kavet \& Rockler. Mr. Kavet and Mr. Rockler.

We then anticipate putting on our Historic and Cultural witness, Ms. O'Donnell from Heritage.

And then we plan on putting our Environmental Panel which will be all the Environmental Prefiled Testimony, Mr. Lew-Smith,

Mr. Parsons, Mr. Amaral and Mr. Reynolds. MR. IACOPINO: What was the first one? MR. PAPPAS: Lew-Smith. Michael Lew-Smith. MR. IACOPINO: So Lew-Smith, Parsons, Amaral and Reynolds?

MR. PAPPAS: And Reynolds. Then we anticipate putting our Aesthetics Panel on, the three gentleman from T.J. Boyle, Mr. Buscher, Mr. Palmer and Mr. Owens. And our final panel will be what I call Market Economics, Dr. Weiss and Dr. Newell.

That's our intended order. Obviously, I'm comfortable with our Construction Panel leading off and the Local Economics probably going second. Beyond that, it's going to depend on availability of witnesses and where we are in the hearing days, but if I had my druthers that would be order which we would present them.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So after Counsel for the Public would normally be Municipal Group 1-North. Municipal Group 1-North on my list has three Boards of Selectmen that filed testimony. Pittsburg, Clarksville and Stewartstown. It's been, I guess the Chair of each of those groups
filed, and by my notes they all involve, they all overlap on Orderly Development, some of them overlap on Public Interest, and then, well, actually, they tend to overlap on Environment and Aesthetics as well. But we don't have any representative here. Is anybody from that group here at all? Okay. We will have to make inquiry from them.

But at this point, if the Chair were to ask me, I would say to call those representatives as a Panel. They appear to all come from the same geographic area, and they're, at least by my notes, their Prefiled Testimony overlaps substantially. We'll follow up. At some point we'll find a way to notify everybody of what we learn.

Municipal Group 1 South, I know that you have, there's one witness that is shared by a number of Municipal Groups. That's Mr. Sansoucy. I assume you intend to present him separately?

MR. WHITLEY: That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: And then for Municipal Group
1 South, I have -- and I'm sorry if I butcher
people's names. Cassandra Laleme from Bethlehem. Cheryl Jensen, am I right group? Cheryl Jensen, Bethlehem Conservation Commission. Edwin Mellett from Northumberland. My notes say Hersom and Lombardi, Whitefield Board of Selectmen and the Planning Board. Lise Moran on behalf of the Town of Whitefield.

Am I correct that those are your remaining witnesses after Sansoucy or did I miss up my groups?

MR. TANGUAY: Those are primarily correct. I can't speak to Bethlehem because they have decided to represent themselves.

MR. IACOPINO: Is Ms. Jensen here?
MR. TANGUAY: I don't believe anybody from Bethlehem is here.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Tanguay, what would be your plan to put these on -- obviously, without knowing what Ms. Jensen intends to do, as a Panel or separately?

MR. TANGUAY: We were anticipating putting on each town because of the different dynamics and characteristics of each town so we were hoping to put each town on as a Panel onto
itself.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So that would mean that, assuming Bethlehem was on board with you, Laleme and Jensen is representing Bethlehem. Then Ed Mellett on Northumberland, and then Hersom and Lombardi and Moran for Whitefield?

MR. TANGUAY: That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. WHITLEY: Mike, I'm the spokesperson for Group 1 South, and I've had some conversations with Ms. Jensen from Bethlehem, and I believe that she is on board with the Bethlehem witnesses being presented as a single Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. WHITLEY: Consistent with what Shawn just mentioned.

MR. IACOPINO: Let me just make a note here.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I also have Lore Moran Dodge as one of the witnesses.

MR. WHITLEY: Who was that, Pam?
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Lore Moran Dodge and Lise Moran filed jointly, I believe.
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MR. IACOPINO: Oh. I'm sorry.
MR. TANGUAY: Attorney Iacopino did mention Lise Moran, and that's who we have as the witness for that.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Okay. But not Lore?
MR. TANGUAY: I don't believe so, no. I think Lise Moran will be the one providing that testimony.

MS. MANZELLI: Excuse me, Pam. Amy Manzelli for the Forest Society. The Moran sisters filed Joint Testimony on behalf of the Forest Society. So I think that's the confusion.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: Municipal Group 2, we have testimony from Deborah Stever which has been adopted by Robert Thibault on behalf of the Easton Board of Selectmen. Testimony from Eric Meth on behalf of the Franconia Board of Selectmen. Mr. Sansoucy, but we've already addressed him. Jim Collier on behalf of the Easton Planning Board. Judy Welch. Kris Pastoriza on behalf of the Easton Conservation Commission. Margaret Connors on behalf of Sugar
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Hill Board of Selectmen. And Sharon Penney whose testimony was adopted which Brian Murphy on behalf of the town of Plymouth. Is that correct?

MR. WHITLEY: Mr. Iacopino, this is Steven Whitley. The Town of Woodstock has withdrawn from this matter, and you mentioned Judy Welch.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I didn't have her, so I should, so you're not going to present her as a witness.

MR. WHITLEY: She will be not be appearing as a witness.

MR. IACOPINO: I take it you have no objection to her Prefiled Testimony being removed from the record or stricken?

MR. WHITLEY: Correct.
MR. TANGUAY: In terms of all the other names of all the other witnesses, Attorney Iacopino, those are all correct.

MR. IACOPINO: How are you anticipating the presentation of those witnesses?

MR. TANGUAY: Once again, we were thinking about doing them as a Panel for each town.

MR. IACOPINO: So we would have a Panel
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from Easton, a Panel from Franconia, and a Panel from Sugar Hill and then Mr. Murphy for Plymouth?

MR. TANGUAY: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So Municipal Group number 2 will be presenting four separate sets of testimony. Okay.

Let's move on to Municipal Group 3 North. I have in my list, and please correct me if I'm wrong, the following witnesses. Barbara Lucas from the town of New Hampton, Daniel Moore on behalf of the town of New Hampton. Again, Mr. Sansoucy, we've already addressed him. Kenneth Kettenring from New Hampton. Kris Pastoriza again. I don't know why I have her -- I just have her in the wrong group, I guess. Neil Irvine, Board of Selectmen, New Hampton. Nicholas Coates, Town of Bristol. This is Municipal Group 3 North.

MR. WHITLEY: That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: What is the proposal for how you're going to present those witnesses?

MR. WHITLEY: Similar to the other municipalities, each municipality will be its
own Panel.
MR. IACOPINO: So we've got New Hampton, Bristol. Did I miss a town?

MR. WHITLEY: I don't believe so. No.
MR. IACOPINO: So it's just two on that. Municipal Group 3 South. Again, they have Mr. Sansoucy as well. We're only going to do him once. I have Ammy Heiser from the Conservation Committee, Town of Pembroke. Andrew Robertson on behalf of the Town of Deerfield. Beth Fenstermacher on behalf of the City of Concord. Edward Roberge, I don't have where he's from. Concord. Heather Shank, also from Concord. Justine Courtenmanche whose testimony is adopted by David Jodoin from Pembroke. Kate Hartnett on behalf of the Planning Board and Building Department of the Town of Deerfield. Joint Testimony of Matson and Bouchard for Concord. Joint Testimony of McLure and Tardiff for the Concord Conservation Commission. Peter Scott from Sabbow and Company. Rick Van De Poll from Concord and Stephanie Verdile from the Town of Pembroke. Did I miss anybody in that group? MS. PACIK: No. That's correct.

MR. IACOPINO: How are we going to do that group?

MS. PACIK: So Pembroke will be a Panel. All the Deerfield will be a Panel, and then from Concord, all of the Prefiled Testimony that we submitted would be a Panel, with possibly the exception of Peter Scott. We could put him on the same day, but we might want him to be separate just because he has a very narrow window of time.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm listing him as separate just for our purposes and scheduling purposes.

MS. PACIK: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: It would be great if you can have him sit with the Panel. It makes things more efficient. That would be great.

MS. PACIK: Is there going to be room to accommodate nine people?

MR. IACOPINO: We'll make it.
MS. PACIK: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Might be a little crowded, but we'll make it.

MR. IACOPINO: Grafton County Commissioner. They have one witness, Linda Lauer?
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MS. SAFFO: Yes. That's it.
MR. IACOPINO: Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. I have, I know you did a memo, but $I$ don't have it in front of me so I don't remember what was in it, but I'm going to go through the witnesses first and you tell me how you have them set up as Panels, Ms. Manzelli, is that okay?

MS. MANZELLI: That's fine.
MR. IACOPINO: For everybody's benefit, they presented Prefiled Testimony from Jane Difley, Will Abbott, Raymond Lobdell, Harry Dodson, Dean Wilber, Donald and Diane Bilodeau, Dawn Bilodeau and Dana Bilodeau. I think that's a Joint Testimony. Kelly O'Brien Normandeau or is Normandeau a separate witness?

MS. MANZELLI: Yes. Kelly O'Brien
Normandeau is one of our witnesses.
MR. IACOPINO: Just the way $I$ have it in my notes is $I$ don't know if it's one person or two. Sorry. Here we have Lore and Lise Moran Dodge. And then John Conkling. Did I get all of your witnesses?

MS. MANZELLI: Yes. You did.

MR. IACOPINO: Can you tell us how you plan on splitting them up, please?

MS. MANZELLI: So Jane Difley and Will Abbott would be a Panel for the two of them. The Bilodeau family, the northern Bilodeaus, Donald, Diane, Dawn and Dana will be a Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MS. MANZELLI: It might be easier to skip the next Panel and say that Ray Lobdell and Harry Dodson will go second to last and last as individual witnesses. And then everybody else will be our third set of witnesses. So that's John Conkling, Dean Wilber, Kelly O'Brien Normandeau, Lore Moran Dodge and Lise Moran.

MR. IACOPINO: How many total people is that?

MS. MANZELLI: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.
MR. IACOPINO: It will be a little crowded up there, too. So you intend to present five Panels, with the third one being the larger group.

MS. MANZELLI: Correct, and with the fourth and fifth, quote, unquote, Panel just being individual witnesses.
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MR. IACOPINO: Yes.
MS. MANZELLI: I did want to make the same caveat that Attorney Pappas mentioned. This is how we would prefer to do it. We'll remain flexible based on the needs of all the other parties and also recognize that our clients, weather, all that.

MR. IACOPINO: We understand that there's still a lot of question marks out there in terms of scheduling, and I think everybody understands that flexibility is necessary.

MS. MANZELLI: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: The NGOs, Appalachian Mountain Group, Conservation Law, and Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust is a group. I have three filings, three prefiled filings for them. Chris Thayer, Dr. David Publicover, and then a Joint Testimony of Dr. Kenneth Kimball and Larry Garland. Did I miss anybody?

MR. PLOUFFE: That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: What is the plan for the presentation of these witnesses?

MR. PLOUFFE: So the Joint Testimony of Kimball and Garland and the testimony of Thayer

I would see as a, quote, "Panel." And Publicover is on a separate topic, but he could sit up there at the same time as you were suggesting before.

MR. IACOPINO: Put all three of your witnesses on at the same time? Same Panel?

MR. PLOUFFE: Yes, right.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay, great.
MR. PLOUFFE: But we could separate the topics, perhaps, if that would make sense. Publicover being separate from the -- he's the wildlife/forestry whereas the others are Aesthetics.

MR. IACOPINO: It's your preference to put them all on as a Panel?

MR. PLOUFFE: I think that's the most efficient for the Subcommittee.

MR. IACOPINO: I agree. Thank you.
Mr. Monahan, we now turn to NEPGA in my list here, and this list isn't in the same order as the other list, but $I$ have two filings, but I'm not sure about them. James Ginnetti and William Fowler.

MR. MONAHAN: We'll be offering William
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Prehearing Conference] \{8-9-17\}

Fowler, and while we haven't prepared it yet, Mr. Ginnetti's testimony focused on the PPA and we'll be withdrawing that testimony.

MR. IACOPINO: You'll be what?
MR. MONAHAN: Withdrawing that testimony so we wouldn't be presenting Mr. Ginnetti.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So you won't be presenting Mr. Ginnetti, just be presenting Mr. Fowler.

MR. MONAHAN: Correct. I'm sorry.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Okay. Mr. Thompson. I'm going to combine both of your groups. Where is Mr. Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. I'm here.
MR. IACOPINO: I have both of your groups combined in this.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Are you ready? Because it's pretty long. I have a total of 12.

MR. THOMPSON: I can simplify it a lot.
MR. IACOPINO: Let me read it so everybody knows who's in your group, and then you simplify it for us. I've got John Petrofsky, Bradley Thompson, Daryl Thompson, E. Martin Kaufman,

Lori and Joan Levesque, Roger McAllaster. I've got John Petrofsky again, but obviously he can't -- Sally Zankowski, Peter Perkins, Stephan Nix, Roderick Moore and David Schrier. Does that sound right to you, Mr. Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: It was.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Tell us what it is.
MR. THOMPSON: Separately, I'll have two witnesses: John Petrofsky and then Stephan Nix. And also we have a 21-minute video which we bring into play here. And I have a couple of questions concerning the video.

MR. IACOPINO: Let's just address how you're going to present your witnesses first and then we'll talk about the video, okay?

MR. THOMPSON: Each of them will be separate. My two. And then the last two witnesses, Moore and Schrier, are Mr. Baker's. Attorney Baker.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. What about yourself, Daryl Thompson, Mr. Kaufman, the Levesques, the McAllasters?

MR. THOMPSON: Those folks --
MR. IACOPINO: Zankowski, Perkins.
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MR. THOMPSON: -- were part of the video, and the question $I$ have is do we need them present for representation for authenticity with the video. It's 7 participants in the video.

MR. IACOPINO: Have you distributed your video to all the parties?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: What's the Applicant's position with respect to that?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think we've already indicated that we object to the showing of the video, and we would also object to witnesses filing testimony and then not being available for cross-examination.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. I will flag this issue for the Chairperson. I would expect, Mr. Thompson, that you may need to file a motion just explaining what you want to do. The Applicant will have to file an objection, and anybody who objects to it or supports it, please feel free to chime in, but it's something that's going to be ruled on by the Chair. Now, you could just wait until the hearing, until your time, but if you don't know in advance, you
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don't know whether to have those people here or not. So there is some time before we begin again and certainly some time before we get to your presentation so $I$ would suggest that if you can get it on paper and explain what you want to do, and the Applicant will have ten days to respond and anybody else will have ten days to respond as well, maybe we can get a ruling out of the Chair early enough so that you know what to expect.

MR. THOMPSON: We'll move right ahead with that. Thank you.

MS. PACIK: Attorney Iacopino?
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Pacik?
MS. PACIK: I believe the video was subject to a Motion to Strike that was denied.

MR. PALMER: Yes, that's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: When was that?
MS. PACIK: A long time ago. Shortly after it was filed.

MR. IACOPINO: Do you agree that was the case?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: It was subject to a Motion to Strike, and that was denied. I think that's
a separate issue from what we're talking about now.

MR. IACOPINO: Do you have any objection with sort of doing this as a Motion in Limine with respect to the objection that you would make to the video?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No.
MR. IACOPINO: I assume the objection that you're going to make is on a separate issue, separate issue or separate basis than what your Motion to Strike was.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So your plan
initially was he was going to come and present the video, and you were going to object. Let's deal with it like a Motion in Limine then.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's fine.
MR. IACOPINO: So explain what you want to do and why you want to do it, make sure that you copy the Service List. Anybody who wants to either support or oppose that, support or oppose it. And the Applicant will have ten days to file their objection. I'd rather, I mean, you guys can wait if you want, but I think everybody
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would rather have this decided in advance.
So let me ask you the next question. And the reason why that is is he claims that his objection is on a different basis than the Motion to Strike was. So we'll have to see what that is.

MS. BIRCHARD: I have a question. If he hasn't stated the basis, then why does the witness have the obligation to file a motion?

MR. IACOPINO: Because we don't know exactly what he wants to do.

MS. BIRCHARD: Well, he's already sought to admit it into evidence, and the effort to strike that from evidence has been defeated. So he would like to introduce it into evidence per his earlier --

MR. IACOPINO: Now he knows there's an objection. We'd like to know what it is he wants to do with the video, and that's the way it's going to be. So I suggest that you do that. That way, the Chair will know why you want to do what you want to do and what it is you want to do. Obviously, the Applicant could object, could object as you're walking up to the
podium to do it so we want to get this cleared out. If you find the need to respond to the objection, as long as you get it in quickly, you're free to do so, Mr. Thompson.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Judge?
MR. JUDGE: Mr. Presiding Officer, maybe I'm just not understanding. If there's been a Motion to Strike, and the Motion to Strike has been denied, then it seems to me that the burden should be on the Applicant and that we're talking about who's filing the motion because you're shifting, if the person who's putting forward the video has the burden of establishing that they should be allowed in, that doesn't seem appropriate. Should be the Applicant who files the motion.

MR. IACOPINO: Person who proffers evidence also always has the burden of establishing its admissibility. I want to resolve that issue in advance, and that's the way that we're going to do it. Mr. Thompson, you'll have an opportunity to respond if there's something in the objection that you need to respond to. Ms. Manzelli?

MS. MANZELLI: Thank you, Attorney
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Iacopino. I called up the order. It does say that the video as presented by the Intervenors contain information that is relevant to the subject matter of the docket and may be helpful to show potential impacts. It goes on to say that evidence may be presented in different forms, including recorded oral statements and exhibits or videorecorded statements with visual exhibits. The fact that this information has been presented in the form of video does not render it inadmissible. The rules of evidence do not apply in these proceedings. And it goes on at length. So I just wanted to call that to your attention.

MR. IACOPINO: If Counsel for the Applicant was telling me they simply intend to object on the same basis that they filed the Motion to Strike, then I would agree, but he's indicating that he has a different basis for objection to the video. Mr. Needleman?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I believe everything everybody has said just related to the video as presentation of evidence. None of it related, I think, to it being a substitute for witnesses
being present, subject to cross-examination. Those are completely different issues.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, maybe we can cut to the chase then. That's the basis of your remaining objection?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: At this point, yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Thompson, can you have those people here?

MR. THOMPSON: I'm sure I can. They're all from the North Country, but we'll make it happen.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Maybe what we should do is the Applicant and Mr. Thompson should have a separate discussion off-line about this issue, and we'll see if we can work something out rather than continuing to talk about it now and have a lot of potential motion practice that may ultimately not be helpful.

MR. IACOPINO: I don't want any motion practice. It's not helpful. I thought the motion practice because you said that your objection was on a different basis than it was to the Motion to Strike. I thought the motion practice would be helpful. If it's merely a
matter of having the witnesses here,
Mr. Thompson says he'll have them here, I don't see an issue. I don't see you objecting under those circumstances. You'll be able to cross-examine them, and we'll go through it and move on.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That's fine.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Mr. Baker, you have two clients in there, in this group that filed Prefiled Testimony. Is it the intention that you're going to present them or that Mr. Thompson will present them? How do you guys plan to --

MR. BAKER: What I would like to do is what I originally suggested way back in the spring, and that is present my four clients as a Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Can you tell me their names?
MR. BAKER: Yes. Rod Moore and David Schrier own properties in Stewartstown. One is on the underground route, one is under the aboveground portion of the line by virtue of a right-of-way into the property.

The other two clients are in Dummer and Stark, both in the Dummer to Northumberland
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Abutters Group. One is Joshua Olson who will be giving the testimony on behalf of the Olson family. The other is Rodney Beland. Mr. Beland is also on the existing right-of-way as is Mr. Olson.

MR. IACOPINO: Just so everybody is clear, what I have as the witnesses and groups for the Clarksville and Stewartstown Abutting and Non-Abutting is Mr. Petrofsky separately, Mr. Nix separately, the group that is involved in the video, I'm not going to go through all those names, as a Panel. And then another Panel including Mr. Baker's clients from two different groups, Moore, Schrier, Olson and Beland.

And what about you, Mr. Thompson? Where are you going to be? You have testimony filed as well.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: Are you going to be on your own or are you going to put yourself in a Panel with Petrofsky, Mr. Nix, the video group?

MR. THOMPSON: I hadn't thought about it.
What do you want me to do?
MR. IACOPINO: I can't try your case for
you, sir, but as I indicated before, we like to be as efficient as possible.

MR. THOMPSON: I'll be by myself.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
Dummer, Stark, Northumberland Abutters. Is Ms. Percy here now?

MS. PERCY: I am.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MS. PERCY: So Dummer --
MR. IACOPINO: Let me just go through the list of witnesses that $I$ have first and then you can -- the list that $I$ have initially for your group is Karen Spencer, Eric and Margaret Jones, Eric, Elaine and Joshua Olson who I understand is going to be put in the prior group. Mr. Beland, who I understand will be with Mr. Baker as well. And yourself. Did I miss anybody who filed Prefiled Testimony?

MS. PERCY: Eric Jones.
MR. IACOPINO: Got him. That was the second one. Spencer, Eric and Margaret Jones. MS. PERCY: Sorry.

MR. IACOPINO: Then the Olson family, Mr. Beland and yourself.

MS. PERCY: Right. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
MS. PERCY: So we have Eric Jones and the Percy Summer Club will be on a Panel together. And then Attorney Cunningham will speak on his group.

MR. IACOPINO: What about Karen Spencer?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, Mike. Art Cunningham here. I'm going to bring Karen who filed the testimony, wrote and filed the testimony. I'm also going to bring Kevin Spencer and Mark Legasse who are the owners and builders of the Percy.

MR. IACOPINO: Have they filed testimony?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: They have not, but I want them on the Panel just in case there's a question.

MR. IACOPINO: How do you intend for them to present any Direct Testimony?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: They won't be presenting testimony. Karen will do that.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. So it's Ms. Percy and Mr. Jones. Mr. and Mrs. Jones. I don't know if they're Mr. and Mrs. Eric and

Margaret Jones. That's who's left in this group. Are you guys to be separate from each other or is that considered together?

MS. PERCY: That's together.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. That's what I thought.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mike?
MR. IACOPINO: Just one minute.
Iryna points out to me, Ms. Percy, that you, although you did file the Prefiled Testimony, when you submitted your exhibit list you never submitted your own testimony as an exhibit. You should probably do that.

MS. PERCY: Thank you. I will.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Now somebody wanted my attention? I'm sorry.

I'm sorry, Mr. Needleman. I should go back to the prior group where Mr. Baker is suggesting combining Mr. Moore, Mr. Schrier, the Olson family and Mr. Beland together, sort of a combination of witnesses from two separate groups. Do you have any objection to that?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't think so.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Sorry. I meant to
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ask you that and I forgot.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think that's fine. I do have an objection to Mr. Cunningham's proposal to present witnesses who have not submitted testimony.

MR. IACOPINO: I think that's something that can be dealt with at the time because, obviously, if there's no Direct Testimony there's nothing to cross-examine them on, but we'll leave that up to the Chair, and Mr. Cunningham has been around for a long time so he knows the waters that he's in.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I've talked about Kevin Spencer and Mark Legasse multiple times. I think the Panel would like to see them.

MR. IACOPINO: They may or they may not, but ultimately it will be up to the Chairman of the Committee.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Sure. Understand.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. The next group that I have is Mr. Brekke's group, I believe. Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem Abutters. I have in that group the following testimonies: Bruce and Sandra Brekke. Am I saying that correctly?

MR. BREKKE: Yes, that's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: David Van Houten, James and Judy Ramsdell, Peter Powell, Tim and Brigitte White. So there's five, I have five testimonies from that group. Mr. Brekke, do you know how you're going to break them up?

MR. BREKKE: Do you have testimony from Neil Lupton in that group? I think he made Prefiled Testimony.

MR. IACOPINO: I don't think, there was a Motion to Strike -- my understanding is that that motion, the Motion to Strike was denied and there's actually some discovery apparently going on with respect to having the Applicant and other parties have the opportunity to ask questions of Mr. Lupton outside of the Committee presence, but yes, at this point Mr. Lupton is one of those witnesses. So let me just make a quick note. So there's six testimonies. Mr. Brekke, can you raise your hand?

MR. BREKKE: Yes. Right here. I'm sorry. Did you mention Peter Powell? Was he in that list?

MR. IACOPINO: Yes.

MR. BREKKE: Yes. Six is correct.
MR. IACOPINO: What's your plan on how you intend to present these witnesses? Just to give you an idea of what $I$ have them listed as on my list, I have that they all pretty much overlap on Orderly Development. There is, obviously, Mr. Powell has some impact on tourism, economy and real estate values which are part of Orderly Development. And then there's overlap on Health and Safety, Public Interest. So what was your plan on how you were going to present these witnesses?

MR. BREKKE: We would like to present Peter Powell first as an individual.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. BREKKE: And then the remaining five as a Panel would be fine.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you.
MR. BREKKE: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer, the Bethlehem to Plymouth, Abutting Property Owners group, I have testimony from Bruce Ahern, Campbell McLaren, Carl Lakes, Eric and Barbara Meyer. Susan Schibanoff who I understand has moved over to
another group. And then Walter and Kathryn Ting. And I'm told Mary Grote. Am I correct on your Prefiled Testimonies? Did I get that right?

MR. PALMER: Slight difference from what you've said. We have a Panel from our group who have presented Prefiled Testimony including a video.

MR. IACOPINO: Who is on that Panel?
MR. PALMER: That Panel includes Barbara and Eric Meyer, Robert Thibault, Russell and Lydia Cumbee, Walter Palmer and Kathryn Ting, Carl and Barbara Lakes, Bruce Ahern, and Peter and Mary Grote.

MR. IACOPINO: So they're all the folks that $I$ just read off.

MR. PALMER: So all of those people are on the Panel that presented the group's Prefiled Testimony, but then we also have five separate people who've presented separate testimony. So we would like to present the Panel together as one group. And then each of the people who have filed Prefiled Testimony separately will appear as separate witnesses.
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MR. IACOPINO: Why would you want to do that? You're only going to present them through their Prefiled Testimony. For what reason would you want to put them on as a Panel and then call them each one at a time?

MR. PALMER: Because the Counsel for the Applicant is requiring that the people who are listed as having been witnesses for the video should all be there, and so I'm saying that we will all be there when the video is presented. However, each of us has different issues that we want to discuss and that we have raised in our own separate Prefiled Testimony, and so the five people who filed separate Prefiled Testimony will appear as separate witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: So we have a Panel, I'll call it the Video Panel. So then you want to call Mr. Ahern, Dr. McLaren.

MR. PALMER: Myself.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Lakes. Eric and Barbara Meyer.

MR. PALMER: No. They're just going to be part of the Video Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. Mary Grote.
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MR. PALMER: Peter Grote.
MR. IACOPINO: Peter Grote. Sorry. Walter and Kathryn Ting. And Mr. Palmer.

MR. PALMER: Walter Palmer, that's me.
MR. IACOPINO: Sorry.
MR. PALMER: My wife is Kathryn Ting, but she will not be presented separately.

MR. IACOPINO: My apologies. I'm trying to read from my notes here.

MR. PALMER: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: So that's the way you want to do that.

MR. PALMER: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. PALMER: And again, we would like to reserve time to present our video.

MR. IACOPINO: Has your video been distributed?

MR. PALMER: It has been distributed, yes.
MR. IACOPINO: How long is your video?
MR. PALMER: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: So you have the same concerns?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I do, and I'm not quite
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sure I understand how Mr. Palmer's describing this, but it sounds as those witnesses are going to be appearing twice.

MR. IACOPINO: I think what he is saying is we'll put the people who actually speak in the video up there when he intends to show the video assuming --

MR. PALMER: Sorry. I'd like to clarify. There are no speakers in our video. Our video is strictly video of the route of the power line.

MR. IACOPINO: They're the folks who produced the video that are in that Panel, correct?

MR. PALMER: The people who are in that Panel are just the people who signed as presenters of this video. It was a group testimony that we submitted which included the video.

MR. IACOPINO: So you're going to use that group to authenticate your video?

MR. PALMER: Yes. As required by the Applicant, if we all need to sit there and raise our hand and adopt that video, then we will.
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MR. IACOPINO: It's not required by the Applicant. It's a rule of the Committee, okay? And it happens in every case, not just in this case.

MR. PALMER: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: So it's not about them. So my understanding is these folks, you're putting them on because they presented the video. They're the people who are sponsoring the video.

MR. PALMER: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: If the Applicant has cross-examination, if the video is allowed to be shown, and I assume the Applicant will object to this video as well at the time.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: This one is not entirely clear to me because it's not sounding like this is meant to be a substitute for Prefiled Testimony. It's meant to be an exhibit. So we're going to have to clarify this.

MR. IACOPINO: At this point, I think what I'm hearing and the way that I'm processing this is with respect to this video, there are five people who are the authenticators, or if you were in court the people, each of them would be
called to say that the video is authentic, and you could cross-examine them about that if you so chose. Of course, assuming that the video is allowed in over any action that you might make. And then after that, then we're going to get into the substance of the Prefiled Testimonies one at a time. So that's my understanding of how you want to proceed. You're going to have all of those folks here on the day when you present the video.

MR. PALMER: Yes. I'd like to clarify that our group testimony consists of both written testimony and the video, and we will have the whole group there as a Panel to adopt the written testimony and video, and that's what we intend to do, yes.

MR. IACOPINO: I think that's what I laid out.

MR. PALMER: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you for confirming that that's your intention.

MR. PALMER: With one exception and that is that Eric Meyer is a surgeon, and he works difficult schedule, and it might not be possible
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MR. IACOPINO: All right. We'll address that as need be at the time.

Okay. I'm going to try to just get through the sort of designation of witnesses and Panels, and then we'll take a break. Are you doing okay?

COURT REPORTER: Yes. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm on page 23 of 28 for my notes. So we're getting there.

So the next group that $I$ have is Ashland to Concord Abutting Property Owners. Mary Lee, Michelle Kleindienst. Let me deal with Ms. Lee first. Actually, let me deal with Mr. Judge here. I assume you don't intend to do this as a Panel.

MR. JUDGE: That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: And Ms. Lee, I understand that you want to have Mr. Kucman essentially take you through the steps of putting in your testimony, is that right?

MS. LEE: If he finds it to be pertinent at the time --

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

MS. LEE: -- he'll step in and assist.
MR. IACOPINO: You understand he's not a witness.

MS. LEE: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: He would just be there to say is this your testimony, do you swear that's true, do you have any changes to it.

MS. LEE: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. All right.
MS. LEE: Because he assisted in one of the exhibits.

MR. IACOPINO: He did, and it was helpful. Thank you.

Next group I have is the Deerfield Abutters. I have testimony from D. Scott Newman, and then I just have Deerfield Abutters Joint Testimony. Then I have Erick and Kathleen Berglund. Then I have Jeanne Menard on behalf of Peter Menard and Anne Burnett, and then Jeanne Menard on behalf of the Menard Forest Family. Jo Anne Bradbury. Joint testimony of Robert Cote and Bruce Adami. Did I get those correct?

MS. MENARD: That is correct.

MR. IACOPINO: And Ms. Menard, do you have a plan as to how you'd like to present these? You're not going to testify twice, are you?

MS. MENARD: We would like to present Scott Newman first relating to his Historic expertise. And then all of the remaining abutters would be happy to sit as a Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MS. MENARD: I'll just review the names again and make sure we have everybody. Jo Anne Bradbury, Bob Cote, Bruce Adami, Kathy and Erick Berglund and myself, Jeanne Menard.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I got them. Nobody else?

MS. MENARD: That is correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Next I have is Philip and Joan Bilodeau. And, of course, I mean, I assume you guys -- are both of you going to testify, Mr. Bilodeau, you and your wife will be here or not or just you?

MR. BILODEAU: Yes. We would both appear depending on the day.

MR. IACOPINO: As a Panel?
MR. BILODEAU: We'll have to follow the
scheduling.
MR. IACOPINO: We'll get to scheduling after the break.

MR. BILODEAU: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: So following the Bilodeaus, I have the Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem Non-Abutters. Mark and Susan Orzeck. They withdrew. And then Rebecca Weeks and Sherrill More. And Ms. More is not here. Ms. Monroe has had some contact with Ms. More, and apparently Ms. More will be the only witness testifying for the Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Dalton group.

Then I have Ashland to Deerfield Non-Abutters. Testimony that $I$ have in that group is from Maureen Quinn, Madelyn and Thomas Foulkes, and the Webster Family Group which is Professor Crane, Ms. Mumford and Ms. Townsend. And Jeanne Menard on behalf of Pawtuckaway View? And Elisha Gray. Sorry.

MS. CRANE: And Gray. And although we are a wide range of issues and wide geography, I think that it's likely that we'll appear as a Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MS. CRANE: I need some clarification because Mr. Gray's appearance is going to be difficult to schedule. If he cannot be physically here, should $I$ be letting him know that it's likely that his testimony will be stricken?

MR. IACOPINO: Yes.
MS. CRANE: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: I mean, that would be the default position, but $I$ encourage you to talk to the other parties, talk to the Applicant. If there's something that can be worked out, I mean, everybody has been fairly accommodating so far so don't be afraid to talk to each other, even if you have opposite positions on the Application.

MS. CRANE: And again, depending upon the schedule, it may be either Mrs. Mumford, Ms. Townsend or me speaking up on behalf of the Webster family.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. So next I have the Sugar Hill Historical Museum, New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and National
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Trust for Historic Preservation, North Country Scenic Byways Council. I have Jessica Martland's testimony, is that correct?

MS. MARTLAND: That's correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Then I have the Pemi. Always at the end of my list. I'm sorry, guys. Barry Draper, Gretchen Draper have each filed testimony and Max Stamp. Do you intend to testify as a Panel?

MR. STAMP: We will testify as a Panel. Yes.

MR. IACOPINO: Did I miss any? Ms. Schibanoff?

MS. SCHIBANOFF: There will be no witnesses from this group.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. All right. We're going to take a 15-minute break. What I would ask you all to do over that break is we now have the list and the presentation preferences of each of the parties from the Business Groups all way down through all of our Intervenors, I believe. Did I miss anybody?

I would like you all over the break to think hard about how much time you intend to
spend with each of those panels or witnesses because when we get back, that's what we're going to do. We're going to go over what the expected, and, again, these are estimates. You're not going to be held to them during the course of the hearing. I think we've been very flexible with everybody's questioning. So think about that, and we'll be back at quarter of.
(Recess taken 10:30-10:51 a.m.)
MR. IACOPINO: I want to take this opportunity to thank you all for working so diligently through this very tedious process, but it is important that we do this because it makes for a more organized hearing.

The next thing that $I$ want to address is just the order in which the presentations are going to take place. We're going to complete the Applicant. Then we're going to have the business group with Cate Street, et al. Then we're going to have the Cities of Franklin and Berlin. Wagner Forest had no testimony, right? Okay. Then we're going to go to Counsel for the Public.

This is for the presentation. The order of
presentation for your witnesses.
Municipal Group 1 North. Municipal Group 1 South. Municipal Group 2. Municipal Group 3 North. Municipal Group 3 South.

Now, if somebody from the Munis can just tell me where in that mix you're going to call Mr. Sansoucy. Is he going to be your first witness from your groups or your last or what's your plan at least?

MR. WHITLEY: I think our preference would be to have him towards the end of the Muni Panels, and then the other complication for Mr . Sansoucy is his schedule. So that will probably be more determinative than our hope for when he might be able to appear.

MR. IACOPINO: Who's going to present him? Who should we speak to? Who is dealing with him of the three?

MR. WHITLEY: He is dealing with all of us. Because we all have --

MR. IACOPINO: Who should be the Committee's point person?

MR. WHITLEY: I'm happy to be the Committee's point person.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. We'll speak to you about any flexibility or scheduling issues that occur from Mr. Sansoucy.

Following the Muni Groups we then have the Grafton County Commissioners presenting their witnesses, followed by the Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests, and if -I'm trying to go in the same order that we've gone in the past so if I go out of order here, please, somebody just yell at me.

Following the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests would be the NGOs, followed by the Abutting Property Owners, Underground and Aboveground now, from Clarksville to Stewartstown. That's the group generally represented by Mr. Thompson.

Followed by the Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead Portion, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland. So NEPGA. I'm going to mark NEPGA as 12 A after the NGOs. So that we'll have the NGOs, then NEPGA. Got that, Mr. Monahan?

MR. MONAHAN: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: So you'll be technically the

13th in order. But I'm just marking you as 12 A because everything else is typed.

Then I have the Abutting Property Owners Underground, Mr. Thompson's Group. There's two of those combined now, and then I have Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Dummer, Stark and Northumberland, and that is Ms. Percy and Mr. Cunningham, correct?

And then we have the Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem, Mr. Brekke's group; and then the Abutting Property Owners, Underground, Bethlehem to Plymouth, Mr. Palmer's group. Followed by Abutting Property Owners, Ashland to Concord, Overhead, and that's split between Ms. Lee and Mr. Judge. And then we have the Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, from Deerfield. That's Ms. Menard's group. And we have Mr. and Mrs. Bilodeau from Deerfield.

And then we have Non-Abutters which were Non-Abutters Overhead from Clarksville to Stewartstown already combined with Mr. Thompson's previous group. I'm just going to take those off the list here. I'll probably
just refer to it as the Thompson group from now on.

Then we go to the Non-Abutting Property Owners of the Overhead of Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Dalton, and Bethlehem, and I believe that was Ms. More. Is that correct? They weren't present today.

And then we have Non-Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Ashland to Deerfield. That's Professor Crane's group. And then I have the Pemigewassett -- I'm sorry. Nancy Martland's group, Sugar Hill Historic and that group and then Pemigewassett.

Did I leave anybody out of the order of presentation of witnesses? That's technically the same order of examination that we've used as well during the course of this proceeding. It's worked pretty well. I haven't heard anybody object to it. Is there any reason why we would need discuss it?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Mike, I've got an availability issue with my witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: Right. Other than availability, though, I mean availability we'll
try to work around in terms of scheduling if somebody can't or can't be there because we don't usually know the dates yet but at least you'll have a general idea of where you fall in the order, and also where you fall in the order to question the witnesses from the other groups because that's the next thing we're going to get to is we're going to go through this list and try to get best estimates from everybody of how much time they intend to spend with each witness and Witness Panel.

I'm sorry. It is going to be a tedious process, but it was helpful for the first round. We had a list up here. Chair knew how long to expect things to take. We were only 6 days over what we expected so -- and that sounds crazy, but in the scheme of things that's not too bad. It could have been a lot worse.

But before we get to that, I want to talk about something called friendly cross-examination. Okay? A number of you have set up your witnesses in such a way that you either have them testifying separately or as a Panel. I can tell you that $I$ have had a
conversation with the Chair. He generally frowns upon the use of cross-examination for friendly purposes, and what that means is basically to rehash a witness's Direct Testimony or to ask them about your own testimony. Those types of things are -- in other words, to enhance your own Direct Testimony or to enhance their Direct Testimony.

The Chair has indicated to me to send the message to you-all that he frowns upon that; that we do not need, the Committee has read all of the Prefiled Testimony. We understand what the testimony says. That testimony is for the most part is or will be part of the record, and it is, and we understand, and the reason why we do Direct Testimony on a prefiled basis is to make this process more efficient and quite frankly shorter. So I've been asked to express that he's going to frown -- he can't stop you, but he's going to frown upon "friendly cross-examination" for lack of a better term, and that should people engage in it, you should be prepared to be stopped or at the very least to explain why your cross-examination does not
fall into the category of simply enhancing the Direct Testimony of yourself or the witness that's on the witness stand.

So you need to be prepared for that. I'd like you to keep that in mind as we're discussing the amount of time that you intend to spend with the various witnesses from other, from groups other than yours. And does anybody have any questions about friendly cross-examination or anything they want to say? Mr. Judge?

MR. JUDGE: I wanted to see if I could give an illustration of something that's not friendly cross-examination. The Public Counsel calls witnesses who have to do with the market value and the effect on market value. If I'm asking them questions that are contrary to Mr. Chalmers' testimony, that's not friendly cross-examination.

MR. IACOPINO: I don't know if -- I don't know if that would be actually the right witnesses. Probably the local economy witnesses.

MR. JUDGE: That's what $I$ meant.
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MR. IACOPINO: Yes. Okay. Yes, I suppose that would be allowed because you're not questioning him about your own client's testimony, you're not questioning him about his own testimony, you're questioning him about what another witness has said. Yes, that would be cross-examination.

Now, let's say it was two friendly witnesses who said the same thing. So if I've got two witnesses who are testifying that the only way to do this in an aesthetically neutral manner or without causing an unreasonable adverse impact to aesthetics is to bury it along I-93, and you start questioning the other witness about their burial plan along I-93 or their reasons for their opinion, that's friendly cross-examination. And that's the opposite from the example that you've provided.

MR. JUDGE: Right.
MR. IACOPINO: So any other questions or comments about friendly cross? Yes. Danielle.

MS. PACIK: Just looking at, for example, Bill Quinlan's testimony, I know there was friendly cross from IBEW with Mr. Raff, and
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there weren't any limitations on that. So I just want to clarify whether the same rules apply to the Intervenors here for Phase III as that.

MR. IACOPINO: The rules apply to everybody. I am conveying a message from the Chair that friendly cross-examination will be frowned upon. I don't recall what questions were asked that you consider to be friendly cross-examination. Apparently, the Chairman didn't, and, apparently, there was no objection.

But the rules are the same for everybody. You do your cross-examination, but if the Chair determines that it's, you know, it's too friendly, or really the concern is simply highlighting what's already in the Direct Testimony. That's the biggest concern that we have. You may get, you may hear from the bench. Move on, we've already seen that in Direct Examination. It's nothing but friendly cross-examination. It doesn't advance the ball. Ms. Manzelli?

MS. MANZELLI: Thanks, Mike. I just wanted to confirm we're still operating under the
parameters set forward in the Chair's order from March 31st of this year regarding the use of friendly cross-examination where he was denying a request for a prehearing determination that all friendly cross should be excluded. And in particular, I've been operating under the understanding that the rules are -- let's see here. That we will need to explain, if we receive an objection, or if the Chair jumps in on his own, that we will need to explain why our line of questioning should be allowed, why it's adding new information to the record, why it's not cumulative and not redundant of prior lines of inquiry. This is the order that we should be living by. Right?

MR. IACOPINO: That's the order. Yes.
MS. MANZELLI: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: The motion to exclude all friendly examination was denied as a blanket matter, but, as I said, friendly
cross-examination will be frowned upon. There was a question over there. Mr. Whitley?

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you, Mike. Other than what you already described and what Ms. Manzelli
just read into the record from that previous order, is there any other guidance that you could possibly give or caution about cross-examining another witness that's within the same spokesperson group?

MR. IACOPINO: You mean a group that you've put up?

MR. WHITLEY: Yeah. I guess it is a little confusing. I guess I mean just for purposes of an example, are there any additional guidance or cautions you might offer, for instance, if the City of Concord's witnesses are on a Panel, and I have cross-examination questions for them.

MR. IACOPINO: Right. Yeah, don't do friendly cross.

MR. WHITLEY: The same.
MR. IACOPINO: Yes, it's the same, it's the same rules. And just as a reminder for folks is, you know, just as the Applicant has had an opportunity to conduct Redirect Examination after all the questioning, you will be extended that same opportunity with respect to the witnesses that you present. So you will have an opportunity to the extent that there are
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cross-examination questions that you think you need to provide clarifying information about or address further for whatever reason, you will have that opportunity on redirect examination. So remember that, and that may, if you think about it, may limit what you want to do with the witnesses from other groups. Somebody else have their hand up? Mr. Plouffe?

MR. PLOUFFE: I want to follow up on Steven's question. So as I understand it, for example, in the NGO group, the Appalachian Mountain Club witnesses are not the witnesses of the NGO group in the sense that Attorney Birchard would be prohibited from cross-examining the $A M C$ witnesses just because AMC and CLF have been grouped in the same group procedurally.

MR. IACOPINO: That's a little bit different than what Mr. Whitley asked. Mr. Whitley asked about two different Intervenor Groups, City of Concord which would be Municipal Group 3 South, and you have a, my understanding is you're putting up Panels of witnesses, somebody is going to take them through their

Direct and swear them in, any changes, and then there will be an opportunity to redirect them after the rest of the questions. I do not anticipate that you'll split up and you'll get to cross-examine other witnesses in your group. I do not anticipate that.

MR. PLOUFFE: So it would be your position that Attorney Birchard would not be able to, as the attorney for CLF, be able to cross-examine AMC witnesses?

MR. IACOPINO: That's correct. You're not in this proceeding as separate parties. You're a combined Intervenor.

MS. BIRCHARD: With all due respect, apart from the question of whether or not we could in fact ask cross questions, I would like the record to reflect that we are in fact in this proceeding as separate parties. Although we are grouped for procedural reasons as one intervener grouping, we do have individual rights as parties. Do you agree with that?

MR. IACOPINO: You have been combined as Intervenors under RSA 541-A:33, and it does not give you the right to cross-examine members of
your own Intervenor Group. That's the way I see it. The Chairman may see it differently, but at this point, in answer to Mr. Plouffe's question, that's the way I understand it to be.

MS. BIRCHARD: Sure. And Attorney
Iacopino, I think my question goes to something a little bit broader. So, for example, if Conservation Law Foundation, for instance, wishes to appeal or wishes to hold a different position from Appalachian Mountain Club, I would just like the record to reflect that it is Conservation Law Foundation's understanding that we can certainly do so as an independent party apart from any other group that may be in our Intervenor grouping.

MR. IACOPINO: I think you should go back and read the order on intervention that allowed you to Intervene. It did say if there does become an issue between the parties in your group, you raise it with the Committee. That's the way that we've addressed it in the order on intervention, and $I$ would suggest that you look at that and be aware of it, and those are the rules of the intervention.
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Professor Crane, you had a question?
MS. CRANE: I think you just answered it but, Ashland to Deerfield Non-Abutters do not share entirely common interests in this matter.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, there was a time when that was argued and you were grouped together as Intervenors so the decision has already been made on that, you know, that for the purposes of this proceeding, you're one party, one group, and it's done. I mean, the statute specifically allows it for precisely this reason because you have multiple, in this case, more than multiple, parties that are involved, and the administrative agency has the ability to streamline presentations. And one way to do that is by grouping Intervenors together. Ms. Pacik? Did you have another question?

MS. PACIK: Two questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Sure.
MS. PACIK: First question is as spokesperson for Municipal Group 3-South, I only represent City of Concord. Pembroke and Deerfield are related by Attorney Whitley. Will he be permitted to do redirect of his clients?

MR. IACOPINO: Say that again? I'm sorry. I missed the setup.

MS. PACIK: I am the spokesperson for Municipal Group 3 South so I would anticipate doing redirect of City of Concord witnesses. Pembroke and Deerfield are represented by Attorney Whitley. Will he be permitted to do redirect of his clients when the Panel is up?

MR. IACOPINO: I see that less of a question that's been on the floor. That's more of how we've been doing it. We've allowed split-up of both cross-examination during the course of this proceeding where various groups have said that they're going to cross on different issues to split up the workload. I don't see why that couldn't occur on redirect examination. But again, it will be in the discretion of the Chairman to make that decision. And just like I asked the other folks who may want to split things up, please let us know when you know once we're back in session. When you know that there will be that kind of breakdown occurring. Ms. Menard?

MS. PACIK: I actually have two questions.

MR. IACOPINO: Oh, I'm sorry.
MS. PACIK: Second one was how do pro se Intervenors do redirect?

MR. IACOPINO: Well --
MS. PACIK: That might have been somebody else's question.

MR. IACOPINO: Generally, through the spokesperson of the Committee, but even if like they're the only person like I know Ms. Lee has asked to have Mr. Kucman present her and I assume do her redirect as well. If there's an issue like that, let us know. Ms. Lee let us know very early on. And we're going to be flexible and try to accommodate folks, but this isn't going to become a, you know, a game of musical chairs where everybody gets ten cracks at somebody during the course of the proceeding. It's just not a good way to run, it's not good administrative law. It's not good efficient hearing practice. Ms. Menard, you had a question?

MS. MENARD: Yes. It's just in followup to Danielle's question. So, for example, the Deerfield Abutters are sitting as a Panel, and
then a designated person may leave the Panel to do the redirect of the Deerfield Abutters? That would be acceptable?

MR. IACOPINO: Yes. That's fine. But even in the situation, let's take it one step further. Let's say there is nobody to do that. Let's say Mr. Bilodeau, for instance. At the end of his cross-examination by the last party cross-examining him while he's seated up there, assuming he doesn't have somebody asking him the questions, the Chair will probably turn to him and say do you have anything to say in redirect. And he's not going to be required to ask himself questions and then answer them, but he'll be allowed to state anything that, you know, he's just been through an hour or two of cross-examination, and if there are things that he's made note about that he wants to respond to because he thinks it's proper on redirect, he'll be permitted to do that, even in the absence of somebody speaking or asking questions of him.

That would go for a group, too. If for some reason a Panel didn't have somebody questioning them, they would be given the same
opportunity. As a practical matter, my experience is that the Chair would probably go down the table and say okay, witness number 1, did you have any redirect based upon the cross examination of witness 2 , and go through them each individually because it just -- rather than one person saying something and another and then going back to the other one and back and forth.

But yes, the answer to your question is two-fold. You can have one person designated to ask the questions and you can also, even if you didn't do that, you would still have the right to redirect which in that case would be redirect statement as opposed to redirect examination, I guess.

Any other questions about friendly cross-examination? All right. What we're going to do now is move on to the list -- I'm sorry. MS. BIRCHARD: I'm sorry. I don't mean to bog down this Prehearing Conference, but $I$ just wanted to ask you a followup question. My understanding is that although we are grouped together for procedural reasons, and I understand that there's some logic to that, and

I have been operating under those parameters, that nonetheless, Conservation Law Foundation is not, for example, adopting the testimony of any other party that is in our grouping. And if you are advising me otherwise, then I would be very appreciative of your clarifying that because Conservation Law Foundation certainly does not intend to adopt or sign on to in any way the testimony of Appalachian Mountain Club.

MR. IACOPINO: By presenting testimony as a group, you're not adopting each other's testimony. It's no different than in a trial every witness that you call in a trial isn't necessarily adopting the testimony of another witness that you've called.

MS. BIRCHARD: So we are not supporting or in any way on the record as in an agreement with Appalachian Mountain Club's testimony.

MR. IACOPINO: If you're not in agreement, if there's something that you disagree with, it probably would behoove you to somehow let the Committee know that. There was a provision for that in the Intervention Order.

MS. BIRCHARD: Appalachian Mountain Club
did in this case file their testimony separately. We did not file it jointly.

MR. IACOPINO: Understood, but it was all filed as part of your group. I'm not saying you adopt what Appalachian Mountain Club said, not saying that you're adopting their testimony word for word, but those are the witnesses that are presented by that group. So that's --

MS. BIRCHARD: I would have to seek further clarity on that. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Any other questions or concerns about friendly cross-examination?

All right. Let's move on. Back to the tedious process of going through our list of the witnesses and trying to get an idea of how much time it's going to, we're going to use up on cross-examination.

So we're going to start with the Business Groups. Is that right? Okay. So the Business Groups reported that they're going to have to put on three, two witnesses and one joint witness. So that's Mr. Bouthillier, Mr. Otten, and Mr. Casey and Mr. Eaton together. So I'm going to go through the list of Applicant, how
much time with them, if any?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: We don't expect any questions.

MR. IACOPINO: City of Franklin and Berlin?
MR. BOLDT: None. And, frankly, for the record, none on any of the other witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Wagner Forest?
MR. NOVELLO: None on this or any of the other witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Counsel for the Public?

MR. PAPPAS: 30 minutes each.
MR. IACOPINO: Municipal Group 1 North, we don't have anybody here from them. Mr. Baker, I know that you've probably had the most contact with Mr. Ellis. Any idea? If you don't, that's fine.

MR. BAKER: I'm afraid I can't report what is on their minds with respect to that issue.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Municipal Group 1 South?

MS. PACIK: I'm just going to speak for the Muni Groups, and we'll give you estimated times for all of the remaining Muni Groups which is 45
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minutes for each.
MR. IACOPINO: So then we'll skip down to Grafton County Commissioners.

MS. SAFFO: Same summary. Half an hour for the groups that have something in Grafton County. So I can give you the list. Like one group has Bethlehem in it. It's mostly Coos but does include Bethlehem.

MR. IACOPINO: So that, well --
MS. SAFFO: But just the Grafton County ones are the only ones we're going to be asking questions on.

MR. IACOPINO: There's only one then. Mr. Bouthillier? Because Mr. Otten -- I'm sorry. Mr. Otten is not in your county, right?

MS. SAFFO: Actually, Mr. Otten would be the primary witness.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MS. SAFFO: And -- never mind. I'll just leave it at that.

MR. IACOPINO: Will you have questions for the union representatives? Casey and Eaton? MS. SAFFO: I don't think so.

MR. IACOPINO: So you have questions for
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Mr. Otten, 30 minutes, and then what about for Mr. Bouthillier?

MS. SAFFO: I don't believe so.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Amy?
MS. MANZELLI: Thank you. 15 minutes for Mr. Otten. 15 minutes for Mr. Bouthillier. And no time for Mr. Casey and Mr. Eaton. There are a few witnesses that we're going to talk about today that we're not going to reserve any time for, and $I$ just want to state that what that means for us is we do not plan to come prepared to ask any questions that day. If something comes up during the cross-examination that requires us to ask a question, of course we will. But we are not planning to ask any cross-examination.

MR. IACOPINO: And that is, what Ms. Manzelli just expressed is what the entire Prehearing Conference is based on here. Nobody has been held to their time. I mean, we've said, hey, look, you told us 15 minutes and now you've gone a half hour. But nobody is held to their time. We're trying to get an idea so we can schedule, and that's really what we're
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trying to do here. That's the most important part of it. So thank you, Amy, for that.

NGOs. Mr. Bouthillier, the IBEW witnesses, and Mr. Otten.

MS. BIRCHARD: 15 minutes for Mr. Otten. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Thompson. For your groups.

MR. THOMPSON: None.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland. Ms. Percy.

MS. PERCY: None.
MR. IACOPINO: And Mr. Cunningham, I know that you have a stake in that group. I didn't know if you had any questions?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: And Mr. Baker, you had somebody in that group, too?

MR. BAKER: I do. I'd like to reserve 30 minutes for the three of them.

MR. IACOPINO: 30 minutes total or 30 each? MR. BAKER: Total. Not each.

MR. IACOPINO: We'll say 10 minutes each.
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How's that?
MR. BAKER: That would be fine. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Then we move on to the Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem. Mr. Brekke's group.

MR. BREKKE: We have no questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And then we'll move down to Mr. Palmer's group. Bethlehem to Plymouth Abutters, Underground.

MR. PALMER: We'd like to reserve 30 minutes. Ten minutes for each group.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Now we go to Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Ashland, Northfield, Canterbury. That's Ms. Lee and Mr. Judge.

MR. JUDGE: Not planning on any questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Then we go to Deerfield Abutters.

MS. MENARD: We have 45 minutes, and they'll be split between all the Business Orderly Development witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: That's about 15 minutes each?

MS. MENARD: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Did Mr. Bilodeau leave?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: And then we've got Non-Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Bethlehem. There was not anybody here. That's Ms. More's group. Then we have Non-Abutting Property Owners, Ashland to Deerfield, Professor Crane's group?

MS. CRANE: 10 minutes for Mr. Otten.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I skipped NEPGA. NEPGA. I actually should have asked you few back. I'm sorry.

MR. MONAHAN: That's fine, but we have no questions.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Martland?
MS. MARTLAND: 15 minutes for Mr. Otten, please.

MR. IACOPINO: And last but certainly not least, Pemi.

MR. STAMP: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: That takes care of the Business Groups. Move on to the witness --
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Prehearing Conference] \{8-9-17\}

MS. SCHIBANOFF: Excuse me.
MR. IACOPINO: Oh, I'm sorry, Susan. I keep forgetting you're in a separate group now.

MS. SCHIBANOFF: I would like to reserve 30 minutes total, 10 minutes per witness or witness pair.

MR. IACOPINO: Gotcha, thank you. And my apologies.

Okay. Franklin and Berlin. This is the Panel of Mayor Grenier and the replacement for Ms. Dragon who is actual simply to going to adopt her testimony, is that correct?

MR. BOLDT: That's my understanding.
MR. IACOPINO: Applicant?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Don't expect any.
MR. IACOPINO: Business Groups? Mr. Raff?
Okay. All right. Counsel for the Public.
MR. PAPPAS: 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Joint Munis.
MS. PACIK: Ten minutes combined.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Saffo for Grafton County?

MS. SAFFO: None.
MR. IACOPINO: SPNHF?
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MS. MANZELLI: None, thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: NGOs.
MS. BIRCHARD: None, thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: NEPGA?
MR. MONAHAN: None.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Thompson.
MR. THOMPSON: None.
MR. IACOPINO: Abutting Property Owners, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland. Ms. Percy, Mr. Cunningham or Mr. Baker?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: None.
MR. BAKER: None.
MS. PERCY: None. My thing doesn't work very well so I'm just going to yell.

MR. IACOPINO: When you folks speak, if you just raise your hand so $I$ can see where you're at. Sorry.

Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Whitefield, Dalton, and Bethlehem. Mr. Brekke's group?

MR. BREKKE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer? Bethlehem to Plymouth?

MR. PALMER: 15 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Abutting Properties, Overhead, Ashland, Northfield, Canterbury. That's Mr. Judge and Ms. Lee? MR. JUDGE: None.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Overhead Abutters in Deerfield?

MS. MENARD: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Bilodeau is not here.
Ms. More is not here. Non-Abutting Property
Owners on the Overhead portion, Ashland to
Deerfield, Professor Crane's group?
MS. CRANE: 10 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Martland?
MS. MARTLAND: 10 minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: And then the Pemi.
MR. STAMP: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: Five minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Now we've got Counsel
for the Public's. I'm going to go Panel by Panel with them. So start with Construction Panel. Applicant. This isn't the order,
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obviously, that we're going to be going in at the time. You'll be going last.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I can just run through all of these Panels if that's more efficient. I can do it quickly.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. That's fine.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: So for Counsel for the Public's Construction Panel, 90 minutes. I believe Tom said his expect Panel is Kavet Rockler. Three hours. Third Panel, Heritage Landscapes, two hours. Fourth Panel, Arrowwood, one hour. Fifth panel, T.J. Boyle, three hours. And Sixth Panel, Brattle Group, one hour.

MR. IACOPINO: Business Groups? Any questions for the Panels from Counsel for the Public?

MR. RAFF: We'd like to reserve ten minutes for the Construction Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Boldt already told us he has no questions for anybody else. Counsel for the Public's witnesses. Muni Groups?

MS. PACIK: I think I have this correct, but Cultural Resources, one hour. Construction Panel, one hour. Environmental Panel, one hour.
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Local Economics for Kavet Rockler, two hours. Aesthetics, two hours; and Energy Benefits, one hour.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Saffo, any questions for any of these Panels presented by Counsel for the Public?

MS. SAFFO: Yes. Construction Panel, one hour. Cultural Resources, 10 minutes. Heritage Landscape, 10 minutes. Aesthetics, 30 minutes. And Environmental, one hour. And the other one, no.

MR. IACOPINO: You said Historical and then you said Cultural. You had ten minutes each, but they're the same.

MS. SAFFO: I'm sorry. I had Heritage, and Cultural Resources and Heritage as two separate ones.

MR. IACOPINO: No.
MS. SAFFO: Okay. 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Let me just go through that again. Construction Panel, one hour; Environmental Panel, one hour; Historic and Cultural Panel, 20 minutes. Did I miss any? Local economy?

MS. SAFFO: Aesthetics. 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Sorry.
MS. SAFFO: I apologize. Local Economy, I should reserve 10 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: NEPGA? No. I'm sorry. Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests?

MS. MANZELLI: Thank you. For the Construction Panel, 1.5 hours. Local Economics, two hours. Historic and Cultural, two hours. Environmental, 1.5 hours. Aesthetics, two hours. And Market Economics, one hour.

MR. IACOPINO: Now the NGOs.
MS. BIRCHARD: Local Economics, 30 minutes. Historic and Cultural Resources, 30 minutes. The Environmental Panel, 1 hour. Aesthetics, 45 minutes. And Market Economics, 45 minutes. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. NEPGA?
MR. MONAHAN: The Market Economics with the Brattle Group, two hours. Subject to check, I think some portion of that may be confidential.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Nothing for Local Economics?

MR. MONAHAN: No.
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MR. IACOPINO: Now Mr. Thompson.
MR. THOMPSON: Construction Panel, three hours.

MR. IACOPINO: Is that it?
MR. THOMPSON: That's it.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. The Abutting Owners Group, Overhead, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland. Hi, Susan.

MS. PERCY: Construction, 30 minutes. Historic and Cultural Resources, ten minutes. Aesthetics, 10 minutes. Environmental, 30 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: So 30 for Construction, 10 for Historical and Cultural. Aesthetics was how long?

MS. PERCY: Ten.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Brekke's group?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Mike.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry, Art.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'm going to have a few questions. Say 15 for Construction, zero for Local, zero for Historic, zero for Environmental, 15 Aesthetics, 15 Energy
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Economics.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Baker, do you have any questions in that group?

MR. BAKER: I do. I'd like to reserve 15 minutes. I'm hopeful that that 15 minutes will not be needed depending on other questions that come in, but if you could put me down 15 for each Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Now to Mr. Brekke's group.
MR. BREKKE: We'd like to reserve 15
minutes for the Construction Panel and 15 minutes for the Aesthetics. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Palmer?
MR. PALMER: We'd like to reserve 30 minutes for each Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Abutting Property Owners. All right. This is Mr. Judge and Ms. Lee.

MR. JUDGE: Construction, 15 minutes. Local Economics 30 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: Construction, 15 minutes. Aesthetics, 15 minutes. Environment, 15 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Menard?
MS. MENARD: 45 minutes for the Construction Panel, one half hour for the Local Economics, one and a half hours for the Historical, one and a half hours for Environmental, one hour Aesthetics, one half hour Macroeconomics.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Bilodeau's not here. Ms. More's not here. Professor Crane, your group?

MS. CRANE: We have a wide variety of interests. I'm going to reserve ten minutes for each Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Martland?
MS. MARTLAND: Historical and Cultural, one hour. Aesthetics, one hour.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. I skipped Wagner Forest.

MR. NOVELLO: We have none.
MR. IACOPINO: And then I guess PRLAC.
MR. STAMP: Construction Panel, 30. Local Economics, 30. Historical, 15. Environmental, 1 hour. Aesthetics, 45. Market Economics, 15.

MR. IACOPINO: Can you give us those again,

Mr. Stamp? I'm sorry. I've got 30 minutes on Construction, 30 minutes on Local Economy.

MR. STAMP: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: And then I lost you.
MR. STAMP: Historical, 15. Environmental, one hour. Aesthetics, 45 minutes. Market Economics, 15 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: Construction, 30 minutes. Historical/Cultural, 15 minutes. Local Economics, 15 minutes. And Aesthetics, 15 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Okay. I know there's somebody out there waiting for this one. City of Berlin. And actually, did we already do them? Yes. So what did you need? What else did you need, Mr. Boldt? I know you had to leave.

MR. BOLDT: Nothing other than will we have any idea in the relative near future when those of us in these groups will be reached.

MR. IACOPINO: The only thing that $I$ can say about that is we're going to take what we learn today and determine how much Committee
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time it's going to take, and then we're going to issue a schedule after we find out from the Committee members what they have available. That's the best $I$ can tell you.

MR. BOLDT: Sure. Will we be going before or after Counsel for the Public's witnesses?

MR. IACOPINO: You?
MR. BOLDT: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: You'll be going before theirs.

MR. BOLT: That helps me get the time frame. It may be in some of the early September dates.

MR. IACOPINO: Probably.
MR. BOLDT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: We're going to take the one witness that's for all, most of the Municipal Groups at least, Mr. Sansoucy, and deal with him separate. Then I'll go through each Muni Group for the remaining witnesses.

So Applicant, how much time do you expect with Mr. Sansoucy?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: One hour.
MR. IACOPINO: Business Groups? Nothing?
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Okay. Mr. Boldt? Nothing. Counsel for the Public?

MR. PAPPAS: Three hours.
MR. IACOPINO: Muni Groups? He's your witness so I assume you won't have cross-examination for him.

Ms. Saffo, will you have cross-examination for Mr. Sansoucy?

MS. SAFFO: Half an hour, please. I might be a little longer but hopefully.

MR. IACOPINO: Amy?
MS. MANZELLI: Two hours, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Melissa?
MS. BIRCHARD: 30 minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Thompson.
MR. THOMPSON: Nothing.
MR. IACOPINO: Susan.
MR. PERKINS: Nothing.
MR. IACOPINO: Art?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: No.
MR. WHITLEY: Mr. Iacopino, I apologize, but I'm forgetting who each of these people are spokespeople for, and I'm trying to keep a record.
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MR. IACOPINO: Sure. Number 14, Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead, Dummer to Stark, and this is the group that Susan Percy is the spokesperson, but they have broken up their questioning in the past between her and Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Baker.

MR. WHITLEY: And Mr. Thompson?
MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Thompson had no questions.

MR. WHITLEY: What group though?
MR. IACOPINO: He's Clarksville to Stewartstown, both Underground and Aboveground, Abutters.

MR. WHITLEY: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. Abutters and Non-Abutters. I'm sorry.

I'm sorry. Mr. Baker. I was with you. Questions for Sansoucy?

MR. BAKER: Yes. One hour, sir.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Next group is Mr. Brekke's group which is the Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead Portion, Whitefield, Dalton, and Bethlehem.

MR. BREKKE: No questions.
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MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer who is the Underground Portion of Abutting Property Owners Bethlehem to Plymouth?

MR. PALMER: One hour, please.
MR. IACOPINO: The next group is the group that includes McKenna's Purchase's. It's the Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Ashland, Northland, Canterbury, Concord, and there have been two people who have spoken as part of that group in the past. Attorney Judge from McKenna's Purchase and Mary Lee as spokesperson for the group. So let's hear from Ms. Lee first. Any questions for Mr. Sansoucy?

MS. LEE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Judge?
MR. JUDGE: 30 minutes for Mr. Sansoucy, and with great trepidation I say I will have no more questions for anyone else.

MR. IACOPINO: As I've said before, nobody's going to hold you if it turns out you have questions. Just speak up at the time.

MR. JUDGE: I bid you a fond farewell.
MR. IACOPINO: Have fun. I thought Mr. Boldt was going to be the first one to bolt.

MR. BOLDT: I'm trying to get something done. I was running for the door.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Deerfield. Ms. Menard?

MS. MENARD: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Bilodeau's not here. Professor Crane, your group. That's the Non-Abutting Property Owners on the overhead group from Ashland to Deerfield.

MS . CRANE: 15.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Historical Groups. Ms. Martland?

MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff, you're going to have to tell us what group you're representing because $I$ don't have it written down, and I know Mr. Whitley is interested.

MS. SCHIBANOFF: Non-Abutting Property Owners, Bethlehem to Plymouth.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. And then finally, Pemi.

MR. STAMP: 30 minutes.
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MR. IACOPINO: Okay. That's Mr. Sansoucy. And then going to go to the Municipal Group 1. MS. PACIK: Mike, I have a favor. This is Danielle. Can we do Muni Group 3 South first because I have to actually leave.

MR. IACOPINO: You're going to with Chris?
MS. PACIK: Yeah. No, but I do need to leave at some point soon.

MR. IACOPINO: So this is the Panels from New Hampton and Bristol?

MS. PACIK: No. The Municipal Group 3-South.

MR. IACOPINO: Sorry. So we have a Panel of Pembroke and Deerfield?

MS. PACIK: And Concord. Maybe we could do the Concord one first.

MR. IACOPINO: And then Mr. Scott.
MS. PACIK: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: So the municipalities are all going on as one Panel. That's what my notes say. Is that right? Heiser. Yes. Okay. We'll do that one next and we'll move on.

The Applicant, any questions for those Municipal Panels -- the Municipal Panel, I'll
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call it, for Muni Group 3 South and that's the Panel from Deerfield, Pembroke, and Concord.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So I understand that each of those towns are going up separately; is that correct.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: So for City of Concord, understanding Mr. Scott may be separate, a total of two and a half hours. For town of Pembroke, 45 minutes. And for town of Deerfield, 45 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: And so you've included Mr. Scott with Concord?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: More or less, yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Why doesn't everybody do that for the time being, and if he gets taken out we'll deal with it.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. Business Groups.
MR. RAFF: No, and if it makes it easier, we won't have any questions for the rest either.

MR. IACOPINO: I know Franklin and Berlin don't. Counsel for the Public?

MR. PAPPAS: Concord/Scott Panel, two and a half hours; Deerfield, an hour; Pembroke 30
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minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Muni Group 1 South, are you going to have cross-examination for Muni Group 3 South?

MR. WHITLEY: We'd like to reserve 45 minutes, and that is Muni Group 1 South and Muni Group 2 and Muni Group 3 North together. So all the Municipal Groups other than the spokesperson group that Concord is in.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. 35 minutes for --

MR. WHITLEY: 45 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: 45 minutes. For which witnesses?

MR. WHITLEY: For the Concord Panel. Actually $I$ want to amend that. Apologies. 45 for each municipality within that group.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: So 45, because there's three towns we're talking about, right? You're confusing me. I'm sorry. Maybe it's just getting close to lunch.

MR. WHITLEY: 45 minutes for the Concord Panel. 45 minutes for the Deerfield Panel. And 45 minutes for the Pembroke Panel.
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ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Got it.
MR. IACOPINO: That's all the remaining Muni Groups and now we go on to Grafton County. Lara?

MS. SAFFO: Ten minutes for each. Ten minutes, Pembroke; 10 minutes, Pembroke; and 10 minutes, Concord.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Manzelli?
MS. MANZELLI: Two hours for Concord. One hour for Deerfield and Pembroke each.

MR. IACOPINO: NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: 30 minutes for City of Concord.

MR. IACOPINO: Nothing for the others?
MS. BIRCHARD: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. NEPGA?
MR. MONAHAN: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Thompson for --

MR. THOMPSON: Nothing.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Ms. Percy for Overhead, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland Abutters?

MS. PERCY: None.
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MR. IACOPINO: Art or Bob, are you going to ask questions?

MR. BAKER: I will. One hour for Concord and none for the other two.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke's group, Abutters, Overhead, Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem?

MR. BREKKE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Palmer? Bethlehem, Plymouth?

MR. PALMER: Ten minutes for each Panel.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: And Mr. Judge, you already told me no questions, right?

MR. JUDGE: Right.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard. Deerfield.
MS. MENARD: 30 minutes, Concord. 30 minutes, Pembroke. One hour, Deerfield.

MR. IACOPINO: Professor Crane for the Non-Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Ashland to Deerfield?

MS. CRANE: Ten minutes for Concord, 10 minutes for Deerfield, probably none for

Pembroke.
MR. IACOPINO: Historic Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: 30 minutes for Deerfield.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: Ten minutes for each, please.

MR. IACOPINO: And Pemi?
MR. STAMP: Nothing for Pembroke. 20 minutes for Concord, and 20 minutes for Deerfield.

MR. IACOPINO: Did I miss somebody? I feel like I missed somebody. No? Okay.

Muni Group 1 South. Ms. Pacik, do you have what you need?

MS. PACIK: Yes, thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Municipal Group 1 South, we had Bethlehem, Northumberland, and Whitefield. So three separate sets of witnesses. Applicant.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Did you skip Muni Group 1 North?

MR. IACOPINO: There's nobody here. We don't know. Mr. Baker suggested it might be one Panel with all the towns, but we don't really
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know yet.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: Trying to do what we know. Hold on one second. I have a question. Ms. Menard?

MS. MENARD: Could you repeat the three towns? I got the Bethlehem and what were the other two towns?

MR. IACOPINO: Northumberland or Groveton, and Whitefield.

MS. MENARD: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: For Muni Group 1 South, Northumberland, 30 minutes. Whitefield, 45. Bethlehem, 45.

MR. IACOPINO: Nothing for the Business Groups, right? Nothing from City of Franklin and Berlin, Counsel for Wagner Forest will have nothing, and then Mr. Pappas?

MR. PAPPAS: I have the same as the Applicant.

MR. IACOPINO: You guys are good. Okay.
MR. WHITLEY: Mr. Iacopino? Sorry. Just wanted to clarify Counsel for the Public's for
that group so that's 45 minutes, Tom?
MR. PAPPAS: 45 for Bethlehem, 45 for Whitefield, and 30 minutes for Northumberland. MR. WHITLEY: Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So this is 1 South. So we don't know if 1 North will have any questions. Is Municipal Group 2 going to have questions for Muni Group 1 South?

MR. TANGUAY: Attorney Iacopino, we'd like to reserve 30 minutes for each municipality.

MR. IACOPINO: So that was Muni Group 2. Muni Group 3 North. Questions for?

MR. WHITLEY: That's combined with what Attorney Tanguay just mentioned.

MR. IACOPINO: Is Municipal Group 3 South combined with that as well? So that's all the Muni Groups?

MR. WHITLEY: Correct. Remaining Muni Groups may be the best way to characterize that, and we'll do that in the future.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Ms. Saffo?
MS. SAFFO: Half an hour.
MR. IACOPINO: For which one? There's three. There's Bethlehem, witnesses from
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Bethlehem, the witnesses from Northumberland.
MS. SAFFO: I apologize. Just Bethlehem. That's the only Grafton County town in that group. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests?

MS. MANZELLI: 20 minutes for Bethlehem, nothing for Northumberland, and 20 minutes for Whitefield.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. NGOs.
MS. BIRCHARD: Nothing. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Thompson, for both of your groups, the Abutting Property Owners, Clarksville/Stewartstown, and Non-Abutters. These are questions for Bethlehem Panel, Northumberland Panel, and Whitefield Panel.

MR. THOMPSON: Nothing.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Percy,
Abutting Property Owners, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, Overhead?

MS. PERCY: Nothing.
MR. IACOPINO: Looking at Art and Bob as well.

MR. BAKER: I would have 15 minutes max for Northumberland. None for the other two.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke's group, Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem, Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead?

MR. BREKKE: 15 minutes for Whitefield, 15 minutes for Bethlehem and none for Northumberland. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Palmer?
MR. PALMER: Ten minutes for Whitefield, 10 minutes for Northumberland, and 15 minutes for Bethlehem.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. Ms. Lee, any questions?

MS. LEE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard for Deerfield?
MS. MENARD: 20 minutes for each town.
Bethlehem, Northumberland and Whitefield.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: Nothing anticipated at the moment.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Did I skip NEPGA again on this one? Sorry.

MR. MONAHAN: Hi. Yes. We have no
questions, but, frankly, I have no questions for any of the other witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you very much. Ms. Martland?

MS. MARTLAND: Ten minutes for each town, please.

MR. IACOPINO: And that brings us to the Pemigewassett.

MR. STAMP: 20 minutes for Bethlehem, zero for the other two.

MR. MONAHAN: Could you repeat that, Mr. Stamp?

MR. STAMP: 20 minutes for Bethlehem. No minutes for the other two towns.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: Ten minutes for each, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. That brings us to Municipal Group 2 witnesses which are an Easton Panel, Sugar Hill Panel, Franconia, and Plymouth. So is everyone on board? You understand what we're going to ask? If you could tell me what your estimate is for each one of those, and we will try to get through the
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Muni Groups and the Grafton County Commissioners, and then we'll probably have to take a break for lunch.

So we'll talk about Municipal Group 2. They have 1, $2,3,4$ sets of witness presentations. Easton, Sugar Hill, Franconia, Plymouth is the way we're referring to them. Barry?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 45 minutes for Easton. 30 minutes for each of the other three.

MR. IACOPINO: Business Groups don't have any. City of Franklin and Berlin don't have any. Mr. Pappas?

MR. PAPPAS: One hour for Easton, one hour Franconia, 30 minutes for Sugar Hill and a hour and a half for Plymouth.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Are the Municipal Groups doing this jointly?

MR. WHITLEY: The remaining Muni Groups will have 30 minutes for each Panel combined.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Grafton County Commissioners?

MS. SAFFO: 45 minutes for Easton, Franconia and Plymouth. 15 minutes for Sugar

Hill.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. The NGOs? Sorry. I'm sorry, Ms. Manzelli.

MS. MANZELLI: That's okay. Thank you. I'm sorry also because $I$ have a question. Is Brian Murphy still a witness in this case?

MR. IACOPINO: Let me go to my list.
MR. TANGUAY: Yes. He is.
MS. MANZELLI: What Panel will he be a witness on?

MR. TANGUAY: He's on Plymouth.
MS. MANZELLI: Thank you. 15 minutes for Plymouth. Nothing for anyone else. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. You guys ask questions, you throw me off. NGOs?

MS. BIRCHARD: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Thompson for Clarksville/Stewartstown.

MR. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Percy for Abutting Property Owners, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland?

MS. PERCY: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Bob or Art, are either of you going to seek to ask questions?
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MR. CUNNINGHAM: Not for me.
MS. MARTLAND: Bob stepped out, but he asked me to tell you he has no questions.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Brekke for the Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem folks?

MR. BREKKE: 30 minutes for the Easton. That's all.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Palmer for the Bethlehem to Plymouth?

MR. PALMER: 25 minutes for Franconia, 25 minutes for Easton, 25 minutes for Plymouth, and 10 minutes for Sugar Hill.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Lee, any questions for these?

MS. LEE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard for Deerfield Abutters?

MS. MENARD: 30 minutes for Easton, 20 minutes Sugar Hill, 20 for Franconia, and 10 minutes for Plymouth.

MR. IACOPINO: So 30, 20, 20, 10 .
MS. MENARD: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: 10 minutes for Franconia, 20
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minutes for Plymouth.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Historical Groups?

MS. MARTLAND: Ten minutes for each town, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 20 minutes for each town, please.

MR. IACOPINO: And Pemigewassett Local River Advisory Committee?

MR. STAMP: 10 minutes each for Easton, Franconia, Sugar Hill; 15 for Plymouth.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. We already did, no. We did 3 South. Municipal Group North, there's two, I believe we had two Panels for that being New Hampton and Bristol. Am I correct? Mr. Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 30 minutes each.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: Bristol, 30 minutes. New Hampton, one hour.

MR. IACOPINO: Remaining Municipal Groups.
MR. WHITLEY: 30 minutes each, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Grafton County?
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MS. SAFFO: Half an hour for -- hold on. MS. IACOPINO: New Hampton and Bristol. MS. SAFFO: Just Bristol. Nothing for New Hampton.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Manzelli?
MS. MANZELLI: I'm sorry, Mike. Can you give me a minute and come back to me?

MR. IACOPINO: Sure. Remind me though. Okay?

MS. MANZELLI: I will.
MR. IACOPINO: I think you're doing this on purpose. No problem. NGOs?

MS. BIRCHARD: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Amy, you ready now?

MS. MANZELLI: Sorry about that. Nothing for either.

MR. IACOPINO: NEPGA. No questions, right? Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Ms. Percy for Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, Overhead Abutters.

MS. PERCY: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Art and Bob, you have in the
past asked to ask questions?
MR. BAKER: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Art?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you very much. Mr. Brekke's group, Abutting Property Owners, Overhead, Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem?

MR. BREKKE: No questions. Thank you. MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Palmer's group Bethlehem and Plymouth?

MR. PALMER: Ten minutes for New Hampton and ten minutes for Bristol.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee, any questions for these groups?

MS. LEE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard for the Deerfield Abutters?

MS. MENARD: 30 minutes, New Hampton. Ten minutes, Bristol.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Professor Crane? MS. CRANE: Ten, New Hampton.

MR. IACOPINO: Historical Group?
MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
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MS. SCHIBANOFF: Five minutes for each, please.

MR. IACOPINO: And Pemi?
MR. STAMP: 30 minutes each.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. We've already done Municipal Group South so we're just going to move on to Grafton County. That's Ms. Lauer, I believe? Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: One hour.
MR. IACOPINO: Are the Municipal Groups together on this one?

MR. WHITLEY: Joint Muni Groups, 30 minutes, please. Pardon me. 45 minutes. Sorry.

MR. IACOPINO: 45. Thank you. It's your witness. Society for the Protection of the Forests?

MS. MANZELLI: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: Nothing. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: NEPGA has nothing.
Mr. Thompson for your groups?
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MR. THOMPSON: Nothing.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Percy for your group?
MS. PERCY: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Art or Bob? Any questions?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: No.
MR. BAKER: No, none.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Brekke's group, Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem, Overhead, Abutters?

MR. BREKKE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Palmer?
MR. PALMER: 25 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Historic Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Deerfield, Ms. Menard. Sorry.

MS. MENARD: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And Pemi River?
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MR. STAMP: 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: All right. It's 12:10. At this point we're going to take a one-hour break for lunch. Come back at 1:10.
(Lunch recess taken 12:10 p.m.)
(Hearing resumed at 1:19 p.m.)
MR. IACOPINO: Okay, folks. We're going to pick up where we left off. We finished with the Grafton County Commissioner's witnesses.

So we're going to move on to the witnesses for the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, and they are going to be presented with, the first Panel is Difley and Abbott. Then the Bilodeaus. Then Conkling, Wilber, Lobdell. There's one Panel that's Conklin, et al. Then we have Lobdell and Dodson they wanted to go last. They've got a Panel of Difley and Abbott. So we're going to go Difley and Abbott, Lobdell, Dodson, and then the Panel with the remaining witnesses on it. Okay? So Mr. Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: For the Difley/Abbott panel, 45 minutes. For the Bilodeaus, don't expect any questions. For Mr. Dodson, one and a
half hours. For Mr. Lobdell, 30 minutes. And then for the last Panel, don't expect any questions.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Counsel for the Public?

MR. PAPPAS: For the first Panel, an hour. For the Bilodeaus, 30 minutes. Lobdell, an hour. Dodson, two hours. The other Panel 30 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Appalachian Mountain Club and the NGOs?

MS. BIRCHARD: We'd like to reserve 15 minutes for Mr. Lobdell and no time for the other witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: NEPGA. No questions, right?
Mr. Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Back to the Joint Municipal Groups.

MR. WHITLEY: The Joint Munis would like to reserve 30 minutes for the first Panel, nothing for the Bilodeaus, and then 30 minutes for the three remaining Panels so 30 for Lobdell, 30 for

Dodson and 30 for the last Panel.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Ms. Percy.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: She had to leave. No questions, Mike.

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke for the Overhead Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem Abutting Group?

MR. BREKKE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Palmer, Bethlehem to Plymouth?

MR. PALMER: Ten minutes for each Panel.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: Ten minutes for Difley and Abbott. 10 minutes for Lobdell. None for the others.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Deerfield.
MS. MENARD: One hour for Difley/Abbott, 10 minutes for the Bilodeaus, one hour for each Mr. Lobdell and Dodson. And then ten minutes for the O'Brien Panel. Remaining witnesses. MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Martland for
the Historic Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: Ten minutes for Difley and Abbott, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 15 Difley/Abbott, 15 Dodson, 15 Bilodeaus, nothing for Lobdell and then I'm confused about who the fifth Panel is.

MR. IACOPINO: It's a group Panel of Conkling, O'Brien, Dodge, John Conkling, Lore Moran, Dodge, Ms. Moran, Kelly O'Brien and Dee Wilber.

MS. SCHIBANOFF: 15 minutes for that Panel as well. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. And Pemi?
MR. STAMP: 30 minutes for Difley/Abbott. 10 minutes for Bilodeau and Conkling. 15 minutes for Lobdell, 15 for Dodson. And zero for the rest.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Did I miss anybody on that one?

MS. SAFFO: Grafton County is still here. So you can count 20 minutes for each except Bilodeau would be zero.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Next one is the

NGOs. For them, I believe we have one Panel. Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: If it's Thayer, Kimball, Garland and Publicover all together, then three hours.

MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: The same.
MR. IACOPINO: Municipal Groups?
MR. WHITLEY: One hour, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Grafton County Commissioner?
MS. SAFFO: 45 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests?

MS. MANZELLI: One and a half hours.
MR. IACOPINO: They're your witnesses. NEPGA doesn't have any. Mr. Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mrs. Thompson. I'm sorry.
Ms. Percy.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: 15 minutes. MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke?

MR. BREKKE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer?
MR. PALMER: 15 minutes.
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MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard?
MS. MENARD: 45 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Historical Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: 15 minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 45 minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Pemi?
MR. STAMP: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Did I miss anybody on that one? Good. So next we have Mr. Fowler, witness for NEPGA. Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: An hour and a half.
MR. IACOPINO: Muni Groups?
MR. WHITLEY: This is NEPGA, Mike?
MR. IACOPINO: Yes.
MR. WHITLEY: 45 minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Fowler. Yes.
Ms. Saffo?
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MS. SAFFO: 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Manzelli?
MS. MANZELLI: 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: 45 minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: How about Susan Percy's
group?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke's group?
MR. BREKKE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer's group?
MR. PALMER: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Historical Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard?
MS. MENARD: 15 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: And Pemi River?
MR. STAMP: 20 minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. The next in the order of presentation would be the Clarksville and Stewartstown group. That's Mr. Thompson's group. And in that group, if $I$ have this correctly, we have Mr. Petrofsky testifying singly, then we have a -- I'll call them the -Mr. Nix and Mr. Thompson, each of them testifying individually. Then we have the Video Group. And then we have another Panel. It's a combination from two different Intervenor Groups because Mr. Baker is going to put them all on at once. So that's the Moore, Schrier, Olson, Beland Group. Okay. So Applicant, start with Mr. Petrofsky and go down the list.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I haven't broken these up individually. I expected them to be a Panel so we're estimating a total of one hour for all witnesses in this group.

MR. IACOPINO: Are there any that you wouldn't have any questions for?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Almost certainly. It's just hard to say at this point because we just
estimated them as a block.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Counsel for the Public.

MR. PAPPAS: For all of them except Mr. Nix, 30 minutes. And Mr. Nix, an hour.

MR. IACOPINO: When you say 30 minutes, 30 minutes for each group?

MR. PAPPAS: I actually had them as a block as well. So, for instance, Mr. Petrofsky, 30 minutes; Mr. Thompson, 30 minutes; the group of four, 30 minutes; the Video Group, I don't know if I'll have any questions for them. So I'll just say 30 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Muni Groups?
MR. WHITLEY: For Mr. Nix, 45 minutes. For Mr. Petrofsky, 15 minutes. And for Mr. Thompson, a half an hour, please. And then none for the Video Group and none for the remaining Panel of four.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Saffo?
MS. SAFFO: Zero.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Manzelli for Society?

MS. MANZELLI: None for Mr. Petrofsky. 15
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minutes for Mr. Nix. None for Mr. Thompson. 15 minutes for the Video Group. And 30 minutes for that final Panel there.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: No questions, thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. NEPGA is not going to have any questions. Mr. Thompson's group. Susan Percy's group, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke's group, Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem?

MR. BREKKE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer's group, Bethlehem to Plymouth?

MR. PALMER: Ten minutes for each Panel. Or each witness on each Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Wait a minute. So you're telling me 40 minutes for the Panel of four witnesses?

MR. PALMER: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And then what about this Video Group? Do you really anticipate asking ten minutes of questions to each person
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in that group?
MR. PALMER: No. I meant ten minutes for the group all together.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Lee, any questions for this group of witnesses?

MS. LEE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: Ten minutes for Petrofsky, ten minutes for Nix, none for the others.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard?
MS. MENARD: We would like to reserve one hour for the group collectively, and we need to confer in terms of how we're going to divide it up, but we anticipate ten minutes for the Video Group and 30 minutes for Mr. Thompson and then 10 minutes for the various other entities in that group.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Crane? I already did you. Historic Groups?

MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 20 minutes for everyone except Nix collectively, no questions for Nix.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. And
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Pemigewassett?
MR. STAMP: 20 minutes for Thompson, 10 minutes for the Video Group, and that's all.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. All right. Moving on, now looking at the Dummer, Stark, Northumberland Abutters Group. Do I have that right? Yes. This is the Percy group. And we have two Jones and Karen Johnson and Spencer and then Eric Jones. Eric and Margaret Jones. And Susan Percy. So I call the Jones Percy Panel and the Spencer Panel. Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Again, I didn't divide these up so for the entire group a total of 45 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: I'll going to say 25 minutes each. Counsel for the Public?

MR. PAPPAS: 30 minutes each.
MR. IACOPINO: Joint Munis?
MR. WHITLEY: 10 minutes each, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Grafton County Commissioners?

MS. SAFFO: So for, this is Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem APO, correct?

MR. IACOPINO: This is Dummer, Stark,

Northumberland.
MS. SAFFO: I'm sorry. Zero time.
MR. IACOPINO: So next would be Ms.
Manzelli for the Forest Society.
MS. MANZELLI: Can you clarify for me the witness on each Panel, please?

MR. IACOPINO: Sure, it's Karen Johnson. I said Jones, I'm sorry, Susan Percy on one -sorry, Spencer on one Panel. And then Eric and Margaret Jones and Susan Percy on the other Panel.

MS. MANZELLI: Okay. So for the Panel with Ms. Percy, 20 minutes. For the other Panel, 5 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: NEPGA has no questions. Mrs. Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Susan Percy group. Mr. Brekke, any questions?

MR. BREKKE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer, any questions?
MR. PALMER: No questions.
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MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee, any questions?
MS. LEE: No, thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. Ms. Menard, for some reason where this is in my list my eyes go right over it. I'm sorry.

MS. MENARD: No problem. Can you clarify for me the Susan Percy? This is Susan of the Percy Summer Club, is that correct?

MR. IACOPINO: I believe it is.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: She's in the group with Mr. Cunningham.

MS. MENARD: With Eric Jones and -- yes. We would like 20 minutes with that Panel and then 20 minutes with the Spencer/Legasse Panel. MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Crane?

MS. CRANE: No questions anticipated right now.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Historic Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 10 minutes for each of the two Panels, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. And --
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MR. STAMP: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Then our next group is the Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem group. This is the group that's, their spokesperson is Mr. Brekke. We have Peter Powell, and then the remaining five witnesses in that were going on as a Panel, and they are Bruce and Sandra Brekke, David Van Houten, James and Judy Ramsdell, Tim and Brigitte White, and Elmer and Claire Lupton. So Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 30 minutes total for the entire group.

MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: One hour for Mr. Powell and 30 minutes for the rest of the Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Joint Munis?
MR. WHITLEY: 20 minutes for Mr. Powell and 30 minutes for the other Panel, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Grafton County Commissioners?

MS. SAFFO: Just the Bethlehem part, 30 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: They're not really separated by town. Mr. Powell, I believe, is primarily,
he's a real estate agent?
MS. SAFFO: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: I think his testimony was primarily about real estate values.

MS. SAFFO: Except I think he goes all the way through the whole region.

MR. IACOPINO: He may, but --
MS. SAFFO: Why don't I do 20 minutes Mr. Powell and then leave 10 minutes to question one other person on the Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests?

MS. MANZELLI: Nothing for Mr. Powell and 30 minutes for the Panel. Thanks.

MR. IACOPINO: Mrs. Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: NGOs? I have a little birdie when $I$ skip that whispers in my right ear.

MS. BIRCHARD: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Palmer?
MR. PALMER: Ten minutes for Mr. Powell and 15 minutes for the Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?

MS. LEE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Charlotte?
MS. CRANE: 10 minutes for Mr. Powell.
None for the rest.
MR. IACOPINO: Historic Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 15 minutes for Mr. Powell. Nothing for the other, for the Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. And PRLAC?
MR. STAMP: Ten minutes for Mr. Powell and 15 minutes for the remainder.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Did I miss anybody on that one? Okay. I did it again. I'm sorry. Ms. Menard. I even put a big arrow here, and I'm going to make it even bigger.

MS. MENARD: That's okay. No worries. For Mr. Powell, we'd like to reserve two hours. And the Panel, 30 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. The next group we have is the Bethlehem to Plymouth Abutters, and on this one we have, $I$ know there's a video but skip that for a minute. We have Ahern? I'm sorry. Peter Grote, Bruce Ahern, Dr. McLaren,

Mr. Lake. And then Walter Palmer and Kathryn Ting. Each of those are testifying separately, and then we have this Video Panel. So let's take them as best as we can. Mr. Needleman? MR. NEEDLEMAN: For the entire group, 45 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: Leaving aside the video, I just have 30 minutes each.

MR. IACOPINO: 30 minutes each. Muni Groups.

MR. WHITLEY: Not including the video Panel, 45 minutes for the entire, all the witnesses.

MR. IACOPINO: Would you guys say that all we're doing is just dividing it by the number of witnesses?

MR. WHITLEY: That's fine.
MR. IACOPINO: And my crack math student to my right is doing that.

MR. WHITLEY: Round up.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Are you answering for Grafton County, too, Mr. Whitley?

MR. WHITLEY: I am, yes.
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MR. IACOPINO: How much do they have?
MR. WHITLEY: Ms. Saffo has broken hers down. The lakes, 10 minutes. Ahern, 10 minutes. McLaren, 15 minutes. And Walter Palmer, 20 minutes. And is Ms. Schibanoff in this group? Or do I have that confused? MS. SCHIBANOFF: No.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you. That's all for Grafton County.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Forest Society?
MS. MANZELLI: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: NEPGA had no questions. Ms. Thompson?

MS. THOMPSON: Ahern 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Is that it? Thank you. Mr. Cunningham? Your group?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke, your group?
MR. BREKKE: Yes. I'd like to reserve 30 minutes for McLaren and zero time for all the others.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
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MR. BREKKE: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Go down to Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Menard?
MS. MENARD: One hour for the group.
MR. IACOPINO: So we're just going to take that and divide it by 6 , and that's like 10 minutes each.

MS. MENARD: Correct. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And did you have any idea as far as the Video Panel goes?

MS. MENARD: No. I was including that in the time.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. Thank you. Charlotte Crane?

MS. CRANE: 10 minutes with Ahern.
MR. IACOPINO: Historical?
MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: One hour for the group.
MR. IACOPINO: And Pemi River?
MR. STAMP: 30 minutes for the group. I don't know how to divide it.

MR. IACOPINO: It's like five minutes each.
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MR. STAMP: Good.
MR. IACOPINO: We'll move on to the next group is the Ashland to Concord Abutters. There are two sets of witnesses. There's Ms. Lee and then Ms. Kleindienst who is the property manager from McKenna's Purchase. Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 20 minutes for McKenna's and no questions for Ms. Lee.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: Ten minutes for Ms. Lee and 30 minutes for McKenna's.

MR. IACOPINO: Joint Munis?
MR. WHITLEY: Ten minutes for Ms. Lee. 30 minutes for McKenna's Purchase, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Grafton County?
MR. WHITLEY: Grafton County has no
questions for this Panel.
MR. IACOPINO: Forest Society?
MS. MANZELLI: No questions, thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: No questions, thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: No questions. Thank you.
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MR. IACOPINO: Art? For the Dummer to Northumberland?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: For which one?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'll split it. Five, five.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Mr. Brekke?
MR. BREKKE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer?
MR. PALMER: Ten minutes for each group.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee, this is you so we don't ask you. Ms. Menard?

MS. MENARD: We would like 30 minutes with Ms. Kleindienst and 20 minutes with Ms. Lee.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Historic Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: Ten minutes Ms. Lee, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. And Pemi River?
MR. STAMP: 10 minutes for Lee and 20 minutes for the remaining Panel.
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MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. The next group that we're going to address are the Deerfield Abutters, and we have on that one two sets of witnesses. D. Scott Newman is the first one, and then there's a joint testimony of Erick and Kathleen Berglund, Jeanne Menard, Jo Anne Bradbury, Robert Cote, Bruce Adami, and as we know, Ms. Menard has provided a couple of different territories on behalf of different properties owned by her or her family. So for the Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 45 minutes for Mr. Newman. One hour for the other Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public? MR. PAPPAS: 30 minutes for Mr. Newman and a hour and a half for the Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Joint Munis?
MR. WHITLEY: 30 minutes for Mr. Newman and then 30 minutes for the remainder of the Panel. MR. IACOPINO: How about Grafton? Has she got any questions?

MR. WHITLEY: She didn't divide it up. Grafton County asked for 30 minutes total so 15 and 15.
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MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Just so the record is clear, we did receive a note from Ms. Saffo that Mr. Whitley would have the rest of her estimates for times because she had to leave. So we just finished Grafton County. So Ms. Manzelli for the Forest Society?

MS. MANZELLI: For Mr. Newman 20 minutes and for the Panel 30 minutes.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Questions for Ms. Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: The Percy group?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: 15 total, Mike.
MR. IACOPINO: So we'll just make it 10 each.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke?
MR. BREKKE: We would like to reserve 30 minutes, please.

MR. IACOPINO: 15 each?
MR. BREKKE: That's fine. Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer?
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MR. PALMER: Ten minutes for Mr. Newman and 15 minutes for the Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Menard? This is -- never mind. You're on this Panel, sorry. This time we didn't forget you. Knew that was going to happen, right?

Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: 10 minutes each.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Historic Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: 15 minutes for the Panel, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: Ten for Newman, 20 for the Panel.

MR. IACOPINO: And Pemi River?
MR. STAMP: 30 minutes for the Panel, zero for Newman.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. The next set of witnesses are the Bilodeaus from Deerfield. Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
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MR. PAPPAS: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Joint Munis?
MR. WHITLEY: 15 minutes. Please.
MR. IACOPINO: Did Ms. Saffo want to question them at all?

MR. WHITLEY: No. No questions for Ms. Saffo.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Manzelli for the Forest Society?

MS. MANZELLI: 10 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Art?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke?
MR. BREKKE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Water Palmer?
MR. PALMER: Ten minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Crane?
MS. CRANE: No questions.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard?
MS. MENARD: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Historic Groups?
MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: And Pemi?
MR. STAMP: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Great. We're now down to the Stark, Whitefield, Dalton which is Rebecca More. I don't think I said the towns correctly. It's Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem Non-Abutting Property Owners. So it's just the one witness. Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: 45 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Joint Munis?
MR. WHITLEY: 45 for the Joint Munis and 30 for Grafton County, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Forest Society?
MS. MANZELLI: I'm sorry. Who was the witness?
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MR. IACOPINO: Rebecca More.
MS. MANZELLI: Thank you. 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: No questions. Thank you. MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Thompson. MS. THOMPSON: 15 minutes for Mr. Baker. MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. Art?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No questions, Mike.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke?
MR. BREKKE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer?
MR. PALMER: 15 minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions. Thanks.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard?
MS. MENARD: Can you clarify for me? We just, I just heard that, for Mr. Baker he's not a witness. That was just she was recording for questions for Mr. Baker, is that correct?

MR. IACOPINO: That he intends to ask, I believe.

MS. MENARD: Yes. Okay. So Deerfield would like to reserve 30 minutes for Rebecca
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More.
MR. IACOPINO: Charlotte Crane?
MS. CRANE: 10 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Nancy Martland?
MS. MARTLAND: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And Pemi?
MR. STAMP: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Next group is
the Ashland to Deerfield Non-Abutters. And all of the witnesses are testifying as a Panel on this one. And they are Maureen Quinn, Madelyn and Thomas Foulkes, the Webster family group, Elisha Gray and Jeanne Menard. All right. Are you actually going to come to two Panels, Jeanne?

MS. MENARD: Yes. I wouldn't miss it.
MR. IACOPINO: You understand that, Barry?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: So this is one single Panel. Applicant. Any idea?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 45 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Counsel for the
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Public?
MR. PAPPAS: Hour and a half.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Joint Munis?
MR. WHITLEY: 20 minutes for the Munis.
And 15 minutes for Grafton County, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Manzelli?
MS. MANZELLI: 20 minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Any questions
from the NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mrs. Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Art?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Bruce?
MR. BREKKE: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Walter?
MR. PALMER: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Mary?
MS. LEE: No questions. Thanks.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard, you're on this Panel so you don't get any time to ask yourself any questions.

MS. MENARD: Deerfield Abutters request one
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hour roughly to be split halfway between Quinn and Foulkes, the Deerfield contingency, and then the Webster family, Crane/Webster family contingency. One hour total.

MR. IACOPINO: One hour total?
MS. MENARD: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Charlotte?
MS. CRANE: I'm on this Panel.
MR. IACOPINO: Oh, I'm sorry. Historic Groups?

MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Susan?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: Ten minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And Pemi?
MR. STAMP: 45 minutes total.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Next one is the Historic groups, and it is Mr. Martland's testimony. Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: Hour and a half.
MR. IACOPINO: Joint Munis?
MR. WHITLEY: 30 minutes for the Munis and 20 minutes for Grafton County.
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MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Society?
MS. MANZELLI: One hour.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: 10 minutes. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mrs. Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Art?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Bruce?
MR. BREKKE: No questions, thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer?
MR. PALMER: Ten minutes, please.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions. Thanks.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard?
MS. MENARD: One hour.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: 10 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: This is the Historic Group. So Susan Schibanoff?

MS. SCHIBANOFF: 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And the Pemi?
MR. STAMP: 30 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Moving on, I
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think we're down to the last one. Am I correct?
MR. DRAPER: Who would that be?
MR. IACOPINO: That would be the people with the most interesting exhibits. And they're it's one Panel. Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: 20 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: 30 minute per animal.
MR. IACOPINO: Joint Muni Group?
MR. WHITLEY: 30 minutes for the Munis and 30 minutes for Grafton County.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests?

MS. MANZELLI: 15 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. NGOs?
MS. BIRCHARD: No questions, thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mrs. Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Cunningham?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Brekke?
MR. BREKKE: No questions. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer?
MR. PALMER: 15 minutes, please.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Prehearing Conference] \{8-9-17\}

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: No questions. Thanks.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Menard?
MS. MENARD: 30 minutes. Ms. Crane?
MS. CRANE: 10 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Martland?
MS. MARTLAND: No questions.
MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: 10 minutes.
MR. IACOPINO: And you guys don't get to cross-examine yourself. Did I get everybody on that? I think that we have gone through and gotten estimates, I'm sorry. Steve?

MR. WHITLEY: Did I miss, did we do the Bethlehem to Plymouth Non-Abutting Group?

MR. IACOPINO: Do we have testimony from them?

MS. SCHIBANOFF: There will be no testimony from the Non-Abutting Bethlehem to Plymouth first.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Schibanoff.

MR. IACOPINO: Any other questions about what we've just tediously but necessarily have
gone through? Okay.
So we're down to number 7 on our agenda. Getting there. Number 7 on the agenda involves Post-hearing briefing by the parties. For those of you who are unfamiliar with -- well, for those of you who aren't lawyers and probably aren't familiar with any of this, you probably know that in a courtroom setting at the end of the evidence the lawyers get to make a closing argument. And on TV that's generally presented as a very dramatic and passionate moment.

We don't have those in this process usually unless they're very brief at the end of a relatively simple proceeding. Generally what we do at the Committee is we provide a period of time for the parties to provide their arguments in written form. You can call it a memo, you can call it a brief, but it's basically your argument on why the evidence supports your position or why the evidence doesn't support the party with the burden of proof's position, and you put it in writing.

There are a number of different things that are subject to discussion regarding this, but,
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ultimately, the final decision on how this will be accomplished will be made by the Chairman as a procedural decision.

He has asked me to point out to you all that you have been getting transcripts very regularly because we have a crack team of court reporters who have been working, trading off with each other. One will be taking the notes from the proceeding, and the other one will be working on the transcript. You have probably gotten transcripts much faster than $I$ have ever seen in my history of these proceedings, and I go back to about 1998. So you should be reading those and formulating your arguments as we are going along. So he's asked me to point that out to you and to understand that there's not going to be a significant period of time from the end of the evidence until the time when those briefs are due because there's still a lot for the Committee to do once they even receive the briefs.

Once the briefs are received, the Committee will then meet in public, and we'll deliberate, and $I$ can anticipate that that will take, that
will be a multi-day process if past experience is any indicator of what will happen in the future. In cases that involve a lot fewer parties than that, sometimes our deliberations have gone three, four days, a week. I wouldn't be surprised if deliberations in this case take more than a week of the Committee's time. And maybe even more than two weeks. I don't know. But there's a lot of information. As you've know, we've gone through everything today in terms of just trying to set up the organization. So the word is that when the procedural schedule does come out from the Chair, don't be surprised if you feel pressured to finish your brief. So that's the first thing that I have to deliver in terms of a message to you.

There are a number of different ways that briefs have been required. Generally, at least recently, briefs have been filed by the parties who are in opposition to an Application followed by a reply brief by the party with the burden of proof. In most of these cases it's an Applicant unless it's some other type of proceeding.

That's what has occurred in the past. I think I I'm going to open up the floor to the timing of the briefs, but I think I know where everybody stands on this issue. It's ultimately not an issue that I'm going to decide. It's an issue that the Chair will decide.

But $I$ know that, for instance, the Forest Society has filed a memo with respect to today's hearing. I believe they asked for four to six weeks to file the brief and having all of the briefs filed contemporaneously. I suspect the Applicant doesn't agree with that, and there may be other people have other requests. Somebody requested me today if they could file their brief after Counsel for the Public to avoid repetition.

But in any event, I'm going to open the floor to discussions of the briefs right now. Things that we need to discuss is the amount of time. I do want a report back how much time you all think you'll need. I'm sure you're not all going to agree. And also your thoughts on contemporaneously filing or staggered filing, and also I'm pretty aware of the Chairman's
practice in this regard. Some of our Chair people have put limits on the briefs. I have heard Mr. Honigberg say that, you know, you're all grownups, and you know that if you file a thousand-page brief, it probably really isn't going to get read all the way through so he's generally left it to the discretion of the parties, understanding that this is a major undertaking, and there has been a lot of evidence that could be discussed in those briefs.

But so if anybody wanted to let us know how you feel about any of those issues with respect to briefing, now is the time to speak up. I'm going to start with the Applicant, and then come back around to the Applicant at the end, but if you have anything to say with respect to the briefing, any suggestions to make, understanding that I'm not the one making the decision.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Understood. So for the record, our position regarding the issues you raised is as follows. First of all, for purposes of simultaneous filing, we are opposed to that. The Applicant is in the unique
position of being the only party in this docket with the burden of proof, and as such, we strongly believe that we should be entitled to file after the other parties have filed. That process was just followed in the Antrim docket. We think it was the correct process. We actually feel strongly that if he were not permitted to do that it would raise Due Process issues with respect to our position.

In terms of timing, it's the Applicant's position here, again, picking up on what the Committee did in the Antrim docket, all parties except for the Applicant should have two weeks to file their briefs after the last witness finishes testifying, and the Applicant would then propose that it file its brief three days after the other parties have filed.

MR. IACOPINO: You said three days?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Three days. It's our view again that that is consistent with recent practice in Antrim. I would note that the order that the Committee issued in Antrim I think was approaching 200 pages, one of the longest if not the longest ever issued. So the complexity in
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that case, while maybe not the same as Northern Pass, was significant, and I would also note that I think as the Chair alluded to transcripts have been produced, and this has certainly been a very long process, and we have been working on our brief, I understand some other parties have been, and it's our expectation that with a fair bit of time still to go until the conclusion, parties could continue to do that and meet that deadline.

MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: Mike, I'd request that I go later in this circle. Peter couldn't make it today, and this is my first time through this process.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Anybody else who wishes to be heard with respect to the briefing? Mr. Whitley?

MR. WHITLEY: For the Joint Munis, I think we would prefer to have the opportunity to respond to whatever Applicant or other parties who are in favor of the Project submit in their briefs. So we would ask for the opportunity to file a response brief. We would also ask that
the initial round of briefing be simultaneous. I understand that the Applicant does have the burden of proof here, but in a court hearing or something else, you know, where the one party has the burden, there's simultaneous briefing in that context.

In terms of a time frame for when the briefing, when the briefs are due, we would ask for four weeks before that first round is due, and we also are concerned about some of the outstanding information that has been offered or pledged to be provided has not at this point, and in terms of putting together a brief, you know, for instance, I'll take the, for example, the revisions to the overhead portion of the route. That information should be provided before the clock starts ticking on submitting our briefs because we don't want to have an argument in the brief that is mooted by those materials or not have the opportunity to raise an argument because we didn't have those materials when our briefs were due. So we would ask for the beginning day to be after those materials that are outstanding or submitted to
the parties. And we agree and hope that there is no page limit imposed by the Chair. That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: I guess Ms. Manzelli. I know you have a position. You've already put it in writing. Anything to add?

MS. MANZELLI: Just to expand on what's been said here, I think it might be a fair accommodation of the parties' desires if we have one filing date for the initial brief that would include the Applicants, Counsel for the Public, and all Intervenors, and then one reply date. I think setting it up that way would accommodate the Applicant's desire to have the last word, so to speak.

I also wanted to note $I$ put in my memo that a period of 4 to 6 weeks would be appropriate given the magnitude of this proceeding. If we start the clock, as Attorney Whitley was talking, later so not in the last day of the hearings, but when everything is said and done. So the final transcripts have been made available, any exhibits, testimony, you know, any last thing that's going to be filed has been
filed. Then I think four weeks would be appropriate. If we start counting on the last day of the hearing then $I$ think something more like six weeks is appropriate so I just wanted to explain my thinking in that range there. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Mr. Plouffe?
MR. PLOUFFE: Is there a date by or a time when the record officially closes? That's what I'm used to dealing with. Briefing beginning a certain number of days after the record closes.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes, and that's generally what -- it's been rare that we had anything outstanding by the time of the end of the witness evidence, but we have had cases where the record was held open for the filing of one thing or another. So sometimes it does happen. I don't know what's going to happen in this case, and maybe we can address that under other business. Maybe get a check on where some of the things that people believe are still outstanding are from the Applicant, but we'll do that after we get everybody's opinion with respect to the briefing.
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Yes, sometimes we have, in fact, held the record open and $I$ can understand that if the record is held open on waiting on a document or something like that that $I$ understand the argument that it should be once that document is filed and that the time frame starts.

MR. PLOUFFE: That would be my suggestion is that that be the start of the clock for submission of briefs, when the record closes. I think four weeks is fine.

MS. BIRCHARD: I would reiterate the point made by Attorneys Whitley and Manzelli that simultaneous filing followed by a simultaneous reply deadline would be appropriate and satisfy the needs of all parties.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Anybody else want to address this? Ms. Pastoriza?

MS. PASTORIZA: Since the Applicant is still in dialogue with DOT, could we have the Applicant upload anything they give to DOT uploaded to ShareFile that same day? Because we're having a delay that's setting us back in responding to what's happening there.

MR. IACOPINO: We're going to address that
in a minute, okay? When we're done speaking about the briefing. I am going to ask them where we're at with a number of things. But do you, did you have anything to add with respect to the briefing?

MS. PASTORIZA: That relates to the briefing.

MR. IACOPINO: I understand that it does, but anything other than -- okay. Anybody else want to step in? Mr. Baker and then Ms. Crane and then Mr. Palmer.

MR. BAKER: I would support those who are in favor of the simultaneous filing, and $I$ would ask as others have for a four-week period from the time the record closes. It's my experience that briefs get sharper and shorter if there's enough time and when there's time pressure they tend to contain the kitchen sink and all the utensils.

MR. IACOPINO: I can just tell you in other dockets we have been told by Counsel for the Public, the same Counsel for the Public in this case, that if you give me more time I'll write a shorter brief.
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MR. BAKER: I think that was my point. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Professor Crane?
MS. CRANE: I'm left a little bit confused about the significance of the grouping of Intervenors and how that affects the briefing process, and I guess I should just ask my question in a straightforward way. If the Intervenor group realizes that they cannot file a joint brief, will --

MR. IACOPINO: File your brief along with a motion that explains the situation to the Committee as indicated in the original Intervention Order.

MS. CRANE: Okay. But the problem being, if the Committee rejects the motion, then we need more -- there's a time problem unless the motion is likely to be accepted as a matter of course.

MR. IACOPINO: I can't say it will be accepted as a matter of course, but I can tell you what you should do, especially since you're going to be under a tight timeline. You should, if you can't agree on a brief and you file two
briefs from your Intervenor Group, file a motion that explains why you're doing it, and ultimately the Chairman will rule on that as a procedural matter.

MS. CRANE: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Palmer was next.
MR. PALMER: Our group supports all of the positions taken by the Joint Municipal Group. We think that there should be an opportunity for response briefs. We think that initial briefs and response briefs should be filed simultaneously. We think that there should be four weeks allowed for preparation of the initial briefs, and that that clock should start once an accurate plan for the Underground Portion of the Project is provided by the Applicants. The plans so far provided are rife with inaccuracies and limits our ability to write a brief. And finally we feel there should be no page limit on the brief.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Somebody had their arm up beside Mr. Palmer? Ms. Schibanoff?

MS. SCHIBANOFF: I want to support Mr. Baker's point that one's deathless prose does
tend to die with time, and that would be to support a minimum four-week period after the record closes. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: There was a hand up behind Ms. Schibanoff, and then I'll go to the left. Was it you, Mr. Monahan?

MR. MONAHAN: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: You're actually in front of Ms. Schibanoff, but my depth perception is gone for the day.

MR. MONAHAN: NEPGA's issues in this case are pretty narrow so we'll defer to the people who have broader issues to brief. But I do have an issue with regard to the close of the record. In the event there were outstanding motions that haven't been addressed by the Committee, would those need to be addressed before the record would be deemed closed?

MR. IACOPINO: My hope is that all those motions that aren't addressed -- I mean, we still get motions coming in as time goes on. Usually we try to get those orders out. Is there a particular motion that you think is outstanding that should be addressed?
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MR. MONAHAN: Not now. I just noticed that the Committee sometimes isn't as quick as they could be because probably they're spending lots of time in the hearings so I know there's been some period of time --

MR. IACOPINO: I don't think that we've ever completed a hearing without any motion that had to do with the procedure of that hearing or the substance of that hearing being decided one way or another, whether it was decided as part of the deliberations on the actual Application or it was a procedural matter by the Chairperson who wrote a procedural order regarding the issue. Or rule from the bench.

MR. MONAHAN: You're saying there's a chance that some outstanding motions could be not answered by the Committee prior to the briefs being --

MR. IACOPINO: If they're the type of motion that requires deliberation on the subject matter of the Application, yes. I could see that, I could see an issue like that being left to deliberations. And then probably as a tag in any eventual order that comes from the Committee
saying the motion is denied for the reasons, whatever they were, discussed in the deliberations.

So I don't know if that's a helpful answer to you, but that's --

MS. MONAHAN: It's not unhelpful.
MR. IACOPINO: Well, good. But we have a checklist of outstanding motions and usually they're resolved before we go into deliberations so -- was there somebody else? Mr. Cote?

MS. COTE: I just wanted to clarify. Is there one brief per Intervenor Group allowed or can each individual Intervenor submit --

MR. IACOPINO: We are presuming that each Intervenor Group will file one brief. If there's an issue as raised by Ms. Crane, then proceed as I discussed before, you know, filing a motion explaining the problem so that the Chair can rule on it.

Nobody is trying to cabin your ability to argue your cases. It's just a matter of -- you can look around the room. If everybody files, if every individual witness in this case or every person who wanted to be an individual
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party files 500 pages of briefing, how much attention to do you think the Committee can really give to it. You know? Even if we deliberate for months.

So the parties were combined into Intervenor Groups under RSA 541-A for the purposes, specifically for the purposes that that law exists. So I'd ask you all to cooperate in the filing of your briefs with the other folks in your Intervenor Groups and work as hard as you can to make those briefs efficient, persuasive, and understandable. Mr. Whitley?

MR. WHITLEY: I don't know what the common practice is in the $S E C$, but is it typical that if you cite to, for instance, the transcript or an exhibit that has been submitted that is also provided with the brief?

MR. IACOPINO: No. No. If there's something, we're probably going to spend a whole day at least at the end of this proceeding going through the exhibit list and making sure that we know what exhibits there are and that they're all part of the record or not part of the record
if they were ruled not to be part of the record. So, no, you don't have to put the copies of the exhibits. The Committee will have their own set of the exhibits. In fact, each individual member of the Committee will probably have their own set. As you know you've been putting them up on ShareFile, we're been copying. In some instances you've provided jump sticks and we've been making sure that the Committee members see these exhibits as they come in. Whether or not they'll be admitted is, of course, a final decision that will be made at the end of the proceeding. But there will be, all of the exhibits will be available to each member of the Committee. So you don't have to attach them to your brief.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: References would be good if you can, but even if you can't reference the transcript or the exhibit number, you know, that's not going to disqualify your brief either.

MR. WHITLEY: I think you answered my question. I was just trying to avoid the time
and the electric space and tree space. Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: I'm just seeing some blank stares out behind you as well and over here so I just wanted to make sure that people understood that. Don't hesitate to actually reference the exhibit or reference the page number that you're talking about in a transcript. Ms. Manzelli?

MS. MANZELLI: On the referencing the transcript point, I completely agree. It would be very helpful if you could give us a standardized way to do that and then all the parties could do that in that same one way.

MR. IACOPINO: Every time I try to give you guys something standardized, you change it all on me anyway. So I don't know. But we can try to accommodate that. And we'll try to do it in the Procedural Order, assuming the Chairman agrees that that's what he wants to do. I doubt that he'll disagree with that.

Seeing no other hands raised about -- oh, Mr. Pappas. That's right. You wanted us to come back it. It's a sneaky way of getting the last word, I guess.

MR. PAPPAS: I don't have a lot to add. I
think you've heard all different views. Just a couple of points. One, I think, I suspect that 14 days may be a bit short given the size, but $I$ do think that a very short period for response makes sense. If you do Applicant only, if you do everybody response, I don't see a need for a lengthy response time. It seems to me that makes some sense.

The only other thing $I$ would add is, and $I$ don't know when, and no one here knows when the hearing will close or the evidence will close, but if it is around a holiday, you may want to take that into consideration because $I$ know a lot of people travel on holidays and that may cause some people some difficulty.

MR. IACOPINO: Give you a reason not to go see the family, right? Anyway, thank you. All right. Well, the Chair is going to issue an order. The plan from here is I'm going to issue a report from this proceeding. It's going to go to the Chair. To the extent that he decides that we need additional days and additional scheduling, our awesome Administrator will get those dates from the Committee members and get a
scheduling order put together, procedural order put together for signature by the Chairman which will have any additional dates as well as additional dates that are available to the Committee.

You should anticipate that we, at least in the first instance we're going to go in the order that will be in the report from here, and then when you see that, and we have the dates and if there is a problem and I anticipate, for instance, Mr. Sansoucy might have a problem, that's the time to call Pam or myself, and we'll see what flexibility there can be about that, but try to, when you see what the dates are, you see what the order is, everybody here will have the same information on the amount of time that's expected. So if it turns out, it looks like you've got a witness who is supposed to be called at a time when you know they're on vacation or having a baby or something, let us know that as soon as possible so that we can make any changes that are necessary or so we can plan to move people around.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mike?

MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. Yes.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: You did say you were going to circle back to us at the end.

MR. IACOPINO: I am, but I'm not there yet. So there's that process, and then as I said the Chair will issue the procedural order which will, I hope, go through the balance of the proceedings and provide enough time for us to finish. Provide enough hearing time for us to finish. I don't know that the procedural order will include deliberation time because we don't know how long they're going to have to deliberate so that may be the subject of a subsequent procedural order which will obviously be issued a notice to everybody. So I just wanted to point that out. I was going to circle back to the Applicant.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I just want to pick up what Mr. Whitley and some others said regarding -MR. IACOPINO: About outstanding -MR. NEEDLEMAN: The timing of the briefing. MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Whitley suggested the idea of have other parties having a response
brief which we're certainly opposed to, and then others suggested the idea that maybe there could be simultaneous briefing and simultaneous responses. We're also opposed to that. First of all, I don't believe that's Committee practice, but more importantly, that undercuts what in our view is the important purpose of the Applicant going last. Again, we've got the burden of proof, and I think we're entitled because of that to have the last say. And so we would oppose any of those suggestions.

MR. IACOPINO: I assumed you would oppose them. Let's go to the last thing. The other business. There's been some discussion, Mr. Needleman -- I'm sorry. Ms. Manzelli? Did you want to respond to what he just said?

MS. MANZELLI: No, I do not. I want to ask you to include something in what $I$ think you're about to say.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. MANZELLI: I think you're about to talk about information that might be forthcoming from the Applicants.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes.
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MS. MANZELLI: And I would like to ask if you would include in that whether the Applicants intend to file any form of, for lack of a better word, alternative PPA or anything like that that they would use to in part satisfy their burden of proof with respect to public interest or any of the other standards that apply in this proceeding.

MR. IACOPINO: Understanding that there is, there was a filing, a Motion to Strike, a filing that are still pending to be determined by the Chair, so you're asking if there's anything other than that?

MS. MANZELLI: As I understand it, that Motion to Strike was related to a press release.

MR. IACOPINO: Right.
MS. MANZELLI: So I'm not talking about the press release. I'm talking about whatever document it is that that press release says that they're going to create in the future. I think they characterized it as an alternative to the PPA.

MR. IACOPINO: So you're not meaning to ask them to comment on the motion at this point.

MS. MANZELLI: Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. All right. There are a number of things that the Applicant has indicated that they were going to provide as part of the proceeding. To me, the ones that stick out the most are the DOT Exception Requests. I know that you have provided us with some of those. I think there are still more pending. And there are a number of other items also. Does the Applicant have an idea as to when that information might be available?

MR. GETZ: With respect to the DOT Exception Requests and the Responses, we've been doing two things. One is providing all of the Responses to the Committee and the other is loading on to ShareFile all of both the Responses and the Requests. We had been accumulating them and not putting them in one at a time as they may come and go under the theory that it would be more efficient to upload them roughly on a monthly or some other periodic time frame. We had a discussion with Counsel for the Public about that and so we would intend to continue. We don't expect it to go much longer,
but --
MR. IACOPINO: Roughly where are we? 50 percent, 60 percent? I don't mean it to be exactly. Like I said, roughly.

MR. GETZ: I don't have a good estimate of what that number would be.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MR. GETZ: I guess I can indicate that we have made the bulk if not all of the Requests, but in terms of when we're going to get Responses back from DOT, we don't have a good feeling for that.

MR. IACOPINO: That's what I understood right from the beginning was that $I$ think it was 180 or something like that, and I have seen that you have filed some of them. I believe Ms. Pastoriza is requesting that they be filed as received on the ShareFile which apparently is different than what Counsel for the Public would like. I'm going to leave that to the parties to deal with in terms of -- but do you anticipate that will we have them all before the conclusion of the evidence in the case? Before the last day, last witness?
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MR. GETZ: I can't make an estimate of that, but $I$ can say that consistent with our opinion all along, the DOT decision is a separate permitting and regulatory process. The DOT has issued its decision. This is part of implementation in this case. And there's no requirement that the DOT make its decisions with respect to exceptions and implementing its decision before that this proceeding closes.

MR. IACOPINO: Understood. Ms. Pastoriza?
MS. PASTORIZA: Could I point out that the Exceptions are dated on Northern Pass's own schedule as having been given to DOT in May. We didn't get them on the ShareFile until August.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry. I missed the first part of what you said.

MS. PASTORIZA: Northern Pass had their own schedule that they submitted to DOT, and it showed those Exceptions being given to DOT in May. They weren't uploaded to ShareFile until August.

MR. IACOPINO: You mean the Request for Exceptions from the Applicant?

MS. PASTORIZA: Yes.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.
MS. PASTORIZA: And we're still waiting on DOT's response to them.

MR. IACOPINO: I understand they're waiting on the response to some of them, but I understand their representation to be that they have put a good number at least of them including the response from DOT on the ShareFile. Am I correct? Am I interpreting what you said correctly?

MR. GETZ: That's correct. There may be a few that, you know, are due to be uploaded, but that's correct.

MR. IACOPINO: I think the difference is is that they've been saving them until they amass and then putting them on the ShareFile; and your request is that they do it as received. Is that correct? That's what I understood your request to be. So if they get a letter from DOT today that deals with one exception, say, for one corner of a road, somewhere, that they put it up on the ShareFile immediately rather than waiting until they have 2 or 3 or 2 or 3 weeks' worth?

MS. PASTORIZA: I think we've been left
three months behind. I think it was deliberate. I think we should get stuff the day DOT gets it, and the day DOT sends a response to Northern Pass we should have it as well, and the day the DOT responds to Northern Pass's survey that was submitted three months ago we should know about that as well.

MR. IACOPINO: But today you have what was submitted is my understanding.

MS. PASTORIZA: I believe the Applicant filed to upload the White Mountain National Forest Exceptions and the Coos Exceptions. I didn't see those on the ShareFile.

MR. IACOPINO: Have you guys made requests to DOT in those areas? If you have --

MR. GETZ: I can't speak to the particulars. I'd have to check on those.

MR. IACOPINO: If you have, we ask that you provide them to all the parties. Okay? That's what you should be doing anyway, and you have a very good system. It seems to work. You're doing it. So if there have been requests made to DOT that you're waiting on answers for or waiting on your --

MR. GETZ: I can tell you this: that nothing has been deliberately withheld. MR. IACOPINO: I'm not adopting Ms. Pastoriza's opinion that something was deliberately withheld. I'm just saying that if there is anything outstanding that you've sent to DOT, it would be the practice to copy the other parties in the docket so -- or received from DOT, it would be the practice to copy the other parties. And so if you could do that, check and see what's outstanding that hasn't been provided, that would be helpful.

Mrs. Menard, is this about DOT?
MS. MENARD: Different topic.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. What topic was it that you were raising your hand about?

MS. MENARD: I'm just wondering if the Applicant could update with regards to a cultural landscape report. There was a notation from the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources that there was an expected report due at the end of June, and $I$ was just wondering if that has actually been produced and is available for review.
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MR. IACOPINO: Do the representatives from the Applicant that are here know the answer to that question? Mr. Bisbee is not here, I know.

MR. BELLIS: What $I$ know is that whatever has been produced is available for review at DHR. That's -- I'm not sure which cultural landscape Ms. Menard is referring to. So I can't speak to the specifics, but whatever has been produced is available at DHR.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So the reason why it wasn't provided to the parties? Is this part of the whole 106 confidential party issue?

MR. BELLIS: I believe it is in some measure potentially covered by that. But Dana, Mr. Bisbee would be the better person to speak to that specific.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. For those of you who don't know, there was apparently, I guess the Department of Energy requested that the consulting parties in the Federal Section 106 process maintain confidentiality over certain things that were filed there. Apparently, DHR disagrees with the Federal Department of Energy and believes that they are public records and
have made them available. I think that's the reason why you may not have gotten copies because, obviously, the Applicant in the course of the 106 process is not going to want to anger the Department of Energy, but the documents are available right now at the DHR.

I would like to clear up with either Mr. Walker or Mr. Bisbee whether or not those documents can be made available to the parties in this case. I believe that the Site Evaluation Committee, our Chairman has already said that hey, if they're public at DHR they're public as far as we are concerned. But if we have to accommodate the 106 process as well, we'll have to have a discussion about that.

But the short answer to your question is you can -- if they've been filed they're at the Division of Historical Resources over on Pillsbury Street.

MS. MENARD: Okay. Thank you. I'll check there.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Manzelli? I'm sorry, Ms. Martland.

MS. MARTLAND: I just want to make a
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comment that these records if they're publicly available at DHR and nowhere else constitute a hardship for people who live some distance from Concord. That's the only way that we can see these materials. So I would appreciate your efforts in making them available in some other way.

MR. IACOPINO: Understood. Thank you. Ms. Manzelli raised this issue of some new PPA or other type of filing. Obviously, we're not here to argue the merits of the pending motion. But I guess it's a fair question. Do you anticipate filing any new PPA as part of the Site Evaluation Committee process, understanding that you have publicly expressed that you have a bid in to the Massachusetts RFP process. So is there, obviously, excluding that because we're aware of that, is there any plan to try to enter a PPA into the record of this case?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: No. I thought we were very clear in our motion with respect to that. The PPA was withdrawn. We have no intention of submitting anything into this docket that we would ask the Committee or any other party to
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rely upon as a benefit in lieu of that PPA. And to the extent something is created later, so be it, but that's not something we would be asking the Committee to consider.

MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Pastoriza?
MS. PASTORIZA: Back to the issue of DOT. The Applicant is claiming that they don't really need to get the DOT documents in because the DOT decision can be pushed after the SEC decision, but if that's going to happen or not hasn't been decided and needs to be decided pretty soon because we're left now behind if they're going to claim that half of the route is going to be decided later on.

MR. IACOPINO: You are correct, and if that's the position that they ultimately take, the Committee will have to decide whether that's in the public interest and meets the rest of the criteria under RSA 162-H. There are a number of areas where the Applicant has asked that they be permitted to continue in an iterative process beyond the issuance of a Certificate if one is issued as a condition, and the statute specifically allows them to make that request,
but the Committee will decide whether or not an Application that bears that type of request meets the criteria of the statute and should be granted a Certificate. So, ultimately, that makes a substantive issue for the Committee to decide.

MS. PASTORIZA When do they decide that?
MR. IACOPINO: During their deliberations.
MS. PASTORIZA: How do we keep the Applicant from failing to produce the data?

MR. IACOPINO: There's two things you're talking about. There's data that can be provided which we've asked them to provide, and I'm sure that they will, but there's also requests pending not only for DOT but in other areas of the Application where they are requesting that the Committee grant them a Certificate subject to a condition that they continue in the process with either a federal or some other federal or state agency as a condition to the Certificate. That's something that ultimately is a substantive determination that will be made by the Subcommittee during the course of their deliberations, and they will
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consider that by considering whether or not granting a Certificate with that type of condition in it meets the criteria of the statute including the public interest criteria.

MS. PASTORIZA: So how do we formulate our questions if we don't have all the data to ask the questions about?

MR. IACOPINO: If you don't have the data, then don't have the data. So you can ask the questions, and they're going to have to say we don't have that. Although, quite frankly, that Panel has already come and gone. I don't know who you're going to ask questions of with respect to that.

MS. PASTORIZA: So are the final DOT permit packages part of the data that's going to get to us before the end?

MR. IACOPINO: I think the Applicant's position is "maybe" if DOT answers them all, but I think their further answer is probably, but if they don't, they're asking that we permit them to continue, as a condition of a Certificate, that the Committee allow them to continue through the iterative process with the DOT. Am
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I correct in that, Mr. Getz?
MR. GETZ: That's correct. We'll keep providing the information as it comes in, but we don't believe it has a final impact on the decision that the Committee is required to make.

MR. IACOPINO: And that's a substantive determination that the Committee will make whether or not they agree with that -- not whether they agree with that or whether that's an appropriate way to issue a Certificate in this particular case.

MR. BELLIS: Mike? I've confirmed that the last upload we had of the DOT Exception Requests was on July 28th, and we distributed that to the parties, notice of that, so that they could download those Exception Requests. I believe that was all of the Exception Requests that have been made to DOT to date.

MR. IACOPINO: But all have not been responded to yet.

MR. BELLIS: Clearly, not all of them have been responded to.

MR. IACOPINO: That was my understanding as well. I'm sorry. I did cut you off to get that
information, Ms. Pastoriza. You were about to raise another --

MS. PASTORIZA: I think they did not upload White Mountain National Forest and Coos Roads, number 1. Number 2, the fact that the Applicant had to scramble and come up late with the burial route now leave us, those of us on the burial route, behind in the data. So why should we be faced with a lack of data to rebut their plan because they came up late with a route?

MR. IACOPINO: I think what you're saying, you're asking me why you should be, with a lack of data, I think the answer is you have to argue about whether that lack of data is a basis not to grant the Certificate or not. I'm not going to do your job for you, but if they haven't provided sufficient data to establish that there won't be an unreasonable adverse impact on whichever, whatever you want to consider, whether it's Health and Safety, Orderly Development or Public interest, that's an argument for you to make if you choose to make it.

It's the same in that any type of trial or
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adversary pro sincere. If the party with the burden of proof hasn't presented sufficient evidence, that's an argument for the opponent to make. That's part of what would go into the briefs or memos that the various parties file at the close of the record or end of the evidence in the case.

MS. PASTORIZA: But if the parties are arguing that DOT is going to make a decision down the road, they can simply say the information is there, it's just not finished up yet. It's iterative.

MR. IACOPINO: Correct. And you can argue that the iterative process doesn't satisfy the statutory requirements in this case. Was there -- Mr. Whitley? I'm sorry.

MR. WHITLEY: Mike, there was a couple other outstanding items.

MR. IACOPINO: That's what $I$ was going to get to, if anybody knew of any other outstanding items they wanted to raise.

MR. WHITLEY: I didn't want to cut you off if you wanted to do something else first.

MR. IACOPINO: No, go ahead, Steve.

MR. WHITLEY: There was some testimony during the Construction Panel that the Overhead Portion of the route was going to have certain changes made, and $I$ don't believe those have been provided as of yet.

There was a list of businesses along the route that were part of a Business Registry that I believe were supposed to be provided and have not been provided as of yet.

And I believe there were communications among businesses or owners along the route also to be provided which have not been provided as of yet.

MR. IACOPINO: You don't mean business to business communications.

MR. WHITLEY: No, I don't.
MR. IACOPINO: You mean communications with the Applicant.

MR. WHITLEY: With the Applicant. Correct.
MR. IACOPINO: I believe, yes, there was an order. Pam might have one. I think that order is still in the time frame in which they can file the Motion for Rehearing.

MR. WHITLEY: Of the items, which one are
you talking about? Just to be clear.
MR. IACOPINO: That's the Business
Directory, as I understand it. Am I correct in that, Pam?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes.
MR. IACOPINO: That's the business directory issue. I'm not sure I understand the communications unless it was part of that same order. Communications between the businesses and the Applicants. I don't know if that's something that --

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I believe the list of the businesses was provided. The Business Directory who answered those has been the subject of an order from the Chair.

MR. WHITLEY: That's right, Pam. That's what I'm referring to.

MR. IACOPINO: That's still within their right to ask for rehearing. What was the first thing?

MR. WHITLEY: The first one was the revised plan for the Overhead Route.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, does the Applicant want to respond to that?

MR. BELLIS: I'm just not understanding the question. I'm not aware of or recalling everything about revised plans for the Overhead Route.

MR. WHITLEY: During the Construction Panel, there were a number of instances, and, you know, I say a number, not to -- 2 , 5, whatever, where the Construction Panel or Mr. Bowes said we will make changes to the plans, and we will get you those changes. We're still waiting for those changes to be implemented in a revised set of plans and provided to the parties.

MR. IACOPINO: I recall a lot of that discussion on the Underground.

MR. WHITLEY: Underground as well. I mean, both things.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. Well. Okay. Underground, I think, is fairly encapsulated in the DOT requests. Do you know, like, was it a particular area or something?

MR. WHITLEY: I can think of two in particular because they deal with my clients. I can think of the area near the area and sewer
lagoons in Ashland, and I can think of some errors that were admitted to in the Town of Pembroke, just as an example, not an exhaustive list.

MR. IACOPINO: The other thing that comes to my mind actually is the Applicants, there was a question of whether, $I$ forget if it was Transition Station 4 or 5 was going to be moved. Because $I$ remember I actually asked the question of the Construction Panel with respect to that. I guess it was a hotel being built or something like that. Some question about whether they're going to move a transition station. So I mean I know, that's the only one that $I$ could think of. I don't know which one Mr. Whitley's mentioning.

Somebody over here had their hand up.
MS. MANZELLI: Thanks, Mike. I was just going to mention that transition station in Bethlehem.

MR. IACOPINO: Any response from the Applicant on that?

MR. BELLIS: Well, I believe the Construction Panel, one or another of the witnesses, gave you the answer to the transition
station question which was there are no plans to move that transition station at present. I believe Mr. Bowes spoke to that issue, but I may be misrecalling that.

I believe there were some commitments made in response to some lines of inquiry where there would be a willingness to relocate a structure in relation to a vernal pool or some other resource should that be either required or desirable. I don't recall specifically a commitment to say we will make that change to the drawing and submit it within a time frame. That part I don't recall from the hearings on the Construction Panel.

With respect to errors on drawings, such as the Ashland Water and Sewer, I'll have to go back and look at the transcript and see what was said there.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm going to suggest that we all do that. Go back to the transcript so that we can maybe put a little sharper point on your request, Steve. See if there's something that's specifically outstanding or if it was as Mr. Bellis has indicated, something that they
would be willing to do, and --
MR. WHITLEY: I'm happy to do that. My memory is --

MR. IACOPINO: We're going to do it, too.
MR. WHITLEY: Well, yeah, I'm happy for everyone to do that because I agree that the transcript is probably the most accurate place.

MR. IACOPINO: I just don't want you to think I'm sloughing it off on you.

MR. WHITLEY: No, no, no. My memory is a little different from Mr. Bellis's so we'll go back to the transcript and see what was actually said. Because my memory is that it was, commitments were made and there was a representation that revisions would be made and revised plans provided, but subject to check, you know.

MR. IACOPINO: We're going to look at that as well, and ask the Applicant as well and anybody else who thinks they may have issue with it.

Was there anything else that was outstanding that folks wanted to ask of the Applicant? Mr. Baker?
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MR. BAKER: I don't think Mr. Cunningham is here, but there are motions pending with respect to a co-location study?

MR. IACOPINO: Right. We're not going to argue those motions here today. They'll be decided by the Chair. They're procedural.

MR. BAKER: Yes. I was just responding to your inquiry.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes. I'm talking about things that were suggested that they would be provided as exhibits or whatever. Steve, again?

MR. WHITLEY: Well, I wanted to follow up on the discussion, and $I$ meant to include this in my previous remarks, but I didn't see the note here.

We were talking earlier about the delegation, the state agencies and the iterative process that the Applicant is requesting.

MR. IACOPINO: Right.
MR. WHITLEY: I wanted to know when we would know all such requests that the Applicant was planning to make to the various state agencies that may have jurisdiction.

MR. IACOPINO: I think you should look at
the Application. I mean, I think that's where they all are.

MR. WHITLEY: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: If you go through the Application, there is clearly portions of the Application where they say, they asked that the Certificate be conditioned on something that's going to go on beyond the issuance of a Certificate if one is issued.

MR. WHITLEY: I guess I'm asking to the extent their position has changed from what was put in the initial Application, when we would know?

MR. IACOPINO: I don't know if their position has changed. That's the problem. So, hopefully, I expect, and I don't doubt that they will, that the Applicant, if there's a chance in their position, they will let us know one way or another, whether it be orally at a hearing or through something in writing if there is a change. I mean, I would expect that.

But I think there were quite a few areas where there was a reference to the iterative process in the Application.
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I'll flip it around. Is there anything that the Applicant believes is outstanding from any of the other parties?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Can't think of anything.
MR. IACOPINO: Counsel for the Public?
MR. PAPPAS: Nor can I.
MR. IACOPINO: Anybody else? Ms. Lee?
MS. LEE: Would you please clarify for me, I thought you said that in writing the brief, one person from the group is the spokesperson, and that one brief is submitted for the entire group.

MR. IACOPINO: Yes, but one person doesn't have to write it. You can all contribute in writing it, but there should be one brief for the Intervenor Group. So you should talk to Mr. Judge about that.

MS. LEE: Okay. Thanks for clarification.
MR. IACOPINO: As I said, if Mr. Judge says to you, there is no way we can write a brief together, you or Mr. Judge or somebody should probably notify the Committee that that's going to be an issue through a motion.

MS. LEE: All right. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Is there anything else that anybody wishes to address at this point in time? Not including pending motions. Ms. Manzelli?

MS. MANZELLI: Can you just clarify for me?
I think you referenced it at the beginning of the day. What the order of inquiry will be.

MR. IACOPINO: The same as we've been doing except we're going to move the Applicant to last, and just before the Applicant we'll have the Business Groups, Wagner Forest and Cities of Berlin and Franklin. So that it will be the same order which means that we'll be starting with Counsel for the Public -- well, except when they are their witnesses. So start with Counsel for the Public, followed by the Muni Groups in the order that they're in, 1 North, 1 South, 2, 3 North, and all the way down the list which I can tell you that this list right here is not in the same order that we've been doing. It will be in the same order. In fact, I'm probably going to cut and paste the order from the prior Prehearing Conference order.

MS. SCHIBANOFF: Excuse me, Mike. Before we leave this, could you actually, could you
read that list again?
MR. IACOPINO: Sure. This is the last I have, but like I said, it's not, especially when it gets towards the end, it's not in very good order. So with respect to, this is for the witnesses that are from either Counsel for the Public or any of the Intervenors. Counsel for the Public will go first, followed by Muni Group number 1 North, followed by Muni Group number 1 South, followed by Muni Group number 2, followed by Muni Group 3 North, followed by Muni Group 3 South, followed by the Grafton County Commissioners, followed by the Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests, followed by the NGOs, Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation Law and Ammonoosuc, followed by NEPGA, followed by the Abutting Property Owners on the Underground Portion of Clarksville and Stewartstown, which has been -- this is why it gets confusing towards the end -- which has been combined with the Non-Abutters for that area for which Mr. Thompson is the spokesperson, followed by the, what I call the Percy group which is the Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead Portion
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from Dummer, Stark and Northumberland. Followed by Mr. Brekke's group which is the Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead Portion of Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem. Followed by Mr. Palmer's group which is the Abutting Owners Underground, Bethlehem to Plymouth. Followed by Ms. Lee and Attorney Judge for the Abutting Property Owners on the Overhead Portion, Ashland, Northfield, Canterbury, Allenstown and Concord. Followed by the Deerfield Abutting Property Owners. Followed by Philip and Joan Bilodeau of Deerfield. Followed by the Non-Abutting Property Owners in the Overhead Portion, Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Dalton and Bethlehem which I believe their spokesperson is Ms. More. Rebecca More. Followed by the Non-Abutting Property Owners, Overhead Portion, Ashland to Deerfield which has been spoken for by Professor Crane. Followed by the -- and this is where I've lost that. Ms. Schibanoff, I don't know if your group came before or after the Historical Group in the prior, but it's either Historical Group, then your group, Ms. Schibanoff, which is the Non-Abutters, Bethlehem
to Plymouth, followed by, as usual, at the end, our friends from the Pemi River Local Advisory Committee.

Now, of course, we have flipped that around at different times to accommodate folks, whether it be accommodation for witness or accommodation for people who need to question a certain Panel. Any other business anybody thinks needs to be addressed at this Prehearing Conference? Take one minute. Is everybody ready to adjourn? We're adjourned.
(Hearing adjourned at 3:06 p.m.)
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