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(Hearing resumed at 1:47 p.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right.
We are going to resume with the Bethlehem to
Plymouth Group, Ms. Meyer. You may proceed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. MEYER:

Q Thank you. And if it's okay with everybody,
I'll do the presentation from back here if you
can see me okay.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Let's see. Just by way of introduction, I'm
Barbara Meyer, and I'm a member of the Abutting
Property Owners from Bethlehem to Plymouth Group
so that puts us on the underground portion of
the line. For the most part, I'm 116, 112, that
general area, Franconia, Easton.

Okay. So I wanted to start with Ms.
Widell. In your Prefiled Testimony, you
indicated that there's, it's unlikely that there
would be adverse effects to historical resources
along the buried portion of the route, but I'd
like to ask nevertheless if you recall part of
the underground route at the north end of
Franconia where there are a cluster of older homes, homes with foundations dating from the 1790s, 1800s, there's probably I'm guessing maybe a dozen homes like that, and they're all within very close proximity of the pavement where the construction would be accomplished. They're like maybe 15 or 20 feet from the pavement. So I don't know. Do you recall seeing those houses in Franconia?

A (Widell) I've been along the underground line, but I do not know precisely the properties you are talking about.

Q Do you have any recollection of the north end of Franconia where there are those small homes close to the road?

A (Widell) No. Not as I sit here right now.

Q Okay. Do you have an opinion about what the impact of construction might be on homes that have a foundation from the early 1800s being, you know, within 15 feet of excavation and blasting?

A (Widell) The effects, the direct effects are all being considered and Effects Tables are being prepared right now. The Project will take that
into account. And my understanding is that the blasting will be avoided, if at all possible.

Q So are these properties, they're not on your list of adversely effected buildings, correct?

A (Widell) No. They're not on the list of adversely affected buildings. They would be in the entire underground, the Project area is on the area where there could be adverse effects, and they will be determined through direct effects, and for the most part that is very near completion at this time.

Q Can you state that a different way? Because I wasn't following you.

A (Widell) Yes. Each historic property that is along the underground route is being assessed for direct adverse effects, be it where there might be digging that would affect the vegetation or walls or vibration.

Q Okay. So I take it for these particular homes, and I do want to get more into the idea of what's going on on the rest of the underground route along 116, but for a minute still sticking with this cluster of homes in the northern part of Franconia, because they're so close to the
blasting, they're obviously old homes, has anybody visited those properties? Has anyone from either your team or the Applicant visited those homes?

A (Widell) Yes, and my team is part of the Applicant. Yes, Preservation Company and I are preparing and have prepared Effects Tables on portions of the underground route, yes. So they which look very carefully at historic properties and features that are close to the road that contribute to the significance of those properties.

Q Okay. So now moving on to the other parts of the underground route, say along 116, in your Prefiled Testimony, and I could give you the specific reference if you need to, but it's only one sentence that I'm going to cite here so I could just read it.

You say, "In the underground segments of the Project, it is very unlikely that there will be adverse effects to historic resources because the transmission lines will be buried within the already disturbed area of existing roadways."

So my question now is because it looks like
the Project now could be sited at more the outer edge of the roadway that would put the Project potentially 20 feet maybe from the pavement into front yards into the undisturbed areas, don't you need to redo your analysis of that underground portion of the line?

A (Widell) As I indicated, we are assessing the underground portions and have done a number of properties at this time to take that into account that the Project may not be in the center of the roadway but within the area of potential effect on either side of the roadway. We are looking at that very carefully.

Q So what maps are you using? How far are you, your maps, how much are they showing the Project now moving into front yards?

A (Widell) Well, the area of potential effect that we need to consider, and the Project, I believe, is limited to 20 feet on either side of the pavement.

Q Okay. So it is the 20-foot number. And do you have maps that show an inventory of where our stone walls, where there might be particularly historic buildings, historic trees
that are very large and so would have some significance? Do you have maps that show that on your inventory even though initially you were asked to just look at the, you know, assume it's a Project under the pavement. Now it's expanded. Do you have maps that show inventories of those things you'd need to look at?

A (Widell) I do know that our team has looked at a historic transportation map that indicates some of those features, and, of course, through site visits we are identifying those features that contribute to the significance of the property.

Q When will the public be able to access the kind of data that you're using?

A (Widell) I can't answer that. I don't know. The transportation map is probably available to the public.

Q The what map? Could you repeat that?

A (Widell) The map that we are using that is a historic transportation map that indicates walls and features along that roadway.

Q Do you know where we could access that?

A (Widell) Through the Department of
Transportation.

Q  Change of pace. I wanted to ask also about some of these small scale artifacts that you might turn up along the route. I presume that it is safe to say that you're more likely to recover artifacts of historical significance in relatively undisturbed ground, more so than in highly disturbed ground where there's been excavation, grading, gravel poured, things like that?

A  (Widell) I believe that this is a question for my colleague.

Q  Yes.

A  (Widell) Thank you.

A  (Bunker) Yes. Thank you.

Q  Did you want me to repeat that?

A  (Bunker) Yes, please.

Q  Okay. So I'm presuming that if you're looking for small historical artifacts, things that you might be, your teams were looking for along the roadside, I'm assuming that you're more likely to find those in relatively undisturbed ground than you are in heavily excavated ground that earth movers have been through and gravel's been
poured and graded and that sort of thing; is that true?

A (Bunker) Yes. That's correct.

Q So then it's reasonable to conclude, would you say, that you would find less historical artifacts on, say, I-93 than you would 20 feet away from the pavement in my front yard?

A (Bunker) I'm not exactly sure what your question is implying. Could you try again for me, please?

Q Sure. If you're looking for a small historical artifacts and there's different, comparing different locations and how likely you are to find significant artifacts in different locations, I'm assuming that it just seems like common sense that if you've got a heavily graded area, a place where earth movers have moved the earth around and put down gravel and graded that you're less likely to find artifacts there than you would be in somebody's front yard where it's undisturbed tall trees 20 feet away from pavement.

A (Bunker) When there's less disturbance disturbance, there is a greater potential of
finding artifacts in a more intact context such as a front yard.

Q Thank you. That's all I have.

A (Bunker) You're welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: All right.

Next up is the Historical Nongovernmental Organizations. Ms. Merritt?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. MERRITT:

Q Good afternoon. I'm Elizabeth Merritt. I'm Deputy General Counsel with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Like Ms. Widell, I'm not a local, but thank you for bearing with me with my equipment up here.


A (Widell) Good afternoon, Ms. Merritt.

Q I have a series of questions that I'd like to focus on the written testimony that you submitted to the Committee, both your Original Direct Testimony and your Supplemental Testimony so primarily I'm going to go through both of those documents with some specific questions for you. And I have -- okay. So this is your Original Testimony. Let's start with page 3.
You've got it in front of you, too, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Page 3. Lines 4 and 5. You say, on the screen there, you say that Historic Resources compliance review generally involves three major steps. Identification, evaluation, and mitigation. Doesn't that statement skip a couple of steps that are supposed to happen before mitigation? And I wonder if you might want to elaborate on the steps that are missing before mitigation.

A (Widell) I would -- yes. I'd be happy to.

Avoidance and minimization. Often mitigation is often considered a word that is used for avoidance and minimization. Some use it broadly as a way to make up for adverse effects that cannot be mitigated and so it is used in a different, couple different ways. So I would consider avoidance and minimization as part of that.

Q Is this document big enough that people can read it okay? Or do I need to zoom in? Tell me if you need me to change it.

My next question relates to page 3,
Footnote 3, and this is the question of direct versus indirect effects and how those terms are defined.

In Footnote 3, you are assuming that direct refers to physical touching, some kind of physical harm, as opposed to the direct chain of causation. Am I interpreting your footnote correctly?

A (Widell) Could you give me a moment just to review it?

Q Okay.

A (Widell) I'm not sure how you got to that interpretation from that footnote.

Q Okay. Language is, you say that visual is indirect.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Visual impacts. Can you explain why you equate visual impacts with indirect impacts?

A (Widell) They are not direct, related directly to physical destruction of the resource.

Q So physical destruction is a key factor or criterion in determining whether it's direct or indirect?

A (Widell) No. Not necessarily. You were asking
me about how I look at visual effects as an indirect impact.

Q Let me bring up a different document. You're familiar with NEPA, right, the National Environmental Policy Act?

A (Widell) Yes. I'm aware of it. Yes.

Q Can you see, you can read this? These are regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality that govern NEPA. Are you generally aware of those regulations?

A (Widell) Generally aware, yes.

Q So I wanted to show you the definitions in the CEQ regulations at Volume 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 1508.8. And they define direct effects as those which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place whereas indirect effects are caused by the action but occur later in time or farther removed in distance but still reasonably foreseeable. So often that distinction is interpreted as to whether there's a third party involved. For example, is the Applicant's Project directly going to cause the impact or will it be the actions of a third party in
response to that Project that occur at a
different time or a different place. So I just
wanted to see whether you're familiar with these
regulations and whether they influence the
characterization of visual impacts from the
Applicant's Project as indirect.

A (Widell) No. The definition of direct and
indirect and definition of adverse effect we
used was from 36 C.F.R. Part 800 provisions.

Q Okay. I have those regulations, and I'll pull
them up on the screen, and perhaps you can show
me where in those regulations you're looking at.

Can you tell me what section you want me to
pull up here? Is it the definition section? Do
you have access to the regulations as well?

A (Widell) Discussion of assessment of adverse
effects is in the Section 800.5 on page 5 of the
federal regulations.

Q 800.5. Okay. So is there a particular, I know
the lines aren't numbered, but is there a piece
of this where you see a definition of direct
versus indirect?

A (Widell) Did you ask me a question?

Q Yes. There a particular part of this text that
you're focusing on that defines direct or indirect?

A (Widell) There are examples in this section on what are adverse effects and the definition. They don't break down into direct and indirect. The direct and indirect comes from an establishment of an area of potential effects with a likelihood of effects to historic resources.

Q Okay. Well, I'm not seeing a definition that is as specific as the one in the NEPA regulations, and I bring this to your attention in part because your testimony seems to repeatedly try to minimize the adverse effect by suggesting it's merely indirect, and I wanted to bring these additional definitions to your attention to point out that there is an argument that these effects are direct because they're caused by the, they would be caused by the action permitted by the SEC's decision. So the direct versus indirect characterization which is used to minimize the effects is more complicated than just physical touching based on these regulations.
Okay. I'll move on to my next question which is Footnote 4 on page 3 of your Original Testimony. If I can do this better this time.

Okay. There's Footnote 4 which says resources dating from 1966 to '68 were mapped and included in the database.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Slow down.

Q Sorry. Mapped and included in the database but received no further analysis because they were less than 50 years old and did not meet National Register eligibility criteria.

Approximately how many resources fell into this category? Your testimony said there were 1,284 resources that had a date before 1966. Do you know approximately how many resources fell into the category of 1966 to '68?

A (Widell) Sitting here, no, I do not know the exact number, but they are all listed in the database.

Q Do you have a ballpark?

A (Widell) No. Not sitting here right now. I do not.

Q So the resources on that list that date from 1966 and 1967 would now be 50 years old, right?
Q And those that date from 1968 would be 50 years old in another four months, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q So let me pull up the Section 106 regulations again. Okay. And I'm going to Section 800.4(c)(1) of the regulations. Maybe I better blow them up a little bit. Okay. And I know you're familiar with these. Okay. In 800.4(c)(1) in the top left paragraph that's on this page, on the screen, there's a provision that says the passage of time changing perceptions of significance or incomplete prior evaluations may require the agency official to reevaluate properties previously determined eligible or ineligible.

You're familiar with that regulation, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Is there a risk to the Applicant that these properties may be deemed National Register eligible now that they are 50 years old?

A (Widell) No. Because the complete inventory that was determined by the Department of Energy
and the Division of Historic Resources has been completed within the last year, year and a half. So properties that may be now 50 years old or older were considered to be included in that inventory and by the Department of Energy in consultation with the Division of Historic Resources.

Q So the properties between 1966 and '68 have been considered by the DOE even though they weren't considered as part of your report? Is that what you're saying?

A (Widell) Yes. The Department of Energy prepared a separate list of historic properties to be inventoried. They were identified in the Project Area Form, and the recommendation was made to the Division of Historic Resources, and I have reviewed all of those new inventory forms.

Q So Footnote 3 then, I'm sorry, Footnote 4 you're saying is no longer accurate or relevant because you're saying those properties from 1966 to 1968 have, in fact, been evaluated?

A (Widell) They would have been part of the group of historic properties or nonhistoric properties
that would be considered for this Project under the Section 106 process.

Q Okay. But Footnote 4 says they were mapped and included in the database but received no further analysis because they were less than 50 years old.

So are you saying they later did actually receive further analysis?

A (Widell) In a totally separate way, yes. This is referring to the Assessment Report that was prepared as part of the Application for the SEC.

Q Which consultant prepared those, the forms regarding those properties between 1966 and 1968?

A (Widell) I did with Preservation Company. Wait, wait, wait. I'm sorry. I answered that indirectly. You said which contractor prepared the forms for properties between 1966 and 1968?

Q I asked the question that way because I thought I understood you to be saying that you reviewed those forms but did not prepare them in the first instance.

A (Widell) No. They would have been part of the broad number of historic properties that would
have been considered in consultation between the Department of Energy and the Division of Historic Resources in the Section 106 process. Those inventory forms were completed by 7 different contracting companies to my knowledge, and I reviewed all of them that were determined eligible for National Register and some that were determined not eligible for the National Register. None were prepared for properties built between 1966 and 1968.

Q None were prepared for those properties?
A (Widell) Not that I, no. No. I do not recall one, but they would have been considered as part of the Section 106 process.

Q Okay. Now I'd like to turn to page 5 of your Testimony. It puts me back at the beginning again. Okay. Here's page 5. Line 26. You say that of the 1,284 pre-1966 properties within the one-mile search area, 194 had a sufficient visual relationship to the Project to be evaluated for their historic character.

A (Widell) I didn't see the word "search" in the area that you read.

Q Okay. I translated APE to search area.
A (Widell) Oh.

Q Because I saw that language used in a different document. The question is of the 1,284, were they all assumed to be historic or were they unevaluated?

A (Widell) They were built prior to 1968, and they were not yet evaluated, other than that 50-year cutoff.

Q Of the 194 properties that were evaluated, how many of those were individual structures and how many were districts or landscapes or large areas of some kind?

A (Widell) I would have to look at the database to be precise.

Q Can you give us a ballpark?

A (Widell) A ballpark. I'm going to, a ballpark would be probably 20, 30 would be large areas or districts.

Q Okay. Now, on the last page you created the list of -- whoops. Yes. I'll keep going. 12 of the 194 properties that you determined might be adversely effected.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Has the, and I realize this list was modified in
your subsequent testimony and we'll get to that, but has the DHR concurred in your determinations of adverse effect?

A (Widell) No.

Q Okay. Under Section 106, if the Permit Applicant submits something that says they don't think there's an adverse effect, and the State Historic Preservation Office or here, DHR, or the federal agency disagree with that, whose opinion counts under Section 106?

A (Widell) If the Applicant states that there are no adverse effects?

Q With regard to a particular property.

A (Widell) With regard to a particular property. The State Historic Preservation Officer has 30 days in which to respond to the federal agency to disagree.

Q And if they do disagree, then what happens?

A (Widell) The federal agency has to provide information that is requested by the State Historic Preservation Officer to indicate that there is no adverse effect.

Q What if the Applicant says there's no adverse effect and the DHR and the federal agency both
disagree and think there is an adverse effect, whose opinion counts?

A (Widell) I can't speak for how the DHR manages their Section 106 compliance in New Hampshire.

Q You're saying that if Northern Pass says they think there's no adverse effect on a historic property and the DHR says they think there is an adverse effect on that historic property and DOE also thinks there's an adverse effect, you're saying you don't know whether that would be treated as an adverse effect going into the Section 106 process?

A (Widell) You asked me to speak on behalf of DHR.

Q No. I did not ask you to speak on behalf of DHR.

A Is it then a hypothetical question, Betsy, related to the standard process for Section 106?

Q It's a general question based on your experience with Section 106 in general if an Applicant says there's no adverse effect and the State Historic Preservation Office and the federal agency disagree, whose opinion counts?

A (Widell) The State Historic Preservation Officer.
Q Okay. Let's see. Going to page 10 of your testimony. On line 21. You say this is part of your reasons why you think there's no unreasonable adverse effect, and one of your factors is there are not many, there are not many adverse effects. In your count which was 12 at the time, some of the properties are individual structures and some are larger areas with multiple properties, right?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Do these count as the same?

A (Widell) I don't know what you mean by "counting." They're adverse effects.

Q Well, you say in line 21, this is not many adverse effects. And so, for example, as a hypothetical, if there were only one property listed as having an adverse effect, one could certainly say there aren't many, but if it was a large Historic District with hundreds of structures and/or thousands of acres, would you think it was appropriate to say well, there's only one property adversely affected?

A (Widell) The number of adverse effects do not necessarily point to the determination that it
is an unreasonable adverse effect. There are five criteria. We are looking at this hearing, Betsy, for determining whether there's an unreasonable adverse effect. The identification of adverse effects using the Section 106 process is one of those five criteria. You could absolutely have one property that was so significant that it would cause an unreasonable adverse effect or you could have 50 very small effects and still not have an unreasonable adverse effect as I read the five criteria that are in SEC rules.

Q Okay. I'd like to turn to the letter from DHR dated August 25th, 2017, and I believe it's Exhibit number 443 from Counsel for the Public. And on page 1 of that letter, how many historic properties does DHR say are potentially affected by the proposed Project?

A (Widell) When you say how many properties are potentially affected, that would be the number, the complete number of properties that were first considered for inventory which is a total of 186. Then there were a number of reasons why those properties were not inventoried and so it
went down to 118 inventory forms that were completed.

Q Okay. And on the first page of the DHR letter from August 25th, there's a number referenced of 100. As of this date, 100 aboveground individual historic properties and Historic Districts have been identified in the study area and are potentially affected by the proposed Project. So do you know how many of these 100, let's use that as a ballpark figure, how many are Historic Districts as opposed to individual properties?

A (Widell) I would have to look at the database here. Would you like me to give you a ballpark? I would say ballpark it's probably similar. It's probably 20, 30 that are districts.

Q That's useful.

As long as we have the August 25th letter on the screen, let's scroll down and look at, there are some districts that are named in the letter that are under review, and I understand from your description yesterday that there may be a couple of these, there may be some of these that are not literally yet in the hands of DHR
staff, but are about to be. So starting on page 2 of the letter they list what I count as 10 cultural landscapes that are being evaluated and reviewed. Do you see that list?

A (Widell) Yes. These are study areas and there have been ten cultural landscape reports that have been completed by the Applicant and have been submitted to DOE.

Q Okay. And then on page 3 there's one that carries over, one of that list carries over to page 3, or maybe it's page 4. Here we go. At the bottom of page 4 of that letter, it mentioned a large, several intact farms that were identified as Rural Historic Districts within the study area, and it lists them and it lists their acreage. Oak Hill Agricultural, 661 acres. Nottingham, 741 acres. Peaked Hill Road, 1,295 acres. North Road, 1,423 acres. And Plain Road, 214 acres.

Can you help us figure out the overlap between these properties, the cultural landscapes, and the five Rural Historic Districts and the properties that are on your list as being adversely affected? Maybe I
should pull up your short list from your subsequent testimony.

So I'm going to the end of your Supplemental Testimony when you have the short list of six. There we go. Here's our list of six. So can you help us understand the overlap between this list and the list of 10 cultural landscapes and five Rural Historic Districts in the DHR letter?

A (Widell) Okay. Let me make sure I understand so that I can do this clearly. First, you would like to know which ones of these Historic Districts are in cultural landscapes?

Q I guess what I'm asking is which ones are specifically within the 10 cultural landscapes listed in that August 25th letter.

A (Widell) Okay. First I would tell you that all of the inventory forms for these have been completed and submitted to DHR as have the Effects Tables for all of these Historic Districts. Now, which ones are in the cultural landscape reports that have been completed are North Road, and Grange District is within the North Road, and Lost Nation cultural landscape,
and I believe the Plain Road one is also in that. No. Plain Road is in a cultural landscape. And I would have to double-check my boundaries to tell you which one, but Plain Road Historic District is within the one of the Great North Woods cultural landscapes.

Q Plain Road is one of the Rural Historic Districts, right?
A (Widell) Yes.

Q What about Weeks State Park? Is that within one of the cultural landscapes?
A (Widell) Yes, it is.

Q Which one?
A (Widell) The Martin Meadow and Weeks. No, it's not --

Q Mount Prospect.
A Mount Prospect.

Q Then Peaked Hill Road?
A (Widell) Is not within a cultural landscape.

Q It does look like it's one of the Rural Historic Districts. At least there's one with an identical name.

A (Widell) Yes, it is.

Q So one followup question is let's take Weeks
State Park, for example. Do you know how the acreage of the resource you looked at and listed here compares with the acreage that is within the cultural landscape report that's currently either about to be given to DOE or has already been given to DOE? How does the acreage compare?

A (Widell) I do not have the acreage right in front of me, but I'm going to estimate that the area that we looked at was not just the listed property. Weeks Mansion at the top of Weeks State Park. It included Weeks State Park itself which is, I believe, around 420 acres. So I'm going to say that what we reviewed as a Historic District under the Assessment Report was about approximately half of the size of the cultural landscape that has been completed.

Q Okay. I'll take that as ballpark figure.

That's useful.

A (Widell) Thank you.

Q I won't hold you to that specific number, but that's very useful. And then I guess my, I would have a similar question for North Road and the Grange District which do you know the
accredage of the district you looked at in your adverse effect determination?

A  (Widell) Yes. It would have been what is listed here which is 1,423 acres.

Q  Okay. That answers my questions.

A  (Widell) I believe that's approximately right. They may have been a little bigger, but approximately that.

Q  And then for the Peaked Hill Road District which combines what used to be two listings on your longer list in your Original Testimony, what's your, what's the acreage of what you looked at?

A  (Widell) That I honestly cannot remember, to tell you. But once again, Jeffers Farm is at one end of the now Peaked Hill Road District and the Locke Road Neighborhood is a substantial part of what has become the Peaked Hill Road District, so, once again, almost half.

Q  So there is clearly some overlap here. However, the lists that are in the August 25th letter from DHR include a total of 15 districts that are within the study area or APE, however you want to characterize it, so something's missing from your list of six. Can you explain or
elaborate on where everything else is?

A (Widell) I'm sorry. I don't understand, Betsy, what you mean. The list of six. There are more, there are more Historic Districts that have been inventoried and submitted to DHR and there are more Historics than this that were on our, in our Assessment Report.

Q So let's just assume that the three we talked about, Peaked Hill, Weeks, and North Road account for three of the 15 cultural landscapes and Rural Historic Districts mentioned in the August 25th letter. So with respect to the other 12, what's your understanding of how and when those will be evaluated in terms of their adverse effects once they're evaluated for their National Register eligibility?

A (Widell) I'm not sure I understand the numbers, but I will tell you that all of the properties, that all of the Rural Historic Districts, all the additional Historic Districts have been inventoried and sent into DHR with the exception of individual properties at Webster Lake. Five of them which will be sent in in the next two weeks. All of that information has been
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submitted to DHR, all of those 118 inventory forms have been reviewed for Determination of Eligibility by DHR.

Q Didn't you say yesterday that these forms had been almost entirely given to DOE but that DOE had not yet passed them on to DHR?

A (Widell) no. You must have misunderstood. Those are the cultural landscape reports that have been completed. They have all been sent to DOE.

Q Okay. So the five Rural Historic Districts are already in the DHR office but not the ten cultural landscapes?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Okay. And once that review is completed, and I believe you just said you thought it had been completed, did I mishear you?

A (Widell). No. It has been completed. All of the inventory forms, save these few that I mentioned from Webster Lake which was divided from a Historic District into individual properties, have been reviewed, and they all have also been reviewed for Determination of Eligibility. Basically, the identification
stage of this process is completed, and I believe that that states that on page 1 that it's near completion or very close to that, and all of, I have reviewed all of the Effects Tables for the properties as well.

Q Except for the ten cultural landscape nominations that are not yet in the hand of DHR, correct?

A (Widell) They are not yet in the hands of DHR because we are waiting for the Department of Energy to okay their release. I have personally reviewed all of the cultural landscape reports.

Q And what is your view as to the National Register eligibility of those ten cultural landscapes?

A (Widell) I believe that it is likely that at least a portion, if not the existing boundaries, they will be found eligible for National Register.

Q You suggested that DHR had already concurred in eligibility determinations but not for cultural landscapes, correct? Because they don't even have those.

A (Widell) That's correct.
Q  Do you know the total number of acres involved in the 10 cultural landscape areas that are being evaluated?
A  (Widell) No. I cannot tell you what the total number of acres are.
Q  Could be a lot of acres, right?
A  (Widell) It is what you would expect for cultural landscapes, yes.
Q  Do you know the acreage of the five Rural Historic Districts?
A  (Widell) No. Not in my head, I'm sorry. No.
Q  Let's go to your testimony on page 9. Oh, this is the Supplemental Testimony, sorry. Here we go. Line 17 and 18. You say that NPT evaluated potential historic resource impacts early in the planning process, and that minimizing impacts to Cultural Resources were all considerations in the route selection process. You see that?
A  (Widell) Yes.
Q  By early in the planning process, approximately when are you referring to? What year, what month and year?
A  (Widell) It would have been before I came on board so before 2014.
Q Do you know how long before 2014?
A (Widell) No.
Q And you were hired in 2014?
A (Widell) I believe the end of 2014. Yes.
Q Okay. And two and a half years later, what is the status of the historic identification process?
A (Widell) I believe I just answered that, but I'm happy to go over it again. All of the historic properties identified in consultation between the Department of Energy and DHR have been identified and the inventory forms have been completed, all the forms requested, and submitted to DHR. DHR has reviewed those inventory forms and found those which are eligible for the National Register. There are approximately five that need to be submitted in the next two weeks for Webster Lake.
Q But the ten cultural landscape nominations were not available back in 2014 or 2015, correct?
A (Widell) No.
Q So the route selection that was supposedly informed by an evaluation of potential historic resource impacts was not informed by the
knowledge of those ten National Register eligible cultural landscapes, correct?

A (Widell) Not those particular, but a number of those Rural Historic Districts had been identified.

Q And what about your October 2015 testimony? Was that informed by the knowledge of those National Register eligible cultural landscapes?

A (Widell) No. But a number of large areas within those cultural landscapes and certainly every historic resource within the area of potential effect and the zone of visual influence that are in those cultural landscapes were assessed for potential adverse effects so we have knowledge of what effects may be on those cultural landscapes at this time.

Q So if the current cultural landscape evaluation process were to result in a determination that there are -- let's pull a number out of thin air -- 5,000 acres of cultural landscapes eligible for the National Register, and the aboveground portion of the transmission line would cut right through the heart of those cultural landscapes, would that likely result in
an adverse effect under Section 106?

A (Widell) We already are aware of the adverse effects likely within the area of potential effect in those cultural landscapes from our previous review of the historic properties in the area of potential effect.

Q Well, but we determined that only one of the 10 cultural landscapes currently under review and two of the Rural Historic Districts were identified in your report, and so the remainder are not yet determined, not yet fully evaluated, so how could they have been considered?

MR. WALKER: Objection. This has been asked a few times and answered a few times.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Ms. Merritt?

MS. MERRITT: Okay.

BY MS. MERRITT:

Q I think this is a different question.

If there was a determination that there were 5,000 acres of eligible cultural landscapes -- No. Let me drop that. That's too similar.

Was the 2014 route selection informed by the knowledge of the impacts on those National
Register eligible cultural landscapes?

A (Widell) No. And let me clarify. One is I didn't state that the route selection was in 2014. I indicated that the route selection likely happened prior to my coming on board.

Q Okay.

A (Widell) And second, no, the cultural landscapes were not in existence at the time.

Q If those cultural landscapes are identified after the route is approved, based on your experience, what kinds of actions could be taken to avoid and minimize harm to those National Register eligible cultural landscapes if the overhead transmission line would cut through the heart of them?

A (Widell) We already know where the cultural landscapes are, and, as I indicated to you, because some of them have portions located in the area of potential effect which have been studied in great detail, any of the contributing individual resources, because a cultural landscape is made up of individual contributing properties, they have already been assessed and inventoried and determined whether there is an
adverse effect on those properties.

Q  But isn't it true that a cultural landscape is a type of historic resource in which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, and that in evaluating a cultural landscape, there are views and visual characteristics that would go beyond merely a collection of architectural structures.

A  (Widell) The views and viewsheds of contributing resources that are within these cultural landscapes in the APE have been considered.

Q  How is that possible if they have not yet been submitted to the DHR?

A  (Widell) Because we identified every historic property within the area of potential effect that may be eligible for the National Register. And as you know, Betsy, a cultural landscape is made up of contributing resources. They may be fields, they may be barns and large numbers of farms, for example, we identified the North Road Agricultural District long before the cultural landscape reports were completed. It informed greatly what that cultural landscape would be. But we have already assessed the effects on the North Road Agricultural District, and we have
assessed that that would be an adverse effect. The cultural landscape for that area will add land to it, but the effect will not be larger because there is more land because we've already looked at the area that would be affected. As you know, often a larger area may mean that effect may be less. It is often a larger effect on a smaller area.

Q If you turn to page 10 of your Original Testimony, lines 9 through 10, you say that the northern, in the northern 32 miles of the route, there's only one finding of adverse effect and that it's indirect. And which adverse effect determination on your part is that referring to?

A (Widell) The Dummer Pond Sporting Club.

Q Has the DHR concurred in your determination that there's only one finding of adverse effect?

A (Widell) No. They have not reviewed the Effects Tables. They have received many of them. But they did concur that it was eligible for the National Register.

Q Okay. My next question is, of the 10 cultural landscapes that are listed in the DHR left from August 25th, the ones we've been talking about,
are any of these ten cultural landscapes within the northern 32 miles of the route?

A (Widell) yes. The Harvey swale cultural landscape.

Q Is that the only one?

A (Widell) You're talking about the 32 mile overhead, yes. That's the only one that is within the area of potential effect in that area other than the Dummer Pond Sporting Club which is not part of a cultural landscape.

Q Okay. Scrolling down a little on page 10, you say the adverse effects on the, I'm sorry. Lines 23 to 25. You say the indirect adverse effects on the Weeks Estate would not cause it to be removed from the National Register, and then on, I think it's lines 1 and 2. Maybe it's the next page. Sorry. Yes. Page 11. Lines 1 and 2. You say the indirect visual effects on the other nine of the 11 properties you had listed would not prevent them from being determined National Register eligible. Are you saying that it doesn't count as an adverse effect if it's not severe enough to result in a loss of National Register eligibility? You're
not saying that, are you?

A (Widell) No. I said that the adverse effect would not cause it to be determined not eligible for the National Register. Nor would it cause something listed on the National Register in these particular visual adverse effects to be removed.

Q Are you saying that it's only an unreasonable adverse effect under New Hampshire law if it's that severe, so severe that it would be essentially de-listed or no longer eligible?

A (Widell) No. I was not referring to the criteria of unreasonable adverse effect for that particular statement.

Q Okay. Going to page 11, lines 3 and 4, you say the 11 indirect adverse effects are not located in one discrete geographic area, but rather they are dispersed along the length of the Project.

Wouldn't it be true that in some cases, based on your experience, adverse effects that might be dispersed along an entire corridor or throughout a Project could be more severe than effects that are located just in one discrete geographic area?
A (Widell) Is that a hypothetical question?
Q Yes. Just based on your experience.
A (Widell) Yes, its possible.
Q On lines 22 and 23 of page 11, you say, "Although I have concluded there's adverse effect to the integrity of the setting or landscape of these sites, it is my opinion that the actual effect on these aboveground resources is small."

Has the DHR concurred in your opinion?
A (Widell) The DHR has received the Effects Tables, 57 of them, and it has not finalized their review of them yet so I cannot say that.
Q Then on line 29 of that same page, you say, you're talking about how the Project has minimized adverse effects at the 11 overhead route locations, and then you say structure, locations, and structure design type were modified at 16 of the properties.

I was confused by the reference to 16 when you were talking about 11. Can you explain the 16 and what that's referring to?
A (Widell) Yes. It is in the Assessment Form that was submitted, and it's on page 19 and 20, and
it talks in very precise terms about the avoidance and minimization that was done for 16 historic properties that were identified.

Q So is that the 11 plus five more or is it 16 different properties that you deem are not -- what's the relationship between the 11 and the 16?

A (Widell) Can we go back to the portion of the testimony?


A (Widell) The overhead avoidance and minimization as I indicated were at 16 locations that had been identified that were all visually affected and on the overhead route.

Q Are you saying it was 16 locations and not 16 historic properties?

A (Widell) No. They were 16 historic properties.

Q And did that consist of the 11 properties or the 12 plus the additional ones or --

A (Widell) No. The 12 it is referring to are the 12 adverse effects that I had indicated within my testimony.

Q So you're saying there were, there were four of the 16 that you determined were not adversely
A A (Widell) No.
Q I'm completely confused. I just do not understand the relationship between the 16 and the 12. Or 11.
A (Widell) There isn't necessarily any relationship. The 16 were areas where some of them were on the list of adverse effects. Some were not on the list of adverse effects because we made avoidance and minimization to them.
Q I'll leave it at that. I'd like to turn now to your Supplemental Testimony from April of this year. I'd like to start with a question on page 9. Lines 20 to 30. You're addressing, the heading says insufficient capture of cultural landscapes. And you say you disagree that there was an earlier failure to sufficiently identify and consider cultural landscapes. And you say in your written testimony that when you refer to historic sites you're including cultural landscapes. And I'm struggling to understand how your earlier testimony could have included all of these cultural landscapes if they have not even been reviewed by DHR yet and the...
evaluations were not completed certainly in 2015 but nor in April of 2017. I don't understand how you could have considered those cultural landscapes when the analysis had not been done to identify and evaluate them at the time of your report.

MR. WALKER: Objection. Asked and answered.

MS. MERRITT: Okay.

Q Going to page 10 of your Supplemental Testimony, lines 6 and 7, mention specifically that you considered North Road Agricultural District which is over 1000 acres and Weeks State Park which was 420 acres, and these, as we discussed, are both on the list of 10 that are mentioned in the August 25th letter. So both of these are the subject of valuations that were prepared after your April 2017 testimony, right?

A (Widell) No. We didn't consider them. We identified both the North Road Agricultural District which had never been identified as a Rural Historic District, and I believe, as you know, the National Park Service uses the term Rural Historic District for identifying cultural
landscapes and that is what we did with North Road. In addition, Weeks State Park which is a designed landscape, a designed cultural landscape, we identified and included in our consideration. There are other portions within the cultural landscapes that we identified specific resources that are part of those cultural landscapes that might be affected by the Project which we take into consideration for my, the preparation of my testimony and my finding that there's no unreasonable adverse effect.

Q Oh, with regard to the two that were mentioned, do you know whether the acreage is the same in the new evaluations as you assumed in your earlier evaluation?

A No. I believe I told you both of them are about half of the size, but the areas that are included either are not within or adjacent to the area of potential effect or we had previously assessed the historic properties that were.

Q Okay. Turning to page 10 of your Supplemental Testimony, lines 26 and 27, you say the Project
has substantially avoided impacts and minimized
effects to Historic Resources by locating 99.5
miles in existing rights-of-way. Has the DHR
concurred in this determination that the Project
has substantially avoided and minimized affects
to Historic Resources?

A (Widell) No. The DHR has not completed its
review of the Effects Tables that have been done
for each of the historic properties that are
being, that have been inventoried.

Q And in lines 29 to 30, you say that the
underground portion of the Project has, quote,
"eliminated visual effects over long distances."
Has the DHR concurred in that determination?

A (Widell) No. I do not know what determination
you are looking for. That would not normally be
part of the Section 106 process to determine,
frankly, either one of those statements. It is
information related to why with a 194-mile
Project even now DHR has identified 100
properties that they are concerned about within
that area.

Q So to answer your question, let's just look at
lines 29 and 30. And the words there in your
testimony say, you're referring to the underground portion of the Project, and you say the Project has eliminated visual effects over long distances. Does that mean that using Section 106 terminology you would say that that portion of the Project has no adverse effect since visual effects have been eliminated?

A (Widell) No.

Q And how would you translate that to a Section 106 effects evaluation?

A (Widell) We are aware, Preservation Company prior to the announcement of the undergrounding of this portion of the Project, work had begun to look at the visual affects in that 60.5-mile area to see what would be the adverse effects to historic properties, and this is a rough number but from materials that I saw there had been identified approximately 283 historic properties that may have been affected visually if the Project had gone overhead in that area.

Q So does that mean that you believe there will be some adverse effect within this segment using Section 106 terminology?

A (Widell) No. I do not.
Q Do you think there's no adverse effect from this segment using Section 106 terminology?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. Going to page 14 of your testimony. At the bottom, line 27, and over to the top line of page 15, you say that the Section 106 process has not presented any new eligible historic resources that cause you to question your assessment regarding adverse effects. Let me get this.
A (Widell) I'm sorry. I don't know where you are. Can you point that to me? Thank you.
Q Sure. Page 14, line 27, to page 15, line 1. That carryover sentence. The Section 106 review and consultation process has not presented any new eligible historic resources that cause me to question my assessment. But that process is not completed yet, correct? Has DHR finished the process of determining whether there are any new eligible historic resources such as cultural landscapes?
A (Widell) They have completed review of the identity of historic properties and participated in the identification of the cultural landscape
study areas and are aware of those areas. And, once again, I reiterate, the area of potential effect within those cultural landscapes have been assessed for adverse effects.

Q DHR has not yet reviewed the 10 cultural landscape -- do you call them nominations? The 10 cultural landscape evaluations, have they?

A (Widell) They are being called cultural landscape reports.

Q Okay.

A (Widell) And they have not reviewed them.

Q Okay. Do you anticipate that DHR will conclude that none of these will be deemed eligible or do you anticipate that they will conclude that most or all of them will be deemed eligible for the National Register?

A (Widell) I cannot anticipate what DHR would do, but based on my professional opinion, I think they will find them eligible for the National Register.

Q I just have, I'm almost done here, but I have some questions about your short list comparing your long list, and I don't know how to put two documents on the screen at once, but your short
list which we were looking at before has six properties listed on it. The Peaked Hill Road Historic District represents a combination of what was previously two listings on your earlier list, and I'm going to pull up your original list.

Okay. I want to ask you about four properties that were dropped from your list, and as I understood your testimony, forgive me for not putting this language on the screen, I understood you to say that these other four sites were dropped because they were deemed not eligible, not National Register eligible?

A (Widell) No. I don't think that's necessary, but I would be happy to go through them with you.

Q Yes. Let's go through them one by one because I want to just understand the status. One of them is the first one on the list here, the Quimby Fife House, where in 2015 you felt it would be potentially adversely affected, and in your more recent testimony you did not include this on the list. Can you explain where that went?

A (Widell) Yes. I believe an inventory form was
completed for DHR, and DHR determined that it was eligible for the National Register, but only under C which means that it was only significant under architecture, and, therefore, the visual effects, the Project could not visually affect the architecture for which it was significant.

Q So do you take the position that if a property is eligible only under Criterion C it cannot by its nature be adversely affected by a visual intrusion?

A (Widell) Not necessarily, but that is not my decision. DHR is the one who decided this in this case of this property.

Q I want to come back to the DHR letter of August 25th, but, first, let's, as long as we have the chart here, let's look at the other three properties that were dropped from the list, and then I want your help finding them in the August 25th letter.

So the second property is the Montminy Farm and Country Store. What happened to that property, and why was it dropped from the list?

A (Widell) DHR determined that it should not be surveyed, inventoried.
Q  Does that --
A  (Widell) Go ahead. No. Please continue.
Q  Does that mean they determined it wasn't eligible?
A  (Widell) They determined that they did not need to complete an inventory form. I was not in the room and cannot tell you precisely why that decision was made.
Q  Is it possible the decision was made because they already knew enough about it?
A  (Widell) No. It has never been identified before.
Q  You don't know their rationale. Okay. Okay.
A  (Widell) It is, it would be identified in the notes from their discussion of the property, and Eversource staffperson Mark Doperalski would have reported that information. It is available through DHR, I would expect.
Q  The next one that's dropped from the list is the Northside Road Agricultural District?
A  (Widell) Yes. It was determined that that should not be inventoried. It is included in the Upper Ammonoosuc cultural landscape.
Q  Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. And then
finally the Leighton Farm was also dropped from the adverse effect list.

A (Widell) That property was not included in inventory, and it was not included in the cultural landscape.

Q Why?

A (Widell) these are decisions that have been made by DHR, and I took them into account for my Supplemental Testimony.

Q So that doesn't necessarily amount to a determination of noneligibility? What's your understanding?

A (Widell) As you know, when you complete an inventory for the completion of a Section 106 process, it is then reviewed, the list, the overall list is prepared by the Department of Energy in consultation with DHR based on the area of potential effect and the zone of visual influence, the inventory forms are completed, and then carefully reviewed by DHR to review, determine whether which ones are eligible for the National Register or not. They're called DOE which is Determination of Eligibility, and DHR specifically refers to it as the green sheet
process.

Q So does that mean that they have made some determinations of eligibility for properties along the route?

A (Widell) Once again, I've stated this previously, Betsy, so let me make sure you understand. The identification of historic properties on the route of Northern Pass has been completed except for those five inventory forms from Webster Lake which are being submitted next week. Those inventory forms have been submitted to DHR and reviewed by DHR and the Determination of Eligibility for those properties has been completed.

Q Okay. So this is going to be hard because of the sideways nature of these charts, but I was looking at the charts attached to the August 25th letter from DHR, and I was looking for these four properties?

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record)

Q So clearly, this is going to be a difficult question, but can you help find reference to any
of these four properties in these charts that are at the end of the August 25th letter?

A (Widell) No. Because this chart is what is basically the universe of the properties that have been identified by DHR for the Northern Pass Project. I do not believe --

Q The first chart shows properties that are determined eligible, but if you continue looking, there are other charts that show properties that have been determined not eligible, and I just can't find reference to any of these properties on those lists, and I was assuming that if indeed there had been a determination that something like the Leighton Farm, for instance, was not National Register eligible that it would be on one of those lists of properties deemed not eligible.

A (Widell) There are no properties listed on this list that state "not eligible." There is listed "other," and they are the properties that we've discussed including the five Lake Shore Drive from Webster Lake that will be sent into DHR next week.

I think what you are looking for which is a
sheet that I have which goes through and has a number of properties including those that I mentioned that DHR through their deliberations decided that the property was out of the area of potential effect. In this case, for example, the Campton townhouse out of the area of potential effects not on Route 3.

Q What page are you on?

A (Widell) Here's the North Hill Road Rural Historic District. This is not this list. This is a list that has more information specifically related to DHR.

Q Okay.

A (Widell) And why they decided to eliminate -- remember we are down from a total of 186 properties in total that they looked at and 111 that were then inventoried. So there were a number of properties that were eliminated by DHR for a number of reasons, and I'm just giving you a few of those reasons. They have been identified clearly, and I would expect DHR can provide that for you.

Q So I was looking at electronic pages 20 and 21 of this August 25th document, and that's where
there's a two-page chart that says Post-Contact European-American Sites, and they're all recommended as not eligible, no further survey. So these aren't, these are not pre-historic sites. These are Post-Contact sites, but I couldn't find any of these properties on that list either.

A (Widell) I cannot speak to the archeological sites. I will turn to my colleague.

Q Is it your understanding that the sites on electronic page 20 are archeological sites?

A (Bunker) Yes.

Q The first item on that list is called the Hobbs House. Is it your understanding that that's not actually a house? Perhaps Ms. Bunker?

A (Bunker) It's a cellar hole.

Q Thank you for clarifying that.

A (Bunker) You're welcome.

Q I have a couple more questions. I have a document that I want to show you which is a Determination of Eligibility by New Hampshire DHR. It has dates on it from 2015 and 2016, says it was received on April 30th, 2015, and March 15th, 2016, and it's the Project Area Form
for the Northern Pass Great North Woods region. And I want to just show this to you and ask you one question about it.

Is this the document that you referred to and relied on in answering the questions from Mr. Baker regarding the Indian Stream Republic site?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Thank you. Okay. I want to pull one more thing up on my screen.

This is the August 25th letter from DHR. And I'm looking at the last sentence on the first page. It says as plans for the proposed Northern Pass Project are further refined, it would not be unusual to identify additional properties that may require inventory and evaluation. Do you see that?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q Is that consistent with your experience of how Project review works under Section 106?

A (Widell) Sometimes after the Programmatic Agreement has been signed, as you know there are provisions in the Programmatic Agreement for discovery of both aboveground and underground
resources. So, yes, I have seen that in my experience of Section 106.

Q I'm now pulling up on the screen a copy of the -- hold on. What section is this. Site 301.14(b) which is the criteria relative to finding unreasonable adverse effects which I know you've been talking about, a lot about this over the last couple days. And do you see Criterion (b)(1) which says in determining whether a proposed energy facility will have an unreasonable adverse effect, the Committee shall consider all of the historic sites and archeological resources potentially affected.

A (Widell) Yes.

Q And isn't it fair to say that that process hasn't been completed yet?

A (Widell) No. Absolutely not. I believe that we have, we have identified and they were attached to the August 25th letter from DHR to SEC of the identified historic properties likely to be affected, if at all, by the Northern Pass Project.

Q So has the SEC seen the 10 cultural landscape nominations?
A (Widell) No. They are not. This have been transferred to the Department of Energy, and I know that Northern Pass is working extremely diligently to get them into the hands of the SEC.

Q So how can you reconcile your statement that the SEC has seen all historic sites when there are ten cultural landscape nominations that have not yet been conveyed to the SEC, much less to DHR?

A (Widell) I believe you asked me if all of the historic sites and archeological resources potentially affected had been identified and they have.

Q Does that mean that you think none of the cultural landscapes, the ten cultural landscapes, will be adversely affected?

A (Widell) No. But we know what portions of those cultural landscapes are in the area of potential effects, and we know the likely effects that will be caused by this Project to the cultural landscapes from our previous assessment work.

Q But your list which as we've discussed has not yet received concurrence from DHR, your list has two of the 10 cultural landscapes listed in it,
your list of six?

MR. WALKER: Objection. This has been asked a number of times, again, and answered a number of times.

MS. MERRITT: But the answers are internally inconsistent. That's what I was trying to straighten out.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: And Ms. Merritt, if you want to try to pursue an answer to that question, talk to me, and we'll see if his objection should be sustained or overruled or we can come around to get an answer to the question you want another way. So I heard the beginning of what you said was that she's answered the question inconsistently. Why don't you state your understanding of the way she's answered the question, and maybe she can reconcile the two for you.

MR. MERRITT: I was tempted to just leave the contradictions on the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: That's fine, too. I'm not sure why you raised it again if you were satisfied that you had the contradictions.
MR. MERRITT: I wasn't satisfied, but I'm inclined to stop beating a dead horse at this hour.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Fair enough.

MS. MERRITT: So I'll leave the record as it is. Thank you for your patience with my technology here. And so that would end the questions that I have for Ms. Widell.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: Okay.

WITNESS WIDELL: Thank you, Ms. Merritt.

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGBERG: I have no other Intervenor Groups on the list that are lined up to ask questions of this Panel.

When we resume tomorrow, the Subcommittee will be asking questions, and then Mr. Walker will have a chance to redirect. Is there anything else we need to do before we adjourn for the day?

I will say another thing that we're going to talk about tomorrow, and I don't know if we'll take any action on it, but we're certainly going to talk about the schedule going forward. The Subcommittee will have a discussion about that. There may be opportunities to ask
questions of you or for you to offer thoughts, but don't count on that. This may just be a discussion among the Subcommittee about the schedule going forward.

Anything else we need to do? All right. We'll adjourn and the Subcommittee will be back five o'clock for the Public Comment Hearing.

(Hearing recessed at 3:35 p.m.)
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