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## PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to Day 40 of the Northern Pass hearings. We are resuming the questioning of Mr. Varney with questions from the Subcommittee. And I believe Mr. Oldenburg is going to start us off.

MR. OLDENBURG: Good morning, Mr. morning.

WITNESS VARNEY: Good -- whoops.
Sorry. Good morning.
MR. OLDENBURG: Just for point of reference, my name is Bill Oldenburg. I'm from the Department of Transportation. And $I$ won't sway too far from that, from that sort of wheelhouse, if you will. A lot of my questions are related to orderly development and dealing with state plans, etcetera.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q And, so, the first thing I did was I looked at the rules. And, so, what $I$ did is on the screen you'll see the rules, as I understand it, for the Application. So, this is what was in the Application. And $I$ understand it's sort
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of split into land use, the economy, and various subsections of that. And, then -- so, I blew it up a little bit so you can -- I could see it. And, then, there's the criteria which have to rate it, and it's all lumped together. So, if we go back into, say, the economy, and there are six subsections of the economy, and you found one of those to have an -- what's the exact term -- an "undue", an "adverse effect", whatever, but not the other five. How do you -- I mean, you basically said there would be no adverse effect to the economy.

So, how do you -- how would rectify or how do you -- how do you rectify it, if there might be one that would have an adverse effect and the others didn't? Did you lump them together or average them, you know, when you looked at it like that?

A No. I reviewed each of the items. There are two for land use and six for economy. And, then, I believe two more shown on the screen for employment.

Q Uh-huh.
A And $I$ found that, in looking at each of those,
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that they would not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region.

Q So, you took each one individually, and then the conclusion was is that, as a whole, they wouldn't adversely affect it?

A Yes. Correct. And I recited that near the end of my prefiled testimony.

Q Okay. So, in your report, this is sort of the same type of question, in your report, this is the Table of Contents for Chapter 4, Prevailing Land Uses. And you list 11 land uses there, or actually 10 land uses, and then sort of a conclusion at the bottom.

A lot of the communities along the area have multiple -- multiple of these land uses. So, one community can have a forest, an agriculture, a residential -[Court reporter interruption.] MR. OLDENBURG: Sorry.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q -- a forest, agriculture, residential, commercial, probably all have transportation and utilities and recreation. So, as you took each one individually for a community, how did
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you weigh one against the other in your review? So, if you found that there might be an impact to, say, recreation in one community, did that weigh more or equally with the rest of them?

A I reviewed each one. And, again, the review was to identify the uses that were along the line, to answer the question "if this Project is constructed, will it prevent or unduly interfere with the continued use that is already in existence?" And that was -- that was the thought process in evaluating each one. To look at that use, and to think about how the lands are used. And whether or not that proposed use would unduly interfere with orderly development of the region, and whether or not, from a land use perspective, to evaluate those uses.

And what $I$ found in the review was that it would not have any significant impact on any of these land uses. And that is described or summarized in the report. And, of course, there's a detailed description of the land uses along the route, not only for the Project as a whole, but went far beyond the requirements to
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detail land uses in each of the communities along the route.

Q Okay. So, in your prefiled testimony, the slide you see, you conducted a review of local, regional, and state and federal long range plans.

A Yes.
Q And, then, this is just a slide of the plans that you -- most of the plans that you reviewed in Section 5.6. And, when I looked at these, and I didn't go into each one individually, but you have experience in state government and with regional planning commissions. All plans are not created equal. Is that a fair statement?

A Yes.
Q Some plans are useful, more useful than others?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Some plans are required and done because they're required?

A (Nodding in the affirmative).
Q So, the first one that struck me was "New Hampshire State Development Plan", Number 1 , from 2000 .
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A Yes.
Q Is that plan still relevant? I just -- that plan was created eight gubernatorial election ago, eight legislative sessions ago, eight executive council sessions ago. It's about the development of the state. And how much of it is still relevant, I guess, from your review?

A I don't know, but it was, for a very long time in New Hampshire, it was the only statewide development plan in existence. And, so, I thought it better to include it than to arbitrarily exclude it from consideration.

Q Okay. And Number 3 and 4, Number 3 is the "New Hampshire 10-year State Energy Strategy" from 2014, and Number 4 is the "New Hampshire Energy Plan" from 2002. The Energy Strategy from 2000, does that supercede the Energy Plan or do they go in concert or --

A That wasn't clear to me. So, I, again with an abundance of caution, $I$ included both documents and summarized them.

Q Okay. Do you know how many of these plans are required by state law?

A I don't recall. It wouldn't be that difficult
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[WITNESS: Varney]
to determine that. But some may be federal requirements, maybe federally funded, to be eligible for future funding, for example. Others are directed by the Legislature. Q Uh-huh.

A Some may be programs that the agency wants them to -- wants to use a plan to help them guide future needs and think long range about their issues. So, there are multiple reasons for the plans. There's probably no single reason. And many of them are -- make sense. In many cases, there are significant investments of federal or state dollars, or management of and stewardship of resources. And these plans help address that as well.

Q Okay. And that was sort of what $I$ was just going to get to, is some of these are required by state law, because the Legislature passed a law saying "you shall report on this" or "you have to create a report". Some are required by -- to be updated routinely. And some, like you say, require a federal reporting, because we get -- the state gets federal money for this program and you have to report. So, that makes
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sense to me in why they're there.
One I'd like to sort of -- let me go back. And one is -- number 19 on the list is the State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. I know this one a little bit. So, I wanted to pick on it a little bit.

A Sure.
Q So, in your report -- actually, no. Let me -I got ahead of myself. So, let me go back.

So, this is a question $I$ had, $I$ couldn't make sense of this part of the report. In Table 2, you talk about the scenic and cultural byways designation. And some of the work that's been done by the North Country Scenic Byway Council and some management plans that were done, and some designations that may change. And the second part of this is an excerpt that, in 2015, the North Country Council adopted a corridor management plan for various trails and redesignated them.

So, this is Table 2 that that paragraph talked about. And it lists the different byways and the total byway length and the Project crossings. And could you explain -- I
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guess $I$ don't understand the table on the "Project Crossings". What does that mean?

A Yes. It indicates locations where the Project may -- the existing right-of-way or the undergrounding or new right-of-way may cross the state designated scenic byway. And it includes information about whether that crossing is an overhead crossing or an underground crossing of the roadway. Okay. So, the River Heritage Trail, and we heard about this from another panel, the River Heritage Trail is -- basically, covers the entire underground route. So, it starts on Route 18, and 116, and goes down 112 to U.S. 3. So, it says "one crossing along a segment of", and I didn't know if that meant one aerial crossing? Or, I mean, it's under the entire trail, so --

A Yes. Yes. And, again, if it says
"underground", it's an underground segment. If it's "OH", it's an overhead segment at the crossing.

Okay. So, the next table was Table 3, which showed that the byway designation was changed,
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and that the River Heritage Trail has no crossings. That's "no aerial crossings" or -I'm trying to figure out what the table is telling us.

A Yes. Yes. And the table was revised. You showed language about the updates of the state designations.

Q Yes.
A And, so, there were proposed changes in the designations. They were then submitted to the New Hampshire DOT and the Scenic Byways Council -- Advisory Council.

Q Uh-huh.
A And, then, they can either approve or deny the designation proposals all or in part. They can also de-designate some areas. For example, Canterbury Shaker Village Scenic Byway was eliminated. It was de-designated. And, then, the route itself may change. And there were some changes made to these routes based on the final determination by New Hampshire DOT. And we submitted an update to the table, which was an update in Appendix 41 that was part of my supplemental testimony. And, so,
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for the River Heritage Trail, it's underground throughout that entire area. There are no overhead crossings of the River Heritage Trail. Q So, I thought the difference between the two tables, Table 2 shows Route 302 in Bethlehem, which $I$ guess you could say has a crossing, because that's where the transition station is. And the difference in Table 3 is Route 302 in Bethlehem is no longer designated, and so that crossing went away. That was my assumption. So, is that correct?

A The table -- the table now reads, for the River Heritage Trail, that it includes -- there's Route 302 in Bethlehem, 18/116 in Franconia, 116 in Easton, 112 and 3 in Woodstock, Route 3 in Thornton, Route 3 in Campton, and Route 3 in Plymouth. And it's all underground, and is shown on the New Hampshire DOT website of scenic and cultural byways.

Q Okay. All right. So, let me move on and go back to some of my preclude, which was under the statewide plans, the Statewide Bike and Pedestrian Plan. And your sort of write-up on that was that the corridor crosses multiple
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bicycle routes along the existing roadways. And your conclusion was "the Project would not have an adverse impact on the continued use of these bicycle routes, but temporary impacts from construction will be minimized by coordinating with the towns and appropriate agencies by using best management practices."

So, it's that last line that sort of caught my eye. When you say "temporary impacts", do you mean temporary impacts to the bike routes will be minimized by coordinating with the towns or is that just a generalized construction statement?

A It's a generalized construction statement. And refers to the fact that most of the bicycle routes that are identified on state and regional planning commission maps are located along existing roadways.

Q Okay.
A In other words, it's -- you're off to the right of that paved roadway. And, so, to the extent that there may be construction ahead, there needs to be some thought given to pedestrian --
to bicycles, who may be -- it's not just the
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traveling public and automobiles or trucks, it would be any bicycle activity that may exist on that roadway.

Q Okay. So, what I did is I went to the bicycle maps that are online. And this is sort of a section of the White Mountain area, which is in the Project area. And what $I$ zoomed in on, and you can see my mouse, is the underground project area, see where my mouse is up here at the top?

A Yes.
So, that's 302, in Bethlehem. And then this is 93, but right next to it is this green line, which shows Route 18 , comes down into Franconia, and then the underground route sort of follows where my mouse is going, through Franconia and Easton, to 112, and then along 112, into Woodstock, and then down off the bottom of the map. You see that, right?

A Yes.
Q So, $I$ won't belabor the fact by going through the legend. But the green lines on this plan are shown as "recommended bike routes". And these purple dots that are along here represent
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a "bike loop". So, you can see right in the middle it says "Loop 202"?

A Yes.
Q And, if you looked at the legend, this star down in downtown Woodstock is the recommended starting point. And these arrows signify the direction of the loop that they recommend you take.

A Yes.
Q So, if you're a tourist or a recreational biker, and you want go this route, they put out these plans that say "go that way". So, this is a 39-mile loop. And, if you started, you wouldn't have a problem until you probably got the farthest point away in Franconia. And, then, if you're going down this route, then you hit construction through there. And, basically, your entire half of your route home, back to where your -- assuming your car is your starting point, is under construction.

The next plan that $I$ show -- the next excerpt from the Bike Route is that loop. I mean, they go into detail of showing you a profile and, you know, the distance, and, you
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know, what type of rider you should be. So, they spend a considerable amount of time sort of laying out these loops and everything. So, during construction, the Construction panel, Lynn Farrington specifically, said that "In a construction zone, the road will be limited to one lane." And, in my discussions with them, I sort of threw out some math, and how long it would take them to complete each of the things that they have to do. So, how long -- how many crews that they would have to do to trench? How many crews to do the splice boxes? How many crews do the HDD drilling? Because they said how long it would take at each site. So, we came up, we did the math, and how long it would take given the construction period, and how many crews would be out there at one time? And it was over 20 crews would be in the underground section at one time. So, that meant a construction zone at least every two and a half miles, if they were -- if the construction zone was one foot long.

A Uh-huh.
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Q So, some of these construction zones are going to be longer. So, there's going to be a considerable number of construction zones. Per se.

So, there's this state law that's on the books, $I$ don't know how many people realize it, but it's "The Rules of the Road and Exercising Caution When Approaching Bicycles". I don't know if you've ever seen this. But it basically lays out the distance that a vehicle passing a bicycle has to stay away from, give that bicycle a -- what is the exact wording? -"reasonable and prudent distance". And the law states that, if you're going 30 miles an hour, that you have to give the bicycle at least three feet. So, most of the section isn't 30 , it's 40 or, you know, 50 miles an hour. I'll give you the fact that, during construction, maybe the Project will decrease the speed limit to 40. So, if it's 40 miles an hour, you have to give the bicyclist four feet. And you've seen pictures, other people, $I$ didn't put any in here, but you saw pictures of the narrowness of the road. In a lot of cases, the Route
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16 -- or, I'm sorry, 116 doesn't have shoulders. So, when you're down to one lane, you might only have 11 or 12,13 feet of pavement. So, and sort of to supplement that, this is the traffic control plans from the Project that Ms. Farrington described that says "the minimum lane width is going to be 11 feet." So, if there's 11 feet out there, and you have to give a bicyclist four feet, to me, that's going to cause a little consternation, maybe.

Do you -- is it reasonable to assume that a bicyclist is going to have a less than pleasant time going down that road, with vehicles blocked up behind them?

A Yes. A few thoughts.
Q Okay.
A If I could offer a few thoughts about that? First of all, the Project will need to coordinate with New Hampshire DOT on this issue. There can be outreach efforts made through the DOT website, for example, or anywhere -- any locations where these routes are advertised or promoted, to indicate that
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there -- you know, during the 2018 season, there will be construction on this roadway. It may suggest options for that loop, some of which follows that River Heritage Trail that you were referring to earlier. And there also can be signage on the route itself.

And then the traffic control plan and traffic management plan will need to incorporate this into the plan that's signed off on eventually by DOT. So, DOT will have -will exercise its responsibility in looking at this issue, looking at the state statute, looking at the traffic control plan, to make sure that reasonable steps are taken to ensure public safety along the route, and to let people know about the construction in advance of their trip, if possible. While also perhaps using signage on the route itself to alert people to that fact.

As it relates to a flagger coming up -when you're coming up to a construction site with flagger, there's a temporary, when traffic is either going one way or the other at all times, there's always a lane of traffic that's
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open. If a flagger stops the line of traffic, the bicyclist would be stopped along with that line of traffic, and then they would go through the construction site, which is probably -- I can't recall the exact distances. Bill, you may remember. But $I$ think the maximum that they discussed was 1,600 feet perhaps. So, well under a mile, it would be a short distance where they would perhaps be in this line of traffic.

Q Uh-huh.
A As you see in more urban areas, where there are lots of bicyclists, in downtown Boston and other suburban areas. Where there's a segment where they would be in that area where they're moving through the construction site slowly and carefully, and then they would be back into a undisturbed segment for a while.

So, those are the kinds of issues, as you know, that the DOT works through with anyone that's planning roadway/right-of-way construction, and one of the many factors that has to be incorporated into the plan.
And, so, it's a good question. And it's,
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I think, an issue that can be handled reasonably, so that there is advance notice and there is a safe environment for bicyclists, if they choose to be on that stretch of roadway during that period of construction. So, do you know of any outreach that's happened to like the DOT to update those bike maps and things? Because $I$ can tell you, the DOT didn't create those plans. They hired a consultant to do them. So, changing those plans isn't just going in and changing them. So, any outreach --

A And $I$ believe many of the -- my understanding is that many of the regional planning commissions were very involved with DOT in producing those plans. So, I would assume that they will work with them as well.

Q Uh-huh.
A And as well as bicycle organizations. There are many bicycle clubs and groups where there can be outreach. And, so, again, multiple avenues for trying to inform the public about what's taking place, so that there aren't any surprises, and, secondly, to ensure a safe
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environment for those bicyclists who decide to follow that portion of the route.

MR. WAY: Mr. Oldenburg?
MR. OLDENBURG: Yes.
MR. WAY: Could I have a question?
MR. OLDENBURG: Sure.
MR. WAY: Good morning, Mr. Varney. WITNESS VARNEY: Good morning.

BY MR. WAY:
Q And I'm somewhat new to this as well, and I'm learning about the DOT role. But it sort of sounds like this will become DOT's issue, and not the Project's issue, in terms of outreach and coordination. What's to prevent this -that outreach from falling through the cracks? Because I heard you say "assuming the regional planning commissions", and you could imagine assuming one group will do it, assuming that DOT will do it, unless there's a coordination at some point, what prevents this from falling through the cracks?

A The traffic management plan and traffic control plan that's part of that are reviewed and approved by New Hampshire DOT. And that would
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include all of the steps that will be undertaken to deal not only with the bicycle issue, but a whole range of issues that are typically a consideration with the development of one of these plans.

The DOT will then also be able to ensure that they're complying with the DOT conditions, and -- that have already been submitted under this docket and the details of the plan. If they're not achieving the requirements, then they will be required to address them.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q And I think I would add to that, as Chris inferred from your response that the DOT would be responsible for some of this, I don't agree. The Project is going to propose information.

A Correct.
Q And the DOT is going to review and approve that?

A Yes.
Q All right.
A And that's consistent with what $I$ was trying to say.

Q Yes.
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MR. WAY: That's where I was going.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A Which is that the plan is developed by consultants for the Project, qualified consultants who develop these traffic control plans. And then they submit it for review by the New Hampshire DOT. And then DOT eventually signs off on it. And, then, if there are issues raised about anything related to that plan, then it's a responsibility of the Applicant and the Applicant's consultants and contractors to resolve it.

But the DOT has the ability to step in and say "We're not satisfied with this. We've had a complaint or something. Can we sit down and look at this issue? And we want to see it corrected immediately."

MR. WAY: Thank you. That answers the concern.

MR. OLDENBURG: Okay.
BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q So, one of the things that you had mentioned was a work zone that could be like 1,600 feet. And some of them are going to be controlled by
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signals. I think that was the testimony of the Construction panel. That, like some of the HDD drilling, the work zone is long, without a flagger, so, they're going to put up signals. Have you ever seen how a bicycle -- so, if you have a line of traffic at a red light during a construction zone, and that construction zone is 1,600 feet long, have you talked to the Construction panel on how those signals would work from a timing standpoint?

A No.
Q Okay. So, let me -- I don't want to put --
A Yes.
Q I don't want to testify.
A Okay.
Q I have an issue with doing that. So, would it be reasonable to assume that these signals are timed? That they figure out how many cars are going to go through, how long it's going to take. And, if it takes two minutes, then they're going to get a green light for, you know, 30 seconds, the cars are going to go, and everything is going to stay red for a minute and a half. And, then, the other side, they're
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going to assume that all the cars are cleared and then the green light goes for the other direction. And it alternates like that.

There's a lot of assumptions in there. One thing that the signals don't know and don't take into account is a slow-moving bicycle holding up traffic. So, if it takes four minutes for that bicycle to get through that construction zone, the light could have changed, and now you have traffic heading head-on on a one-lane road. So, those are some of the concerns.

A Yes.
Q I don't know if anybody has talked to you about how to deal with that, from a bicycle standpoint?

A Well, again, the traffic moving through the construction area, obviously, will begin to speed up, there will be a speed limit there. And my understanding is that the bicyclist would follow along with that traffic. I would hope that they would have much more than the minimum three-foot distances. And my experience is that they usually are far in
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excess of that. And that they would then move through a relatively short segment of roadway, and then be back to the pre-existing condition again.

Q Okay.
A I really honestly believe that this is an issue that can be managed well. And with, obviously, with decisions made on flagging and lights, as you know, there are many factors that are taken into account, not only the distance of the segment, but the amount of expected traffic that would be on that roadway.

And, just yesterday, $I$ was at a flagged location on a state highway, Route 28 .

Construction has been going the entire year.
Construction started last fall with clearing and site work. It's been going all year. It's still underway. And there were flaggers there. There were about thirty cars in line on a major state roadway. And it was less than a minute wait for those thirty or so cars.

Q Uh-huh.
A So, and that $I$ believe would be much, much heavier traffic than what you would typically
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see in this area.
Q Okay. All right. I'm going to move onto a different topic. And this was just a follow-up slide that $I$ won't use. Another section of your report, "short-term construction impacts would include closures of recreational resources and disruption of normal recreational activities, and would be limited to the duration of construction, maintenance, and emergency repairs."

This is sort of the first time we've -that $I$ remember that we've heard that there would be "closures of recreational resources". Can you sort of give more detail on what that means?

A Yes. It's primarily relating to trailheads. Where, if the construction is occurring right in the trailhead area, there would -- or, a trail crossing, where there would need to be steps taken. And this is frequently done in the White Mountain National Forest as well, where they would close a small segment of the trail and reroute hikers around the construction area in a safe manner.
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1

Q Okay. All right. That makes sense. This next slide is -- I've compiled your conclusions from a number of the chapters under the land use. So, the first one was from forest management, where you say "the Project will not have an adverse impact on forest management", etcetera. The next one, "the Project will not have an adverse effect on agricultural uses." "The Project will not have an adverse impact on residential land use." "The Project will not interfere or have an adverse impact on conservation lands." And "the Project is consistent with local and regional plans and will not have an adverse impact on preventing" -- or, "on prevailing land uses." So, all those are very definitive in they "will not adversely impact".

And, then, when you get down to the transportation and utility section, there's not such a definitive conclusion. And it says "the Applicant will coordinate with towns, other utilities, and appropriate agencies to ensure that the construction and operation of the Project does not have an adverse impact on
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current or future ongoing transportation and utility services and facilities along the right-of-way."

It seems like you've passed the responsibility of ensuring that there's no adverse effect on someone else. And that it's up to them to ensure there's no adverse effect, and that you haven't come to a conclusion whether or not there's an adverse effect?

A My conclusion is that there would not be a significant impact on those adjacent uses. This primarily refers to the fact that there needs to be coordination with towns on issues like water and sewer, and storm water culverts, or, in the more urban areas, there may be considerations associated with existing gas lines. There are roadways. There are access needs that homeowners and businesses have. And a whole host of issues that local communities are interested in, which oftentimes are addressed through MOUs with those communities.

Examples would be, which was raised by one of the prior questioners, about special events in the community. And those can be included in
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the MOU, hours of the day, seasons of the year, to, again, with the goal -- with the goal of minimizing any adverse effects on nearby property owners or businesses, or the other utilities that already may be there.

Q But one of the -- I guess my comment to that is, we've heard a lot of testimony that there's only been one community that's signed an MOU, and many communities have stopped discussing the Project details with the Applicant. And I don't want to call it "uncooperative", but they have stopped communicating.

So, how do you deal with going into a community that you need to coordinate all that with and not getting any communication?

A The Project needs to continue their efforts to try to negotiate the MOUs with those, with those communities. And, again, they are typically used to minimize any perceived adverse effects that the local community may see that can be addressed through time of year, time of day, consideration of special events, and other issues of interest or concern to the local municipality.
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Q Okay.
MS. BAILEY: Bill, can I ask a
follow-up on that?
MR. OLDENBURG: Sure.
BY CMSR. BAILEY:
Q Do you think that it would be reasonable --
A I'm sorry.
Q Sorry, Mr. Varney. It's Kate. Do you think that it would be reasonable for us if we were to approve the Project to make a condition of the certificate that, before they begin underground construction in any municipality, that they have an MOU with the Town?

A My -- yes, except for the fact that a community may decide to not negotiate an MOU as a way to try to block the Project. So, I would urge that, if that type of condition is considered, that you think about that scenario. And, aside from that. I think it's a good practice and a reasonable condition.

MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
MR. WAY: Quick question, Bill, if $I$
might?
MR. OLDENBURG: Yes.
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BY MR. WAY:
Q So, if that condition wasn't put in place, and a community dug their heels in and absolutely refused to deal with the Project at any point, how does that work for the coordination process?

A If the Applicant doesn't or the town?
Q Well, if the town doesn't. In other words, the community just refuses to sign an MOU, refuses to cooperate, to coordinate on traffic issues, how does that work? How does that affect the Project?

A I think it's a lost opportunity by the community. And I believe that the Applicant would continue to try to negotiate an MOU with them, and will also be trying -- will try to work with local businesses and property owners along the route as well.

MR. WAY: Thank you.
MR. OLDENBURG: Okay. I guess it's back to me.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q So, out of your report also there's a statement that "the Project is consistent with the goals
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and strategies of local, regional, and state plans, and will not interfere with their implementation." That's correct?

A Yes.
Q So, I wanted to talk about a state plan, a state plan $I$ know probably better than most. But, first, before $I$ go into that, this is a cover of the Utility Accommodation Manual that we've heard a lot of testimony about, exceptions to this manual and that. Do you know what this manual is for?

So, let me -- if $I$ were to tell you that, because a utility can be in the state right-of-way by federal law, that each state is required by federal law to have a manual and policies and procedures governing the utility's occupancy of that right-of-way.

A Yes. That's my understanding.
Q This is the manual, okay. Do you know what it means when a "utility is in the state's right-of-way by sufferance"?

A No.
Okay. So, on the top of this slide is the definition out of that Utility Accommodation
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for what "sufferance" means. "For the purposes herein, the term is meant to indicate that a utility has no real property interest in the right-of-way, fee or easement, and merely uses and occupies the public right-of-way subject to the terms and conditions of this manual and state law." You see that?

A Yes.
Q And the second part of this slide is the terms or the conditions in which sufferance is
determined. So, in number $1(a), \quad$ does the utility have a valid right-of-way either by easement or fee?" Can you tell me whether

Northern Pass has an easement or fee
right-of-way in the underground section?
A This was not the scope of my --
Q Okay.
A -- my review and analysis. It's not within the scope.

Q Okay.
A Sorry.
Q So, I would infer that they do not, and are not trying to acquire a fee or easement, you know, or an easement from the state. So that (b) is
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also they "don't have any easement rights". So, I draw your attention to number 2. "When the utility facility is occupying the state's right-of-way by sufferance, common law places the obligation of costs associated with the installation, alterations, relocations, and/or protections on the utility owner." So, basically, just like a utility pole, or anything else, if it's in the right-of-way by sufferance, and the DOT has a project, and requires that utility to be moved, the utility has to move, correct? And it's at their own cost. There's no cost to the state for that relocation?

A Yes.
Q Reading that, you could understand --
A Yes. And my understanding is that the Applicant has reviewed this and has a clear understanding of their obligations.

Q Okay. So, do you know what the -- and we've heard it, so do you know what the cost, the total cost of the Northern Pass Project is? Like we've heard "\$1.5 billion". Does that sound right from what you've heard?
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}

1

A Yes, $I$ can't recall off the top of my head. Q Okay.

MR. OLDENBURG: 1.6 billion? 1.6 billion, okay. What's a few hundred million between friends.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q So, do you know what that cost would be per foot?

A $\quad$ No.
Q So, I did the math. The lawyers do math and everybody chuckles. And the engineer does the math and everybody rolls their eyes. I'm so sorry.

So, let's assume that everything is equal.
That the overhead line costs the same as the underground line of the HDD, it's all equal. So, $\$ 1.6$ billion divided by 192 miles, is it? Works out to be 100 -- or, $\$ 1,500$ per foot, just for grins.

Now, if they had to relocate, if they had to move a portion, would it be reasonable to assume they're not going to relocate ten feet, just because -- that it's reasonable to assume that they would go for the underground sections
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like the splice vault -- splice box, a splice box? And $I$ don't know, but just assume that that would be the case that --

A Yes, I'm not sure.
Q Okay.
A I think that that might be a good question for the construction panel when they return.

Q So, I should have probably started, this is going to be the longest set-up question in the history of the SEC probably. But it's going to take me a while to get there, but $I$ swear I'm going to get there.

So, just for grins, say that if, for some reason, a section of the line had to be replaced, that it would be from splice box to splice box, and that, in previous testimony, that's been about 2,000 feet between splice boxes. So, if you did the math, 2,000 feet times $\$ 1,500$ dollars a foot, would place a relocation cost of at least $\$ 3$ million. That's based upon what the construction cost is. So, it's a big dollar amount if they were to replace, had to move a section of this line, right? That's not -- it's not like you're
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moving a distribution line, it's big money.
A (Nodding in the affirmative).
Q So, let's assume, for the reason of the question is, that it's going to cost 2 million, 3 million, $\$ 5$ million to relocate a section of line five years after it's in place. If the DOT came about and said "I have to put a stop sign on this road and the line's in the way." Is it reasonable to assume that Northern Pass is going to move their line for the installation of that stop sign?

A I don't know.
Q I wouldn't think so, right?
A Yes.
Q They're not going to move a $\$ 3$ million line for a $\$ 500$ sign, $I$ wouldn't imagine. They might gripe about that?

A I'm sure it would -- first of all, hopefully many of these questions would be addressed up front in the engineering, design, and review in partnership with New Hampshire DOT. And there usually are options to solve a problem. And, so, I -- but this wasn't within the scope of my -- of my review.
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}

1

Q But orderly -- what my questions will eventually get to is the orderly development and the cost, the future cost of the line to the state and to the citizens.

A And there may be more -- if there were a need to relocate something, there would be more construction jobs associated with that as well.

Q Right. So, you don't know whether or not they would relocate the line for a stop sign. So, if they had to redo say the signal pole in downtown Woodstock and move it, and the line was in the way, that might be questionable, too. You have a $\$ 100,000$ signal pole and you're going to replace a $\$ 3$ million Northern Pass line, I don't know if that makes sense either. So, the idea is probably the state would have to move that pole to a different location to avoid the line. Does that sound reasonable?

A I think the existence of any utility lines is a factor to be considered with any project along the route.

Okay. So, if it gets more complicated than this, say there's a bridge that has to be
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rebuilt, and the line is under the existing bridge, and could that be a reasonable justification for having to move the line?

A Again, I don't know. It would force me to speculate, and $I$ can't do that.

Q Okay. So, one of the plans that you reviewed was Number 7, the "New Hampshire Ten-Year Transportation Improvement Plan". This is the cover of the current plan, it's actually two years older than the one you reviewed, because at the time the 2015 to 2024 Plan was enacted. They're currently working on the 2019-2028 Plan, because this is, as the plan shows, this is a required plan by state law, it's approved by the Legislature, signed into law by the Governor, and is required to be updated every two years. So, when you reviewed the Ten-Year Plan, you probably saw something like this. This is the very first project in it. And it's basically a listing of all projects, construction projects and construction programs that the DOT does, correct?

A Yes. And $I$ was involved in the ten-year planning process when $I$ was in regional
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planning --
Q Excellent.
A -- as well.
Q Excellent. So, each of these, let me just sort of summarize, so, each of these, this project is in Allenstown, as it says. It's on Route 28. And it's a bridge rehabilitation project. It shows sort of an initial scope of what that project will entail, because it's not going to be designed -- started a design, so we really don't know what it is, but the bridge, as it shows, is on the Red List. So, the bridge has issues. So, something is going to be done on that bridge.

Also shown on here is the estimated engineering costs, any potential right-of-way costs, and then a construction cost. So, there's a budget associated with this. So, is this -- this is typical of what you saw when you reviewed the plan for each project, correct?

A Yes.
Q So, one of the things that the plan is required for is to be transparent, so people know what
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projects are being done. And the other thing is to estimate funding needs. Correct?

A Correct.
Q Okay. So, you've been in state government.
The bucket of money is not limitless, and that the ten-year plan is also a budgeting tool. So, the DOT gets a certain amount of money from federal gas tax, from state gas tax, from other sources, and that is limited. So, the number of projects that we do is limited by the number of dollars we get, correct? That's basically how all state government works.

A Yes. And $I$ would note that the ten-year plan is -- has some changes every two years as well. Q Correct.

A And, so, there may be projects in the ten-year plan in the outer years that drop off the plan. There may be others added. And I reviewed the plan, reviewed projects that were located in project communities, and took note of them. I, when considering them, felt that they -- the Project would not interfere with their implementation, with the obvious understanding that, for any areas where the Project is in the
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vicinity of these projects, there will need to be consideration and coordination, and some forward thinking on the part of the DOT that has these projects in its plan, and, on the part of the Applicant, in its consideration of its project, as it may or may not relate to that, projects in that plan.

Q All right. So, you've reviewed the roadway projects that are in the underground section and the bridge projects that are in the plan in the underground section?

A I believe $I$ went beyond that. I think I reviewed every project that was in a project community. Every project in the ten-year plan that was included in a host community, even if it wasn't along the proposed route. So, on your screen now is a section of a plan that was part of the Application. This plan shows an HDD drilling site under the Connecticut River at the Clarksville/Pittsburg town line. So, you see where the directional drilling goes underneath the river, and, on the accompanying sheet, it would come out the other side. It goes under the river. Can you see
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the bridge in this plan? It's not shown.
A Yes, I don't see it.
Q So, there's no foundation for the bridge either shown, correct?

A (No verbal response).
Q So, you can't tell from this plan whether or not that HDD drilling actually hits or impacts or is close to the foundations of the existing bridge?

A $\quad$ No.
Q From the information we have?
A Yes. right. I assume that will be addressed in the final design.

Q I just asked this, because these are the latest plans and the only plans that we've seen.

A Okay.
Q And they don't show it. So, when Ms. Widell was up, she had this Historic Resource Assessment Form for this bridge. And this is a copy of that assessment. And I would just point out that, right in the center right here, it states that "the bridge was built in 1931." Do you know what the average life of a bridge is in New Hampshire?
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A $\quad$ No.
Q Do you know what the life expectancy of the Northern Pass line is anticipated to be? How long it will be functioning?

A A very long time.
Q So, if we said "50 years", would that be a reasonable assumption to say --

A Yes.
Q -- "at least 50 years"?
A Yes.
Q So, the odds are pretty good that this bridge, something will have to be done with this bridge in the next 50 years, because that would place it at over 120 years old. I will just tell you that there's not many 120 year-old bridges still in service in New Hampshire.

A Right.
Q So, this slide just shows some of the components of a bridge. And $I$ really wanted to talk about the ones that are underneath that you don't see, like the pier, the foundations, and the abutments. So, it's a typical bridge. A Yes.

Q The components of a typical bridge that you
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don't see. And when a designer designs a bridge, there's different options. You had talked about that. There's different options available to avoid impacts to the line.

I know you might not have firsthand knowledge of this, but would it be fair to assume that all these designs cost different? That there would be a different cost involved?

A Yes.
Q And that, when a designer, unlike what people think, is the first thing that they do is design for safety, and then cost-effectiveness.

They don't want to spend more money than they have to to build a design. So that they would pick a foundation design that is the most cost-effective. Does that make sense?

A Most of the time, yes.
Q Okay.
A I've seen instances in which there were other considerations. But, yes. That is one of the overriding factors.

So, what if the most cost-efficient design couldn't be used because it would impact the underground transmission line, and it cost more
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money?
A And this is an example of an issue that the New Hampshire DOT will be looking at with the Applicant. And this would be part of the review, and would be a consideration as they reviewed this.

The DOT knows the status of the bridge.
They know when they are likely to need to replace it. And I'm sure that they will be -I would be very surprised if they did not -and disappointed if they did not consider the replacement of the bridge as they were discussing this crossing technique with the Applicant.

Q Well, I guess one of the -- one of the questions $I$ would have is this bridge was built in 1930. What do you think the records are, from 1930, of how that bridge was constructed? How deep the piles went into the ground? Does that information even exist?

A Yes.
Q That's some of the questions. So, we won't -we won't know them all, $I$ would assume, but -so, with this HDD drilling, and let me go back
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to the picture, that's the assumed location of where they would like to place it. And you've testified that you know a little bit about what the construction technique is. And they say they can "steer" this drill bit. So, it will be close to this location. If you hit a rock, it might go astray, do this, that. So, typically, this would be shown as a proximate location?

A Correct.
Q So, the design in the future would have to assume a location that may not be exactly known, correct?

A Yes. Again, that would be a consideration in the final design.

Okay. So, that's one bridge. So, what I did is this is a summary of all the bridges that are in the underground section in the Town of Campton. You can see up here where it says "Town of Campton", correct?

A Yes.
Q And, basically, $I$ tried my best to compile all the bridges in the underground section by town. And what $I^{\prime} d$ point out is the red circles off
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to the side. That represents, you'll see up in the top, the "year built" and "rebuilt". So, you'll see all three bridges that you're going to go over or under with the line, in Campton, were built in 1927, 1935, 1934. So, that's comparable to the Clarksville-Pittsburg bridge?

A Yes. And these are all crossings of -Water? -- of brooks.

Right. So, it's the same --
Not a major river, but a brook.
The same type of issue, though. You're going to have the same type of construction, same concerns with the line being in the way. So, we go into Easton. And there is a dozen or so bridges. And you'll see that five of them are older than 1950. That's what I circled. They had to be older than 1950. That places them at almost 70 years old. Again, life expectancy of the project, 50 years. That's 120 years before the -- we assume that the Project won't be a concern anymore, but it might be. And, in Franconia and Plymouth, you see in Franconia, there's six bridges. Three of them
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are older than that. And, in Plymouth, there's three bridges, and there's one, the truss bridge in front of The Common Man. Sugar Hill has one bridge.

In Thornton, none of the bridges are older than that. And, then, in Woodstock, one of the things $I$ would point out is, I'm not sure what happened in Woodstock, but they had a massive rebuilding project, because almost all their bridges were rebuilt in the '80s or '90s. So, that only leaves one bridge.

So, the long and the short of that is, there's 39 bridges, about, in the underground section, and 14 of them are 70 years old or older. So, within the life of the Project, that same issue of avoiding the line, additional cost incurred, potentially cost incurred to avoid the line due to design changes, and that is a real potential, correct?

A Yes. Again, you're speaking to the need for the Project to continue its discussions with New Hampshire DOT on the final design of the Project, and try to incorporate any issues like this, and consider these issues, as you look
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forward. And $I$ have every confidence that the staff at New Hampshire DOT that are involved with crossings of brooks and streams, and, in a few cases, rivers, that they will coordinate with the Project engineers and come up with a solution that leaves as many options as possible going forward, and tries to ensure that long range planning is taken into account as the Project construction is carried out.

Q But the further you go into the future, that crystal ball gets a little fuzzy, doesn't it?

A Yes, it does. But, again, I think this is a question for the construction panel, because I haven't been involved in their ongoing, frequent work sessions with the DOT.

So, $I$ won't belabor that point. But, since you left as DES Commissioner, there's been new stream crossing rules implemented by DES.

A Yes.
So, some of these culverts, if we replace those culverts, would now be bridges. So, some of these bridges that are shown as a certain size today, no one knows in the future how long, how deep, what size those bridges will be. So,
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anticipating that is difficult.

A (Nodding in the affirmative).
Q Isn't there a risk also by the contractor that that risk will be passed on in a higher bid price to the DOT, when those bridges are constructed?

A I don't know. I think that's a good question for the Construction panel.

Q All right. Because $I$ would just point out that, $I$ don't know if you saw this in the news, but this is an article from CNN about the power outage in the Outer Banks, in North Carolina. And that was a bridge contractor who put a bridge pile through an underground transmission line. I don't know if the contractor of the state understood the risk. But I'm sure they do now, wouldn't you agree?

A Yes.
Q This is a picture of I-93 -- or, 393, in Concord, over Portsmouth Street. I think you've heard a couple questions about this. And one of the things that was stated is "the DOT is requiring the Northern Pass to use extra tall towers in this area." "165 feet" was
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mentioned. Do you know why the DOT would require that?

A I haven't spoken with them directly about it. I believe $I$ heard some reference to use of -potential use of cranes at some point in the future. Again, thinking long range, thinking ahead, to try to address those long range questions now, in the final design of the Project.

Q Correct. So, at some point in the future, those bridges will have to be maybe replaced, rehabilitated, maybe widened. And the way you do that, to put the steel in place, is you use cranes. And, if those towers aren't tall enough, you won't be able to use cranes, correct?

A Again, I haven't looked at that, that issue from the standpoint of construction. But, yes. My understanding is that use of cranes may, in some instances, require higher -- taller structures or higher conductors to provide clearances.

So, if they don't use cranes, they use some other technique, the reason why they use cranes
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}
is it's the most cost-effective method of lifting the steel. So, if they don't, it's going to cost the state more money to widen, rehabilitate, or replace this bridge, correct?

A Uh-huh.
Q Because of the lines overhead --
A Potentially, yes.
Q All right. So, I guess the whole point of this line of questioning, as $I$ said, the longest lead-up to questions is, --

A That's okay. -- so, there's 14 bridges, there's this bridge, these towers, there's going to be an additional cost just because the line exists for future construction. Wouldn't you agree?

A I don't know that. There are -- my understanding is that there are ongoing discussions between the Project engineers and the New Hampshire DOT. They're considering various options. And I am not aware of any final decisions with respect to that crossing. All right. So, I guess my question was more in general, that the sheer presence of the line, and the need to avoid impacts to the line in
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the future, because the cost to relocate is so high, that that cost is going to be borne by others. So, in the case of the DOT, if it costs you $\$ 100,000$ more to avoid the line, that $\$ 100,000$ is passed on to the citizens, and $\$ 100,000$ isn't spent somewhere else in the state.

If, say, the Profile School, up in
Franconia, wanted to add a turn lane, and the line was in the way, are they going to have to spend more money to do an alternative design to avoid the line, costing the citizens more money, you know, to avoid the line, instead of relocating it?

And, you know, I've just -- I guess that's my question is, just the sheer presence of the line, and the avoidance of having to make it relocate, do some of these things, it's going to cost the citizens of the state and the communities, potentially, money?

A With respect to the DOT, the Project has an ongoing dialogue with the DOT to work through these issues, and take them into account in the final design. And in working with local
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property owners and local communities, to try to identify any potential issues, and have some advance planning.

But, at the same time, there are rights to build the Project, staying within the existing corridor is a sound land use practice. And, if there is some need to address a specific segment, and there's a better solution, I'm sure everyone would want to seriously consider that -- that solution to a specific site problem.

Q Uh-huh.
A I don't think that we can anticipate every potential future use in New Hampshire. The New Hampshire DOT's roads, that they maintain and restore and at times expand, are affected by private property use throughout the state of New Hampshire. Increased traffic, increased truck activity, increased uses affect their future costs and affect -- and may, in some instances, raise questions in the future that DOT hadn't considered when it improved a section of roadway.

So, it's very hard to speculate about all
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of those issues. And the best that we can do is to make sure that there is an ongoing dialogue between the Applicant and the DOT, to try to reasonably foresee any future issues, and to factor those, that information that we know about, or is likely to occur at some point in the future, into the -- into the final design and into the final decision that DOT is making on the Project.

Q Okay. So, I say this with a wink and a grin. It's been testified by, I think, Mr. Quinlan and Mr. Bowes about, if a business potentially loses money due to the Project, that they could ask for reimbursement. Does that apply to State agencies as well?

A I do know that the Project certainly understands its responsibilities with respect to the Project and with respect to the New Hampshire DOT. There's also, as you know, a ForwardNH Fund, which is $\$ 20$ million per year, but am $I$-- is it 20 million or -- it's 10 million.

Q Yes, that's --
A I'm sorry, I'm correcting myself. It's \$10
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million per year for twenty years. And, so -and, in addition to that, obviously, we have sixteen miles of transmission lines that already exist in this state. And $I$ have rarely heard of them as being a significant problem with respect to state DOT.

Q Okay. I'm going to move on and talk about some of the master plan discussions that you had.

A Sure.
Q And this is going to be really brief. And I think this was Counsel for the Public's exhibit, where you discussed, and these are your notes from the City of Franklin, your planning meeting notes, and the discussion of the Master Plan.

Did you, when you talked about the Master Plan, one thing I noticed, and I have a series of them, I'm not going to go through them just to save time, is, when you talked to these communities about their master plans, basically, this one says "updates to the Master Plan were put on hold." But there was no identification of how old the plan was, and what updates have been made or completed since
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the initial plan. So, and it seemed to be a reoccurring theme with the notes. You mentioned the master plan, but there was no, in a couple of them, let me just scroll through.

This one, Deerfield was one where you did. So, there's a 2008 Master Plan, and then it talked about changes or implementations that have occurred as a result of the Master Plan. But $I$ didn't get that with all of them. And did you ask those questions? So, you asked -- and it says what the current Master Plan is and whether it's current, but what was done?

A Yes. I reviewed each adopted master plan, legally adopted master plan, in each community, in detail, and prepared a summary of that plan, with its goals and objectives and recommendations.

During the meetings with the planners, we asked if there were any updates to the plans that were anticipated in the near future that we needed to track or be aware of. And we learned that there were some in the works. And in the supplemental testimony that $I$ provided,
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there was an update to some of the plans that were in the process of being updated. In some cases, they would update a single chapter, and in other cases there may be an effort to revise the entire plan in a one or two-year period. So, we identified the existing plans that were adopted. We asked for information about any plans that may be -- may be in the process of being updated, what was being updated, and then tracked those communities on their website, and updated our document as any new information, pertinent information became available.

Q Okay. So, you tracked what the current approved plan is, and then changes that might affect land use in subsequent years, even if it wasn't rewritten. So, if you had a 2008 master plan, and they rezoned an area in 2010, you knew about that. If they, say, added to the school in 2012, you knew about that. And, so, all these things that would affect land use --

A If there were items that were included in the master plan, we would be aware of it. But we tracked the master plan, because they are --
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while most of them would stay the same, there may be some that were being updated, and the same with zoning ordinances. So, we produced a working draft. And the reason it was called a "working draft" is because they're subject to updates over time.

Q Okay. So, if you used the current plan, how did you -- I guess I just want to make sure that you captured the changes, whether or not they're in the master plan, because the master plan is a vision, correct?

A Yes.
Q And it says "Boy, it would be nice to promote commercial development if we put in a water line", and that might have been the wish in 2008. But what if it was put in in 2010 , did you ask those questions and track that?

Because, potentially, that water line would then induce -- could induce a change in land use, correct?

A Yes. When we -- when we met in these meetings, we included maps of the Project route, and asked if there were any anticipated -- any significant anticipated changes along the route
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in the near future. I recall, for the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, for example, there was an area in Pelham that was -- they were hoping to develop for industrial use.

Q Uh-huh.
A And, so, we factored that into the consideration in our review of the project. So, there was an effort made to not only review
the legally adopted plans, but to also keep track of changes that were occurring in any communities along the route, and to periodically update our information. And it's addressed in the supplemental prefiled testimony.

MR. OLDENBURG: Okay. I'm good.
That's all the questions $I$ have.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who has a short --

DIR. WRIGHT: I do.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Wright.
DIR. WRIGHT: Good morning, Mr.
Varney.
WITNESS VARNEY: Good morning.
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}

[WITNESS: Varney]
old three-legged stool analogy.
A Right.
Q If one of those legs is removed, does the entire stool fall down?

A Understood. And I reviewed the prefiled testimony, reports, supplemental testimony, supplemental reports, if provided, throughout this process. And I felt that they were -they were high-quality reports, and were a sound basis for my conclusions in their areas of expertise.

Q Did you also read the reports filed by the experts for Counsel for the Public in those general areas as well?

A Yes, I did. Not recently, but back when they were first filed, yes.

Okay. In your prefiled testimony, you noted
that "the operation of the line will not place any new demands on local or regional services".

What do you mean by "local or regional
services" in that statement?
A A transmission line provides, obviously, it provides substantial benefits to the community in the form of local property taxes and jobs,
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energy, all the things that have been mentioned. And, with respect to costs in the community, for public services, there -- if you consider it in comparison to other forms of development, for example, a subdivision could be allowed in a residential zone in a community, they may place additional burdens on the community, for education of students in the school system, for police and fire protection, and a whole range of other issues, even perhaps a need for a road-widening due to increased traffic.

So, in considering the use that's proposed under this Project, within an existing corridor, there is a substantial increase in taxable property to the community, but very few demands for services that would be associated with that use.

Q You mentioned three of them that $I$ wanted to cover, police, fire, and emergency services. We know that there's going to be a new converter station in Franklin, a significantly expanded substation in Deerfield. Will those communities require any special training, in
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terms of responding to emergency situations at those facilities?

A I'm not aware of any. But $I$ would say that, if there was any training, that they would, obviously, provide it. But $I$ don't know the answer.

Q Okay. Would the Applicant help cover the costs of that special training, if it were needed?

A I'm sure they would.
Q Okay. What about during construction? Will there be a need for police at construction sites along the way? I can admit, I've lived in New Hampshire my entire life, and I'm never quite sure, when $I$ come to a construction zone, whether it's just going to be a flagger, or whether there's going to be a state trooper or a local officer there or not. Would that be covered by, if those costs were incurred by a city or town, would that be covered by the Applicant?

A I believe, if they were associated with the Project, yes.

Q Okay. A number of times you've mentioned the use of the existing right-of-way, and I believe
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something like over 80 percent of this Project will be in an existing right-of-way. I know one of the municipal attorneys went down this road the other -- last week with you at this point, but $I$ did want to follow up on that a little bit.

Would you agree that this Project results in significant changes within the existing right-of-way?

A No.
Q You don't? You don't feel that relocating an existing 115 line, raising the height of that line, putting in a new line with even taller structures, replacing wooden $H$-frame with either monopoles or lattice towers is not a significant change?

A To the extent that it's already a transmission corridor, there would be an incremental
increase in structure heights, just as there was in the Merrimack Valley Project. And, so, there would be very limited change. The uses is the same. And there would be more
structures. And there would be some
incremental increase in the height of
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|  | structures within the corridor. Is there an intensity impact to the development |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q | of the utility corridor? I mean, are you |
|  | suggesting that we can continue to develop |
|  | within the utility corridor and never have an |
|  | impact, either on land use or on orderly |
|  | development around the corridor? |
| A | The intent is to try to use these corridors |
|  | efficiently, and to -- and to minimize effects |
|  | on the environment and on the land uses along |
|  | the route. And, by staying within a corridor, |
|  | you, in a general sense, you are helping to |
|  | minimize impacts in the community. You're |
|  | not -- you're not introducing a new corridor in |
|  | an area where an existing corridor already |
|  | exists. If we were to be sitting here today, |
|  | and suggesting that we're going to create a new |
|  | corridor through one of the southern |
|  | communities in the -- along the route, the |
|  | first question would be "Why didn't you locate |
|  | this within the existing corridor, so you're |
|  | not introducing a new use in an area where it |
|  | doesn't currently exist?" |
| Q | Okay. I'm just, again, I'm just trying to |
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think of, --
A Sure.
Q -- do you get to a point where you reach the point where you do start to impact either land use -- could you somehow restrict further development, further residential development along the corridor, by clearing buffer zones or things along those lines?

A The Project is only clearing within their existing right-of-way. And the residential uses that are along the right-of-way may want to retain buffer on their land, with the knowledge that that's -- there's an existing easement in place. And, so, they would -- I can't see any instances of where a transmission line has prevented residential development. In fact, in my review of several transmission projects, I've seen many expensive homes constructed in proximity to existing transmission corridors.

Q Okay. I'll shift gears a little bit and talk a little bit about the new right-of-way up in the northern part of the state. And Attorney Reimers raised this issue last week also, and
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that's potential impacts to remote trout ponds. I'm just curious, is that something that you considered in looking at your analysis and potential impacts on those types of resources? A Yes. We did. And, in the written description that wasn't fully presented in that cross-examination, we described uses that are along that corridor. And we also pointed out where there were potential crossings of ATV trails and snowmobile trails in those areas. And it was referenced in Nathan Pond, but what wasn't mentioned is the Nathan Pond "Ride the Wilds ATV Trail", and that's the name of it. And there's extensive ATV use in these areas, along with snowmobile use. And the line is located -- the line does cross some of these trails, but $I$ don't see any adverse effect on fishermen who are in these ponds that are stocked by Fish \& Game, and in areas that have ATV trail use during one part of the season and snowmobile use in the other part of the season. Focusing in a little bit on the remote trout ponds. I understand Fish \& Game operates something like 48 -- or, they stock 48 of these
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ponds. What type of setting do you think Fish \& Game is shooting for in managing these things as remote?

A I think they extend from the Lake sunapee area, all the way to Pittsburg. They tend to be locations that would support a remote stout -a trout stocking program. And I'm very familiar with them, because New Hampshire DOT -- I'm sorry, New Hampshire DES sometimes accompanied them when they were conducting their stockings, and DES was collecting water quality samples for these remote ponds that were being affected by acid rain and regional air pollution.

> So, I did consider their existence, along with all of the forestry uses and recreational -- other recreational uses in that sparsely populated area.

Q In Mr. DeWan's report, he identified in
Millsfield, and $I$ just quickly picked up on these two ponds, Long Pond and --

> [Court reporter interruption.]

BY DIR. WRIGHT:
Q $\quad$ Long Pond and Bragg Pond. And, in
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Mr. DeWan's report, he identifies those resources as being 0.4 and 0.6 miles away from the transmission line. And, in his April 2017 Supplemental Report, he notes that the lines would be visible from those two particular ponds. Is that something that you considered in your analysis?

A Yes.
Q Do you -- has there been any discussions with Fish \& Game, if those lines were visible, would they no longer be considered "remote"?

A I don't believe that the designation of Fish \& Game's pond for trout stocking is a directive on how private property owners use their land. It relates to the use of the waters there. And, as you said, and as in this report, the Normandeau Report, Bragg Pond is about 1,760 feet west of the right-of-way. It's a considerable distance away, with a lot of mature vegetation, and in an area where there's extensive -- extensive snowmobile and ATV trail use. So, the judgment was made that this was not a -- would not prevent fishermen from continuing to fish that pond should Fish \& Game
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continue to stock it.
And the use and enjoyment issue was considered by Mr. DeWan within the context of the SEC rules and requirements.

DIR. WRIGHT: Okay. I think I'm all set.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Why don't we take a ten-minute break.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (\text { Recess taken at 10:42 a.m. } \\
& \text { and the hearing resumed at } \\
& 10: 54 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m} .)
\end{aligned}
$$

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner
Bailey.
CMSR. BAILEY: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Varney.

WITNESS VARNEY: Good morning.
BY CMSR. BAILEY:
Q So, your analysis basically looked at the requirements of 301.09 , right?

A Yes.
Q And you focused on land use, because the other factors were primarily considered by other witnesses, right?

A Yes.
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Q Who focused on the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies regarding the proposed facilities, that you did that, if they were expressed in writing?

A Yes, from the standpoint of land use and orderly development.

Q Right.
A Yes.
Q I'm talking about orderly development.
A Yes. Yes.
Okay. Did you include views that were expressed in writing in testimony from any municipal witnesses?

A Yes. I reviewed any that appeared to be related to orderly development. Well, what do you think municipal views about orderly development would say? Would cover?

A It would address land use, and whether or not the Project is consistent with existing land uses in the community, and whether or not it would unduly interfere with land use in the future. I reviewed the economy of the region, and employment in the region as well. And,
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}
then, of course, for your finding, you have the decommissioning plan and the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and local governing bodies.

So, I reviewed all of the information that was on the DOE docket for the Draft EIS, reviewed those comments and issues of concern that were expressed, and any basis for those concerns that they may have provided. In most cases, they did not. They were general opinions about the Project, without any specific reference to a basis for that conclusion.

And I also attended the public informational meetings, some of the open houses, and public hearings, and read transcripts for them as well, prior to finalizing my prefiled testimony.

And, then, with my supplemental testimony that $I$ provided, I also went back and considered other information that related to these topics that had been submitted, especially with respect to the supplemental testimony and/or reports related to employment
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and the economy.
Q And what about the concern for order during construction in the towns?

A There, obviously, with any construction project, there is a temporary impact associated with the construction process. And my experience is that those issues can be managed in such a way as to not cause any undue adverse effect.

Q But construction, by nature, is always temporary, and the rules do require us to consider orderly development and the views of the municipalities --

A Yes.
Q -- for construction. So -- or, during construction. So, you know, one way that $I$ would think about it would be, you know, is there a way that we can do this construction to avoid certain impacts in towns that have concerns?

A Generally speaking, yes. I agree with that.
Q Or route it a different way?
A The projects were required -- the Project was required under NEPA to --
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Q Under what?
A Under NEPA, under the Draft EIS with the DOE. Q Okay.

A And that, in the federal process, they are required to consider a wide range of alternatives. Similarly, the U.S. Forest Service is required to consider a range of alternatives through the White Mountain

National Forest. And the Department of
Environmental Services is required to consider alternatives as well. So, there was a long list of alternatives that were considered.

And, throughout the process, $I$ believe any applicant before the SEC has been willing to consider any small -- small deviations, if there's a better solution presented in a specific area that makes sense.

Q Well, let's take one example. When we were on the site tour in Franconia, they have to do a horizontal directional drill under the Ham Branch River there.

A Yes.
Q And it's buried in the road. And your
testimony was that these impacts were
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considered before you knew exactly where it was going to be buried?

A Correct.
Q Okay. So, it's in the middle of the road, and they have to open this huge pit, I think it's 20 feet wide, in the middle of the road. How is -- why didn't you, as the orderly
development person, advise the Applicant that that's going to really impact that town during construction?

A Because it's a temporary impact that is associated with construction of the Project. And this occurs with culvert work and other significant areas where there may be a need to manage the traffic in such a way that there may be a disruption for a certain period of time.

Q I understand disruption with construction.
And --
A Right.
Q And I'm not against that. But I think that part of orderly development should be thinking about the greatest impacts. And where there's so much opposition to this Project from a lot of towns, --
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A Uh-huh.
Q -- some consideration should have been given to say "how could we make it better?"

A And that's what $I$ believe the Project has been trying to do. They have been trying to reach out to towns to meet with them and work through issues of concern. They have been reaching out to businesses and local property owners along the route asking to meet with them, and indicating their desire to minimize effects in the community and effects on individual business or property owners. And they're, of course, going to be developing a traffic control plan and a traffic management plan in concert with local officials, to try to come up with the best possible solution that will minimize effects on the traveling public and ensure public safety.

Q I think, in response to a question that Mr. Whitley asked you about the New Hampton Master Plan, that he pointed out says "any new installations of utility lines", may be
"transmission lines", I don't remember exactly, "shall be buried". And your answer was
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something about "jurisdiction", do you remember that?

A No.
Q Like "it wasn't jurisdictional"? Is it your opinion that, if a master plan says that "transmission lines should be buried", and that's a plan of the town that we're supposed to consider, that they don't have -- that the town doesn't have jurisdiction, but we do?

A The master plan is a vision for the community. It's aspirational. It's not a legally binding document. There are many recommendations in the master plan that may never be implemented. There are many that are. There are sometimes attempts to revise the zoning ordinance at the local level, and sometimes those proposals for amendments are turned down in the community. So, the master plans do not implement regulations. They don't implement or relate to exercising jurisdiction over a project.

Q Wait, say that again. Because that's what I really want to understand your point about jurisdiction.

A Yes. So, the Site Evaluation Committee clearly
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has jurisdiction over this Project. There is a requirement for the SEC to "consider" the views and concerns expressed by local governing bodies and local and regional planning commissions. And that's something that the SEC certainly has been doing.

Q So, under our jurisdiction, we should be looking at the master plans to see what the town's plan is for their individual towns, and consider those and decide whether the Project out weighs their plans?

A A detailed description of each master plan along the Project route, as well as the master plans of abutting communities that are not along the route, has been prepared and submitted on the record.

Right. But what do we do about the plans that specifically address transmission lines?

A That's part of the testimony, which states -and reports, which states that, generally speaking, they do not speak to transmission lines. And, when they do mention "transmission lines", it's either mentioned as a fact of land use, such as "there is 0.9 percent of land area
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in the community is occupied by a transmission corridor."

Q Yes. But let's use New Hampton --
A Sure.
Q -- as an example.
A Okay.
Q The New Hampton Master Plan says "future development of transmission lines have to be buried".

A No. That was for local distribution lines for new developments, new subdivisions. Where
there is a new commercial or residential
development.
Q Only?
A And they ask them to bury them in those locations.

Q Only distribution, not transmission?
A That's my understanding.
Q Okay. So, --
A But, in any case, this is not within their
jurisdiction as an SEC project. And, so, it's
up to the Site Evaluation Committee to make
those decisions, while considering the views
expressed by communities and while considering
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their master plans and zoning ordinances.
Q Right. So, if we're acting in their stead for consideration of this Project as a whole, in the benefits to the state, what should we do if we find out that the Project is inconsistent with the views of certain municipalities? That's for the SEC to decide. But, based on the review that was conducted of all of those master plans and zoning ordinances, there -other than the fact that there's a broad statement made about "protecting rural character in the community", which is in almost every town plan in the state, there were not any specific discussions about transmission lines, unless it related to the town's trail system, looking at these as a continuous vegetated corridor that was frequently used as part of the town's trail system. And, oftentimes, because it's a continuous linear corridor, enabled them to connect other trails that were not within the right-of-way within the community. And providing, as the underlying landowners allow for, other recreational uses that may be appropriate.
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Q So, what about --
A And, then, in addition, in looking at some other transmission projects that were already constructed, our findings were that, despite the tall structures and the size of the Project, there were no -- no significant statements in the plan about the existence of the transmission line as a challenge, a problem, or a significant planning consideration in the community. And one would think that, if it was a significant issue in the community, that the plan that was developed after the construction of the line would have raised that as a planning consideration.

Q Don't you think that towns like Deerfield and Concord, who seem to have a lot of planning, very careful planning, are you not persuaded at all by their arguments, that even though maybe the words "transmission lines" are not in their plans, that transmission lines may have an impact on what they perceive as the orderly development of their towns?

A Again, consideration of their opinions was certainly taken into account. But the use of
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the land for electric transmission line is a sound land use practice, and for many reasons, which are detailed in my testimony and reports. The issues raised in most cases were concerns about visual impact, which were addressed by a visual impact expert.

Q Only from scenic resources, not from overall planning.

A Again, I relied on -- that was not -Okay. I'm not an expert on visual impact. Although, I've certainly thought about it long and hard, during my tenure on the $S E C$ and being involved with various issues. And, in my opinion, there is no significant effect on prevailing land uses along the corridor that could be attributed to a preexisting line or a future line. And it's been thoroughly studied by experts who have looked at property values and the economy and prevailing land uses along the right-of-way.

And the conclusion is that it -- following these existing corridors has consistently been considered a sound practice. That's where you
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want to place the transmission line, and -when one exists. And you don't want to introduce it into a new area when an existing corridor already exists. And properties that abut that line today are adjacent to a transmission corridor. And, after the Project is completed, they will still be adjacent to a transmission corridor. There will be taller structures, but the use will remain the same.

Q And, in the rule that tells us how to evaluate a finding of undue interference in determining whether the facility will have -- unduly interfere with orderly development, the Committee shall consider "the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies regarding the proposed facility".

A Yes.
Q So, if we have an overwhelming number of municipalities who believe that this is inconsistent with orderly development of their region, what would you do?

A Well, they're speaking for not the entire project, --
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Q Right.
A -- as I have done, but rather concerns within their community. And what I've always tried to do is to listen to the basis for their concerns, and then to -- and to examine the facts that forms the basis for their opinion. And, when the -- when I -- and listened carefully in hearings and read testimony carefully to try to identify what those issues of concern are.

They have, in the northern part of the region of the Project, there has been some concern about or perceived concern about tourism and effects of tourism -- effects on tourism. There have been concerns raised at times that they will -- there will be a significant adverse effect on property taxes. And we've had an expert examine that in great detail.

And there have been concerns about visual. And that's been evaluated, subject to the SEC's rules that speak to this issue of use and enjoyment and visual impact, were covered by an expert in the field.
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And when the -- and, then, as it relates to the economy, it was thoroughly studied by a highly qualified economist, highly qualified tourism expert, highly qualified tax expert. And they all concluded that there was not an unreasonable adverse effect in any of those areas.

CMSR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
MR. WAY: Could I just chime in and follow up with a question on that?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And you can even go next, if you'd like.

MR. WAY: Not sure I was offering that.

BY MR. WAY:
Q So, on that, you know, I would say -- actually, I'm looking at my list, about 90 percent of my questions have been answered.

So, I'm getting more towards a broader perspective of how we're going to handle this. It seems, you know, when we're taking into account the views of municipalities, the one thing $I$ just heard you say, that they "can't speak on the entire Project". Sometimes that
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seems like a way of discounting the view of the municipality. Am $I$ reading that wrong?

A No. I spent a great deal of time looking at each community. Reading and summarizing their master plans, reading and summarizing their zoning ordinances, trying to stay up to date on changes that were occurring. Reading the record of statements that were posted on the DOE website, statements that were posted on the SEC website. Listening very carefully to people speaking at open houses and hearings. And, so, there was a unprecedented amount of attention, as it relates to orderly development, considering local views and concerns.

Q And I don't -- and I'm trying to figure out exactly what my point is, but the Project as a whole, if you don't consider the Project as a whole, while you did a lot of work on those other individual pieces, they're never going to rise to a level where they'll dismiss or negate the Project as a whole. And that's the challenge that I'm having, is that we're having so much concerns that are giving -- that are
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coming before us on a more micro level, but they're not looking at the Project as a whole. If we have job losses at a local level, that's one thing. But think of all the jobs we'll get on the whole.

And, so, that's the challenge that I'm having as we talk about all of this. Like, for example, when we were talking with

Mr. Bouthillier -- I hope I didn't butcher his name -- yesterday, and we were talking about the effects of underground construction. And we were talking about the jobs that might be lost, and they were sort of dismissal there. But, yet, we're referring to all the jobs that will be gained. But, on the local level, we're dismissing those jobs.

And I think even you said, Mr. Varney, that, when we were talking about those 70 plus businesses in the Plymouth area, that it was speculation. And, so, I'm wondering why there's speculation on that side, but, yet, on this side "well, we've got 2,600 jobs"?

It's hard to -- I'm trying to think of what argument you could ever make that would
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negate that larger picture?
A Yes. You're correct, in the sense that there have been calculations that have been done on a New England basis, a statewide basis, and there's been tax data on a local level basis about the significant tax benefits. The difficulty in assessing impacts on local businesses is that, as you well know from your work, there are many factors involved in the operation of a business and its profitability, and its success as a business, many, many factors involved.

Fortunately, here, the President of Eversource indicated in his testimony that there would be a guarantee against business loss. And I've seen forms that are typically used for that type of effort. But, more importantly, the Project is and has been trying to reach out to these local businesses to engage them, and to understand their needs and to try to minimize impacts. Louis Karno Company, that very successfully worked with the businesses in downtown Concord, has been in touch with several businesses in
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the Plymouth area already, for example. And the effort will be to engage them early and often throughout this Project, to address their concerns and minimize businesses'...

When $I$ spoke with him about his efforts, he indicated to me that there was not a perception of a loss of businesses in downtown Concord during that intensive redevelopment in the downtown area.

In Plymouth?
No, I'm referring to Concord, --
Oh.
A -- for his prior work in working with the business community --

Q Okay.
A -- on the redevelopment of downtown Concord. They interfaced with the businesses. They were involved with signage and multimedia efforts to reach out to the public and to reach out to their customer base, and try to help them anyway possible to continue to offer a successful business. And seeing how successful that was, Eversource has engaged them to help them work with the business community in
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Plymouth, and with any other areas along the undergrounded route, where they can assist in minimizing and avoiding business impacts.

Q And I think where I'm trying to get to is, like you said, in terms of working with businesses, and doing a lot -- there's a lot of reasons why businesses have a problem. And I think I would disagree with the statement that was made yesterday that "construction would be just an excuse".

I think there is one thing I'd like to convey, maybe get your thoughts on, is that, if I'm a business, and let's say could be the theater in downtown Plymouth, if I'm the landscaper up in Sugar Hill area, and I know my operation. I know the value of my suppliers, I know how my employees are going to get here, and $I$ know all those things. And, then, when $I$ add them up, $I$ know that something is probably not going to work out. I would seem to almost take that to the bank, as much as $I$ would take on the Project side about indirect jobs being created, because, to me, that's just as speculative.
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Would you agree that the -- I mean, those are real concerns that have to be considered at an equal level?

A I'm not sure about them being "at an equal level". But $I$ would agree with you that involvement in outreach with the business community is very important, especially in areas where there's a concentration of businesses in the underground route. And the Applicant understands that. They have engaged a consultant already who has been talking with businesses. The Project itself sent a letter out in, I indicated previously, I believe it was March of 2017, which was a follow-up to letters that were back in 2015, I believe. And there have been interactions with businesses, to the extent that they're willing to talk. And the Project has made it clear that they want to talk with them, they want to engage, and they sincerely want to avoid and minimize impacts to those businesses, which is a temporary disruption.

And we have temporary disruption on our roadways all across the state. And, by having
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them work together in partnership, I feel confident that those impacts can be avoided, or at least minimized, by understanding the business. As you've stated, could be the time of day when their deliveries occur, and the route that they take to make those deliveries, and having adequate access. It can be things like controlling dust and keeping the streetscape clean and in an attractive appearance; work hours and times, and considering peak activity that may occur, and trying to avoid that to the extent practicable, are all things that need to happen.

Q I agree that communication is important. But, you know, like $I$ was saying yesterday, the one thing we can't dismiss it isn't -- it is possible, particularly if you're, you know, a bed-and-breakfast on one of these long routes that are having a lot of construction, it is possible that, even if you are a little bit on the edge, that you could lose business to the extent, over that two to three-year period, that you could go out of business. And I have a hard time seeing how you can make up that
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loss there. But that is a reality, would you agree?

A There's a guarantee against business loss. And it's been documented on the record that there will be vouchers and efforts made to focus construction spending at hotels and restaurants in the area, and some of those facilities may see an increase in activity during that period of construction. While keeping in mind that the Project is moving along, it's not in one specific location for two years. It's moving along, and you may have a period of time where, for a couple of weeks, there may be a project moving down the street. But, to suggest that that's going to have a significant adverse effect on businesses, when looking back at their year of operation, is wrong.

Q So, when I have Polly's Pancake Parlor up in front of us, and they're giving us numbers, they're giving us a very good assessment and what they predict, that you would say that "that's just a temporary, and you'll get through it, and Louis Karno will work with you", or --
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A Well, and keep in mind that Polly's Pancakes is not located on the Project route. It's about a mile and a half away. And there is activity in Franconia, and in an area where people would be turning onto that road, there would be some temporary work in that location. But that's the kind of issue that, with a sound traffic control plan, visitors can still get to Polly's Pancakes a mile and a half from the Project site and enjoy having a nice breakfast.

Q And, so, Louis Karno Associates, you feel really comfortable that they're making a good outreach? How do you know that? Have they sat down with you and said "Bob, here's all the companies that we've sent letters to back in March, here's the follow-up"? Because you're absolutely right, is that success here is going to be based upon whether they can do, in places like that, like they did in Concord. But, if they haven't done that outreach, and even -even legitimately, if people aren't getting back to them, and that's an answer as well, but --

A Yes. The Project has a -- has developed a
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draft outreach plan that is still being fine-tuned, but is a major document that $I$ had a chance to look at briefly one day. And I conducted a conference call with Louis Karno Company to ask them about their outreach relating to this Project, as well as their experiences and lessons learned associated with Concord and other places where they have been engaged.

Q Because that was sort of my sense -MR. WAY: One second, Bill. I'll be right with you.

BY MR. WAY:
Q That was sort of my sense, is that there was an initial push, maybe an initial second push, and then, according to the hearings that we had, it really -- nothing has really happened much up to this point. And, so, you're saying there's a "draft plan" in place. When do you think we'll be able to see that plan?

A Well, again, I want to -- I think, for the record, $I$ think it's important to recognize that there has been a substantial amount of outreach with local property owners over the
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course of the Project. There have been individual meetings with property owners in many locations. Some owners have been eager to engage and discuss things and work through any issues of concern or develop a better and clearer understanding of how it relates to their property. So, that's been ongoing for several years.

In addition, there are outreach staff with Eversource who have been conducting outreach. There have been letters and meetings that they have had with businesses or property owners along the route. And they are also beefing up their capability by hiring additional
consultants to help them with this effort, to ensure that they avoid and minimize impacts to the extent practicable.

Q And, so, bear with me as I --
A Sure.
Q -- beat this horse dead.
A Okay.
Q But $I$ just, you know, for my own part, we're going to be going up on a site visit in

Plymouth. If $I$ went to every store along that
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front, could I say "Have you been approached by Eversource for the Project? What's the level of communications?" Do you feel that they would say "well, yeah, $I$ got a letter a couple weeks ago, they want me to call", or "I haven't heard from them", or "I'm engaged"? What level of response do you think they might give me?

A They -- it depends who you talk with when you're there.

Sure.
Was it the manager or not?
Let's assume I hit the perfect sweet-spot person.

A And, so, they would likely -- they would obviously know whether or not they received a letter. And they would be able to tell you whether or not they have conducted an interview with Louis Karno Company. And I -- they discussed some of the results of those discussions with me. All right. Very good. Just one second. MR. OLDENBURG: Chris, could I just chime in? MR. WAY: Oh. Sorry, Bill.
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MR. OLDENBURG: Yes.
BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q I just wanted to ask about the Louis Karno again.

A Sure. Hi, Bill.
Q Because it's come up a couple times in comparison to the concord. But aren't they like really two totally different projects?

I mean, in Concord, there was an improvement being made. So, Karno could go out to these businesses and say "Hey, we know there's going to be construction. Just bear with it." But they could almost negotiate. "Parking spaces? Do you need outdoor dining? Do you want this? Do you want that?" And it was a negotiation effort, really, between, you know, what the end product would be, which was an improvement to the downtown, and the business just having to live through the construction.

Whereas, you know, Northern Pass's best wish is that, when they're done, there's no difference. And, so, what is Karno offering these people?
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A They're offering communication with the businesses, understanding their issues, which is a similarity between the two. They both -both locations have concerns about parking and access, and minimizing disruption, and appearance and clean-up at the end of the day, and hours of the day for access, a whole host of similar issues. That the two downtowns are different. The -- you're correct in that there was an expectation among the businesses that, when the Project was completed, it would be an attractive and improved downtown area.

And, with respect to this Project, the Applicant has engaged the community to try to work together and partner on improvements in downtown Plymouth, either to avoid the Main Street businesses or to perhaps partner with the Water \& Sewer District with -- to replace existing old water and sewer lines at the same time, at potentially significant less cost, and impacting the Main Street only once, instead of twice. They're doing the right things. They're engaging them and trying to come up with the best solution that works well for
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everyone. And that's the goal that everyone has.

They don't want to hear about problems later due to lack of communication. They want to have that communication up front, and to work closely with them, each and every day and each and every week that the Project is being -- is within the construction phase.

MR. OLDENBURG: Thank you.
BY MR. WAY:
Q If you don't have that communication, let's assume that it just doesn't happen, as a matter of fact, let's even assume that the town, we're picking on Plymouth right now, but let's assume that, as $I$ said earlier, the town doesn't want to play ball in any way, shape or form. Do you envision where there could be adverse impacts on the business that could result in job losses, if not addressed? Because I'm assuming, if Louis Karno wants to have traffic avoidance -- or, traffic mitigation plans, there's a recognition that there could be an impact. If you don't have that communication, if there isn't that coordination, could you
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have an impact beyond temporary?
A I can't speculate on that. There, again, are so many factors involved in operating a business. And, again, $I$ think that the key for the Committee is to understand that there will be an effort to work -- work with and partner with the businesses along the route, and to avoid and minimize impacts wherever possible.

This is the same issue that you have with DOT projects that are undertaken in proximity to business -- existing businesses. And it's the same consideration as it relates to replacement of or extension of water or sewer lines, or natural pipelines, in a community. On a completely different topic, and I think Mr. Oldenburg raised the issue of the trails, and $I$ think he took, once again, 90 percent of what I was wondering about. But you mentioned that there could be some disruption, some trailheads might be closed or something. And whose responsibility is it for addressing that closure? Whose responsibility, you mentioned "signage", who does the signage? If it's a State trail, is the State doing -- because it
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isn't, I have to imagine, it isn't as easy as just saying "well, let's just go over here." How is that going to occur?

A Well, it would be the Applicants' responsibility. And they would work with the organization that is involved with that trail. If it's an ATV crossing, then they're going to want to reach out to the State Parks agency, and they're going to, where they're involved with ATV and snowmobile use, and they would reach out to any ATV and snowmobile clubs in the area who are involved with that stretch of ATV trails or snowmobile trails.

With respect to hiking trails, it would be, again, it could be the White Mountain National Forest, it could be a State resource, and they would consult with the appropriate parties for a short-duration temporary effect, to ensure public safety.

Q And when do you think those conversations should occur? Because $I$ think, with the trails, at least the State trails, I don't think that conversation has happened yet. And, so, if there is a major trail that's a tourist
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destination, that might have to have a temporary closure.

A That would be a good example of a condition for the SEC to incorporate into its certificate.

MR. WAY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Weathersby. MS. WEATHERSBY: Good morning, Mr. Varney.

WITNESS VARNEY: Good morning.
MS. WEATHERSBY: A couple of
follow-up questions to some of the testimony this morning, and then $I$ 'll launch into my other questions.

BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q It occurred to me, I think, when you were speaking with Mr. Oldenburg about the road construction. I'm wondering if there's going to be any as-built plans provided to DOT or the municipalities indicating exactly where the underground portion is located? Do you know?

A I would assume so. But that would be a question for the Construction panel that will be returning.

Q Okay. You agree that would probably be
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something they would be interested in, so they can work their underground utilities, for the work, etcetera, around that?

A Correct. And, of course, Eversource would always have copies of them as well, given their responsibilities for the Project being within the right-of-way in the undergrounded areas. Okay. The outreach that we've been talking about this morning, and really throughout the last several days, those -- the outreach letters that we talked about from Mr. Karno -the Louis Karno Company, those have been sent only to businesses, as $I$ understand it, and not to homeowners along the way, is that correct?

A I believe his responsibility is related to businesses. But there have been many meetings between people representing Eversource and private property owners.

Q Right. I think we've heard some testimony that, if a homeowner approaches Eversource, they are willing to work with them, and that's terrific. But we've also heard testimony that a lot of homeowners don't know about exactly where the underground line is going, and now it
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[WITNESS: Varney]
may need to be closer to their homes than originally intended or they perhaps had been told originally by Eversource.

So, I'm wondering, is Eversource planning, do you know, to reach -- to do some kind of mailing to homeowners along the way, to update things, once the road issue is resolved?

A Yes. In fact, the letter that $I$ previously referred to that was sent by the Project, in March of 2017, just a few months ago, was a Project update, and was sent to everyone along the route.

My understanding is that there were some who may have responded, but many who didn't take advantage of the opportunity, didn't call the number, didn't respond to Eversource after receiving the letter.

Q And will there be any further letters?
A I am sure there will be, yes.
Q In your analysis, you indicated you broke the corridor, the right-of-way corridor, down into the various regions for the purposes of your analysis. How did you define "region"?

A Based on the regional planning commissions that
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exist along the route.
Q And, so, what are the regions that you looked at? What was your --

A It would be the North Country Council; the Lakes Region Planning Commission, where I once worked; the Central New Hampshire Planning Commission; the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission.

Q So, your analysis broke it down into those four regions?

A Actually, $I$ went beyond that and broke it down by community, in looking at land use and planning and so on. So, I did that for the entire route, and met with each of the regional planning commissions, and developed information on a town-by-town basis along the route. So, when you determined orderly effects -effects of orderly development in the region, is it each -- did you look at it as each region or did you look at it for the Project as a whole?

A Well, typically, with projects before the SEC, they're in an area of the state. This Project, being 192 miles, is, obviously, longer than
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[WITNESS: Varney]
most projects, with the possible exception of the Portland Natural Gas Transmission and Maritimes \& Northeast projects. But the -- so, we looked at each town, we looked at each region, and we looked at the Project as a whole.

The final judgment that was made about orderly development of the region was looking at the Project as a whole.

MR. WAY: Can I ask a question?
MS. WEATHERSBY: Yes.
BY MR. WAY:
Q Going back to your planning background, if you had looked at the Project region by region, in other words, so you're looking at the municipalities and regional planning commissions, but, if you look at the benefits of the Project to that region apples-to-apples, would you feel you'd have the same findings? A Yes.

MR. WAY: Thank you.
BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q And I guess a similar question, if you had found, hypothetically, that in one region there
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}
was an adverse effect, an unreasonable adverse effect, but in the other three regions there were not, what then would be your final analysis?

A It would depend on the nature of that effect and the significance of that effect. Was it -"would it unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region?"

Q Okay.
A Is a principal question. And I kept that question in mind throughout the preparation of my testimony and reports.

Q Okay. You've stated that you relied on the expert analysis of others, Mr. Nichols for tourism, Ms. Frayer, for your overall conclusion concerning orderly development of the region. Their analysis, as I recall it, was done on a statewide basis. So, on what in their testimony did you rely on to base your conclusions on just the "region", as you're now defining it?

A I looked at the issues on a regional basis, not just the entire state. I tried to look regionally. I considered views expressed by
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[WITNESS: Varney]
the regional planning commissions, issues of concern that regional planning commissions brought to my attention, issues of concern raised by communities within the region, by any regional groups that may have supported the Project for job creation or energy benefits, or others who express concerns, and looked for the basis for those concerns.

And $I$ found that, in reviewing that, that, while there were many concerns expressed, there was a lack of information that was contrary to the opinions by the experts who testified before you.

Q So, say Mr. Nichols, for example, on tourism, he did this analysis on a statewide basis that there would be no unreasonable adverse impact. And, then, you looked at the concerns of towns and cities, like Plymouth, for example, and you just kind of figured out that their concerns affecting their community didn't change your analysis based on what Mr. Nichols said?

A Yes. I looked at the facts that were presented that substantiated their concerns. And, in many cases, they had an opinion or an
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assumption of impacts, which weren't supported by the facts, and there was an absence of credible information that supported their claims, as it related to effect on tourism or effect on property taxes or other related issues.

Q Okay. You've provided the Applicant and you have provided the SEC with summaries concerning municipal views in their master plans, for example. Do you -- was it your interpretation of 301.09 that you were not obligated to provide the SEC with the actual master plans or zoning ordinances?

A I provided a summary of each one, with a link to the ordinance or the plan itself. And $I$ did that not only with local plans, but also with regional and statewide plans.

I think we saw some of that in some of the exhibits that were used by intervenors while I was here on the witness stand.

Q The rules, 301.09 , requires you to do this analysis for all of the "affected communities". How did you define "affected community"?

A I used an abundance of caution, and, by looking
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at every community that abutted a host community along the route. So, rather than try to make a judgment as to whether or not that community was, in fact, affected, $I$ covered them anyway. And, in many cases, they were a substantial distance away from the Project route, but $I$ still reviewed their master plans. And it also was helpful with some communities, because they were communities that had the Hydro-Quebec Phase II line within the community, and $I$ was interested to see what they said about the line in their master plans, and found that they, as I said previously, they did not identify the presence of the Hydro-Quebec line as a problem, a challenge, a planning contribution in their plan.

So, the master plans are generally silent on the issue of transmission lines. There are broad statements about rural character and, in some cases, scenic quality. But there are also many other recommendations about property taxes and, you know, funding needs that exist in the community, and many recommendations about renewable energy and promoting renewable
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energy, and improving air quality and supporting efforts to reduce air emissions and address climate change and reduce greenhouse gases.

Q And that was in your report, but my question was just how you define "affected community"? And it sounds like the answer is "host communities and abutting communities". And do you feel that your March 2017 Working Draft Review of Master Plans includes an analysis of all affected communities?

A Yes. If I could add to that?
Q Uh-huh.
A I reviewed every abutting community, including some that are outside the state as well. It's not included in the report, because this is a State of New Hampshire SEC proceeding. But I did look at each and every community that abutted a host community along the route. So, it was very thorough and went well beyond what others have ever done for this review relating to a project before the SEC.

So, that was concerning master plans.
Concerning the zoning ordinances, I understand
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[WITNESS: Varney]
that you perhaps started a zoning ordinance summary, but it wasn't complete.

A Uh-huh.
Q Or, do you have a summary of zoning ordinances of the affected communities?

A Yes. In fact, there were references to it in some of the exhibits during my testimony here this past week. And the -- as you know, the statute states that it requires a review of zoning ordinances in the host communities, but not the affected communities. So, a detailed description of the zoning ordinance for each community was prepared.

Q And why wasn't that provided to the SEC?
A I don't know whether it was provided as part of discovery. I provided this information to the Applicant, and was not involved in the preparation of the Application itself. MS. WEATHERSBY: Can that -- I can tell you that has not been provided to the SEC, as far as $I$ know. I think perhaps it may have been provided in discovery.

But $I$ guess $I$ would like to make a request that that be provided to the SEC.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Needleman? MR. NEEDLEMAN: Understood.
(Record request reserved.)
BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q So, zoning ordinances are generally -- most towns update them after a town meeting in March. When was your last review of the zoning ordinances of the towns?

A Initially, it would have been before the -just prior to the filing of my prefiled testimony and report, which would have been October 2015. And, then, I have tried to keep abreast of any significant zoning changes that may have occurred. There's no process for notification. But $I$ noticed, for example, that the Town of Dummer revised their ordinance. Initially, they actually told us over the phone that it had been abolished. But then we later learned that that person in the town office was incorrect, in that they had eliminated the multiple zones in the town, and had a -somewhat unusual in that it's a single-zone ordinance.

So, we reviewed zoning ordinances
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[WITNESS: Varney]
thoroughly. We considered them, and tried to stay abreast of any changes.

Q I understand how laborious it must be to go back each year and check for each town. But, given the amount of work that's gone into this Project, that seems like something that would be reasonable to do. But am I understanding correctly that you've made some efforts to do that, but perhaps it's not -- you haven't checked back with every town for 2016 and 2017 to see if their zoning ordinances have been changed?

A Yes. And I'm not sure. I assume that we have, but I'm not sure.

Q Okay. Your report contains lots of statements and conclusions about how the Northern Pass Transmission Project is consistent with the master plans and the zoning ordinances. But I didn't see much analysis, or really any analysis, as to how the Project would be inconsistent with each town zoning ordinances. Do you feel that it is consistent with the provisions of each town's master plan and zoning ordinance?
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[WITNESS: Varney]

1

A Yes, I do. And, in the report and testimony, we tried to explain that the master plans had broad, inspirational statements, like "protecting rural character" and the "unique qualities of the town", and things like that. But they did not directly speak to electric transmission lines, unless it was in reference to the small land area that was occupied by a utility right-of-way, in most cases, it was less than one percent of total land use in the community.

And there were references to use of the right-of-way as an opportunity for trails and improving recreational opportunities for connecting trails and expanding trails within the town.

There was also reference in the Master Plan or the Open Space Plan for Concord that referred to place -- recommending a new boat ramp be located within the right-of-way for the Hydro-Quebec Phase II line near the Hopkinton town line on the Contoocook -So, those are great examples of how you feel it's consistent with the master plans. And my
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question was whether it was inconsistent? So, your position is that, if master plans said "let's preserve our rural character" or "let's protect our scenic vistas", that the Project is not inconsistent with those provisions of the master plan?

A Correct.
Q And, if a master plan said "let's bury our utilities for every new development", that's not inconsistent with the Project?

A No. Because they're typically talking about a new residential or commercial development within the community, where they're placing new streets and new infrastructure or new other utility lines as well.

Q Is Northern Pass Transmission Project a commercial venture?

A It's a commercial venture and it's a utility.
Q And I'm guessing most zoning ordinances that you reviewed had the usual provisions of breaking towns into residential zones, commercial zones, industrial zones. And you feel as though putting the Northern Pass Transmission Project in an existing corridor,
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which may happen to be in a residential zone, for example, that would not be inconsistent with that town's zoning ordinance?

A That's correct.
Q And likewise, I'm sure they have height limitations of $30,35,40$ feet for structures. Putting in a 100 -foot pole would not be inconsistent with that zoning provision?

A In most cases, you're correct. There are -- in
a typical zoning ordinance, they would differentiate between "occupied space" and "unoccupied space", where they allow for structure heights to be -- to be taller than for structures where it's occupied space for business or a residential type of use. And this is described in that zoning report for each community.

Q So, you feel most zoning ordinances in these affected communities separate height restrictions to occupied/unoccupied space?

A I would say that that's typical, a typical provision in a zoning ordinance, based on my experience and my review of dozens of zoning ordinances. And, of course, they have
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}
[WITNESS: Varney]
provisions for cell towers and small wind energy systems with height limitations as well. And those typically are set at -- some cases it could be 150 feet, or 35 feet above treeline as the maximum height, and they vary by community. But I did review that as well. Those are unoccupied structures that are either a permitted use or a conditional use or special exception in their ordinances. And towns are required to allow telecommunication facilities in their town or city, aren't they?

A Yes. And they frequently try to collocate them as well.

Q Right.
A Which is a principle that is different, but not unlike the collocation of a transmission line within an existing right-of-way.
Q You indicated, generally speaking, that there were no specific prohibitions or restrictions in master plans concerning transmission lines specifically. Do you think the towns should have foreseen a project like Northern Pass and addressed it? I mean, --
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A I can't speculate. I tried to present factual information --

Q Okay. Fair enough.
A -- in the report and for the Committee's consideration.

Q Fair enough. Have you compiled letters or comments from the municipalities along the route, letters, comments submitted to us, perhaps submitted directly to Eversource, from the selectmen, the conservation commissions, town officials, intervention petitions? Are all those sort of gathered somewhere that you reviewed?

A If they were related to land use, yes. And I assembled many of them in notebooks for review. Q And did you do any kind of chart or summary or somehow organize all of that information?

A It's possible, but $I$ would need to go back and look. But I did try to look at who was providing comments and the nature of the concerns that were expressed.

And what is your understanding of the concerns of the communities as they fall into the land use and orderly development arena?
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A There were -- they usually had broad comments that said "it's not consistent with our master plan and it's not considered orderly development", without -- and often without further explanation. But, in some cases, they would cite the goals in the plan relative to rural character or scenic quality or tourism promotion, things like that. And I certainly considered them carefully.

Q At this point in time, do you know how many memorandum of understandings are in place with any municipality along the route?

A I'm not sure. I think it's four or five perhaps. I know they have been sent to all of the communities, and I'm not sure about the status of each one. But there seems to be more interest and more activity in trying to sit down and iron out agreements. But $I$ believe four or five have been executed to date.

Q And do you know which municipalities they're with?

A I believe the Applicant would be able to, it's a factual matter. I can't remember exactly. I believe Thornton was one of them, perhaps
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}

Lancaster, and a couple of other communities. Make you could check at lunch around and -Sure. Be happy to.
-- get back to us.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Needleman, I assume you're on that?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: We will address that. MS. WEATHERSBY: Thank you. I'm all most done.

BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q Much of your conclusion in your report seems to be based on, as long as Northern Pass

Transmission Project goes in the existing utility corridor, it won't interfere with the existing use, and therefore there's no adverse impact. Correct?

A Yes.
Q Is it your position that the interference then needs to be a physical interference with that use? I mean, physically limiting the farming or limiting access, somehow that actually physically affects the use in order for there to be an effect?

A $\quad$ No.
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}

Q What other types of interference did you consider?

A I considered abutting property owners, including some who don't own land within the easement area of the right-of-way, and looked very carefully at those uses. And with the knowledge that the Applicant would work with abutters, as they do on other projects, to address buffering or landscaping or other forms of mitigation, that there would not be any impact on the continued use of those properties.

In many cases, there are property owners who purchased their land or purchased their building with the knowledge that this was an existing utility corridor, where there were rights for the utility to use that corridor. And $I$ have seen many instances of cooperation between the utility and the owners.

But $I$ don't see any significant effect on the continued use of those -- of those properties.

So, my question was whether the interference with that use of that property had to be a
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|  | "physical interference", and I'm not sure I got -- and you said "no". |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | I said -- my response was "no", I don't |
|  | consider it. |
| Q | And I asked you how -- what other types of |
|  | interference did you consider? Did you |
|  | consider visual, noise, enjoyment? What other, |
|  | maybe kind of list them for me? |
| A | Recreational opportunities, -- |
| Q | How would a recreational opportunity be |
|  | affected other than by physically altering the |
|  | access or the terrain or -- |
| A | Well, because so many people use the |
|  | right-of-way as trails, you would look at the |
|  | continued recreational use of the corridor. |
|  | And there may be some temporary impacts during |
|  | construction for people that use the trail |
|  | system within the right-of-way, as an example. |
|  | So, again, I looked at existing land uses |
|  | along the corridor, and considered whether or |
|  | not those uses would be able to continue after |
|  | the Project is completed. And the conclusion |
|  | was, yes, they will be. |
| Q | Okay. Let's just look at recreational use just |
|  | 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\} |

for a second. People enjoy a hiking trail with beautiful views. The enjoyment of many hikers, once the Project is built, hypothetically, has been diminished. Use goes down. Only half as many hikers now use that trail.

A Uh-huh.
Q This is a hypothetical, of course. Is that land use then affected? They can still hike. But is -- so, in your analysis, is that land use affected by the Project?

A No. And I disagree with the hypothetical. My experience in looking at it is that, even after projects are constructed, that, as communities grow, there's an increase in use. And, if you were to look, for example, at the Hydro-Quebec line in West Concord, there are trails in that area, including portions of the trail that are within the right-of-way that are advertised and promoted on the City's website, in Concord, and on the Town of Hopkinton's website as well.

Q You indicated that, and we already went over this, that if the utility -- the transmission project is in the existing utility corridor, it's not a change of land use, doesn't affect
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orderly development in the area. But I'm trying to understand, and others have hinted around at this, and I'm not sure we've nailed it down, kind of what the threshold is that would tip a utility corridor build-out to becoming a change of land use? I mean, is that possible?

A It's avoided by use of existing rights-of-way. It's more of a concern if an applicant were proposing to ignore an existing right-of-way and was placing a new transmission line in an area that does not currently have one, and where the uses don't currently have one.

Q And I understand that. But I'm trying to see if there's a tipping point. I mean, if there's a utility corridor, and it's 300, 200 feet wide, and it was possible, from an engineering and a safety perspective, to build five transmission lines down that corridor. Do you believe that would be an adverse impact?

A In most cases, no. And I think the Merrimack Valley line would be an example of that. In which the Project was not only approved by the SEC, but, in the four New Hampshire communities
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which the Project was located, none of the four were intervenors in that docket.

Q And, similarly, if these five transmission lines, you know, hypothetical transmission lines in this corridor, and the poles got to be -- towers were 300 feet high. Does that then become a land use -- an adverse impact? Does it, you know, kind of what's the -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

A I believe it would be a question of visual impact, and that was not within the scope of my review.

Q But, as far as orderly development of the area, adverse effect on land use, 300-foot towers would not change your analysis, land use analysis?

A No, because it's -- you're maintaining the existing land use pattern.

Q And is your answer the same if these towers were located ten feet from a residence? Does that change the land use, the effect on land uses in the area?

A If it's within the corridor within which the utility has the right to construct --
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Q Yes.
A -- facilities, then they would, obviously, work very closely with that landowner to try to minimize the impacts.

I recall an example for the Merrimack Valley Project where a property owner cut the vegetation up to the edge of the right-of-way to locate a driveway coming into -- for his house. And the -- Eversource worked with that property owner to help him relocate his driveway, so that Eversource could pay for landscape improvements to provide that buffer between the driveway and the edge of the right-of-way, the very buffer that that landowner had removed, and that Eversource was not responsible for. It was an example -- an impressive example of working with local landowners to try to minimize concerns that an abutting property owner may $I$ have.

So, my next hypothetical is, in this utility corridor, whether additional utilities could be added, such as perhaps a cell tower or a wind turbine, all coexisting safely and harmoniously within the corridor. Does that -- is that
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still within does not change the land use?
A That would not be electric transmission, that would be a different type of project. The two examples that you cited would be -- would be subject to local review under their zoning bylaws and would not relate to this Project.

Q No. But would, in your opinion, would that affect the land use?

A I haven't reviewed it. I would need to consider that. But my immediate reaction would be that it's a slightly different land use and would need to be carefully reviewed.

Q Okay. My second to last question. In your supplemental testimony, there's a great discussion about the Phase II line, in that how it doesn't -- did not interfere with the orderly development of that area. Do you have an opinion as to whether the development of the area around the Phase II corridor would have been different if there was no Phase II line?

A I don't know. It's a difficult question to answer, due to the many factors involved, and the state of the economy, and expectations of property owners, and the need for growth and
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development, and the market for that growth and development. But it was interesting to review, because, as I stated with other communities, they did not talk about the Phase II line as a problem or a challenge or a major planning consideration, other than it was part of their green network for trails. And they considered it a form of open space in the community that linked various areas in the town.

And there's been substantial economic development near and within view of that line, as well as other uses, such as agricultural uses that chose to locate adjacent to the line, agricultural, and recreational uses, such as soccer fields, with significant investment of creating additional fields and all-turf, artificial turf fields, and adding lighting, and having a significant amount of activity adjacent to and within the right-of-way itself.

Q And the three towns that you specifically
analyzed in the southern region, those towns have all seen really pretty significant growth townwide or citywide, correct?

A Yes. They have zoning that allows for a wide
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range of uses. They also had sophisticated master plans that had been developed well after the construction of the project, and had crossings of parking and transportation routes that were highly visible. So, I was interested to see what had actually occurred there.

You know, we can speculate all we want, but it's also informative to go back and look to see whether there had been any development activity after the fact. And, in this case, there was significant development activity for a wide range of reasons. But there was no indication, based on what we saw, that the project caused them to have limited development options.

MS. WEATHERSBY: Thank you. I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner Bailey has something she wants to follow up on. BY MS. BAILEY:

Q Do you remember our conversation about the Master Plan in New Hampton that $I$ thought said "transmission lines should be buried", and you said "no, it was probably just distribution
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|  | lines"? |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | I said I couldn't remember exactly, but, in |
|  | most cases, towns will say "electric lines". |
|  | And, usually, when you look at that, it relates |
|  | to local lines that would be typically within a |
|  | subdivision, for example, where they require |
|  | the developer to bury the lines for that new |
|  | development. |
| Q | Well, I went back to the exhibit that I think |
|  | it was Mr. Whitley who he pointed -- that he |
|  | pointed to on this particular item that's stuck |
|  | in my head. And it was Joint Muni 120. And |
|  | it's testimony from the Chairman of the |
|  | Planning Board in New Hampton. |
| A | Uh-huh. |
| Q | And he says, on Page 12, and I -- oh, hang on. |
|  | That it's in the Site Plan Review Regulations, |
|  | and it states that "Where appropriate, |
|  | installation of any new utilities and/or |
|  | transmission lines shall be buried |
|  | underground", and that -- and those Site Plan |
|  | Review Regulations have been in effect since |
|  | 2005. |
| A | Yes. I've reviewed them. |
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Q You have?
A After he made the comment, because $I$ wanted to make sure that those provisions were not in the Zoning Ordinance, which was what was required by the SEC. And it's not located in the Zoning Ordinance. It's located in Site Plan Review, which is not required by the SEC.

Q But those are the -- if this Project were just in the Town of New Hampton, those are the regulations that the Applicant would have to meet to get siting in the Town of New Hampton, right?

A They would be site plan review requirements, they would look to see "Can you bury it within this area? It's preferred to bury it." And to make the case as to, if they can't bury it, why not. And I think that issue has been well discussed here.

Q Do you think, though -- why do you think we shouldn't look at site plan review relations?

A There are many town regulations that
potentially could exist. And, in the SEC's rules, it specifically calls for "reviewing master plans and zoning ordinances". It does
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not speak to "site plan review" or "subdivision regulations" or other regulations that may exist.

Q What about views that have been expressed in writing? I mean, I thought that we agreed that the Site Evaluation Committee is standing in place of the towns and looking at the Project on a state -- you know, on a statewide basis, but we have to consider the views of the towns. And, if the views of the towns are laid out in the site plan review regulations, those individual towns, and they have specific references to a project like this, only not on a statewide basis, why should we not consider that?

A Well, I read the letter, and I considered the view expressed. I didn't summarize it in the report because of the $\operatorname{SEC}$ requirements. But $I$ did consider the comment that was made. And, of course, they know that they don't have any jurisdiction over regional transmission line projects. And, so, $I$ was of the opinion that it, while it was worth noting, when $I$ heard -when $I$ read his letter that came in, it was a
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regulation that wasn't cited in the SEC rules, and it probably was based on projects that are subject to their jurisdiction, rather than the SEC's jurisdiction.

Q But, in his testimony, which we have to consider, --

A Yes.
Q -- he's a municipal planner, --
A Yes.
Q --his view is that this does have an undue impact on orderly development because of this regulation?

A Yes. I understand his view that he expressed in the letter. He's on the local planning board, not a professional planner, a former wetlands permitting person at DES. What do you mean by "letter"? I'm looking at testimony.

A I'm sorry. You're correct. I stand corrected. It was his prefiled testimony that $I$ read.

CMSR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
WITNESS VARNEY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Iacopino, do
you have questions?
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BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q Mr. Varney, I'm just going to follow up with the issue just raised by Commissioner Bailey. I understand your first principle to collocate the line with existing lines in those areas where the line already exists. But, when you consider the underground portion of this Project, it's really no surprise that the towns' master plans, along the underground portion, would not consider this type of development. Isn't that correct?

A They're silent on the issue in their plans.
Q And you would expect that, because they're focused, to the extent that they may focus on transmission lines, it's because they are focused on existing transmission lines, which, for the part, historically, in New Hampshire, are above ground?

A Yes. But, again, the same principle exists, whether it's underground or overhead within an existing corridor. That you're locating the Project in an existing disturbed area within the community, which then helps protect open
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space elsewhere in the community and does not introduce a new route when an existing corridor was available.

Q Well, understanding that, in the towns where the Project is slated to go underground, there may be no reference with respect to transmission -- no reason for the Town to have a reference to transmission lines. What documents do you believe the Site Evaluation Committee should consider when considering the municipal views of those towns? Are there better -- are there better documents than the master plan for the Committee to consider?

A No. I think, looking at prevailing land uses along the route and considering the fact that the Project tried to be consistent with the Master Plan for the White Mountain National Forest, which was cited in the Draft Record of Decision by the Forest Supervisor for the White Mountain National Forest recently, to locate within the existing transportation corridor, and to view that as the best option for the Project to cross the White Mountain National Forest, and to avoid an inconsistency --
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potential inconsistency with the Management Plan for the White Mountain National Forest. So, your answer then is we should look at the White Mountain National Forest plan, and not any subdivision regulations or zoning ordinances of the town, towns like Easton, Franconia, Plymouth, where the line will actually go underground?

A No. I am stating that -- that we reviewed the master plans and the zoning ordinances within those communities, if they existed. Some of the towns don't have zoning ordinances. And reviewed the Project in the context of those master plans or zoning ordinances to see if it would appear to interfere with the implementation of their goals, objectives, and recommendations in the plan, and that the -within the White Mountain National Forest, they have a master plan that needed to be reviewed. And, if there was an overhead route through the Forest, that there may have been an inconsistency with their plan as well. That was cited in the report also.

Okay. But $I$ guess my question is more of a
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methodological one than what you did or didn't do, I guess. My question is, given the fact that these towns where the 52 miles where the Project will now be run underground in order to avoid the White Mountain National Forest, in those 52, I think, if we assume that they had no reason to believe that there would ever be an underground commercial, or whatever you want to call the Project, is there some documents that are commonly found in town government that the Committee should focus on more than the master plan?

A I'm not aware of any.
Q Okay. I understand the request of the Applicant, with respect to the underground portion of the road, to be that the Subcommittee delegate to the Department of Transportation the authority to make a final decision with respect to the actual location within the right-of-way, and that this exception process that's going on is part of that delegation. Is that what you understand as well?

A I believe so. But $I$ have not been involved in
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any of those discussions.
Q Okay. Let me ask you this question.
Mr. Oldenburg went -- drew on his experience, as an administrator in the Department of Transportation, his vast experience, to point out some of the difficulties that the Department of Transportation might have with respect to the underground portion of the route.

And one of the things that he raised was the fact that there are costs that might be attribute -- that might now be incurred by the State, or maybe a municipality, if you're talking about the eight miles up north, in the future.

And do you know if the Applicant is asking
the Site Evaluation Committee to also delegate the authority to the Department of

Transportation to assess those costs to the Applicant in the future?

A I don't know. But $I$ would not disagree with Bill, in the sense that, if there are future costs within the right-of-way, for the DOT, that it would be the responsibility of the
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Applicant to pay for those costs.
Q Okay. So, from a planning -- from a planning perspective, land use planning perspective, at least from where you sit, that would be a reasonable condition if we could somehow fashion that?

A Yes, if it's consistent with the law.
Q Okay. And, then, the last question $I$ have is, on Day 12, there was a request made of Mr. Bowes. And this is at Page 90, I believe, of the transcript from that day. He had mentioned that there is -- there was a -- I don't think he referred to as a "database", but a compilation of all of the contacts with the businesses that the Applicant had. And there was an indication that he was going to provide that to the Committee.

Do you know if that has been completed and provided yet?

A I don't know.
MR. IACOPINO: Does the Applicant
know?

> MR. NEEDLEMAN: I need to check.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'll let you know. MR. IACOPINO: I don't have any other questions.

BY CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:
Q Mr. Varney, almost everything I was going to ask you about has been covered. At one point, though, you I think referred to something that businesses who are harmed by the Project can apply for some sort of relief. I don't recall it in your testimony, which I looked at this morning, and I don't -- I can't tell you whether it was discussed in your report at all.

Tell me what your understanding of that program is.

A My understanding is that Bill Quinlan testified that the Project would have two Guarantee Programs. One would be a guarantee against business loss, and the other guarantee would be a guarantee against loss of property value.

And I believe --
Q Are those two programs, in your view, significant to your opinions about orderly development?

A No. Because I do not -- that, if the Project
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is carried out as we think it -- we all think it should be, that there would be very limited impact on businesses. There would be temporary impact due to the nature of the Project. And that there are very few properties that are affected, as it relates to property values, according to the analysis by Dr. Chalmers. So, it would not change my overall
opinion. But $I$ feel that both of them are appropriate and are in the best interests of Eversource and any affected property owners.

Q Understanding that ultimately the upshot of that answer was "no", they're not significant to your analysis, --

A Right.
-- do you know if anyone has done any analysis of them to determine how they might work? Any efficacy analysis of those two programs that he outlined?

A $\quad$ No.
Q I think my last question for you, and it really will be my last question for you, unless somebody else does something. Have you ever seen anything like this? You were Chair of the
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SEC for some number of years, right?
A Yes.
Q And you've never seen anything like this,
right?
A It's been an interesting process. And I'll
leave it at that.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. Does
anyone else on the Subcommittee have any
questions for Mr. Varney?
[No verbal response.]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Needleman,
you have redirect?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I do. I'm guessing
it's thirty minutes or less. Your choice as to
when $I$ do it.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
[Brief off-the-record discussion
ensued.]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Needleman,
you're up for redirect.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'll try to do this
as fast as I can.
MR. PATNAUDE: Well, not too fast.
[Laughter.]
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```
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Keep up, Steve. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
                                    [Brief off-the-record discussion
                    ensued.]
```

                    REDIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q Mr. Varney, Ms. Weathersby asked you about the status of MOUs. And, for the record, there are five of them at this point: Lancaster, which is Applicants Exhibit 146; Canterbury, which is Applicant 206; Plymouth Water \& Sewer. Applicant 207; Thornton, Applicant 208; Franklin, Applicant 209. And I'm going to ask you about Plymouth Water \& Sewer in a minute.

Is it your understanding that the Applicants' efforts with respect to getting additional MOUs are ongoing?

A Yes.
Q Mr. Oldenburg asked you a little while ago about the Plymouth Water \& Sewer. In particular, he was asking you about Plymouth. And, in comparison to Louis Karno, his question was "is there something in it for Plymouth?" And $I$ think you made reference to a provision
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about coordinating with the Town of Plymouth. And what $I$ want to do is pull up this MOU, and I'm looking at -- this is Applicant 207, and I'm looking at Section 2. Is this the section that you were referring to, section 2.1?

A Yes.
Q And, when you talked about "coordinating with the Town of Plymouth", what specifically were you talking about?

A Efforts such as this.
Q And "such as this", do you mean working with the Town, so that, to the extent they have projects in Main Street, the street is only torn up once instead of more than once?

A Yes. And, in this case, it's an effort to not only coordinate, but to also provide some funds for engineering and consultant services, so that they could explore the installation of water and sewer main replacements while the Project is constructing the electric cable. Turning to a different topic, Ms. Schibanoff, when she was questioning you, asked about businesses like Tamarack Camp, Kinsman Lodge,
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and Franconia Lodge. Do you recall that?
A Yes.
Q And is it your understanding that all of these businesses were contacted by the Project in March, and with the intention of reaching out to them and soliciting their input?

A Yes.
Q And Applicants Exhibit 215, which we'll put up now, is the letter to Tamarack. Is that your understanding of it?

A Yes.
Q And I'll leave that up there for a minute.
Just a couple of other questions about
Tamarack. You were asked about interference with a business like this. Do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q And is it your understanding that this Camp operates on a seasonal basis?

A Yes.
Q And, so, if the Project agreed to do its work without interrupting the Camp's seasonal operations, would that be relevant to your analysis?

A Yes.
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Q How so?
A Because it would minimize potential impacts on the operation of a business. In this case, I believe the Tennis Camp is a seven-week period. So, there would be an opportunity for the Project to avoid and minimize impacts by reaching an agreement with them about the timing of the work.

Q A while ago Commissioner Bailey focused on working with businesses and the importance of Project mitigation, and Mr. Way also focused on that. I want to talk to you more about that. You've testified multiple times about the Project reaching out and opportunities to work with businesses. I want to get very granular about that for a moment. And $I$ want to put up Exhibit 216. This is a summary thus far, and it's a two-page exhibit. So, I wanted to give people a chance to look at it.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And then, Dawn, after
a little while, if you can flip to Page 2.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q But my questions to you are going to relate to
this in general. And my understanding is that
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Q And there is a child care center in one of the towns that has asked the Project to accommodate parents dropping kids off and picking them up. Is that your understanding?

A Yes.
Q And there is an auto repair shop that has asked the Project to be mindful of their need to conduct test drives of vehicles that they're repairing. Is that your understanding?

A Yes.
Q And is it your understanding, with respect to all of these that we've just talked about, and ones that $I^{\prime} m$ still going to go through, that the Project is working to accommodate all these concerns?

A Yes.
Q And do you understand that businesses have talked to the Project about accounting for times when they might receive deliveries and making sure that those are not interrupted?

A Yes.
Q And is it your understanding that businesses have talked to the Project about ensuring that adequate parking exists, and, if parking is
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going to be blocked, that alternative parking is made available?

A Yes.
Q Is it your understanding that businesses, and certainly on this list we've seen a lot of it, have significant concerns about signage, and want the Project to ensure that consumers and the public is made aware of the fact that they remain open and are doing business during the construction?

A Yes.
Q Is it your understanding, and I think you testified to this before, that businesses were concerned about fugitive dust, and, in particular, they're concerned about display windows being made dirty, and they want the Project to keep dust controlled and to keep those windows clean?

A Yes.
Q And I think you also mentioned that the Project is working carefully with certain
establishments, like restaurants and lodges, to direct workers to those places. Is that correct?
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A Yes. That's my understanding.
Q Let me ask you about master plans. I think, when Ms. Pacik was questioning you, she criticized you for not providing information about Concord's Master Plan. Do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q And am I correct that Applicants Exhibit 1, Appendix 41, Page 2, which is your report, you specifically said that you "compiled a detailed summary" of various documents, and that summary included master plans. Is that right?

A Yes.
Q And that detailed summary was provided to all
the parties in discovery, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q And the Committee now has that detailed summary as "Applicant Exhibit 121", is that right?

A Yes.
Q You were also asked several times about
"affected communities". Do you recall that?
A Yes.
Q And, in your supplemental testimony, which is Applicants Exhibit 96, at Page 9, Lines 3
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through 7, you specifically spoke to the issue of affected communities. Is that right?

A Yes.
Q And, on Pages [Lines?] 6 and 7, you offered the opinion that "the abutting communities are often a considerable distance from the Project and, regardless of distance, likely will not be affected." Correct?

A Correct.
Q And, with respect to "affected communities", Applicants Exhibit 123 is the list of affected community master plans, is that right?

A Yes.
Q You were asked at one point about "joint use agreements". I can't remember who asked you. But you testified that you didn't review any as part of your work here.

Have you ever seen a joint use agreement before?

A Yes.
Q Are you generally familiar with them?
A Yes, generally. I didn't look at specific properties along this, for this Project. But I am well aware of those agreements.
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Q Is it your understanding that they allow landowners to use a portion of the right-of-way, as long as it doesn't interfere with the utility's use of the right-of-way?

A Yes. That's my understanding.
So, in light of that understanding, were the joint use agreements that are at issue here relevant to you?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Why is that?
A Because they allow for the use of the right-of-way for electric transmission. And it's a responsibility of the property owner to work with the utility to address any issues associated with joint use, and to have an agreement in place to work cooperatively.

Q Mr. Reimers asked you about the Site Evaluation Committee's decision in the Portland Natural Gas Transmission System case, and, in particular, a small segment in Shelburne, New Hampshire. Do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q I'm going to put an exhibit up in a minute and ask you to speak to it. But, as a general
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matter, having sat on the Committee at that time, how do you compare the facts of that particular case to the facts here?

A Totally different set of facts.
Q Let me put up Applicants Exhibit 123. This is a Google map screen shot, when it comes up. MS. GAGNON: 213.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q Sorry, 213. This is a Google map screen shot of the particular location at issue in that decision. And am I correct that the proposed route would have created a new right-of-way through a forest in an undisturbed part of town on the north side of the river, is that right?

A Yes.
Q And the Town proposed a specific design change to move this small segment of line to a disturbed area on the south side of the river, is that right?

A Yes.
Q And, if we see it on the map, I think the disturbed area is the existing utility
corridor. Is that your understanding?
A Yes.
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 40/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-26-17\}

Q And the specific alternative that was ultimately chosen by the SEC was one that was not only found to be feasible, but had been carefully studied and analyzed as part of that SEC proceeding?

A Yes.
Q Are there any other facts relevant to this opinion that you want to call to the attention of the Committee?

A They were -- this was an underground gas pipeline project. And one of the key factors was that the project could have been located within an existing disturbed area, and the applicants were proposing to not use that existing disturbed area, the existing corridor, and instead were proposing to go through an undeveloped area, when the alternative that had been studied existed.

Q Moving to a different topic, Mr. Wright asked you about impacts on specific resources, and I think he was picking up on questions that Mr. Reimers had asked you about places like Big and Little Diamond Pond, Nathan Pond, etcetera. Do you recall that?
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A Yes.
Q As a general matter, why did you include resources like this in your report?

A In some cases, it was for illustrative purposes. In other cases, it was related to a major facility or a trail or route that existed. For example, I believe it was Nathan Pond, was the Nathan Pond Ride the Wilds Trail, and was named as such. And we discussed crossings of named snowmobile trails and a number of named ATV trails along the route. It was not intended to be a complete description of every single water body within miles of the line.

Q Your analysis of these resources was from a land use perspective on a before-and-after basis, is that correct?

A Correct.
Q So, you weren't looking at them from an aesthetics use and enjoyment perspective?

A $\quad$ No.
Q And you weren't looking at them from a tourism perspective. That was Mr. Nichols, is that correct?
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A Correct.
Q You were asked about various meetings that you had with town planners. You said repeatedly during the course of this process that siting transmission lines in existing transportation and utility corridors is, in your opinion, sound planning, correct?

A Yes. In both, with meetings with town planners, as well as regional planners.

Q When you met with these town planners and regional planners, did you tell them that that was your view?

A That that was likely to be my conclusion, yes.
Q And did you tell them it was your intention to offer that opinion in the context of these proceedings?

A Yes.
Q And did any of them, when you told them these things, disagree with you or take issue with that characterization?

A No.
Q You were asked questions about the North Country Council. I think Mr. Baker at one point showed you a 2011 resolution of the
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Council, and you were asked about why you didn't include these in your report. And I think that you indicated that you thought that the Project that was submitted to the Committee was different from the one that they offered their views on. Is that correct?

A Yes.
Q I want to pull up Joint Muni 160 , which is an exhibit that Ms. Fillmore used. And I'm looking, in particular, at Bates number 006957 . This is the minutes that Normandeau created of its meeting with the North Country Council on March 27,2015 . Is that right?

A Yes.
Q And I want to focus your attention on Points 5 and 6, which $I$ don't think were discussed earlier. With respect to Point Number 5, can you explain to me what's contained there and how that is supportive of your decision not to include the 2011 resolution?

A Yes. They were -- they were raising concerns about the Project's potential visual impacts in Pittsburg and in the Easton/Sugar Hill area, as well as the White Mountain National Forest.
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This, of course, was prior to the revised route, which included undergrounding in these areas.

Q And how about Number 6?
A This similarly was an issue of concern about the Appalachian Trail crossing and visual from the Balsams and Mountain View Grand. And these issues have been addressed by the visual consultant. And the Appalachian Trail crossing is now undergrounded and in a location that is supported by the Supervisor of the White Mountain National Forest.

Q So, the changes that were made didn't completely address every concern that the North Country Council had, is that right?

A Not everything, but it was substantial -substantially addressed many of their concerns.

Q Moving on, when Ms. Saffo was questioning you, she asked you about traffic control plans, and she was pressing you on the issue of whether, if it took 30 to 45 minutes to travel in each direction, that's something that would have been considered "reasonable" in your view. Do you remember that?
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A Yes.
Q Is it your understanding that the Department of Transportation will have to approve the traffic control plan and the traffic management plan?

A Yes.
Q And do you believe that DOT would approve any plans if they didn't consider them to be reasonable?

A No.
Q And, so, if the Project receives approved plans from DOT, would that address those concerns
that Ms. Saffo raised with respect to that issue?

A I believe they would, yes.
Q Two more topics. When Ms. Fillmore was questioning you, she showed you a letter from a nursery. I believe it was in Sugar Hill. And the nursery expressed concern about significant impacts that it believed had occurred to its business as a result of a recent road closure. Do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q And $I$ think that the nursery was trying to equate that experience with what might happen
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rega
Yes.
Q So, $I$ want to call up Applicants Exhibit 214. This is the New Hampshire DOT notice with respect to the road closure that was at issue in that letter. You've reviewed this before?

A Yes, I've seen it.
Q Okay. And what was the period of time that that road closure occurred?

A It was a five-week road closure and detour.
Q Okay. And it was -- and your understanding was it was a complete closure of the road, is that right?

A Yes.
Q And when did that occur?
A In the -- beginning on July loth, so, in the middle of the summer -- peak summer season.

Q Is it your understanding that, in the 52-mile underground stretch that Northern Pass is proposing to construct in, that there won't be any road closures, except possibly for sporadic ones at the Plymouth traffic circle that will have detours?

A That's my understanding, yes.
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Q So, do you find that -- well, what is your opinion then with respect to the concerns expressed in that letter in relation to what you understand the facts of Northern Pass to be?

A That the Project will be addressing the concerns and will not cause some of the impacts that were being suggested by the intervenor.

Q I want to go to the ELMO for a minute, just so everybody is clear about the locations. So, the map we have on here will be Applicants Exhibit 217 .

There is an "N" on that map. I'm going to ask that that be circled. That's what we understand to be the approximate location of the nursery. And then the bridge crossing or culvert crossing, where the road was closed, if we could circle that. And, again, my understanding is that is the location. And, then, where is the Town of Franconia? And, then, if we can put with highlighting what is the proposed Northern Pass route?

Okay. And then one last question. There is a -- we've heard a lot about this, so I just
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want to have a clear record for this. There is a -- is there a "P" on that map? Yes. Could we circle the "P". And what do you understand that location to be, Mr. Varney?

A That's Polly's Pancake Parlor.
Q And you had said earlier you thought you knew the distance from the proposed construction area?

A Yes. Given the interest, I measured it. And it's about a mile and a half from the Project corridor.

Q Okay. One more set of questions with regarding MOUs. When Ms. Bradbury was asking you questions, she was talking about local town events that would be of importance to the people of Deerfield, like the Deerfield Arts Tour and the Deerfield Fair. Do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q And I think you explained at one point that these are the sorts of issues that could be worked out between the Applicant and the Town?

A Yes.
Q So, I want to call up Applicants Exhibit 208.
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This is the Thornton MOU. Have you looked at this document before?

A Yes.
Q And $I$ want to call your attention to Page 2, Section 2.3. This is "Traffic Control". And is it your understanding that the Town of

Thornton had concerns, like the Town of
Deerfield, about the impact that construction might have on important community events?

A Yes.
Q And this document memorializes that
understanding and evidences a commitment of the
Project to work with the Town to address those specific concerns?

A Yes.
Q And is this the type of approach that you had in mind when you were speaking about the

Deerfield events?
A Yes. Especially regarding the reference here to the Blue Grass Festival and Blues Festival located at the Sugar Shack Campground in the Town. It's a very good example.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. Nothing
further.
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|  | 65/20 76/6 76/11 | 24/2 24/4 24/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BY CHAIRMAN | 91/10 109/5 119/24 | 25/24 26/17 34/21 |
| HONIGBERG: [1] | 128/4 137/17 | 35/18 91/8 91/12 |
| 148/3 | 141/22 150/6 | 101/10 103/23 |
| BY CMSR. | 150/10 150/15 | 109/4 113/9 113/20 |
| BAILEY: [2] 34/4 | 150/18 151/1 | MS. BAILEY: [2] |
| 76/16 | 171/24 | 34/1 34/20 |
| BY DIR | CMSR. BAILEY: | MS. GAGNON: |
| WRIGHT: [2] | [3] 76/13 91/7 | [1] 161/6 |
| 66/2 74/22 | 141/20 | MS. |
| BY MR. | DIR. WRIGHT | WEATHERSBY: |
| IACOPINO: [1] | [4] 65/19 65/21 | [6] 109/6 109/9 |
| 142/1 | 65/24 76/4 | 113/10 119/18 |
| BY MR. | MR. IACOPINO: | 128/7 137/15 |
| NEEDLEMAN: [3] | [4] 141/24 147/20 | WITNESS |
| 151/5 154/21 161/7 | 147/23 148/1 | VARNEY: [6] 4/9 |
| BY MR. | MR. | 24/7 65/23 76/15 |
| OLDENBURG: [7] | NEEDLEMAN: | 109/8 141/21 |
| 4/18 6/19 25/11 | 120/1 128/6 147/22 | \$ |
| 26/20 35/21 39/5 | 150/20 150/24 | \$1,500 [2] 39/18 |
| 104/1 | $\begin{aligned} & 150 / 20150 / 24 \\ & 154 / 19171 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | 40/19 |
| BY MR. WAY: [6] | 154/19 171/22 MR. | \$1.5 [1] 38/23 |
| 24/8 34/24 91/14 |  | \$1.6 [1] 39/17 |
| 101/12 106/9 | $\text { [14] } 4 / 74 / 116 / 18$ | \$10 [1] 60/24 |
| 113/11 | 24/3 26/5/19 | \$100,000 [4] 42/13 |
| BY MS. BAILEY: | $\begin{aligned} & 24 / 3 \\ & 34 / 3 \\ & 34 / 5 \\ & 34 / 23 \\ & 35 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | 58/4 58/5 58/6 |
| [1] 137/19 BY MS. | $39 / 265 / 15 \quad 103 / 21$ | \$20 [1] 60/20 |
| BY MS. WEATHERSBY: | 103/24 106/8 | \$3 [3] 40/20 41/15 |
| [4] 109/13 113/21 | MR. PATNAUDE: | 42/14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[4] 109 / 131} \\ & \mathbf{1 2 0 / 3} 128 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | [1] 150/22 | $\$ 3 \text { million [1] } 40 / 20$ |
| CHAIRMAN | MR. WAY: [14] | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5[1] 41 / 5 \\ & \$ 500[1] 41 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| HONIGBERG: <br> [17] 4/1 65/17 |  |  |


|  | 112 [4] 12/14 14/15 | 18/116 [2] 3/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80s [1] 53/10 | 16/17 16/18 | 14/14 |
| '90s [1] 53/10 | 113 [2] 2/8 2/11 | 19 [1] 11/3 |
| [1] 53/10 | 115 [1] 70/12 | 192 [2] 39/17 |
| 0 - 0 | 116 [5] 3/19 12/14 | 112/24 |
| 0.4 [1] 75/2 | 14/14 14/15 20/1 | 1927 [1] 52/5 |
| 0.6 [1] 75/2 | 12 [3] 20/3 138/16 | 1930 [2] 50/17 |
| 0.9 [1] 84/24 | 147/9 | 50/18 |
| 006957 [1] 165/10 | 120 [5] 2/19 48/14 | 1931 [1] 47/22 |
| 03-22-17 [1] 3/13 | 48/15 52/20 138/12 | 1934 [1] 52/5 |
| 052 [1] 1/24 | 121 [1] 158/18 | 1935 [1] 52/5 |
| 06 [1] 1/7 | 123 [2] 159/11 | 1950 [2] 52/17 |
| 06-14-17 [1] 3/20 | 161/5 | 52/18 |
| 1 | 13 [1] 20/3 | 1:08 [1] 172/6 |
| 1,600 feet [3] 22/7 | 137 [1] 2/9 | 2 |
| 1,26/23 27/8 | 14 [2] 53/14 57/12 142 [1] 2/12 | 2,000 [2] 40/17 |
| 1,760 [1] 75/17 |  | 40/18 |
| 1.6 [2] 39/3 39/3 | 148 [1] 2/13 | 2,600 [1] 93/22 |
| 10 [2] 6/12 60/21 | 150 [1] 125/4 | 2.1 [1] 152/6 |
| 10-10-17 [1] 1/6 | $151[6] 2 / 153 / 43 / 5$ | 2.3 [1] 171/5 |
| 10-year [1] 9/14 | $151[6] 2 / 153 / 43 / 5$ $3 / 73 / 93 / 10$ | 20 [3] 18/18 60/21 |
| 100 [1] 39/18 | 153 [1] 3/12 | 81/6 |
| 100-foot [1] 124/7 | 154 [1] 3/14 | 200 [1] 132/16 |
| 104 [1] 2/7 | 116 [1] 20/1 | 2000 [2] 8/24 9/17 |
| 106 [1] 2/8 | 160 [1] 165/8 | 2002 [1] 9/16 |
| 109 [1] 2/11 | $161 \text { [1] 3/16 }$ | 2005 [1] 138/23 |
| 10:42 [1] 76/9 | $165 \text { feet [1] } 55 / 24$ | 2008 [3] 62/6 63/17 |
| 10:54 [1] 76/11 | 165 feet [1] 55/24 | 64/16 |
| 10th [1] 168/16 | $169 \text { [1] 3/21 }$ | 2010 [2] 63/18 |
| 11 [3] 6/11 20/3 | $17[3] 1 / 63 / 13$ 3/20 | 64/16 |
| 20/7 | $18[2] 12 / 14$ 16/14 | 2011 [2] 164/24 |


| 2 | 27 [1] 165/13 | 48/9 48/13 52/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 [1] 63/20 | 28 [2] 29/14 44/7 | 52 [3] 145/3 145/6 |
| 2014 [1] 9/15 | 3 | 173/18 |
| 2015 [5] 11/18 | 30 [5] 19/14 19/16 | 52-mile [1] 168 |
| 43/11 97/15 120/12 | 27/22 124/6 166/21 | 6 |
| 165/13 | 300 [1] 132/16 | 66 [1] 2/10 |
| 2015-06 [1] 1/7 | 300 feet [1] 133/6 | 7 |
| 2016 [1] 121/10 | 300-foot [1] 133/14 | 70 [3] 52/19 53/14 |
| 2017 [6] 1/3 75/3 | 301.09 [3] 76/19 | 70 [3] 52/19 53/14 |
| 97/14 111/10 118/9 | 116/11 116/21 | $\begin{aligned} & 93 / 18 \\ & 76[1] \\ & 2 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 121/10 | 302 [4] 14/5 14/8 |  |
| 2018 [1] 21/1 | 14/14 16/12 | 8 |
| 2019-2028 [1] | 310-A:173 [1] | 80 [1] 70/1 |
| 43/12 | 173/19 | 9 |
| 202 [1] 17/2 <br> 2024 [1] 43/11 | 34 [1] 2/9 35 [4] 2/7 2/8 124/6 | 90 [3] 91/17 107/17 |
| 2024 [1] 43/11 | $\begin{aligned} & 35[4] \text { 2/7 2/8 124/6 } \\ & 125 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | 90 [3] 91/17 107/17 147/10 |
| 206 [2] 3/5 151/11 | 39 [1] 53/13 | 91 [1] 2/8 |
| 207 [3] 3/7 151/12 | 39-mile [1] 17/13 | 93 [2] 16/13 55/19 |
| 152/3 | 393 [1] 55/19 | 96 [1] 158/24 |
| 208 [3] 3/9 151/12 | 4 | 9:00 [1] 1/3 |
| 170/24 |  | A |
| 209 [2] 3/10 151/13 | 40 [8] 1/3 4/3 19/17 |  |
| 213 [3] 3/16 161/7 | 19/20 19/20 124/6 | a.m [3] 1/3 76/9 |
| 161/9 | 172/7 172/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 76/11 } \\ & \text { A:173 [1] } \end{aligned}$ |
| 214 [2] 3/18 168/3 | 41 [2] 13/23 158/9 | A:173 [1] 173/19 |
| 215 [2] 3/12 153/8 | 45 [1] 166/21 | ability [2] 26/13 |
| 216 [2] 3/14 154/17 | 48 [2] 73/24 73/24 | 173/8 |
| 217 [2] 3/21 169/12 | 49 [1] 1/4 | able [6] 25/6 56/15 |
| 24 [1] 2/8 | 5 | 101/20 103/16 |
| $25[1] 2 / 7$ | 5.6 [1] 8/10 | abolished [1] |
| 26 [1] 1/3 | 50 [5] 19/17 48/6 |  |


| A | 117/19 117/21 | abundance [2] 9/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| abolished... [1] | 117/23 121/16 | 116/2 |
| 120/18 | 123/11 127/15 | abut [1] 89/5 |
| about [136] 7/12 | 135/15 136/4 | abutments [1] |
| 9/5 10/8 11/12 | 137/21 140/4 | 48/22 |
| 11/22 12/7 12/11 | 146/14 148/6 | abutted [2] 117/1 |
| 13/6 20/18 21/16 | 148/22 151/7 | 118/19 |
| 23/22 24/11 26/9 | 151/14 151/20 | abutters [1] 129/8 |
| 28/14 29/19 32/23 | 151/21 152/1 152/8 | abutting [6] 84/14 |
| 34/18 36/5 36/9 | 152/10 152/23 | 118/8 118/14 129/3 |
| 40/17 41/7 41/17 | 153/13 153/14 | 134/19 159/5 |
| 48/20 49/3 51/3 | 154/7 154/12 | access [6] 32/17 $98 / 7$ 105/5 105/7 |
| 53/13 55/11 55/21 | 154/13 154/16 | 98/7 105/5 105/7 |
| 56/3 59/24 60/6 | 156/12 156/18 | 128/21 130/12 |
| 60/12 61/7 61/16 | 156/23 157/6 | accommodate [3] |
| 61/20 62/7 63/7 | 157/14 157/15 | 155/17 156/2 |
| 63/19 63/20 69/10 | 158/2 158/5 158/20 | 156/14 |
| 72/22 75/17 77/10 | 159/14 160/17 | Accommodation [2] |
| 77/17 78/11 79/2 | 162/20 162/22 | 36/8 36/24 |
| 79/17 81/22 82/20 | 164/2 164/22 165/1 | accompanied [1] |
| 83/1 83/22 84/17 | 165/22 166/4 166/5 | 74/10 |
| 86/11 86/14 87/1 | 166/19 167/18 | accompanying [1] |
| 87/7 88/5 88/12 | 169/10 169/24 | 46/23 |
| 90/13 90/13 90/20 | 170/10 170/14 | according [2] |
| 91/17 93/7 93/10 | 171/8 171/17 | 101/16 149/7 |
| 93/12 93/18 94/6 | above [2] 125/4 | account [6] 28/6 |
| 95/5 96/22 97/4 | 142/19 | 29/10 54/8 58/23 |
| 100/2 101/5 104/3 | abreast [2] 120/13 | 87/24 91/22 |
| 105/4 106/3 107/18 | 121/2 | accounting [1] |
| 109/16 110/9 | absence [1] 116/2 | 156/18 |
| 110/11 110/23 | absolutely [2] 35/3 | accurate [2] 66/8 |
| 113/7 117/12 | 100/17 | 173/5 |


| A | address [14] 10/14 | 32/7 32/9 33/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| achieving [1] 25/10 | 25/11 56/7 59/7 | 33/20 73/17 79/8 |
| acid [1] 74/13 | 77/19 84/18 95/3 | 90/17 91/6 99/15 |
| acquire [1] 37/23 | 118/3 128/7 129/9 | 106/17 114/1 114/1 |
| across [1] 97/24 | 160/14 166/14 | 115/16 128/15 |
| acting [1] 86/2 | 167/11 171/13 | 132/20 133/7 |
| action [2] 173/12 | addressed [10] | 33/14 |
| 173/15 | 32/21 33/21 41/1 | adversely [2] 6/5 |
| activities [1] 30/8 | 47/12 65/14 88/5 | 31/17 |
| activity [9] 16/2 | 106/19 125/24 | advertised [2] |
| 59/19 98/11 99/8 | 166/8 166/17 | 20/24 131/18 |
| 100/3 127/17 | addressing [2] | advise [1] 81/8 |
| 136/18 137/10 | 107/21 169/6 | Advisory [1] 13/12 |
| 137/11 | adequate [2] 98/7 | aerial [2] 12/16 |
| actual [2] 116/12 | 156/24 | 13/2 |
| 145/19 | adjacent [5] 32/11 | aesthetics [1] |
| actually [10] 6/12 | 89/5 89/7 136/13 | 163/20 |
| 11/8 43/9 47/7 | 136/19 | Affairs [1] 1/16 |
| 91/16 112/11 | administrator [2] | affect [9] 6/5 35/11 |
| 120/17 128/21 | 1/21 146/4 | 59/19 59/20 63/16 |
| 137/6 144/8 | admit [1] 69/12 | 63/21 66/23 131/24 |
| add [4] 25/13 58/9 | adopted [5] 11/19 | 135/8 |
| 96/19 118/12 | 62/14 62/15 63/7 | affected [20] 59/16 |
| added [4] 3/21 | 65/10 | 74/13 116/22 |
| 45/18 63/19 134/22 | advance [3] 21/16 | 116/23 117/4 118/6 |
| adding [1] 136/17 | 23/2 59/3 | 118/11 119/5 |
| addition [3] 61/2 | advantage [1] | 119/11 124/19 |
| 87/2 102/9 | 111/15 | 130/11 131/8 |
| additional [7] | adverse [28] 5/9 | 131/10 149/6 |
| 53/17 57/13 68/7 | 5/12 5/15 15/3 31/6 | 149/11 158/21 |
| 102/14 134/21 | 31/8 31/9 31/11 | 159/2 159/8 159/10 |
| 136/16 151/17 | 31/14 31/24 32/6 | 159/11 |


| A | ago [7] 9/4 9/4 9/5 | 51/17 51/22 52/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| affecting [1] 115/20 | 103/5 111/10 | 52/7 53/9 55/9 57/8 |
| affects [1] 128/22 | 151/19 154/9 | 57/22 59/24 62/9 |
| affirmative [3] 8/21 | agree [10] 25/15 | 63/21 65/17 68/1 |
| 41/2 55/2 | 55/17 57/15 70/7 | 74/5 74/16 76/5 |
| after [13] 41/6 | 79/21 97/1 97/5 | 76/7 78/5 86/8 |
| 87/13 89/6 111/16 | 98/14 99/2 109/24 | 87/18 91/5 93/4 |
| 120/6 130/21 | agreed [2] 140/5 | 93/7 93/14 96/18 |
| 131/12 137/2 | 153/20 | 97/24 98/13 100/14 |
| 137/10 139/2 | agreement [3] | 103/21 116/22 |
| 154/20 163/16 | 154/7 159/18 | 118/11 126/12 |
| 172/5 | 160/16 | 126/17 127/14 |
| Afternoon [1] | agreements [4] | 128/8 134/23 |
| 172/11 | 127/18 159/15 | 136/16 136/22 |
| again [28] 7/5 9/19 | 159/24 160/7 | 137/7 147/14 |
| 12/19 23/21 28/17 | agricultural [3] | 148/12 149/1 153/3 |
| 29/4 33/2 33/18 | 31/8 136/12 136/14 | 155/6 156/12 |
| 43/4 51/14 52/19 | agriculture [2] 6/17 | 156/14 158/14 |
| 53/20 54/12 56/6 | 6/21 | 172/1 |
| 56/17 71/24 83/21 | ahead [4] 11/9 | all-turf [1] 136/1 |
| 87/23 88/9 101/21 | 15/22 56/7 133/9 | Allenstown [1] 44/6 |
| 104/4 107/2 107/4 | air [3] 74/14 118/1 | allow [5] 86/23 |
| 107/17 108/15 | 118/2 | 124/12 125/10 |
| 130/19 142/20 | alert [1] 21/18 | 160/1 160/11 |
| 169/18 | all [71] 5/5 6/22 | allowed [1] 68/6 |
| against [6] 7/1 | 8/13 13/15 14/17 | allows [1] 136/24 |
| 81/20 94/15 99/3 | 14/20 20/19 21/23 | almost [6] 52/19 |
| 148/17 148/19 | 25/1 25/21 28/1 | 53/9 86/12 96/20 |
| agencies [3] 15/7 | 29/17 30/2 31/1 | 104/13 148/5 |
| 31/22 60/15 | 31/15 33/14 39/16 | along [53] 3/15 |
| agency [2] 10/6 | 41/18 43/20 45/12 | 6/14 7/6 7/23 8/2 |
| 108/8 | 46/8 49/7 50/23 | 12/15 15/1 15/18 |


| A | 117/8 117/20 | analysis [25] 37/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| along... [45] 16/17 | 122/17 137/1 137/8 | 73/3 75/7 76/18 |
| 16/24 21/15 22/2 | 144/23 146/17 | 111/20 111/23 |
| 28/21 32/2 35/18 | 152/17 154/11 | 112/9 114/4 114/1 |
| 42/21 46/16 64/24 | 155/15 157/20 | 114/17 115/15 |
| 65/12 69/12 71/10 | 158/20 | 115/21 116/22 |
| 71/19 72/7 72/8 | alterations [1] 38/6 | 118/10 121/19 |
| 72/11 73/8 73/15 | altering [1] 130/11 | 121/20 131/9 |
| 74/15 82/8 84/13 | alternates [1] 28/3 | 133/15 133/16 |
| 84/15 88/16 88/20 | alternative [4] | 149/7 149/14 |
| 96/1 99/10 99/12 | 58/11 157/1 162/1 | 149/16 149/18 |
| 102/13 102/24 | 162/17 | 153/23 163/15 |
| 107/7 110/14 111/6 | alternatives [4] | analyzed [2] 136/2 |
| 111/11 112/1 | 80/6 80/8 80/11 | 162/4 |
| 112/16 117/2 | 80/12 | and/or [3] 38/7 |
| 118/19 126/7 | Although [1] 88/11 | 78/24 138/19 |
| 127/12 130/20 | always [4] 21/24 | Androscoggin [1] |
| 142/10 143/15 | 79/10 90/3 110/5 | 3/17 |
| 159/23 163/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{am}[12] ~ 57 / 20 \\ & 60 / 2192 / 2111 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | another [2] 12/11 $30 / 4$ |
| already [12] 7/10 |  | 30/4 |
| 25/8 33/5 61/4 | 121/7 144/9 15 |  |
| 70/17 71/15 87/3 | 159/24 161/11 | 82/24 100/22 118/7 |
| 89/4 95/1 97/11 | 173/10 173/12 | 133/19 135/22 $144 / 3$ 149/13 |
| 131/21 142/7 | amendments [1] | answered [1] 91/18 |
| also [33] 1/19 13/16 | amendments [1] $83 / 17$ | answered [1] 91/18 answers [1] 26/18 |
| 21/5 21/17 25/6 35/16 35/23 38/1 | $\text { among [1] } 105 / 10$ | anticipate [1] 59/13 |
| 35/16 35/23 38/1 44/15 45/6 55/3 | amount [9] 18/2 | anticipated [4] 48/3 |
| 60/19 65/10 67/12 | 29/11 40/22 45/7 | 62/21 64/23 64/24 |
| 72/24 73/8 78/14 | 66/20 92/12 101/23 | anticipating [1] |
| 78/20 102/13 110/22 116/16 | 121/5 136/18 analogy [1] 67/1 | $\begin{aligned} & 55 / 1 \\ & \text { any [81] } 7 / 197 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |


| A | 173/13 | 80/14 81/8 97/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| any... [79] 16/2 | anybody [1] 28/14 | 105/14 116/7 |
| 19/22 20/23 23/6 | anymore [1] 52/22 | /17 127/22 |
| 23/11 23/23 33/3 | anyone [3] 22/20 | 129/7 132/9 139/10 |
| 33/15 33/19 34/12 | 149/16 150/8 | 145/15 146/16 |
| 35/4 38/1 42/20 | anything [4] 26/9 | 146/20 147/1 |
| 42/21 44/16 45/24 | 38/9 149/24 150/3 | 147/15 147/21 |
| 53/23 57/20 59/2 | anyway [2] 95/21 | 151/11 151/12 |
| 60/4 62/20 63/8 | $117 / 5$ | 151/12 151/13 |
| 63/11 64/23 64/23 | anywhere [1] 20/23 | 152/3 158/18 |
| 65/11 66/11 67/19 | APP [10] 3/4 3/5 | 170/22 |
| 68/24 69/3 69/4 | 3/7 3/9 3/10 3/12 | Applicant's [1] |
| 72/15 73/17 75/9 | 3/14 3/16 3/18 3/21 | 26/11 |
| 77/13 77/15 78/8 | Appalachian [2] | applicants [10] |
| 78/11 79/4 79/8 | 166/6 166/9 | 151/10 153/8 158/8 |
| 80/13 80/15 82/21 | appear [1] 144/15 | 158/24 159/11 |
| 85/20 86/14 91/6 | appearance [2] | 161/5 162/14 168/3 |
| 96/1 102/4 106/16 | 98/10 105/6 | 169/11 170/24 |
| 108/11 109/18 | Appearances [1] | Applicants' [2] |
| 111/18 115/4 | 1/23 | 108/4 151/16 |
| 120/13 121/2 | appeared [1] 77/15 | Application [5] 1/8 |
| 121/19 126/16 | Appendix [2] 13/23 | 4/23 4/24 46/18 |
| 127/12 129/10 | 158/9 | 119/18 |
| 129/20 137/9 | apples [2] 113/18 | apply [2] 60/14 |
| 138/19 140/20 | 113/18 | 148/9 |
| 144/5 145/13 146/1 | apples-to-apples [1] | approach [1] |
| 148/2 149/11 | 113/18 | 171/16 |
| 149/16 149/17 | applicant [35] | approached [1] |
| 150/8 159/16 | 26/11 31/21 33/10 | 103/1 |
| 160/14 162/7 | 35/7 35/14 38/18 | approaches [1] |
| 164/18 167/6 | 46/5 50/4 50/14 | 110/20 |
| 168/21 173/11 | 60/3 69/7 69/20 | Approaching [1] |


| A |
| :--- |
| Approaching... [1] | 19/8

appropriate [6]
15/6 31/22 86/24
108/17 138/18
149/10
approve [5] 13/14 25/18 34/10 167/3 167/6
approved [5] 24/24 43/14 63/15 132/23 167/10
approximate [1] 169/15
April [1] 75/3
arbitrarily [1] 9/12 are [154] 4/4 4/17 5/7 5/19 7/13 8/14 8/17 8/19 9/22 10/4 10/9 10/11 10/12 10/17 10/20 14/2 15/16 15/17 16/5 16/23 16/24 19/1 20/24 21/14 22/12 22/19 23/20 24/23
25/3 26/8 26/24
27/17 27/18 27/22
28/1 28/12 28/24
29/9 29/9 31/16
32/17 32/17 32/20
32/20 33/18 37/22

41/22 45/1 46/9 46/10 47/14 48/11 48/20 50/8 50/17 51/18 52/7 52/16 53/1 53/5 53/14 54/2 54/22 55/5 57/16 57/17 58/10 59/4 59/16 61/12 63/24 66/17 71/3 71/12 72/11 73/7 73/18 73/18 80/4 83/12 83/14 83/14 83/14 83/17 84/14 87/17 87/19 88/3 89/5 90/10 92/24
92/24 94/9 94/16 96/17 97/2 98/13 98/19 98/20 102/9 102/13 105/8 107/2 107/10 108/12
110/21 112/2
117/17 117/18
117/20 118/15
120/5 122/23 124/9
125/3 125/6 125/7
125/10 126/11
127/11 129/13
131/13 131/16
131/17 131/18
139/8 139/9 139/21 140/10 141/2
142/16 142/19

143/11 143/12 145/10 146/11 146/22 148/8
148/21 149/5 149/5
149/9 149/10 151/8
151/17 154/23
155/22 156/20
157/9 159/5 159/21
160/7 162/7 170/21
area [49] 3/17 6/14
14/2 16/6 16/7 16/9
22/15 28/18 30/1
30/18 30/24 55/24
63/18 65/3 71/15
71/22 74/4 74/18
75/20 80/17 84/24
89/3 93/19 95/1
95/9 96/15 99/7
100/4 105/12
108/12 112/23
122/8 129/5 131/17
132/1 132/12
133/13 133/22
135/17 135/19
139/15 142/23
161/18 161/22
162/13 162/15
162/17 165/23

## 170/8

areas [18] 13/16
22/12 22/14 32/15
45/24 67/10 67/14

| A | 54/9 54/17 54/22 | 128/12 129/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| areas... [11] 73/10 | 57/9 60/15 60/19 | 130/14 130/18 |
| 73/14 73/19 81/14 | 61/5 62/8 63/11 | 131/4 131/13 |
| 91/7 96/1 97/8 | 66/16 67/14 70/19 | 131/20 133/13 |
| 110/7 136/9 142/6 | 74/3 75/2 75/16 | 133/13 134/22 |
| 166/3 | 75/16 77/24 78/17 | 135/18 136/3 136/4 |
| aren't [5] 23/23 | 79/8 80/11 81/7 | 136/12 136/12 |
| 56/14 100/21 104/7 | 84/13 84/13 84/23 | 136/12 136/14 |
| 125/12 | 84/24 85/5 85/21 | 139/16 143/22 |
| arena [1] 126/24 | 86/3 86/16 86/17 | 144/22 145/23 |
| argument [1] 93/24 | 86/22 87/8 87/14 | 146/4 147/13 149/1 |
| arguments [1] | 87/21 90/2 91/1 | 149/6 150/14 |
| 87/18 | 92/13 92/17 92/18 | 150/22 150/22 |
| around [8] 30/23 | 92/22 93/2 93/7 | 152/11 152/12 |
| 71/7 110/3 128/2 | 94/8 94/11 96/21 | 158/18 159/16 |
| 132/3 135/19 | 96/21 96/23 98/4 | 160/3 160/3 160/24 |
| 155/21 172/5 | 100/22 101/6 101/6 | 162/4 163/2 163/9 |
| arrows [1] 17/6 | 102/18 106/12 | 164/9 164/9 165/23 |
| article [1] 55/11 | 106/15 107/12 | 165/24 167/20 |
| artificial [1] 136/17 | 108/1 108/1 109/18 | 172/10 |
| Arts [1] 170/16 | 110/5 110/13 | as-built [1] 109/18 |
| as [162] 1/13 4/22 | 112/19 112/20 | aside [1] 34/18 |
| 6/4 6/23 7/23 10/15 | 113/5 113/9 114/17 | ask [14] 34/2 60/14 |
| 16/23 21/20 22/12 | 114/20 116/4 117/3 | 62/10 64/17 85/15 |
| 22/19 23/17 23/19 | 117/13 117/15 | 101/5 104/3 113/10 |
| 23/19 24/10 25/13 | 118/15 119/8 | 146/2 148/6 151/13 |
| 29/8 30/21 34/15 | 119/15 119/21 | 158/2 160/24 |
| 35/18 39/15 42/7 | 119/21 121/20 | 169/14 |
| 43/13 44/3 44/6 | 122/13 123/15 | asked [24] 47/14 |
| 44/11 45/14 46/6 | 123/23 125/2 125/4 | 62/11 62/20 63/7 |
| 50/5 50/12 51/8 | 125/6 125/14 | 64/23 82/20 130/5 |
| 53/24 54/6 54/6 | 126/23 128/12 | 151/7 151/19 |


| A | 47/12 49/7 50/23 | authority [2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| asked... [15] 152/23 | 51/12 52/21 103/12 | 145/18 146/18 |
| 153/14 155/20 | 106/12 106/13 | auto [1] 156/6 |
| 156/2 156/6 158/20 | 106/14 109/21 | automobiles [1] |
| 159/14 159/15 | 121/13 128/6 145/6 | 16/1 |
| 160/17 162/19 | assumed [1] 51/1 | available [4] 49/4 |
| 162/22 164/2 | assuming [5] 17/19 | 63/13 143/3 157/2 |
| 164/22 165/1 | 24/16 24/18 24/18 | avenues [1] 23/22 |
| 166/19 | 106/20 | average [2] 5/17 |
| asking [4] 82/9 | assumption [3] | 47/23 |
| 146/16 151/21 | 14/10 48/7 116/1 | avoid [16] 42/18 |
| 170/13 | assumptions [1] | 49/4 53/18 57/24 |
| aspirational [1] | 28/4 | 58/4 58/12 58/13 |
| 83/11 | astray [1] 51/7 | 79/19 97/20 98/12 |
| assembled [1] | attempts [1] 83/15 | 102/16 105/16 |
| 126/15 | attended [1] 78/14 | 107/8 143/24 145/5 |
| assess [1] 146/19 | attention [6] 38/2 | 154/6 |
| assessing [1] 94/7 | 92/13 115/3 162/8 | avoidance [2] 58/17 |
| assessment [3] | 165/15 171/4 | 106/21 |
| 47/19 47/20 99/20 | attorney [3] 72/23 | avoided [2] 98/2 |
| assist [1] 96/2 | 173/10 173/13 | 132/8 |
| associated [12] | attorneys [1] 70/3 | avoiding [2] 53/16 |
| 32/16 38/5 42/7 | attractive [2] 98/9 | 96/3 |
| 44/18 66/18 66/21 | 105/12 | aware [7] 57/20 |
| 68/17 69/21 79/5 | attribute [1] 146/12 | 62/22 63/23 69/3 |
| 81/12 101/7 160/15 | attributed [1] | 145/13 157/8 |
| Associates [1] | 88/17 | 159/24 |
| 100/11 | ATV [10] 73/9 | away [7] 14/10 |
| assume [23] 20/12 | 73/13 73/14 73/20 | 17/15 19/11 75/2 |
| 23/16 27/17 28/1 | 75/21 108/7 108/10 | 75/19 100/3 117/6 |
| 39/14 39/22 39/23 | 108/11 108/13 |  |
| 40/2 41/3 41/9 | 163/11 |  |

## B

 background [1]113/13
Bailey [6] 1/14 2/9 76/13 137/19 142/4 154/9
Baker [1] 164/23 ball [2] 54/11 106/16
Balsams [1] 166/7 bank [1] 96/21 Banks [1] 55/12 base [2] 95/20 114/19
based [10] 13/20 40/21 86/7 100/18
111/24 115/21
124/22 128/12 137/13 141/2 basically [10] 5/11 12/12 17/18 19/10 38/8 43/20 45/11
51/22 61/21 76/18 basis [17] 67/10 78/8 78/12 90/4 90/6 94/4 94/4 94/5 112/16 114/18 114/22 115/8 115/15 140/8 140/14 153/18 163/17
Bates [1] 165/10
be [273]
bear [2] 102/18 104/12
beat [1] 102/20 beautiful [1] 131/2 became [1] 63/12 because [51] 8/19
10/18 10/22 14/7
18/14 23/8 24/16
36/13 39/23 43/10
43/13 44/9 47/14
48/13 49/23 53/9
54/13 55/9 57/6
57/14 58/1 63/24
64/5 64/10 64/18
74/8 76/21 81/11
83/21 86/19 96/23
100/16 101/10
104/6 106/19
107/24 108/21
117/9 118/16
123/11 130/13
133/17 136/3 139/2
140/18 141/11
142/14 142/16
148/24 154/2
160/11
become [2] 24/12 133/7
becoming [1] 132/6 bed [1] 98/18
bed-and-breakfast
[1] 98/18
beefing [1] 102/13 been [75] 11/14 25/8 29/15 29/17 33/8 40/17 45/4 54/14 54/17 60/11 61/24 64/15 68/1
75/9 78/22 80/14
82/2 82/4 82/5 82/7
84/6 84/15 88/18
88/23 90/12 90/15
90/20 90/21 91/18
94/3 94/3 94/5
94/19 94/24 97/11
97/16 99/4 101/8
101/23 102/1 102/3
102/7 102/10
102/11 103/1 110/8
110/12 110/16
111/2 119/20
119/22 120/9
120/11 120/18
121/11 127/14
127/19 131/4
135/20 136/10
137/2 137/9 138/22
139/17 140/4
144/21 145/24
147/18 148/6 150/5 162/3 162/12
162/18 166/8 166/23
before [15] 34/11

| B | 132/20 133/10 | 23/20 25/2 27/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| before... [14] 36/7 | 143/9 145/7 145/24 | 28/6 28/8 28/15 |
| 52/20 80/14 81/1 | 147/10 148/20 | bicycles [2] 15/24 |
| 93/1 112/22 115/13 | 154/4 163/7 167/6 | 19/8 |
| 118/22 120/9 | 167/14 167/17 | bicyclist [5] 19/21 |
| 157/13 159/19 | believed [1] 167/19 | 20/9 20/13 22/2 |
| 163/16 168/6 171/2 | benefits [6] 66/17 | 28/20 |
| before-and-afte | 67/23 86/4 94/6 | bicyclists [3] 22/13 |
| 163/16 | 113/17 115/6 | 23/3 24/1 |
| begin [2] 28/18 | best [9] 15/7 51/22 | bid [1] 55/4 |
| 34/11 | 60/1 82/16 104/21 | big [3] 40/22 41/1 |
| beginning [1] | 105/24 143/22 | 162/22 |
| 168/16 | 149/10 173/7 | bike [6] 14/22 |
| behind [1] 20/15 | Bethlehem [4] 14/5 | 15/11 16/23 17/1 |
| being [19] 45/1 | 14/9 14/14 16/12 | 17/22 23/7 |
| 52/14 61/5 63/2 | better [8] 9/11 36/6 | biker [1] 17/11 |
| 63/9 63/9 64/2 | 59/8 80/16 82/3 | Bill [9] 4/13 22/5 |
| 74/13 75/2 88/13 | 102/5 143/12 | 34/2 34/22 101/11 |
| 96/22 97/4 101/1 | 143/12 | 103/24 104/5 |
| 104/10 106/8 110/6 | between [12] 14/4 | 146/22 148/15 |
| 112/24 157/16 | 39/5 40/17 57/18 | billion [4] 38/23 |
| 169/8 | 60/3 104/16 105/3 | 39/3 39/4 39/17 |
| belabor [2] 16/21 | 110/17 124/11 | binding [1] 83/11 |
| 54/16 | 129/19 134/13 | bit [10] 5/3 11/5 |
| believe [32] 4/6 | 170/22 | 11/6 51/3 51/5 70/6 |
| 5/21 23/13 29/6 | beyond [5] 7/24 | 72/21 72/22 73/22 |
| 29/23 35/14 46/12 | 46/12 107/1 112/11 | 98/20 |
| 56/4 69/21 69/24 | 118/20 | blew [1] 5/3 |
| 75/12 80/13 82/4 | bicycle [16] 11/4 | block [1] 34/16 |
| 89/20 97/13 97/15 | 15/1 15/4 15/15 | blocked [2] 20/15 |
| 110/15 127/18 | 16/2 16/4 19/11 | 157/1 |
| 127/22 127/24 | 19/12 19/15 23/19 | Blue [1] 171/20 |

## 100/10

breaking [1]
123/21
Brennan [1] 1/20
bridge [34] 3/18
42/24 43/2 44/7
44/11 44/12 44/14
46/10 47/1 47/3
47/9 47/19 47/22
47/23 48/11 48/12
48/19 48/22 48/24
49/2 50/7 50/12
50/16 50/18 51/16
52/6 53/3 53/4
53/11 55/13 55/14
57/4 57/12 169/16
bridges [16] 48/15
51/17 51/23 52/3
52/16 52/24 53/2
53/5 53/10 53/13
54/21 54/22 54/24
55/5 56/11 57/12
brief [3] 61/10
150/17 151/3
briefly [1] 101/3
broad [5] 66/4
86/10 117/19 122/3
127/1
broader [1] 91/19
broke [3] 111/20
112/9 112/11
brook [1] 52/11
brooks [2] 52/9

## 54/3

brought [1] 115/3
bucket [1] 45/5
budget [1] 44/18 budgeting [1] 45/6 buffer [4] 72/7
72/12 134/12
134/14
buffering [1] 129/9 build [4] 49/14 59/5 132/5 132/18
build-out [1] 132/5
building [1] 129/15
built [6] 47/22
50/16 52/2 52/5 109/18 131/3
burdens [1] 68/7
buried [7] 80/23
81/2 82/24 83/6
85/9 137/23 138/20
bury [6] 85/15
123/8 138/7 139/14
139/15 139/16
bus [1] 155/19
buses [1] 155/22
business [27] 1/15
3/14 60/12 82/12
94/10 94/11 94/15
95/14 95/22 95/24
96/3 96/13 97/6
98/4 98/21 98/23

| B | 11/23 13/11 14 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| business... [11] | C | 8/24 100/8 100/18 |
| 99/3 104/19 106/18 | cab |  |
| 107/11 <br> 148/18 | calculations [1] | 131/8 137/7 139/ |
| 3/15 154/3 157/9 |  | 148/8 150/22 |
| 167/20 | 103/5 111/15 145/9 | 154/21 155/8 |
| businesses | 162/8 168/3 170/24 | 155/14 165/17 |
| 32/18 33/4 35/1 | 17 | 169/21 |
| /19 | called [1] 64/4 | 't [13] 22/5 |
| 94/23 9 | calls [1] 139/23 |  |
| 95/7 95/17 96/5 | came [3] 18/15 41/7 |  |
| 96/7 97/9 97/12 | 140/24 | 126//16 148/11 |
| 97/21 99/1 | C | $159 / 15$ |
| 105/10 | 152/24 153/17 | Canterbury [3] |
| 5/17 107/7 | Camp's [1] 153/21 | $3 / 17 \text { 151/10 }$ |
| $1110 / 1$ | Campground [1] | pability [1] |
| $16147 / 15$ | 171/21 | captured [1] 64/9 |
| 149/3 152/24 | Campton [5] 14/16 | car [1] 17/19 |
| 153/415 155/4 | 51/19 51/20 52/4 | care [1] 156/1 |
| 156/17 |  | careful [1] 87/ |
| 122 157/4 | 13/14 13/15 16/8 | refully [9] 22/17 |
| 157/13 | 17/1 20/21 21/6 | 90/8 90/9 92/10 <br> 127/9 129/6 135/ |
| businesses' [1] 95/4 | 23/1 23/8 23/21 | 157/21 162/4 |
| butcher [1] 93/9 | 26/15 29/7 30/14 | Carolina [1] 55/12 |
| bylaws [1] 135/6 byway [5] 11/15 | 32/24 33/21 34/2 |  |
| byway [5] 11/15 $11 / 23$ 12/6 12/24 | 36/13 37/13 46/24 | carried [2] 54/9 |
| 11/23 12/6 12/24 13/17 | 51/19 |  |
| byways [4] 11/13 | 60/11 69/12 71/4 $79 / 7$ $79 / 1891 / 11$ | cars [5] 27/18 27 |


| C | 84/6 87/24 88/12 | 23/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cars... [3] 28/1 | 127/8 157/5 | chapter [2] 6/10 |
| 29/19 29/21 | certificate [3] 1/10 | 63/3 |
| case [10] 40/3 58/3 | 34/11 109/4 | chapters [1] 31/3 |
| 85/20 137/10 | certify [2] 173/4 | character [5] 86/12 |
| 139/16 152/16 | 173/10 | 117/19 122/4 123/3 |
| 154/3 160/19 161/3 | Chair [1] 149/24 | 127/7 |
| 173/14 | Chairman [2] 2/13 | characterization [1] |
| cases [19] 10/11 | 138/13 | 164/20 |
| 19/24 54/4 63/3 | challenge [5] 87/8 | chart [2] 3/14 |
| 63/4 78/10 88/4 | 92/23 93/6 117/15 | 126/16 |
| 115/24 117/5 | 136/5 | check [3] 121/4 |
| 117/20 122/9 124/9 | Chalmers [2] 66/7 | 128/2 147/23 |
| 125/3 127/5 129/13 | 149/7 | checked [1] 121/10 |
| 132/21 138/3 163/4 | chance [2] 101/3 | child [1] 156/1 |
| 163/5 | 154/19 | chime [2] 91/9 |
| caught [1] 15/9 | change [17] 11/17 | 103/23 |
| cause [3] 20/10 | 13/19 64/19 66/13 | choice [1] 150/14 |
| 79/8 169/7 | 66/14 66/15 70/16 | choose [1] 23/4 |
| caused [1] 137/14 | 70/21 115/20 118/3 | chose [1] 136/13 |
| caution [3] 9/20 | 131/24 132/6 | chosen [1] 162/2 |
| 19/8 116/24 | 133/15 133/21 | Chris [2] 25/13 |
| cell [2] 125/1 | 135/1 149/8 161/16 | 103/22 |
| 134/22 | changed [3] 12/24 | Christopher [1] |
| center [2] 47/21 | 28/10 121/12 | 1/15 |
| 156/1 | changes [14] 13/9 | Chrmn [1] 1/13 |
| Central [1] 112/6 | 13/20 45/14 53/19 | chuckles [1] 39/1 |
| certain [8] 3/21 | 62/7 63/15 64/9 | circle [3] 168/22 |
| 45/7 54/22 66/19 | 64/24 65/11 70/8 | 169/18 170/3 |
| 79/19 81/16 86/6 | 92/7 120/13 121/2 | circled [2] 52/17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 157 / 21 \\ & \text { certainly }[6] \quad 60 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | 166/13 <br> changing [2] 23/10 | $\begin{aligned} & 169 / 14 \\ & \text { circles [2] } 3 / 21 \end{aligned}$ |


| C | climate [1] 118/3 | coming [5] 21/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1] 51/24 | close [3] 30/22 47/8 | 21/21 93/1 134/8 |
| cite [1] 127/6 | 51/6 | 155/22 |
| cited [4] 135/4 | closed [2] 107/20 | Comm [2] 1/13 |
| 141/1 143/18 | 169/17 | 1/14 |
| 144/23 | closely [2] 106/6 | comment [3] 33/6 |
| cities [1] 115/18 | 134/3 | 139/2 140/19 |
| citizens [4] 42/4 | closer [1] 111/1 | comments [5] 78/7 |
| 58/5 58/12 58/19 | closure [7] 107/22 | 126/7 126/8 126/20 |
| city [3] 61/13 69/19 | 109/2 167/20 168/5 | 127/1 |
| 125/12 | 168/9 168/10 | commercial [8] |
| City's [1] 131/19 | 168/12 | 6/22 64/14 85/12 |
| citywide [1] 136/23 | closures [3] 30/6 | 123/12 123/17 |
| claims [1] 116/4 | 30/13 168/21 | 123/18 123/22 |
| Clarksville [2] | clubs [2] 23/20 | 145/8 |
| 46/20 52/6 | 108/11 | commission [4] |
| Clarksville-Pittsbur | Cmsr [2] 1/14 2/9 | 15/17 112/5 112/7 |
| g [1] 52/6 | CNN [1] 55/11 | 112/8 |
| Clarksville/Pittsbur | coexisting [1] | Commissioner [5] |
| $g[1] 46 / 20$ | 134/23 | 54/17 76/12 137/18 |
| clean [3] 98/9 105/6 | collecting [1] 74/11 | 142/4 154/9 |
| 157/18 | collocate [2] 125/13 | commissions [13] |
| clean-up [1] 105/6 | 142/5 | 8/13 23/15 24/17 |
| clear [5] 9/19 38/18 | collocation [1] | 77/2 78/3 84/5 |
| 97/18 169/10 170/1 | 125/17 | 89/15 111/24 |
| clearances [1] | come [7] 32/8 46/23 | 112/15 113/17 |
| 56/22 | 54/5 69/14 82/15 | 115/1 115/2 126/10 |
| cleared [1] 2 | 104/6 105/23 | commitment [1] |
| clearer [1] 102/6 | comes [2] 16/14 | 171/12 |
| clearing [3] 29/16 | 161/6 | COMMITTEE [16] |
| 72/7 72/9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { comfortable [1] } \\ & \mathbf{1 0 0 / 1 2} \end{aligned}$ | 1/2 1/12 83/24 85/22 89/14 107/5 |


| C | 127/15 128/1 | 110/12 155/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMMITTEE... | 131/13 132/24 | comparable [1] |
| [10] 140/6 143/10 | 136/3 144/1 | 52/6 |
| 143/13 145/11 | 158/21 159/2 159/5 | compare [1] 161/2 |
| 146/17 147/17 | 159/10 | comparison [3] |
| 158/17 161/1 162/9 | community [58] | 68/4 104/7 151/22 |
| 165/4 | 6/16 6/24 7/3 32/24 | compilation [1] |
| Committee's [2] | 33/8 33/14 33/20 | 147/14 |
| 126/4 160/18 | 34/14 35/3 35/9 | compile [1] 51/22 |
| common [2] 38/4 | 35/14 46/14 46/15 | compiled [3] 31/2 |
| 53/3 | 62/15 67/23 68/3 | 126/6 158/10 |
| commonly [1] | 68/7 68/8 68/16 | complaint [1] 26/15 |
| 145/10 | 71/13 77/21 82/11 | complete [4] 18/9 |
| communicat | 83/10 83/17 85/1 | 119/2 163/12 |
| 33/12 | 86/12 86/22 87/10 | 168/12 |
| communication [7] | 87/12 90/3 92/4 | completed [5] |
| 33/15 98/14 105/1 | 95/14 95/24 97/7 | 61/24 89/7 105/11 |
| 106/4 106/5 106/11 | 105/14 107/14 | 130/22 147/18 |
| 106/23 | 112/12 115/20 | completely [2] |
| communications [1] | 116/23 117/1 117/2 | 107/15 166/14 |
| 103/3 | 117/4 117/11 | complicated [1] |
| communities [38] | 117/23 118/6 | 42/23 |
| 6/14 8/1 32/19 | 118/14 118/18 | complying [1] 25/7 |
| 32/21 33/9 33/18 | 118/19 119/13 | components [2] |
| 45/20 58/20 59/1 | 122/11 123/13 | 48/19 48/24 |
| 61/20 63/10 65/12 | 124/17 125/5 136/8 | concentration [1] |
| 68/24 71/19 84/14 | 142/24 143/1 | 97/8 |
| 85/24 115/4 116/22 | 159/12 171/9 | concern [16] 26/19 |
| 117/8 117/9 118/8 | companies [1] | 33/23 52/22 78/7 |
| 118/8 118/11 119/5 | 100/15 | 79/2 82/7 90/10 |
| 119/10 119/11 | company [6] 1/9 | 90/13 90/13 102/5 |
| 124/19 126/23 | 94/22 101/5 103/18 | 115/2 115/3 132/9 |


| C | 128/11 130/22 | connect [1] 86/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| concern... [3] 166/5 | 164 | Connecticut [1] |
| 166/14 167/18 | conclusions [5] | 46/20 |
| concerned [2] | 31/2 66/5 67/10 | connecting [1] |
| 157/14 157/15 | Concord [14] 1/4 | conservation [2] |
| concerning [5] | 55/20 87/16 94/23 | 31/12 126/10 |
| 114/16 116/8 | 95/8 95/11 95/16 | consider [29] 50/11 |
| 125/21 | 100/19 101/8 104/7 | 53/24 59/9 68/4 |
| concerns [35] 3/15 | 104/9 122/18 | 74/15 79/12 80/5 |
| 28/12 52/14 78/9 | 131/16 131/19 | 80/7 80/10 80/15 |
| 79/20 84/3 88/4 | Concord's [1] | 83/8 84/2 84/10 |
| 90/2 90/5 90/15 | 158/5 | 89/14 92/18 129/2 |
| 90/20 92/15 92/24 | concrete [1] 155/6 | 130/4 130/6 130/7 |
| 95/4 97/2 105/4 | condition [7] 29/3 | 135/10 140/9 |
| 115/7 115/8 115/10 | 34/10 34/17 34/20 | 140/14 140/19 |
| 115/17 115/19 | 35/2 109/3 147/5 | 141/6 142/8 142/1 |
| 115/23 126/21 | conditional [1] | 143/10 143/13 |
| 126/22 134/18 | 125/8 | 167/7 |
| 155/17 156/15 | conditions [4] 25/7 | considerable [4] |
| 157/6 165/21 | 37/6 37/10 173/8 | 18/2 19/3 75/19 |
| 166/17 167/11 | conduct [1] 156/8 conducted [4] 8/4 | consideration [1 |
| 169/2 169/7 171/7 | conducted [4] 8/4 86/8 101/4 103/17 | $9 / 12 \text { 25/4 33/22 }$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 171 / 14 \\ & \text { concert [2] 9/18 } \end{aligned}$ | conducting [2] | 46/2 46/5 50/5 |
| 82/15 | 74/10 102/10 | 51/14 65/8 82/2 |
| concluded [1] 91/5 | conductors [1] | 86/3 87/10 87/14 |
| concludes [1] 172/7 | 56/21 | 87/23 107/12 126/5 |
| conclusion [12] 6/4 | conference [1] | 136/6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6/13 } 15 / 231 / 20 \\ & 32 / 832 / 1078 / 13 \\ & 88 / 22 ~ 114 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | 101/4 confidence [1] 54/1 confident [1] 98/2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { considerations [2] } \\ & \mathbf{3 2 / 1 6 ~ 4 9 / 2 0} \\ & \text { considered [23] } \end{aligned}$ |


| C | 15/5 15/13 15/14 | 102/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| considered... [23] | 15/22 17/17 17/20 | consumers [ |
| 34/17 42/21 59/22 | 18/4 18/4 18/6 | 157/7 |
| 66/6 73/3 75/6 | 18/17 18/20 18/22 | contacted [1] 153/4 |
| 75/11 76/3 76/22 | 19/1 19/3 19/18 | contacts [1] 147/14 |
| 78/21 80/12 81/1 | 21/2 21/16 21/21 | contained [1] |
| 88/24 97/2 114/24 | 22/4 22/16 22/22 | 165/18 |
| 121/1 127/3 127/9 | 23/5 27/2 27/7 27/8 | contains [1] 121/15 |
| 129/3 130/20 136/7 | 27/9 28/9 28/18 | Contents [1] 6/10 |
| 140/16 166/23 | 29/15 29/16 30/5 | context [3] 76/3 |
| considering [10] | 30/9 30/17 30/24 | 144/13 164/15 |
| 45/21 57/19 66/24 | 31/23 34/12 40/7 | continue [7] 33/16 |
| 68/13 85/23 85/24 | 40/21 42/7 43/21 | 35/15 53/21 71/4 |
| 92/14 98/11 143/10 | 43/21 44/17 51/4 | 76/1 95/21 130/21 |
| 143/15 | 52/13 54/9 54/13 | continued [5] 7/9 |
| consistent [10] | 55/8 56/18 57/15 | 15/3 129/11 129/21 |
| 25/22 31/13 35/24 | 69/10 69/11 69/14 | 130/15 |
| 77/20 121/17 | 79/3 79/4 79/6 | continues [1] 172/8 |
| 121/22 122/24 | 79/10 79/15 79/16 | continuing [1] |
| 127/2 143/16 147/7 | 79/18 81/10 81/12 | 75/24 |
| consistently [1] | 81/17 87/13 93/11 | continuous [2] |
| 88/23 | 96/9 98/19 99/6 | 86/16 86/19 |
| consternation [1] | 99/9 104/12 104/20 | Contoocook [1] |
| 20/10 | 106/8 109/17 | 122/22 |
| construct [2] | 109/22 130/17 | contractor [3] 55/3 |
| 133/24 168/20 | 137/3 155/9 155/21 | 55/13 55/15 |
| constructed [6] 7/8 | 157/10 170/7 171/8 | contractors [1] |
| 50/18 55/6 72/19 | consult [1] 108/17 | 26/12 |
| 87/4 131/13 | consultant [4] 23/9 | contrary [1] 115/11 |
| constructing [1] | 97/11 152/18 166/9 | contribution [1] |
| $152 / 21$ | consultants [4] 26/4 26/5 26/11 | 117/16 <br> control [10] 20/5 |


| C | 14/11 25/17 36/3 | 129/16 129/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| control... [9] 21/7 | 38/12 43/22 44/21 | 130/15 130/20 |
| 21/13 24/22 26/5 | 45/2 45/3 45/11 | 131/23 132/5 |
| 82/14 100/8 166/19 | 45/15 47/4 51/10 | 132/16 132/19 |
| 167/4 171/5 | 51/13 51/20 53/19 | 133/5 133/23 |
| controlled [2] | 56/10 56/16 57/4 | 134/21 134/24 |
| 26/24 157/17 | 64/11 64/20 81/3 | 135/19 142/22 |
| controlling [1] 98/8 | 94/2 105/9 110/4 | 143/2 143/21 |
| conversation [2] | 110/14 123/7 124/4 | 161/23 162/15 |
| 108/23 137/21 | 124/9 128/16 | 170/11 |
| conversations [1] | 136/23 141/19 | corridors [4] 71/8 |
| 108/20 | 142/12 155/12 | 72/20 88/23 164/6 |
| converter [1] 68/22 | 157/24 158/8 | cost [26] 38/13 |
| convey [1] 96/12 | 158/15 159/8 159/9 | 38/13 38/21 38/22 |
| cooperate [1] 35/10 | 161/11 163/17 | 39/7 40/20 40/21 |
| cooperation [1] | 163/18 163/24 | 41/4 42/3 42/3 |
| 129/18 | 164/1 164/7 165/6 | 44/17 49/7 49/8 |
| cooperatively [1] | corrected [2] 26/17 | 49/12 49/16 49/22 |
| 160/16 | 141/19 | 49/24 53/17 53/17 |
| coordinate [7] | correcting [1] | 57/1 57/3 57/14 |
| 20/20 31/21 33/14 | 60/24 | 58/1 58/2 58/19 |
| 35/10 54/4 152/17 | correctly [1] 121/8 | 105/20 |
| 155/20 | corridor [46] 11/19 | cost-effective [2] |
| coordinating [4] | 14/24 59/6 68/15 | 49/16 57/1 |
| 15/6 15/11 152/1 | 70/18 71/1 71/3 | cost-effectiveness |
| 152/8 | 71/5 71/7 71/11 | [1] 49/12 |
| coordination [6] | 71/14 71/15 71/18 | cost-efficient [1] |
| 24/14 24/19 32/13 | 71/21 72/7 73/8 | 49/22 |
| 35/5 46/2 106/24 | 85/2 86/17 86/20 | costing [1] 58/12 |
| copies [1] 110/5 | 88/16 89/4 89/6 | costs [13] 38/5 |
| copy [1] 47/20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89/8 111/21 111/21 } \\ & 123 / 24 ~ 128 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 / 15 \text { 44/16 44/17 } \\ & 58 / 459 / 2068 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |


| C | 61/11 67/13 173/11 | 96/23 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| costs... [6] 69/7 | 17 | 165 |
| 69/18 146/11 | Country [6] 11/14 | creating [1] 13 |
| 146/19 146/23 | 11/18 112/4 164/23 | creation [1] 115/6 |
| 147/1 | 165/12 166/15 | credible [1] 116/3 |
| could [45] 5/3 | couple [9] 55/21 | crews [5] 18/11 |
| 11/24 14/6 20/18 | 62/4 99/13 103/4 | 18/12 18/13 18/17 |
| 24/5 24/17 26/23 | 104/6 109/10 128/1 | 18/19 |
| 28/9 38/16 43/2 | 142/1 153/13 | criteria [1] 5/4 |
| 60/13 64/19 68/ | course [10] 7/21 | criticized [1] 158/4 |
| 72/5 82/3 88/16 | 78/1 82/13 102/1 | cross [4] 12/5 73/7 |
| 91/9 93/24 96/13 | 110/4 124/24 131/7 | 73/16 143/23 |
| 98/4 98/21 98/23 | 140/20 164/4 166/1 | cross-examinat |
| 103/1 103/22 | COURT[5] 1/24 | [1] 73/7 |
| 104/10 104/13 | 6/18 74/22 173/4 | crosses [1] |
| 106/17 106/18 | 173/18 | crossing [17] 12/8 |
| 106/22 106/24 | cover [6] 36/8 43/9 | 12/8 12/9 12/15 |
| 107/19 108/15 | 68/20 69/7 77/18 | 12/17 12/22 14/6 |
| 108/16 118/12 | 172/9 | 14/10 30/19 50/13 |
| 125/4 128/2 134/11 | covered [5] 69/18 | 54/18 57/21 108/7 |
| 134/21 139/22 | 69/19 90/23 117/4 | 166/6 166/9 169 |
| 147/5 152/19 | 148/6 | 169/17 |
| 1216 | covers [1] 12/12 | crossings [10] |
| 170/21 | cracks [2] 24/15 | 11/24 12/2 13/2 |
| couldn't [3] 11/10 | 24/21 | 13/2 14/3 52/7 54/3 |
| 49/23 138/2 | Craig | 73/9 137/4 163/10 |
| council [10] 9/5 | cranes [6] 56/5 | crystal [1] 54/11 |
| 11/15 11/19 13/12 | 56/14 56/15 56/19 | cultural [2] 11/12 |
| 13/12 112/4 164/23 | 56/23 56/24 | 14/19 |
| 165/1 165/12 | create [3] 10/20 | culvert [2] |
| 166/15 | 23/9 71/17 | 169/17 |
| counsel [6] 1/20 2/5 | created [5] 8/14 9/3 | culverts [3] 32/14 |


| C | 13/18 | 145/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| culverts... [2] 54/20 | dead [1] 102/20 | deliveries [3] 98/5 |
| 54/21 | deal [5] 25/2 28/15 | 98/6 156/19 |
| curious [1] 73/2 | 33/13 35/4 92/3 | demands [2] 67/19 |
| current [6] 32/1 | dealing [1] 4/17 | 68/17 |
| 43/9 62/11 62/12 | decide [4] 24/1 | deny [1] 13/14 |
| 63/14 64/7 | 34/15 84/10 86/7 | Department [8] |
| currently [4] 43/12 | decision [7] 60/8 | 4/14 66/2 80/9 |
| 71/23 132/12 | 66/23 143/19 | 145/17 146/4 146/7 |
| 132/13 | 145/19 160/18 | 146/18 167/2 |
| customer [1] 95/20 | 161/11 165/19 | depend [2] 66/13 |
| cut [1] 134/6 | decisions [3] 29/8 | 114/5 |
| D |  |  |
| d/b/a [1] 1/9 | [1] 78/2 | depends [1] 103/8 |
| data [1] 94/5 | decrease [1] 19/19 | Dept [3] 1/15 1/15 |
| database [1] 147/ | deep [2] 50/19 | 1/16 |
| date [3] 92/6 | 54/24 | DES [5] 54/17 |
| 127/19 173/7 | Deerfield [8] 62/5 | 54/18 74/9 74/11 |
| dated [1] 3/13 | 68/23 87/15 170/16 | 141/16 |
| Dawn [1] 154/20 | 170/16 170/17 | described [4] 7/20 |
| day [15] 1/3 4/3 | 171/8 171/18 | 20/6 73/7 124/16 |
| 33/1 33/22 98/5 | define [3] 111/23 | description [5] 7/22 |
| 101/3 105/6 105/7 | 116/23 118/6 | 73/5 84/12 119/12 |
| 106/6 147/9 147/11 | defining [1] 114/21 | 163/13 |
| 155/15 155/16 | definition [1] 36/24 | design [16] 41/20 |
| 172/7 172/10 | definitive [2] 31/16 | 44/10 47/13 49/12 |
| days [1] 110/10 | 31/20 | 49/14 49/15 49/22 |
| de [2] 13/16 13/18 | degree [1] 66/19 | 51/11 51/15 53/18 |
| de-designate [1] | delegate [2] 145/17 | 53/22 56/8 58/11 |
| 13/16 | 146/17 | 58/24 60/8 161/16 |
| de-designated [1] | delegation [1] | designate [1] 13/16 |

## D

designated [3] 12/6 13/18 14/9
designation [4] 11/13 12/24 13/15 75/12
designations [3] 11/16 13/7 13/10 designed [1] 44/10 Designee [3] 1/15 1/15 1/16
designer [2] 49/1 49/10
designs [2] 49/1 49/7
desire [1] 82/10 despite [1] 87/4 destination [1] 109/1
detail [5] 8/1 17/23 30/14 62/16 90/19 detailed [7] 7/22 84/12 88/3 119/11 158/10 158/14 158/17
details [2] 25/9
33/10
determination [1] 13/21
determine [2] 10/1 149/17
determined [2]

37/11 112/17 determining [1] 89/11
detour [1] 168/10 detours [1] 168/23 develop [4] 26/5 65/4 71/4 102/5 developed [5] 26/3 87/12 100/24 112/15 137/2 developer [1] 138/7 developing [1] 82/13
development [50] 4/17 6/2 7/15 8/23 9/6 9/10 25/4 42/2 64/14 68/5 71/2
71/7 72/6 72/6
72/16 77/7 77/10
77/16 77/18 79/12
81/8 81/21 85/8
85/13 87/22 89/13
89/21 92/14 112/18
113/8 114/8 114/16
123/9 123/12
126/24 127/4 132/1
133/13 135/17
135/18 136/1 136/2
136/11 137/9
137/11 137/14
138/8 141/11
142/12 148/23
developments [1] 85/11
deviations [1] 80/15
DeWan [1] 76/3
DeWan's [2] 74/19
75/1
dialogue [2] 58/22 60/3
Diamond [1]
162/23
did [53] 4/20 4/21
5/16 6/24 7/3 16/4 18/15 39/10 40/18 50/10 50/11 51/16 61/16 62/5 62/10
64/8 64/16 67/12
67/15 70/5 73/5
74/15 77/4 77/12
78/10 92/19 100/19
111/23 112/13
112/19 112/20
114/19 115/15
116/15 116/23
117/14 118/18
122/6 125/6 126/16 126/19 129/1 130/6 130/6 135/16 136/4 140/19 145/1 163/2 164/11 164/14 164/18 168/15
didn't [21] 5/16

| D | directed [1] 10/4 | 146/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| didn't... [20] 8/11 | direction [3] 17/7 | dismiss [2] 92/21 |
| 12/16 19/22 23/8 | 28/3 166/22 | 98/16 |
| 62/9 71/20 81/7 | directional [2] | dismissal [1] 93/13 |
| 93/9 111/14 111/15 | 46/21 80/20 | dismissing [1] |
| 111/16 115/20 | directive [1] 75/13 | 93/16 |
| 121/19 140/17 | directly [3] 56/3 | display [1] 157/15 |
| 145/1 159/16 | 122/6 126/9 | disruption [7] 30/7 |
| 159/22 165/2 | dirty [1] 157/16 | 81/16 81/17 97/22 |
| 166/13 167/7 | disagree [5] 66/10 | 97/23 105/5 107/19 |
| difference [3] 14/4 | 96/8 131/11 146/21 | distance [10] 17/24 |
| 14/8 104/23 | 164/19 | 19/10 19/13 22/8 |
| different [19] 11/22 | disappointed [1] | 29/10 75/19 117/6 |
| 30/3 42/17 49/2 | 50/11 | 159/6 159/7 170/7 |
| 49/3 49/7 49/8 | discounting [1] | distances [2] 22/5 |
| 79/22 104/8 105/9 | 92/1 | 28/23 |
| 107/15 125/16 | discovery [3] | distribution [4] |
| 135/3 135/11 | 119/16 119/22 | 41/1 85/10 85/17 |
| 135/20 152/22 | 158/15 | 137/24 |
| 161/4 162/19 165/5 | discuss [1] 102/4 | District [1] 105/18 |
| differentiate [1] | discussed [7] 22/7 | disturbed [5] |
| 124/11 | 61/12 103/19 | 142/23 161/18 |
| difficult [3] 9/24 | 139/18 148/12 | 161/22 162/13 |
| 55/1 135/21 | 163/9 165/16 | 162/15 |
| difficulties [1] | discussing [2] 33/9 | divided [1] 39/17 |
| 146/6 | 50/13 | do [122] 5/11 5/13 |
| difficulty [1] 94/7 | discussion [4] | 5/14 5/14 9/17 9/22 |
| diminished [1] | 61/14 135/15 | 15/10 18/10 18/12 |
| 131/4 | 150/17 151/3 | 18/12 18/13 20/12 |
| dining [1] 104/14 | discussions [8] 18/7 | 23/6 23/10 24/18 |
| Dir [2] 1/15 2/10 | 53/21 57/18 61/8 | 24/19 33/13 34/6 |
| direct [1] 157/23 | 75/9 86/14 103/20 | 34/8 36/10 36/19 |


| D | 150/13 150/15 | 141/10 143/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| do... [101] 37/22 | 150/21 152/2 | 147/21 149/23 |
| 38/20 38/21 39/7 | 152/12 153/1 | 150/7 |
| 39/10 43/5 45/10 | 153/15 153/20 | doesn't [11] 20/1 |
| 47/23 48/2 49/11 | 155/15 156/17 | 35/7 35/8 54/11 |
| 50/17 51/7 55/17 | 158/5 158/21 | 71/23 83/9 106/12 |
| 56/1 56/13 58/11 | 160/21 161/2 | 106/15 131/24 |
| 58/18 60/1 60/16 | 162/24 166/23 | 135/16 160/3 |
| 65/20 67/20 72/3 | 167/6 167/21 169/1 | doing [6] 27/16 |
| 72/4 74/1 75/9 | 170/3 170/17 173/4 | 84/6 96/6 105/22 |
| 77/17 79/11 79/18 | docket [4] 1/7 25/9 | 107/24 157/9 |
| 80/19 82/5 83/1 | 78/6 133/2 | dollar [1] 40/22 |
| 83/9 83/18 84/17 | document [5] 63/11 | dollars [3] 10/13 |
| 84/17 84/21 84/22 | 83/12 101/2 171/2 | 40/19 45/11 |
| 86/4 89/22 90/4 | 171/11 | don't [64] 9/8 9/24 |
| 100/13 100/18 | documented [1] | 12/1 19/6 19/8 |
| 101/19 103/3 103/7 | 99/4 | 25/15 27/12 27/14 |
| 104/14 104/15 | documents [5] 9/20 | 28/5 28/5 28/14 |
| 104/15 106/16 | 143/9 143/12 145/9 | 33/11 38/1 40/2 |
| 108/20 109/20 | 158/11 | 41/12 42/8 42/15 |
| 111/5 111/5 116/10 | DOE [3] 78/6 80/2 | 43/4 44/11 47/2 |
| 116/21 118/8 119/4 | 92/9 | 47/17 48/21 49/1 |
| 121/7 121/8 121/22 | does [31] 9/17 12/2 | 49/13 55/7 55/10 |
| 122/1 125/22 | 31/24 35/5 35/11 | 55/15 56/23 57/2 |
| 126/16 127/10 | 35/11 37/11 38/23 | 57/16 59/13 69/5 |
| 127/20 129/8 | 39/11 42/18 43/22 | 70/11 70/11 73/17 |
| 132/19 135/17 | 49/16 50/19 54/12 | 75/12 76/8 82/23 |
| 137/21 139/19 | 60/14 66/11 67/3 | 83/8 83/19 87/15 |
| 139/19 141/17 | 73/16 107/23 | 89/2 92/16 92/18 |
| 141/23 143/9 145/2 | 132/12 133/6 133/8 | 106/3 106/11 |
| 146/16 147/18 | 133/20 134/24 | 106/23 108/22 |
| 148/24 149/16 | 135/1 139/24 | 110/23 119/15 |


| D | 107/10 109/18 | draw [1] 38/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| don't... [14] 129/4 | 146/23 167/6 | drew [1] 146/3 |
| 129/20 130/3 | 167/11 168/4 | drill [2] 51/5 80/20 |
| 132/13 135/21 | DOT's [2] 24/12 | drilling [6] 18/13 |
| 140/20 144/12 | 59/15 | 27/3 46/19 46/22 |
| 146/21 147/13 | dots [1] 16/24 | 47/7 50/24 |
| 147/20 148/2 148/9 | down [22] 12/14 | drives [1] 156/8 |
| 148/11 165/16 | 16/14 16/18 17/5 | driveway [3] 134/8 |
| done [17] 8/19 | 17/16 20/2 20/14 | 134/11 134/13 |
| 11/14 11/16 30/20 | 26/15 31/18 66/19 | drop [1] 45/17 |
| 44/13 45/1 48/12 | 67/4 70/3 83/17 | dropping [1] 156/3 |
| 62/13 90/2 94/3 | 99/14 100/14 | due [6] 53/18 60/13 |
| 100/20 104/22 | 111/21 112/9 | 68/11 106/4 135/22 |
| 114/18 118/21 | 112/11 127/18 | 149/4 |
| 128/9 149/16 155/8 | 131/4 132/4 132/19 | dug [1] 35/3 |
| Donovan [1] 1/4 | downtown [11] | Dummer [1] |
| DOT [52] 3/19 | 17/5 22/13 42/11 | 120/16 |
| 13/11 13/21 14/18 | 94/23 95/7 95/9 | duration [2] 30/9 |
| 20/20 20/22 21/10 | 95/16 96/14 104/18 | 108/18 |
| 21/10 22/20 $23 / 7$ | 105/12 105/16 | during [19] 18/4 |
| 23/8 23/15 24/11 | downtowns [1] | 19/18 21/1 23/5 |
| 24/19 24/24 25/6 | 105/8 | 27/7 62/19 69/10 |
| 25/7 25/14 25/18 | dozen [1] 52/15 | 73/20 79/2 79/15 |
| 26/7 26/7 26/13 | dozens [1] 124/23 | 81/9 88/13 95/8 |
| 38/10 41/7 41/21 | Dr [1] 149/7 | 99/8 119/7 130/16 |
| 43/22 45/7 46/3 | Dr. [1] 66/7 | 155/8 157/9 164/4 |
| 50/3 50/7 53/22 | Dr. Shapiro [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dust [3] 98/8 } \\ & \mathbf{1 5 7 / 1 4} 157 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 54/2 54/15 55/5 |  | 157/14 157/17 |
| 55/23 56/1 57/19 | draft [8] 64/4 64/5 | E |
| 58/3 58/21 58/22 59/22 60/3 60/8 60/19 61/6 74/9 | 101/19 118/9 143/18 | $\begin{array}{lll} \hline \text { each }[35] & 5 / 19 & 5 / 24 \\ 6 / 3 & 6 / 24 & 7 / 5 \\ 7 / 11 \\ 8 / 18 / 11 & 18 / 9 & 18 / 15 \end{array}$ |


| $\mathbf{E}$ | 77/23 79/1 88/20 | 33/16 95/5 95/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| each... [25] 36/14 | 91/2 135/23 | 99/5 118/2 121/8 |
| 44/4 44/5 44/20 | edge [3] 98/21 | \| 151/16 152/11 |
| 62/14 62/15 84/12 | 134/7 134/13 <br> education [1] 68/8 | eight [4] 9/3 9/4 9/4 <br> 146/14 |
| 92/4 106/6 106/7 | education [1] 68/8 <br> effect [25] 5/10 | EIS [2] 78/6 80/2 |
| 112/14 112/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{effect}[25] 5 / 10 \\ & 5 / 125 / 1531 / 832 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | EIS [2] 78/6 80/2 <br> either [11] 13/14 |
| 112/19 113/4 113/4 116/14 118/18 | 32/7 32/9 73/17 | either [11] 13/14 |
| 116/14 118/18 119/12 121/4 12 | 79/9 88/15 90/17 | 47/3 70/15 71/6 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 2 & 121 / 4 \\ & 121 / 2 \end{array}$ | 91/6 99/16 108/18 | 72/4 84/23 105/16 |
| 124/17 127/16 | 114/1 114/2 114/5 | 125/7 |
| 166/21 | 114/6 116/4 116/5 | election [1] 9/3 |
| eager [1] 102/3 | 128/23 129/20 | electric [6] 88/1 |
| earlier [4] 21/5 | 133/14 133/21 | 122/6 135/2 138/3 |
| 106/15 165/17 | 138/22 | 152/21 160/12 |
| 170/6 | effective [2] 49/16 57/1 | Electronically [1] |
| easement [8] 37/4 | effectiveness [1] | eligible [1] 10/3 |
| 37/13 37/14 37/23 | 49/12 | eliminated [2] |
| 37/24 38/1 72/14 | effects [11] 33/3 | 13/18 120/20 |
| 129/5 | 33/20 71/9 82/10 | ELMO [1] 169/9 |
| Easton [5] 14/15 | 82/11 82/17 90/14 | else [6] 32/6 38/9 |
| 16/17 52/15 144/6 | 90/14 93/11 112/17 | 58/6 149/23 150/8 |
| 165/23 | 112/18 | 172/2 |
| Easton/Sugar [1] 165/23 | efficacy [1] 149/18 <br> efficient [1] 49/22 | elsewhere [1] 143/1 <br> emergency [3] |
| easy [1] 108/1 | efficiently [1] 71/9 | 30/10 68/20 69/1 |
| economic [2] 1/16 | effort [8] 63/4 65/9 | emissions [1] 118/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 136 / 10 \\ & \text { economist [1] } 91 / 3 \\ & \text { economy [10] } 5 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 94/17 95/2 102/15 } \\ & \text { 104/16 107/6 } \\ & \text { 152/16 } \\ & \text { efforts [9] 20/21 } \end{aligned}$ | employed [2] <br> 173/11 173/14 <br> employee [1] <br> 173/13 |

$\qquad$
employees [1] 96/17
employment [3]
5/22 77/24 78/24 enabled [1] 86/20 enacted [1] 43/11 end [3] 6/6 104/17 105/6
energy [10] $1 / 10$ 9/14 9/15 9/16 9/17 68/1 115/6 117/24 118/1 125/2
engage [4] 94/20 95/2 97/19 102/4 engaged [6] 95/23 97/10 101/9 103/6 105/14 155/2
engaging [1]
105/23
engineer [1] 39/11 engineering [4] 41/20 44/16 132/17 152/18
engineers [2] 54/5 57/18
England [1] 94/4 enjoy [2] 100/10 131/1
enjoyment [5] 76/2 90/23 130/7 131/2 163/20
enough [3] 56/15
126/3 126/6
ensued [2] 150/18 151/4
ensure [10] 21/14
23/24 25/6 31/22
32/7 54/7 82/18 102/16 108/19 157/7
ensuring [2] 32/5 156/23
entail [1] 44/9
entire [12] 12/13
12/17 14/2 17/18
29/15 63/5 67/4
69/13 89/23 91/24
112/14 114/23
Environ [1] 1/15
environment [3]
23/3 24/1 71/10
Environmental [2]
66/2 80/10
envision [1] 106/17 equal [5] 8/14 39/14 39/16 97/3 $97 / 4$
equally [1] 7/4 equate [1] 167/24 especially [3] 78/23 97/7 171/19
Esq [1] 1/20
establishments [1]

157/22
estimate [1] 45/2 estimated [1] 44/15 etcetera [4] 4/18 31/6 110/3 162/23 evaluate [2] 7/17 89/10
evaluated [1] 90/21 evaluating [1] 7/11 EVALUATION [8] 1/2 1/12 83/24
85/22 140/6 143/9 146/17 160/17 even [13] 46/15 50/20 63/16 68/10 70/13 87/18 91/11 93/17 98/20 100/20 100/21 106/13
131/12
events [5] 32/23
33/22 170/15 171/9
171/18
eventually [3]
21/10 26/7 42/2
ever [7] 19/9 27/5
93/24 118/21 145/7 149/23 159/18
Eversource [16]
1/9 94/14 95/23
102/10 103/2 110/4
110/17 110/20
111/3 111/4 111/16

| E | example [28] 10/3 | 83/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eversource... [5] | 13/16 20/22 50/2 | exhibit [17] 3/3 |
| 126/9 134/9 134/11 | 65/3 66/17 68/5 | 61/12 138/9 151/10 |
| 134/15 149/11 | 80/18 85/5 93/8 | 153/8 154/17 |
| every [18] 18/21 | 95/1 109/3 115/14 | 154/18 158/8 |
| 43/16 45/14 46/13 | 115/18 116/10 | 158/18 158/24 |
| 46/14 54/1 59/13 | 120/15 124/2 | 159/11 160/23 |
| 86/13 102/24 106/6 | 130/18 131/15 | 161/5 165/9 168/3 |
| 106/7 117/1 118/14 | 132/22 134/5 | 169/12 170/24 |
| 118/18 121/10 | 134/16 134/17 | Exhibit 208 [1] |
| 123/9 163/13 | 138/6 155/11 | 170/24 |
| 166/14 | 155/19 163/7 | exhibits [2] 116/19 |
| everybody [3] | 171/22 | 119/7 |
| 39/11 39/12 169/10 | examples [4] 32/22 | exist [8] 16/2 50/20 |
| everyone [5] 4/3 | 122/23 135/4 155/7 | 61/4 71/23 112/1 |
| 59/9 106/1 106/1 | Excellent [2] 44/2 | 117/22 139/22 |
| 111/11 | 44/4 | 140/3 |
| everything [5] 18/3 | except [2] 34/14 | existed [3] 144/11 |
| 27/23 39/14 148/5 | 168/21 | 162/18 163/7 |
| 166/16 | exception [3] 113/1 | existence [5] 7/10 |
| evidences [1] | 125/9 145/21 | 9/10 42/20 74/15 |
| 171/12 | exceptions [1] | 87/7 |
| exact [3] 5/9 19/12 | 36/10 | existing [45] 12/4 |
| 22/5 | excerpt [2] 11/18 | 15/1 15/18 29/3 |
| exactly [8] 51/12 | 17/22 | 32/16 43/1 47/8 |
| 81/1 82/23 92/17 | excess [1] 29/1 | 59/5 63/6 68/14 |
| 109/19 110/23 | exclude [1] 9/12 | 69/24 70/2 70/8 |
| 127/23 138/2 | excuse [1] 96/10 | 70/12 71/15 71/21 |
| examination [3] | executed [1] 127/19 | 72/10 72/13 72/19 |
| 2/15 73/7 151/5 | executive [1] 9/5 | 77/20 88/23 89/3 |
| examine [2] 90/5 | exercise [1] 21/11 | 105/19 107/11 |
| 90/18 | exercising [2] 19/7 | 123/24 125/18 |



| F | 123/23 124/18 | finalizing [1] 78/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fair... [4] 126/3 | 149/9 | financially [1] |
| 126/6 168/1 170/17 | feet [21] 19/16 | 173/14 |
| fall [3] 29/16 67/4 | 19/21 20/3 20/8 | find [3] 66/10 86/5 |
| 126/23 | 20/8 20/9 22/7 | 169/1 |
| falling [2] 24/15 | 26/23 27/8 39/22 | finding [2] 78/1 |
| 24/20 | 40/17 40/18 55/24 | 89/11 |
| familiar [2] 74/8 | 75/18 81/6 124/6 | findings [5] 66/7 |
| 159/21 | 125/4 125/4 132/16 | 66/11 66/12 87/4 |
| far [7] 4/15 7/24 | 133/6 133/20 | 113/19 |
| 28/24 119/21 | felt [2] 45/21 67/8 | fine [1] 101/2 |
| 133/13 154/17 | Festival [2] 171/20 | fine-tuned [1] |
| 155/1 | 171/20 | 101/2 |
| farming [1] 128/20 | few [7] 20/16 20/18 | fire [2] 68/9 68/20 |
| Farrington [2] 18/5 | 39/4 54/4 68/16 | first [12] 4/20 8/22 |
| 20/6 | 111/10 149/5 | 20/19 30/11 31/4 |
| farthest [1] 17/15 | field [1] 90/24 | 36/7 41/18 43/19 |
| fashion [1] 147/6 | fields [3] 136/15 | 49/11 67/16 71/20 |
| fast [2] 150/22 | 136/16 136/17 | 142/5 |
| 150/23 | figure [3] 13/3 | firsthand [1] 49/5 |
| feasible [1] 162/3 | 27/18 92/16 | fish [7] 73/19 73/23 |
| federal [9] 8/5 10/1 | figured [1] 115/19 | 74/1 75/10 75/12 |
| 10/12 10/22 10/23 | filed [3] 1/6 67/12 | 75/24 75/24 |
| 36/14 36/15 45/8 | 67/16 | fishermen [2] 73/18 |
| 80/4 | filing [1] 120/10 | 75/23 |
| federally [1] 10/2 | Fillmore [2] 165/9 | five [9] 5/10 41/6 |
| fee [4] 37/4 37/13 | 167/15 | 52/16 127/13 |
| 37/14 37/23 | final [12] 13/21 | 127/19 132/18 |
| feel [11] 70/11 98/1 | 47/13 51/15 53/22 | 133/3 151/9 168/10 |
| 100/11 103/3 | 56/8 57/21 58/24 | five-week [1] |
| 113/19 118/9 | 60/7 60/8 113/7 | 168/10 |
| 121/22 122/23 | 114/3 145/18 | flagged [1] 29/13 |

flaggers [1] 29/18 flagging [1] 29/8 flip [1] 154/21 focus [4] 99/5
142/15 145/11
165/15
focused [6] 76/21
77/1 142/15 142/17 154/9 154/11
Focusing [1] 73/22 follow [11] 24/2
28/21 30/3 34/3
70/5 91/10 97/14
100/16 109/11
137/19 142/3
follow-up [5] 30/3 34/3 97/14 100/16 109/11
following [1] 88/22 follows [2] 16/16 21/4
foot [7] 18/22 28/23 39/8 39/18 40/19 124/7 133/14
force [1] 43/4
foregoing [1] 173/4 foresee [1] 60/4 foreseen [1] 125/23
forest [20] 6/16
6/21 30/21 31/4
31/6 80/6 80/9
108/16 143/18
143/19 143/20
143/24 144/2 144/4
144/18 144/21
145/5 161/13
165/24 166/12
forestry [1] 74/16
form [4] 47/19
67/24 106/16 136/8
former [1] 141/15
forms [4] 68/4 90/6
94/16 129/9
forth [1] 173/7
Fortier [1] 3/12
Fortunately [1] 94/13
forward [3] 46/3
54/1 54/7
ForwardNH [1]
60/20
found [9] 5/8 5/24
7/2 7/18 113/24
115/9 117/13
145/10 162/3
foundation [2] 47/3 funds [1] 152/17 49/15
foundations [2]
47/8 48/21
four [8] 19/21 20/9

28/7 112/9 127/13 127/19 132/24 133/1
frame [1] 70/14
Franconia [12]
14/14 16/15 16/17
17/15 52/23 52/24
58/9 80/19 100/4
144/7 153/1 169/20
Franklin [4] 3/10
61/13 68/22 151/13
Frayer [2] 66/8 114/15
frequent [1] 54/15
frequently [3]
30/20 86/17 125/13
friends [1] 39/5
front [5] 41/20 53/3
99/19 103/1 106/5
fugitive [1] 157/14
fully [1] 73/6
functioning [1]
48/4
Fund [1] 60/20
funded [1] 10/2
funding [3] 10/3
45/2 117/22
further [9] 54/10
72/5 72/6 111/18
127/5 137/17
171/24 173/10

| F | generally [7] 79/21 | 91/12 98/23 104/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| further... [1] | 84/20 117/17 120/5 | 108/2 121/3 126/18 |
| 173/12 | 125/19 159/21 | 133/9 137/8 143/5 |
| future [24] 10/3 | 159/22 | 144/8 155/6 156/13 |
| 10/8 32/1 42/3 | get [20] 10/17 10/23 | 162/16 169/9 172/3 |
| 51/11 54/10 54/23 | 27/21 28/8 31/18 | goal [3] 33/2 33/2 |
| 56/6 56/10 57/14 | 40/11 40/12 42/2 | 106/1 |
| 58/1 59/14 59/20 | 45/11 62/9 72/3 | goals [4] 35/24 |
| 59/21 60/4 60/7 | 93/4 96/4 96/12 | 62/17 127/6 144/16 |
| 62/21 65/1 77/23 | 96/17 99/22 100/8 | goes [6] 12/14 28/2 |
| 85/7 88/17 146/15 | 128/4 139/11 | 46/22 46/24 128/13 |
| 146/20 146/22 | 154/15 | 131/4 |
| fuzzy [1] 54/11 | gets [4] 10/23 42/23 | going [82] 4/7 |
| - | 45/7 54/11 | 10/17 16/16 16/21 |
| G | getting [4] 33/15 | 17/16 19/1 19/2 |
| gained [1] 93/15 | 91/19 100/21 | 19/14 20/7 20/10 |
| Game [5] 73/19 | 151/16 | 20/13 20/14 21/23 |
| 73/23 74/2 75/10 | give [8] 19/11 19/15 | 23/11 25/16 25/18 |
| 75/24 | 19/18 19/21 20/9 | 26/1 26/24 27/4 |
| Game's [1] 75/13 | 30/14 103/7 154/18 | 27/19 27/19 27/21 |
| gas [6] 32/16 45/8 | given [7] 15/23 | 27/22 27/23 28/1 |
| 45/8 113/2 160/19 | 18/16 82/2 110/5 | 29/15 29/17 30/2 |
| 162/10 | 121/5 145/2 170/9 | 33/13 39/22 40/9 |
| gases [1] 118/4 | giving [3] 92/24 | 40/10 40/12 41/4 |
| gathered [1] 126/12 | 99/19 99/20 | 41/10 41/15 42/14 |
| gears [1] 72/21 | go [35] 5/6 8/11 | 44/9 44/13 52/3 |
| general [7] 57/23 | 9/18 11/2 11/9 | 52/12 54/7 57/3 |
| 67/14 71/12 78/10 | 14/20 17/11 17/12 | 57/13 58/2 58/10 |
| 154/24 160/24 | 17/23 22/3 27/19 | 58/18 61/7 61/10 |
| 163/2 | 27/22 36/7 39/24 | 61/18 68/21 69/15 |
| generalized [2] | 50/24 51/7 52/4 | 69/16 71/17 81/2 |
| 15/12 15/14 | 52/15 54/10 61/18 | 81/9 82/13 91/20 |


| G | 8/12 45/4 45/12 | 14/6 33/6 35/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| going... [24] 92/20 | 145/10 | 50/15 57/8 57/22 |
| 96/17 96/20 99/15 | Governor [1] 43/16 | 58/15 64/8 66/24 |
| 100/17 102/23 | Grand [1] 166/7 | 113/23 119/23 |
| 102/23 104/12 | granular [1] 154/15 | 144/24 145/2 |
| 108/3 108/7 108/9 | Grass [1] 171/20 | guessing [2] 123/19 |
| 109/17 110/24 | great [4] 90/18 92/3 | 150/13 |
| 113/13 142/3 | 122/23 135/14 | guide [1] 10/7 |
| 145/21 147/16 | greatest [1] 81/22 | H |
| 148/5 151/13 | green [5] 16/13 | H-frame [1] 70/14 |
| 154/23 156/13 | 16/22 27/21 28/2 | had [49] 11/10 |
| 157/1 160/23 | greenhouse [1] | 26/14 26/22 39/20 |
| 169/13 | $118 / 3$ | 39/20 40/14 40/23 |
| gone [1] 121/5 | grin [1] 60/10 | 42/10 47/18 49/2 |
| $\operatorname{good}[23] ~ 4 / 24 / 8$ | $\text { grins }[2] \quad 39 / 19$ | 52/18 53/8 61/8 |
| 4/10 4/11 22/24 | grins [2] $39 / 19$ $40 / 13$ | 63/17 78/22 90/18 |
| 24/7 24/8 34/19 | gripe [1] 41/17 | 101/2 101/16 |
| 40/6 48/11 55/7 | ground [2] 50/19 | 102/12 111/2 |
| 65/16 65/22 65/24 | ground [2] 50/19 | 113/14 113/23 |
| 76/14 76/16 99/20 |  | 115/24 117/9 |
| 100/12 103/21 | group [1] 24/18 <br> groups [2] 23/20 | 120/18 120/20 |
| 109/3 109/7 109/9 | groups [2] 23/20 | 120/21 122/2 |
| 171/22 | 115/5 | 123/20 127/1 |
| Google [3] 3/16 | grow [1] 131/14 | 129/24 134/15 |
| 161/6 161/9 | growth [3] 135/24 | 137/1 137/2 137/3 |
| got [6] 11/9 17/14 |  | 137/6 137/9 145/6 |
| 93/22 103/4 130/2 | $99 / 3 \text { 148/16 148/17 }$ | 147/11 147/15 |
| 133/5 | 148/18 148/19 | 162/3 162/17 |
| governing [5] 36/16 | gubernatorial | 162/22 164/3 |
| 77/3 78/4 84/3 |  | 166/15 167/19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 89 / 16 \\ & \text { government [4] } \end{aligned}$ | guess [15] 9/7 12/1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170/6 171/7 171/16 } \\ & \text { hadn't [1] 59/22 } \end{aligned}$ |

## H

half [7] 17/18 18/21 27/24 100/3 100/9

## 131/4 170/10

Ham [1] 80/20 HAMPSHIRE [35] 1/1 1/4 1/9 8/23 9/9 9/14 9/15 13/11 13/21 14/18 20/20
24/24 26/7 41/21
43/7 47/24 48/16
50/3 53/22 54/2
57/19 59/14 59/15
59/18 60/19 69/13
74/8 74/9 112/6
112/7 118/17
132/24 142/18
160/21 168/4
Hampton [7] 82/20
85/3 85/7 137/22
138/14 139/9
139/11
handle [1] 91/20 handled [1] 23/1 hang [1] 138/16 happen [4] 98/13 106/12 124/1 167/24
happened [4] 23/6 53/8 101/17 108/23 happy [1] 128/3 hard [4] 59/24

88/12 93/23 98/24 harmed [1] 148/8 harmoniously [1] 134/23
has [55] 13/1 14/6 19/11 22/23 26/13 28/14 29/15 37/3 37/14 38/10 38/12 38/18 38/18 42/24 44/12 45/14 46/4 53/4 58/21 65/18 72/16 75/9 80/14 82/4 84/1 84/6
84/15 88/23 90/12
94/19 94/24 95/23
97/11 97/18 100/24
100/24 101/17
101/23 105/14
106/2 108/23
119/20 131/3
133/24 137/19
139/17 147/18
148/6 149/16 155/2 155/3 155/20 156/2 156/6 158/17
have [192]
haven't [8] 32/8
54/14 56/3 56/17
100/20 103/5 121/9
135/9
having [12] 43/3
58/17 92/23 92/23

93/7 97/24 98/7 98/19 100/10 104/19 136/18

## 161/1

HDD [6] 18/13 27/2
39/16 46/19 47/7
50/24
he [19] 74/19 75/1
75/4 82/21 95/6 107/17 115/15
138/10 138/10
138/16 139/2
141/13 146/10
147/11 147/13
147/16 149/18
151/21 162/21
he's [2] 141/8 141/14
head [3] 28/11 39/1 138/12
head-on [1] 28/11 heading [1] 28/10 hear [1] 106/3 heard [18] 12/11 24/16 30/12 33/7 36/9 38/21 38/23 38/24 55/21 56/4 61/5 91/23 103/6 110/19 110/22 140/23 155/3 169/24
hearing [3] 1/11
hearing... [2] 76/10 172/8
hearings [5] 4/4
78/16 90/8 92/11 101/16
heavier [1] 29/24 heels [1] 35/3
height [6] 70/12
70/24 124/5 124/19 125/2 125/5
heights [2] 70/19 124/13
help [7] 10/7 10/14 69/7 95/20 95/23 102/15 134/10
helpful [1] 117/8
helping [1] 71/12 helps [1] 142/24 here [19] 16/9
16/24 19/23 44/15 47/21 51/19 71/16 94/13 96/17 100/17 108/2 116/20 119/7 139/18 159/17
160/7 161/3 169/11 171/19
here's [2] 100/14 100/16
hereby [1] 173/4 herein [1] 37/2 hereinbefore [1]

173/7
Heritage [7] 12/10
12/12 13/1 14/1
14/3 14/13 21/4
Hey [1] 104/11
Hi [1] 104/5
high [3] 58/2 67/9
133/6
high-quality [1] 67/9
higher [3] 55/4
56/20 56/21
highlighting [1] 169/21
highly [4] 91/3 91/3 91/4 137/5
highway [1] 29/14 hike [1] 131/8
hikers [3] 30/23
131/2 131/5
hiking [2] 108/14 131/1
Hill [5] 3/19 53/3 96/15 165/23 167/17
him [3] 95/5 134/10 172/3
hinted [1] 132/2
hired [1] 23/9
hiring [1] 102/14
his [16] 75/3 93/9
94/14 95/5 95/13

110/15 134/8 134/10 140/24 141/5 141/10 141/13 141/20 146/3 146/5 151/22 Historic [1] 47/18 historically [1]

## 142/18

history [1] 40/10
hit [3] 17/17 51/6
103/12
hits [1] 47/7
hold [1] 61/22
holding [1] 28/7
home [1] 17/18
homeowner [1] 110/20
homeowners [4]
32/18 110/14
110/23 111/6
homes [2] 72/18 111/1
honestly [1] 29/6
Honigberg [2] 1/13 2/13
hope [2] 28/22 93/9
hopefully [1] 41/18
hoping [1] 65/4
Hopkinton [1]
122/21
Hopkinton's [1]
131/20

## H

horizontal [1] 80/20
horse [1] 102/20 host [7] 32/19 46/15 105/7 117/1 118/7 118/19 119/10 hotels [1] 99/6 hour [3] 19/14 19/17 19/20
hours [3] 33/1
98/10 105/7
house [1] 134/9
houses [2] 78/16 92/11
how [63] 5/10 5/13
5/13 5/13 5/14 6/24
7/12 9/6 9/22 18/9
18/10 18/11 18/12
18/13 18/14 18/16
18/17 19/6 27/5
27/9 27/18 27/19
28/15 33/13 35/5
35/11 35/11 45/12
48/3 50/18 50/19
54/23 54/23 61/23
64/7 66/11 75/14 81/6 82/3 89/10
91/20 95/22 96/17
98/24 100/13 102/6
108/3 111/23
116/23 118/6 121/3

| $121 / 16121 / 20$ |
| :--- |
| $122 / 23127 / 10$ |
| $130 / 5130 / 10$ |
| $135 / 15149 / 17$ |
| $154 / 1161 / 2165 / 19$ | 166/4

huge [1] 81/5
huh [15] 5/23 10/5
13/13 18/24 22/11
23/18 29/22 57/5
59/12 65/6 82/1
118/13 119/3 131/6
138/15
hundred [1] 39/4
Hydro [4] 117/10
117/15 122/21
131/15
Hydro-Quebec [4]
117/10 117/15
122/21 131/15
hypothetical [4]
131/7 131/11 133/4 134/20
hypothetically [2] 113/24 131/3
I
I'd [3] 11/2 51/24

## 96/11

I'll [8] 19/17 72/21
101/11 109/12
148/1 150/5 150/21
153/12

I'm [73] 4/13 13/3 20/1 24/10 24/10 30/2 34/7 39/12 40/4 40/11 41/18 50/9 53/7 55/16 59/8 60/24 60/24 61/7 61/18 65/16 66/24 69/3 69/9 69/13 71/24 71/24
73/2 74/7 74/9 76/5
77/10 81/20 88/11
91/17 91/19 92/16
92/23 93/6 93/20
93/23 95/11 96/4
96/13 96/14 97/4
103/6 106/19
109/17 111/4
121/13 121/14
123/19 124/5
127/13 127/15
128/8 130/1 132/1
132/3 132/14 133/8 141/17 141/19
142/3 145/13
150/13 151/13
152/3 152/4 156/13 160/23 165/9 169/13
I've [10] 31/2 49/19 58/15 69/12 72/18 88/12 90/3 94/16 138/24 168/7

| I |
| :--- |
| I-93 [1] 55/19 |

Iacopino [4] 1/20
1/20 2/12 141/23
idea [1] 42/16
identification [1] 61/23
identified [3] 15/16 63/6 74/19
identifies [1] 75/1 identify [4] 7/6 59/2 90/9 117/14
ignore [1] 132/10
II [6] 117/10 122/21 135/15 135/19
135/20 136/4
illustrative [1]

## 163/4

imagine [3] 24/17
41/16 108/1
immediate [1]
135/10
immediately [1] 26/17
impact [35] 7/2
7/19 15/3 31/6 31/9 31/11 31/14 31/17 31/24 32/11 49/23 66/12 71/2 71/6 72/4 79/5 81/9 81/11 87/21 88/5 88/6 88/11 90/23

106/23 107/1
115/16 128/16
129/11 132/20
133/7 133/11
141/11 149/3 149/4 171/8
impacting [1]
105/21
impacts [31] 15/4
15/10 15/10 30/5
47/7 49/4 57/24
71/13 73/1 73/4
79/19 80/24 81/22
94/7 94/21 96/3
97/21 98/2 102/16
106/17 107/8 116/1
130/16 134/4 154/2
154/6 155/8 162/20
165/22 167/19
169/7
implement [2]
83/18 83/19
implementation [3] 36/3 45/23 144/16 implementations [1] 62/7
implemented [2] 54/18 83/13
importance [2]
154/10 170/15
important [4] 97/7
98/14 101/22 171/9
importantly [1] 94/18
impressive [1] 134/17
improved [2] 59/22 105/12
improvement [3]
43/8 104/10 104/18
improvements [2]
105/15 134/12
improving [2]
118/1 122/14
include [7] 9/11
25/1 30/6 77/12
163/2 165/2 165/20
included [8] 9/20
32/24 46/15 63/22
64/22 118/16
158/12 166/2
includes [3] 12/7
14/13 118/10
including [3]
118/14 129/4
131/17
inconsistency [3]
143/24 144/1
144/22
inconsistent [8]
86/5 89/21 121/21
123/1 123/5 123/10
124/2 124/8
incorporate [3]

| I | 6/24 8/11 | installations [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| incorporate... [3] | induce [2] 64/19 | 82/22 |
| 21/9 53/23 109/4 | 64/19 | instances [5] 49/19 |
| incorporated [1] | industrial [2] 65/5 | 56/20 59/21 72/15 |
| 22/23 | 123/22 | 129/18 |
| incorrect [1] | infer [1] 37/22 | instead [4] 58/13 |
| 120/20 | inferred [1] 25/14 | 105/21 152/15 |
| increase [5] 68/15 | inform [1] 23/22 | 162/16 |
| 70/19 70/24 99/8 | information [18] | intended [2] 111/2 |
| 131/14 | 12/7 25/16 47/11 | 163/12 |
| increased [4] 59/18 | 50/20 60/5 63/7 | intensity [1] 71/2 |
| 59/18 59/19 68/11 | 63/12 63/12 65/13 | intensive [1] 95/8 |
| incremental [2] | 78/5 78/21 112/15 | intent [1] 71/8 |
| 70/18 70/24 | 115/11 116/3 | intention [2] 153/5 |
| incurred [4] 53/17 | 119/16 126/2 | 164/14 |
| 53/18 69/18 146/12 | 126/17 158/4 | interactions [1] |
| indicate [2] 20/24 | informational [1] | 97/16 |
| 37/2 | 78/15 | interest [4] 33/23 |
| indicated [7] 94/14 | informative [1] | 37/3 127/17 170/9 |
| 95/6 97/13 111/20 | 137/8 | interested [5] 32/20 |
| 125/19 131/21 | infrastructure [1] | 110/1 117/11 137/5 |
| 165/3 | 123/14 | 173/15 |
| indicates [1] 12/3 | initial [4] 44/8 62/1 | interesting [2] |
| indicating [2] 82/10 | 101/15 101/15 | 136/2 150/5 |
| 109/19 | Initially [2] 120/9 | interests [1] 149/10 |
| indication [2] | 120/17 | interfaced [1] |
| 137/13 147/16 | input [1] 153/6 | 95/17 |
| indirect [1] 96/22 | inspirational [1] | interfere [13] 6/1 |
| individual [5] | 122/3 | 7/9 7/14 31/11 36/2 |
| 82/11 84/9 92/20 | installation [4] 38/6 | 45/22 77/22 89/13 |
| 102/2 140/12 | 41/11 138/19 | 114/7 128/14 |
| individually [3] 6/3 | 152/19 | 135/16 144/15 |


interfere... [1] 160/3
interference [8] 89/11 128/18 128/19 129/1
129/23 130/1 130/6 153/14
interpretation [1]
116/10
interrupted [1]
156/20
interrupting [1]
153/21
interruption [2] 6/18 74/22
intervenor [1] 169/8
intervenors [2]
116/19 133/2
intervention [1]
126/11
interview [1] 103/17
introduce [2] 89/3 143/2
introducing [2]
71/14 71/22
investment [1]
136/15
investments [1] 10/12
involved [16] 23/15
43/23 49/8 54/2
54/14 88/13 94/9
94/12 95/18 107/3
108/6 108/9 108/12
119/17 135/22
145/24
involvement [1]
97/6
iron [1] 127/18
is [380]
isn't [9] 19/16
23/10 55/3 58/6
98/16 106/24 108/1 108/1 142/12
issue [33] 20/21
21/12 23/1 24/12
24/13 25/3 26/16
27/16 29/6 50/2
52/12 53/16 56/17
72/24 76/2 87/11
90/22 100/7 107/9
107/16 111/7
117/18 139/17
142/4 142/13 159/1
160/7 161/10
164/19 166/5
166/20 167/13
168/5
issues [33] 10/9
22/19 25/3 26/9
32/13 32/19 33/23

35/10 44/13 53/23
53/24 58/23 59/2
60/1 60/4 68/10
78/7 79/7 82/7 88/4
88/14 90/9 102/5
105/2 105/8 114/22
115/1 115/3 116/6
155/11 160/14
166/8 170/21
it [267]
it's [117] 4/24 5/5
9/5 12/17 12/20
12/21 12/21 14/1
14/17 15/8 15/14
15/20 15/24 19/7
19/17 19/20 22/24
22/24 26/10 27/19
29/17 29/17 30/16
32/6 34/8 34/19
35/13 35/20 37/18 38/9 38/12 39/16 39/23 40/10 40/22 40/24 41/1 41/4 41/6 43/9 43/14 43/19 44/6 44/7 44/9 47/1 48/22 52/10 57/1 57/2 58/18 59/24 60/11 60/21 60/24 62/12 65/13 69/15 70/17 75/18 80/23 81/4 81/5 81/11 83/11

| I | 21/18 97/12 116/15 | 69/15 70/19 71/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| it's... [52] 83/11 | 11 | 71/24 73/2 74/20 |
| 84/23 85/21 86/19 | J | 91/9 91/23 96/9 |
| 88/18 93/23 99/4 | Jerry [1] 3/12 | 96/23 99/22 102/22 103/21 103/22 |
| 99/10 99/11 100/2 | job [3] 93/3 106/18 | 103/ |
| 101/22 104/6 | 115/6 |  |
| 107/11 107/23 | jobs [8] 42/7 67/24 | 108/2 108/2 111/10 |
| 108/7 118/15 | 93/4 93/12 93/14 | 114/20 114/23 |
| 120/22 121/9 | 93/16 93/22 96/22 | 115/19 118/6 |
| 122/24 123/18 | joint [7] 1/8 138/12 | 120/10 130/24 |
| 123/18 124/14 | 159/14 159/18 | 130/24 137/24 |
| 126/18 127/2 127/3 | 160/7 160/15 165/8 | 139/8 142/1 14 |
| 127/13 127/22 | judgment [3] 75/22 | 142/4 153/13 |
| 131/24 132/8 132/9 | 113/7 117/3 | $\begin{aligned} & 142 / 4153 / 13 \\ & 156 / 12169 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 132/16 133/17 | July [1] 168/16 | 169/24 |
| 133/23 135/11 | jurisdiction [10] | justification [1] |
| 135/21 137/8 | 83/1 83/9 83/20 | $43 / 3$ |
| 138/13 138/1 <br> 139/5 139/6 | 83/23 84/1 84/7 | K |
| 142/9 142/16 | 141/4 | Karno [14] |
| 142/21 147/7 150/5 | jurisdictional [1] | 99/23 100/11 101/4 |
| 150/14 152/16 | 83/4 | 103/18 104/3 |
| 154/18 160/13 | just [66] 4/12 8/8 | 104/10 104/23 |
| 170/10 171/22 | 9/2 10/16 15/12 | 106/20 110/11 |
| item [1] 138/11 | 15/24 23/10 29/13 | 110/12 151/22 |
| items [2] 5/19 63/22 | 30/3 35/9 38/8 | 155/2 155/3 |
| its [13] 21/11 46/4 | 39/19 39/23 40/2 | Kate [1] 34/8 |
| 46/5 46/6 53/21 | 40/13 44/4 47/14 | Kathryn [1] 1/14 |
| 60/17 62/17 94/10 | 47/20 48/14 48/18 | keep [6] 65/10 |
| 94/11 109/4 153/20 | 55/9 57/14 58/15 | 100/1 120/12 151/1 |
| 165/12 167/19 | 58/16 61/18 62/4 | 157/17 157/17 |
| itself [7] 13/19 21/6 | 64/8 66/4 66/24 | keeping [2] 98/8 |


| K | 70/2 79/16 79/17 | land [57] 5/1 5/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| keeping... [1] 99/9 | 91/16 91/21 94/8 | 6/11 6/11 6/12 6/15 |
| kept [1] 114/10 | 96/15 96/16 96/17 | 7/16 7/20 7/22 |
| key [2] 107/4 | 96/18 96/19 98/15 | 31/3 31/10 31/15 |
| 162/11 | 98/17 100/13 | 59/6 63/16 63/21 |
| kids [1] 156/3 | 102/22 103/15 | 64/19 71/6 71/10 |
| kind [8] 66/24 | 104/11 104/17 | 72/4 72/12 75/14 |
| 100/7 111/5 115/19 | 104/21 109/20 | 76/21 77/6 77/19 |
| 126/16 130/8 132/4 | 110/23 111/5 | 77/20 77/22 84/23 |
| 133/8 | 117/22 119/8 | 84/24 88/1 88/2 |
| kinds [1] 22/19 | 119/15 119/21 | 88/15 88/20 112/12 |
| Kinsman [1] | 127/10 127/14 | 122/8 122/10 |
| 152/24 | 127/20 133/4 133/8 | 126/14 126/23 |
| knew [4] 63/19 | 135/21 137/7 140/8 | 129/4 129/14 |
| 63/20 81/1 170/6 | 140/20 146/16 | 130/19 131/8 131/9 |
| know [92] 5/17 9/8 | 146/21 147/18 | 131/24 132/6 133/7 |
| 9/22 11/4 12/16 | 147/20 147/22 | 133/14 133/15 |
| 17/24 18/1 19/6 | 148/1 149/16 | 133/18 133/21 |
| 19/9 19/17 21/1 | knowledge [4] 49/6 | 133/21 135/1 135/8 |
| 21/16 22/20 23/6 | 72/13 129/7 129/15 | 135/11 143/14 |
| 27/22 28/5 28/14 | known [1] 51/13 | 147/3 163/16 |
| 29/9 36/6 36/11 | knows [2] 50/7 | landowner [2] |
| 36/19 37/23 38/20 | 54/23 | 134/3 134/15 |
| 38/21 39/7 40/2 | L | landowners [3] |
| 41/12 42/8 42/15 | laborious [1] 121/3 | 86/23 134/18 160/2 |
| 43/4 44/11 44/24 | lack [2] 106/4 | lands [2] 7/13 31/1 |
| 47/23 48/2 49/5 | lack 2 115/11 | landscape [1] |
| 50/8 50/23 51/3 | laid [1] 140/10 | 134/12 |
| 55/7 55/10 55/15 | Lake [1] 74/4 | landscaper [1] |
| 56/1 57/16 58/13 | Lakes [1] 112/5 | 96/15 |
| 58/15 60/6 60/16 | Lancaster [3] 3/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { landscaping [1] } \\ & 129 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |


lane [6] 18/7 20/2 20/7 21/24 28/11 58/9
language [1] 13/6 larger [1] 94/1 last [11] 15/8 29/16 70/4 72/24 110/10 120/7 135/13 147/8 149/21 149/22 169/23
later [2] 106/4 120/18
latest [1] 47/14 lattice [1] 70/15
Laughter [1] 150/24
launch [1] 109/12 law [12] 9/23 10/18 10/19 19/5 19/13 36/14 36/15 37/7 38/4 43/14 43/15 147/7
lawyers [1] 39/10 laying [1] 18/3 lays [1] 19/10 LCR [3] 1/24 173/17 173/18 lead [1] 57/10 lead-up [1] 57/10 learned [3] 62/23 101/7 120/19
learning [1] 24/11 least [7] 18/21
19/15 40/20 48/9 98/3 108/22 147/4 leave [2] 150/6 153/12
leaves [2] 53/11 54/6
leaving [1] 155/22 left [1] 54/17
legally [3] 62/15 65/10 83/11
legend [2] 16/22 17/4
legged [1] 67/1
legislative [1] 9/4
Legislature [3] 10/4 10/18 43/15
legitimately [1] 100/21
legs [1] 67/3
Lenehan [1] $1 / 20$
length [1] 11/23
less [5] 20/13 29/20
105/20 122/10
150/14
lessons [1] 101/7
let [15] 11/2 11/8
11/9 14/20 21/15
27/12 36/12 44/4
50/24 62/4 146/2
148/1 158/2 161/5

172/3
let's [14] 39/14 41/3
80/18 85/3 96/13
103/12 106/11
106/13 106/14
108/2 123/3 123/3
123/8 130/24
letter [14] 3/12
97/12 103/4 103/16 111/8 111/17
140/16 140/24
141/14 141/17
153/9 167/16 168/6 169/3
letters [8] 3/21
97/15 100/15
102/11 110/11
111/18 126/6 126/8
level [10] 83/16
92/21 93/1 93/3
93/15 94/5 97/3
97/5 103/2 103/6
Licensed [2] 173/3 173/18
life [5] 47/23 48/2
52/19 53/15 69/13
lifting [1] 57/2
light [5] 27/6 27/21
28/2 28/9 160/6
lighting [1] 136/17
lights [1] 29/8
like [51] 5/18 10/21

| L | 128/21 | line's [1] 41/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| like... [49] 11/2 | limitless [1] 45/5 | linear [1] 86/19 |
| 23/7 24/12 26/23 | line [80] 7/7 15/8 | lines [41] 16/22 |
| 27/2 28/3 32/4 | 16/13 22/1 22/3 | 32/17 42/20 57/6 |
| 32/14 38/8 38/23 | 22/9 27/6 29/19 | 61/3 72/8 75/4 |
| 40/1 40/24 43/18 | 39/15 39/16 40/14 | 75/10 82/22 82/23 |
| 48/21 51/2 53/23 | 40/23 41/1 41/6 | 83/6 84/18 84/22 |
| 70/1 73/24 83/4 | 41/10 41/15 42/3 | 84/23 85/8 85/10 |
| 87/15 91/12 92/1 | 42/9 42/11 42/15 | 86/15 87/19 87/20 |
| 93/7 96/4 96/11 | 42/18 43/1 43/3 | 105/19 107/14 |
| 98/8 98/15 100/19 | 46/21 48/3 49/4 | 117/18 122/7 |
| 100/19 104/8 | 49/24 52/4 52/14 | 123/15 125/21 |
| 115/18 118/7 | 53/16 53/18 55/15 | 132/19 133/4 133/5 |
| 119/23 121/6 122/3 | 57/9 57/14 57/23 | 137/23 138/1 138/3 |
| 122/5 125/23 127/8 | 57/24 58/4 58/10 | 138/5 138/7 138/20 |
| 140/13 144/6 | 58/12 58/13 58/17 | 142/6 142/16 |
| 149/24 150/3 | 64/15 64/18 67/18 | 142/17 143/8 |
| 152/24 153/15 | 67/22 70/12 70/13 | 158/24 159/4 164/5 |
| 157/22 162/22 | 70/13 72/16 73/15 | link [1] 116/14 |
| 163/3 170/16 171/7 | 73/16 75/3 87/8 | linked [1] 136/9 |
| likely [6] 50/8 60/6 | 87/13 88/1 88/17 | list [8] 6/11 11/3 |
| 66/20 103/14 159/7 | 88/18 89/1 89/5 | 44/12 80/12 91/17 |
| 164/13 | 110/24 117/10 | 130/8 157/5 159/11 |
| likewise [1] 124/5 | 117/12 117/15 | listen [1] 90/4 |
| limit [2] 19/19 | 122/21 122/22 | listened [1] 90/7 |
| 28/19 | 125/17 131/16 | Listening [1] 92/10 |
| limitations [2] | 132/11 132/22 | listing [1] 43/20 |
| 124/6 125/2 | 135/15 135/20 | lists [1] 11/22 |
| limited [7] 18/7 | 136/4 136/11 | little [14] 5/3 11/5 |
| 30/8 45/9 45/10 | 136/13 140/21 | 11/6 20/10 51/3 |
| 70/21 137/14 149/2 | 142/6 142/7 144/7 | 54/11 70/6 72/21 |
| limiting [2] 128/20 | 161/17 163/14 | 72/22 73/22 98/20 |

little... [3] 151/19
154/21 162/23
live [1] 104/19
lived [1] 69/12
LLC [1] 1/8
local [34] 8/4 31/13
32/19 33/20 33/24
35/17 36/1 58/24
59/1 66/20 67/19
67/20 67/24 69/17
78/3 82/8 82/15
83/16 84/3 84/4
85/10 92/14 93/3
93/15 94/5 94/7
94/19 101/24
116/16 134/17
135/5 138/5 141/14 170/14
locate [4] 71/20
134/8 136/13
143/20
located [12] 15/17
45/19 73/16 100/2
109/20 122/20
133/1 133/20 139/5
139/6 162/12
171/21
locating [1] 142/22 location [14] 29/14 42/18 51/1 51/6
51/9 51/12 99/11

100/6 145/19
161/10 166/10 169/15 169/19 170/4
locations [7] 12/3
20/23 74/6 85/16
102/3 105/4 169/10
Lodge [2] 152/24 153/1
lodges [1] 157/22 long [25] 8/5 9/8 10/8 18/9 18/11
18/14 18/16 18/23
27/3 27/8 27/19
48/4 48/5 53/12
54/8 54/23 56/6
56/7 74/21 74/24
80/11 88/12 98/18 128/12 160/3
longer [5] 14/9 19/2
66/16 75/11 112/24
longest [2] 40/9
57/9
look [21] 7/12
26/16 53/24 101/3
112/19 112/20
113/17 114/23
118/18 126/19
126/19 130/14
130/24 131/15
137/8 138/4 139/14
139/20 144/3

154/19 159/22
looked [20] 4/20
5/17 8/10 17/4
56/17 76/18 88/19
112/2 113/4 113/4
113/5 113/14
114/22 115/7
115/17 115/22
129/5 130/19
148/10 171/1
looking [26] 5/24
21/11 21/12 21/13
50/3 73/3 84/8
86/16 87/2 91/17
92/3 93/2 99/16
112/12 113/8
113/15 116/24
131/12 140/7
141/17 143/14
152/3 152/4 163/19
163/22 165/10
loop [6] 17/1 17/2
17/7 17/13 17/22
21/3
loops [1] 18/3
lose [1] 98/21
loses [1] 60/13
loss [6] 94/16 95/7
99/1 99/3 148/18
148/19
losses [2] 93/3
106/19

| L | 105/21 152/14 | managing [1] 74/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| lost [2] 35/13 93/13 | 152/20 | manner [1] 30/24 |
| lot [16] 4/16 6/14 | maintain [1] 59/15 | manual [6] 36/8 |
| 19/24 28/4 33/7 | maintaining [1] | 36/10 36/11 36/15 |
| 36/9 75/19 81/23 | 133/17 | 36/19 37/6 |
| 87/16 92/19 96/6 | maintenance [1] | many [44] 9/22 |
| 96/6 98/19 110/23 | 30/9 | 10/11 10/11 18/11 |
| 157/5 169/24 | major [6] 29/19 | 18/12 18/13 18/17 |
| lots [2] 22/13 | 52/11 101/2 108/24 | 19/6 22/22 23/13 |
| 121/15 | 136/5 163/6 | 23/14 23/20 27/18 |
| Louis [11] 94/22 | make [19] 10/11 | 29/9 33/9 41/19 |
| 99/23 100/11 101/4 | 11/11 21/13 34/10 | 48/15 54/6 72/18 |
| 103/18 104/3 | 49/16 58/17 60/2 | 83/12 83/14 88/2 |
| 106/20 110/12 | 64/8 82/3 85/22 | 94/9 94/11 94/11 |
| 151/22 155/2 155/3 | 93/24 98/6 98/24 | 102/3 107/3 110/16 |
| lump [1] 5/16 | 117/3 119/23 128/2 | 111/14 115/10 |
| lumped [1] 5/5 | 139/3 139/16 | 115/24 117/5 |
| lunch [3] 128/2 | 145/18 | 117/21 117/23 |
| 172/4 172/6 | makes [4] 10/24 | 126/15 127/10 |
| Lynn [1] 18/5 | 31/1 42/15 80/17 | 129/13 129/18 |
| M | making [3] 60/9 | 130/13 131/2 131/5 |
| made [21] 13/20 |  | 66/17 |
| 20/21 29/8 61/24 | manage [1] 81/15 | map [10] 3/16 3/21 |
| 65/9 75/22 86/11 | managed [2] 29/7 | 3/21 16/19 161/6 |
| 96/8 97/18 99/5 | 79/7 | 161/9 161/21 |
| 104/10 113/7 121/8 | management [11] | 169/11 169/13 |
| 139/2 140/19 147/9 | 10/13 11/15 11/19 | 170/2 |
| 151/24 157/2 157/8 | 15/7 21/8 24/22 | maps [4] 15/17 16/5 |
| 157/16 166/13 | 31/4 31/6 82/14 | 23/7 64/22 |
| mailing [1] 111/6 | 144/1 167/4 | March [7] 97/14 |
| main [4] 105/16 | manager [1] 103/11 | 100/16 111/10 |

March... [4] 118/9
120/7 153/5 165/13 March 2017 [1]

## 118/9

Maritimes [1]
113/3
market [1] 136/1 Martin [1] 1/13
massive [1] 53/8 master [59] 61/8
61/15 61/16 61/20 61/21 62/3 62/6
62/8 62/11 62/14
62/15 63/17 63/23
63/24 64/10 64/10
82/21 83/5 83/10
83/13 83/18 84/8
84/12 84/13 85/7
86/1 86/9 92/5
116/9 116/12 117/7
117/12 117/17
118/10 118/23
121/18 121/23
122/2 122/17
122/24 123/2 123/6
123/8 125/21 127/2
137/2 137/22
139/24 142/10
143/13 143/17
144/10 144/14
144/19 145/12

> | $158 / 2$ | $158 / 5$ | $158 / 12$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | $101 / 15130 / 8$ 159/12

> 146/13

math [6] 18/8 18/15 me [30] 8/22 9/19
39/10 39/10 39/12 40/18
matter [4] 106/12
127/23 161/1 163/2 mature [1] 75/20 maximum [2] 22/6 125/5
may [52] 10/1 10/6 11/16 12/4 12/5
13/19 15/22 15/24
16/2 21/3 22/6
32/15 33/5 33/20
34/15 42/5 45/16
45/18 46/6 46/6
51/12 56/19 59/20
63/4 63/8 63/8 64/2
68/7 72/11 78/9
81/14 81/15 82/22
83/13 86/24 87/20
98/11 99/7 99/12
99/13 111/1 111/14
115/5 119/21
120/14 124/1
130/16 134/19
140/2 142/15 143/6 144/21
maybe [10] 10/2
19/19 20/11 56/11
56/12 87/18 96/12

11/1 11/2 11/8 11/9
14/20 20/9 27/12
35/21 36/12 37/13
40/11 43/4 44/4
50/24 62/4 95/6
96/23 102/18 103/5
103/7 103/20
109/15 130/8 146/2
148/13 158/2 161/5
165/18
mean [16] 5/11
12/2 12/17 15/10
17/23 67/20 71/3
97/1 104/9 125/24
128/20 132/6
132/15 140/5
141/17 152/12
means [3] 30/15
36/20 37/1
meant [3] 12/16
18/20 37/2
measured [1] 170/9
meet [3] 82/6 82/9
139/11
meeting [3] 61/14 120/6 165/12
meetings [8] 62/19
64/21 78/15 102/2
102/11 110/16
meetings... [2]
164/2 164/8
Member [1] 1/17
MEMBERS [1] 2/5 memorandum [6] 3/4 3/5 3/7 3/9 3/10 127/11
memorializes [1]

## 171/11

mention [1] 84/22
mentioned [13]
26/22 56/1 62/3
68/2 68/19 69/23
73/12 84/23 107/18
107/22 147/12
155/10 157/20
merely [1] 37/4
merits [1] $1 / 11$
Merrimack [4]
65/2 70/20 132/21
134/5
met [3] 64/21
112/14 164/10
method [1] 57/1 methodological [1] 145/1
Michael [1] 1/20
micro [1] 93/1 middle [4] 17/2 81/4 81/6 168/17 might [23] 5/14 7/2

20/3 34/23 40/6 41/16 42/12 49/5 51/7 52/22 63/15 64/15 93/12 103/7 107/20 109/1 146/7 146/11 146/12 149/17 156/19 167/24 171/9
mile [6] 17/13 22/8 100/3 100/9 168/18 170/10
miles [11] 18/21
19/14 19/17 19/20
39/17 61/3 75/2
112/24 145/3
146/14 163/14
million [11] 39/4
40/20 41/4 41/5
41/5 41/15 42/14
60/20 60/21 60/22
61/1
Millsfield [1] 74/20 mind [4] 99/9 100/1
114/11 171/17
mindful [1] 156/7
minimize [15]
33/19 71/9 71/13
82/10 82/17 94/21
95/4 97/20 102/16 107/8 134/4 134/18 154/2 154/6 155/8
minimized [3] 15/5

## 15/11 98/3

minimizing [3]
33/3 96/3 105/5
minimum [2] 20/7
28/23
minute [7] 27/23
29/20 76/8 151/14
153/12 160/23
169/9
minutes [6] 27/20
28/8 150/14 165/11
166/21 172/5
mitigation [3]
106/21 129/10
154/11
moment [1] 154/16 money [11] 10/23
41/1 45/5 45/7
49/13 50/1 57/3
58/11 58/13 58/20 60/13
monopoles [1]
70/15
Monroe [1] 1/21 months [1] 111/10 more [30] 5/21 7/4 8/17 22/12 28/22 30/14 32/15 42/5 42/6 42/23 49/13 49/24 57/3 57/22 58/4 58/11 58/12 70/22 91/19 93/1

| M | 166/12 | 147/10 150/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| more... [10] 94/18 | MOUs [5] 32/21 | 150/19 151/19 |
| 127/16 127/17 | 33/17 151/8 151/17 | 154/11 160/17 |
| 132/9 144/24 | 170/13 | 162/22 164/23 |
| 145/11 152/15 | mouse [3] 16/8 16/9 | Mr. Baker [1] |
| 154/12 167/15 | 16/16 | 164/23 |
| 170/12 | move [13] 14/20 | Mr. Bouthillier [1] |
| morning [17] 1/4 | 29/1 30/2 38/12 | 93/9 |
| 4/2 4/8 4/9 4/11 | 39/21 40/23 41/10 | Mr. Bowes [2] |
| 24/7 24/8 65/22 | 41/15 42/11 42/17 | 60/12 147/10 |
| 65/24 76/15 76/16 | 43/3 61/7 161/17 | Mr. Chalmers [1] |
| 109/7 109/9 109/12 | moved [1] 38/11 | 66/7 |
| 110/9 148/11 172/7 | moving [9] 22/16 | Mr. DeWan [1] |
| most [20] 8/9 15/15 | 28/6 28/17 41/1 | 76/3 |
| 19/16 36/6 49/15 | 99/10 99/11 99/14 | Mr. DeWan's [2] |
| 49/17 49/22 57/1 | 162/19 166/18 | 74/19 75/1 |
| 64/1 78/9 88/4 | Mr [22] 2/7 2/8 | Mr. Iacopino [1] |
| 113/1 120/5 122/9 | 2/12 2/15 4/5 4/8 | 141/23 |
| 123/19 124/9 | 24/7 34/8 65/22 | Mr. Karno [1] |
| 124/18 128/9 | 76/15 93/17 109/7 | 110/11 |
| 132/21 138/3 | 114/14 115/21 | Mr. Needleman [4] |
| MOU [13] 3/4 3/6 | 142/3 148/5 150/9 | 120/1 128/5 150/11 |
| 3/8 3/9 3/11 33/1 | 151/7 162/19 | 150/19 |
| 33/8 34/13 34/15 | 163/23 170/4 172/2 | Mr. Nichols [2] |
| 35/9 35/15 152/2 | Mr. [29] 4/6 24/3 | 66/8 115/14 |
| 171/1 | 60/11 60/12 65/21 | Mr. Oldenburg [6] |
| Mountain [14] 16/6 | 66/7 66/8 74/19 | 4/6 24/3 107/16 |
| 30/21 80/8 108/15 | 75/1 76/3 82/20 | 109/16 146/3 |
| 143/17 143/20 | 93/9 107/16 109/16 | 151/19 |
| 143/23 144/2 144/4 | 110/11 115/14 | Mr. Quinlan [1] |
| 144/18 145/5 | 120/1 128/5 138/10 | 60/11 |
| 165/24 166/7 | 141/23 146/3 | Mr. Reimers [2] |


| M | 95/18 | 72/17 78/18 78/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mr. Reimers... [2] | multiple [7] 6/15 | 79/6 85/18 88/3 |
| 160/17 162/22 | 6/15 10/9 14/24 | 88/13 88/14 91/17 |
| Mr. Way [1] | 23/21 120/21 | 91/17 92/17 96/15 |
| 154/11 | 154/13 | 96/16 96/17 101/10 |
| Mr. Whitley [2] | Muni [2] 138/12 | 101/14 102/22 |
| 82/20 138/10 | 165/8 | 109/12 111/13 |
| Mr. Wright [1] | municipal [11] 70/3 | 114/12 115/3 118/5 |
| $65 / 21$ | 77/1 77/2 77/14 | 119/7 120/10 |
| Ms [7] 2/11 66/7 | 77/17 78/2 89/15 | 122/24 124/22 |
| 109/6 114/15 151/7 | 89/16 116/9 141/8 | 124/23 129/23 |
| 166/18 170/13 | 143/11 | 130/3 131/11 |
| Ms. [7] 20/6 47/17 | municipalities [8] | 133/11 134/20 |
| 152/22 158/3 165/9 | 79/13 86/6 89/20 | 135/10 135/13 |
| 167/12 167/15 | 91/22 109/19 | 138/12 144/24 |
| Ms. Farrington [1] | 113/16 126/7 | 145/2 148/15 149/8 |
| 20/6 | 127/20 | 149/21 149/22 |
| Ms. Fillmore [2] | municipality [5] | 154/23 154/24 |
| 165/9 167/15 | 33/24 34/12 92/2 | 158/1 160/5 164/13 |
| Ms. Pacik [1] 158/3 | 127/12 146/13 | 168/24 169/18 |
| Ms. Saffo [1] | must [1] 121/3 | 173/5 173/7 |
| 167/12 | my [82] 4/13 4/16 | myself [2] 11/9 |
| Ms. Schibanoff [1] | 6/7 13/24 14/10 | 60/24 |
| 152/22 | 14/21 15/9 16/8 | N |
| Ms. Widell [1] | 16/9 16/16 18/7 | N.H [1] 173/18 |
| 47/17 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 23/13 28/20 28/23 } \\ 32 / 10 & 33 / 6 ~ 34 / 14\end{array}$ | nailed [1] 132/3 |
| much [10] 9/6 | $\begin{aligned} & 32 / 1033 / 6 ~ 34 / 14 \\ & 36 / 18 ~ 37 / 16 ~ 37 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | name [3] 4/13 |
| 28/22 29/23 29/23 |  | 73/13 93/10 |
| 81/23 92/24 96/21 |  | named [3] 163/9 |
| 101/17 121/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41/24 42/1 51/22 } \\ & 56 / 1957 / 1657 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | 163/10 163/11 |
| 128/11 <br> multimedia [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 56 / 1957 / 1657 / 22 \\ & 58 / 1667 / 1069 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | narrowness [1] 19/23 |


| $\mathbf{N}$ | needs [9] 10/8 | 89/3 94/4 112/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nathan [5] 73/11 | 15/23 32/13 32/18 | 112/7 118/17 |
| 73/12 162/23 163/7 | 33/16 45/2 94/21 | 122/19 123/9 |
| 163/8 | 117/22 128/19 | 123/12 123/13 |
| National [12] 30/21 | negate [2] 92/21 | 123/14 123/14 |
| 80/9 108/16 143/17 | 94/1 | 132/11 132/24 |
| 143/20 143/23 | negotiate [4] 33/17 | 137/22 138/7 |
| 144/2 144/4 144/18 | 34/15 35/15 104/13 | 138/14 138/19 |
| 145/5 165/24 | negotiation [1] | 139/9 139/11 |
| 166/12 | 104/16 | 142/18 143/2 |
| natural [3] 107/14 | neither [1] 173/10 | 160/20 161/12 |
| 113/2 160/18 | NEPA [2] 79/24 | 168/4 |
| nature [5] 66/13 | 80/2 | news [2] 3/18 55/10 |
| 79/10 114/5 126/20 | network [1] 136/7 | next [9] 12/23 |
| 149/4 | never [5] 69/13 | 16/13 17/21 17/21 |
| near [5] 6/6 62/21 | 71/5 83/13 92/20 | 31/1 31/7 48/13 |
| 65/1 122/21 136/11 | 150/3 | 91/12 134/20 |
| nearby [1] 33/3 | new [70] 1/1 1/4 1/9 | NH [2] 3/19 3/19 |
| need [22] 20/19 | 8/22 9/9 9/13 9/15 | nice [2] 64/13 |
| 21/8 30/19 33/14 | 12/5 13/11 13/21 | 100/10 |
| 42/5 46/1 50/8 | 14/18 20/20 24/10 | Nichols [5] 66/8 |
| 53/20 57/24 59/7 | 24/24 26/7 41/21 | 114/14 115/14 |
| 68/11 69/11 81/14 | 43/7 47/24 48/16 | 115/21 163/23 |
| 98/13 104/14 111/1 | 50/2 53/22 54/2 | no [69] 1/7 1/23 |
| 126/18 135/9 | 54/17 57/19 59/14 | 1/24 2/3 3/3 3/3 |
| 135/12 135/24 | 59/14 59/18 60/18 | 5/12 5/19 10/10 |
| 147/23 156/7 | 63/11 67/19 68/21 | 11/8 13/1 13/2 14/2 |
| needed [3] 62/22 | 69/13 70/13 71/14 | 14/9 27/11 32/5 |
| 69/8 144/19 | 71/17 71/22 72/22 | 32/7 36/22 37/3 |
| Needleman [5] 2/15 | 74/8 74/9 82/20 | 38/13 39/9 47/3 |
| 120/1 128/5 150/11 | 82/21 85/3 85/7 | 47/5 47/10 48/1 |
| 150/19 | 85/11 85/11 85/12 | 54/23 61/22 62/3 |


| $\mathbf{N}$ | northern [21] 1/8 | 77/21 78/10 79/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| no... [41] 66/16 | 3/12 4/3 37/14 | 81/20 83/11 83/18 |
| 70/10 75/11 83/3 | 38/22 41/9 42/14 | 84/14 84/21 85/17 |
| 85/10 87/6 87/6 | 48/3 55/23 72/23 | 85/20 86/13 86/21 |
| 88/15 92/3 95/11 | 90/11 104/21 | 87/17 87/19 88/7 |
| 104/22 115/16 | 121/16 123/16 | 88/9 88/11 89/23 |
| 120/14 123/11 | 123/23 125/23 | 91/5 91/13 93/2 |
| 125/20 128/15 | 128/12 168/1 | 95/6 96/20 97/4 |
| 128/24 130/2 130/3 | 168/19 169/4 | 99/10 100/2 103/11 |
| 131/11 132/21 | 169/22 | 103/15 103/17 |
| 133/17 135/7 | not [164] 5/10 6/1 | 106/19 110/13 |
| 135/20 137/12 | 7/13 7/16 7/19 7/23 | 114/3 114/22 |
| 137/24 142/9 143/6 | 8/14 15/2 15/24 | 116/11 116/16 |
| 143/7 143/14 144/9 | 24/13 25/2 25/10 | 117/3 117/14 |
| 145/7 148/24 | 26/14 29/10 31/5 | 118/16 119/11 |
| 149/13 149/20 | 31/7 31/9 31/10 | 119/17 119/20 |
| 150/10 160/9 | 31/14 31/16 31/19 | 121/9 121/13 |
| 163/21 164/21 | 31/24 32/9 32/10 | 121/14 122/6 123/5 |
| 167/9 173/18 | 33/15 34/15 36/2 | 123/10 124/2 124/7 |
| Nodding [3] 8/21 | 37/16 37/18 37/22 | 125/16 127/2 127/3 |
| 41/2 55/2 | 37/22 39/22 40/4 | 127/13 127/15 |
| noise [1] 130/7 | 40/24 40/24 41/15 | 129/10 130/1 |
| none [2] 53/5 133/1 | 42/8 44/9 45/5 | 130/21 131/24 |
| normal [1] 30/7 | 45/22 46/6 47/1 | 132/3 132/12 |
| Normandeau [2] | 47/7 48/15 49/5 | 132/23 133/11 |
| 75/17 165/11 | 50/10 50/11 51/12 | 133/15 134/16 |
| north [9] 11/14 | 52/11 53/7 57/20 | 135/1 135/2 135/6 |
| 11/18 55/12 112/4 | 61/18 64/9 65/9 | 135/16 136/4 139/3 |
| 146/14 161/14 | 66/14 67/15 67/18 | 139/5 139/7 139/17 |
| 164/22 165/12 | 69/3 69/17 70/15 | 140/1 140/13 |
| 166/14 | 71/14 71/14 71/22 | 140/14 141/15 |
| Northeast [1] 113/3 | 75/23 75/23 77/19 | 142/11 143/1 144/4 |


| $\mathbf{N}$ | 106/14 110/24 | 122/8 124/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| not... [18] 145/13 | 114/20 131/5 145/4 | 124/14 124/20 |
| 145/24 146/21 | 146/12 153/9 | occupied/unoccupie |
| 148/24 149/8 | 158/17 166/10 | d [1] 124/20 |
| 149/13 150/23 | number [20] 8/23 | occupies [1] $37 / 5$ |
| 152/16 156/20 | 9/13 9/13 9/15 11/3 | occupying [1] 38/3 |
| 158/4 159/7 162/3 | 19/3 31/3 37/11 | occur [6] 60/6 98/5 |
| 162/14 163/12 | 38/2 43/7 45/9 | 98/11 108/3 108/21 |
| 165/19 166/16 | 45/10 69/23 89/19 | 168/15 |
| 169/7 173/13 | 111/16 150/1 | occurred [6] 62/8 |
| note [2] 45/13 | 163/11 165/10 | 109/15 120/14 |
| 45/20 | 165/17 166/4 | 137/6 167/19 168/9 |
| notebooks [1] | numbers [1] 99/19 | occurring [3] 30/17 |
| 126/15 | nursery [4] 167/17 | 65/11 92/7 |
| noted [3] 3/21 | 167/18 167/23 | occurs [1] 81/13 |
| 67/17 172/10 | 169/16 | October [1] 120/12 |
| notes [5] 61/13 | 0 | October 2015 [1] |
| 61/14 62/2 75/4 | objectives [2] 62/17 |  |
| 173/6 | 144/16 | odds [1] 48/11 <br> off [14] 4/7 15/20 |
| nothing [4] 101/17 | obligated [1] | $16 / 1821 / 1026 / 8$ |
| 137/17 171/23 | 116/11 | 39/1 45/17 51/24 |
| 172/2 | obligation [1] 38/5 | 66/4 150/16 150/17 |
| notice [2] 23/2 | obligations [1] | 151/2 151/3 156/3 |
| 168/4 ${ }^{\text {noticed [2] } 61 / 17}$ | 38/19 | off-the-record [2] |
| noticed [2] 61/17 120/15 | obvious [1] 45/23 | 150/17 151/3 |
| notification [1] | obviously [9] 28/18 | offer [3] 20/18 |
| 120/15 | 61/2 67/22 | 95/21 164/15 |
| noting [1] 140/23 | 11 | offered [2] 159/4 |
| now [16] 14/12 | occupancy [1] | 165/5 |
| 28/10 39/20 46/17 | $\mathbf{3 6} / \mathbf{1 7}$ | offering [3] 91/13 |
| 54/21 55/17 56/8 | occupied [5] 85/1 | 104/23 105/1 |


| 0 | 109/24 110/8 114/9 | 33/8 43/6 43/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| office [1] 120/19 | 114/13 116/7 | 44/23 49/20 50/15 |
| officer [2] 1/13 | 121/15 126/3 | 50/15 51/16 53/2 |
| 69/17 | 130/24 135/13 | 53/4 53/6 53/11 |
| officials [2] 82/15 | 141/21 144/24 | 54/23 55/22 61/17 |
| 126/11 | 145/14 146/2 147/2 | 61/21 62/5 62/5 |
| often [3] 95/3 127/4 | 147/8 168/8 168/11 | 63/5 66/11 67/3 |
| 159/6 | 169/23 170/12 | 70/3 71/18 73/20 |
| oftentimes [2] | old [7] 48/14 48/15 | 79/16 80/18 87/10 |
| 32/20 86/19 | 52/19 53/14 61/23 | 89/2 91/22 93/4 |
| oh [4] 12/21 95/12 | 67/1 105/19 | 96/11 98/15 98/18 |
| 103/24 138/16 | Oldenburg [9] 1/16 | 99/10 101/3 101/11 |
| okay [77] 6/8 8/3 | 2/7 4/6 4/13 24/3 | 103/21 113/24 |
| 8/19 9/13 9/22 | 107/16 109/16 | 116/14 122/10 |
| 10/16 12/10 12/23 | 146/3 151/19 | 127/16 127/24 |
| 14/20 15/19 16/4 | older [6] 43/10 | 132/12 132/13 |
| 20/17 26/20 27/12 | 52/17 52/18 53/1 | 145/1 146/10 148/6 |
| 27/15 29/5 30/2 | 53/5 53/15 | 148/17 155/10 |
| 31/1 34/1 35/20 | once [7] 105/21 | 156/1 159/14 162/2 |
| 36/19 36/23 37/17 | 107/17 111/7 112/5 | 162/11 164/23 |
| 37/20 38/20 39/2 | 131/3 152/15 | 165/5 169/23 |
| 39/4 40/5 42/23 | 152/15 | 170/12 170/20 |
| 43/6 45/4 47/16 | one [90] 5/8 5/15 | one-lane [1] 28/11 |
| 49/18 51/16 57/11 | 6/3 6/16 6/24 7/1 | ones [3] 48/20 |
| 60/10 61/7 63/14 | 7/3 7/5 7/11 8/11 | 156/13 168/22 |
| 64/7 65/16 66/22 | 8/22 11/2 11/3 11/5 | ongoing [7] 32/1 |
| 66/24 67/17 69/7 | 12/15 12/16 18/7 | 54/14 57/17 58/22 |
| 69/10 69/23 71/24 | 18/18 18/20 18/22 | 60/2 102/7 151/17 |
| 72/21 76/5 77/12 | 20/2 21/23 22/22 | online [1] 16/5 |
| 80/3 81/4 85/6 | 24/18 25/5 26/22 | only [24] 1/4 7/23 |
| 85/19 88/10 91/8 | 28/4 28/11 31/4 | 9/9 20/3 25/2 29/10 |
| 95/15 102/21 | 31/7 32/22 33/6 | 33/8 47/15 53/11 |


| 0 | 35/13 111/15 | 119/4 119/10 120/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| only... [15] 65/9 | 122/13 130/10 | 120/8 120/24 |
| 72/9 85/14 85/17 | 154/5 | 121/11 121/18 |
| 88/7 105/21 110/13 | opposition [1] | 121/21 123/19 |
| 116/16 131/4 | 81/23 | 124/18 124/24 |
| 132/23 140/13 | option [1] 143/22 | 125/9 139/24 144/6 |
| 152/14 152/17 | options [7] 21/3 | 144/10 144/12 |
| 162/3 172/11 | 41/22 49/2 49/3 | 144/14 |
| open [8] 22/1 78/15 | 54/6 57/20 137/15 | organization [1] |
| 81/5 92/11 122/18 | order [4] 79/2 | 108/6 |
| 136/8 142/24 157/9 | 128/22 145/4 | organizations [1] |
| operates [2] 73/23 | 155/16 | 23/19 |
| 153/18 | orderly [29] 4/17 | organize [1] 126/17 |
| operating [1] 107/3 | 6/2 7/15 42/1 42/2 | originally [2] 111/2 |
| operation [6] 31/23 | 71/6 77/7 77/10 | 111/3 |
| 67/18 94/10 96/16 | 77/16 77/18 79/12 | other [56] 5/10 7/1 |
| 99/17 154/3 | 81/7 81/21 87/21 | 15/20 19/22 21/23 |
| operations [1] | 89/13 89/21 92/13 | 22/14 27/24 28/2 |
| 153/22 | 112/17 112/18 | 31/21 33/4 33/23 |
| opinion [13] 83/5 | 113/8 114/7 114/16 | 35/8 45/1 45/8 |
| 88/14 90/6 115/24 | 126/24 127/3 132/1 | 46/23 49/19 56/24 |
| 135/7 135/18 | 133/13 135/17 | 63/4 68/4 68/10 |
| 140/22 149/9 159/5 | 141/11 148/22 | 70/4 73/21 74/17 |
| 162/8 164/6 164/15 | ordinance [12] | 76/21 76/22 78/21 |
| 169/2 | 83/15 116/15 119/1 | 81/13 86/10 86/20 |
| opinions [4] 78/11 | 119/12 120/16 | 86/23 87/3 92/20 |
| 87/23 115/12 | 120/23 121/24 | 96/1 101/8 109/13 |
| 148/22 | 124/3 124/10 | 113/15 114/2 116/5 |
| opportunities [3] | 124/22 139/4 139/6 | 117/21 123/14 |
| 122/14 130/9 | ordinances [24] | 128/1 129/1 129/8 |
| 154/14 | 2/19 64/3 86/1 86/9 | 129/9 130/5 130/7 |
| opportunity [5] | 92/6 116/13 118/24 | 130/11 136/3 136/6 |


| 0 | outlined [1] 149/19 | 102/2 102/3 102/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| other... [7] 136/12 | outreach [17] 20/21 | 110/18 129/3 |
| 140/2 148/2 148/18 | 23/6 23/12 23/21 | 129/13 129/19 |
| 153/13 162/7 163/5 | 24/13 24/15 97/6 | 135/24 149/11 |
| others [9] 5/16 8/17 | 100/13 100/20 | P |
| 10/4 45/18 58/3 | 101/1 101/5 102/9 102/10 | p.m [1] 172/6 |
| 114/14 115/7 | 110/10 155/1 | Pacik [1] 158/3 |
| 118/21 132/2 | outside [1] 118/15 | page [9] 2/3 3/3 |
| our [11] 63/11 65/8 | over [14] 18/18 | 138/16 147/10 |
| 65/13 84/7 87/4 | 48/14 52/4 55/20 | 154/18 154/21 |
| 97/23 123/3 123/4 | 64/6 70/1 83/20 | 158/9 158/24 171/4 |
| 123/8 127/2 137/21 | 84/1 98/22 101/24 | pages [3] 3/13 3/15 |
| out [42] 13/3 17/11 | 84/1 98/22 101/24 108/2 | 159/4 |
| 18/3 18/8 18/18 |  | Pamela [1] 1/21 |
| 19/10 20/8 27/18 | overall [3] 88/7 | Pancake [2] 99/18 |
| 35/23 36/24 39/18 | overall [3] 88/7 | 170/5 |
| 46/23 47/21 51/24 | overhead [7] 12/8 | Pancakes [2] 100/1 |
| 53/7 54/9 55/9 73/8 | 12/21 14/3 39/15 | 100/9 |
| 82/6 82/7 82/21 | $57 / 6142 / 21144 / 20$ | panel [8] 12/11 |
| 84/11 86/5 92/16 | overriding [1] | 18/5 27/2 27/9 40/7 |
| 94/19 95/19 95/19 |  | 54/13 55/8 109/22 |
| 96/20 97/13 98/23 | overwhelming | paragraph [1] |
| 104/10 108/8 108/11 115/19 | 89/19 | 11/21 |
| 108/11 115/19 | own [3] 38/12 | parents [1] 156/3 |
| 127/18 132/5 | 102/22 129/4 | parking [6] 104/14 |
| 140/10 146/6 149/1 | owner [5] 38/7 | 105/4 137/4 156/24 |
| 153/5 154/14 | owner [5] 38/7 <br> 134/6 134/10 | 156/24 157/1 |
| 170/22 | 134/19 160/13 | Parks [1] 108/8 |
| outage [1] 55/12 | owners [16] 33/4 | Parlor [2] 99/18 |
| outdoor [1] 104/14 | 35/17 59/1 75/14 | 170/5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { outer }[2] \quad 45 / 17 \\ & 55 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}35 / 17 & 59 / 1 & 75 / 14 \\ 82 / 8 & 82 / 12 & 101 / 24\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { part [25] 11/11 } \\ & 11 / 17 \text { 13/15 13/24 } \end{aligned}$ |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | passed [4] 10/18 | 122/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| part... [21] 24/23 | 32/4 55/4 58/5 | perception [1] 95/7 |
| part.. [21] 46/3 46 | passing [1] 19/11 | perfect [1] 103/12 |
| 46/18 50/4 72/23 | past [1] 119/8 | perhaps [13] 21/17 |
| 73/20 73/21 81/21 | Patnaude [3] 1/24 | 22/7 22/9 68/10 |
| 84/19 86/18 90/11 | 173/3 173/17 | 105/17 111/2 119/1 |
| 102/22 119/15 | Patricia [1] 1/17 | 119/21 121/9 126/9 |
| 136/6 142/18 | pattern [1] 133/18 | 127/14 127/24 |
| 145/21 159/17 | paved [1] 15/21 | 134/22 |
| 161/13 162/4 | pavement [1] 20/4 | period [9] 18/17 |
| particular [8] 75/5 | pay [2] 134/11 | 23/5 63/5 81/16 |
| 138/11 151/21 | 147/1 | 98/22 99/8 99/12 |
| 157/15 160/20 | peak [2] 98/11 | 154/4 168/8 |
| 161/3 161/10 | 168/17 | periodically [1] |
| 165/10 | pedestrian [3] 11/4 | 65/13 |
| particularly [1] | 14/23 15/23 | permitted [1] 125/8 |
| 98/17 | Pelham [1] 65/3 people [16] 19/6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { permitting [1] } \\ & 141 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| parties [3] 108/18 | people [16] 19/6 <br> 19/22 21/16 21/19 | 141/16 <br> person [4] 81/8 |
| 158/15 173/12 | $\begin{array}{ll} 19 / 22 & 21 / 16 \\ 44 / 24 & 21 / 19 \\ 92 / 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { person [4] 81/8 } \\ & 103 / 13120 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| partner [3] 105/15 | 100/4 100/21 | 141/16 |
| 105/17 107/6 | 104/24 110/17 | perspective [8] |
| 41/21 98/1 | 130/13 130/17 | 7/16 91/20 132/18 |
| Pass [18] 1/8 3/12 | 131/1 154/19 | 147/3 147/3 163/16 |
| 4/4 37/14 38/22 | 170/16 | 163/20 163/23 |
| 41/9 42/15 48/3 | per [5] 19/3 39/7 | persuaded [1] |
| 55/23 121/16 | 39/18 60/20 61/1 | 87/17 |
| 123/16 123/23 | perceive [1] 87/21 | pertinent [1] 63/12 |
| 125/23 128/12 | perceived [2] 33/19 | petitions [1] 126/11 |
| 168/1 168/19 169/4 | 90/13 | phase [7] 106/8 |
| 169/22 | percent [5] 70/1 | 117/10 122/21 |
| Pass's [1] 104/21 | 84/24 91/17 107/17 | 135/15 135/19 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | 160/16 173/6 | 87/7 87/12 100/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| phase... [2] 135/20 | places [6] 38/5 | 101/1 101/19 |
| 136/4 | 52/18 100/18 101/8 | 101/20 116/15 |
| phone [1] 120/17 | 157/23 162/22 | 117/16 121/23 |
| physical [2] 128/19 | placing [2] 123/13 | 122/18 122/18 |
| 130/1 | 132/11 | 123/6 123/8 127/3 |
| physically [3] | plan [113] 8/23 9/2 | 127/6 137/22 |
| 128/20 128/22 | 9/3 9/10 9/16 9/17 | 138/17 138/21 |
| 130/11 | 10/7 11/4 11/19 | 139/6 139/13 |
| pick [2] 11/5 49/15 | 14/23 16/22 17/21 | 139/20 140/1 |
| picked [1] 74/20 | 21/7 21/8 21/9 | 140/11 143/13 |
| picking [3] 106/14 | 21/13 22/23 24/22 | 143/17 144/2 144/4 |
| 156/3 162/21 | 24/23 25/9 26/3 | 144/17 144/19 |
| picture [3] 51/1 | 26/10 36/5 36/6 | 144/22 145/12 |
| 55/19 94/1 | 43/8 43/9 43/11 | 158/5 167/4 167/4 |
| pictures [2] 19/22 | 43/13 43/13 43/14 | planner [2] 141/8 |
| 19/23 | 43/18 44/20 44/23 | 141/15 |
| pieces [1] 92/20 | 45/6 45/13 45/17 | planners [6] 62/19 |
| pier [1] 48/21 | 45/17 45/19 46/4 | 164/3 164/9 164/9 |
| pile [1] 55/14 | 46/7 46/10 46/14 | 164/10 164/11 |
| piles [1] 50/19 | 46/17 46/18 47/1 | planning [38] 8/13 |
| pipeline [1] 162/11 | 47/6 61/8 61/15 | 15/17 22/21 23/14 |
| pipelines [1] 107/14 | 61/17 61/22 61/23 | 24/17 43/24 44/1 |
| pit [1] 81/5 | 62/1 62/3 62/6 62/8 | 54/8 59/3 61/14 |
| Pittsburg [4] 46/20 | 62/12 62/14 62/15 | 77/2 78/3 84/4 87/9 |
| 52/6 74/5 165/23 | 62/16 63/5 63/15 | 87/14 87/16 87/17 |
| place [17] 23/23 | 63/18 63/23 63/24 | 88/8 89/15 111/4 |
| 35/2 40/19 41/6 | 64/7 64/10 64/11 | 111/24 112/5 112/6 |
| 48/13 51/2 56/13 | 78/2 82/14 82/14 | 112/7 112/13 |
| 67/18 68/7 72/14 | 82/21 83/5 83/7 | 112/15 113/13 |
| 89/1 101/19 122/19 | 83/10 83/13 84/9 | 113/16 115/1 115/2 |
| 127/11 140/7 | 84/12 85/7 86/13 | 117/16 136/5 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | play [1] 106/16 | 68/20 69/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| planning... [6] | pleasant [1] 20/1 | policies [1] 36/16 |
| 138/14 141/14 | plus [1] 93/18 | pollution [1] 74/14 |
| 147/2 147/2 147/3 | Plymouth [22] 3/7 | Polly's [4] 99/18 |
| 164/7 | 14/17 52/23 53/1 | 100/1 100/8 170/5 |
| plans [67] 4/18 8/6 | 93/19 95/1 95/10 | pond [12] 73/11 |
| 8/8 8/9 8/13 8/17 | 96/1 96/14 102/24 | 73/12 74/21 74/24 |
| 8/19 9/22 10/10 | 105/16 106/14 | 74/24 75/13 75/17 |
| 10/14 11/15 14/22 | 115/18 144/7 | 75/24 162/23 |
| 17/12 20/5 23/9 | 151/11 151/14 | 162/23 163/8 163/8 |
| 23/10 23/16 25/5 | 151/20 151/21 | ponds [7] 73/1 |
| 26/6 31/13 36/2 | 151/23 152/1 152/9 | 73/18 73/23 74/1 |
| 43/6 47/15 47/15 | 168/22 | 74/12 74/21 75/6 |
| 61/20 62/20 63/1 | point [30] 4/12 17/6 | populated [1] 74/18 |
| 63/6 63/8 65/10 | 17/15 17/20 24/20 | portion [8] 24/2 |
| 83/18 84/8 84/11 | 35/4 47/21 51/24 | 39/21 109/20 142/8 |
| 84/14 84/17 86/1 | 53/7 54/16 55/9 | 142/11 145/16 |
| 86/9 87/20 92/5 | 56/5 56/10 57/8 | 146/8 160/2 |
| 106/21 109/18 | 60/6 70/5 72/3 72/4 | portions [1] 131/17 |
| 116/9 116/12 | 83/22 92/17 101/18 | Portland [2] 113/2 |
| 116/16 116/17 | 127/10 132/15 | 160/18 |
| 117/7 117/12 | 146/5 148/6 151/9 | Portsmouth [1] |
| 117/17 118/10 | 159/14 164/24 | 55/20 |
| 118/23 121/18 | 165/17 170/20 | position [2] 123/2 |
| 122/2 122/24 123/2 | pointed [4] 73/8 | 128/18 |
| 125/21 137/2 | 82/21 138/10 | possible [11] 21/17 |
| 139/24 142/10 | 138/11 | 54/7 82/16 95/21 |
| 142/13 144/10 | Points [1] 165/15 | 98/17 98/20 107/8 |
| 4/14 158/2 | pole [5] 38/8 42/10 | 113/1 126/18 132/7 |
| 158/12 159/12 | 42/13 42/17 124/7 | 132/17 |
| 166/19 167/7 | poles [1] 133/5 | possibly [1] 168/21 |
| 167/10 | police [3] 68/9 | posted [2] 92/8 92/9 |

84/15 119/13
presence [3] 57/23
58/16 117/14
present [4] 1/12
1/19 126/1 173/8
presented [3] 73/6
80/16 115/22
preserve [1] 123/3
President [1] 94/13
Presiding [2] 1/13
1/13
pressing [1] 166/20 pretty [2] 48/11 136/22
prevailing [5] 6/10 31/15 88/15 88/20 143/14
prevent [3] 7/8 24/14 75/23
prevented [1] 72/16 36/16 preventing [1] 31/14
prevents [1] 24/20 previous [1] 40/16 previously [3] 97/13 111/8 117/13 price [1] 55/5
primarily [3] 30/16 32/12 76/22
principal [1] 114/10
principle [3]

125/16 142/5
142/20
prior [5] 32/23
78/17 95/13 120/10
166/1
private [3] 59/17
75/14 110/18
probably [13] 6/22
10/10 17/14 22/4
36/6 40/8 40/10
42/16 43/18 96/19
109/24 137/24
141/2
problem [8] 17/14
41/22 59/11 61/5
87/9 96/7 117/15 136/5
problems [1] 106/3 procedures [1]
proceeding [2]
118/17 162/5
proceedings [2]
164/16 173/6
process [13] 7/11
35/6 43/24 63/2
63/8 67/8 79/6 80/4 80/13 120/14
145/21 150/5 164/4
produced [1] 64/3
producing [1]
23/16

| $\mathbf{P}$ | 117/24 | protecting [2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| product [1] 104/17 | promotion [1] | 86/11 122/4 |
| professional [1] | 127/8 | protection [1] 68/9 |
| 141/15 | properties [5] 89/4 | protections [1] 38/7 |
| profile [2] 17/24 | 129/12 129/22 | provide [6] 56/21 |
| 58/8 | 149/5 159/23 | 69/5 116/12 134/12 |
| profitability [1] | property [31] 33/4 | 147/16 152/17 |
| 94/10 | 35/17 37/3 59/1 | provided [16] |
| program [3] 10/24 | 59/17 66/20 67/24 | 62/24 67/7 78/9 |
| 74/7 148/14 | 68/16 75/14 82/8 | 78/20 109/18 116/7 |
| programs [5] 10/6 | 82/12 88/19 90/17 | 116/8 116/14 |
| 43/21 148/17 | 101/24 102/2 102/7 | 119/14 119/15 |
| 148/21 149/18 | 102/12 110/18 | 119/16 119/20 |
| prohibitions [1] | 116/5 117/21 129/3 | 119/22 119/24 |
| 125/20 | 129/13 129/24 | 147/19 158/14 |
| project [182] | 134/6 134/10 | provides [2] 67/22 |
| Project's [2] 24/13 | 134/19 135/24 | 67/23 |
| 165/22 | 148/19 149/6 | providing [3] 86/22 |
| projects [24] 43/20 | 149/11 160/13 | 126/20 158/4 |
| 43/21 45/1 45/10 | proposals [2] 13/15 | provision [3] 124/8 |
| 45/16 45/19 46/1 | 83/16 | 124/22 151/24 |
| 46/4 46/7 46/9 | propose [1] 25/16 | provisions [5] |
| 46/10 72/18 79/23 | proposed [10] 7/14 | 121/23 123/5 |
| 87/3 104/8 107/10 | 13/9 46/16 68/13 | 123/20 125/1 139/3 |
| 112/22 113/1 113/3 | 77/3 89/17 161/11 | proximate [1] 51/8 |
| 129/8 131/13 | 161/16 169/22 | proximity [2] 72/19 |
| 140/22 141/2 | 170/7 | 107/10 |
| 152/14 | proposing [4] | prudent [1] 19/13 |
| promote [1] 64/13 | 132/10 162/14 | public [17] 1/9 1/13 |
| promoted [2] 20/24 | 162/16 168/20 | 1/14 1/17 16/1 |
| $131 / 19$ | protect [2] 123/4 | 21/15 23/22 37/5 |
| promoting [1] | 142/24 | 67/13 68/3 78/14 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | 131/15 | 164/22 170/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| public... [6] 78/16 | question [36] 6/9 | 170/14 |
| 82/17 82/18 95/19 | 7/7 11/10 22/24 | Quick [1] 34/22 |
| 108/19 157/8 | 24/5 34/22 40/6 | quickly [1] 74/20 |
| Public's [1] 61/11 | 40/9 41/4 54/13 | Quinlan [2] 60/11 |
| pull [2] 152/2 165/8 | 55/7 57/22 58/16 | 148/15 |
| purchased [2] | 66/5 71/20 82/19 | quite [1] 69/14 |
| 129/14 129/14 | 91/10 109/22 | R |
| purple [1] 16/24 | 113/10 113/23 | rain [1] 74/13 |
| purposes [3] 37/1 |  | raise [1] 59/21 |
| 111/22 163/5 | 118/5 123/1 129/23 | raised [11] 26/9 |
| push [2] 101/15 |  | 32/22 72/24 87/14 |
| 101/15 | 135/21 144/24 | 88/4 90/15 107/16 |
| put [16] 17/11 | $149 / 21 \text { 149/22 }$ | 115/4 142/4 146/10 |
| 19/22 27/4 27/12 | $\begin{aligned} & 149 / 21149 / 22 \\ & 151 / 22169 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | 167/12 |
| 35/2 41/7 55/13 $56 / 13$ 61/22 64/14 | questionable [1] | raising [2] 70/12 |
| 56/13 61/22 64/14 | $42 / 12$ | 165/21 |
| 64/16 153/8 154/16 | questioners [1] | ramp [1] 122/20 |
| 160/23 161/5 | questioners [1] $32 / 23$ | range [11] 8/5 10/8 |
| 169/21 | questioning [6] 4/4 | 25/3 54/8 56/6 56/7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { putting [3] 70/13 } \\ & \mathbf{1 2 3 / 2 3} 124 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | 57/9 152/23 158/3 | 68/10 80/5 80/7 |
| Q | 166/18 167/16 | rarely [1] 61/4 |
| qualified [4] 26/4 | 4/5 4/16 41/19 42/1 | rate [1] 5/5 |
| 91/3 91/3 91/4 | 50/16 50/22 55/21 | rather [3] 90/2 |
| qualities [1] 122/5 | 56/8 57/10 59/21 | 117/2 141/3 |
| quality [5] 67/9 | 62/10 64/17 65/17 | re [3] 1/7 2/19 3/18 |
| 74/12 117/20 118/1 | 91/18 109/11 | reach [8] 72/3 82/5 |
| 127/7 | 109/13 141/24 | 94/19 95/19 95/19 |
| Quebec [4] 117/10 | 150/9 153/13 | 108/8 108/11 111/5 |
| 117/15 122/21 | 154/23 162/21 | $\begin{gathered} \text { reaching [5] } \quad \text { 66/5 } \\ 82 / 7153 / 5154 / 7 \end{gathered}$ |


| $\mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- |
| reaching... [1] |

154/14
reaction [1] 135/10 read [6] 67/12
78/16 90/8 140/16 140/24 141/20 reading [5] 38/16 92/2 92/4 92/5 92/7 reads [1] 14/12 real [3] 37/3 53/19 97/2
reality [1] 99/1 realize [1] 19/6 really [16] 29/6 44/10 48/19 61/10 81/9 83/22 100/12 101/17 101/17
104/8 104/16 110/9
121/19 136/22
142/9 149/21
reason [7] 10/10 40/14 41/3 56/24 64/4 143/7 145/7 reasonable [17]
19/13 20/12 21/14 27/17 34/6 34/9 34/20 39/21 39/23 41/9 42/19 43/2 48/7 121/7 147/5 166/23 167/8 reasonably [2] 23/2

60/4
reasons [4] 10/9
88/2 96/6 137/12
rebuilding [1] 53/9
rebuilt [3] 43/1
52/2 53/10
recall [15] 9/24
22/5 39/1 65/1
114/17 134/5 148/9
153/1 153/15 158/5
158/21 160/21
162/24 167/21
170/17
receive [1] 156/19 received [1] 103/15
receives [1] 167/10
receiving [1]

## 111/17

recent [1] 167/20
recently [2] 67/15
143/20
recess [2] 76/9 172/6
recited [1] 6/6
recognition [1] 106/22
recognize [1] 101/22
recommend [1]
17/7
recommendations
[5] 62/18 83/12

## 117/21 117/23 <br> 144/17

recommended [2] 16/23 17/5
recommending [1] 122/19
record [13] 2/19
84/16 92/8 99/4
101/22 120/3
143/18 150/16
150/17 151/2 151/3
151/8 170/1
records [1] 50/17
recreation [2] 6/23
7/3
recreational [13]
17/10 30/6 30/7
30/13 74/16 74/17
86/24 122/14 130/9
130/10 130/15
130/24 136/14
rectify [2] 5/13 5/14
red [4] 27/6 27/23
44/12 51/24
redesignated [1] 11/20
redevelopment [2]
95/8 95/16
redirect [4] 2/15
150/12 150/20 151/5
redo [1] 42/10

## R

reduce [2] 118/2 118/3
reference [9] 4/13
56/4 78/12 122/7
122/17 143/6 143/8
151/24 171/19
referenced [1]
73/11
references [3]
119/6 122/12
140/13
referred [4] 111/9
122/19 147/13
148/7
referring [4] 21/5
93/14 95/11 152/5
refers [2] 15/15
32/12
refused [1] 35/4 refuses [2] 35/9 35/9
regarding [5] 77/3
89/16 168/1 170/12 171/19
regardless [1] 159/7
region [21] 6/2 7/15 77/23 77/24 89/22 90/12 111/23 112/5
112/18 112/19
113/5 113/8 113/14

113/14 113/18
113/24 114/8
114/17 114/20
115/4 136/21
regional [26] 8/5
8/13 15/17 23/14
24/16 31/13 36/1
43/24 67/19 67/20
74/13 77/2 78/3
84/4 89/15 111/24
112/14 113/16
114/22 115/1 115/2
115/5 116/17
140/21 164/9
164/11
regionally [1]
114/24
regions [4] 111/22
112/2 112/10 114/2
regulation [2]
141/1 141/12
regulations [9]
83/19 138/17
138/22 139/10
139/21 140/2 140/2 140/11 144/5
rehabilitate [1]
57/4
rehabilitated [1]
56/12
rehabilitation [1]
44/7
reimbursement [1] 60/14
Reimers [3] 72/24
160/17 162/22
relate [4] 46/6
83/19 135/6 154/23
related [12] 4/17
26/9 77/16 78/21
78/24 86/15 110/15
116/4 116/5 126/14
163/5 173/11
relates [8] 21/20
75/15 91/1 92/13
102/6 107/12 138/4 149/6
relating [3] 30/16 101/6 118/21
relation [1] 169/3
relations [1] 139/20
relative [2] 127/6
173/13
relatively [1] 29/2
Release [1] 3/18
relevant [5] 9/2 9/7
153/22 160/8 162/7
Reliability [1] 65/2
relied [2] 88/9
114/13
relief [1] 148/9
relocate [8] 39/20
39/22 41/5 42/6
42/9 58/1 58/18
$\mathbf{R}$
relocate... [1]
134/10
relocating [2] 58/14 70/11
relocation [2] 38/14 40/20
relocations [1] 38/6 rely [1] 114/19 remain [2] 89/9 157/9
remember [9] 22/6 30/12 82/23 83/1
127/23 137/21
138/2 159/15
166/24
remote [6] 73/1
73/22 74/3 74/6
74/12 75/11
removed [2] 67/3
134/15
renewable [2]
117/24 117/24
reoccurring [1] 62/2
repair [1] 156/6 repairing [1] 156/9 repairs [1] 30/10 repeatedly [1] 164/3
replace [6] 40/23 42/14 50/9 54/20

57/4 105/18 replaced [2] 40/15 56/11
replacement [3] 3/19 50/12 107/13
replacements [1] 152/20
replacing [1] 70/14 report [29] 6/8 6/9
7/21 10/19 10/20
10/24 11/8 11/11
30/5 35/23 74/19
75/1 75/4 75/16
75/17 118/5 118/16
120/11 121/15
122/1 124/16 126/4
128/11 140/18
144/23 148/12
158/9 163/3 165/2
reporter [5] 1/24
6/18 74/22 173/4
173/18
reporting [1] 10/22 reports [9] 66/11 67/6 67/7 67/9 67/12 78/24 84/20 88/3 114/12
represent [1] 16/24 representing [1] 110/17
represents [1] 52/1 request [5] 2/19

119/24 120/3
145/14 147/9
require [6] 10/22
56/2 56/20 68/24
79/11 138/6
required [18] 8/19
8/20 9/23 10/17
10/20 25/11 36/15
43/14 43/16 44/23
79/23 79/24 80/5
80/7 80/10 125/10 139/4 139/7
requirement [1] 84/2
requirements [7]
7/24 10/2 25/10
76/4 76/19 139/13
140/18
requires [3] 38/11 116/21 119/9
requiring [1] 55/23
reroute [1] 30/23
reserved [2] 2/19
120/3
residence [1]
133/20
residential [12]
6/17 6/21 31/10
68/6 72/6 72/10
72/16 85/12 123/12
123/21 124/1
124/15

## R

resolution [2]
164/24 165/20
resolve [1] 26/12 resolved [1] 111/7 resource [2] 47/18 108/16
resources [9] 10/14 30/7 30/13 73/4
75/2 88/7 162/20 163/3 163/15 respect [20] 57/21
58/21 60/17 60/18 61/6 68/2 78/23 105/13 108/14
143/6 145/15
145/19 146/8
151/16 156/11
159/10 165/17
167/12 168/5 169/2 respond [1] 111/16 responded [1]
111/14
responding [1] 69/1 response [6] 25/14 47/5 82/19 103/7
130/3 150/10
responsibilities [2] 60/17 110/6
responsibility [9] 21/11 26/10 32/5 107/21 107/22

108/5 110/15
146/24 160/13 responsible [2] 25/15 134/16 rest [1] 7/4
restaurants [2]
99/6 157/22
restore [1] 59/16 restrict [1] 72/5 restrictions [2]
124/20 125/20
result [3] 62/8
106/18 167/20
results [2] 70/7 103/19
resumed [2] 2/4 76/10
resuming [1] 4/4 retain [1] 72/12
return [1] 40/7 returning [1]

## 109/23

review [33] 7/1 7/5
7/18 8/4 9/7 25/18
26/6 37/18 41/20
41/24 50/5 65/8
65/9 72/17 86/8
118/10 118/21
119/9 120/7 124/23
125/6 126/15
133/12 135/5 136/2 138/17 138/22

139/6 139/13 139/20 140/1
140/11 159/16
reviewed [33] 5/19
7/5 8/9 24/23 38/18
43/6 43/10 43/17
44/20 45/18 45/19
46/8 46/13 50/6
62/14 66/6 67/5
77/15 77/23 78/5
78/7 117/7 118/14
120/24 123/20
126/13 135/9
135/12 138/24
144/9 144/13
144/19 168/6
reviewing [2] 115/9
139/23
revise [2] 63/4
83/15
revised [3] 13/5
120/16 166/1
rewritten [1] 63/17
rezoned [1] 63/18
Ride [2] 73/12
163/8
rider [1] 18/1
right [98] 12/4 12/5
14/20 15/20 16/13
16/19 17/1 22/21
25/21 30/2 30/17
31/1 32/3 36/14

| $\mathbf{R}$ | 160/12 161/12 | 21/4 46/20 46/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| right... [84] 36/17 | 161/14 161/19 | 46/24 52/11 80/21 |
| 36/21 37/4 37/5 | 165/13 166/15 | 161/14 161/18 |
| 37/12 37/15 38/4 | 168/13 172/1 | rivers [1] 54/4 |
| 38/9 38/24 40/24 | right-of-way [42] | road [22] 18/6 19/7 |
| 41/13 42/8 44/16 | 12/4 12/5 32/3 | 19/24 20/14 28/11 |
| 46/8 47/12 47/21 | 36/14 36/17 36/21 | 41/8 68/11 70/4 |
| 47/21 48/17 52/10 | 37/4 37/5 37/12 | 80/23 81/4 81/6 |
| 55/9 57/8 57/22 | 37/15 38/4 38/9 | 100/5 109/16 111/7 |
| 67/2 69/24 70/2 | 44/16 69/24 70/2 | 145/16 167/20 |
| 70/9 72/10 72/11 | 70/9 72/10 72/11 | 168/5 168/9 168/10 |
| 72/22 75/18 76/7 | 72/22 75/18 86/21 | 168/12 168/21 |
| 76/19 76/23 77/8 | 88/21 110/7 111/21 | 169/17 |
| 81/19 84/17 86/2 | 122/9 122/13 | road-widening [1] |
| 86/21 88/21 90/1 | 122/20 125/18 | 68/11 |
| 100/17 101/12 | 129/5 130/14 | roads [1] 59/15 |
| 103/21 105/22 | 130/18 131/18 | roadway [11] 12/9 |
| 106/14 110/7 | 132/10 134/7 | 15/21 16/3 21/2 |
| 110/19 111/21 | 134/14 136/19 | 22/21 23/4 29/2 |
| 122/9 122/13 | 145/20 146/23 | 29/12 29/20 46/8 |
| 122/20 125/15 | 160/3 160/4 160/12 | 59/23 |
| 125/18 129/5 | 161/12 | roadway/right-of-w |
| 130/14 130/18 | rights [4] 38/1 59/4 | ay [1] 22/21 |
| 131/18 132/10 | 129/17 132/8 | roadways [4] 15/1 |
| 133/24 134/7 | rights-of-way [1] | 15/18 32/17 97/24 |
| 134/14 136/19 | 132/8 | ROBERT [1] 2/4 |
| 139/12 145/20 | rise [1] 92/21 | rock [1] 51/6 |
| 146/23 149/15 | risk [3] 55/3 55/4 | role [1] 24/11 |
| 150/1 150/4 155/4 | 55/16 | rolls [1] 39/12 |
| 155/6 158/12 | river [15] 3/17 | route [61] 3/15 7/23 |
| 158/18 159/2 | 12/10 12/11 13/1 | 8/2 12/13 12/14 |
| 159/12 160/3 160/4 | 14/1 14/3 14/12 | 13/19 14/5 14/8 |


| $\mathbf{R}$ | run [1] 145/4 | satisfied [1] 26/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| route... [53] 14/14 | rural [5] 86/11 | save [1] 61/19 |
| 14/15 14/16 14/16 | 117/19 122/4 123/3 | saw [6] 19/23 43/18 |
| 16/14 16/15 17/11 | 127/7 | 44/19 55/10 116/18 |
| 17/16 17/18 17/22 | S | 137/13 |
| 19/24 21/6 21/15 | safe [3] 23/3 23/24 | say [33] 5/6 7/3 |
| 21/18 24/2 29/14 | 30/24 | 10/22 14/6 15/9 |
| 35/18 42/22 44/6 | safely [1] 134/23 | 17/12 24/16 25/23 |
| 46/16 64/22 64/24 | safety [5] 21/15 | 26/14 31/5 40/13 |
| 65/12 71/11 71/19 | 49/12 82/18 108/19 |  |
| 79/22 82/9 84/13 | 132/18 | /69/3 67/19 |
| 84/15 96/2 97/9 | Saffo [2] 166/18 | 82/3 83/21 91/16 |
| 98/6 100/2 102/13 | 167/12 | 91/23 96/13 99/21 |
| 107/7 111/12 112/1 | said [25] 5/11 18/5 | 103/1 103/4 104/11 |
| 112/14 112/16 | 18/14 41/7 48/6 | 115/14 124/21 |
| 117/2 117/7 118/19 | 57/9 75/16 93/17 | 138/3 168/1 |
| 126/8 127/12 143/2 | 96/5 100/14 106/15 |  |
| 143/15 144/20 | 115/21 117/12 | 98/15 101/18 108/2 |
| 146/9 161/12 163/6 | 117/13 123/2 123/8 |  |
| 163/11 166/2 | 127/2 130/2 130/3 | 12/19 17/2 20/6 |
| 169/22 | 137/22 137/24 | $31 / 2044 / 651 / 19$ |
| routes [9] 13/20 | 138/2 158/10 164/3 | 61/21 62/11 64/13 |
| 15/1 15/4 15/11 <br> 15/16 16/23 20/23 | 170/6 | 82/21 83/5 85/7 |
| 98/18 137/4 | same [18] 6/9 39/15 | 138/16 |
| routinely [1] 10/21 | 52/10 52/12 52/13 | scenario [1] 34/18 |
| RSA [1] 173/19 | 54/13 53/16 59/4 $\mathbf{6 4 / 1}$ 70/22 | scenic [10] 11/12 |
| rule [1] 89/10 | 64/1 64/3 70/12 89/9 107/9 | 11/14 12/6 13/11 |
| rules [10] 4/21 4/22 | 107/12 113/19 | 13/17 14/19 88/7 |
| 19/7 54/18 76/4 | 133/19 142/20 | 117/20 123/4 127/7 |
| 79/11 90/22 116/21 | samples [1] 74/12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Schibanoff [1] } \\ & 152 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 103/21 131/1 | seems [6] 32/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| school [4] 58/8 |  | 91/21 92/1 121/6 |
| 63/20 68/9 155/21 | secondly [1] 23/2 | $\text { 127/16 } 128$ |
| scope [5] 37/16 |  | seen [14] 19/9 |
| 37/19 41/23 44/8 | section [21] 8/10 | 19/22 27/5 47/15 |
| 133/11 | 16/6 18/19 19/16 | 49/19 72/18 94/16 |
| screen [6] 3/16 4/22 | 30/4 31/19 37/15 | 129/18 136/22 |
| 5/21 46/17 161/6 | 40/14 40/23 41/5 | 149/24 150/3 157/5 |
| 161/9 | 46/9 46/11 46/17 | 159/18 168/7 |
| scroll [1] 62/4 | 51/18 51/23 53/14 | segment [11] 12/15 |
| se [1] 19/4 | 59/23 152/4 152/5 | 12/20 12/21 22/14 |
| season [4] 21/1 | 152/5 171/5 | 22/18 29/2 29/11 |
| 73/20 73/21 168/17 | sections [1] 39/24 | 30/22 59/8 160/20 |
| seasonal [2] 153/18 | see [37] 4/22 5/4 | 161/17 |
| 153/21 | 8/4 16/8 16/9 16/19 | selectmen [1] |
| seasons [1] 33/1 | 17/1 22/12 26/16 | 126/10 |
| SEC [32] 1/6 1/7 | 30/1 33/21 37/7 | sense [12] 10/11 |
| 1/19 1/20 1/21 2/5 | 46/21 46/24 47/2 | 11/1 11/11 31/1 |
| 40/10 76/4 80/14 | 48/21 49/1 51/19 | 42/15 49/16 71/12 |
| 84/2 84/5 85/21 | 52/1 52/3 52/16 | 80/17 94/2 101/10 |
| 86/7 88/13 92/10 | 52/23 72/15 73/17 | 101/14 146/22 |
| 109/4 112/22 116/8 | 84/8 99/8 101/20 | sent [6] 97/12 |
| 116/12 118/17 | 117/11 121/11 | 100/15 110/12 |
| 118/22 119/14 | 121/19 129/20 | 111/9 111/11 |
| 119/20 119/24 | 132/14 137/6 137/9 | 127/14 |
| 132/24 139/5 139/7 | 139/14 144/14 | separate [2] 124/19 |
| 140/18 141/1 150/1 | 161/21 | 172/9 |
| 162/2 162/5 | seeing [2] 95/22 | September [1] 1/3 |
| SEC's [3] 90/21 | 98/24 | series [1] 61/17 |
| 139/22 141/4 | seem [2] 87/16 | seriously [1] 59/9 |
| second [7] 11/17 | $\begin{aligned} & 96 / 20 \\ & \text { seemed [1] } 62 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | Serv [1] 1/15 service [3] 1/9 |


| S | Shapiro [1] 66/7 | shouldn't [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| service... [2] 48/16 | she [8] 47/18 | 139/20 |
| 80/7 | 137/19 152/23 | show [2] 17/21 |
| services [9] 32/2 | 158/3 166/19 | 47/17 |
| 66/2 67/19 67/21 | 166/20 167/16 | showed [4] 12/24 |
| 68/3 68/17 68/20 | 170/14 | 13/6 164/24 167/16 |
| 80/10 152/18 | sheer [2] 57/23 | showing [2] 3/16 |
| Session [3] 1/4 | 58/16 | $17 / 23$ |
| 172/8 172/11 | sheet [1] 46/23 <br> Shelburne [1] | shown [8] 5/21 <br> 14/18 16/23 44/15 |
| sessions [3] 9/4 9/5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shelburne [1] } \\ & \text { 160/20 } \end{aligned}$ | 14/18 16/23 44/15 <br> 47/1 47/4 51/8 |
| 54/15 | shift [1] 72/21 | 47/1 47/4 51/8 54/22 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { set [6] } & 40 / 976 / 6 \\ 125 / 3161 / 4170 / 1 \end{array}$ | shooting [1] 74/2 | shows [7] 14/5 |
| 173/7 | shop [1] 156/6 | 16/14 43/13 44/8 |
| set-up [1] 40/9 | short [6] 22/8 29/2 | 44/12 46/19 48/18 |
| setting [1] 74/1 | 30/5 53/12 65/19 | side [8] 27/24 46/24 |
| seven [1] 154/4 | 108/18 | 52/1 93/21 93/22 |
| seven-week [1] | short-duration [1] | 96/22 161/14 |
| 154/4 | 108/18 | 161/18 |
| several [5] 72/17 | short-term [1] 30/5 | sign [5] 35/9 41/8 |
| 94/24 102/8 110/10 | Shorthand [1] | 41/11 41/16 42/9 |
| 158/20 | 173/3 | signage [6] 21/6 |
| sewer [9] 3/7 32/14 | shot [3] 3/16 161/6 | 21/18 95/18 107/23 |
| 105/18 105/19 | 161/9 | 107/23 157/6 |
| 107/13 151/11 | should [16] 18/1 | signal [2] 42/10 |
| 151/14 151/20 | 40/8 75/24 81/21 | 42/13 |
| 152/20 | 82/2 83/6 84/7 86/4 | signals [5] 27/1 |
| Shack [1] 171/21 | 108/21 125/22 | 27/4 27/10 27/17 |
| Shaker [1] 13/17 | 137/23 140/14 |  |
| shall [4] 10/19 |  | 43/15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 82 / 2489 / 14138 / 20 \\ & \text { shape [1] 106/16 } \end{aligned}$ | 145/11 149/2 <br> shoulders [1] 20/2 | 43/15 <br> significance [1] |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 120/22 | 28/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| significance... [1] | sit [3] 26/15 127/17 | slowly [1] 22/16 |
| 114/6 | 147/4 | small [7] 30/22 |
| significant [26] | site [26] 1/2 1/10 | 80/15 80/15 122/8 |
| 7/19 10/12 32/11 | 1/12 18/15 21/21 | 125/1 160/20 |
| 61/5 64/24 70/8 | 22/4 22/16 29/17 | 161/17 |
| 70/16 81/14 87/6 | 46/19 59/10 80/19 | snowmobile [8] |
| 87/9 87/11 88/15 | 83/24 85/22 100/10 | 73/10 73/15 73/21 |
| 90/17 94/6 99/15 | 102/23 138/17 | 75/21 108/10 |
| 105/20 120/13 | 138/21 139/6 | 108/11 108/13 |
| 129/20 136/15 | 139/13 139/20 | 163/10 |
| 136/18 136/22 | 140/1 140/6 140/11 | so [264] |
| 137/11 148/22 | 143/9 146/17 | soccer [1] 136/15 |
| 149/13 157/6 | 160/17 | soliciting [1] 153/6 |
| 167/18 | sites [1] 69/12 | solution [6] 54/6 |
| significantly [1] | siting [2] 139/11 | 59/8 59/10 80/16 |
| 68/22 | 164/4 | 82/16 105/24 |
| signify [1] 17/6 | sitting [1] 71/16 | solve [1] 41/22 |
| signs [1] 26/8 | situations [1] 69/1 | some [80] 8/17 8/19 |
| silent [2] 117/17 | six [3] 5/7 5/20 | 10/1 10/6 10/17 |
| 142/13 | 52/24 | 10/20 10/21 11/13 |
| similar [2] 105/8 | sixteen [1] 61/3 | 11/15 11/16 13/16 |
| 113/23 | size [3] 54/22 54/24 | 13/20 14/21 15/23 |
| similarity [1] 105/3 | 87/5 | 18/8 19/1 21/3 |
| similarly [3] 80/6 | skill [1] 173/8 | 24/20 25/15 26/24 |
| 133/3 166/5 | slated [1] 143/5 | 27/2 28/12 40/13 |
| since [3] 54/16 | slide [7] 8/4 8/8 | 45/14 46/2 48/18 |
| 61/24 138/22 | 30/4 31/2 36/23 | 50/22 54/20 54/21 |
| sincerely [1] 97/20 | 37/9 48/18 | 56/4 56/5 56/10 |
| single [4] 10/10 | slightly [1] 135/11 | 56/20 56/23 58/18 |
| 63/3 120/22 163/13 | slow [1] 28/6 | 59/2 59/7 59/20 |
| single-zone [1] | slow-moving [1] | 60/6 61/7 62/23 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | sometimes [4] 74/9 | southern [3] 71/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| some... [39] 63/1 | 83/14 83/16 91/2 | 112/7 136/21 |
| 63/2 64/2 70/23 | somewhat [2] 24/10 | space [7] |
| 73/16 78/15 82/2 | 120/22 | 124/11 124/12 |
| 87/2 90/12 99/7 | somewhere [2] 58/6 | 124/14 124/20 |
| 100/5 102/3 103/19 | 126/12 | 136/8 143/1 |
| 107/19 107/19 | sophisticated [1] | spaces [1] 104/ |
| 109/11 110/19 | 137/1 | sparsely [1] 74/1 |
| 111/5 111/13 | sorry [13] 4/11 | speak [6] 84/21 |
| 116/18 116/18 | 20/1 34/7 34/8 | 90/22 91/24 122/6 |
| 117/8 117/20 | 37/21 39/13 60/24 | 140/1 160/24 |
| 118/15 119/7 121/8 | 74/9 103/24 133/9 | speaking [8] 53/20 |
| 125/3 127/5 129/4 | 141/19 161/9 | 79/21 84/21 89/23 |
| 130/16 144/11 | sort [23] 4/15 4/2 | 92/11 109/16 |
| 145/9 146/6 148/9 | 6/8 6/12 10/16 11/2 | 125/19 171/17 |
| 150/1 152/17 155/6 | 14/23 15/8 16/5 | special [5] 32/23 |
| 163/4 169/7 | 16/15 18/2 18/8 | 33/22 68/24 69/8 |
| somebody [1] | 20/4 24/11 30/11 | 125/8 |
| 149/23 | 30/14 44/4 44/8 | specific [14] 59/7 |
| somehow [4] 72/5 | 93/13 101/10 | 59/10 78/12 80/17 |
| 126/17 128/21 | 101/14 126/12 | 86/14 99/11 125/20 |
| 147/5 | 148/9 | 140/12 155/3 |
| someone [1] 32/6 | sorts [2] 155/2 | 159/22 161/16 |
| something [20] | 170/21 | 162/1 162/20 |
| 26/15 42/6 43/18 | sound [8] 38/24 | 171/14 |
| 44/13 48/12 70/1 | 42/18 59/6 67/10 | specifically [8] 18/5 |
| 73/2 73/24 75/6 | 88/2 88/24 100/7 | 84/18 125/22 |
| 83/1 84/5 96/19 | 164/7 | 136/20 139/23 |
| 107/20 110/1 121/6 | sounds [2] 24/12 | 152/9 158/10 159/1 |
| 137/19 148/7 | 118/7 | speculate [5] 43/5 |
| 149/23 151/23 | sources [1] 45/9 | 59/24 107/2 126/1 |
| 166/22 | south [1] 161/18 | 137/7 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 119/1 | 67/21 86/11 96/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| speculation [2] | starting [2] 17/6 | statements [6] 87/7 |
| 93/20 93/21 | 17/20 | 92/8 92/9 117/19 |
| speculative [1] | starts [1] 12/13 | 121/15 122/3 |
| 96/24 | state [58] 1/1 4/18 | states [6] 19/14 |
| speed [3] 19/19 | 8/5 8/12 8/23 9/6 | 47/22 84/19 84/20 |
| 28/19 28/19 | 9/14 9/23 10/13 | 119/9 138/18 |
| spend [3] 18/2 | 10/18 10/23 11/4 | statewide [9] 9/9 |
| 49/13 58/11 | 12/6 13/6 15/16 | 14/22 14/22 94/4 |
| spending [1] 99/6 | 19/5 21/12 29/14 | 114/18 115/15 |
| spent [2] 58/6 92/3 | 29/20 36/1 36/5 | 116/17 140/8 |
| splice [7] 18/12 | 36/6 36/13 36/14 | 140/14 |
| 40/1 40/1 40/1 | 37/7 37/24 38/13 | stating [1] 144/9 |
| 40/15 40/16 40/17 | 42/4 42/16 43/14 | station [2] 14/7 |
| split [1] 5/1 | 45/4 45/8 45/12 | 68/22 |
| spoke [2] 95/5 | 55/16 57/3 58/7 | status [3] 50/7 |
| 159/1 | 58/19 59/17 60/15 | 127/16 151/8 |
| spoken [1] 56/3 | 61/4 61/6 69/16 <br> 72/23 86/4 86/13 | statute [2] 21/12 |
| sporadic [1] 168/21 | 72/23 86/4 86/13 97/24 107/24 | $\begin{array}{\|lll} 119 / 9 & \\ \text { stay [5] } & 19 / 11 & 27 / 23 \end{array}$ |
| spot [1] 103/12 | $\begin{aligned} & 97 / 24107 / 24 \\ & 107 / 24108 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stay [5] 19/11 27/23 } \\ & 64 / 192 / 6121 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { staff [2] 54/2 102/9 } \\ & \text { stand [2] 116/20 } \end{aligned}$ | 108/16 108/22 | staying [2] 59/5 |
| 141/19 | 112/23 114/23 | 71/11 |
| standing [1] 140/6 | 118/15 118/17 | stead [1] 86/2 |
| standpoint [4] | 135/23 140/8 | steel [2] 56/13 57/2 |
| 27/10 28/16 56/18 | 146/13 <br> state's [2] 36/20 | steer [1] 51/5 stenographic [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 77 / 6 \\ & \text { star [1] } 17 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { state's [2] 36/20 } \\ & \mathbf{3 8 / 4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stenographic [1] } \\ & 173 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| start [3] 4/7 66/4 | stated [4] 55/22 | step [1] 26/13 |
| 72/4 | 98/4 114/13 136/3 | steps [3] 21/14 25/1 |
| started [5] 17/13 | statement [7] 8/15 | 30/20 |
| 29/16 40/8 44/10 | 15/13 15/14 35/23 | Steve [1] 151/1 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 152/14 | 84/16 126/8 126/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Steven [3] 1/24 | streets [1] 123/14 | 165/4 |
| 173/3 173/17 | streetscape [1] 98/9 | subsections [2] 5/2 |
| stewardship [1] | stretch [3] 23/4 | 5/7 |
| 10/13 | 12 168/19 | subseq |
| still [12] 9/2 9/7 | struck [1] 8/22 | 63/16 |
| 29/18 48/16 66/19 | structure [2] 70/19 | subsequently [1] |
| 89/7 100/8 101/1 | 124/13 | 66/10 |
| 117/7 131/8 135/1 | structures [9] | substantial [9] |
| 156/13 | 56/21 70/14 70/23 | 66/15 66/17 66/20 |
| stock [2] 73/24 76/1 | 71/1 87/5 89/9 | 67/23 68/15 101/23 |
| stocked [1] 73/19 | 124/6 124/14 125/7 | 117/6 136/10 |
| stocking [2] 74/7 | stuck [1] 138/11 | 166/16 |
| 75/13 | students [1] 68/8 | substantially [1] |
| stockings [1] 74/11 | studied [4] 88/18 | 166/17 |
| stool [2] 67/1 67/4 | 91/2 162/4 162/18 | substantiated [1] |
| stop [3] 41/7 41/11 | SUBCOMMITTEE | 115/23 |
| 42/9 | [6] 1/12 2/5 2/19 | substation [1] |
| stopped [3] 22/2 | 4/6 145/17 150/8 | 68/23 |
| 33/9 33/12 | SUBCOMMITTEE /SITE [1] 1/12 | suburban [1] 22/14 <br> success [2] 94/11 |
| stops [1] 22/1 | subdivision [4] | success [2] 94/11 100/17 |
| store [1] 102/24 | 68/5 138/6 140/1 | successful [2] 95 |
| storm [1] 32/14 <br> stout [1] 74/6 | 144/5 | 95/22 |
| strategies [1] 36/1 | subdivisions [1] | successfully [1] |
| Strategy [2] 9/14 | 85/11 | 94/22 |
| 9/16 | subject [5] 37/5 | such [10] 31/20 |
| stream [1] 54/18 | 64/5 90/21 135/5 | 79/8 81/15 84/24 |
| streams [1] 54/3 | 141/3 | 134/22 136/12 |
| street [7] 1/4 55/20 | submit [1] 26/6 | 136/14 152/11 |
| 99/14 105/17 | submitted [8] 13/10 | 152/12 16 |
| 105/21 152/14 | 13/22 25/8 78/22 | sufferance [5] |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | supplement [1] | surprises [1] 23/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sufferance... [5] | 20/4 | sway [1] 4/15 |
| 36/21 37/1 37/10 | supplemental [10] | swear [1] 40/11 |
| 38/4 38/10 | 13/24 62/24 65/14 | sweet [1] 103/12 |
| Sugar [6] 3/19 53/3 | 67/6 | sweet-spot |
| 96/15 165/23 | 78/19 78/23 135/14 | 103/12 |
| 167/17 171/21 | 158/23 | system [5] 68/9 |
| suggest [3] 21/3 | suppliers [1] 96/16 | 86/16 86/18 130/18 |
| 66/15 99/14 | support [1] 74/6 <br> supported [4] | 160/19 <br> systems [1] 125/2 |
| suggested [1] 169/8 | supported [4] |  |
| suggesting [2] 71/4 | 115/5 116/1 116/3 | T |
| 71/17 | supporting [1] | table [13] 6/10 |
| summaries [1] | 118/2 | 11/12 11/21 12/1 |
| 116/8 |  | 12/23 12/23 13/3 |
| summarize [2] 44/5 | 165/1 | 13/5 13/22 14/5 |
| 140/17 |  | 14/8 14/12 14/12 |
| summarized [2] | sure [33] 11/7 | tables [1] 14/5 |
| 7/21 9/21 | 21/14 24/6 34/4 | take [15] 17/8 18/9 |
| summarizing [2] | 40/4 41/18 50/9 | 18/14 18/16 27/20 |
| 92/4 92/5 | 53/7 55/16 59/9 | 28/6 40/11 58/23 |
| summary [13] 2/19 | 60/2 61/9 64/8 69/9 | 76/8 80/18 96/21 |
| 51/17 62/16 116/14 | 69/14 72/2 85/4 | 96/21 98/6 111/15 |
| 119/2 119/4 126/16 |  | 164/19 |
| 154/17 155/1 |  | taken [9] 1/23 |
| 158/11 158/11 |  | 21/14 29/9 30/20 |
| 158/14 158/17 |  | 54/8 76/9 87/24 |
| summer [2] 168/17 | $\begin{aligned} & 121 / 14124 / 5 \\ & 127 / 13127 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | 172/6 173/6 |
| 168/17 |  | takes [2] 27/20 28/ |
| Sunapee [1] 74/4 supercede [1] 9/17 | 139/3 156/20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { taking [2] 23/23 } \\ & 91 / 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Supervisor [2] } \\ 143 / 19166 / 11 \end{gathered}$ | surprise [1] 142/9 <br> surprised [1] 50/10 | talk [11] 11/12 36/5 48/20 61/7 72/21 |


| T | tell [11] 23/8 36/12 | test [1] $156 / 8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| talk... [6] 93/7 | 37/13 47/6 48/14 | testified [7] 51/3 |
| 97/17 97/19 103/8 | 103/16 119/20 | 60/11 115/12 |
| 136/4 154/12 | 148/11 148/13 | 148/15 154/13 |
| talked [12] 11/22 | 164/11 164/14 | 157/13 159/16 |
| 27/9 28/14 49/3 | telling [1] 13/4 | testify [1] 27/14 |
| 61/16 61/19 62/7 | tells [1] 89/10 | testimony [37] 6/7 |
| 110/11 152/8 | temporary [16] | 8/3 13/24 27/1 33/7 |
| 156/12 156/18 | 15/4 15/9 15/10 | 36/9 40/16 62/24 |
| 156/23 | 21/22 79/5 79/11 | 65/15 66/6 67/6 |
| talking [11] 77/10 | 81/11 97/22 97/23 | 67/6 67/17 77/13 |
| 93/8 93/10 93/12 | 99/22 100/6 107/1 | 78/18 78/19 78/24 |
| 93/18 97/11 110/8 | 108/18 109/2 | 80/24 84/19 88/3 |
| 123/11 146/14 | 130/16 149/3 | 90/8 94/14 109/11 |
| 152/10 170/14 | ten [11] 39/22 43/7 | 110/19 110/22 |
| tall [3] 55/24 56/14 | 43/17 43/23 45/6 | 114/12 114/19 |
| 87/5 | 45/13 45/16 46/14 | 119/7 120/11 122/1 |
| taller [4] 56/20 | 76/8 133/20 172/5 | 135/14 138/13 |
| 70/13 89/8 124/13 | ten-minute [1] 76/8 | 141/5 141/18 |
| Tamarack [5] 3/13 | ten-year [7] 43/7 | 141/20 148/10 |
| 152/24 153/9 | 43/17 43/23 45/6 | 158/23 |
| 153/14 155/11 | 45/13 45/16 46/14 | than [27] 8/17 9/11 |
| $\operatorname{tax}[6] ~ 45 / 845 / 8$ | tend [1] 74/5 | 20/13 28/22 29/20 |
| 66/17 91/4 94/5 | Tennis [2] 3/13 | 29/24 36/6 42/23 |
| 94/6 | 154/4 | 43/10 49/13 52/17 |
| taxable [1] 68/16 | tenure [1] 88/13 | 52/18 53/1 53/6 |
| taxes [6] 66/16 | term [3] 5/9 30/5 | 86/10 111/1 112/24 |
| 66/21 67/24 90/17 | 37/2 | 117/2 122/10 |
| 116/5 117/21 | terms [5] 24/13 | 124/13 130/11 |
| technique [3] 50/13 | 37/6 37/9 69/1 96/5 | 136/6 141/3 143/12 |
| 51/4 56/24 | terrain [1] 130/12 | 145/1 145/11 |
| telecommunication <br> [1] 125/11 | terrific [1] 110/22 | 152/15 |


| $\mathbf{T}$ | 166/22 168/24 | 166/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thank [14] 26/18 | 169/14 170 | them [84] 5/16 5/17 |
| 34/21 35/19 76/14 | theater [1] 96/14 | 7/4 9/21 10/6 10/7 |
| 91/8 106/9 109/5 | their [77] 10/8 | 10/11 11/20 18/8 |
| 113/21 128/8 | 21/17 33/16 35/3 | 18/9 20/15 23/10 |
| 137/16 141/21 | 36/2 38/12 38/19 | 23/11 23/17 25/11 |
| 141/22 147/24 | 39/12 41/10 45/22 | 26/24 32/7 35/16 |
| 171/23 | 53/9 54/14 59/19 | 45/20 45/21 50/23 |
| that [954] | 61/20 63/10 67/10 | 52/16 52/18 52/24 |
| that's [69] 11/14 | 72/9 72/12 74/11 | 53/14 56/3 58/23 |
| 13/2 14/7 16/12 | 74/15 75/14 82/10 | 61/5 61/18 61/18 |
| 19/5 20/10 21/9 | 84/9 84/11 85/20 | 62/4 62/9 64/1 |
| 21/24 22/21 23/6 | 86/1 86/2 87/18 | 68/19 74/8 74/10 |
| 24/23 25/22 26/1 | 87/19 87/22 87/23 | 78/17 82/6 82/9 |
| 33/8 36/3 36/18 | 89/21 90/3 90/4 | 85/15 85/15 86/20 |
| 40/17 40/20 40/24 | 90/6 92/4 92/5 | 94/20 95/2 95/20 |
| 45/11 50/22 51/1 | 94/21 95/3 95/20 | 95/23 95/24 96/19 |
| 51/16 52/5 52/17 | 98/5 99/17 101/5 | 97/4 97/19 98/1 |
| 52/20 55/7 57/11 | 101/6 102/7 102/14 | 100/22 101/5 |
| 58/15 60/23 65/17 | 105/2 110/2 110/5 | 102/15 103/6 |
| 68/13 72/13 73/1 | 111/1 114/17 | 105/23 106/6 110/5 |
| 73/13 81/9 82/4 | 114/19 115/19 | 110/21 117/5 120/6 |
| 83/7 83/21 84/5 | 115/20 115/23 | 121/1 125/13 |
| 84/19 85/18 86/7 | 116/3 116/9 117/7 | 126/15 127/9 |
| 88/24 90/21 92/22 | 117/12 117/16 | 127/24 130/8 |
| 93/3 93/6 96/23 | 120/16 121/11 | 137/14 138/24 |
| 99/15 99/22 100/6 | 125/9 125/11 | 149/9 149/17 151/9 |
| 100/22 102/7 106/1 | 129/14 129/14 | 153/6 154/7 155/10 |
| 108/24 110/21 | 135/5 136/6 141/3 | 156/3 159/21 |
| 121/5 123/9 124/4 | 142/13 144/16 | 163/19 163/22 |
| 124/21 138/11 | 144/22 153/6 | 164/11 164/14 |
| 145/21 158/1 160/5 | 155/21 156/7 165/6 | 164/18 164/18 |


| T | 32/5 32/7 32/9 33/7 | 61/19 63/21 64/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| them... [1] 167/7 | 35/23 38/13 42/24 | 71/8 73/14 73/16 |
| theme [1] 62/2 | 44/18 47/3 48/15 | 73/18 73/24 74/2 |
| then [63] 5/2 5/4 | 49/2 49/3 52/24 | 74/12 74/21 78 |
| 5/21 6/3 6/12 8/8 | 53/1 53/2 53/13 | 80/24 86/16 88/23 |
| 13/10 13/14 13/18 | 54/17 57/12 57/12 | 94/19 98/18 104/11 |
| 16/12 16/15 16/17 | 57/13 59/8 60/19 | 104/24 124/18 |
| 16/18 17/16 17/16 | 62/6 68/21 69/16 | 133/3 133/19 145/3 |
| 21/7 22/3 22/17 | 72/13 73/14 75/20 | 153/3 156/12 |
| 25/6 25/10 26/6 | 80/16 81/22 86/10 | 156/14 163/15 |
| 26/7 26/8 26/10 | 93/21 94/5 96/6 | 164/10 164/15 |
| 27/20 27/24 28/2 | 97/8 99/3 101/18 | 164/18 165/2 166/2 |
| 29/1 29/3 31/18 | 104/12 104/22 | 166/7 170/21 173/ |
| 44/17 49/12 53/6 | 106/22 109/17 | they [204] |
| 62/6 63/10 63/15 | 120/14 128/15 | they'Il [1] 92/21 |
| 64/19 78/1 78/19 | 131/14 132/15 | they're [38] 8/20 |
| 87/2 90/5 91/1 | 132/15 135/14 | 11/1 22/15 25/7 |
| 96/18 101/16 108/7 | 136/10 155/19 | 25/10 27/4 27/21 |
| 109/12 114/3 | 172/2 | 27/24 39/22 41/15 |
| 115/17 120/12 | therefore [1] | 43/12 57/19 64/5 |
| 120/18 128/18 | 128/15 | 64/10 82/12 89/23 |
| 131/8 133/7 134/2 | these [67] 6/15 7/20 | 92/20 93/2 97/17 |
| 142/24 144/3 147/8 | 8/10 9/22 10/14 | 99/19 99/20 100/12 |
| 154/20 169/2 | 10/17 13/20 15/4 | 104/22 105/1 |
| 16 169/20 | 16/24 17/6 17/12 | 105/22 105/23 |
| 169/21 169/23 | 18/3 19/1 20/2 | 108/7 108/9 108 |
| there [200] | 25/5 26/5 27/17 | 112/23 123/11 |
| there's [63] 5/4 | 41/19 44/4 44/5 | 123/13 127/20 |
| 7/22 10/10 14/13 | 46/1 46/4 47/14 | 142/13 142/14 |
| 19/2 19/5 20/8 | 49/7 52/7 53/24 | 149/13 15 |
| 21/22 21/24 22/19 | 54/20 54/22 57/13 | 157/ |
| 24/19 28/4 31/19 | 58/18 58/23 61/12 | thing [9] 4/20 28/5 |


| T | 110/19 116/18 | 33/18 54/20 54/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| thing... [7] 45/1 | 119/21 125/22 | 55/5 56/7 56/11 |
| 49/11 61/17 91/23 | 127/13 132/21 | 56/14 60/1 60/5 |
| 93/4 96/11 98/16 | 138/9 139/17 | 62/10 63/10 64/17 |
| things [22] 18/10 | 139/19 139/19 | 66/11 67/3 67/13 |
| 23/8 26/22 44/23 | 143/14 145/6 | 68/23 69/2 69/18 |
| 53/7 55/22 58/18 | 147/13 148/7 149/1 | 72/8 73/4 73/10 |
| 63/21 68/1 72/8 | 149/1 149/21 | 75/1 75/5 75/10 |
| 74/2 96/18 98/7 | 151/24 157/12 | 78/7 78/8 79/7 |
| 98/13 102/4 105/22 | 157/20 158/2 | 83/16 84/10 85/15 |
| 111/7 122/5 127/8 | 161/21 162/21 | 85/23 86/8 90/9 |
| 146/10 155/3 | 164/23 165/3 | 91/6 92/19 93/16 |
| 164/19 | 165/16 167/23 | 93/18 96/18 97/1 |
| think [79] 7/12 | 170/20 | 97/21 98/2 98/6 |
| 10/8 22/6 23/1 | thinking [4] 46/3 | 99/7 103/19 108/20 |
| 25/13 27/1 34/6 | 56/6 56/6 81/21 | 110/10 110/12 |
| 34/8 34/18 34/19 | thirty [3] 29/19 | 112/9 115/8 122/23 |
| 35/13 40/6 41/13 | 29/21 150/14 | 123/5 125/3 125/6 |
| 42/20 46/12 49/11 | this [209] | 126/12 129/6 |
| 50/17 54/12 55/7 | Thornton [7] 3/9 | 129/11 129/21 |
| 55/20 59/13 60/11 | 14/16 53/5 127/24 | 129/21 130/21 |
| 61/11 72/1 74/1 | 151/12 171/1 171/7 | 136/21 138/21 |
| 74/4 76/5 77/17 | thorough [1] | 139/3 139/8 139/9 |
| 79/17 81/5 81/20 | 118/20 | 140/11 142/6 |
| 82/19 87/11 87/15 | thoroughly [3] | 143/11 144/11 |
| 93/4 93/17 93/23 | 88/18 91/2 121/1 | 144/13 145/6 146/1 |
| 96/4 96/7 96/11 | those [98] 5/8 5/24 | 146/19 147/1 |
| 101/19 101/21 | 7/17 22/19 23/7 | 148/21 149/18 |
| 101/22 103/7 107/4 | 23/9 23/10 23/16 | 156/20 157/18 |
| 107/15 107/17 | 24/1 27/9 28/12 | 157/23 159/24 |
| 108/20 108/21 | 29/21 31/16 32/11 | 167/11 171/13 |
| 108/23 109/15 | 32/21 32/24 33/17 | though [5] 52/12 |

though... [4] 87/18
123/23 139/19 148/7
thought [9] 7/11
9/11 14/4 15/23
88/12 137/22 140/5
165/3 170/6
thoughts [3] 20/16 20/18 96/12 three [10] 19/16 28/23 52/3 52/24 53/2 67/1 68/19 98/22 114/2 136/20 three feet [1] 19/16 three-foot [1] 28/23 three-legged [1] 67/1
three-year [1] 98/22
threshold [1] 132/4 threw [1] 18/8 through [31] 16/16 16/21 17/17 20/22 22/3 22/16 22/20 24/15 24/21 27/19 28/8 28/17 29/2 32/21 33/21 55/14 58/22 61/18 62/4 71/18 80/8 82/6 99/23 102/4 104/19 144/20 155/6

156/13 159/1
161/13 162/16 throughout [7] 14/2 59/17 67/7
80/13 95/3 110/9
114/11
thus [2] 154/17
155/1
time [26] 9/8 18/2
18/18 18/20 20/14
30/11 33/21 33/22
43/11 48/5 49/17
59/4 61/19 64/6
81/16 92/3 98/4
98/24 99/12 105/20
127/10 155/10
155/15 161/2 168/8 173/9
timed [1] 27/18
times [12] 21/24
40/19 59/16 69/23
90/16 98/10 104/6
154/13 155/16
155/21 156/19
158/20
timing [2] 27/10 154/8
tip [1] 132/5
tipping [1] 132/15
titled [1] 3/14
today [3] 54/23
71/16 89/5
together [4] 5/5
5/16 98/1 105/15 told [3] 111/3
120/17 164/18
too [3] 4/15 42/13
150/23
took [5] 6/3 6/23
45/20 107/17
166/21
tool [1] 45/6
top [4] 16/10 36/23
39/1 52/2
topic [4] 30/3
107/15 152/22
162/19
topics [2] 78/22
167/15
torn [1] 152/15
total [3] 11/23
38/22 122/10
totally [2] 104/8 161/4
touch [1] 94/24
tour [2] 80/19
170/17
tourism [9] 90/14
90/14 90/15 91/4
114/15 115/14
116/4 127/7 163/22
tourist [2] 17/10 108/24
towards [1] 91/19

| T | 112/16 | 171/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [1] 134/22 | towns [30] 15/6 | trail [26] 12/10 |
| towers [8] 55/24 | 15/12 31/21 32/13 | 12/12 12/18 13/1 |
| 56/14 57/13 70/15 | 79/3 79/19 81/24 | 14/1 14/3 14/13 |
| 125/1 133/6 133/14 | 82/6 84/9 87/15 | 21/4 30/19 30/23 |
| 133/19 | 87/22 115/17 120/6 | 73/13 73/20 75/21 |
| town [52] 34/13 | 120/8 123/21 | 86/15 86/18 107/24 |
| 35/7 35/8 46/21 | 125/10 125/22 | 108/6 108/24 |
| 51/18 51/20 51/23 | 136/20 136/21 | 130/17 131/1 131/5 |
| 69/19 81/9 83/7 | 138/3 140/7 140/9 | 131/17 163/6 163/8 |
| 83/9 86/13 106/13 | 140/10 140/12 | 166/6 166/9 |
| 106/15 112/16 | 143/4 143/11 144/6 | trailhead [1] 30/18 |
| 112/16 113/4 120/6 | 144/12 145/3 156/2 | trailheads [2] 30/16 |
| 120/16 120/19 | towns' [1] 142/10 | 107/20 |
| 120/21 121/4 | townwide [1] | trails [19] 11/20 |
| 121/10 121/21 | 136/23 | 73/10 73/10 73/17 |
| 122/5 122/16 | track [3] 62/22 | 86/20 107/16 |
| 122/22 125/11 | 64/17 65/11 | 108/13 108/13 |
| 126/11 131/20 | tracked [3] 63/10 | 108/14 108/22 |
| 136/9 139/9 139/11 | 63/14 63/24 | 108/22 122/13 |
| 139/21 143/7 144/6 | traffic [33] 20/5 | 122/15 122/15 |
| 145/10 152/1 152/9 | 21/7 21/8 21/13 | 130/14 131/16 |
| 152/13 161/13 | 21/22 21/24 22/1 | 136/7 163/10 |
| 161/16 164/3 164/8 | 22/3 22/10 24/22 | 163/11 |
| 164/10 169/20 | 24/22 26/5 27/6 | training [3] 68/24 |
| 170/14 170/22 | 28/7 28/10 28/17 | 69/4 69/8 |
| 171/6 171/7 171/13 | 28/21 29/11 29/24 | transcript [3] |
| 171/22 | 35/10 59/18 68/12 | 147/11 172/10 |
| town's [5] 84/9 | 81/15 82/13 82/14 | 173/5 |
| 86/15 86/18 121/23 | 100/7 106/20 | transcripts [1] |
| 124/3 | 106/21 166/19 | 78/17 |
| town-by-town [1] | 167/3 167/4 168/22 | transition [1] 14/7 |


| T | traveling [2] 16/1 | 132/14 167/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| transmission [52] | 8 | tuned [1] 101/2 |
| 1/8 49/24 55/14 | treeline [1] 125/4 | turbine [1] 134/23 |
| 61/3 67/22 70/17 | trench [1] 18/12 | turf [2] 136/16 |
| 72/15 72/17 72/20 | tried [8] 51/22 90/3 | 136/17 |
| 75/3 82/23 83/6 | 114/23 120/12 | turn [1] 58/9 |
| 84/18 84/21 84/22 | 121/1 122/2 126/1 | turned [1] 83/17 |
| 85/1 85/8 85/17 | 143/16 | turning [2] 100/5 |
| 86/14 87/3 87/8 | tries [1] 54/7 | 152/22 |
| 87/19 87/20 88/1 | trip [1] 21/17 | twenty [1] 61/1 |
| 89/1 89/6 89/8 | trooper [1] 69/16 | twice [1] 105/22 |
| 113/2 117/18 | trout [4] 73/1 73/22 | two [23] 5/20 5/21 |
| 121/17 122/7 | 74/7 75/13 | 14/4 18/21 27/20 |
| 123/16 123/24 | truck [1] 59/19 | 43/9 43/17 45/14 |
| 125/17 125/21 | trucks [1] 16/1 | 63/5 74/21 75/5 |
| 128/13 131/22 | true [1] 173/5 | 98/22 99/11 104/8 |
| 132/11 132/19 | truss [1] 53/2 | 105/3 105/8 135/3 |
| 133/3 133/4 135/2 | try [20] 33/17 34/16 | 148/16 148/21 |
| 137/23 138/20 | 35/15 35/16 53/23 | 149/18 154/18 |
| 140/21 142/16 | 56/7 59/1 60/4 71/8 | 167/15 172/5 |
| 142/17 143/7 143/8 | 82/15 90/9 94/21 | two-page [1] |
| 160/12 160/19 | 95/20 105/14 117/2 | 154/18 |
| 164/5 | 125/13 126/19 | two-year [1] 63/5 |
| transparent [1] | 134/3 134/18 | type [11] 6/9 18/1 |
| 44/24 | 150/21 | 34/17 52/12 52/13 |
| transportation [14] | trying [19] 13/3 | 74/1 94/17 124/15 |
| 1/16 4/14 6/22 | 23/22 25/22 35/16 | 135/3 142/11 |
| 31/19 32/1 43/8 | 37/23 71/24 82/5 | 171/16 |
| 137/4 143/21 | 82/5 92/6 92/16 | types [3] 73/4 129/1 |
| 145/18 146/5 146/7 | 93/23 94/19 96/4 | 130/5 |
| 146/19 164/5 167/3 | 98/12 105/23 | typical [6] 44/19 |
| travel [1] 166/21 | 127/17 132/2 | 48/22 48/24 124/10 |


| T | 84/7 135/5 172/9 | 145/14 145/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| typical... [2] 124/21 | 173/8 | 156/17 169/4 |
| 124/21 | underground [38] | 169/15 170/3 |
| typically [9] 25/4 | 12/9 12/13 12/20 | understanding [50] |
| 29/24 33/19 51/8 | 12/20 14/1 14/17 | 3/4 3/6 3/7 3/9 3/11 |
| 94/16 112/22 | 16/8 16/15 18/19 | 23/13 28/20 36/18 |
| 123/11 125/3 138/5 | 34/12 37/15 39/16 | 38/17 38/19 45/23 |
| U | 39/24 46/9 46/11 | 56/19 57/17 85/18 |
| U | 49/24 51/18 51/23 | 98/3 102/6 105/2 |
| U.S [2] 12/14 80/6 | 53/13 55/14 93/11 | 111/13 121/7 |
| Uh [15] 5/23 10/5 | 97/9 109/20 110/2 | 126/22 143/4 |
| 13/13 18/24 22/11 | 110/24 138/21 | 148/13 148/15 |
| 23/18 29/22 57/5 | 142/8 142/10 | 149/12 151/15 |
| 59/12 65/6 82/1 | 142/21 143/5 144/8 | 153/3 153/10 |
| 118/13 119/3 131/6 | 145/4 145/8 145/15 | 153/17 154/24 |
| 138/15 | 146/8 155/9 162/10 | 155/7 155/14 |
| Uh-huh [15] 5/23 | 168/19 | 155/23 156/4 156/9 |
| 10/5 13/13 18/24 | undergrounded [3] | 156/11 156/22 |
| 22/11 23/18 29/22 | 96/2 110/7 166/10 | 157/4 157/12 158/1 |
| 57/5 59/12 65/6 | undergrounding [2] | 160/1 160/5 160/6 |
| 82/1 118/13 119/3 | 12/5 166/2 | 161/23 167/2 |
| 131/6 138/15 | underlying [1] | 168/11 168/18 |
| ultimately [2] | 86/23 | 168/24 169/19 |
| 149/12 162/2 | underneath [2] | 171/6 171/12 |
| uncooperative [1] | 46/22 48/20 | understandings [1] |
| 33/11 | understand [22] | 127/11 |
| under [20] 12/17 | 4/22 4/24 12/1 | understands [2] |
| 14/21 17/20 22/8 | 38/16 73/23 81/17 | 60/17 97/10 |
| 25/8 31/3 43/1 | 83/22 94/20 107/5 | understood [3] |
| 46/19 46/24 52/4 | 110/13 118/24 | 55/16 67/5 120/2 |
| 68/14 79/24 80/1 | 121/3 132/2 132/14 | undertaken [2] |
| 80/2 80/2 80/20 | 141/13 142/5 | 25/2 107/10 |

underway [1] 29/18 undeveloped [1] 162/17
undisturbed [2] 22/18 161/13 undue [4] 5/9 79/8 89/11 141/10 unduly [6] 6/1 7/8 7/14 77/22 89/12 114/7
unique [1] 122/4 unless [4] 24/19
86/15 122/7 149/22 unlike [2] 49/10
125/17
unoccupied [3]
124/12 124/20
125/7
unprecedented [1] 92/12
unreasonable [3]
91/6 114/1 115/16 until [1] 17/14 unusual [1] 120/22 up [62] 5/3 14/23
16/9 18/15 20/15
21/20 21/21 27/4
28/7 28/19 30/3
32/7 34/3 40/9
41/19 47/18 51/19
52/1 54/5 57/10

58/8 66/18 70/5
72/22 74/20 82/15
85/22 91/10 92/6
96/15 96/19 97/14
98/24 99/18 100/16
101/17 102/13
102/23 104/6 105/6
105/23 106/5
109/11 134/7
137/19 142/3
146/14 150/20
151/1 152/2 152/15
153/8 153/12
154/16 156/3
160/23 161/5 161/6 162/21 165/8 168/3 170/24
update [9] 13/22
13/23 23/7 63/1
63/3 65/13 111/6
111/11 120/6
updated [7] 10/21
43/16 63/2 63/9
63/9 63/11 64/2
updates [5] 13/6
61/21 61/24 62/20 64/6
upon [2] 40/21
100/18
upshot [1] 149/12
urban [2] 22/12
32/15
urge [1] 34/16 us [12] 4/7 13/4 34/9 79/11 89/10 93/1 99/19 99/19 99/20 120/17 126/8 128/4
use [99] 5/1 5/20
7/9 7/12 7/14 7/16
10/7 15/3 30/4 31/3
31/10 55/23 56/4
56/5 56/13 56/15
56/19 56/23 56/23
56/24 59/6 59/14
59/17 63/16 63/21
64/20 65/5 68/13
68/18 69/24 71/6
71/8 71/22 72/5
73/14 73/15 73/20
73/21 75/14 75/15
75/22 76/2 76/21
77/6 77/19 77/22
84/24 85/3 87/24
88/2 89/9 90/22
108/10 112/12
122/10 122/12
124/15 125/8 125/8
126/14 126/24
128/15 128/20
128/22 129/11
129/17 129/21
129/24 130/13
130/15 130/17

| $\mathbf{U}$ | using [4] 15/7 21/18 | 149/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| use... [28] 130/24 | 66/16 66/16 | various [8] 5/2 |
| 131/4 131/5 131/8 | usual [1] 123/20 | 11/20 57/20 88/14 |
| 131/10 131/14 | usually [4] 28/24 | 111/22 136/9 |
| 131/24 132/6 132/8 | 41/22 127/1 138/4 | 158/11 164/2 |
| 133/7 133/14 | utilities [9] 1/13 | VARNEY [14] 2/4 |
| 133/15 133/18 | 1/14 6/23 31/22 | 4/5 24/7 34/8 65/23 |
| 133/21 135/1 135/8 | 33/5 110/2 123/9 | 76/15 93/17 109/8 |
| 135/11 147/3 | 134/21 138/19 | 142/3 148/5 150/9 |
| 159/14 159/18 | utility [33] 31/19 | 151/7 170/4 172/2 |
| 160/2 160/4 160/7 | 32/2 36/8 36/13 | vary [1] 125/5 |
| 160/11 160/15 | 36/20 36/24 37/3 | vast [1] 146/5 |
| 162/14 163/16 | 37/12 38/3 38/7 | vault [1] 40/1 |
| 163/20 | 38/8 38/11 38/11 | vegetated [1] 86/17 |
| used [9] 7/13 33/19 | 42/20 71/3 71/5 | vegetation [2] |
| 49/23 64/7 86/17 | 82/22 122/9 123/15 | 75/20 134/7 |
| 94/17 116/19 | 123/18 128/14 | vehicle [1] 19/10 |
| 116/24 165/9 | 129/16 129/17 | vehicles [2] 20/15 |
| useful [2] 8/17 8/17 | 129/19 131/22 | 156/8 |
| uses [34] 6/11 6/11 | 131/23 132/5 | venture [2] 123/17 |
| 6/12 6/15 7/6 7/17 | 132/16 133/24 | 123/18 |
| 7/20 7/22 8/1 31/8 | 134/20 160/14 | verbal [2] $47 / 5$ |
| 31/15 32/11 37/4 | 161/22 164/6 | 150/10 |
| 59/19 70/21 71/10 | utility's [2] 36/16 | very [25] 9/8 23/15 |
| 72/11 73/7 74/16 | 160/4 | 31/16 43/19 48/5 |
| 74/17 77/21 86/24 | V | 50/10 59/24 66/4 |
| 88/16 88/20 129/6 | valid [1] 37/12 | 68/16 70/21 74/7 |
| 130/19 130/21 | Valley [4] 65/2 | 87/17 92/10 94/22 |
| 132/13 133/22 | 70/20 132/22 134/6 | 97/7 99/20 103/21 |
| 136/12 136/13 | 70/20 132/22 134/6 | 118/20 129/6 134/3 |
| 136/14 137/1 | value 2 [ $26 / 16$ 148/19 | 134/14 149/2 149/5 |
| 143/14 | values [2] 88/19 | 154/15 171/22 |


| $\mathbf{V}$ | 83/21 | 105/18 105/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vicinity [1] 46/1 | want [41] 17/11 | 107/13 151/11 |
| view [10] 92/1 | 26/16 27/12 27/14 | 151/14 151/20 |
| 136/11 140/17 | 33/11 49/13 59/9 | 152/20 163/13 |
| 141/10 141/13 | 64/8 70/5 72/11 | waters [1] 75/15 |
| 143/22 148/21 | 83/22 89/1 89/2 | way [66] 1/15 2/8 |
| 164/12 166/7 | 97/19 97/19 97/20 | 12/4 12/5 17/12 |
| 166/23 | 101/21 103/5 | 21/23 22/21 32/3 |
| views [19] 77/1 | 104/15 104/15 | 34/15 36/14 36/17 |
| 77/12 77/17 78/2 | 106/3 106/4 106/15 | 36/21 37/4 37/5 |
| 79/12 84/2 85/23 | 108/8 137/7 145/8 | 37/12 37/15 38/4 |
| 86/6 89/14 91/22 | 152/2 154/12 | 38/9 41/8 42/12 |
| 92/14 114/24 116/9 | 154/15 154/16 | 44/16 52/14 56/12 |
| 131/2 140/4 140/9 | 155/6 157/7 157/16 | 58/10 69/12 69/24 |
| 140/10 143/11 | 162/8 165/8 165/15 | 70/2 70/9 72/10 |
| 165/6 | 168/3 169/9 170/1 | 72/11 72/22 74/5 |
| Village [1] 13/17 | 170/24 171/4 | 75/18 79/8 79/16 |
| visible [3] 75/5 | wanted [9] 11/5 | 79/18 79/22 81/15 |
| 75/10 137/5 | 36/5 48/19 58/9 | 86/21 88/21 92/1 |
| vision [2] 64/11 | 66/4 68/19 104/3 | 106/16 110/7 |
| 83/10 | 139/2 154/18 | 110/14 111/6 |
| visit [1] 102/23 | wants [4] 10/6 10/7 | 111/21 122/9 |
| visitors [1] 100/8 | 106/20 137/19 | 122/13 122/20 |
| vistas [1] 123/4 | was [226] | 125/18 129/5 |
| visual [10] 88/5 | wasn't [11] 9/19 | 130/14 130/18 |
| 88/6 88/11 90/20 | 35/2 41/23 46/16 | 131/18 132/8 |
| 90/23 130/7 133/10 | 63/17 73/6 73/12 | 132/10 134/7 |
| 165/22 166/6 166/8 | 83/4 119/2 119/14 | 134/14 136/19 |
| vouchers [1] 99/5 | 141/1 | 145/20 146/23 |
| W | water [15] 3/7 | 160/12 161/12 |
| wait [2] 29/21 | 64/14 64/18 74/11 | we [98] 4/4 5/6 |


| W | 149/1 161/21 163/9 | weighs [1] 84/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| we... [96] 10/23 | 169/11 169/14 | Welcome [1] 4/3 |
| 12/10 13/22 18/15 | 169/18 169/21 | well [56] 10/15 22/8 |
| 18/15 26/15 26/16 | 170/3 172/2 | 23/17 23/19 24/10 |
| 34/9 44/10 45/10 | we'll [4] 93/4 | 28/17 29/7 30/21 |
| 45/11 47/11 48/6 | 101/20 153/8 172/4 | 35/8 35/18 42/7 |
| 50/22 50/23 52/15 | we're [11] 26/14 | 44/3 45/14 50/15 |
| 52/21 54/20 59/13 | 71/17 83/7 86/2 | 60/15 67/14 77/17 |
| 60/1 60/5 61/2 | 91/20 91/21 92/23 | 77/24 78/17 80/11 |
| 62/19 62/22 62/22 | 93/14 93/15 102/22 | 80/18 84/13 89/23 |
| 63/6 63/7 63/23 | 106/13 | 93/22 94/8 100/1 |
| 63/23 64/3 64/14 | we've [18] 26/14 | 100/22 101/6 |
| 64/21 64/21 64/22 | 30/11 30/12 33/7 | 101/21 103/4 |
| 65/7 66/10 68/21 | 36/9 38/20 38/23 | 105/24 108/2 108/4 |
| 71/4 71/16 73/5 | 47/15 90/18 93/22 | 110/5 112/22 |
| 73/7 73/8 76/8 | 100/15 110/8 | 118/15 118/20 |
| 79/18 80/18 82/3 | 110/19 110/22 | 123/15 125/2 125/6 |
| 83/9 84/7 84/17 | 132/3 156/12 157/5 | 125/14 130/13 |
| 86/4 86/5 89/19 | 169/24 | 131/20 136/12 |
| 93/3 93/7 93/8 | Weathersby [4] | 137/2 138/9 139/17 |
| 93/10 93/12 93/18 | 1/17 2/11 109/6 | 140/16 143/4 |
| 97/23 98/16 101/16 | 151/7 | 144/22 145/23 |
| 104/11 110/11 | website [7] 14/18 | 150/23 159/24 |
| 113/4 113/4 113/5 | 20/22 63/11 92/9 | 164/9 165/24 169/1 |
| 116/18 120/18 | 92/10 131/19 | went [14] 7/24 |
| 120/24 121/1 | 131/20 | 14/10 16/4 46/12 |
| 121/13 122/2 128/7 | week [6] 70/4 72/24 | 50/19 66/18 70/3 |
| 131/21 137/7 137/7 | 106/7 119/8 154/4 | 78/20 102/24 |
| 137/13 139/19 | 168/10 | 112/11 118/20 |
| 140/5 140/9 140/14 | weeks [2] 99/13 | 131/21 138/9 146/3 |
| 141/5 144/3 144/9 | 103 | were [115] 7/6 |
| 145/6 147/5 149/1 | weigh [2] 7/1 7/4 | 11/16 13/9 13/10 |

were... [111] 13/19
18/22 21/5 23/15
29/18 29/19 34/9
36/12 40/22 42/5
45/19 49/19 50/12
52/5 53/10 61/22
62/20 62/21 62/23
63/2 63/7 63/22
63/22 64/2 64/23
65/4 65/11 67/8
67/9 67/9 67/16
69/8 69/18 69/21
71/16 73/9 74/10
74/13 75/10 76/22
77/4 77/12 78/8
78/10 79/23 80/12
80/18 80/24 86/13
86/21 87/3 87/4
87/6 88/4 88/5
90/23 92/7 92/8
92/9 93/8 93/10
93/12 93/13 93/18
95/17 97/15 109/15
111/13 114/3
115/10 115/22
116/11 116/19
117/5 117/9 119/6
122/12 125/20
126/14 126/21
127/1 129/16
131/15 132/9 133/2

133/6 133/20 137/5
139/3 139/8 149/24
152/5 152/9 153/4
153/14 157/13
158/20 159/14
160/6 162/10
162/14 162/16
164/2 164/22 165/1
165/16 165/21
165/21 166/13
169/8 171/17
weren't [3] 116/1 163/19 163/22 west [2] 75/18 131/16 wetlands [1] 141/16 what [99] 4/21 4/23 7/18 10/16 12/2 13/3 16/4 16/7 18/1 19/12 24/20 25/22 29/24 30/14 36/11 36/19 37/1 38/20 38/21 38/24 39/7 40/21 42/1 44/8 44/11 44/19 44/24 47/23 48/2 49/10 49/22 50/17 51/3 51/16 51/24 52/17 53/7 54/24 61/24 62/11 62/12 63/9 63/14 64/16 67/20 69/10 73/11 74/1

77/17 79/2 80/1 82/4 83/21 84/8 84/17 86/4 87/1 87/21 89/22 90/3 90/9 92/17 93/24 99/21 103/6 104/17 104/23 107/18 112/2 112/3 114/3 114/18 115/21
117/11 118/20
126/22 129/1 130/5 130/7 132/4 137/6 137/13 139/4 140/4 141/17 143/8 145/1 145/22 148/13
152/2 152/9 155/7 167/24 168/8 169/1 169/3 169/14 169/21 170/3 what's [7] 5/8 23/23 24/14 39/4 103/2 133/8 165/18 whatever [2] 5/10 145/8
wheelhouse [1] 4/16
when [71] 5/17
8/10 15/9 19/8 20/2
21/21 21/22 31/18
36/20 38/3 40/7
43/17 43/24 44/19
45/21 47/17 49/1

| W | 72/3 72/4 72/15 | 14/21 16/6 16/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| when... [54] 49/10 | 73/9 75/20 81 | 21/4 22/4 26/3 |
| 50/8 55/5 59/22 | 81/14 81/22 85/11 | 32/20 32/22 37/10 |
| 61/16 61/19 64/21 | 88/24 92/21 96/2 | 49/19 60/20 84/19 |
| 64/21 67/15 69/14 | 96/4 97/8 99/12 | 84/20 86/12 88/3 |
| 74/10 80/18 84/22 | 100/4 101/8 106/17 | 88/5 97/14 97/21 |
| 89/2 89/3 90/7 90/7 | 108/9 109/19 | 104/17 105/2 116/1 |
| 91/1 91/21 93/8 | 110/24 112/5 | 120/11 124/1 |
| 93/18 95/5 96/18 | 123/13 124/12 | 125/16 127/20 |
| 98/5 99/16 99/18 | 124/14 129/16 | 132/23 133/1 |
| 101/19 103/8 | 132/13 134/6 138/6 | 133/23 139/4 139/7 |
| 104/22 105/11 | 138/18 142/7 143/4 | 141/5 142/17 |
| 108/20 109/15 | 144/7 145/3 145/3 | 142/24 143/18 |
| 112/17 120/7 138/4 | 147/4 169/17 | 148/10 151/9 |
| 140/23 140/24 | 169/20 | 151/10 153/8 158/9 |
| 142/7 143/2 143/10 | Whereas [1] 104/21 | 158/23 165/8 |
| 150/15 152/8 | wherever [1] 107/8 | 165/16 166/2 |
| 152/23 156/19 | whether [30] 7/13 | while [15] 21/17 |
| 158/3 161/6 162/17 | 7/15 12/7 32/9 | 22/18 40/11 64/1 |
| 164/10 164/18 | 37/13 42/8 47/6 | 85/23 85/24 92/19 |
| 166/18 167/15 | 62/12 64/9 66/14 | 99/9 115/10 116/19 |
| 168/15 170/13 | 69/15 69/16 77/19 | 140/23 151/19 |
| 171/17 | 77/21 84/10 89/12 | 152/20 154/9 |
| where [63] 12/3 | 100/18 103/15 | 154/21 |
| 14/7 16/9 16/16 | 103/17 117/3 | White [13] 16/6 |
| 17/19 20/23 22/9 | 119/15 123/1 | 30/21 80/8 108/15 |
| 22/12 22/14 22/15 | 129/23 130/20 | 143/17 143/19 |
| 22/15 23/20 26/1 | 134/21 135/18 | 143/23 144/2 144/4 |
| 30/17 30/19 30/22 | 137/9 142/21 | 144/18 145/5 |
| 31/5 45/24 46/21 | 148/12 166/20 | 165/24 166/11 |
| 51/2 51/19 61/12 | which [47] 5/4 | Whitley [2] 82/20 |
| 62/5 71/15 71/22 | 12/23 13/23 14/6 | 138/10 |


| $\mathbf{W}$ | widen [1] 57/3 | William [1] 1/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| who [26] 15/24 | widened [1] 56/12 | willing [3] 80/1 |
| 24/1 26/5 55/13 | widening [1] 68/11 | 97/17 110/21 |
| 65/18 73/18 77/1 | width [1] 20/7 | wind [2] 125/1 |
| 87/16 88/19 89/20 | Wilds [2] 73/13 | 134/22 |
| 97/11 102/10 103/8 | 163/8 | windows [2] 157/16 |
| 107/23 108/12 | will [76] 4/16 7/8 | 157/18 |
| 111/14 111/14 | 15/5 15/11 18/6 | wink [1] 60/10 |
| 115/7 115/12 | 19/19 20/19 21/2 | wish [2] 64/15 |
| 126/19 129/4 | 21/8 21/10 21/11 | 104/22 |
| 129/14 138/10 | 23/17 24/12 24/18 | within [45] 37/18 |
| 148/8 155/20 | 24/19 25/1 25/6 | 41/23 53/15 59/5 |
| 159/15 | 25/11 28/18 28/19 | 68/14 70/8 71/1 |
| whole [16] 6/4 7/24 | 31/5 31/7 31/9 | 71/5 71/11 71/21 |
| 25/3 32/19 57/8 | 31/10 31/14 31/16 | 72/9 76/3 85/20 |
| 68/10 86/3 92/18 | 31/21 35/16 35/16 | 86/21 86/21 90/2 |
| 92/19 92/22 93/2 | 36/2 42/1 44/9 46/1 | 106/8 110/6 115/4 |
| 93/5 105/7 112/21 | 47/12 48/4 48/12 | 117/10 122/15 |
| 113/6 113/9 | 48/14 50/3 50/9 | 122/20 123/13 |
| whoops [1] 4/10 | 51/5 54/4 54/24 | 125/18 129/4 |
| whose [2] 107/21 | 55/4 56/11 67/18 | 130/18 131/18 |
| 107/22 | 68/23 69/10 70/2 | 133/11 133/23 |
| why [15] 11/1 56/1 | 82/16 89/7 89/8 | 133/23 134/24 |
| 56/24 71/20 76/7 | 89/9 89/12 90/16 | 135/1 136/11 |
| 81/7 93/20 96/6 | 90/16 93/15 95/2 | 136/19 138/5 |
| 119/14 139/16 | 99/5 99/23 107/5 | 139/14 142/21 |
| 139/19 140/14 | 109/22 111/18 | 142/23 143/21 |
| 160/10 163/2 165/1 | 111/19 128/7 | 144/10 144/18 |
| wide [5] 80/5 81/6 | 130/23 138/3 144/7 | 145/20 146/23 |
| 132/17 136/24 | 145/4 149/22 159/7 | 162/13 163/13 |
| 137/12 | 167/3 168/22 169/6 | without [5] 27/3 |
| Widell [1] 47/17 | 169/7 169/11 172/2 | 78/11 127/4 127/4 |

## W

without... [1]
153/21
witness [3] 2/4 26/2 116/20
witnesses [2] 76/23 77/14
won't [10] 4/14 16/21 30/4 50/22 50/23 52/21 54/16 56/15 128/14 168/20
wondering [4]
93/20 107/18 109/17 111/4
wooden [1] 70/14 Woodstock [6]
14/15 16/18 17/5 42/11 53/6 53/8
wording [1] 19/12 words [4] 15/20 35/8 87/19 113/15 work [43] 11/13 23/17 26/23 27/3 27/10 29/17 35/5 35/11 35/17 54/15 58/22 81/13 82/6 92/19 94/9 95/13
95/24 96/20 98/1 98/10 99/23 100/6 102/4 105/15 106/6 107/6 107/6 108/5

110/2 110/3 110/21 written [1] 73/5 121/5 129/7 134/2 149/17 153/20
154/8 154/14 155/15 159/17
160/14 160/16 171/13
worked [4] 94/23
112/6 134/9 170/22 workers [1] 157/23 working [12] 43/12 58/24 64/4 64/5 95/13 96/5 118/9 134/17 152/12 154/10 156/14 157/21
works [5] 22/20 39/18 45/12 62/23 105/24
worth [1] 140/23 would [214] wouldn't [8] 6/5 9/24 17/14 41/13 41/16 55/17 57/15 66/23
Wright [5] 1/15 2/10 65/21 66/1 162/19
write [1] 14/23
write-up [1] 14/23
writing [3] 77/5
77/13 140/5
wrong [2] 92/2 99/17
yard [1] 155/22 yeah [1] 103/4 year [21] 9/14 29/15 29/17 33/1 33/21 43/7 43/17 43/23 45/6 45/13 45/16 46/14 48/15 52/2 60/20 61/1 63/5 98/22 99/17 121/4 155/11
year-old [1] 48/15 years [18] 41/6 43/10 43/17 45/14 45/17 48/6 48/9 48/13 48/14 52/19 52/20 52/20 53/14 61/1 63/16 99/11 102/8 150/1
yes [161] 6/6 8/7 8/16 8/18 9/1 12/3 12/19 12/19 13/5 13/5 13/8 16/11 16/20 17/3 17/9 20/16 24/4 25/20 25/24 27/13 28/13 30/16 34/14 34/24 36/4 36/18 37/8 38/15 38/17 39/1



