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## PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good morning, everyone. It's Day 41. We're continuing with Ms. Widell and Dr. Bunker. And the questions will be taken up by Ms. Boepple.
(Continuation of the witness panel of Cherilyn Widell and Victoria Bunker.)

MS. BOEPPLE: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Ms. Widell, Dr. Bunker.

WITNESS BUNKER: Hi.
WITNESS WIDELL: Good morning, Ms.
Boepple. Nice to see you this morning.
MS. BOEPPLE: You, too. Just for the record, Beth Boepple, for the associate Society for the Protection of New Hampshire's Forests.

My questions this morning will primarily focus on the Programmatic Agreement. I have a few general questions about the Cultural Landscape Reports. But, to get us started, if you could make sure you have in front of you the Programmatic Agreement, that would be great.

WITNESS WIDELL: I do have it. Thank
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[WITNESS PANEL: Widell|Bunker]
you.
BY MS. BOEPPLE:
Q So, my first question -- I'm going to refer back frequently, as we go through these questions, to your testimony when you were last here. Not earlier this week, but the first go-around. And, if you don't recall some of the questions that were asked of you, I believe I have all of the pages from the transcripts from that time. So, we can put those up on the ELMO and remind you of the sequence of questions and answers.

So, the first question $I$ have for you is in response to a sequence of questions that came from Commissioner Way. And your testimony, in response to a question that he asked you having to do with the Programmatic Agreement, he alluded to the Programmatic Agreement as a "joint venture" to carry the Project through completion and then operation. Do you recall that sequence of questions?

A (Widell) Not precisely.
Q Do you generally remember those questions?
A (Widell) Generally, I remember, certainly,
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-28-17\}
answering questions about the Programmatic Agreement, yes.

Q Okay. And specifically from Commissioner Way?
A (Widell) The specifics, as I said, I do not remember precisely.

Do you remember Commissioner Way asking you questions?

A (Widell) Yes, I do.
Q Okay. Great. That's a good start. So, some of his questions, let's go to a page from the transcript of that exchange. So, can you see at the bottom, toward the bottom of the page, where it's highlighted, and let's see if I can zoom in.

ADMIN. MONROE: Beth, I'll help you. MS. BOEPPLE: Thank you, Pam.

BY MS. BOEPPLE:
Q So, now can you see that clearly?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And it says "I imagine, over the lifetime of the Project, there will be changes that might have to occur to that Programmatic Agreement?" A (Widell) Yes.

Q And you see that. And do you recall him
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-28-17\}
asking -- him making that statement and asking that question?

A (Widell) Yes. You have refreshed that. Thank you.

Okay. Great. Do you remember what your answer was?

A (Widell) Clearly, I said "yes".
Q Yes, you did. And, then, do you also see --
A (Widell) I would like to see the rest of it, the top of it, the top of -- on the top of the next page, $I$ believe my answer continues.

Q You see that?
A (Widell) Yes. And it indicates that I also said that "making changes and amendments. And it has a duration as well."

Q Yes. And, then, do you also see where
Commissioner Way continued and said "Who
instigates it?" and "where is the
responsibility?" in the --
A (Widell) Yes. "Who motivates those changes?
Who instigates it? Where is the
responsibility?" Yes.
Right. And do you see what your answer was?
(Widell) Yes. It's clearly delineated in the
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY] \{09-28-17\}
document.
Q Okay. And, so, I'm going to ask you to pull up the Programmatic Agreement and tell me where in the Programmatic Agreement that is delineated and documented?

A (Widell) I don't understand the question, as far as what that means. Are you referring to Resolution of Effects? Amendments to the Agreement? The Dispute Resolution provision? Which part of it do you want me to indicate is responsible for when there is need for a change or amendment? There's actually a provision for making amendments as well.

Q I believe the questioning had to do with, if the Programmatic Agreement itself had to be changed. That's my understanding of the sequence of the questions. Was that your understanding?
(Widell) Well, a programmatic agreement can be changed in different ways, depending on the needs of the parties who are part of that agreement. So, there are different provisions for making an amendment, for all sorts of different things. So, those are all delineated
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in different parts of the Programmatic Agreement.

Q And, so, my question is, where in the Programmatic Agreement is that delineated and where is the detail in the Programmatic Agreement?

A (Widell) Shall I just take, under Stipulation XVI, which provides, and it's on Page 44, it provides for how amendments are made to the Programmatic Agreement.

Q Right. And doesn't that specifically deal with amendments to the document itself?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. And who are the signatories to this document?

A (Widell) The signatories are the Vermont SHPO, the New Hampshire SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Department of Energy.

Q Right. Not the SEC, correct?
A (Widell) That's correct.
Q Okay. And, if something were to occur that requires a change to this document, who is likely to be the instigator of making an
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amendment to the Programmatic Agreement?
A (Widell) It is the signatories who have the authority to instigate any amendment to the Agreement.

Q And, again, so that wouldn't come from the site Evaluation Committee, correct? They're not a signatory, correct?

A (Widell) They are not a signatory. A
Consulting Party may approach the Department of
Energy with a concern. There is a provision
for that. And the general public may even go to the Department of Energy and indicate a concern, which may be entertained by the Department of Energy.

Q That's the Department of Energy, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
That's not the same thing as the site
Evaluation Committee, correct?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay.
A (Widell) That's correct.
Q I just want to be very clear about what entities are parties to this Agreement, and what responsibilities lie with the different
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entities. So, let's talk about the Department of Energy. I've put up a section of the Programmatic Agreement. And this is Applicants Exhibit 204, APP68671. And I'm going to draw your attention to Paragraph 18 , that begins "whereas".

A (Widell) Yes, I see it.
Q Do you see that?
A (Widell) Uh-huh.
Q And do you see what that says?
A (Widell) Yes.
Okay. So, let's -- could you read that please?
(Widell) Yes. "Whereas, this Programmatic
Agreement addresses the planning and
construction activities of the proposed
Project; this Programmatic Agreement also addresses operations and maintenance activities of the proposed Project as reasonably
foreseeable effects; this scope is limited because operation and maintenance activities are outside Department of Energy's jurisdiction."

Okay. So, in light of this, would it be accurate to say that it's unlikely that the
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Department of Energy will be the one -- will be one of the parties monitoring the Project?

A (Widell) Yes, that is true. They will not be monitoring. But, since there will be a Historic Properties Treatment Plan that they have been part of developing, as will also the other signatories as well, they will have had an opportunity to participate in the development of that Historic Properties Treatment Plan, which will oversee the operations and maintenance and construction stage of the Project.

Q So, where is that Hydro-Quebec Historic Properties Treatment Plan in the Programmatic Agreement?

A (Widell) I will have to look it up. Give me a moment here.

Q Take your time.
A (Widell) I'm asking my colleague as well, who is very familiar with the document.

It's on Page 27, under C, looks like
Stipulation V.C, "Resolution of Adverse Effects".

Q Right. Where's the detailed Historic Treatment
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Plan in that section? Is that a detailed plan that's incorporated within this section of the Programmatic Agreement?

A (Widell) I'm going to take that question in two parts. It is a very detailed plan.

Q Excuse me. I just want to focus on the plan that you've made reference to, and ask you is it within this document, the Programmatic Agreement?

A (Widell) May I please answer your first question? The Historic Property Treatment Plan is a very detailed plan, which is directed to be done with party participation in that creation and part of this Programmatic Agreement.

Q Has that been drafted yet?
A (Widell) Portions of it have been drafted, yes.
Q Do we have that in front of the Site Evaluation Committee?

A (Widell) No.
Q And it's not actually detailed within the Programmatic Agreement, correct?

A (Widell) It certainly -- the pieces and parts that need to be included are discussed in the
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Programmatic Agreement. Such as unanticipated discoveries, monitoring a training plan for the work -- construction workers, that sort of thing. So, what is going to be in that Historic Properties Treatment Plan is definitely part of the Programmatic Agreement. It is not common to include the entire plan in such an agreement document in my professional experience.

Q And I believe, in fact, your prior testimony was that the details and the specifics for this particular Project would be incorporated into a totally separate document. That it's not part of the Programmatic Agreement as a detailed plan?

A (Widell) Yes.
Okay. I'm also going to ask you to take a look at another paragraph within the Programmatic Agreement. At the top, Paragraph 16, could you read that please.

A (Widell) I'm following along in my copy. Thank you. "Whereas", number 16, "the Department of Energy has determined that the undertaking has the potential to adversely affect historic
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properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places".

Q So, that describes, does it not, what the Department of Energy's jurisdiction is over the types of historic properties, does it not?

A (Widell) I'm not sure I understand your question. Can you clarify it for me? Yes, I can. Sure.

A (Widell) So that $I$ can make sure $I$ answer it accurately for you.

Q Absolutely. That paragraph identifies what the Department of Energy's undertaking is with respect to historic properties, is that correct?

A (Widell) Basically, it states that the Department of Energy has determined that this type of undertaking is one that has the potential to adversely affect historic properties.

Q Which are listed in or eligible for listing on the National Register, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. That's what the definition of an historic property is in a Section 106 document. Q Right. Now, are you familiar with New
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Hampshire's definition of "historic
properties"?
A (Widell) If I can clarify that, the New Hampshire Department of Historic Resources -Division of Historic Resources' definition of "historic properties" under Section 106 would be identical.

Q No. That wasn't my question.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes.
Ms. Widell, I'm going to ask you to listen to the questions carefully. That was a "yes" or "no" question.

WITNESS WIDELL: Okay.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And I believe
your answer was "yes", because you gave a whole lot of information about something. And all she had asked you was "are you familiar with", right?

WITNESS WIDELL: Okay.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. So, please listen to the questions carefully.

WITNESS WIDELL: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
BY MS. BOEPPLE:
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-28-17\}

Q Okay. Are you familiar with New Hampshire's definition of "historic property"?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Then, if I put this up, you'll understand that I'm showing you a section of New Hampshire's statute where the definition of "historic property" is down under Section VI. Do you see that?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And what does that say?
A (Widell) "'Historic property' means any building, structure, object, district, area, or site that is significant in the history, architecture, archeology, and culture of this state, its communities, or the nation."

Q Would you say that that definition is broader than the definition that we find in the Programmatic Agreement that the Department of Energy uses for defining an "historic site", which is that it's eligible for or is listed on the National Register?

A (Widell) It is different, but it's not necessarily broader.

Q Well, why don't we take a look at "historic
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resource" and the definition for that under New Hampshire statute.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chair, I'm going to object. We've had this -- we've covered this topic in prior hearings. And I'm not sure where she's going with this, but we've discussed this at length with Ms. Widell. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Boepple. MS. BOEPPLE: So, the whole point of this line of questioning is to try and get at how the Programmatic Agreement is responsive to New Hampshire's requirements under both the statute for its definition of "historic properties", as well as protection for those resources.

If the Department of Energy -- so, in brief, if the Department of Energy has entered into an agreement, and their scope of properties is limited to properties that are eligible for or listed on the National

Register, what about all those properties that would otherwise be defined as an historic property under New Hampshire's statute? CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And it's all
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tied to the Programmatic Agreement, correct? MS. BOEPPLE: That's correct. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled. You can continue.

BY MS. BOEPPLE:
Q So, could we take a look at "historic resources" under the statute please.

MS. DORE: And can you identify the statutes we're looking at?

MS. BOEPPLE: And we're looking at, as it states, Title XI [Title XIX?], Public Recreation, Chapter 227-C, Historic Preservation, Section 227-C:1, Section VI and Section VII.

BY MS. BOEPPLE:
Q So, "historic resource", what does that say, Ms. Widell?

A (Widell) "Any historic property which has been listed in the New Hampshire state register of historic places or has been determined eligible for the New Hampshire state register of historic places by the division of historical resources or which had been -- has been listed in the National Register of Historic Places or
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has been determined by the keeper of the register to be eligible for the National Register using the criteria for evaluation in 36 C.F.R. Part 800 [sic]."

Thank you. So, if New Hampshire intended their definition of "historic property" to be limited strictly to properties that are eligible for or are actually listed on the National Register, why would they waste all that language in paper? Isn't it intended to cover a broader range of properties?

A (Widell) $I$ can't answer that. I don't know what this particular statute, the purpose of it is for.

Q The words themselves indicate that there are other properties beyond those listed on the National Register, does it not?

A (Widell) It states that for this particular statute, in this set of definitions, yes. Thank you. I'm going to ask you if you know or can point to any section of the Programmatic Agreement that defines "historic properties" that are covered by the Programmatic Agreement and uses the New Hampshire definition? Is
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there a place in the Programmatic Agreement that does that?

A (Widell) No.
Q Okay.
A (Widell) There certainly is a part of that statute, which is the 36 C.F.R. Part 800 which is referenced in the Programmatic Agreement.

Q So, I'd also like you to take a look at
Paragraph 15. Again, this is in the
Programmatic Agreement. And if you could read that paragraph please.
(Widell) "Whereas, portions (the majority) of the proposed Project will also require state siting authorization from the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee (NH SEC), in
accordance with NH RSA 162-H; NH SEC's review of NPT's October 19, 2015 application filing is pending (NH SEC Docket Number 2015-06); the $N H$ SEC review is conducted as a separate, independent process from the federal review under Section 106 and is governed by New Hampshire state law, and, as part of the New Hampshire SEC review, the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NH DHR)
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executed a Memorandum of Understanding with Northern Pass Transmission on December 4th, 2016 (available at...)", and it gives a link.

Q Right. And the language $I$ want you to focus on again is the line that says "the NH SEC review is conducted as a separate, independent process from the federal review". That's what it says, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Right. So, since the SEC has to conduct a separate review, again, the Programmatic Agreement was intended -- strike that. The Programmatic Agreement addresses the Section 106 process, does it not?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. And the SEC is focused on its jurisdiction as established by New Hampshire statute, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. I'm going to ask you if you recall when Mr. Roth was asking you questions?
(Widell) Yes.
Okay. And do you recall, in his questioning, he said "I'm not asking -- I'm not asking you
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whether there's going to be an adverse effect or whether it can be mitigated. My question is simply, with what remains to be done" -- do you that? I can show you a copy of the transcript, if that helps.

A (Widell) Yes. I remember.
Q Okay. So, this is Mr. Roth's questioning. He's saying "I'm not asking" -- "I'm not asking you" -- excuse me -- "I'm not asking you whether there is going to be an adverse effect or whether it can be mitigated. My question is simply, with what remains to be done," -- I think the "to" should be a "do", "do you believe that there is a tremendous amount of work that remains to be done to do all that?" Do you see your response?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And he said "and it has" -- and then you go on and he says "okay", and then you said "and it has, and they have outlined how that will be accomplished through a programmatic agreement." Correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q That's what you said?
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A (Widell) Uh-huh.
Q Okay. And, again, so, you've pointed to the Programmatic Agreement, and said that the mitigation and the steps to protect New Hampshire's historic properties are going to be controlled and mitigated and protected through this Programmatic Agreement. Is that correct?

A (Widell) Through the Agreement and Historic Properties Treatment Plan that is developed through this Programmatic Agreement, yes.

All right. So, I'm trying to understand how the Committee can have an assurance that this document and this treatment plan, that they don't have in front of them and hasn't been completely written yet, is going to protect New Hampshire's resources? Can you explain that? (Widell) It is my understanding that a programmatic agreement a memorandum of agreement has been the vehicle that this body has used for a number of projects in the past, where all of the work had not yet been completed.

My question was, with respect to this Project,
the Project that's before the Site Evaluation
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Committee, that's subject to their review today, how does this Programmatic Agreement address those concerns of New Hampshire's historic resources?

A (Widell) In a number of ways, I'd be happy to illustrate a couple, and then $I$ would be happy to go into further. I think the most important one is what we just mentioned, which is the development of specific mitigations for specific adverse effects, and the creation of a specific mitigation plan, which will be documented and written in an Historic Properties Treatment Plan.

Q Okay, "which will be". It's not done yet, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
So, it's not in front of the Committee. They can't look at that and say "Wow, I'm so relieved. I don't have to worry about historic properties anymore. I know that there is a plan in place that's going to protect them." Correct? They don't have that, right?

A (Widell) No. They do not have it.
Q That was my question. They just -- they don't
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have it in front of them, right? And I don't have it. So, I can't ask you questions about whether it's adequately protecting New Hampshire's resources, right?

A (Widell) No, not exactly. And let me explain. Traditionally, it has always been the Division of Historic Resources, which is the appointed body for protecting New Hampshire's cultural resources, historic resources. And they will be -- they will not only be at the table, they will have a review authority and approval authority on that mitigation plan. And it will be in writing, and it will have oversight not just even by the Division of Historic Resources, but the other parties that have signed the Agreement. And there will be an opportunity for the Consulting Parties, and even the public, to see that mitigation plan. That is beyond what might be put together by just a separate group of individuals representing a project.

So, I have, from my professional experience, extraordinary amount of confidence in this document, that not only will the
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-28-17\}
mitigation for these historic properties be completed, $I$ think it will be done in a very careful way that not only cares for the individual properties, but benefits the State of New Hampshire.

Q Ms. Widell, that's all well and good that you have great confidence. It's really the Site Evaluation Committee that has to have the confidence. They're the ones who have to make the decision here. And they need to look to something and say "I know, we've looked, and our resources are going to be protected."

Are you aware of whether the Division for Historic Resources has exercised its authority under New Hampshire statute to seek input and provide input to the Site Evaluation Committee?

A I'm not sure $I$ understand the question. Can you help me understand it, so $I$ can answer it?

Q I'm going to show you a statute. I'm showing you a section of Title XII Public Safety and Welfare, Chapter 162-H, Energy Facility Evaluation, Siting, Construction and Operation. This is Section 162-H:7-a, Role of State Agencies. Do you see the first line?
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A (Widell) Yes.
Q "State agencies having permitting or other regulatory authority may participate in committee proceedings as follows:" Do you see that?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And you see where there's a variety of ways in which State agencies can participate. Do you see that?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And, to your knowledge, has the Division for Historic Resources sought involvement in this proceeding under this statute?

A (Widell) I don't know the definition of "sought involvement". I do know that DHR has communicated a number of times with the SEC informing them of progress, concerns, information related to this Project. And I have seen those letters.

And they've all qualified that they're doing it under the Section 106 process, have they not?

A (Widell) I would have to refer back to the letters precisely.

I can show you at least the most recent letter
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from Commissioner Boisvert, where the Division has repeatedly made it clear that their role is in the Section 106 process. Would you like me to show you that letter? We spent a lot of time on that the last time.

A (Widell) Is that the August 25 th letter?
Q Yes.
A (Widell) I have it before me.
Q If you look at the end of that letter, I think you will find that he has qualified the Division's role is in the Section 106 process. (Widell) I'm sorry. The first, and if you have a copy of it, could you put it up please? Sure.
(Widell) No. I asked for the first page. Oh.
(Widell) The letter refers specifically to the docket number. It is addressed to the members of the Northern Pass Transmission Subcommittee. And it says "The purpose of this letter is to present the members of the Site Evaluation Subcommittee for the Northern Pass Transmission Project (Docket 2015-06) a summary and status of the historical resources identification and
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effects evaluation process."
Q And then it goes on to say "The DHR has the responsibility to review this project under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act". Correct?

A (Widell) No. On the fourth line it also says "and under New Hampshire RSA 227-C:9". So, my understanding is that there has been quite a bit of information and dialogue between DHR and SEC related to historic resources identification and effects evaluation. Okay. I read the letter, and I've read all communications between $D H R$ and the $S E C$, where the qualification has always been that they are conducting a review pursuant to the Section 106 process. Do you agree with that? (Widell) No. Okay. Why do you disagree with that? (Widell) I specifically have also reviewed a memo that clarified resources to be concerned with related to the SEC process. And I do not have that memo here. But $I$ think that that is the clarification that, to the SEC, about what historic resources are and how they should be
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considered.
Q But you can't point to that document, can you?
A (Widell) It is not up here in my materials.
WITNESS WIDELL: Mr. Chairman, may I ask?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: May you ask?
WITNESS WIDELL: To get a copy of it?
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If you need a document to respond to a question?

WITNESS WIDELL: I don't need it.
But my questioner is not familiar with it. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If you need --

BY MS. BOEPPLE:
Q I'm tell you what. Rather than waste time having you look for a document, my questions really have to do with the -- you disagree. You think that the DHR, and this is a simple question, your position is that DHR has exercised its right, as an agency, under the statute, under New Hampshire statute, to advise the SEC. Is that correct?

A (Widell) I can't speak to the legal aspects of it. But, yes, they certainly have communicated and informed the SEC about the progress on the
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identification and evaluation effects of historic properties for the SEC.

Q In the Section 106 process, right?
A (Widell) No.
Okay. We'll agree to disagree, and we'll move on.

Do you recall, during your testimony when you were last here, not this week, before that, that I asked you some specific questions about your prefiled direct testimony. And I asked you to read a section of your prefiled testimony in which you stated "the Section 106 process will require that any adverse effects will be mitigated." Do you remember that line of questioning?

A (Widell) Yes. Vaguely, yes.
Okay. And do you remember -- so, I asked you that specific question. And do you remember what your response was?

A (Widell) No. Not sitting here right now. Q Okay. So, my question is at the top of the page, the bottom of this page and the top of the next. You see that? And you see your answer?
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```
A (No verbal response).
Q And what was your answer?
    (Widell) I'm reading through it. Thank you.
    Let's read it allowed for the record. "The
    Section 106 process will require that any
        adverse effects will be mitigated" -- that
        was -- I was quoting from your testimony, "and
        that is done in the Programmatic Agreement."
        That's what you said, correct?
        (Widell) Yes.
        In your prefiled testimony?
        (Widell) Yes.
        And then your response to my question was what?
        "So, I'm going to go back to the letter from
        DHR from this morning." That was your
        response, correct? That's what the transcript
        says, correct?
        (Widell) Actually, it indicates that that's a
        question.
        I'm sorry. Sorry. I apologize. You read from
        your testimony "the Section 106 process will
        require that any adverse effects will be
        mitigated", correct?
    A (Widell) Yes.
```
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    Q And then you said "And that is done in the Programmatic Agreement." Correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. So, again, I'm going to ask you to go back to the Programmatic Agreement and tell me where in the Programmatic Agreement the adverse effects are addressed? How are they mitigated? Does the Programmatic Agreement define how those mitigation efforts will be undertaken? (Widell) I'll answer your questions in a couple parts. The Resolution of Adverse Effects in the Programmatic Agreement is on Page 26. The standard and way that mitigation is done for resolution of adverse effects, and much of this is boilerplate from programmatic agreements used elsewhere for projects of this size, is to develop a plan for the mitigation of adverse effects that are identified in Stipulation --

Q Let's read one paragraph from that.
"Resolution of Adverse Effects", what does that first paragraph say? Let's read it allowed please, for the record.
(Widell) "Resolution of adverse effects on historic properties from the undertaking will
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be considered in the preferred order of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation. The plan for resolution of adverse effects will be documented in the Historic Properties Treatment Plan. DOE will encourage Northern Pass Transmission to make every effort to avoid adverse effects when implementing the Northern Pass project."

Q Thank you. So, it's not detailed in the Programmatic Agreement, correct?

A (Widell) No. And that's very typical. That's normal.

Q Whether it's typical or normal, I just want to -- I'm just trying to get into the record that it's not detailed in the Programmatic Agreement, correct?

A (Widell) Correct.
Q Thank you. Do you recall Attorney Pacik questioning you as well the last time you were here?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. Again, this is from the transcript. And do you see, toward the bottom of the page, where Attorney Pacik says "But let's talk about
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the Programmatic Agreement." And then she goes on and says "Say hypothetically there's a determination that there is going to be an adverse effect to an historic resource. Then you're going to have a Programmatic Agreement. And in the Programmatic Agreement they're going to want, first, at least to be some sort of avoidance or minimization to the historic resource, right?" And then your response was "yes"?

A (Widell) Yes.
Correct? And, again, not to be a dead horse, but we don't have a detailed plan in the Programmatic Agreement, do we? (Widell) No. Thank you. And we don't have an avoidance or minimization plan in the Programmatic Agreement either, do we?
(Widell) No.
Do you recall Attorney -- excuse me,
Commissioner Weathersby asking you some specific questions, and this is addressed to you, Dr. Bunker. And her questions had to do with the potential discovery of human remains.
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-28-17\}

A (Bunker) Yes.
Q Do you recall that?
A (Bunker) Yes, I do.
Q And, specifically, she asked you how that would be handled. And do you remember giving her an answer?

A (Bunker) I remember.
Q Do you remember what your answer was?
A (Bunker) That there was -- there's sequences and steps, a protocol, to identifying the burials and addressing them immediately. Let's look at what the answer was that you gave in the transcript. And there you said "In the case of unanticipated human remains, we have a policy and a protocol for that. And, in fact, that's part of the Programmatic Agreement."

Correct? That's what you said?
A (Bunker) That's what you've shown me, yes.
Q This is a transcript from the hearing. Are you saying that the transcript is not an accurate recording of what you said?
(Bunker) $I$ did not say that.
So, do you agree that this is an accurate recording of what you testified to?
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A (Bunker) Yes, I do.
Q Okay. So, you see that that's what you said, correct?

A (Bunker) Yes.
Does the Programmatic Agreement set forth in detail a process and protocol for dealing with undiscovered human remains?

A (Bunker) No.
Q Thank you. Does the Committee have a protocol and procedure before it to consider today for undiscovered human remains?

A (Bunker) Not written as such. The Committee has reference to other materials.

Q But they don't have a specific plan, protocol or procedure in front of them, correct?

A (Bunker) Correct.
Thank you. Ms. Widell, do you recall
Commissioner Oldenburg asking you questions?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q Do you recall that he asked you some questions regarding bridges and structural supports for bridges?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. So, do you see the "Q" that's
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highlighted here? This is Commissioner Oldenburg's question. And he says "And, typically, they just don't sit on the river. There's piles, basically, you know, metal I-beams that they pound into the ground, you know, 20, 30, 50 feet, until they hit bedrock. So, there's a structure underneath the bridge. And how do you know that this drilling isn't going to hit those structures or affect those bridges? And are there any measures that could be done to protect those?" You see that?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And you see your answer. And you said "And that is, and with bridges, in the example you've just given me, that would be a -- a vibration would be a direct effect in the underground portion, and could affect its significance from an engineering standpoint. So, it should be taken into consideration." Correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Do you recall two days ago when Attorney Aslin was asking you questions about the vibration effects?
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A (Widell) Yes.
Q And do you recall that you were quite certain that there wouldn't be an impact, because the engineers would make sure that that didn't happen? Do you recall that was your testimony?

A (Widell) No. I do not believe that that's exactly my wording. I said that the Project has committed to following the New Hampshire Department of Transportation, I believe it's 211, which is vibration monitoring, for underground resources that might be affected by vibration.

Q And, again, is there something in the Programmatic Agreement that addresses that and says that that's what's going to happen?
(Widell) That specific citation is not in the Programmatic Agreement.

Q All right.
A (Widell) But it is in the Effects Tables. So, it is something that would be taken into consideration in determining how to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects. I'm going to take you back to your testimony the last time you were here. And, according to
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the transcript, what you said was, when Commissioner Oldenburg said "Vibration monitoring or whatever?", you responded with "And that would also be part of the Programmatic Agreement... which will have a Historic Preservation Treatment Plan...to make sure any of the resources, whatever they be, along the way are protected during the construction phase." That was your testimony, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. I believe I said "Historic Properties Treatment Plan", but I may have made that error to say "Historic Preservation". But I intended to say "Historic Properties Treatment Plan", if that is the point of confusion.

Q That wasn't the point of my question.
A (Widell) Oh, okay.
Q But thank you for clarifying that from you testimony.

A (Widell) All right.
Q I thought that's what you intended to say.
A (Widell) Thank you.
Q Not "Preservation".
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A (Widell) Thank you.
Q My question goes to the fact that you said that it "would also be part of the Programmatic Agreement". Did you not say that? That's what the transcript indicates was your testimony, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. And the development of the Historic Properties Treatment Plan is part of the Programmatic Agreement. It is part of that work, which will be accomplished as part of that document.

We've already established it's not in the document itself.

A (Widell) The plan has not been finalized.
Q Vibration monitoring is also not in the Programmatic Agreement, correct?

A (Widell) No.
Q Thank you. Do you recall in Commissioner Way's questioning about stone walls, and asking about impact of the Project on stone walls?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And do you recall your response to those questions?

A (Widell) No, not precisely.
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Q Want to take a guess as to what it might have been?

A (Widell) No. I don't want to take a guess.
Q Would it surprise you if you said it was the Programmatic Agreement that was going to address those issues?

A (Widell) Not at all, because that is the case, --

Q And where --
A (Widell) -- absolutely, to avoid, minimize, and mitigate any adverse effects.

Q And, again, we don't have an avoidance, minimizing, and mitigation plan encompassed specifically for this Project within the Programmatic Agreement, do we?

A (Widell) No. And that is typical for the development of programmatic agreements. In memorandums of agreements sometimes it is possible to put the precise mitigations for the precise resources, because usually that covers smaller projects. This is a large project. So, you normally develop a mitigation plan for the resources.

Q This is a very large project, isn't it?
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A (Widell) Yes.
Q One hundred ninety-two (192) miles. Potential impacts on resources in New Hampshire are huge, aren't they?

A (Widell) No.
Q They're not?
A (Widell) My testimony has indicated repeatedly that the adverse effects on historic resources of this Project are not large. They are of a small number and of minimal impact to the historic resources.

Okay. That's your opinion. But the site Evaluation Committee can only evaluate based on what they have in front of them. And some of what they don't have in front of them are things you are saying they can rely on that will protect the resources that may not even be identified as part of the Section 106 process, correct?

A (Widell) No. The Site Evaluation Committee, and I have stated this before, so I won't make it in a summary, that has an extremely large amount of information, frankly, extraordinary, even documents that are new to the state of New
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Hampshire in the form of cultural landscapes reports, that show precisely where the historic properties are, the type of effects that will occur, be they underground or aboveground, and, frankly, as $I$ just stated, the small number of resources that will be affected by this Project.

Q We'll talk about the cultural landscapes, actually, $I$ think other questioners will ask you about those. So, I'll leave that for now. I think there may be an disagreement of opinion on that.

So, Dr. Bunker, I'd like to ask you a couple of questions. And ask if you recall Commissioner Way asking you some specific questions that have to do with what happens during the construction process. Do you remember that?

A (Bunker) Yes.
Q Okay. And one of your questions, $I$ believe one of the statements you said was, at the top of the page of the transcript that you have in front of you, "Part of our planning process
that will go forward as part of the
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Programmatic Agreement is training of construction personnel." Do you remember -(Bunker) Yes.
-- testifying to that? Is there a written training plan in place yet?

A (Bunker) No.
Q Okay. And I believe you also testified during his questioning that there would be monitors put in place. Do you recall that?
(Bunker) Yes.
Again, is there a plan for those monitors
that's already written?
A (Bunker) No.
Q And that's not in front -- and, therefore, the Site Evaluation Committee doesn't have that in front of them, correct?
(Bunker) Not as such, no.
Thank you. And, in fact, you testified to that specifically when Commissioner Way asked you "What happens if you find a game-changer? How do you handle that?" Do you remember him asking you that?

A (Bunker) Somewhat.
He did. At the bottom of the page, you see
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highlighted "What happens if you find a game-changer?" The last highlighted sentence on the page.

A (Bunker) I don't see my name on the last sentence. Am I reading the wrong page?

Q No. You're reading the correct page.
Commissioner Way said "What happens if you find a game-changer, that is something that could have impacted" -- I know he's asking Ms. Widell the question. And then he goes on to say "that is something that could have impacted your judgment, Ms. Widell, ahead of time, or, Ms. Bunker? How do you handle that?" And then Ms. Widell talks about the Programmatic Agreement. But further on, Dr. Bunker, your testimony is that you talk about "the monitors" and "the training programs".

A (Bunker) I would agree that that's the direction it took, yes.

Q Okay. Thank you. And would you also agree that those plans and those processes and those procedures have not been finalized?

A (Bunker) I would agree.
Q Thank you. Ms. Widell, do you recall
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Mr. Iacopino asking you questions?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And do you recall where he specifically asked you, and again I'm showing you a page from the transcript of your testimony, "And other than the Effects Tables for the underground section, is there anything else other than that and, of course, the cultural landscapes that are pending?" And your response was "Not to my knowledge, no. No." You see that was your response?

A (Widell) Yes. I don't see the original question, however.

Q So, his questioning, I may not -- I don't have all of his line of questioning, but he was asking you "what else needed to be provided", and he was asking you about the Effects Tables. You see that?
(Widell) "Other than the Effects Tables", yes. Okay.
(Widell) Uh-huh.
Okay. And he went on to say -- you said -- he asks you "have those cultural landscape reports actually gone over to the DOE yet or are they
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still somewhere in between?" You see that?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. And what was your answer?
A (Widell) "Yes, they have, except for one, that is being delivered -- tomorrow's Friday."

And then he goes on and he says "This is maybe too deep into the weeds, but why is there some sort of hesitation, in terms of where is it going once you're done with it? I mean, I figured you would be the last person before it goes to DOE?" Right? Do you remember that exchange?

A (Widell) Vaguely.
Q Okay. I'll show you what you responded to, what you're response was. And you explain the reason for your hesitation.

A (Widell) Uh-huh.
Q Your answer begins at the bottom of the page on your left, you see what that says? And you say "I am. I just reviewed the cultural landscape report that will be delivered Friday", etcetera. Then you talk about a consultant, do you see that?

A (Widell) Yup.
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Q Okay. And Mr. Iacopino asks you "So, you're waiting for staff to actually put the stamp on it or however it gets filed with DOE?" You see that? Down toward the bottom of the page?

A (Widell) Yes. Yes.
Q Okay. And he then asks you "how long it typically takes for the DOE once they have received these things to issue them to the State Historic Preservation Officer and invite the comments?" Do you see that?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. And your response was "I'm sorry, I can't --" Correct? You see that?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And Mr. Iacopino said "Well, you've been a State Historic Preservation Officer. I think you might have an idea of what the typical timeframes are." Correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And your response was?
A (Widell) "Thirty days".
Q "Normally, normally, that would be done in thirty days".

A (Widell) Yes.
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Q So, --
A (Widell) That is the case, I believe, with this Programmatic Agreement. We could go directly to it, yes.

I'm talking about the cultural landscape reports. That's what those questions were, and the Effects Tables. Have those been -- do you know if DOE has completed their review and sent those to DHR yet?

A (Widell) I do not know if they have completed their review and sent them to DHR yet. I do know that they are all with the Department of Energy.

And thirty days is consistently the review time that is called for in this Programmatic Agreement, except where there is a concern about resolution of a disagreement.

Q So, do you know what the date of your testimony was, which you've said that it would be about -- it would be thirty days, based on your experience?

A (Widell) It's the week of August 28th.
So, the date of that testimony was August 31st.
Do you know what the date is today?
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A (Widell) Thirty days hath September, and tomorrow is October 1 st.

Q I do that, too. So, it's been about thirty days, correct?

A (Widell) If they were, in fact, all at the DOE. I said I believe that was the case. It was not my responsibility to deliver them. So, I can not speak precisely to the date that they received them.

Okay. So, would it surprise you to learn that, as of this morning, DHR still has not received those from DOE?

A (Widell) Once again, in my experience, the federal agency gives them to you at the last possible moment. But, like most of us, we complete our work just in time to meet the deadline. Now, that's not any statement on DOE, but it is something that $I$ have experienced.

Q So, it wouldn't surprise you, is what you're saying?

A (Widell) Depending on the date that they received them, and $I$ don't know precisely the date that they received them.
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Q So, you're not surprised that DHR still has not received the Effects Tables from DOE or the cultural landscape reports that you filed, correct? You're not surprised by that, is that what you're saying?

A (Widell) I am surprised if none of them have been received yet.

Q DOE has not sent anything, that last batch, the cultural landscape reports or the Effects Table have not gone from DOE to DHR as of this morning. That's typical, is that your testimony?

A (Widell) What do you mean by "typical"?
Meaning, they don't meet their thirty-day deadlines? No, that's not typical. In my experience, when you have a programmatic agreement with specific review times, the parties work in good intentions and do meet their thirty-day deadlines.

But they haven't in this case?
(Widell) I don't know that, because $I$ do not know the date that the material was received by DOE. It was -- the Programmatic Agreement had just been signed.
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY] \{09-28-17\}

Q Okay. Just a couple more questions. During Attorney Aslin's questioning, you said several times that you had great confidence in the Programmatic Agreement process, you had great confidence in avoidance of these very few, apparently somewhat insignificant historic resources in the State of New Hampshire, and impacts or effects on those, if I've mischaracterized this, I'm sure you'll correct me. But that you, yourself, have great confidence that any mitigation will occur and will be put in place. And that the implication, it seemed to me anyway, and if this is wrong, please correct me, that somehow the engineers will participate in this process and make sure that the route design manages to avoid, and, if it can't avoid, there will be mitigation measures put in place. Is that roughly accurate?
(Widell) Yes, with one very important correction. And that is $I$ never said that the "New Hampshire historic properties were insignificant".

Q Thank you for that correction. And I apologize
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for mischaracterizing your statement. So, I just want to understand what your continued role is then with respect to this Project?

A (Widell) I do not have a continuing role that I'm aware of. I may continue to be pulled in by the Project Applicant. But $I$ have no role specifically in the Programmatic Agreement. Okay. So, your confidence is just your confidence in a process. It's not something that the Committee can rely on, because you're not going to continue to be involved, as far as you know at this point, correct?
(Widell) No. That is not an accurate characterization. I do have great confidence in this blueprint for dealing with the continued identification, assessment of effects, and resolution of effects. I have great confidence in the professionals that have been involved in this, from the Department of Energy, from the Division of Historic Resources, from the White Mountain National Forest, from the National Park Service, which has signed this document, the Consulting Parties, who have continued to stay engaged as
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the public. So, my confidence comes from the professionalism that $I$ have seen, their knowledge of how to identify effects and historic properties and take them into consideration, and the public, which continues to watch over that process.

Q I understand that.
A (Widell) So, my confidence, though I could say, comes from having worked with dozens of programmatic agreements, not just in California, but elsewhere. But $I$ have been working on this Project in New Hampshire for over two years. And $I$ have seen and met the individuals involved in this. And they are excellent professionals.

Q I understand that's where your confidence comes from. I understand that. My question had to do with where the Site Evaluation Committee's confidence should come from? And you seem to be implying that it should come from you, correct?

A (Widell) No. I think that they can feel very confident in those who have been participating in this process in good faith for years now.
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Q Okay. Despite the fact that the controling document doesn't do anything of the sort, other than say "some plans should be written", correct?

A (Widell) No. I have to disagree with that. As I have stated before, the SEC has used a programmatic agreement from the Section 106 process or a memorandum of agreement from the Section 106 process as a vehicle to continue this iterative process as it moves forward through to completion. And I think that this is another example where that would be an appropriate thing to consider by the SEC body. MS. BOEPPLE: Okay. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Plouffe, you're next on my list.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sure.
WITNESS WIDELL: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's break for ten.

WITNESS WIDELL: Thank you.
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(Recess taken at 10:10 a.m. and
hearing resumed at 10:22 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Plouffe, you may proceed.

MR. PLOUFFE: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. Ms. Widell, I'll re-introduce myself, --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Microphone.
MR. PLOUFFE: Thank you. Ms. Widell, I'll re-introduce myself. I'm Bill Plouffe. And I'm an attorney representing the Appalachian Mountain Club.

WITNESS WIDELL: Good morning, Mr. Plouffe.

MR. PLOUFFE: Good morning. Good to see you back again.

WITNESS WIDELL: Thank you.
MR. PLOUFFE: And Attorney Boepple asked a lot of the questions that $I$ was thinking of asking, so that will abbreviate my questioning of you.

BY MR. PLOUFFE:
Q So, I want to start by trying to understand just what your position is with respect to the
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role of the Programmatic Agreement and the decisions that need to be made under the SEC rules by the Subcommittee. And I'm going to put up for you Site $301.14(b)$ on the ELMO. And this is the Site rule which pertains to the "Criteria Relative to Findings of Unreasonable Adverse Effects". So, at the end of this adjudicative process, as you know, the Subcommittee needs to deliberate and determine whether or not this Project will have unreasonable adverse effects on various issues, and one of those is historic resources.

And you see, in Subsection (b), it says that "In determining whether a proposed energy facility will have an unreasonable adverse effect on historic sites, the committee shall consider:", and then subsection (4) of that talks about the "Findings and determinations by the New Hampshire division of historical resources", and I'll abbreviate and say essentially the 106 process, what New Hampshire division of historical resources says about the 106 process, "and", and it does use the word "and", "(5)", and I've highlighted that, "The
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effectiveness of the measures proposed by the applicant to avoid, minimize, or mitigate unreasonable adverse effects on historic sites and archeological resources, and the extent to which such measures represent best practical measures."

So, is it your position that the Programmatic Agreement that we've been talking about here this morning suffices for this Committee's review under both Subsection (4) and Subsection (5)?

A (Widell) No. In my previous testimony, I need to clarify that, although $I$ took into consideration all of these criteria, I do not believe that this Project will cause an unreasonable adverse effect on historic resources. What $I$-- to further clarify, there are adverse effects, and I agree with that, and I've talked about that in great length in my testimony and supplemental testimony. And the Programmatic Agreement will provide a vehicle for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating adverse effects.

Q So, I guess I'll repeat my question, because
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can we find for the $S E C$ information for it to make a determination of unreasonable adverse effects? Where can we find information concerning the effectiveness of the proposed measures by the Applicant to avoid, minimize, or mitigate unreasonable adverse effects?

A (Widell) As $I$ just stated in -- certainly, in the assessment form and report that was provided to the SEC at the time of the Application, there is a list of a number of structures that were changed in location and design, obviously, also in undergrounding the Project through the White Mountain National Forest, avoided well over 250 historic properties.

Q But I -- I thought, under the 106 process that you're now going through, and it appears to be something that is a work in process, that falling out of that process we will get an Historic Properties Treatment Plan, is that correct?

A (Widell) Yes. It is part of the Programmatic Agreement for the Section 106 process, to complete a Historic Properties Treatment Plan,
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to address adverse effects that cannot be mitigated.

Q And those treatment plans will spell out the specifics of what the Applicant has to do in order to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effects?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q But we don't have those treatment plans before the Subcommittee now?

A (Widell) It's one plan. And, no.
Q And we don't know when we would have those?
A (Widell) No. But --
Q Or, that plan, I'm sorry.
A (Widell) -- a draft -- an initial draft has been done. And $I$ would think it would be as soon as possible, because that's in the best interest of all, the Applicant and all those participating in the review process.

Q So, would you agree with me that the Subcommittee really can't address Subsection (5) of the rule until it has the Historic Properties Treatment Plan?

A (Widell) No.
Q You don't agree with me?
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A (Widell) No.

Q Okay.
A (Widell) Because, in my testimony, I have stated that $I$ do not believe that this Project will cause an unreasonable adverse effect as a project on historic properties.

Q Okay. So, now, I want to move to kind of a very practical day-to-day thing about this and about the Project and effect on historic properties. Let's hypothetically assume we're in a position where we have the Historic Properties Treatment Plan has been issued, and the Project has been given a certificate and it's moving ahead. You with me?

A (Widell) Yes.
Okay. So, and we're out in the field, and I understand that there will be monitors supplied by the -- or, paid for by the Applicant, who have been trained in the field, monitoring this Project as it moves forward and its effects on historic properties, essentially monitoring compliance with the Treatment Plan?

A (Widell) Yes.

Q So, hypothetically, I'm not saying this will
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happen, but, hypothetically, we're in the field, and they run into something where the people in the field doing the construction say "we're not going to do that", and they go ahead and do something that doesn't comply with, let's say, a minimization strategy that's in the Treatment Plan. What happens then?

A (Widell) We could go to find specifics in the Programmatic Agreement, if you would like, as to how about that occurs.

Q You're an expert. Maybe you can just tell me in shorthand, in practical language, what happens?

A (Widell) Well, the first thing I would want to know, as a professional, is it an aboveground effect or mitigation, --

Well, let's say it's a --
(Widell) -- or is it archeology, because there would be somewhat different approaches.

Q Okay. Well, let's assume it's an underground, it's a burial situation.

A (Widell) Then, I'm going to refer to my colleague --

Q Well, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Okay. Let's make
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it easier. So, we don't want to involve Dr. Bunker if she doesn't have to be. Let's say it's aboveground. Makes no difference to my hypothetical to me.

A (Widell) Okay.
Q What happens in an enforcement situation?
A (Widell) I'm going to speak generally, -Q Yes.

A (Widell) -- because $I$ don't know that we need to go precisely. But, generally, the monitor would immediately contact, obviously, the Project Applicant's cultural resources person, which Northern Pass has Mark Doperalski, who is a qualified archeologist, but also would be handling aboveground resources, would contact the DHR, depending on the severity of the situation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, who has oversight over any federal agency's compliance with Section 1 of the National -- 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. And, initially, that's what would happen.

Depending on the severity, if it was an unanticipated discovery of a historic resource
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we didn't know about, underground or aboveground, that would be identified, documented, it would be determined whether it was eligible for the National Register, and a mitigation process would be dealt with, avoidance/minimization first, and then mitigation, if that's not possible.

Well, let me --
(Widell) So, I'm just giving you -okay.
(Widell) -- Broadly from my experience in a project like this. But there is a precise process in the Programmatic Agreement right now that begins to talk about some of that. And then the Historic Preservation -- Properties Treatment $P$ lan would have more things, as specific as telephone numbers and all of that, and deadlines. Okay?

Q Well, thank you for that.
A (Widell) All right.
Q I read through the Programmatic Agreement. And I'll just -- I guess I'll cut to chase here to save time. Who has authority, if the Treatment Plan is being violated, to stop the Project and
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impose fines, if necessary? I couldn't find that.

A (Widell) Any of the signatories can bring to the attention of the Department of Energy, who is the lead federal agency, that they have a concern. It could be about something that was found in the field and not dealt with. It could be one agency isn't getting -- meeting review times very well. Any of those sorts of things.

My hypothetical is a flat-out violation. (Widell) Okay. So, --

That's my hypothetical. A flat-out violation of what the Treatment Plan calls for, in terms of minimization or avoidance or --

A (Widell) Then, there would be consultation, once again, $I$ 'm not going to the precision in the Programmatic Agreement there, but there is consultation between the parties and resolution. If there is not an ability to get resolution, say, between a invited signatory, the Applicant and the DHR, the Department of Energy then can go to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and provide all the
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information from all the parties and ask them
to adjudicate it.

Q Adjudicate it how? They consult with each other?

A (Widell) They would provide information and a decision on how they believe that it should be carried out.

Q Okay.
A (Widell) And that is the Resolution of, let's see, excuse me, Dispute Resolution, which is in Stip XIII, Page 42 .

Q Okay. Do they have authority to stop the Project?

A (Widell) The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation could.

Q How do they do that? How do they go about doing that?

A (Widell) They would inform the head of the federal agency. I've had experience where that has happened, well, in the end, the head of the federal agency got involved and changed it. But, yes. That can occur under Section 106 , if there is disregard for historic properties, once there has been resolution through an
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agreement document.
Q That's not in the Programmatic Agreement, though. That's why I didn't find it there?

A (Widell) It would be in the federal regulations that are carrying out Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. It is a responsibility of every federal agency to take historic properties into consideration in their projects, and they must show evidence that they have done that.

Perhaps you could follow up and your counsel could send a CFR citation to us --

A (Widell) It would 36 C.F.R., Part 18 -- I mean, yes, Part 800, excuse me.

Q Do you have the precise citation?
A (Widell) 36 C.F.R., Part 800 . That's it, for sure.

Q Okay. I saw in your prefiled testimony, on Page 12, that you requested that the SEC, this Subcommittee, "delegate to DHR monitoring and compliance authority with respect to historic resources". Do you know whether or not -- and that's the end of the quote. Do you know if the SEC can legally delegate compliance
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authority to DHR?
A (Widell) Can you tell me again? I'm sorry. I was looking for the passage that you were referencing, --

Yes.
(Widell) -- and then I'd be happy to answer your question.

Q We can put it up on the ELMO for you, if you want. It's on Page 12, Lines 15 through 17 . (Widell) Oh, this is in my testimony. Yes.
(Widell) I thought you were referring to the Programmatic Agreement.

Q No, no.
A (Widell) Forgive me.
Q I'm sorry.
(Widell) Okay.
Your prefiled testimony.
(Widell) Uh-huh. Yes. And your question?
My question was, are you still asking, is it still your position that this Subcommittee should delegate to the DHR the monitoring and compliance authority with respect to historic resources? Is that still your position? And,
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if so, do you know whether or not the SEC can legally do that?

A (Widell) Yes, it still is my opinion. I am not an attorney, but $I$ do understand that, in the past, the SEC has used the Section 106 process to deal with issues related to historic property resolution in the issuance of the permit certificate.

Q And, if they did that, do you think -- so, does DHR have enforcement authority? Going back to my hypothetical, can DHR stop a project because it's not complying with protection of historic resources?

A (Widell) I have to admit $I$ do not know -Q Okay.

A (Widell) -- DHR's legal authority under state law. I can tell you that DHR would definitely be in a position with this Project, and from what is laid out in this agreement document, to go to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. And, once again, as we talked about, they would be in a position to question the Department of Energy. And, in the most severe situations, it is possible for the
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Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to, yes, stop a project.

Q And you've seen that happen?
A (Widell) I know that that has happened, yes. It has only been close in any of my experience, but I know that it has happened.

Q How long does the process take, do you know?
A (Widell) That $I$ don't know.
Q Do you know whether the project gets stopped in the meantime?

A (Widell) Yes, normally. Absolutely, yes.
And who issues that "stop work" order?
(Widell) That depends, once again, it depends on the Historic Preservation Treatment Plan.

Q I'm going to move on to your cultural resources submissions that you made. And I asked you some questions last time when $I$ was here, asking you about the North Country and whether or not that could be a cultural resource and so forth. And $I$ guess I might ask you, you've been involved, you said, for two years in this process, why didn't you identify cultural resources when you started out? They seem to be late to the game.
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A (Widell) No. I think what you're referring to is "cultural landscapes"?

Q Yes.
A (Widell) Okay. I'm sorry.
(Widell) No. We included cultural landscapes in the Assessment Report that was provided to the SEC in October of 2015 , as part of the Application to the SEC. Some examples of those cultural landscapes that were identified are the North Road Agricultural District, which is over a thousand acres; Weeks State Park, which I think is close to 400 acres. And those are a couple of examples. So, we absolutely did look at cultural landscapes in the very beginning.

Through what the Department of Energy did, in the completion of its project area forms, it also identified cultural landscape study areas for the Pemigewasset River Valley and the Suncook River Valley. And, so, the areas to be identified where expanded at that time. And, then, as $I$ think you know, they were expanded again in January of 2017, with the addition of three more study areas.
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So, I think this has been a process which is appropriate to identify any possible historic resources that could be considered. And that's why I'm so confident that we have identified the historic resources likely to be affected, and that we understand what those effects -- if there are any adverse effects, and where they might be.

Q So, just let me just take an example of one of the cultural landscapes that's recently been identified or at least a report was done, the Harvey Swell, for example?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q So, you're familiar with that?
A (Widell) Yes.
And just want to confirm with you that I understand that you are dealing with this primarily under the 106 process. But the Site 102.23 is the definition of "historic sites" that we use before the SEC, and Ms. Boepple talked a little bit about that with you. And just to remind you again, it says "any building, structure, object --
[Court reporter interruption.]
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MR. PLOUFFE: I'm sorry.
BY MR. PLOUFFE:
Q "Any building, structure, object, district, area or site that is significant in the history, architecture or culture of this state, its communities, or the nation." So, would you agree with me that, for example, that Harvey Swell cultural landscape qualifies under the SEC rules as an historic site?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And would you agree with me that it has -- that the Harvey Swell landscape has scenic values?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And it has a so-called "scenic quality".
MR. PLOUFFE: Yes. Great. That's
all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Ms. Widell.

WITNESS WIDELL: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I have Mr. Baker up next.

MR. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, Ms. Widell.

WITNESS WIDELL: Good morning. MR. BAKER: I'm Bob Baker. I think
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-28-17\}
you may recall, I represent four landowners with properties in the Great North Woods. And they have property that is relatively close to two of the cultural landscapes that we've been looking at. One is Harvey Swell, and the other is the Upper Ammonoosuc River. I have those documents in front of me, and $I$ would like to bring them up on the screens, if we can now.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q And this is the Harvey Swell cultural landscape.

A (Widell) I'm sorry to interrupt you. I don't have a signal at this point.

Q I'm sorry, I put --
A (Widell) I think I've got it now. There's a little blue thing in the middle of it. But $I$ have a copy of it, too. I'm fine. Thank you.

Q Okay. Thank you. And I had a number of questions about this, some of which have just been covered.

But am I correct that your determination on the Harvey Swell cultural landscape is that, while the Northern Pass Project could have an effect, that it has been determined that the
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effect is not adverse?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And that's a recommended finding that will be dealt with by others, is that correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q So, that may or may not be the final determination?

A (Widell) Yes. That's possible.
Q Okay. With respect to the Harvey Swell determination, and I'm paging down now through the document, there is a paragraph at the top of what I think is Page APP -- whoops -- I'm going to go down to the bottom of it and make sure $I$ have it right. APP 83092.

Though, I've outlined in yellow before you, at the very top of the page, can you tell me who wrote that?

A (Widell) The Preservation Company and myself certainly was involved in the review of the precise words that were used to describe the potential adverse effect.

Q Am I correct that this paragraph at the very top of that page is sort of the essence of the reasons why there was a determination that it
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-28-17\}
had no adverse effect?
A (Widell) No. I would say the last paragraph probably is the essence of it.

Q Okay. And, if this refreshes your recollection, can you outline for us, just very briefly, the major reasons that you and your cohorts determined to recommend "no adverse effect"?

A (Widell) Well, some of it is in here. That in our evaluation of what is potentially visible from the viewshed mapping, which the maps are in there, that they're limited views, intermittent views from Bear Rock Road, that the tops of some of the overhead structures that will be within that forest area above, $I$ believe it's Heath Road, might be possible. There also might be very, very distant views of over three miles, $I$ believe, in Sugar Hill. That ninety percent of the Harvey Swell cultural landscape lies outside of the Area of Potential Effect, so unlikely that there would be effects to the cultural resources in and around that area.

And, so, the final determination was, and
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I'm doing this very quickly, but there is very precise information in here that the visibility, three miles in the distance, and the views of a couple of the structures within the forest half a mile to a mile away, would not cause the significance of the cultural landscape or the integrity of the cultural landscape to be diminished. Which, if you go back to the very beginning of this, on Page 2, the Criteria of Adverse Effect, you can see that that is the criteria that needs to be applied. Will it diminish the integrity of the properties, --

Q Okay.
A (Widell) -- different integrity measurements? So, that's about as short, I think, with giving you some detail.

Q Yes. No, and I appreciate that.
A (Widell) Okay.
Q This is detail, it's an effort to justify the determination that there's no adverse effect. Is there any reason that you did not mention the number of structures that would be visible from the area within the APE in this cultural
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landscape?
A (Widell) Yes. Because there are no structures that would have visibility of the Project within the area in the APE. There is one, basically, we would call it almost an
"archeological feature", because it is the foundation of a bank --

> [Court reporter interruption.]

## CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:

A (Widell) -- what we might call almost an
"archeological feature", because it's a foundation of a bank barn. The name of which is in here, but $I$ don't think we need that.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q Okay.
A (Widell) That was the only structure that was within the Area of Potential Effect that might possibly have Project visibility. But, of course, --

Q I have asked --
A (Widell) -- that value wouldn't be important to that particular structure.

Q I have asked the question badly. And it's not your fault that you misunderstood what $I$ was
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trying to get at.
A (Widell) Okay.
Q I was talking about the number of Northern Pass lattice or monopole structures that would be visible from the area within the APE. Do you know how many others have estimated would be visible?

A (Widell) I have no idea what others have estimated. If you go to Page 4, under "Relationship of the Project", you will see the distance, and then --

Do I have the right page in front of you now?
(Widell) No. That's the viewshed mapping.
Uh-huh. I'm not sure which page you're referring to as "Page 4".
(Widell) Keep going up. It's in the written portion of it. Go -- no, the other way. Am I getting warmer?
(Widell) No. The other way. You see that said "Page 7". No, you're going toward Page 8. Go -- no, the other way. No. No. No. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's go off the record.
[Brief off-the-record discussion
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[WITNESS PANEL: Widell|Bunker]
ensued.]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is there a pending question? I'm not sure there is.

MR. BAKER: The witness was referring me in her answer to something that was on Page 4.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
BY MR. BAKER:
Q What is it specifically on Page 4 that you were referencing, Ms. Widell?

A (Widell) If you look at the last several sentences, you'll see the aboveground structures, half mile away, how high they will be. That there will be one single 120-foot structure located where the terrain drops off suddenly, and the transition structure, meaning where it goes from aboveground to underground will be 80 feet.

Q Right. You mentioned that there are multiple structures that are visible from within the APE, correct?

A (Widell) No. The tops of structures will be potentially visible, and it states that on the next page.
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Q All right. Well, the tops of the structures are part of the structures, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. And do you know how many structures are in the transmission line between Transition Station 4 and the Dixville border, at the top of Sugar Hill?
(Widell) $I$ cannot tell you that now. But $I$ can tell you that we would have looked at that precisely at the time that we wrote this. Okay. Well, the Project maps will tell us that.

A (Widell) Yes.
Q We don't have to get into that. I'd like to now take you to Appendix 17 -- whoops. Oh, dear. I'm praying that this will come up now. I'm going to simply make reference to the fact that, in Appendix 17 to the Applicants Exhibit 1, which is the DeWan visual analysis, there are charts of this area showing that, within the APE, the number of structures that are visible. And, if I'm reading it correctly, and, again, we can reference that later, I can't pull it up now, it talks about 25
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structures.
A (Widell) The Area of Potential Effect for the visual impact analysis for DeWan \& Associates is different than the Area of Potential Effect for historic resources.

Q I understand that's your position. But there are 25 structures, according to Mr. DeWan. And I don't want to argue with you.

The next question is, assume for a moment that there are 25 structures visible, whether it's the tops of them or half of them or all of them in this area. What are the reasonable mitigation steps or techniques that this Committee should consider, if it determines that the protection of the Harvey Swell cultural landscape is an important thing to do? (Widell) Is that specific to the Harvey Swell cultural landscape?

Q I'm asking you what mitigation could be done to reduce the impact of 30 visible structures from the Harvey Swell cultural landscape?

A (Widell) There is not an adverse effect, and there is not 30 structures visible from the cultural -- the Harvey Swell cultural
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landscape. So, there is not a need for mitigation, because it does not diminish the significance or integrity of that cultural landscape.

Q Let me -- I'm sorry, maybe I'm misunderstanding. I thought that your determination that there was no effect is a recommended determination, not one which is final?

A (Widell) Yes, that is true. But I am professionally absolutely convinced that there is no adverse effect to this cultural landscape and stand by that recommendation.

If this Committee were to have a concern that the cultural landscape of the Harvey Swell be protected, what mitigation options are there for it to consider?

A (Widell) Lowering of the height of the structures; perhaps continuing the underground, if it felt, and $I$ believe the SEC would want to base that on the recommendation of professionals in the field of historic and cultural resources.

Q All right. You could -- one of the things --
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one of the things you could do is move Transition Station 4 to over the crest of Sugar Hill and keep it underground until you reach that point, correct?

A (Widell) I can't answer that, because I don't know where Structure 4 is precisely.

Q That's fair enough. But it's something -- it's something that you might wish to investigate if you were looking at reasonable options, correct?

A (Widell) If it had been determined it was an adverse effect, moving structures is certainly one of the things that we have done in other places. But, once again, I, professionally, and my colleagues agree, that there's not an adverse effect to this cultural landscape. Do you know how many miles it is from the proposed location of Transition Station 4 to the Dixville boundary with Stewartstown?

A (Widell) No, I do not.
Q Okay. Would it surprise you if it was approximately three miles?

A (Widell) I don't know how far it is. So, I can't speak to that.
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Q All right.
A (Widell) I'm sorry.
Q I understand. I understand. We can easily determine that from the Project maps, however, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. Are there any other mitigation steps that might be taken with respect to the structures that are proposed along the area from Transition Station 4 to the Dixville boundary?

A (Widell) Once again, I do not believe that there is an adverse effect. So, there is not a need for mitigation to prevent an adverse effect on historic resources.

Q Okay. We're now looking on the screen at the Upper Ammonoosuc River cultural landscape results of the effect evaluation. And, again, the evaluation is that it could have an effect, correct?

A (Widell) No. Our evaluation was a recommended finding is that it does have an adverse effect, in answering your question.

Q Right. I was going to --
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A (Widell) Yes.
Q I was going to get that. But the initial evaluation is that the Project could have an effect, and then we go into the evaluation, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. That's where you begin, yes.
Q And I've now paged down to the recommended finding that you've just referenced. And the adverse effect that's determined, it states that it's primarily with respect to the Ammonoosuc River crossing in the North Side Road area, and a view from Route 110, I assume that's the intersection of Route 110 and the Stark Road, towards the Project, is that correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Okay. What $I$ have on the screen before you now is an Exhibit CS 94A. Have you been to the Ammonoosuc River crossing of the Coos Loop, where the Project proposes to replace the coos Loop structures and add the high-voltage direct current structures for the proposed facility? (Widell) $I$ have been along the route as it is accessible. But $I$ cannot say specifically $I$
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have been to the location you are speaking of.
Q Okay. I will represent to you that this is the crossing of the Coos Loop over the Ammonoosuc River. In looking at this, what possible mitigation could be done with respect to the proposed structures, which are approximately twice as high as the existing structure that you see in this photograph?

A (Widell) I don't know what the proposed structures will be in this location, the height.

Well, let's assume that the height of the structures are twice as high as the existing structure that you see in this photograph, and that they're proposed to be placed on
monopoles. Should they be silver or is it better to have them mud brown?

A (Widell) You know, is this -- this is a conjectural question for this particular site, because $I$ don't believe that this is related to a particular contributing element of the cultural landscape, is it?

Well, this is the exact location on the Upper Ammonoosuc River where you said that this
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Project will have an adverse effect.
A (Widell) The area that is depicted in the Effects Tables talk specifically about the "alluvial fields", which is a contributing element to the significance and integrity of the cultural landscape. In that location, the mitigation that -- or, not "mitigation", excuse me, the minimization that was proposed was the use of weathering steel monopoles, spread as far as possible away from one another. And that is part of the proposed Project in that location. And $I$ believe that there is a photosimulation to show that to you.

Q All right. There is not a photosimulation that I'm aware of this site. So, the question that I have is, do you have any other recommendations, other than weathering steel monopoles, for this location?

A (Widell) No.
Q Okay. If there is a dispute amongst the Consulting Parties and parties to the Programmatic Agreement as to what to do at this location, how is it resolved again?

A (Widell) If this is part of the area where
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there is an adverse effect, which is determined through the consultation process, then it would, if it was deemed that this particular part of the Project was causing a visual adverse effect to a cultural landscape, then they would look at maybe lowering structures, a different type of structure, moving the structure.

Q Okay. I'm just assuming there's a dispute amongst the parties as to what to do here. Some might say "don't come here at all", "take it outside of this area, bring it down Route 3". I mean, there's all kinds of possibilities. My question is, assuming a dispute, and I'm asking you to assume there's a dispute, how is it resolved? Who is going to be the final arbiter of what gets done here?

A (Widell) It would go under the Dispute Resolution provision in Stipulation XIII.

Q Right. It's in the Programmatic Agreement. And isn't it the DOE that makes the final determination?

A (Widell) No. No, not necessarily. It's also possible that, depending, and I'm not looking
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at the precise language, so, once again, as I stated previously, in some cases, the Advisory Council provides input to the Department of Energy for a final. But that would -- that would unlikely be for the type of structure that was used for avoidance or minimization. I would think, once again, as I stated, the professionals who have much experience on this would be able to resolve that between themselves.

And, so, that's -- I think it would be resolved between the professional parties, the signatories.

Q Let me ask it a different way, and this is a different question. I have four clients, none of whom are members of the Consulting Party group. Do they have any say in this?

A (Widell) Yes. The public does have say in this. I could refer, if you would like, I will find precisely the section that --

Q No. It's okay.
A (Widell) And that is a really important part of this. That it is not just limited to those who have signed this Agreement.
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Q Okay. Well, --
A (Widell) The public continues to have an opportunity to participate, if it chooses to. If they wish to?
(Widell) Yes.
And they get to write a letter. Do they have a role in the dispute resolution process as well?

A (Widell) No. Not once they have provided their dispute.

MR. BAKER: Okay. I have no further questions. Thank you.

WITNESS WIDELL: Thank you. Mr.
Chairman, unfortunately, I need to take another break.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
WITNESS WIDELL: Forgive me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's take a short break.
(Recess taken at 11:08 a.m. and
hearing resumed at 11:15 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Ms.
Percy, are you ready to go?
MS. PERCY: I am.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You may proceed. MS. PERCY: Okay. Hello, Ms. Widell. WITNESS WIDELL: Good morning, Ms.

Percy.

MS. PERCY: How are you?
WITNESS WIDELL: Good. Thank you. MS. PERCY: I only have a few questions.

WITNESS WIDELL: Okay.
MS. PERCY: And only because, I think as all of us go through this process, we learn more and more and more, and so we have more and more questions. But $I^{\prime} m$ going to limit it to a few.

BY MS. PERCY:
Q So, did you, in your participation with the New Hampshire DHR on cultural landscapes, did you visit the designations considered important? Did they add any extras?

A (Widell) Your question is, first, did I -- I didn't -- I was not involved with DHR on the cultural landscapes.

Q You didn't participate at all?
A (Widell) Not with DHR, no.
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Q So, am
So, am I asking that question incorrectly? Did you participate with someone else?

A (Widell) Well, certainly, with PAL, which is the consultant who prepared the cultural landscapes based on the guidance from DHR. And I am familiar with that guidance, and also was involved in and reviewed the materials, and also certainly visited the cultural landscapes.

Q And, so, did you -- you know that stark, because you helped me, you told me that stark was going to be listed as a cultural landscape or a piece of it was. Did you visit all the locations in Stark?

A (Widell) Pretty well, yes. And in the public areas of the Percy Summer Club as well, yes. But not the buildings.

Right. Sorry about that. So, in the Stark Cultural Landscape Report, that's the Woodland Heritage Scenic Byway.

A (Widell) Uh-huh.
Q Is that right?
A (Widell) There is one -- a couple of photosimulations for the Woodland Scenic Byway. Yes. The Ammonoosuc River, which runs through
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Stark?
A (Widell) The Upper Ammonoosuc River cultural landscape, yes.

Q Thank you. Devil's Slide?
A (Widell) Uh-huh.
Q South Pond, and the Stark Church, Christine Lake, --

A (Widell) Uh-huh.
Q -- Nash Stream Forest, the Kauffman Forest, Percy Forest, Percy Summer Club, a small sampling. But a fairly impressive list, don't you think?

A (Widell) Yes. Those are all what we would call "contributing elements".

Q Right. And can you just help me understand the -- there are all these natural elements that make up the cultural landscape in Stark that contribute to the overall impact of that community. Is that considered in your cultural landscape evaluation?

A (Widell) Natural features are considered part of it. And that's why it's called the "Upper Ammonoosuc cultural landscape", because there were two corridors that were important to
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identifying those contributing elements. One was the river, which provided the rich alluvial soils, where the farmers then settled and used, --

Q Uh-huh.
(Widell) -- and adjacent to Stark Village. And
then the railroad corridor, --
Right.
A (Widell) -- which provided ability for
lumbering, for the settlement of the Town of Stark, and even for recreation for the Percy Summer Club.

Q So, the first map please. So, this is -- are you familiar with this map?

A (Widell) Yes. It's upside-down.
MS. PERCY: Art and I are a team.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: Sorry.
MS. PERCY: And eventually we'll get
this ELMO thing right.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: We'll get it figured
out.
BY MS. PERCY:
Q And does this map include the Nash Stream
Forest?
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A (Widell) Let me --
Q So, when you look at the boundary line that's drawn?

A (Widell) You mean, is it identified or does it include it? It does include certainly part, if not all of it, yes.

Q It doesn't stretch it out for the -- so, in this map, the district is "condensed". Would that be a good way to reference that? (Widell) Well, I don't want to -- but we've got several districts in the cultural landscape. We've got the Percy Summer Club as a district, we've got --

Stark.
(Widell) -- Stark as a district, and Northside Road. So, is it condensed?

Well, in the cultural landscape map that is right here, there is an outline that details what is included in the Cultural Landscape Report, is that right?

A (Widell) Yes. I'd like to go to my copy of it, so $I$ can see it slightly better.

Okay.
(Widell) Just give me a minute please. Much
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-28-17\}
better. Thank you very much for waiting. And your question?

Q The Nash Stream Forest isn't included in its full -- I'm specifically looking at the Victor Head, Bald Mountain, Long Mountain, Percy Peaks. So, that is left out, is that correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And can you tell me why?
A (Widell) Certainly, the report will give you that in detail. The way cultural landscapes were identified were based on direction. One, certainly, the overall direction is how the National Park Service has identified and set boundaries. I think that's specifically in the very beginning of each Cultural Landscape Report. And the specific report is 16A. But, also, a guidance came from a document entitled "Identifying and Evaluating Historic Landscapes", from Caltrans, from 1999, which was chosen by the Division of Historic Resources as kind of a overall guiding document, and they gave more precise direction from that document. So, the boundaries are established by using the information and
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|  | direction from those guidance documents. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q | Okay. Just for my help, would -- do you |
|  | believe that the Victor Head, Bald Mountain, |
|  | Percy Peaks have significance to the Town of |
|  | Stark? |
| A | (Widell) Certainly, they have significance. |
|  | But they have not -- |
| Q | Okay. |
| A | (Widell) -- they were not included in the |
|  | cultural landscape, based on the criteria |
|  | established. |
| Q | Okay. So, I think we go to the next map. So, |
|  | in -- oh, wait. Stay with that map a second. |
|  | I'm sorry. |
|  | In the Percy Summer Club area, and within |
|  | the cultural district outline that is in there, |
|  | Potters Ledge is included in that as a -- in |
|  | that outline. Would you know that? |
| A | (Widell) I would have to review the specific |
|  | write-up of the Cultural Landscape Report. |
|  | Obviously, there is a lot of material, as you |
|  | well know, in each one of them. |
| Q | Right. |
| A | (Widell) So, it is not on the map. So, - |
| \{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY] \{09-28-17\} |  |

Q Okay. But would you trust me that Potters Ledge is included in the district?
(Widell) I believe that you are familiar with the area. So, yes.

Thank you. So, now, we go to the next page -MS. PERCY: Oh, no. I'm sorry, Art. Yes.

BY MS. PERCY:
Q So, this is a view of Potters Ledge overlooking the lake. What it doesn't do, I didn't put it to the -- it is looking east towards the Town of -- or, the Town of Dummer. And it is -- has a tiny piece of the south side of where the transmission corridor will go. The transmission corridor runs along the south side.

In all the viewsheds from Potters Ledge, except for one tiny area, the towers are visible. You wouldn't know that, because you didn't climb Potters Ledge, right?

A (Widell) I did not climb Potters Ledge.
Q Okay. And, so, at the second picture, the bottom picture, is -- and $I$ apologize for these pictures, they're terrible -- but the
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structures are visible at the east end of the lake, coming down from Dummer. Can you see that? You could probably see the right-of-way, is that correct?

A (Widell) The photographs aren't identified. I am assuming you're talking about the lower photograph?

Q Yes. That's the east end.
A (Widell) And the cut through the -- for the right-of-way, --

Q Yes.
A (Widell) -- $I$ can see that in that particular picture. But, obviously, --

Q Now you're going to have to trust me on the tower thing again.

MS. PERCY: So, thank you. Next one, Art.

BY MS. PERCY:
Q So, I'm getting to the last pieces of it. So, Potters Ledge is a significant viewpoint. That I think Mr. DeWan sent someone up there, and he might still be lost, but $I$ don't know. We're hoping not. We've hiked it a number of times since then. But we don't have any viewsheds
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looking from Potters Ledge over to the White Mountain National Forest, is that correct, in any of your analysis?

A (Widell) Not in any of the photographs of our Effects Table, no.

Q Okay. Great. So, just moving on, in evaluating the transmission corridor itself, did you base -- and this is the transmission corridor that runs all the way through Stark. Did you base your analysis in the Cultural Landscape Report on the 150 feet right-of-way? (Widell) I'd have to look at the Effects Table. Okay. Great. And just as you're looking at that, I'll just tell you that this picture is done by DOE, and it's a photosimulation of the Cohos Trail, or where the Cohos Trail intersects with the right-of-way in the Town of Stark.
(Widell) On Page 5 of the Effects Table, in the first sentence of the second paragraph, it is 150 -foot wide corridor, which was acquired in 1946 and '47.

Great. And, so, would you say this is a fair representational view of the corridor?
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A (Widell) The corridor immediately below the Percy Summer Club on the piece of property that is related to access to the water rights, yes. Q Okay. So, if $I$ told you that the corridor is actually not cleared to 150 feet, would that change your analysis in this area?

A (Widell) No. No. Because, when we looked at making an assessment, the areas that would be cleared for the Project were identified in a particular color on the mapping. So, that was taken into consideration.

Okay. Next, last picture. This is a picture of the right-of-way at Christine Lake. And this is looking, oh, towards Stark, the Town of Stark, running south of Christine Lake. Would you agree that -- can you trust me that this is where it is?
(Widell) I have seen this. I have been to this location. This is, once again, below the lake and outside of any view of that contributing element.

Right. So, --
(Widell) And it is visible from the -- it's
Christine Road there, right? Yes.
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Q Someday I'm going to tell everyone about Christine, but --

A (Widell) Excuse me, "Christine". Forgive me. You should know. I'm so sorry. Oh, no. That's --
[Multiple speakers at the same time.]

BY MS. PERCY:
Q That's okay. So, going back to this, though, the Applicant has identified that an additional 40 feet will be cleared in order to accommodate the new structures. Would that be significant in your view?

A (Widell) It certainly should be taken into consideration, yes. And, as I stated, we did take that into consideration in our assessment of visual adverse effects and direct effects.

Q And, so, what's the mitigation then?
A (Widell) There's not an adverse effect. There is not an adverse effect. And that, in this contributing element of the cultural landscape, there would not be mitigation required. So, on a drive to Christine Lake, you have to -- you pass under this corridor that will be
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now cleared an additional 40 feet on either side of the road. You don't think that's significant?

A (Widell) No, but let me speak to that. Once again, this --

Actually, --
(Widell) The existing roadway to the Percy Summer Club --

Q Uh-huh.
(Widell) -- goes through this area, it has gone through this area since $I$ think at least the '50s, because the property has been a right-of-way for a transmission corridor since that time period.

Obviously, we thought it could possibly have an adverse effect on cultural or natural -- or, not historical resources in this particular case. And, so, it was taken into consideration in our assessment.

Could there be some plantings that would help along the sides of the road? Yes. I would agree with that, yes. Yes. But there is not an adverse effect from this right-of-way on a historic resource, specifically, the Percy
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Summer Club here.
Q Well, I'm actually thinking that the adverse effect is more from all the mountains that are used by the public. And, so, all those viewsheds are now impacted not only by higher towers and structures, but by also a widened right-of-way, and widened only to the extent that the right-of-way legally is able to go to 150 feet. But, for what you've agreed to, is that this representation is not 150 feet, is that correct?

A (Widell) The clearing of the right-of-way is not to its full 150 feet --

Q Right.
A (Widell) -- in this photograph, and that will occur as part of the Project.

And, so, could that occur all the way through Stark?
(Widell) It could. I don't know. That's just conjecture. I don't know. I can't speak without looking at the vegetation clearing maps.

And, so, just one final question, because I am puzzled by the fact that the right-of-way
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through Stark is established at 150 feet. However, there are multiple reports from the Applicant that say the clearing on this right-of-way will be at the minimum 10 feet and maximum 40. So, all the way through the right-of-way through Stark that we've been talking about, including Mr. Baker's recent view from the Ammonoosuc, that we don't know what it is right now that we're looking at. So, how much more should we be expecting in terms of that impact?

A (Widell) The vegetation clearing maps I'm sure are available on the Northern Pass Project website. So, I would suggest, for specifics on that, I would look at that. And I would also further state that the contributing element of Stark is not adversely impacted by this Project.

MS. PERCY: Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard is next on my list. Off the record. [Brief off-the-record discussion ensued.]
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[WITNESS PANEL: Widell|Bunker]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard, you may proceed.

MS. MENARD: Thank you. Good morning, ladies.

WITNESS WIDELL: Good morning.
BY MS. MENARD:
Q I'd like to ask you about the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, and how it ties to the Section 106 process. And I'd like to put up a flow chart that was generated by the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation Act. Can you see that okay?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q So, you're familiar with this flow chart?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And you're aware that a link to this document is found on the Northern Pass website, on a page titled "Consultations Section 106", and there's a notation of that on the bottom?

A (Widell) $I$ haven't seen it on that particular website. But I'm familiar with this flow chart from the Advisory Council.

MS. MENARD: And I will, for the record, this will be listed as "Deerfield
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Abutter Exhibit $151(a) "$.
BY MS. MENARD:
Q So, back to the flow chart. Would it be correct to state that the ACHP, the organization that generated this flow chart, is responsible for administration of the -- for the Section 106 regulations?

A (Widell) Yes. They have oversight. But it also is carried out in each state by the state Historic Preservation Office --

Q Correct.
A (Widell) -- and the federal agencies.
Q Uh-huh.
A (Widell) I would say that those are three primary parties.

Q So, given that -- so, "yes" is the answer?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q Thank you. So, given that this 106 flow chart was developed by the federal entity responsible for its administration, you would accept it to be accurate in describing the steps in the 106 process?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q So, I'd like to go briefly through a few of
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these steps. And, first, representation, Step 1, we can skip, basically, the federal undertaking, and that there is a plan to involve the public, has already been moved through.

But, regarding Step 2, the identification of historic properties, there is a back-and-forth between the Applicant and DHR to identify historic properties, correct?

A (Widell) In the Section 106 process, it actually, technically, is between the federal agency and the state Historic Preservation Officer, and the Applicant usually is providing that information to the federal agency. Q Yes.

A (Widell) And that is what has happened here. Q Okay.

A (Widell) Yes.
Q So, the federal agency --
A (Widell) Yes.
Q $\quad-\quad$ to DHR?
A (Widell) Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. And the
Applicant provides the information.
Q Yes. And, so, Step 3 is the same process,
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correct? The Applicant does its analysis, submits its Effects Tables, and then -- to the federal agency, then DHR. They review, and an agreement is presumably reached, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q So, Step 4, the property -- if the properties are adversely affected, the Applicant works with DHR to agree on the mitigation measures, and commits them to writing in some form of agreement, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
So, regarding the Northern Pass Project, we know that there is a Programmatic Agreement, and it was executed last month, to govern the Section 106 process, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
So, I'd like to look at the page from the PA
that is the "Table of Contents". And I'll put it up on the screen for just one quick comment. So, this -- you recognize this as the Table of Contents?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And it was touched on earlier that Sections III, IV, and V, would you agree that these
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chapters, if you will, or topics, correspond to the Section 106 Flow Chart?

A (Widell) They are the same function, yes. Yes. Q Okay. Thank you. So, what I have up before you is labeled "Deerfield Abutter Exhibit 152, Section 2" -- excuse me, "151(b)".

So, the checkmarks represent that only Step 1 has been completed. It shows that each of these four steps has two parts. And the Applicant's submitting information, and the review by DHR. Do you see that each step has two boxes that --

A (Widell) Yes. I see the two boxes.
Q -- that are contained here?
A (Widell) I see the two boxes, uh-huh.
Q Okay. So, would you agree that it is accurate to say that the rest of the process will be completed under the terms of the PA? Would you agree with that representation?

A (Widell) Are you saying that as a general
statement or referring to the box that you -the boxes that you've --

To the process, we're talking the process here.
(Widell) The process --
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## BY THE WITNESS:

A Yes. The continuation of the Section 106 is now a part of the Programmatic Agreement.

BY MS. MENARD:
Q Okay. So, I'd just like to refer back to rules that were cited earlier today. And this is the excerpt that shows that the SEC shall consider the DHR's determination of effects to historic properties in its deliberations on unreasonable adverse effects. So, you'd agree that this excerpt is from the SEC rules? Site 301.14(b)?

A (Widell) Yes. It is from the -- yes, Site 301.14(b). Uh-huh.

Q So, this, citing here, does not say that the SEC can or should use a programmatic agreement for this purpose, is that correct?

A (Widell) It does not say that, right. It does not say that it can or should.

Do you believe that the $S E C$ should suspend its rules, specifically Site $301.14(b)(4)$, and proceed with deliberations on unreasonable
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adverse effects using a PA?
A (Widell) No, but let me clarify that. In past cases, Section 106 has been depended upon to continue the process after the issuance of a certificate in other $S E C$ deliberations.

Q Is it your understanding that the Section 106 review process requires a federal agency to consider measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse effects?

A (Widell) Yes.
In this language, "to consider measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate", is this language in the Northern Pass PA?

A (Widell) "Avoid, minimize, and mitigate", yes. I'd want to see precisely. But, yes, from my --

Is it your --
(Widell) Let me look at Resolution of Adverse Effects, if you want me to be precise about it. But, yes. I believe that is standard language for dealing with adverse effects on historic resources.

Q Is it your understanding that the Section 106 review process, the $P A$, in this case, can
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result in design changes for projects?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q What is your understanding would happen, if following the $P A$ for the Northern Pass resulted in design changes to the Project, after the SEC review process has closed?

A (Widell) I'm not an attorney, so I can't speak to that. I would, with dependence on the $P A$ to avoid, minimize, mitigate resources, historic resources, could be depended upon, even if there does have to be changes to the design of the Project.

MS. MENARD: Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record. [Off-the-record discussion ensued.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Merritt, are you ready to go?

MS. MERRITT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You may proceed.
MS. MERRITT: Elizabeth Merritt, with
the National Trust for Historic Preservation.
If Ms. Widell says "yes" to a lot of my
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questions, perhaps I'll be finished early, too.
I am going to ask a number of
questions that are specific to the Programmatic
Agreement. And I'm going to try to use the projector by putting pieces of paper there.

BY MS. MERRITT:

Q I wanted to ask you first, though, you referred, in your testimony earlier this morning, to a situation that you'd been involved in in the past where the head of the agency got involved and changed the project. Do you remember that reference earlier this morning?

A (Widell) Oh, yes. And you're going to ask me which, I believe -- yes. I believe the Long Beach, the Navy, the Long Beach Naval Yard.

Q Okay.
A (Widell) Yes.
Q I was just curious which project you were referring to.

A (Widell) Yes. Yes.
Q I have another background question for you regarding the Programmatic Agreement, before I start putting provisions on the screen. Did
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you work with the Applicant on reviewing drafts of the Programmatic Agreement and preparing comments?

A (Widell) Very early on I saw copies of the Programmatic Agreement. So, you had seen some drafts before the final Programmatic Agreement --

A (Widell) Yes.
Q -- was issued?
A (Widell) Yes, I have.
Okay. And you were aware generally that some revisions were made?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Did you -- never mind, I'll ask this later.

Let me start with Page 12. I'm going to skip the "whereas" clauses. Now, I have to use this. In the Paragraph I.D, you see it refers to the fact that the Applicant can propose to implement the Project "in geographically-based segments prior to [beginning] construction within each geographic area", correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And what is your understanding about how those segments will be divided? I'm going to put up
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on the screen Page 61, which is an exhibit in the Programmatic Agreement. Is it your understanding that the -- that the Project would be divided into geographic segments like that or do the Applicant's planned segments have no relationship to this map?

A (Widell) I do not know.
Q Okay. So, you don't know which portion of the Project the Applicant is planning to initiate first, --

A (Widell) No.
Q -- in terms of construction?
A (Widell) No.
Q Okay. I'd like to next go to Page 14 of the -thank you -- of the Programmatic Agreement.

And focus on Paragraph b.iii here, regarding the "Cultural Landscape Inventories". And it requires completing the cultural landscape inventories "prior to commencement of construction", correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And is it your understanding that that refers to construction within the segment that is currently under review? So that they wouldn't
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be required to complete everything before constructing segment 1 , but that each segment would be reviewed -- could be reviewed separately?

A (Widell) Yes. But it does not state that in this location. I believe it is in another location in the Programmatic Agreement that states that's possible, but --

Q Okay. I'd next like to turn to Page 20. Thank you. And, on Page 20, first, I'd like to look at Stipulation III.D.2 [III.C.2?], up at the top of the page, which $I$ have not highlighted. And it's -- let's see, --

A (Widell) Bring it down a little. Other way. Thank you.

Q Okay. And it says, "After the required identification investigations...are completed...DOE", I'm translating the acronyms here, "DOE, the Forest Service, and the Army Corps shall initiate the process for evaluating identified properties, in consultation with SHPO and" -- "the SHPO...to confirm or determine their National Register eligibility." Is that a fair translation of what it says?
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A (Widell) Yes.
Q Translating the acronyms. And, then, in
Paragraph D.3 [C.3?], we -- actually, hang on a second. One of the -- the thing I was going to ask is, is there any time limit that you see in the Programmatic Agreement for DOE to transmit the documentation to the DHR? I heard you say earlier that you "assumed there was a thirty-day time limit". And I, frankly, can't find it. There are other thirty-day time limits, which we're going to go through. But, if you see anything in the Programmatic Agreement that requires DOE to pass on documentation from the Applicant to the DHR within thirty days, $I$ can't -- I can't find it? A (Widell) I believe, if you go to Page 21, under D. $3--$

Q I'm going to pull up 21 anyway. So, let's put that up on the screen.
(Widell) Under D.3, "Review of Documentation", 3.c talks about "30 days from receipt of the draft documentation to provide comments to DOE", and to prepare -- DOE will direct Northern Pass to prepare drafts of all
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documentation. Is that on the -- yes, that's up now, okay.

Q This refers to after DOE provides the documentation to other agencies, specifically the Forest Service, the Army Corps, and the DHR. Again, I'm translating the acronyms. In b, 3.b, it says "DOE", in the second sentence "DOE will distribute the drafts to the Forest Service, Army Corps, and SHPO", which is DHR. (Widell) And it has done that already, Elizabeth. The inventory forms have been provided by DOE to the Forest Service, the Army Corps, and DHR. And the cultural landscapes have also been provided to I know the Forest Service, and I believe the National Park Service as well, and the Effects Table. So, this documentation of identification and evaluation is considerably on its way. The Cultural Landscape Reports have not yet been provided to DHR, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. That's correct.
Q Okay. So, I want to walk through this provision to make sure that we all understand the process for resolving any disagreements
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about eligibility of properties for the National Register and the process for reviewing.

So, in Paragraph a, 3.a, it again refers to the Applicant's ability to pursue this process in separate geographical segments, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. But the identification has been completed for the entire Project.

So, in Paragraph b, that's where DOE provides the documents to the other federal agencies and DHR, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. And that has been done. The inventory forms have been provided to DHR, yes.

Q With the exception of the cultural landscape material --

A (Widell) Yes.
Q -- to DHR. In c, Paragraph c, it allows the agencies thirty days to review the draft documentation, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And then it says "Based on the comments received, DOE...may require NPT", which is the Applicant, "to revise the documentation".
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A (Widell) Yes.
Q And then it says "If NPT's revisions are sufficiently substantive, DOE may request a second 15 -day review from the agency reviewers".

A (Widell) Yes. That's what it says.
Q Okay. So, just putting that all together, in a worst-case scenario, you'd have, once the agencies get it, you'd have a thirty-day review period, plus the time between the end of that thirty-day review period when comments are given to DOE, and DOE directing the Applicant to make revisions. And then you'd have the time required for $D O E--\quad$ mean, sorry, the Applicant to make those revisions. And then you might have a second fifteen-day review.

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Is that correct?
A (Widell) Basically, that's already occurred. The cultural landscapes have already -- reports have already been provided by DOE to the federal agencies. So, the thirty-day time period is, if not finished already, close to finished.
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Q Is it your understanding that the federal agencies, namely Forest Service and Corps of Engineers have already had the cultural landscape notebooks for thirty days?

A (Widell) I don't know that they have had them for thirty days. I know that they have provided comments to the DOE.

Q Okay. But DHR, their thirty-day period has not begun yet, correct?
(Widell) Yes. That's correct.
Okay. So, what I'm trying to lay out here is the fact that, under the Agreement, for this step in the process, you could have, let's say, in a worst-case scenario, you could have more than two months just for this step of the process, because you'd have DHR's thirty days, then you'd have the time required for DOE to request that the Applicant make revisions, then the time needed to make those revisions, and then fifteen more days. And, as we have repeatedly observed, DOE does not act quickly. (Widell) I believe DOE has already requested of the Applicant some changes, and they were made to the cultural landscapes.
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Q Oh. Are you aware of what those changes were?
A (Widell) Yes, some. Yes, some of them. Yes.
Q So, the notebook --
A (Widell) They were technical corrections, basically. Formatting, that sort of stuff, yes.

Q Do you know whether any changes were made in the boundaries of any of the cultural landscapes?

A (Widell) No. No, there were not. So, once DHR receives the draft documentation, this time period of thirty days, plus revision time, plus fifteen days, will then go forward. So, it could be as much as two months for that step, once DHR receives the cultural landscape documentation?

A (Widell) I see forty-five days there, but - -
Q In addition to the time required for DOE to direct the Applicant to make changes, and then for those changes to be made. Do you know how much time it took for the Applicant to make the changes that were requested in response to comments from the Forest Service and the Corps?

A (Widell) Not precisely, but very quickly. I
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would say, in a matter of a week or two.
Q Okay.
A (Widell) But that's just an estimate from my understanding.

Q Okay. So, we could round it off at two months, in a worst-case scenario. Then, we go to Paragraph d. And, then, after that process we were just discussing, DOE provides the draft documentation to the Consulting Parties. And the Consulting Parties have thirty days to review and comment on the documentation. And, again, DOE can require, in response to those comments, that the Applicant revise the documentation and can trigger a second fifteen-day review period from the Consulting Parties, correct?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q So, if we add together these two sequential processes, that second one, in Paragraph d, could again take another couple of months in a worst-case scenario?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Are you aware of the fact that the Applicant objected to this process in the Programmatic
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Agreement?
A (Widell) No.
Q Okay. Now, going to Page 22, which is right here. Oh, I think it's on the back. Okay. Page 22. In Paragraph III.D.3.e, up at the top. It says "Any agency or Consulting Party may request an extension from DOE...explaining the reasons why the extension is needed", and DOE can grant that extension of time.

So, I just wanted to be sure we're all aware of the fact that, even in addition to the four months we've already outlined, additional time could be granted by DOE, if requested and if needed by another review party.

And, then, in Paragraph $g$, it says DOE essentially makes the determination that the identification of historic properties is complete. But it also refers to -- let's see, where is that cross-reference? There is a procedure later in the Agreement for raising objections or disputes regarding the eligibility of properties for the National Register. And I'm going to direct you to Page 43, and I'm going to put Page 43 on the screen.
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So, in Paragraph $F$, and this is
Stipulation XIII.F, it refers to "any disputes or objections [regarding] eligibility of properties for the National Register that can be resolved by the Keeper of the National Register", and it refers to the regulations.

I assume you're generally familiar with that process for referring disagreements to the Keeper of the National Register?

A (Widell) Yes. And I believe, as you know, it is rarely used in my professional experience, because the parties usually are able to come to resolution.

Q And how much time does the Keeper of the National Register have to engage in that review under the regulations cited in the PA? Do you recall off the top of your head?

A (Widell) I do not recall off the top of my head, but it is in the regulations, I believe.

Q Yes. Does "45 days" ring a bell to you?
A (Widell) Oh, I can't remember. I'm sorry.
Q Okay. In your previous experience as a State Historic Preservation Officer and Federal Preservation Officer, have you been involved
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[WITNESS PANEL: Widell|Bunker]
directly in any disputes that have been referred to the Keeper of the National Register or not?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And what's an example?
(Widell) It was regarding the eligibility of Mount Shasta.

> MR. IACOPINO: Of what?

BY MS. MERRITT:
Q Mount Shasta, in California?
A (Widell) Yes.
Q And what happened as a result of that? Did the Keeper of the National Register disagree with the agency's recommendations or --

A (Widell) No. It determined that it was eligible for the National Register.

Q Was the agency involved the Forest Service?
A (Widell) Yes, it was.
Q Okay. So, take my word for it, the amount of time the Keeper has to review a referred disagreement is forty-five days. And, so, if there were an unresolved disagreement about eligibility, that could potentially add another forty-five days onto the worst-case scenario,
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four months, that we've already walked through, correct?

A (Widell) No, not necessarily. Because, if there is disagreement, it wouldn't necessarily be found the last day of all this consultation. Might be found pretty early on. And, so, my experience is that it would be done in parallel time limitations.

Q Could you clarify that answer? Because your reference to "parallel time" seems contrary to the language in the $P A$ itself, which the Applicant fought hard to change, but DOE refused to change. So, could you clarify that answer?

A (Widell) You'll have to show me the part of the PA you're referring to, I'm sorry. Okay. You referred to "parallel" -- you referred to the resolution of disagreements in a "parallel" process. And the portion of the PA that seems inconsistent with that answer would be Page 21, which specifically calls for a subsequent review, first, by the agencies, and subsequently by the Consulting Parties. And, so, DOE has prohibited that sort of
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parallel review.
A (Widell) Only if you take all thirty days. Sometimes, in my experience, it becomes apparent, and, like I said, I don't know why we're specifically spending time, because this is a very rare occurrence, a very rare occurrence. In my experience, the federal agencies and the SHPO come to agreement 99 percent of the time. But, if it is a property that there is disagreement between the federal agencies whether it's eligible or not, it is possible that that review by the federal agency, SHPO, and the Consulting Parties could happen much more quickly on a particular property. It wouldn't be necessarily at the end of sixty days, Ms. Merritt.

Well, in this case, I'm thinking that reviewing 1,500 pages of Cultural Landscape Reports, never mind the extensive documentation that has already occurred, could well take the full thirty days?

A (Widell) It could well, but it also could be assumed eligible as well.

And I'm also assuming that, in this case, most
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of the issues, most of the disagreements regarding eligibility would come from Consulting Parties more than the agencies. But, clearly, under the $P A$, the Consulting Parties have specific rights to raise those objections and to use the procedural mechanisms for attempting to resolve those objections?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q So, I was going to do this later, but it might be helpful for me to put up on the screen a couple of examples of what I'm referring to. Let's take, let's see, this is Page 82274, from the cultural landscape notebooks. And what's that exhibit number? 211? Applicants 211 .

This is a map that shows some of the cultural landscapes that were looked at, but not pursued as cultural landscapes. In the right-of-way, down towards the bottom of this area of the map, we see the Peaked Hill Road district, which is already identified as a National Register district, correct? (Widell) It has been identified as a National Register eligible district by DHR, in consultation with DOE.
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 41/Morning Session ONLY]\{09-28-17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Widell|Bunker]

1

Q And $I$ believe it is one of your acknowledged adverse effects?

A (Widell) Yes, it is.
Q Okay. So, if there were a Consulting Party that wanted to raise issues about the boundaries of this already National Register eligible district, and wanted to argue that additional areas should be included within the district, that would be an issue that would be raised under the procedures that we just walked through, correct? It would be while the Consulting Parties were going through their thirty-day review of the identification materials, and then they would raise comments to DOE "we think these boundaries should be expanded, and here's why". And then DOE would take that into account, and perhaps require the Applicant to do additional work, perhaps not. But, then, the Consulting Party could potentially raise that issue all the way to the Keeper of the National Register, correct? I'm just trying to use examples from the maps we have.

A (Widell) I'm not sure of that, because,
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Ms. Merritt, the determination of eligibility has already been done by DHR for the boundaries for that historic district. DOE provided a recommendation for establishment of the boundaries of that district through the Project Area Forms. And, so, this is not our recommendation alone for the boundaries of that district, which were changed based on our original assessment of the properties.

But this is consultation already concluded between DOE and DHR regarding capture of the essence of that historic resource. So, this has moved forward before the Programmatic Agreement was signed, as part of the regular Section 106 process between DOE and DHR for this Project.

Q But the Consulting Parties' thirty-day review period has not yet occurred with respect to these resources, correct?

A (Widell) This happened not under the Programmatic Agreement.

Q Are you saying that some of these resources the Consulting Parties would not be allowed to comment on in that provision we just reviewed
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concerning eligibility and boundaries?
A (Widell) No. I don't know how DHR would accept those comments, since they have already completed this stage of the identification prior to the signature of the Programmatic Agreement.

Q Under the Programmatic Agreement, didn't it say the comments are to go to DOE, rather than DHR?

A (Widell) Once again, Ms. Merritt, this identification of the boundaries for this historic district were, and I'd have to look at the Inventory Form, what is called the "green sheet", and the green sheet process. The Department of Energy provided this historic resource to DHR in their regular review of determination of eligibility of properties. And, so, the boundaries were identified at that time for the Peaked Hill Historic District. Let me use another example from the Cultural Landscape Report. This is Page 82011, from Exhibit 211. And this is the Upper Ammonoosuc River cultural landscape that you were just discussing with Ms. Percy.

If there were -- if one of the Consulting
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Parties believed that the boundaries of this proposed cultural landscape should be expanded, for example, wouldn't that thirty-day review period in the Programmatic Agreement that we just talked through, on Page 21, wouldn't that be the place for the Consulting Parties to make that argument, to raise that issue and try to persuade DOE?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. And, so, if -- that disagreement could potentially go through the dispute resolution process, as DOE decides how to respond to that comment, correct?

A (Widell) Yes. There would be consultation probably prior to that, yes.

Okay. So, let's now go to the effects portion of the Programmatic Agreement. After we -- we were going through the portion that deals with resolving the identification of resources.

And, so, my point was to try to make sure we laid out the process for resolving disagreements, whether those disagreements relate to boundaries or relate to eligibility at all. And that that process, in the extreme,
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could take months, four months, plus five months, depending on whether the Keeper gets involved.

Now, let's turn to the effects determinations in the Programmatic Agreement. And let's start with Page $23--$ wait a minute, yes. Here's 23.

So, this comes after the identification process is completed. And I want to just clarify some references $I$ heard you made earlier. We've talked about the Effects Tables, right? And $I$ just want to clarify my understanding that those represent the Applicant's proposed determinations of effect, but those determinations would still go through the process in the Programmatic Agreement that we're about to walk through for addressing any potential disagreements with those determinations, is that correct?

A (Widell) Yes. And I would add, the Effects Tables formatting was developed by DHR, in consultation with the Applicant. Is that the same thing that is referred to as the PAF or is the PAF just an identification
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document?
A (Widell) The PAF is a "Project Area Form". It is a form that the New Hampshire State Historic Preservation Officer uses to develop context for a undertaking. So, the Department of Energy, using consultants named "SEARCH" developed Project Area Forms. And the key thing, in addition to developing an historic context, is it also enabled DOE to identify the specific properties that might be affected by the Project. And they were brought prior to the signature of this Programmatic Agreement to DHR for consultation. And that is how the properties that were inventoried, the single properties or multiple properties that were inventoried, these are aside from the cultural landscapes, were chosen and done in consultation with DHR. And those have all been completed and provided to DHR.

Q Okay. Turning back to the language of the Programmatic Agreement, we have Page 23 on the screen, Stipulation -- this is IV, IV.E,
"Consultation on Assessing Effects on
Identified Historic Properties". And we do
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anticipate, as we've already heard from the questions this morning, that there may be some disagreements regarding whether effects are adverse or not, and that those disagreements will need to be resolved through the process in the $P A, r i g h t ?$

A (Widell) Yes.
Q So, first, it says, in E.l.b, it says that "DOE will direct Northern Pass", the Applicant, "to host at least two in-person Consulting Party meetings (one up in Whitefield and one in the Laconia/Concord area)...to discuss the effects of the Project on of the identified historic properties." And "DOE...can determine whether additional in-person meetings on conference calls are needed". So, that alone will take some time to schedule and arrange those meetings, correct?
(Widell) I can't speak to how much time it will take. But it is a provision in the Programmatic Agreement for inclusion of the public and Consulting Parties.

So, farther down on this same page, in
Stipulation E.3.a, it says "DOE will distribute
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the draft Effects Documentation to Consulting Parties...for 30 days to review", right?

A (Widell) Yes.
Q And, then, it says "Any disputes regarding findings of effect [are] resolved in accordance with Stipulation XIII." And, we already looked at Stipulation XIII with respect to referring eligibility disputes to the Keeper, but this is the portion of Stipulation XIII that refers to other dispute regulation.

We can come back to that. But let's just keep going through this process and see what happens next. Let's go to Page 24. Is that on the other side of that?

ADMIN. MONROE: Yes.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A (Widell) Yes.
BY MS. MERRITT:
Q Okay. So, then, in response to Consulting Parties' comments, as happened before, DOE can require the Applicant to make revisions to the Effects Documentation. And I assume that the Effects Documentation begins with the tables that were put up on the screen earlier that we
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were looking at, right, in response to other questioners?

A (Widell) Are you referring to the Cultural Landscape Effects Tables? And, in my previous testimony, we also had the individual inventory form, property effects form.

Q I guess I was referring to what you've been calling the "Effects Tables". So, DOE can request that the Applicant make revisions, and they can request a second fifteen-day review period after that, if changes are sufficiently substantive, right?

A (Widell) Yes.
So, then, after that Consulting Party review occurs, then, in Paragraph 4, there's public review of the Effects Documentation. The DOE makes it available to the public for a thirty-day review. And, again, there's the reference to the dispute resolution procedure. There's the ability of DOE to require the Applicant to make revisions in response to the comments. So, this is an additional period of time, correct?

MR. WALKER: Objection, Mr. Chairman.
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Mostly what Ms. Merritt is doing is going through the document, having Ms. Widell confirm what it says. I think the document speaks for itself. And Ms. Widell would probably stipulate that it says what it says.

MS. MERRITT: Can I respond to that? CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You may. MS. MERRITT: I noted that earlier questioners were asking Ms. Widell to read the PA. And I thought I would be more efficient by reading it myself, but my --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Both are pretty excruciating, $I$ got to tell you.
[Laughter.]
MS. MERRITT: I know, I know. But the purpose, what I'm trying to achieve here is, none of the other questioners, of -- in Tuesday or today, have gone through the Programmatic Agreement in excruciating detail like this. And $I$ know that the Committee members are interested in understanding what this process is that magically solves all the problems. And I'm trying to point out the timing involved. The amount of time, if you
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add up what the different steps are, how long that could take.

So, that's what I'm trying to get at.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't know if there's a more efficient way to do what you're doing. I think, if you ask her some leading questions about what Section II.B. 3 says, or the timeline there, she may well agree with you, without you having to read it or her having to read it. And, if you don't get that kind of answer, maybe then you'll go through it. But that's just a suggestion.

I'm fairly certain, though, that, if she has to agree with you, she'll agree with you. And I think we've seen that from other questioners.

MS. MERRITT: Well, it is also something that we can certainly discuss -CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And just to finish the thought. I mean, Mr. Walker is correct, the document says what the document says. And having someone read it into the record doesn't make the document say anything different from what it says.
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So, why don't you try and lead her through this timeline that you want to create. And, if you can't connect with her on a particular aspect of the timeline, draw her attention to the section that you think says what you think it says, and maybe you'll get on the same page with her.

MS. MERRITT: Okay. Maybe what I'll do is shift to a couple of specific examples, if that would be helpful.

BY MS. MERRITT:
Q And, so, let me put a couple of maps on the screen. This is Page 82067 of Exhibit 211. This is the Harvey Swell cultural landscape district. And there have been some earlier questions today regarding the proposed determination by the Applicant that there would be no adverse effect on this district.

So, is it your understanding that those members of the public or Consulting Parties who disagree with that determination would then use the process in the Programmatic Agreement to raise those disagreements?

A (Widell) Yes.
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Q So, they would do their thirty-day review, and then submit their comments to DOE disagreeing with the proposed determination of adverse effect, and they would argue why they think that determination is wrong, given the visibility and so forth?

A (Widell) There would be a variety of reasons they might want to include. So, I can't say why they would say that.

So, here's another map, which is -- oh, sorry, that's the wrong one. This is Page 81576. And it's a map of the Nottingham Road Historic District. So, this map shows, from left to right, the lines, they're not very dark, but the lines where the transmission line would cut through the district. And this has also been determined by the Applicant to be proposed as a "no adverse effect" determination, correct? (Widell) Yes. But this is not a cultural landscape.

Q I understand that.
A (Widell) This is a -- this is a multiple property inventory that was completed. And my understanding that we were limited to talking
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about cultural landscapes today.
Q Well, my reason for putting this map on is that my understanding is that, if Consulting Parties or members of the public disagree with the Applicant's proposed determination that this will not be adversely affected, that they would use that process in the Programmatic Agreement to raise those disagreements. That's where they would bring those disagreements about that "no adverse effect" determination.

A (Widell) Yes.
And they would have the thirty-day period to comment under the PA. And then, DOE, if it felt -- if it agreed with them, DOE could require a change, could trigger another fifteen-day period, correct?

A (Widell) No. Once again, this is a historic district, like Peaked Hill Road Historic District, which was first identified by DOE in the Project Area Form, recommended to DHR, DHR, in their green sheet process, which is the process for determination of eligibility and identification of the resource and boundaries, identified this as a historic district which
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needed to be inventoried, and it has been inventoried. So, that process of identification is completed prior to the Programmatic Agreement.

Now, for effects to it, yes. It would follow the Programmatic Agreement now.

Q Okay. So, the Programmatic Agreement prescribes the process for parties to challenge that "no adverse effect" determination? (Widell) Yes.

And then -- hmm. I'm trying to figure out a way to do this without putting more language from the $P A$ on the screen.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If you need to do it, you need to do it. I mean, don't hesitate to do what you feel you need to do to examine the witness.

```
                                    MS. MERRITT: I know it's
```

            excruciating.
    BY MS. MERRITT:

Q Okay. Let me just put one more provision. And
 "dispute resolution" provision. If there's a disagreement, so, for
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example, let's use Nottingham Road. If Consulting Parties object to the "no adverse effect" determination, first, there's the process where DOE decides whether it agrees with those comments. And, if the Consulting Parties remain unhappy with DOE's response, then they can invoke this dispute resolution procedure, correct?

A (Widell) Who did you say precisely is requesting this dispute? Is it a concurring party or --

Q Let's say it's a concurring party, for simplicity.

A (Widell) Okay. Thank you. Okay. Yes.
Q And, so, I just wanted to make sure my understanding is correct, that this process first requires a determination in $B$, $a$ determination by DOE "within thirty days whether the objection can be resolved through consultation". And, then, if not, under B. $2 . a$, there's a thirty-day process for getting comments from the Advisory Council. And then, on the next page, there's another thirty-day process for DOE to make a decision, a final
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decision on how to resolve that objection.
So, I guess I just wanted to point out that there's another ninety days in which, depending on the outcome of that dispute resolution, you wouldn't know until the end what the final decision is on even whether there's an adverse effect under Section 106? (Widell) Yes. But $I$ would point out, which we kind of skipped over, under Stip XIII.A, -What page is that?
(Widell) It's on the same page right above where you began reading, on Page 42, --

Q Uh-huh.
A (Widell) -- "Stip XIII Dispute Resolution, A. Objections", that DOE is particularly here directed to first consult with the party for seven days. And, once again, much of this Programmatic Agreement is boilerplate, is, as you know, Betsy, having worked in this field for a long time, that these are processes that have been used for small and large projects effectively. And consultation for seven days, in my professional experience, almost always moves the needle to some agreement, not always,
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but more often than not. And, so, the direction in this dispute resolution is first to have DOE consult with the party. And I think that's wise.

So, I guess the point $I$ was trying to make by using some of these examples was that, in disputed situations, such as, for instance, the Harvey Swell District that was discussed earlier, districts where there's a proposed determination of "no adverse effect", that issue might not be resolved for months, if you -- if the Consulting Parties invoke the review procedure. And, in some cases, you may also have boundary disagreements as well that would need to be resolved first.

So, the point $I$ was trying to just confirm
is that, even the determinations of adverse effect, such as for the districts like Harvey Swell, like Nottingham Road, like Franklin Falls Dam, could take months to resolve before we even know what the final federal determination is regarding that adverse effect. A (Widell) Is there a question?

Q Do you disagree with that?
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A (Widell) Yes.
Q Okay. Explain.
A (Widell) Yes, it is possible, but I think unlikely. And primarily because, once again, the number of professionals that have prepared these materials. PAL has a great deal of experience applying the criteria for identifying cultural landscapes. The others, consultant -- contractors, we had eight different contractors that work in the field of historic resources preparing inventories, identifying boundaries, not just Preservation Company.

And, so, in my experience, with working with a broad group of professionals who bring decades of experience, that they have done excellent work identifying these resources. And, in what we have done so far through the Section 106 process, in consultation and working with DHR, they have agreed, they have agreed with the majority of the identification that has been accomplished through this process.

Q I guess I'm focused more on the Effect
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Determinations, which have not been reviewed yet. And isn't it -- isn't it fair to say that the "no adverse" -- some of the "no adverse effect" determinations could ultimately be reversed through the dispute resolution process or through DOE itself disagreeing?
(Widell) Anything is possible, yes.
Okay. And we may not know for months.
MS. MERRITT: I think I'll cut short my questions, in light of the hour and so forth, and because of the fact that the Programmatic Agreement does speak for itself and does lay out these time limits. So, I guess I'll, in light of the hour, go ahead and end my questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We will break for lunch, and be back in an hour, which is roughly 20 minutes to two.
(Lunch recess taken at 12:40
p.m. and concludes Day 41

Morning Session. Hearing
continues under separate cover
in the transcript noted as Day
41 Afternoon Session ONLY.)
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| 32/3 32/12 33/5 | 151 [4] 3/6 3/7 | 227-C [1] 19/12 |
| 33/21 44/18 57/7 | 111/1 114/6 | 227-C:1 [1] 19/13 |
| 57/9 59/21 59/23 | 152 [1] 114/5 | 227-C:9 [1] 30/7 |
| 61/12 62/16 62/23 | 16 [2] 14/19 14/22 | 23 [3] 139/6 139/7 |
| 66/20 69/22 70/5 | 162-H [2] 21/16 | 140/21 |
| 72/5 75/18 110/7 | 27/21 | 24 [1] 142/13 |
| 110/9 110/18 111/7 | 162-H:7-a [1] 27/23 | 25 [3] 84/24 85/7 |
| 111/18 111/21 | 16A [1] 100/16 | 85/10 |
| 112/10 113/15 | 17 [4] 1/6 71/9 | 250 [1] 62/14 |
| 114/2 115/5 116/3 | 84/15 84/18 | 25th [1] 29/6 |
| 116/6 116/23 | 18 [2] 11/5 70/13 | 26 [1] 34/12 |
| 136/15 151/7 | 19 [1] 21/17 | 27 [1] 12/21 |
| 153/19 | 192 [1] 44/2 | 28 [1] 1/3 |
| 10:10 [1] 58/1 | 1946 [1] 104/22 | 28th [1] 51/22 |
| 10:22 [1] 58/2 | $1999 \text { [1] 100/19 }$ | 3 |
| 110 [4] 2/10 3/5 | 1st [1] 52/2 | 3.a [1] 124/4 |
| 89/12 89/13 | 2 | 3.b [1] 123/7 |
| 114 [1] 3/7 | 20 [4] 39/6 121/9 | 3.c [1] 122/21 |
| 118 [1] 2/11 | 121/10 154/18 | 30 [5] 39/6 85/20 |
| 11:08 [1] 94/20 | 2015 [2] 21/17 74/8 | 85/23 122/21 142/2 |
| 11:15 [1] 94/21 | 2015-06 [3] 1/7 | 301.14 [4] 59/4 |
| 12 [3] 70/19 71/9 | 21/18 29/23 | 115/14 115/16 |
| 119/15 | 2016 [1] 22/3 | 115/23 |
| 120-foot [1] 83/14 | 2017 [2] 1/3 74/23 | 310-A:173 [1] |


| 3 | 8 | 42/19 45/8 45/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 310-A:173... [1] | 80 [1] 83/18 | 47/14 47/16 48/17 $49 / 2251 / 551 / 17$ |
| 155/19 | 800 [4] 20/4 21/6 | 49/22 51/5 51/17 |
| 31st [1] 51/23 | 70/14 70/16 | 51/20 52/3 59/18 |
| 36 [4] 20/4 21/6 | 81576 [1] 147/11 | 59/22 60/9 60/19 |
| 70/13 70/16 | 82011 [1] 137/20 | 61/15 64/8 64/9 |
| 4 | 82067 [1] 146/13 | 65/10 67/1 67/14 |
| 40 [4] 106/11 107/1 | 82274 [1] 134/12 | 68/6 69/16 72/22 $73 / 1875 / 2177 / 19$ |
| 109/5 149/22 | $83092 \text { [1] 78/14 }$ | 80/16 82/3 84/24 |
| 400 [1] 74/13 | 89 [1] 3/4 | 91/3 96/17 103/6 |
| 41 [4] 1/3 4/3 | 9 | 106/1 109/7 110/7 |
| 154/20 154/24 | 94A [2] 3/4 89/18 | 116/19 119/23 |
| 42 [3] 69/11 149/22 | 95 [1] 2/9 | 122/21 124/1 |
| 151/12 | 99 [1] 133/8 | 131/22 135/5 |
| 43 [2] 129/24 | 9:02 [1] 1/3 | 139/11 139/17 |
| 129/24 | A | 145/7 148/1 148/9 |
| 44 [1] 9/8 |  | above [2] 79/15 |
| 45 [1] 130/20 | 58/2 94/20 94/21 | 151/11 |
| 49 [1] 1/4 |  | aboveground [7] |
| 4th [1] 22/2 | A:173 [1] 155/19 | 45/4 65/15 66/3 |
| 5 | 58/20 59/20 | 66/15 67/2 83/12 |
| 50 [1] 39/6 | ability [5] 68/20 | absolutely [5] |
| 52 [1] 155/18 | 98/9 124/5 143/20 | 15/11 43/10 73/11 |
| 58 [1] 2/7 | 155/8 | 74/14 86/11 |
| 6 | able [3] 93/9 108/8 | ABTR [2] 3/5 3/7 |
| 61 [1] 120/1 | about [61] 4/19 6/1 | Abutter [2] 111/1 |
| 7 | 10/22 11/1 16/16 | 114/5 |
| 77 [1] 2/8 | $\begin{array}{lll} 18 / 21 & 25 / 19 & 26 / 2 \\ 30 / 23 & 31 / 24 & 32 / 9 \\ 35 / 24 & 39 / 23 & 42 / 19 \end{array}$ | 137/2 <br> access [1] 105/3 |


| A | actually [12] 8/12 | Administrator [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| accessible [1] 89/24 | 13/21 20/8 33/18 | 1/22 |
| accommodate [1] | 45/9 48/24 50/2 | admit [1] 72/14 |
| 106/11 | 105/5 107/6 108/2 | adverse [78] 12/22 |
| accomplished [3] | 112/11 122/3 | 23/1 23/10 25/10 |
| 23/21 42/10 153/22 | add [6] 89/21 95/19 | 32/13 33/6 33/22 |
| accordance [2] | 128/18 131/23 | 34/6 34/11 34/14 |
| 21/16 142/5 | 139/20 145/1 | 34/17 34/20 34/23 |
| according [2] 40/24 | addition [4] 74/23 | 35/3 35/7 36/4 |
| 85/7 | 127/18 129/11 | 40/22 43/11 44/8 |
| account [1] 135/17 | 140/8 | 59/7 59/11 59/15 |
| accurate [8] 11/24 | additional [7] | 60/3 60/16 60/18 |
| 37/20 37/23 54/19 | 106/10 107/1 | 60/23 61/9 61/11 |
| 55/13 111/21 | 129/12 135/8 | 61/17 61/20 62/2 |
| 114/16 155/5 | 135/18 141/15 | 62/6 63/1 63/6 64/5 |
| accurately [1] | 143/22 | 75/7 78/1 78/21 |
| 15/10 | address [4] 25/3 | 79/1 79/7 80/10 |
| achieve [1] 144/16 | 43/6 63/1 63/20 | 80/21 85/22 86/12 |
| ACHP [1] 111/4 | addressed [3] 29/18 | 87/12 87/16 88/13 |
| acknowledged [1] | 34/7 36/22 | 88/14 88/22 89/9 |
| 135/1 | addresses [4] 11/14 | 91/1 92/1 92/5 |
| acquired [1] 1 | 11/17 22/13 40/14 | 106/17 106/19 |
| acres [2] 74/12 | addressing [2] | 106/20 107/16 |
| 74/13 | 37/11 139/17 | 107/23 108/2 |
| acronyms [3] | adequately [1] 26/3 | 115/13 116/1 116/9 |
| 121/18 122/2 123/6 | adjacent [1] 98/6 | 116/18 116/21 |
| act [5] 30/5 66/21 | adjudicate [2] 69/2 | 135/2 141/4 146/18 |
| 70/6 110/11 126/21 | 69/3 | 147/3 147/18 |
| ion [2] 155/12 | adjudicative [1] | 148/10 149/9 150/2 |
| 155/15 | 59/8 | 151/7 152/10 |
| activities [3] 11/15 | administration [2] | 152/17 152/22 |
| 11/17 11/20 | 111/6 111/20 | 154/3 154/3 |


| A | 103/15 105/19 | 145/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| adversely [5] 14/24 | 10 | agreed [4] 108/ |
| 15/18 109/17 113/7 | 128/12 128/20 | 148/14 153/20 |
| 148/6 | 137/9 143/18 | 153/21 |
| advise [1] 31/20 | 148/17 151/17 | agreement [141] |
| Advisory [10] 9/17 | 153/4 | 4/18 4/22 5/18 5/19 |
| 66/17 68/23 69/14 | agencies [14] 27/24 | 6/2 6/22 8/3 8/4 8/9 |
| 72/20 73/1 93/2 | 28/2 28/8 111/12 | 8/15 8/19 8/22 9/2 |
| 110/10 110/22 | 123/4 124/11 | 9/4 9/6 9/10 10/1 |
| 150/22 | 124/19 125/9 | 10/4 10/23 11/3 |
| Affairs [1] 1/16 | 125/22 126/2 | 11/14 11/16 12/15 |
| affect [4] 14/24 | 132/22 133/8 | 13/3 13/9 13/15 |
| 15/18 39/9 39/17 | 133/11 134/3 | 13/22 14/1 14/6 |
| affected [6] 40/11 | agency [17] 31/19 | 14/8 14/14 14/19 |
| 45/6 75/6 113/7 | 52/14 68/5 68/8 | 17/18 18/11 18/18 |
| 140/10 148/6 | 69/19 69/21 70/7 | 19/1 20/22 20/23 |
| after [9] 116/4 | 112/12 112/14 | 21/1 21/7 21/10 |
| 117/5 121/16 123/3 | 112/19 113/3 116/7 | 22/12 22/13 23/21 |
| 128/7 138/17 139/8 | 118/11 125/4 129/6 | 24/3 24/7 24/8 |
| 143/11 143/14 | 131/17 133/13 | 24/10 24/18 24/19 |
| Afternoon [1] | agency's [2] 66/19 | 25/2 26/16 33/8 |
| 154/24 | 131/14 | 34/2 34/5 34/6 34/8 |
| again [40] 10/5 | ago [2] 39/22 61/23 | 34/12 35/10 35/16 |
| 21/9 22/5 22/11 | agree [22] 30/16 | 36/1 36/5 36/6 |
| 24/2 34/4 35/22 | 32/5 37/23 47/18 | 36/14 36/17 37/16 |
| 36/12 40/13 43/12 | 47/20 47/23 60/18 | 38/5 40/14 40/17 |
| 46/11 48/4 52/13 | 63/19 63/24 76/7 | 42/4 42/9 42/16 |
| 58/16 61/6 68/17 | 76/11 87/15 105/16 | 43/5 43/15 46/1 |
| 71/2 72/21 73/13 | 107/22 113/8 | 47/15 51/3 51/16 |
| 74/23 75/22 84/23 | 113/24 114/16 | 53/17 53/23 54/4 |
| 87/14 88/12 88/18 | 114/19 115/13 | 55/7 57/7 57/8 59/1 |
| 91/23 93/1 93/7 | 145/8 145/14 | 60/8 60/21 61/3 |


| A | \|64/14 65/4 154/14 | 141/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| agreement... [53] | all [60] 5/9 8/23 | along [6] 14/21 |
| 61/10 62/23 65/9 | 8/24 16/16 18/21 | 41/8 88/9 89/23 |
| 67/13 67/21 68/18 | 18/24 20/9 23/15 | 102/15 107/21 |
| 70/1 70/2 71/13 | 24/11 24/21 27/6 | already [21] 42/12 |
| 72/19 91/22 92/20 | 28/20 30/12 40/18 | 46/12 61/21 112/4 |
| 93/24 110/8 113/4 | 41/21 43/7 48/15 | 123/10 125/19 |
| 113/10 113/13 | 51/12 52/5 60/14 | 125/20 125/21 |
| 115/6 115/18 118/4 | 63/17 63/17 67/17 | 125/23 126/3 |
| 118/23 119/2 119/5 | 67/20 68/24 69/1 | 126/22 129/12 |
| 119/7 120/2 120/15 | 76/16 83/7 84/1 | 132/1 133/20 |
| 121/7 122/6 122/13 | 85/11 86/24 88/1 | 134/20 135/6 136/2 |
| 126/12 129/1 | 91/14 92/11 92/13 | 136/10 137/3 141/1 |
| 129/20 133/8 | 94/15 94/22 95/11 | 142/6 |
| 136/14 136/21 | 95/23 96/12 97/13 | also [36] 1/19 7/8 |
| 137/6 137/7 138/4 | 97/16 99/6 102/17 | 7/13 7/16 11/16 |
| 138/17 139/5 | 104/9 108/3 108/4 | 12/6 14/17 21/8 |
| 139/16 140/12 | 108/17 109/5 | 21/13 30/6 30/19 |
| 140/21 141/21 | 122/24 123/23 | 41/4 42/3 42/15 |
| 144/19 146/22 | 125/7 129/10 132/5 | 46/7 47/20 62/12 |
| 148/7 149/4 149/6 | 133/2 135/20 | 66/14 74/18 79/17 |
| 149/7 151/18 | 138/24 140/18 | 92/23 96/6 96/8 |
| 151/24 154/12 | 144/22 154/16 | 100/17 108/6 |
| Agreement...which | allowed [3] 33/4 | 109/15 111/9 |
| [1] 41/5 | 34/21 136/23 | 123/14 129/18 |
| agreements [4] | allows [1] 124/18 | 133/22 133/24 |
| 34/15 43/17 43/18 | alluded [1] 5/18 | 140/9 143/5 145/17 |
| 56/10 | alluvial [2] 91/4 98/2 | 147/16 152/14 <br> Alternate [1] 1/17 |
| agrees [1] 150/4 <br> Agricultural [1] | $\underset{\text { almost [3] 81/5 }}{ }$ | although [1] 60/13 |
| 74/11 <br> ahead [4] 47/12 | $\begin{aligned} & 81 / 10151 / 23 \\ & \text { alone [2] } 136 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { always [4] 26/6 } \\ & \mathbf{3 0 / 1 4} 151 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |


| A |
| :--- |
| always... [1] 151/24 | am [17] 47/5 49/20

53/6 72/3 77/21
78/22 82/18 86/10
94/24 96/1 96/6 103/6 108/23 118/2 155/10 155/12 155/14
amendment [4]
8/12 8/23 10/1 10/3 amendments [5]
7/14 8/8 8/13 9/9
9/12
Ammonoosuc [11]
77/6 88/17 89/11
89/19 90/3 90/24
96/24 97/2 97/23
109/8 137/21
amongst [2] 91/20 92/10
amount [5] 23/14 26/23 44/23 131/19 144/24
analysis [6] 84/19 85/3 104/3 104/10 105/6 113/1 another [14] 14/18 57/12 91/10 94/13 118/22 121/6
128/20 129/14
131/23 137/19

147/10 148/15 150/23 151/3 answer [27] 7/5 7/11 7/23 13/10 15/9 16/15 20/12 27/18 32/24 33/2 34/10 37/6 37/8 37/12 39/13 49/3 49/18 61/1 61/6
71/6 83/5 87/5
111/16 132/9
132/14 132/20
145/11
answered [1] 61/5 answering [2] 6/1 88/23
answers [1] 5/12 anticipate [1] 141/1 any [41] 10/3 17/11 19/18 20/21 32/13 33/5 33/22 39/10 41/7 43/11 52/17 54/11 61/9 66/18 68/3 68/9 73/5 75/2 75/7 75/22 76/3 80/22 88/7 91/16 93/17 95/19 103/24 104/3 104/4 105/20 122/5 123/24 127/7 127/8 129/6 130/2 131/1 139/17 142/4 155/11 155/13
anymore [1] 25/20 anything [6] 48/7 53/8 57/2 122/12 145/23 154/7 anyway [2] 54/13 122/18
APE [5] 80/24 81/4 82/5 83/21 84/21 apologize [3] 33/20 54/24 102/23
APP [2] 78/12
78/14
APP68671 [1] 11/4 Appalachian [1] 58/12
apparent [1] 133/4
apparently [1] 54/6
Appearances [1] 1/23
appears [1] 62/17
Appendix [2] 84/15

## 84/18

applicant [37] 3/7
55/6 60/2 62/5 63/4 63/17 64/18 68/22
106/10 109/3 112/8
112/13 112/23
113/1 113/7 119/1
119/18 120/9
122/14 124/24
125/12 125/15
126/18 126/23

| A | archeologist [1] | 102/18 103/1 108/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| applicant... [13] | 66/14 | 108/5 109/2 109/13 |
| 127/19 127/21 | archeology [2] 17/14 65/18 | 111/14 113/7 114/3 114/14 114/20 |
| 128/13 128/23 | architecture [2] | 117/18 118/3 |
| 139/22 141/9 | 17/14 76/5 | 122/10 125/2 |
| 142/21 143/9 | are [109] 8/7 8/21 | 125/11 127/1 |
| 143/21 146/17 | 8/22 8/24 9/9 9/14 | 128/23 130/12 |
| 147/17 | 9/16 10/8 10/23 | 136/22 137/8 |
| Applicant's [6] | 11/21 13/24 15/20 | 140/16 141/3 |
| 66/12 114/10 120/5 | 15/24 16/17 17/1 | 141/16 142/5 143/3 |
| 124/5 139/14 148/5 | 18/19 20/7 20/8 | 143/11 144/12 |
| Applicants [3] 11/3 | 20/15 20/23 24/5 | 144/21 145/1 |
| 84/18 134/14 | 27/12 27/13 30/14 | 151/20 |
| application [4] 1/8 | 30/24 34/7 34/7 | area [32] 17/12 |
| 21/17 62/10 74/9 | 34/18 37/19 39/10 | 74/17 76/4 79/15 |
| applied [1] 80/12 | 41/8 44/3 44/9 44/9 | 79/20 79/23 80/24 |
| applying [1] 153/7 | 44/15 44/16 44/24 | 81/4 81/17 82/5 |
| appointed [1] 26/7 | 45/3 48/8 48/24 | 84/20 85/2 85/4 |
| appreciate [1] | 50/18 51/12 56/14 | 85/12 88/9 89/12 |
| 80/18 | 60/18 61/9 70/5 | 91/2 91/24 92/12 |
| approach [1] 10/9 | 71/20 74/10 74/13 | 101/15 102/4 |
| approaches [1] | 75/7 75/17 79/11 | 102/18 105/6 |
| 65/19 | 81/2 83/19 83/20 | 107/10 107/11 |
| appropriate [2] | 84/2 84/4 84/20 | 119/21 134/19 |
| 57/13 75/2 | 84/22 85/7 85/10 | 136/6 140/2 140/7 |
| approval [1] 26/11 | 85/12 86/16 88/7 | 141/12 148/20 |
| approximately [2] | 88/9 90/1 90/6 | areas [6] 74/18 |
| 87/22 90/6 | 90/13 93/16 94/23 | 74/20 74/24 96/15 |
| arbiter [1] 92/17 | 95/5 97/13 97/16 | 105/8 135/8 |
| archeological [3] | 97/21 98/13 98/16 <br> 100/23 102/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { aren't [2] 44/4 } \\ & 103 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |


| A |
| :--- |
| argue [3] 85/8 |

135/7 147/4
argument [1] 138/7 Army [4] 121/19 123/5 123/9 123/12 around [2] 5/7
79/23
arrange [1] 141/17
Art [3] 98/16 102/6 103/17
as [110] 1/13 3/4 3/7 5/4 5/19 6/4 7/15 8/6 8/7 8/13 10/17 11/18 12/6 12/7 12/19 14/1 14/14 18/14 18/14 18/22 19/11 21/19 21/22 22/6 22/17 28/4 31/19 35/19 38/12 42/10 43/1 44/18 45/5 45/24 46/17 52/11 53/10 55/11 55/11 55/24 57/5 57/9 57/10 59/8 61/1 61/24 62/7 63/15 63/16 64/5 64/20 65/9 65/15 67/16 67/17 72/21 74/8 74/22 76/9 80/16 82/15 89/23 90/7 90/7

90/13 90/13 91/9
91/10 91/22 92/10 93/1 93/7 94/7
95/11 96/11 96/15 99/12 99/15 100/21 101/17 101/21 104/13 106/15 108/16 110/24
113/20 114/20
123/16 126/20
127/14 127/14
130/10 130/22
131/12 133/23
134/17 134/20
134/22 136/14
138/12 139/23
141/1 142/20
147/17 148/24
151/18 152/7
152/14 152/18
154/23
aside [1] 140/16 ask [23] 8/2 13/7
14/17 16/10 20/20
22/20 26/2 31/5
31/6 34/4 45/9
45/13 45/14 69/1
73/20 93/14 110/7
118/2 118/7 118/14
119/14 122/5 145/6 asked [15] 5/8 5/17 16/17 29/15 32/9

32/10 32/17 37/4 38/20 46/19 48/3
58/19 73/16 81/20 81/23
asking [27] 6/6 7/1
7/1 12/19 22/21
22/24 22/24 23/8
23/8 23/9 36/21
38/18 39/23 42/19
45/15 46/22 47/9
48/1 48/16 48/17
58/20 71/20 73/18
85/19 92/15 96/1
144/9
asks [3] 48/23 50/1 50/6
Aslin [1] 39/22
Aslin's [1] 54/2 aspect [1] 146/4 aspects [1] 31/22
Assessing [1] 140/23
assessment [8]
55/16 61/22 62/8
74/7 105/8 106/16 107/19 136/9
associate [1] 4/15
Associates [1] 85/3
assume [8] 64/10
65/20 85/9 89/12
90/12 92/15 130/7
142/22

| A | avoidance [8] 35/2 | Bald [2] 100/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| assumed [2] 122/8 | 36/8 36/16 43/12 | 101/3 |
|  | 54/5 67/6 68/15 | bank [2] 81/7 81/12 |
| assuming [4] 92/9 | 93/6 | barn [1] 81/12 |
| 92/14 103/6 133/24 | avoidance/minimiz | base [3] 86/21 |
| assurance [1] 24/12 attempting [1] | ation [1] 67/6 | 104/8 104/10 |
|  | avoided [1] 62/14 | based [8] 44/13 |
| 134/7 | avoiding [1] 60/22 | 51/20 96/5 100/11 |
| attention [3] 11/5 | aware [8] 27/13 | 101/10 119/19 |
| 68/4 146/5 | 55/5 91/15 110/16 | 124/22 136/8 |
| attorney [11] 35/18 | 119/11 127/1 | basically [6] 15/15 |
| 35/24 36/20 39/22 | 128/23 129/11 | 39/4 81/5 112/2 |
| 54/2 58/11 58/18 | away [3] 80/5 83/13 | 125/19 127/5 |
| 72/4 117/7 155/10 | 91/10 | batch [1] 53/8 |
| 155/13 | B | be [197] |
| August [3] 29/6 | B.2.a [1] 150/20 | be a [1] 39/15 |
| 51/22 51/23 | b.i.a [1] 120/16 | Beach [2] 118/16 |
| authority [12] 10/3 | back [16] 5/4 28/22 | 118/16 |
| 26/11 26/12 27/14 | 33/14 34/5 40/23 | beams [1] 39/5 |
| 28/3 67/23 69/12 | 58/16 72/10 80/9 | Bear [1] 79/13 |
| 70/21 71/1 71/23 | 106/9 111/3 112/8 | because [35] 11/20 |
| 72/10 72/16 | 106/9 111/3 112/4 140/20 | 16/15 40/3 43/7 |
| authorization [1] | 142/11 154/17 | 43/20 53/21 55/10 |
| 21/14 |  | 60/24 61/8 63/16 |
| available [3] 22/3 | back-and-forth | 64/3 65/18 66/9 |
| 109/13 143/17 | 112/8 | 72/11 81/2 81/6 |
| avoid [13] 35/6 |  | 81/11 86/2 87/5 |
| 40/21 43/10 54/17 |  | 90/20 95/10 96/10 |
| 54/17 60/2 61/19 | Bailey [1] 1/ | 97/23 102/19 105/7 |
| 62/5 63/5 116/8 | Baker [3] 2/8 7 | 107/12 108/23 |
| 116/12 116/14 | 76/24 | 126/16 130/12 |
| 117/9 | Baker's [1] 109/7 | 132/3 132/9 133/5 |


| B | 153/22 154/1 | bell [1] 130/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| because... [3] | before [18] 24/24 | below [2] 105/1 |
| 135/24 153/4 | 29/8 32/8 38/10 | 105/19 |
| 154/11 | 44/21 49/10 57/6 | benefits [1] 27/4 |
| becomes [1] 133/3 | 63/8 75/20 78/15 | best [3] 60/5 63/1 |
| bedrock [1] 39/6 | 89/17 114/4 118/23 | 155/7 |
| been [70] 12/6 | 119/6 121/1 136/13 | Beth [2] 4/15 6/15 |
| 13/16 13/17 19/18 | 142/20 152/20 | Betsy [1] 151/19 |
| 19/20 19/23 19/23 | began [1] 151/12 | better [3] 90/17 |
| 20/1 24/14 24/19 | begin [1] 89/6 | 99/22 100/1 |
| 24/21 26/6 30/8 | beginning [4] 74/15 | between [14] 30/9 |
| 30/14 42/14 43/2 | 80/9 100/15 119/20 | 30/13 49/1 68/19 |
| 47/22 50/15 51/7 | begins [4] 11/5 | 68/21 84/5 93/9 |
| 52/3 53/7 53/24 | 49/18 67/14 142/23 | 93/12 112/8 112/11 |
| 55/19 56/11 56/23 | begun [1] 126/9 | 125/10 133/10 |
| 60/8 61/18 61/21 | being [3] 49/5 61/1 | 136/11 136/15 |
| 63/15 64/12 64/13 | 67/24 | beyond [2] 20/16 |
| 64/19 69/24 73/5 | believe [35] 5/8 | 26/19 |
| 73/21 75/1 75/10 | 7/11 8/14 14/10 | Bill [1] 58/10 |
| 77/4 77/20 77/24 | 16/14 23/14 40/6 | bio [1] 57/19 |
| 87/11 89/18 89/23 | 40/9 41/11 45/20 | bit [2] 30/9 75/21 |
| 90/1 105/18 107/12 | 46/7 51/2 52/6 | blue [1] 77/16 |
| 109/6 112/4 114/8 | 60/15 64/4 69/6 | blueprint [1] 55/15 |
| 116/3 118/9 123/11 | 79/16 79/18 86/20 | Bob [1] 76/24 |
| 123/14 123/20 | 88/12 90/20 91/12 | body [3] 24/19 26/8 |
| 124/8 124/13 | 101/3 102/3 115/22 | 57/13 |
| 124/14 125/21 | 116/20 118/15 | Boepple [7] 2/6 4/5 |
| 130/24 131/1 | 118/15 121/6 | 4/13 4/15 18/8 |
| 134/22 136/2 | 122/16 123/15 | 58/18 75/20 |
| 140/18 143/7 | 126/22 130/10 | boilerplate [2] |
| 146/15 147/16 | 130/19 135/1 | 34/15 151/18 |
| 149/1 151/21 | believed [1] 138/1 | Boisvert [1] 29/1 |


| B | briefly [2] 79/6 | 70/13 70/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| border [1] 84/6 | 1/2 | C:1 [1] 19/13 |
| both [3] 18/12 | bring [6] 68/3 77/8 | C:9 [1] 30/7 |
| 60/10 144/12 | 92/12 121/14 148/9 | California [2] |
| bottom [11] 6/12 | 153/15 | 56/11 131/10 |
| 6/12 32/22 35/23 | broad [1] 153/15 | call [3] 81/5 81/1 |
| 46/24 49/18 50/4 | broader [3] 17/16 | 97/13 |
| 78/13 102/23 | 17/23 20/10 | called [4] 51/15 |
| 110/19 134/18 | Broadly [1] 67/11 | 76/14 97/22 137/12 |
| boundaries [15] | brought [1] 140/11 | calling [1] 143/8 |
| 100/14 100/23 | brown [1] 90/17 | calls [3] 68/14 |
| 127/8 135/6 135/15 | building [3] 17/12 | 132/21 141/16 |
| 136/2 136/5 136/7 | 75/23 76/3 | Caltrans [1] 100/19 |
| 137/1 137/10 | buildings [1] 96/16 | came [2] 5/15 |
| 137/17 138/1 | BUNKER [30] 2/4 | 100/17 |
| 138/23 148/23 | 4/4 4/8 4/10 36/23 | can [70] 5/10 6/1 |
| 153/12 | 37/1 37/3 37/7 37/9 | 6/13 6/18 8/19 15/7 |
| boundary [4] 87/19 | 37/18 37/22 38/1 | 15/8 15/9 16/3 19/4 |
| 88/11 99/2 152/14 | 38/4 38/8 38/12 | 19/8 20/21 23/2 |
| box [1] 114/21 | 38/16 45/13 45/19 | 23/4 23/11 24/12 |
| boxes [5] 3/7 | 46/3 46/6 46/10 | 24/16 27/17 27/18 |
| 114/12 114/13 | 46/13 46/17 46/23 | 28/8 28/24 31/2 |
| 114/15 114/22 | 47/4 47/13 47/15 | 44/13 44/16 52/7 |
| break [5] 57/19 | 47/18 47/23 66/2 | 55/10 56/22 62/1 |
| 57/22 94/14 94/19 | burial [1] 65/21 | 62/3 65/11 68/3 |
| 154/17 | burials [1] 37/11 | 68/23 69/22 70/24 |
| Brennan [1] 1/21 | Business [1] 1/15 | 71/2 71/8 72/1 |
| bridge [1] 39/7 | Byway [2] 96/19 | 72/11 72/17 77/8 |
| bridges [4] 38/21 | 96/23 | 78/16 79/5 80/10 |
| 38/22 39/10 39/14 | C | 84/8 84/23 88 |
| brief [4] 18/17 | C. 3 [1] 122/3 | 97/15 99/22 100 |
| 57/19 82/24 109/23 | C.F.R [4] 20/4 21/6 | 103/2 103/12 |


| C | case [15] 37/14 43/8 challenge [1] 149/8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| can... [19] 105/16 | 51/2 52/6 53/20 | change [6] 8/11 |
| 110/11 112/2 | 107/18 116/24 | 9/23 105/6 132/12 |
| 115/18 115/21 | 125/8 126/14 128/6 | 132/13 148/15 |
| 116/24 119/18 | 128/21 131/24 | changed [6] 8/16 |
| 128/12 128/14 | 133/17 133/24 | 8/20 62/11 69/21 |
| 129/9 130/4 142/11 | 155/14 | 118/11 136/8 |
| 142/20 143/8 | cases [3] 93/2 116/3 | changer [3] 46/20 |
| 143/10 144/6 | 152/13 | 47/2 47/8 |
| 145/18 150/7 | cause [3] 60/15 | changes [13] 6/21 |
| 150/19 | 64/5 80/6 | 7/14 7/20 117/1 |
| can't [20] 20/12 | causing [1] 92/4 | 117/5 117/11 |
| 25/18 26/2 31/2 | certain [2] 40/2 | 126/23 127/1 127/7 |
| 31/22 50/13 54/17 | 145/13 | 127/19 127/20 |
| 63/20 84/24 87/5 | certainly [16] 5/24 | 127/22 143/11 |
| 87/24 108/20 117/7 | 13/23 21/5 31/23 | Chapter [2] 19/12 |
| 122/9 122/15 | 61/19 62/7 78/19 | 27/21 |
| 122/15 130/21 | 87/12 96/3 96/8 | chapters [1] 114 |
| 141/19 146/3 147/8 | 99/5 100/9 100/12 | characterization [1] |
| cannot [3] 63/1 | 101/6 106/14 | 55/14 |
| 84/8 89/24 | 145/18 certificate [4] 1/10 | chart [9] 3/5 3/7 110/10 110/14 |
| Canoe [1] 3/4 capture [1] 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { certificate [4] } 1 / 10 \\ & 64 / 1372 / 8116 / 5 \end{aligned}$ | 110/21 111/3 111/ |
| careful [1] 27/3 | certify [2] 155/4 | 111/18 114/2 |
| carefully [2] 16/11 | 155/10 CFR [1] 70/12 | charts [1] 84/20 chase [1] 67/22 |
| 16/21 | CFR [1] 70/12 <br> Chair [3] 4/9 18/3 | chase [1] 67/22 checkmarks [1] |
| cares [1] 27/3 | 76/21 | $114 / 7$ |
| Caron [1] 1/21 carried [2] 69/7 | Chairman [7] | CHERILYN [2] |
| 111/9 | 16/23 31/4 57/18 | 2/4 4/7 |
| carry [1] 5/19 | 58/6 76/16 94/13 | chooses [1] 94/3 |
| carrying [1] 70/5 | 143/24 | chosen [2] 100/20 |


| C | clients [1] 93/1 | 136/24 138/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| chosen... [1] 140/17 | climb [2] 102/20 | 148/13 |
| Christine [7] 97/6 | 102/21 | comments [16] |
| 105/13 105/15 | close [4] 73/5 74/13 | 50/10 119/3 122 |
| 105/24 106/2 106/3 | 77/3 125/23 | 124/22 125/11 |
| 106/23 | closed [1] 117/6 | 126/7 127/23 |
| Christopher [1] | Club [9] 58/12 | 128/13 135/14 |
| 1/15 | 96/15 97/10 98/12 | 137/3 137/8 142/2 |
| Chrmn [1] 1/13 | 99/12 101/15 105/2 | 143/22 147/2 150/5 |
| Church [1] 97/6 | 107/8 108/1 | 150/22 |
| citation [3] 40/16 | Cmsr [1] 1/14 | Commissioner [13] |
| 70/12 70/15 | cohorts [1] 79/7 | 5/15 6/3 6/6 7/17 |
| d [2] | Cohos [2] 104/16 | 9/1 36/21 38/18 |
| 30/16 | 104/16 | 39/1 41/2 42/18 |
| citing [1] 115/17 | colleague [2] 12/19 | 45/15 46/19 47/7 |
| clarification [1] | 65/23 | commits [1] |
| 30/23 | colleagues [1] | committed [1] 40/8 |
| clarified [1] 30/20 | 87/15 | committee [22] $1 / 2$ |
| clarify [9] 15/7 16/3 | color [1] 105/10 | 1/12 10/6 10/18 |
| 60/13 60/17 116/2 | come [9] 10/5 56/19 | 13/19 21/15 24/12 |
| 132/9 132/13 | 56/20 84/16 92/11 | 25/1 25/17 27/8 |
| 139/10 139/12 | 130/12 133/8 134/2 | 27/16 28/4 38/9 |
| clarifying [1] 41/19 | 142/11 | 38/12 44/13 44/20 |
| uses [1] 119/16 | comes [4] 56/1 56/9 | 46/15 55/10 59/16 |
| clear [2] 10/22 29/2 | 56/16 139/8 | 85/14 86/14 144/20 |
| cleared [4] 105/5 | coming [1] 103/2 | Committee's [2] |
| 105/9 106/11 107/1 | Comm [2] 1/13 | 56/18 60/10 |
| clearing [4] 108/12 | 1/14 | common [1] 14/7 |
| 108/21 109/3 | commencement | communicated [2] |
| 109/12 | 120 | 28/16 31/23 |
| clearly [4] 6/18 7/7 | comment [5] | communications [1] |


| C | 86/14 | confident [2] 56/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| communities [2] | concerned [1] | 75/4 |
| 17/15 76/6 | 30/20 <br> concerning [2] 62/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { confirm [4] 75/16 } \\ & 121 / 22144 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { community [1] } \\ & 97 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | concerning [2] 62/4 137/1 | 152/16 |
| Company [3] 1/9 | concerns [2] 25/3 | confusion [1] 41/16 |
| 78/18 153/13 | 28/17 | conjectural [1] |
| complete [6] 3/8 | concluded [1] | 90/19 |
| 3/8 52/16 62/24 | 136/10 | conjecture [1] |
| 121/1 129/18 | concludes [1] | 108/20 |
| completed [12] | 154/20 | connect [1] 146/3 |
| 24/22 27/2 51/8 | Concord [2] 1/4 | consider [8] 38/10 |
| 51/10 114/8 114/18 | 141/12 | 57/13 59/17 85/14 |
| 124/9 137/4 139/9 | concurring [2] | 86/17 115/10 116/8 |
| 140/19 147/23 | 150/10 150/12 | 116/11 |
| 149/3 | condensed [2] 99/8 | considerably [1] |
| completed...DOE | 99/16 | 123/18 |
| [1] 121/18 | conditions [1] | consideration [9] |
| completely [1] | 155/8 | 39/19 40/21 56/5 |
| 24/15 | conduct [1] 22/10 | 60/14 70/8 105/11 |
| completing [1] | conducted [2] | 106/15 106/16 |
| 120/18 | 21/19 22/6 | 107/19 |
| completion [3] 5/20 | conducting [1] | considered [6] 31/1 |
| 57/11 74/17 | 30/15 | 35/1 75/3 95/18 |
| compliance [5] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { conference [1] } \\ & 141 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | 97/19 97/21 <br> consistently [1] |
| 64/22 66/19 70/21 | 141/15 <br> confidence [14] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { consistently [1] } \\ & 51 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 70/24 71/23 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { confidence [14] } \\ 26 / 2327 / 727 / 9 \end{array}$ | constructing [1] |
| comply [1] 65/5 | 54/3 54/5 54/11 | 121/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { complying [1] } \\ & 72 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 55/8 55/9 55/14 | construction [12] |
| concern [5] 10/10 | 55/18 56/1 56/8 | 11/15 12/11 14/3 |
| 10/13 51/16 68/6 | 56/16 56/19 | 27/22 41/9 45/17 |


| C | 142/19 143/14 | controlled [1] 24/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| construction... [6] | 146/20 148/3 150/2 | controlling [1] 57/1 |
| 46/2 65/3 119/20 | 150/5 152/12 | convinced [1] 86/11 |
| 120/12 120/20 | contact [2] 66/11 | Coos [3] 89/19 |
| 120/23 | 66/15 | 89/20 90/3 |
| consult [3] 69/3 | contained [1] | copies [1] 119/4 |
| 151/16 152/3 | 114/14 | copy [6] 14/21 23/4 |
| consultant [3] | Contents [2] | 29/13 31/7 77/17 |
| 49/22 96/4 153/9 | 113/18 113/21 | 99/21 |
| consultants [1] | context [2] 140/4 | Corps [6] 121/20 |
| 140/6 | 140/9 | 123/5 123/9 123/13 |
| consultation [15] | continuation [2] $4 / 6115 / 5$ | 126/2 127/23 correct [98] 9/20 |
| 68/16 68/19 92/2 | continue [5] 19/4 | 9/21 10/6 10/7 |
| 121/21 132/5 $134 / 24136 / 10$ | 55/5 55/11 57/9 | 10/15 10/18 10/21 |
| 134/24 136/10 | 116/4 | 13/22 15/14 15/21 |
| 138/14 139/22 | continued [5] 7/17 | 19/1 19/2 22/8 |
| 140/23 150/20 | 55/2 55/16 55/24 | 22/18 23/22 24/7 |
| 151/22 153/19 | 81/9 | 25/15 25/22 30/5 |
| Consultations [1] | continues [4] 7/11 | 31/21 33/9 33/16 |
| 110/18 | 56/5 94/2 154/22 | 33/17 33/23 34/2 |
| Consulting [30] | continuing [3] 4/3 | 35/10 35/16 35/17 |
| 10/9 26/17 55/23 | 55/4 86/19 | 36/12 37/17 38/3 |
| 91/21 93/16 128/9 | contractors [2] | 38/15 38/16 39/20 |
| 128/10 128/15 | 153/9 153/10 | 41/10 42/6 42/16 |
| 129/6 132/23 | contrary [1] 132/10 | 44/19 46/16 47/6 |
| 133/13 134/3 134/4 | contribute [1] | 50/13 50/18 52/4 |
| 135/4 135/12 | 97/18 | 53/4 54/9 54/14 |
| 135/19 136/17 | contributing [7] | 55/12 56/21 57/4 |
| 136/23 137/24 | 90/21 91/4 97/14 | 62/21 77/21 78/4 |
| 138/6 141/10 | 98/1 105/20 106/21 | 78/22 83/21 84/2 |
| 141/22 142/1 | 109/16 | 87/4 87/10 88/5 |


| C | 106/24 107/13 | 70/11 155/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| correct... [40] | corridors [1] 97/24 | 155/14 |
| 88/20 89/5 89/15 | could [56] 4/21 | Country [1] 73/18 |
| 100/6 103/4 104/2 | 11/12 14/19 19/6 | couple [11] 25/6 |
| 108/11 111/4 | 21/10 29/13 39/10 | 34/10 45/14 54/1 |
| 111/11 112/9 113/1 | 39/17 47/8 47/11 | 74/14 80/4 96/22 |
| 113/4 113/10 | 51/3 56/8 65/8 68/6 | 128/20 134/11 |
| 113/15 115/19 | 68/8 69/15 70/11 | 146/9 146/12 |
| 119/21 120/20 | 70/12 73/19 75/3 | course [2] 48/8 |
| 123/20 123/21 | 77/23 85/19 86/24 | 81/19 |
| 124/7 124/12 | 87/1 88/19 89/3 | COURT [6] 1/24 |
| 124/20 125/18 | 90/5 93/19 103/3 | 75/24 81/8 115/1 |
| 126/9 126/10 | 107/15 107/20 | 155/4 155/18 |
| 128/16 132/2 | 108/17 108/19 | cover [2] 20/10 |
| 134/21 135/11 | 117/10 121/3 | 154/22 |
| 135/21 136/19 | 126/13 126/14 | covered [3] 18/4 |
| 138/13 139/19 | 127/14 128/5 | 20/23 77/20 |
| 141/18 143/23 | 128/20 129/13 | covers [1] 43/20 |
| 145/21 147/18 | 131/23 132/9 | Craig [1] 1/15 |
| 148/16 150/8 | 132/13 133/13 | create [1] 146/2 |
| 150/16 | 133/20 133/22 | creation [2] 13/14 |
| correction [2] | 133/22 135/19 | 25/10 |
| 54/21 54/24 | 138/10 139/1 145/2 | crest [1] 87/2 |
| corrections [1] | 148/14 148/15 | criteria [7] 20/3 |
| 127/4 | 152/20 154/4 | 59/6 60/14 80/10 |
| correctly [1] 84/22 | couldn't [1] 68/1 | 80/11 101/10 153/7 |
| correspond [1] | Council [10] 9/17 | cross [7] 2/6 2/7 2/8 |
| 114/1 | 66/17 68/23 69/14 | 2/9 2/10 2/11 |
| corridor [11] 98/7 | 72/20 73/1 93/3 | 129/19 |
| 102/14 102/15 | 110/11 110/22 | Cross-examination |
| 104/7 104/9 104/21 | 150/22 | [6] 2/6 2/7 2/8 $2 / 9$ |
| 104/24 105/1 105/4 | counsel [4] 1/20 | 2/10 2/11 |


| C | 126/3 126/24 127/8 | 125/16 125/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cross-reference [1] | 127/15 133/18 | 126/8 128/15 132/5 |
| 129/19 | 134/13 134/16 | 135/13 136/17 |
| crossing [3] 89/11 | 134/17 137/19 | 138/3 143/10 |
| 89/19 90/3 | 137/22 138/2 | 143/18 147/1 |
| CS [2] 3/4 89/18 | 140/16 143/3 | 148/12 148/16 |
| cultural [87] 4/20 | 146/14 147/19 | 150/21 150/23 |
| 26/8 45/1 45/8 48/8 | 148/1 153/8 | 154/20 154/23 |
| 48/23 49/20 51/5 | culture [2] 17/1 | day-to-day [1] 64/8 |
| 53/3 53/9 66/12 | 76/5 | days [29] 39/22 |
| 73/15 73/19 73/22 | curious [1] 118/19 | 50/21 50/23 51/14 |
| 74/2 74/6 74/10 | current [1] 89/22 | 51/20 52/1 52/4 |
| 74/15 74/18 75/10 | currently [1] | 122/15 122/21 |
| 76/8 77/4 77/10 | 120/24 | 124/19 126/4 126/6 |
| 77/22 79/20 79/22 | cut [4] 67/22 103/9 | 126/16 126/20 |
| 80/6 80/7 80/24 | 147/15 154/9 | 127/12 127/13 |
| 85/16 85/18 85/21 | D | 127/17 128/10 |
| 85/24 85/24 86/3 | D. 3 [3] 122/3 | 130/20 131/21 |
| 86/12 86/15 86/23 | 122/17 122/20 | 131/24 133/2 |
| 87/16 88/17 90/22 | d/b/a [1] 1/9 | 133/16 133/21 |
| 91/6 92/5 95/17 | Dam [1] 152/20 | 142/2 150/18 151/3 |
| 95/22 96/4 96/8 | Dandeneau [1] | 151/17 151 |
| 96/11 96/18 97/2 | Dandi | dead [1] 36/12 |
| 97/17 97/19 97/23 | dark [1] 147/14 | deadline [1] 52/17 |
| 99/11 99/17 99/19 | date [8] 51/18 | deadlines [3] 53/15 |
| 100/10 100/15 | 51/23 51/24 52/8 | 53/19 67/18 |
| 101/10 101/16 | 52/22 52/24 53/22 | deal [3] 9/11 72/6 |
| 101/20 104/10 | 155/7 | 3/6 |
| 106/21 107/16 | day [28] 1/3 4/3 |  |
| 120/17 120/18 | 53/14 53/19 64/8 |  |
| 123/13 123/19 | 64/8 122/9 122/10 | deals [4] 61/12 |
| 124/15 125/20 | 125/4 125/9 125/11 | deals [4] 61/12 |

deals... [3] 61/14
61/14 138/18 dealt [3] 67/5 68/7 78/4
dear [1] 84/16 decades [1] 153/16 December [1] 22/2 decides [2] 138/12 150/4
decision [5] 27/10 69/6 150/24 151/1 151/6
decisions [1] 59/2 deemed [1] 92/3 deep [1] 49/7
Deerfield [2]
110/24 114/5
define [1] 34/8 defined [1] 18/22 defines [1] 20/22 defining [1] 17/19 definitely [2] 14/6 72/17
definition [13]
15/22 16/1 16/5
17/2 17/6 17/16
17/17 18/1 18/13
20/6 20/24 28/14 75/19
definitions [1] 20/19
delegate [3] 70/20 70/24 71/22 deliberate [1] 59/9 deliberations [3]
115/12 115/24 116/5
delineated [4] 7/24 8/4 8/24 9/4
deliver [1] 52/7
delivered [2] 49/5 49/21
Department [26]
9/18 10/9 10/12
10/14 10/15 11/1
11/21 12/1 14/22
15/4 15/12 15/16
16/4 17/18 18/16
18/17 40/9 51/12
55/19 68/4 68/22
72/23 74/16 93/3
137/14 140/5
depended [2] 116/3

## 117/10

dependence [1]
117/8
depending [7] 8/20
52/22 66/16 66/23
92/24 139/2 151/4
depends [2] 73/13
73/13
depicted [1] 91/2
Dept [3] 1/15 1/15

## 1/16

describe [1] 78/20 describes [1] 15/3 describing [1]
111/21
design [5] 54/16
62/12 117/1 117/5
117/11
designations [1] 95/18
Designee [3] 1/15 1/15 1/16
Despite [1] 57/1
detail [6] 9/5 38/6
80/17 80/20 100/10
144/19
detailed [9] 12/24
13/1 13/5 13/12
13/21 14/14 35/9
35/15 36/13
details [2] 14/11
99/18
determination [29]
36/3 62/2 77/21
78/7 78/10 78/24
79/24 80/21 86/7
86/8 92/22 115/11
129/16 136/1
137/16 146/17
146/21 147/3 147/5
147/18 148/5
148/10 148/22
determination... [6] 149/9 150/3 150/17 150/18 152/10 152/22
determinations [8] 59/18 139/5 139/14 139/15 139/19
152/17 154/1 154/4 determine [4] 59/9 88/4 121/23 141/14 determined [12]
14/23 15/16 19/20 20/1 67/3 77/24 79/7 87/11 89/9
92/1 131/15 147/17 determines [1] 85/14
determining [2] 40/21 59/14
develop [3] 34/17 43/22 140/4 developed [4] 24/9 111/19 139/21 140/7
developing [2] 12/6 140/8
development [4]
12/9 25/9 42/7 43/17
Devil's [1] 97/4
DeWan [4] 84/19

85/3 85/7 103/21
DFLD [2] 3/5 3/7
DFLD-ABTR [2] 3/5 3/7
DHR [57] 3/8 21/24 28/15 30/2 30/9 30/13 31/17 31/18
33/15 51/9 51/11
52/11 53/1 53/10
66/16 68/22 70/20
71/1 71/22 72/10
72/11 72/17 95/17
95/21 95/24 96/5
112/8 112/21 113/3
113/8 114/11 122/7
122/14 123/6 123/9
123/13 123/20
124/12 124/14
124/18 126/8
127/11 127/15
134/23 136/2
136/11 136/15
137/2 137/8 137/15
139/21 140/13
140/18 140/19
148/20 148/20
153/20
DHR's [3] 72/16 115/11 126/16 dialogue [1] 30/9 did [25] 7/8 37/22 42/4 46/24 61/8

61/16 72/9 74/14
74/16 80/22 95/16
95/17 95/19 95/20
96/1 96/9 96/12
102/21 104/8
104/10 106/15
118/24 119/14
131/12 150/9
didn't [9] 40/4 67/1
70/3 73/22 95/21
95/23 102/10
102/20 137/7
difference [1] 66/3
different [15] 8/20
8/22 8/24 9/1 10/24
17/22 65/19 80/15
85/4 92/7 93/14
93/15 145/1 145/24 153/10
diminish [2] 80/12 86/2
diminished [1] 80/8
Dir [1] 1/15
direct [8] 32/10
39/16 89/21 106/17
122/23 127/19
129/23 141/9
directed [2] 13/12 151/16
directing [1] 125/12
direction [6] 47/19

| D | 128/8 137/23 | 148/19 148/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| direction... [5] | discussion [3] | 152/8 |
| 100/11 100/12 | 82/24 109/23 | districts [3] 99/11 |
| 100/22 101/1 152/2 | 117/16 | 152/9 152/18 |
| directly [2] 51/3 | dispute [19] 8/9 | divided [2] 119/24 |
| 131/1 | 69/10 91/20 92/9 | 120/4 |
| disagree [8] 30/18 | 92/15 92/16 92/18 | division [12] 16/5 |
| 31/16 32/5 57/5 | 94/7 94/9 138/11 | 19/22 21/24 26/6 |
| 131/13 146/21 | 142/10 143/19 | 26/14 27/13 28/11 |
| 148/4 152/24 | 149/23 150/7 | 29/1 55/20 59/19 |
| disagreeing [2] | 150/10 151/4 | 59/22 100/20 |
| 147/2 154/6 | 151/14 152/2 154/5 | Division's [1] 29/11 |
| disagreement [8] | disputed [1] 152/7 | Dixville [3] 84/6 |
| 45/11 51/17 131/21 | disputes [5] 129/21 | 87/19 88/10 |
| 131/22 132/4 | 130/2 131/1 142/4 | do [141] 4/24 5/17 |
| 133/10 138/10 | 142/8 | 5/21 5/23 6/4 6/6 |
| 149/24 | disregard [1] 69/23 | 6/8 6/24 7/5 7/8 |
| disagreements [13] | distance [2] 80/3 | 7/16 7/23 8/10 8/14 |
| 123/24 130/8 | 82/11 | 11/8 11/10 13/18 |
| 132/18 134/1 | distant [1] 79/17 | 17/7 22/23 23/3 |
| 138/22 138/22 | distribute [2] 123/8 | 23/13 23/13 23/15 |
| 139/18 141/3 141/4 | 141/24 | 23/16 25/23 27/24 |
| 146/23 148/8 148/9 | district [26] 17/12 | 28/4 28/8 28/15 |
| 152/14 | 74/11 76/3 99/8 | 30/16 30/18 30/21 |
| discoveries [1] 14/2 | 99/12 99/15 101/16 | 31/16 32/7 32/14 |
| discovery [2] 36/24 | 102/2 134/20 | 32/17 32/18 35/18 |
| 66/24 | 134/21 134/23 | 35/23 36/14 36/18 |
| discuss [2] 141/12 | 135/7 135/9 136/3 | 36/20 36/23 37/2 |
| 145/18 | 136/5 136/8 137/11 | 37/3 37/5 37/8 |
| discussed [3] 13/24 | 137/18 146/15 | 37/23 38/1 38/17 |
| 18/7 152/8 | 146/18 147/13 | 38/20 38/24 39/8 |
| discussing [2] | 147/16 148/18 | 39/22 40/2 40/5 |


| D | 152/24 155/4 | 50/7 51/8 52/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| do... [85] 40/6 | docket [4] 1/7 | 52/12 52/18 53/2 |
| 42/18 42/22 43/15 | 21/18 29/18 29/23 | 53/8 53/10 53/23 |
| 45/16 45/17 46/2 | document [31] 8/1 | 92/21 104/15 |
| 46/9 46/21 46/21 | 9/12 9/15 9/23 | 121/19 122/6 |
| 47/13 47/24 48/3 | 12/20 13/8 14/8 | 122/13 122/23 |
| 49/11 49/22 50/10 | 14/13 15/23 24/13 | 122/23 123/3 123/7 |
| 51/7 51/10 51/11 | 26/24 31/2 31/9 | 123/8 123/12 |
| 51/18 51/24 52/3 | 31/15 42/11 42/13 | 124/10 125/3 |
| 53/13 53/18 53/21 | 55/23 57/2 70/1 | 125/12 125/12 |
| 55/4 55/14 56/18 | 72/19 78/11 100/17 | 125/14 125/21 |
| 57/2 60/14 63/4 | 100/22 100/23 | 126/7 126/17 |
| 64/4 65/4 65/5 | 110/16 140/1 144/2 | 126/21 126/22 |
| 69/12 69/16 69/16 | 144/3 145/21 | 127/18 128/8 |
| 69/16 70/15 70/22 | 145/21 145/23 | 128/12 129/9 |
| 70/23 72/1 72/2 | documentation [19] | 129/13 129/15 |
| 72/4 72/9 72/14 | 122/7 122/14 | 132/12 132/24 |
| 73/7 73/9 82/5 | 122/20 122/22 | 134/24 135/15 |
| 82/12 84/4 85/16 | 123/1 123/4 123/17 | 135/16 136/3 |
| 87/1 87/17 87/20 | 124/20 124/24 | 136/11 136/15 |
| 88/12 91/16 91/22 | 127/11 127/16 | 137/8 138/8 138/12 |
| 92/10 93/17 94/6 | 128/9 128/11 | 140/9 141/8 141/24 |
| 101/2 102/10 | 128/14 133/19 | 142/20 143/8 |
| 114/11 115/22 | 142/1 142/22 | 143/16 143/20 |
| 118/12 120/5 120/7 | 142/23 143/16 | 147/2 148/13 |
| 127/7 127/20 | documented [4] 8/5 | 148/14 148/19 |
| 130/16 130/18 | 25/12 35/4 67/3 | 150/4 150/18 |
| 134/9 135/18 | documents [4] | 150/24 151/15 |
| 140/24 145/5 146/9 | 44/24 77/7 101/1 | 152/3 154/6 |
| 147/1 149/12 | 124/11 | DOE's [1] 150/6 |
| 149/15 149/15 | DOE [68] 35/5 | DOE...can [1] |
| 149/16 149/16 | 48/24 49/11 50/3 | 141/14 |

## D

DOE...explaining
[1] 129/7
DOE...may [1]
124/23
does [33] 15/3 15/5
17/10 19/16 20/17
21/2 22/14 25/2
34/8 34/20 38/5
38/9 59/23 61/3
72/9 73/7 86/2
88/22 93/18 98/23
99/4 99/5 113/1
115/17 115/20
115/20 117/11
121/5 126/21
130/14 130/20
154/12 154/13
doesn't [8] 9/11 46/15 57/2 65/5 66/2 99/7 102/10
145/23
doing [6] 28/20 65/3 69/17 80/1 144/1 145/6
don't [55] 5/7 8/6 17/24 20/12 24/14 25/19 25/22 25/24 26/1 28/14 31/10 36/13 36/16 38/14 39/3 43/3 43/12 44/15 47/4 48/12

48/14 52/23 53/14
53/21 63/8 63/11
63/24 66/1 66/9
73/8 77/12 81/13
84/14 85/8 87/5
87/23 90/9 90/20
92/11 97/11 99/10
103/22 103/24
107/2 108/19
108/20 109/8 120/8
126/5 133/4 137/2
145/4 145/10 146/1
149/15
done [27] 13/13
23/3 23/12 23/15
25/14 27/2 33/8
34/1 34/13 39/11
49/9 50/22 63/15
70/10 75/11 85/19
87/13 90/5 92/17
104/15 123/10
124/13 132/7 136/2
140/17 153/16 153/18
Donovan [1] 1/4 Doperalski [1] 66/13
Dore [1] 1/20
down [11] 17/7
50/4 78/10 78/13
89/7 92/12 98/15
103/2 121/14

134/18 141/23 dozens [1] 56/9
Dr. [6] 4/4 4/10
36/23 45/13 47/15
66/2
Dr. Bunker [6] 4/4
4/10 36/23 45/13
47/15 66/2
draft [7] 63/14
63/14 122/22
124/19 127/11
128/8 142/1
drafted [2] 13/16 13/17
drafts [4] 119/1
119/6 122/24 123/8
draw [2] 11/4 146/4
drawn [1] 99/3
drilling [1] 39/8
drive [1] 106/23
drops [1] 83/15
Dummer [2]
102/12 103/2
duration [1] 7/15 during [5] 32/7
41/8 45/17 46/7
54/1

| E |
| :--- |
| E.1.b [1] 141/8 |
| E.3.a [1] 141/24 |
| each [8] 69/3 |
| $100 / 15101 / 22$ |


| E | 147/18 148/10 | 123/16 135/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| each... [5] 111/9 | 149/9 150/3 151/7 | 138/16 139/4 |
| 114/8 114/11 | 152/10 152/18 | 139/11 139/20 |
| 119/21 121/2 | 152/22 153/24 | 140/23 141/3 |
| earlier [11] 5/6 | 154/4 | 141/12 142/1 |
| 113/23 115/9 118/8 | effectively [1] | 142/22 142/23 |
| 118/12 122/8 | 151/22 | 143/4 143/6 143/8 |
| 139/11 142/24 | effectiveness [2] | 143/16 149/5 |
| 144/8 146/15 152/9 | 60/1 62/4 | efficient [2] 144/10 |
| early [3] 118/1 | effects [80] 8/8 | 145/5 |
| 119/4 132/6 | 11/19 12/23 25/10 | effort [2] 35/6 |
| easier [1] 66/1 | 30/1 30/11 32/1 | 80/20 |
| easily [1] 88/3 | 32/13 33/6 33/22 | efforts [1] 34/9 |
| east [3] 102/11 | 34/7 34/11 34/14 | eight [1] 153/9 |
| 103/1 103/8 | 34/18 34/20 34/23 | either [2] 36/18 |
| Economic [1] 1/16 | 35/3 35/7 39/24 | 107/1 |
| effect [55] 23/1 | 40/19 40/22 43/11 | Electronically [1] |
| 23/10 36/4 39/16 | 44/8 45/3 48/6 | 1/6 |
| 59/16 60/16 61/17 | 48/17 48/19 51/7 | element [5] 90/21 |
| 64/5 64/9 65/16 | 53/2 53/9 54/8 | 91/5 105/21 106/21 |
| 77/24 78/1 78/21 | 55/17 55/17 56/3 | 109/16 |
| 79/1 79/8 79/21 | 59/7 59/11 60/3 | elements [3] 97/14 |
| 80/10 80/21 81/17 | 60/18 60/23 61/9 | 97/16 98/1 |
| 85/2 85/4 85/22 | 61/11 61/20 62/3 | eligibility [13] |
| 86/7 86/12 87/12 | 62/6 63/1 63/6 | 121/23 124/1 |
| 87/16 88/13 88/15 | 64/20 75/7 75/7 | 129/22 130/3 131/6 |
| 88/18 88/19 88/22 | 79/22 91/3 104/5 | 131/23 134/2 136/1 |
| 89/4 89/9 91/1 92/1 | 104/12 104/19 | 137/1 137/16 |
| 92/5 106/19 106/20 | 106/17 106/17 | 138/23 142/8 |
| 107/16 107/23 | 113/2 115/11 | 148/22 |
| 108/3 139/14 142/5 | 115/13 116/1 116/9 | eligible [13] 15/1 |
| 146/18 147/4 | 116/19 116/21 | 15/20 17/20 18/20 |


| E | 27/21 51/13 55/20 | 59/21 64/21 129/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| eligible... [9] 19/20 | 59/14 68/4 68/23 | established [5] |
| 20/2 20/7 67/4 | 72/23 74/16 93/4 | 22/17 42/12 100/2 |
| 131/16 133/11 | 137/14 140/6 | 101/11 109/1 |
| 133/23 134/23 | Energy's [3] 11/21 | establishment [1] |
| 135/7 | 15/4 15/12 | 136/4 |
| Elizabeth [2] | enforcement [2] | estimate [1] 128 |
| 117/22 123/11 | 66/6 72/10 | estimated [2] 82/ |
| ELMO [4] 5/11 | engage [1] 130/15 | 82/9 |
| 59/4 71/8 98/19 | engaged [1] 55/24 | etcetera [1] 49/22 |
| else [3] 48/7 48/16 | engineering [1] | evaluate [1] 44/13 |
| 96/2 | 39/18 | evaluating [3] |
| elsewhere [2] 34/16 | engineers [3] 40/4 | 100/18 104/7 |
| 56/11 | 54/15 126/3 | 121/20 |
| employed [2] | enough [1] 87/7 | evaluation [27] 1/2 |
| 155/11 155/14 | ensued [3] 83/1 | 1/12 10/6 10/18 |
| employee [1] | 109/24 117/17 | 13/18 20/3 21/15 |
| 155/13 | entered [1] 18/17 | 24/24 27/8 27/16 |
| enabled [1] 140/9 | entertained [1] | 27/22 29/21 30/1 |
| encompassed [1] | 10/13 | 30/11 32/1 44/13 |
| 43/13 | entire [2] 14/7 | 44/20 46/15 56/18 |
| encourage [1] 35/5 | 124/9 | 79/10 88/18 88/19 |
| end [10] 29/9 59/7 | entities [2] 10/23 | 88/21 89/3 89/4 |
| 69/20 70/23 103/1 | 11/1 | 97/20 123/18 |
| 103/8 125/10 | entitled [1] 100/17 | even [11] 10/11 |
| 133/16 151/5 | entity [1] 111/19 | 26/14 26/18 44/17 |
| 154/15 | Environ [1] 1/15 | 44/24 98/11 117/10 |
| energy [24] 1/10 | error [1] 41/13 | 129/11 151/6 |
| 9/19 10/10 10/12 | Esq [2] 1/20 1/20 | 152/17 152/21 |
| 10/14 10/15 11/2 | essence [3] 78/23 | eventually [1] |
| 12/1 14/23 15/16 | 79/3 136/12 | 98/18 |
| 17/19 18/16 18/17 | essentially [3] | Eversource [1] 1/9 |


| E | 144/13 144/19 | 26/5 49/15 153/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| every [2] 35/6 70/7 <br> everyone [2] 4/3 |  | 181818 |
|  | excuse [8] 13/6 23 | 129/8 129/9 |
| 106/1 | 36/20 69/10 70/14 | extensive [1] |
| everything [1] | 91/7 106/3 114/6 | 133/19 |
| 121/1 | executed [2] 22/1 | extent [2] 60/4 |
| evidence [1] 70/9 | 113/14 | 108/7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { exact [1] 90/23 } \\ & \text { exactly [2] } 26 / 5 \end{aligned}$ | exercised [2] 27/14 | extraordinary [2] |
|  | 31/19 | 26/23 44/23 |
| 40/7 | exhibit [10] 3/3 | extras [1] 95/19 |
| examination [6] 2/6 | 11/4 84/19 89/18 | extreme [1] 138/24 |
| 2/7 2/8 2/9 2/10$2 / 11$ | 111/1 114/5 120/1 | extremely [1] 44/22 |
|  | 134/14 137/21 | F |
| examine [1] 149/17 | 146/13 | facility [4] 1/10 |
| example [9] 39/14 | existing [3] 90/7 90/13 107/7 | 27/21 59/15 89/22 |
| 57/12 75/9 75/12 |  | fact [13] 14/10 |
| 76/7 131/5 137/19 |  | 37/15 42/2 46/18 |
| 138/3 150/1 | expecting [1] | 52/5 57/1 84/18 |
| examples [6] 74/9 | expecting [1] | 108/24 119/18 |
| 74/14 134/11 | experience [18] | 126/12 128/23 |
| 135/22 146/9 152/6 | 14/9 26/23 51/21 | 129/11 154/11 |
| excellent [2] 56/15 |  | fair [4] 87/7 104/23 |
| 153/17 | 69/19 73/5 93/8 | 121/24 154/2 |
| except [3] 49/4 | 130/11 130/22 | fairly [2] 97/11 |
| 51/16 102/18 | 132/7 133/3 133/' | 145/13 |
| exception [1] | 151/23 153/7 | faith [1] 56/24 |
| /15 | 153/14 153/16 | falling [1] 62/19 |
| excerpt [2] 115/10 | experienced [1] | Falls [1] 152/20 |
|  | 52/19 | familiar [12] 12/20 |
| exchan | expert [1] 65/11 | 15/24 16/17 17/1 |
| excruciating [3] | explain [4] 24/16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 31/11 75/14 96/6 } \\ & 98 / 14102 / 3 ~ 110 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |


| F | 95/7 95/14 111/24 | 93/20 122/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| familiar... [2] | field [8] 64/16 | 2/15 |
| 110/21 130/7 | 64/19 65/2 65/3 | finding [3] 78/3 |
| far [5] 8/7 55/11 | 68/7 86/22 151/1 | 88/22 89/8 |
| 87/23 91/10 153/18 | 153/10 | findings [3] 59/6 |
| farmers [1] 98/3 | fields [1] 91/4 | 59/18 142/5 |
| farther [1] 141/23 | fifteen [6] 125/16 | fine [1] 77/17 |
| fault [1] 81/24 | 126/20 127/13 | fines [1] 68/1 |
| feature [2] 81/6 | 128/15 143/10 | finish [1] 145/20 |
| 81/11 | 148/16 | finished [3] 118/1 |
| features [1] 97/21 | fifteen-day [4] | 125/23 125/24 |
| federal [25] 21/20 | 125/16 128/15 | first [26] 5/3 5/6 |
| 22/7 52/14 66/19 | 143/10 148/16 | 5/13 13/10 27/24 |
| 68/5 69/19 69/21 | figure [1] 149/11 | 29/12 29/15 34/21 |
| 70/4 70/7 111/12 | figured [2] 49/10 | 36/7 65/14 67/6 |
| 111/19 112/2 | 98/20 | 95/20 98/13 104/20 |
| 112/11 112/14 | filed [3] 1/6 50/3 | 112/1 118/7 120/10 |
| 112/19 113/3 116/7 | 53/3 | 121/10 132/22 |
| 124/11 125/22 | filing [1] 21/17 | 141/8 148/19 150/3 |
| 126/1 130/23 133/7 | final [11] 78/6 | 150/17 151/16 |
| 133/10 133/12 | 79/24 86/9 92/17 | 152/2 152/15 |
| 152/21 | 92/21 93/4 108/23 | five [4] 127/17 |
| feel [2] 56/22 | 119/6 150/24 151/6 | 131/21 131/24 |
| 149/16 | 152/21 | 139/1 |
| feet [11] 39/6 83/18 | finalized [2] 42/14 | flat [2] 68/11 68/13 |
| 104/11 105/5 | 47/22 | flat-out [2] 68/11 |
| 106/11 107/1 108/9 | financially [1] | 68/13 |
| 108/10 108/13 | 155/14 | flow [9] 3/5 3/7 |
| 109/1 109/4 | find [14] 17/17 | 110/10 110/14 |
| felt [2] 86/20 | 29/10 46/20 47/1 | 110/21 111/3 111/5 |
| 148/14 | 47/7 61/8 62/1 62/3 | 111/18 114/2 |
| few [5] 4/19 54/5 | 65/8 68/1 70/3 | focus [4] 4/18 13/6 |

focus... [2] 22/4 120/16
focused [2] 22/16 153/24
follow [2] 70/11 149/6
following [3] 14/21 40/8 117/4
follows [1] 28/4 foot [2] 83/14 104/21
foregoing [1] 155/4 foreseeable [1]

## 11/19

forest [19] 3/4
55/22 62/14 79/15
80/5 97/9 97/9
97/10 98/24 100/3
104/2 121/19 123/5
123/8 123/12
123/14 126/2
127/23 131/17
Forests [1] 4/16
Forgive [3] 71/15
94/16 106/3
form [9] 45/1 62/8
113/9 137/12 140/2 140/3 143/6 143/6 148/20
formatting [2]
127/5 139/21
forms [5] 74/17
123/11 124/14 136/6 140/7
forth [6] 38/5 73/20 full [3] 100/4
112/8 147/6 154/11 108/13 133/20
155/7
forty [3] 127/17
131/21 131/24
forty-five [3]
127/17 131/21
131/24
forward [5] 45/24
57/10 64/20 127/13 136/13
fought [1] 132/12 found [5] 61/16 68/7 110/17 132/5 132/6
foundation [2] 81/7 81/12
four [6] 77/1 93/15
114/9 129/12 132/1 139/1
fourth [1] 30/6
Franklin [1] 152/19
frankly [3] 44/23
45/5 122/9
frequently [1] 5/4
Friday [2] 49/5 49/21
front [13] 4/22
13/18 24/14 25/17

26/1 38/15 44/14 44/15 45/23 46/14 46/16 77/7 82/12
function [1] 114/3
further [10] 25/7
47/15 57/14 60/17
94/10 109/16
109/19 117/14
155/10 155/12
G
game [4] 46/20 47/2
47/8 73/24
game-changer [3] 46/20 47/2 47/8 gave [3] 16/15 37/12 100/22 general [3] 4/19 10/11 114/20
generally [6] 5/23
5/24 66/7 66/10 119/11 130/7
generated [2] 110/10 111/5
geographic [2] 119/21 120/4 geographical [1] 124/6
geographically [1] 119/19
$\underset{\text { geographically-base }}{\text { d [1] 119/19 }}$

| G | 111/24 117/19 | 129/24 134/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| get [16] 4/20 18/10 | 120/14 122/11 | 135/12 138/18 |
| 31/7 35/14 62/19 | 122/16 127/13 | 142/12 144/1 |
| 68/20 82/1 84/14 | 128/6 137/8 138/11 | gone [4] 48/24 |
| 89/2 94/6 98/18 | 138/16 139/15 | 53/10 107/10 |
| 98/20 125/9 145/3 | 142/13 145/11 | 144/18 |
| 145/10 146/6 | 154/14 | good [17] 4/2 4/9 |
| gets [4] 50/3 73/9 | go-around [1] 5/7 | 4/12 6/9 27/6 53/18 |
| 92/17 139/2 | goes [8] 30/2 36/1 | 56/24 58/13 58/15 |
| getting [4] 68/8 | 42/2 47/10 49/6 | 58/15 76/22 76/23 |
| 82/18 103/19 | 49/11 83/17 107/10 | 95/3 95/6 99/9 |
| 150/21 | going [65] 5/3 8/2 | 110/3 110/5 |
| give [3] 12/16 99/24 | 11/4 13/4 14/4 | got [7] 69/21 77/15 |
| 100/9 | 14/17 16/10 18/3 | 99/10 99/12 99/13 |
| given [6] 39/15 | 18/6 20/20 22/20 | 118/11 144/13 |
| 64/13 111/16 | 23/1 23/10 24/5 | govern [1] 113/14 |
| 111/18 125/12 | 24/15 25/21 27/12 | governed [1] 21/21 |
| 147/5 | 27/19 33/14 34/4 | grant [1] 129/9 |
| gives [2] 22/3 52/14 | 36/3 36/5 36/6 39/9 | granted [1] 129/13 |
| giving [3] 37/5 67/9 | 40/15 40/23 43/5 | great [16] 4/23 6/9 |
| 80/16 | 49/9 55/11 59/3 | 7/5 27/7 54/3 54/4 |
| go [45] 5/4 5/7 6/10 | 62/17 65/4 65/22 | 54/10 55/14 55/18 |
| 10/11 23/18 25/7 | 66/7 68/17 72/10 | 60/19 76/15 77/2 |
| 33/14 34/4 45/24 | 73/15 78/13 82/16 | 104/6 104/13 |
| 51/3 65/4 65/8 | 82/20 84/17 88/24 | 104/23 153/6 |
| 66/10 68/23 69/16 | 89/2 92/16 95/13 | green [3] 137/12 |
| 72/20 78/13 80/8 | 96/11 103/14 106/1 | 137/13 148/21 |
| 82/9 82/17 82/21 | 106/9 118/2 118/4 | ground [1] 39/5 |
| 82/22 89/4 92/18 | 118/14 119/15 | group [3] 26/20 |
| 94/23 95/11 99/21 | 119/24 122/4 | 93/17 153/15 |
| 101/12 102/5 | 122/11 122/18 | guess [10] 43/1 43/3 |
| 102/14 108/8 | 129/3 129/23 | 60/24 67/22 73/20 |


| $\mathbf{G}$ | 18/12 18/23 24/5 | 19/20 19/23 20/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| guess... [5] 143/7 | 24/16 25/3 26/4 | 22/10 23/18 23/20 |
| 151/2 152/5 153/24 | 26/8 | 24/19 24/20 26/6 |
| 154/14 | handle [2] 46/21 | 27/8 27/14 28/11 |
| guidance [4] 96/5 | 47/13 | 28/15 29/2 29/10 |
| 96/6 100/17 101/1 | handled [1] 37/5 | 30/2 30/8 30/14 |
| guiding [1] 100/21 | handling [1] 66/15 | 31/18 38/13 40/8 |
|  | hang [1] 122/3 | 42/14 44/7 44/22 |
|  | happen [7] 40/5 | 51/8 52/11 53/1 |
| H:7 [1] 27/23 | 40/15 65/1 66/22 | 53/8 55/23 57/6 |
| had [21] 8/14 8/15 | 73/3 117/3 133/14 | 61/21 63/4 63/14 |
| 12/7 16/17 18/4 | happened [7] 69/20 | 63/21 64/12 64/13 |
| 19/23 24/21 36/23 | 73/4 73/6 112/16 | 66/13 66/18 67/23 |
| 53/23 54/3 54/4 | 131/12 136/20 | 69/20 69/24 72/5 |
| 56/17 69/19 77/18 | 142/20 | 73/4 73/5 73/6 75/1 |
| 79/1 87/11 119/6 | happens [8] 45/16 | 76/11 76/12 76/14 |
| 126/3 126/5 143/5 | 46/20 47/1 47/7 | 77/24 100/13 |
| 153/9 | 65/7 65/13 66/6 | 102/12 106/10 |
| half [3] 80/5 83/13 | 142/13 | 107/10 107/12 |
| 85/11 | happy [3] 25/5 25/6 | 112/4 112/16 114/8 |
| HAMPSHIRE [29] | 71/6 | 114/9 114/11 116/3 |
| 1/1 1/4 1/9 9/17 | hard [1] 132/12 | 117/6 123/10 124/8 |
| 16/4 18/2 19/19 | Harvey [16] 75/12 | 124/13 126/8 |
| 19/21 20/5 20/24 | 76/7 76/12 77/5 | 126/22 131/20 |
| 21/14 21/22 21/23 | 77/10 77/22 78/9 | 132/24 133/19 |
| 21/23 22/17 27/5 | 79/19 85/15 85/17 | 134/22 136/2 |
| 27/15 30/7 31/20 | 85/21 85/24 86/15 | 136/13 136/18 |
| 40/8 44/3 45/1 54/7 | 146/14 152/8 | 145/14 147/16 |
| 54/22 56/12 59/19 | 152/18 | 149/1 153/6 153/22 |
| 59/21 95/17 140/3 | has [87] 7/15 13/16 | hasn't [1] 24/14 |
| Hampshire's [11] | 14/23 14/23 15/16 | hath [1] 52/1 |
| 4/16 16/1 17/1 17/5 | 15/17 18/17 19/18 | have [202] |

H
haven't [2] 53/20 110/20
having [9] 5/17
28/2 31/15 56/9
144/2 145/9 145/10 145/22 151/19
he [19] 5/16 5/18
22/24 23/18 23/19
29/10 38/20 39/2
46/24 47/10 48/3
48/15 48/17 48/22 48/22 49/6 49/6 50/6 103/21
he's [2] 23/8 47/9
head [7] 69/18
69/20 100/5 101/3
118/10 130/17
130/19
heard [3] 122/7
139/10 141/1
hearing [5] 1/11
37/19 58/2 94/21 154/21
hearings [1] 18/5
Heath [1] 79/16
height [3] 86/18 90/11 90/12
Hello [1] 95/2
help [5] 6/15 27/18
97/15 101/2 107/21 helped [1] 96/10
helpful [2] 134/10 146/10
helps [1] 23/5 her [9] 36/23 37/5 83/5 145/6 145/9 146/1 146/3 146/4 146/7
here [31] 5/6 12/17
27/10 30/22 31/3
32/8 32/20 35/20
39/1 40/24 60/9
67/22 73/17 79/9
80/2 81/13 92/10
92/11 92/17 99/18
108/1 112/16
114/14 114/23
115/17 120/16
121/19 126/11
129/4 144/16
151/15
here's [4] 135/16
139/7 147/10
149/22
hereby [1] 155/4
hereinbefore [1]

## 155/7

Heritage [1] 96/19
hesitate [1] 149/16
hesitation [2] 49/8 49/16
Hi [1] 4/11
high [4] 83/13

89/21 90/7 90/13 high-voltage [1] 89/21
higher [1] 108/5
highlighted [6]
6/13 39/1 47/1 47/2
59/24 121/12
hiked [1] 103/23
Hill [6] 79/18 84/7
87/3 134/19 137/18 148/18
him [3] 6/24 7/1 46/21
his [5] 6/10 22/23 46/8 48/14 48/15 historic [130] 9/18 12/5 12/9 12/13
12/24 13/11 14/5 14/24 15/2 15/5
15/13 15/18 15/23
16/1 16/4 16/5 16/6
17/2 17/6 17/19
17/24 18/13 18/22
19/6 19/12 19/16
19/18 19/20 19/22
19/24 20/6 20/22
24/5 24/8 25/4
25/12 25/19 26/7
26/9 26/14 27/1
27/14 28/12 30/4
30/10 30/24 32/2
34/24 35/4 36/4

| H | historical [6] 19/22 | huh [15] 11/9 24/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| historic... [80] 36/8 | 21/24 29/24 59/19 | 48/21 49/17 71/19 |
| 41/6 41/11 41/13 | 59/22 107/17 | 82/14 96/20 97/5 |
| 41/14 42/8 44/8 | history [2] 17/13 | 97/8 98/5 107/9 |
| 44/11 45/2 50/9 | 76/5 | 111/13 114/15 |
| 50/16 54/6 54/22 | hit [2] 39/6 39/9 | 115/16 151/13 |
| 55/20 56/4 59/12 | hmm [1] 149/11 | human [4] 36/24 |
| 59/16 60/3 60/16 | Honigberg [1] 1/13 | 37/14 38/7 38/11 |
| 61/11 61/18 62/14 | hoping [1] 103/23 | hundred [1] 44/2 |
| 62/20 62/24 63/21 | horse [1] 36/12 | Hydro [1] 12/13 |
| 64/6 64/9 64/11 | host [1] 141/10 | Hydro-Quebec [1] |
| 64/21 66/17 66/20 | hour [3] 154/10 | 12/13 |
| 66/24 67/15 68/24 | 154/14 154/17 | hypothetical [4] |
| 69/14 69/23 70/6 | how [41] 9/9 18/11 | 66/4 68/11 68/13 |
| 70/8 70/21 71/23 | 23/20 24/11 25/2 | 72/11 |
| 72/6 72/12 72/20 | 30/24 34/7 34/8 | hypothetically [4] |
| 73/1 73/14 75/3 | 37/4 39/8 40/21 | 36/2 64/10 64/24 |
| 75/5 75/19 76/9 | 46/20 47/13 50/6 | 65/1 |
| 85/5 86/22 88/15 | 56/3 65/10 69/3 | I |
| 100/18 100/20 | $69$ | I'd [17] 21/8 25/5 |
| 107/24 110/11 | $\text { 73/7 82/6 } 83$ | 45/13 71/6 84/14 |
| 111/10 112/7 112/9 | 84/4 87/17 87/23 | 99/21 104/12 110/7 |
| 112/12 115/11 | 91/23 92/16 95/5 <br> 100/12 109/10 | 110/9 111/24 |
| 116/21 117/9 |  | 113/17 115/8 |
| 117/23 129/17 | 110/8 119/23 | 116/15 120/14 |
| 130/23 136/3 | 137/2 138/12 | 121/9 121/10 |
| 136/12 137/11 | 140/13 141/19 | 137/11 |
| 137/14 137/18 | $145 / 1151 / 1$ | I'll [17] 6/15 34/10 |
| 140/3 140/8 140/24 | 145/1 151/1 | 45/10 49/14 58/6 |
| 141/13 147/12 | however [4] 48/13 50/3 88/4 109/2 | 58/10 59/20 60/24 |
| 148/17 148/18 |  | 67/22 67/22 104/14 |
| 148/24 153/11 | huge [1] 44/3 | 113/18 118/1 |


| I | 110/21 117/7 118/4 | identified [22] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I'll... [4] 119/14 | 119/15 119/24 | 34/18 44/18 67/2 |
| 146/8 154/9 154/14 | 121/18 122/18 | 74/10 74/18 74/21 |
| I'm [108] 5/3 8/2 | 123/6 126/11 | 75/5 75/11 99/4 |
| 11/4 12/19 13/4 | 129/23 129/24 | 100/11 100/13 |
| 14/17 14/21 15/6 | 130/21 132/16 | 103/5 105/9 106/10 |
| 16/10 17/5 18/3 | 133/17 133/24 | 121/21 134/20 |
| 18/5 20/20 22/20 | 134/11 135/21 | 134/22 137/17 |
| 22/24 22/24 23/8 | 135/24 144/16 | 140/24 141/13 |
| 23/8 23/9 24/11 | 144/23 145/3 | 148/19 148/24 |
| 25/18 27/17 27/19 | 145/13 149/11 | identifies [1] 15/11 |
| 27/19 29/12 31/14 | 153/24 | identify [6] 19/8 |
| 33/3 33/14 33/20 | I've [9] 11/2 30/12 | 56/3 73/22 75/2 |
| 34/4 35/14 40/23 | 54/8 59/24 60/19 | 112/9 140/9 |
| 48/4 50/12 51/5 | 69/19 77/15 78/15 | identifying [6] |
| 54/9 55/5 58/10 | 89/7 | 37/10 98/1 100/18 |
| 58/11 59/3 61/1 | I-beams [1] 39/5 | 153/8 153/12 |
| 63/13 64/24 65/22 | I.D [1] 119/17 | 153/17 |
| 65/24 65/24 66/7 | Iacopino [5] 1/20 | II.B. 3 [1] 145/7 |
| 67/9 68/17 71/2 | 1/21 48/1 50/1 | III [1] 113/24 |
| 71/16 73/15 74/5 | 50/15 | III.C. 2 [1] 121/11 |
| 75/4 76/1 76/24 | idea [2] 50/17 82/8 | III.D. 2 [1] 121/11 |
| 77/12 77/14 77/17 | identical [1] 16/7 | III.D.3.e [1] 129/5 |
| 78/10 78/12 80/1 | identification [18] | illustrate [1] 25/6 |
| 82/14 83/3 84/16 | 29/24 30/11 32/1 | imagine [1] 6/20 |
| 84/17 84/22 85/19 | 55/16 112/6 121/17 | immediately [3] |
| 86/5 86/5 88/2 | 123/17 124/8 | 37/11 66/11 105/1 |
| 91/15 92/9 92/15 | 129/17 135/13 | impact [7] 40/3 |
| 92/24 95/13 100/4 | 137/4 137/10 | 42/20 44/10 85/3 |
| 101/14 102/6 | 138/19 139/8 | 85/20 97/18 109/11 |
| 103/19 106/1 106/4 | 139/24 148/23 | impacted [4] 47/9 |
| 108/2 109/12 | 149/3 153/21 | 47/11 108/5 109/17 |



54/8
implement [1] 119/19
implementing [1] 35/7
implication [1]
54/13
implying [1] 56/20 important [7] 25/7 54/20 81/21 85/16 93/22 95/18 97/24 impose [1] 68/1 impressive [1] 97/11
in-person [2]
141/10 141/15
include [5] 14/7
98/23 99/5 99/5 147/8
included [8] 13/24 74/6 99/19 100/3 101/9 101/17 102/2 135/8
including [1] 109/7 inclusion [1]
141/21
inconsistent [1]
132/20
incorporated [2]
13/2 14/12
incorrectly [1] 96/1 instigates [2] 7/18 independent [2] 7/21
21/20 22/6 indicate [3] 8/10 10/12 20/15 indicated [1] 44/7 indicates [3] 7/13 33/18 42/5 individual [2] 27/4 143/5
individuals [2]
26/20 56/14
inform [1] 69/18
information [13]
16/16 28/18 30/9
44/23 62/1 62/3
69/1 69/5 80/2
100/24 112/14
112/23 114/10
informed [1] 31/24
informing [1] 28/17 intersects [1]
initial [2] 63/14 89/2
initially [1] 66/21
initiate [3] 3/6 120/9 121/20
input [3] 27/15 27/16 93/3
insignificant [2]
54/6 54/23
instance [1] 152/7
instigate [1] 10/3
instigator [1] 9/24 integrity [5] 80/7 80/12 80/15 86/3 91/5
intended [5] 20/5
20/10 22/12 41/14 41/22
intentions [1] 53/18
interest [1] 63/17
interested [2]
144/21 155/15
intermittent [1]
79/13
interrupt [1] 77/12
interruption [3]
75/24 81/8 115/1
intersection [1]
89/13
104/17
introduce [2] 58/6
58/10
inventoried [4]
140/14 140/16
149/1 149/2
inventories [3]
120/17 120/19
153/11
inventory [5]
123/11 124/14
 investigations...are [1] 121/17 invite [1] 50/9 invited [1] 68/21 invoke [2] 150/7 152/12
involve [2] 66/1 112/4
involved [14] 55/11 55/19 56/14 69/21 73/21 78/19 95/21 96/7 118/10 118/11 130/24 131/17
139/3 144/24
involvement [2] 28/12 28/15
Iryna [1] 1/20
is [416]
isn't [8] 20/10 39/8 43/24 68/8 92/21 100/3 154/2 154/2 issuance [2] 72/7 116/4
issue [5] 50/8 135/9 135/20 138/7 152/11
issued [2] 64/12
$119 / 9$
issues [6] 43/6 59/11 72/6 73/12 134/1 135/5 it [316]
it's [54] 4/3 6/13
7/24 9/8 11/24
12/21 13/21 14/13
17/20 17/22 18/24
25/14 25/17 26/3
27/7 35/9 35/13
35/15 40/9 42/12
51/22 52/3 55/9
63/10 64/14 65/17
65/20 65/21 66/3
71/9 72/12 79/16
80/20 81/11 81/23
82/16 85/11 87/7
87/7 89/10 92/20
92/23 93/21 97/22
98/15 104/15
105/23 121/13
129/4 133/11
147/12 149/18 150/12 151/11 iterative [1] 57/10 its [17] 17/15 18/13 22/16 27/14 31/19 39/17 64/20 74/17 76/6 100/3 108/13 111/20 113/1 113/2 115/12 115/22

## 123/18

itself [8] 8/15 9/12 42/13 104/7 132/11
144/4 154/6 154/12
IV [2] 113/24 140/22
IV.E [1] 140/22

January [1] 74/23 joint [2] 1/8 5/19 judgment [1] 47/12 jurisdiction [3] 11/22 15/4 22/17 just [66] 4/14 9/7 10/22 13/6 25/8 25/24 26/14 26/20 35/13 35/14 39/3 39/15 45/5 49/20 52/16 53/24 54/1 55/2 55/8 56/10 58/24 62/7 65/11 67/9 67/22 75/9
75/9 75/16 75/22 77/19 79/5 89/8 92/9 93/23 97/15 99/24 101/2 104/6 104/13 104/14
108/19 108/23
113/19 115/8
118/19 125/7
126/15 128/3 128/8 129/10 135/10

| J |
| :--- |
| just... [15] 135/22 |

136/24 137/22
138/5 139/9 139/12
139/24 142/11
145/12 145/19
149/21 150/15
151/2 152/16
153/12
justify [1] 80/20 K
Kathryn [1] 1/14 Kauffman [1] 97/9 keep [3] 82/16 87/3 142/12
keeper [10] 20/1
130/5 130/9 130/14
131/2 131/13
131/20 135/21
139/2 142/8
key [1] 140/7
kind [4] 64/7
100/21 145/11
151/9
kinds [1] 92/13
know [70] 20/12
20/20 25/20 27/11
28/14 28/15 39/4
39/6 39/8 47/9 51/8
51/10 51/12 51/18
51/24 52/23 53/21

53/22 55/12 59/8 63/11 65/15 66/9 67/1 70/22 70/23
72/1 72/14 73/4
73/6 73/7 73/8 73/9
74/22 82/6 84/4
87/6 87/17 87/23
90/9 90/18 96/9
101/18 101/22
102/19 103/22
106/4 108/19
108/20 109/8
113/13 120/7 120/8
123/14 126/5 126/6
127/7 127/20
130/10 133/4 137/2
144/15 144/15
144/20 145/4
149/18 151/5
151/19 152/21
154/8
knowledge [3]
28/11 48/10 56/3
L
labeled [1] 114/5
Laconia [1] 141/12
Laconia/Concord
[1] 141/12
ladies [1] 110/4
laid [3] 61/21 72/19 138/21
lake [7] 97/7

102/10 103/2
105/13 105/15
105/19 106/23
landowners [1]
77/1
landscape [55] 4/20 48/23 49/20 51/5
53/3 53/9 74/18
76/8 76/12 77/11
77/22 79/20 80/7
80/8 81/1 85/16
85/18 85/21 86/1
86/4 86/12 86/15
87/16 88/17 90/22
91/6 92/5 96/11
96/18 97/3 97/17
97/20 97/23 99/11
99/17 99/19 100/15
101/10 101/20
104/11 106/21
120/17 120/18
123/19 124/15
126/4 127/15
133/18 134/13
137/20 137/22
138/2 143/4 146/14
147/20
landscapes [24]
45/1 45/8 48/8 74/2
74/6 74/10 74/15
75/10 77/4 95/17
95/22 96/5 96/8

| L | LCR [3] 1/24 | 37/12 57/22 64/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| landscapes... [11] | 155/17 155/18 | 65/6 65/17 65/20 |
| 100/10 100/19 | lead [2] 68/5 146/1 | 65/24 66/2 69/9 |
| 123/13 125/20 | leading [1] 145/6 | 82/22 90/12 94/18 |
| 126/24 127/9 | learn [2] 52/10 | 121/13 122/18 |
| 134/16 134/17 | 95/11 | 126/13 129/18 |
| 140/17 148/1 153/8 | least [5] 28/24 36/7 | 134/12 134/12 |
| language [10] 20/9 | 75/11 107/11 | 138/16 139/4 139/6 |
| 22/4 65/12 93/1 | 141/10 | 142/11 142/13 |
| 116/11 116/13 | leave [1] 45/10 | 150/1 150/12 |
| 116/20 132/11 | Ledge [8] 101/17 | letter [9] 28/24 29/4 |
| 140/20 149/12 | 102/2 102/9 102/17 | 29/6 29/9 29/17 |
| large [5] 43/21 | 102/20 102/21 | 29/20 30/12 33/14 |
| 43/24 44/9 44/22 | 103/20 104/1 | 94/6 |
| 151/21 | left [3] 49/19 100/6 | letters [2] 28/19 |
| last [17] 5/5 29/5 | 147/13 | 28/23 |
| 32/8 35/19 40/24 | legal [2] 31/22 | Licensed [2] 155/3 |
| 47/2 47/4 49/10 | 72/16 | 155/18 |
| 52/14 53/8 73/17 | legally [3] 70/24 | lie [1] 10/24 |
| 79/2 83/11 103/19 | 72/2 108/8 | lies [1] 79/20 |
| 105/12 113/14 | Lenehan [1] 1/21 | lifetime [1] 6/20 |
| 132/5 | length [2] 18/7 | light [3] 11/23 |
| late [1] 73/24 | 60/19 | 154/10 154/14 |
| later [4] 84/23 | let [14] 26/5 61/5 | like [27] 7/9 12/21 |
| 119/14 129/20 | 67/8 75/9 86/5 | 21/8 29/3 45/13 |
| 134/9 | 93/14 99/1 107/4 | 52/15 65/9 67/12 |
| lattice [1] 82/4 | 116/2 116/18 | 77/7 84/14 93/19 |
| Laughter [1] | 119/15 137/19 | 99/21 110/7 110/9 |
| 144/14 | 146/12 149/21 | 111/24 113/17 |
| law [2] 21/22 72/17 | let's [33] 6/10 6/13 | 115/8 120/4 120/14 |
| lay [2] 126/11 | 11/1 11/12 33/4 | 121/9 121/10 133/4 |
| 154/13 | 34/19 34/21 35/24 | 144/20 148/18 |

$L$
like... [3] 152/18
152/19 152/19
likely [2] 9/24 75/5
limit [3] 95/13
122/5 122/9
limitations [1]

## 132/8

limited [6] 11/19
18/19 20/6 79/12
93/23 147/24
limits [2] 122/11 154/13
line [9] 18/10 22/5
27/24 30/6 32/14
48/15 84/5 99/2 147/15
lines [3] 71/9
147/14 147/15
link [2] 22/3 110/16 list [4] 57/17 62/10
97/11 109/22
listed [10] 15/1
15/20 17/20 18/20
19/19 19/23 20/8
20/16 96/11 110/24
listen [2] 16/10
16/21
listing [2] 15/1
15/20
little [3] 75/21
77/16 121/14

LLC [1] $\mathbf{1 / 8}$
located [1] 83/15
location [12] 62/11
87/18 90/1 90/10
90/23 91/6 91/12
91/18 91/23 105/19
121/6 121/7
locations [1] 96/13
long [7] 50/6 73/7
100/5 118/15
118/16 145/1
151/20
look [20] 12/16
14/17 17/24 19/6
21/8 25/18 27/10
29/9 31/15 37/12
74/14 83/11 92/6
99/2 104/12 109/15
113/17 116/18
121/10 137/11
looked [5] 27/11
84/9 105/7 134/16
142/6
looking [16] 19/9
19/10 71/3 77/5
87/9 88/16 90/4
92/24 100/4 102/11 104/1 104/13
105/14 108/21
109/9 143/1
looks [1] 12/21
Loop [3] 89/19

89/21 90/3
lost [1] 103/22
lot [5] 16/16 29/4
58/19 101/21
117/24
lower [1] 103/6
lowering [2] 86/18 92/6
lumbering [1] 98/10
lunch [2] 154/17
154/19
M
made [11] 9/9 13/7
29/2 41/12 59/2
73/16 119/12
126/23 127/7
127/20 139/10
magically [1]
144/22
maintenance [3]
11/17 11/20 12/11
major [1] 79/6
majority [2] 21/12 153/21
make [29] 4/21
15/9 27/9 35/6 40/4 41/6 44/21 54/16
62/2 65/24 78/13
84/17 97/17 123/23
125/13 125/15
126/18 126/19
material [3] 53/22
101/21 124/16 materials [5] 31/3 38/13 96/7 135/14 153/6
matter [1] 128/1 maximum [1] 109/5
may [27] 10/9
10/11 10/13 13/10
28/3 31/4 31/6
41/12 44/17 45/11
48/14 55/5 57/18
58/4 77/1 78/6 78/6
95/1 110/2 117/21
125/3 129/7 141/2
144/7 145/8 152/13
154/8
maybe [7] 49/6
65/11 86/5 92/6
145/11 146/6 146/8
me [61] 8/3 8/10
12/16 13/6 15/7
23/9 26/5 27/18
29/3 29/8 34/5
36/20 37/18 39/15
54/10 54/13 54/14
61/5 63/19 63/24
64/14 65/11 66/4
67/8 69/10 70/14
71/2 71/15 75/9
76/7 76/11 77/7

78/17 83/5 86/5 91/8 93/14 94/16 96/10 96/10 97/15 99/1 99/24 100/8 102/1 103/14 105/16 106/3 106/3 107/4 114/6 116/2 116/18 116/19
118/14 119/15
132/15 134/10
137/19 146/12 149/21
mean [8] 49/9
53/13 70/13 92/13
99/4 125/14 145/20 149/15
meaning [2] 53/14
83/16
means [2] 8/7 17/11
meantime [1] 73/10
measurements [1]
80/15
measures [9] 39/10
54/18 60/1 60/5
60/6 62/5 113/8
116/8 116/11
mechanisms [1]
134/6
meet [3] 52/16
53/14 53/18
meeting [1] 68/8
meetings [3] 141/11
meetings... [2]
141/15 141/18 Member [2] 1/17 1/17
members [6] 29/18 29/21 93/16 144/21 146/20 148/4
memo [2] 30/20 30/22
memorandum [3]
22/1 24/18 57/8
memorandums [1] 43/18
Menard [3] 2/10

## 109/21 110/1

mention [1] 80/22
mentioned [2] 25/8 83/19
merits [1] 1/11
Merritt [7] 2/11
117/18 117/22
133/16 136/1 137/9 144/1
met [1] 56/13
metal [1] 39/4
methodology [1]
61/22
Michael [1] 1/20
Microphone [1]
58/8
middle [1] 77/16
might [21] 6/21 26/19 40/11 43/1 50/17 73/20 75/8
79/16 79/17 81/10
81/17 87/8 88/8
92/11 103/22
125/16 132/6 134/9
140/10 147/8
152/11
mile [3] 80/5 80/5
83/13
miles [5] 44/2 79/18 mitigated [8] 23/2
80/3 87/17 87/22
mind [2] 119/14
133/19
minimal [1] 44/10
minimization [8]
35/2 36/8 36/17
65/6 67/6 68/15
91/8 93/6
minimize [10]
40/22 43/10 60/2
61/19 62/5 63/5
116/8 116/12
116/14 117/9
minimizing [2]
43/13 60/22
minimum [1] 109/4
minute [2] 99/24 139/6
minutes [1] 154/18 mischaracterized [1] 54/9
mischaracterizing [1] 55/1
misunderstanding [1] 86/6
misunderstood [1] 81/24
mitigate [10] 40/22
43/11 60/2 61/20
62/6 63/5 116/9
116/12 116/14
117/9
23/11 24/6 32/14
33/6 33/23 34/7
63/2
mitigating [1]
60/22
mitigation [28]
24/4 25/11 26/12
26/18 27/1 34/9
34/13 34/17 35/2
43/13 43/22 54/11
54/18 65/16 67/5
67/7 85/13 85/19
86/2 86/16 88/7
88/14 90/5 91/7
91/7 106/18 106/22 113/8
mitigations [2] 25/9
43/19
moment [3] 12/17 52/15 85/9
monitor [1] 66/10 monitoring [10] 12/2 12/4 14/2 40/10 41/3 42/15 64/19 64/21 70/20 71/22
monitors [4] 46/8 46/11 47/16 64/17 monopole [1] 82/4 monopoles [3] 90/16 91/9 91/18 Monroe [1] 1/22 month [1] 113/14 months [12] 126/15 127/14 128/5 128/20 129/12
132/1 139/1 139/1
139/2 152/11
152/20 154/8
more [21] 54/1
67/16 74/24 95/12
95/12 95/12 95/12
95/13 100/22 108/3
109/10 126/14
126/20 133/14
134/3 144/10 145/5 149/12 149/21
152/1 153/24
morning [21] $1 / 4$ 4/2 4/10 4/12 4/13 4/17 33/15 52/11

53/11 58/13 58/15 60/9 76/22 76/23 95/3 110/4 110/5 118/9 118/13 141/2 154/21
most [6] 25/7 28/24 52/15 72/23 133/24 134/1
Mostly [1] 144/1
motivates [1] 7/20
Mount [2] 131/7
131/10
Mountain [7] 55/21
58/12 62/13 100/5
100/5 101/3 104/2
mountains [1]
108/3
move [4] 32/5 64/7 73/15 87/1
moved [2] 112/4 136/13
moves [3] 57/10 64/20 151/24
moving [4] 64/14 87/12 92/7 104/6
$\operatorname{Mr}[10] 2 / 7$ 2/8
16/22 18/3 31/4
57/18 58/5 58/13
76/16 94/12
Mr. [14] 22/21 23/7 48/1 50/1 50/15 57/16 58/3 76/19

76/21 85/7 103/21
109/7 143/24
145/20
Mr. Baker [1]
76/19
Mr. Baker's [1]
109/7
Mr. Chair [1]
76/21
Mr. Chairman [1]
143/24
Mr. DeWan [2]
85/7 103/21
Mr. Iacopino [3] 48/1 50/1 50/15
Mr. Plouffe [2] 57/16 58/3
Mr. Roth [1] 22/21
Mr. Roth's [1] 23/7
Mr. Walker [1]
145/20
Ms [13] 2/6 2/9
2/10 2/11 4/10 4/12
94/22 95/2 95/3
110/1 117/18
117/24 137/23
Ms. [27] 4/4 4/5
16/10 18/7 18/8
19/17 27/6 38/17
47/9 47/12 47/13
47/14 47/24 58/6
58/9 75/20 76/17

| M | must [1] 70/9 | $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ms.... [10] 76/22 | my [78] 4/17 5/3 | N.H [1] 155/18 |
| 83/10 109/21 | 7/11 8/16 9/3 12/19 | name [2] 47/4 |
| 133/16 136/1 137/9 | 14/8 14/21 16/8 | 81/12 |
| 144/1 144/2 144/4 | 23/2 23/11 24/17 | named [1] 140/6 |
| 144/9 | 24/23 25/24 26/22 | namely [1] 126/2 |
| Ms. Boepple [3] 4/5 | 30/7 31/3 31/11 | Nash [3] 97/9 98/23 |
| 18/8 75/20 | 31/15 32/21 33/13 | 100/3 |
| Ms. Bunker [1] | 40/7 41/17 42/2 | nation [2] 17/15 |
| 47/13 | 44/7 47/4 48/9 52/7 | 76/6 |
| Ms. Menard [1] |  | National [34] 15/2 |
| 109/21 | 56/8 56/17 57/17 | 15/21 17/21 18/20 |
| Ms. Merritt [4] | 58/20 60/12 60/19 | 19/24 20/2 20/8 |
| 133/16 136/1 137/9 | 60/24 61/2 64/3 | 20/17 30/4 55/21 |
| 144/1 | 65/22 66/4 67/11 | 55/22 62/13 66/20 |
| Ms. Widell [18] 4/4 | 68/11 68/13 71/10 | 66/20 67/4 70/6 |
| 16/10 18/7 19/17 | 71/20 72/3 72/11 | 100/13 104/2 |
| 27/6 38/17 47/9 | 73/5 87/15 92/14 | 117/23 121/23 |
| 47/12 47/14 47/24 | 99/21 101/2 109/22 | 123/15 124/2 |
| 58/6 58/9 76/17 | 116/16 117/24 | 129/22 130/4 130/5 |
| 76/22 83/10 144/2 | 12 | 130/9 130/15 131/2 |
| 144/4 144/9 | 130/18 131/19 | 131/13 131/16 |
| much [11] 34/14 | 132/6 133/3 133/7 | 134/21 134/22 |
| 93/8 99/24 100/1 | 138/20 139/12 | 135/6 135/21 |
| 109/10 127/14 | 143/4 144/11 | natural [3] 97/16 |
| 127/21 130/14 | 147/23 148/2 148/3 | 97/21 107/16 |
| 133/14 141/19 | 150/15 151/23 | Naval [1] 118/16 |
| 151/17 | 1 | Navy [1] 118/16 |
| mud [1] 90/17 | 154/15 155/5 155/7 | necessarily [5] |
| multiple [6] 83/19 | myself [4] 58/7 | 17/23 92/23 132/3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 106 / 6109 / 2115 / 2 \\ & 140 / 15147 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | 58/10 78/18 144/11 | 132/4 133/15 <br> necessary [1] 68/1 |


| $\mathbf{N}$ | 106/12 140/3 | 74/6 79/1 79/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| need [18] 8/11 | next [15] 7/11 | 80/18 80/21 81/2 |
| 13/24 27/10 31/8 | 32/23 57/17 76/20 | 82/8 82/13 82/17 |
| 31/10 31/12 59/2 | 83/24 85/9 101/12 | 82/19 82/20 82/21 |
| 60/12 66/9 81/13 | 102/5 103/16 | 82/21 82/21 82/21 |
| 86/1 88/14 94/13 | 105/12 109/22 | 83/22 86/7 86/12 |
| 141/5 149/14 | 120/14 121/9 | 87/20 88/21 91/19 |
| 149/15 149/16 | 142/13 150/23 | 92/23 92/23 93/21 |
| 152/15 | NH [7] 21/15 21/16 | 94/8 94/10 95/24 |
| needed [6] 48/16 | 21/16 21/18 21/18 | 102/6 104/5 105/7 |
| 126/19 129/8 | 21/24 22/5 | 105/7 106/5 107/4 |
| 129/14 141/16 | Nice [1] 4/13 | 109/19 116/2 |
| 149/1 | ninety [3] 44/2 | 117/13 120/6 |
| needle [1] 151/24 | 79/19 151/3 | 120/11 120/13 |
| needs [3] 8/21 59/9 | ninety-two [1] 44/2 | 127/10 127/10 |
| 80/11 | no [107] 1/7 1/23 | 129/2 131/15 132/3 |
| neither [1] 155/10 | 1/24 2/3 3/3 3/3 | 137/2 146/18 |
| never [3] 54/21 | 13/20 16/8 16/12 | 147/18 148/10 |
| 119/14 133/19 | 21/3 25/23 26/5 | 148/17 149/9 150/2 |
| new [42] 1/1 1/4 1/9 | 29/15 30/6 30/17 | 152/10 154/3 154/3 |
| 4/16 9/17 15/24 | 32/4 32/20 33/1 | 155/18 |
| 16/3 17/1 17/5 18/1 | 35/11 36/15 36/19 | none [3] 53/6 93/15 |
| 18/12 18/23 19/19 | 38/8 40/6 42/17 | 144/17 |
| 19/21 20/5 20/24 | 42/24 43/3 43/16 | normal [2] 35/12 |
| 21/14 21/21 21/22 | 44/5 44/20 46/6 | 35/13 |
| 21/23 22/17 24/4 | 46/13 46/17 47/6 | normally [4] 43/22 |
| 24/15 25/3 26/3 | 48/10 48/10 53/15 | 50/22 50/22 73/11 |
| 26/8 27/5 27/15 | 55/6 55/13 56/22 | North [4] 73/18 |
| 30/7 31/20 40/8 | 57/5 57/14 60/12 | 74/11 77/2 89/11 |
| 44/3 44/24 44/24 | 61/8 63/10 63/12 | Northern [16] 1/8 |
| 54/7 54/22 56/12 | 63/23 64/1 66/3 | 22/2 29/19 29/22 |
| 59/19 59/21 95/16 | 71/14 71/14 74/1 | 35/5 35/7 66/13 |



| 0 | 121/16 123/2 | 102/18 103/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| okay... [112] 25/14 | 123/22 125/7 126/8 | 108/23 113/19 |
| 30/12 30/18 32/5 | 126/11 128/2 128/5 | 122/4 128/19 135/1 |
| 32/17 32/21 34/4 | 129/3 129/4 130/22 | 137/24 141/11 |
| 35/22 38/2 38/24 | 131/19 132/17 | 141/11 147/11 |
| 41/18 44/12 45/20 | 135/4 138/10 | 149/21 |
| 46/7 47/20 48/20 | 138/16 140/20 | ones [1] 27/9 |
| 48/22 49/3 49/14 | 142/19 146/8 149/7 | only [14] 1/4 26/10 |
| 50/1 50/6 50/12 | 149/21 150/14 | 26/24 27/3 44/13 |
| 52/10 54/1 55/8 | 150/14 153/2 154/8 | 73/5 81/16 95/7 |
| 57/1 57/14 61/7 | Oldenburg [3] 1/16 | 95/10 108/5 108/7 |
| 61/14 61/15 64/2 | 38/18 41/2 | 114/7 133/2 154/24 |
| 64/7 64/16 65/20 | Oldenburg's [1] | operation [3] 5/20 |
| 65/24 66/5 67/10 | 39/2 | 11/20 27/22 |
| 67/18 68/12 69/8 | once [21] 49/9 50/7 | operations [ |
| 69/12 70/18 71/17 | 52/13 68/17 69/24 | 11/17 12/11 |
| 72/15 74/4 77/18 | 72/21 73/13 87/14 | opinion [3] 44/12 |
| 78/9 79/4 80/14 | 88/12 93/1 93/7 | 45/11 72/3 |
| 80/19 81/15 82/2 | 94/8 105/19 107/4 | opportunity [3] |
| 84/4 84/11 87/21 | 125/8 127/11 | 12/8 26/17 94/3 |
| 88/7 88/16 89/17 | 127/15 137/9 | options [2] 86/16 |
| 90/2 91/20 92/9 | 148/17 151/17 | 87/9 |
| 93/21 94/1 94/10 | 153/4 | order [4] 35/1 63/5 |
| 95/2 95/9 99/23 | one [38] 12/1 12/2 | 73/12 106/11 |
| 101/2 101/8 101/12 | 15/17 25/8 34/19 | organization [1] |
| 102/1 102/22 104/6 | 44/2 45/20 45/20 | 111/5 |
| 104/13 105/4 | 49/4 54/20 59/12 | original [2] 48/12 |
| 105/12 106/9 | 63/10 68/8 75/9 | 136/9 |
| 110/12 112/17 | 77/5 81/4 83/14 | other [29] 12/7 |
| 114/4 114/16 115/8 | 86/8 86/24 87/1 | 20/16 26/15 28/2 |
| 118/17 119/11 | 87/13 91/10 96/22 | 38/13 45/9 48/5 |
| 120/8 120/14 121/9 | 98/1 100/11 101/22 | 48/7 48/19 57/2 |



| $\mathbf{P}$ | 99/5 108/16 115/6 | 142/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pamela [1] 1/22 | 132/15 136/14 | Parties...for [1] |
| panel [2] 2/4 4/7 | participate [7] 12/8 | 142/2 |
| paper [2] 20/10 | 28/3 28/8 54/15 | parts [5] 9/1 13/5 |
| 118/5 | 94/3 95/23 96/2 | 13/23 34/11 114/9 |
| paragraph [24] | participating [2] | party [13] 10/9 |
| 11/5 14/18 14/19 | 56/23 63/18 | 13/13 93/16 129/6 |
| 15/11 21/9 21/11 | participation [2] | 129/14 135/4 |
| 34/19 34/21 78/11 | 13/13 95/16 | 135/19 141/10 |
| 78/22 79/2 104/20 | particular [13] | 143/14 150/11 |
| 119/17 120/16 | 14/12 20/13 20/18 | 150/12 151/16 |
| 122/3 124/4 124/10 | 81/22 90/19 90/21 | 152/3 |
| 124/18 128/7 | 92/3 103/12 105/10 | pass [18] 1/8 22/2 |
| 128/19 129/5 | 107/18 110/20 | 29/19 29/22 35/5 |
| 129/15 130/1 | 133/14 146/4 | 35/8 66/13 77/23 |
| 143/15 | particularly [1] | 82/3 106/24 109/13 |
| parallel [5] 132/7 | 151/15 | 110/17 113/12 |
| 132/10 132/17 | parties [35] 8/21 | 116/13 117/4 |
| 132/19 133/1 | 10/23 12/2 26/15 | 122/13 122/24 |
| Park [4] 55/22 | 26/17 53/18 55/24 | 141/9 |
| 74/12 100/13 | 68/19 69/1 91/21 | passage [1] 71/3 |
| 123/15 | 91/21 92/10 93/12 | past [4] 24/20 72/5 |
| part [35] 8/10 8/21 | 111/15 115/2 128/9 | 116/2 118/10 |
| 12/6 13/14 14/6 | 128/10 128/16 | Patnaude [3] 1/24 |
| 14/13 20/4 21/5 | 130/12 132/23 | 155/3 155/17 |
| 11/6 21/22 37/16 | 133/13 134/3 134/5 | Patricia [1] 1/17 |
| 41/4 42/3 42/8 42/9 | 135/12 136/23 | Peaked [3] 134/19 |
| 42/10 44/18 45/23 | 138/1 138/6 141/22 | 137/18 148/18 |
| 45/24 62/22 70/13 | 146/20 148/3 149/8 | Peaks [2] 100/6 |
| 70/14 70/16 74/8 | 150/2 150/6 152/12 | 101/4 |
| 84/2 91/11 91/24 | 155/12 | Pemigewasset [1] |
| 92/4 93/22 97/21 | Parties' [2] 136/17 | 74/19 |

pending [3] 21/18 48/9 83/3
people [1] 65/3 percent [2] 79/19 133/9
Percy [15] 2/9
94/23 95/4 96/15
97/10 97/10 98/11 99/12 100/5 101/4 101/15 105/2 107/7 107/24 137/23 perhaps [5] 70/11 86/19 118/1 135/17 135/18
period [13] 107/14 125/10 125/11
125/23 126/8
127/12 128/15
136/18 138/4
143/11 143/22
148/12 148/16
permit [1] 72/8
permitting [1] 28/2 person [4] 49/10 66/12 141/10 141/15
personnel [1] 46/2 persuade [1] 138/8 pertains [1] 59/5 phase [1] 41/9 photograph [5] 3/4

90/8 90/14 103/7 108/15
photographs [2] 103/5 104/4
photosimulation [3] 91/13 91/14 104/15 photosimulations [1] 96/23
picture [6] 102/22 102/23 103/13
104/14 105/12 105/12
pictures [1] 102/24 piece [3] 96/12 102/13 105/2
pieces [3] 13/23
103/19 118/5
piles [1] 39/4
place [8] 21/1 25/21 46/5 46/9 54/12
54/18 138/6 155/6
placed [1] 90/15
places [5] 15/2
19/20 19/22 19/24
87/14
plan [47] 12/5
12/10 12/14 13/1
13/1 13/5 13/6
13/11 13/12 14/2
14/5 14/8 14/15
24/9 24/13 25/11
25/13 25/21 26/12

26/18 34/17 35/3 35/5 36/13 36/17 38/14 41/12 41/15 42/8 42/14 43/13 43/22 46/5 46/11 62/20 62/24 63/10 63/13 63/22 64/12 64/22 65/7 67/16 67/24 68/14 73/14 112/3
Plan...to [1] 41/6
planned [1] 120/5
planning [3] 11/14
45/23 120/9
plans [4] 47/21 57/3
63/3 63/8
plantings [1]
107/20
please [11] 11/12
13/10 14/20 16/21 19/7 21/11 29/13
34/22 54/14 98/13 99/24
Plouffe [5] 2/7
57/16 58/3 58/10 58/14
plus [4] 125/10 127/12 127/13 139/1
point [14] 18/9 20/21 31/2 41/15 41/17 55/12 77/13

| $\mathbf{P}$ | potentially [5] | prescribes [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| point... [7] 87/4 | 79/10 83/23 131/23 | 149/8 |
| 138/20 144/23 | 135/20 138/11 | pr |
| 151/2 151/8 152/5 | Potters [8] 101/17 | 1/19 29/21 155/8 |
| 152/16 | 102/1 102/9 102/17 | Preservation [26] |
| pointed [1] 24/2 | 102/20 102/21 | 9/18 19/13 30/5 |
| policy [1] 37/15 | 103/20 104/1 | 41/6 41/13 41/24 |
| Pond [1] 97/6 | pound [1] 39/5 | 50/9 50/16 66/18 |
| portion [7] 39/17 | practical [3] 60/5 | 66/21 67/15 68/24 |
| 82/17 120/8 132/19 | 64/8 65/12 | 69/15 70/6 72/21 |
| 138/16 138/18 | praying [1] 84/16 | 73/1 73/14 78/18 |
| 142/9 | precise [9] 43/19 | 110/11 111/10 |
| portions [2] 13/17 | 43/20 67/12 70/15 | 112/12 117/23 |
| 21/12 | 78/20 80/2 93/1 | 130/23 130/24 |
| position [9] 31/18 | 100/22 116/19 | 140/4 153/12 |
| 58/24 60/7 64/11 | precisely [14] 5/22 | Presiding [2] 1/13 |
| 71/21 71/24 72/18 | 6/5 28/23 42/24 | 1/13 |
| 72/22 85/6 | 45/2 52/8 52/23 | presumably [1] |
| possibilities [1] | 66/10 84/10 87/6 | 113/4 |
| 92/14 | 93/20 116/15 | pretty [3] 96/14 |
| possible [15] 43/19 | 127/24 150/9 | 132/6 144/12 |
| 52/15 63/16 67/7 | precision [1] 68/17 | prevent [1] 88/14 |
| 72/24 75/2 78/8 | preferred [1] 35/1 | previous [3] 60/12 |
| 79/16 90/4 91/10 | prefiled [5] 32/10 | 130/22 143/4 |
| 92/24 121/8 133/12 | 32/11 33/11 70/18 | previously [1] 93/2 |
| 153/3 154/7 | 71/18 | primarily [4] 4/18 |
| possibly [2] 81/18 | prepare [2] 122/23 | 75/18 89/10 153/4 |
| 107/15 | 122/24 | primary [1] 111/15 |
| potential [10] 14/24 | prepared [2] 96/4 | prior [8] 14/10 18/5 |
| 15/18 36/24 44/2 | 153/5 | 119/20 120/19 |
| 78/21 79/21 81/17 | preparing [2] 119/2 | 137/5 138/15 |
| 85/2 85/4 139/18 | 153/11 | 140/11 149/3 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | 63/18 67/5 67/13 | professionally [2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| probably [4] 79/3 | 72/5 73/7 73/22 | 86/11 87/14 |
| 103/3 138/15 144/4 | 75/1 75/18 92/2 | professionals [6] |
| problems [1] | 94/7 95/11 110/9 | 55/18 56/15 86/22 |
| 144/23 | 111/22 112/10 | 93/8 153/5 153/15 |
| procedural [1] | 112/24 113/15 | programmatic |
| 134/6 | 114/17 114/23 | [126] 4/18 4/22 |
| procedure [6] | 114/23 114/24 | 5/17 5/18 6/1 6/22 |
| 38/10 38/15 129/20 | 116/4 116/7 116/24 | 8/3 8/4 8/15 8/19 |
| 143/19 150/8 | 117/6 121/20 | 9/1 9/4 9/5 9/10 |
| 152/13 | 123/24 124/2 124/6 | 10/1 11/3 11/13 |
| procedures [2] | 126/13 126/16 | 11/16 12/14 13/3 |
| 47/22 135/10 | 128/7 128/24 130/8 | 13/8 13/14 13/22 |
| proceed [5] 58/4 | 132/19 136/15 | 14/1 14/6 14/14 |
| 95/1 110/2 115/24 | 137/13 138/12 | 14/18 17/18 18/11 |
| 117/21 | 138/21 138/24 | 19/1 20/21 20/23 |
| proceeding [1] | 139/9 139/16 141/5 | 21/1 21/7 21/10 |
| 28/13 | 142/12 144/22 | 22/11 22/13 23/21 |
| proceedings [2] | 146/22 148/7 | 24/3 24/7 24/10 |
| 28/4 155/6 | 148/21 148/22 | 24/18 25/2 33/8 |
| process [91] 3/6 | 149/2 149/8 150/4 | 34/2 34/5 34/6 34/8 |
| 21/20 22/6 22/14 | 150/16 150/21 | 34/12 34/15 35/10 |
| 28/21 29/3 29/11 | 150/24 153/19 | 35/15 36/1 36/5 |
| 30/1 30/16 30/21 | 153/23 154/5 | 36/6 36/14 36/17 |
| 32/3 32/13 33/5 | processes [3] 47/21 | 37/16 38/5 40/14 |
| 33/21 38/6 44/18 | 128/19 151/20 | 40/17 41/5 42/3 |
| 45/17 45/23 54/4 | professional [6] | 42/9 42/16 43/5 |
| 54/15 55/9 56/6 | 14/9 26/22 65/15 | 43/15 43/17 46/1 |
| 56/24 57/8 57/9 | 93/12 130/11 | 47/14 51/3 51/15 |
| 57/10 59/8 59/21 | 151/23 | 53/16 53/23 54/4 |
| 59/23 61/12 62/16 | professionalism [1] | 55/7 56/10 57/7 |
| 62/18 62/19 62/23 | 56/2 | 59/1 60/8 60/21 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | 43/24 44/9 45/7 | 24/5 24/9 25/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| programmatic... | 55/3 55/6 56/1 | 25/20 27/1 27/4 |
| [45] 61/3 61/10 | 59/10 60/15 61/16 | 32/2 34/24 35/4 |
| 62/22 65/9 67/13 | 61/20 62/13 64/4 | 41/12 41/14 42/8 |
| 67/21 68/18 70/2 | 64/6 64/9 64/13 | 45/3 54/22 56/4 |
| 71/13 91/22 92/20 | 64/20 66/12 67/12 | 61/11 61/18 62/15 |
| 110/8 113/13 115/6 | 67/24 69/13 72/11 | 62/20 62/24 63/22 |
| 115/18 118/3 | 72/18 73/2 73/9 | 64/6 64/10 64/12 |
| 118/23 119/2 119/5 | 74/17 77/23 81/3 | 64/21 67/15 69/23 |
| 119/7 120/2 120/15 | 81/18 82/10 84/11 | 70/8 77/2 80/13 |
| 121/7 122/6 122/12 | 88/4 89/3 89/14 | 112/7 112/9 113/6 |
| 128/24 136/13 | 89/20 91/1 91/11 | 115/12 121/21 |
| 136/21 137/5 137/7 | 92/4 105/9 108/16 | 124/1 129/17 |
| 138/4 138/17 139/5 | 109/13 109/18 | 129/22 130/4 136/9 |
| 139/16 140/12 | 113/12 117/5 | 137/16 140/10 |
| 140/21 141/21 | 117/12 118/11 | 140/14 140/15 |
| 144/19 146/22 | 118/19 119/19 | 140/15 140/24 |
| 148/7 149/4 149/6 | 120/3 120/9 124/9 | 141/14 |
| 149/7 151/18 | 136/5 136/16 140/2 | property [16] 13/11 |
| 154/12 | 140/7 140/11 | 15/23 17/2 17/7 |
| programs [1] 47/17 | 141/13 148/20 | 18/23 19/18 20/6 |
| progress [2] 28/17 | projector [1] 118/5 | 72/7 77/3 105/2 |
| 31/24 | projects [6] 24/20 | 107/12 113/6 133/9 |
| prohibited [1] | 34/16 43/21 70/9 | 133/15 143/6 |
| 132/24 | 117/1 151/21 | 147/23 |
| project [76] 5/20 | properties [65] | property' [1] 17/11 |
| 6/21 11/16 11/18 | 12/5 12/9 12/14 | propose [1] 119/18 |
| 12/2 12/12 14/12 | 14/5 15/1 15/5 | proposed [21] |
| 21/13 24/23 24/24 | 15/13 15/19 16/2 | 11/15 11/18 21/13 |
| 26/21 28/18 29/23 | 16/6 18/14 18/19 | 59/14 60/1 62/4 |
| 30/3 35/8 40/7 | 18/19 18/21 20/7 | 87/18 88/9 89/22 |
| 42/20 43/14 43/21 | 20/11 20/16 20/22 | 90/6 90/9 90/15 |

$\qquad$
proposed... [9] 91/8 91/11 138/2 139/14 146/16 147/3
147/17 148/5 152/9 proposes [1] 89/20 protect [5] 24/4 24/15 25/21 39/11 44/17
protected [4] 24/6 27/12 41/8 86/16 protecting [2] 26/3 26/8
protection [4] 4/16 18/14 72/12 85/15 protocol [5] 37/10 37/15 38/6 38/9 38/14
provide [5] 27/16 60/21 68/24 69/5 122/22
provided [16] 48/16 61/23 62/9
74/7 94/8 98/2 98/9 123/12 123/14
123/20 124/14
125/21 126/7 136/3
137/14 140/19
provides [7] 9/8 9/9 93/3 112/23 123/3 124/10 128/8 providing [1]

## 112/13

provision [9] 8/9
8/12 10/10 92/19
123/23 136/24
141/20 149/21
149/23
provisions [2] 8/22 118/24
public [21] 1/9 1/13 1/14 1/17 1/17
10/11 19/11 26/18
27/20 56/1 56/5
93/18 94/2 96/14
108/4 112/4 141/22
143/15 143/17
146/20 148/4
pull [3] 8/2 84/24 122/18
pulled [1] 55/5
purpose [4] 20/13 29/20 115/19
144/16
pursuant [1] 30/15 pursue [1] 124/5 pursued [1] 134/17 put [23] 5/10 11/2
17/4 26/19 29/13
43/19 46/9 50/2
54/12 54/18 59/4
71/8 77/14 102/10
110/9 113/18
119/24 122/18

129/24 134/10
142/24 146/12 149/21
putting [5] 118/5
118/24 125/7 148/2 149/12
puzzled [1] 108/24

## Q

qualification [1] 30/14
qualified [3] 28/20 29/10 66/14
qualifies [1] 76/8 quality [1] 76/14 Quebec [1] 12/13 question [49] $5 / 3$ 5/13 5/16 7/2 8/6
9/3 13/4 13/11 15/7 16/8 16/12 23/2 23/11 24/23 25/24 27/17 31/9 31/18 32/18 32/21 33/13 33/19 39/2 41/17 42/2 47/10 48/13 56/17 60/24 61/2 61/5 71/7 71/19
71/20 72/22 81/23
83/3 85/9 88/23
90/19 91/15 92/14
93/15 95/20 96/1
100/2 108/23
118/22 152/23

| Q | quote [1] 70/23 | ready [2] 94/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| questioner [1] | quoting [1] 33/7 | 117/19 |
| 31/11 | R | really [4] 27 |
| questioners [5] | Rachel [1] 1/17 | 31/16 63/20 93/22 <br> reason [3] 49/16 |
| 45/9 143/2 144/9 | railroad [1] 98/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reason [3] 49/16 } \\ & 80 / 22148 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 144/17 145/16 | raise [7] 134/5 | reasonable [2] |
| questioning [12] | 135/5 135/14 | 85/12 87/9 |
| 8/14 18/10 22/23 23/7 32/15 35/19 | 135/20 138/7 | reasonably [1] |
| 42/19 46/8 48/14 | 146/23 148/8 | 11/18 |
| $48 / 1554 / 258 / 21$ | raised [1] 135/10 | reasons [4] 78/24 |
| questions [48] 4/4 | raising [1] 129/20 | 79/6 129/8 147/7 |
| 4/17 4/19 5/5 5/8 |  | recall [23] 5/7 5/21 |
| 5/12 5/14 5/21 5/23 |  | 6/24 22/20 22/23 |
| 6/1 6/7 6/10 8/17 |  | 32/7 35/18 36/20 |
| 16/11 16/21 22/21 | rather [2] 31/1 | 37/2 38/17 38/20 |
| 26/2 31/15 32/9 | rather [2] 31/8 | 39/22 40/2 40/5 |
| 34/10 36/22 36/23 | re [3] | 42/18 42/22 45/14 |
| 38/18 38/20 39/23 |  | 46/9 47/24 48/3 |
| 42/23 45/14 45/16 | re-introduc | 77/1 130/17 130/18 |
| 45/20 48/1 51/6 | $8 / 658 / 10$ | receipt [1] 122/21 |
| 54/1 57/15 58/19 | reach [1] 87/3 | received [9] 50/8 |
| 73/17 77/19 94/11 | reach [1] [1] 113/4 reached | 52/9 52/11 52/23 |
| 95/8 95/13 109/20 | read [15] 11/12 | 52/24 53/2 53/7 |
| 117/14 118/1 118/3 | 14/20 21/10 30/12 | 53/22 124/23 |
| 141/2 145/7 146/16 | 30/12 32/11 33/4 | receives [2] 127/11 |
| 154/10 154/15 | 33/20 34/19 34/21 | 127/15 <br> recent [2] 28/24 |
| quick [1] 113/19 | 67/21 144/9 145/9 | recent [2] 28/24 |
| quickly [4] 80/1 | 145/10 145/22 |  |
| 126/21 127/24 | reading [6] 33/3 | recently [1] 75/10 recess [3] 58/1 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 133/14 } \\ \text { quite [2] 30/8 40/2 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47 / 547 / 684 / 22 \\ & 144 / 11151 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 94/20 154/19 |

recognize [1]
113/20
recollection [1]
79/5
recommend [1]
79/7
recommendation
[4] 86/13 86/21
136/4 136/7
recommendations [2] 91/17 131/14 recommended [5] 78/3 86/8 88/21 89/7 148/20 record [13] 4/15 33/4 34/22 35/14 61/24 82/23 82/24 109/22 109/23
110/24 117/15
117/16 145/23
recording [2] 37/21 37/24
recreation [2] 19/12 98/11 reduce [1] 85/20 refer [5] 5/3 28/22 65/22 93/19 115/8 reference [9] 13/7 38/13 84/17 84/23 99/9 118/12 129/19 132/10 143/19
referenced [2] 21/7 89/8
references [1]

## 139/10

referencing [2]

## 71/4 83/10

referred [6] 118/8
131/2 131/20
132/17 132/18
139/23
referring [13] 8/7
71/12 74/1 82/15
83/4 114/21 118/20
130/8 132/16
134/11 142/7 143/3 143/7
refers [9] 29/17
119/17 120/22
123/3 124/4 129/18
130/2 130/6 142/9
refreshed [1] 7/3
refreshes [1] 79/4 refused [1] 132/13 regarding [14] 38/21 112/6 113/12 118/23 120/16 129/21 130/3 131/6 134/2 136/11 141/3 142/4 146/16 152/22
register [26] 15/2
15/21 17/21 18/21

19/19 19/21 19/24 20/2 20/3 20/8 20/17 67/4 121/23 124/2 129/23 130/4 130/6 130/9 130/15 131/2 131/13
131/16 134/21
134/23 135/6
135/21
regular [2] 136/14 137/15
regulation [1]
142/10
regulations [5] 70/4
111/7 130/6 130/16 130/19
regulatory [1] 28/3 relate [2] 138/23 138/23
related [7] 28/18 30/10 30/21 72/6 90/20 105/3 155/11 relationship [2] 82/10 120/6
relative [2] 59/6 155/13
relatively [1] 77/3
relieved [1] 25/19
rely [2] 44/16 55/10
remain [1] 150/6
remains [7] 23/3
23/12 23/15 36/24

| $\mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- |
| remains... [3] 37/14 | 38/7 38/11

remember [18]
5/23 5/24 6/5 6/6
7/5 23/6 32/14
32/17 32/18 37/5
37/7 37/8 45/18 46/2 46/21 49/11
118/12 130/21
remind [2] 5/11 75/22
repeat [1] 60/24 repeatedly [3] 29/2 44/7 126/21
replace [1] 89/20
report [13] 49/21 61/22 62/8 74/7
75/11 96/18 99/20
100/9 100/16
100/16 101/20
104/11 137/20
reporter [6] $1 / 24$
75/24 81/8 115/1
155/4 155/18
reports [10] 4/20 45/2 48/23 51/6
53/3 53/9 109/2
123/19 125/20
133/18
represent [5] 60/5 77/1 90/2 114/7

139/13
representation [3] 108/10 112/1 114/19
representational [1] 104/24
representing [2] 26/21 58/11 request [5] 125/3 126/18 129/7 143/9 143/10
requested [4] 70/19 resolved [9] 91/23
126/22 127/22
129/13
requesting [1] 150/10
require [10] 21/13
32/13 33/5 33/22
124/23 128/12
135/17 142/21
143/20 148/15
required [6] 106/22
121/1 121/16
125/14 126/17
127/18
requirements [1] 18/12
requires [5] 9/23
116/7 120/18
122/13 150/17
resolution [29] 8/8 8/9 12/22 34/11

34/14 34/20 34/23 35/3 51/17 55/17 68/20 68/21 69/9
69/10 69/24 72/7
92/19 94/7 116/18
130/13 132/18
138/11 143/19
149/23 150/7 151/5
151/14 152/2 154/5 resolve [4] 93/9
134/7 151/1 152/20
92/16 93/12 130/5
141/5 142/5 150/19
152/11 152/15
resolving [3]
123/24 138/19
138/21
resource [10] 18/1 19/16 36/4 36/9 66/24 73/19 107/24 136/12 137/15 148/23
resources [58] 16/4 18/15 19/7 19/23
21/24 24/16 25/4
26/4 26/7 26/9 26/9
26/15 27/12 27/14
28/12 29/24 30/10 30/20 30/24 40/11 41/7 43/20 43/23 44/3 44/8 44/11

| $\mathbf{R}$ | 143/1 143/21 150/6 | 129/14 130/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| resources... [32] | responsibilities [1] | 131/20 132/22 |
| 44/17 45/6 54/7 | 10/24 | 133/1 133/12 |
| 55/21 59/12 59/20 | responsibility [5] | 135/13 136/17 |
| 59/22 60/4 60/17 | 7/19 7/22 30/3 52/7 | 137/15 138/3 142/2 |
| 66/12 66/15 70/22 | 70/7 | 143/10 143/14 |
| 71/24 72/13 73/15 | responsible [3] | 143/16 143/18 |
| 73/23 75/3 75/5 | 8/11 111/6 111/19 | 147/1 152/13 |
| 79/22 85/5 86/23 | responsive [2] | reviewed [7] 30/19 |
| 88/15 100/21 | 18/11 61/2 | 49/20 96/7 121/3 |
| 107/17 116/22 | rest [2] 7/9 114/17 | 121/3 136/24 154/1 |
| 117/9 117/10 | result [2] 117/1 | reviewers [1] 125/5 |
| 136/19 136/22 | 131/12 | reviewing [3] 119/1 |
| 138/19 153/11 | resulted [1] 117/4 | 124/3 133/17 |
| 153/17 | results [1] 88/18 | revise [2] 124/24 |
| Resources' [1] 16/5 | resumed [3] 2/4 | 128/13 |
| respect [12] 15/13 | 58/2 94/21 | revision [1] 127/12 |
| 24/23 55/3 58/24 | reversed [1] 154/5 | revisions [9] 119/12 |
| 70/21 71/23 78/9 | review [52] 3/8 | 125/2 125/13 |
| 88/8 89/10 90/5 | 21/16 21/19 21/20 | 125/15 126/18 |
| 136/18 142/7 | 21/23 22/5 22/7 | 126/19 142/21 |
| respond [3] 31/9 | 22/11 25/1 26/11 | 143/9 143/21 |
| 138/12 144/6 | 30/3 30/15 51/8 | rich [1] 98/2 |
| responded [2] 41/3 | 51/11 51/14 53/17 | right [70] 7/23 9/11 |
| 49/14 | 60/10 63/18 68/9 | 9/20 12/24 15/24 |
| response [20] 5/14 | 78/19 101/19 113/3 | 16/18 22/4 22/10 |
| 5/16 23/16 32/19 | 114/11 116/7 | 24/11 25/22 26/1 |
| 33/1 33/13 33/16 | 116/24 117/6 | 26/4 31/19 32/3 |
| 36/9 42/22 48/9 | 120/24 122/20 | 32/20 36/9 40/18 |
| 48/11 49/15 50/12 | 124/19 125/4 125/9 | 41/21 49/11 67/13 |
| 50/20 127/22 | 125/11 125/16 | 67/20 78/14 82/12 |
| 128/12 142/19 | 128/11 128/15 | 83/7 83/19 84/1 |

R
right... [44] 86/24
88/1 88/24 91/14
92/20 94/15 94/22
96/17 96/21 97/15
98/8 98/19 99/18
99/20 101/23
102/20 103/3
103/10 104/11
104/17 105/13
105/22 105/24
107/13 107/23
108/7 108/8 108/12
108/14 108/24
109/4 109/6 109/9
115/20 129/3
134/18 139/12
141/6 142/2 143/1
143/12 147/14
151/11 154/16
right-of-way [14]
103/3 103/10
104/11 104/17
105/13 107/13
107/23 108/7 108/8 108/12 108/24
109/4 109/6 134/18 rights [2] 105/3

## 134/5

ring [1] 130/20 river [13] 39/3
74/19 74/20 77/6

88/17 89/11 89/19
90/4 90/24 96/24
97/2 98/2 137/22
road [14] 74/11
79/13 79/16 89/12
89/14 99/16 105/24
107/2 107/21
134/19 147/12
148/18 150/1
152/19
roadway [1] 107/7
Rock [1] 79/13
role [8] 27/23 29/2 29/11 55/3 55/4
55/6 59/1 94/7
Roth [1] 22/21
Roth's [1] 23/7
roughly [2] 54/19
154/18
round [1] 128/5
route [5] 54/16
89/12 89/13 89/23
92/12
RSA [3] 21/16 30/7 155/19
rule [2] 59/5 63/21
rules [5] 59/3 76/9
115/8 115/14 115/23
run [1] 65/2
running [1] 105/15
runs [3] 96/24

102/15 104/9 S
Safety [1] 27/20 said [34] 6/4 7/7 7/14 7/17 22/24
23/18 23/19 23/24
24/3 33/9 34/1
37/13 37/17 37/21
38/2 39/13 40/7
41/1 41/2 41/11
42/2 43/4 45/21
47/7 48/22 50/15
51/19 52/6 54/2
54/21 73/21 82/19
90/24 133/4
same [9] 10/17
106/6 112/24 114/3
115/3 139/23
141/23 146/7
151/11
sampling [1] 97/11
save [1] 67/23
saw [2] 70/18 119/4
say [47] 11/24
17/10 17/16 19/16 25/18 27/11 30/2
34/21 36/2 37/22
41/13 41/14 41/22
42/4 47/10 48/22
49/19 56/8 57/3
59/20 65/3 65/6
65/17 66/3 68/21

| S | scenic [4] 76/12 | 122/4 123/7 125/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| say... [22] 79/2 | 76/14 96/19 96/23 | 125/16 128/14 |
| 89/24 92/11 93/17 | schedule [1] 141/17 | 128/19 143/10 |
| 93/18 104/23 109/3 | scope [2] 11/19 | section [56] 3/5 3/6 |
| 111/14 114/17 | 18/18 | 3/7 11/2 13/1 13/2 |
| 115/17 115/20 | screen [12] 88/16 | 15/23 16/6 17/5 |
| 115/21 122/7 | 89/17 113/19 | 17/7 19/13 19/13 |
| 126/13 128/1 137/7 | 118/24 120/1 | 19/14 20/21 21/21 |
| 145/23 147/8 147/9 | 122/19 129/24 | 22/13 27/20 27/23 |
| 150/9 150/12 154/2 | 134/10 140/22 | 28/21 29/3 29/11 |
| saying [8] 23/8 | 142/24 146/13 | 30/4 30/15 32/3 |
| 37/20 44/16 52/21 | 149/13 | 32/11 32/12 33/5 |
| 53/5 64/24 114/20 | screens [1] 77/8 | 33/21 44/18 48/6 |
| 136/22 | SEARCH [1] 140/6 | 57/7 57/9 61/12 |
| says [39] 6/20 11/10 | SEC [42] 1/6 1/7 | 62/23 66/19 69/22 |
| 22/5 22/7 23/19 | 1/19 1/20 1/22 9/20 | 70/5 72/5 93/20 |
| 29/20 30/6 33/17 | 21/15 21/18 21/19 | 110/7 110/9 110/18 |
| 35/24 36/2 39/2 | 21/23 22/5 22/10 | 111/7 112/10 |
| 40/15 49/6 49/19 | 22/16 28/16 30/10 | 113/15 114/2 114/6 |
| 59/13 59/22 75/22 | 30/13 30/21 30/23 | 115/5 116/3 116/6 |
| 117/24 121/16 | 31/21 31/24 32/2 | 116/23 136/15 |
| 121/24 123/7 | 57/6 57/13 59/2 | 145/7 146/5 151/7 |
| 124/22 125/2 125/6 | 61/23 62/1 62/9 | 153/19 |
| 129/6 129/15 141/8 | 70/19 70/24 72/1 | Sections [1] 113/23 |
| 141/8 141/24 142/4 | 72/5 74/8 74/9 | see [65] 4/13 6/11 |
| $144 / 3$ 144/5 144/5 | 75/20 76/9 86/20 | 6/13 6/18 6/24 7/8 |
| 145/7 145/21 | 115/10 115/14 | 7/9 7/12 7/16 7/23 |
| 145/22 145/24 | 115/18 115/22 | 11/7 11/8 11/10 |
| 146/5 146/6 | 116/5 117/5 | 17/7 23/16 26/18 |
| scenario [5] 125/8 | SEC's [1] 21/16 | 27/24 28/4 28/7 |
| 126/14 128/6 | second [10] 101/13 | 28/9 32/23 32/23 |
| 128/21 131/24 | 102/22 104/20 | 35/23 38/2 38/24 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | \|120/4 120/5 124/6 | 98/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| see... [40] 39/11 | send [1] 70/12 | seven [2] 151/17 |
| 39/13 46/24 47/4 | sent [4] 51/8 51/11 | 151/22 |
| 48/10 48/12 48/18 | 53/8 103/21 | several [3] 54/2 |
| 49/1 49/19 49/23 | sentence [4] 47/2 | 83/11 99/11 |
| 50/3 50/10 50/13 | 47/5 104/20 123/7 | severe [1] 72/24 |
| 58/16 59/13 69/10 | sentences [1] 83/12 | severity [2] 66/16 |
| 80/10 82/10 82/19 | separate [7] 14/13 | 66/23 |
| 83/12 90/8 90/14 | 21/19 22/6 22/11 | shall [4] 9/7 59/16 |
| 99/22 103/2 103/3 | 26/20 124/6 154/22 | 115/10 121/20 |
| 103/12 110/12 | separately [1] | Shasta [2] 131/7 |
| 114/11 114/13 | 121/4 | 131/10 |
| 114/15 116/15 | September [2] 1/3 | she [6] 16/17 36/1 |
| 119/17 121/13 | 52/1 | 37/4 66/2 145/8 |
| 122/5 122/12 | sequence [4] 5/11 | 145/14 |
| 127/17 129/18 | 5/14 5/21 8/17 | she'll [1] 145/14 |
| 134/12 134/19 | sequences [1] 37/9 | she's [1] 18/6 |
| 142/12 | sequential [1] | sheet [3] 137/13 |
| seek [1] 27/15 | 128/18 | 137/13 148/21 |
| seem [2] 56/19 | Serv [1] 1/15 | shift [1] 146/9 |
| $73 / 23$ | Service [12] 1/9 | short [3] 80/16 |
| seemed [1] 54/13 | 55/22 100/13 | 94/19 154/9 |
| seems [2] 132/10 | 121/19 123/5 123/9 | shorthand [2] |
| 132/20 | 123/12 123/15 | 65/12 155/3 |
| seen [8] 28/19 56/2 | 123/16 126/2 | should [19] 23/13 |
| 56/13 73/3 105/18 | 127/23 131/17 | 30/24 39/19 56/19 |
| 110/20 119/6 | Session [3] 1/4 | 56/20 57/3 69/6 |
| 145/15 | 154/21 154/24 | 71/22 85/14 90/16 |
| segment [3] 120/23 | set [4] 20/19 38/5 | 106/4 106/14 |
| 121/2 121/2 | 100/13 155/7 | 109/10 115/18 |
| segments [5] | settled [1] 98/3 | 115/21 115/22 |
| 119/20 119/24 | settlement [1] | 135/8 135/15 138/2 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | significance [6] | sitting [1] 32/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| show [9] 23/4 27/19 | 39/18 80/6 86/3 | situation [4] 65/21 |
| 28/24 29/4 45/2 | 91/5 101/4 101/6 | 66/6 66/17 118/9 |
| 49/14 70/9 91/13 | significant [5] | situations [2] 72/24 |
| 132/15 | 17/13 76/4 103/20 | 152/7 |
| showing [4] 17/5 | 106/12 107/3 | sixty [1] 133/16 |
| 27/19 48/4 84/20 | silver [1] 90/16 | size [1] 34/16 |
| shown [1] 37/18 | simple [1] 31/17 | skill [1] 155/8 |
| shows [4] 114/8 | simplicity [1] | skip [2] 112/2 |
| 115/10 134/15 | 150/13 | 119/15 |
| 147/13 | simply [3] 23/3 | skipped [1] 151/9 |
| SHPO [6] 9/16 9/17 | 23/12 84/17 | Slide [1] 97/4 |
| 121/22 123/9 133/8 | since [6] 12/4 22/10 | slightly [1] 99/22 |
| 133/13 | 103/24 107/11 | small [4] 44/10 45/5 |
| SHPO...to [1] | 107/13 137/3 | 97/10 151/21 |
| 121/22 | single [2] 83/14 | smaller [1] 43/21 |
| sic [1] 20/4 | 140/14 | so [219] |
| side [5] 89/11 | sit [1] 39/3 | so-called [1] 76/14 |
| 102/13 102/16 | site [27] 1/2 1/10 | Society [1] 4/15 |
| 107/2 142/14 | 1/12 10/5 10/17 | soils [1] 98/3 |
| sides [1] 107/21 | 13/18 17/13 17/19 | solves [1] 144/22 |
| signal [1] 77/13 | 21/15 24/24 27/7 | some [37] 5/7 6/9 |
| signatories [6] 9/14 | 27/16 29/21 44/12 | 32/9 36/7 36/21 |
| 9/16 10/2 12/7 68/3 | 44/20 46/15 56/18 | 38/20 44/14 45/15 |
| 93/13 | 59/4 59/5 75/18 | 49/7 57/3 67/14 |
| signatory [3] 10/7 | 76/4 76/9 90/19 | 73/17 74/9 77/19 |
| 10/8 68/21 | 91/15 115/14 | 79/9 79/14 80/17 |
| signature [2] 137/5 | 115/15 115/23 | 92/11 93/2 107/20 |
| 140/12 | sites [3] 59/16 60/3 | 113/9 119/6 119/11 |
| signed [5] 26/16 | 75/19 | 126/23 127/2 127/2 |
| 53/24 55/23 93/24 | siting [2] 21/14 | 134/15 136/22 |
| 136/14 | 27/22 | 139/10 141/2 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | sort [7] 14/3 36/7 | 132/21 133/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| some... [7] 141/17 | 78/2 | specifics [5] 6/4 |
| 145/6 146/15 | 127/5 132/24 | 14/11 63/4 65/8 |
| 151/24 152/6 | sorts [2] 8/23 68/9 | 109/14 |
| 152/13 154/3 | sought [2] 28/12 | spell [1] 63/3 |
| Someday [1] 106/1 | 28/14 | spending [1] 133/5 |
| somehow [1] 54/14 | south [4] 97/6 | spent [1] 29/4 |
| someone [3] 96/2 | 102/13 102/15 | spread [1] 91/9 |
| 103/21 145/22 | 105/15 | staff [1] 50/2 |
| something [17] | speak [9] 31/22 | stage [2] 12/12 |
| 9/22 16/16 27/11 | 52/8 66/7 87/24 | 137/4 |
| 40/13 40/20 47/8 | 107/4 108/20 117/7 | stamp [1] 50/2 |
| 47/11 52/18 55/9 | 141/19 154/12 | stand [1] 86/13 |
| 62/18 65/2 65/5 | speakers [1] 106/6 | standard [2] 34/13 |
| 68/6 83/5 87/7 87/8 | speaking [2] 90/1 | 116/20 |
| 145/18 | 115/2 | standpoint [1] |
| sometimes [2] | speaks [1] 144/3 | 39/18 |
| 43/18 133/3 | specific [19] 25/9 | stands [1] 61/24 |
| somewhat [3] 46/23 | 25/10 25/11 32/9 | Stark [22] 3/4 |
| 54/6 65/19 | 32/18 36/22 38/14 | 89/14 96/9 96/10 |
| somewhere [1] 49/1 | 40/16 45/15 53/17 | 96/13 96/17 97/1 |
| soon [1] 63/16 | 61/10 67/17 85/17 | 97/6 97/17 98/6 |
| sorry [24] 29/12 | 100/16 101/19 | 98/11 99/14 99/15 |
| 33/20 33/20 50/12 | 118/3 134/5 140/10 | 101/5 104/9 104/18 |
| 63/13 65/24 65/24 | 146/9 | 105/14 105/15 |
| 71/2 71/16 74/5 | specifically [19] 6/3 | 108/18 109/1 109/6 |
| 76/1 77/12 77/14 | 9/11 29/17 30/19 | 109/17 |
| 86/5 88/2 96/17 | 37/4 43/14 46/19 | start [5] 6/9 58/23 |
| 98/17 101/14 102/6 | 48/3 55/7 83/9 | 118/24 119/15 |
| 106/4 125/14 | 89/24 91/3 100/4 | 139/6 |
| 130/21 132/16 | 100/14 107/24 | started [2] 4/21 |
| 147/10 | 115/23 123/4 | 73/23 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 101/13 | strategy [1] 65/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| state [25] 1/1 17/15 | steel [2] 91/9 91/17 | Stream [3] 97/9 |
| 19/19 19/21 21/13 | stenographic [1] | 98/23 100/3 |
| 21/22 27/4 27/23 | 155/5 | Street [1] 1/4 |
| 28/2 28/8 44/24 | step [9] 112/1 112/6 | stretch [1] 99/7 |
| 50/9 50/16 54/7 | 112/24 113/6 114/8 | strictly [1] 20/7 |
| 72/16 74/12 76/5 | 114/11 126/13 | strike [1] 22/12 |
| 109/16 111/4 111/9 | 126/15 127/15 | structural [1] 38/21 |
| 111/9 112/12 121/5 | steps [8] 24/4 37/10 | structure [14] |
| 130/22 140/3 | 85/13 88/7 111/21 | 17/12 39/7 75/23 |
| stated [9] 32/12 | 112/1 114/9 145/1 | 76/3 81/16 81/22 |
| 44/21 45/5 57/6 | Steven [3] 1/24 | 83/15 83/16 87/6 |
| 62/7 64/4 93/2 93/7 | 155/3 155/17 | 90/7 90/14 92/7 |
| 106/15 | Stewartstown [1] | 92/8 93/5 |
| statement [4] 7/1 | 87/19 | structures [31] |
| 52/17 55/1 114/21 | still [9] 49/1 52/11 | 39/9 62/11 79/14 |
| statements [1] | 53/1 71/20 71/21 | 80/4 80/23 81/2 |
| 45/21 | 71/24 72/3 103/22 | 82/4 83/13 83/20 |
| states [6] 15/15 | 139/15 | 83/22 84/1 84/2 |
| 19/11 20/18 83/23 | Stip [3] 69/11 151/9 | 84/4 84/21 85/1 |
| 89/9 121/8 | 151/14 | 85/7 85/10 85/20 |
| Station [4] 84/6 | stipulate [1] 144/5 | 85/23 86/19 87/12 |
| 87/2 87/18 88/10 | Stipulation [11] 9/7 | 88/9 89/21 89/22 |
| status [1] 29/23 | 12/22 34/18 92/19 | 90/6 90/10 90/13 |
| statute [14] 17/6 | 121/11 130/2 | 92/6 103/1 106/12 |
| 18/2 18/13 18/23 | 140/22 141/24 | 108/6 |
| 19/7 20/13 20/19 | 142/6 142/7 142/9 | study [2] 74/18 |
| 21/6 22/18 27/15 | stone [2] 42/19 | 74/24 |
| 27/19 28/13 31/20 | 42/20 | stuff [1] 127/5 |
| 31/20 | stop [5] 67/24 69/12 | SUBCOMMITTEE |
|  | 72/11 73/2 73/12 | [9] 1/12 29/19 |
| stay [2] 55/24 | stopped [1] 73/9 | 29/22 59/3 59/9 |


| S |
| :--- |
| SUBCOMMITTEE |

... [4] 63/9 63/20
70/20 71/21
SUBCOMMITTEE
/SITE [1] 1/12 subject [1] 25/1 submissions [1] 73/16
submit [1] 147/2 submits [1] 113/2 Submittal [1] 3/8 submitting [1] 114/10
subsection [7] 59/13 59/17 60/10 60/11 61/4 61/4 63/20
subsequent [1]
132/22
subsequently [1]

## 132/23

substantive [2]
125/3 143/12
such [7] 14/1 14/8 38/12 46/17 60/5 152/7 152/18
suddenly [1] 83/16 suffice [1] 61/3 suffices [1] 60/9 sufficiently [2] 125/3 143/11

Sugar [3] 79/18 84/7 87/2 suggest [1] 109/14 suggestion [1]

## 145/12

summary [2] 29/23 44/22
Summer [8] 96/15 97/10 98/12 99/12 101/15 105/2 107/8 108/1
Suncook [1] 74/20 supplemental [1] 60/20
supplied [1] 64/17 supports [1] 38/21 sure [23] 4/21 15/6 15/8 15/9 18/5 27/17 29/14 40/4 41/7 54/9 54/16 57/20 61/1 70/17 78/14 82/14 83/3 109/12 123/23 129/10 135/24 138/20 150/15 surprise [4] 43/4 52/10 52/20 87/21 surprised [3] 53/1 53/4 53/6
suspend [1] 115/22 Swell [16] 75/12 76/8 76/12 77/5

77/10 77/22 78/9
79/19 85/15 85/17
85/21 85/24 86/15 146/14 152/8
152/19
table [8] 26/10 53/9 104/5 104/12 104/19 113/18 113/21 123/16 tables [13] 40/19 48/6 48/17 48/19 51/7 53/2 91/3
113/2 139/12
139/21 142/23
143/4 143/8
take [31] 9/7 12/18
13/4 14/17 17/24
19/6 21/8 40/23
43/1 43/3 56/4
57/19 70/7 73/7
75/9 84/15 92/11
94/13 94/18 106/16
128/20 131/19
133/2 133/20
134/12 135/17
139/1 141/16
141/20 145/2
152/20
taken [12] 1/23 4/5 39/19 40/20 58/1 88/8 94/20 105/11
taken... [4] 106/14
107/18 154/19
155/6
takes [1] 50/7
talk [7] 11/1 35/24 45/8 47/16 49/22 67/14 91/3
talked [5] 60/19
72/21 75/21 138/5 139/11
talking [7] 51/5
60/8 82/3 103/6
109/7 114/23
147/24
talks [4] 47/14
59/18 84/24 122/21 team [1] 98/16 technical [1] 127/4 technically [1] 112/11
techniques [1] 85/13
telephone [1] 67/17 tell [14] 8/3 31/14
34/5 65/11 71/2
72/17 78/16 84/8
84/9 84/11 100/8
104/14 106/1
144/13
ten [1] 57/23
terms [5] 49/8

68/14 109/11
114/18 120/12 terrain [1] 83/15 terrible [1] 102/24 testified [3] 37/24 46/7 46/18
testifying [1] 46/4 testimony [29] 5/5 5/16 14/10 32/7
32/10 32/12 33/7
33/11 33/21 40/5
40/23 41/9 41/20
42/5 44/7 47/16
48/5 51/18 51/23
53/12 60/12 60/20
60/20 64/3 70/18
71/10 71/18 118/8
143/5
than [12] 17/17
31/14 48/5 48/7
48/19 57/3 85/4
91/17 126/15 134/3
137/8 152/1
thank [50] 4/9 4/24 6/16 7/3 14/21
16/22 20/5 20/20
33/3 35/9 35/18
36/16 38/9 38/17
41/19 41/23 42/1
42/18 46/18 47/20
47/24 54/24 57/21
57/24 58/5 58/9

58/17 67/19 76/16 76/18 76/21 77/17
77/18 94/11 94/12
94/16 95/6 97/4
100/1 102/5 103/16 109/19 110/3
111/18 114/4
117/13 120/15
121/9 121/15
150/14
that [767]
that's [83] 6/9 8/16
9/21 10/15 10/17
10/21 13/2 15/22
19/2 22/7 23/24
24/24 25/1 25/21
27/6 33/9 33/16
33/18 35/11 35/11
37/16 37/17 37/18
38/2 38/24 40/6 40/15 41/22 42/4
44/12 46/12 46/14 47/18 51/6 52/17
53/11 53/15 56/16
61/7 63/16 65/6
66/21 67/7 68/13
70/2 70/3 70/16
70/23 75/4 75/10
76/15 78/3 78/8
80/16 82/13 85/6
87/7 89/6 89/9
89/13 93/11 96/18

| T | 23/19 25/6 30/2 | 46/11 48/7 49/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| that's... [21] 97/22 | 33/13 34/1 36/1 | 51/16 54/17 60/17 |
| 99/2 100/14 103/8 | 36/4 36/9 47/10 | 61/8 61/16 61/18 |
| 106/5 106/9 107/2 | 47/13 49/6 49/22 | 62/10 64/17 65/18 |
| 108/19 121/8 123/1 | 50/6 55/3 59/17 | 67/12 68/16 68/18 |
| 123/21 124/10 | 65/7 65/22 67/6 | 68/18 68/20 69/23 |
| 125/6 125/19 | 67/15 68/16 68/23 | 69/24 70/3 75/7 |
| 126/10 128/3 145/3 | 71/6 74/22 82/11 | 78/11 78/24 79/12 |
| 145/12 147/11 | 89/4 92/2 92/5 98/3 | 79/17 79/21 80/1 |
| 148/8 152/4 | 98/7 103/24 106/18 | 80/22 81/2 81/4 |
| The Nash [1] 100/3 | 113/2 113/3 122/2 | 83/2 83/3 83/14 |
| their [18] 18/18 | 124/22 125/2 | 83/19 84/20 85/6 |
| 20/5 25/1 29/2 51/8 | 125/13 125/15 | 85/10 85/22 85/23 |
| 51/11 53/14 53/19 | 126/17 126/18 | 86/1 86/7 86/11 |
| 56/2 70/8 94/8 | 126/20 127/13 | 86/16 88/7 88/13 |
| 121/23 126/8 | 127/19 128/6 128/7 | 88/13 91/12 91/14 |
| 135/12 137/15 | 129/15 135/14 | 91/20 92/1 96/22 |
| 147/1 147/2 148/21 | 135/16 135/19 | 97/16 97/23 99/18 |
| them [29] 24/14 | 142/4 142/19 | 101/16 101/21 |
| 25/21 26/1 28/17 | 143/14 143/15 | 103/21 105/24 |
| 37/11 38/15 44/14 | 145/11 146/21 | 106/19 106/22 |
| 44/15 46/16 50/8 | 147/2 148/13 | 107/20 107/22 |
| 51/11 52/7 52/9 | 149/11 150/7 | 109/2 112/3 112/7 |
| 52/14 52/23 52/24 | 150/20 150/22 | 113/13 117/11 |
| 53/6 56/4 69/1 77/8 | there [108] 6/21 | 118/5 122/5 122/8 |
| 85/11 85/11 85/12 | 8/11 8/22 10/10 | 122/10 127/10 |
| 90/17 101/22 113/9 | 12/4 20/15 21/1 | 127/17 129/19 |
| 126/5 127/2 148/14 | 21/5 23/10 23/14 | 131/22 132/4 |
| themselves [2] | 25/20 26/16 30/8 | 133/10 135/4 |
| 20/15 93/10 | 36/3 37/9 37/13 | 137/24 138/14 |
| then [66] 5/20 7/8 | 39/10 40/3 40/13 | 141/2 145/8 146/15 |
| 7/16 17/4 23/18 | 45/11 46/4 46/8 | 146/17 147/7 |



| T | 108/4 111/14 | 111/24 112/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| thirty... [13] 127/12 | 119/23 125/15 | 122/11 123/22 |
| 128/10 133/2 | 126/19 127/1 | 132/1 135/11 |
| 133/21 135/13 | 127/20 128/12 | 135/12 136/5 138/5 |
| 136/17 138/3 | 134/5 134/7 137/3 | 138/11 138/18 |
| 143/18 147/1 | 138/22 139/13 | 139/15 139/17 |
| 148/12 150/18 | 139/15 139/18 | 141/5 142/12 144/2 |
| 150/21 150/23 | 140/18 141/4 | 144/18 145/11 |
| thirty-day [16] | 141/17 146/19 | 146/2 147/16 |
| 53/14 53/19 122/9 | 146/23 148/8 148/9 | 150/19 153/18 |
| 122/10 125/9 | 150/5 | 153/22 154/5 154/6 |
| 125/11 125/22 | though [6] 56/8 | tied [1] 19/1 |
| 126/8 135/13 | 70/3 78/15 106/9 | ties [1] 110/8 |
| 136/17 138/3 | 118/7 145/13 | time [46] 5/10 |
| 143/18 147/1 | thought [7] 41/22 | 12/18 29/5 29/5 |
| 148/12 150/21 | 62/16 71/12 86/6 | 31/14 35/19 40/24 |
| 150/23 | 107/15 144/10 | 47/12 51/15 52/16 |
| this [256] | 145/20 | 62/9 67/23 73/17 |
| those [64] 5/10 5/23 | thousand [1] 74/12 | 74/21 84/10 106/7 |
| 7/20 8/24 18/14 | three [5] 74/24 | 107/14 115/3 122/5 |
| 18/21 20/16 25/3 | 79/18 80/3 87/22 | 122/9 122/10 |
| 28/19 34/9 39/9 | 111/14 | 125/10 125/14 |
| 39/9 39/11 42/22 | through [51] 5/4 | 125/22 126/17 |
| 43/6 45/10 46/11 | 5/20 23/21 24/6 | 126/19 127/12 |
| 47/21 47/21 47/21 | 24/8 24/10 33/3 | 127/13 127/18 |
| 48/23 51/6 51/7 | 57/11 62/13 62/17 | 127/21 129/9 |
| 51/9 52/12 54/8 | 67/21 69/24 71/9 | 129/13 130/14 |
| 56/23 59/12 63/3 | 74/16 78/10 92/2 | 131/20 132/8 |
| 63/8 63/11 63/17 | 95/11 96/24 103/9 | 132/10 133/5 133/9 |
| 68/9 74/9 74/13 | 104/9 107/10 | 137/18 141/17 |
| 75/6 77/6 93/23 | 107/11 108/17 | 141/19 143/23 |
| 97/13 98/1 101/1 | 109/1 109/5 109/6 | 144/24 151/20 |

T
time... [2] $154 / 13$ 155/9
timeframes [1] 50/18
timeline [3] 145/8 146/2 146/4
times [5] 28/16
53/17 54/3 68/9

## 103/23

timing [1] 144/24 tiny [2] 102/13 102/18
Title [3] 19/11 19/11 27/20
titled [1] 110/18
today [7] 25/2
38/10 51/24 115/9
144/18 146/16 148/1
together [3] 26/19 125/7 128/18
told [2] 96/10 105/4 tomorrow [1] 52/2 tomorrow's [1] 49/5
too [5] 4/14 49/7
52/3 77/17 118/1
took [3] 47/19
60/13 127/21
top [15] 7/10 7/10 7/10 14/19 32/21

32/22 45/21 78/11
78/16 78/23 84/6 121/12 129/6 130/17 130/18 topic [1] 18/5
topics [1] 114/1
tops [4] 79/14 83/22 84/1 85/11
totally [1] 14/13
touched [1] 113/23
toward [4] 6/12
35/23 50/4 82/20
towards [4] 89/14
102/11 105/14
134/18
tower [1] 103/15
towers [2] 102/18 108/6
Town [6] 98/10 101/4 102/11
102/12 104/17
105/14
Traditionally [1] 26/6
Trail [3] 3/4 104/16 104/16
trained [1] 64/19
training [4] 14/2 46/1 46/5 47/17
transcript [13] 6/11 tremendous [1] 23/4 33/16 35/22 37/13 37/19 37/20

41/1 42/5 45/22 48/5 154/23 155/5 transcripts [1] 5/9 transition [5] 83/16
84/5 87/2 87/18 88/10
translating [3]
121/18 122/2 123/6
translation [1]
121/24
transmission [12] 1/8 22/2 29/19
29/22 35/6 84/5 102/14 102/15
104/7 104/8 107/13 147/15
transmit [1] 122/6
Transportation [2] 1/16 40/9
treatment [26] 12/5 12/10 12/14 12/24
13/11 14/5 24/9
24/13 25/13 35/4
41/6 41/12 41/15
42/8 62/20 62/24
63/3 63/8 63/22
64/12 64/22 65/7
67/16 67/23 68/14
73/14
23/14
trigger [2] 128/14
trigger... [1] 148/15 true [3] 12/3 86/10 155/5
trust [4] 102/1 103/14 105/16
117/23
try [5] 18/10 118/4
138/7 138/20 146/1
trying [12] 24/11
35/14 58/23 82/1
126/11 135/22
144/16 144/23
145/3 149/11 152/5
152/16
Tuesday [1] 144/18 turn [2] 121/9 139/4
Turning [1] 140/20 twice [2] 90/7 90/13 two [20] 3/7 13/4 39/22 44/2 56/13 61/23 73/21 77/4 97/24 114/9 114/12 114/13 114/15
126/15 127/14
128/1 128/5 128/18
141/10 154/18
type [4] 15/17 45/3
92/7 93/5
types [1] 15/5
typical [7] 35/11

35/13 43/16 50/17 53/11 53/13 53/15 typically [2] 39/3 50/7
U
uh [15] 11/9 24/1 48/21 49/17 71/19 82/14 96/20 97/5 97/8 98/5 107/9 111/13 114/15 115/16 151/13 uh-huh [15] 11/9 24/1 48/21 49/17 71/19 82/14 96/20 97/5 97/8 98/5 107/9 111/13 114/15 115/16 151/13
ultimately [1] 154/4
unanticipated [3] 14/1 37/14 66/24 under [44] 9/7 12/21 16/6 17/7 18/1 18/12 18/23 19/7 21/21 27/15 28/13 28/21 30/3 30/7 31/19 31/20 59/2 60/10 61/4 61/12 62/16 69/22 72/16 75/18 76/8 82/9 92/18 106/24

114/18 120/24 122/16 122/20 126/12 130/16 134/4 135/10 136/20 137/7 148/13 150/20 151/7 151/9 154/22 155/8
underground [9] 39/17 40/11 45/4 48/6 65/20 67/1 83/17 86/19 87/3 undergrounding [1] 62/12
underneath [1] 39/7
understand [21]
8/6 15/6 17/4 24/11
27/17 27/18 55/2
56/7 56/16 56/17
58/23 64/17 72/4
75/6 75/17 85/6
88/3 88/3 97/15
123/23 147/21
understanding [19]
8/16 8/18 22/1
24/17 30/8 116/6
116/23 117/3
119/23 120/3
120/22 126/1 128/4
139/13 144/21
146/19 147/24
understanding... [2]
148/3 150/16 understood [1] 61/1 undertaken [1] 34/9
undertaking [6]
14/23 15/12 15/17 34/24 112/3 140/5 undiscovered [2] 38/7 38/11
unfortunately [1] 94/13
unhappy [1] 150/6 unlikely [4] 11/24 79/21 93/5 153/4 unreasonable [12] 59/6 59/11 59/15 60/3 60/16 61/9 61/17 62/2 62/6 64/5 115/12 115/24 unresolved [1]
131/22
until [4] 39/6 63/21 87/3 151/5
up [32] 4/5 5/10 8/2 11/2 12/16 17/4 29/13 31/3 59/4 70/11 71/8 76/20 77/8 82/16 84/16 84/24 97/17 101/20

103/21 110/9
113/19 114/4
119/24 121/11
122/18 122/19
123/2 129/5 134/10
141/11 142/24
145/1
upon [2] 116/3
117/10
Upper [6] 77/6
88/17 90/23 97/2
97/22 137/21
upside [1] 98/15
upside-down [1]
98/15
us [6] 4/20 52/15
70/12 79/5 84/11 95/11
use [12] 59/23
75/20 91/9 115/18
118/4 119/16 134/6
135/22 137/19
146/21 148/7 150/1
used [10] 24/20
34/16 57/6 72/5
78/20 93/6 98/4
108/4 130/11
151/21
uses [3] 17/19 20/24 140/4
using [5] 20/3
100/24 116/1 140/6

152/6
usually [3] 43/20 112/13 130/12
Utilities [2] 1/13
1/14
V.C [1] 12/22

Vaguely [2] 32/16 49/13
Valley [2] 74/19 74/20
value [1] 81/21 values [1] 76/12 variety [2] 28/7 147/7
various [1] 59/11 vegetation [2] 108/21 109/12
vehicle [3] 24/19 57/9 60/21
venture [1] 5/19
verbal [1] 33/1
Vermont [1] 9/16 very [28] 10/22 12/20 13/5 13/12 27/2 35/11 43/24 54/5 54/20 56/22 64/8 68/9 74/15 78/16 78/22 79/5 79/17 79/17 80/1 80/1 80/9 100/1 100/15 119/4

| V | 80/23 82/5 82/7 | wanted [6] 118/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| very... [4] 127/24 | 83/20 83/23 84/22 | /10 135/5 135/7 |
| 133/6 133/6 147/14 | 85/10 85/20 85/23 | 150/15 151/2 |
| VI [2] 17/7 19/13 | 102/19 103/1 | warmer [1] 82/1 |
| vibration [6] 39/16 | 105/23 | was [106] 7/6 7/23 |
| 39/23 40/10 40/12 | visit [2] 95/18 96/12 | 8/17 14/11 16/11 |
| 41/2 42/15 | visited [1] 96/8 | 16/15 16/17 22/12 |
| Victor [2] 100/4 | visual [4] 84/19 | 22/21 24/23 25/24 |
| 101/3 | 85/3 92/4 106/17 | 32/19 33/2 33/7 |
| VICTORIA [2] 2/4 | voltage [1] 89/21 | 33/7 33/13 33/15 |
| 4/8 | W | 36/9 37/8 37/9 |
| view [6] 89/12 | wait [2] 101/13 | 37/12 39/23 40/5 |
| 102/9 104/24 | 139/6 | 43/5 45/21 48/9 |
| 105/20 106/13 | waiting [2] 50/2 | 48/10 48/15 48/17 |
| 109/8 | 100/1 | 49/3 49/15 50/12 |
| viewpoint [1] 103/20 | walk [2] 123/22 | 50/20 51/19 51/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 103 / 20 \\ & \text { views [4] 79/12 } \end{aligned}$ | 139/17 | 52/6 52/6 53/22 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \mid v i e w s ~[4] ~ 79 / 12 ~ \\ 79 / 13 ~ 79 / 17 ~ 80 / 4 ~ \end{array}$ | walked [2] 132/1 | 53/23 58/19 61/22 |
| viewshed [2] 79/11 | 135/10 | 62/8 66/23 67/4 |
| 82/13 | Walker [1] 145/20 | 68/6 71/3 71/20 |
| viewsheds [3] | 2] | 73/17 74/7 75/11 |
| 102/17 103/24 | want [25] 8/10 | 78/19 78/24 79/24 |
| 108/5 | 10/22 13/6 22/4 | 81/16 81/16 81/24 |
| VII [1] 19/14 | 35/13 36/7 43/1 | 82/3 83/4 83/5 86/7 |
| Village [1] 98/6 | 43/3 55/2 58/23 | 87/11 87/21 88/21 |
| violated [1] 67/24 | 43/3 55/2 $58 / 23$ $64 / 765 / 1466 / 1$ | 88/24 89/2 91/8 |
| violation [2] 68/11 | 71/9 75/16 85/8 | 91/8 92/3 92/4 93/6 |
| 68/13 | 86/20 99/10 116/15 | 95/21 96/6 96/11 |
| visibility [4] 80/3 | 116/19 123/22 | 96/12 98/2 100/20 |
| 81/3 81/18 147/6 | 139/9 139/12 146/2 | 104/21 105/10 |
| visible [13] 79/10 | 147/8 | 107/18 110/10 |


| W | 149/12 | 140/21 140/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| was... [22] 111/19 | Way's [1] 42/18 | 142/6 142/11 |
| 113/14 113/23 | ways [3] 8/20 25/5 | 142/24 143/5 |
| 118/19 119/9 122/4 | 28/7 | 145/18 147/24 |
| 122/8 131/6 131/15 | we [89] 5/4 5/10 | 151/8 152/21 153/9 |
| 131/17 131/18 | 13/18 17/17 17/24 | 153/18 154/8 |
| 134/9 136/14 | 19/6 25/8 29/4 | 154/16 |
| 138/20 139/21 | 36/13 36/14 36/16 | we'll [5] 32/5 32/5 |
| 143/7 147/23 | 36/18 37/14 43/12 | 45/8 98/18 98/20 |
| 148/19 152/5 152/6 | 43/15 51/3 52/15 | we're [15] 4/3 19/9 |
| 152/8 152/16 | 62/1 62/3 62/19 | 19/10 64/10 64/16 |
| wasn't [2] 16/8 | 63/8 63/11 63/11 | 65/1 65/4 88/16 |
| 41/17 | 64/11 65/8 66/1 | 103/22 109/9 |
| waste [2] 20/9 | 66/9 67/1 71/8 | 114/23 122/11 |
| 31/14 | 72/21 74/6 74/14 | 129/10 133/5 |
| watch [1] 56/6 | 75/4 75/6 75/20 | 139/17 |
| water [1] 105/3 | 77/8 81/5 81/10 | we've [17] 18/4 |
| way [39] 1/15 5/15 | 81/13 84/9 84/10 | 18/4 18/6 27/11 |
| 6/3 6/6 7/17 27/3 | 84/14 84/23 87/13 | 42/12 60/8 77/4 |
| 34/13 41/8 45/15 | 88/3 89/4 95/11 | 99/10 99/12 99/13 |
| 46/19 47/7 82/17 | 95/12 97/13 101/12 | 103/23 109/6 |
| 82/19 82/21 93/14 | 102/5 103/24 105/7 | 129/12 132/1 |
| 99/9 100/10 103/3 | 106/15 107/15 | 139/11 141/1 |
| 103/10 104/9 | 109/8 109/10 112/2 | 145/15 |
| 104/11 104/17 | 113/12 122/3 | weathering [2] 91 |
| 105/13 107/13 | 123/23 126/20 | 91/17 |
| 107/23 108/7 108/8 | 128/5 128/6 128/7 | Weathersby [2] |
| 108/12 108/17 | 128/18 134/19 | 1/17 36/21 |
| 108/24 109/4 109/5 | 135/10 135/15 | website [3] 109/14 |
| 109/6 121/14 | 135/22 136/24 | 110/17 110/21 |
| 123/18 134/18 | 138/4 138/17 | weeds [1] 49/7 |
| 135/20 145/5 | 138/17 138/20 | week [4] 5/6 32/8 |


| W | 115/9 118/19 | 53/13 55/2 58/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| week... [2] 51/22 | 119/11 119/12 | 59/21 60/17 61/ |
| 128/1 | 126/23 127/1 127/4 | 63/4 65/7 65/12 |
| Weeks [1] 74/12 | 127/7 127/10 | 66/6 66/21 68/14 |
| Welfare [1] 27/21 | 127/22 128/8 | 72/19 74/1 74/16 |
| well [44] 7/15 8/13 | 131/22 134/16 | 75/6 78/12 79/10 |
| 8/19 12/7 12/19 | 135/4 135/12 136/8 | 81/10 81/24 82/8 |
| 17/24 18/14 27/6 | 137/11 137/17 | 83/9 85/12 85/19 |
| 35/19 50/15 61/7 | 137/22 137/24 | 86/16 89/17 90/4 |
| 61/24 62/14 65/14 | 138/18 140/11 | 90/9 91/22 92/10 |
| 65/17 65/20 65/24 | 140/14 140/15 | 92/17 97/13 99/19 |
| 67/8 67/19 68/9 | 140/17 142/24 | 102/10 108/9 109/9 |
| 69/20 79/9 84/1 | 143/1 144/9 147/24 | 112/16 114/4 117/3 |
| 84/11 90/12 90/23 | what [124] 7/5 7/23 | 119/23 121/24 |
| 94/1 94/7 96/3 | 8/7 10/22 10/24 | 125/6 126/11 127/1 |
| 96/14 96/15 99/10 | 11/10 14/4 15/3 | 131/8 131/12 |
| 99/17 101/22 108/2 | 15/11 15/22 17/10 | 134/11 137/12 |
| 123/16 133/17 | 18/21 19/16 20/13 | 142/12 143/7 144/1 |
| 133/20 133/22 | 22/7 23/3 23/12 | 144/3 144/5 144/16 |
| 133/23 145/8 | 23/24 25/8 26/19 | 144/21 145/1 145/3 |
| 145/17 148/2 | 30/23 31/14 32/19 | 145/5 145/7 145/21 |
| 152/14 | 33/2 33/9 33/13 | 145/24 146/6 146/8 |
| went [1] 48/22 | 33/16 34/20 37/8 | 149/16 151/6 |
| were [54] 5/5 5/8 | 37/12 37/17 37/18 | 151/10 152/21 |
| 9/22 32/8 35/19 | 37/21 37/24 38/2 | 153/18 |
| 40/2 40/24 51/6 | 41/1 41/22 42/4 | what's [4] 40/15 |
| 52/5 54/22 62/11 | 43/1 44/14 44/15 | 106/18 131/5 |
| 71/3 71/12 74/10 | 45/16 46/20 47/1 | 134/13 |
| 74/22 78/20 83/9 | 47/7 48/16 49/3 | whatever [2] 41/3 |
| 86/14 87/9 97/24 | 49/14 49/15 49/19 | 41/7 |
| 97/24 100/11 | 50/17 51/6 51/18 | when [15] 5/5 8/11 |
| 100/11 101/9 105/9 | 51/24 52/20 53/5 | 22/20 32/7 35/7 |


| W | 73/18 85/10 127/7 | 62/13 104/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| when... [10] 39/22 | 133/11 138 | itefie |
| 41/1 46/19 53/16 | 139/2 141/3 14 | 1/11 |
| 63/11 73/17 73/23 | 150/4 150/19 151/6 | who [25] 7/17 7/20 |
| 99/2 105/7 125/11 | which [66] 8/10 9/8 | 7/21 8/21 9/14 9/23 |
| where [50] 6/13 | 10/13 12/10 13/12 | 10/2 12/19 27/9 |
| 7/16 7/18 7/21 8/3 | 15/20 17/20 19/18 | 55/24 56/23 64/18 |
| 9/3 9/5 12/13 17/6 | 19/23 21/6 21/6 | 66/13 66/18 67/23 |
| 18/6 24/21 28/7 | 25/8 25/11 25/14 | 68/4 73/12 78/17 |
| 29/1 30/13 34/6 | 26/7 28/8 32/12 | 92/16 93/8 93/23 |
| 35/24 43/9 45/2 | 40/10 42/10 51/19 | 96/4 146/20 150/9 |
| 48/3 49/8 51/16 | 55/22 56/5 59/5 | 153/15 |
| 56/16 56/18 57/12 | 60/5 66/13 69/10 | whole [2] 16/15 |
| 61/24 62/3 64/11 | 74/11 74/12 75/1 | 18/9 |
| 65/2 69/19 74/21 | 77/19 79/11 80/8 | whom [1] 93/16 |
| 75/8 83/15 83/17 | 81/12 82/14 84/19 | whoops [2] 78/12 |
| 87/6 89/6 89/20 | 86/8 90/6 91/4 92/1 | 84/15 |
| 90/24 91/24 98/3 | 96/3 96/24 98/2 | why [16] 17/24 |
| 102/13 104/16 | 98/9 100/19 104/21 | 20/9 30/18 49/7 |
| 105/17 118/10 | 118/15 118/19 | 70/3 73/22 75/4 |
| 124/10 129/19 | 120/1 120/8 121/12 | 78/24 97/22 100/8 |
| 147/15 148/8 150/4 | 122/11 123/9 | 129/8 133/4 135/16 |
| 151/12 152/9 | 124/23 129/3 | 146/1 147/4 147/9 |
| Where's [1] 12/24 | 132/11 132/21 | wide [1] 104/21 |
| whereas [5] 11/6 | 134/20 136/8 | WIDELL [449] |
| 11/13 14/22 21/12 | 147/10 148/19 | widened [2] 108/6 |
| 119/16 | 148/21 148/24 | 108/7 |
| whether [24] 23/1 | 151/3 151/8 154/1 | will [91] 4/5 4/17 |
| 23/2 23/10 23/11 | 154/18 | 6/21 12/1 12/1 12/3 |
| 26/3 27/13 35/13 | while [2] 77/23 | 12/4 12/6 12/7 |
| 59/10 59/14 67/3 | 135/11 | 12/10 12/16 21/13 |
| 70/22 72/1 73/9 | White [3] 55/21 | 23/20 25/11 25/14 |


| W | wish [2] 87/8 94/4 | working [3] 56/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| will... [76] 26/9 | within [19] 13/2 | 153/20 |
| 26/10 26/11 26/12 | 13/8 13/21 14/18 | works [1] 113/7 |
| 26/13 26/16 26/24 | 43/14 79/15 80/4 | worry [1] 25/19 |
| 27/2 29/10 32/13 | 80/24 81/4 81/17 | worst [5] 125/8 |
| 32/14 33/5 33/6 | 82/5 83/20 84/21 | 126/14 128/6 |
| 33/21 33/22 34/9 | 101/15 119/21 | 128/21 131/24 |
| 34/24 35/3 35/5 | 120/23 122/15 | worst-case [5] |
| 41/5 42/10 44/17 | 135/8 150/18 | 125/8 126/14 128/6 |
| 45/3 45/6 45/9 | without [3] 108/21 | 128/21 131/24 |
| 45/24 49/21 54/11 | 145/9 149/12 | would [131] 4/23 |
| 54/12 54/15 54/17 | witness [7] 2/4 4/6 | 7/9 11/23 14/12 |
| 58/20 59/10 59/15 | 81/9 83/4 115/4 | 16/6 17/16 18/22 |
| 60/15 60/21 62/19 | 142/16 149/17 | 20/9 25/6 28/22 |
| 63/3 64/5 64/17 | won't [1] 44/21 | 29/3 37/4 39/15 |
| 64/24 78/3 79/15 | Woodland [2] | 39/16 40/4 40/20 |
| 80/12 82/10 83/13 | 96/18 96/23 | 41/4 42/3 43/4 46/8 |
| 83/14 83/18 83/22 | Woods [1] 77/2 | 47/18 47/20 47/23 |
| 84/11 84/16 90/2 | word [2] 59/23 | 49/10 50/22 51/19 |
| 90/10 91/1 93/19 | 131/19 | 51/20 52/10 57/12 |
| 100/9 102/14 | wording [1] 40/7 | 63/11 63/15 63/15 |
| 106/11 106/24 | words [2] 20/15 | 63/19 65/9 65/14 |
| 108/15 109/4 | 78/20 | 65/19 66/11 66/14 |
| 110/23 110/24 | work [13] 14/3 | 66/15 66/22 67/2 |
| 114/1 114/17 | 23/15 24/21 42/10 | 67/3 67/5 67/16 |
| 119/24 122/23 | 52/16 53/18 61/19 | 68/16 69/5 69/18 |
| 123/8 127/13 141/5 | 62/18 73/12 119/1 | 70/4 70/13 72/17 |
| 141/9 141/16 | 135/18 153/10 | 72/22 76/6 76/11 |
| 141/19 141/24 | 153/17 | 77/7 79/2 79/21 |
| 148/6 154/17 | worked [2] 56/9 | 80/5 80/23 81/3 |
| William [1] 1/16 wise [1] 152/4 | $\begin{aligned} & 151 / 19 \\ & \text { workers [1] } 14 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 81 / 582 / 482 / 684 / 9 \\ 86 / 20 ~ 87 / 21 ~ 92 / 3 \end{array}$ |


| W | 132/4 133/15 138/3 | yes [225] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| would... [65] 92/6 | 138/5 151/5 | yet [13] 13/16 24/ |
| 92/18 93/4 93/5 | Wow [1] 25/18 | 24/21 25/14 46/5 |
| 93/7 93/9 93/11 | Wright [1] 1/15 | 48/24 51/9 51/11 |
| 93/19 97/13 99/8 | write [2] 94/6 | 53/7 123/19 126/9 |
| 101/2 101/18 | 101/20 | 136/18 154/2 |
| 101/19 102/1 | write-up [1] 10 | you [484] |
| 104/23 105/5 105/8 | writing [2] 26/13 | you base [1] 104/8 |
| 105/15 106/12 | 113/9 | you'd [7] 115/13 |
| 106/22 107/20 | written [7] 24/15 | 118/9 125/8 125/9 |
| 107/22 109/14 | 25/12 38/12 46/4 | 125/13 126/16 |
| 109/15 109/15 | 46/12 57/3 82/16 | 126/17 |
| 111/3 111/14 | wrong [4] 47/5 | you'll [6] 17/4 54/9 |
| 111/20 113/24 | 54/14 147/5 147/11 | 83/12 132/15 |
| 114/16 114/18 | wrote [2] 78/17 | 145/11 146/6 |
| 117/3 117/8 120/4 | 84/10 | you're [26] 36/5 |
| 121/3 128/1 132/7 | X | 47/6 49/9 49/15 |
| 132/21 134/2 135/9 | XI [1] 19/11 | 50/1 52/20 53/1 |
| 135/9 135/11 | XII [1] 27/20 | 53/4 53/5 55/10 |
| 135/14 135/16 | XIII [6] 69/11 | 57/17 62/17 65/11 |
| 136/23 137/2 | 92/19 142/6 142/7 | 74/1 75/14 82/14 |
| 138/14 139/15 | 142/9 151/14 | 82/20 103/6 103/14 |
| 139/20 144/4 | XIII.A [1] 151/9 | 104/13 110/14 |
| 144/10 146/10 | XIII.F [1] 130/2 | 110/16 118/14 |
| 146/17 146/21 | XIX [1] 19/11 | 130/7 132/16 145/5 |
| 147/1 147/4 147/7 | XVI [1] 9/8 | you've [12] 13/7 |
| 147/9 147/15 148/6 | Y |  |
| 148/9 148/12 149/5 |  |  |
| 151/8 152/15 | Yard [1] 118/16 | 73/20 89/8 108/9 <br> 114/22 143/7 |
| wouldn't [11] 10/5 | years [4] 56/13 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40/3 52/20 81/21 } \\ & 102 / 19 ~ 120 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 56/24 61/23 73/21 } \\ \text { yellow [1] 78/15 } \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { your }[95] \\ 7 / 57 / 5 \\ 7 / 23 \\ 8 / 17 \\ \hline \end{gathered} 115\right.$ |



