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business purpose of the Balsams Resort Holdings and Dixville Capital.
A. The Balsams closed in 2011. And along with a team of people that I've been working with, we're trying to reopen the resort, redevelop the property.
Q. Thank you. So I have given you two exhibits this morning, an exhibit that's marked BUS 1 is your prefiled testimony that was submitted on November 15th, 2016. And the second exhibit is BUS 2, and that is your supplemental prefiled testimony submitted on March 24, 2017. Do you have any changes that you would like to make to your prefiled testimony?
A. The only change is that we'd indicated approximately $\$ 18$ million of real estate, and that's grown to almost $\$ 25$ million since that time.
Q. Is that in presales?
A. In presales of real estate, yes.
Q. Thank you.

MR. BELIVEAU: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
Otten is ready for cross-examination.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And if you asked him the same questions, he would give the same answers, and he adopts that testimony; correct?

MR. BELIVEAU: Yes.
WITNESS OTTEN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. And according to my list, the municipal groups are going first. Oh, no, I'm looking at the wrong list. Mr. Pappas, you are up. Sorry. I'm looking at the wrong list.

MR. PAPPAS: That's okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. PAPPAS :
Q. Good morning, Mr. Otten. My name is Tom Pappas. I represent Counsel for the Public in this proceeding. I want to start by just asking you a little bit about your background. You have extensive experience in ski reports; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have operated several ski resorts in

New England; correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. You operated Sunday River and Sugarloaf over in Maine?
A. Yes.
Q. You operated Attitash in New Hampshire?
A. Yes.
Q. And you operated Killington, Sugarbush and Mount Snow in Vermont?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that the focal point of those resorts in New England is the ski area itself?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you also agree with me that the primary reason people go to these ski resorts is to ski?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you some questions about the Balsams and the redevelopment of the Balsams. Now, the Balsams is located in Dixville Notch; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's surrounded by some mountains; is that right?
A. It is.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 44 MORNING Session ONLY] \{10-6-17\}
Q. And you would agree with me, there are some gorgeous views of Dixville Notch from the front of the Dix House.
A. Yes.
Q. And there will be equally gorgeous views of Dixville Notch and the surrounding mountains from the new buildings you propose to construct; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that the setting of the Balsams and the views from the Balsams and the buildings there are one of the things that makes the Balsams Resort special?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree with me, the stunning views are prominently shown on virtually every page of your web site?
A. Yes, I would hope so.
Q. They are. I looked at it yesterday.

Now, in your prefiled testimony at
Lines 24 and 25, you testified that the
Northern Pass Transmission Line is
approximately 4 miles from where the majority
of the redevelopment of the Balsams would be
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constructed. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you were referring to the "majority of the redevelopment of the Balsams," are you referring to the buildings that either currently exist or will be added to the currently existing buildings?
A. The first few buildings will be located adjacent to the existing buildings, and that's the location that we're discussing.
Q. Okay. Mr. Otten, do you see a map on the screen in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So what's on the screen in front of you is Applicant's Exhibit 201, Bates stamp No. 67785. And that is a page from the Applicant's August 2017 supplemental project maps. Have you looked at these maps before?
A. I'm not familiar with this map.
Q. Okay. Well, what this map shows is the proposed new transmission line in this area of the state. And if you look --

MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Pappas, we
have a screen out down here. Dawn's on her way.
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(Pause in proceedings)
BY MR. PAPPAS :
Q. Mr. Otten, on the screen in front of you is a page depicting the new transmission line in a section of Dixville. And are you familiar that in the Dixville area, the new transmission line will be a new right-of-way corridor through the Wagner Forest? Are you familiar with that?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see.

Nathan Pond?
A. I do.
Q. And is the Balsams Resort south of Nathan Pond?
A. I'm sorry. From a geographic standpoint, I'm not able to tell you -- I'm not -- I don't think I understand what I'm supposed to be -or what you're asking me.
Q. Okay. Let me do this: Mr. Otten, what's in front of you now is Counsel for the Public 583. Do you see that?
A. I see it, yes.
Q. Okay. And if you look at this exhibit, it is
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a map that includes portions of Dixville. Do you see Dixville on the right-hand side?
A. I do.
Q. And if you look up at the top right-hand portion, first you can see the Nathan Pond Ridge in black. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Next to that do you see Nathan Pond?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. And then if you go south from Nathan Pond, all the way down, do you see Dixville Notch?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Balsams is located in Dixville Notch; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you see Route 26?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Balsams is off of Route 26 in Dixville Notch?
A. Yes.
Q. So if you recall from the prior exhibit, the new right-of-way was going to go just a
little below Nathan Pond. Do you recall that
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 44 MORNING Session ONLY] \{10-6-17\}
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Q. Okay. All right. So is it your understanding that the closest it gets, the new transmission line, the closest it gets to the buildings in the Balsams Resort is about 4 miles?
A. That's my -- from the skiing, it's about 4 miles. But if I'm transposing in my mind what you were showing me earlier, it looks as though the direction going north from Dixville Notch, it may be... yeah, may be somewhat the same distance or may be a little bit less.
Q. Okay. What's in front of you now is Counsel for the Exhibit -- Counsel for the Public Exhibit 584, which is taken from the Balsams Resort web site. Do you recognize that picture?
A. I do.
Q. And the picture shows, on the left-hand side, if you look at the buildings in the red, are those existing buildings?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you look off to the right of the existing buildings, the sort of the tan
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color, are those the new proposed buildings?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that, from either the existing buildings or from the new buildings, one will not be able to see the Northern Pass Transmission Line, if it's built, from any of these buildings?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And would you also agree with me that no one would be able to see the new Northern Pass Transmission Line, if it is built, from any of the grounds around these buildings, including the front lawn or behind the buildings or any of the locations depicted in this exhibit around the buildings? Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. In your prefiled testimony, at Lines 26 through 29 you were asked the question, quote, "Do you anticipate that NPT will impact the Balsams Resort's ability to sell real estate or attract vacationers?" close quote. Do you have that in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
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Q. And you answered that question, quote, "I do not believe the construction of NPT will adversely impact tourism or real estate sales based on the current route configuration," close quote. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So would you agree with me that the current route configuration will not adversely impact tourism or real estate sales because you cannot see the transmission line from the Balsams Resort?
A. No, not at all. That's a complete sort of -I can't agree with that statement at all. You're assuming that people will never leave their hotel room. The Balsams Resort is 11,000 acres. Primarily from all of the skiing area you'll be able to see the Northern Pass Transmission Line from the top of the gondola. You'll be able to see it. You'll be able to see it from I believe Table Rock. We already have seven large wind towers on our property that can be seen, and you'll see the northern transmission line from the golf course, the Panorama golf
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course, and from all the future development and real estate area on the east side of the mountain.
Q. So would you agree with me that the people going to the ski area are primarily going to ski, correct, much like the people who went to the ski areas you testified about earlier?
A. No, it's a very different kind of resort configuration. We're looking for long-term, week -- long-term-stay guests who will be using all the facilities, from golf to skiing to cross-country, snowmobiling,
four-wheeling, hiking, biking. It's
11,000 acres that make up the resort. If you're buying real estate at the Balsams, you're not just buying a room in a hotel, you're buying access to an entire piece of property. So I have to disagree with your conclusion.
Q. Well, would you agree with me that those folks that are going to the ski resort, when they go to the ski resort, they're going to the ski area to ski? That's why they're visiting the ski section; correct?
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A. Again, you're conflating things that shouldn't be put together.
Q. Well, let's --
A. A ski resort is an amenity of the resort rooms. And because of our location and where we are, we don't expect to attract the same type of visitors that have gone to the other resorts that you mentioned earlier. Our visitors are visitors that are going to be coming from longer distances, staying for longer periods of time, and not coming to the resort just to ski.
Q. Would you agree with me that whether or not the skiers at the ski area at the Balsams can see the transmission line or can't see it, it's not going to impact their decision to either go skiing that day or not go skiing that day?
A. Could you repeat that?
Q. Sure.
A. Sorry.
Q. Would you agree with me that the decision of whether somebody at the Balsams goes to the ski resort to ski for a day, that decision is
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not dependent on whether or not they can see the transmission line? Correct? That decision's based on whether they want to go ski.
A. I will assume so. But it's hard for me to actually know what someone's making a decision about. But yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that whether or not someone decides to go golf on the Ross course is not based on whether or not they can see transmission lines, but rather, they want to go golfing that day on a very nice golf course?
A. Again, you're asking me to assume what someone's thinking. I can tell you from my vantage point, I think it all sort of goes together. I think the views are important from the ski resort and from the golf course. And I think what you see from those points may be important to you, but I don't know that I can agree or disagree that that would be your decision-making point.
Q. Okay. So you can't -- what you're telling me is you really can't assume why somebody
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either goes to the ski area or goes to the golf course or, frankly, goes to the other amenities at the Balsams because you can't assume what they're thinking. Is that your testimony?
A. I can't assume what they're thinking. But as a business person, $I$ made a decision that $I$ don't believe that either the wind towers or the Northern Pass Transmission Line will negatively affect my ability to do tourism and be in the tourism business and the real estate business at this location.
Q. Okay. And that's an assumption you've made as a businessperson.
A. That's a -- yes. That's what I do.
Q. Okay. Now, you also testified that more than

90 individuals have made a 5-percent deposit to select a future condominium at the Balsams; is that right?
A. That was in my testimony. That number's
grown now. The gross sales represented by deposits is about just under $\$ 25$ million.
Q. Okay. And are those deposits refundable deposits?
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.
A. They are.
Q. Okay. So those individuals, if they chose to, they could receive their deposit back as of today; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay.
A. I should add that they started with a $\$ 1200$ deposit, which was less than 1 percent.
Q. Mr. Otten --
A. -- and increased it to 5 percent.
Q. Okay. But nonetheless, they remain refundable; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. So what I want to do now, Mr. Otten, is ask you some questions about the Forward NH Fund which you testified about in your prefiled testimony.

Now, I understand that the Balsams received a $\$ 2$ million loan from the Forward NH Fund; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Balsams received that loan in February of 2016; is that correct?
A. I believe so, yes.
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Q. Did that money come from -- to whom -- who provided that money? Who was the entity that provided that money?
A. Northern Pass.
Q. Is that Northern Pass Transmission?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you personally involved in securing this loan?
A. Yes.
Q. Who from Northern Pass Transmission did you deal with?
A. Bill Quinlan.
Q. Okay. Did Northern Pass Transmission approach you about the loan or did you approach them?
A. My involvement with Northern Pass -- in order to answer that question, I need to go to the beginning of the -- if that's all right.
Q. Well, why don't you answer the question first, and then if you want to explain it, that's fine. But it's helpful if you answer the question first.

Did you approach Northern Pass
Transmission or did Northern Pass
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Transmission approach you?
A. That was not -- I can't answer that in that context because of the prior history.
Q. Did you ask them for a loan?
A. Again, because of the history leading up to that, to answering that question, I'd have to explain how we got to that point to make that answer make any sense.
Q. Well, you can answer whether or not you asked them for a loan. Did you ask them for a loan?
A. Yes, but there was a long lead-up to that which had nothing to do with the loan to get to that point.
Q. Okay. Did the Balsams fill out a loan application in connection with securing this funding?
A. No.
Q. Did the Balsams submit any documentation to NPT in connection with obtaining this financing?
A. Not per se.
Q. Okay. Did the Forward NH Fund or Northern Pass Transmission provide the Balsams with
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any documentation other than the loan documents themselves in connection with this funding?
A. There was general information shared by both parties about what they were doing, but there was no specific documentation.
Q. Okay. Did Northern Pass Transmission or the Forward NH Fund provide the Balsams with any criteria that the Balsams needed to meet in order to obtain this funding?
A. No.
Q. From the time that you requested funding from

Northern Pass Transmission until
February 2016 when you obtained funding,
about how long was the process?
A. Well, the process actually began without any discussion of funding or the Northern Pass Transmission line.
Q. Yeah. What I'm interested in, though, is just the process of the funding. I
understand that --
A. I'm sorry, but it's impossible for me to correctly answer that question without giving you the history.
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Q. Well, let me ask you this: Do you remember about what period of time you first asked for funding, what month and year?
A. Again, you're asking me to answer a question that does not -- the precursor to the actions before that were not my -- I did not make a specific request for funding. And if you would allow me to explain how we got to that point, $I$ think it would become clear.
Q. What I'm interested in is the date, the month and year when the issue of funding first came up. When did you first talk to them about receiving funds?
A. The Northern -- the fund for the future, Northern Pass fund, first came into discussion in October of 2015.
Q. Okay.
A. Approximately.
Q. All right. Now, after you received funding in February of 2016, have you been required to submit any documentation to Northern Pass Transmission in connection with the funding? MR. BELIVEAU: Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 44 MORNING Session ONLY] \{10-6-17\}

Beliveau.

MR. BELIVEAU: I'm going to
object to that question. This Committee issued an order on January 19th, 2017, that made it quite clear that, with regard to any aspects of the funding, terms and conditions, the only question that would be relevant is to whether there was a quid pro quo, a condition that needed to be met in order to receive the funds. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Pappas. MR. PAPPAS: This witness testified in prefiled testimony about the Forward NH Fund, about its criteria, about its goals, about the fact that they met them. The Forward NH Fund is a significant issue in this case. I'm not asking about specific terms of the funding. I'm asking about process. I want to know about the fund itself and how it works.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled.
Do you remember the question? WITNESS OTTEN: No, I don't. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Neither do
I. Mr. Pappas.

BY MR. PAPPAS:
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Q. Mr. Otten, after you received funding from the Forward NH Fund, was the Balsams required to submit any documentation to Northern Pass Transmission in connection with the funding?
A. Not that I remember.
Q. The Balsams received funding from the Forward NH Fund or NPT. Has the Balsams met with anybody from NPT or the Forward NH Fund to discuss whether or not the funding has met the goals of NPT?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you had discussions with NPT or anybody from the Forward NH Fund about additional funding, receiving additional funding from them?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to ask you about the process of that. I don't want to ask you about specific terms and condition, but I'm interested in the process. Have you been asked to submit any documentation with respect to requests for more funds?
A. No.
Q. Have you been given any documentation that
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provides criteria or other things that the Balsams needs to meet or do in order to seek additional funding?
A. The additional funding requirement that we are -- that you're alluding to and that we're discussing did have an agreement by me to testify today about my original testimony and my supplemental testimony. But it was
limited to that. Otherwise, I'm just continuing to support Northern Pass, as I began to support it with Gary Long prior to the fund for the future being established in 2014, when I was first approached about supporting the Forward Fund.
Q. So would I be correct in saying that as part of receiving funding from Northern Pass Transmission or the Forward NH Fund, you were required to testify in this proceeding?
A. Yes, I agreed to testify to my prior
testimony today.
Q. Okay. Would I be correct in saying that with respect to future funding, there have been discussions but no documentation involved?
A. Future funding beyond where we are today?
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Q. Correct.
A. There have not been discussions about future funding beyond today. Although, the Forward Fund I think is a marvelous opportunity for the North Country of New Hampshire, and I'm pleased to have been able to take part in it.
Q. Okay. In your supplemental prefiled testimony, you state that, quote, "The Forward NH Fund's investment in our efforts have been vital," close quote. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Was funding from the Forward NH Fund necessary for the continued development of the Balsams?
A. Yes. I mean, you know, I would say decidedly yes. I think it's an extraordinary and important part of the Balsams being able to redevelop. We're in a very depressed area of the state, and the Forward Fund has been a big help to getting development moving.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Otten. I have no other questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I have
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municipal groups next on my list. Who's going to be asking questions? Ms. Pacik is grabbing a microphone.

MS. PACIK: We don't have any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I understand Ms. Saffo is not here for the Grafton County Commissioners.

Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests is up next. Mr. Reimers.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. REIMERS:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Otten.
A. Good morning.
Q. My name is Jason Reimers, and I represent the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. Mr. Pappas asked nearly all of my questions, but I want to follow up.

You testified that the Balsams received
the loan, the $\$ 2$ million loan, in
February 2016?
A. That's correct.
Q. And February 2016 was also when you filed
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your prefiled testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. You had not, prior to that, spoken publicly at an SEC public hearing or information session in favor of the Northern Pass, had you?
A. I'm not sure if $I$ had or hadn't. But $I$ don't have a recollection.
Q. Okay. And prior to filing your prefiled testimony, you had not spoken out publicly otherwise in favor of the Northern Pass, had you?
A. No, I had spoken on many different occasions to anyone that was in the audience about the development of the Balsams and Northern Pass. It was a continued topic of conversation. I think I addressed it with the Chamber or Commerce prior to that point.
Q. Do you know when that was --
A. Prior to that point.
Q. -- when you addressed it with the Chamber or Commerce?
A. Prior to 2016, the date that you said earlier.
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Q. Right. My question is: Do you recall when you addressed that with the Chamber of Commerce?
A. Prior to that date because I remember discussing with the Chamber or Commerce my position on Northern Pass. Prior to receiving the loan, my position was well known. And the local Chamber or Commerce, I sat down with their board of directors to discuss my position.
Q. And do you remember when you sat down with them?
A. I guess, to the best of my recollection, it was prior to receiving the loan.
Q. But you don't know how far in advance of receiving the loan that was?
A. I know it was prior to that. Several months, I assume. But I shouldn't be assuming things. But $I$ can tell you that it was prior to that date.
Q. Okay. So if it was several months, that would be in the early 2016, late 2015 time period?
A. I believe so, yes.
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Q. You first started talking with Northern Pass about a loan in October 2015?
A. Well, I started talking to them about a loan when they brought up the fact to me that they were looking at the Forward Fund, establishing it. But my association began with Gary Long in 2014, when he came to visit me at my --
Q. Let me interrupt. My question specifically was whether you had testified just a few minutes ago that the issue -- you started first talking about funding or a loan in October 2015. Did I hear that wrong?
A. Began to start talking -- well, not -- began to know of the existence of the Forward Fund for the future in October of 2015.
Q. Okay. And are you aware that --
A. I believe your question was had I spoken publicly prior to receiving a loan. And the answer to that is correct. So you've got two different dates. You've got a date in 2016 when we got a loan, and we have a date in 2015 when we began to speak about the Forward Fund. And what I'm saying is, prior to
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receiving the loan in 2016, I publicly spoke about my position with Northern Pass -- about Northern Pass.
Q. Correct. With the Chamber of Commerce.
A. That's correct.
Q. And that was a few months before you received the loan.
A. Yes.
Q. And then I followed up with a question asking you, just confirming that your testimony was that you first started talking about funding or a loan with Northern Pass in October 2015, and you answered that question.
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And are you aware that it was October 2015 that the Northern Pass submitted their application to the SEC?
A. I would have no reason to not agree to that.
Q. Okay.

MR. REIMERS: Dawn, can you turn on the ELMO, please?

BY MR. REIMERS:
Q. I'm showing you what has been marked as SPNHF 260. Do you see that?
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A. I do.
Q. Probably too small for you to read. Do you recall seeing this article in InDepthNh.org?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Is that you in the photo?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. And according to the article, this is you at a Northern Pass technical session. Do you recall attending that?
A. Yes. I believe that was in this room.
Q. Okay. And do you see the highlighted part here?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to read that to you. "When pressed by Attorney Amy Manzelli, who represents the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, if his support of the Project was necessary to receive the loan, Otten answered, 'The loan? No.'
"'Was anything else provided to the Balsams conditioned upon your support?' Manzelli asked?
"Otten responded, 'There are no other documents that I'm going to discuss or talk
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about at this juncture. And I do not feel I need to support Northern Pass for any reason other than $I$ believe it's beneficial to me and my business.'"

So when you were asked about the loan and whether there were other documents, you said, "There are no other documents that I'm going to discuss or talk about at this juncture." What documents were you referring to?
A. I assume perhaps I'm talking about the actual loan documents, which were not part of the questioning.
Q. If the question was about the loan and you were referring to "other documents," why wouldn't you talk about them at that time?

MR. BELIVEAU: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to object to this line of questioning. An order has been issued by the Chair with regard to essentially the conversations that took place at the technical sessions. And this newspaper article is allegedly reporting on that session and is providing quoted remarks. Attorney is questioning him about those remarks. I'm not
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sure where he's going with it or what his purpose is, but I think we need to be mindful that he's in technical session right now.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think we are all mindful of that. I suspect Attorney Reimers is mindful of that and is trying to stay away from violating the terms of the order. I'm not sure he's close yet.

But Mr. Reimers, what do you have in mind here?

MR. REIMERS: I'm nearly done.
I wanted to find out if there were other documents. And I was careful not to use this for impeachment.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, I
think that was the limitation, largely. So you may continue.

BY MR. REIMERS:
Q. So when there were documents that you wouldn't discuss at that juncture, is it your testimony that you were simply referring to loan documents and nothing else?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Are there other documents that would have
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 44 MORNING Session ONLY] \{10-6-17\}
been responsive to that question besides loan documents?
A. Not in relation to the question. But there were drafts of the Forward Fund for the future that were available at that time that we were looking at. But there were no documents other than our loan documents. I believe so. I believe my answer is correct and would stand by it.

MR. REIMERS: That's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next on my list are the AMC and CLF, although I don't see -- Mr. Kimball, is anyone here to ask --

MR. KIMBALL: We have no questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. That's simple enough.

Mr. Baker, I have you next.
MR. BAKER: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. BAKER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Otten. We've met briefly
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at a couple of places. It's nice to see you again.

I represent four property owners in the North Country who are opposed to the Northern Pass, unlike you. And I have a few preliminary questions for you.
A. Certainly.
Q. Your supplemental prefiled testimony states that you are the "lead developer" behind the Balsams Resort. What does that term mean?
A. The buck stops here.
Q. So you're in charge of the operation.
A. Correct. That's -- yeah.
Q. Are there any other developers other than the organizations that you own or control?
A. No, there are not.
Q. Okay. And it states in your supplemental testimony that you're acting on behalf of two different entities: One is Dixville Capital, LLC, a limited liability company, and the other is Balsams Resort Holdings, LLC, also a limited liability company. Could you tell us just briefly what those two entities do in this operation, as far as their roles in
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have several different companies that are all under the same umbrella, and I'm not -- I want to give you the right answer. But Dixville Capital and Dixville Resort Holdings, for purposes of the development take different roles, but they're one in the same.
Q. You said Dixville Resort Holdings. Your supplemental prefiled testimony says it's Balsams Resort Holdings. Is there a difference?
A. No. I stand corrected. Balsams Resort Holdings would be correct. Dixville Capital and Balsams Resort Holdings.
Q. And is Balsams Resort Holdings formed under the laws of Delaware?
A. I'm not certain of that.
Q. Do you know when it first registered to do business in New Hampshire?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Would it surprise you to know it was after you filed your prefiled supplemental testimony?
A. No.
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Q. Do either of these two companies own any real estate in Dixville Notch?
A. No, they do not.
Q. Do you have any interest in any of the entities that own the real estate in Dixville Notch that the Balsams Resort is trying to develop?
A. I do.
Q. Which entities do you own that own part of or own real estate involved in this project?
A. I believe the primary is something called Balsams View.
Q. And you own all or a part of that?
A. A part of that.
Q. And did you acquire that from Mr. -- I'm going to pronounce his name and I hope I get it right -- Dagesse?
A. Dagesse. But yes, I did.
Q. That was relatively recently. That was after you filed your prefiled supplemental testimony, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. When your development entities received the \$2 million wire transfer in February of 2016,
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it was not called a loan at that time, was it?
A. It was a loan.
Q. Well, publicly it was not called a loan, was it?
A. I'm not sure what it was -- it was an investment, a loan to our entity. I'm not sure what --
Q. Well, you testified there were no strings attached, didn't you?
A. Strings attached to what, sir?
Q. When you testified before the Site Evaluation Committee in March of 2016 at hearings in Colebrook and in Concord, did you not state that there were no strings attached to this money?
A. That's correct.
Q. And nothing was said at those hearings about this being a loan; correct?
A. I don't... I'm not -- I have no recollection. But clearly this was an investment in the form of a loan, has publicly always been so. That's just what it was.
Q. Okay. So, whether or not it was stated, it
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was in fact a loan as far as all parties were concerned when the wire transfer was made in February; am I correct?
A. It was a loan. And yes.
Q. And the expectation was that the entities that received the money would pay it back someday; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And they would pay it back with interest, or just the principal?

MR. BELIVEAU: Objection, your
Honor. Terms of the loan.
MR. BAKER: Well, I think it's
very important for the Committee to understand how this loan may have some continuing influence on Mr. Otten and his organization, and therefore he may be testifying in ways that he hopes will make the holder of the loan, the obligee -Northern Pass --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The people he owes the money to.

MR. BAKER: Exactly. So if they had a string to pull the money back, I think it's important for the Committee to understand
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that.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Can the money be pulled back?

WITNESS OTTEN: No.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next question.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q. So it's not a loan.
A. It's a loan.
Q. And the answer is the money can't be pulled back? Is that what you just said?
A. That's correct.
Q. Well, what makes it a loan if the money can't be pulled back?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: When you borrow money to buy a car, you use that money. You give it to the dealer and then you pay the people who gave you the loan back. There's no pulling of money. I'm having trouble with the terminology, and I suspect he is, too. He has to pay back a loan $I$ think is what he's saying.

MR. BAKER: Right. I think that the loan terms -- and obviously I disagree with the ruling the Committee made, but I do
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understand it. But I think the Committee needs to understand what the terms are that require repayment of this loan.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Let's
talk about the terms that require repayment of the loan without using phrases that don't mean anything in the context of a loan. "Pulling money back" out of a loan is not even a term that makes any sense.

MR. BAKER: I understand the -CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So let's use terms that makes sense in the context of a loan and see what those terms are.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q. What are the terms for repayment of this loan?

MR. BELIVEAU: I have to object.
The law of the case is that there will be no questioning regarding terms and conditions of the loan. Repayment terms are terms of the loan.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: He has to repay the loan.

MR. BELIVEAU: He's already
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> testified that it's a loan that needs to be repaid.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: What more do you need to know?

MR. BAKER: Well, I thought he just testified that there is no repayment obligation on this loan.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, that's not what he said. He responded to a meaningless phrase that you used, and he said that meaningless phrase doesn't exist. There's no ability to "pull the money back." That's what he said.

MR. BAKER: I understand now that
the Committee feels the phrase I used was meaningless. I disagree. But you're making a ruling, and $I$ understand it.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q. So the loan does have to be repaid someday; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And which entities are obligated to repay the loan?
A. The entity that received the loan.
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Q. The entities that don't own the real estate; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Are there any guarantors of the repayment of this loan?
A. No.

MR. BELIVEAU: Same objection.
MR. BAKER: Asked and answered.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
Sustained.
MR. BAKER: I'll take the answer. BY MR. BAKER:
Q. All right. Moving along, I'd just like to go just through the chronology briefly with you. In early February of 2016, your counsel filed a motion for permission to allow your two development companies to intervene in these proceedings; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in that motion there was nothing said about whether or not you supported or opposed the Northern Pass through these development companies; is that correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. On February 10th, approximately, you received a wire transfer from Northern Pass for \$2 million; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then subsequently you appeared before this Committee at two hearings, public hearings, and testified that you were in support of the Northern Pass. Both of those hearings were in early March. The record has transcripts of those hearings.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, about a year later, Mr. Quinlan appears and testifies here and says that it's not $\$ 2$ million, that it's actually \$5 million; correct?
A. If that's what he testified to.
Q. Do you dispute his testimony, assuming he testified to that?
A. No.
Q. And has the full $\$ 5$ million been advanced or just the $\$ 2$ million, or something in between?
A. In between.
Q. So you've received more than $\$ 2$ million, but not the full five.
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A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And after that, within approximately six weeks you buy out Mr. Dagesse, who owns half the real estate involved in this project; correct?
A. Yes. Well, I have to --
Q. There's no question pending, sir.
A. No, I misspoke. I'm under oath. I misspoke.
Q. You want to correct --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, let's correct whatever you misspoke.

MR. BAKER: I have no problem with that.
A. I am different than the entity. So the LLC entity that received the $\$ 2$ million and part of the $\$ 3$ million is a different entity than I am. I misspoke in my answer to you. Those entities did not buy. I personally bought. BY MR. BAKER:
Q. I understand. You personally bought out Mr . Dagesse. In an insider transaction, you paid him money, and you got the benefit of his interest in that real estate; correct?
A. That's correct.
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Q. All right. And you haven't guaranteed repayment of the loan; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, on your web page --
A. Which loan? Okay. Go ahead.
Q. Yeah, I did mean personally. You personally have not guaranteed the loan; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. So on your web page, the disclosure statement for the investors in the condominium project are told that the developer does not have to build any of this project out, that it may never get built. Do you recall that from the disclosure statement on your web site?
A. I'll take your word that it's there. I haven't refreshed myself with that legal detail. But $I$ assume there's a disclaimer there.
Q. Yeah, I'll put it slightly differently. The developers have reserved the rights with the people who've put these refundable deposits up not to build anything; correct?
A. That's correct.
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MR. BAKER: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next on my list is Mr. Palmer. Is anybody here from Palmer's group? I don't see anyone.

Ms. Menard.
MS. MENARD: Our questions have been answered. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Crane.
MS. TOWNSEND: Hi, it's Ms.
Townsend today, and our questions also have been answered.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Do any of the other intervenor groups -- Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I have just a few questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You want to do them from there?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, I can do them from here.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. CUNNINGHAM :
Q. Art Cunningham. I represent Kevin Spencer
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and Mark Legasse, who are building the Percy Lodge and Campground in Stark, New Hampshire. Are you familiar with those gentlemen?
A. No, sir, I'm not.
Q. Or the Percy Lodge?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. I just have a few questions from Page 84 to 87 or 88 in your prefiled testimony. You talk about the electricity needs for the Balsams.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And before the Balsams closed, where did the resort obtain its electricity?
A. From the Coos Co-op from Colebrook, the west side of Dixville.
Q. And does that Co-op have a connection with the Coos Loop?
A. I believe it does.
Q. And in conjunction with your proposed
development, where do you anticipate --
should the development proceed, where do you propose to obtain your electricity?
A. That goes back to the conversation that $I$ had -- the answer to that is, in the spring
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of 2014 I was approached by Gary Long, who heard that we were redeveloping at the Balsams, and he came to my office. I have an energy company, an alternative energy company in Bethel, Maine. He came to my office there to discuss the potential of bringing service to the Balsams Resort, based on what he had read in reports that we were considering doing. At that time we discussed the needs of the Balsams. And that led to an ongoing conversation, which then led to an interest that I had in supporting green energy. And my support of Northern Pass began in the spring of 2014. And that history was how I got involved. And our project initially will need somewhere around 10-megawatts of power, and literally we would be sucking twice as much power from the Coos Loop as possible. So we began discussions about my being a customer and Eversource being able to help provide power. And that's the discussion and sort of the rest of the story of the Coos Loop and the Balsams.
Q. And I see from Page 87 of your prefiled
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testimony that you anticipate perhaps using as much as 25 megawatts of electricity should the development proceed.
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Well, I think I already know the answer, that none of that electricity will come from the Northern Pass transmission lines, will it?
A. No, not directly.
Q.

It'll all come from the Coos Loop.
A. It will all come from the Coos Loop. But I think that's -- to answer that definitively that way I think is incorrect. When you shake an electron in Danbury, Connecticut, the value of shaking that electron in

Danbury, Connecticut may be the lights in the building this today. So to say that a 1,000-plus megawatts of power coming from Canada isn't going to be consumed at the Balsams I think is sort of a short-circuit, if you will, of how the power grid is built. My expectation is that all of New Hampshire residents, as well as the Balsams, will save 5 percent against current power needs by the decreasing costs, to say nothing of the
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cleaner atmosphere, giving up the equivalent coal-fired tonnage of CO2 that would be out there. So I do think there is direct linkage. There's direct linkage as well from power purchase agreements that can be made not only by my company, but by other businesses in New Hampshire who can benefit from sustainable hydropower that's available 24/7. So --
Q. Let's look at your immediate deal with respect to the Coos Loop. Have you been asked to contribute to the upgrade of the Coos Loop?
A. The discussion about --
Q. Just answer my question, please. Have you been asked to contribute to what I understand from Bill Quinlan's testimony is the $\$ 50$ million upgrade to the Coos Loop?
A. As a paying customer, I am anticipating paying for power. That's what they do --
Q. No. Answer my question. Have you been asked to contribute to the $\$ 50$ million upgrade to the Coos Loop like other business owners in that area have been asked to do?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 44 MORNING Session ONLY] \{10-6-17\}

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Other than as a ratepayer.
A. No.

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:
Q. And did Mr . Long or Mr . Quinlan represent what obligation you would have with respect to the Coos Loop beyond being an ultimate ratepayer?
A. The expectation was that we would be signing an agreement with them to buy our power through their transmission lines.
Q. So you have not been asked to make any capital contribution to that $\$ 50$ million upgrade?
A. Well, first of all, I'm not aware that it's a \$50 million upgrade. I don't believe there are any final plans yet. And no, I haven't been asked to do anything specifically other than to guarantee to be a ratepayer, to pay my, you know, service.
Q. And what, if any, discussions have there been about you being a ratepayer off of the Coos Loop should the Coos Loop be completed?
A. Discussions about being a ratepayer.
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Q. Just a couple more questions. What's the status of the development?
A. We're in the final phases of our financing and meeting our goals with permits, and we're hopeful of starting the project soon.
Q. And I notice in your prefiled testimony that you were looking to raise some, what, \$124 million?
A. The total project cost is a little bit north of that.
Q. Hundred and 43 million $I$ think you said.
A. Yeah, it's north of that, and we're in the process of raising that.
Q. And where are you in terms of dollars with respect to that goal?

MR. BELIVEAU: Those type of details $I$ think are fair to be kept confidential at this point as it relates to his project, so I object to the question.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Cunningham.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: I withdraw the question. That's all the questions I have, Mr . Chair.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Are there any other intervenor groups who had questions for Mr. Otten?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
We're ready for questions from the Subcommittee. We'll start to my right. Ms. Weathersby. QUESTIONS FROM THE SEC COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SEC COUNSEL:

BY MR. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Good morning, Mr . Otten. Patricia Weathersby. I'm a public member on the Site Evaluation Committee.
A. Good morning.
Q. I have just one question for you. In your testimony there's definitely an emphasis on the environmental aspects of Northern Pass and your goal to make the Balsams kind of a green resort. I'm wondering -- I saw that I think you're planning on a biomass energy facility as well at the Balsams; is that correct?
A. Yes, we'd like to supply some of the hot water using biomass. That's correct.
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Q. Other than that facility, what other efforts do you intend to make to have the Balsams Resort be energy-independent or more green?
A. Certainly the biomass for heat will be a major component of that. The older buildings are all being re-skinned and insulated and resealed and with all new window systems put in them to become more energy-efficient. The new buildings being designed are being designed to be heated in the most efficient way possible. Our business depends on being able to buy power purchase agreements whenever possible. We'd like to buy them from green sources, wind or hydro. We're trying to arrange our snowmaking systems so that they can take advantage of low-cost, easily available power later at night to sort of change the way they're built so that we aren't using power during peak periods. Charging stations, things of that nature, will be part of the resort.
Q. Okay. So what I'm hearing is you're making a lot of efforts to be more efficient, but not
a lot of generation of power at the resort,
solar, wind, et cetera, other than the biomass facility for heat; is that correct?
A. We have 21 megs of wind power visible from most of our resort on the mountain peaks, and we are in discussions with Brookfield to be able to buy some of that power that they can't ship out. Right now they're constrained to a degree with the lines that are available coming up from Berlin to Dummer. Those lines -- if our project gets built, those lines get upgraded, and they actually then have the ability to pump more of their wind power out. We would like to be able to buy some of that. Because of our location, we're not an ideal spot for solar. It's a very snowy, cloudy place for much of the year, and it's dark for much of the year, so solar doesn't really make a lot of sense for us. Wind is there. And the only thing that's really left at this point that's viable economically is thermal biomass. And I own a thermal biomass company in Maine, and if $I$ can cross-pollinate that, $I$ will.
Q. Thank you.
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A. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner Bailey.

CMSR. BAILEY: Thank you.
BY COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. My name is Kate Bailey, and I'm a

Commissioner at the Public Utilities Commission.

To follow up on Ms. Weathersby's question about the wind power, if you obtain wind power from Brookfield, will you have to build infrastructure to get it to your resort?
A. By their very nature, as I'm sure you know, the fluctuations and the variations of wind power make it very difficult to take that power directly. So that power needs to go down to Dummer. And then in order for us to take advantage of it, the line from Dummer south needs to be rebuilt, and then we would be hopeful, with Eversource and Coos, that the northern loop that serves all the
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businesses in the region would benefit by the lines being built up through Errol, over through Dixville and then back down into Colebrook.
Q. So I think what you're saying is that infrastructure needs to be built to get power from the wind farm and from Eversource.
A. Yes.
Q. And when it gets to your property, will it be buried?
A. When it gets to our property, it will go above ground through the ski land, which is to the south of Dixville State Park, and go up over what's known as Dixville Peak, through that Dixville Peak and the Table Rock Ridge. That will be an above-ground line.
Q. And then does it ever go underground?
A. Yeah, you know, at local, once you're --
Q. In the village?
A. Yeah, once you're in the inside, it's buried.
Q. So, the distribution facilities --
A. The transmission, the larger transmission portion is above ground, and then the local distribution is underground.
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Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. You're welcome.
Q. Will your project have to pay for any of the transmission facilities that have to be built to get the power you need there?
A. That hasn't been determined at this time.

We're hopeful that the overall need of the community and the new load will support the transmission work that needs to be done -- or the distribution work that needs to be done. Q. Okay.

CMSR. BAILEY: Sandy, can you
pull up that Counsel for the Public exhibit that shows the resort from the web page? I don't remember the number of that exhibit. 580? Thank you.

MS . MERRIGAN: 584.
CMSR. BAILEY: 584. Thank you.
BY COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
Q. Mr. Otten, assume hypothetically that that red line that comes down the mountain -- do you see it --
A. Yes.
Q. -- was the transmission line. Would that
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have an impact on the real estate value in the development?
A. If that red line was a transmission line, that's a very hypothetical --
Q. Very hypothetical. Totally hypothetical.
A. -- question. And I can only say at this time I don't know because it's a hypothetical and --
Q. I know, but I want you to assume for purposes of the question that that was a transmission line. I'm just trying to see whether you think visibility of a transmission line would never have an impact, or it depends on where it is. So, assume that that is the transmission line.
A. If it pleased the Commissioner, this is a hypothetical, and my initial reaction is that the answer would be that it would depend.
Q. On what?
A. On placement of towers, size of the cut. I mean, that particular line is going to be a gondola line, which will be probably a 60-foot-wide swath filled with towers and cables going up and down. The purpose of
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that will be very visually mechanical, but will be pleasing to the user because of what it's accomplishing. If that transmission line that you talk of was there for the purpose of providing power to the whole resort and people wanted to be at the resort, I think that they might not be offended by seeing that transmission line.

I think it really -- what's really so interesting to me in this entire proceeding is when I look at a hydro transmission line. I see something that I like to see because of what it represents. It doesn't offend me. If I was looking at that, I have -- the business I've been in for many years was once taken under question because a ski lift line was going to be seen from the Appalachian Trail and that the person walking the Appalachian Trail didn't want to see that. But if that person was a skier, they would want to see it. So you're asking me certainly hypothetically what would I see. But it's the use of what I'm seeing that would make the difference to me. And again,
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my outlook on this is, from being in the renewable energy business, when I see a transmission line and you tell me it's moving green hydropower on it, it's not offensive to me. If I saw the same line being built to service a coal plant, it would be. So this is, to a great degree, in the eye of the user or the beholder, which is why I don't really think I'd be offended by seeing that as a hydro line if it was there to provide the needed power, green power to run the resort. I'm going to be looking at that line as a gondola line with eight or ten towers and cables and all mechanical devices.
Q. So if the gondola line were expanded by

150 feet and we put the Northern Pass towers next to the gondola line, that wouldn't offend you?
A. No, if you could ski underneath it.
Q. Okay. All right. I think your testimony is that you're really in favor of renewables, and that's because of the carbon reduction; is that correct?
A. Yeah, part -- yes, in great part.
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Q. Is that the biggest part?
A. No. Actually, my father was born in 1886, before we used gasoline to run cars. My perspective on fossil fuels is that our society has consumed what it took the planet 500 million years to make in the heartbeat of time between when my father was born and my grandchild will die, which seems to me to be an abhorrent use of a resource. Whenever I see something that is using those things, I would like to see something different. So when I look at a hydro power line, wherever it is, I see something that represents a move towards a cleaner society, moving away from using fossil fuels, moving away from CO2. I'm not a climate denier. I don't run around every day of the week and tell people to shut their cars off. But if we have a choice of how we're going to live, I prioritize green energy over non-green energy, which means, again, when $I$ see a hydro line, it's something that I like to see.
Q. So you think that this project will reduce the carbon footprint of the planet.
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A. I do, yes.
Q. Okay. Would it change your opinion of the Project if the resource that will be delivered over this line is currently being delivered to Ontario or New York, so we've already gotten the benefit from the carbon reduction and we're just shifting it?
A. Well, I'm not aware of that. There's a -you're asking me to take what you're saying.
Q. Assume just hypothetically if that's the case. I don't even know if it's true.
A. Hypothetically, I would have to know whether this is a better route, whether this is more efficient, whether it was going to get the power closer to the customers, whether it was going to benefit people. What coal plants was it going to replace? Hypothetically, if you're just swapping one line for another line, hypothetically, you might change my opinion. But from the knowledge that I have, this 1090 megawatts is currently not being consumed by the marketplace, and it will replace over 1,000 megawatts of power that is fossil-based. And that's the lens that I'm
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looking at this in.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I have one more area that I just want to ask you about.

In Line 93 in your original prefiled testimony, you estimated that having access to this low-cost hydro would save the resort about $\$ 200,000$ a year over current prices.
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you explain to me how you figured that out? What were the prices that you assumed were current, and how much of a reduction did you believe that this would provide?
A. We estimated what we thought our power bill would look like after we completed the first phase of the resort.
Q. Based on what prices?
A. Based on current prices. But with time, everything seems to be inflating. So, as a benchmark --
Q. Okay. So what prices were current when you made this calculation?
A. I think the average kilowatt was in the 16,
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16-1/2-cent range.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, we're one of the, what, third or fourth highest cost of electricity in the nation.
Q. But does a big business pay 16-1/2 cents per kilowatt hour?
A. No, and that's part of the time-of-day usage, source, power purchase agreements. But as a baseline, we looked at what our power bill would be, and I asked my staff to estimate that to me. And I did take at face value, without questioning very deeply, Eversource's prediction that this would save the average customer 5 percent.
Q. Okay. So you just took 5 percent off whatever your staff believed you would have to pay for energy.
A. That's correct.
Q. So it may not be 16-1/2 cents a kilowatt hour. It would be whatever the commercial rate that they thought they were going to --
A. Correct.
Q. -- achieve and then reduced it by 5 percent.
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. And then the other piece of that was, in all the time that I've been in business, in the resort business, we had the ability to work with power purchase agreements. And we assumed, I hope correctly, that Hydro-Quebec would be an entity that we would be able to do business with and buy directly from them and that that would additionally get our costs down. But that was -- there was no definitive agreement. There was discussion that led me to that opinion.
Q. Has there been any further discussion about that?
A. No, there has not.
Q. Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.
A. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Wright.
BY DIR. WRIGHT:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Otten. Craig Wright with the Department of Environmental Services. You mentioned a personal belief that moving to a clean energy future is important to you;
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is that correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Do you believe that electric vehicles represent a cleaner energy future?
A. I think it depends on the source of the electricity. So there's an efficiency gain against fossil fuel using electricity that's created with fossil fuel. My company now is introducing a mini CHP pellet boiler that's 90-percent efficient, that can produce 12 to 15 kilowatts of heat and 1 kilowatt of electricity at the same time. That's from trees. So that would mean that you could drive your car the equivalent of 40-cent-a-gallon gas if you took the electricity that came from that unit as you bring in your house. So, in that instance, I would say an electric car is great because it can take advantage of electricity produced in your own back yard. If the electricity is produced inefficiently with biomass -- and again I'm kind of getting my old-line politics about this out on the table. But if it's biomass and it's electricity and it's
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produced at the source with a 30-percent efficiency -- in order words, 70 percent of the biomass isn't used to create the electricity, and that's the electricity you're using to put in your car, well, now you really haven't gained anything. So this is hopefully going to be a system of two steps forward and only one step back. But as we move to electric-powered vehicles at the same time if we're moving to solar, thermal biomass, anything that's produced with high efficiency, then we're going to be gaining on the CO2 problem.
Q. Okay. Let's assume for a minute that -we've definitely seen a "greening" of the power grid in New England with the phaseout of coal-fired power plants in New England; correct?
A. Yes, but we have replaced a lot of it with gas, which also, your definition -- of course, the definition of "clean" comes into play. So, natural gas doesn't produce the sulfurs and the atmospheric problems that, you know, ruin the finish on your car, but
they're still a CO2, still a carbon-based fuel and has a limited future. It's been talked as a "transition fuel" in many of the things that I've read. And in that instance it's great. What are we transitioning to?

We need to transition to something that's truly renewable.
Q. I would agree with that statement.

Do you plan on investing in EV charging at your resort?
A. Yes. Absolutely. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. You mentioned that part of your business model is to attract a wide variety of people to your resort, including snowmobilers and ATVs; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there currently a network of trails at the Balsams Resort?
A. Yeah, there are two networks, actually. There's a network of snowmobile trails that crosses the property and ATV trails that crosses the property.
Q. And they connect to parcels of land outside of the property as well?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 44 MORNING Session ONLY] \{10-6-17\}
A. They connect, from what I understand, I haven't spent much time on them, they connect to 1,000 miles of trails that takes you up and down New Hampshire, into Quebec, and as far up as Montreal.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I assume that would be important if you're trying to attract those type of people, that you have that network available to them.
A. And I recently read a blurb that Bombardier was having an EV-powered four-wheeler instead of gasoline-powered. So I think that a whole bunch of people are thinking about getting green.
Q. I can say as an ice fisherman, I switched a couple years ago to a battery-powered auger versus gasoline-powered, and I would never go back. So batteries do work.

Just one more area of questioning. In your prefiled testimony, you tout the carbon benefits of this project. And you throw out a number of 3.3 million tons, and that would be the equivalent of removing 690,000 cars from the highways in the region. Those are
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numbers we've heard before. Are those numbers you got from Julia Frayer?
A. No, I didn't. Actually, those numbers -- I'm part owner of a company called Future Metrics, and we deal globally with thermal biomass and benefits of carbon reduction. And we work for DREX and Sumitomo and Hancock around the world providing and collecting data for them.

That prefiled testimony, my supplemental testimony, actually, corrected what I said. I missed it by about 50 percent. So the impact was closer to $\$ 1.2$ million cars a year coming off the road by switching to hydropower from coal.
Q. Okay. I'm glad you went there, 'cause that's where $I$ was going to go next. In your supplemental testimony, you mentioned, or you kind of upped those numbers by making the assumption that you're displacing -- the 1,000 megawatts from this line would displace 1,000 megawatts of coal. Is that how you basically came up with that?
A. Yes. Yes, it is.
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Q. Is that a realistic scenario in New England, do you know?
A. Well, I think it's honest to say that if this 1,000 megawatts doesn't come in, that it's either going to be produced with undefined natural gas or the continuation of coal. So I don't think $I$ can definitively say that this line will take 1.2 million cars off the road. What I can say is, if those 1.2 million cars were to run on coal, they would produce that tonnage which would support 1.2 million cars. So $I$ did make the assumption that the hydropower was replacing coal power.
Q. Okay. I read that in your testimony. Thank you.
A. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Oldenburg.
BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Otten. My name's Bill

Oldenburg, and $I$ work for the Department of Transportation.

My questions basically revolve around
the resort and your expertise with tourism.
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We heard a lot about the possible negative impacts on tourism that the line would have. And as a resort owner, and I notice the list of especially ski resorts that you own, did you ever start any of those from scratch, or did you buy them already in operation?
A. I bought them in operation with the following caveat, that when I bought Sunday River, it was doing 30,000 skier visits a year and it grew to 550,000; and when I bought the Canyons, it was doing about 15,000 skier visits a year, and it's now grown to approximately half a million now. So I've done both buying existing and basically starting things from scratch. But I've never -- to your point, this is the first time, with the Balsams, that I've ever attempted to do something that -- there was a ski area at the Balsams that was basically closed, where there was nothing.
Q. So when you start or maybe an expansion of an existing ski area or starting one, what are the typical complaints that you might get from abutters of the community? I'm thinking
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of things probably like traffic.
A. Traffic, yeah.
Q. Do you get complaints maybe about water use, like for snowmaking?
A. There have been -- yes. Actually, I believe that $I$ can give you a large list of things that people complain about, because it seems there's always somebody that wants to complain about something. But noise from snowmaking, snow cats belching diesel fuel, loud concerts, water resources. Back in 1973, we were, with the oil embargo, we were accused of being a luxury item that no one would want, and everybody that needed a gallon of gas that couldn't get one was against having tourists come up and try to buy gasoline. So there's a litany of things that people complain about.
Q. So that's the community around. But the folks that you get, that want to come to your resort, you probably have to do some sort of benefit-cost ratio type of thing of will they like this or will it detract from them coming. So, you know, I think of, you know,
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the Balsams as going to have these great views, it's going to have a ski area in the back, probably going to have night skiing. So are the lights from the night skiing going to detract from the scenic view from the resort? Obviously, a lot of resorts have skiing and things like that. So there's an analysis that you would go through for the target base of people, whether that amenity is going to draw people or detract people from going to your resort, I would assume; right?
A. Yeah. So if I can take your statement and sort of put a question and answer behind it, we have -- one of the criteria that we have to develop the Balsams is to see whether or not people would actually buy what we were selling, which is the whole process of preselling real estate, planning the resort out, find out what the customer base would look like.

So, every customer -- not every
customer. Ninety percent of the customers that have come up to work with us drive up
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through Colebrook, drive up Route 3 until they turn right on 26, and they all see the same signs that say, "Kiss my ass, Northern Pass." And if you live in our neck of the woods, that's the billboard that you see. One guy has kind of a green and a blue sign that says, "I like renewable power." But that's the predominance of it.

So my answers to you are based on the guests' reactions that we've had. And that's one of the first things that the guests say when they come up, "What's the deal with Northern Pass?" And we explain what it is, and we explain that you can see the wind towers from the ski area and be able to see the Northern Pass line from the golf course. It will be out there. You'll see that. And it has not affected in any way that we can see, it hasn't negatively affected people's interest being on the property.

So I was previously questioned by a gentleman that was trying to sort of confine my answer to the people that were staying in hotel rooms or just in that one piece of
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space, and no, they can't see it. But if you took the tour that we take people on, we tour them through the golf course, through the ski area, through everything so they get a feeling, and we point out to them where Northern Pass would be. So it's not something that's being buried or shoveled under the table. But in our judgment, it hasn't affected those people who are interested in our product.
Q. And I think you see it at least to some degree. So the Mount Washington Resort, right across the street is Bretton Woods. So you can see that. I'm assuming that if that was a distraction from the folks staying at Mount Washington, that would be an issue and you would hear of that. So there seems to be a co-mingling of uses that don't detract. But one of the things we talked about a little bit with the aesthetics -- and I'm not sure. I can't remember who it was now. All these days are going together. We were at Coleman State Park, and we were talking about the uses that go on there. And there's
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similar uses that $I$ think are going to go on at your resort. You have people who are going to go to hike and people who are going to go to stay and people who are going to go to ATV and people who are going to go visit, fishing and boating and things like that. And there's different levels of impact that those folks would have; like an ATVer might not recognize the line, a utility line or a transmission line being a negative, but the hiker might. So there's an assessment, I'm assuming, you make as the owner that is the give and take of whether or not a use is going to detract from visitors coming.

So, like an example is we were up at the Mountain View Grand Resort, which is very old, has the golf course, has everything else. But right next to it is a windmill. Here you've got this historic building and a modern windmill right next to it. I'm sure somebody, an owner like yourself, went through and said, Is that going to detract? Is somebody not going to come to the hotel or my resort because of that windmill? Is that
reasonable to assume that that happens?
A. I think this is the interesting thing about this proceeding. "In the eye of the beholder" I think is the question you're really asking, if I can put words in your mouth.
Q. Right.
A. So if you're at Vail in Colorado and you look into the valley, you see giant transmission lines and you see a six-lane highway which doesn't detract at all from the resort at Vail, because it couldn't exist without that being there. If you're at Okemo and you look out across the valley, you see a transmission line. If you live in South Pond Shore in Greenwood, Maine, a mile down the lake from my dock is the transmission line that serves Sunday River ski area, that incidentally got built after my house was there. Now, that transmission line was serving my business.

So I think it's important in all these proceedings, for me, if I'm being asked, you're getting my opinion. I'm one man, and I have a goal for the state of New Hampshire,
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to try to build an extraordinary resort. Will I succeed? I can't sit in front of you and tell you that I'll succeed. What I can tell you, in my opinion, is that the Northern Pass Line is not the impediment to my success. And that's all I can testify to. I can't go beyond that, because beyond that doesn't really involve me.

So, the impact of the initially 600 jobs and 400 construction jobs and potentially 2,000 jobs from my project are not being put in jeopardy. There are a lot of other things that we have to conquer to be successful. But the Northern Pass line is not, in my opinion, objectionable.
Q. Okay.

MR. OLDENBURG: That's all the questions I have.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Way.
BY MR. WAY:
Q. Good morning, Mr . Otten. So, just to pick up on what Mr . Oldenburg said, the one thing I've learned about ski areas, or at least ski trails, is that they're somewhat fluid in
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their development, that as you go along, whether it be the permitting process, the design stage, there's going to be tweaking one way or another; correct?
A. When you build the ski trail?
Q. Yes.
A. You try to -- ski trails are like building a ride. You want to make it as adventurous and as fun as you can. So you do the best you can to use the terrain to make the trail as good as you can make it.
Q. But if you hit a wetland or the potential of a wetland over here, you say, well, can we go over here to avoid the wetland?
A. Unless you can get the Army Corps to agree with you. But actually, Mr. Way, in that particular case, a ski lift trail that goes across a wetland, as long as the trail remains, the wetland remains on the trail. As long as you don't fill it, as long as you're skiing over it, it's not an unacceptable use. So you can ski over a wetland.
Q. But my point is there's factors that come
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into account that may cause you to tweak or nudge or to design things a little bit differently as the process goes.
A. You mean like is there a ledge outcropping that you avoid?
Q. Right. So I guess my question is: As you're designing this. And you know that deep in the distance or close in the distance that you may see a power line or a transmission line, did that impact whether you would put the trail this way or that you could go over here and avoid seeing that altogether? Did that play any -- was that --
A. No.
Q. -- a factor?
A. No, it did not factor.
Q. And the wind turbines that are up there, and I've seen the wind turbines, are you having ski trails within sight of those wind turbines?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. Did you try to design it -- I would imagine you designed your trails obviously for safety and safety concerns. But did you design the
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trails to minimize the view of those turbines, or was that a factor?
A. No.
Q. In terms of people that are coming here that you say they learn about the Northern Pass, and you talk to them about the Northern Pass, and maybe they put a deposit down and then they go back and they may think about it, has anyone asked for their deposit back after thinking about it and then stated that maybe there was some concerns?
A. Because of Northern Pass?
Q. Yeah. Right.
A. There was one gentleman and his wife, who was a teacher in the Londonderry area, who came up, and after seeing the signs were dismayed, briefly withdrew their deposit, went home, called back a couple days later and changed their mind and went ahead with their deposit.

So, as I said, there are hundreds of these people that are seeing this. And, you know, they're more attuned to the controversy than they are to the actual power line. So I can't say with a hundred percent certainty
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that the $\$ 25$ million worth of deposits that we have wouldn't be greater. I'll never know. But there's only been one instance when it was brought to our attention. And in that particular instance, we showed them and talked about it, and they decided that they were fine.
Q. Thank you.

MR. WAY: No further questions. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.

Iacopino.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. I just have one set of questions, just jumping off what Mr. Way asked you.

On the mountain itself, okay, not down where the buildings are, but up on the mountain, $I$ assume that there are summer uses up there that you're going to be using for non-skiing season uses beyond just the ATV trails; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And that's all sold as part of the package to the folks buying your units?
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A. Yes.
Q. And these deposits that you're talking about, are you taking those deposits under regulation of the Attorney General's Office? Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And do you disclose to your buyers the fact that the Northern Pass may be visible from parts of the property?
A. Yes, we talk about it. It's general conversation.
Q. Okay.

MR. IACOPINO: I have no other questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: My questions have been answered.

Do you have any further
questions for your witness?
MR. BELIVEAU: No.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
I think we are done with you, Mr. Otten. Thank you very much.

We will take a ten-minute
break.
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(Recess was taken at 10:53 a.m. and the hearing resumed at 11:10 a.m.) CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Pappas, you ready to call your first witnesses? MR. PAPPAS: We are, Mr.

Chairman.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I see
they're in place.
(WHEREUPON, THOMAS KAVET AND NICOLAS
ROCKLER were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PAPPAS :
Q. Gentlemen, please introduce yourselves for the Committee.
A. (Kavet) My name is Tom Kavet. I'm President of Kavet, Rockler \& Associates.
A. (Rockler) And my name is Nicolas Rockler, and I'm CEO of Kavet, Rockler \& Associates.
Q. Mr. Kavet, let me start with you. You filed testimony this morning marked as Counsel for the Public's Exhibit 146. Do you have that
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in front of you?
A. (Kavet) I do.
Q. And attached to your December 30, 2016 prefiled testimony is your report, also dated December 30, 2016. Do you have that in front of you?
A. (Kavet) I do.
Q. And you also filed supplemental testimony dated April 17, 2017, which was marked as Counsel for the Public's Exhibit 148. Is that in front of you?
A. (Kavet) Yes, it is.
Q. Exhibit B to your supplement testimony is your supplemental report dated April 17,2017. Do you have that in front of you?
A. (Kavet) I do.
Q. And finally, you also -- we also marked as Counsel for the Public Exhibit 148A, which consists of three pages that make corrections to the corresponding pages in your April 17, 2017 supplement report. Do you have that in front of you?
A. (Kavet) Yes, I do.
Q. Mr. Kavet, do you swear by, adopt and affirm
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[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
your prefiled testimony dated December 30, 2016; your original report dated December 30, 2016; your supplemental testimony dated April 17, 2017; your supplemental report, the same date, and the corrections that are in Counsel for the Public Exhibit 148A?
A. (Kavet) I do.
Q. Thank you.

Dr. Rockler, do you have in front of you your December 30, 2016 prefiled testimony?
A. (Rockler) I do.
Q. Do you have in front of you your December 30, 2016 initial report?
A. (Rockler) I do as well.
Q. Do you have in front of you your April 17, 2017 supplemental testimony?
A. (Rockler) Yes.
Q. Do you have in front of you your April 17, 2017 supplemental report?
A. (Rockler) Yes.
Q. And do you have with you Counsel for the Public Exhibit 148A containing corrections to your supplemental report?
A. (Rockler) Yes.
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[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
Q. Do you swear by, adopt and affirm these five documents?
A. (Rockler) I do.
Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Kavet and Dr. Rockler, does your supplemental testimony and your supplemental report consist of corrections to your original report?
A. (Kavet) Yes.
Q. And does Counsel for the Public's Exhibit 148A contain a few additional corrections?
A. (Kavet) Yes.
Q. So would I be correct in saying that your supplemental report in Exhibit 148A contains all of your analysis and opinions in this matter?
A. (Kavet) Yes.
A. (Rockler) Yes.
Q. Mr. Kavet and Dr. Rockler, since the time that you filed your supplemental testimony and produced your supplemental report, have the Applicants provided additional information and additional analysis regarding this project?
A. (Kavet) They have.
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[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
Q. And have you reviewed some of this new information and new analysis about the Project?
A. (Kavet) We have reviewed some of it. We were not tasked with reviewing everything, and some are still in process.
Q. Have your opinions in your testimony and reports changed as a result of your review of any new information or new analysis produced by the Applicants?
A. (Rockler) No.
A. (Kavet) Not significantly, no.
Q. During your testimony in this proceeding, are you prepared to address any questions regarding the new information and new analysis that you've had the opportunity to review?
A. (Kavet) Yes, to the extent we've had the opportunity to review it.
A. (Rockler) Yes.
Q. And same for you, Dr. Rockler?
A. (Rockler) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

MR. PAPPAS: These witnesses are
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[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
available for cross-examination.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
First on my list is the municipal group. Who is going to be -- oh, he's approaching the lecturn. Mr. Whitley.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WHITLEY:
Q. Good morning, gentlemen.
A. (Kavet) Good morning.
Q. My name is Steven Whitley. I'm counsel for several municipalities that are along the route, Deerfield, Pembroke, New Hampton, Littleton, and the Water and Sewer Department of the Town of Ashland.

I want to start and look at each of your backgrounds for a second before we get into some of your opinions. And I wanted to start with you, Mr. Kavet.

I understand from your CV that was attached to your report that you trained as an economist at Columbia University; correct?
A. (Kavet) That's correct.
Q. And you hold a B.A. in that field; is that correct?
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[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
A. (Kavet) That's correct.
Q. Okay. Did you start grad school and not finish? Because there's a mention in your CV of a couple semesters of grad school work and --
A. (Kavet) Yeah, I did graduate work and then worked for a professor who was starting a company that was using technology and organizing data into some of the first economic data bases and found that more compelling than the academic work I was doing.
Q. Okay. So you -- and I didn't mean to interrupt you if you were going to keep going.
A. (Kavet) No, that's it.
Q. So instead of continuing on in that graduate studies program, you went to the private sector.
A. (Kavet) That's right.
Q. Okay. And those two semesters of grad school work, what was the focus of your studies?
A. (Kavet) Economics.
Q. So was that a master's program or a Ph.D.
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[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
program or something?
A. (Kavet) What it was, was as an undergraduate you could take graduate-level courses. And so that's what it was. So there were two semesters of all graduate-level courses.
Q. Got it. Okay. Thank you.

Your CV also mentions some experience or work at McGraw-Hill. I have that correct; right?
A. (Kavet) That's correct.
Q. And that's a company and not a university or college; right?
A. (Kavet) That's a company. That's right.
Q. Okay. And it said that you went to a management school there.
A. (Kavet) Uh-huh.
Q. And can you describe what that management school is?
A. (Kavet) It was sort of like a set of business school courses that the company provided. Employees had to be chosen to be part of it, and they would basically go through business school sort of course work.
Q. How long was that program? How many years?
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[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
A. (Kavet) It was two years, but it was not every day. So it was, you know, periodic. And it was more like an executive training type of focus rather than --
Q. Okay. I take it there was no degree awarded upon completion --
A. (Kavet) No, no.
Q. -- of that program?
A. (Kavet) No, it was just a completion of it, yeah.
Q. And I see the stenographer there. We have to be careful not to talk over one another so that she can take down an accurate record --
A. (Kavet) Okay.
Q. -- so wait a half a beat before you answer.
A. (Kavet) Okay.
Q. And those courses there, what were the focus of those courses at McGraw-Hill Company?
A. (Kavet) They'd be business school-type courses. So, accounting and marketing and business management and operational stuff. So it was designed to sort of provide background for executives and future executives, and that was its purpose.
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[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
Q. Okay. It sounds to me similar to an MBA program. Is that a fair --
A. (Kavet) It had many of the same components, but it wasn't as long or academically oriented. It had very practical, immediate applications.
Q. Okay. And what does the McGraw-Hill Company do?
A. (Kavet) Well, McGraw-Hill's primarily a publisher. But at the time $I$ was with the company, and still, they have a tremendous amount of business information products. So, in a lot of different industries they would have trade publications and also businesses that would be involved in collecting information and selling information. And they bought a company that specialized in economic analysis that I ended up working with and was involved with in integrating that with McGraw-Hill. So that was a computerized, some of the early work in applying computer technology to economic analysis. So, organizing databases with computer technology and then doing analysis
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[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
using computers, building computer models, things like that. That was based in Lexington, Massachusetts. So that division was doing -- it was all economics, and it was -- you know, we were doing lots of studies and analyses and developing the information. We specialized in the construction of real estate information and developed that into various types of economic analysis and then products that would flow from that.
Q. Okay. But it sounds like your role for the company, while you were there, was akin to an economist.
A. (Kavet) Well, I started as an economist and became a senior economist, a managing economist, and then I ran a group with more than a hundred economists in it. And so, yeah, I was working with a bunch of economists doing economic forecasting, developing economic models and working with economic applications of various data sets, and then applying new technology to all this. And they would make a lot more money with
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 44 MORNING Session ONLY] \{10-6-17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
those products when they could do them that way.
Q. And was there a particular focus? And by "focus," I mean an industry type, a field that you focused on while at the company.
A. (Kavet) Construction and real estate economics were the initial area that we were focusing on. And McGraw-Hill owned a company that had a unique data base in the area. It was the F.W. Dodge Division. And they collect information on construction projects, individual projects. We then organized that into economic models that would help people investing in real estate understand where markets were underserved and overserved and where they could make more or less money in. So it involved clients that were in building products, manufacturing and construction, in real estate from the investment side.

Anything to do with a building going up, you know, potentially had some application. And then we forecast that activity at a regional level. So the data base was every single building that was contracted for on an
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 44 MORNING Session ONLY] \{10-6-17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: KAVET|ROCKLER]
architect's drawing board and then built, and so the flow of inputs to that became many different products.
Q. As part of that forecasting, did you look at the potential local economic benefits of investment in a particular area?
A. (Kavet) Occasionally there were clients that were interested in construction from that angle, and so we did. We had -- we developed some of the early regional input/output models that were used. So this model that's REMI you'll hear about, the regional economic modeling, was started around the same time that I was working at McGraw-Hill. And so it was a similar kind of exercise.
Q. Okay. And you said "input/output." Can you -- were some of the outputs that you were asked to develop, is there a comparable to what you did for your opinion before the SEC of looking at local economic impact?
A. (Kavet) Yeah. I mean, at the core of this REMI model that everybody's using for this analysis -- DOE used it and the Applicant used it, and we did as well -- are these
relationships between, you know, what goes into various sectors and, you know, what's needed to produce output. And so when you change something in the economy, it ripples through using that construct. Now, that's not the only construct. There are lots of other things, behavioral things that go on, too. But that's kind of at the core of this modeling approach that's used with this.
Q. I think you mentioned a question or two ago that that sort of modeling maybe wasn't the typical scope of your work. Did I remember that correctly?
A. (Kavet) Well, economic impact modeling was something that some clients would request and so we'd do. But we were -- I would say the thrust of it was looking at what was happening with construction activity and how that related to the demand for various products that are used in construction, and also in the profitability of people investing in those buildings.
Q. Okay, okay. While you were there at the company, did you have any opportunity to
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evaluate utility projects?
A. (Kavet) We worked with a utility group that specialized in utilities the way we specialized in construction and real estate, and so there was a little bit of overlap. They were doing, again, primarily forecasting of demand for electricity and change, structural changes in electricity markets. And so we would interact with them sometimes on a project basis. But we weren't doing just an economic impact analysis then of a particular project. I don't recall any. Maybe Nick would. We were both at McGraw-Hill for --
A. (Rockler) We did a number of projects that related to estimated stock of commercial building space, and utilities used that as a means of estimating demand.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley, what are we doing here? Are we polishing their resumes?

MR. WHITLEY: No, just trying to get a sense of what their experience is in relation to the opinion that they've rendered.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We have their background and experience in their CVs, and the party that put them on chose to put whatever information is in there.

MR. WHITLEY: I understand that, Mr. Chair. But the CVs don't go into the same level of detail about what kind of experience they have with relation to the opinion that they rendered, so that's what I'm trying to get at.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You're trying to make their opinions better? Counsel for the Public had the opportunity to put in whatever information they wanted about their witnesses' backgrounds and experience.

MR. WHITLEY: I'll move on, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you.
BY MR. WHITLEY:
Q. Mr. Rockler -- or Dr. Rockler, I want to ask you a couple questions. You are a regional scientist, and I wanted to know what that is.
A. (Rockler) That is a field which evolved in the 1950s, I would say. And it's one that is an amalgam of largely economics, but some
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geography, some elements of sociology. People would develop interests that were usually more focused than just the broad definition of regional science. And my choice was to go into regional economics. And that's -- it was in that department that I could pursue regional economics and regional economic geography.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And the company that you gentlemen work for has been working for the Vermont State Government for 20 years, I think it was?
A. (Kavet) Vermont State Government has been a client of ours for a little more than 20 years, and we've been the state economists and principal economic advisor to the Vermont Legislature for that period.
Q. So you're working for the legislature or the Governor's Office?
A. (Kavet) The legislature and then various agencies at different times, but primarily for the legislature through the Joint Fiscal Office.
Q. And in your time working for the Vermont
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Legislature, have you done any work on linear utility projects?
A. (Kavet) What do you mean by "linear utility projects"? You mean transmission line?
Q. Something, yes --
A. (Kavet) Yeah. No, we have not done a lot of work with utilities. We were involved in the Vermont Yankee proceedings and case, looking at the demand from that. The Public Service Board and Public Service Department in Vermont has an economic staff and does most of the utility-related work. Occasionally there will be an issue like Vermont Yankee that rises above their capabilities and we'll be involved with some of that. We provide them input and forecasts and other things, so we work closely with them.
Q. And I take it that, because you worked for the Vermont Legislature, that your experience didn't focus exclusively on New Hampshire markets. Would that be correct?
A. (Kavet) That's correct.
Q. So do you have any experience focusing on New Hampshire markets then?
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A. (Kavet) Not with electricity projects, any other projects. I mean, occasionally there's regional New England-wide analysis. There are forecasting activities done sometimes with and for New Hampshire, but not a great deal of work in New Hampshire.
Q. In your opinion, is there a difference between a market in Vermont and a market in New Hampshire?
A. (Kavet) Well, sure. I mean, any two places -- there are similarities between the states and there are differences.
Q. And during your 20 years working for the legislature, $I$ presume there's been a change in leadership --
A. (Kavet) Many.
Q. -- a time or two?
A. (Kavet) Yeah, many changes.
Q. And you guys have retained your role as chief economists to the legislature?
A. (Kavet) That's right.
Q. I want to turn now to the opinion that you rendered in this proceeding. And just to start off, your April 2017 report, which is
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the supplement that you provided, the date on Page 1 still says December 30th, but I assume that that's a typo.
A. (Kavet) That certainly is.
Q. Okay. Because your report has certainly changed since that date, since that December $30 t h$ date.
A. (Kavet) There have been some changes. The bulk of it's the same, but there are some changes.
Q. So, very broadly, when you rendered your opinion, you evaluated the work of a number of Northern Pass's experts, and you did two things: You evaluated the work that they did, and then for some of them you offered your own independent methodology and approach on the same general subject matter. Is that a fair characterization?
A. (Kavet) For the most part. With respect to electricity markets, we used Counsel for Public's electricity expert, which was Brattle Group. So we had input from them on that, and that's a crucial and fairly large component.
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Q. And that actually leads me to my next question. I wanted to ask you what kind of expertise you had to render an independent opinion on the electricity markets. And it sounds like your answer is that you relied on the Brattle Group for that analysis.
A. (Kavet) Well, there are two parts of it. One is what's going to happen with prices and markets and things like that, and that's not something that we do. But there are a number of times that we've done analyses where somebody else will do that, and we'll incorporate it into a larger economic analysis. So, in terms of how that then plays through in terms of economic benefits and enters into a model like REMI to generate local economic impacts, that we have done.
Q. And I understand that you may not have the expertise to do that sort of work on the electricity markets. But you do have expertise in use of the REMI model.
A. (Kavet) Yes, that's correct.
Q. So that portion of the Frayer opinion, her local economic benefit, you did your own
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independent analysis on how to -- on how you would use the REMI model?
A. (Kavet) Yeah. The REMI model can kind of be thought of as sort of a big score card where you're saying let's put all the stuff in that might be happening and then see what kind of economic impacts there would be from that. And so that's -- you know, there could be a lot of things that you would test and really put parameters around. And it should be thought of as sort of an order-of-magnitude estimate of what might occur given certain assumptions.
Q. And in your report, you critiqued Mr. Chalmers and his impact on -- or his opinion on the potential impact to property values. But neither of you are real estate experts; correct?
A. (Kavet) Well, we've done lots of work in real estate. As I've said, the whole division that we ran at McGraw-Hill was construction and real estate. So, in terms of real estate investment, real estate data, real estate economics, we've done lots of it. Has it
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been property valuation analysis with respect to transmission lines? Not necessarily. But we read the literature on that. It's not rocket science.
Q. In your report, you criticized --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley, this doesn't sound anything like a cross-examination of these witnesses. It sounds like you are asking them about the work that they've done, the way a direct examination would go, which repeats what's in their report that Mr. Pappas has already gotten into evidence. Their background, their experience, the work they did, their reliance on the Brattle Group's work, to the extent they relied on others, they did their own work in some ways, this sounds like a repeat of their report. What are you planning on doing that is cross-examination that is new or different that is within the scope of their testimony, but not repeating their testimony, that is necessary for this Committee to hear?

MR. WHITLEY: I can move on, Mr.
Chair.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm happy to hear an offer of proof as to what you think you anticipate getting from these witnesses if you're allowed to continue, because I haven't heard anything that sounds like a cross-examination yet that's necessary for the Committee.

MR. WHITLEY: I guess, Mr. Chair, my questions $I$ think are getting at information that was not included in their supplemental or prefiled testimonies and goes to their -- what kind of experience they have to render an opinion on this project.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, I hear a lot of things that were in their report. But the sponsor of the testimony put in what they felt, Counsel for the Public felt was important. And if it's not within their testimony, it's too late to put it in now. And I think Counsel for the Public understands that. But the other parties aren't going to be allowed to do that.

So what do you want to do with these -- so far what I've heard is you want to supplement their testimony with things
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that's not in the supplemental testimony. I don't think you're going to be allowed to do that. What else would you like to do with these guys?

MR. WHITLEY: I have other subjects that I can cover.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And those would be?

MR. WHITLEY: I'm going to ask them about the corrected table that they just introduced.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
MR. WHITLEY: And I'm going to ask them, go into some depth about Mr. Chalmers' analysis and their opinion, and Mr. Chalmers' response of their analysis --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Chalmers' response, $I$ don't understand why that wasn't done by Counsel for the Public in asking -- let me ask you, Mr. Pappas.

I mean, this came up in the
Antrim Wind case. You know, if the Applicant chose -- I mean, you have a lot of other intervenors here. But, you know, the
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Applicant put in a case. Everybody else responded to it. The Applicant rebutted and then testified. You know, in Antrim Wind, Counsel for the Public ran into a problem by not having their expert witnesses do whatever rebuttal they wanted to do during their direct examination, which would have been allowed. I think Mr. Needleman argued in Antrim Wind, or his analogue argued in Antrim Wind, that that was the only time that they should have done it. And if the Applicant didn't ask any questions about it, there was no opportunity to provide that rebuttal. That's a problem. And we don't want the other intervenors doing the work that Counsel for the Public should be doing, or anyone's witnesses. If a witness wants to respond to something that was in the Applicant's rebuttal testimony or something that happened on the stand or information that's happened, the time to do it is during their direct examination, whatever supplemental direct needs to be done, not through questioning by intervenors. So, is there a reason why you
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chose not to do it, Mr . Pappas?
MR. PAPPAS: Yes. That was not my understanding. And I thought it seemed to me to be more efficient, rather than me do essentially a direct, that if an intervenor wanted to delve into an area, they would, and to the extent they did, I wouldn't do it on redirect. If there was an area I thought that needed true redirect, then I would do it. But I wouldn't go back in and do a direct, because I thought that this was direct. Direct is prefiled, and this is cross.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, I
mean, $I$ wasn't in the Antrim Wind hearings, but I'm familiar at some level with what happened. And that specific issue came up. And if there were no intervenors here and you chose not to do a supplemental direct testimony -- it's not a redirect. It's really a supplemental direct based on responding to rebuttal testimony put in by the Applicant and things that happened during the hearing and information that is new or information that's changed. The time to do it is in a supplemental direct before everyone
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cross-examines.
Mr. Needleman, you were in
Antrim Wind; right?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I was, yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And have I recounted that roughly correctly?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I would say almost perfectly. If I could add one thing?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And that would be?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: This arose when Counsel for the Public in Antrim Wind tried to do redirect and introduce new information. I objected, and the Committee sustained that objection. There was some discussion at that point that, if Counsel for the Public wanted to do that, they should have tried to do it on initial direct, as you're talking about. I didn't concede that that would be appropriate. But that was the extent of the discussion. But certainly that additional testimony is something that we would not think would be appropriate during the course of this proceeding.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let me make
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sure I understand what you just said.
So, if Mr. Pappas had wanted to ask these witnesses to respond to something Mr. Chalmers said during his testimony, live testimony that happened here, you would have objected to that?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I would have a concern about that, Mr. Chair. And it's the same reason $I$ expressed in Antrim Wind, which is we're the party with the burden of proof. And there comes a point where somebody has to have the last word, and I would think that the party with the burden of proof should have the last word. And if, after our witnesses have all testified, we now have other witnesses coming on and trying to rebut that testimony, I'm not sure that's fair.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, but is there any other way to do it? I mean, there's no other way for the witnesses who have been put forward by Counsel for the Public and the intervenors to respond to the changes that your witnesses identified in their reports or their testimony or new information that they brought
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that's different from introducing new information that was never part of the case. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It is different. I agree with that. Those two things are different. And I think you could probably make a distinction along those lines and treat those two differently. But it's fairly clear to me that the time to try and do it is -- and we have discussion about this specific question. But the time to try to do it is when the sponsor of that witness is putting that witness forward because -- and you would agree with that.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I would absolutely agree with that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Pappas, let me come back to you. And I'll open the floor to other intervenors on this in a moment.

But why is -- putting aside the potential disagreement about rebuttal versus responding to new information, when is the right time to do this? How can this possibly work in any coherent fashion?

Mr. Aslin, you want to address this?
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MR. ASLIN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the distinction in our minds, as Counsel for the Public, is between Counsel for the Public attempting to present a direct rebuttal to previous rebuttal testimony that was submitted, which we have not chosen to do with this witness, and appropriate cross-examination questions, which we're not directing the cross-examination of our witnesses, obviously. But if this were a different set of witnesses and we were cross-examining them, another party's witness, I think it's fair to ask a witness if they have an opinion about new information that has been brought in by the Applicant since the witness's final testimony and --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who should be doing that, though? Shouldn't it be the party that sponsors the witness?

MR. ASLIN: It depends. The party sponsoring the witness may do that if they feel that it's important to directly rebut something. But if I have a witness that I'm cross-examining and they've addressed an issue
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that's important to me that wasn't specifically rebutted by them in their direct exam, I don't see that that would be inappropriate for me to ask, just as I'm sure the Committee might want to ask questions of a witness about how they see prior testimony in this case.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That seems like an uncontrolled system, Mr. Aslin. There's no limit then on any intervenor's or your ability to expand a witness's testimony beyond what they filed and beyond what they said on the stand.

Mr. Pappas, you have a -- you want to add something here?

MR. PAPPAS: I do. Two things. One, I think the control is they have to be asking about the new things that were presented. For instance, if there's new analysis in the Applicant's supplemental testimony, or if there was new analysis on the witness stand, and there have been both in many areas, the supplemental testimony presented new analysis for the first time came in in April, and a number of witnesses have presented new things. We just heard last
week the construction folks, a lot of new things that came in. So I think those things are appropriate to be addressed through cross-examination.

What we -- the second point is this is not a two-party case. This is a multi-party case with a lot of people asking questions. And we thought that the more efficient way to do it, and maybe we were wrong, but we thought it would be efficient to, rather than us spend an hour or two doing that and then everybody following us, picking up on those things and doing it as well, we would allow the intervenors who have different interests -- the municipalities are interested in their specific municipalities, different areas have different interests, whether environmental groups and so forth -we thought perhaps the more efficient way was to allow those parties to delve into the areas of which they've been doing throughout the proceeding.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You want to
say something, Mr. Needleman?
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: I do. I would disagree with Mr. Pappas. I don't think there's anything efficient about that. I think if it's going to happen, if it's going to happen, and it's truly going to relate to new information and not rebuttal information, it should happen once up front. If every person is going to get to do that throughout the course of the proceeding, $I$ think that's terribly inefficient.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, I had the same reaction to one of the things you said, Mr. Pappas, and that was for everyone else to do it as well. It seems that if there's a table that's been put forward, Mr. Whitley asked questions about that. I'm not sure anybody else should be asking questions about it. It should be done one time, and one time only. And now maybe that's going to require the intervenors to get together and decide who wants to ask questions about the new information. But we're not going to have Mr . Reimers then do a series of questions about it and then Mr. Baker do a series of questions about it and then Mr . Cunningham do a series of questions about it.
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Now, I think the municipal group working together has been pretty good about not duplicating efforts. So I wouldn't have expected Ms. Pacik or Ms. Fillmore to duplicate questions. But I could imagine others doing it. And that's not a criticism, because the system was -- the situation with the Applicant's witnesses was different. You are all adverse to the Applicant's witnesses. And while there was some level of adversity among the intervenor group, bury, not bury, certain more subtle differences in certain other areas, for the most part, you're all on the same side. You're all trying to do the same thing. And we're not going to have multiple people doing the same thing with each panel of witnesses. That's not going to happen.

MR. PAPPAS: I guess I envisioned that one person would, for instance, tackle the real estate, and perhaps one person would tackle the tourism and along those lines. I didn't envision that all 25 people after us would plow the same thing, one after each other. And maybe I was mistaken in that.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, having read the cross-examination notices filed by many of the parties, it's apparent that everybody intends to ask about everything that each witness testified about. That's the notices that the overwhelming majority of the intervenors filed. If you've had a chance to look at them, you will see.

I'm going to open the floor to some others. Ms. Pacik, you look like you want to say something.

MS. PACIK: I think everyone, at
least from what I've seen in terms of the intervenors and how they've presented their cases, have tried to comply with the rule, which is that questions should not be unduly repetitive. So I do think, for the most part, intervenors are trying to focus on one area and not repeat others. And you've mentioned the Joint Municipal Groups have been working to try to avoid that. And I know that other intervenor groups have also tried to do that. And we had anticipated doing the same thing with the witnesses for Counsel for the Public. And I
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recognize the notices for friendly cross-examination were repetitive. And I think that was just to reserve the right to ask certain questions. But I don't think there was any intent to be repetitive when it comes to any of the upcoming witnesses.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik, I
have some opinions about the work that was done with respect to those notices, but it's not really relevant as we sit here right now.

The fact that the Deerfield people want to talk about Deerfield and the Bridgewater people want to talk about Bridgewater and the people in Plymouth want to talk about Plymouth and the people up further north want to talk about their particular communities, this testimony is this testimony, and it's broad and it's general about the Project. I have a hard time envisioning useful questions that are specifically relevant to each of the geographic areas coming out differently from these witnesses. So I'm even surprised that some people claim to have 20 or 30 minutes
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for these witnesses. But I'm prepared to listen to people and have them tell me what it is they want to do. I heard Mr. Whitley say he wanted to talk about the new exhibit. I then got into it with Mr. Pappas and others about why Mr. Pappas didn't do that, and I understand his answer. And maybe we can control this cross-examination process by having one questioner deal with a particular issue for witnesses who are testifying about the entire project like these. The answers aren't going to be any different for the different geographic areas for these witnesses. There may be others for whom their testimony is going to be different, but that's not this situation here. And the general proposition here is that the party putting on the witness is responsible for getting that witness in a position so that they can be cross-examined by the people who are adverse to them. And polishing their resumes, having them go beyond their direct examination is not what's contemplated by the administrative rules generally in this state,
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the processes of the SEC historically and currently. So I'm very concerned about how long this is going to take if people go on doing what they've been doing in this part of the case.

Ms. Pacik.
MS. PACIK: I mean, just to comment on that, for this particular witness, I agree that probably geographic differences aren't going to really be helpful. But still, the rule that you can't be unduly repetitive $I$ think we've all kept in mind. So, whether or not it may relate to a specific area of the state, I know that we are going to try not to repeat topical areas in these individuals' testimony.

And in terms of the rules, my understanding was that it wasn't just for adverse questions, but if it was information to clarify a particular topic or something that was helpful for the true and full disclosure of facts for the Committee, that that was an area that we could talk about. And certainly if there's been, for example, a
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rebuttal report from Ms. Frayer criticizing Kavet Rockler's original report, we thought that was something that we could raise during our examination of those witnesses.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, in the passive voice, yes, someone should be given -they should be given the opportunity to respond to what Ms. Frayer said. I agree with that proposition. Maybe Mr. Needleman doesn't. But it doesn't seem inappropriate to me to have that happen. Maybe we're going to get an objection to that when it happens. It just seems to me that, for the most part, that should have been Mr. Pappas doing that. And I guess if up front we know Mr. Pappas would say I'm not going to do that, I'm going to have Mr. Whitley do that or I'm going to have Ms. Pacik do that or have Mr. Cunningham do that, we'll know it's going to get done, and it's going to get done once and we won't have to hear it over and over.

Now, circling back to Mr.
Whitley's examination that's been going on, this has 98 percent so far been things from the report, from their backgrounds, from
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their resumes, which isn't advancing his case in any way that's different from what Counsel for the Public has put forward. So, whether those are long scene setters or not, I don't know. I did hear you say you want to talk about the new exhibit. Mr. Pappas didn't do it. I'm going to let you do it. But I think that we may need to have another conversation about this. And the intervenors are going to have to plan out some, quote, unquote, cross-examination of future witnesses.

MR. WHITLEY: Mr. Chair. Thank you. I just want to start off and say that I misunderstood as well kind of the ground rules for these experts. So I apologize for kind of going at it like this --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Don't
apologize, Mr. Whitley. It's apparent to me that no one really had a clear understanding among the intervenor groups, Counsel for the Public. It's apparent that the Applicant didn't fully -- wasn't fully on the same page as anybody. And I think Mr. Iacopino and Ms. Monroe, in the various prehearing conferences,
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the conference reports, then the response to someone's motion about friendly cross, were trying to bring some order to this so that it will be done efficiently, that people can make the cases that they need to make and have a right to make without repeating themselves, "gilding the lily" unnecessarily, and making this a longer process than it needs to be for people to do what they need to do. And it is at least my view that you don't need to embellish these witnesses' resumes because their resumes are their resumes. And Counsel for the Public put them in. They have qualifications, whatever they are on paper and whatever they've put in their testimony. It's there. You can do substance with them that's relevant to your case that will help us understand what it is that we need to know and move on. But you do not need to apologize.

MR. WHITLEY: I appreciate that.
I just wanted to, while we're on this kind of larger procedural discussion -- you know, I had a quick side bar with the other municipal counsel, and I think that, you know, in terms of
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how to go forward, you know, I think we're probably more comfortable having an opportunity to do some sort of a direct on our witnesses that we're putting up and then let the parties that follow fill in the gaps or do cross or do whatever they need to do. I think to us, that seems to be the more efficient way to handle this proceeding. So I just want to put that out there.

And my next question was, I think, you know, before $I$ continue, I'd like to get a little clarity about what the expectation is for my questioning of these witnesses right now, because clearly I had a different one when $I$ put this together. So I don't want to stumble along. You know, I want to avoid that if I can.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And that's why I asked you to tell me what it is you're planning on doing with these witnesses, and that will help focus us all.

MR. WHITLEY: Okay. Well, I
mentioned that they've corrected their table which is at the end of their report.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good. And Mr. Pappas didn't do it. You should do it. What else you got?

MR. WHITLEY: In addition to that, I was going to discuss Mr. Chalmers' response to some of the concerns that were raised by intervenors to his analysis with respect to his subdivision analysis, which they have rendered an opinion on. So I was going to ask them to --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
We'll see when you get to that one. Okay.
MR. WHITLEY: Okay. And the other thing I was going to do, Mr. Chair, was put up for them some exhibits that our witness put in, Mr. Sansoucy, related to the literature cited by Mr. Chalmers in his subdivision studies and ask some questions of the panel based on those exhibits.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
We'll see how that comes out when you get to it. But it seems like your safest one is the first one you mentioned. Let's talk about the new exhibit.
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MR. WHITLEY: And I understand that, Mr. Chair.

Dawn, can I have the ELMO, please?

BY MR. WHITLEY:
Q. Gentlemen, I'm going to put up on the screen here shortly the corrected tables that were at the very end of your supplemental report. And so I'm talking about Table 24 and 25. And just for the record, this is Counsel for the Public 148A, and it's correcting Page 76 of your supplemental report. Is that up on your screen, gentlemen?
A. (Kavet) It is.
A. (Rockler) Yes.
Q. So you testified when Attorney Pappas was doing your direct that you made some changes to your testimony. Can you tell us what those changes were?
A. (Kavet) They were corrections. There was a transposition of a model input line that we corrected, and that changed the construction phase. Employment estimates didn't change materially in terms of our conclusions. But
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it was an input error, and so it's correcting that input error.
Q. And did that correction carry through on both Table 24 and Table 25?
A. (Kavet) Yes, it did. And it starts with Table 7, where, you know, it just has construction impacts and then it flows through to that.
Q. Okay. And I don't have Table 7. Well, I guess it's probably on that exhibit earlier.
A. (Kavet) It's one of the pages.
Q. Okay. One second --
A. (Kavet) Page 42.
Q. -- and I'll turn to that. This table here?
A. (Kavet) That's correct.
Q. And what was the correction on this table that was carried through to Tables 24 and 25?
A. (Kavet) Well, it would have been all the figures on the KRA --
A. (Rockler) All the KRA columns.
A. (Kavet) -- would have changed. I could read the old ones if you want or --
Q. No, that's okay. I mean, it's in the record.

But I just wanted to understand what you
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corrected here and what the cause of that correction was. It sounds like it was an input error to the REMI model.
A. (Kavet) That's correct.
Q. Okay.
A. (Kavet) And it served to raise the estimate of the economic impacts associated with construction slightly.
Q. And what was the error? So, before you had one input and you learned it was incorrect?
A. (Kavet) Yeah, there are a listing of states, and they're sometimes alphabetized in different ways. And so it just had -- it mixed up those inputs by state, and this corrected it.
Q. Okay.
A. (Kavet) So it was just one component of professional and scientific employment inputs as a direct input. And it had the state order wrong, so it corrects that. And then that flows through to the total construction, total project.
Q. Okay. So, safe to say that the numbers as a result of this correction went up both for
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employment and for the GSP dollar figure.
A. (Kavet) Personal income, disposable income, GSP, all those went up slightly.
Q. Okay. So, other than that change that you just described, these tables -- and other than that change that you just described and how those changes, you know, carry throughout the calculations of these tables, there is nothing else different about these tables than was in your supplemental report.
A. (Kavet) That's correct.
Q. Okay. I believe you mentioned in your testimonies that some of these "forecasts" -and I use that term very loosely -- but some of these forecasts have a more narrow range of outcomes and others have a wider range; is that correct?
A. (Kavet) Yes, but $I$ would not characterize them as "forecasts." I really think that's kind of an important distinction, just to understand what's -- how this modeling approach is used and how it could be useful to a group that's trying to make a decision around this. The REMI is basically a
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simulation model. So you're not using it to do a forecast. You're using it to tell, well, what would a difference relative to some baseline be? And especially in these sorts of, you know, these last couple tables, we're not saying this is what's going to happen in these areas. We're saying, if you put in these sort of assumptions, if you believe this about it, here's the order of magnitude of what could occur. So it's a way of understanding risk. It's not really saying this is what we think is going to happen. That's a forecast. That's really a different sort of thing. And we never use REMI for forecasting purposes.
A. (Rockler) Embedded in the model you will see in the long run, a trend-based forecast, but it's really not a critical part of the analysis. It really is a trend-based thing when you go out past three or four years. So it has no major assumption, changes or anything that's made explicit in the use of the model.
Q. And am $I$ correct in saying that the changes
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that you made to these two tables doesn't alter the answers that you just provided about how you would characterize these tables and them not being a forecast?
A. (Kavet) No, that doesn't have anything to do with it.
Q. Okay.
A. (Kavet) It's like changing an assumption and saying, oh, you know, there's a little bit different alignment of what we're describing is going to be happening associated with the construction, and so then the impact would change a little bit.
Q. Okay. At the bottom of this page, Footnote 70, you mention intentionally including overlapping years. Do you see that?
A. (Kavet) Yeah.
Q. So do I understand that one of the years in your construction phase is combined with or bleeds over into the operational period, for instance?
A. (Kavet) It's the rounding -- yeah. So, 2020 shows up both in the first part and then the
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|  |  |  | 142 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | second part for averaging purposes. |  |
| 2 | Q. | You've included here some negative impacts |  |
| 3 |  | from the Project in both tables there. And |  |
| 4 |  | I'm looking at the tourism effects and then |  |
| 5 |  | the electricity market effects in the later |  |
| 6 |  | phases of the Project. And that goes for |  |
| 7 |  | both of those tables; correct? |  |
| 8 | A. | (Kavet) That's correct. I would describe |  |
| 9 |  | them as "potential negative effects." |  |
| 10 | Q. | Thank you. Yeah, potential negative effects. |  |
| 11 |  | But that's an approach that Northern Pass and |  |
| 12 |  | its experts didn't utilize. |  |
| 13 | A. | (Kavet) I don't know that there were any |  |
| 14 |  | negative externalities or negative impacts |  |
| 15 |  | that were considered. I don't recall if |  |
| 16 |  | there were any. But I don't think there |  |
| 17 |  | were. I think they should be thought of more |  |
| 18 |  | in terms of risk, you know, downside risks |  |
| 19 |  | that exist in association with this. |  |
| 20 | Q. | One second. Apologies. |  |
| 21 |  | (Pause) . |  |
| 22 | Q. | I want to turn now to Dr. Chalmers and his |  |
| 23 |  | literature review. And I believe, very |  |
| 24 |  | generally, that one of your critiques of his |  |
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methodology was that he used proximity to the right-of-way as the main measurable as opposed to visibility. Do I have that roughly correct?
A. (Kavet) Yeah, that's one aspect of it.
Q. Okay. And are you familiar with Dr.

Chalmers' response to that criticism? Did you gentlemen review his supplemental testimony, his April supplemental testimony?
A. (Kavet) We read that. We didn't do anything analytic around it or do any response, but we're aware of it.
Q. What I'm going to put before you now on the screen is an exhibit from Mr. Sansoucy's December 2016 testimony. It's been marked and provided already as Sansoucy 18 for the record. Are you familiar with this exhibit, either of you?
A. (Kavet) No, but I can see it here on the screen, so I'm happy to...
Q. Okay. Take a look for one second, and then I'm going to ask you some questions about it.
(Witnesses reviews document.)
A. (Kavet) Okay.
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Q. So, this exhibit, I'll represent to you, looks at the studies referenced by Dr. Chalmers. And then you see in the rows there -- excuse me -- the columns, it classifies various characteristics of each of those studies. And I want to draw your attention to Columns D and E.
A. (Kavet) Okay.
Q. You see that nearly all of those fall outside of the New England area; correct?
A. (Kavet) Hmm-hmm. Yes.
Q. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt.

And you also see from Column A that some of these studies are quite old, beyond 40 years; correct?
A. (Kavet) That's correct.
Q. Would you agree that valuation is a very local issue, and it can be quite different from state to state in terms of how it is defined and arrived at?
A. (Kavet) Absolutely.
Q. So these cited studies from Dr. Chalmers could be from places that do not value property and potential impacts from a
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transmission line in a way comparable to New Hampshire; correct?
A. (Kavet) That's correct.
Q. And without knowing how those states value property -- excuse me. Strike that.

Without knowing whether those states value property in a manner similar to New Hampshire, that could cast doubt on Dr. Chalmers' reliance on these studies as they support his opinion in New Hampshire.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This exhibit I'm reading says it's from the prefiled direct testimony of Mr . Sansoucy. So this exhibit was available to these witnesses, and they could have commented on it. So the only thing we're seeing here is eliciting additional direct testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley.
MR. WHITLEY: I think this is new
testimony, Mr. Chair, in that they have criticized Dr. Chalmers and his literature studies, but I don't know if they have done so on the same basis as what I'm putting up here.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm not sure
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that helped. I'm going to sustain the objection.

MR. WHITLEY: I'll move on.
A. (Kavet) The only thing I would add about that --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You don't have to answer.

BY MR. WHITLEY:
Q. I'm going to put up another exhibit for you gentlemen. And this one is from Mr . Sansoucy's April 2017 testimony. And let me just put it up on the screen here first.

MR. WHITLEY: Dawn, can you switch over to the hardwire, please?

BY MR. WHITLEY:
Q. Let me know when it pops up on your screen.
A. (Kavet) Okay.
Q. So this has been marked already as Sansoucy, SAN 37. And as I just mentioned, it's an exhibit to his April 2017 testimony. And it's very difficult to read. I have a hard copy which I'm going to hand you in the hopes it may help you. So, one second.
A. (Rockler) I'm not sure that made it easier.
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Q. I tried. For the record, it's SAN 37.
A. (Kavet) Okay.
Q. Have either of you seen this exhibit?
A. (Kavet) I have not.
A. (Rockler) I haven't.
Q. Again, each of these rows is a different exhibit that was -- or excuse me -- a different study that was cited by Dr. Chalmers in his report. And I don't know if you can tell from what's on the screen or with the hard copy there, but I'll represent to you that, similar to the last exhibit, each row is a different study, and the columns are various characteristics or information that was pulled from those studies. Do you see that on the handout or on the screen there?
A. (Kavet) Yeah.
A. (Rockler) Yes.
Q. And I'll represent to you that Column E, which on the screen is the biggest one, the widest one, that column lists the internally cited studies of the study that Mr. Chalmers referred to. Does that make sense?
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A. (Kavet) Yes.
A. (Rockler) Hmm-hmm. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in addition, I'll represent to you that Mr. Sansoucy -- the reason there are red text in the handout and on the screen before you is that those particular studies were subsequently cited by other authors and studies that Mr . Chalmers relied on.
A. (Kavet) Hmm-hmm.
Q. Does that make sense?
A. (Kavet) Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. So as you -- I'm going to scroll down here, and I'm going to ask you to flip the pages, or just watch on the screen as I do so. But you're going to see that as we go down this list of studies reviewed or relied on by Dr. Chalmers, that the text in red is going to increase as we continue to go down through this list. I'm just going to...
A. (Kavet) We can see that.
Q. And it's probably easier for you to see that on the handout by flipping the pages.
A. (Kavet) I'm doing that.
Q. I apologize that $I$ don't have more copies for
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the other parties.
You see the amount of red generally increases as the studies get more recent in time?

So, would it be fair to say that Dr . Chalmers relied on the same core sources of information to support his opinion?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm going to object for several reasons. First of all, it's the same issue. And the fact that this came in the April 2017 testimony instead of initial testimony doesn't matter. Under the Antrim Order, the Committee said that if people want to go into this sort of stuff, that they should have given notice by filing a motion.

Second of all, this sounds to
me like an effort by Mr. Whitley to bolster his witness's testimony by using these witnesses. Now, I don't think that's appropriate either.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Whitley.
MR. WHITLEY: Honestly, Mr.
Chair, I'm not aware of the Antrim Order prior to the discussion earlier today of what it laid
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out. And I'm further not aware of its applicability to this proceeding, short of something else being issued after today. In relation to what I'm doing now, $I$ believe it's fair game to ask them to look at an exhibit that came out, that was submitted after they submitted their testimony, and ask them their opinion on it. And I think that my understanding of the kind of scope of what we're doing here is that, you know, we're trying to get to a full and true disclosure of the facts.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It sounds like you want them to give a new opinion here; is that right?

MR. WHITLEY: I wouldn't characterize it as a "new opinion." I think it is based on what $I$ understand their opinion to be. I think it's pretty consistent. I think it is. I don't know. That's why I'm asking. I think it's consistent with what their opinion is.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: But it's one they haven't given yet. You think they -- you
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want them to -- well, $I$ want to know exactly where you want to end up.

MR. WHITLEY: They haven't given
it yet because they haven't --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm sorry.
Can you refresh my memory of what the specific pending question is?

MR. WHITLEY: I asked them -well, $I$ just went over what the exhibit shows and asked them --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And what's the specific spending question?

MR. WHITLEY: I asked them to agree or not that Dr. Chalmers relied upon a very small source of information to support his opinion.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think the phrase you used was "four sources."

MR. WHITLEY: "Sources" I think I said, plural.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, four sources.

MR. WHITLEY: I don't know if I put a number on it. $I$ don't recall putting a
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number on it.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And I recall them answering that question. Or I thought they did, and I thought you were on your next question.

MR. WHITLEY: I don't think they answered. I think Mr. Needleman --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
I'm going to overrule the objection for that question and allow and have the witnesses answer.
A. (Kavet) I think I'm understanding the question. If not, then you can correct me. But I mean, our opinion was, and this is consistent with that, is that it was difficult to find relevant studies in the existing literature that were applicable to this project. And that made it difficult to rely on any of those as being relevant. The thing that is missing from these is who paid for the studies. We found that also to be an issue because there was a 19 -- Edison Electric review of studies and found that 80 percent of them were paid for by industry
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groups, and so that then cedes the whole academic literature. Sometimes you don't even know who paid for them. When the Department of Energy did their analysis of property valuation impacts, they excluded all studies that had been paid for by parties with a financial interest in the outcome. So that made it difficult to find unbiased studies that were appropriate to the areas under analysis with which to rely on.

MR. IACOPINO: Which federal agency did you say?

WITNESS KAVET: It was Edison
Electric Institute did the surveys. Oh, Department of Energy, the DOE study.

MR. IACOPINO: DOE? Okay.
WITNESS KAVET: Yeah, updated in August.

BY MR. WHITLEY:
Q. I want to put up for you now Dr. Chalmers' supplemental testimony from April 2017. I've highlighted here on Page 14 -- and just for the record, this is Applicant's Exhibit 104.

We're looking at Page 14 of that testimony.
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And I've highlighted a section there at the top of the page. I'll give you a second to read that.
(Witnesses reviews document.)
A. (Rockler) I think Mr. Chalmers has some elements of what he said here are actually correct. I think they're --
Q. You're assuming the question, but --
A. (Rockler) Oh, I'm sorry. I thought the question was -- I thought I heard the question.
Q. No, I just wanted you to look at it and tell me when you had a chance to read it.
A. (Rockler) Right. Okay.
Q. The question, though, is: Do you agree with Dr. Chalmers that it's the only valid approach, as he says at the end?
A. (Rockler) I wouldn't say that, no.
Q. And what other approach might there be?
A. I think there are other approaches, depending on the circumstance. If you have a situation in which there are a large number of property transactions that will allow you to get the necessary characteristics of different
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properties into the sample or into the population, preferably, that's a reasonable way of doing a statistical analysis. But in cases where you don't, where you have to rely on either reasonable or well-informed opinion as to what the effects might be, you may have to fall back on something like that. I mean, there are three techniques we've seen presented in the Applicant's data. There are case studies, there are opinion-related appraisal studies, and there are statistical studies. And all three have their merits. It depends on what you have as data available to you. And I think when you have a large statistical data base in an area that has lots of observations, and you have the characteristics of the property well documented, then I think you have a basis for doing a statistical analysis. And so in the case of Northern Pass, the difficulty is that you're dealing with an area which has sometimes very few observations or transactions in a short period of time, and so you'll want to be doing something over a
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very long period of time. And then you get into the problem of having relevant data, if you're going back for a long period, whether or not it actually is measuring what you're looking for, or whether it can even measure what you're looking for.
A. (Kavet) Yeah, I would just add that it takes -- it's an unusual data base that has the kind of detail with respect to property characteristics that really allow the best possible analysis. And in the case of this issue, we'd be saying, is there a view of this, and from what part of the house and in what season and things like that. You know, I've not seen data bases like that in any of this literature. In the wind farm area, there's a data base that the Berkeley Lab has that is robust in the way you might need to do the best possible analysis.
Q. And by "best," you mean a statistical analysis.
A. Yes, a statistical analysis that has a large data set with the right -- with enough detail about the characteristics of each property so
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|  |  | 157 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | that you can test for the things that are |
| 2 |  | relevant. And one of those things would be, |
| 3 |  | you know, a view encumbrance. And it would |
| 4 |  | probably not just be a "yes" or "no." It |
| 5 |  | would be on a scale. And then you could, you |
| 6 |  | know, start -- you could get some meaningful |
| 7 |  | statistical data back on how important that |
| 8 |  | variable was compared to others. |
| 9 | Q. | Thank you, gentlemen. That's all I have. |
| 10 |  | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. |
| 11 |  | I think it makes sense for us to break for |
| 12 |  | lunch, and we'll be back at 1:30. |
| 13 |  | (Discussion off the record) |
| 14 |  | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's go |
| 15 |  | back on the record. We're back on the record, |
| 16 |  | Mr. Cunningham. |
| 17 |  | MR. CUNNINGHAM: Let me pose what |
| 18 |  | I thought $I$ would do with witnesses for the |
| 19 |  | Counsel for the Public. And I think I can make |
| 20 |  | it clear. There were two general areas and two |
| 21 |  | specific areas. One, $I$ figure it would be |
| 22 |  | perfectly appropriate for intervenors like my |
| 23 |  | clients to ask the CFP witnesses to expand |
| 24 |  | points that are unclear, and I plan to do that. |
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The other area in that area would be if a CFP witness does not cover something I think they should have covered vis-a-vis the Applicant's witnesses -- in other words, did they miss something I think that is critical to understanding the issues. That's the first general area.

The second general area is if Mr. Needleman conducts cross-examination of CFP witnesses and opens the door to new matter -- and this is based on my courtroom experience -- opens the door to new matter, $I$ think intervenors should have the opportunity to follow-up on Mr. Needleman's cross-examination questions that open the door.

So I think it's pretty simple, from my point of view. One, can intervenors expand on points of the CFP witnesses that are not clear; two, can intervenors ask questions that the CFP witnesses did not cover that's critical to the consideration of this Committee; and again, repeating myself, if Needleman asks questions that open the
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door, can intervenors follow-up with further examination?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'll give you a chance in a second, Mr. Needleman. But I think my answer to those questions are "Yes, No and No," respectively. If there's a part of the testimony that is unclear and you want clarification, that seems to me to be the type of thing you can ask. If you want Counsel for the Public or any other witness to go on to a topic that they didn't address, I don't think you're allowed to do that. I think their testimony is their testimony. Their prefiled testimony defines the scope of their prefiled testimony. The topics that they covered are the topics that they covered. And that's why we do prefiled testimony in administrative hearings, so we know what witnesses are going to testify about.

And as to the third one, I
don't know what courtrooms you practiced in, but the only person who would be doing redirect of those witnesses would be Mr .

Pappas, of the CFP witnesses, or Mr. Aslin,
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whoever presented the witness. Other parties, friendly or unfriendly, once they're done, there's no -- I mean, it would be a rare, rare situation where someone other than the party sponsoring the witness would be doing any redirect of a witness who's testified.

Mr. Needleman.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I agree with you on Points 2 and 3, and I generally agree on Point 1. What I heard Mr. Cunningham say was, with respect to Point 1 , at one point he said "expand" and at one point he said "clarify." Certainly clarifying is fair game. I would say expanding is not.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, I
think expanding moved into Point 2. I think Point 1 was clarify, Point 2 was expand and Point 3 was redirect.

Mr. Pappas, you wanted to --
it looked like you wanted to say something.
Or maybe it was Mr. Aslin. I saw one of you reach for the mic. Mr. Aslin.

MR. ASLIN: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
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Chairman. I think, just to get a little more clarity on No. 2, I tend to agree with you that asking about new testimony that wasn't part of the direct testimony is inappropriate. But I believe you could properly ask whether and why a witness did not address a certain issue in their testimony, not to get into what is their response necessarily, but why didn't they go there.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I tend to agree with you. I think it would probably come up as a question-by-question situation. But I believe you're probably right.

Mr. Reimers, you look like you
wanted to say something. Maybe I
misunderstood your body language.
MR. REIMERS: You misunderstood.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Not the
first time, won't be the last.
Mr. Baker.
MR. BAKER: I'll preface my
comments by saying $I$ have no questions of this panel. It seems to me that there's been an awful lot of new material introduced in this
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case as it's moved forward. Part of that is because of the iterative process -- for instance, the construction schedule has gone to 30 percent and now I understand 60 percent complete. But these are introducing new elements into the case. I simply want to note that it may be, and I can't be sure at this point, but it may be that these elements affect the position of our individual clients and that the witnesses that we'd like to ask about these new elements that have been introduced by the Applicants are coming before us and they may be deemed friendly or they may be deemed informative, I'm not sure. But it seems to me that there is a limited area of questioning that could be helpful to the SEC, as well as protecting the interests of our clients.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think I
agree with you. And I think when Mr. Needleman was speaking earlier, he articulated a new information provision where he felt -- I think he agreed. I think we would take it up on an issue-by-issue, question-by-question basis.

Ms. Fillmore.
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MS. FILLMORE: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I'd like to clarify whether -- well, one of the areas that $I$ had planned to cover was responses that Dr. Chalmers had given to questioning here in response to cross-examination questions that includes statements that were not part of his prefiled testimony or report and to ask this panel about that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think Mr.
Needleman may have objections to that. We're going to take them up on a question-by-question basis. But as a general proposition, I think my view is that that's fair game. If it happened here live and is not part of the prefiled testimony or clarified or supplemented prefiled testimony, that's something that can be asked about. But again, it may be a question-by-question, issue-by-issue, and it may be different for different things. But as a general rule, you're not going to be stopped for answering those questions in the first instance. They may draw objections. Those objections will get ruled on as they come.
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MS. FILLMORE: Thank you. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.

Needleman.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I was just going to say, Mr. Chair, I agree it's probably situational. But I think it's still guided by the same point I made before; it's the difference between rebut and rebuttal versus addressing new information.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Understood.
Anyone else on this topic?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Thank you. We will now break for lunch and be back more like twenty minutes to two.
(Lunch recess taken at 12:37 p.m. and concludes the Day 44 Morning Session. The hearing continues under separate cover in the transcript noted as Day 44 Afternoon Session.)
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