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P ROCEE D I N G
        (Hearing resumed at 2:02 p.m.)
            CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Patnaude,
        would you swear in the witness please.
                    (Whereupon Stephan T. Nix was
                    duly sworn by the Court
                Reporter.)
            CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I understand
        that Mr. Thompson is going to get you started
        here, Mr. Nix.
            MR. THOMPSON: Good afternoon.
            WITNESS NIX: Good afternoon.
            STEPHAN T. NIX, SWORN
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q Good afternoon, Mr. Nix, Attorney Nix. Would
    you please give the Committee a brief synopsis
    of your education, professional licenses, and
    work experience.
                            CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: After you've
    given us your name and --
BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q Name and rank.
A Yes. My name is Stephan Nix. That's
```
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[WITNESS: Nix]

S-t-e-p-h-a-n, N-i-x. I am -- my office is at 25 Country Club Road, Unit 502, Gilford, New Hampshire 03249 .

And just to move it along, if it's okay, I am an attorney in New Hampshire, and $I$ am also a licensed land surveyor. I have a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of New Hampshire, a J.D. degree from Franklin Pierce Law School, currently known as the University of New Hampshire School of Law.

I -- excuse me -- have over 35 years experience in land surveying, civil engineering. In the early 1980s, I worked as a land surveyor and engineering technician designing subdivisions, commercial and industrial site plans, roads, sewers, water systems, utility systems, both aboveground and belowground. I then -- I became licensed as a land survivor, became a partner -- in the mid '80s I became a partner in a civil engineering company, I was a managing partner. I also was a project manager in that capacity for many years.

Went to law school in 1994, I believe, '4,
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yes. Graduated in 1997. I have maintained my surveyor's license, as well as being licensed as an attorney. And my practice focuses on land use issues, development issues. I still consult as a surveyor.

And, as an aside other licenses that I've held in the past include Level 2 Weld Inspector on a tunnel project for $I-95$, digging underneath the Baltimore Harbor, the Fort McHenry Tunnel Project. I was also a licensed septic designer for over twenty years. I let that one go, and I just didn't want to keep that one up anymore. I was also a licensed septic installer. And I designed literally -literally thousands of systems.

Q Thank you. Do you recall your prefiled testimony dated December of 2016 and your supplemental prefiled testimony dated March of 2017? Do you confirm and adopt that testimony today?

A I do recall that testimony. And I do adopt and confirm it as of the date that it was submitted to the Committee. Since those dates, there have been additional submittals by the
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Applicant, which $I$ have reviewed and come to conclusions on.

Q Thank you. Will you please describe the documents that were filed by Northern Pass Transmission line after your -- after you submitted your testimony that you reviewed?

A Well, if $I$ answer the question the way you phrased it, the list would go on and on, folks. So, I'm going to narrow it down a little bit to the ones that apply to my review: The Meridian Survey Report, dated April 12th, 2017; the BL Company Survey Report, dated April 19th, 2017; the DOT Survey Report, which I call the "rejection letter", dated August 11th, 2017, with an addendum, which is a memorandum from the Department of Transportation, $I$ call it the "Talon memo", dated August 1st, 2017; the DOT letter amending the survey requirements, dated October 3rd, 2017, with an addendum, the second Talon memo, dated September 5th, 2017; and the transcripts of the construction committee testimony, dated September 29th, 2017 and October 2nd, 2017.

There are also survey plans. The one I
\{SEC 2015-06\}Day 49/Afternoon Session ONLY\{10-20-17\}
have written down here was the "BL Survey Plan", which was I believe submitted sometime in May of 2017 to the Department of Transportation.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Mr.
Aslin, I assume you have questions for the witness?

MR. ASLIN: I do. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: While he's getting set up, who else has questions for this witness?

I see Ms. Saffo. I see Mr. Palmer.
I see Ms. Pastoriza. I see Ms. Menard. I see Ms. Draper -- I see two Drapers.

MR. DRAPER: No, not me. I'm just pointing it out.

MS. DRAPER: Just a longer arm.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes.
Mr. Draper, you said your arm is longer.
MR. DRAPER: That's what $I$ was trying to do.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Was there
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[WITNESS: Nix]
anybody else?
Oh, there are more. Okay. All
right. We've got all kinds of folks. We'll call them in the order that $I$ have them on the sheet.

Mr. Aslin, you may proceed.
MR. ASLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Attorney Nix, good afternoon, at this point. My name is Chris Aslin. I'm from the -- I'm an Assistant Attorney General, and I've been designated as Counsel for the Public in this proceeding.

I'm going to ask you a few questions about your prefiled testimony and the developments in the record that have come up since then.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q Just as a preliminary matter, I assume, though it was not 100 percent clear in your testimony, that you were retained by the Thompsons to provide expert testimony in this proceeding?

A Yes. And it's the -- in the supplemental it states that the Thompsons, for the Northern
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Abutters. So, it was Brad Thompson, as the spokesman, that is my contact.

Q Okay. So, you're here on behalf of the entire group of Combined?

A That's my understanding, yes.
Q Very good. And I did want to point out one error it looked like, in your supplemental, the date appears to have the wrong year. So, Mr. Thompson referenced the date of it as being "March of 2016", which -- or, "2017", which I think is the actually correct date, but the document itself has a different date?

A That would be correct. I will make that amendment. I apologize.

Q Just wanted to clear that up for the record.
Your testimony, both your direct prefiled and your supplement testimony, in essence, raised a number of critiques to the survey -- the right-of-way survey done by the Northern Pass Project for the underground portion of the Project. And would it be a fair summary to say that you found numerous inadequacies in what the original survey that was submitted by the Applicant?
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A That's correct. Right. The original survey did not -- basically, had so little information on it that it did not appear that an adequate on-the-ground survey, if an on-the-ground survey had been done at all. And it also -the analysis, if there was any analysis, seemed to be so poor that there were, and in my supplemental $I$ went on page-by-page to indicate how the plans don't meet the requirements of the Board of Licensure for land surveying in New Hampshire.

Q Yes. And you referenced a minute ago with Mr. Thompson the DOT letter from July 17 th of this year, which $I$ will put up on the screen. I believe it is -- oh, down here. I believe this was marked earlier as "Counsel for the Public Exhibit 493", although I don't have the official version on my computer.

Is this the letter that you were referencing in your exchange with Mr. Thompson?

A This is one of them. That's correct.
Q And do you understand that, in this letter, DOT, in essence, rejected the survey that had been submitted by the Applicant?
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A That is correct. This is in response to the submittal of the April -- or, submittal, I think it has it in here, May 4th, 2017 submittal to DOT of the Meridian and the BL Companies survey reports and plans.

Q And would you agree that part of the reasoning from DOT was that the survey submitted failed to satisfy the General Condition Number 4 of the DOT Standards?

A That's correct. And I agree with I believe it was Mr. Talon who wrote the underlying memorandum on that. And $I$ agree with him that those plans did not meet the requirements of the Board of Licensure rules for a boundary survey.

Q And $I$ believe you also testified with Mr. Thompson that you're aware of the DOT approving a procedure for Northern Pass to move forward with creating and submitting a new survey, is that correct?

A That is correct.
Q And are you familiar with this October 3rd, 2017 letter?

A I am. And, if you can scroll down to the
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A $\quad \mathrm{No}$.
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Q Why not?
A Well, first of all, the survey plans are, in the overall permitting process, are coming in at the eleventh hour. There was testimony by Mr. Johnson and Mr. Bowes at the rehearing, I guess, of the construction committee, that this was an iterative process and that this is a normal process that they go through. And I completely disagree with that.

The design process is based upon baseline information, which is the survey information. In the 35 plus years that I've been working on projects, the baseline information, which is the boundary, is completed prior to the design work being done. And that's with the caveat that preliminary conceptual design work can be done prior to the completion, but that's not adequate for governmental review.

So, in other words, the survey and the establishment of the boundaries are not part of the design process. They are preliminary to the design process. They need to be done prior to the design process starting. So, to include them as part of the design process is not
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correct. They need to be done, or at least 95 or 98 percent done.

In this case, there's zero percent done. We've got a plan that has no metes and bounds on it. The April 5th BL Plan has no metes and bounds on it. There is no tie-in to the road. There is no tie-in to the Project. They don't meet the standards for land surveying in New Hampshire. And they're totally inadequate for the purposes at hand, especially at the eleventh hour of an application review of this magnitude. This should have been done years ago.

Q Okay. Attorney Nix, I understand that answer. But what I'm asking is, to looking forward at this point, if the Applicant follows the procedure that's outlined in this memorandum that's been adopted by DOT, is it your opinion that the resulting survey will meet the requirements of the surveying laws and rules that you were referencing in your testimony?

A No.
Q Okay.
A This memorandum appears to be Dot's approach to
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an end run around the Board of Licensure's rules for the production of a land survey. And I don't mean "end run" in a derogatory way. I mean, the DOT does not have the authority to determine what constitutes a boundary survey. That is established in the Board of Licensure rules, Lan 500.

And, so, many of these tasks that are outlined would be tasks that the surveyor does. But, at the end, when DOT says "This is all you have to do, we'll be satisfied with the boundary", is usurping the Board of Licensure's authority in determining what is necessary.

There is one line item in here that DOT does not have the authority at all under the law, nor do the land surveyors, and that is the third black bullet down, the third open bullet, which "Prescriptive right-of-way centered on existing traveled way lacking other evidence, adjusted per private recorded plans and/or field observations." A prescriptive right-of-way is a right-of-way that was neither laid out or dedicated and accepted. And a prescriptive right-of-way, under New Hampshire
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law, RSA 229, is a right-of-way that is established by twenty years of public use prior to January 1st, 1968 .

Under Gordon v. Rye --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Whoa. Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. We are so far beyond the question that was asked. And $I$ know you're a lawyer, but you're not here to give legal opinions, okay?

WITNESS NIX: My answer had to do with land surveying. The definition of "land surveying" states that --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, why don't you just stop talking right now, and let Mr. Aslin ask a more focused question that will get a more focused answer.

MR. ASLIN: Thank you.
BY MR. ASLIN:
Q Attorney Nix, from what you were just describing, am $I$ correct in understanding that your critique is that, while the survey itself may depict the correct information at the end of this process, it is not within the purview of DOT to determine whether a survey meets the
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think you asked. Is that, "will this process create a valid survey?"

Q Well, you've challenged the survey in the sense that it doesn't meet legal standards under the Board of Surveyors?

A Correct.
Q What I'm trying to get at is, with regard to this process at the SEC, is it your opinion or testimony here that this process that DOT has set forth will not create a factually accurate survey that the SEC can rely on?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. And, so, setting aside the legality of who decides what is a proper survey under the Board of Licensure, what do you believe is missing from this approach that will not -that will lead to an inaccurate or incomplete survey?

A What is missing from this approach are the requirements laid out in the Board of Licensure rules, 503, which requires that a licensed land surveyor look to additional evidence, and there's a whole list of it. If you want to me to go through it, I can?
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Q No, that's okay. Because I think it's in your testimony already.

A It is. It is. One of the issues that is missing here are historic plans and records, the 1860 wall maps, the 1895 Atlas, the 1909 USGS maps, if that's the date for that particular part of the country, but in that era. Those aren't on here.

The other issue that's on here is that a land surveyor -- as a licensed land surveyor, I may not certify that a road is a public highway by prescription.

Q Okay.
A I cannot do that.
Q Let's not get into that issue quite yet.
You've mentioned a few things that are
required, in your opinion, under the
Licensure -- Board of -- sorry, the Board of
Surveyors. Is it your contention that the information -- well, let me ask it a different way. Do you believe that this process precludes the Applicant from following what you believe are the requirements under the Board of Licensure rules? Or is it that this procedure
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is not detailed enough to satisfy you that they will follow those rules?

A I agree with your first statement. That this does not preclude a land surveyor from doing a proper survey of these roads.

Q Okay. And because you haven't seen the final product, we don't yet know or you don't have an opinion on whether the final product meets the rules?

A Correct.
Q Okay. I want to ask about one other thing that you addressed in your supplemental testimony, which was at Page 9. You've made an argument that, under Site $301.03(c)(3)$, the mapping requirement in the $S E C$ rules must or should be read to require a standard Property Survey.

Is it your position that the SEC can't accept a map that doesn't -- isn't stamped by a surveyor for the purposes of reviewing this Project?

A For this Project, yes. That's my position.
Q Okay. You qualified it "for this Project". Is it different for other projects?

A Well, there's other projects that may or may
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not involve lands.
Q I see.
A So, --
Q Okay. And do you have any legal support for that position that's not within the rules for this body, the SEC rules?

A Yes. In the statute, 162-H, it specifically says that private property rights are one of the issues that this Board needs to address. And, in order to properly address them, a proper survey needs to be produced.

Q Okay. So, your contention is, because the Board has to address property rights, they need a survey of the property that's being affected?

A That's correct.
MR. ASLIN: Okay. I have no further questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Of the folks who identified themselves, I believe, Ms. Pastoriza, you'll be first.

So, let me just read the order, and that will confirm that $I$ have everybody: Ms. Pastoriza; Ms. Saffo; Mr. Palmer and Mr. Lakes were from the same group, so we're probably
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going to ask you to specify what it is the two of you are going to ask about; Ms. Menard; Ms. Townsend; and Ms. Draper.

Did I miss anybody?
[No verbal response.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay Ms. Pastoriza, you may proceed.

MS. PASTORIZA: I'm Kris Pastoriza, Eastern Conservation Commission. My questions somewhat overlap Mr. Aslin's, but not exactly. So, I'm going to proceed. And, if they overlap, you can avoid the overlaps.

Could you turn on the screens, Apple TV?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Apple TV.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
So, this is Joint Muni 298. It's Paragraph 4 of the New Hampshire DOT General Conditions of Approval for their permit that they issued to Northern Pass for burial on April 3rd.

You are aware that one of the General
Conditions of Approval was that the Applicant provide a certified survey report identifying the means and methods used to determine the
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right-of-way?
A Correct.
Q You're also aware that another Condition of Approval was that a licensed surveyor certify that the right-of-way lines shown on the submitted plans should be defined by ground survey and all pertinent research?

A Correct.
Q So, what is your understanding of the term "pertinent research"?

A The "pertinent research" is research that is required to establish the boundaries. The land surveyor who is going to certify would determine what is adequate research for that particular job. So, in other words, there isn't a defined list. There's generalities. That some of those generalities are on the DOT list, but then there's other sources.

Q So, could you just give us a short list of what some of those might be?

A Sure. I talked about historic maps, parole evidence, additional research in the town halls up through today to determine whether any portions of the road have been moved or
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discontinued. There's physical evidence on the ground that needs to be looked at as well.

Q And, so, six months have passed since this letter was issued. What is your understanding of whether the Applicants have complied with these requirements to date?

A Well, my understanding is they have not.
Q So, this is Joint Muni 298. It's a page from BL Companies' survey, which they sent to DOT on April 12th. And it was uploaded to the Department of Transportation's website on August l8th. This survey was signed by Jennifer Marks, a Licensed Land Surveyor in the State of New Hampshire.

In your opinion, is this survey missing any of the information required in Paragraph 4 of the Conditional Permit?

A Yes.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm going to object. This is beyond the scope of his testimony. His testimony focused, I think, on the state roads in the north, and this is looking at 116 -- the town roads in the north. This is looking at 116.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pastoriza.

MS. PASTORIZA: His focus was on the practice of surveying in general, which applies to any road on this route.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled. You can answer.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A This is typical of all of the plans that were submitted in May. There are no metes and bounds on these plans. There's no indication of how the right-of-way was determined in the different locations. What the surveyor did do, in the bottom left-hand corner, is indicate that, in a solid line, that there are areas where they feel comfortable in determining the right-of-way, but the dash lines are indicated to be a line based on the centerline of the road. And, then, the line with two dashes are approximate right-of-way.

So, essentially, this is a very, very
preliminary plan of the surveyor's work, and does not meet the requirements of Lan 500 for plats. There's no indication of the -- what evidence the surveyor obtained for the legal
\{SEC 2015-06\}Day 49/Afternoon Session ONLY\{10-20-17\}
status of the roads. So, in other words, there's no note on here that states that the road was laid out. There's no evidence to indicate that it's determined to be a road by prescription.

The only thing that is on here are -well, it's not even on the plan. There's no reference to why or how they determined the solid lines on it.

Q So, can you see any reason why they hold to one iron boundary there and not the concrete monument there in the center?

A There's not enough information on this plan to determine why they did that.

Q And there's no information as to why the paved surface is wandering throughout the claimed right-of-way?

A That, the wandering of the paved surface throughout the right-of-way, does not necessarily create a problem, because the road is not always centered in the right-of-way. You know, over time, they shift or they may have been built off-center from the centerline of the right-of-way.
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However, if the -- excuse me -- if the -can you move it back over to the left where the legend is?

If you look at the approximate right-of-way line based on centerline, and then you go up to the top right-hand, where there's two dashed lines, you will see that those dashed lines are not centered on the right-of-way. So, that raises a question of what was really held. And there's not enough information on there, but it's in direct -it's internally inconsistent, where the legend says they're holding the centerline, but the line work does not hold the centerline. And that's pretty graphically evidenced above the Coots property, where the road is shifted over to the left.

Q So, you would say that this document does not contain notions on -- notations on all records and plans, as required?

A No, it does not.
Q And would you consider notification of abutters to a right-of-way, such as this one here, to be part of the pertinent research?
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A In a case like this, I would be contacting abutters in locations that $I$ didn't have any other information. There is -- it's best practices for a land surveyor to discuss with abutters. As a matter of fact, the parole evidence is one of the -- parole evidence is evidence that's verbal evidence, where the land surveyor will actually talk to landowners, and because landowners have a huge wealth of knowledge, especially if they've lived there for a long time, about the land. So, the land surveyor should be obtaining that parole evidence.

Q Okay. So, this is Joint Muni 298, part of a letter from DOT Commissioner Sheehan to Easton. On July 17th, 2017, the Towns of Easton, Sugar Hill, and Franconia wrote to Commissioner Sheehan expressing concern with the right-of-way boundaries, and asking her to follow RSA 228.35, and have DOT establish the right-of-way in areas of uncertainty.

Her response, in part, stated that "this document", meaning the survey that Northern Pass was going to produce, "will be certified
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by a Licensed Land Surveyor in New Hampshire as meeting the required standards for real property surveys."

So, you are aware of recent testimony that Northern Pass is actively in the process of attempting a second survey that will meet these required standards?

A (Scott) That's my understanding.
Q So, this is Joint Muni 298, which is a page -one page of the Standards of Real Property Survey from the New Hampshire Land Surveyors Association, Ethics and Standards. So, under 502.01, there was a requirement that "In the absence of sufficient record evidence substantiating the property lines and corners being surveyed, attempts shall be made to obtain evidence from unrecorded sources." Based on your review of this Project to date, is it your opinion that there is an absence of sufficient record evidence substantiating the property lines and corners being surveyed?

A The answer to the question is "yes". But, preliminarily, this is not from the Land
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[WITNESS: Nix]

Surveyors Association. This is the Rules of Administrative Procedure from the Board of Licensure of Land Surveyors for the minimum standards for surveying.

Q So, in the terms of the requirement in Paragraph 4 that an effort should be exerted to obtain evidence from unrecorded sources, and we just kind of went over this, would that include notification of abutters or discussions with abutters to obtain historical information about property?

A Yes. The land surveyor, it's generally accepted procedures, when there's a lack of evidence, to approach the abutters and ask them what they know about their property. Many times throughout my career, when I've talked to abutters, they have taken me to corners that they knew about that were difficult to find, or they knew it was buried five feet down, and we dug down and found it. So, that type of evidence is very valuable.

The other evidence is what they have in their attics. You know, the old plans from the 1920's that a surveyor did that were never on
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record, but they are, in fact, very weighty evidence to the surveyor as to what existed at that time period.

Q In terms of the requirements in Paragraph (2), that "All abutting tracts be researched as far back as practical", based on your review of the documents to date, what is your opinion regarding whether the Applicants have fulfilled that requirement?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Which documents? And with respect to what part of the Project?

MS. PASTORIZA: Any of the documents in --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't have a problem with the question being asked about compliance with this set of rules or his opinion about it.

But, Ms. Pastoriza, when you're reading them, you're reading them differently than they appear on the screen in front of us. And I'm not quite sure what the source of the disagreement is. You added the words "to the extent reasonably practical", or something like
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that, when you read it. So, I'm not sure what's happening.

MS. PASTORIZA: There's two very similar documents. One was the New Hampshire Land Surveyors Association Ethics, the other one was the Lan standards. So, what I was looking at was the Ethics, and what we have on the screen is the Land -- the Lan. So, that's the difference in wording. And I don't know why there are two very similar documents here. I can try to look on the screen, but that's going to slow things up.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It will
certainly be less confusing, for those of us trying to follow along, if you use the document that we're looking at. That's just -- but, if there's some reason why both documents are relevant, maybe you can explore that with the witness.

MS. PASTORIZA: No.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't even
know.
MS. PASTORIZA: I can look at the computer.
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BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q So, in terms of the requirements in Paragraph (2), which is that "All abutting tracts shall be researched to ensure the correctness of the record evidence", what is your opinion regarding whether the Applicants have fulfilled that requirement from what you've seen?

A From what $I$ have seen, I don't know whether they have fulfilled that requirement or not. They don't have any notes on the plan to indicate what they did.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record. [Brief off-the-record discussion ensued.]

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q Then, based on your review of the Project, are there other requirements for real land surveys that you believe have been neglected to date?

A Yes. Yes. I was on the site yesterday. I took the plans, the BL plans for North Hill Road, Bear Rock Road, and Old County Road, and went up to see what was up there. And I got up to the north end of Old -- yes, North Hill Road, and there is a cemetery that abuts this
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proposed area that is not mapped on these plans. Next to the cemetery is an old section of road that goes up to the cemetery, and it's not very far. It's only from here to the middle of the room. And it was apparent to me that at some point the road was moved, because the original road went up a steep bank next to the cemetery in the way.

And it took -- $I$ was there for at least a half an hour going through these plans to figure out where they -- where it should be on the plans, and they are not mapped. The cemetery, it really raises a question about the complete adequacy of the fieldwork that's been done out here.

The moving of the road, for a land surveyor, it raises all kinds of questions about whether the road was relaid out, whether the old section was discontinued. In many cases, the town road agent will sometimes just move the road, which raises the question of "what is it?" Is it really a public road or is it an encroachment on private property?

None of that is mapped. It doesn't show
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up. Again, I was there for quite a while. And I can tell you that it's on -- I think it's NRTH-17. I finally could figure out, through abutting properties and the way the road goes, and there's a brook and a couple roads nearby, where this would be on the plans, and none of that shows up. Which raises a question of the validity of all the fieldwork.

Q So, I'm going to return to -- so, I'm going to return to the October 3rd new conditions, and if you could just quickly reiterate your assessment. In your opinion, do these conditions honor -- satisfy New Hampshire laws regarding land survey standards referenced by DOT, specifically Lan 503.03 and 503.04, and which were required by Condition Number 4 in DOT's Permit to Northern Pass?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Asked and answered, and it calls for a legal conclusion. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pastoriza. MS. PASTORIZA: What he was saying was that a surveyor could, if they were doing the right thing, use these rules and come up with something good. My question is, if
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someone follows these rules in a loose-handed fashion, could they come up with something that followed the rules without satisfying the Lan 503.03, etcetera?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled. You can answer.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A Yes. Well, specifically, under "Fieldwork", it says "Field locate observable monuments and physical evidence". An "observable monument" is a monument that you can see when you walk down the road without doing anything further. Many, many times there are monuments that are buried. And, in order to -- you need to do deed research, research the plan record, you need to do some preliminary layout of the abutting lots. And then you need to go out with a metal locator and see if -- a metal locator can locate a monument that's been buried. Even if they're three or four feet down, it will send an indication. Those should all be found and dug up. And that's a basic requirement of fieldwork.

The research does not indicate, looking at
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any of the -- it indicates historic road layout records, but it does not discuss historic or even current road discontinuance records, which need to be looked at.

Again, the prescriptive right-of-way, as a land surveyor, we cannot determine whether it is a public right-of-way or not. We are finders of fact. So, a surveyor would map the physical evidence in the field, indicate to their client that they do not have the authority to determine that it is a public right-of-way, or where the limits of those rights-of-way are. The land surveyor would then work with the client in a court proceeding to have those limits established.

I will say that $I$ don't have a problem with using the centerline for the metes and bounds, and then doing the stationing to the right or left. Although, on a route survey of this nature, that would be relatively standard. For a boundary survey, people would generally see it along their frontage.

What else is not on here is that, under the rules for surveying, it requires that, when
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a boundary survey is performed, that monuments be set. And, now, this is a pretty extensive route survey, so $I$ wouldn't expect a monument to be set at every property corner. But I would expect that, in areas where there are no monuments, that the surveyor would determine appropriate places to set monuments, so that the next surveyor can follow in today's surveyor's steps and reconstruct this.

And that's one of the underlying rules of surveying, is that we follow in the prior surveyor's steps. And we have to leave enough evidence on the ground of what we did. And that there's no indication here that there will be any evidence or any monuments set.

And then, again, without seeing the final plans, that's what I'm picking up off of this, this list.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q So, in regards to Paragraph 3, since prescriptive right-of-ways are generally set or the layout is unknown, or the width of the layout was not stated, could you explain how private survey markers set on the abutting
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property by a surveyor, without knowledge of the road right-of-way, could be used to determine the road boundary?

A If there is no -- if there is no layout width and it's determined to be by prescription, that is simply evidence of the prior surveyor's location. Many times the surveyor will note on their plans that there is no determined width of the right-of-way. And the surveyor will pick a common width for that area, so they can put a monument in to determine the line. If my right arm pointing up is the road [indicating], and my left arm coming in at a perpendicular [indicating] is the private property line between two parties, the surveyor needs to pick some place to put the monument. And they will generally pick a width that is consistent with other widths in the area.

And beyond that, it's -- again, the surveyor's job is a fact-finder. Prescriptive rights, all that evidence would be put in front of the judge, and the judge would decide. So, the private survey marker on an unknown right-of-way is a convenience, and they just
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had to pick a point to put it down. It's not an indicator of the road right-of-way generally?

A Generally, correct.
Q So, this covers something you already covered, but $I$ wanted to put it up. So, in this email to me, DOT states that they are not requiring the surveyor to place survey markers. And just to confirm, in your opinion, this does not conform with New Hampshire land survey standards?

A That's correct.
Q And what is the purpose of placing survey markers?

A So that future surveyors and landowners will be able to walk in the footsteps of the current land surveyor and reconstruct the survey, today's survey, 30 or 40 or 50 years from now.

Q And would the lack of survey markers make it difficult for abutters to determine the claimed right-of-way?

A Absolutely. There's no indication here at all that this right-of-way will be staked at all. So, if a property owner wanted to defend their
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property rights, in the face of an inaccurate or incomplete survey, how would they do this?

A The property owner would have to, assuming that -- assuming that this process goes through. It's approved at the Committee. It's approved by DOT. The only recourse the property owners then have is to bring a quiet title action in superior court.

Q And can you give a ballpark figure for how much that might cost someone?

A Twenty to fifty thousand dollars, per lot. So, a person without 20 or $\$ 50,000$ has no legal recourse to dispute a boundary setting?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Relevance.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, it's sustained.

MS. PASTORIZA: I withdraw the question.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q So, this is marked as "Grafton County 36".
Going to Page 10. Sorry about that. So, this document shows that Northern Pass, in the person of Mark Hodgdon, had the layout
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documents for the proposed route in 2015.
They're stating "The overwhelming length of
Route 116 from Franconia to Route 112
intersection dates to an 1833 layout."
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Slow down just a
little when you read.
MS. PASTORIZA: Yes.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q And this is Applicants Exhibit 142, Page 7. So, this is BL's description of the layout for Franconia and Easton. So, given that, in the 2015 Application for burial, this 1833 layout was cited, can you explain why Cynthia Boisvert, of Arago, who did the research on this survey, was not in possession of this layout and was unable to find it or any other at the New Hampshire State Archives?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. It's beyond the scope of his testimony. And it also relates to documents that were available to him when he prepared his testimony, and they could have been included.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pastoriza.
MS. PASTORIZA: This survey, I only
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found out about at the first hearing of the construction panel. And, given the amount of information flowing in, $I$ think it's reasonable to cover it at this point.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The question
isn't when you learned about it. The question is when it was available, and whether it could have been included in his original testimony. I'm going to sustain the objection.

MS. PASTORIZA: I'd like to make an offer of proof. And I've asked the question, and I think what the answer would be was that Mr. Nix has no idea how Cynthia Boisvert could have missed the 1833 layout.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Thank
you.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q So, I had three more questions on discrepancies, but $I$ have to pass those over. This is Applicants Exhibit [Bates Page?] 62271, marked as "Applicants 130", Page 1. So, looking at paragraph two, which it might take you a minute to read through, can you explain why the Applicant's subcontractor PAR Request
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for Proposal was to "verify and locate edges of the state or local right-of-way", yet BL Companies was only requested by the Applicant to use evidence in the field and tax maps to create their survey?

A This, what the surveyor did here in his report, and quite properly so, was that he indicated in his report exactly what the Applicant asked him to do. And that was to locate the edges of the right-of-way and adjacent parcel lines,
"plotted from a combination of evidence measured during the field survey and supplemental evidence available from tax mapping" -- "assessors mapping and GIS".

This is typical of a preliminary request from an engineering company. And the surveyor did exactly what he was asked, and he wasn't asked to produce a plan that met the requirements of the Board of Licensure. So, on Page 2, in the same document, the survey shows three levels of certainty. One of these was "Bold Solid for Determined", and they state "This line remains un-used at this time. We expected that there would be specific sections
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of right-of-way where a full determination would be requested, which would require additional research, fieldwork, and LLS evaluation. We have not received any requests for this is level of effort."

Can you explain why the surveyors were not asked for a full determination for any portion of the right-of-way?

A Again, the surveyor properly indicated what he was asked to do and what he was not asked to do. I don't know why the design engineer or Northern Pass did not ask to have a proper survey performed.

Q So, you cannot explain why the Applicant submitted a survey that they knew would not satisfy the conditions of DOT's conditional -Condition Number 4 permit for burial?

A I --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Grounds?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: It's assuming facts not in evidence. The Applicants did intend for it to satisfy those requirements.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pastoriza.
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MS. PASTORIZA: I find that hard to believe.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. The objection is sustained.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q Can you explain why DoT took more than three months to reject this survey?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. He has no basis to answer that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pastoriza.

MS. PASTORIZA: I would say he has a lot of basis. He's done a lot of surveying. He's probably assessed surveys. He would look at this survey and have a good idea of how long it would take an experienced surveyor to decide whether it met the Lan standards.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That may be true. But does he know what's going on within the Department of Transportation?

MS. PASTORIZA: I would hope they operate by the same standards as he's operating by

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: In terms of their workload and how long it takes to get to
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work?
MS. PASTORIZA: Well, if you --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's find out if he has any idea. Do you have any idea?

WITNESS NIX: My understanding is
there's only one licensed land surveyor in the Department of Transportation. They might have hired another one in the recent past. But Bob Talon is the only one in there. And he is in charge of the Right-of-Way -- I forgot exactly his department, but $I$ know he has a lot on his plate.

MS. PASTORIZA: That's all I have. Thanks.

MS. FILLMORE: Just one moment please, Mr. Chairman.
(Short pause.)
MS. FILLMORE: Mr. Chairman, we have been reminded that the BL Companies' discussion of Franconia, the objection to which you sustained a moment ago, was under cover of a letter dated April 19th, which was after the April 17 th deadine for supplemental prefiled testimony. And it was uploaded to the
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Department of Transportation's website in August of 2017, which is when it would have become available.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Needleman.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, I didn't have that in mind. What $I$ had in mind is it was referring to an October 2015 letter. So, I don't know how the two relate together.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. And I'm not sure I do either. So, why don't we reopen that issue.

If you have questions about this, about the document that you say was generated in April and uploaded in August, let's find out what the question is. Maybe Mr. Needleman still has an objection to it, but let's find out at least what the question is you want to ask about it.

MR. IACOPINO: And could you also identify the exhibit number for that BL report?

MS. PASTORIZA: So, we're back on Applicants Exhibit 142. And we have to show this old and outdated document to ask questions about the newer document, which is why it's up
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there.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q So, the question again was, as we're waiting for BL Companies' assessment of Franconia and Easton, can you explain how the 2015

Application for burial could have sited the 1833 layout for Route 116 in Franconia and Easton, yet Cynthia Boisvert, of Arago, was not in possession of this layout and was unable to find it or any other at the New Hampshire State Archives?
(Short pause.)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think people are having trouble understanding what the question is and what it relates to.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q So, under "Records Research", a state -"research was conducted at the New Hampshire State Archives Records", and they couldn't find anything. So, in light of the fact that, in 2015, the Application to DOT included the 1833 layout, can you explain how the later survey, which was rejected by DOT, in their records research they state that they could not find
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any layout at the archives for Route 116?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm gone to -- to the extent $I$ understand it, I'm going to object again, because it sounds like it's asking the witness to speculate.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm sorry, Ms. Pastoriza. It's probably me, but $I$ am confused. But what document am I looking at? What's the -- you said this was -- this is an old document that we're looking at?

MS. PASTORIZA: No. This is the new summary by BL Companies of what they did for research in the various towns and the roads.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The one that a moment ago Ms. Fillmore said was created in April and uploaded in August?

MS. PASTORIZA: Yes. So, in this assessment, the surveyors state that they could not find any road layouts for Route 116 in Franconia and Easton. And I'm curious as to how Northern Pass could have sited the 1833 layout in their Application?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. And, so, the missing piece that we're not seeing is the
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[WITNESS: Nix]

1
older document from the Application? Is it Mr. Hodgdon's letter from --

MS. PASTORIZA: Yes. Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. So,
that's what this ties back to.

MS. PASTORIZA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: A statement from Mr. Hodgdon's letter, you're asking how that representation in Mr. Hodgdon's letter matches up with what we're looking at on the screen in front of us?

MS. PASTORIZA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. I
apologize. As $I$ said, this is probably just me.

So, then I'm going to apologize again and ask you to restate the question, now that $I$ have been brought up to the right place.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q Can you explain why the surveyors and Cynthia Boisvert, of Arago, were not in possession of this layout when they did their research on the right-of-way?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And that's my
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objection. It calls for speculation.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. I'm going
to overrule it and allow you to answer.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A As a land surveyor reading another land surveyor's research report, in combination with Mr. Hodgdon's letter, $I$ read this that Cynthia Boisvert does not agree with Mr. Hodgdon that the layout that Mr. Hodgdon found or someone else found is for the road in question.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q If there were a 90 percent certainty that it was for the road in question, would that change your opinion?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Again, well, there's no basis for that, and it calls for speculation.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Assume that everyone was certain that we were talking about the same thing, any explanation?

WITNESS NIX: I would have no explanation -- if there was a 90 percent certainty, no, $I$ would have no explanation. BY MS. PASTORIZA:
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Q So, I'll read this slowly as we wait for it to come onto the screen. This is "Easton and Woodstock". "Research was conducted at the New Hampshire Archive Records." They state that "The majority of this right-of-way was defined in State Project 12971", the "majority of this right-of-way".

So, can you square that statement with Exhibit 12971, which is --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That's not an exhibit number. That's a page number. MS. PASTORIZA: I think it's a discovery number. It's going to be numbered later. So, this is a DOT plan. It's showing State Project 12971. And it will be marked as "Joint Muni 302".

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q And it shows this Project is ending around Olesons Brook, which is about ten miles from where 112 ends in North Woodstock. And this is in DOT records. It was given to Northern Pass, I believe, in 2014 .

So, can you square the fact that Northern Pass had this document, it's easily accessible
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on the DOT site, and yet the researcher was confused as to where the Project ended by ten miles?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Now, we're talking about documents that all predated the filing of the testimony, as far as $I$ can tell.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm not sure. I think they're asking, am $I$ correct, that the document you're asking for a contrast is that same document that was created in April and uploaded in August?

MS. PASTORIZA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, so, it --
you went through it without context. So, I got lost, and it's possible that others got lost as well.

MS. PASTORIZA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So,
Ms. Fillmore, would you pull up the previous document and the paragraph that you were highlighting? And, so, the paragraph that is partially highlighted makes a reference to that 12971 map that is the other document you just
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had up.
All right. Now that we understand what documents you're talking about, what's the question that you would like Mr. Nix to answer? BY MS. PASTORIZA:

Q Can you explain how this surveyor could state that the 2002 State Project 12971 covers the majority of Route 112, when this Project ended at Olesons Brook, which is more than ten miles from where 112 ends in North Woodstock?

WITNESS NIX: Mr. Chairman, I'm completely unfamiliar with the plan.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. He has no answer for that question.

MS. PASTORIZA: Okay.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q So, this is the same BL Companies' Records Research for Clarksville. And it states that "Old County Road was established in August 26...in Book 1 Page 10 as a four road", implying that the whole of the road was a four rod road. And this a Clarksville-Stewartstown map showing that layout. This is the layout that
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was referenced in the records research that we just looked at. And it's only a short segment that is four rods. So, if you can see it, it's 13-4, upper left.

A Okay. I see that.
Q So, do you understand that to be the layout that's referenced here? Book 1, Page 10? It's 4-4. It's a little farther down.

The point I'm trying to make here is that, in the Research Report, it states that the road was laid out at four roads. And, when you look at the DOT mapping, it shows that a short segment of the road, 4-4, was laid out at four rods.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think we know what you're trying to do. I'm not sure that Mr. Nix understands or has enough familiarity with what you're showing him. I just don't know.

Mr. Nix, what are your thoughts on this?

WITNESS NIX: My thoughts are, I know what's on the screen. This is a snapshot of a page in one of the older right-of-way books
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that lives at Department of Transportation. And, over the years, as Department of Transportation felt comfortable that they had figured out where an ancient layout was on one of these maps, they would highlight it and then cross-reference. That's what the 4-4 is. So, that cross-references back to this four rod layout.

Without digging deep into the layout and the analysis of it back into 1803, I can't comment more than that. But to simply assume that the entire layout is four rods is not proper process immediately, without doing more research.

MS. PASTORIZA: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, now, Ms.
Saffo.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { [Brief off-the-record discussion } \\
& \text { ensued.] }
\end{aligned}
$$

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Fillmore or Ms. Pastoriza, can we get an exhibit number on that page, the ancient map we were just looking at? Or has it not yet been marked?

MS. FILLMORE: It will be marked as
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[WITNESS: Nix]
"Joint Muni 301".
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Thank you.

MS. FILLMORE: I apologize.
MR. ASLIN: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who's up? Yes, Mr. Aslin.

MR. ASLIN: Just for the record, I neglected to mention that the document I showed Mr. Nix, --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes.
MR. ASLIN: -- which would be the
October 3rd DOT letter, we will be marking that as "Counsel for the Public 593", if anyone else wants to reference it.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'll note it's already marked.

MR. ASLIN: Oh, okay. What --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Applicant 228.
MR. ASLIN: 228 .
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. So, you
don't need to mark it. It's Applicant 228.
MR. ASLIN: Great. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
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[Brief off-the-record discussion ensued.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Saffo.
MS. SAFFO: Thank you. So, good afternoon, Attorney Nix.

WITNESS NIX: Good afternoon.
BY MS. SAFFO:
Q I have in front of us New Hampshire RSA 310-A:52 [310-A:53?], the "General Provisions".

And the chapter is "Land Surveyors". What's the purpose of this chapter?

A This chapter creates the licensure of land surveyors, as well as the practice of land surveying. And the other underlying purpose is for the safeguard of property and to promote public welfare.
Q So, what surveyors do is defined by statute, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And it also regulates the company, this statute, correct?

A (Rockler) That is correct.
Q And that's the Lan regs that you were referring to earlier?
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A That's correct.
MS. SAFFO: Okay. Can we switch over to the ELMO? Thank you.

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q And this is just a page from Grafton Exhibit 43, and which is the well-known survey. When
you look at this survey, how quickly does it
take you to realize that it doesn't comply with
the regulations?
A Less than a second.
Q So, it's pretty obvious, correct?
A Correct.
Q And then go into the legend part of it.
A Yes.
Q And this legend actually -- sorry --
specifically uses the word "approximate".
A That's correct.
Q And what does that mean in surveyor land?
A What that means is the surveyor did -- located the evidence, did research, and was unable to determine with the proper degree of certainty the location, the historical location of the line. So, they approximated as best they could where the line is.
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MS. SAFFO: Okay. And then going back, expanding back so we can see the map itself.

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q In this particular page, which is for the record noting Phyllis Gilbert's land on the left-hand side, we have two lines, major lines, and one them indicates the edge of the roadway. And do you see where that is?

A Yes. You're talking about the edge of the traveled way?

Q Yes.
A The pavement, yes.
Q And can you point that out on this? Can you -oh, no, you can't. Never mind. Okay. I was going real high-tech for a second all by myself in my head.
[Laughter.]
BY MS. SAFFO:
Q And then past that, there's another line. And is that what is represented to be the right-of-way in this particular document?

A Yes. I can -- for the record, I can describe where the edge of the traveled way is.
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Q Please do.
A And, first, for the record, the traveled way is the area within the legal right-of-way that is utilized as the viatic surface. So, in this case, it's pavement. On a gravel road, it would be the width of the gravel. There are other areas within the right-of-way that are used for drainage and culverts. But the traveled way is the pavement. And, if you look in the middle of this plan, it says "Franconia Road (HWY", which stands for "Highway", "18)". The dash line immediately above that is the edge of the traveled way.

Then, if you go another half inch, let's say, above that, there is a longer dash line, and that represents the approximate edge of the legal right-of-way, the edge of the easement. The division between the private property line -- the private property owner and the public rights.

Q And is there any way to approximate the distance between the traveled way and what is represented to be the approximate right-of-way in this document, by looking at this document?
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[WITNESS: Nix]

```
                    WITNESS NIX: Can you scan back a
        little bit? Okay. Can you go back farther?
        And can you go down into the right-hand corner?
                        MS. MENARD: Down here?
                        WITNESS NIX: Yes. Oh, no. Yes.
        Yes.
    BY THE WITNESS:
    A Yes, there is. Right at the bottom, in the
        middle, there is a graphic scale.
    BY MS. SAFFO:
    Q Now, as far as scales are concerned, how
        accurate is this one?
    A Well, --
            WITNESS NIX: Scan in a little
        further.
    BY THE WITNESS:
    A Okay. So, this is -- given this scale, this
        plan is drafted at a one inch equal to thirty
        feet scale, which isn't bad. You could
        graphically scale this to within, if you have a
        very good first-generation print, you could
        scale this probably within plus or minus a foot
        or so.
        BY MS. SAFFO:
```
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    Q Okay. And, if you're a citizen and you're looking at this, and you're trying to figure out where on your property this alleged right-of-way is, is this a good document to be able to do that? Can you tell?

A It would be very, very difficult to do that, based on this, with this document.

Q And why is that?
A The only -- there are a few permanent features that are shown on this plan. The building corners are permanent features. You could scale from the building corners out. There appear to be some monuments. You could scale those monuments. But it's -- once you start doing that, there's error in the location of the buildings, there's error in the drafting of the buildings. Then, it's printed on the plan, then the plan is copied. So, now you're talking about errors, and you have your errors in scaling. So, now you're talking, you know, two or three feet to figure out a guess. It's a guess at that point. So, you need to have -- in order to use this plan, you need to have -- locate physical
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features that haven't changed. And, when $I$ say
"haven't changed", the property owner didn't add siding to his building. He didn't move his building. That happens a lot. There's a building in Laconia, where they call for the corner of the brick as the witness to the property corner. And every surveyor in Laconia knows that, in the early $1920^{\prime} s$, they added an extra layer of brick on the outside of that building. So, we have to deduct that. So, if you don't know that that happened, you can get in trouble.

So, that's -- I think that's the answer to your question.

Q Okay. Thank you. And then you've already testified, $I$ won't ask you to reiterate it, how this particular survey did not comply with the regulations and the standards, correct?

A Yes. The list goes on and on.
Q And that there is a mechanism to do it right, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And that's outlined in the regulations, correct?
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A That's correct.
Q And that's why we have the regulations to tell
us how to do them right?
A That's correct.
Q And those regulations are a very public document, are they not?

A Yes, they are.
Q Now, if this was certified, what would it be certified as? Can you think of like --

A If I were -- if this were labeled as a
"preliminary" document -- it is the work product of a licensed land surveyor. So, when you say "certified", when a licensed land surveyor puts his stamp on a product, there should be come definition on that product describing what it is. So, in this case, and I haven't seen these plans stamped. So, are there plans that have been stamped?

Q Well, if there's been a representation by
Northern Pass that they have a "certified
stamped set of drawings"?
A I have never seen those.
Q Okay.
A I have seen a stamped surveyor's report that
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[WITNESS: Nix]
described what the surveyors did.
Q Yes.
A And $I$ have seen these plans. But these plans do not carry the certification.

Q And these plans don't carry the certification.
The report that you did see, describe that?
A That's correct.
Q And what was that report that you did see?
A That report described pretty accurately what the surveyors did and what they did not do.

The surveyors were limited by their client in
their research, they were limited in their fieldwork. And, so, the surveyors, quite properly, labeled the plans -- or, labeled these lines as "approximate".

Q And when you said "they were limited by their client in research", what did you mean by that?

A In the letter, I think it was the Meridian letter, --

Q Uh-huh.
A -- which references the contract from the Northern Pass electrical contractor, and I don't remember what the name is offhand.

```
Q PAR?
```
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[WITNESS: Nix]

A PAR, yes. That's correct.
Q And then "limited in fieldwork", what did you mean by that? "Limited by client in fieldwork"?

A Well, if we could look at that Meridian document again, it would help.

MS. SAFFO: Can we switch back over to the --

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q And, while we're doing that, so, if a client limits the surveyor in their research and in their fieldwork, and the client has decided to rely on a document that is limited, at least as far as the land survey standards are concerned, correct?

A That's correct. It's a contractual relationship between the client and the surveyor.

Q Okay. And, so, if Northern Pass, the client, says "we have a certified stamped set of drawings we believe is accurate", if they're the ones who created these conditions that made it hard to do an accurate survey, it would really be at their peril, correct?
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A That's correct.
Q Or the peril of the people who --
A Well, it would be an incorrect statement. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Dawn, could you please turn on Apple TV. Okay. Thank you. BY MS. SAFFO:

Q And, as we're doing that, these surveys are particularly important to the private landowners, correct?

A Yes. Oh, absolutely.
Q Because among the things happening in Grafton County, we're looking at a burial of 130 vaults the size of a boxcar, correct?

A Yes. I have seen those plans.
Q And then we're also looking at horizontal diagonal drilling, which is going to take significant staging areas, correct?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr. Chair.
We're reiterating what could have or should have been in the initial testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Saffo.
MS. SAFFO: No. I think, in this
particular case, we have seen numerous
documents filed by Northern Pass since the
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prefiled testimony deadline was due. We've also seen these surveys rejected by Dot after these deadlines were due, and that was August. But we're looking at them submitted in May, written in April, uploaded in May, and then rejected by DOT in August. And, obviously, DOT, we've learned, has only so many people. But the fact of the matter is that didn't happen until August. So, I think it's more than fair.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled. You can continue.

WITNESS NIX: Can you repeat the question?

MS. SAFFO: Yes. Do you mind reading it into the record? Don't worry. I can rephrase it. My little sign telling me to go slow isn't up.

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q So, we're looking at the construction, the temporary impacts and the permanent impacts of this Project being significant on private landowners, correct?

A Correct.
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Q So, if we're going to be protecting private rights, it's very vital that we have this information up front, correct?

A Absolutely.
Q Now, when you make design plans, can you do a design plan without a proper survey, if you're interested in the impacts on private property?

A No.
Q And why not?
A The proper survey is a precursor to the design plan. In any land use -- I've been in land use, again, for thirty five years. In any land use proceedings, municipalities, state, even in federal government, before the project can move, in many cases, before the governmental agency will accept the project, a -- or, excuse me, accept the application -- or, approve the application, a complete boundary survey must be completed, because it delineates the rights of the applicant.

In this case, you had mentioned the underground drilling. And, as I was fumbling around, $I$ was looking for one of the exception reports that were recently filed regarding Bear
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Rock Road. And the widths necessary for the underground drilling, and I'm going to do this from memory, but the width between the two drillings they indicated need to be approximately twenty feet, and -- because of whatever technical reason. Then, they went on to say that the drilling needs to be ten feet from the property line. And then it indicated that the error in the drilling is five feet plus or minus.

Now, if you add all those numbers up, in the worst case scenario, they're going to go outside or be, unless it's done perfectly, they're going to be outside of the right-of-way, in some case, underground, if you add those numbers up.

And that's one reason why it's so
important to know what the width of the right-of-way is and where it is.

Q And then also letting the private landowners know as well, correct?

A Exactly.
Q Because they can't evaluate the design plans without having an accurate survey?
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A Correct.
Q Okay. And you just mentioned that, in your experience, applications are generally not approved without an accurate survey, correct? That's correct. And, so, if this Application was approved upon a reliance of a survey that then deemed -- was determined to be not accurate, is that a problem with the approval right from the beginning of this Project?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Again, we're talking about material that could have and should have been included in the testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And I think -and it probably was.

MS. SAFFO: So, we did go into some of this and the accuracy of the initial design plans and the disclosure. I think it's also appropriate for me to delve into this again, because we're just finding out now, way past this, that they're going to be providing us with a whole new plan. That we don't even have the final survey now, and it doesn't comply with DOT.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: But the opinions that are in his original testimony cover what you're asking him right now.

MS. SAFFO: Okay. I'll wait -- I'll hold off then.

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

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q So, while we're working through that, I've just shown you the SHEB documents, which are the plan documents. Are you familiar with the design plan documents?

A Yes, I am.
Q So, again, for the record, can you just pick one of the numbers of one of the pages? It would be at the bottom, you'll see "SHEBC", and I think we're at 106 , but we might have flipped it.

A Okay. Why don't you go ahead and ask, and then I'll figure out what --

Q Yes. On the page that you're on, which page are you on?

A I'm on 106 .
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[WITNESS: Nix]

Q Okay. So, taking SHEBC106, that particular document, can you see if they overlaid their survey on that document?

A No. And excuse me, are you talking about the April 2016 survey document?

We'll start from that one.
Okay. And are you asking me if the April 2017
document -- plan is overlaid on the
December 8th, 2016 design plan?
Q So, what I'm asking is, can you see if a survey has been used in that particular plan?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm going to object
to this. We're now talking about old documents that could have and should have been included in the testimony.

MS. SAFFO: Let me strike that.
BY MS. SAFFO:
Q Is the more recent documents reflected in the design plans?

A No, they're not.
Q And they wouldn't be, unless the design plans are dated after the more recent survey?

A That's correct.
Q Thank you. Okay. So, can you see in front of
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[WITNESS: Nix]
you the Meridian Report?
A I cannot.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
[Brief off-the-record discussion
ensued.]
WITNESS NIX: I have my own copy. MS. SAFFO: Oh, perfect.

WITNESS NIX: It took me a minute.
MS. SAFFO: I'm right with him.
Okay.
So, if we can make it a little
smaller -- I mean, make it so $I$ can see the whole page.

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q Now, you were talking about the significance of this document. Can you explain that?

A Yes. What this document is is the surveyor's report indicating, and this is signed by Ken Clinton of Meridian, he indicated to the client what he was asked to do, and then he indicated what he did do. And he actually went a little bit further than what they asked. And the way I'm reading this is that, limiting it to what he was asked to do, he probably couldn't have
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produced anything. And, so, he went a little bit further and came up with the concept of the solid lines for "determined rights-of-way", bold dashed for "approximate", you know, with annotations, and dashed for "approximate, based on tax map and GIS".

So, he's stated quite clearly what he's done. And he's also indicated to the client that, if they want the rights-of-way to be further determined, that additional work would have to be done.

Q And, so, we're in April of 2017, and that's where we're at, as far as the survey is concerned, as far as the accuracy of the survey?

A That's correct. April 12th.
Okay. Now, I'd like to turn to what has been uploaded in the Grafton County Commissioners Exhibit 2 [Track 2?] in ShareFile as "Grafton Exhibit 51. And this is a letter from the Gale River Motel. It's dated October 19th, 2017. And it outlines a business's communication with Northern Pass when they came to do a visit at their business.
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MS. SAFFO: So, if you want to switch to the last page real quick, so we can see the name for the record.

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q The name of the individual is Kevin Johnson, and he's from the Gale River Motel.

MS. SAFFO: And we can go back to the first page.

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q So, one of the things he specifically notes is "They were unable to answer questions about Right-of-Way access on my property." Does that surprise you, in light of the status of the survey where it is right now?

A No, because they don't have a survey.
MS. SAFFO: And then switching to the next page. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. Go back to the last paragraph on the first page.

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q And then it says "In fact, I provided more detailed information about the project to your representatives pointing out a sewer line that runs under the roadway to a septic tank located eight feet from the roadway which services my
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residence and the water line crossing under the roadway servicing my neighbor."

Are those details that you would put in a plan?

A Yes, absolutely. And those are details that, and I'm referencing back to the September 5th, 2017, I'm calling it the "Bob Talon memo", but it was a draft conference report, where the DOT has decided that only observable monuments and physical evidence along the right-of-way needs to be mapped. These are not observable.

Also, the only way, assuming that there's nothing on record at the Registry of Deeds, the only way that this surveyor would know about these would be through communication with the abutters.

Q And that's why the regulations require communication with the abutters, correct?

A That's correct.
Q There's good reason for that, correct?
A That's correct.
Q Because an underground line -- transmission line that goes through water lines and septic systems is a problem, isn't it?
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1

A That's correct.
Q And, so, these standards created by law in New Hampshire protect against that, correct?

A That's correct.
By having people speak to the landowners and the abutter?

A That's correct. And, if I could -Sure.

A -- just clarify a statement. I said "the only way would be to talk to the abutters", but that's usually the easiest way. The land surveyor could also find out this information by reviewing the town building files for every one of the lots. And, if this septic system were constructed from about 1974 to date, there should be something in the town files. Many towns don't always keep everything. But they could run -- the surveyor can also run a check on the DES website. There's a one-stop check there, and to find out whether there's septic systems, water lines, wells, things like that. They really should, in a case like this, run every one of the names to see what's going on. Q And, if Northern Pass has taken the position
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that they would like to create their survey, the one discussed on September 5th in the Talon draft memo conference, and submitted to DOT for approval, and only after that contact the landowners, would that be a good idea, in your opinion, as a surveyor?

A No. That would put -- that would eliminate -essentially eliminate the ability of the land surveyors to have any administrative input or review. I can imagine that, if DOT approved it, and then a land surveyor -- excuse me -- an abutter stepped forward, after thirty days after the approval, the Dot's attorneys would argue that they didn't exhaust their administrative remedies, and on and on it goes. So, that the abutters are being shut out. So, it would shut out the abutters, and it also wouldn't comply with the land surveyor regulations by shutting them out, correct?

A That's correct.
Q Now, there's been talk about this "iterative process". As a surveyor, why does that concern you?

A Well, the term "iterative" is not a term of art
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in design. Essentially what it means is
"dynamic", means it's always changing. It's sort of the floating dartboard. And, as a surveyor, what concerns me is that this Project, and with any project, is that being so far in the design/review process before a governmental body without having the baseline survey information is a real problem. If it's determined sometime in the future that one of these roads is only two rods wide, and it's in a location that one of these vaults is located, or one of these drills are located, or there's an extensive two-rod road, then this Project may not work. And the question is "well, how is that going to be figured out?" There's no appeal. There's no review.

And, so, it's not government -- it's not adequate for government review, is that another way of saying it?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. It calls for a legal conclusion.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained.
MS. SAFFO: Okay.
BY MS. SAFFO:
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Q Now, you talked earlier about this being
"baseline information" before you do the design plans?

A Correct.
Q And, as you just said, it's not dynamic information. This is -- surveys are set-in-stone information, correct? I might be oversimplifying it, so correct me.

A It's not granite. But it's -- again, they should be between 90 and 100 percent. And getting to that point will -- the surveyor will at least identify the areas that need to be determined, and we're not even there.

And in testimony there has been extensive discussion about "prescriptive rights-of-way". I know we don't want to go into a legal opinion. But, as far as the definition of "land surveying", how does that tie into these prescriptive rights-of-way?

A A land surveyor does not have the legal authority, under the statute, under the licensing laws, to determine whether a road is a public road by prescription, nor does the land surveyor have the legal authority to
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determine the width of a prescriptive easement.
What the land surveyor does is, the land surveyor's role is as a fact-finder. So, the land surveyor will map the road, provide the evidence, and then, again, work with the client and act -- generally, the land surveyor will act as an expert witness in a court proceeding, asking the court to determine if the road is a public highway by prescription.

Q Okay. So, put another way, if there's a dispute as to whether something's prescriptive or not, the land surveyor can't resolve that?

A That's correct.
Q Now, the October 3rd, 2017 letter - CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record. [Brief off-the-record discussion ensued.]

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q Okay. So, we talked about the survey markers, --

A Yes.
Q -- and why they're required. In the case where people are questioning what the rights-of-way are and what the survey should reflect and what
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is on their property, can you think of any reason why not to put markers down?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This is calling for generic information on surveying, and could have and should have been included.

MS. SAFFO: You know, once again, this is a situation where surveys were provided. We relied on those surveys. We learned in August. I think it's totally appropriate.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is it a scene-setter for something else?

MS. SAFFO: Yes. It's just that now they are redoing the survey.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes.
MS. SAFFO: But, in the course of redoing the survey, knowing how complicated this is with everybody, they're still not putting markers in the ground so people can see what they think is the boundaries.

And I'm wondering, in land -surveying land, does that make any sense to a land surveyor?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think he's
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already testified to that.
MS. SAFFO: Okay. Okay. Almost
done.
BY MS. SAFFO:
Q Okay. Last, but not least. So, I'm putting on the screen Page 150, Day 9 Afternoon Session ONLY, May 4th, 2017 testimony. And the question is "Fair to say you've been saying "You'd have to ask my surveyor"; correct?" And the answer was "No. We have a certified stamped set of drawings we believe is accurate."

Now, based on what you have reviewed as the only survey in place as of May 4th, 2017, do you think they had a "certified stamped set of drawings" they could rely on as accurate?

A $\quad$ No.
Q And why not?
A They don't exist.
MS. SAFFO: Thank you. No further
questions.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Let's take a break. But, before anybody leaves the room, let's figure out how much more we're
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going to try and do today. Off the record.
[Brief off-the-record discussion
ensued. Thereafter a recess was taken at 3:50 p.m. and the hearing resumed at 4:05 p.m.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Palmer, I understand you now have no questions for this witness?

MR. PALMER: Yes. My questions have all been asked and answered.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you.
Mr. Lakes.
MR. LAKES: Yeah. All right. I've cut my questions down by a couple as well. So, I'm hoping, too, this would go fairly quickly.

Mr. Nix, thank you for being here.
WITNESS NIX: You're welcome.
BY MR. LAKES:
Q With regard to surveying, in this case establishing the ROE boundaries, if a property owner thinks their property is violated, but does not bring suit, and the Project is installed and found to be in violation after-the-fact, is there any legal recourse at
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that point for the landowner?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Calls for
a legal conclusion.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Lakes, I will confess, that does sound an awful lot like a request for legal advice.

MR. LAKES: No. I think that this would be -- I think everybody along the route has that particular question in mind.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The objection is sustained. Next.

MR. LAKES: Well, that makes it even shorter. Thank you.

BY MR. LAKES:
Q In your testimony, you give what you call "representative samples" of New Hampshire Code of Administration Rules that require a plan be prepared and sealed by a licensed land surveyor. And then you mention some of these representative samples. I'm just -- I want to mention three of them and get your thoughts on this.

First one is Department of Environmental Services, DES, with regard to oil and
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remediation programs, contaminated sites, etcetera, activity and use restrictions. Now, this is something that surveyors do as part of their job?

A Yes. What you're referring to is a -- and I can't remember whether it was a statutory requirement or a rule, $I$ think it was a DES rule, that requires for these remediation sites to have a boundary survey performed as part of the remediation. That's something that I've done, several of those, over the years. And what that does is establish the interrelated property rights of the parties. Sometimes the -- if there's a leaking underground storage tank, and it leaks onto an abutting property, the parties need to figure out who's going to be responsible for what. And so that's why we prepare the boundary surveys for those.

They're required.
Q So that would be delineated along the entire underground route, if, in fact, there were areas, and there are, that are contaminated by oil/gas or carbon materials?

A Well, in that particular rule, the baseline is
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for the contaminated property. I have been involved in cases where, if there is underground travel of the contaminant, that the client would then be required to survey other properties to determine who and where that contamination is.

Q Okay. The next representative sample you mention is again with the DES: Drinking water programs, water supply, land protection. What does that entail? Is this the distance to wells and things of that nature?

A Yes. Actually, I've done several of those as well. Those rules, those DES rules have to do with large either public or large private wells and water systems. Say, if you have a condominium unit, with 70 units and they have their own on-site water, the wells are required to have a protective well radius that is completely controlled by the owner. So, in order to understand whether you can control that well radius, and sometimes those well radiuses can be several hundred or a thousand feet in diameter -- excuse me, in radius, which is a very large piece of land.
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So, to understand whether the owner can control that land, we do the boundary survey to determine where the bounds of the property are, we locate the well, we put the radius on it, and that's our charge to do that.

Q Does this also relate to reservoirs or aquifers?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. It sounds
like we're just elaborating on existing testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes, it does.
But I'll let you answer this question. And then ask Mr. Lakes to move on to another topic.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A Okay. Aquifers and reservoirs, it depends. It depends on what it is. The reservoir -- the Massabesic Reservoir, I'm familiar with that, and the City of Manchester is very concerned about what they owned, who's doing what on it. So, they have their own boundary surveys. But I don't know whether they're required by the statute to have them, but they do have them. I know that.

As far as aquifers, that's a completely
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different issue. That's the geologists generally map those. You know, we get involved if we're asked to help out.

BY MR. LAKES:
Q And the last sample $I$ want to talk about, again, it's a DES, and it's with regard to water quality and quality programs with regard to large groundwater withdrawals, water level monitoring, locations, etcetera. How does that play into the surveying that you would do?

A That's an interesting one. Generally, where that -- the large quantity water withdrawals come from is either (a) a bottling plant, which there's been several of those, that's become very popular, or the biggest impact that $I$ know of, and I've done several of these, are golf courses, for irrigation purposes. So, what we do is we map the limits of the property. We map the wells. And then we give that to the hydrologist, and, through the hydrologist's magic, they add lines on the plans to show where the water underground will be impacted. Q Well, $I$ was asking this in regard to horizontal directional drilling, where water is needed in
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that process to do the underground drilling, would that be --

A Beyond my expertise.
MR. LAKES: Okay. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard, I understand you have no questions?

Okay. Ms. Townsend?
MS. TOWNSEND: My questions have been
asked and answered. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Draper?
MS. DRAPER: I have one question, really building on what Mr. Lakes just said.

BY MS. DRAPER:
Q I'm interested in the surveys when you go out into an undeveloped area. So, a place like it might have streams, natural outcroppings, springs, that kind of area that you're making a survey map.

A Uh-huh.
Q Do you put all those in, is that correct?
A It completely depends on what the applicant requested us to do.

Q What the client would be requesting?
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A Excuse me, yes.
Q Yes.
A What the client asked us to do, right.
Q All right. And what about if you -- I'm thinking about Bear Brook [Bear Rock?] Road, and things like drainage and those kinds of, perhaps, as you're mapping and you see potential problems, again, it goes with what the client has asked for, is that right?

A Well, yes. In the case of Bear Rock Road, because this is a route survey for development purposes, the surveyor would be picking up the drainage, the existing culverts, the catch basins, swales, runoffs, things like that, encroachments, if there's other structures. Utility poles should be picked up. Any physical aspect of the road. MS. DRAPER: All right. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Reimers? MR. REIMERS: I no longer have any questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Any
intervenors that we haven't called who have questions?
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```
                    [No verbal response.]
    CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
        Mr. Needleman.
                            MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Hodgdon has
        questions.
    CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hodgdon.
    MR. HODGDON: Thank you, Mr.
        Chairman, members of the Committee. Mr. Nix.
        WITNESS NIX: Mr. Hodgdon.
        MR. HODGDON: My name is, for the
        record, Mark Hodgdon. I'm an attorney for the
        Applicant.
    BY MR. HODGDON:
    Q I want to be clear here just as your role, and
        I know you have a couple of hats, as a lawyer
        and a surveyor. You're not here as a legal
        advocate for Mr. Thompson and the abutters,
        correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q Okay. And you're not here telling the SEC
        members that the Committee should be
        substituting your legal judgment for theirs,
            right?
    A I have not done that, no.
```
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BY MR. HODGDON:
Q And you reference a "cover letter" to the SEC from Attorney Tom Getz, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And your criticism -- in that letter you quote him as saying that those "comprise the final design packages prepared for DOT". Do you recall that?

A Yes, I do.
Q And much of your testimony and your supplemental testimony is premised on whether those are final design plans, correct?

A That's what the attorney -- that's correct. That's what the attorney stated in his letter. Q Okay. But, and you relied entirely from the cover letter for that?

A For the statement that they were "final plans", that's correct.

Q Okay. Now, clearly, based on your prefiled statement, you scrutinized those plans fairly closely?

A That's correct.
Q And I see that, at the time, you were looking
almost entirely at the local roads up in the
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North Country?
A That's correct.
Q So, that would be the tail end of Bear Rock
Road to the east, I'll call it the "tail end", but to the eastern section, and North Hill and Old County?

A Correct.
Q And is it fair to say those are the plans you scrutinized closely?

A Correct.
Q You didn't mention --
MR. HODGDON: And, Dawn, could you
pull up Applicants Exhibit 73 please, Page 41713 and 715.

MS. GAGNON: Side by side or one at a time.

MR. HODGDON: If you could. We can go with that first one, that's okay. And if you can get 715 up? But, if you can't, that's okay, the first one will work.

BY MR. HODGDON:
Q The cover sheet, 41713, do you notice down in the lower right corner, did you notice that those plans were marked "Preliminary - Not For
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|  | Construction"? |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | That's correct. |
| Q | Okay. But you didn't notice that -- you didn't |
|  | refer to that or mention that in your |
|  | testimony, did you? |
| A | No, I -- well, you just asked two questions. |
| Q | Right. You didn't mention the fact that it |
|  | was -- that it was noted as "Preliminary" in |
|  | your testimony, your prefiled testimony? |
| A | That's correct. |
| Q | And those plans also, if you look down in the |
|  | corner, if you go to 41715, Dawn, the lower - |
|  | yes, right there. Where it says "NRTHC100", |
|  | you see that? |
| A | Yes. |
| Q | What's the "C" designate? |
| A | I don't know. |
| Q | You don't know that that means "Civil |
|  | engineering plans"? |
| A | Oh. Okay. That's fine. Yes. |
| Q | Okay. |
| A | That makes sense, yes. |
| Q | And, if they were survey plans, they would |
|  | typically have an "S"? |
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A In -- yes. I'm going to take your --
Q Oh, if you don't know, --
A No, no.
Q -- I'm not trying to be unfair to you.
A Well, many different engineers will do it different ways. And that is, you know, one of the ways to do it.

Q Okay.
A Absolutely.
Q So, and those plans, there's nowhere on them
that they're stamped by a registered or
licensed certified land surveyor?
A That's correct.
Q Now, these plans, even the final plans, they're not going to be recorded in the Registry of Deeds, are they?

A I have no idea whether the final plans are going to be recorded in the Registry or not.

Q Okay. But they're not going to be registered as a plat, do you know?

A What final plans are you talking about?
Q The final plans for this Project, they're not going to be registered as a plat in the

Registry of Deeds?
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A Well, I would think that, on a project of this magnitude, that the Applicant would probably want to record them. Just like DOT records many of its route surveys and highway plans. But that's --

Q Well, --

A -- there's no requirement for that.
Q Okay. So, now, the Applicant, Northern Pass and its surveyors, aren't working for DOT, correct? They're submitting these to DOT for review?

A That's my understanding. That's correct.
Q And --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Stop.

Mr. Hodgdon, the microphone is kind of important.

MR. HODGDON: Thank you. Fair enough.

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

BY MR. HODGDON:
Q But that's -- the landowner in this case is DOT, correct?
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A $\quad$ No.
Q Well, who owns the right-of-way, let my ask it that way?

A Well, it depends. It depends on whether it's a state highway or whether it's a town highway.

Q Fair enough. But, in the case of the state highways, the landowner is -- the agency having jurisdiction over the public highway is NHDOT, correct?

A The way you stated that, that is correct.
Q Okay.
A Yes.
Q And, for the town roads, the party that has
jurisdiction over the public highway are the municipalities?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. And Northern Pass is neither a
municipality or a state agency, correct?
A That's correct.
Q And what they're doing is providing essentially an existing conditions survey for permit approval. Is that a fair statement?

A In "existing conditions", the question doesn't -- it is not clear as to whether you're
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speaking regarding the boundary portion or whether it's the physical evidence on the field portion.

Q Okay.
A Or both.
Q But, as to both the right-of-way and the physical evidence, they're providing the existing conditions. They're not laying out a new road. They're not establishing new boundaries. They're laying out the existing conditions.

A They're mapping existing conditions, correct.
Q Right. And, so, if we get to what Dot actually requested -- well, let me back up a bit before I ask that question.

You've already mentioned, you know that the survey work is ongoing. The surveyors are working with NHDOT to meet the requirements that DOT set forth, right?

A That's my understanding.
Q Right. And you acknowledge that NHDOT, and especially their Right-of-Way Bureau, has far more experience, including decades of collective experience establishing or analyzing
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public highways' right-of-ways?
A They have experience.
Q Right.
A Absolutely.
Q And, in fact, you know Bob Talon?
A I do know Bob Talon.
Q And he has a lot of experience establishing
public -- existing public highway
right-of-ways, right?
A Well, actually, I've never seen a survey prepared by Bob Talon. Bob -- my interaction with him has been as Bob being, and I can use
the word "administrator", I don't know if
that's what they call him at DOT, but he works
at DOT, and works -- my interaction with him
has been on obtaining plans, obtaining
information, historical information, things;
like that.
Q Okay. But he's a licensed land surveyor?
A He is a licensed land surveyor.
Q And, in fact, he's the chief of what they call
the "Land Title" section, if $I$ recall
correctly?
A Thank you. I was struggling for that earlier.
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Q And, so, when you look at --
MR. HODGDON: I'm going to use the ELMO, if I could.

BY MR. HODGDON:
Condition 4, what the surveyors were actually asked for, and I'm probably going to get this upside-down, --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, you guessed right.

MR. HODGDON: Now I've got to be Phil Donahue. Sorry, Mr. Chair.

BY MR. HODGDON:
Q If you look at Condition 4, that requires that they "certify the survey report" -- they "provide a certified survey report delineating the means and methods of determining the right-of-way as shown on the plans." Correct?

A That's correct.
Q In other words, that exactly says it's a
"certified survey report", not a "certified survey plan". That's what it says?

A That's correct.
Q Okay.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hodgdon,
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what document are we looking at?
MR. HODGDON: This is Applicants Page
26961, Exhibit 107. This is the DOT
conditional order -- condition letter.
BY MR. HODGDON:
Q And then it also requires that they certify
that the right-of-way shown is accurate and the
"locations are defined by ground survey and pertinent research". Correct?

A Correct.
Q And, with public highways, sometimes the level
of accuracy simply is impossible to get to 100
percent, correct?
A That's correct.
Q So, there's nowhere in that condition letter
that our NPT surveyors were asked to do a
boundary survey, correct?
A Are you asking me if the term "boundary survey" is in that letter somewhere?

Q Yes.
A It is not.
Q And regarding -- you said twice, this was
Applicants Page 83397, I don't have the number,
I apologize, the exhibit number. But this is
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the conference report. Oh, I'm sorry. It was attached to Appellant's [Applicants?] Exhibit 228, from DOT. That's the draft conference report that was attached to --

A Correct.
Q Right. And twice, in your direct testimony and then to Ms. Saffo, you said that "this did not meet the standards because it only required fieldwork to locate observed monuments", correct?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. Except that's not exactly what that says, because what it continues on and says "or as noted in viewed deeds and record plans". Correct?

A That's correct.
Q So, in other words, they have to find the monuments that are on record plans or in other information they locate, correct?

A That's correct.
Q So, you understand that DOT has set forth the criteria and the surveyors are meeting that criteria as we speak?

A Well, that's my understanding. I don't have
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any confirmation on that.

Q Okay. And you disagree with DOT's criteria?
A Well, I think -- yes, I do.
Q Okay. And that's the -- the problem then of your essential argument here is that DOT isn't requiring them to do a boundary survey under the standards of the rules for licensed land surveyors?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. But that's not what DOT has required, right?

A Has required for what?
Q For -- based on the agreement, that is not what DOT is requiring is a boundary survey? They're not requiring that?

A That's what it appears. That's correct.
Q Right. And you also mentioned that one of your criticisms was that Northern Pass isn't putting bounds in the highways at the edges. Correct?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. Again, Northern Pass is not NHDOT, correct?

A That's correct.
Q So, isn't it NHDOT's right-of-way? And
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shouldn't, if they wanted to put bounds in, it would be DOT's responsibility to do so, correct?

A Not necessarily. The rules for land surveyors specifically state that, when a boundary survey is done, and $I$ know -- I understand you're arguing that this isn't a boundary survey, so those rules don't apply, I think that's what you're arguing. But the rules state specifically that monuments shall be set. And what my testimony was, and if it wasn't clear, is that, in an extensive route survey of this nature, there should be some agreement or -between the Applicant, DOT, and the municipalities, to monument this route survey, so the future surveyors and property owners can reestablish where these lines are.

Q Okay. But you know that DOT is not performing this work, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And DOT has to authorize the bounds to be placed on their right-of-way?

A That's not correct.
Q You don't believe -- you believe that Northern
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Pass could put bounds on DOT's right-of-way without their approval?

A Well, it depends on --
Q For the right-of-way?
A If I'm performing a boundary survey of an abutting lot, and I've determined where the boundary of the right-of-way is, as a land surveyor, $I$ have the authority to put bounds in.

Q For the abutting lot?
A That's correct.
Q But you're not putting them in for DOT's right-of-way?

A And, as $I$ said earlier, the parties all need to come to some type of agreement. I specifically said that three minutes ago.

Q Okay.
A Including DOT, I believe --
Q But if DOT isn't -- I'm sorry.
A I specifically said DOT was one of those parties.

Q If DOT does not require it, then that's their prerogative?

A As a land surveyor, I would have difficulty in
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being able to reconcile performing a boundary survey of the right-of-way without leaving any monuments at all. And $I$ would have -- I would be having a conversation with DOT about that. There's a conflict. DOT does not have the authority to overrule the rules for land surveying, regardless of how much experience they have.

Q Okay. But that's if DOT is requiring a boundary survey?

A That's correct.
Q And there's nothing in those requests and agreements with Northern Pass that says that Northern Pass has to do -- meet the standards of a boundary survey?

A The last bullet states that "A Survey Report Addendum will be issued, explaining the process, which is to include a Survey Plan Set" -- "a Survey Plan Set which depicts the resulting" -- the second bullet down, thank you.

Q Where are you?
A Last dark bullet.
Q Yes.
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A It says "A Survey Report Addendum...explaining the process, which is to include a Survey Plan Set", which is capitalized, "which depicts", and then the second bullet down says "The resulting right-of-way determination as noted above." Those words indicate that DOT is requiring a standard property survey as defined under the law. They have capitalized the words "Survey Plan Set".

You're telling me every survey plan set is, by definition, a boundary survey?

A They're asking for this to be certified as to the location of the right-of-way. Under the definition of "boundary" -- excuse me, "standard survey", it includes the easement rights and road rights-of-way. So, by definition, what they're asking for -- by law what they're asking for is a standard Property Survey.

Q That's your interpretation?
A That is my interpretation as a land surveyor.
Q Okay. But Dot has never used those words or never indicated to NPT that specifically that that was a requirement. Is that fair?
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A I just read the words they used.
Q Okay. Well, I read those words differently. I understand you have an interpretation. NPT has an interpretation. But it doesn't use the word "standard boundary survey", does it?

A $\quad$ No.
MR. HODGDON: May I have just one minute?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're off the record for a moment.

BY MR. HODGDON:
Q But, at the end of the day, if Northern Pass submits survey plans to NHDOT, and NHDOT finds that they meet their expectations and requirements, and approve them, are you asking the Committee to substitute your adjustment judgment for NHDOT?

A You've created --
Q At the end of the day, --
A You've created a hypothetical.
Q Yes.
A And what $I$ need to know is, at the end of what day? If those plans are submitted to the Committee prior to them making a decision, then
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it is my understanding that everybody would be able to review them. So, I guess I'm a little lost as to where you're going with that.

Q When it comes to NHDOT's roads and NHDOT's own right-of-way, wouldn't you agree that their judgment is more sound and more appropriate to rely on than yours?

A No.

MR. HODGDON: Okay. I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Members of the Committee have questions for Mr. Nix?

Ms. Weathersby.
MS. WEATHERSBY: Good afternoon, Mr. Nix.

WITNESS NIX: Good afternoon.
BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q I think $I$ heard you say that you do not feel that New Hampshire DOT's requirement for a certified survey report is adequate, is that correct?

A Well, if $I$ may explain. The report goes with the plans. So, what the report would do would be to describe what the surveyor did in the
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preparation of the plans. And, in DOT's outline of what they will accept, it is my opinion that this does not meet the requirements of a full boundary survey. Okay. And you feel a full boundary survey is necessary?

A It's the only way to establish the division between the private and the public property rights.

Q In my life, I've come across construction surveys. Is a construction survey different than a full boundary survey? And would a construction survey, in your opinion, provide adequate information for this Project?

A Yes and no.
Okay.
A construction survey would be done, it would include the topographic mapping, wetland mapping, sometimes there are soils mapping, overlaid if -- and then that would be used for the site plan design.

In today's world, very, very rarely is a site plan approved without having the underlying boundary survey, and then the
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construction survey laid on top of it. Is doing, essentially, what -- what we have in our hand from December is a construction survey. And whether there's physical evidence missing or not is beside the point, but this is essentially a construction survey, with a best guess that -- of the boundaries at the time. And, because this is a route survey, very narrow, and it's a rather large project that's going to go within it, the protection of the private property rights would require that a boundary survey be performed on this.

Q Okay. Concerning monumentation, in your experience, when a route is being surveyed, do -- are monuments typical to be installed?

A Yes. As a matter of fact, DOT would require them generally at the points of curvature, points of --
[Court reporter interruption.]

## CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:

A -- points of curvature and points of tangency, which are terms of art, and other important places along the route, so surveyors can go back later in time and determine where that
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right-of-way is.
They're also important for the construction of the project. Not knowing where the right-of-way is, when the contractor shows up on the site, they're going to have a plan that has lines on it, but nothing to relate it to the ground. And I remember, when $I$ was a young surveyor, the Winnipesaukee River Basin Project, which is a huge sewer project around the lakes, was -- it was at the end of the project at that point, in the early '80s, and they had some plans that were similar to these preliminary plans. And the contractors just dug the holes and laid the sewer in, and they caused so much damage to the private property over time. As a land surveyor, we went in, in the ' 80 s and '90s, and found that, because it wasn't monumented, it wasn't properly surveyed, that property corners all over the place had been destroyed.

And it created huge economic problems for people, as well as a lot of boundary disputes, because it was around the lakes. And that's very similar to what could happen here.
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Q So, what I'm hearing is, is you believe that monumentation is necessary not only for the future, in establishing where the boundaries of the right-of-way are, but are necessary for construction of the Project to be in the exact location in which it's planned to go?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. How difficult is it to installa monument?

A It's not difficult at all.
Dig a hole, put in the granite pin --
You could use iron -- you could use iron pipes and pound them in, you could do offsets. It's not difficult at all.

Q Okay. Aside from the survey and monumentation issues, DOT has asked the Applicant to provide a lot more detail and information. Do you feel as though, if those are met, that other concerns of yours would be adequately addressed?

A As far as the physical evidence in the field, again, you said "aside from the boundary issue"?

Q Right. I'm not exactly sure what I'm referring
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to. I know you have other -- your testimony covered a lot of ground, and most of it concerned the boundaries --

A Right.
-- and the layout. Do you have -- let me back up. Do you have concerns beyond boundaries and monumentation that DOT has also addressed?

A I believe that, in DOT's requirements, that they are asking the surveyors to provide the additional information. I don't really have a problem with that part of it. I do have, as I said earlier, $I$ do have a problem with the information that is not on these plans regarding that cemetery and the road that had been moved. They're just plain not there, which raises a number of red flags. That was on a municipal highway. And $I$ don't know -I'm not clear at this point whether DOT is reviewing those municipal records or plans or not.

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

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Oldenburg. MR. OLDENBURG: Thank you, Mr.
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Chairman. Good afternoon, Mr. Nix. My name is Bill Oldenburg. I work for the Department of Transportation. I have a few questions. I'll start with the easy ones first.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q This is not a DOT project, is it?
A No, it's not.
Q Okay. And there is a difference between what the DOT needs and what the Registry needs to record a plan, correct?

A You mean --
Q If the DOT --
A -- if the DOT isn't going to record the plan?
Q This isn't our project. So, we're not going to record plans.

A Okay.
Q All right. So, the DOT -- DOT needs
information to review and approve the Project, correct?

A That's correct.
Q DOT is not going to record the plans. If Northern Pass is going to record the plans, there's a different need.

A That's correct.
\{SEC 2015-06\}Day 49/Afternoon Session ONLY\{10-20-17\}

Q Right?
A Well, my -- for DOT to adequately review this Project, they need to know where the limits of the rights-of-way are. Because, if part of the design is outside the right-of-way, or it's so close that it's going to impact the right-of-way, without having that knowledge, whether you record the plan or not is not dispositive of having to know where that right-of-way line is.

Q Exactly. So, let me go to the -- you've seen it before, it's that -- it's on the DOT requirements, Number 4, which, and I'll read it to you, because I'm not going to bring it up, is "The Applicant shall provide a certified survey report delineating the means and methods of determining the right-of-way shown on the plans." And then it goes on, "The report shall include all notations and all records and plans used and the monumentation held to control the right-of-way lines." And then "the report will be certified by a licensed land surveyor in charge that the right-of-way lines shown on the submitted plans are accurate", and it
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continues. DOT just cares where the right-of-way is.

A That's correct.
Q It doesn't care where -- who owns the properties on the other side of the right-of-way, where the property lines are, what a boundary survey is. They just care where the right-of-way is, to ensure that the Project is in the state right-of-way and not on private land, correct?

A Correct.
So, if the requirement is that the plans have to be registered and recorded at the Registry by Northern Pass, that's a separate issue of what the DOT needs to review the plans for that compliance, right?

A If I may, and there may be a misunderstanding, I didn't say that there is a requirement that the plans be recorded. I think the question was, is there a requirement -- is there a requirement? And $I$ think my answer was, and if it wasn't, I'll clarify, is that, if $I$ were Northern Pass, I would want them recorded -Q Okay.
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A $\quad-\quad$ to protect myself. But that's their choice. But that's not, whether the plan is recorded or not, is not dispositive of whether a boundary survey has to meet the requirements of Lan 500. So, on -- and I lost it, I had it up here. In the memo from Bob Talon, wasn't the very last statement saying that the plans need to comply with the requirements and -- for the licensed land surveyor requirements in the RSAs?

A The first Bob Talon memo did, in fact, say that. And the second Bob Talon -- I'm calling it the "Bob Talon memo", but it's the memorandum from the meeting, did not reiterate that. So, I have taken that to mean that Requirement Number 4, in the first Talon memo, is not part of the requirements.

Okay. So, Meridian surveyors, they're licensed in New Hampshire, correct?

A Yes. Yes, they are.
Q And BL Companies, they have folks who are licensed in New Hampshire?

A I looked them up, too. Yes.
Q Okay. So, they know what it means to meet the requirements of, you know, for developing a
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stampable plan in New Hampshire?
A I believe they do, yes.
Q Okay. I'm sorry, my notes are going to -- I'm going to bob all over the place here, so I apologize.

Historic layouts. One of the things that we talked about or heard testimony about was historic layouts and how they're treated. So, a lot of surveys start, you know, we've seen evidence of the 1800's. So, how do you treat, when you survey using your experience, when you use a historic layout, what do you do if there's nothing past that historic layout? And some of the examples are, you know, "the survey starts, you know, at a spike in the oak tree in Captain Smith's front yard."

A Right.
Q And the tree is gone, the spike's gone, Captain Smith is gone. So, how do you -- how do you reconcile that historic layout with what's there today?

A There is a lot of historical research that goes into it. If -- now, these layouts I don't
think go back to 1803, maybe some of them did.
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But, in 1803, there was a -- the Legislature passed a statute that required that every town in the State of New Hampshire map itself, and show all major highways, boundary lines, major water courses. Those maps were -- it took a while to do it, most of them came out in 1806. They were compiled in what's called the "Carrigain Map". And, on the Carrigain Map -and those original town surveys, for each town, are in books at the Archives. You could actually go to each town. Some are really good, some are not so good.

But the point is is that, if there's a major road shown on those plans, there's a very, very high probability that it was laid out as a highway. And, so, that's one place we go to look.

Another place would be the 1860's Wall Map. Where we compare the location of those roads, which are generally -- the Wall Maps were done for insurance purposes, on a county-by-county basis. And the insurance was that, if your house was on the map, you could get insurance. But, if it wasn't on the map,
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you couldn't get insurance. And they were very accurate, and they were accurate as to the roads. So, we'd look at where those roads are. There's an 1895 Atlas that was published. Actually, $I$ have one of the original copies. That's another place that we go to look. And we look to see if that road follows that early layout. Is it generally there?

We also look at the U.S. -- early USGS maps. And that earlier map that Kris had put up, that's based on the -- that's what the underlying map is. And we look at that and compare it to later USGS maps to see if the roads moved. Many, many times, it's interesting, but roads move.

And, so, that's -- those are the processes. Then, we also look at the deeds. And, in order to tie into those ancient -because -- those ancient layouts, which were from Smith to Jones's house, we had to figure out where Smith lived and where Jones lived. And I've done that in -- well, $I$ did one in Gilford, on Watson Road, where $I$ found the oldest house on the south end and the oldest
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house on the north end, and took those back, and, sure enough, you know, found the layout. That's sort of the process.

If there's -- if there's a disagreement as to the layout, then, as a land surveyor, if $I$ had a private client, I would explain it to him and they -- there are processes. You can go to the selectmen and ask them to re-layout the road. DOT has that same statute. Where you notify the abutters, you know, and then if -they have a certain amount of time to object or not object. If they object, then it goes into a new layout process. So, that can establish it. That's probably the easiest, one of the easiest ways to do it.

Or, you go to superior court and ask the court to determine that. You present the court with a plan and ask the court to determine that that is where the layout is. That's another method of doing it. So, there's ways to do it.

Q So, it's a jigsaw puzzle you're putting together?

A It's an absolute jigsaw --
Q Parcel by parcel, --
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A Yes.
Q -- and sometimes there's pieces missing.
A That's right.
Q And you take more or less a best guess or best estimate, based upon --

A That's right.
Q -- physical evidence and deeds --
A That's right.
Q -- and information to fill in that line.
A Right.
Q And that's why a lot of times you see on a plan it's an approximate right-of-way.

A That's right. That's correct.
Q Because there's not enough information for you to definitely say that's where it is?

A That's correct.
Q Okay.
A That's correct.
Q So, it's not unreasonable for someone to have an "approximate right-of-way" on a right-of-way plan?

A Well, it depends on what you're doing. This Project is -- the magnitude of this Project, and how it fits between the lines, is so large
\{SEC 2015-06\}Day 49/Afternoon Session ONLY\{10-20-17\}
that knowing where those lines are and establishing those lines is very important. It's like the reconstruction of 93, or the construction of new 93 down south. In order for $D O T$ to know where those lines are, they went through the whole process. And they actually took additional land. And, when they took the land, they surveyed it. You know, I've seen those plans. DOT knew exactly what they were getting. And that's not happened here.

Q Well, it's because, on that project, they're purchasing land. So, they can set where the new right-of-way line is. On this, there's no land being purchased. So, it's that jigsaw puzzle of figuring out exactly where the existing right-of-way is?

A That's right. Yes.
Q Okay. So, some of the timeline, in your opinion, from what you know about the Project, the original plans that were submitted with the Project had the line underneath the pavement. Would there be a need for a survey, if the line was totally underneath the pavement, because it
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would be under public roads?
A Well, the example of the road that moved by the cemetery. We don't know whether the new road is actually in the right-of-way or not. So, just to assume that it's under the pavement is not good enough. Just to assume that under the pavement is within the right-of-way is not good enough. There's places along --

```
                    [Court reporter interruption.]
```


## CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:

A -- Chemung Road, in Meredith, where the town moved the road without laying out a new road, and significantly. And, you know, the land surveyors in that area, we all know about it, and that hasn't been solved.

But the DOT in Alton, when you go from the old Route 11 to the new Route 11, down near 11D, that corner has moved over time. And there's no new layout for that. We're fully aware of that. But, you know, the landowners haven't objected, but the road's better.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q So, but in the case of where the line is underneath the pavement, knowing exactly where
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the right-of-way is wasn't as important with the Project that -- that was in the original application. And then it moved to more or less under the edge of pavements. And then the requirement from the DOT, in April of '17, was really where they said "you need to be as close to the right-of-way as possible." Wasn't it really in April of '17 where that right-of-way became a critical component? And, so, there's been a lot of talk back and forth about the timeline. Wasn't that really when this became an issue? Because --

A Well, this -- I understand that you're coming, correct me if I'm wrong, but you're coming at it from the point of view of an engineer. I'm
a land surveyor, and $I$ look at a project of this magnitude, and, from day one, the right-of-way is important. If that right-of-way were the width of $I-93$, and you -and they were putting that line between the two lanes, north and southbound lane, that's fine. No problem. You're so far away from it. But, in many cases, these are three rod right-of-ways, 49 and a half feet. For the
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vaults, $I$ forgot what the width of them are, but they're relatively wide. And just to get the excavation done, and stay within the 49 , is going to be a little bit of a challenge. So, the plans that were shown, you were shown some plans that had the right-of-way lines on them, it was sort of the set that you were asked what the distance were. And you've seen some of those plans that were submitted by the Applicant where it was -- that they weren't to standard, as you said?

A Correct.
Q Okay. But there was no label on those. They weren't stamped. Could those -- so, there was no portrayal that those were "completed plans". And the Applicant, when the Construction panel was up last, one of the questions I asked them was "were they going to prepare plans and stamp plans?" And they said "yes". That most of -most of the information for the title work, the abstracting was complete, and that they have, I think the quote was "a number of survey crews in the field today collecting data". So, if we ignore those plans that you saw
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and say that the plans that are submitted meet the licensing requirements and could be stamped by a land surveyor, would you have an issue with them, if they only showed the right-of-way? Or do you think that they, to be stampable plans, they have to do total boundary surveys of every boundary along the sixty miles of underground?

A Oh, you mean of every lot?
Q Yes.
A Oh, no. They don't have to do that. They need to establish where the limits of the right-of-way are. Right.

Q Okay. So, they don't need a -- you wouldn't say, to be stampable, they don't need a boundary survey for all that?

A Not for every single abutting lot.
Q Okay.
A The boundary survey is the boundary of the right-of-way. The problem is where we're at the eleventh hour, and the Committee is going to make a decision without having the benefit of the boundary survey that, in basically 99 percent of the projects of this magnitude,
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would have been done before the plans were even submitted. So, we wouldn't be having this conversation today.

Q Okay. Thank you for that clarification, because that was a lot of my question. Because I was wondering if you were going to make them do a boundary survey of the White Mountain

National Forest. Not that you would make them, but if that was your recommendation.

In your prefiled testimony, you had mentioned that you had worked on DOT highway right-of-way plans. Have you ever worked for the NHDOT?

A No, I haven't.
MR. OLDENBURG: Okay. All right.
Thank you. I have no other questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner Bailey.

CMSR. BAILEY: I'll try one question or so. Mr. Oldenburg clarified a lot of things that were not clear in my mind.

BY CMSR. BAILEY:
Q But you said you weren't sure whether DOT was
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going to be reviewing the municipal highway rights-of-way. And let's assume, for purposes of this question, that they are not going to take jurisdiction over the municipal highways. I believe that leaves it to the Site Evaluation Committee?

A That's correct.
Q And, so, --
A Well, I think --
Q Let me ask the question --
A I think there's a dispute about that. And I don't want to get into a --

Q Legal --
A -- making a legal argument about that dispute.
Q Right. Right.
A Right.
So, assume that we think we have to grant
permission for the Project to be located in the municipal right-of-way. What advice would you give to us about how we should evaluate whether or not to approve that? Would it be that they have to have stamped plans in the municipal rights-of-way? I mean, can you just elaborate a little bit?
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A Yes. It would be -- yes. They should have stamped survey plans of the entire route, whether it's in the state highway or whether it's in the municipal highways. And that, if the Committee is going to review it and DOT is not, then they should be held to the standard of the Board of Licensure rules and regulations.

CMSR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Iacopino.
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q I just want to clear up some terminology first, Mr. Nix, because I'm a little bit confused. In your supplemental prefiled testimony, you give three examples of places where, and it's on Page 11 and 12 , $I$ think it's three, three examples of instances where the DOT requires "boundary survey plans". And, in the question, it says "Does New Hampshire DOT require boundary survey plans meeting the requirements of Lan 100 through 500 by a licensed land surveyor?" And the first sentence of your answer says "Yes. The following are references
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to manuals adopted by NHDOT regarding the requirement for a Standard Property Survey."

Is a "boundary survey" and a "Standard Property Survey" the same thing?

A In the context of my prefiled testimony, yes. And I apologize for mixing terms.

Q Okay. So, now let's talk about the context of your testimony here today then.

A Yes.
Q In your testimony -- in your testimony today, is there a difference between when you've mentioned "boundary survey" and any other type of survey?

A Well, a "boundary survey", in my terminology, is equivalent to the "Standard Property Survey" as defined in Lan 500. "Boundary survey" is the general term that's used. I think "construction survey" was mentioned. That is different in the way $I$ described it. It's used by the engineers for their design work. It's laid on top of the Standard Property Survey.

The "route survey" that I mentioned earlier is a subset of a Standard Property Survey. A route survey is a survey of -- it's
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a longitudinal survey of a highway. We also do them of railroads, establishing the boundaries. If there's a very long, say, sewer -- a sewer line, and there's an easement surrounding that, that would be a route survey as well.

But those are all subsets of the Standard Boundary Survey.

Q Okay. And they have lesser requirements?
A No. They have the same requirements.
Q They have the same requirements?
A Yes. It's just the way -- it's just the term for a very long, narrow survey.

Q And I think you were asked this question by Mr. Hodgdon, but I'm not sure I understood the answer. So, I'm just going to ask it again.

Is it your understanding that the Department of Transportation has requested a "boundary survey" from the Applicant in order to meet its requirements?

A I apologize. Because, after Mr. Oldenburg questioned me about that, I'm not sure exactly what DOT is asking for at this point. If the provisions of the first Talon memo are still applicable, then the answer is "yes".
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[WITNESS: Nix]

Q Okay.
A If it's not applicable, then the answer is
"no". No, no. That isn't correct. The
first -- the first Talon memo specifically
cites the requirements of Lan 500. And then
the second Talon memo lays out "this is what we will accept for a boundary survey." So, it becomes conflicting.

Q Okay. So, the Committee then should look at those memos to make that determination on their own?

A (No verbal response).
[Court reporter interruption.]
WITNESS NIX: That was a non-answer. [Laughter.]

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q Well, you sort of raised your hand like "maybe so". But do you have -- do you have an answer to that?

A I don't have an answer to that.
Q In your prefiled testimony, you reference a number of places, $I$ think to demonstrate why surveys are so important, different places in New Hampshire law that licensed land surveyors
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MS. MENARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you, Mr. Nix.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MENARD:
Q There's been discussion regarding stamped plans and the anticipation that these stamped plans be provided to the DOT for state roads. And Ms. Bailey was asking you questions about stamped plans as being also a requirement for the SEC. So, based on the timing of the plans, what, if any, concerns do you have about abutters being able to dispute the boundaries determined by the survey before potential approval of the Project?

A If --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Hang on. Hang on, Mr. Nix.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. I don't think that's within the scope of redirect.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. What are
you tying that back to, Ms. Menard? What
testimony that's occurred here today are you
tying that to?
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MS. MENARD: There was some great discussion with Commissioner Bailey -- I mean, excuse me, Lara Saffo regarding property owners and the burden of property owners, regarding having to be put in a position of dispute after the approval process.

So, I believe that Mr. Nix's experience as a land surveyor, to any opinion regarding preempting property disputes, whether the timing of decisions is important to avoid that whole scenario.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Boy, I'm not even sure $I$ remember that.

MS. MENARD: I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I remember a question that drew an objection that was sustained. Mr. Needleman, was there something else? Does anybody -- Mr. Aslin, do you -Mr. Aslin looks like he has something.

MR. ASLIN: Well, I do recall the line of questioning. I don't recall whether there was an objection that was sustained on that question or not. We'd have to look back at the record, I think.
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[WITNESS: Nix]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm pretty sure I did object, and it was sustained.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. I'm
concerned that you're going outside of the scope of cross, of cross that was allowed.

MS. MENARD: I'm going to have to defer to your judgment.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, I --

MS. MENARD: And I appreciate the opportunity to put it out there.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Don't back off just yet.

MS. MENARD: Okay. This is a
property rights issue that -- or, property value burden concern.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You've got a surveyor up here.

MS. MENARD: Yes. And he has
experience in preventing -- or, he has
experience that demonstrates what happens when
things go wrong, and he used the example in
Meredith. Where there was tremendous burdens
to private property owners as a result of not
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having survey plans.
So, to avoid disputes between property owners and the Project, it would make sense to have a review period, well, I'm asking Mr. Nix if he agrees that the timing could prevent -- should allow for a review period. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think it's been established that the purpose of these plans is not for that purpose. So, I'm not sure the question has any meaning. These aren't to establish boundaries that people can rely on for purposes of court proceedings.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'll going to sustain the objection, Ms. Menard.

Is there anything else? I think the answer is "no". That Mr. Thompson doesn't have any other questions.

MR. THOMPSON: I will say that Mr. Thompson has no more questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. That brings us to the end then of the day. Thank you, Mr. Nix.

WITNESS NIX: Thank you very much.
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| 131/14 132/10 | accept [5] 21/18 | added [2] 32/23 |
| 136/11 136/14 | 72/16 72/17 116/2 | 66/8 |
| 136/20 138/7 | 140/7 | addendum [3] 7/ |
| 139/21 143/8 | accepted [2] 16/23 | 7/19 112/17 |
| 143/11 | $\begin{aligned} & 31 / 13 \\ & \text { access [1] } 79 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | Addendum...explai ning [1] 113/1 |
| above [4] 28/15 | access [1] 79/12 accessible [1] 54/24 | ning [1] 113/1 ${ }_{\text {additional [7] } 6 / 24}$ |
| aboveground [1] | accuracy [3] 74/17 | 19/22 24/22 46/3 |
| $5 / 17$ | 78/14 107/12 | 78/10 120/10 130/7 |
| absence [2] 30/14 | accurate [15] 18/23 | address [4] 13/22 |
| 30/20 | 19/10 64/12 69/21 | 22/9 22/10 22/13 |
| absolute [1] 128/23 | 69/23 73/24 74/4 | addressed [3] 21/12 |
| absolutely [7] | 74/8 87/12 87/16 | 119/20 120/7 |
| 41/22 70/10 72/4 | 107/7 122/24 127/2 | adequacy [1] 35/14 |
| 80/5 101/9 105/4 | 127/2 148/5 | adequate [6] 11/3 |
| 141/15 | accurately [1] 68/9 | 14/18 24/14 83/18 |
| abstracting | acknowledge [1] | 115/20 116/14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 133 / 21 \\ & \text { abuts [1] 34/24 } \\ & \text { abutter [2] 81/6 } \\ & 82 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 104 / 21 \\ & \text { across [1] 116/10 } \\ & \text { act [2] 85/6 85/7 } \\ & \text { action [3] 42/8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { adequately [2] } \\ & 119 / 19122 / 2 \\ & \text { adjacent [1] } 45 / 10 \\ & \text { adjourn [1] } 147 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |


| $\mathbf{A}$ |
| :--- |
| adjourned [1] |
| $147 / 8$ |

147/8
adjusted [1] 16/20 adjustment [1] 114/16
Administration [1] 89/17
administrative [4] 31/2 82/9 82/15 141/20
administrator [2] 1/21 105/13
adopt [2] 6/19 6/21 adopted [3] 13/20 15/18 138/1
advice [2] 89/6 136/19
advocate [2] 96/17 97/4
affected [1] 22/14 after [12] 4/20 7/5 7/5 48/22 71/2
76/22 82/4 82/12 82/13 88/24 139/20 144/5
after-the-fact [1] 88/24
afternoon [12] 1/4 4/11 4/12 4/16 9/8 60/5 60/6 87/6
115/14 115/16

121/1 147/7
again [24] 13/18 36/1 38/5 39/16 40/19 46/9 50/3
51/4 52/16 53/15
69/6 72/12 74/11
74/19 75/15 84/9
85/5 86/6 91/8 93/6
95/8 109/21 119/22
139/15
against [1] 81/3
agency [3] 72/16
103/7 103/18
agent [1] 35/20
ago [5] 11/12 15/13
48/21 51/15 111/16
agree [8] 12/6
12/10 12/12 18/3
18/12 21/3 53/8
115/5
agreed [1] 13/20 agreement [3]
109/13 110/13
111/15
agreements [1] 112/13
agrees [1] 146/5
ahead [1] 75/20
Aid [1] 3/4
all [53] 8/5 9/2 9/3
11/5 14/2 16/10
16/15 24/7 26/8

28/19 32/5 34/3
35/17 36/8 37/22
40/21 41/22 41/23
48/13 55/5 56/2
62/16 73/11 87/22
88/10 88/13 94/21
95/4 95/18 95/22
96/2 97/1 111/14
112/3 118/19
119/10 119/14
121/17 122/19
122/19 125/4 126/4
131/14 134/16
135/15 137/10
139/6 142/4 142/5
142/7 142/20
142/24 146/21
alleged [1] 65/3
allow [2] 53/3
146/6
allowed [1] 145/6 almost [2] 87/2 98/24
along [9] 5/4 33/15 38/22 80/10 89/8 90/20 117/23 131/8 134/7
already [7] 13/17 20/2 41/5 59/17
66/15 87/1 104/16 also [31] 1/19 5/5
5/21 6/10 6/13 7/24

| A | ancient [5] 3/6 58/4 | 46/7 48/4 48/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| also... [25] 11/5 | 58/22 127/18 | 50/10 51/1 51/1 |
| 12/16 24/3 43/19 | 127/19 | 53/20 63/21 72/11 |
| 49/19 60/20 70/15 | and/or [1] 16/20 | 72/12 82/9 83/5 |
| 71/2 73/20 74/18 | annotations [1] | 86/1 86/22 88/24 |
| 78/8 80/12 81/12 | 78/5 | 95/16 95/20 95/22 |
| 81/18 82/17 92/6 | another [11] 24/3 | 109/1 112/2 138/1 |
| 100/11 107/6 | 48/8 53/5 62/20 | 142/10 143/11 |
| 109/17 118/2 120/7 | 63/14 83/18 85/10 | 144/8 146/11 |
| 127/9 127/17 139/1 | 92/13 126/18 127/6 | 146/18 148/11 |
| 143/9 | 128/19 | 148/13 |
| Alternate [1] 1/16 | answer [26] 7/7 | anybody [4] 9/1 |
| although [2] 11/17 | 15/14 17/10 17/16 | 23/4 87/23 144/18 |
| 38/19 | 26/6 30/23 37/6 | anymore [1] 6/13 |
| Alton [1] 131/16 | 44/12 47/9 53/3 | anyone [1] 59/14 |
| always [3] 27/21 | 56/4 56/14 66/13 | anything [4] 37/12 |
| 81/17 83/2 | 79/11 87/10 92/12 | 50/20 78/1 146/16 |
| am [12] 5/1 5/5 5/5 | 123/21 137/24 | apologize [8] 10/14 |
| 12/24 17/20 51/7 | 139/15 139/24 | 52/14 52/16 59/4 |
| 51/8 55/9 75/14 | 140/2 140/14 | 107/24 125/5 138/6 |
| 148/10 148/12 | 140/18 140/20 | 139/20 |
| 148/14 | 142/11 146/17 | apparent [1] 35/5 |
| amending [1] 7/18 | answered [5] 18/11 | appeal [1] 83/16 |
| amendment [1] | 36/19 88/10 94/10 | appear [3] 11/3 |
| 10/14 | 142/9 | 32/21 65/13 |
| among [1] 70/11 | anticipation [1] | Appearances [1] |
| amount [2] 44/2 | 143/6 | 1/23 |
| 128/11 | any [42] 11/6 22/4 | appears [3] 10/8 |
| analysis [3] 11/6 | 24/23 25/16 26/4 | 15/24 109/16 |
| 11/6 58/10 | 27/10 29/2 32/13 | Appellant's [1] |
| analyzing [1] | 34/10 38/1 39/15 | $108 / 2$ |


| A | appreciate [1] | 49/14 51/16 55/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apple... [2] 23/15 | 1 | 71/5 76/5 76/7 |
| 70/5 | approach [4] 15/24 | 78/12 78/16 132/5 |
| applicable [2] | 19/16 19/19 31/14 | 132/8 |
| 139/24 140/2 | appropriate [4] | April 2016 [1] 76/5 |
| applicant [24] 7/1 | 39/7 74/19 86/10 | April 2017 [1] 76/7 |
| 10/24 11/24 13/9 | 115/6 | aquifers [3] 92/7 |
| 13/21 15/16 20/22 | approval [10] | 92/15 92/24 |
| 23/22 45/3 45/8 | 23/19 23/22 24/4 | Arago [3] 43/14 |
| 46/14 59/19 59/22 | 74/9 82/4 82/13 | 50/8 52/21 |
| 72/20 94/22 96/12 | 103/22 111/2 | Archive [1] 54/4 |
| 102/2 102/8 110/14 | 143/14 144/6 | archives [5] 43/17 |
| 119/16 122/15 | approve [4] 72/17 | 50/11 50/19 51/1 |
| 133/10 133/16 | 114/15 121/18 | 126/10 |
| 139/18 | 136/21 | are [127] 7/24 9/2 |
| Applicant's [2] | approved [6] 42/5 | 12/22 14/2 14/3 |
| 44/24 97/15 | 42/6 74/4 74/6 | 14/20 14/21 16/8 |
| Applicants [12] | 82/10 116/23 | 17/6 18/8 19/19 |
| 25/5 32/8 34/6 43/9 | approving [1] | 20/4 20/16 20/23 |
| 44/20 44/21 46/22 | 12/18 | 22/8 23/2 23/21 |
| 49/22 99/13 107/2 | approximate [11] | 24/17 26/9 26/14 |
| 107/23 108/2 | 26/19 28/4 61/16 | 26/16 26/18 27/6 |
| application [11] 1/8 | 63/16 63/21 63/23 | 28/8 30/4 32/1 |
| 15/11 43/12 50/6 | 68/15 78/4 78/5 | 33/10 33/17 34/16 |
| 50/21 51/22 52/1 | 129/12 129/20 | 35/12 37/13 37/13 |
| 72/17 72/18 74/6 | approximated [1] | 38/7 38/13 39/5 |
| 132/3 | 61/23 | 39/21 41/7 50/14 |
| applications [1] | approximately [1] | 57/20 57/22 63/6 |
| 74/3 | 73/5 | 63/7 64/11 65/9 |
| applies [1] 26/3 | April [18] 7/11 7/12 | 65/10 65/11 67/5 |
| apply [2] 7/10 | 12/2 15/5 23/20 | 67/6 67/7 67/17 |
| 110/8 | 25/10 48/22 48/23 | 69/14 70/7 74/3 |


| A | 40/18 63/3 94/16 | 59/14 60/13 60/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| are... [74] 75/2 | 9 | /23 63/4 64/11 |
| 75/11 75/12 75/23 | areas [7] 26/14 | 64/11 66/6 67/9 |
| 76/4 76/7 76/22 | 29/21 39/5 63/7 | 67/10 68/15 69/13 |
| 80/3 80/5 80/11 | 70/17 84/12 90/22 | 69/14 70/7 72/22 |
| 82/16 83/12 84/6 | aren't [3] 20/8 | 73/21 78/13 78/13 |
| 85/23 85/24 86/14 | 102/9 146/11 | 78/14 78/14 78/19 |
| 90/22 90/22 91/17 | argue [1] 82/14 | 82/6 82/22 83/3 |
| 92/3 93/16 97/5 | arguing [2] 110/7 | 84/5 84/17 84/17 |
| 98/12 99/8 101/16 | 110/9 | 85/3 85/7 85/11 |
| 101/17 101/21 | argument [3] 21/13 | 87/13 87/14 87/16 |
| 103/14 104/17 | 109/5 136/14 | 88/14 90/3 90/9 |
| 107/1 107/8 107/18 | arm [4] 8/19 8/21 | 91/12 92/24 92/24 |
| 108/18 108/22 | 40/12 40/13 | 95/7 96/14 96/15 |
| 110/17 112/22 | around [5] 16/1 | 96/16 97/3 97/4 |
| 114/15 114/23 | 54/18 72/23 118/9 | 98/6 100/8 101/20 |
| 116/19 117/15 | 118/23 | 101/23 103/24 |
| 117/22 119/4 119/4 | art [2] 82/24 117/22 | 104/6 105/12 |
| 119/18 120/9 122/4 | as [131] 1/13 3/4 | 106/17 108/14 |
| 122/24 123/6 | 3/5 3/5 3/6 5/9 5/13 | 108/23 111/7 |
| 124/19 124/20 | 5/18 6/2 6/2 6/3 6/5 | 111/14 111/24 |
| 125/3 125/14 | 6/6 6/22 9/11 9/19 | 113/5 113/7 113/12 |
| 126/10 126/11 | 10/1 10/9 11/16 | 113/21 115/3 |
| 126/12 126/20 | 14/24 20/10 25/2 | 117/16 118/16 |
| 127/3 127/16 128/7 | 27/15 28/20 28/23 | 118/22 118/22 |
| 130/1 130/5 132/23 | 29/5 30/1 32/2 32/5 | 119/18 119/21 |
| 133/1 134/1 134/13 | 32/6 38/5 42/21 | 119/21 120/11 |
| 136/3 137/24 139/6 | 44/21 47/21 50/3 | 126/16 127/2 128/4 |
| 139/23 140/23 | 51/20 52/14 53/5 | 128/5 132/1 132/6 |
| 141/1 141/2 143/21 | 54/1 54/15 55/2 | 132/7 133/11 |
| 143/23 | 55/6 55/6 55/16 | 138/16 139/5 143/9 |
| area [7] 35/1 40/10 | 56/20 58/2 58/24 | 144/8 145/24 |


| A | 120/9 139/22 143/8 | 148/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| As-Built [1] 3/5 | Aslin [10] 2/6 8/8 | attorneys [1] 82/13 <br> August [12] 7/14 |
| aside [4] 6/6 19/13 | Aslin [10] 2/6 8/8 9/6 9/9 17/15 18/16 | August [12] 7/14 $7 / 17 \text { 25/12 49/2 }$ |
| 119/15 119/22 | 9/6 9/9 17/15 18/16 | $\text { 49/14 51/16 } 5$ |
| ask [24] 9/13 13/4 | 59/7 144/18 144/19 <br> 147/1 | 56/19 71/3 71/6 |
| 17/15 20/20 21/11 | 147/1 <br> Aslin's [1] 23/10 | 56/19 71/3 71/6 71/9 86/9 |
| 23/1 23/2 31/14 | Aslin's [1] 23/10 aspect [1] 95/17 | authority [9] 16/، |
| 46/12 49/18 49/23 |  | 16/13 16/15 18/5 |
| 52/17 66/16 75/20 | assessed [1] 47/13 | 16/13 16/15 18 |
| 87/9 92/13 103/2 | assessment [3] | 38/11 84/21 84/24 |
| 104/15 128/8 | 36/12 50/4 51/18 | 111/8 112/6 |
| 128/16 128/18 | assessors [1] 45/14 | authorize [1] |
| 136/10 139/15 | Assistant [1] 9/10 | 110/21 |
| 142/21 | Association [3] | available [4] 43/ |
| asked [27] 17/7 | 30/12 31/1 33/5 | 44/7 45/13 49/3 |
| 19/1 32/16 36/18 | assume [9] 8/8 9/19 | avoid [3] 23/12 |
| 44/11 45/8 45/17 | 53/18 58/11 131/5 | 144/10 146/2 |
| 45/18 46/7 46/10 | 131/6 136/2 136/17 | aware [6] 12/17 |
| 46/10 77/20 77/22 | 141/2 | 23/21 24/3 30/4 |
| 77/24 88/10 93/3 | assuming [4] 42/3 | 131/20 141/7 |
| 94/10 95/3 95/9 | 42/4 46/21 80/12 | away [1] 132/22 |
| 100/6 106/6 107/16 | Atlas [2] 20/5 127/4 | awful [1] 89/5 |
| 119/16 133/8 | attached [2] 108/2 | B |
| 133/17 139/13 | 108/4 | Bachelor [1] 5/6 |
| 142/21 | attempts [1] 30/16 | back [25] 28/2 32/6 |
| asking [20] 15/15 | attics [1] 31/23 | 49/21 52/5 58/7 |
| 29/19 51/4 52/8 | attorney [14] 4/16 | 58/10 62/2 62/2 |
| 55/9 55/10 75/3 | attorney [14] 4/16 <br> 5/5 6/3 9/8 9/10 | 64/1 64/2 69/7 79/7 |
| 76/7 76/10 85/8 | 5/5 6/3 9/8 $9 / 10$ | 79/17 80/6 97/7 |
| 93/23 107/18 | 96/11 98/3 98/13 | 97/9 104/14 117/24 |
| 113/12 113/17 | 96/11 98/3 98/13 <br> 98/14 148/10 | 120/5 125/24 128/1 |
| 113/18 114/15 | 98/14 148/10 | 132/10 143/22 |

## B

 back... [2] 144/23 145/12bad [1] 64/19
Bailey [5] 1/14 2/17 135/19 143/8 144/2 ballpark [1] 42/9 Baltimore [1] 6/9 bank [1] 35/7
based [14] 14/10 26/17 28/5 30/18
32/6 34/16 65/7
78/5 87/13 98/19
109/13 127/11
129/5 143/10
baseline [5] 14/10
14/13 83/7 84/2 90/24
basic [1] 37/22 basically [2] 11/2 134/23
Basin [1] 118/8 basins [1] 95/14 basis [4] 47/9 47/12 53/16 126/22
Bates [1] 44/20
be [143] 10/13
10/21 11/7 13/9
14/16 14/22 15/1
15/24 16/9 16/11
21/15 22/11 22/20
24/6 24/20 25/2

26/17 27/4 28/23
29/1 29/12 29/24
30/16 31/6 32/5
33/14 34/4 35/11 36/6 37/22 38/4
38/20 39/2 39/4 39/15 40/2 40/5 40/21 41/15 41/23 44/12 45/24 46/2 47/17 54/13 54/15 57/6 58/24 59/12 59/13 62/21 63/6 63/23 65/4 65/6 65/13 67/8 67/15 69/24 70/3 72/1 72/18 73/4 73/7 73/13 73/14 74/8 74/21 75/17 76/21 78/9 78/11 80/11 80/15 81/10 81/16 82/5 83/15 84/7 84/10 84/12 88/23 89/8 89/17 90/17 90/20 91/4 91/22 93/22 94/2 94/24 95/12 95/16 96/14 96/21 97/3 97/17 99/3 101/4 101/15 101/18 101/19 101/23 106/10 110/2 110/10 110/13 110/21

112/4 112/17
113/12 115/1
115/24 116/17
116/20 117/12
117/15 119/5
119/19 122/22
123/13 123/17
123/19 126/18
130/23 131/1 132/6
133/4 134/2 134/5
134/15 135/2 136/1
136/18 136/21
137/1 137/6 139/5
141/14 143/7 144/5
147/2 147/5
Bear [6] 34/21
72/24 95/5 95/5
95/10 99/3
became [5] 5/18
5/19 5/20 132/9 132/11
because [32] 13/13
20/1 21/6 22/12
27/20 29/9 35/6
51/4 70/11 72/19
73/5 73/23 74/20
79/15 80/22 95/11
108/8 108/13 117/8
118/17 118/23
122/4 122/14
127/19 129/14
130/12 130/24
because... [5]
132/12 135/5 135/5 137/14 139/20 become [2] 49/3 93/14
becomes [1] 140/8 been [46] 6/24 9/11
11/5 11/24 13/13
13/19 14/12 15/12
15/18 24/24 27/23
34/18 35/14 37/19
43/22 44/8 48/19
52/18 58/23 67/18
67/19 70/20 72/11
74/13 76/11 76/14
78/17 82/21 84/14
86/5 87/8 88/10
91/1 93/14 94/9
105/12 105/16
118/20 120/15
131/15 132/10
135/1 142/8 142/13
143/5 146/8
before [11] 13/7
72/14 72/15 83/6
84/2 87/23 104/14
122/12 135/1 141/4 143/13
beginning [2] 74/10 141/12
behalf [1] 10/3
being [18] 6/2 10/9 $94 / 3$ 120/6
14/15 22/14 30/16
30/22 32/16 71/22
82/16 83/5 84/1
88/16 105/12 112/1
117/14 130/15
143/9 143/12
believe [23] 5/24
8/2 11/15 11/15
12/10 12/16 19/15
20/21 20/23 22/19
34/18 47/2 54/22
69/21 87/11 110/24
110/24 111/18
119/1 120/8 125/2 136/5 144/7
belowground [1] 5/18
benefit [1] 134/22 beside [1] 117/5 best [6] 29/3 61/23
117/6 129/4 129/4 148/7
better [1] 131/21
between [13] 40/15 63/18 63/22 69/17 73/3 84/10 110/14 116/8 121/8 129/24 132/20 138/11 146/2
beyond [6] 17/6
25/20 40/19 43/19
biggest [1] 93/15
Bill [1] 121/2
bit [8] 7/9 64/2
77/22 78/2 104/14
133/4 136/24
137/14
BL [13] 7/11 8/1
12/4 15/5 25/9
34/20 45/2 48/19
49/20 50/4 51/12
56/17 124/20
BL's [1] 43/10
black [1] 16/17
Board [17] 11/10 12/14 16/1 16/6 16/12 18/1 19/5 19/15 19/20 20/18 20/18 20/23 22/9
22/13 31/2 45/19 137/7
bob [12] 48/8 80/7 105/5 105/6 105/11 105/11 105/12
124/6 124/10
124/11 124/12
125/4
body [2] 22/6 83/7
Boisvert [5] 43/14
44/13 50/8 52/21

## 53/8

bold [2] 45/22 78/4

| B | 126/4 134/6 134/7 | brought [1] 52/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Book [3] 3/7 56/20 | 134/16 134/19 | building [8] 65/10 |
| 57/7 | 134/19 134/23 | 65/12 66/3 66/4 |
| books [2] 57/24 | 135/7 137/19 | 66/5 66/10 81/13 |
| 126/10 | 137/21 138/3 | 94/13 |
| both [5] 5/17 10/16 | 138/12 138/14 | buildings [2] 65/16 |
| 33/17 104/5 104/6 | 138/16 139/7 | 65/17 |
| bottling [1] 93/13 | 139/18 140/7 | built [2] 3/5 27/23 |
| bottom [3] 26/13 | 141/18 141/23 | bullet [6] 16/17 |
| 64/8 75/17 | 142/2 | 16/17 112/16 |
| boundaries [13] | bounds [10] 15/4 | 112/20 112/23 |
| 14/20 24/12 29/19 | 15/6 26/10 38/18 | 113/4 |
| 86/20 88/20 104/10 | 92/3 109/19 110/ | burden [2] 144/4 |
| 117/7 119/3 120/3 | 110/21 111/1 111/8 | 145/16 |
| 120/6 139/2 143/12 | Bowes [2] 14/5 | burdens [1] 145/23 |
| 146/12 | 141/11 | Bureau [1] 104/22 |
| boundary [59] | boxcar [1] 70/13 | burial [5] 23/20 |
| 12/14 14/14 16/5 | Boy [1] 144/12 | 43/12 46/17 50/6 |
| 16/12 18/6 27/11 | Brad [1] 10/1 | 70/12 |
| 38/21 39/1 40/3 | break [1] 87/23 | buried [3] 31/19 |
| 42/13 72/18 90/9 | Brennan [1] 1/20 | 37/14 37/20 |
| 90/18 92/2 92/20 | brick [2] 66/6 66/9 | business [1] 78/24 |
| 104/1 107/17 | bridge [1] 97/9 | business's [1] 78/22 |
| 107/18 109/6 | brief [10] 4/17 | C |
| 109/14 110/5 110/7 | 34/13 58/18 60/1 | call [8] 7/13 7/16 |
| 111/5 111/7 112/1 |  | 9/4 66/5 89/15 99/4 |
| 112/10 112/15 | 88/2 102/20 142/18 | 105/14 105/21 |
| 113/11 113/14 | $88 / 22122 / 14$ | called [2] 95/23 |
| 114/5 116/4 116/5 | 88/22 122/14 | 126/7 |
| 116/12 116/24 |  | calling [4] 18/8 |
| 117/12 118/22 | brook [4] 36/5 54/19 56/9 95/5 | 80/7 86/4 124/11 |
| 119/22 123/7 124/3 | 54/19 56/9 95/5 | calls [5] 36/19 53/1 |


| C | 146/12 | 35/2 35/3 35/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| calls... [3] 53/16 | can't [7] 21/17 | 35/13 120/14 131/3 |
| 83/20 89/2 | 58/10 62/15 73/23 | center [2] 27/12 |
| came [3] 78/2 78/23 | 85/12 90/6 99/19 | 27/23 |
| 126/6 | cannot [4] 20/14 | centered [3] 16/18 |
| can [77] 12/24 13/3 | 38/6 46/14 77/2 | 27/21 28/8 |
| 13/4 14/16 19/11 | capacity [1] 5/22 | centerline [6] 26/17 |
| 19/24 23/12 26/6 | capitalized [2] | 27/23 28/5 28/13 |
| 27/10 28/2 33/11 | 113/3 113/8 | 28/14 38/17 |
| 33/18 33/23 36/2 | Captain [2] 125/16 | certain [3] 53/19 |
| 37/6 37/11 37/19 | 125/18 | 97/5 128/11 |
| 39/8 40/10 42/9 | carbon [1] 90/23 | certainly [1] 33/14 |
| 43/13 44/23 46/6 | care [2] 123/4 | certainty [4] 45/21 |
| 47/6 50/5 50/22 | 123/7 | 53/12 53/23 61/21 |
| 52/20 54/8 54/23 | career [1] 31/16 | Certificate [1] 1/10 |
| 55/6 56/6 57/3 | cares [1] 123/1 | certification [2] |
| 58/21 61/2 62/2 | Caron [1] 1/20 | 68/4 68/5 |
| 62/14 62/14 62/23 | Carrigain [2] 126/8 | certified [17] 23/23 |
| 62/23 64/1 64/2 | 126/8 | 29/24 67/8 67/9 |
| 64/3 65/5 66/11 | carry [2] 68/4 68/5 | 67/13 67/20 69/20 |
| 67/9 69/7 71/12 | case [16] 15/3 29/1 | 87/10 87/15 101/12 |
| 71/13 71/16 72/5 | 63/5 67/16 70/23 | 106/15 106/20 |
| 72/14 75/15 76/2 | 72/21 73/12 73/15 | 106/20 113/12 |
| 76/10 76/24 77/11 | 81/22 85/22 88/19 | 115/20 122/15 |
| 77/12 77/16 79/2 | 95/10 102/23 103/6 | 122/22 |
| 79/7 81/18 82/10 | 131/23 148/14 | certify [7] 20/11 |
| 86/1 86/19 91/20 | cases [4] 35/20 | 24/4 24/13 106/14 |
| 91/22 92/1 99/17 | 72/15 91/2 132/23 | 107/6 148/4 148/10 |
| 99/19 105/12 | catch [1] 95/13 | Chair [4] 25/19 |
| 110/16 117/23 | caused [1] 118/15 | 59/5 70/18 106/11 |
| 128/7 128/13 | caveat [1] 14/15 | Chairman [7] 9/7 |
| 130/13 136/23 | cemetery [7] 34/24 | 48/16 48/18 56/11 |


| C | 135/4 | collective [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chairman... [3] | clarified [1] 135/21 | 104/24 |
| /8121/1 143/1 | clarify [2] 81/9 | combinatio |
| allenge [1] 133/4 | 123/22 | 45/11 53/6 |
| hallenged [1] 19/3 | clarifying [1] 97/1 | Combined [1] 10/4 |
| challenging [1] | Clarksville [3] 3/7 | come [9] 7/1 9/15 |
| 18/21 | 56/18 56/23 | 36/23 37/2 54/2 |
| change [1] 53/13 | Clarksville-Stewart | 67/15 93/13 111 |
| changed [2] 66/1 | stown [1] 56/23 | 116/10 |
| changed [2] 661 | clear [9] 9/20 10/1 | comes [1] 115/4 |
| changing [1] 83/2 | 96/14 97/17 103/24 | comfortable [2] |
| chapter [3] 60/10 | 110/11 120/18 | 26/15 58/3 |
| 60/11 60/12 | 137/13 | coming [4] 14/3 |
| charge [3] 48/10 | clearly [2] 78/7 | 40/13 132/13 |
| 2/5 122/23 | 98/19 | 2/1 |
| ck [2] 81/18 |  | Comm [2] 1/13 |
| 19 | 6814 68/11 68/17 |  |
| Chemung [1] | 69/3 69/10 69/12 | comm |
| 1/11 | 69/17 69/19 77/1 | 147/10 |
| chief [1] 105/21 | 78/8 85/5 91/4 | comment [3] 13/3 |
| choice [1] 124/1 | 94/24 95/3 95/9 | 13/4 58/11 |
| Chris [1] 9/9 | 128/6 | commercial [1] |
| Chrmn [1] 1/13 | Clinton [1] 77/19 | 5/15 |
| cited [1] 43/13 | close [2] 122/6 | Commission |
| cites [1] 140/5 |  | 23/9 <br> Commissioner [4] |
| citizen [1] 65/1 | ${ }_{\text {closely [2] }}$ 98/21 | Commissioner [4] |
| City [1] 92/18 civil [3] 5/12 5/20 | Club [1] 5/2 | $144 / 2$ |
| 18 | Cmsr [2] 1/14 2/17 | Commissioners [1] |
| claimed [2] 27/16 | Code [1] 89/16 | 78/18 |
| 41/20 | collecting [1] | committee [18] 1/2 |
| clarification [1] | 133/23 | 1/12 4/17 6/23 7/21 |


| C | complicated [1] | 106/5 106/13 107/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| committee... [13] | 86/17 | 107/15 |
| 14/6 42/5 96/8 | complied [1] 25/5 | conditional [3] |
| 96/21 97/14 114/16 | comply [5] 61/8 | 25/17 46/16 107 |
| 114/24 115/12 | 66/17 74/23 82/18 | conditions [12] |
| 134/21 136/6 137/5 | 124/7 | 23/18 23/22 36/10 |
| 140/9 141/9 | component [1] | 36/13 46/16 69/22 |
| common [1] 40/10 | 132/9 | 103/21 103/23 |
| communication [3] | comprise [1] 98/6 | 104/8 104/11 |
| 78/22 80/15 80/18 | computer [2] 11/1 | 104/12 14 |
| Companies [4] 12/5 |  | condominium |
| 45/3 51/12 124/20 | concept [1] 78/2 | 91/16 |
| Companies' [4] | conceptual [1] | conducted [2] |
| 25/9 48/19 50/4 | 14/16 | 50/18 54/3 |
| 56/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { concern [3] 29/1 } \\ & 82 / 22 \text { 145/16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { conference [4] 80/ } \\ & 82 / 3108 / 1108 / 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $5 / 217 / 1245 / 16$ | concerned [6] | confess [1] 89/5 |
| 60/20 | 64/11 69/14 78/14 | confirm [4] 6/19 |
| compare [2] 126/1 | 92/18 120/3 145/5 | 6/22 22/22 41/9 |
| 127/13 | Concerning [1] | confirmation [1] |
| compiled [1] 126/7 | 117/13 | 109/1 |
| complete [3] 35/14 | concerns [5] 13/22 | conflict [1] 112/5 |
| 72/18 133/21 | 83/4 119/19 120/6 | conflicting [1] |
| completed [4] 13/9 | 143/11 | 140/8 |
| 14/14 72/19 133/15 | conclusion [3] | conform [1] 41/10 |
| completely [5] 14/9 | 36/19 83/21 89/3 | confused [3] 51/8 |
| 56/12 91/19 92/24 | conclusions [2] 7/2 | 55/2 137/14 |
| 94/22 | 18/9 | confusing [1] 33/14 |
| completion [1] | Concord [1] 1/4 | Conservation [1] |
| 14/17 | concrete [1] 27/11 | 23/9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { compliance [2] } \\ & 32 / 17 \text { 123/16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { condition [8] 12/8 } \\ & 24 / 3 \text { 36/16 46/17 } \end{aligned}$ | consider [1] 28/22 considered [1] |


| C | [ 7 | correct [140] 10/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| considered... [1] | CONTINUED [2] | $1311 / 1$ 11/2 |
| 141/14 | 117/20 131/10 | 12/10 12 |
| consistent [1] 40/17 | continues [2] | /21 13/14 |
| constitutes [2] 16/5 | 108/13 123/1 | 15/1 17/20 17/22 |
| 18/5 | contract [1] 68/2 | 19/6 19/12 21/10 |
| constructed [1] | contractor [2] | 22/15 24/2 24/8 |
| 81/15 | 68/22 118/4 | 41/4 41/12 55/9 |
| construction [18] | contractors [1] | 60/18 60/19 60/ |
| 3/4 7/21 14/6 44/2 | 118/13 | 60/22 61/1 61/1 |
| 71/20 100/1 116/10 | contractual [1] | 61/12 61/17 66/18 |
| 116/11 116/13 | 69/16 | 66/21 66/22 66/2 |
| /17 117/1 117/3 | contrast [1] 55/10 | 67/1 67/4 68/7 69/1 |
| 117/6 118/3 119/5 | control [3] 91/20 | 69/15 69/16 69/ |
| 130/4 133/16 | 92/2 122/20 | 70/1 70/9 70/13 |
| 138/18 | controlled [1] | 70/17 71/23 7 |
| consult [1] 6/5 | 91/19 | 73/21 |
| contact [2] 10/2 | convenience [1] | 74/4 74/5 76/23 |
| 82/4 | 40/24 | 80/18 80/19 |
| contacting [1] 29/1 | conversation [2] | 80/20 80/21 81/1 |
| contain [2] 28/19 | 112/4 135/3 | 81/3 81/4 81/7 |
| $141 / 9$ | Coots [1] 28/16 | 82/19 82/20 84/4 |
| contamin | copied [1] 65/18 | 84/7 84/8 85/13 |
|  | copies [1] 127/5 | 87/9 94/21 96/18 |
| contaminated [3] | copy [1] 77/6 | $97 / 4$ 98/3 |
| $190 / 2$ | corner [8] 26/13 | 98/4 98/12 98/13 |
| contamination [1] | 39/4 64/3 66/6 66/7 | 98/18 98/22 99/2 |
|  | 99/23 100/12 | 99/7 99/10 100/2 |
| contention [2] | 131/18 | 100/10 101/13 |
| 20/19 22/12 | corners [6] 30/15 | 102/10 102/12 |
| context [3] 55/15 | 30/21 31/17 65/11 | 102/24 103/9 |
| 138/5 138/7 | 65/12 11 | 103/10 103/16 |


| C | 24/19 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| correct... [49] | 36/11 36/22 | se [1] 86/16 |
| 103/18 103/19 | 0/2 | es [2] 93/17 |
| 104/12 106/17 | 44/7 44/13 49/19 | 6/5 |
| 106/18 106/22 | 50 | urt [16] |
| 107/9 107/10 | 51/21 56/6 61/2 | 38/14 42/8 85/ |
| 107/13 107/14 | 64/19 64/21 65/11 | 85/8 117/19 |
| 107/17 108/5 | 65/13 69/5 70/4 | 28/17 128 |
| 108/10 108/11 | 70/19 74/12 76/14 | 128/18 13 |
| 108/15 108/16 | 81/7 81/12 81/18 | 140/13 146/13 |
| 108/19 108/20 | 86/5 87/16 99/12 | 148/4 148/18 |
| 109/9 109/16 | 99/17 106/3 11 | cover [6] 44/4 |
| 109/19 109/2 | 118/24 119/12 | 48/21 75/2 98/2 |
| 109/22 109/23 | 119/12 119/13 | 98/16 99/22 |
| 110/3 110/19 | 126/10 126/23 | covered [2] 41/5 |
| 110/20 110/23 | 133/14 134/2 146/5 | 120/2 |
| 111/11 112/11 | 147/2 | covers [2] 41/5 5 |
| 115/21 119/7 | couldn't [3] 50/19 | Craig [1] 1/15 |
| 121/10 121/1 | 77/24 127/1 | create [6] 18/22 |
| 121/20 121/2 | counsel [7] 1/20 | 19/2 19/10 27/2 |
| /3 123/10 | 2/14 9/11 11/16 | 82/1 |
| 123/11 124/18 | 4 148/11 | created [7] 51/15 |
| 129/13 129/16 | 148/14 | 55/11 69/22 81/2 |
| 129/18 132/14 | country [3] 5/2 | 14/18 114/20 |
| 133/12 136/7 140/3 | 20/7 99/1 | 118/21 |
| 141/5 142/23 | county [8] 34/21 | creates [1] 60/12 |
| correctly [2] 18/20 | 42/21 56/19 70/12 | creating [1] 12/19 |
| , | 78/18 99/6 126/22 | creation [1] 13/20 |
| correctness [1] | 126/22 | crews [1] 133/22 |
| 34/4 | county-by-county <br> [1] 126/22 <br> couple [3] 36/5 | criteria [3] 108/22 108/23 109/2 critical [1] 132/9 |


| C | D | 71/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| criticism [1] 98/5 | d/b/a [1] 1/9 | deadlines [1] 71/3 |
| criticisms [1] | damage [1] 118/15 | decades [1] 10 |
| 109/18 | Dandeneau [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { December [3] 6/17 } \\ & 76 / 9117 / 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| critique [1] 17/21 | 1/16 | December 8th [1] |
| critiques [1] 10/18 | dark [1] 112/23 | $76 / 9$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{cross}[11] \quad 2 / 62 / 7 \\ 2 / 82 / 92 / 102 / 11 \end{gathered}$ | dartboard [1] 83/3 dash [3] 26/16 | decide [2] 40/22 |
| 2/8 2/9 2/10 2/1 $9 / 17$ 58/6 58/7 | $63 / 1263 / 15$ | 47/15 |
| 145/6 145/6 | dashed [4] 28/7 | decided [2] 69/12 |
| Cross-examination | 28/8 78/4 78/5 | 80/9 |
|  | dashes [1] 26/18 | decides [1] 19/14 |
| 2/10 2/11 9/17 | data [1] 133/23 | decision [2] 114/24 |
| cross-reference [1] | date [12] 6/22 10/8 | 134/22 |
| 58/6 | 10/9 10/11 10/12 | decisions [1] |
| cross-references [1] | 20/6 25/6 30/19 | 144/10 |
| 58/7 | 32/7 34/18 81/15 | dedicated [1] 16/23 <br> deduct [1] 66/10 |
| crossing [1] 80/1 | 148/7 | $\text { deed [1] } 37 / 15$ |
| $95 / 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dated [13] 6/17 } \\ & \mathbf{6 / 1 8} 7 / 117 / 127 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | deeds [6] 80/13 |
| curious [1] 51/20 | 7/17 7/18 7/20 7/22 | 101/16 101/24 |
| current [2] 38/3 | 48/22 76/22 78/21 | 108/14 127/17 |
| 41/16 | 97/14 | 129/7 |
| currently [1] 5/9 | dates [2] 6/23 43/4 | deemed [1] 74/7 |
| curvature [2] | Dawn [3] 70/4 | deep [1] 58/9 |
| 117/17 117/21 | 99/12 100/12 | defend [1] 41/24 |
| cut [1] 88/14 | day [8] 1/3 87/6 | defer [1] 145/8 |
| Cynthia [5] 43/13 | 114/12 114/19 | defined [7] 24/6 |
| 44/13 50/8 52/20 | 114/23 132/17 | 24/16 54/5 60/17 |
| 53/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146/22 147/7 } \\ & \text { days [1] 82/12 } \\ & \text { deadline [2] } 48 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | 107/8 113/7 138/16 definitely [1] 129/15 |

## D

definition [6] 17/11 67/15 84/17 113/11 113/14 113/17 degree [3] 5/7 5/8 61/21
delineated [1] 90/20 delineates [1] 72/19 delineating [2] 106/15 122/16 delve [1] 74/19 demonstrate [1] 140/22 demonstrates [1] 145/21
department [13]
7/16 8/3 18/4 25/11 47/19 48/7 48/11 49/1 58/1 58/2 89/23 121/2 139/17 depends [7] 92/15 92/16 94/22 103/4 103/4 111/3 129/22 depict [1] 17/22 depicts [2] 112/19 113/3
Dept [2] 1/15 1/15 derogatory [1] 16/3 DES [6] 81/19 89/24 90/7 91/8 91/13 93/6
describe [4] 7/3
62/23 68/6 115/24 described [3] 68/1 68/9 138/19
describing [2]
17/20 67/16
description [1]
43/10
design [25] 14/10
14/14 14/16 14/21
14/22 14/23 14/24
46/11 72/5 72/6
72/10 73/23 74/17
75/13 76/9 76/19
76/21 83/1 83/6
84/2 98/7 98/12
116/21 122/5
138/20
design/review [1]
83/6
designate [1]
100/16
designated [1] 9/11 designed [1] 6/14
Designee [2] 1/15 1/15
designer [1] 6/11
designing [1] 5/15 destroyed [1]
118/20
detail [1] 119/17 detailed [2] 21/1

79/21
details [2] 80/3 80/5 determination [4] 46/1 46/7 113/5 140/10
determine [22]
16/5 17/24 23/24
24/14 24/23 27/14
38/6 38/11 39/6
40/3 40/11 41/20
61/21 84/22 85/1
85/8 91/5 92/3
117/24 128/17
128/18 141/21
determined [13]
26/11 27/4 27/8
40/5 40/8 45/22
74/8 78/3 78/10
83/9 84/13 111/6
143/13
determining [4]
16/13 26/15 106/16
122/17
developing [1]
124/24
development [2] 6/4 95/11
developments [1] 9/15
diagonal [1] 70/16 diameter [1] 91/23 dictate [1] 18/5

| D | 41/20 65/6 119/8 | 143/5 144/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| did [43] 10/6 11/2 | 119/10 119/14 | discussions [1] 31/9 |
| $11 / 312 / 1318 / 13$ | difficulty [1] | dispositive [2] |
| 23/4 26/12 27/14 | 111/24 | 122/9 124/3 |
| 31/24 34/11 39/13 | Dig [1] 119/11 | dispute [6] 42/13 |
| 43/14 45/6 45/17 | digging [2] 6/8 58/9 | 85/11 136/11 |
| 46/12 46/22 51/12 | Dir [1] 1/15 | 136/14 143/12 |
| 52/22 61/19 61/20 | direct [6] 2/5 4/14 | 144/5 |
| 66/17 68/1 68/6 | 10/16 13/23 28/11 | disputes [3] 118/22 |
| 68/8 68/10 68/10 | 108/6 | 144/9 146/2 |
| 68/17 69/2 74/16 | directional [1] | distance [3] 63/22 |
| 77/21 99/23 100/5 | 93/24 | 91/10 133/8 |
| 108/7 115/24 | disagree [2] 14/9 | division [2] 63/18 |
| 124/10 124/13 | 109/2 | 116/7 |
| 125/24 127/22 | disagreement [2] | do [101] 6/16 6/19 |
| 141/11 141/20 | 32/23 128/4 | 6/21 6/21 8/10 8/23 |
| 141/24 142/1 145/2 | disclosure [1] 74/18 | 11/22 16/11 16/16 |
| didn't [12] 6/12 | discontinuance [1] | 17/10 19/15 20/14 |
| 29/2 49/5 66/2 66/3 | 38/3 | 20/21 22/4 26/12 |
| 71/8 82/14 99/11 | discontinued [2] | 36/12 37/14 37/16 |
| 100/3 100/3 100/7 | 25/1 35/19 | 38/10 42/2 45/9 |
| 123/18 | discovery [1] 54/13 | 46/10 46/11 48/4 |
| difference [3] 33/9 | discrepancies [1] | 49/10 57/6 57/16 |
| 121/8 138/11 | 44/19 | 60/17 62/9 63/1 |
| different [11] 10/12 | discuss [2] 29/4 | 65/5 65/6 66/20 |
| 20/20 21/23 26/12 | 38/2 | 67/3 68/4 68/10 |
| 93/1 101/5 101/6 | discussed [1] 82/2 | 69/23 71/15 72/5 |
| 116/11 121/23 | discussion [13] | 73/2 77/20 77/21 |
| 138/19 140/23 | 34/13 48/19 58/18 | 77/24 78/23 84/2 |
| differently [2] | 60/1 75/7 77/4 | 87/15 88/1 90/3 |
| 32/20 114/2 | 84/15 85/16 88/2 | 91/13 92/2 92/5 |
| difficult [6] 31/18 | 102/20 142/18 | 92/22 93/10 93/18 |


| D | 76/2 76/3 76/5 76/8 | 129/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| do... [47] 94/1 |  | dollars [1] 42/11 |
| 94/21 94/23 95/3 | documents [17] 7/4 | don't [50] 11/9 |
| 98/7 98/9 99/22 | 32/7 32/11 32/13 | 11/17 15/7 16/3 |
| 101/5 101/7 101/20 | 33/4 33/10 33/17 | 17/13 21/7 21/7 |
| 105/6 107/16 109/3 | 43/1 43/20 55/5 | 32/15 33/9 33/21 |
| 109/6 110/2 112/14 | 56/3 70/24 75/11 | 34/8 34/10 38/16 |
| 115/18 115/23 | 75/12 75/13 76/13 | 46/11 49/8 49/10 |
| 117/15 119/13 | 76/18 | 57/18 59/22 66/11 |
| 119/17 120/5 120/6 | does [38] 16/4 16/9 | 68/5 68/23 71/16 |
| 120/11 120/12 | 16/15 18/4 21/4 | 74/22 75/20 79/15 |
| 125/2 125/10 | 26/22 27/19 28/14 | 81/17 84/16 87/19 |
| 125/12 125/12 | 28/18 28/21 37/24 | 92/21 97/10 100/17 |
| 125/19 125/19 | 38/2 41/9 47/18 | 100/18 101/2 |
| 126/6 128/15 | 53/8 61/7 61/18 | 105/13 107/23 |
| 128/20 134/5 134/6 | 79/12 82/22 84/18 | 108/24 110/8 |
| 134/11 135/7 139/1 | 84/20 84/23 85/2 | 110/24 120/10 |
| 140/18 140/18 | 86/22 88/22 89/5 | 120/17 125/23 |
| 141/1 142/10 | 90/12 91/10 92/6 | 131/3 134/11 |
| 143/11 144/18 | 92/11 93/9 111/22 | 134/14 134/15 |
| 144/20 148/4 | 112/5 114/5 116/3 | 136/12 140/20 |
| DOCKET [1] 1/7 | 137/20 141/9 | 143/19 144/21 |
| document [34] | 144/18 | 145/12 |
| 10/12 28/18 29/23 | doesn't [10] 19/4 | Donahue [1] |
| 33/15 42/23 45/20 | 21/18 35/24 61/8 | 106/11 |
| 49/13 49/23 49/24 | 74/23 103/24 114/4 | done [26] 10/19 |
| 51/8 51/10 52/1 | 123/4 142/2 146/17 | 11/5 14/15 14/17 |
| 54/24 55/10 55/11 | doing [13] 21/4 | 14/22 15/1 15/2 |
| 55/21 55/24 59/9 | 36/22 37/12 38/18 | 15/3 15/12 35/15 |
| 62/22 63/24 63/24 | 58/13 65/15 69/10 | 47/12 73/13 78/8 |
| 65/4 65/7 67/6 | 70/7 92/19 103/20 | 78/11 87/3 90/11 |
| 67/11 69/6 69/13 | 117/2 128/20 | 91/12 93/16 96/24 |


| D | 120/7 120/18 121/6 | 94/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| done... [7] 110/6 | 12/12 | Drapers [1] 8/16 |
| 116/17 126/21 | 121/13 121/17 | drawings [4] 67/21 |
| 127/22 133/3 135/1 | 121/17 121/21 | 69/21 87/11 87/16 |
| 142/6 | 122/2 122/12 123/1 | drew [1] 144/16 |
| Donovan [1] 1/4 | 123/15 128/9 130/5 | drilling [7] 70/16 |
| DOT [94] 7/13 7/17 | 130/9 131/16 132/5 | 72/22 73/2 73/7 |
| 11/13 11/23 12/4 | 135/11 135/24 | 73/9 93/24 94/1 |
| 12/7 12/9 12/17 | 137/5 137/18 | drillings [1] 73/4 |
| 13/10 13/20 15/18 | 137/20 139/22 | drills [1] 83/12 |
| 16/4 16/10 16/14 | 143/7 | Drinking [1] 91/8 |
| 17/24 19/9 23/18 | DOT's [11] 15/24 | due [2] 71/1 71/3 |
| 24/17 25/9 29/15 | 36/17 46/16 82/13 | dug [3] 31/20 37/22 |
| 29/20 36/15 41/7 | 109/2 110/2 111/1 | 118/14 |
| 42/6 47/6 50/21 | 111/12 115/19 | duly [1] 4/6 |
| 50/23 54/14 54/21 | 116/1 120/8 | during [1] 45/12 |
| 55/1 57/12 59/13 | down [23] 7/9 8/1 | dynamic [2] 83/2 |
| 71/2 71/6 71/7 | 11/15 12/24 16/17 | 84/5 |
| 74/24 80/8 82/3 | 31/19 31/20 37/12 | E |
| 82/10 97/15 98/7 | 37, | each [2] 126/9 |
| 102/3 102/9 102/10 | 57/8 64/3 64/4 86/2 | 126/11 |
| 102/24 104/13 |  | earlier [8] 11/16 |
| 104/19 105/14 | 106/7 112/20 113/4 | 60/24 84/1 105/24 |
| 105/15 107/3 108/3 | draft [3] 80/8 82/3 | 111/14 120/12 |
| 108/21 109/5 | 108/3 | 127/10 138/23 |
| 109/10 109/14 | drafted [1] 64/ | early [5] 5/13 66/8 |
| 110/14 110/18 |  | 118/11 127/7 127/9 |
| 110/21 111/18 |  | easement [4] 63/17 |
| 111/19 111/20 | drainage [3] 6 <br> 95/6 95/13 | 85/1 113/15 139/4 |
| 111/22 112/4 112/5 | 95/6 95/13 <br> Draper [5] 2/10 | easiest [3] 81/11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112/9 113/6 113/22 } \\ & 117 / 16119 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Draper [5] 2/10 } \\ 8 / 16 ~ 8 / 21 ~ 23 / 3 ~ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 128 / 14128 / 15 \\ \text { easily [1] 54/24 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |


| $\mathbf{E}$ | 106/3 | engineers [2] 101/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| east [1] 99/4 | else [8] 8/12 9/1 | 13 |
| eastern [2] 23/9 | 38/23 53/10 59/1 | enough [11] 21/1 |
| 99/5 | 86/12 144/18 | 27/13 28/10 39/12 |
| Easton [7] 29/15 | 146/16 | 57/17 102/18 103/6 |
| 29/16 43/11 50/5 | email [1] 41/6 | 128/2 129/14 131/6 |
| 50/8 51/20 54/2 | employed [2] | 131/8 |
| easy [1] 121/4 | 148/11 148/14 | ensued [9] 34/14 <br> 58/19 60/2 75/8 |
| economic [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { employee [1] } \\ & 148 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | 58/19 60/2 75/8 <br> 77/5 85/17 88/3 |
| 118/21 ${ }^{\text {edge }}$ [7] 62/8 62/10 | 148/13 ${ }^{\text {enabling [3] 141/8 }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77/5 85/17 88/3 } \\ & \text { 102/21 142/19 } \end{aligned}$ |
| edge [7] 62/8 62/10 | enabling [3] 141/8 $141 / 12141 / 13$ | ensure [2] 34/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62/24 63/13 63/16 } \\ & 63 / 17 \text { 132/4 } \end{aligned}$ | 141/12 141/13 <br> encroachment [1] | ensure [2] 34/4 123/8 |
| edges [3] 45/1 45/9 | 35/23 | entail [1] 91/10 |
| 109/19 | encroachments [1] | entire [4] 10/3 |
| education [1] 4/18 | 95/15 | 58/12 90/20 137/2 |
| effort [2] 31/6 46/5 | end [14] 16/1 16/3 | entirely [2] 98/15 |
| eight [1] 79/24 | 16/10 17/22 34/23 | 98/24 |
| either [3] 49/10 | 99/3 99/4 114/12 | Environ [1] 1/15 |
| 91/14 93/13 | 114/19 114/22 | Environmental [1] $89 / 23$ |
| elaborate [1] | 128/1 146/22 | equal [1] 64/18 |
| 136/23 | 128/1 146/22 <br> ended [2] 55/2 56/8 | equal [1] 64/18 equivalent [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { elaborating [1] } \\ & 92 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | ending [1] 54/18 | 138/15 |
| electrical [1] 68/22 | ends [2] 54/20 | era [1] 20/8 |
| Electronically [1] | 56/10 | error [4] 10/7 65/ |
| 1/6 | Energy [1] 1/10 | 65/16 73/9 |
| eleventh [3] 14/4 | engineer [2] | errors [2] 65/ |
| 15/11 134/21 | engineering | 65/19 |
| eliminate [2] 82/7 | engineering [5] | especially [3] 15/10 |
| 82/8 | 5/13 5/14 5/20 | 29/10 104/22 |
| ELMO [2] 61/3 | 45/16 100/19 | Esq [1] 1/20 |


| $\mathbf{E}$ | 72/13 74/22 84/13 | 45/8 45/17 48/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| essence [2] 10/17 | 89/12 101/14 135/1 | 73/22 106/19 |
| 11/23 | 144/13 | 108/12 119/24 |
| essential [1] 109/5 | ever [1] 135/12 | 122/11 130/9 |
| essentially [6] | Eversource [1] 1/9 | 130/16 131/24 |
| 26/20 82/8 83/1 | every [9] 39/4 66/7 | 139/21 |
| 103/20 117/2 117/6 | 81/13 81/23 113/10 | examination [11] |
| establish [7] 24/12 | 126/2 134/7 134/9 | 2/5 2/6 2/7 2/8 2/9 |
| 29/20 90/12 116/7 | 134/17 | 2/10 2/11 2/12 4/14 |
| 128/13 134/12 | everybody [4] | 9/17 143/3 |
| 146/12 | 22/22 86/18 89/8 | example [2] 131/2 |
| established [5] 16/6 | 115/1 | 145/22 |
| 17/2 38/15 56/19 | everyone [1] 53/19 | examples [3] |
| 146/9 | everything [1] | 125/14 137/16 |
| establishing [7] | 81/17 | 137/18 |
| 88/20 104/9 104/24 | evidence [39] 16/19 | excavation [1] |
| 105/7 119/3 130/2 | 19/22 24/22 25/1 | 133/3 |
| 139/2 | 26/24 27/3 29/6 | Except [1] 108/12 |
| establishment [1] | 29/6 29/7 29/7 | exception [1] 72/23 |
| 14/20 | 29/13 30/14 30/17 | exceptions [1] 97/6 |
| estimate [1] 129/5 | 30/20 31/7 31/14 | exchange [1] 11/20 |
| etcetera [3] 37/4 | 31/21 31/22 32/2 | excuse [9] 5/11 28/1 |
| 90/2 93/9 | 34/5 37/10 38/9 | 72/16 76/4 82/11 |
| Ethics [3] 30/12 | 39/13 39/15 40/6 | 91/23 95/1 113/14 |
| 33/5 33/7 | $\begin{aligned} & 40 / 2145 / 445 / 11 \\ & 45 / 1346 / 2261 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | 144/3 |
| evaluate [2] 73/23 | 45/13 46/22 61/20 | exerted [1] 31/6 |
| 136/20 | 80/10 85/5 104/2 | exhaust [1] 82/14 |
| evaluation [6] 1/2 | 104/7 117/4 119/21 | exhibit [16] 3/3 |
| 1/12 46/4 97/14 | 125/10 129/7 | 11/17 43/9 44/20 |
| 136/5 141/9 | evidenced [1] 28/15 | 49/20 49/22 54/9 |
| even [11] 27/7 | exact [1] 119/5 | 54/11 58/21 61/5 |
| 33/21 37/20 38/3 | exactly [13] 23/10 | 78/19 78/20 99/13 |


| $\mathbf{E}$ | 112/17 | familiar [3] 12/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| exhibit... [3] 107/3 | explanation [3] | 75/12 92/17 |
| 107/24 108/2 | 53/20 53/22 53/23 | familiarity [1] |
| exist [1] 87/19 | explore [1] 33/18 expressing [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 57 / 17 \\ & \text { far [14] } \quad 17 / 6 \quad 32 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| existed [1] 32/2 | expressing [1] 29/18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { far }[14] \quad 17 / 632 / 5 \\ 35 / 455 / 664 / 11 \end{gathered}$ |
| existing [10] 16/19 | extensive [4] 39/2 | 69/14 78/13 78/14 |
| 92/9 95/13 103/21 103/23 104/8 | 83/13 84/14 110/12 | 83/6 84/17 92/24 |
| 104/10 104/12 | extent [2] 32/24 | 104/22 119/21 |
| 105/8 130/17 | $51 / 3$ | 132/22 |
| expanding [1] 62/2 | extra [1] 66/9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { farther [2] 57/8 } \\ & 64 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| expect [2] 39/3 39/5 | F | fashion [1] 37/2 |
| expectations [1] $114 / 14$ | face [1] 42/1 | features [3] 65/9 |
| 114/14 | Facility [1] 1/10 | 65/11 66/1 |
| experience [13] | fact [16] 29/5 32/1 | federal [2] 3/4 |
| experience 4/19 5/12 | 38/8 40/20 50/20 | 72/14 |
| 104/23 104/24 | 54/23 71/8 79/20 $85 / 388 / 2490 / 21$ | feel [4] 26/15 |
| 105/2 105/7 112/7 | 100/7 105/5 105/21 | 115/18 116/5 |
| 117/14 125/11 | 117/16 124/10 | 119/17 |
| 144/8 145/20 | fact-finder [2] | feet [10] 31/19 |
| 145/21 | 40/20 85/3 | 37/20 64/19 65/21 |
| experienced [1] | facts [1] 46/21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 73/5 73/7 73/9 } \\ & 79 / 2491 / 23 ~ 132 / 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 47/15 | factually [2] 18/23 | felt [1] 58/3 |
| expert [2] 9/22 85/7 expertise [1] 94/3 | 19/10 failed [1] 12/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { few [4] 9/13 20/16 } \\ & 65 / 9121 / 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| explain [13] 39/23 | fair [8] 10/21 71/10 | field [8] 16/21 37/9 |
| 43/13 44/23 46/6 | 87/8 99/8 102/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { field [8] 16/21 37/9 } \\ & \text { 38/9 45/4 45/12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 46/14 47/6 50/5 | 103/6 103/22 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 38 / 945 / 445 / 12 \\ 101 / 0110 / 21 \end{array}$ |
| 50/22 52/20 56/6 $77 / 16115 / 22$ 128/6 | 113/24 |  |
| 77/16 115/22 128/6 explaining [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fairly [2] 88/15 } \\ & 98 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | fieldwork [10] |

$\qquad$
fieldwork... [10] 35/14 36/8 37/8 37/23 46/3 68/13 69/2 69/4 69/12 108/9
fifty [1] 42/11 figure [9] 35/11 36/3 42/9 65/2 65/21 75/21 87/24 90/16 127/20
figured [2] 58/4 83/15
figuring [1] 130/16 filed [5] 1/6 7/4 70/24 72/24 141/4 files [2] 81/13 81/16 filing [1] 55/6 fill [1] 129/9
Fillmore [3] 51/15 55/20 58/20
final [11] 21/6 21/8 39/16 74/23 98/6 98/12 98/17 101/14 101/17 101/21 101/22
finally [1] 36/3
financially [1]

## 148/14

find [13] 31/18 43/16 47/1 48/3 49/14 49/16 50/10

50/19 50/24 51/19 follow [5] 21/2 81/12 81/20 108/17 $29 / 20$ 33/15 39/8 finder [2] 40/20 85/3
finders [1] 38/8 finding [1] 74/20 finds [1] 114/13 fine [2] 100/20
132/21
first [20] 14/2 18/19 footsteps [1] 41/16 21/3 22/20 44/1 foregoing [1] 148/4 63/2 64/21 79/8 79/18 89/23 99/18 99/20 121/4 124/10 124/15 137/13
137/23 139/23
140/4 140/4
first-generation [1] 64/21
fits [1] 129/24
five [3] 31/19 72/12 73/9
flags [1] 120/16
flipped [1] 75/18 floating [1] 83/3
flowing [1] 44/3
focus [1] 26/2
focused [3] 17/15
17/16 25/21
focuses [1] 6/3
folks [4] 7/8 9/3
22/19 124/20

Forest [1] 135/8
forgot [2] 48/10 133/1
Fort [1] 6/9
forth [5] 19/10 104/19 108/21
132/10 148/7
forward [3] 12/19
15/15 82/12
found [10] 10/22
31/20 37/22 44/1
53/9 53/10 88/23
118/17 127/23
128/2
four [8] 37/20
56/20 56/21 57/3
57/11 57/13 58/7
58/12
Franconia [8]
29/17 43/3 43/11 48/20 50/4 50/7

Franconia... [2]
51/20 63/10
Franklin [1] 5/8 front [7] 32/21
40/21 52/11 60/8
72/3 76/24 125/16 frontage [1] 38/22 fulfilled [3] 32/8 34/6 34/9
full [5] 46/1 46/7
116/4 116/5 116/12 fully [1] 131/19 fumbling [1] 72/22 further [12] 22/16 37/12 64/15 77/22 78/2 78/10 87/20 94/4 115/10 120/22 148/10 148/12 future [4] 41/15 83/9 110/16 119/3
G

Gale [2] 78/20 79/6 gas [1] 90/23 general [7] 9/10 12/8 23/18 23/21
26/3 60/9 138/17 generalities [2] 24/16 24/17 generally [14] 31/12 38/21 39/21

40/17 41/3 41/4 74/3 85/6 93/2 93/11 97/5 117/17 126/20 127/8
generated [1] 49/13 generation [1] 64/21
generic [1] 86/4
geologists [1] 93/1 get [19] 4/9 13/7 17/16 18/13 19/7 20/15 47/24 58/21 66/11 89/21 93/2 99/19 104/13 106/6 107/12 126/24
127/1 133/2 136/12 getting [3] 8/12 84/11 130/10
Getz [1] 98/3
Gilbert's [1] 62/6
Gilford [2] 5/2 127/23
GIS [2] 45/14 78/6
give [10] 4/17 13/16 13/17 17/8 24/19 42/9 89/15 93/19 136/20 137/15
give you [1] 13/16 given [5] 4/21 43/11 44/2 54/21 64/17
go [36] 6/12 7/8
14/8 19/24 28/6

37/17 61/13 63/14 64/2 64/3 71/17
73/12 74/16 75/20 79/7 79/17 84/16
88/15 94/15 97/7
97/9 99/18 100/12
117/10 117/23
119/6 122/11
125/24 126/11
126/17 127/6 128/7
128/16 131/16
142/16 145/22
goes [11] 35/3 36/4
42/4 66/19 80/23
82/15 95/8 115/22
122/18 125/22
128/12
going [65] 4/9 7/9
9/13 18/7 23/1 23/2
23/11 24/13 25/19
29/24 33/12 35/10
36/9 36/9 42/22
44/9 47/18 51/3
52/16 53/2 54/13
62/1 62/16 70/16
72/1 73/2 73/12
73/14 74/21 76/12
81/23 83/15 88/1 90/16 97/9 101/1 101/15 101/18 101/19 101/23
106/2 106/6 115/3

| G | 61/5 70/11 78/18 | 127/10 127/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| going... [22] 117/10 | 78/19 | 128/6 130/22 133/6 |
| 118/5 121/13 | granite [2] 84/9 | 135/10 135/11 |
| 121/14 121/21 | 119/11 | half [4] 18/2 35/10 |
| 121/22 122/6 | grant [1] 136/17 | 63/14 132/24 |
| 122/14 125/3 125/4 | graphic [1] 64/9 | halls [1] 24/22 |
| 133/4 133/18 | graphically [2] | HAMPSHIRE [31] |
| 134/21 135/6 136/1 | 28/15 64/20 | 1/1 1/4 1/9 5/3 5/5 |
| 136/3 137/5 139/15 | gravel [2] 63/5 63/6 | 5/8 5/10 11/11 15/9 |
| 145/5 145/7 146/14 | great [2] 59/23 | 16/24 23/18 25/14 |
| 147/5 | 144/1 | 30/1 30/11 33/4 |
| golf [1] 93/16 | ground [9] 11/4 | 36/13 41/10 43/17 |
| gone [4] 51/2 | 11/4 24/6 25/2 | 50/10 50/18 54/4 |
| 125/18 125/18 | 39/13 86/19 107/8 | 60/8 81/3 89/16 |
| 125/19 | 118/7 120/2 | 115/19 124/18 |
| $\operatorname{good}[20] ~ 4 / 11 ~ 4 / 12 ~$ | Grounds [1] 46/20 | 124/21 125/1 126/3 |
| 4/16 9/8 10/6 36/24 | groundwater [1] | 137/20 140/24 |
| 47/14 60/4 60/6 | 93/8 | hand [7] 15/10 |
| 64/21 65/4 80/20 | group [2] 10/4 | 26/13 28/6 62/7 |
| 82/5 115/14 115/16 | 22/24 | 64/3 117/3 140/17 |
| 121/1 126/12 | guess [8] 13/16 14/ | handed [1] 37/1 |
| 126/12 131/6 131/7 | 65/21 65/22 115/2 | handing [1] 142/14 |
| Gordon [1] 17/4 | 117/7 129/4 142/4 | Hang [2] 143/17 |
| got [7] 9/3 15/4 | guessed [1] 106/8 | 143/17 |
| 34/22 55/15 55/16 | H | happen [2] 71/9 |
| 106/10 145/17 | had [25] 11/2 11/5 |  |
| government [3] | 11/23 13/22 17/10 | happened [2] 66/11 |
| 72/14 83/17 83/18 | 41/1 42/24 44/18 |  |
| governmental [3] | 49/6 54/24 56/1 | happening [2] 33/2 |
| 14/18 72/15 83/7 | 58/3 72/21 87/15 | 70/11 |
| Graduated [1] 6/1 | 118/12 118/19 | happens [2] 66/4 |
| Grafton [5] 42/21 | 120/14 124/5 | 145/21 |

H
Harbor [1] 6/9 hard [2] 47/1 69/23 has [52] 8/12 10/12 12/3 13/19 15/4
15/5 19/9 22/13 42/12 44/13 47/8 47/11 48/4 48/11 49/16 56/13 57/17 58/23 69/12 71/7 76/11 78/17 80/9
81/24 84/14 89/9
95/9 96/4 103/13
104/22 105/7
105/12 105/16
108/21 109/10
109/12 110/21
112/14 113/22
114/3 118/6 119/16
120/7 124/4 128/9
131/18 139/17
144/19 145/19
145/20 146/11
146/20
hasn't [2] 13/13 131/15
hats [1] 96/15
have [180]
haven't [9] 13/12 21/6 66/1 66/2 67/17 95/23 131/21 135/14 142/8
having [13] 50/14 73/24 81/5 83/7 103/7 112/4 116/23 122/7 122/9 134/22 135/2 144/5 146/1 he [33] 36/21 43/21 45/7 45/17 45/17 46/9 46/10 47/8 47/11 47/13 47/18 48/4 48/9 48/11
56/13 66/3 77/19
77/20 77/20 77/21
77/21 77/24 77/24
78/1 79/10 105/7
105/14 105/20
144/19 145/19
145/20 145/22 146/5
he's [11] 8/11 47/12 47/13 47/21 78/7
78/7 78/8 79/6
86/24 105/19
105/21
head [1] 62/17
heading [1] 97/15
heard [2] 115/18 125/7
hearing [6] 1/11 4/2 44/1 88/5 119/1 147/9
held [4] 6/7 28/10 122/20 137/6
help [2] 69/6 93/3 her [2] 29/19 29/22
here [37] 4/10 8/1
10/3 11/15 12/3
16/14 17/8 19/9
20/4 20/8 20/9 27/2
27/6 28/23 33/10
35/4 35/15 38/23
39/14 41/22 45/6
57/7 57/9 64/4
88/16 96/14 96/16
96/20 97/2 109/5
118/24 124/5 125/4
130/11 138/8
143/23 145/18
hereby [1] 148/4
hereinbefore [1] 148/7
high [2] 62/16 126/15
high-tech [1] 62/16 highlight [1] 58/5 highlighted [1] 55/23
highlighting [1]
55/22
highway [15] 20/11
63/11 85/9 102/4 103/5 103/5 103/8
103/14 105/8
120/17 126/16
135/11 136/1 137/3
highway... [1]

## 139/1

highways [6] 103/7 107/11 109/19 126/4 136/4 137/4 highways' [1] 105/1 Hill [4] 29/17 34/20 34/23 99/5
him [11] 12/12 43/20 45/8 57/18 75/3 77/9 98/6 105/12 105/14 105/15 128/6 hired [1] 48/8 his [16] 25/20 25/21 26/2 32/17 43/19 43/21 44/8 45/6 45/8 48/11 48/11 66/3 66/3 67/14 75/2 98/14
historic [9] 20/4
24/21 38/1 38/2
125/6 125/8 125/12 125/13 125/20
historical [4] 31/10 61/22 105/17 125/22
Hodgdon [12] 2/11 42/24 53/8 53/9
96/4 96/6 96/9
96/11 97/18 102/15

106/24 139/14 Hodgdon's [4] 52/2 52/8 52/9 53/7 hold [3] 27/10 28/14 75/5
holding [1] 28/13
hole [1] 119/11
holes [1] 118/14
Honigberg [1] 1/13
honor [1] 36/13
hope [1] 47/20
hoping [1] 88/15
horizontal [2]
70/15 93/23
hour [4] 14/4 15/11 35/10 134/21
house [4] 126/23
127/20 127/24
128/1
how [32] 11/9
26/11 27/8 39/23
42/2 42/9 44/13
47/14 47/24 49/8
50/5 50/22 51/21
52/8 56/6 61/7
64/11 66/16 67/3
83/14 84/18 86/17
87/24 93/9 112/7
119/8 125/8 125/10
125/19 125/19
129/24 136/20
However [1] 28/1
huge [3] 29/9 118/9 118/21
huh [2] 68/20 94/20 hundred [1] 91/22 HWY [1] 63/11
hydrologist [1]
93/20
hydrologist's [1]
93/20
hypothetical [1] 114/20

I'd [2] 44/10 78/17
I'll [16] 13/4 13/16
13/17 18/24 54/1
59/16 75/4 75/4
75/21 92/12 99/4
121/3 122/13
123/22 135/20
146/14
I'm [79] 7/9 8/17
9/9 9/10 9/13 15/15 18/7 18/19 19/7
23/8 23/11 25/19
32/22 33/1 36/9
36/9 39/17 44/9
49/9 51/2 51/3 51/6
51/20 52/16 53/2
55/8 56/11 57/9
57/16 73/2 75/24
76/10 76/12 77/9
77/23 79/17 80/6

| I | 101/17 | include [7] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I'm... [42] 80/7 | identified [1] 22/19 | 14/23 31/8 112/18 |
| 86/21 87/5 88/15 | identify [2] 49/20 | 113/2 116/18 |
| 89/20 92/17 94/15 | 84/12 | 122/19 |
| 5/4 96/11 97/1 | identifying [1] | included [6] 43/22 |
| /9 101/1 101/4 | 23/23 | 44/8 50/21 74/13 |
| /2 106/6 108/1 | ignore [1] 133/24 | 48 |
| 111/5 111/19 115/2 | imagine [1] 82/10 | includes [1] |
| 119/1 119/24 | immediately [2] | including [2] |
| 119/24 120/18 | 58/13 63/12 | 104/23 111/18 |
| 122/14 124/11 | impact [2] 93/15 | incomplete [2] |
| 125/3 125/3 132/14 | 122/6 | 19/17 42/2 |
| 132/15 137/14 | impacted [1] 93/22 | inconsistent [1] |
| 139/14 139/15 | impacts [3] 71/21 | 28/12 |
| 139/21 142/5 | 71/21 72/7 | incorrect [1] 70/3 |
| 142/14 144/12 | implying [1] 56/21 | indicate [7] 11/8 |
| 144/14 145/2 145/4 | important [10] | 26/13 27/4 34/11 |
| 145/7 146/4 146/10 | 70/8 73/18 102/16 | 37/24 38/9 113/6 |
| I've [18] 6/6 9/11 | 117/22 118/2 130/2 | indicated [9] 26/16 |
| 14/12 31/16 44/11 | 132/1 132/18 | 45/7 46/9 73/4 73/8 |
| 72/11 75/10 88/13 | 140/23 144/10 | /20 78/8 |
| 90/10 91/12 93/16 | impossible [1] | 113/23 |
| 105/10 106/10 |  | indicates [2] 38/1 |
| 111/6 116/10 | inaccurate | 62/8 |
| 127/22 130/9 | 19/17 42/1 | indicating [3] |
| 142/13 | inadequacies [1] | 40/14 77/18 |
| I-93 [1] 132/19 | 10/22 | indication [5] 26/10 |
| I-95[1] 6/8 | inadequate [1] 15/9 | 26/23 37/21 39/14 |
| Iacopino [4] 1/20 | inappropriate [1] | 41/22 |
| 1/20 2/18 137/11 | 97/3 | indicator [1] 41/2 |
| idea [6] 44/13 47/14 | inch [2] 63/14 | individual [1] 79/5 |
| 48/4 48/4 82/5 | 64/18 | industrial [1] 5/16 |


| I | 94/15 148/15 | 123/14 132/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| information [32] | interesting [2] | 134/3 145/15 |
| 11/2 14/11 14/11 | 93/11 127/15 | issued [3] 23/19 |
| 14/13 17/22 20/20 | internally [1] 28/12 | 25/4 112/17 |
| 25/16 27/13 27/15 | interpretation [4] | issues [5] 6/4 6/4 |
| 28/11 29/3 31/10 | 113/20 113/21 | 20/3 22/9 119/16 |
| 44/3 72/3 79/21 | 114/3 114/4 | it [274] |
| 81/12 83/8 84/2 | interrelated [1] | it's [98] 5/4 9/23 |
| 84/6 84/7 86/4 | 90/12 | 20/1 23/17 25/8 |
| 105/17 105/17 | interruption [3] | 27/4 27/7 28/11 |
| 108/19 116/14 | 117/19 131/9 | 28/12 29/3 31/12 |
| 119/17 120/10 | 140/13 | 35/3 35/4 36/2 36/2 |
| 120/13 121/18 | intersection [1] | 40/5 40/19 41/1 |
| 129/9 129/14 | 43/4 | 42/5 42/5 42/16 |
| 133/20 | intervenors [1] | 43/18 44/3 46/21 |
| initial [2] 70/20 | 95/23 | 49/24 51/4 51/7 |
| 74/17 | involve [1] 22/1 | 54/12 54/13 54/14 |
| input [1] 82/9 | involved [2] 91/2 | 54/24 55/16 57/2 |
| Inspector [1] 6/7 | 93/2 | 57/3 57/7 57/8 |
| install [1] 119/8 | iron [3] 27/11 | 59/16 59/22 61/11 |
| installed [2] 88/23 | 119/12 119/12 | 63/5 65/14 65/17 |
| 117/15 | irrigation [1] 93/17 | 65/21 69/16 71/9 |
| installer [1] 6/14 | is [403] | 72/2 73/13 73/17 |
| instances [1] | isn't [14] 21/18 | 74/18 78/21 83/2 |
| 137/18 | 24/16 44/6 64/19 | 83/2 83/8 83/10 |
| insurance [4] | 71/18 80/24 109/5 | 83/17 83/17 84/5 |
| 126/21 126/22 | 109/18 109/24 | 84/9 84/9 86/9 |
| 126/24 127/1 | 110/7 111/19 | 86/13 93/6 93/6 |
| intend [1] 46/22 | 121/13 121/14 | 103/4 103/5 104/2 |
| interaction [2] | 140/3 | 106/19 116/7 117/9 |
| 105/11 105/15 | issue [9] 20/9 20/15 | 119/6 119/10 |
| interested [3] 72/7 | 49/11 93/1 119/23 | 119/13 121/7 122/5 |


| I | 25/8 29/14 3 | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| it's... [24] 122/6 | 54/16 59/1 | 145/13 |
| 122/12 122/12 | Jones [1] 127/21 | point |
| /12 127/14 | Jones's [1] 127/20 | 8/18 |
| 8/21 128/23 | Jt [2] 3/4 3/6 | K |
| 9/12 129/19 | judge [2] 40/22 | Kathryn [1] 1/14 |
| 0/3 130/12 |  | Keep [2] 6/12 81/17 |
| 130/15 131/5 137/3 | judgment [4] 96/22 | Ken [1] 77/18 |
| 137/4 137/16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114/17 115/6 145/8 } \\ & \text { July [2] 11/13 } \end{aligned}$ | Kevin [1] 79/5 |
| 137/17 138/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { July [2 } \\ & \text { 29/16 } \end{aligned}$ | kind [3] 31/8 94/18 |
| 138/20 138/24 | jurisdiction [3] | 102/15 |
| 140/2 146/8 | 103/8 103/14 136/4 | kinds [3] 9/3 35/17 |
| item [1] 16/14 | just [56] 5/4 6/12 |  |
| iterative [3] 14/7 | 8/18 8/19 9/19 |  |
| 82/21 82/24 | 10/15 17/14 17/19 | know [59] 17/7 |
| its [3] 102/4 102/9 | 22/21 24/19 | 21/7 27/22 31/15 |
| 39/19 | 31/8 33/16 35/20 | 31/23 33/9 33/22 |
| itself [4] 10/12 | 36/11 40/24 41/8 | 34/8 46/11 47/18 |
| 17/21 62/3 126/3 | 43/5 48/15 52/14 | 48/11 49/8 57/15 |
| J |  | 57/19 57/22 65/20 |
| J.D [1] 5/8 | 74/2 74/20 75/10 | 66/11 73/18 73/21 |
| January [1] 17/3 | 75/15 81/9 84/5 | 78/4 80/14 84/16 |
| Jennifer [1] 25/13 | 86/13 89/20 92/9 | 86/6 92/21 92/23 |
| jigsaw [3] 128/21 | 94/13 96/14 97/1 | 93/2 93/15 96/15 |
| 128/23 130/15 | 100/6 102/3 114/1 | 97/8 100/17 100/18 |
| job [3] 24/15 40/20 | 114/7 118/3 | 101/2 101/6 101/20 |
| 90/4 | 120/15 123/1 123/7 | 104/16 105/5 105/6 |
| Johnson [2] 14/5 | 131/6 133/2 | 105/13 1 |
| 79/5 | /13 | 11 |
| Joint [7] 1/8 23/17 | 139/11 139/11 | $\begin{aligned} & 120 / 1120 / 17122 / 3 \\ & 102 / 0121 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |


| K | 94/13 118/10 | 111/7 111/24 112/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| know... [13] 124/24 | 118/23 | 113/21 118/16 |
| 125/9 125/14 | Lan [12] 16/7 26/22 | 122/22 123/10 |
| 125/15 128/2 | 33/6 33/8 36/15 | 124/9 128/5 130/7 |
| 128/10 130/5 130/8 | 37/3 47/16 60/23 | 130/8 130/13 |
| 130/20 131/3 | 124/4 137/22 | 130/15 131/13 |
| 131/13 131/14 | 138/16 140/5 | 132/16 134/3 |
| 131/20 | land [93] 5/6 5/12 | 137/22 140/24 |
| knowing [4] 86/17 | 5/14 5/19 6/4 11/10 | 144/8 |
| 118/3 130/1 131/24 | 15/8 16/2 16/16 | landowner [3] 89/1 |
| knowledge [3] | 17/11 17/11 19/21 | 102/23 103/7 |
| 29/10 40/1 122/7 | 20/10 20/10 21/4 | landowners [9] |
| known [2] 5/9 61/6 | 24/12 25/13 29/4 | 29/8 29/9 41/15 |
| knows [1] 66/8 | 29/7 29/11 29/11 | 70/9 71/23 73/20 |
| Kris [2] 23/8 | 30/1 30/11 30/24 | 81/5 82/5 131/20 |
| 127/10 | 31/3 31/12 33/5 | lands [1] 22/1 |
| L | 33/8 34/17 35/16 | lane [1] 132/21 |
| label [1] 133/13 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| labeled [3] 67/10 | 53/5 53/5 60/10 | large [7] 91/14 |
| 68/14 68/14 | 60/12 60/13 61/18 | 91/14 91/24 93/8 |
| lack [2] 31/13 | 62/6 67/12 67/13 | 93/12 117/9 129/24 |
| 41/19 | 69/14 72/11 72/11 | last [8] 79/2 79/18 |
| lacking [1] 16/19 | 72/12 81/11 82/8 | 87/5 93/5 112/16 |
| Laconia [2] 66/5 | 82/11 82/18 84/18 | 112/23 124/6 |
| 66/7 | 84/20 84/24 85/2 | 133/17 |
| laid [9] 16/23 19/20 | 85/2 85/4 85/6 | later [4] 50/22 |
| 27/3 57/11 57/13 | 85/12 86/21 86/22 | 54/14 117/24 |
| 117/1 118/14 | 86/23 89/18 91/9 | 127/13 |
| 126/15 138/21 | 91/24 92/2 101/12 | Laughter [2] 62/18 |
| lakes [8] 2/9 22/23 | 105/19 105/20 | 140/15 |
| 88/12 89/4 92/13 | 105/22 109/7 110/4 | law [10] 5/9 5/10 |

law... [8] 5/24 16/16 leaking [1] 90/14
17/1 81/2 113/8 113/17 140/24 141/3
laws [4] 15/20
36/13 84/22 141/3 lawyer [2] 17/8 96/15
layer [1] 66/9
laying [3] 104/8 104/10 131/12 layout [36] 37/16 38/1 39/22 39/23 40/4 42/24 43/4 43/10 43/12 43/16 44/14 50/7 50/9
50/22 51/1 51/22
52/22 53/9 56/24
56/24 57/6 58/4
58/8 58/9 58/12
120/5 125/12
125/13 125/20
127/8 128/2 128/5
128/8 128/13
128/19 131/19
layouts [5] 51/19
125/6 125/8 125/23 127/19
lays [1] 140/6
LCR [3] 1/24
148/17 148/18
leaks [1] 90/15
learned [3] 44/6
71/7 86/9
least [6] 15/1 35/9 49/17 69/13 84/12 $87 / 5$
leave [1] 39/12
leaves [2] 87/23
136/5
leaving [1] 112/2 left [7] 26/13 28/2 28/17 38/19 40/13 57/4 62/7
left-hand [2] 26/13 62/7
legal [21] 17/8 18/8 19/4 22/4 26/24
36/19 42/12 63/3
63/17 83/21 84/16
84/20 84/24 88/24
89/3 89/6 96/16
96/22 97/3 136/13 136/14
legality [1] 19/13
legend [4] 28/3
28/12 61/13 61/15
Legislature [1]
126/1
Lenehan [1] $1 / 20$
length [1] 43/2
less [4] 33/14 61/10 129/4 132/3
lesser [1] 139/8 let [12] 6/11 17/14 18/24 20/20 22/21 76/16 92/12 103/2 104/14 120/5 122/11 136/10
let's [11] 20/15 48/3 49/14 49/16 63/14 87/23 87/24 136/2 138/7 142/16 147/5 letter [26] 7/14 7/18 11/13 11/19 11/22 12/23 25/4 29/15 48/22 49/7 52/2 52/8 52/9 53/7 59/13 68/18 68/19 78/20 85/14 98/2 98/5 98/14 98/16 107/4 107/15 107/19
letting [1] 73/20 level [4] 6/7 46/5 93/8 107/11
levels [1] 45/21 license [1] 6/2 licensed [26] 5/6 5/18 6/2 6/10 6/13 19/21 20/10 24/4 25/13 30/1 48/6 67/12 67/13 89/18

| L | limiting [1] 77/23 | 43/6 57/8 64/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| licensed... [12] | limits [6] 38/12 | 64/14 71/17 77/11 |
| 101/12 105/19 | 38/15 69/11 93/18 | 77/21 78/1 115/2 |
| 105/20 109/7 | 122/3 134/12 | 133/4 136/24 |
| 122/22 124/8 | line [30] 7/5 16/14 | 137/14 |
| 124/17 124/21 | 26/14 26/17 26/18 | lived [3] 29/10 |
| 137/22 140/24 | 28/5 28/14 40/11 | 127/21 127/21 |
| 148/3 148/18 | 40/14 45/23 61/23 | lives [1] 58/1 |
| licenses [2] 4/18 6/6 | 61/24 62/20 63/12 | LLC [1] 1/8 |
| licensing [2] 84/22 | 63/15 63/19 73/8 | LLS [1] 46/3 |
| 134/2 | 79/22 80/1 80/22 | local [2] 45/2 98/24 |
| licensure [11] | 80/23 122/10 129/9 | locate [8] 37/9 |
| 11/10 12/14 16/6 | 130/14 130/22 | 37/19 45/1 45/9 |
| 19/15 19/20 20/18 | 130/23 131/23 | 65/24 92/4 108/9 |
| 20/24 31/3 45/19 | 132/20 139/4 | 108/19 |
| 60/12 137/7 | 144/21 | located [6] 61/19 |
| Licensure's [2] | lines [26] 24/5 | 79/23 83/11 83/12 |
| 16/1 16/12 | 26/16 27/9 28/7 | 97/13 136/18 |
| life [1] 116/10 | 28/8 30/15 30/21 | location [8] 40/7 |
| light [2] 50/20 | 45/10 62/7 62/7 | 61/22 61/22 65/15 |
| 79/13 | 68/15 78/3 80/23 | 83/11 113/13 119/6 |
| like [21] 10/7 29/1 | 81/21 93/21 110/17 | 126/19 |
| 32/24 44/10 51/4 | 118/6 122/21 | locations [4] 26/12 |
| 56/4 67/9 78/17 | 122/23 123/6 126/4 | 29/2 93/9 107/8 |
| 81/21 81/22 82/1 | 129/24 130/1 130/2 | locator [2] 37/18 |
| 89/5 92/9 94/16 | 130/5 133/6 | 37/19 |
| 95/6 95/14 102/3 | list [7] 7/8 19/23 | long [5] 29/11 |
| 105/18 130/3 | 24/16 24/18 24/19 | 47/14 47/24 139/3 |
| 140/17 144/19 | 39/18 66/19 | 139/12 |
| limited [6] 68/11 | literally [2] 6/14 6/15 | longer [4] 8/19 8/21 63/15 95/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68/12 68/16 69/2 } \\ & \text { 69/3 69/13 } \end{aligned}$ | (ittle [14] 7/9 11/2 | longitudinal [1] |


| L | 47/12 48/11 66/4 | manager [1] 5/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| longitudinal... [1] | 89/5 105/7 111/6 | managing [1] 5/21 |
| 139/1 | 111/10 118/22 | Manchester [1] |
| look [24] 13/18 | 119/17 120/2 125/9 | 92/18 |
| 19/22 28/4 33/11 | 125/22 129/11 | manuals [1] 138/ |
| 33/23 47/13 57/11 | 132/10 134/9 | many [15] 5/22 |
| 61/7 63/9 69/5 | 134/17 135/5 | 16/8 31/15 35/19 |
| 100/11 106/1 | 135/21 | 37/13 37/13 40/7 |
| 106/13 126/17 | lots [2] 37/17 81/14 | 71/7 72/15 81/16 |
| 127/3 127/6 127/7 | lower [2] 99/23 | 101/5 102/4 127/14 |
| 127/9 127/12 | 100/12 | 127/14 132/23 |
| 127/17 132/16 | M | map [21] 3/6 21/18 |
| 140/9 141/20 | made [3] 21/13 | 38/8 55/24 56/23 |
| 144/23 | 30/16 69/22 | 58/22 62/2 78/6 |
| looked [6] 10/7 | magic [1] 93/21 | 85/4 93/2 93/18 |
| 25/2 38/4 57/2 | magnitude [5] | 93/19 94/19 126/3 |
| 124/22 141/2 | 15/12 102/2 129/23 | 126/8 126/8 126/19 |
| looking [20] 15/15 | 132/17 134/24 | 126/23 126/24 |
| 25/23 25/24 33/7 | maintained [1] 6/1 | 127/10 127/12 |
| 33/16 37/24 44/22 | major [4] 62/7 | mapped [4] 35/1 |
| 51/8 51/10 52/10 | 126/4 126/4 126/14 | 35/12 35/24 80/11 |
| 58/22 63/24 65/2 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 126/4 } \\ \text { majority [3] } & 54 / 5\end{array}$ | mapping [9] 21/14 |
| 70/12 70/15 71/4 | m4/6 56/8 | 45/14 45/14 57/12 |
| 71/20 72/23 98/23 | make [13] 10/13 | 95/7 104/12 116/18 |
| 107/1 | 41/19 44/10 57/9 | 116/19 116/19 |
| looks [1] 144/19 | 72/5 77/11 77/12 | maps [9] 20/5 20/6 |
| loose [1] 37/1 | 86/22 134/22 135/6 | 24/21 45/4 58/5 |
| loose-handed [1] | 135/8 140/10 146/3 | 126/5 126/20 |
| 37/1 | makes [3] 55/23 | 127/10 127/13 |
| lost [4] 55/16 55/16 | m | March [2] 6/18 |
| 115/3 124/5 | 89/12 100/22 | 10/10 |
| lot [20] 42/11 47/12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { making [3] 94 } \\ & 114 / 24136 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | mark [3] 42/24 |

mark... [2] 59/22 96/11
marked [8] 11/16 42/21 44/21 54/15 58/23 58/24 59/17 99/24
marker [1] 40/23 markers [7] 39/24 41/8 41/14 41/19 85/20 86/2 86/19 marking [1] 59/13 Marks [1] 25/13 Martin [1] 1/13 Massabesic [1] 92/17
matches [1] 52/9 material [1] 74/12 materials [1] 90/23 matter [4] 9/19 29/5 71/8 117/16 may [22] 8/3 9/6 12/3 17/22 18/15 18/24 20/11 21/24 21/24 23/7 26/9 27/22 47/17 71/4 71/5 83/14 87/7 87/14 114/7 115/22 123/17 123/17 maybe [4] 33/18 49/15 125/24 140/17

McHenry [1] 6/10
112/14 114/14 me [34] 5/11 8/17
18/24 19/23 20/20
22/21 28/1 31/17
35/5 41/7 51/7
52/15 71/17 72/17
74/19 76/4 76/7
76/16 77/8 82/11
83/4 84/8 91/23
95/1 104/14 107/18
113/10 113/14
120/5 122/11
132/14 136/10
139/21 144/3
mean [11] 16/3
16/4 61/18 68/17
69/3 77/12 121/11
124/14 134/9
136/23 144/2
meaning [2] 29/23
146/11
means [8] 23/24 61/19 83/1 83/2 100/18 106/16 122/16 124/23
measured [1] 45/12 mechanism [1] 66/20
meet [16] 11/9
12/13 15/8 15/19
19/4 26/22 30/6
104/18 108/8

116/3 124/4 124/23
134/1 139/19
meeting [4] 30/2
108/22 124/13 137/21
meets [2] 17/24 21/8
Member [2] 1/16 1/16
members [3] 96/8 96/21 115/11 memo [11] 7/17 7/20 80/7 82/3
124/6 124/10
124/12 124/15
139/23 140/4 140/6
memorandum [6]
7/15 12/12 13/1
15/17 15/24 124/13
memory [1] 73/3
memos [1] 140/10
Menard [7] 2/12
8/15 23/2 94/6
142/21 143/22
146/15
mention [7] 59/9 89/19 89/21 91/8 99/11 100/4 100/7 mentioned [9] 20/16 72/21 74/2 104/16 109/17

97/10 135/22 minimum [1] 31/3 minus [2] 64/22 73/10
minute [4] 11/12 44/23 77/8 114/8 minutes [1] 111/16 miss [1] 23/4
missed [1] 44/14 missing [7] 19/16 19/19 20/4 25/15 51/24 117/4 129/2 misunderstanding [1] 123/17
mixing [1] 138/6 moment [4] 48/15 48/21 51/15 114/10 Monday [1] 147/6 monitoring [1] 93/9 Monroe [1] 1/21 months [2] 25/3 47/7
monument [9]
27/12 37/10 37/11
37/19 39/3 40/11
40/16 110/15 119/9
monumentation [5]
117/13 119/2
119/15 120/7
122/20
monumented [1]
118/18
monuments [14]
37/9 37/13 39/1
39/6 39/7 39/15
65/13 65/14 80/9
108/9 108/18
110/10 112/3
117/15
more [20] 9/2 17/15
17/16 44/18 47/6
56/9 58/11 58/13
71/9 76/18 76/22
79/20 87/24 104/23
115/6 115/6 119/17
129/4 132/3 146/20
morning [1] 147/6
most [4] 120/2
126/6 133/19
133/20
Motel [2] 78/21
79/6
Mountain [1] 135/7
move [8] 5/4 12/18 28/2 35/21 66/3
72/15 92/13 127/15
moved [8] 24/24
35/6 120/15 127/14 131/2 131/12
131/18 132/3
moving [1] 35/16
Mr [41] 2/5 2/6 2/9
2/11 2/16 2/18 4/10
8/7 8/14 9/7 22/23

| M | 146/20 | 4/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mr... [30] 23/10 | Mr. Aslin [5] 9/6 | Mr. Reimers [1] |
| 25/19 44/13 48/16 | 17/15 18/16 59/7 | 95/19 |
| 48/18 56/4 56/11 | 144/19 | Mr. Talon [1] |
| 57/17 59/5 59/10 | Mr. Bowes [2] 14/5 | 12/11 |
| 70/18 88/6 88/16 | 141/11 | Mr. Thompson [10] |
| 96/4 96/7 96/8 | Mr. Chair [1] | 4/9 10/9 11/13 |
| 115/12 115/14 | 106/11 | 11/20 12/17 96/17 |
| 120/24 121/1 | Mr. Draper [1] | 142/10 142/22 |
| 137/14 142/11 | 8/21 | 146/17 146/20 |
| 143/1 143/2 143/18 | Mr. Hodgdon [8] | Ms [31] 2/7 2/8 |
| 144/7 144/18 146/5 | 53/8 53/9 96/6 96/9 | 2/10 2/12 2/15 8/14 |
| 146/23 147/1 | 97/18 102/15 | 8/15 22/19 22/22 |
| Mr. [52] 4/3 4/9 | 106/24 139/14 | 22/23 23/2 23/3 |
| 4/16 8/21 9/6 10/9 | Mr. Hodgdon's [4] | 23/6 26/1 32/19 |
| 11/13 11/20 12/11 | 52/2 52/8 52/9 53/7 | 36/20 43/23 46/24 |
| 12/17 14/5 14/5 | Mr. Iacopino [1] | 47/10 51/6 51/15 |
| 17/15 18/16 22/23 | 137/11 | 58/16 58/21 60/3 |
| 49/4 49/15 52/2 | Mr. Johnson [1] | 70/21 94/11 108/7 |
| 52/8 52/9 53/7 53/8 | 14/5 | 115/13 143/8 |
| 53/9 57/20 59/7 | Mr. Lakes [5] | 143/22 146/15 |
| 88/12 89/4 92/13 | 22/23 88/12 89/4 | Ms. [8] 8/15 8/16 |
| 94/13 95/19 96/3 | 92/13 94/13 | 23/3 55/20 58/20 |
| 96/6 96/9 96/17 | Mr. Needleman [6] | 94/6 94/8 142/21 |
| 97/18 102/15 | 49/4 49/15 96/3 | Ms. Draper [1] |
| 106/11 106/24 | 144/17 145/1 146/7 | 8/16 |
| 120/23 135/21 | Mr. Nix [2] 4/16 | Ms. Fillmore [2] |
| 137/11 139/14 | 57/20 | 55/20 58/20 |
| 139/20 141/11 | Mr. Oldenburg [3] | Ms. Menard [3] |
| 142/10 142/22 | 120/23 135/21 | 8/15 94/6 142/21 |
| 144/17 144/19 | 139/20 | Ms. Townsend [2] |
| 145/1 146/7 146/17 | Mr. Patnaude [1] | 23/3 94/8 |

much [6] 42/9 87/24 98/10 112/7
118/15 146/24 Muni [8] 3/4 3/6
23/17 25/8 29/14 30/9 54/16 59/1 municipal [7] 120/17 120/19
136/1 136/4 136/19
136/22 137/4
municipalities [3]
72/13 103/15
110/15
municipality [1]
103/18
must [2] 21/15
72/18
my [58] 4/24 5/1
6/1 6/3 7/10 9/9
10/2 10/5 11/7
11/18 13/11 17/10
21/21 23/9 25/7
30/8 31/16 36/24
40/11 40/13 48/5
52/24 57/22 62/17
71/17 77/6 79/12
79/24 80/2 87/9
88/9 88/14 94/3
94/9 96/10 102/12
103/2 104/20
105/11 105/15

108/24 110/11
113/21 115/1 116/2 116/10 121/1 122/2 123/21 125/3 135/5
135/22 138/5
138/14 141/15
141/17 148/5 148/7
myself [2] 62/16 124/1
N
N-i-x [1] 5/1
N.H [2] 3/5 148/18
name [9] 4/21 4/23
4/24 9/9 68/23 79/3
79/5 96/10 121/1
names [1] 81/23
narrow [3] 7/9 117/9 139/12
National [1] 135/8
natural [1] 94/17 nature [3] 38/20 91/11 110/13
near [1] 131/17
nearby [1] 36/5
necessarily [2] 27/20 110/4
necessary [5] 16/13
73/1 116/6 119/2 119/4
need [23] 14/22
15/1 22/13 37/14
37/16 37/17 38/4

59/22 65/23 65/24
73/4 84/12 90/16 111/14 114/22
121/23 122/3 124/7
130/23 132/6
134/11 134/14
134/15
needed [1] 93/24
Needleman [6] 49/4 49/15 96/3 144/17 145/1 146/7
needs [10] 22/9
22/11 25/2 40/15
73/7 80/10 121/9
121/9 121/17
123/15
neglected [2] 34/18 59/9
neighbor [1] 80/2 neither [3] 16/22 103/17 148/10
never [6] 31/24 62/15 67/22 105/10 113/22 113/23
new [46] 1/1 1/4 1/9
5/2 5/5 5/7 5/10
11/11 12/19 13/8
13/21 15/8 16/24
23/18 25/14 30/1
30/11 33/4 36/10
36/13 41/10 43/17
50/10 50/18 51/11

| $\mathbf{N}$ | 143/18 146/5 | 140/3 140/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| new... [21] 54/3 | 146/23 | 141/19 142/3 142/8 |
| 60/8 74/22 81/2 | Nix's [1] 144/7 | 146/17 146/20 |
| 89/16 104/9 104/9 | no [92] 1/7 1/23 | 148/18 |
| 115/19 124/18 | 1/24 2/3 3/3 3/3 3/5 | non [1] 140/14 |
| 124/21 125/1 126/3 | 8/17 13/24 15/4 | non-answer [1] |
| 128/13 130/4 | 15/5 15/6 15/7 | 140/14 |
| 130/14 131/3 | 15/22 18/11 20/1 | none [2] 35/24 36/6 |
| 131/12 131/17 | 22/16 23/5 26/9 | normal [1] 14/8 |
| 131/19 137/20 | 26/10 26/23 27/2 | north [11] 25/22 |
| 140/24 | 27/3 27/7 27/15 | 25/23 34/20 34/23 |
| newer [1] 49/24 | 28/21 33/20 39/5 | 34/23 54/20 56/10 |
| next [6] 35/2 35/7 | 39/14 40/4 40/4 | 99/1 99/5 128/1 |
| 39/8 79/17 89/11 | 40/8 41/22 42/12 | 132/21 |
| 91/7 | 44/13 47/8 51/11 | Northern [31] 1/8 |
| NHDOT [9] 103/8 | 53/16 53/21 53/23 | 7/4 9/24 10/19 |
| 104/18 104/21 | 53/23 56/13 62/15 | 12/18 23/20 29/23 |
| 109/21 114/13 | 64/5 70/22 72/8 | 30/5 36/17 42/23 |
| 114/13 114/17 | 76/4 76/20 79/15 | 46/12 51/21 54/21 |
| 135/13 138/1 | 82/7 83/15 83/16 | 54/23 67/20 68/22 |
| NHDOT's [3] | 87/10 87/17 87/20 | 69/19 70/24 78/23 |
| 109/24 115/4 115/4 | 88/7 89/7 94/4 94/7 | 81/24 102/8 103/17 |
| nine [1] 147/6 | 95/20 96/1 96/24 | 109/18 109/21 |
| NIX [27] 2/4 4/5 | 100/6 101/3 101/3 | 110/24 112/13 |
| 4/10 4/13 4/16 4/16 | 101/17 102/7 103/1 | 112/14 114/12 |
| 4/24 9/8 15/14 | 106/8 114/6 115/8 | 121/22 123/14 |
| 17/19 44/13 56/4 | 116/15 121/7 | 123/23 |
| 57/17 57/20 59/10 | 130/14 131/19 | not [170] |
| 60/5 88/16 96/8 | 132/22 133/13 | notations [2] 28/19 |
| 115/12 115/15 | 133/15 134/11 | 122/19 |
| 121/1 137/14 | 135/14 135/16 | note [3] 27/2 40/7 |
| 142/11 143/2 | 139/9 140/3 140/3 | 59/16 |


| $\mathbf{N}$ | 113/23 114/3 | 86/3 89/2 89/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| noted [6] 3/4 3/5 | NRTH [1] 36/3 | 92/8 143/16 143/1 |
| 3/6 100/8 108/14 | NRTH-17 [1] 36/3 | 144/16 144/22 |
| 113/5 | NRTHC100 [1] | 146/15 |
| notes [4] 34/10 | 100/13 | observable [4] 37/9 |
| 79/10 125/3 148/6 | number [16] 10/18 | 37/10 80/9 80/11 |
| nothing [6] 80/13 | 12/8 36/16 46/17 | observations [1] |
| 112/12 115/9 118/6 | 49/20 54/11 54/11 | 16/21 |
| 120/22 125/13 | 54/13 58/21 107/23 | observed [1] 108/9 |
| notice [3] 99/22 | 107/24 120/16 | obtain [3] 30/17 |
| 99/23 100/3 | 122/13 124/15 | 31/7 31/10 |
| notification [2] | 133/22 140/22 | obtained [1] 26/2 |
| 28/22 31/9 | numbered [1] | obtaining [3] 29/12 |
| notify [1] 128/10 | 54/13 | 105/16 105/16 |
| noting [1] 62/6 | numbers [3] 73/11 | obvious [1] 61/11 |
| notions [1] 28/19 | 73/16 75/16 | obviously [1] 71/6 |
| now [33] 17/14 | numerous [2] 10/2 | occurred [1] |
| 39/2 41/18 52/17 | 70/23 | 143/23 |
| 55/4 56/2 58/16 | 0 | October [10] 1/3 |
| 64/11 65/18 65/20 | o'clock [1] 147/6 | $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 197 / 2312 / 22 \\ & 36 / 1049 / 759 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 67/8 72/5 73/11 | oak [1] 125/15 | 78/21 85/14 147/10 |
| 74/20 74/23 75/3 | object [8] 18/7 | October 2015 |
| 76/13 77/15 78/17 | 25/20 51/3 76/12 | 49/7 |
| 79/14 82/21 84/1 | 128/11 128/12 | off [23] 27/23 34/ |
| 85/14 86/13 87/13 | 128/12 145/3 | $34 / 1339 / 1758 / 18$ |
| 88/7 90/2 98/19 | objected [1] 131/21 | 59/24 60/1 75/5 |
| 101/14 102/8 | objection [24] | 75/6 75/7 77/3 77/4 |
| 106/10 125/23 | 32/10 36/18 42/14 | 85/15 85/16 88/1 |
| 138/7 | 43/18 44/9 46/19 | 88/2 102/19 102/20 |
| nowhere [2] 101/10 | 47/4 47/8 48/20 | 114/9 142/16 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { 107/15 } \\ \text { NPT [3] 107/16 } \end{array}$ | 49/16 53/1 55/4 | 142/18 145/12 |

off... [1] 147/2 off-center [1] 27/23 off-the-record [9] 34/13 58/18 60/1 75/7 77/4 85/16 88/2 102/20 142/18 offer [1] 44/11 offhand [1] 68/23 office [1] $5 / \mathbf{1}$
Officer [1] 1/13 official [1] 11/18 offsets [1] 119/13 oh [14] 9/2 11/15 59/18 62/15 64/5 70/10 77/7 79/17 100/20 101/2 108/1 134/9 134/11 141/6 oil [2] 89/24 90/23 oil/gas [1] 90/23 okay [120] 5/4 8/7 9/2 10/3 13/6 13/12 13/16 15/14 15/23 17/9 18/15 19/13 20/1 20/13 21/6 21/11 21/22 22/4 22/12 22/16 22/18 23/6 29/14 44/15
47/3 51/23 52/4
52/13 53/2 56/13
56/15 57/5 59/2
59/18 59/21 61/2

62/1 62/15 64/2
64/17 65/1 66/15
67/23 69/19 70/5
74/2 75/4 75/20
76/1 76/7 76/24
77/10 78/17 83/23
85/10 85/19 87/2
87/2 87/5 91/7
92/15 94/4 94/8
96/20 98/15 98/19
99/18 99/20 100/3
100/20 100/21
101/8 101/19 102/8
103/11 103/17
104/4 105/19
106/23 108/12
109/2 109/4 109/10
109/21 110/18
111/17 112/9
113/22 114/2 115/9
116/5 116/16
117/13 119/8
119/15 120/21
121/8 121/16
123/24 124/17
124/23 125/3
129/17 130/19
133/13 134/14
134/18 135/4
135/15 137/9 138/7
139/8 140/1 140/9
141/7 141/16

141/20 142/4 145/14 147/4 old [11] 31/23
34/21 34/23 35/2
35/19 49/23 51/10
56/19 76/13 99/6

## 131/17

Oldenburg [6] $1 / 15$
2/16 120/23 121/2 135/21 139/20
older [2] 52/1 57/24
oldest [2] 127/24
127/24
Olesons [2] 54/19 56/9
on-site [1] 91/17
on-the-ground [2] 11/4 11/4
once [2] 65/14 86/6
one [59] 6/12 6/13
7/24 10/6 11/21
16/14 20/3 21/11
22/8 23/21 27/10
28/23 29/6 30/10
33/4 33/6 39/10
45/21 48/6 48/8 48/9 48/15 51/14 57/24 58/4 62/8 64/12 64/18 72/23 73/17 75/16 75/16 76/6 79/10 81/14 81/19 81/23 82/2

| 0 | 144/8 | 35/11 35/15 35/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| one... [21] 83/9 | opinions [2] 17/9 | 36/3 37/17 44/1 |
| 83/11 83/12 89/23 | 75/1 | 48/3 49/14 49/17 |
| 93/11 94/12 99/15 | opportunity [1] | 57/11 57/13 58/4 |
| 99/18 99/20 101/6 | 145/11 | 62/14 65/3 65/12 |
| 109/17 111/20 | order [10] 9/4 | 65/21 74/20 75/21 |
| 114/7 125/6 126/16 | 22/10 22/21 37/14 | 79/22 81/12 81/20 |
| 127/5 127/22 | 65/23 91/20 107/4 | 82/16 82/17 82/19 |
| 128/14 132/17 | 127/18 130/4 | 83/15 87/24 90/16 |
| 133/17 135/20 | 139/18 | 93/3 94/15 104/8 |
| one-stop [1] 81/19 | original [10] 10/23 | 104/10 126/6 |
| ones [3] 7/10 69/22 | 11/1 35/7 44/8 75/2 | 126/16 127/21 |
| 121/4 | 97/7 126/9 127/5 | 130/16 131/12 |
| ongoing [1] 104/17 | 130/21 132/2 | 140/6 145/11 |
| only [23] 1/4 27/6 | other [32] 6/6 14/19 16/19 20/9 21/11 |  |
| 35/4 42/6 43/24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16/19 20/9 21/11 } \\ & 21 / 23 ~ 21 / 24 ~ 24 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | outdated [1] 49/23 |
| 45/3 48/6 48/9 57/2 | $\begin{aligned} & 21 / 23 \quad 21 / 2424 / 15 \\ & 24 / 18 \\ & 27 / 1 \\ & 29 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | outline [1] 116/2 |
| 65/9 71/7 80/9 $80 / 1280 / 1481 / 9$ | 31/22 33/5 34/17 | outlined [3] 15/17 |
| 82/4 83/10 87/7 | 40/18 43/16 50/10 | 16/9 66/23 |
| 87/14 108/8 116/7 | 55/24 60/14 63/7 | outlines [1] 78/22 |
| 119/2 134/4 | 91/4 95/15 106/19 | outside [5] 66/9 |
| open [1] 16/17 | 108/17 108/18 | 73/13 73/14 122/5 |
| operate [1] 47/21 | 117/22 119/18 | 145/5 |
| operating [1] 47/21 | 120/1 123/5 135/16 | over [18] 5/11 6/11 |
| opinion [19] 13/19 | 138/12 146/18 others [1] 55/16 | 27/22 28/2 28/16 <br> 31/8 44/19 58/2 |
| 15/18 19/8 20/17 | others [1] 55/16 <br> our [5] 92/5 107/16 | 61/2 69/7 90/11 |
| 21/8 25/15 30/19 | our [5] 92/5 107/16 | 103/8 103/14 |
| 32/7 32/18 34/5 | 1171/20 | 118/16 118/19 |
| 36/12 41/9 53/14 |  |  |
| 82/6 84/17 116/3 <br> 116/13 130/20 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { out [43] 8/18 10/6 } \\ & 16 / 23 \text { 19/20 27/3 } \end{aligned}\right.$ | 125/4 131/18 136/4 <br> overall [1] 14/3 |


| 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 25 / 830 / 930 / 10 \\ & 42 / 2243 / 944 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29/14 29/22 32/11 } \\ & 61 / 1390 / 390 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| overlaid [3] 76/2 |  |  |
| 76/8 116/20 | 44/21 45/20 54/11 | 120/11 122/4 |
| overlap [2] 23/10 | 56/20 57/7 57/24 | 124/16 |
| 23/12 | 58/22 61/5 62/5 | partially [1] 55/23 |
| overlaps [1] 23/12 | 75/22 75/22 77/13 | particular [11] |
| overrule [2] 53/3 | 79/2 79/8 79/17 | 20/7 24/15 62/5 |
| 112/6 | 79/18 87/6 97/12 | 62/22 66/17 70/23 |
| Overruled [3] 26/5 | 99/13 107/2 107/23 | 76/1 76/11 89/9 |
| 37/5 71/11 | 137/17 | 90/24 141/1 |
| oversimplifying [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { page-by-page [1] } \\ & \text { 11/8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { particularly [1] } \\ & 70 / 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 84/8 | pages [1] 75/16 | parties [6] 40/15 |
| $43 / 2$ | Palmer [3] 8/14 | 90/13 90/16 111/14 |
| own [5] 77/6 91/17 | 22/23 88/6 | 111/21 148/12 |
| 92/20 115/4 140/11 | Pamela [1] 1/21 | partner [3] 5/19 |
| owned [1] 92/19 | panel [2] 44/2 | 5/20 5/21 |
| owner [7] 41/24 | 133/16 | party [1] 103/13 |
| 42/3 63/19 66/2 | PAR [3] 44/24 | pass [31] 1/8 7/4 |
| 88/21 91/19 92/1 | 68/24 69/1 | 10/19 12/18 23/20 |
| owners [6] 42/7 | paragraph [10] | 29/24 30/5 36/17 |
| 110/16 144/3 144/4 | 23/17 25/16 31/6 | 42/23 44/19 46/12 |
| 145/24 146/3 | 32/4 34/2 39/20 | 51/21 54/21 54/24 |
| owns [2] 103/2 | 44/22 55/21 55/22 | 67/20 68/22 69/19 |
| 123/4 | 79/18 | 70/24 78/23 81/24 |
|  | parcel [3] 45/10 | 102/8 103/17 |
| P | 128/24 128/24 | 109/18 109/21 |
| p.m [5] 1/3 4/2 88/4 | parole [4] 24/21 | 111/1 112/13 |
| 88/5 147/9 | 29/5 29/6 29/12 | 112/14 114/12 |
| packages [1] 98/7 | part [16] 12/6 | 121/22 123/14 |
| page [34] 2/3 3/3 | 14/20 14/24 18/12 | 123/23 |
| 3/7 11/8 11/8 21/13 | 18/19 20/7 28/24 | passed [2] 25/3 |

$\mathbf{P}$
passed... [1] 126/2 past [5] 6/7 48/8 62/20 74/20 125/13 Pastoriza [14] 2/7 8/15 22/20 22/23
23/7 23/8 26/1
32/19 36/20 43/23 46/24 47/10 51/7 58/21
Patnaude [4] 1/24 4/3 148/3 148/17 Patricia [1] 1/16 pause [2] 48/17 50/12
paved [2] 27/15 27/18
pavement [8] 62/13 63/5 63/9 130/22
130/24 131/5 131/7 131/24
pavements [1] 132/4
people [9] 38/21 50/13 70/2 71/7 81/5 85/23 86/19 118/22 146/12 per [2] 16/20 42/11 percent [8] 9/20 15/2 15/3 53/12 53/22 84/10 107/13 134/24
perfect [1] 77/7 perfectly [1] 73/13 performed [4] 39/1 46/13 90/9 117/12 performing [3] 110/18 111/5 112/1 perhaps [1] 95/7 peril [2] 69/24 70/2 period [3] 32/3 146/4 146/6 permanent [3] 65/9 65/11 71/21
permission [1] 136/18
permit [5] 23/19 25/17 36/17 46/17 103/21
permitting [1] 14/3 perpendicular [1] 40/13
person [2] 42/12 42/24
pertinent [5] 24/7 24/10 24/11 28/24 107/9
Phil [1] 106/10 phrased [1] 7/8 Phyllis [1] 62/6 physical [11] 25/1 37/10 38/9 65/24 80/10 95/17 104/2 104/7 117/4 119/21

129/7
pick [5] 40/10 40/15 40/17 41/1 75/15
picked [1] 95/16 picking [2] 39/17 95/12
piece [2] 51/24 91/24
pieces [1] 129/2 Pierce [1] 5/8 pin [1] 119/11 pipes [1] 119/12 place [11] 40/16 41/8 52/18 87/14 94/16 118/19 125/4 126/16 126/18
127/6 148/6
placed [1] 110/22
places [6] 39/7
117/23 131/8
137/16 140/22 140/23
placing [1] 41/13 plain [1] 120/15 plan [46] 3/4 3/4 8/2 15/4 15/5 26/21 27/7 27/13 34/10 37/15 45/18 54/14 56/12 63/10 64/18 65/10 65/17 65/18 65/24 72/6 72/11

| $\mathbf{P}$ | 102/4 105/16 | 73/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| plan... [25] 74/22 | 106/17 108/14 | point [19] 9/8 10/6 |
| 75/12 75/13 76/8 | 108/18 114/13 | 13/8 13/12 15/16 |
| 76/9 76/11 80/4 | 114/23 115/23 | 35/6 41/1 44/4 57/9 |
| 89/17 106/21 | 116/1 118/12 | 62/14 65/22 84/11 |
| 112/18 112/19 | 118/13 120/13 | 89/1 117/5 118/11 |
| 113/2 113/9 113/10 | 120/19 121/15 | 120/18 126/13 |
| 116/21 116/23 | 121/21 121/22 | 132/15 139/22 |
| 118/5 121/10 | 122/18 122/19 | pointing [3] 8/18 |
| 121/13 122/8 124/2 | 122/24 123/12 | 40/12 79/22 |
| 125/1 128/18 | 123/15 123/19 | points [4] 117/17 |
| 129/11 129/21 | 124/7 126/14 130/9 | 117/18 117/21 |
| planned [1] 119/6 | 130/21 133/5 133/6 | 117/21 |
| plans [98] 3/5 5/16 | 133/9 133/15 | poles [1] 95/16 |
| 7/24 11/9 12/5 | 133/18 133/19 | poor [1] 11/7 |
| 12/13 14/2 16/20 | 133/24 134/1 134/6 | popular [1] 93/15 |
| 20/4 24/6 26/8 | 135/1 135/12 | portion [4] 10/20 |
| 26/10 28/20 31/23 | 136/22 137/2 | 46/7 104/1 104/3 |
| 34/20 34/20 35/2 | 137/19 137/21 | portions [1] 24/24 |
| 35/10 35/12 36/6 | 143/5 143/6 143/9 | portrayal [1] |
| 39/17 40/8 67/17 | 143/10 146/1 146/9 | 133/15 |
| 67/18 68/3 68/3 | plant [1] 93/13 | position [5] 21/17 |
| 68/5 68/14 70/14 | plat [2] 101/20 | 21/21 22/5 81/24 |
| 72/5 73/23 74/18 | 101/23 | 144/5 |
| 76/19 76/21 84/3 | plate [1] 48/12 | possession [3] |
| 93/21 97/13 98/12 | plats [1] 26/23 | 43/15 50/9 52/21 |
| 98/17 98/20 99/8 | play [1] 93/10 | possible [2] 55/16 |
| 99/24 100/11 | please [7] 4/4 4/17 | 132/7 |
| 100/19 100/23 | 7/3 48/16 63/1 70/5 | potential [2] 95/8 |
| 101/10 101/14 | 99/13 | 143/13 |
| 101/14 101/17 | plotted [1] 45/11 | pound [1] 119/13 |
| 101/21 101/22 | plus [3] 14/12 64/22 | practical [2] 32/6 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | prerogative [1] | 118/15 123/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| practical... [1] | 111/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128/6 141/1 } \\ & 145 / 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| $32 / 24$ | 20/12 27/5 40/5 | probability [1] |
| $26 / 360 / 13$ | 84/23 85/9 | 126/15 |
| practices [1] 29/4 | prescriptive [10] | probably [10] |
| preclude [1] 21/4 | 16/18 16/21 16/24 | 22/24 47/13 51/7 |
| precludes [1] 20/22 | 38/5 39/21 40/20 | 52/14 64/22 74/15 |
| precursor [1] 72/10 | 84/15 84/19 85/1 | 77/24 102/2 106/6 |
| predated [1] 55/5 | 85/11 <br> present [4] 1/12 | 128/14 |
| preempting [1] | 1/19 128/17 148/8 | 32/16 38/16 74/9 |
| 144/9 | Presiding [2] 1/13 | $\begin{array}{ll} 32 / 16 & 38 / 16 \\ \text { 80/24 83/9 } & 109 / 4 \end{array}$ |
| prefiled [15] 6/16 | Presiding [2] 1/13 $1 / 13$ | 80/24 83/8 109/4 120/11 120/12 |
| 6/18 9/14 10/16 $48 / 23$ 71/1 97/7 | pretty [5] 28/15 |  |
| 48/23 71/1 97/7 97/11 98/19 100/9 | $39 / 261 / 1168 / 9$ | problems [2] 95/8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97/11 98/19 100/9 } \\ & 135 / 10137 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | 39/2 61/11 $68 / 9$ | 118/21 |
| 138/5 140/21 141/4 | prevent [1] 146/6 | procedure [5] |
| preliminarily [1] | preventing [1] | 12/18 13/19 15/17 |
| 30/24 | 145/20 | 20/24 31/2 |
| preliminary [10] | previous [1] 55/20 | procedures [1] |
| 9/19 14/16 14/21 | print [1] 64/21 |  |
| 26/21 37/16 45/15 | printed [1] 65/17 | proceed [4] 9/6 |
| 67/11 99/24 100/8 | prior [7] 14/14 | 18/16 23/7 23/11 |
| 118/13 | 14/17 14/22 17/2 | proceeding [4] 9/12 |
| premised [1] 98/11 | 39/11 40/6 114/24 | 9/22 38/14 85/7 |
| preparation [1] | private [21] 16/20 | proceedings [3] |
| 116/1 | 22/8 35/23 39/24 | 72/13 146/13 148/6 |
| prepare [2] 90/18 | 40/14 40/23 63/18 | process [27] 14/3 |
| 133/18 | 63/19 70/8 71/22 | 14/7 14/8 14/10 |
| prepared [4] 43/21 | 72/1 72/7 73/20 | 14/21 14/22 14/23 |
| 89/18 98/7 105/11 | 91/14 116/8 117/11 | 14/24 17/23 18/21 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | 102/1 116/14 117/9 | 73/8 79/12 86/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| process... [17] | 118/3 118/9 118/9 | 88/20 88/21 90/13 |
| 18/22 19/1 19/8 | 118/11 119/5 121/6 | 90/15 91/1 92/3 |
| 19/9 20/21 30/5 | 121/14 121/18 | 93/18 110/16 113/7 |
| 42/4 58/13 82/22 | 122/3 123/9 129/23 | 113/18 116/8 |
| 83/6 94/1 112/18 | 129/23 130/12 | 117/11 118/15 |
| 113/2 128/3 128/13 | 130/20 130/22 | 118/19 123/6 138/2 |
| 130/6 144/6 | 132/2 132/16 | 138/4 138/15 |
| processes [2] | 136/18 143/14 | 138/21 138/23 |
| 127/17 128/7 | 146/3 | 141/13 144/3 144/4 |
| produce [2] 29/24 | projects [4] 14/13 | 144/9 145/15 |
| 45/18 | 21/23 21/24 134/24 | 145/15 145/24 |
| produced [2] 22/11 | promote [1] 60/15 | 146/3 |
| 78/1 | proof [1] 44/11 | Proposal [1] 45/1 |
| product [5] 21/7 | proper [8] 19/14 | proposed [2] 35/1 |
| 21/8 67/12 67/14 | 21/5 22/11 46/12 | 43/1 |
| 67/15 | 58/13 61/21 72/6 | protect [2] 81/3 |
| production [1] 16/2 | 72/10 | 124/1 |
| professional [1] | properly [5] 22/10 | protecting [1] 72/1 |
| /18 | 45/7 46/9 68/14 | protection [2] 91/9 |
| programs [3] 90/1 | 118/18 | 117/10 |
| 91/9 93/7 | properties [3] 36/4 91/5 123/5 | protective [1] 91/18 <br> provide [8] 9/22 |
| project [53] 3/4 3/5 | 91/5 123/5 | provide [8] 9/22 <br> $\mathbf{2 3 / 2 3} 85 / 4106 / 15$ |
| 5/22 6/8 6/10 10/20 | property [57] 21/16 | 23/23 85/4 106 |
| 10/21 15/7 21/20 | 22/8 22/13 22/14 | 116/13 119/16 |
| 21/21 21/22 30/18 | 28/16 30/3 30/10 | 120/9 122/15 |
| 32/12 34/16 54/6 | 30/15 30/21 31/11 | provided [3] 79/20 |
| 54/15 54/18 55/2 | 31/15 35/23 39/4 | 86/8 143/7 |
| 56/7 56/8 71/22 | 40/1 40/14 41/24 | providing [3] 74/21 |
| 72/14 72/16 74/10 | 42/1 42/3 42/7 | 103/20 104/7 |
| 79/21 83/5 83/5 | 60/15 63/18 63/19 | provisions [2] 60/9 |
| 83/13 88/22 101/22 | 65/3 66/2 66/7 72/7 | 139/23 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | puts [1] 67/14 | questioning [2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| public [27] 1/9 1/13 | putting [6] 86/19 | 85/23 144/21 |
| 1/14 1/16 1/16 9/11 | 87/5 109/18 111/12 | questions [30] 2/13 |
| 11/17 17/2 20/11 | 128/21 132/20 | 8/8 8/12 9/13 22/17 |
| 35/22 38/7 38/11 | puzzle [2] 128/21 | 23/9 35/17 44/18 |
| 59/14 60/16 63/20 | 130/16 | 49/12 49/23 79/11 |
| 67/5 84/23 85/9 | Q | 87/21 88/7 88/9 |
| 91/14 103/8 103/14 | qualified [1] 21/22 | 94/9 95/21 95/24 |
| 105/1 105/8 105/8 | quality [2] 93/7 | $\begin{aligned} & 94 / 9 \\ & 95 / 5 \\ & 96100 / 6 \\ & 95 / 24 \\ & \hline 15 / 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 107/11 116/8 131/1 | 93/7 | 121/3 133/17 |
| published [1] 127/4 | quantity [1] 93/12 | 135/16 142/8 143/8 |
| pull [2] 55/20 99/13 <br> purchased [1] | question [48] 7/7 | 146/18 146/20 |
| purchased [1] 130/15 | 17/7 17/15 18/3 | quick [1] 79/2 |
| purchasing [1] | 18/11 18/13 18/19 28/9 32/16 | quickly [3] 36/11 |
| 130/13 | 35/13 35/21 36/7 | 61/7 88/15 |
| purpose [5] 41/13 | 36/24 42/19 44/5 | quiet [1] 42/7 |
| 60/11 60/14 146/9 | 44/6 44/11 49/15 | quite [6] 20/15 |
| 146/10 | 49/17 50/3 50/15 | 32/22 36/1 45/7 |
| purposes [7] 15/10 | 52/17 53/10 53/13 | 68/13 78/7 |
| 21/19 93/17 95/12 | 56/4 56/14 66/14 | quote [2] 98/5 |
| 126/21 136/2 | 56/4 56/14 66/14 | 133/22 |
| 146/13 | 89/9 92/12 94/12 | R |
| purview [1] 17/23 | 103/23 104/15 | Rachel [1] 1/16 |
| put [19] 11/14 | 123/19 135/5 | radius [4] 91/18 |
| 40/11 40/16 40/21 | 135/20 136/3 | 91/21 91/23 92/4 |
| 41/1 41/6 80/3 82/7 | 136/10 139/13 | radiuses [1] 91/22 |
| 85/10 86/2 92/4 | 141/15 141/17 | railroads [1] 139/2 |
| 94/21 110/1 111/1 | 142/21 144/16 | raised [3] 10/17 |
| 111/8 119/11 | 144/23 146/11 | 13/22 140/17 |
| 127/10 144/5 | questioned [1] | raises [6] 28/9 |
| 145/11 | 139/21 | 35/13 35/17 35/21 |


| $\mathbf{R}$ | $\operatorname{Rec}[1] 3 / 7$ | 121/15 121/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| raises... [2] 36/7 | recall [7] 6/16 6/21 | 1/22 122/8 |
| 120/16 | 97/16 98/8 105/22 | 142/17 142/18 |
| rank [1] 4/23 | 144/20 144/21 | 144/24 147/3 |
| rarely [1] 116/22 | received [1] 46/4 | recorded [7] 16/20 |
| rather [1] 117/9 | recent [4] 30/4 48/8 | 101/15 101/18 |
| re [2] 1/7 128/8 | 76/18 76/22 | 123/13 123/19 |
| re-layout [1] 128/8 | recently [1] 72/24 | 123/23 124/2 |
| read [11] 21/16 | recess [1] 88/3 | records [14] 20/4 |
| 22/21 33/1 43/6 | recognize [1] 97/2 | 28/19 38/2 38/3 |
| 44/23 53/7 54/1 | recommendation | 50/17 50/19 50/23 |
| 114/1 114/2 122/13 | [1] 135/9 | 54/4 54/21 56/17 |
| 141/11 | reconcile [2] 112/1 | 57/1 102/3 120/19 |
| reading [5] 32/20 | 125/20 | 122/19 |
| 32/20 53/5 71/15 | reconstruct [2] | recourse [3] 42/6 |
| 77/23 | 39/9 41/17 | 42/13 88/24 |
| real [6] 30/2 30/10 | reconstruction [1] | red [1] 120/16 |
| 34/17 62/16 79/2 | 130/3 | redirect [4] 2/12 |
| 83/8 | record [45] 9/15 | 142/11 143/3 |
| realize [1] 61/8 | 10/15 30/14 30/20 | 143/20 |
| really [11] 28/10 | 32/1 34/5 34/12 | redoing [2] 86/14 |
| 35/13 35/22 69/24 | 34/13 37/15 58/18 | 86/17 |
| 81/22 94/13 120/10 | 59/8 59/24 60/1 | reestablish [1] |
| 126/11 132/6 132/8 | 62/6 62/23 63/2 | 110/17 |
| 132/11 | 71/16 75/6 75/7 | refer [1] 100/4 |
| reason [6] 27/10 | 75/15 77/3 77/4 | reference [6] 27/8 |
| 33/17 73/6 73/17 | 79/3 80/13 85/15 | 55/23 58/6 59/15 |
| 80/20 86/2 | 85/16 88/1 88/2 | 98/2 140/21 |
| reasonable [1] 44/3 | 96/11 102/3 102/19 | referenced [5] 10/9 |
| reasonably [1] | 102/20 108/14 | 11/12 36/14 57/1 |
| 32/24 | 108/18 114/10 | 57/7 |
| reasoning [1] 12/6 | 121/10 121/13 | references [3] 58/7 |

## R

references... [2]
68/21 137/24
referencing [3]
11/20 15/21 80/6 referring [4] 49/7 60/23 90/5 119/24 reflect [1] 85/24 reflected [1] 76/18 regard [6] 19/7 88/19 89/24 93/6 93/7 93/23 regarding [12] 32/8 34/6 36/14 72/24 104/1 107/22
120/14 138/1 143/5 144/3 144/4 144/9 regardless [1]

## 112/7

regards [1] 39/20 registered [4]
101/11 101/19
101/23 123/13
Registry [6] 80/13
101/15 101/18
101/24 121/9
123/13
regs [1] 60/23
regulates [1] 60/20
regulations [9] 61/9 66/18 66/23 67/2 67/5 80/17 82/19

## 137/8 141/21

 rehearing [1] 14/5 Reimers [1] 95/19 reiterate [3] 36/11 66/16 124/13 reiterating [1]
## 70/19

reject [1] 47/7
rejected [4] 11/23
50/23 71/2 71/6
rejection [1] 7/14
relaid [1] 35/18
relate [3] 49/8 92/6 118/6
related [1] 148/11
relates [2] 43/20
50/15
relationship [1]
69/17
relative [1] 148/13
relatively [2] 38/20 133/2
Relevance [1] 42/15
relevant [1] 33/18
reliance [1] 74/7
relied [2] 86/8
98/15
rely [5] 19/11 69/13 87/16 115/7 146/12 remains [1] 45/23 remediation [3]

90/1 90/8 90/10 remedies [1] 82/15 remember [5] 68/23 90/6 118/7 144/13 144/15
remembering [1] 18/20
reminded [1] 48/19 reopen [1] 49/10 repeat [1] 71/13 rephrase [1] 71/17 report [29] 7/11
7/12 7/13 23/23
45/6 45/8 49/20
53/6 57/10 67/24
68/6 68/8 68/9 77/1
77/18 80/8 106/14
106/15 106/20
108/1 108/4 112/16
113/1 115/20
115/22 115/23
122/16 122/18
122/21
reporter [7] 1/24
4/7 117/19 131/9
140/13 148/4
148/18
reports [2] 12/5 72/24
representation [2] 52/9 67/19
representative [3]
representative... [3] 89/16 89/20 91/7 representatives [1] 79/22
represented [2] 62/21 63/23
represents [1]
63/16
request [4] 44/24 45/15 89/6 97/16 requested [5] 45/3 46/2 94/23 104/14 139/17
requesting [1]

## 94/24

requests [2] 46/4 112/12
require [8] 21/16 46/2 80/17 89/17 111/22 117/11
117/16 137/20
required [19] 20/17
24/12 25/16 28/20
30/2 30/7 36/16
85/22 90/19 91/4
91/17 92/21 108/8 109/10 109/12
126/2 141/1 141/2 141/23
requirement [20] 21/15 30/13 31/5

32/9 34/7 34/9
37/23 90/7 102/7
113/24 115/19
123/12 123/18
123/20 123/21
124/15 132/5 138/2
141/10 143/9
requirements [31]
7/18 11/9 12/13
15/20 18/1 19/20
20/23 25/6 26/22
32/4 34/2 34/17
45/19 46/23 104/18
114/15 116/4 120/8
122/13 124/4 124/8
124/9 124/16
124/24 134/2
137/21 139/8 139/9
139/10 139/19
140/5
requires [7] 19/21
38/24 90/8 106/13
107/6 137/18
141/17
requiring [6] 41/7 109/6 109/14
109/15 112/9 113/7
research [29] 24/7
24/10 24/11 24/11
24/14 24/22 28/24
37/15 37/15 37/24
43/14 46/3 50/17

50/18 50/24 51/13
52/22 53/6 54/3
56/18 57/1 57/10
58/14 61/20 68/12
68/17 69/11 107/9
125/22
researched [2] 32/5 34/4
researcher [1] 55/1 reservoir [2] 92/16 92/17
reservoirs [2] 92/6 92/15
residence [1] 80/1 resolve [1] 85/12
respect [1] 32/11
response [6] 12/1
23/5 29/22 96/1
97/15 140/12
responsibility [1] 110/2
responsible [1]

## 90/17

restate [2] 18/24 52/17
restrictions [1] 90/2
result [1] 145/24
resulting [3] 15/19
112/20 113/5
resume [1] 147/9
resumed [2] 4/2

R
resumed... [1] 88/5 resuming [1] 147/6 retained [1] 9/21 return [2] 36/9 36/10
review [19] 7/10
13/10 14/18 15/11 30/18 32/6 34/16
82/10 83/6 83/16 83/18 102/11 115/2 121/18 122/2
123/15 137/5 146/4 146/6
reviewed [5] 7/1 7/6 13/17 87/13 97/13
reviewing [4] 21/19 81/13 120/19 136/1 right [162]
right-hand [2] 28/6 64/3
right-of-way [94]
10/19 16/18 16/22
16/22 16/24 17/1
24/1 24/5 26/11
26/16 26/19 27/17
27/19 27/21 27/24
28/5 28/9 28/23
29/19 29/21 38/5
38/7 38/12 40/2
40/9 40/24 41/2
$41 / 2141 / 2345 / 2$ 45/10 46/1 46/8 48/10 52/23 54/5 54/7 57/24 62/22 63/3 63/7 63/17 63/23 65/4 73/15
73/19 79/12 80/10 103/2 104/6 104/22 106/17 107/7 109/24 110/22
111/1 111/4 111/7 111/13 112/2 113/5 113/13 115/5 118/1 118/4 119/4 122/5 122/7 122/10
122/17 122/21
122/23 123/2 123/6
123/8 123/9 129/12
129/20 129/20
130/14 130/17
131/4 131/7 132/1
132/7 132/8 132/18
132/19 133/6 134/5
134/13 134/20
135/12 136/19
right-of-ways [4]
39/21 105/1 105/9
132/24
rights [23] 22/8
22/13 38/13 40/21
42/1 63/20 72/2
72/19 78/3 78/9

84/15 84/19 85/23 90/13 113/16
113/16 116/9
117/11 122/4 136/2
136/23 141/13
145/15
rights-of-way [10] 38/13 78/3 78/9 84/15 84/19 85/23
113/16 122/4 136/2 136/23
River [3] 78/21
79/6 118/8
road [63] 5/2 15/6
20/11 24/24 26/4
26/18 27/3 27/4
27/20 28/16 34/21
34/21 34/21 34/24
35/3 35/6 35/7
35/16 35/18 35/20
35/21 35/22 36/4
37/12 38/1 38/3
40/2 40/3 40/12
41/2 51/19 53/10
53/13 56/19 56/20
56/21 56/22 57/10
57/13 63/5 63/11
73/1 83/13 84/22
84/23 85/4 85/8
95/5 95/10 95/17
99/4 104/9 113/16
120/14 126/14

R
road... [8] $127 / 7$ 127/23 128/9 131/2 131/3 131/11 131/12 131/12 road's [1] 131/21 roads [19] 5/16
21/5 25/22 25/23
27/1 36/5 51/13
57/11 83/10 98/24 103/13 115/4
126/20 127/3 127/3
127/14 127/15
131/1 143/7
roadway [4] 62/8 79/23 79/24 80/2 Rock [5] 34/21 73/1 95/5 95/10 99/3
Rockler [1] 60/22 rod [4] 56/22 58/7 83/13 132/23
rods [5] 3/7 57/3
57/14 58/12 83/10
ROE [1] 88/20 role [2] 85/3 96/14 room [2] 35/5 87/24 route [25] 26/4
38/19 39/3 43/1
43/3 43/3 50/7 51/1
51/19 56/8 89/8
90/21 95/11 102/4
110/12 110/15

117/8 117/14
117/23 131/17
131/17 137/2
138/22 138/24 139/5
RSA [6] 17/1 29/20 60/8 141/7 141/11
148/19
RSAs [1] 124/9
rule [3] 90/7 90/8 90/24
rules [27] 12/14
15/20 16/2 16/7
19/21 20/24 21/2
21/9 21/15 22/5
22/6 31/1 32/17
36/23 37/1 37/3
38/24 39/10 89/17
91/13 91/13 109/7
110/4 110/8 110/9 112/6 137/7
run [5] 16/1 16/3
81/18 81/18 81/22
runoffs [1] 95/14
runs [1] 79/23
Rye [1] 17/4
S
S-t-e-p-h-a-n [1]

## 5/1

S.R [1] 3/6
safeguard [1] 60/15
Saffo [8] 2/8 8/14

22/23 58/17 60/3 70/21 108/7 144/3 said [20] 8/21 18/13
51/9 51/15 52/14
68/16 81/9 84/5
94/13 107/22 108/7
111/14 111/16
111/20 119/22
120/12 132/6
133/11 133/19
135/24
same [10] 22/24
45/20 47/21 53/20
55/11 56/17 128/9
138/4 139/9 139/10
sample [2] 91/7 93/5
samples [2] 89/16 89/20
satisfied [1] 16/11 satisfy [5] 12/8 21/1 36/13 46/16 46/23 satisfying [1] 37/3 saw [1] 133/24
say [22] 10/21 18/3 28/18 38/16 47/11 49/13 63/15 66/1 67/13 73/7 87/8 91/15 99/8 115/18 123/18 124/10 129/15 134/1
134/15 139/3 142/2

| $\mathbf{S}$ | 32/21 33/8 33/11 | seeing [2] $39 / 16$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| say... [1] 146/19 | 52/10 54/2 57/23 | 51/24 |
| saying [5] 36/21 | 87/6 | seemed [1] 11/6 |
| 83/19 87/8 98/6 | screens [1] 23/13 | seen [17] 13/12 |
| 124/7 | scroll [1] 12/24 | 13/15 21/6 34/7 |
| says [20] 16/10 | scrutinized [2] | 34/8 67/17 67/22 |
| 28/13 37/9 63/10 | 98/20 99/9 | 67/24 68/3 70/14 |
| 69/20 79/20 97/19 | sealed [1] 89/18 | 70/23 71/2 105/10 |
| 97/22 100/13 | SEC [14] 1/6 1/7 | 122/11 125/9 130/9 |
| 106/19 106/21 | 1/19 1/20 1/21 2/14 | 133/8 |
| 108/13 108/13 | 19/8 19/11 21/15 | segment [2] 57/2 |
| 112/13 113/1 113/4 | 21/17 22/6 96/20 | 57/13 |
| 137/20 137/24 | 98/2 143/10 | selectmen [1] 128/8 |
| 141/12 | second [11] 7/19 | send [1] 37/21 |
| scale [7] 64/9 64/17 | 13/18 18/2 18/12 | sense [6] 18/23 19/3 |
| 64/19 64/20 64/22 | 30/6 61/10 62/16 | 86/22 100/22 |
| 65/12 65/13 | 112/20 113/4 | 142/11 146/4 |
| scales [1] 64/11 | 124/11 140/6 | sent [1] 25/9 |
| scaling [1] 65/20 | section [4] 35/2 | sentence [1] 137/23 |
| scan [2] 64/1 64/14 | 35/19 99/5 105/22 | separate [1] 123/14 |
| scenario [2] 73/12 | sections [1] 45/24 | September [4] 7/20 |
| 144/11 | see [33] 8/14 8/14 | 7/22 80/6 82/2 |
| scene [1] 86/12 | 8/15 8/15 8/15 8/16 | septic [6] 6/11 6/14 |
| scene-setter [1] | 22/2 27/10 28/7 | 79/23 80/23 81/14 |
| 86/12 | 34/22 37/11 37/18 | 81/20 |
| school [3] 5/9 5/10 | 38/22 57/3 57/5 | Serv [1] 1/15 |
| 5/24 | 62/2 62/9 68/6 68/8 | Service [1] 1/9 |
| Science [1] 5/7 | 75/17 76/2 76/10 | services [2] 79/24 |
| scope [4] 25/20 | 76/24 77/12 79/2 | 89/24 |
| 43/19 143/20 145/6 | 81/23 86/19 95/7 | servicing [1] 80/2 |
| Scott [1] 30/8 | 98/23 100/14 127/7 | Session [3] 1/4 87/6 |
| screen [8] 11/14 | 127/13 129/11 | 147/8 |


| S | 29/18 | shows [6] 36/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| set [25] 8/12 19/10 | sheet [3] 3/7 9/5 | 54/ |
| 32/17 39/2 39/4 | 99/22 | 57/12 118/4 |
| 39/7 39/15 39/21 | shift [1] 27/22 | shut [2] 82/16 |
| 39/24 67/21 69/20 | shifted [1] 28/16 | 82/17 |
| 84/7 87/11 87/15 | short [5] 24/19 | shutting [1] |
| 104/19 108/21 | 48/17 50/12 57/ | side [4] 62/7 99/15 |
| 110/10 112/19 | 57/12 | 99/15 123/5 |
| 112/19 113/3 113/9 | shorter [1] 89/1 | siding [1] 66/3 |
| 113/10 130/13 | Shorthand [1] | sign [1] 71/17 |
| 133/7 148/7 | 148/3 | signed [2] 25/12 |
| set-in-stone [1] | should [25] 15/12 | 77/18 |
| 84/7 | 21/15 24/6 29/12 | significance [1] |
| setter [1] 86/12 | 31/6 35/11 37/2 | 77/15 |
| setting [2] 19/13 | 67/15 70/19 74 | significant [2] |
| 42/13 | 76/14 81/16 81/22 | 70/17 71/22 |
| several [5] 90/11 | 84/10 85/24 8 | significantly [1] |
| 91/12 91/22 93/14 | 95/16 96/21 11 | 131/13 |
| 93/16 | 136/20 137/1 1 | similar [4] 33/4 |
| sewer [5] 79/22 | 140/9 141/14 146/6 | 33/10 118/12 |
| 118/9 118/14 139/3 | shouldn't [1] 110/1 | 118/2 |
| 139/3 | show [4] 35/24 | simply [3] 40/6 |
| sewers [1] 5/16 | 49/22 93/21 126/4 | 58/11 107/12 |
| shall [5] 30/16 34/3 | showed [2] 59/9 | [5] 6/23 9/1 |
| 110/10 122/15 | 134/4 | 25/3 39/20 70/24 |
| 122/18 | 56/24 57/18 | site [14] 1/2 1/10 |
| ShareFile [1] 78/19 | shown [10] 24/5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { site }[14] \text { 1/2 } 1 / 1 \\ & 1 / 125 / 1621 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| SHEB [1] 75/11 | 65/10 75/11 106/17 | 34/19 55/1 91/17 |
| SHEBC106 [1] | 107/7 122/17 | 116 |
| 76/1 | 122/23 126/14 | 1 |
| Sheehan [2] 29/15 | 133/5 133/5 | 141/8 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | \| 42/10 53/9 129/19 | 130/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sited [2] 50/6 51/21 | something [11] | southbound [1] |
| sites [2] 90/1 90/8 | 32/24 36/24 37/2 | 132/21 |
| situation [1] 86/7 | 41/5 81/16 86/12 | speak [2] 81/5 |
| six [1] 25/3 | 90/3 90/10 142/14 | 108/23 |
| sixty [1] 134/7 | 144/17 144/19 | speaking [1] 104/1 |
| size [1] 70/13 | something's [1] | specific [1] 45/24 |
| skill [1] 148/8 | 85/11 | specifically [12] |
| slow [3] 33/12 43/5 | sometime [2] 8/2 | 22/7 36/15 37/8 |
| 71/18 | 83/9 | 61/16 79/10 110 |
| slowly [1] 54/1 | sometimes [6] | 110/10 111/15 |
| smaller [1] 77/12 | 35/20 90/13 91/21 | 111/20 113/23 |
| Smith [3] 125/19 | 107/11 116/19 | 140/4 142/2 |
| 127/20 127/21 | 129/2 | specify [1] 23/1 |
| Smith's [1] 125/16 | somewhat [1] 231 | speculate [1] 51/5 |
| snapshot [1] 57/23 | somewhere [1] | speculation [2] |
| so [210] | 107/19 | 53/1 53/17 |
| soils [1] 116/19 | sorry [11] 18/21 | spike [1] 125/15 |
| solid [4] 26/14 27/9 | 20/18 42/22 51/6 | spike's [1] 125/18 |
| 45/22 78/3 | 61/15 79/17 106/11 | spokesman [1] 10/2 |
| solved [1] 131/15 | 108/1 111/19 125/3 | springs [1] 94/18 |
| some [23] 24/17 | 144/14 | square [2] 54/8 |
| 24/20 33/17 35/6 | sort [4] 83/3 128/3 | 54/23 |
| 37/16 40/16 65/13 | 133/7 140/17 | staging [1] 70/17 |
| 73/15 74/16 89/19 | sound [2] 89/5 | staked [1] 41/23 |
| 97/8 110/13 111/15 | 115/6 | stamp [2] 67/14 |
| 118/12 125/14 | sounds [2] 51/4 | 133/18 |
| 125/24 126/11 | 92/8 | stampable [3] |
| 126/12 130/19 | source [1] 32/22 | 125/1 134/6 134/1 |
| 133/6 133/9 137/13 | sources [3] 24/18 | stamped [16] 21/18 |
| 144/1 | 30/17 31/7 | 67/17 67/18 67/21 |
| someone [4] 37/1 | south [2] 127/24 | 67/24 69/20 87/11 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 103/5 103/6 103/18 | Stewartstown [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| stamped... [9] | 110/5 110/9 123/9 | 56/23 |
| 87/15 101/11 | 126/3 137/3 143/7 | still [4] 6/4 49/16 |
| 133/14 134/2 | stated [6] 29/22 | 86/18 139/23 |
| 136/22 137/2 143/5 | 39/23 78/7 97/12 | stone [1] 84/7 |
| 143/6 143/9 | 98/14 103/10 | stop [3] 17/14 81/19 |
| standard [14] | statement [9] 21/3 | 102/14 |
| 21/16 38/20 113/7 | 52/7 54/8 70/3 81/9 | storage [1] 90/14 |
| 113/15 113/18 | 98/17 98/20 103/22 | streams [1] 94/17 |
| 114/5 133/11 137/6 | 124/7 | Street [1] 1/4 |
| 138/2 138/3 138/15 | states [7] 9/24 | strike [1] 76/16 |
| 138/21 138/23 | 17/12 27/2 41/7 | structures [1] |
| 139/6 | 56/18 57/10 112/16 | 95/15 |
| standards [19] 12/9 | stating [1] 43/2 | struggling [1] |
| 15/8 19/4 30/2 30/7 | stationing [1] 38/18 | 105/24 |
| 30/10 30/12 31/4 | status [2] 27/1 | SUBCOMMITTE |
| 33/6 36/14 41/11 | 79/13 | [2] 1/12 2/13 |
| 47/16 47/21 66/18 | statute [9] 22/7 | SUBCOMMITT |
| 69/14 81/2 108/8 | 60/17 60/21 84/21 | /SITE [1] 1/12 |
| 109/7 112/14 | 92/22 126/2 128/9 | subcontractor [1] |
| stands [1] 63/11 | 141/8 141/17 | 44/24 |
| start [4] 65/14 76/6 | statutory [1] 90/6 | bbdivisions [ |
| 121/4 125/9 | stay [1] 133/3 | 5/15 |
| started [1] 4/9 | steep [1] 35/7 | submits [1] 114/13 |
| starting [1] 14/23 | stenographic [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { submittal [3] } 12 / 2 \\ & 12 / 212 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| starts [1] 125/15 | STEPHAN [4] 2/4 | submittals [1] 6/24 |
| state [26] 1/1 25/14 | STEPHAN [4] 2/4 4/5 4/13 4/24 | submittals [1] 6/24 submitted [19] 6/22 |
| 25/22 43/17 45/2 | stepped [1] 82/12 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { submitted [19] } 6 / 22 \\ 7 / 68 / 210 / 2311 / 24 \end{array}\right\|$ |
| 45/22 50/10 50/17 $\mathbf{5 0 / 1 9} 50 / 2451 / 18$ | $\text { steps }[2] 39 / 939 / 12$ | 12/7 13/10 13/13 |
| 9 50/24 51/18 | Steven [3] 1/24 | 24/6 26/9 46/15 |
| $56$ | 148/3 148/17 | 71/4 82/3 114/23 |

supply [1] 91/9 support [1] 22/4 sure [15] 24/21 32/22 33/1 49/10 55/8 57/16 81/8 119/24 128/2
135/24 139/14
139/21 144/13
145/2 146/10
surface [3] 27/16 27/18 63/4
surprise [1] 79/13 surrounding [1] 139/4
survey [190] surveyed [5] 30/16 30/22 117/14
118/18 130/8
surveying [18] 5/12
11/10 15/8 15/20
17/11 17/12 26/3
31/4 38/24 39/11
47/12 60/14 84/18
86/4 86/22 88/19
93/10 112/7
surveyor [85] 5/6
5/14 6/5 16/9 19/22
20/10 20/10 21/4
21/19 24/4 24/13
25/13 26/12 26/24
29/4 29/8 29/12
30/1 31/12 31/24

32/2 35/17 36/22
38/6 38/8 38/13
39/6 39/8 40/1 40/7 40/9 40/15 41/8 41/17 45/6 45/16 46/9 47/15 48/6
53/5 56/6 61/18
61/19 66/7 67/12
67/14 69/11 69/18
80/14 81/12 81/18 82/6 82/11 82/18
82/22 83/4 84/11
84/20 84/24 85/2
85/4 85/6 85/12
86/23 87/9 89/19
95/12 96/16 101/12 105/19 105/20
111/8 111/24
113/21 115/24
118/8 118/16
122/22 124/9 128/5
132/16 134/3
137/23 144/8
145/18
surveyor's [11] 6/2
18/1 26/21 39/9
39/12 40/6 40/20
53/6 67/24 77/17
85/3
surveyors [33]
16/16 19/5 20/19
30/11 31/1 31/3


| T | 88/11 88/16 89/13 | 62/8 67/3 71/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| testify [1] 97/3 | 94/10 95/18 96/7 | 82/19 89/21 92/22 |
| testimony [55] 6/17 | 97/24 102/17 | 92/22 101/10 102/3 |
| 6/18 6/19 6/21 7/6 | 105/24 112/20 | 109/6 111/12 |
| 7/22 9/14 9/20 9/22 | 120/21 120/24 | 114/15 114/24 |
| 10/16 10/17 13/23 | 135/4 135/16 | 115/2 117/17 |
| 14/4 15/21 19/9 | 135/16 137/9 142/6 | 119/13 123/23 |
| 20/2 21/12 25/21 | 142/7 143/1 143/2 | 124/22 125/24 |
| 25/21 30/4 43/19 | 146/22 146/24 | 126/6 128/8 133/1 |
| 43/21 44/8 48/24 | Thanks [1] 48/14 | 133/7 133/17 134/4 |
| 55/6 70/20 71/1 | that [625] | 135/6 135/8 139/2 |
| 74/13 75/2 76/15 | that in [1] 127/22 | themselves [1] |
| 84/14 87/7 89/15 | that's [161] | 22/19 |
| 92/10 97/8 97/11 | their [38] 23/19 | then [65] 5/18 9/16 |
| 97/22 98/10 98/11 | 31/15 31/23 38/10 | 13/8 24/18 26/18 |
| 100/5 100/9 100/9 | 38/22 40/8 41/24 | 28/5 34/16 37/17 |
| 108/6 110/11 120/1 | 45/5 47/24 50/23 | 38/14 38/18 39/16 |
| 125/7 135/10 | 51/22 52/22 68/11 | 42/7 52/16 58/5 |
| 137/15 138/5 138/8 | 68/12 68/12 68/16 | 61/13 62/1 62/20 |
| 138/10 138/10 | 69/11 69/12 69/24 | 63/14 65/17 65/18 |
| 140/21 141/4 | 76/2 78/24 82/1 | 66/15 69/2 70/15 |
| 143/23 | 82/14 86/1 88/21 | 71/5 73/6 73/8 |
| than [9] 32/21 47/6 | 90/4 91/17 92/20 | 73/20 74/7 75/5 |
| 56/9 58/11 61/10 | 104/22 110/22 | 75/20 77/20 79/16 |
| 71/10 77/22 115/7 | 111/2 111/22 | 79/20 82/11 83/13 |
| 116/12 | 114/14 115/5 124/1 | 85/5 89/19 91/4 |
| thank [40] 6/16 7/3 | 138/20 140/10 | 92/13 93/19 107/6 |
| 8/5 8/10 9/7 17/17 | 141/1 | 108/7 109/4 111/22 |
| 18/17 22/17 44/15 | theirs [1] 96/22 | 113/4 114/24 |
| 58/15 59/2 59/23 | them [36] 9/4 9/4 | 116/20 116/24 |
| 60/4 61/3 66/15 | 11/21 14/24 22/10 | 122/18 122/21 |
| 70/5 76/24 87/20 | 31/14 32/20 32/20 | 127/17 128/5 |


| T | 133/14 138/11 | 30/6 35/1 35/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| then... [13] 128/10 | 144/1 144/17 | 36/12 36/23 37/1 |
| 128/12 132/3 132/4 | 144/22 145/11 | 45/21 58/5 67/17 |
| 137/6 138/8 139/24 | 145/23 146/16 | 68/3 68/3 68/5 |
| 140/2 140/5 140/9 | there's [65] 15/3 | 68/15 69/22 70/7 |
| 141/7 146/22 147/4 | 19/23 21/24 24/16 | 71/2 71/3 80/11 |
| there [80] 6/23 7/24 | 24/18 25/1 26/10 | 80/15 81/2 83/10 |
| 8/24 9/2 11/6 11/7 | 26/23 27/2 27/3 | 83/11 83/12 84/18 |
| 14/4 15/6 15/7 | 27/7 27/13 27/15 | 89/19 90/8 93/16 |
| 16/14 24/15 26/9 | 28/6 28/10 31/13 | 101/14 102/10 |
| 26/14 27/11 27/12 | 33/3 33/17 36/5 | 110/17 118/12 |
| 28/11 29/3 29/10 | 39/14 41/22 48/6 | 120/13 125/23 |
| 30/13 30/19 33/10 | 53/15 62/20 65/15 | 132/23 143/6 146/9 |
| 34/17 34/22 34/24 | 65/16 66/4 67/19 | 146/11 148/6 |
| 35/9 36/1 37/13 | 80/12 80/20 81/19 | they [148] 14/8 |
| 39/5 39/14 40/4 | 81/20 82/21 83/12 | 14/21 14/22 15/1 |
| 40/4 40/8 45/24 | 83/15 83/16 85/10 | 15/7 21/1 22/13 |
| 48/9 50/1 53/12 | 90/14 93/14 95/15 | 23/11 23/19 25/7 |
| 53/22 63/6 63/15 | 97/8 101/10 102/7 | 25/9 26/15 27/8 |
| 63/21 64/8 64/9 | 107/15 112/5 | 27/10 27/14 27/22 |
| 65/9 65/12 66/20 | 112/12 117/4 | 27/22 31/15 31/17 |
| 67/14 67/18 81/15 | 121/23 125/13 | 31/18 31/19 31/22 |
| 81/20 84/13 84/14 | 126/13 126/14 | 32/1 32/21 34/9 |
| 88/24 90/21 90/22 | 127/4 128/4 128/4 | 34/10 34/11 35/11 |
| 91/2 97/5 100/13 | 128/20 129/2 | 35/12 36/22 37/2 |
| 110/13 116/19 | 129/14 130/14 | 38/10 40/10 40/16 |
| 120/15 121/8 | 131/8 131/19 132/9 | 40/24 41/7 42/2 |
| 123/17 123/18 | 136/11 139/3 139/4 | 43/21 45/22 46/15 |
| 123/20 123/20 | 143/5 | 47/20 48/7 50/19 |
| 125/21 125/22 | Thereafter [1] 88/3 | 50/24 50/24 51/12 |
| 126/1 127/8 128/7 | these [43] 16/8 18/8 | 51/18 52/22 54/4 |
| 130/23 133/13 | 21/5 25/6 26/10 | 58/3 58/5 61/23 |


| $\mathbf{T}$ | 134/4 134/5 134/6 | 19/1 20/1 25/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| they... [96] 61/23 | 134/11 134/11 | 36/2 44/3 44/12 |
| 66/5 66/8 67/6 67/7 | 134/14 134/15 | 50/13 54/12 55/9 |
| 67/20 68/10 68/12 | 136/3 136/21 137/1 | 57/15 66/13 67/9 |
| 68/16 73/4 73/6 | 137/6 139/8 139/9 | 68/18 70/22 71/9 |
| 73/23 76/2 76/21 | 139/10 141/23 | 74/14 74/18 75/18 |
| 77/22 78/9 78/23 | 142/1 | 86/1 86/9 86/20 |
| 79/11 79/15 81/17 | they're [36] 15/9 | 86/24 87/15 89/7 |
| 81/22 82/1 82/14 | 28/13 37/20 43/2 | 89/8 90/7 97/18 |
| 84/9 86/14 86/20 | 55/9 69/21 73/12 | 102/1 109/3 110/8 |
| 87/15 87/16 87/19 | 73/14 74/21 76/20 | 115/18 123/19 |
| 91/16 92/19 92/20 | 85/22 86/18 90/19 | 123/21 125/24 |
| 92/22 93/21 98/17 | 92/21 101/11 | 133/22 134/5 136/9 |
| 100/23 100/23 | 101/14 101/19 | 136/11 136/17 |
| 101/16 105/2 | 101/22 102/10 | 137/17 138/17 |
| 105/14 105/21 | 103/20 104/7 104/8 | 139/13 140/22 |
| 106/14 106/14 | 104/9 104/10 | 142/5 143/20 |
| 107/6 108/17 | 104/12 109/14 | 144/24 146/8 |
| 108/19 110/1 112/8 | 113/12 113/17 | 146/16 |
| 113/8 114/1 114/14 | 113/18 118/2 118/5 | thinking [1] 95/5 |
| 116/2 118/12 | 120/15 124/17 | thinks [1] 88/21 |
| 118/14 120/9 122/3 | 125/8 130/12 133/2 | third [2] 16/17 |
| 123/7 124/19 | they've [1] 29/10 | 16/17 |
| 124/20 124/23 | thing [5] 21/11 27/6 | thirty [3] 64/18 |
| 125/2 126/7 127/1 | 36/23 53/20 138/4 | 72/12 82/12 |
| 127/2 128/7 128/11 | things [12] 20/16 | this [229] |
| 128/12 130/5 130/6 | 33/12 70/11 79/10 | Thompson [12] 2/5 |
| 130/7 130/8 130/10 | 81/21 91/11 95/6 | 4/9 10/1 10/9 11/13 |
| 130/13 132/6 | 95/14 105/17 125/6 | 11/20 12/17 96/17 |
| 132/20 133/10 | 135/21 145/22 | 142/10 142/22 |
| 133/13 133/18 | think [52] 10/11 | 146/17 146/20 |
| 133/19 133/21 | 12/3 18/10 18/11 | Thompsons [2] |


| T | thoughts [3] 57/20 | 129/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thompsons... [2] | 57/22 89/21 | timing [3] 143/10 |
| 9/21 9/24 | thousand [2] 42/11 | 144/10 146/5 |
| those [68] 6/23 | 91/22 | title [3] 42/8 105/22 |
| 12/13 20/8 21/2 | thousands [1] 6/15 | 133/20 |
| 24/17 24/20 28/7 | three [11] 37/20 | today [9] 6/20 |
| 33/14 37/21 38/12 | 44/18 45/21 47/6 | 24/23 88/1 125/21 |
| 38/15 44/19 46/23 | 65/21 89/21 111/16 | 133/23 135/3 138/8 |
| 65/14 67/5 67/22 | 132/23 137/16 | 138/10 143/23 |
| 70/14 73/11 73/16 | 137/17 137/17 | today's [3] 39/8 |
| 80/3 80/5 86/8 | through [16] 14/8 | 41/18 116/22 |
| 90/11 90/18 91/12 | 19/24 24/23 35/10 | together [2] 49/8 |
| 91/13 91/13 91/21 | 36/3 42/5 44/23 | 128/22 |
| 93/2 93/14 94/21 | 55/15 75/10 80/15 | Tom [1] 98/3 |
| 95/6 98/6 98/12 | 80/23 93/20 130/6 | too [2] 88/15 |
| 98/20 99/8 99/24 | 137/22 141/3 141/3 | 124/22 |
| 100/11 101/10 | throughout [3] | took [8] 34/20 35/9 |
| 110/8 111/20 | 27/16 27/19 31/16 | 47/6 77/8 126/5 |
| 112/12 113/6 | tie [4] 15/6 15/7 | 128/1 130/7 130/8 |
| 113/22 114/2 | 84/18 127/18 | top [3] 28/6 117/1 |
| 114/23 119/18 | tie-in [2] 15/6 15/7 | 138/21 |
| 120/19 126/5 126/9 | ties [1] 52/5 | topic [1] 92/13 |
| 126/14 126/19 | time [12] 27/22 | topographic [1] |
| 127/3 127/16 | 29/11 32/3 45/23 | 116/18 |
| 127/18 127/19 | 98/23 99/16 117/7 | total [1] 134/6 |
| 128/1 130/1 130/2 | 117/24 118/16 | totally [3] 15/9 86/9 |
| 130/5 130/9 133/9 | 128/11 131/18 | 130/24 |
| 133/13 133/14 | 148/9 | town [13] 3/7 24/22 |
| 133/15 133/24 | timeline [2] 130/19 | 25/23 35/20 81/13 |
| 9/6 140/10 | 132/11 | 81/16 103/5 103/13 |
| though [2] 9/19 | times [5] 31/16 | 126/2 126/9 126/9 |
| $119 / 18$ | 37/13 40/7 127/14 | 126/11 131/11 |
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| $\mathbf{V}$ | wall [3] 20/5 | 27/21 27/24 28/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vaults [3] 70/12 | 8 126/20 | 8/9 28/23 |
| 83/11 133/1 | wandering [2] | 29/21 35/8 36/4 |
| verbal [4] 23/5 29/7 | 27/16 27/18 | 38/5 38/7 38/12 |
| 96/1 140/12 | want [16] 6/12 10/6 | 38/13 40/2 40/9 |
| verify [1] 45/1 | 19/23 21/11 49/17 | 40/24 41/2 41/21 |
| version [1] 11/18 | 78/9 79/1 84/16 | 41/23 45/2 45/10 |
| very [28] 10/6 | 89/20 93/5 96/14 | 46/1 46/8 48/10 |
| 26/20 26/20 31/21 | 97/7 102/3 123/23 | 52/23 54/5 54/7 |
| 32/1 33/3 33/10 | 136/12 137/13 | 57/24 62/11 62/22 |
| 35/4 64/21 65/6 | wanted [4] 10/15 | 62/24 63/2 63/3 |
| 65/6 67/5 72/2 | 41/6 41/24 110/1 | 63/7 63/9 63/13 |
| 91/24 92/18 93/15 | wants [1] 59/15 | 63/17 63/21 63/22 |
| 116/22 116/22 | was [160] | 63/23 65/4 73/15 |
| 117/8 118/24 124/6 | wasn't [10] 45/17 | 73/19 74/20 77/22 |
| 126/15 126/15 | 110/11 118/18 | 78/3 78/9 79/12 |
| 127/1 130/2 139/3 | 118/18 123/22 | 80/10 80/12 80/14 |
| 139/12 146/24 | 124/6 126/24 132/1 | 81/10 81/11 83/19 |
| viatic [1] 63/4 | 132/7 132/11 | 84/15 84/19 85/10 |
| view [1] 132/15 | water [15] 5/16 | 85/23 103/2 103/3 |
| viewed [1] 108/14 | 80/1 80/23 81/21 | 103/10 104/6 |
| violated [1] 88/21 | 91/8 91/9 91/15 | 104/22 106/17 |
| violation [1] 88/23 | 91/17 93/7 93/8 | 107/7 109/24 |
| visit [1] 78/23 | 93/12 93/22 93/24 | 110/22 111/1 111/4 |
| vital [1] 72/2 | 97/8 126/5 | 111/7 111/13 112/2 |
| W | Watson [1] 127/23 | 113/5 113/13 |
| W | way [130] $7 / 7$ 10/19 | 113/16 115/5 116/7 |
| wait [3] 54/1 75/4 | 16/3 16/18 16/19 | 118/1 118/4 119/4 |
| 79/17 | 16/22 16/22 16/24 | 122/4 122/5 122/7 |
| waiting [1] 50/3 | 17/1 20/21 24/1 | 122/10 122/17 |
| walk [2] 37/11 | 24/5 26/11 26/16 | 122/21 122/23 |
| 41/16 | 26/19 27/17 27/19 | 123/2 123/6 123/8 |


| W | 90/17 92/2 92/4 | wealth [1] $29 / 9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| way... [23] 123/9 | 92/4 93/2 93/17 | Weathersby [3] |
| 129/12 129/20 | 93/18 93/18 93/19 | 1/16 2/15 115/13 |
| 129/20 130/14 | 95/23 99/17 104/13 | website [4] 25/11 |
| 130/17 131/4 131/7 | 107/1 108/23 117/2 | 49/1 81/19 97/14 |
| 132/1 132/7 132/8 | 118/16 125/7 | weighty [1] 32/1 |
| 132/18 132/19 | 126/16 126/19 | welcome [1] 88/17 |
| 133/6 134/5 134/13 | 127/6 127/7 127/9 | Weld [1] 6/7 |
| 134/20 135/12 | 127/12 127/17 | welfare [1] 60/16 |
| 136/2 136/19 | 127/20 131/3 | well [65] 6/2 7/7 |
| 136/23 138/19 | 131/14 133/24 | 13/4 14/2 17/13 |
| 139/11 | 135/2 136/17 | 18/2 19/3 20/20 |
| ways [8] 39/21 | 136/17 136/20 | 21/24 25/2 25/7 |
| 101/6 101/7 105/1 | 139/1 140/6 | 27/7 37/8 42/16 |
| 105/9 128/15 | we'd [2] 127/3 | 48/2 49/5 53/15 |
| 128/20 132/24 | 144/23 | 55/17 60/13 61/6 |
| we [81] 13/7 17/6 | we'll [4] 9/3 16/11 | 64/13 67/19 69/5 |
| 21/7 31/7 31/19 | 76/6 147/5 | 70/3 73/21 82/24 |
| 33/7 38/6 38/7 | we're [32] 22/24 | 83/14 88/14 89/12 |
| 39/11 39/12 39/13 | 33/16 49/21 50/3 | 90/24 91/13 91/18 |
| 45/23 46/4 48/18 | 51/10 51/24 52/10 | 91/21 91/21 92/4 |
| 49/10 49/22 53/19 | 55/5 69/10 70/7 | 93/23 95/10 100/6 |
| 54/1 56/2 57/1 | 70/12 70/15 70/19 | 101/5 102/1 102/6 |
| 57/15 58/21 58/22 | 71/4 71/20 72/1 | 103/2 103/4 104/14 |
| 59/13 61/2 62/2 | 74/12 74/20 75/10 | 105/10 108/24 |
| 62/7 66/10 67/2 | 75/18 76/13 78/12 | 109/3 111/3 114/2 |
| 69/5 69/7 69/20 | 78/13 84/13 87/24 | 115/22 118/22 |
| 69/21 70/23 72/2 | 92/9 93/3 114/9 | 122/2 127/22 |
| 74/16 74/22 75/18 | 121/14 131/19 | 129/22 130/12 |
| 77/11 79/2 79/7 | 134/20 147/5 | 131/2 132/13 136/9 |
| 84/16 85/19 86/8 | we've [5] 9/3 15/4 | 138/14 139/5 |
| 86/8 87/10 87/11 | 71/1 71/7 125/9 | 140/17 142/5 |


| W | 133/15 133/18 | 39/5 46/1 54/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| well... [3] 144/20 | 135/1 135/6 135/22 | 55/2 56/10 58/4 |
| 145/9 146/4 | 139/13 | 61/24 62/9 62/24 |
| well-known [1] | weren't [3] 133/10 | 65/3 66/5 73/19 |
| 61/6 | 133/14 135/24 | 78/13 79/14 80/8 |
| wells [5] 81/21 | wetland [1] 116/18 | 85/22 86/7 91/2 |
| 91/11 91/14 91/17 | what [163] | 91/5 92/3 93/11 |
| 93/19 | what's [11] 33/2 | 93/22 93/24 100/13 |
| went [11] 5/24 11/8 | 47/18 51/9 56/3 | 110/17 111/6 |
| 31/8 34/22 35/7 | 57/23 60/10 81/23 | 112/22 115/3 |
| 55/15 73/6 77/21 | 97/2 100/16 125/20 | 117/24 118/3 119/3 |
| 78/1 118/16 130/6 | 126/7 | 122/3 122/9 123/1 |
| were [61] 7/4 9/21 | whatever [1] 73/6 | 123/4 123/6 123/8 |
| 11/7 11/19 15/21 | when [37] 16/10 | 126/19 127/3 |
| 17/19 22/24 26/8 | 31/13 31/16 32/19 | 127/21 127/21 |
| 31/18 31/24 36/16 | 33/1 37/11 38/24 | 127/23 128/9 |
| 36/22 43/20 46/6 | 43/6 43/21 44/6 | 128/19 129/15 |
| 52/21 53/12 53/19 | 44/7 49/2 52/22 | 130/1 130/5 130/13 |
| 55/21 58/22 60/23 | 56/8 57/11 61/6 | 130/16 131/11 |
| 67/10 67/10 68/11 | 66/1 67/12 67/13 | 131/23 131/24 |
| 68/12 68/16 71/3 | 68/16 72/5 78/23 | 132/6 132/8 133/10 |
| 72/24 77/15 79/11 | 94/15 106/1 110/5 | 134/12 134/20 |
| 81/15 86/7 90/21 | 115/4 117/14 118/4 | 137/16 137/18 |
| 98/17 98/23 99/24 | 118/7 125/11 | 145/23 |
| 100/23 106/5 | 125/11 130/7 | Whereupon [2] 4/5 |
| 107/16 118/12 | 131/16 132/11 | 147/7 |
| 123/22 126/5 126/7 | 133/16 138/11 | whether [40] 17/24 |
| 126/21 127/1 127/2 | 145/21 | 18/20 18/21 21/8 |
| 127/19 130/10 | where [70] 26/15 | 24/23 25/5 32/8 |
| 130/21 132/19 | 28/2 28/6 28/12 | 34/6 34/8 35/18 |
| 132/20 133/5 133/5 | 28/16 29/7 35/11 | 35/18 38/6 44/7 |
| 133/7 133/8 133/9 | 35/11 36/6 38/12 | 47/16 81/20 84/22 |


| W | 17/21 36/1 69/10 | 133/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| whether... [24] | 75/10 126/6 | lths [2] 40/18 |
| 85/11 90/6 91/20 | White [1] 135/7 | 73/1 |
| 92/1 92/21 98/11 | who [13] 8/12 | will [46] $7 / 310$ |
| 101/17 103/4 103/5 | 12/11 19/14 22/19 | 11/14 13/9 13/1 |
| 103/24 104/2 117/4 | 24/13 43/14 69/22 | 13/21 15/19 17/15 |
| 120/18 122/8 124/2 | 70/2 91/5 95/23 | 18/22 19/1 19/10 |
| 124/3 131/3 135/24 | 103/2 123/4 124/20 | 19/16 19/17 21/2 |
| 136/20 137/3 137/3 | who's [3] 59/6 | 22/22 28/7 29/8 |
| 141/17 144/9 | 90/16 92/19 | 29/24 30/6 33/13 |
| 144/21 | whoa [5] 17/5 17/5 | 35/20 37/21 38/16 |
| which [56] 7/1 7/13 | 17/6 17/6 17/6 | 39/14 40/7 40/9 |
| 7/15 8/2 10/10 | whole [6] 19/23 | 40/16 41/15 41/23 |
| 10/10 11/14 14/11 | 56/21 74/22 77/13 | 54/15 58/24 59/13 |
| 14/13 16/18 19/21 | 130/6 144/11 | 72/16 84/11 84/11 |
| 21/13 25/9 26/3 | why [30] 14/1 | 85/4 85/6 89/5 |
| 30/9 32/10 34/3 | 17/13 27/8 27/10 | 93/22 99/20 101/5 |
| 35/21 36/7 36/16 | 27/14 27/15 33/10 | 112/17 116/2 |
| 38/3 44/22 46/2 | 33/17 43/13 44/24 | 122/21 140/7 |
| 48/20 48/22 49/2 | 46/6 46/11 46/14 | 146/19 |
| 49/24 50/23 54/9 | 47/6 49/10 49/24 | William [1] 1/15 |
| 54/19 56/9 59/12 | 52/20 65/8 67/2 | Winnipesaukee [1] |
| 61/6 62/5 63/11 | 72/9 73/17 75/20 | 118/8 |
| 64/19 68/21 70/16 | 80/17 82/22 85/22 | withdraw [1] 42/18 |
| 75/11 75/22 79/24 | 86/2 87/18 90/17 | withdrawals [2] |
| 91/23 93/13 112/18 | 129/11 140/22 | 93/8 93/12 |
| 112/19 113/2 113/3 | wide [2] 83/10 | within [11] 17/23 |
| 113/3 117/22 118/9 | 133/2 | 22/5 47/18 63/3 |
| 119/6 120/16 | width [11] 39/22 | 63/7 64/20 64/22 |
| 122/13 126/20 | 40/4 40/8 40/10 | 117/10 131/7 133/3 |
| 127/19 141/8 | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { 40/17 63/6 73/3 } \\ 73 / 18 & 85 / 1 & 132 / 19 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { 143/20 } \\ \text { without [18] } 37 / 3 \end{array}$ |

## $\mathbf{W}$

without... [17]
37/12 39/16 40/1
42/12 55/15 58/9
58/13 72/6 73/24
74/4 83/7 111/2
112/2 116/23 122/7
131/12 134/22
witness [19] 2/4 4/4
8/9 8/13 26/7 33/19
37/7 51/5 53/4 64/7
64/16 66/6 85/7
88/8 92/14 97/4
97/23 117/20
131/10
won't [1] 66/16 wondering [2] 86/21 135/6
Woodstock [3] 54/3
54/20 56/10
word [3] 61/16
105/13 114/4
wording [1] 33/9 words [11] 14/19
24/15 27/1 32/23 106/19 108/17
113/6 113/8 113/22
114/1 114/2
work [18] 4/19
14/15 14/16 26/21 28/14 38/14 48/1 67/11 78/10 83/14

85/5 99/20 104/17 110/19 121/2
133/20 138/20
141/1
worked [3] 5/13
135/11 135/12 working [4] 14/12 75/10 102/9 104/18 workload [1] 47/24 works [2] 105/14 105/15
world [1] 116/22 worry [1] 71/16 worst [1] 73/12 would [99] 4/4 4/16 7/8 10/13 10/21 12/6 16/9 24/13 28/18 28/22 29/1 31/8 36/6 38/8 38/13 38/20 38/21 39/5 39/6 40/21 40/22 41/19 42/2 42/3 44/12 45/24 46/2 46/2 46/15 47/11 47/13 47/15 47/20 49/2 53/13
53/21 53/23 55/20
56/4 58/5 59/12
63/6 65/6 67/8 69/6 69/23 70/3 75/17 78/10 80/3 80/14 80/15 81/10 82/1

82/5 82/7 82/7 82/13 82/17 88/15 89/8 90/20 91/4
93/10 94/2 94/24
95/12 97/3 99/3
100/23 102/1 102/2
110/2 111/24 112/3
112/3 115/1 115/23
115/23 116/12
116/17 116/17
116/20 117/11
117/16 119/19
123/23 126/18
128/6 130/23 131/1
134/3 135/1 135/8
136/19 136/21
137/1 139/5 146/3
wouldn't [6] 39/3
76/21 82/18 115/5
134/14 135/2
Wright [1] 1/15
written [2] 8/1 71/5
wrong [3] 10/8
132/14 145/22
wrote [2] 12/11 29/17
yard [1] 125/16
Yeah [1] 88/13 year [2] 10/8 11/14 years [10] 5/11 5/23 6/11 14/12 15/12

| $\mathbf{Y}$ | 124/22 125/2 129/1 | 141/7 145/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| years... [5] 17/2 | 13 | you've [16] 4/20 |
| 41/18 58/2 72/12 | 134/10 137/1 137/1 | 13/16 19/3 20/16 |
| 90/11 | 137/24 138/5 138/9 | 21/13 34/7 66/15 |
| yes [97] 4/24 6/1 | 139/11 139/24 | 87/8 104/16 114/18 |
| 8/20 9/23 10/5 | 141/6 141/22 | 114/20 122/11 |
| 11/12 13/2 18/11 | 141/24 142/12 | 133/8 138/11 |
| 18/14 21/21 22/7 | 142/13 143/21 | 142/21 145/17 |
| 25/18 30/23 31/12 | 145/4 145/19 | young [1] 118/8 |
| 34/19 34/19 34/23 | yesterday [1] 34/19 | your [86] 4/18 4/21 |
| 37/8 43/7 49/9 | yet [7] 20/15 21/7 | 6/16 6/17 7/5 7/6 |
| 51/17 52/3 52/3 | 45/2 50/8 55/1 | 8/21 9/14 9/20 10/7 |
| 52/6 52/12 55/13 | 58/23 145/13 | 10/16 10/16 10/17 |
| 55/18 59/6 59/11 | you [366] | 11/20 13/8 13/18 |
| 61/14 62/10 62/12 | You'd [1] 87/9 | 13/23 15/18 15/21 |
| 62/13 62/23 64/5 | you'll [2] 22/20 | 17/21 18/12 19/8 |
| 64/5 64/6 64/8 | 75/17 | 20/1 20/17 20/19 |
| 66/19 67/7 68/2 | you're [41] 10/3 | 21/3 21/12 21/17 |
| 69/1 70/10 70/14 | 12/17 17/7 17/8 | 22/12 24/9 25/4 |
| 71/15 75/14 75/22 | 18/21 24/3 32/19 | 25/15 30/18 30/19 |
| 77/17 80/5 85/21 | 32/20 52/8 55/10 | 32/6 32/7 34/5 |
| 86/13 86/15 88/9 | 56/3 57/16 57/18 | 34/16 36/11 36/12 |
| 90/5 91/12 92/11 | 62/10 65/1 65/1 | 41/9 53/14 57/20 |
| 95/1 95/2 95/10 | 65/2 65/18 65/20 | 65/3 65/19 66/14 |
| 97/5 97/24 98/9 | 72/6 75/3 75/22 | 74/2 79/21 82/5 |
| 100/13 100/15 | 88/17 90/5 94/18 | 89/15 89/21 96/14 |
| 100/20 100/22 | 95/7 96/16 96/20 | 96/22 97/7 98/5 |
| 101/1 103/12 | 103/24 110/6 110/9 | 98/10 98/10 98/19 |
| 107/20 109/3 | 111/12 113/10 | 100/4 100/9 100/9 |
| 112/24 114/21 | 115/3 128/21 | 101/1 108/6 109/5 |
| 116/15 117/16 | 129/22 132/13 | 109/17 113/20 |
| 124/19 124/19 | 132/14 132/22 | 114/16 116/13 |



