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PROCEEDINGS
(Resumed at 1:21 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pastoriza, whenever you're ready. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So, I'm Kris Pastoriza, Eastern Conservation Commission.
(Pause in proceedings)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You may proceed.

MS. PASTORIZA: Thanks.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So, Mr. Bascom, this is part of your prefiled testimony, dated 12/30/2016. You state here, "Based on materials provided for review, it appears that the Applicants have not yet fully evaluated the details of the many underground project work areas, so the viability of construction in some areas is uncertain."

Would you agree that the new materials you have seen in the last six months, since mid-April, indicates that the viability of
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
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construction in some areas is still uncertain?
A. (Bascom) Some areas do have designations that don't fully document, for example, the limits of disturbance or temporary work areas. To the extent that the material that was evaluated at that time, there was a lot of information that was still missing at the time that $I$ prepared this document.
Q. So having seen what you saw in the last six months, would you state that there is still material missing?
A. (Bascom) Yes.
Q. You also state, "Applicants' drawings show conceptual traffic control plans for only some areas, some of which include completely closing portions of the road. Given the complexity and longer duration construction activities associated with horizontal directional drilling, the traffic control plans for each of these areas should be defined and explained to fully assess the impact."

Now, I want to focus on the statement
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
"fully assess the impacts." MS. PASTORIZA: No. 2, Steve.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So, on October 13th of this year, DOT issued a memorandum that states, Northern Pass must complete a traffic control plan because the proposed project, if approved, would create significant traffic impacts. So a traffic control plan would help the SEC and the public fully assess the impact of the problem -- project; would it not?
A. (Bascom) In my opinion it would, yes.
Q. And this is partly because a traffic control
plan would include an assessment of the length of delays that travelers would be subject to and the number of travelers delayed in any given location; is that right?
A. (Bascom) That's generally consistent with a traffic control plan, yes.
Q. And are there other helpful things that it might include?
A. (Bascom) It could include information such as the frequency and activity of construction vehicles arriving and departing from the
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
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site, for example.
Q. So could you give a broad estimate of how long it would take to research and write a traffic control plan for this project?
A. (Bascom) I cannot. I'm not a traffic control plan specialist.
Q. Do anybody on the panel have an estimate they could give within several months?
A. (Taylor) I do not.
Q. A year? Six months?
A. [No verbal response]
Q. Okay. Exhibit -- sorry. Page 3. And this is Joint Muni 305. So this shows two things: It shows DOT guidelines for work safety and mobility. That's the title page and then a snip from the document. And then below that is part of a Northern Pass and Quanta presentation to DOT.

Would you concur with DOT that significant projects should be identified as early as feasible in the project development, prior to the development of alternatives? Any one of you can answer that.
A. (Bascom) Could you just restate the question?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] \{10-23-17\}

Exactly what --
Q. Would you concur with DOT in that statement, the first paragraph, that, quote, "Significant projects should be identified as early as feasible in the project development, prior to the development of alternatives"?
A. (Zysk) I think it's a reasonable statement.
Q. Are you aware that the DOT only identified this project as "significant" within the past two weeks?
A. (Bascom) I was not aware of that.
A. (Zysk) I don't think we were, no.
Q. And is it typical in your experience that a project would be identified as "significant" this late in permitting proceedings?
A. (Zysk) It does seem a bit late to identify it as such, yes.
Q. So are you aware that the Applicant was asked by DOT to confirm the right-of-way boundaries in April of 2016; they submitted right-of-way width surveys to DOT in April of 2017, and these surveys were rejected by DOT in August of this year?
A. (Zysk) We were aware of that, yes.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
Q. Can a traffic control plan be made without knowledge of the width of the right-of-way on the proposed route?
A. (Zysk) In this case I would say probably not. Parts of it could, but not fully.
A. (Bascom) If the limit of disturbance is confined to the available right-of-way, then you would need to know the boundaries of the right-of-way to develop the traffic control plan.
Q. So the Applicant's construction witnesses estimated that it will take until November for the second survey to be completed. The first survey took DOT three months to reject. So, for the purposes of my question, assume that it would take DOT at least three months to assess the second, more detailed survey. If the SEC and intervenors do not see a complete and accepted survey until January, or even February of 2018, could you give an estimate of when the traffic control plan would be completed, approved by DOT and available to the SEC and intervenors?
A. (Taylor) I don't believe we'd be able to give
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] \{10-23-17\}
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you an answer on how long it would take them to do that.
Q. So, Northern Pass indicates in their presentation from Quanta, in part, to DOT, which is the second snip on the screen there, that they plan to submit the Traffic Management Plan to DOT prior to the start of the Project. Would you agree that for the intervenors and SEC to be able to thoroughly assess the effects of traffic delays, closures and detours in the affected areas, the traffic control plan needs to be available to us all well before the end of the hearings?
A. (Taylor) That's a reasonable request. MS. PASTORIZA: All right. So,

No. 4, Steve.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So on the screen is Page 4 from the same presentation made by the Applicant, PAR and Quanta, to DOT this May. In this
presentation to the DOT, the Applicants'
subcontractors, PAR and Quanta, give a short
list of project experience, but do not show
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
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how long each of these projects took.
My research shows that the Tehachapi --
is that the correct pronunciation? The Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project took 7-1/2 years to construct 3 miles of underground. The SDG\&E took a year and a half for 14 miles for the whole project. I could find a breakdown on the underground. PPL Hershey Project, I could not find anything about this except as a withdrawn project due to public resistance. I could not find the Oakland Transmission Project. And the Jefferson-Martin Project came up as done by Black \& Veatch with Quanta.

So, are you familiar with any of these underground trenching projects and how long they took?
A. (Taylor) No.
A. (Bascom) I am familiar with some of these projects.
Q. Do you know how long they took?
A. (Bascom) I believe your estimate from the start of planning to completion for the Tehachapi Renewable Project is approximately
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
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accurate. The construction on that project was started entirely overhead, and the community along part of the route objected to a portion of the route, and it was constructed underground as an alternative. And that redesigned process, including the installation, $I$ believe took approximately seven years as you described.
Q. And that's the one that you're familiar with?
A. (Bascom) Of that first group, yes.
Q. Okay. So do you know how long the underground portion itself took once it was designed, permitted?
A. (Bascom) I do not know precisely, no.
Q. So can you explain why the Applicant did not state on this list how long it took them to do each of the jobs?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Calls for speculation.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Pastoriza.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. As construction people who might be presenting a project to a client, can you
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
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explain why a client would not say how long it took them to do a job that they're presenting as experience?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't
know that that improves the question.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. If you were going to make a resume of your work experience, would you place on it how
long those jobs took you to complete?
A. (Taylor) Typically we do not.
A. (Bascom) I typically would not either unless specifically requested to do so.
Q. So, for the HDD, they give a list of five projects. And are you familiar with any of these?
A. (Taylor) I am not.
A. (Alexander) No.
A. (Bascom) I am familiar with two of the projects.
Q. Which two of those?
A. (Bascom) The Hudson Transmission Project and Florida Power \& Light's Miami reconstruction project.
Q. So when $I$ was trying to research these, I
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found the Platte River and Hudson
Transmission and the Dominion Project appear to have been done by Mears, which is a subsidiary of Quanta. And do you know who did the Florida Power \& Light?
A. (Bascom) I believe Mears was also the contractor that did the HDD on that project as well.

MS. PASTORIZA: No. 5, Steve.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So this is from Quanta's web site. It shows their contractors for $H D D$, and $P A R$ is not listed among these. So, do any of you know who is proposed to be doing the HDD for this project?
A. (Taylor) Nothing beyond what's been already stated by the Applicant.
Q. Do you consider experience to be important in HDD work and safety?
A. (Bascom) Yes, generally with any project.
Q. Would you consider that whoever PAR Electric is using to give correct engineering decisions for each HDD is important to the safety and quality of the work?
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr. Chair. This is all general information regarding $H D D$ that could have and should have been included in their testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Pastoriza.
MS. PASTORIZA: It's related to this recent, to us, proposal from Quanta to DOT, where they do not say who is doing their HDD, though they're listing on their resume their HDD experience.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled.
You can answer, if you remember the question.
A. (Bascom) If you can repeat the question? BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. Would you consider whoever PAR Electric is using to give the correct engineering decisions for each HDD is important to the safety and quality of the work?
A. (Bascom) I think generally that would be acknowledged, yes.
Q. Would you consider that the geotechnical engineer overseeing the HDD and making decisions before and during the HDD is
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
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critical to limiting the risk of frac-out and maintaining the safety of the work?
A. (Zysk) Yes, I would agree with that.
Q. So how can the SEC assess the Project or control the standards for HDD work crew experience if they don't know anything about the HDD contractor?
A. (Bascom) I'm not aware to what extent the SEC has knowledge about the contractors going to be used or not used for the Project, so I can't answer personally on that question.
Q. So would you consider that them knowing who
the contractor is could be helpful in their assessment of the Project?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. So do you know if DOT has any standards for

HDD contractor work experience, New Hampshire DOT?
A. (Zysk) I'm not sure what their requirements for the contractors are. I know they have design guides, a design guide for HDD work.
Q. And you know that that design guide is entirely voluntary?
A. (Zysk) I personally have not seen that guide.
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I am aware that it exists, but I have not been able to get a copy of it.
Q. I have seen it. It's recommendations.

MS. PASTORIZA: SO, NO. 6,
Steve. You can start at the top portion of the map.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So this is Exception Request No. 125. And can you see the streams on this map?
A. (Taylor) I believe there's one.

MS. PASTORIZA: So, Steve, can
you scroll down to the next map?
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So this is the map where $I$ drew the streams in, to the best of my ability, knowing them fairly well.
A. (Taylor) Okay.
Q. So assume that the conditions on the ground here are: No. 1, the right-of-way width is unknown; No. 2, the right-of-way will be set at a prescriptive width, most likely 25 feet, the existing pavement width at the most constrained sections, and it will be up to 30 feet at some locations where the steep
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
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slope on the west side ends and the stream on the east side curves away from the road; and Condition No. 3 is the Gibson Road entry, which is shown here at the very bottom right of the screen has been rebuilt further south, which is also to the right onto 116. So that entry is no longer there.

And the legend on the map, the pavement edge is the faint solid gray line; the proposed new splice vault location is a green rectangle; the proposed new HDD bore hole and conduit locations are dashed red lines; the gray dashed and dotted line is the claimed right-of-way of 66 feet; and there is a utility pole between the proposed splice vault location and the HDD exit locations.

So, given these conditions, could you describe how the proposed splice vault would be installed and the proposed HDD done in less than a 20-foot-wide workspace with a steep slope down to a stream abutting the proposed HDD exit pits, a fairly steep grade on the road at the proposed exit pit location, and a very steep slope immediately
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] \{10-23-17\}
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abutting the road on the west side with utility poles?
A. (Taylor) There was a lot to that question.
Q. I can repeat things one by one if you need that.
A. (Taylor) Please.
Q. So the right-of-way width is unknown.

Because of this, the right-of-way will be set at a prescriptive width. Given that the existing pavement is 25 feet wide, the prescriptive right-of-way would be mostly 25 , expanding to 30 feet, and some locations where the stream isn't present on the east side of the steep slope, isn't present on west side.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, are these meant to be assumptions or facts?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think she
introduced it with assumptions.
MS. PASTORIZA: Yes.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. Are you following this?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
Q. Do you need me to repeat something?
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There is the Gibson Road entry which you see in the lower right is no longer there; it's further south on the road. Do you get that?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. And there is a utility pole between the proposed HDD pits and the proposed splice vault location. Can you see that?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. And you can see what the conditions indicated by the various lines and colors are there?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. So, given these conditions, could you describe how the proposed splice vault would be installed and the proposed HDD be done with less than a 20-foot-wide workspace; with a steep slope down to the stream, abutting the proposed HDD exit pits; a fairly steep grade on the road at the HDD exit pit proposed locations, and a very steep slope immediately abutting the road on the west side with utility poles?
A. (Zysk) Let's start with the splice vault. There would have to be, I'm guessing, some
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temporary relocation of that utility pole to get the overhead line out of the way for both the splice pit and the HDD activity.

Obviously, there's going to be some conflict. The splice vault looks like it's in a fairly level area. While I don't disagree there's a steep slope, there looks to be some 20-plus feet of a level area, reasonably level area if you're going across the road, not accounting for the longitudinal grade of the road.

Given that now, your assumption that the right-of-way is going to be basically at the edge of the road, so that would put everybody outside the right-of-way. So I'm not sure that requires easements or some temporary arrangement with the landowner, assuming that the landowner's property would then come up to the edge of the road.
Q. So, without an easement from the abutting landowner, could this be done here at this corner?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. So how would it be done without any easement
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within the width of the pavement?
A. (Taylor) Well, I think it would have to be within the pavement, under the assumptions that you have put forward.
Q. So everything would be under the pavement?
A. (Taylor) Under the assumptions you've laid out, if it's a narrower right-of-way, which is essentially equal to the pavement width or slightly larger. If the splice pit could not be outside the right-of-way, then that would push it into the pavement area. That's how it could be done under this scenario.
Q. So if it were done that way, would it require a road closure?
A. (Taylor) I think by default it would if you were constructing in the middle of the road.
Q. And what area would the crane for the splice vault take up with the outriggers?
A. (Taylor) I couldn't say. It would depend on the equipment that the contractor was using.
Q. An estimate if it was on the larger side?

Twenty feet, 30 feet?
A. (Taylor) Somewhere between 20 and 30 feet of width, sure.
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Q. What's your estimate of increase in construction time if the right-of-way width at this HDD location is two rods pavement width?
A. (Zysk) An increase in construction time from the current situation?
Q. From the 66-foot right-of-way plan.
A. (Zysk) There would be a requirement to repave the road. So there would be some additional time.
Q. But you don't think there would be an increase in actual construction time with the width constraint?
A. (Zysk) With the road closed? There may be some, not -- it wouldn't double it or something along those lines. There might be some small increase.

MS. PASTORIZA: So, Steve,
Page 7.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So this shows the underground profile of the same location. The bore hole notation says rock depth, 43.5.

Given that the surface altitude is 1145
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and the boring goes down to 1080 , is it reasonable to assume the two 18 -inch bore holes would be going through bedrock?
A. (Zysk) I would say so, yes.
Q. Would this increase the drilling time?
A. (Zysk) I believe it would go into rock, regardless of whether the splice pit was -or the location of the HDD operation was, where it is shown on the plan or if it was moved 20 feet into the roadway. You're going to hit rock regardless, based on this information. So it would not increase the time as it is projected right now.
Q. But my question is, rock conditions in HDD, does that slow down the boring speed?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. And does the rock make it more difficult to keep to the proposed bore path?
A. Not necessarily, no. It's just a harder -it takes longer for them to drill through it.
Q. So are the 60-foot geotechnical borings at the beginning and end of this HDD enough information to fully assess the issues with the HDD, in terms of underground conditions?
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A. (Taylor) The two bores or the two cores that I think you're referencing are typical of what we see for this type of design. So it could be, subject to what is actually encountered during the drill.
Q. So, for a reasonable safety level, or if you wanted to do a frac-out assessment, how many borings might be done for HDD of this length?
A. (Taylor) Again, as I indicated, we typically would see a geotechnical boring at the entry area and exit area. So this would be in line with that for an HDD drill.
Q. And are there any cases where you would do more borings?
A. (Bascom) From my experience on some other projects, usually an initial set of geotechnical borings might be done near the entry and exit pit, and then additional borings might be warranted once the drilling contractor has been selected and a more detailed plan has been developed for that particular site.
A. (Taylor) I'd add one thing to that, to

Rusty's statement. Doing additional bores
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along the length of an HDD actually creates a potential area for a return.
Q. So if you had a geotechnical boring which led to a frac-out, what would be your next step in assessment?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, objection. This sounds to me like this is generic testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Pastoriza.
MS. PASTORIZA: I was just
generally curious. I can move on.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So, does the road grade here look problematic for setting up an HDD exit pit and pulling conduit?
A. (Zysk) I would say no.
Q. So when they say they need a flat, level surface to work, that's a flat, level surface? Or are they simply going to make it into a flat, level surface?
A. (Zysk) I believe when they're referring to "flat" and "level," it's more across the road than longitudinally along the road.
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Q. And what shoring, if any, is needed around an exit or entrance pit for HDD?
A. (Zysk) I think that would depend on the material that they're exiting into.
A. (Bascom) Generally the area around the entry and exit pit are contained to capture and recover the drilling mud that's used as part of the drilling process. But typically sheeting and shoring where you would normally be having a worker enter into the pit is not common for that type of installation.
Q. So the red lettering in the upper right-hand corner says, "Actual proposed depth of utilities to be updated in final drawings." So, deeper trenches than those shown would require greater construction times; would they not?
A. (Zysk) Generally, yes.
Q. And this would be due to material excavation, more trucking, more fill, more water pumping and spoils dumping. Any other considerations that would lead to a longer construction time?
A. (Bascom) As the trench depth becomes deeper,
[WITNESS PANEL: BASCOM|ZYSK|TAYLOR|ALEXANDER]
there might be a necessity to introduce sheeting and shoring, where it might not otherwise be necessary for a shallower trench, and that can add construction time as well.
Q. And as the trenches get deeper, will the thermal dissipation slow down, and will this require more fluidized thermal concrete?
A. (Bascom) The volume of material introduced back in the trench would include FTB, most likely, and it's possible additional material might be used, depending upon the specifics of the soil parameters and the native conditions at that location.
Q. So the amount of FTB would be the same, regardless of the depth?
A. (Bascom) It would be site-specific.
Q. And what depth does OSHA require trench sheeting and shoring?
A. (Zysk) I believe it's not more than 5 feet.
Q. And how much space do the noise barriers for the HDD take up?
A. (Taylor) What do you mean, "noise barriers"?
Q. Well, HDD is known to be very loud, and I'm
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assuming there would be noise barriers set up probably on at least two sides of the HDD rig.
A. (Zysk) We haven't seen anything relative to this.
Q. So you know of no plans by the Applicant for noise mitigation at HDD sites?
A. (Taylor) Not that I'm aware of. MS. PASTORIZA: No. 8, Steve. BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So, this shows Exception Request No. 125, the same one farther north. The red dashed lines show the proposed 18-inch-diameter bore holes and cable locations; the faint gray lines are the existing pavement, and the dashed gray lines are the right-of-way boundaries that the Applicant drew in at 66 feet. I measure 900 feet of bore holes and lines outside the traveled way just in this screenshot. In the entire exception request there is 1500 feet of 18-inch bore holes outside the pavement that would be filled with conductor and bentonite slurry, I think.

If the right-of-way here being unknown
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is set at the prescriptive width of the travel way, the HDD bore hole paths as shown would be on private property for a considerable distance; would they not?
A. (Taylor) It would appear so.
Q. Excuse me?
A. (Taylor) It would appear so.
Q. Thank you.

If the Northern Pass were given the
travel way to work within, would you agree that the need for a 20-foot separation of the cables at depth, the foot-and-a-half diameter of the bore holes, and the only 5-foot accuracy of the tracking of the boring would make it highly improbable that Northern Pass could guarantee no trespass on private property by its bore holes and conduit?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Again, all generic information that could have been included.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Pastoriza.
MS. PASTORIZA: This is an
exception request that was recently posted, and
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the survey rejection was also recently posted. MR. NEEDLEMAN: The exception request is recent, but the design is the same issue.

MS. PASTORIZA: The survey --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: To the extent the witnesses had concerns about these sorts of issues, they could have raised them, and in fact did raise them with respect to temporary easement needs in places.

MS. PASTORIZA: The survey is new information. The rejection of the survey now calls into question every width drawn and permit plans.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled.
You can continue.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. Do you want me to repeat the question?
A. (Taylor) Yes, please.
Q. If Northern Pass were given the travel way to work within, which is roughly 25 feet wide, would you agree that the need for 20 -foot separation of the cables at depth, the foot-and-a-half diameter of the bore holes,
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and only the 5-foot accuracy of the tracking for the HDD would make it highly improbable that the Northern Pass could guarantee no trespass on private property by its bore holes and conduit at this location?
A. (Taylor) Based on those assumptions, it would definitely be tight. But I would defer to see an actual alignment and layout for how that might be proposed to give you a definitive answer, yes or no.

MS. PASTORIZA: No. 9, Steve.
BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. So this is a map of hydrocarbons and groundwater at the corner of 116 and 112 in Easton. So if you accept this map as accurate, how might the remediation necessary at this former gas station site delay construction?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This
is information that could have been included and wasn't. Nothing new here.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Pastoriza.
MS. PASTORIZA: Well, there's an
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exception request that comes up for this corner and it's related to this question.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled.
You can continue.
A. (Taylor) Could you repeat your question? BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. How much time might the remediation necessary at this former gas station site delay construction?
A. (Taylor) I wouldn't be able to speak to that.

I'm not familiar with the remediation
necessary for this site.
Q. So you would not know if it is typical practice to notify the Department of Environmental Services when you're on a geotechnical boring crew and you encounter hydrocarbons?
A. (Zysk) You would certainly notify your client, who I would then expect to run that up to the appropriate agencies, yes. The drilling contractor would not make necessarily a direct report.
Q. And No. 10. This is the same location. The exception request for this location does not
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include moving the trench to the other side of the road to attempt to avoid the hydrocarbons. Would normal practice be to survey the site for contamination and decide on the location of the trenching that was least likely to spread the contamination?
A. (Zysk) If a remediation were not in process, I would say yes. Sounds like there is something in process, based on what you've described.
Q. I don't know of anything in process. I only know that hydrocarbons were encountered there.
A. (Zysk) Okay. You've just mentioned a remediation of a gas station.
Q. I only assume that if the Northern Pass were to build here, they would have to do remediation before construction.
A. (Bascom) As a general strategy in terms of selecting an alignment, one would want to avoid potentially contaminated soils. And so designing the route to avoid those areas might be advantageous, but $I$ don't know that we can speak to this specific location.
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Q. So if the right-of-way width on 116 from Franconia, south of the town center to the Easton border, roughly 7 miles, is three rods rather than the four rods shown on Northern Pass's DOT permit packages, how much might that increase construction times?
A. (Taylor) I don't know that we could answer that without seeing an alignment that would be proposed under those right-of-way conditions.
Q. Can we assume it would take longer because there is a narrower area to work within?
A. (Taylor) Not necessarily.
Q. So how could an area be narrower yet not slow down the process?
A. (Taylor) Again, without seeing the alignment, whether it's off to one side of the road, in one continuous straight run going back and forth across the road, whether there was one or many trenchless versus open trench, there's a lot of variables there. So those variables could in fact be in play currently, and they could be similar under the scenario that you're mentioning.
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Q. Has the Applicant provided any documentation that they have acquired the upland locations required by DOT and DES for dumping the water that would be pumped for the trenches?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Again, calls for generic testimony.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Pastoriza.
MS. PASTORIZA: We're dealing with new information coming in, and I'm wondering if there's new information that has come in since April that $I$ simply haven't seen and that these men know about.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled.
You can answer, if you know.
A. (Taylor) I'm not aware of any, no.
Q. Without such locations, how would construction proceed?
A. (Taylor) Let me step back. Repeat your question, the first question, and then I'll jump to this one.
Q. If the Northern Pass has no locations, upland locations that they've acquired to dump the water from their trenches, which is required
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by DOT and DES, how would they proceed with construction?
A. (Taylor) If that's a requirement, then they would have to get those approvals.
Q. Has the Applicant provided any documentation that you have seen since April that they have secured any laydown or staging areas in the southern 52 miles of the route?
A. (Taylor) I'm not aware of any.
Q. And without such locations, how would construction proceed?
A. (Taylor) Well, if they don't get additional laydown and staging areas, they would have to stage the job from what they have.
Q. And that would increase construction times?
A. (Taylor) I would think so.
Q. And that would increase traffic?
A. (Taylor) I think it would be the same amount of traffic, but traffic extending over much larger areas of the Project corridor.
Q. Given that they are not based on a legal survey of road width, would you say the Applicant's statement that their construction plans are at 60 percent is accurate?
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A. (Taylor) There's a yes and no to that. Sixty-percent plans can be using best available data, which $I$ believe is what they have indicated that they're working with and through. But the no is that, historically on projects that I have seen, by the time we're at 60 percent, property rights and boundaries are fairly firm in most instances.
Q. So the Applicant has said that there will always be a lane open at all construction sites on the 52-mile buried section of the route. Have you seen any contract since you filed your testimonies that ensures this?
A. (Taylor) I'm not aware of any contracts.
A. (Zysk) Contracts? No.
Q. So, to summarize, we have a project without a legal project boundary survey, without accepted plans based on the survey, without a traffic control plan, without staging areas, without spoils storage areas, without concrete batch plans, and without dewatering areas. What potential problems do you see arising if a decision is made regarding permitting this project without this
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] \{10-23-17\}
information?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Again, calls for general testimony. And I don't know whether those are assumptions or stated facts.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, you were layering speculation on speculation on speculation.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. If we assume those to be true based on new information that we have and have not received, what potential problems might be happening?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm going to sustain the objection.

BY MS. PASTORIZA:
Q. What potential problems do you see with construction beginning in the spring of 2018 if the Project were permitted?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This is calling for basic generic testimony. That's everything that's already been included in the testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, I
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That's good. I'm done. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next on the list is Ms. Saffo, but $I$ know she's not here.

Ms. Manzelli, that puts you up.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. MANZELLI:
Q. Good afternoon. My name is Amy Manzelli, representing the Forest Society. So I want to start with one of the rules that governs this proceeding. Have you guys had occasion to review this rule? That's Administrative Rule Site $301.08(d)(5) . W e l l, ~ I ' m$ going to get to (d) (5.) 301.08?
A. (Zysk) Not specifically, no.
Q. Okay. So let's walk through it. This particular rule is about the effects on public health and safety. I've highlighted the pertinent part here. Applications have to include the following information
regarding the effects of and plans for
avoiding, minimizing or mitigating the
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potential adverse effects of the proposed energy facility on public health and safety --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Slow down
when you read, please.
BY MS. MANZELLI:
Q. So, just walking through here, you can see

Section D applies to all energy facilities; right?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. And then, finally, getting to Section 5, you
can see that that requires a description of any additional measures taken or planned to avoid, minimize or mitigate the public health and safety impacts that would result. And here what I'm talking with you about, of course, is that first part from the construction, not from the operation, but from the construction of the proposed facility, and the alternative measures considered, but rejected by the Applicant.

Do you see that provision?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
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Q. Okay. So, based on what you've seen so far, new and old, have you seen anything from the Applicant that is a description of any additional measures taken or planned to avoid, minimize or mitigate, et cetera, as this rule discusses?
A. (Zysk) I know they put out and we did review some of their alternative route analysis that they did early on and rejected for various reasons to come up with the route they have now.
Q. And do you consider those to be public health-related reasons?
A. (Zysk) In part, yes.
Q. Okay. Anyone else?
A. (Taylor) I have nothing further to add.
Q. Okay. Now, I understand that some or perhaps all of you have you had an opportunity to review what I'll call the co-location study. Is that correct?
A. (Zysk) I have not reviewed that.
Q. And what $I$ was going to do is further identify the report that I'm talking about. This is... it's in the record in this case
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as Applicant's Exhibit 179. And it is from a company called Corrpro, and it's a Preliminary Interference Assessment.

So now that I have more specifically identified that, have any of you had a chance to review this?
A. (Alexander) Should we be seeing something on the screen?
Q. I don't have a hard copy with me.

MS. MANZELLI: I don't know, Dawn, if you're able to put Applicant's 179 on the screen. I can certainly try to put my own with the ELMO on my laptop. Thank you, Dawn.

BY MS. MANZELLI:
Q. So this is just the first page of what's -you know, it has a few pages following. Is it on your screen yet? There we go.
A. (Taylor) Just came up.
Q. Okay. So let me give you a moment to at least scan the first page here.
(Pause)
Q. Now, this was provided in this case under a cover letter dated June 30th, 2017, from Tom Getz, from the legal team from McLane
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Middleton. And let me just back up.
I see you guys studying this intently.
Does this look familiar to any of you? Do any of you have any recollection of having seen this before?
A. (Taylor) I have not reviewed this document, no.
A. (Bascom) I have not seen it.
A. (Zysk) Not this one, no.
Q. Okay. Have any of you reviewed any information about the gas pipeline that, if this project were to go through, this project would be co-located with that gas pipeline?
A. (Zysk) Any information? Yes.
Q. Okay. Could you identify what that information is?
A. (Zysk) I have a couple of different ones. I have one that's "Criteria for Pipelines Co-Existing with Electric Power Lines," dated October 2015, by the INGAA Foundation. And I have another one by the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. That is their guide for the influence of high-voltage DC power lines on metallic pipelines.
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Q. Thank you for that. And are these materials that you yourself researched and obtained? Or how did you get these materials?
A. (Zysk) I researched and obtained them myself.
Q. Okay. And why did you do that?
A. (Zysk) It was discussed at some point along the line.
Q. Okay. When you say "it," what do you mean?
A. (Zysk) The potential for co-location, it was brought up as a concern. And this was after we had submitted our testimony.
Q. Understood. It was probably about the time that this study was produced because there were some pleadings that led to the production of this study.

So I had some questions about whether this study was a preliminary study or whether this was a full and complete evaluation of all issues associated with such potential co-location. But what I'm hearing is you have not reviewed this study sufficiently to answer that type of question; is that correct?
A. (Taylor) That's correct.
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A. (Zysk) Yes.

Okay. So do you have concerns about the potential co-location of the proposed project with the Portland Natural Gas pipeline?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Location of the line was well known when they did their work. To the extent they had concerns, that could have and should have been raised.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Manzelli.
MS. MANZELLI: My understanding
is that the Application did not contain any information about the Portland Natural Gas pipeline and that it was only through the course of this calendar year that this study was produced and further information was known. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's well known where the Portland Natural Gas line is and that this was going to be co-located. That's been known from the beginning.

MS. MANZELLI: My understanding
is that was not depicted on the original set of project maps.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's sustained.

MS. MANZELLI: Mr. Chair, could you please explain the rationale for why that is sustained?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Everyone knows where the Portland Natural Gas transmission line is. Everybody knows that the existing corridor is co-located with it and this is going in the same corridor. That's been known from the beginning.

MS. MANZELLI: And so we're not allowed -- I'm not allowed to ask the witnesses questions about it because it is not, quote, unquote, "new information"?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If they had opinions about it and concerns about it, they were free to express them in their prefiled testimony. I'm not going to expand the scope of their prefiled testimony.

MS. MANZELLI: Are you making a ruling that the Counsel for the Public's witnesses, what they may think about the Portland Natural Gas pipeline co-location is
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irrelevant or immaterial or unduly repetitious? CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't think I'm ruling any of those. I sustained the objection to your question on the grounds that if they had opinions about it, they needed to be expressed in their prefiled testimony. And as we've gone over numerous times in the cross-examination of witnesses other than the Applicant's witnesses, because they are different in this context, we're not going beyond the scope of their prefiled testimony. If there's new information that has come in, and there's been plenty of new information, then intervenors are free to ask about that. And there was another exception, the true clarification. There was the "I don't understand something" question when a legitimate "I don't understand." And there's been a few of those as well.

MS. MANZELLI: Yeah. And let me just clarify a word that you just said. An "exception" to what? You just said there was another exception, and then you stated what that was. An exception --
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're not going to play games, Ms. Manzelli.

MS. MANZELLI: I'm not --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The objection's sustained. If you want to have a conversation with some of the other intervenors about prior rulings that have happened orally when others have been questioning, I encourage you to confer with Mr. Pappas, Mr. Aslin or any of the other lawyers who have been here.

MS. MANZELLI: Mr. Chair, let me assure you that $I$ have had such conferences, and I have reviewed the --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't you ask your next question, Ms. Manzelli.

MS. MANZELLI: -- transcripts at length.

I'd like to make an oral objection to the ruling on the question that I just tried to ask and to the manner in which cross-examination has been handled for Track 3. So, my understanding --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Track 3?
MS . MANZELLI: Sorry. My
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understanding of Track 3 is the Counsel for the Public's witnesses and the intervenors' witnesses.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Everybody but the Applicant.

MS. MANZELLI: Yes. Track 1 was the first part of the Applicant; Track 2, the second part of the Applicant; Track 3, Counsel for the Public and Intervenors. That's what I meant when I said Track 3.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So you want to take time right now to make a motion of some sort or a request for reconsideration or -what exactly are we doing here instead of asking questions of the witnesses who are in front of you?

MS. MANZELLI: And I am prepared to ask questions. I don't agree with the limitations put on the questions I'm attempting to ask, and so I'd like to make a statement on the record about the Forest Society's position on those limitations. And I'd like to make this on the record so that $I$ don't have to do it again, so that we can just state our
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objection and then move on so the rest of the many witnesses we have for what I refer to as Track 3, we don't have to keep doing this. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

Whatcha got?
MS. MANZELLI: All right. I
want to first touch on the procedural history of how I understand this issue has come to the floor today.

On March 7th, 2017, Applicants made a motion to clarify the use of "friendly cross-examination." The Forest Society objected to that. On March 31st, 2017, the Chair issued an order. It recited the correct standards, RSA 541-A:33, IV and Administrative Rule Site 202.11, and it denied the motion. In particular, it said, quote, "The Presiding Officer cannot, as requested by the Applicant, make a prehearing determination that all friendly cross-examination will impede the prompt and orderly conduct of the proceeding. Such a determination must be made during the course of the proceeding." That was at Pages 3 and
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4. So that was March of this year.

Next up, more recently in
August, the Applicants filed another motion to determine the extent of friendly cross. That requested an order, quote, "requiring an offer of proof at a prehearing conference..." I'll skip rest of that. The Forest Society again objected.

The written order came out on September $12 t h$, and it denied the specific request. It denied the request for a prehearing conference; but otherwise, it granted the motion.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Oh, I would disagree with that statement.

MS. MANZELLI: I have a quote.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Go ahead.
MS. MANZELLI: It ordered,
quote, "On or [sic] before September 22, 2017, each intervenor shall file a list identifying each witness that the intervenor seeks to cross-examine (excluding the remaining Applicant witnesses). Regarding each witness or witness panel, the list shall include the
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following information: Whether the examining party believes that its position is adverse to the witness, including all reasons; and if the examining party is not adverse to the witness, the examining party must identify the areas of cross-examination and why cross-examination is necessary to a full and true disclosure of the facts." And that was part of the order at Pages 3 and 4.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And where was the word "granted" in that order?

MS. MANZELLI: I don't know if the word "granted" was in that order. So I am happy --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good call.
MS. MANZELLI: -- striking that
characterization. But I do think that I have accurately quoted the order.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And has anyone been prevented from asking questions of a witness categorically? You're not adverse and you haven't adequately identified the reasons. Answer, no. It has all been done on a question-by-question basis, as stated in the
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March 31st Order. So we are proceeding consistently with that. No one who filed either good-faith or not good-faith responses to the Order you were talking about has been told, no, you may not ask questions because you didn't adequately identify anything. Because many people did not take that effort seriously other than putting a lot of time into preserving every possible angle, every possible reason they might ask a witness a question. But no one was stopped. No order has been entered orally or otherwise preventing any intervenor from questioning witnesses.

Specific questions have drawn objections. Many of those objections have been overruled. Many objections have been sustained.

MS. MANZELLI: Following that
order, the Forest Society moved for rehearing, many other parties have joined, and that motion is now pending.

The next part of the
procedural history is that on October 6th there were a series of rulings that you've just described specific to questions that
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arose at the first time -- or the first day that cross-examination of non-Northern Pass witnesses occurred; and in this case, it was a witness for the Counsel for the Public.

Over the course of
October 6th, the Chair made several rulings contained throughout the hundreds of pages of transcripts that day. And I would submit that these rulings were not entirely clear when they were made and have not become clear over the course of time. There is no written order, they are not consistent with each other, and they're not implemented consistently among all witnesses. In particular, it seems that the most stringent approach is with represented intervenors, the medium stringent is for Counsel for the Public, and the least stringent is with the pro se intervenors. Now, we have tried to understand what these limits are, and the gist seems to be that all witnesses for all intervenors, and Counsel for the Public, are friendly to each other; in other words, they are non-adverse; and further, this so-called
"friendly cross" is not allowed unless, and there are a couple of exceptions, and that's why I asked earlier when you were making an exception, to what were you making an exception.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Manzelli, do you have any further questions for this panel?

MS. MANZELLI: Yes, I do.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Whatever you need to say further beyond what you've said you need to put in writing.

MS. MANZELLI: Mr. Chair, we are in the process of writing a motion for rehearing based on the October 6th rulings from the Bench. But I would point out that that motion is not due for 30 days from the time of those rulings; yet, the proceedings are under way. I certainly don't want to put the proceedings on hold.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes, actually, you do. But you're not going to make that request because it would be outrageous.

So what is your next question
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for the witnesses who are in front of you waiting to be asked another question?

MS. MANZELLI: With all due respect, the Forest Society does not wish to delay these proceedings.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: What is the next question you have for the witnesses in front you? If you do not one ask one, I will assume you have no more.

MS. MANZELLI: I just want to make sure that I'm clear with what's happening now, is that $I$ am not allowed to state an objection on the record to a question that $I$ tried to --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: An objection to what?

MS. MANZELLI: To the limitation that has been placed upon the Forest Society in undertaking cross-examination of the Counsel for the Public's witnesses. If I understand that correctly, I'm ready to move on to my next questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And you are
free to make offers of proof regarding
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questions to which objections are sustained. If you choose to take advantage of that, that's fine. If you have concerns about what you perceive to be inconsistent rulings, you need to put that in writing. And whether you think you have 30 days -- if you have a problem, you should alert the tribunal in writing when you can. It's not going to get addressed orally. MS. MANZELLI: Understood. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do you want to make an offer of proof on the question, the objection to which was sustained --

MS. MANZELLI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- if they were allowed to testify.

MS. MANZELLI: Yes. I have some concrete illustrations from today of how I believe that a different standard is being used for witnesses that appear to be friendly. But I'm working through the determination to not raise that any further right now and make my offer of proof.

So I would like -- I would
have discussed with this panel the fact that
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the co-location study that was done by the Applicant was preliminary in nature and was not a full analysis of the issues associated with the prospective co-location. All right. Next topic.

MS. MANZELLI: Dawn, could you please turn on the ELMO?

BY MS. MANZELLI:
Q. All right. This is one of the project maps. I believe this is Applicant's Exhibit 2. Is that correct? It's Bates stamped APP 67741. And you can see here that this depicts a portion of the proposed route in Clarksville. Is it up on your screen?
A. (Taylor) It is.
A. (Alexander) Yes.

MS. MANZELLI: Now, I do want to
state for the record, $I$ understand that this is the August version of the plan set and that a more recent plan set is available. I don't have that with me today. But I don't think that it affects my questions here.

BY MS. MANZELLI:
Q. So are you aware generally -- well, first of
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all, are you aware that the Forest Society has some property ownership on this side of the river?
A. (Taylor) I am not aware of that, no.
Q. Are you aware of a parking lot maintained in this vicinity here, right near to the right of the symbol of Route 3 ?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. That's the Forest Society's parking lot that they maintain for fishing access to the river. Based on the testimony that you rendered earlier today and your understanding of the exception requests, what do you think will be the impact to that parking lot if this project were to be constructed?
A. (Taylor) If $I$ have the area correctly, there's I recall an HDD entry pit just south of that area, with the work area extending to the south. So, impacts would be during construction with the one lane of traffic, presumably next to the HDD entry pit work area, getting through that work zone. And in this case, it would be a northbound right-hand turn in; or conversely, if you
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were exiting and taking a right-hand going north, there would be interplay with the traffic stacking.
Q. Understood. And do I understand from your testimony this morning that that impact would exist for at least six weeks?
A. (Taylor) I'd have to go back and look at that exception request for what they were indicating. But that sounds correct.
Q. And generally, that would be if things go according to plan. So it could be longer, but we don't know how it's going to unfold.
A. (Taylor) Correct.
Q. This is from the same exhibit. This is Bates stamped APP 67843. And this shows some of the Kauffmann Forest, which is owned by the Forest Society. I think it's going to be very faint on your screen. But can you see the label "Kauffmann tract," "Kauffmann tract" --
A. (Taylor) Yes.
Q. Okay. So you agree that in some locations, and this is one example, that the height of the poles is planned to be greater than the
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distance from the base of the pole to the edge of the right-of-way; right?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
There's nothing new here at all. This pertains to testimony that was previously filed.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Manzelli.
MS. MANZELLI: Same response,
that there should be no prohibition to addressing information that is relevant, material and not unduly repetitious.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained.
MS. MANZELLI: So I'd like to make an offer of proof, that $I$ would have discussed with this panel their opinion, if they had any, about the risk of infrastructure, Northern Pass infrastructure falling outside of the right-of-way; and if it were to be designed to not fall in a tipping-over fashion, but to fall in more of a crumbling fashion, whether they would have concerns with large towers crumbling in a narrow right-of-way where there is also co-located an underground gas pipeline.

BY MS. MANZELLI:
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Q. All right. Given the revisions to the project maps that have occurred this year -and let me back up for a second and strike that question.

My understanding is that there were something like a 188 exception requests made to DOT and that all of the exception requests that have not yet been granted have been withdrawn. Are you aware of that?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
Q. Okay. So I want to ask you a question that includes an assumption that the exception requests were granted. And so I'm asking you to assume that all of the exception requests that were not withdrawn -- or excuse me -that were withdrawn, were actually not withdrawn and that they were granted. Okay? So in other words, if the Project were to be built as described in the exception requests that have been approved and the exception requests that have been withdrawn, if that was the Project that was built, do you have an opinion on how long the construction period would be?
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A. (Taylor) A specific time frame, no. However, of the exception requests that I have reviewed where the open trench is crossing the road and then crossing back, it's my opinion that $I$ would expect some level of increased project time if additional crews were not put on the overall job.
Q. Are you able to quantify that addition, either by order of magnitude or percentage?
A. (Taylor) Not as I sit here. But as I stated, I believe earlier this morning, the fact that it's a longer route inherently because you're crossing the road then crossing back, and there are multiple traffic control set-ups, that leads me to the conclusion that it likely would be longer.
Q. And does the duration depend on what time of the year construction would begin? In other words, does it matter if it was started in April of 2018 or October of 2018?
A. (Taylor) I'm not sure I fully understand your question.
Q. Let me try to explain it without just saying
it again. You know, sometimes seasonality,
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the season of the year that a construction project commences, would have construction benefits, in that things could move a little bit more quickly, and sometimes it would be an impediment, such that things would move a little bit more slowly. So I'm asking if you're generally stating that construction would take longer if all the exception requests were granted. So I'm asking you would it take even longer if it started at certain times of the year? Or does that not even matter? No matter what time of the year it starts, it's going to take whatever it takes?
A. (Taylor) Assuming a full work year, it's
logical to project they get the same number logical to project they get the same number of work days whether they start at one time or another. You may have a slower rate if you start at a different time of year -- for example, if you had a long string of inclement weather, if that was typical for that time of year versus a time period where that is not the case. But from a yearly standpoint, the number of yearly work days $I$
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
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would assume to even out.
A. (Bascom) To add to what David said, I would make the additional comment that, if the work were to start in the middle of a construction season, there might be an additional
mobilization because it spans three years as opposed to two calendar years.
Q. Okay. I want to talk with you about --
letter was referenced earlier today, I
believe. This is the August 11, 2017 letter,
which is Applicant's Exhibit 220 and also
Counsel for the Public Exhibit 493. Have you guys seen this letter? And this is the
letter that encloses the comments from DOT
finding the proposed survey to be not
acceptable.
A. (Taylor) Yes.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. And just to show you the whole thing here, it encloses just a brief one-page memo. Are you familiar with this?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
encloses just a brief one-page memo. Are you
familiar with this?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] \{10-23-17\}
A. (Bascom) Yes.
Q. Now, according to this, DOT is looking for, quote, "accurate locations defined by ground survey," end quote, for purposes of defining the right-of-way; right?
A. (Zysk) Hmm-hmm.
A. (Taylor) Correct.
Q. I think you agreed to this earlier, but let me just -- earlier today, but let me just clarify.

Do you agree that you cannot accurately determine whether the Project as proposed would go into privately-owned property because the right-of-way has not been defined by a ground survey showing accurate locations?
A. (Taylor) That's correct.
Q. And would it be helpful in this case for DOT to exercise its statutory authority to survey the right-of-way itself?
A. (Taylor) I would defer to DOT on that matter.
Q. Would it be helpful to you in your analysis of whether this project did or did not go into private property rights if had you a
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survey from DOT?
A. (Zysk) A survey approved by DOT, whether they did it or somebody else did it.
Q. Can you help me understand, is there a distinction between a boundary line survey and something less than a boundary line survey?
A. (Taylor) Short answer is yes. I'll speak to this at a high level. That's a pretty broad of set of variables that you gave.

A boundary survey implies that it has been surveyed and certified by a licensed surveyor using deeds and field monumentation and whatever readily-available documents. The other term I think you used, boundary determination --
Q. Just something less.
A. (Taylor) There's many things that are less than that, both from a deed and plotted. It could be readily-available GIS information that you couldn't define the source and the accuracy of. Sure.
Q. In your opinion, do we need a boundary line survey to define the right-of-way adequately
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
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enough to determine if the Project does or does not go onto private property?
A. (Taylor) I wouldn't -- I can't say a boundary line survey. But I think what would helpful is if there were a survey and a right-of-way line that were represented and backed by a licensed surveyor that took into account the various deeds and plats and field monumentation so that an accurate representation could be put forward. Even if it uncovered uncertainties, there would be no uncertainties at that point.
Q. So, with respect to any uncertainties that you just identified might exist, are you aware that for areas where the boundary of the right-of-way cannot be ascertained with certainty, that the Applicant plans to establish the boundary with DOT through prescriptive rights?
A. (Taylor) I'm generally aware that's being considered.
Q. And do you have any concerns about that?
A. (Taylor) I wouldn't say I have concerns, no.
Q. Are you familiar with such a process?
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A. (Taylor) I have been on projects where that has come into play in the past, yes.
Q. Can you describe that for me?
A. (Taylor) Sure. So, from a prescriptive standpoint, if an area of land has been used for a certain time period, per regulatory requirements it could be construed as that entity or person's property, or they have a right to it. And that could influence the ultimate boundary or easement or right-of-way location, sure.
Q. And are you talking -- the process that you're talking about, does that involve the determination by a court about who owns what or who has what property rights to what land?
A. (Taylor) I haven't been involved with a project to that level. My experience has been at the agency level at the state or county where the parties gather all available information and in the end come to an agreement as to what the land rights are.
Q. And in that case, when you say "the parties," do you include in that the abutting private property owners?
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A. (Taylor) For the examples that I've been in, it was the property owner in question, and the agency in this case $I$ believe it was the state highway. I don't recall abutting, adjacent property owners who were not proximal or immediate to the area in question.
Q. I just got a little bit confused by the last part of what you said there. Did you say that the process did not include abutting property owners who were not nearby?
A. (Taylor) That's correct. In the examples that $I$ have been a part of, the area in question was wholly within a tract boundary. So, adjacent owners were not necessarily close to the area in question; therefore, $I$ believe that's why they weren't included.
Q. All right. Are you aware that, even though the exception requests have been withdrawn, my understanding is still that the Project plan is for all of the HDD to go under pavement or under gravel, under the traveled way of the road? Are you aware of that?
A. (Taylor) I haven't reviewed all of the
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
exemption requests, but I'll accept that as accurate.
Q. Is that your general understanding, that where there's HDD, it's going to be under the traveled way?
A. (Taylor) I wouldn't say in all cases.
A. (Zysk) It's going to be within the
right-of-way, but not necessarily under the traveled way.
Q. Okay. When you design a project and you apprise yourself of what the requirements would be from a document like the Utility Accommodation Manual, and you decide for whatever reason that you need to deviate from the requirements in that Utility Accommodation Manual, or analogue publication for a different state, would you file your special exception requests at the time you submit your application -- excuse me -- your exception requests at the time you submit your application, or would you file them a couple years later?
A. (Taylor) It depends on the agency
requirements and the staging of what I'll
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call the "entitlement process." Although, I will say, generally speaking, exceptions to the rules that you need to follow, they're generally identified. The level of specificity is often longer in duration, $I$ would say, as opposed to doing none.
Q. When you say that they're generally identified, at what time would you generally identify those?
A. (Taylor) For linear projects such as this, typically in the 30 -percent range. As a design team, we're aware of those types of issues.
Q. Have you had the opportunity, or are you aware of the Massachusetts Request for Proposals process, the Mass. RFP?
A. (Taylor) I'm not personally familiar with it.
A. (Bascom) I am generally aware of it.
A. (Alexander) Yes.
Q. Have either of you had an opportunity to review the Northern Pass bids into the Massachusetts RFP?
A. (Bascom) I have not.
A. (Zysk) I have not.
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A. (Alexander) I have not.
Q. Are you generally aware that one of the bids is for a hundred percent hydropower and one of the bids is for a combination of hydropower and wind power?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Relevance, and how does it bear on the testimony of this panel?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Manzelli.
MS. MANZELLI: I would like to ask them if they have studied anything about the wind aspect of one of those bids.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why is it relevant?

MS. MANZELLI: Because it
appears that, while it may not be clear in this docket, it appears that in other -- that in connection with the Massachusetts RFP, the Applicant is holding out this process as the process through which the combination wind-hydropower project would be approved. So I want to know if they have seen anything in this docket about a wind part of this proposal.
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Man relevant?
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'll sustain the objection on relevance grounds, among others, I think, but at least relevance. MS. MANZELLI: Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Let's take a 10-minute break.
(Recess was taken at 2:50 p.m.
and the hearing resumed at 3:12 p.m..)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Next up is Mr. Thompson. Are you ready to go?
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. THOMPSON :
Q. Are you ready, gentleman? My name is Brad Thompson. I'm spokesman for the intervenor group of abutters and non-abutters of Pittsburg, Clarksville and Stewartstown. I've been allotted about three hours. And I'm certain, just so you can plan, that I won't be using that much time, if that's okay.

First of all, just to hit on a couple quick subjects and just kind of for clarification. We've heard quite a bit about
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the exception requests. I'm a little bit confused because I'm not -- being in the construction business for many years, I'm not used to this leniency. Is this a typical technique used in the energy construction field, or is it a technique that you gentlemen are exposed to often? Whoever wants to answer any of these questions can.
A. (Taylor) Are you referring to the fact that there is an exception request?
Q. I'm not aiming at anyone. Just in general, it's the technique that $I$ didn't expect to find and that's being used. Is it common in this industry?
A. (Taylor) Are you referring to filing the exemption request?
Q. Yes.
A. (Taylor) If there's a rule or a regulation that's not being followed, or you would like it to be considered in another manner, then some version of an exemption, or another name it may be called, yes.
Q. My first opinion when $I$ started seeing these come out was that it kind of takes away from
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the competitive bidding process. Any thoughts on that? I mean, how do you bid on a project of this size, $\$ 1.6$ billion, knowing you can ask for exception requests and changes, depending on a number of reasons? Maybe there's a better way to do it or a more convenient way or a cheaper way or less destructive way, part of what's available.
A. (Bowes) I guess $I$ would respond that typically in a competitive bidding process, the selected supplier or contractor -- a determination is made about the selected supplier or contractor to provide the system that's being purchased, and at that point is when exemption requests might come into play, with the understanding that at the bidding process usually there's an equal, or intended to be equal playing field for all the potential suppliers.
Q. Is it possible to equate it at all to a change order? And is there money involved when one of these requests are permitted?
A. (Zysk) These are requests regarding the design. If they're denied or granted,
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whatever gets set is what goes into the bid documents.
Q. And then the next step down the road would be to evaluate if it's more costly or less costly, or not?
A. (Zysk) That would be reflected in the contractors' bids.
Q. Haven't they already bid? We have a general contractor, PAR Electric.
A. (Zysk) I don't think they have any construction contracts bid.
A. (Bascom) I think the situation with the Applicant's project is that they've assembled a team and are trying to do a project, in comparison to a competitive bidding process which is normally associated with a public sector-type project or a private-sector project where more than one supplier of a system could be offering services or equipment. So I think it's a different
scenario. And in any case, as David mentioned, the deviation from accepted rules, laws or practices to either make a project less costly or easier to construct would be
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put forth in some type of a request. And in the context of this forum, that's determined -- that is an exemption request.
Q. Thank you.

Moving along, another aspect that I'm used to, and I guess I'll ask any one of you, in projects like this, is it typical that each town, if they so desire, would be represented by a clerk of the works? Is that common?
A. (Bascom) From my experience, the jurisdiction where a project is going to be installed would have an interest in the project and therefore be a stakeholder and probably have their own representation, either collectively with others or individually. If I understood your question correctly, that's my general experience.
Q. There would be some logic in the possibility that our three towns could be represented by one clerk of the works. And their job would be, I assume, and do you agree, to protect the town, represent them in being sure that proper technique is performed?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}

A. (Bascom) I mean, you know, any agreement among agreeing parties is I think acceptable among the parties.
Q. Yeah. If our towns decided to have a clerk of the works representative, who would you say should pay for it?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Relevance and beyond the scope of the testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Thompson. It does seem a little out there in terms of relevance. Why does it matter?

MR. THOMPSON: Well, it matters because I'm a taxpayer.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If you had such a thing, it would matter if it were happening. But in terms of what we have in front of us, what part of this case is that relevant to?

MR. THOMPSON: I guess I'm just trying to get a feel for the overall game plan as we possibly could move forward.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I mean, I think you got their sense of the overall game
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planning. I think you've probably run this as far as is appropriate. I'll sustain the objection and ask you to move on.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. Will you accept my statement that there's at least some confusion as to whether direct burial is actually under the gravel and pavement roads or in the ditches of the municipal roads in Clarksville and Stewartstown?
A. (Taylor) I think either the plans or whether they're under the road or outside.
Q. So as far as you know, there haven't been any changes from the original documents, as far as where the...
A. (Taylor) Beyond the exemption requests, I'm not aware of anything else.
Q. All right. Thank you.

In that case, we can expect that burial in and under the dirt and paved roads of our towns will be built according to the plans and will include typical excavation around
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-

5 feet and setting the conduit, the fluidized fill, concrete, and more fluidized fill.

That is the planned approach.
A. (Taylor) That's my understanding.
Q. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Bowes stated, when the Northern Pass construction crew gathered here three weeks ago, called back for more questioning, stated that he'd like to see the cables, when they intersect or come in contact with other utilities crossing perpendicular on the road, would like to go over those utilities rather than under?
A. (Taylor) I recall.
Q. You do?
A. (Taylor) Yeah.
Q. Would you say that having the lines above utilities presents a serious obstacle and cost to future development of property owners on these town roads?
A. (Taylor) It could, and I would say it would vary or a case-by-case basis.
Q. Could you also agree that this could very well add devaluation to the private property owners' property along our roads?
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Beyond the scope of their testimony.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Thompson, this is the construction panel.
MR. THOMPSON: All right. I'll move on. Thank you.

BY MR. THOMPSON :
Q. You agree that if a property owner on one side of the street needs to get electric across to the other side of the road to a power line and wants to do it underground, which is logical, there'll be extra effort and cost involved if he has to go under the 5-foot typical direct burial?
A. (Taylor) I'll accept that.
Q. And then the long and short of it, that has to be looked at as extra costs to whatever project he may be doing.
A. (Taylor) Correct.
Q. Thank you.

MR
co
to be looked at as extra costs to whatever

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { And this could be defined, the extra } \\
& \text { efforts involved could be defined as "unduly } \\
& \text { interference with the orderly development of } \\
& \text { the region." } \\
& \text { \{SEC 2015-06\}[Day } 50 \text { AFTERNOON Session ONLY] \{10-23-17\} }
\end{aligned}
$$

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Calls for legal conclusion.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Seems like there's a lot of logic in that question.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Again, this is the construction panel talking about how to build and what the ramifications of it are, not necessarily about the long-term economic or even short- or immediate-term economic aspects regarding development.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. Okay. CFP 002991, which we saw earlier today --

MS. MERRIGAN: Dawn, could you please switch to my system?

BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. This is Google Earth coming up of the intersection of Creampoke Road, North Hill and Old County. If you look from the top of the page coming down, that's Creampoke Road coming up gradual uphill from Route 145.
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Does this make sense, look familiar?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
A. (Bascom) Yes.
Q. Actually want to concentrate on a bridge down Creampoke Road about 300 feet.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay, Pam.
BY MR. THOMPSON :
Q. Are you familiar with the --

MS. MONROE: Need the ELMO.
MR. THOMPSON: I'm sorry.
BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. Are you familiar with the crossing of one of of those three roads?
A. (Bascom) I'm familiar with it because I went down that road by mistake.
Q. Not good this year.

Creampoke Road, for those who need direction, is an access off of Route 145, state highway which goes Colebrook to Pittsburg to go up to the many homes up in that area of Old County Road, North Hill and Creampoke.
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A. (Bascom) I'm familiar with it because I went
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Looking at the picture of my pickup, would you call this a single-lane bridge?
A. (Taylor) I think we would agree, yeah.
Q. Would you agree that this Creampoke Road -and Mr . Bascom, since you recognize it and seen it, this is a major, or will have to be, clearly, a major access road for construction vehicles working on the south end of Old County Road or the north side of North Hill Road.
A. (Bascom) I would agree with that characterization, yes.
Q. Thank you.

Would you care to speculate, on an average day of construction, the number of vehicles that probably -- or definitely would have to cross this bridge going up to the job site? And I know I'm speculating but --
A. (Bascom) I could not speculate without knowing a construction plan in more detail.
Q. Correct. At some point in time there's going to be a lot of vehicles crossing that bridge in the next two-year span that would involve construction; correct?
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A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. Would you think that a traffic control person -- or lights would be necessary at this bridge to control any possible conflicts?
A. (Taylor) I would reiterate Mr. Bascom's comment, that without a traffic control plan in more detail as to how the vehicles are going to be routed, it's difficult to say.
A. (Zysk) Hard to say.
A. (Taylor) Yeah.
Q. Thank you. Will you accept my comment that two and a half, three weeks ago when the construction panel was here, Mr . Bowes referred to the possible use of trench plates, and he used as reasoning, among others, to speed up the construction process? Would you accept that?
A. (Taylor) I do.
Q. Thank you. Would one of you explain to everyone here -- describe first the trench plate and then some of the uses that it provides.
A. (Zysk) A trench plate is a piece of steel
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plate varying in size from 4 by 8 or smaller or bigger, typically 4 by 8, and they're used to temporarily cover a trench to allow access over it.
Q. Probably an inch thick would you say?
A. (Zysk) Probably an inch thick or heavier, yes.
Q. Yeah, 4 by 8 or conceivably much larger than that; would you say?
A. (Zysk) If available and they can get them to the site, yes.
Q. Yeah. In past testimony there's been
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. And am I correct that a typical 1600-foot moving construction site would probably exist, where at the front end would be saw cutting, or perhaps even before that some layout, and at the tail end, 1600 feet back, would be probably temporary paving, with permanent paving at a later date? Would that --
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A. (Zysk) If they were moving in a chain, linear fashion, yes.
Q. Let's concentrate for a minute on part of that 1600 feet, and that's the area of excavation. And that could vary depending on the conditions.
A. (Zysk) Absolutely.
Q. You might get 20 feet done if you're on the Main Street in Plymouth, or you might get 200 feet done if you're on North Hill in good digging; correct?
A. (Zysk) Correct. Yes.
Q. I'd like to go through a day's work of what would happen at that 200-foot of area and concentrate a little bit on timing that the road -- and for simplicity, let's think about the town roads in Clarksville and Stewartstown.

Correct that you'd start off in the morning first thing by removing the plates of the 200 feet that you did from the day before in order to get the job going for the day? That probably logically be one of the first things you do?
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A. (Zysk) Sure.
Q. Or at some point you'd have to do it.
A. (Zysk) Early on, yes, if that was your next step in your process.
Q. Then excavate the 200 feet, the next 200 feet, as you're probably finishing up on the back 200 feet from yesterday.
A. (Zysk) Sure.
Q. You'd excavate the new 200 feet and place the conduit.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. And bring in a Ready Mix truck?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. Pour flowable fill?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, objection. Sounds like we're just walking through general testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Thompson.
MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Bowes made the comment that he was going to make use of trench plates and the reasons for it. And I'm going to argue, and it won't take me long, that there are reasons why you wouldn't want to do
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it.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
I'll overrule the objection. You can continue.
BY MR. THOMPSON :
Q. So a typical day, we've spent some time taking the plates off. That requires, am I correct, that a machine would have to come in and pick the plates up, take them and store them someplace nearby? Closer the better; right?
A. (Zysk) Yes. If they can put it right next to the trench, that's ideal.
Q. That's ideal.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. But the fact is that it's 200 feet. Let's say we're using 8-by-12 plates.
A. (Zysk) Okay.
Q. That's going to require 17 or 16 plates. How long do you think it would take to remove those plates? Thirty, 40 minutes sound good?
A. (Zysk) Yeah, between that, up to an hour.
Q. All right. Let's say 45 minutes.

Then, later on, after you've dug the ditch, set the conduit, you're going to pour
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the flowable fill.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. That has to be poured out of a Ready Mix truck.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. We've seen photos here of a Ready Mix truck pouring, and he's clearly in the next lane to where the ditch is; correct?
A. (Zysk) That would be the fastest way to do it. If there were other constraints, they could transfer the material to an intermediate vehicle to bring it to the trench to deposit it. But yes, pouring it straight out of the mixer would be the best way to do it.
Q. But even if there was another transport, it would still eat up and use both lanes to place the concrete in the ditch.
A. (Zysk) If they were working in a linear fashion, not necessarily.
Q. Define "lineal fashion."
A. (Zysk) Based on one of the graphics that was shown earlier, where everything is within the one travel lane. And it would extend the
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time because vehicles would have to swap places, potentially.
Q. The Ready Mix truck's going to be behind the excavator that's going to bucket material into the ditch, and the Ready Mix truck is straddling the ditch as he's backing down?
A. (Zysk) Could be.
Q. Really? Thank you.

So we're not going to close that second lane or pour in the concrete?
A. (Bascom) I would say typical construction practice would be to dispatch concrete from an adjacent lane directly from a concrete truck, although it's possible it could be done in a linear fashion.
A. (Zysk) Right. Again, depends on the criteria that's set.
Q. That would probably --
A. (Zysk) -- in that specific location.
Q. -- cut into the production time definitely.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. And then there's two more steps with concrete. The protection layer, the 6-inch protection layer, a second pouring. And then
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state highways apparently are not going to have fluidized thermal backfill above the protection, but town roads still do. That would be a third pouring that we'd be facing.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. So if we take a worst-case scenario, or a best case, depending how you define it, and do have the concrete out of the second lane, which it's hard to -- wouldn't you say it's hard to believe that that could occur for 60 miles of not using the second lane? Be pretty cumbersome.
A. (Zysk) Yes, that would be difficult.
Q. Yeah. Would you project 10 minutes to dump a 9-yard load of concrete? Not going to take long to pour it in a ditch.
A. (Zysk) Probably not, no. Yeah, that's not unreasonable.
Q. So in that 200 feet, if my figures are correct, would you agree that 29 yards of flowable fill, 10 yards of protective concrete, and 51 yards of flowable fill above the protective concrete, representing 8 loads of concrete at 10 minutes apiece, that road,
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if poured out of the other lane, will take an hour and 20 minutes a day? Would you accept that?
A. (Zysk) In total, yes.
Q. Thank you. And then the last step, because we got to remember we got concrete on concrete that's got -- one pour's got to set up at least somewhat before the second one can be poured and then the third. But at the end of the day the plates go back on.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. Took us 45 minutes to take the plates off. How long do you it'll take to put the plates on?
A. (Zysk) Probably longer.
Q. Say an hour?
A. (Zysk) Okay. Yes.
Q. Okay. I haven't kept track of the time. Maybe somebody else has. But we're talking three to four hours of time where that second lane more than likely will be obstructed and closed. Do you agree?
A. (Zysk) In total, yes.
Q. When you set the plates at the end of the
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day, is the idea that the plates are replacing the roadway as the traveled way in one lane, or wherever the construction's occurring?
A. (Zysk) In this instance, I would say yes.
Q. That's really what the whole point of the plate is, so you can get back to where the road can be used.
A. (Zysk) Correct.
Q. And setting the plates, you need to be somewhat careful to be using a fairly flat surface which typically an asphalt road offers; correct?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. In other words, you don't want the plate dipping and wiggling around and teetering.
A. (Zysk) Correct.
Q. How does it work on a dirt road, a typical dirt road? I mean, ideally the road would be level and flat. You could put the plates down and it sets there. But there's going to be extra effort involved to try to get the plates settled in.
A. (Zysk) I guess it depends on the extent of
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the disturbance to the road. But there is... they may have to take a little bit of time to level them out. But yes, it would be slightly longer than just placing them on top of a paved road.
Q. Thank you.

Splice pits. Would you accept my statement that the weight of one half of a splice pit per the plan documents -- which is 34 feet long, 10 feet wide, and each half 4 feet high, reinforced with 8-inch-thick walls and an 8-inch top and an 8-inch bottom -- that one half of that weighs just over 25 ton, almost 51,000 pounds?
A. (Taylor) I'll accept that.
Q. Are you aware that at the construction meeting reunion three weeks ago, when Mr.

Bowes and Mr. Johnson were asked what size crane was needed to lift one of these 25 -ton manholes and set it in place, they looked at each other and responded "probably 15- to 20ton crane"? Are you aware of that? Would you accept that?
A. (Taylor) I don't recall that statement.
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A. (Alexander) Do you know when that statement was made?
Q. It was made at the construction hearing three weeks ago. Would you accept it as having occurred?
A. (Alexander) Do you have a document or testimony that we could look at to verify, or a day that --
Q. It exists, but $I$ do not have it.
A. (Taylor) We'll accept that it was said. Just don't recall it specifically.
Q. Yeah, thank you.

Here's off a web site for Cote Crane in Lewiston, Maine, and 15- to 20-ton, the second one down, is the most typical of that. That would be what they would propose to pick up the crane -- or pick up half of a manhole.

Would you accept the fact that, based on the conditions, typical site conditions and the weight of the manhole, that in fact a 130-pound -- 130,000-pound crane with another 110,000 pounds of counterweight is necessary to safely set a 25 -ton, one-half splice pit?
A. (Alexander) There are a large number of
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variables that go into the selection of the crane, including the swing distance, pick height --
Q. Right.
A. (Alexander) -- distance it has to travel. So without knowing those factors, we can't speak to any specific type of crane that may or may not be used. Also, there are variations in the types of cranes that may be used, from hydraulic to boom variations. So, without selecting --
Q. And I will --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. Without selecting a specific location or type, it's hard for us to say what exact crane would be used in a specific location.
Q. Have any of you ever seen the setting of a splice pit with a crane?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
A. (Bascom) Yes.
Q. How about a 25 -ton splice pit?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
A. (Bascom) Yes.
Q. Do you remember the size crane that was
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needed?
A. (Bascom) I don't know the size --
Q. Any idea what it would look like?
A. (Bascom) -- but know the typical
characteristics.
Q. Is either a trench box or steel sheathing necessary for protection against the side walls of an excavated pit when you're going to set a splice pit?
A. (Taylor) Typically that's the case, yes.
Q. Otherwise, there's one heck of a lot of room; correct?
A. (Taylor) That's correct.
A. (Bascom) And due to the depth of the excavation for safety reasons.
Q. Sure.

Okay. Let's go to CS135 [sic], the crane.

MS. MONROE: 136 you mean?
MR. THOMPSON: No, 135.
MS. MONROE: I have -- okay.
Got it.
BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. There you go. Mr. Bascom, does this vehicle
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look something like a crane that probably set a 25-ton manhole?
A. (Bascom) I can't specifically say, other than it did have outriggers to support the crane.
Q. Would you accept the fact that this crane is typical of the ones at the bottom of the page on CS127?

MR. THOMPSON: The bottom -yeah, go back to that, Pam, for a minute. BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. You can see the yellow ones at the bottom, and they're -- if you look over to the right, they're all -- base weight of the vehicle is right at or around the 130,000-pound, and then it talks about the counterweight necessary. Would you accept my statement that the counterweight gets you to where you need to be in order to counterweight picking up about a 25-ton splice pit?
A. (Alexander) The amount of counterweight for any specific type of crane, again, is dependent on the swing, boom and distance that the weight has to travel and weight of the vehicle itself.
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Q. Right. I have some sketches now. They're a little crude, but I think they're descriptive.

MR. THOMPSON: Let's try...
let's go to CS136, Pam.
BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. If you can bear with me for my rather rough sketches, but descriptive, this is showing the key ingredient here, Mr. Alexander. The key number from the right-hand side is the splice pit inside a sheathing-created hole, with 5 feet of protection which is safety around the $10-b y-34$ pit. And the line going vertical down the page is the center line of the pit. The other line cutting down the middle is the center of the boom where it hooks to the truck. My numbers, if you add them up, half the pit is 17 feet; the hole is 5 feet to the sheathing; then the truck to the outriggers is 15; the outriggers are 30 -- and this is per specifications, 30 feet by 30 feet, the four round holes for the outriggers. So, center line to outriggers toward the pit is 15 feet, half of it. And
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then there's a somewhat unknown of how close you can get the truck to the sheathing. It's usually in the typical 5 to 15 , so $I$ averaged it at 10. And that bring us to 47 feet.

And Mr. Alexander, would you accept that is a lot of the important information that dictates how big a crane and how much counterweight you need to pick the 25-ton manhole off a flatbed and into the hole?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman,
I'm going to object. First of all, it's testimony. Second of all, to the extent that it's meant to be a hypothetical, I suppose that's fine. But $I$ believe that the record reflects that Mr. Bowes said it was going to be a 30- to 40-ton, over-the-road crane that they would be using.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Thompson.
MR. THOMPSON: My recollection's
15 to 20. And I'm certain I read it a couple days ago.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, you
can ask them to assume that's what he said.
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The record will reflect whatever it reflects. And if you want to ask them a hypothetical based on that assumption, you can do that. Although, you were moving toward testifying.

MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, yeah. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Don't apologize.

MR. THOMPSON: Try to stay away from that, sir.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Don't apologize.

BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. Hypothetically speaking, do you accept the numbers that $I$ have just gone through and come up with 47 feet center to center, that these are the types of numbers that are necessary to know what size crane is needed?
A. (Alexander) For the layout you provided on the sketch, given your assumptions, yes, those are dimensions that would be required to help select the crane.
Q. Hmm-hmm. And would you accept the fact that the center line to center line of the
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stabilizers at the end of the outriggers, 30 feet by 30 feet, from a safety point there's need for another 5 feet wider than the 30 by 30 , which will make it a 40-by-40 landing area for the crane? Would you accept that?
A. (Alexander) I can't speak to the 5 feet safety around the outriggers.
Q. Seems somewhat logical that you'd need some buildup on the landing beyond the center line of the outriggers.
A. (Alexander) It is likely some additional space would be needed.
Q. Yeah. Okay. Sketch 138. No, let's look at 137 for just a bit.

This simply takes it one step further.
This is looking sideways at it. You come up with 47 feet at the corner. It's not quite as far, depending on how close you can get the tractor trailer delivering the tank. But the point being, and you'll accept my sketch, that you do have a considerable reach. And then one way or another, you got to turn -and go to the third sketch, 138 -- you got to
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make the 180-degree turn. Accept that it's been determined that there are areas on especially Bear Rock Road where it's a three-rod-wide road, which is roughly 50 feet. Would you accept that?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
Q. As a matter of fact, where the Project comes down North Hill and turns up Bear Rock Road, which is a -- right there is a HDD drilling. Just beyond the HDD drilling there's a manhole at Grid No. 249+00 in the right-of-way. Would you accept, according to Steve Nicks, who testified last week, in his supplemental prefiled testimony, that in fact the Application scales to 50 feet at that manhole? You weren't here, but I'm offering that that is the case. And would you accept it?
A. (Taylor) While I haven't measured it, I'll accept that.
Q. That leads to the important issue, going back to page CS -- or stay with 138.

If you would make the assumption that you have a landing pad that's 40 by 40 , as
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the one we see on CS138, the box square encompassing the crane, and if you would make the assumption at the bottom of the page it's directly on the right-of-way, as close as it could possibly be, and at that manhole on Bear Rock Road -- and as a matter of fact, the next one 1800 feet up the road is the same thing, 50 feet -- if that landing area is 40 by 40 , how much right-of-way is left in the 50 feet?
A. (Taylor) Ten feet.
Q. Ten feet. Would you accept the fact that Ms.

Farrington, who was here as part of the construction crew, testified that the width of a lane to get through a construction site needs to be a minimum of 11 feet, even if it's off the side of the road in the gravel or something --
A. (Taylor) correct.
Q. -- 11 feet is the number? Based on my sketch, CS138, would you say the road's going to be closed during this whole process?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
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Q. Okay. Now I'd like to get a better understanding of the splice pits and the splicing process. Cs135. Mr. Bascom -MS. MERRIGAN: Hold on, Brad. Dawn, can you switch back to me, please? BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. Okay. Have you ever witnessed the splicing of a 320 kV cable?
A. (Bascom) I've witnessed the splicing of a 345 kV AC cable, yes.
Q. And I'm not overly familiar with this, but is 320 -- they keep talking about 320 kV cable. Is that a popular, used often size cable?
A. (Bascom) For an HVDC project, it's not uncommon.
Q. Looking at part of your technical report which is part of your prefiled testimony, it kind of hit it fairly quick, but quickly describe $I$ would say the splicing process very quickly.

First of all, the photo that we see here on Page 20 of what looks like a heavy-duty trailer, specialized trailer that hauls the reel, is that -- strike that. No, let's go
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back a couple steps.
$A B B$ is the provider of the cable;
correct?
A. (Bascom) That's my understanding.
Q. And they're the manufacturer also?
A. (Bascom) The terms are synonymous, unless I'm missing a subtlety that you're trying to make.
Q. No.
A. (Bascom) The supplier and provider are the person -- or the company that manufactures the cable is ABB.
Q. Right. Do you have any idea where they do this, where they're located to actually manufacture the cable?
A. (Bascom) I suspect they're located in Europe.
Q. So this is -- the process would probably be to ship it by ship to someplace like Boston or Portland or someplace and then haul it over the road to the job site.

Would it be hauled -- would you know if it would be hauled on a trailer and spool like this, or would they get delivered on a flatbed and then transferred?
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A. (Bascom) Normally the cable would be transported on a larger flatbed to a staging area. And then this particular piece of equipment is what $I$ would characterize as a reel cart. It would pick up the reel and bring it to the installation site, normally more locally to where the installation is going to take place. This type of a trailer is not intended for long-haul purposes on highways.
Q. All right. I suspected that. Thank you.

So the tractor trailer would show up. Might have two of those spools?
A. (Bascom) Potentially two or three, depending on the length of the cable being installed, yes.
Q. Would you accept my calculations that typically one of these spools is going to have in the vicinity of 2,000 feet, roughly a third of a mile, a little more a little less?
A. (Bascom) I would accept that, yes.
Q. And according to some documentation $I$ read, the weight of that is 20.9 pounds per linear foot. Will you accept that?
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A. (Bascom) That's in the range of what it could be, yes, depending on the construction of the cable.
Q. Add that spool. Wooden or steel?
A. (Bascom) Almost definitely would be a steel reel.
Q. Yup. Weighs another estimated two to three ton. Heavy. We are again looking at something in the vicinity of 23 to 25 tons. Will you accept that?
A. (Bascom) Yes, I would say approximately 40,000 to 50,000 pounds for --
Q. And a crane would be required at the staging site to take it off the truck at least once. If you had three on a trailer, you're going to put two on the ground and then need it again to load up, adding to the process; correct?
A. (Bascom) The crane would be necessary to unload the reels from a tractor-trailer. This particular piece of equipment that is in my report is actually capable of picking up a reel off the ground, so a crane is not required to load the reel onto the cart.
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Q. Got some kind of hydraulics --
A. (Bascom) Something like that.
Q. -- to lift it?
A. (Bascom) It picks up the arbor on the reel.
Q. I see that now.

The 320 kV cable's got enough
flexibility to be rolled up on the spool. So it must have enough flexibility to go down if it's a manhole application with a chimney, make the turn inside the manhole and then go into the conduit where it can get pulled. This cable apparently does have that much flexibility; correct?
A. (Bascom) It does. And if you'd like, I could refer you to a photograph in the Applicant's material, if we want to look at that. It's Applicant's Exhibit 227, Page APP 833386. Looks to be 37 th page of that reference. MS. MERRIGAN: Can you repeat the number again? WITNESS BASCOM: Sure. It's Applicant's Exhibit 227. MS. MERRIGAN: And the APP
number, please?
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WITNESS BASCOM: Is 833386.
(Discussion among witnesses.)
WITNESS BASCOM: Sorry. My mistake. It's 83386. I added an extra 3. BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. That's good. That is very descriptive. Thank you.
(Pause)
Q. So, here we see this is a 3-inch at minimum
diameter, and certainly it's showing good flexibility in being able to run it down into the manhole.
A. (Bascom) Approximate minimum radius of bend is about 20 times the outer diameter. And for a cable this size, it's probably on the order of 80 inches, 6 to 7 feet.
Q. Yup. Thank you.

Confusion started to set in on the difference between a splice pit and a manhole. You're using in your description of splicing, you're using the word "manhole." Care to try to define the difference between the two?
A. (Bascom) I would say typically a manhole is a

## . Yup.
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characteristic area where connection of underground utilities might take place, and the free space within the manhole is left open so that a worker or workers could re-enter that space on relatively short notice. A splice pit, in my characterization, may be filled with a thermal sand or it may be left open. And the terms, depending on the circumstance, might be synonymous.
Q. And certainly you could fill a manhole down the chimney with thermal backfill if you so wanted to.
A. (Bascom) Typically be a granular sand if that were the case. I'm not aware that that would be necessary or done in this particular situation.
Q. Getting back to your Page 20 , back where we were, CFP135 again. You talk about, and I assume it's a local expression of a -- let me find it here. I think it's called the "bread truck." Is that what you use to describe the unit that keeps all the tools and stuff you set on top of the manhole, Mr. Bascom?
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A. (Bascom) Yes. It's somewhat of a colloquialism for a box, an oversized box panel truck in which splicing equipment and other tools are contained. And they may also have environmental control that directly connects to the manhole chimney so that access to the manhole is also in a confined or controlled environment to minimize contaminants to the manhole during the splicing operation.
Q. Which is important?
A. (Bascom) It is.
Q. Yeah. Now, you also made the point, and so did ABB in their technical report which we're going to look at next, that in fact specialized splicers, finely trained, oftentimes provided by the manufacturer are used.
A. (Bascom) That's correct.
Q. You need somebody that really knows what they're doing.

Now it's CFP Ex 76. As comparison, now we're going to look at $A B B$, the manufacturer and supplier of the cable's definition of
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splicing. Page 10, I believe. And beginning on the second paragraph on Page 10 of 24 , it refers to custom splicing containers. That's more than likely the equivalent of your container that you work out of, would you say?
A. (Bascom) Yes.
Q. If you go to the next page, 11 , the upper
left shows a good-size container setting on the top of the manhole.

By the way, have you noticed that this ABB manual, technical proposal, is earmarked directly for Northern Pass? If you look in the upper left corner, it's a Northern Pass technical proposal?
A. (Bascom) I see that, yes.
Q. So it would appear that this manual was produced for this project and not just a generic manual?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. It was also produced in discovery. It's the same issue we talked about this morning with Mr .

Pappas. And it could have and should have been included.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Thompson, it seems like information that this panel could have included in its testimony if Counsel for the Public had wanted to. No? Do you agree or disagree?

MR. THOMPSON: Well, it sounds logical. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think Mr. Pappas concluded that, too, ultimately. So I'm going to sustain the objection and ask you to move on.

MR. THOMPSON: Yup.
BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. So I guess my big question is: If this
manual -- how would you respond to my
statement that, if this manual seemed to be designed for the Northern Pass project, would logic say that it should be followed?
A. (Bascom) I would say generally, yes, it should be followed.
Q. Yeah. And it's certainly got a lot more detail, which is not a criticism, but a lot more detail than you put in. But it must be for a reason.
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
A. (Bascom) Yes. In terms of my report, I was trying to characterize for the general audience the circumstances and steps in installing a cable system without specifically addressing one manufacturer's methods and means.
Q. They go into great length on Pages 10 and 11 of showing the custom splicing container and what it does. It's even showing, if you notice in the -- would you accept in the lower left corner of the Page 11 they use the words "AC," indicating to me that it must be air-conditioned, which, again, talks about the importance of clean environment? MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr.

Chair. We're still on the same document. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.

Thompson.
MR. THOMPSON: All right. I'm going to move on.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. Page 12, on top of everything else on Page 10 and 11, talks about the possibility of an
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alternate manhole versus --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Thompson, you should be moving off of this document because this document --

MR. THOMPSON: Oh, okay.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That's sort of the fundamental problem with this.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. All right. Guess we've made the point, or tried to. Thank you.

BY MR. THOMPSON:
Q. Last subject. Would you accept my saying that a couple weeks ago, when Mr . Bowes was here, he made the comment that there are no transmission lines buried in the state of New Hampshire at this time?
A. (Taylor) I don't recall him saying that, no.
Q. Page 59, Line 17 of the transcript will show that, if you'd like to take it out.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You want
him to assume that that's what it said for the purpose of this next question, or do you actually want to show him the page?

MR. THOMPSON: No.
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BY MR. THOMPSON :
Q. Would you accept the fact that on Page 59, Line 17 of the transcript two and a half weeks ago, that was the statement by Mr. Bowes?
A. (Taylor) I'll accept that.
Q. Thank you.

Mr. Bascom, at technical sessions we had a few months ago, $I$ asked you if you knew of any kV lines buried in the dirt road in a geographical area typical of northern New Hampshire. Do you recall that?
A. (Bascom) I do recall it, yes.
Q. And how many states would you say you're familiar and have worked in that are somewhat typical to the geographical area of northern

New Hampshire? I'm thinking of, for instance, northern New York state. Have you had projects --
A. (Bascom) Yes, I'm aware of projects in northern New York state and Connecticut, for that matter, if you consider that similar.
Q. Well, Connecticut, it's kind of out of the --weather-wise. How about Michigan?
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Wisconsin?
A. (Bascom) Michigan, Minneapolis or Minnesota. Q. You've worked in areas like that.

As we ended the day, $I$ asked you the same question, if you remembered any buried line in this type of geographical area. And as the end of the day came of our talk, I asked you to maybe look into it more or think about it. Since that technical session, have you found any dirt roads typical of northern New Hampshire with buried electric transmission lines?
A. (Bascom) I did not in the context of what you had asked. At the time, my response was that the installation of cables like that underneath dirt or gravel were typically confined to substation areas, or conventional utility projects would otherwise be underneath public roadways, asphalt-covered public roadways. So in that context, there's a limited basis for my experience in a dirt road situation.
Q. It's possible that none exist?
A. (Bascom) It's possible.
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Q. There might be a reason why they don't exist; isn't that true?
A. (Bascom) I think it's likely that some do exist, but I'm just not aware of them.
Q. Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: That's it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next on my list is Mr. Cunningham. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:
Q. You guys have been working hard. Thank you.

I'm not going to take very long.
My name is Art Cunningham. I'm an attorney, and I represent Kevin Spencer and Mark Legasse, who own -- or construct and own the Percy Lodge and Campground in Stark, New Hampshire. I'm also here as a representative of the Dummer, Stark, Northumberland Group. And are you familiar with that area of the Project?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
A. (Alexander) Yes.
A. (Zysk) In general, yes.
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Q. And have you been there?
A. (Taylor) Yes.
Q. And are you familiar with the Project at the Percy Lodge and Campground? That's the overhead portion of the Project.
A. (Taylor) I'm not familiar with the campground, no.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Taylor, no one can hear you at this point.
A. (Taylor) I'm not familiar with the campground.

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:
Q. Okay. That's fair enough.
A. (Alexander) Is this campground active or is it closed?
Q. Just about finished. It's active now, and the lodge is just about done. And I can tell you this, that the back of the lodge is somewhere between 3 - and 400 feet from the overhead portion of the line.

Okay. And I don't have many questions, but I did a pretty extensive cross-examination of the construction and environmental panel, the Applicant's
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construction and environmental panel. And a big concern my clients have, and the folks in Dummer, Stark and Northumberland have, are two: One is what blasting will have to be done in the Dummer, stark, Northumberland stretch of the Project; and two, what impact the co-location of these two high-voltage electric lines, both the DC line and the AC line, will have in terms of the safety of the Project.

So my first questions are: When you did your analysis and your testimony and prefiled testimony, what did you have in front of you?
A. (Taylor) I would refer to our response to one of the Applicant's data requests for the list of documents that we had. But I would say substantially for the overhead line what comes to mind are the various maps and plans which would show the alignment and the context of the line.
Q. Okay. And I'm not so much interested in the maps. I'm interested in the plans. What plans did you have?
A. (Taylor) Relative to the overhead?
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Q. Yes, to this particular section, the Dummer, Stark and Northumberland section.
A. (Taylor) Sure. I'm just drawing off of top my head. Appendix 47 comes to mind, which are in fact aerial maps, but it does show the location of the lines, the work pad areas, or crane pads, where the sediment and erosion control and other items, to the extent they were shown.
Q. Would you call those preliminary plans?
A. (Taylor) I wouldn't use the term "preliminary." But they definitely show the intent of where the line is to be located, where the work pads are to be placed. I wouldn't call them construction documents. I wouldn't go that far.
Q. That's my point. Those were not -- the plans that you looked at were not build plans, were they?
A. (Taylor) No.
Q. And in terms of percentage, I know in response to some questions you had earlier today from one of the cross-examiners, they weren't even 30 -percent plans, were they?
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A. (Taylor) I wouldn't say that. No, I wouldn't characterize it that way. Because 30-percent plans generally show alignment and where you're getting into type, size and location information. And it's beyond that point where you get into what $I$ would call the construction, more detailed level.
Q. And were they 10-percent plans?
A. (Taylor) No, they're more than 10 percent.

I'm going to say they're closer to the 30 percent because they're showing type, size and location. But $I$ wouldn't characterize that appendix as more than that.
Q. All right. And in terms of my client's concern and the folks in that stretch of Dummer, Stark and Northumberland, in the somewhere between $10-$ and 30 -percent plans, were you able to, with engineering precision, establish how many foundations would have to be built?
A. (Taylor) I don't recall that number, off the top of my head. But there are -- that could be calculated from the plans.
A. (Alexander) Yes. The plans that we had been
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provided showed locations of proposed foundations. So the ability to quantify and document those I believe were available.
Q. And according to the record, and this is already in the record, there will be, according to those plans, 161 HVDC foundations. Would you agree with that?
A. (Taylor) I'll accept it. I don't have a reason to confirm or not at this point.
Q. And this is in the record as well. There will be 159, 115 kV AC foundations.
A. (Taylor) I'll accept that.
Q. So the total, by my count, is 320
foundations, HVDC foundations and AC
foundations through that stretch, the Dummer, Stark, Northumberland stretch.
A. (Taylor) I'll accept that.
Q. And based on the information you had to develop your testimony and your reports, do you have the dimensions of those foundations?

For example, for the DC foundations, the
depth, the size, do you have that
information?
A. (Alexander) The Applicant provided
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preliminary estimate size, type of foundation. But those were estimates only. Exact depth, functionality of each location, was to be determined based on geotechnical information yet to be provided.
Q. And I assume the same is true with respect to the AC foundations; it's estimates?
A. (Alexander) Correct.
Q. And when you did your study and prepared your testimony and did your reports, did you have in front of you any geotechnical information?
A. (Alexander) I believe there was some limited geotechnical information. I believe that was mostly focused on the underground portions, though, not the overhead as much.
Q. Right. So how would you characterize the geotechnical information you had in front of you with respect to the overhead portion?
A. (Alexander) Those would be preliminary. I believe they were mostly based on soil maps by the USGS.
Q. And did you have any specific information with respect to, say geotechnical boring information, to determine the quality of the
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
terrain? Did you have that kind of information in front of you?
A. (Alexander) For the overhead?
Q. Yes, I'm talking about the overhead.
A. (Taylor) I don't recall that information at that time.
A. (Alexander) No, I don't believe so.
Q. So, referring again specifically to the Dummer, Stark and Northumberland stretch of the overhead project, we don't know whether it was ledge or sand or a combination of ledge and sand. We just don't know, do we?
A. (Taylor) Correct.
Q. So we don't know, based on the information that's in the Application, nor the information that you had in your possession when you prepared your report, whether or not blasting would be required. You don't know that, do you?
A. (Taylor) That's correct. Not at specific locations.
Q. All right. And so we don't know the size of the foundations. We don't know whether blasting would be required. So we don't have
any information with respect to the hydrogeology of those 320 foundation sites in the Dummer, Stark, Northumberland stretch.
A. (Taylor) That's correct. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. And so you can't tell this Committee whether or not any blasting whatsoever will be required to construct the foundation in that stretch, can you?
A. (Taylor) That is correct.
Q. And are you familiar with blasting?
A. (Taylor) Generally aware of blasting, yes.
Q. And I remember specifically, much to my great shock, that I asked Mr. Keiser if he'd ever heard of the blasting compound called ANFO. Do any of you know what ANFO is?
A. (Taylor) I do not.
A. (Bascom) I'm aware of it, but not in the context of building power lines.
Q. And if blasting is required, and if ANFO is used, do you know what the components of ANFO are, for example, in the hydrogeology of this project?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr.
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Chair. This is all generic material that could have and should have been included in the testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Cunningham.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, it was not included, so I'm making that point, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Point made. Objection sustained.

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:
Q. And if I told you that ANFO includes the compound nitrate, are you aware of that? MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained.

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:
Q. Now, the other area that is of great concern to my client, of course, and Ms. Manzelli raised the issue, is the co-location of these high-voltage power lines with the Portland Natural Gas transmission system. And I think you told us that you looked at a couple documents with respect to co-location of high-voltage electric lines with
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high-pressure gas pipelines?
A. (Zysk) With gas pipelines, yes.
Q. Yes. And what do you know about this Portland Natural Gas pipeline?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr.
Chair. No. 1, this was already covered. No.
2, since that point we've identified four different data requests that covered this topic, including one from Mr. Cunningham's client and one from Counsel for the Public, showing that this was an issue that these folks were aware of in August of 2016.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Cunningham.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: Both these
gentlemen identified two documents, Mr. Chair, that they looked at. And I happen to have those previously marked as exhibits in the Dummer, Stark, Northumberland exhibit list. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So I want to show them to make sure they're the documents that they identified that they looked at. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. If
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that's what you want to do, that's okay.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay. Thank
you.
BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:
Q. I'm showing you a document that's entitled "Advanced Analysis of HVDC Electrodes Interference on Neighboring Pipelines." Is that one of the documents?
A. (Zysk) It is not.
Q. It is not?
A. (Zysk) Correct.
Q. For the record, that's DNA Exhibit 61. And now $I$ show you a document entitled, "Criteria for Pipelines Co-Existing with Electric Power Lines." Is that one of the documents that you looked at?
A. (Zysk) It is.
Q. And could you tell me when you were asked to look at that or when you did look at that particular document?
A. (Zysk) I would say I first looked at it probably in the spring.
Q. Of 2017?
A. (Zysk) Of this year, yes.
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MR. CUNNINGHAM: And let the record reflect that this is DNA Exhibit No. 62 in the Sharefile.

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:
Q. And you read that document; did you not?
A. (Zysk) I did.
Q. And did that document raise concerns about the co-location of the pipeline, the Portland Natural Gas pipeline, with respect to the high-voltage electric --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Same basis.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Cunningham.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, they opened that door, Mr. Chair, and I certainly think I can ask them about the existence of that document and their impression of that --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: What door are you talking about?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The door that they identified documents.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who's the
"they" in that sentence?
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\} MR. CUNNINGHAM: This panel. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No. Sorry. That's not what happened here. The question is the scope of the testimony that they submitted at Counsel for the Public's request, or on behalf of Counsel for the Public. The questions you're asking are beyond the scope of that testimony. I'm going to sustain the objection.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, let me make one more point with respect to the scope of their testimony issue. If -- and here's an argument I think has not been advanced, that I think I must advance for the record. Your premise, Mr. Chair, is that this is friendly cross-examination and this is beyond the scope of that examination. I would suggest, Mr. Chair, since they did not cover this critical subject in their testimony, knowing about the existence of the pipeline, that it's not friendly cross-examination, it's cross-examination.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Explain to me how your position on the line in the area
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you're talking about differs from Counsel for the Public's?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It doesn't differ. It's just something I think that the Counsel for the Public's experts should have covered because of the critical nature of the issue.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And they didn't. And that was their decision. That's the witness -- that's the scope of the witness testimony.

The scope of
cross-examination, speaking broadly, is
limited to the scope of what the witnesses testified to on direct. Now, there are certainly plenty of times when you can go beyond that, but that's where you start. You start with the scope of their direct testimony. In this context, because this is friendly, meaning that you are on the same side of this and don't disagree on any significant issue with respect to what you're talking about with these witnesses, that is the basis for the ruling.
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MR. CUNNINGHAM: But the point,
Mr. Chair, is it is not friendly because they did not cover this very important issue. So it's cross-examination, not friendly cross-examination.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You think that these witnesses are not credible because they didn't do certain work, so you want to impeach Counsel for the Public's witnesses and undercut their credibility in the eyes of the Committee?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. I think it's very, very important that the fact that they did not cover this critical co-location issue in their direct testimony allows me to cross-examine them on the lack of coverage of that particular issue, this co-location issue.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Needleman.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Two things:
First of all, if Mr. Cunningham is going to stand by that statement and allow it to stand on the record, that he doesn't find these witnesses credible, I may entertain allowing
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him to go forward if it's my choice.
But second of all, just so the record's clear, it was unequivocal in August of last year, six months before their testimony was due, that they knew about this issue, and they chose not to include it. And to the extent that this repeats itself as we go forward with other parties, and they want to make same claim as Mr. Cunningham, I think they're going to need take the same position as him.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Pappas, you have any thoughts on Mr. Cunningham attacking your experts' credibility?

MR. PAPPAS: Couple thoughts. One, certainly any party is entitled to attack any other party's witness's credibility. And they're capable of defending their credibility as a general proposition.

The second point is that these gentlemen were given charges by Counsel for the Public as to what to look at and what not to look at, so it was Counsel for Public's choice what they should look at and not look
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at. He certainly can inquire about what they looked at what and what they didn't look at and what they investigated and didn't investigate, but ultimately their charge came from Counsel for the Public as to what they should look at and study and analyze on behalf of Counsel for the Public.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And Mr.
Cunningham, you have asked the witnesses what it is they looked at. You may not have closed the loop on everything they looked at or didn't look at. But if you want to run that down, you certainly can. But I'm not persuaded that you should go beyond that at this point. Mr. Pappas. MR. PAPPAS: Let me just make one final point, that Counsel for the Public is not aligned with any party. We're an independent party. So we're not friendly or unfriendly with any particular party. We have a statutory role, and I'm reminded that we're an independent party, not aligned with any of the parties.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Understood
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as a legal matter. But the positions you articulate and your witnesses articulate are agreeable to the folks who are opposed to this project.

MR. PAPPAS: Well, on some issues they may be, but on other issues they're not.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Oh, I
acknowledge that. That is clearly true. There are areas where I think burial versus non-burial is one where there are places where some people say bury the line and others say don't, and that's an area where the parties are actually adverse to each other. The intervenors who are generally opposed to the Project, there are areas where on specific issues they are not aligned. This does not appear to be one of those issues, however. Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I would proceed to ask them about my Exhibit DNA 64, which is the letter from Tom Getz that included the preliminary co-location study, the Applicant's co-location study, and ask them about that
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document.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: This is now a different issue, Mr. Chair. They testified earlier they never saw it.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: True. What would your question be about it?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'm going to repeat the question that Mr . Needleman just asked.

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:
Q. Did you see the Applicant's co-location study that I've got identified as DNA Exhibit No. 64? And the exhibit itself is the so-called Corrpro Preliminary Interference Assessment for the Burns \& McConnell/Northern Pass HVDC project. Have you seen that document?
A. (Taylor) I've seen the document today, but it's not a document that $I$ have reviewed.
Q. And you did not conduct any independent examination of the co-location issue that is between HVDC lines, high-voltage HVDC lines and high-voltage AC lines. You did not do an independent study of my client's concern about the dangers posed by that co-location
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issue.
A. (Taylor) No, we have not.
Q. And you're aware, are you not, that, say for example, the 320 HVDC is a variable voltage -- in other words, it's not a steady-state voltage -- are you aware of the dangers caused by -- let's put it in numbers. 320 kV, DC line is 320,000 volts; is it not?
A. (Bascom) Yes, it's 320,000 volts.
Q. And it's 320 plus or minus. So it can be as much as 340,000 volts of electricity running through that DC line; can it not be?
A. (Bascom) I'm not certain of the basis for that, no.
Q. In other words, you don't know.
A. (Bascom) I do not.
Q. And it can also be steady state; can it not? It can be 320 --
A. (Bascom) Yes.
Q. -- thousand volts. And are you aware, for example, and these are pointed out in the so-called Corrpro study, that there is faults that can come from the 640,000 -volt DC line that pose danger when co-located with
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pipelines?
A. (Bascom) As we've testified, I haven't reviewed this particular report to make a comment on the statement that was made in that report.
Q. And you have not investigated or looked at other experts or other aspects other than the one document that you have identified for us.
A. (DeWan) My focus as a underground cable engineer was to focus on the sections that were to be buried underground. And this co-location is a section that as I understand is overhead, so I did not study that at all.
Q. How about any of the rest of the members of this panel?
A. (Taylor) No, I have not.
Q. Can you help us understand the dangers of this co-location issue and the overhead portion of this project?
A. (Taylor) This isn't something that $I$ have reviewed.
Q. Any of you?
A. (Alexander) This is not my area of expertise, sir.
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A. (Zysk) Again, as I mentioned this morning, I read through the two referenced documents that I have, and which you have one, and what I found appears to be the damage would be potentially to the coating on the pipeline, which would over time potentially cause long-term corrosion. The two documents seem to indicate that effects on other things, persons, whatnot, outside of the actual construction of the line were reasonably within the realm of safety.
Q. And is that your testimony? Based on what?
A. (Zysk) Based on reading those two documents.
Q. And you have not read the Corrpro document?
A. (Zysk) I think that's been made clear.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's all I
have.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's go
off the record for a minute.
(Discussion off the record) CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Ahern, you may proceed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. AHERN:
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Q. Gentlemen, I'm Bruce Ahern. I'm one of the intervenors from Bethlehem to Bridgewater -CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
BY MR. AHERN :
Q. I'm Bruce Ahern, one of the intervenors in the group from Bethlehem to Plymouth. And I'm the only intervenor from the Plymouth area, and that's the area that I'm going to talk about because that's the area I'm familiar with, mainly Route 3 South in Plymouth.

The first thing $I$ want to start off with is, Mr. Taylor -- or excuse me -- Mr. Bascom, in your prefiled testimony, you talked about the Applicants having an unreasonable rate of construction estimation. I've heard different figures and seen different figures in the testimony. I'm assuming that's referring to the 300 feet per day that they originally talked about? Or is that -- I've seen 10 to 100 feet per day figures recently.
A. (Bascom) It was in reference to 300 feet per
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day.
Q. So you think that the 10 to 100 feet per day is a more realistic number for the current, or do you think that's even an over-estimation?
A. (Bascom) I think that's generally acceptable or expected per crew, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And Mr. Taylor, in your prefiled testimony, which is up on the screen there, you mentioned the figure of 19,653 concrete and dump truck trips for the open trench construction. And am I correct in assuming that those figures -- I think they also came from the Applicant -- that was for the 4-foot depth on the trenches; is that correct?
A. (Taylor) Yes. The 19,653 is our calculation, not from the Applicant. But it is based on the Applicant's typical detailed cross-section.
Q. But that was when they were planning on a 4-foot depth; is that correct?
A. (Taylor) That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now that they're having to go down
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7 feet, what do you figure that number is going to be?
A. (Taylor) I don't know specifically. But if the average trench depth increases, then that number would increase as well.
Q. Can you basically assume it's going to, I mean, increase by at least three quarters since we're going from 4 feet to 7 feet?
A. (Taylor) No, I can't make that statement. But I will say definitively that if the line is deeper, they're going to need more dump trucks to bring in. In this case, that was relating to... I believe concrete was our calculation for that, related to the flowable fill from our report.
Q. Okay. Your testimony talks about... it says concrete and dump truck deliveries.
A. (Taylor) That's correct.
Q. So I assumed that you were talking about trucking out the stuff that they've dug out and then hauling it back, whatever they need to after they put their concrete in, to fill over the top. And I'm talking about the areas outside the pavement. Is that --
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A. (Taylor) Correct. If I understand your question, it does refer to both concrete trucks and dump trucks in this calculation. But our estimated volume for a concrete truck, I believe we ran at 8 cubic yards and 10 cubic yards for a dump truck. So that while those numbers aren't the same, I would really have to run the numbers with the new depth to tell you what the increase would be.
Q. Okay. But you would -- as far as the fill that they're taking -- or the dirt they're taking out and bringing back in, it's going to be a significant increase in the number of trucks since you're going 3 feet deeper into the hole.
A. (Taylor) I would assume that to be the case, yes.
Q. And I'm correct, and just the way you understand it, they're going to take dirt out, haul it to a holding location, and then once they're finished with their installation, they're going to bring some of that fill back and put it back in the hole.
A. (Taylor) That could be the case if it's
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suitable material. The DOT's recent finding of a definition of the structural box of the road and the extent that flowable fill could be brought up from within the trench, I haven't run those specific numbers. But that has a factor on -- those too have a factor on how much would be hauled away and/or brought back of native material.
Q. But the way $I$ understand it, a lot of their plans have the ditch outside of the actual structure box of the road. The DOT's requiring them to be outside the pavement, outside that structure box that they're talking about.
A. (Taylor) They could be. I haven't reviewed the exemption request at that level.
Q. Okay. Well, the exception request is you get into the road. The DOT wants them outside the road.
A. (Taylor) That's a true statement. However, on the exemption request, they do show alignments that are in green in some cases where they are realigning outside of the pavement, but still within the right-of-way.
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That's what I'm referring to.
Q. I'm not talking about the right-of-way. I'm talking about the structural box on the road.
A. (Taylor) That's correct. If I recall the definition from DOT, the structural box was a distance below the pavement, and it extended horizontally outwards to the terminus of the slope, which could be whatever the slope is outside of the road edge.
Q. Okay. I'll agree with that. But some of the ditches that they talked about, to me, from what I've seen from the diagrams, have been actually outside of the structure box.
A. (Taylor) That could be the case, yeah.
Q. Okay. Next thing I want to refer to, and I'll bring it up in a minute, is Exception Request No. 3 dealing with an area around Glove Hollow Brook. Are you gentlemen generally familiar with that area?
A. (Taylor) Generally from the maps, but -Q. The building on the left at the bottom of the picture is the Italian Farmhouse. The road to the right near the top is Cummings Hill

Road. The blue lines there show the area
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that bounds the brook itself.
A. (Taylor) Okay.
Q. Are you familiar with that? As I said, this is Exception Request No. 3, Revision No. 3. And it shows there an estimated time of installation of three to five weeks. Do you see that?
A. (Taylor) I do.
Q. Okay. I don't know how clear that is for you, but it's the exception request. And I heard you testify earlier today that on -actually, I'm sorry. I meant to...

The area that I'm concerned about is this top picture. Do you remember that view? That's Route 3 looking north towards the Italian Farmhouse. I think basically you're down almost to the brook, the Glove Hollow Brook, looking north. That's uphill.
A. (Taylor) Okay.
Q. And you couldn't tell from the picture. But if you look at this diagram, and I'll try and... okay. If you look at the really light lines that go across the road, do you know what those are? I mean, can you explain to
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the Committee what those lines are?
A. (Taylor) Are you referring to the contour lines?
Q. Yes, that's what I'm getting at.
A. (Taylor) Okay.
Q. Okay. And also down at the bottom, the diagram at the bottom, you see there is a fair slope to this area. And I understand from your testimony, or from the testimony this morning, that the HDD drilling can drill on a slope like that. It doesn't have to be -- the machine doesn't have to be in a flat area? Because I understood from previous testimony from the construction panel that it needed to have a flat area.
A. (Zysk) A flat area is ideal, but they can work with the grades that are out there.
Q. Okay. So they wouldn't have to dig into the road to make a flat area for the drilling machine to drill the holes?
A. (Zysk) In general, no.
Q. Okay. I don't know if you can see the topographic lines on the left-hand side of the picture just above the road. Can you see
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those lines?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. Yeah. And what does it mean when they're real close together like that?
A. (Zysk) A steep slope.
Q. Steep slope?
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. Within the right-of-way; correct?
A. (Zysk) Yes, in this case.
Q. Okay. And this is the area we were just -this is another drawing depicting the work area in that section. Can you see that, or do you need me to rotate it?
A. (Zysk) No, that's fine.
Q. Okay. My first question is: Do you see that square that's on the left-hand side of the road? That is a house. Is it normal for the work area to go through a house?
A. (Taylor) No.
Q. Okay. This morning they were making a big thing about being within 6 feet of somebody's house; yet, in this example, it's going through somebody's house. Do you find it unusual that they would have that pictured
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that way even on the third revision to their exception request?
A. (Taylor) Yes. It's not something I'm used to seeing on plans.
Q. Okay. The other thing on this, you notice that the work area actually extends out to the very edge of the right-of-way.
A. (Taylor) That's correct.
Q. One of you testified this morning they needed, across the road, they needed a flat area to work. Does that mean they're going to have to dig into that bank that had up to 8 feet of slope within the right-of-way? Are they going to have to excavate all that material so that they have a flat area to work?
A. (Zysk) I don't know that the entire work area has to be flat.
Q. But I mean where there's -- because I'm talking about mainly that area where the entry holes are and the drilling rig has to sit.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. We talked earlier that they needed 30 feet of
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flat area, a flat area for the rig --
A. (Zysk) Correct.
Q. -- which they depict as going out to the edge of the right-of-way, which means they're going to have to excavate a good portion of that bank to get a flat area.
A. (Zysk) They may have to do some there, yes.
Q. Okay. The other thing that I'm concerned about here, I submitted when I was talking to the construction panel, that the right-of-way in this area is depicted as being four rods wide. I told them that the actual width of this road is only three rods wide. So they're going to have to adjust this work area inward, and they're going to have a limited amount of space. And to maintain a single lane of traffic for passage of vehicles, they're going to have to stay on the, well, the lower side of that picture, which is actually the west side of the road. And if they have to bring their work area in, which they said the minimum they need is 30 feet, then they're going to have to actually go off the pavement on the west side
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of the road. And do you see the contour lines there on both sides of Cummings Hill Road?
A. (Taylor) I do.
Q. Okay. Fairly steep?
A. (Taylor) Correct.
A. (Zysk) Yes.
Q. Okay. In a situation like that, how do they -- are you familiar with how they would handle -- because they're actually going to have to be to the edge of the right-of-way where some of those steep slopes are, are they going to cut into Cummings Hill Road? Because it slopes down at that point, and then it doesn't show across on the left side of Cummings Hill Road here. It doesn't go as far as the house that's there. But it's a fairly steep slope up to that house. So you're going to have a difficult time keeping the cars going along that area. And I was just wondering if you see any problem with this, as far as maintaining a lane for traffic in that area.
A. (Taylor) Given the current configuration,
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they can likely get a lane of traffic, from what I've seen on the plans. Your hypothetical, where it's I believe one rod narrower, it's likely that they couldn't do that.
Q. Okay. And that's what I'm concerned about because that's my access to town, and the traffic on that road is fairly heavy.

I just wanted to point out one other thing. Again, that's the same area. And if you look at the building that's on the right-hand side of the road there, you notice it's right at the edge of their depicted right-of-way. And if they have to move their work area closer to the center of the road, or even across the center of the road to stay out of the house that's on the left side, the travel lane is going to have to be very close to the house that's there on the right.

Would you agree?
A. (Taylor) That could be the case, depending on how they configure the work area.
Q. Okay. Do you see -- I mean, do you see enough room there to do a work area plus have
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a lane of traffic between the -- you got a
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maximum of 66 feet as depicted by the right-of-way lines that they depict, which is four rods. Do you see enough room there to have a work area plus a travel lane, plus room for the -- you notice that the gentleman on the right-hand side, his driveway goes to the front of the building, so that's where he parks his cars.
A. (Taylor) Yeah, there's no doubt that would be a challenge. I suspect that the configuration of the work area as shown, which is more of a complete rectangle, would likely not be able to be maintained. And if -- depending what the ultimate right-of-way is, you may not be able to get one lane of traffic through there without widening the road, so to speak, temporarily. But there's a number of hypotheticals there that would need to be look at.
Q. But I mean just looking at the two buildings only 66 feet apart, do you think that they would be able to maintain a lane of traffic through there, even if they had the
a challenge. I suspect that the
[WITNESS PANEL: BASCOM|ZYSK|TAYLOR|ALEXANDER]

\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 50 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-23-17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: BASCOM|ZYSK|TAYLOR|ALEXANDER]

Applicants have submitted now have them digging in areas where there is Japanese knotwood. You said earlier that they're going to haul material out and probably haul material back in to these areas. How are they going to be sure they aren't spreading Japanese knotwood to areas where it isn't at the present time? Do you have any idea as to how they do that with other invasive species if you're not familiar with Japanese knotwood?
A. (Zysk) Offhand, no. I assume it's something the environmental folks would cover in requirements on treating or not treating.
Q. Okay. That wouldn't be part of the construction consideration?
A. (Zysk) Not specifically.
Q. Okay. That's all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
That brings us to the end of the day today. When we come back tomorrow morning, Mr. Lakes will have the microphone, and we'll continue with the list from there. Thank you all.
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(Whereupon Day 50 Afternoon
Session was adjourned at 5:11
p.m., with the Day 51 hearing to resume on October 24, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.)
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