STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE 1 SITE EVALUATION 2 3 DAY 53 4 October 27, 2017 - 1:25 p.m. 49 Donovan Street AFTERNOON Session ONLY 5 Concord, New Hampshire {Electronically filed with SEC on 11-9-17} 6 7 IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-06 8 Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and 9 Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy for a Certificate 10 of Site and Facility. 11 (Hearing on the merits) 12 PRESENT FOR SUBCOMMITTEE/SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE: Chrmn. Martin P. Honigberg Public Utilities Comm. 13 (Presiding as Presiding Officer) 14 Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey Public Utilities Comm. Dir. Craig Wright, Designee Dept. of Environ. Serv. 15 Christopher Way, Designee Dept. of Resources & 16 Economic Development William Oldenburg, Designee Dept. of Transportation 17 Patricia Weathersby Public Member Rachel Dandeneau Alternate Public Member 18 19 ALSO PRESENT FOR THE SEC: Iryna Dore, Esq., Counsel to the SEC 20 (Brennan, Caron, Lenehan & Iacopino) Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator 21 22 (No Appearances Taken) 23 COURT REPORTER: Susan J. Robidas, NH LCR No. 44 24

1

		2	2		
1	INDEX				
2					
3					
4	WITNESS: PATRICIA M. O'DONNELL				
5					
6					
7	EXAMINATION	PAGE			
8	Direct Examination by Mr. Aslin	4			
9	Cross-examination by Ms. Boepple	78			
10	Cross-examination by Ms. Percy	88			
11	Cross-examination by Mr. Kimball	97			
12	Cross-examination by Ms. Pacik	102			
13	Cross-examination by Mr. Whitley	106			
14	Cross-examination by Ms. Bradbury	117			
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
	{SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session O	NLY]{10-27-17}			

INDEX (CONT'D) EXHIBITS DESCRIPTION PAGE 11/15/16 Prefiled Direct CFP 140 Testimony of Patricia M. O'Donnell CFP 141 4/14/17 Supplemental Prefiled Testimony of Patricia M. O'Donnell DFLD-ABTR 154 NH Atlas and Gazetteer 119 (Pgs. 28, 29) {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

4

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (Hearing resumed at 1:25 p.m.) CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Looks like 3 we're ready to resume. 4 (WHEREUPON, PATRICIA O'DONNELL was duly 5 sworn and cautioned by the Court 6 7 Reporter.) 8 PATRICIA O'DONNELL, SWORN 9 MR. ASLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. ASLIN: Good afternoon, Ms. O'Donnell. 13 0. 14 Good afternoon. Α. 15 If you could please state your full name and Q. 16 your employer for the record. 17 Α. Patricia Marie O'Donnell, owner/principal, Heritage Landscapes, LLC. 18 19 Q. All right. Thank you. And do you have 20 before you what's been marked as Counsel for 21 the Public Exhibit 140, which is your 22 November 15, 2016 prefiled direct testimony 23 with the attached report? I do. 24 Α.

 $\{\text{SEC 2015-06}\}$ [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-17\}$

1	Q.	And do you also have in front of you what's
2		been marked as Counsel for the Public
3		Exhibit 141, which is your April 17, 2017
4		supplemental testimony and exhibits?
5	Α.	I do.
6	Q.	And do you have any corrections to either of
7		those documents?
8	Α.	I do. We made a reference in editing that we
9		created an error on Page 10 of our
10		November 15th report under Architectural
11		Focus. In the final sentence we said, "and
12		bridges (including the National Register
13		listed H.L. Styles Bridge," which is
14		incorrect. There's actually no bridge named
15		that. H.L. Styles Bridges is the owner name
16		of an historic house. So we transposed it
17		from the many lists of items.
18	Q.	Okay. So that's a correction on Page 10 of
19		the report attached to Exhibit 140.
20	A.	Paragraph 1, last sentence.
21	Q.	Very good. With that correction, do you
22		today adopt and swear to the testimony in
23		both your direct prefiled testimony and your
24		supplemental testimony?
	[and	201E OGIDER ES NEWERWOON dession ONIVI[10 27 17]

1 A. I do.

2	Q.	All right. Thank you very much. I'd like to
3		start by asking you some questions about the
4		cultural landscape studies and effects tables
5		that have been produced in this proceeding
6		after all the testimony was filed. And just
7		to start off, do you understand, and have you
8		reviewed the five cultural landscape study
9		reports that were submitted, which appear as
10		Appellant Applicant's Exhibit 211? And
11		those are the PAL studies.
12	A.	I will have to admit that they have not been
13		thoroughly studied. They are very lengthy.
14		They have been skimmed. We particularly
15		looked at Section 5 of each of the reports,
16		which is the Recommendations.
17	Q.	And am I correct that there are five
18		different reports that each address a
19		different study area within the state of New
20		Hampshire?
21	Α.	Correct.
22	Q.	And within each of those reports, does PAL
23		identify discrete cultural landscape areas
24		within the study area?
l	[and	2015 06 [Dove 52 NEWERWOON Googies ONLY] [10 27 17]

1	Α.	They do. Discrete areas within the one-mile
2		APE, partially within the one-mile APE, and
3		outside of, within these broad study areas.
4	Q.	Okay. And do you understand that those
5		discrete areas are being characterized as
6		"cultural landscapes" in this proceeding?
7	Α.	They are.
8	Q.	And you agree that those are cultural
9		landscapes?
10	Α.	The ones that have been defined do appear to
11		be. I would not fully be able to endorse
12		that those are the only ones present within
13		the study areas.
14	Q.	So let's take a look at a couple of the study
15		areas.
16	A.	There's a point here, the study areas were
17		defined by DHR and the consulting parties,
18		and then PAL conducted the work and did good
19		research, obviously went also to the field
20		and defined much smaller zones that they
21		called cultural landscapes.
22	Q.	Okay. Great. So hopefully you have
23		something on your screen at this point?
24	Α.	I do.
	∫ e ₽C	2015-06 [Day 52 NETERNOON Gagaion ONIV] $10-27-17$

1	Q.	So what I'm showing you now is a page out of
2		Applicant's Exhibit 211, which is a page out
3		of the Great North Woods Cultural Landscape
4		Study Report. And this is APP81684. And do
5		you see well, have you seen this before,
6		this figure?
7	Α.	Yes. This is the summary showing the
8		cultural landscapes defined within or
9		partially within the one-mile APE.
10	Q.	Okay. And do you recognize that the black
11		outlined area is the study area that was
12		reviewed in this report?
13	A.	The study area shown in the black line,
14		that's the Great North Woods; right?
15	Q.	Yes. And I think you testified a moment ago
16		that that study area was defined by DHR and
17		others.
18	Α.	With input from consulting parties.
19	Q.	Okay. And by "consulting parties," that's a
20		term of art in the 106, the Section 106
21		process?
22	A.	Exactly.
23	Q.	Okay. And then, also on this figure, you see
24		there are one, two, three, four cultural
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

		-
1		landscapes that have been outlined in orange;
2		is that right?
3	A.	Golden.
4	Q.	Golden. I'll take that.
5	A.	Harvey Swell Cultural Landscape, Colebrook
6		and Stewartstown at the top; Upper Ammonoosuc
7		River Cultural Landscape and Stark toward the
8		middle; North Road-Lost Nation Road Cultural
9		Landscape in Lancaster and Northumberland;
10		and adjacent to it, the Mount Prospect-Martin
11		Meadow Pond Cultural Landscape in Lancaster.
12	Q.	Can you describe for the Committee your
13		understanding of the process that takes us
14		from this large study area which is outlined
15		in black down to the individually identified
16		potential cultural landscapes?
17	A.	My understanding of the methodology laid out
18		by the Public Archeology Lab in their work is
19		that it starts from research and field
20		review, and they eventually developed these
21		definitions of what are supposed to be
22		cohesive cultural landscapes of uniform or
23		discernible relationships of character within
24		the larger study area that was defined by DHR
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			1(
1		and the consulting parties.	
2	Q.	Okay. That gets us in this case to these	
3		four. And I'm going to show you a few more	
4		in just a second.	
5		Okay. So you should now be seeing on	
6		your screen another page from the same	
7		document, Applicant's Exhibit 211, APP81688.	
8		And is this also showing the Great North	
9		Woods Cultural Landscape Study Area?	
10	Α.	Yes.	
11	Q.	And now we see an additional four, I guess	
12		four, an additional four cultural landscapes	
13		that have been identified on this map?	
14	Α.	Correct.	
15	Q.	And do you understand that these cultural	
16		landscapes are those that have been	
17		identified within the study area but are	
18		outside the one-mile APE, or Area of	
19		Potential Effect?	
20	Α.	Correct.	
21	Q.	So if you were to look at the two maps	
22		together, there would be eight identified	
23		potential cultural landscapes within this	
24		study area.	
	Jaro	$2015-06$ [Day 52 AFTERNOON Goggion ONIX] $\int 10-27-1$	71

1 A. That is correct.

2	Q.	Okay. And do you have well, what is your
	¥•	
3		understanding of why these cultural
4		landscapes on this map have been separated
5		out from those that were shown in the prior
6		map?
7	A.	I think my impression from the skimming of
8		the report is that reports, plural,
9		hundreds and hundreds of pages is that the
10		definition of "cultural landscapes," based on
11		research and field study, also related to the
12		second task, second step, which was to build
13		more detailed reports for those cultural
14		landscapes that were within or partially
15		within the Area of Potential Effect. The
16		other identified landscapes that are outside
17		of the APE were not subject to further
18		detailed study other than the initial
19		research and definition process.
20	Q.	Okay. Thank you. You should be seeing now
21		the prior page in this report. And if you
22		see in the middle of the page, it says
23		"Landscapes Recommended For Future Study."
24		Does that correspond to what you were just
l	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		discussing, those cultural landscapes that
2		have been identified but are outside of the
3		APE, that PAL here is saying study those
4		later because they're outside of the APE?
5	Α.	Correct.
6	Q.	Okay. Do you agree with that distinction of
7		cultural landscapes that are within or
8		adjacent to the APE and those that are
9		outside the APE for purposes of this review
10		by the SEC?
11	Α.	When you're looking at the plan, you
12		certainly see that they're outside of the
13		APE, as determined in the Section 106
14		process. In our work, as we put in both our
15		initial report and our supplemental report,
16		we looked at bare earth viewshed mapping and
17		found that areas considerably beyond the
18		one-mile APE had good visibility to the line
19		of the proposed project. So our position in
20		the work we did was to look beyond the APE as
21		described in the Section 106 DOE process to
22		relate it more to the SEC rules and the New
23		Hampshire law.
24	Q.	Okay. Thank you. So if I could paraphrase

			1.
1		then. In your opinion, these four cultural	
2		landscapes that have been identified outside	
3		of the APE remain relevant for consideration	
4		by the SEC in its review of the Project.	
5		You'd agree with that?	
6	Α.	Yes.	
7	Q.	Okay. Let's take a quick look at some of the	
8		other study areas just so we have a lay of	
9		the land.	
10		So you should now have another page from	
11		Applicant's Exhibit 211. This is a separate	
12		report within that large exhibit, and this is	
13		from the Ammonoosuc River Valley Study Area.	
14		And do you see that study area outlined in	
15		black?	
16	Α.	Correct.	
17	Q.	And in this case, I believe there are two	
18		cultural landscapes that have been identified	
19		within that study area that are in or	
20		adjacent to the APE?	
21	A.	They are in the underground section. And	
22		it's the Gale, G-A-L-E, River Cultural	
23		Landscape and the Ham Branch River Cultural	
24		Landscape, both somewhat linear corridors,	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

			14
1		valley-hill relationships.	
2	Q.	Okay. Thank you.	
3		And then flip to the other map, which is	
4		at APP81301. Again, now there are two	
5		additional cultural landscapes that were	
6		outside the APE; is that right?	
7	A.	Yes. This map shows the two that are beyond	
8		the Area of Potential Effect for the	
9		underground section, which is very narrow.	
10		And these are to the west, and it's the Sugar	
11		Hill Cultural Landscape and the Landaff	
12		Center Cultural Landscape.	
13	Q.	Okay. Thank you.	
14		So, again, this is an additional study	
15		area for cultural landscapes, and this is	
16		from the portion of Exhibit 211 that is the	
17		Pemigewasset River Valley Study Area. Again,	
18		do you see on this figure the study area is	
19		the large area outlined in black?	
20	А.	Yes, the outline is there.	
21	Q.	And there are here two cultural landscapes	
22		identified within or adjacent to the APE?	
23	А.	Yes, the upper to the north edge of the study	
24		area is the Franconia Notch Cultural	
	∫ c EC	2015-06 Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY $10-27-1$	7]

		1
	Landscape, and the lower is the Franklin	
	Falls Dam and Hill Village Cultural Landscape	
	toward the south end. And the Notch is in	
	the underground section, and the Franklin	
	Falls is in the overhead section.	
Q.	Okay. Thank you. And then if we flip ahead	
	to the second figure, do you see here an	
	additional, I believe there are six	
Α.	Six.	
Q.	cultural landscapes that are identified	
	within the study area, but outside of the	
	APE?	
Α.	Correct, there are six additional. And	
	interestingly in their study, they extended	
	slightly eastward of the original study area	
	boundary for two of these because they found	
	those cultural landscapes to be cohesive, I	
	would assume.	
Q.	Okay. And then flipping to the Suncook River	
	Valley Study Area, this is APP82554. This is	
	a somewhat smaller study area; is that right?	
Α.	Correct. This is the reduction to the	
	cultural landscape scale, and it looks like	
	we have two: Short Falls Cultural Landscape	
{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}
	А. Q. А. Д.	 Falls Dam and Hill Village Cultural Landscape toward the south end. And the Notch is in the underground section, and the Franklin Falls is in the overhead section. Q. Okay. Thank you. And then if we flip ahead to the second figure, do you see here an additional, I believe there are six A. Six. Q cultural landscapes that are identified within the study area, but outside of the APE? A. Correct, there are six additional. And interestingly in their study, they extended slightly eastward of the original study area boundary for two of these because they found those cultural landscapes to be cohesive, I would assume. Q. Okay. And then flipping to the Suncook River Valley Study Area, this is APP82554. This is a somewhat smaller study area; is that right? A. Correct. This is the reduction to the cultural landscape scale, and it looks like

			тс
1		and the Buck Street-Batchelder Road Cultural	
2		Landscape, and it's in a study area that	
3		crosses the APE.	
4	Q.	And again, in this case, the cultural	
5		landscapes that have been identified extend	
6		outside of the study area; is that right?	
7	A.	Right. One almost entirely outside, the	
8		other about half in and half out.	
9	Q.	Okay. So, between those four study areas, I	
10		think we have a total of 10 cultural	
11		landscapes that have been identified that are	
12		within or adjacent to the one-mile APE, and	
13		12 that are outside the one-mile APE. Does	
14		that sound right?	
15	A.	It does.	
16	Q.	Okay. And then there was one additional	
17		study area. So we'll pull that one up. And	
18		this is again part of Applicant's Exhibit	
19		211, and it's APP81564. And this is the	
20		Deerfield Cultural Landscape Study Report, or	
21		rather, the Study Area. Do you agree?	
22	A.	Yeah. It's interesting because they changed	
23		the outer boundary color; it's now blue on	
24		this one. But it appears to be the boundary	
	{SEC	2015-06 [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] {10-27-17	}

			17
1		of their study area.	
2	Q.	Yeah. So this has a slightly different	
3		format.	
4	Α.	Hmm-hmm.	
5	Q.	And within the study area which is in blue in	
6		this figure, there appear to be five areas of	
7		potential cultural landscapes being reviewed;	
8		is that accurate?	
9	Α.	Right. They're reviewing them, but they	
10		haven't called any of them "cultural	
11		landscape" in the title. So it's a	
12		differentiation from the prior mapping.	
13	Q.	And this is well, I don't know if it's the	
14		last page. But it's the summary	
15		recommendations in this same Deerfield	
16		Cultural Landscape Study Report. And take a	
17		minute just to read that paragraph, and then	
18		if you could comment on what the outcome of	
19		this study area was in terms of cultural	
20		landscapes.	
21		(Witness reviews document.)	
22	Α.	They've chosen to recommend that two of the	
23		indicated mapped areas, the Corey WMA and the	
24		junction of Meeting House Hill Road, don't	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17	7}

1possess the qualities of cultural landscapes.2And the three others, Deerfield Parade,3Deerfield Center and the Pawtuckaway State4Park, may be cultural landscapes, but they5don't require any further study. So it6appears that the Deerfield report indicates7that the historic resources in Deerfield are8adequately addressed and that they don't9think it warrants further study.10Q.11terms of review of cultural landscapes? And12I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem13to be making a distinction between areas that14have been reviewed as a district and15potentially cultural landscapes?16Does that seem to square with your17understanding of cultural landscapes?18A.19One, I think Deerfield is a community that20has pervasive, historically valued resources21that would fall in the New Hampshire sites22law, not necessarily all on the National			
3Deerfield Center and the Pawtuckaway State4Park, may be cultural landscapes, but they5don't require any further study. So it6appears that the Deerfield report indicates7that the historic resources in Deerfield are8adequately addressed and that they don't9think it warrants further study.10Q. Does that conclusion make sense to you, in11terms of review of cultural landscapes? And12I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem13to be making a distinction between areas that14have been reviewed as a district and15potentially cultural landscapes more broadly.16Does that seem to square with your17understanding of cultural landscapes?18A. I would want to answer that at two levels.19One, I think Deerfield is a community that20has pervasive, historically valued resources21that would fall in the New Hampshire sites	1		possess the qualities of cultural landscapes.
 Park, may be cultural landscapes, but they don't require any further study. So it appears that the Deerfield report indicates that the historic resources in Deerfield are adequately addressed and that they don't think it warrants further study. Q. Does that conclusion make sense to you, in terms of review of cultural landscapes? And I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem to be making a distinction between areas that have been reviewed as a district and potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	2		And the three others, Deerfield Parade,
5don't require any further study. So it6appears that the Deerfield report indicates7that the historic resources in Deerfield are8adequately addressed and that they don't9think it warrants further study.10Q. Does that conclusion make sense to you, in11terms of review of cultural landscapes? And12I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem13to be making a distinction between areas that14have been reviewed as a district and15potentially cultural landscapes more broadly.16Does that seem to square with your17understanding of cultural landscapes?18A. I would want to answer that at two levels.19One, I think Deerfield is a community that20has pervasive, historically valued resources21that would fall in the New Hampshire sites	3		Deerfield Center and the Pawtuckaway State
 appears that the Deerfield report indicates that the historic resources in Deerfield are adequately addressed and that they don't think it warrants further study. Q. Does that conclusion make sense to you, in terms of review of cultural landscapes? And I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem to be making a distinction between areas that have been reviewed as a district and potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	4		Park, may be cultural landscapes, but they
 that the historic resources in Deerfield are adequately addressed and that they don't think it warrants further study. Q. Does that conclusion make sense to you, in terms of review of cultural landscapes? And I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem to be making a distinction between areas that have been reviewed as a district and potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	5		don't require any further study. So it
 adequately addressed and that they don't think it warrants further study. Q. Does that conclusion make sense to you, in terms of review of cultural landscapes? And I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem to be making a distinction between areas that have been reviewed as a district and potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	6		appears that the Deerfield report indicates
 9 think it warrants further study. 10 Q. Does that conclusion make sense to you, in 11 terms of review of cultural landscapes? And 12 I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem 13 to be making a distinction between areas that 14 have been reviewed as a district and 15 potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. 16 Does that seem to square with your 17 understanding of cultural landscapes? 18 A. I would want to answer that at two levels. 19 One, I think Deerfield is a community that 20 has pervasive, historically valued resources 21 that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	7		that the historic resources in Deerfield are
 Q. Does that conclusion make sense to you, in terms of review of cultural landscapes? And I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem to be making a distinction between areas that have been reviewed as a district and potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	8		adequately addressed and that they don't
11 terms of review of cultural landscapes? And 12 I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem 13 to be making a distinction between areas that 14 have been reviewed as a district and 15 potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. 16 Does that seem to square with your 17 understanding of cultural landscapes? 18 A. I would want to answer that at two levels. 19 One, I think Deerfield is a community that 10 has pervasive, historically valued resources 21 that would fall in the New Hampshire sites	9		think it warrants further study.
 I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem to be making a distinction between areas that have been reviewed as a district and potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	10	Q.	Does that conclusion make sense to you, in
 to be making a distinction between areas that have been reviewed as a district and potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	11		terms of review of cultural landscapes? And
 have been reviewed as a district and potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	12		I guess what I'm asking, really, is they seem
 potentially cultural landscapes more broadly. Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	13		to be making a distinction between areas that
 Does that seem to square with your understanding of cultural landscapes? A. I would want to answer that at two levels. One, I think Deerfield is a community that has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	14		have been reviewed as a district and
 17 understanding of cultural landscapes? 18 A. I would want to answer that at two levels. 19 One, I think Deerfield is a community that 20 has pervasive, historically valued resources 21 that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	15		potentially cultural landscapes more broadly.
 18 A. I would want to answer that at two levels. 19 One, I think Deerfield is a community that 20 has pervasive, historically valued resources 21 that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	16		Does that seem to square with your
19One, I think Deerfield is a community that20has pervasive, historically valued resources21that would fall in the New Hampshire sites	17		understanding of cultural landscapes?
 has pervasive, historically valued resources that would fall in the New Hampshire sites 	18	A.	I would want to answer that at two levels.
21 that would fall in the New Hampshire sites	19		One, I think Deerfield is a community that
	20		has pervasive, historically valued resources
22 law, not necessarily all on the National	21		that would fall in the New Hampshire sites
	22		law, not necessarily all on the National
23 Register, but certainly recognized by the	23		Register, but certainly recognized by the
24 community. And it seems that their	24		community. And it seems that their

1		conception of cultural landscape perhaps was
2		less focused on settlements that were more
3		dense. Many of the others as cataloged
4		within the PAL reports are agricultural
5		landscapes or recreational landscapes, but
6		they haven't really got their head around
7		settlement landscapes. And in this case,
8		they're looking at fairly small areas in
9		Deerfield. It might be possible I mean,
10		where I might begin would be to look at
11		Deerfield mapping over time and see if the
12		structure of the town, because the first
13		level of cultural landscape study is land
14		uses and the second is spacial organization
15		and systems. So, parsing small pieces, you
16		may not see the patterns that continue
17		through time.
18	Q.	Okay. Thank you. And I wanted to touch on
19		the process here that was that has
20		followed to identify these cultural
21		landscapes, that's all within the Section 106
22		process; right?
23	Α.	Correct.
24	Q.	Within that process or the Section 106
	6	

1		process, by definition, looks at resources
2		that are eligible are listed within the
3		National Registry?
4	Α.	Correct. Exclusively.
5	Q.	Exclusively. Okay. And so, you know, Ms.
6		Widell, in her supplemental testimony,
7		criticized you for using a broader APE than
8		the Section 106 APE, where you looked out to
9		10 miles and she focused on 1 mile. That
10		one-mile APE is what's used in this cultural
11		landscape study process; is that correct?
12	Α.	Correct.
13	Q.	And so can you comment on how the cultural
14		landscape studies and reports here, where
15		they're identifying cultural landscapes, how
16		that may capture or not capture resources
17		that you would consider relevant to the SEC
18		process?
19	Α.	I think, again, maybe two answers. One, what
20		the cultural landscape studies in sum, taken
21		together, tell us is that there are more
22		resources than were initially recorded by the
23		Applicants and that the focus of the
24		Applicants on individual properties, and in
	SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

particular, architecture, led them not to pick up as many of these cohesive, larger areas.

1

2

3

And then the second question is the 4 process of defining a study area and then 5 limiting the cultural landscapes within it is 6 somewhat counterintuitive. It's what we did 7 8 because of the New Hampshire law which says it could be on the National Register, but 9 could also be resources of various types that 10 11 are important to the people of New Hampshire that don't necessarily have a designation. 12 What we used was a filter of understanding a 13 14 bit more about community values through the 15 community and community meetings and their 16 own voices and also looking at the typical 17 landscape of New Hampshire, which is a valley-hill-mountain setting, which is valued 18 19 by the people of New Hampshire. 20 Thank you. So I think I want to go 0. Okay. 21 back to the Great North Woods for a second. 22 So, again, we looked at this a few 23 minutes ago, and you, I believe, commented that, though these four cultural landscapes 24 {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		identified on this figure, which is APP81688,
2		those are outside of the one-mile APE. I
3		believe you testified earlier that you think
4		it would be relevant to consider those in
5		this proceeding?
6	Α.	Correct.
7	Q.	Okay. We're looking for something. Might
8		take a second. Here we are.
9		And what I'm showing you now is an
10		attachment to your supplemental testimony,
11		and that's CFP Exhibit 141. And it's
12	А.	Sheet 1 of the North Above Ground?
13	Q.	Yeah. I'm just going to get it for the
14		record. It's CFP5756, very small in the
15		bottom.
16		So, in this exhibit you're showing, I
17		believe, potential visibility of the Project
18		using a bare ground analysis; is that
19		correct?
20	А.	Correct.
21	Q.	So that's discounting any vegetative
22		screening or structural screening. We're
23		looking just at topography.
24	Α.	That is correct.

1	Q.	And if we can, would you agree that this map
2		corresponds roughly to the area that is
3		covered by the Great North Woods?
4	A.	It's a portion, yeah. This map covers the
5		area of the Great North Woods Study Area for
6		cultural landscapes.
7	Q.	Okay.
8	Α.	The pink areas on that map were the
9		visibility zones, quite pervasive.
10	Q.	It's going to come back up in a minute,
11		hopefully.
12		Okay. Now you're looking at both the
13		Great North Woods Cultural Landscape figure
14		showing the four cultural landscapes that
15		have been identified outside of the APE and
16		your exhibit showing potential visibility in
17		the bare ground conditions of that same
18		general portion of the state of New
19		Hampshire.
20		Looking at these two, in your opinion,
21		are the four cultural landscapes identified
22		here, generally speaking, within areas that
23		are shown in pink on the visibility map?
24	A.	Correct. I think the one that would more
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		likely than not be due to topography would be
2		the westernmost Connecticut River landscape
3		because it's on the opposite side of the hill
4		from the corridor. But it's at this on
5		the right-hand side in the plan, the dark red
6		line is the corridor. You can see the Notch
7		there.
8		The other thing that our map shows is
9		the indication of all the shape files and
10		areas from the GIS that we recorded in our
11		report for a more diverse capture of
12		resources.
13	Q.	I want to turn some of the more specific
14		review done by Ms. Widell and the
15		Preservation Company to assess effects at
16		these cultural landscapes. But before I go
17		there, I want to clarify one thing.
18		You did not actually perform an
19		assessment of the effects of the Project on
20		individual cultural landscape or sorry
21		individual historic resources; is that
22		correct?
23	A.	Correct.
24	Q.	Is it correct to say that you looked at the
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		Project's impacts on a landscape level rather
2		than an individual resource level?
3	A.	That is correct.
4	Q.	And is that how you came to your conclusion
5		about the potential impacts of this project
6		on cultural historic landscapes or
7		resources, rather?
8	Α.	I think it's important to indicate that we
9		looked at all the Applicant's materials. We
10		also did specific research at DHR. We
11		downloaded a series of maps from New
12		Hampshire Granit, which is the GIS data base.
13		We looked in the field. And together,
14		mapping all of those, particularly at the
15		town corridor level and then on the map you
16		just showed, there's three components: The
17		north, the center and the south. What we
18		found is that the landscape of New Hampshire
19		through these towns along the corridor and
20		beyond the one-mile APE is full of resources
21		and that those historic and cultural sites,
22		as defined in New Hampshire law, are quite
23		pervasive. So our opinion is that the number
24		of resources, the density of resources, the
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			26
1		visibility of resources taken together	
2		expresses a significant impact from the	
3		potential Northern Pass Project.	
4	Q.	Okay. So I'm going to take us into some of	
5		the specifics, and I'm going to ask you about	
6		the findings and methodology of Ms. Widell	
7		and the Preservation Company. But I'm going	
8		to try not to ask you about making a specific	
9		assessment of individual resources because I	
10		don't believe that is something you have done	
11		in this process.	
12	Α.	And particularly in these cultural	
13		landscapes, these were not defined until well	
14		after we did our time in the field.	
15	Q.	Okay. So the first area I want to look at is	
16		the North Road-Lost Nation Road Cultural	
17		Landscape. And on the screen you should see	
18		now a map of that cultural landscape. This	
19		is part of the Applicant's Exhibit 211, and	
20		it's APP81886. Do you recognize this	
21		cultural landscape that's been identified?	
22	Α.	Yes.	
23	Q.	Okay. And do you see in this map that there	
24		is within the cultural landscape also an area	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

			2
1		that's been identified on its own as a	
2		agricultural historic district? That's the	
3		area in golden or yellow.	
4	A.	Yes. On the west, or lower left of the map,	
5		there's an area that's defined as an	
6		agricultural zone, which was pulled out in	
7		the prior work by Preservation Company.	
8	Q.	I meant to ask you before that went away, but	
9		you probably can remember it from the	
10		picture, does the Project actually pass	
11		through the middle of this cultural	
12		landscape, or at least through a portion of	
13		the cultural landscape?	
14	Α.	It does.	
15	Q.	Okay. And in this area, it's an overhead	
16		portion of the Project.	
17	A.	It is.	
18	Q.	Okay. So what you should be seeing now is a	
19		page from Applicant's 196b, as in boy. And	
20		this is the first page of the Effects	
21		Evaluation done by Ms. Widell and	
22		Preservation Company for this North Road-Lost	
23		Nation Road Cultural Landscape. Have you	
24		reviewed this document before?	
	Jere	2015-06 [Day 52 NETERNOON Goadian ONIV] $10-27-1$	71

1	Α.	I have. This is the summary that indicates
2		the recommendations and definition of effect
3		for the North Road Agricultural District,
4		North Road and Grange Road in Lancaster.
5	Q.	Okay. And so as part of the assessment of
6		the effects, we had testimony from Ms. Widell
7		that she, in collaboration with the
8		Preservation Company, completed this form for
9		DHR and part of the Section 106 process as a
10		way of assessing the impact of the Project on
11		this particular cultural landscape. Does
12		that sound like an accurate description of
13		what has happened?
14	A.	That is accurate to my knowledge.
15	Q.	And if you see at the top of the first area
16		under Criteria of Adverse Effect, is this
17		assessment being done here, is this guided by
18		federal rules in the 106 process?
19	Α.	Yes. Section 106 indicates that adverse
20		effect is judged based on loss of integrity.
21		There are seven aspects of integrity that are
22		listed here: Location, design, setting,
23		materials, workmanship, feeling and
24		association. And the impact on these seven
l	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			29
1		aspects to integrity that would limit	
2		degrade the integrity of the property can	
3		result in its adverse effect.	
4	Q.	Okay. And then looking down below at the	
5		form, there are eight categories listed as	
6		examples of adverse effects. And again, it	
7		cites to Section 800.5(a)(2). That's from	
8		the CFR federal rules; is that correct?	
9	A.	Yes.	
10	Q.	Okay.	
11	А.	And those are the eight that are cited in the	
12		federal rules.	
13	Q.	And so I'd like to kind of look through the	
14		evaluation for each of these and discuss with	
15		you your interpretation of how Ms. Widell and	
16		Preservation Company were applying this	
17		evaluation process under the federal rules,	
18		recognizing that you haven't done an	
19		individual assessment of this particular	
20		cultural landscape.	
21		The first category here is the physical	
22		destruction of or damage to all or part of	
23		the property. Am I correct that that is	
24		essentially one type of direct impact that	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

Γ

			3
1		can be assessed or	
2	A.	Yes.	
3	Q.	And that's sort of the most adverse effect	
4		possible, destroying the resource?	
5	A.	Or some part thereof that's	
6		character-defining and relates to its	
7		integrity.	
8	Q.	And here the evaluation is that, essentially,	
9		even though the transmission corridor passes	
10		through the cultural landscape, their focus	
11		isn't only on vegetation removal. And they	
12		are claiming to avoid any other direct	
13		impacts. Is that a fair assessment of what	
14		they've done?	
15	A.	That's what they say.	
16	Q.	And I'm going to look at No. 2 before we kind	
17		of talk about that process.	
18		The second category is alteration of a	
19		property, with a lot more language that	
20		everyone can read. How is alteration of a	
21		property different from physical destruction	
22		or damage?	
23	Α.	Change doesn't always degrade a	
24		character-defining feature, but alteration	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

1		the issue here is consistency with the
2		Secretary of Interior's standards. So,
3		again, the judging envelope, the criteria, is
4		the Secretary of Interior and the standards.
5	Q.	Okay. And so here we have two different
6		types of potentially direct effects to the
7		property being assessed?
8	A.	Hmm-hmm. Correct.
9	Q.	And the evaluation that was performed by the
10		Applicant's consultants was that there may be
11		some physical destruction, but there would be
12		no alteration of the property. Does that
13		when you are looking at the introduction of a
14		power or transmission line and its structures
15		into a cultural landscape, does that
16		distinction there make sense to you?
17	A.	I think that under Area II, Roman II, Is, I
18		would not have said none. I would have said
19		the insertion of larger poles, higher,
20		bigger, would be an alteration of the
21		property. It goes through the middle. I
22		mean, the way it's described, it's as if you
23		could put the corridor in a vacuum and
24		everything's fine and it's all the same on
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		the sides, so that's okay. But the scale
2		shift and the intensity of that relationship
3		is quite different from what it is today.
4	Q.	And you'd agree that there is an existing
5		power line or transmission line within that
6		corridor, in that cultural landscape today.
7	Α.	Correct.
8	Q.	But I hear that you're saying the proposed
9		project would be an intensification of that
10		intrusion into the cultural landscape?
11	Α.	It's intensifying the size and scale of the
12		power transmission corridor.
13	Q.	Okay. So, skipping down, I think the removal
14		of property from its historic location
15		probably doesn't make sense within the
16		context of cultural landscapes.
17		So the next area is the change of
18		character of the property's use or physical
19		features within the property setting that
20		contributes to historic features.
21		Can you describe what kinds of things
22		that category is trying to capture?
23	Α.	Absolutely. The federal standards, when you
24		look at the practice of cultural landscapes,
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

identifies "character" by using a set of 1 2 character-defining features that then are, in the terminology of the National Register, 3 called "contributing features." 4 So, frequently in this work they've said the 5 current transmission corridor is 6 "non-contributing." The "contributing 7 8 features" would be the open fields, the patterns of land uses, the relationship of 9 land uses to visual organization. 10 Often these cultural landscapes in an agricultural 11 12 component have quite broad panoramas, down to natural systems, vegetation, circulation, 13 topography related to geomorphology, which 14 15 PAL has handled very well in their reports, 16 and then down to buildings, structures and 17 small-scale elements. So, all of that list that I just stated is the character-defining 18 19 features that are considered when you look at 20 the issue of integrity and those seven 21 aspects of integrity. 22 And here the Applicant's consultants have **Q**. 23 looked at, in their report and evaluation section, that there will be no change in use 24 {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		in the hay fields and pasture within the
2		transmission right-of-way on either side of
3		North Road. Does that capture the full
4		breadth of what's covered by this example of
5		adverse, in your opinion?
6	Α.	I don't believe so.
7	Q.	What other kinds of make sure I use the
8		right term what other kinds of
9		"contributing features" would be relevant in
10		reviewing this example of adverse effects?
11	Α.	Well, I just gave you the list, so I'll state
12		it slightly differently. Hay fields and
13		pasture are land uses. Within this area of
14		the North Road Agricultural District and the
15		North Road and Grange Road, there are more
16		land uses than just those two. There's
17		residential land uses, there's some likely
18		commercial land uses along the road frontage,
19		there are possibly forested lands that are
20		recreational or productive lands for forest
21		harvest. So that's just the first category,
22		land use. Then you would drop down and
23		indicate the visual relationships and space,
24		moving on to topography, vegetation,

1		circulation, all the elements. What they're
2		saying is two aspects of land use remain
3		around the electrical transmission
4		right-of-way. So it's a partial answer.
5	Q.	Okay. So I'm hearing that, in your opinion,
6		they haven't fully assessed, at least in the
7		description here, the other uses of the
8		property that would be covered by this
9		category in the effects evaluation.
10	A.	I actually said that they haven't covered all
11		the character-defining features that make the
12		property historically important.
13	Q.	Okay. Thank you for correcting me.
14		The next category down is Roman V, which
15		is introduction of visual atmospheric or
16		audible elements that diminish the integrity
17		of the property's significant historic
18		features. And that one seems a little more
19		understandable to a layperson. Is that
20		essentially how a proposed project will
21		<pre>impact in this case we're focused on</pre>
22		visual but the visual setting of the
23		landscape?
24	A.	Correct.

1	Q.	And when the term "setting" is used in this
2		historic resources context under the federal
3		rules, help me understand where the setting
4		is. Is it the area around the resource? Is
5		it the area the resource is in? Is it
6		adjacent? I think that's been a little
7		unclear through this proceeding so far.
8	A.	When they're talking about large properties,
9		the federal guidance indicates that the
10		setting can be both within and beyond. When
11		we're talking about an individual historic
12		property, setting is almost always used as
13		the area directly adjacent and beyond. So,
14		because of the scale, they make it a little
15		more muddy, a little less clear, and indicate
16		that it can be both within and beyond.
17	Q.	Okay. Is that, in part, because when you're
18		in a cultural landscape, you can be looking
19		at other parts of the cultural landscape that
20		might be part of the setting as opposed to
21		just looking beyond the resource?
22	A.	Exactly. It's foreground, mid-ground and
23		background. And in New Hampshire, you're
24		often in a river valley, on a hillside
	{ SEC	2015-06 Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY (10-27-17)

1		looking at a mountain, and you see layered
2		depth of landscape, which is the setting.
3	Q.	And in this case, for this cultural
4		landscape, the Applicants have indicated that
5		there will be the introduction of visual
6		elements that diminish the integrity of the
7		setting and views. And they go on to
8		ultimately conclude, because of those visual
9		elements that have been introduced, that
10		there will be an adverse effect to this
11		cultural landscape. Do you agree with that
12		statement?
13	A.	I do agree.
14	Q.	All right. But in the final box here under
15		Recommended Finding, it seems to be
16		qualified, that that finding of adverse
17		effect is qualified, but only with respect to
18		the part of the cultural landscape comprising
19		the North Road Agricultural Historic
20		District. And so, if you recall, that was a
21		subset of the cultural landscape itself that
22		had been previously identified as being an
23		eligible resource.
24	A.	Right.

1	Q.	Do you agree with that type of limitation,
2		that there can be an adverse effect to a
3		portion of the cultural landscape, but not to
4		the landscape itself?
5	Α.	I do not agree.
6	Q.	Can you comment on how you assess a cultural
7		landscape, in terms of it's component parts?
8		And I understand that cultural landscapes
9		are, in part, made up of a number of
10		character-defining features that are related
11		to each other in some way that show the
12		history. That's my very layman's approach.
13		But if there are character-defining features
14		that may be impacted, at what point does
15		that do you need more than one? Does it
16		have to be big? When does it become an
17		impact to the entire cultural landscape?
18	A.	The normal approach to assessment is the
19		change to character-defining features and its
20		relationship to the seven aspects of
21		integrity. In this work, they're essentially
22		saying that it changes the visual. It
23		changes the setting. Setting is one of those
24		aspects of integrity. Location: Not
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1	abangod Dogign, A abango a new alement
	changed. Design: A change, a new element
2	added, a different material, a different
3	scale. Setting: Scale relationships
4	altered; person in field next to small tower,
5	next to big tower, scale relationship.
6	Materials: New, bigger poles, trellis or
7	monopole. I'm not sure which occur here.
8	Workmanship: New element added. Feeling is
9	squashy, but that's what it is. It's about,
10	you know, how does this place feel now with
11	this change. I would suggest that there is a
12	change in feeling related to the insertion of
13	these very large power poles and their wires,
14	and the association may now be more toward
15	the agriculture or more toward the visual or
16	more toward the experience of the larger
17	landscape, where with these big elements in,
18	those are pervasive. Those start to make it
19	a double experience. You see this big power
20	line and you're near it and you see the view
21	to the river or the view to the mountains.
22	So I would suggest that there are more
23	impacts to integrity than as stated in this
24	finding.

			4
1	Q.	Okay. And you just walked through, if I	
2		understand, the seven	
3	Α.	Aspects of integrity.	
4	Q.	Are those seven aspects of integrity	
5		addressed in the evaluation that's shown on	
6		this document?	
7	Α.	There is no summary in the document that says	
8		integrity impacts are as follows. They've	
9		simply used the structure from the Section	
10		106, 800 sorry, don't know the exact	
11		citation. So there isn't a paragraph at the	
12		end that says integrity remains or integrity	
13		has been altered, which is what the bar is in	
14		the 106 process, the alteration of integrity.	
15	Q.	So you were just talking about the effects of	
16		a larger transmission structure within a	
17		cultural landscape. And just as an example,	
18		this is the photo sim at the end of the	
19		effects table here for the North Road-Lost	
20		Nation Road Cultural Landscape. Is this the	
21		type of change to a cultural landscape that	
22		you're talking about when you went through	
23		each of those well, you went through	
24		seven. It didn't affect all seven. But this	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

1		is the kind of thing you're talking about?
2	Α.	Five.
3	Q.	Five out of seven? Okay.
4	Α.	So, to me, this simulation is well done.
5		Appears to be accurate to the scale of the
6		new poles. Shows the visual dominance and
7		the importance of these poles. Landscapes
8		are moved through. You're going to see this
9		from many vantages, and it will be consistent
10		and pervasive throughout.
11	Q.	I'd like to turn to another one of the
12		cultural landscapes just to get a different
13		perspective.
14		Now we're going to look at the Upper
15		Ammonoosuc River Cultural Landscape.
16	A.	In Stark and Dummer.
17	Q.	And just to orient us, this is Figure 21 out
18		of the Great North Woods Cultural Landscape
19		Study Report. I couldn't tell you which
20		volume, but it's APP81950. And do you see
21		here outlined in black the cultural landscape
22		that's been identified as the Upper
23		Ammonoosuc River Cultural Landscape?
24	A.	Correct. This is within the larger study
l	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

Γ

			42
1		area of the Great North Woods.	
2	Q.	Right. And in this case, do you see that	
3		there are a few subsets of this maybe	
4		"subsets" is the wrong word but there are	
5		discrete areas that have been identified as	
6		historic districts within the cultural	
7		landscape?	
8	A.	There is. In the gold color they're	
9		indicating that they're historic districts.	
10		And the other colors they appear to be	
11		indicating land uses: The stripe is	
12		conservation land; the green is forest,	
13		public forest.	
14	Q.	Okay. And would I be correct in stating	
15		that, while there may be individual pieces of	
16		this cultural landscape that are that have	
17		significance and integrity as historic	
18		resources on their own, that the cultural	
19		landscape is something more than the sum of	
20		those individual components?	
21	A.	Correct. The relationship of these	
22		individual district areas I think is	
23		indicating that they were previously	
24		identified. And the further study	
	{SEC	$2015-06$ [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-17\}$	7}

1		commissioned, directed by DHR and the
2		consulting parties, dug deeper into the
3		research and the history and indicated that
4		each of these prior identified resources
5		related directly to their adjacencies, which
6		made them a contiguous cultural landscape.
7	Q.	And would you say that let's take the
8		Percy Summer Club, for example, which is the
9		area around Christine Lake. Would you say
10		that that district is itself a cultural
11		landscape?
12	A.	We actually use the term in cultural
13		landscape studies of "component." It's not
14		actually used in this work, to the extent
15		that I'm aware. And because that particular
16		area was developed together and developed
17		with a recreational focus and has a
18		consistency of architecture and is directed
19		toward the views and access to the lake
20		within a context of wooded slopes and more
21		level ground, it has its own qualities and
22		could be a component within the cultural
23		landscape. We are using that kind of
24		definition daily in our office with a larger
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

 cultural landscape and specific component that exhibit their character in a unique Q. Okay. And would I also be correct, to th extent I was correct a minute ago, but am also correct that the cultural landscape 	way. e I
3 Q. Okay. And would I also be correct, to th 4 extent I was correct a minute ago, but am	e I in
4 extent I was correct a minute ago, but am	I
	in
5 also correct that the cultural landscape	
s also correct that the curtural landscape	
6 encompasses more than just districts with	s,
7 it, components that are historic district	
8 or individual structures, but looks beyon	d
9 those sort of discrete physical component	s?
10 A. I would suggest that they're usually link	ed
11 by the historical evolution and the chara	cter
12 that exists today.	
13 Q. Okay. And you mentioned also that there	are
14 forest areas that are identified here wit	hin
15 the cultural landscape. Are those also	
16 components of the cultural landscape?	
17 A. Probably not. I haven't actually been on	the
18 ground there to study this. But I would	say
19 it may be that the actual summer club, Pe	rcy,
20 is sitting within hills around it and rel	ates
21 all the way up to the as far as can be	
22 seen from the club, so that the facing sl	opes
and the valley that the club sits in and	its
24 lake is one component, and then the hill	

dropping to the other side and heading east 1 2 may be the next. So I can't actually clearly indicate 3 that I agree with the boundary of this 4 5 cultural landscape. I might judge it somewhat differently. I think particularly 6 7 where it necks down to be a very small connectivity, I would look carefully at that 8 if I went to the field. 9 So I think the basic point is the 10 11 elements of a cultural landscape that make up its character-defining features are layered, 12 relate to the history, relate to continuity, 13 14 and express themselves individually as 15 places. Okay. Thank you. 16 Q. 17 So you should be seeing now a different map of this same Upper Ammonoosuc River 18 19 Cultural Landscape. And this now is a 20 portion of Applicant's Exhibit 196b. And I 21 just wanted to confirm the location of the 22 Project through the cultural landscape. Do 23 you see the line in purple that's going down 24 through --

			4
1	Α.	Top to bottom.	
2	Q.	Okay. And it's more or less bisecting the	
3		cultural landscape?	
4	Α.	Correct.	
5	Q.	And this is an overhead portion of the	
6		Project?	
7	Α.	Correct.	
8	Q.	Okay. Again, the Applicant's consultants	
9		performed an evaluation of this cultural	
10		landscape, or the impacts or effects to this	
11		cultural landscape, and that's summarized in	
12		this table; correct?	
13	Α.	It is.	
14	Q.	And so we've already gone through the	
15		categories, but I just want to touch on a	
16		couple of these examples for this cultural	
17		landscape.	
18		Again, for Category 2, alteration of the	
19		property, we see an evaluation of "none."	
20		And I believe you testified that you would	
21		characterize an alteration when there's a	
22		project, a transmission corridor or	
23		transmission line and structures being	
24		introduced into a cultural landscape.	
	[and	2015 0.6 [Dev. 52 NUMERNOON description ONLY] [10 07 17]	1

1	A.	Yes. It's a change. It's not simply the
2		replacement of the line as it exists.
3	Q.	Correct. And then, here again, the focus by
4		the Applicants is on visual impacts. And you
5		see that explanation in Roman V. And they
6		seem to be qualifying that there are only
7		very limited views in the cultural landscape.
8	A.	And they characterize it as "limited" by
9		topography, vegetation and distance. Given
10		the overlay of the corridor through this
11		district, I don't think there's much
12		distance. I would also suggest that in their
13		reasoning, not in the table per se, but
14		they're usually looking at points. The
15		cultural landscape is an area that you move
16		through, that you experience parts of, all
17		of. So it's a false judgment to say it's
18		only important when I'm sitting on the porch
19		of this building or it's only important when
20		I'm in Christine Lake. It is a pervasive
21		element in the landscape that you will see
22		from various advantages.
23	Q.	And that relates to the finding here where
24		their recommended finding again is of an
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		adverse effect. But it is qualified once
2		more as, "but primarily with respect to
3		Ammonoosuc River Crossing/North Side Road,
4		and including view from Route 110/Stark Road
5		towards the Project, and center of cultural
6		landscape." Does that distinction make sense
7		to you in the context of a review or
8		evaluating the effects on a cultural
9		landscape?
10	Α.	It's a minimization of the effect by siting
11		three or four locations where they believe
12		it's viewed from. My position is you're
13		walking in the landscape, you can view it
14		from many places, and that that
15		characterization is a false minimization of
16		the impact and the view. I know "minimize"
17		and "mitigate" are used in other ways in
18		these proceedings, so maybe I should strike
19		that word and use something else. Dilution.
20	Q.	Okay. Ms. Widell and I had a kind of
21		circular discussion I think about this
22		distinction between impacts to a particular
23		point, or part of a cultural landscape, and
24		impacts to the entire landscape. And part of
ļ	SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

her -- and this was just --1 MR. ASLIN: And for the record, 2 this is part of the Day 40 discussion in the 3 afternoon. And I could find the page number if 4 5 needed. BY MR. ASLIN: 6 7 But part of her discussion with me was a 0. statement that the cultural landscape 8 evaluation is a new or innovative thing in 9 New Hampshire, and it's difficult for -- it 10 11 was at least difficult for her to be able to distinguish between impacts to a portion of 12 the cultural landscape and impacts to the 13 entirety of the cultural landscape. 14 15 Do you agree that this cultural 16 landscape assessment is a new or innovative process within the world of historic 17 18 resources? 19 Α. No, it's not. I think New Hampshire, 20 particularly DHR, has not been able to do 21 thorough, contextual studies throughout the 22 state or thorough inventories due to staffing 23 and funding limitations over many decades. 24 So, in terms of where states are in their {SEC 2015-06} [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] {10-27-17}

1	required work of inventory and context, they
2	are not very far in New Hampshire. Other
3	states are considerably farther because their
4	departments of historic resources are better
5	funded or better staffed.
6	And then the second answer is within the
7	practice, my work since 1983 has been focused
8	on cultural landscapes. And World
9	Heritage UNESCO World Heritage Centre
10	added cultural landscapes as a listable
11	inscription category for World Heritage in
12	1992. So, a pretty long time ago these
13	things were at the point where they could be
14	listed and inscribed. In 1984 and '85, as
15	the head of the American Society of Landscape
16	Architects, Historic Preservation Committee,
17	we sat down with the Park Service and talked
18	about the approach to writing good cultural
19	landscape nominations, good cultural
20	landscape documentation, started the process
21	of moving to the Historic American Landscape
22	Survey. So these things have been in play
23	for, I would say, 30-plus years in our
24	country.

1	Q.	So if I understand that, it's a relatively
2		new process to go through in New Hampshire
3		based on the amount of background information
4		that's available, but it's a concept that has
5		been around for quite some time in the field.
6	Α.	Correct.
7		MR. ASLIN: Mr. Chairman, this
8		might be a good time for a break if you want.
9		CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
10		We'll break for 10 minutes.
11		(Recess was taken at 2:33 p.m.
12		and the hearing resumed at 2:51 p.m.)
13		CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Aslin,
14		you may proceed.
15		MR. ASLIN: Thank you, Mr.
16		Chairman.
17	BY M	R. ASLIN:
18	Q.	Ms. O'Donnell, we've looked at a couple
19		different cultural landscapes in the effects
20		tables, and we've gone through, I guess it's
21		eight if you count other examples of adverse
22		effects, sort of the criteria that are being
23		evaluated. And you've identified a number of
24		different concerns about the way or maybe
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			5.
1		"concern" isn't the right word but	
2		disagreements with the way the Applicant's	
3		consultants have reviewed these landscapes.	
4		You have, I understand, looked at the	
5		effects tables for all or most of the	
6		resources that were assessed by the	
7		Applicants; is that correct?	
8	A.	Those within and adjacent, yeah. There	
9		were I'm pretty sure there were 10.	
10	Q.	Yes. And we're not going to go through all	
11		of them because well, I'm going to ask:	
12		Would you have similar concerns or	
13		disagreements with the way the Applicant's	
14		consultants have reviewed those other	
15		cultural landscapes?	
16	A.	The style of response from the Applicant to	
17		each of the 10 isn't parallel. The same	
18		issues arise throughout the in, out and	
19		how close and how big and the no adverse	
20		effect or adverse effect but essentially	
21		indicating that there is little negative	
22		influence of the line on these big cultural	
23		landscapes is the conclusion, and I disagree.	
24	Q.	Okay. Thank you. So we've looked at a	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

1		couple that are above-ground portions of the
2		Project. I want to touch on one that's an
3		underground section of the Project because
4		that has some slightly different issues. So
5		we're going to look at the Gale River
6		Cultural Landscape.
7	A.	This is the Ham Branch?
8	Q.	No, that's the wrong exhibit. So we'll try
9		again. I apologize for my bad handwriting.
10		Okay. So this is a figure from
11		Applicant's Exhibit 211 in the section of
12		the oh, let's see. This is the
13		Pemigewasset River Valley Cultural Landscape
14		Study Area report. And this is the specific
15		area that's been identified as the Gale River
16		Cultural Landscape; is that correct?
17	A.	Correct.
18	Q.	And so here again, we see the outline in
19		black of the cultural landscape itself. And
20		this is an area that's stretching between
21		portions of Sugar Hill and Franconia. And I
22		don't believe it's shown on this map, but do
23		you understand that this is an underground
24		portion of the Project?

1	A.	Yes.
2	Q.	Okay.
3	A.	With a limited area of potential effect
4		assigned of 20 feet off either side of the
5		road.
6	Q.	Yeah. So in the 106 process, I think you're
7		referring to the direct APE direct effect
8		to APE for underground portions of the
9		Project, and that went out to 20 feet from
10		the edge of pavement; is that correct? Do
11		you understand that?
12	A.	Correct, with a variable width on the road
13		itself.
14	Q.	Correct. The roads vary in width, but the
15		20 feet extends from the edge of the pavement
16		on both sides.
17		Okay. And just to orient the big
18		picture here, this is the same form that's
19		used for all the effects tables. And again,
20		this is a page from Applicant's Exhibit 196b.
21		And in this particular case, the finding was
22		no adverse effect; is that correct?
23	A.	Correct.
24	Q.	And for the underground portion, we see a
	SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			5.
1		discussion in the first box related to	
2		physical destruction that has to do with	
3		vibration and other temporary construction	
4		impacts. Do you see that?	
5	A.	I do.	
6	Q.	Do you agree that vibration impacts can be a	
7		direct effect to historic resources?	
8	Α.	They certainly can.	
9	Q.	They might indeed cause physical destruction	
10		or damage?	
11	Α.	They can.	
12	Q.	Could they also cause alteration of a	
13		property, or is it really focused on damage	
14		and destruction?	
15	A.	Well, I think in this box, in this response,	
16		it's about damage. But I do think	
17		alteration. When historic features are	
18		disassembled and reassembled, there is a loss	
19		of integrity unless it's carefully done and	
20		carefully managed and, actually, usually	
21		quite expensive. So, if, for example, there	
22		were roadside features like stone walls and	
23		they said not to worry, we're going to pick	
24		this thing up and rebuild it, the photo	
	{SEC	$2015-06$ [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-1\}$	7}

			5
1		before and after may find substantial	
2		differences rather than exact duplications.	
3		So, yeah, I mean, if features are damaged,	
4		altered, disassembled and reassembled, they	
5		can wind up in an altered state going	
6		forward.	
7	Q.	Okay. And you mentioned the disassembly and	
8		reassembly of a feature. In what context	
9		would that occur when dealing with historic	
10		resources?	
11	A.	Well, stone walls are a good example because	
12		they're usually dry-laid and they have a	
13		limited foundation. But they're laid with	
14		traditional means and methods and craft,	
15		often by hand. So	
16	Q.	But in what circumstances	
17	Α.	if that's within 20 feet of the roadside,	
18		it may be needing to be moved and replaced if	
19		the excavation is required within that zone.	
20	Q.	Okay. I see. So if the Project needs to go	
21		through a location where a feature like a	
22		stone wall exists, one option would be to	
23		disassemble it, set it aside and then	
24		reassemble it after the Project has passed	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

1		by?
2	Α.	It is an option. It's not desirable. I
3		think the question you asked was would there
4		be a potential alteration, and I was giving
5		an example of a potential alteration.
6	Q.	Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure
7		I understood.
8		And so in this case, you'll see in that
9		top box that the Applicants, or the
10		consultants are stating that direct effects
11		to these features will be avoided by project
12		design. So am I correct that, as far as the
13		Applicants' proposal, they're not proposing
14		to do any removal and restoration of historic
15		resources or features?
16	A.	Well, they make two statements. They say
17		we're going to avoid, and if we disturb we're
18		going to restore. So there's actually two
19		statements in that paragraph.
20	Q.	And the second one is in relationship to
21		vibration.
22	Α.	No. It just says any disturbed area will be
23		restored to pre-construction condition. So
24		that's a blanket kind of statement.
L	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

		-
1	Q.	So the potential is at least recognized by
2		the Applicants here within this form.
3	A.	Correct.
4	Q.	Fair enough.
5		With regard to vibration effects, in
6		your experience, is 20 feet the 20-foot
7		APE here, is that sufficient to capture
8		resources that might be impacted by vibration
9		effects?
10	A.	Historic construction techniques, foundations
11		and so forth, are often more fragile than
12		more modern construction, or not. But in my
13		experience, there is a bigger realm of
14		monitoring and attention required than
15		20 feet. We added in our supplemental
16		testimony I don't have it in my hand, but
17		maybe Megan can give you the page number
18		that there's one source that's looking at a
19		500-foot monitoring envelope for significant
20		ground disturbance, vibration impact,
21		blasting, drilling. There are other guidance
22		sources that indicate 150 feet. I do not
23		know of any source that is limited to
24		something like 20 feet.

 Q. Okay. So I'm going to show you in a second the New Hampshire DOT standard specifications for vibration monitoring. But before I do that, I want to follow up on what you just said. If 20 feet is an inadequate distance of concern for vibration effects to historic resources or features, how would the Applicant or the SEC or anyone know of the existence of such features outside of the 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in this process? A. The inventory thus far does not give them a 	
for vibration monitoring. But before I do that, I want to follow up on what you just said. If 20 feet is an inadequate distance of concern for vibration effects to historic resources or features, how would the Applicant or the SEC or anyone know of the existence of such features outside of the 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in this process?	
 4 that, I want to follow up on what you just 5 said. 6 If 20 feet is an inadequate distance of 7 concern for vibration effects to historic 8 resources or features, how would the 9 Applicant or the SEC or anyone know of the 10 existence of such features outside of the 11 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in 12 this process? 	
5 said. 6 If 20 feet is an inadequate distance of 7 concern for vibration effects to historic 8 resources or features, how would the 9 Applicant or the SEC or anyone know of the 10 existence of such features outside of the 11 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in 12 this process?	
6 If 20 feet is an inadequate distance of 7 concern for vibration effects to historic 8 resources or features, how would the 9 Applicant or the SEC or anyone know of the 10 existence of such features outside of the 11 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in 12 this process?	
7 concern for vibration effects to historic 8 resources or features, how would the 9 Applicant or the SEC or anyone know of the 10 existence of such features outside of the 11 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in 12 this process?	
8 resources or features, how would the 9 Applicant or the SEC or anyone know of the 10 existence of such features outside of the 11 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in 12 this process?	
9 Applicant or the SEC or anyone know of the 10 existence of such features outside of the 11 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in 12 this process?	
10 existence of such features outside of the 11 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in 12 this process?	
11 20 feet APE if that's what's been studied in 12 this process?	
12 this process?	
13 A. The inventory thus far does not give them a	
-	
14 good capture of anything beyond the 20-foot	
15 APE that was determined. So, under the	
16 Programmatic Agreement, there's a line	
17 there's a paragraph or a section on new	
18 discoveries. But that's I would suggest	
19 that that's a during-construction process	
20 which doesn't offer pre-planning and	
21 protection for historic resources that are	
22 adjacent.	
23 Q. Okay. So let's take a look at the DOT	
24 standard.	

1		Okay. You should be seeing now what's
2		been marked as Counsel for the Public Exhibit
3		49, and it is Section 211 of the New
4		Hampshire DOT's standard specifications, and
5		it's the 2016 version of those specifications
6		which you can see in the bottom right corner.
7		And this section is about vibration
8		monitoring.
9		And if you look at Section 3.4 here,
10		which is the following page, CFP 13489, do
11		you see where it specifies that
12		pre-construction condition surveys should be
13		done within 100 feet of anticipated sources
14		of constructed-related vibrations?
15	A.	You misspoke. It's 150.
16	Q.	Oh, I'm sorry. What did I say?
17	A.	A hundred. Must be Friday afternoon.
18	Q.	It must be Friday afternoon.
19		Okay. So, does this having looked at
20		this, would that confirm to you that in New
21		Hampshire, for standard construction
22		monitoring, New Hampshire DOT recommends
23		looking out at least 150 feet?
24	A.	Before construction. Correct. That is what
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			6
1		the specification indicates.	
2	Q.	And based on what you said a few minutes ago,	
3		am I correct that, given the lack of review	
4		of historic or maybe I the lack of	
5		identification	
6	Α.	Inventory.	
7	Q.	or inventory, thank you, of historic	
8		resources or features outside of the 20-foot	
9		APE, if there were a feature 100 feet away or	
10		150 feet	
11	A.	Or 22 feet.	
12	Q.	or 22, the Applicant may not be aware of	
13		it?	
14	A.	Correct.	
15	Q.	And that hasn't been captured by the 106	
16		process at this point.	
17	Α.	It has not yet been captured. I know that	
18		the intervenors, particularly from some of	
19		the underground sections and I know this	
20		because we reviewed it to develop our	
21		report have indicated, for example, that	
22		their Main Street is narrow, that 20 feet off	
23		just barely misses most of their historic	
24		structures and that they have concerns. So I	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17	7}

1		think this state guidance on vibration
2		monitoring is a good specification. And
3		specifications are basically industry
4		standards. And this is 2016, so it's up to
5		date.
6	Q.	Now, if the Applicant's contractors on the
7		ground are following the specification and
8		they're looking out 150 feet, are they likely
9		to be able to identify historic features that
10		may need special care or attention?
11	Α.	If they did a proper inventory, yes.
12	Q.	An inventory of historic features
13	A.	Correct.
14	Q.	not just a regular construction survey?
15		If you can answer that?
16	A.	And this one even says swimming pools and
17		mobile homes. So, you know, it is a blanket
18		description of structures, which includes
19		walls which might be nearby. I know that
20		some of the town residents have brought up
21		wells, which of course ground vibration can
22		alter your water availability. So these are
23		issues for vibration monitoring.
24	Q.	Okay. Thank you.

1		Okay. I'm showing you a page out of the
2		effects evaluation or the effects table for
3		the Gale River Cultural Landscape. And this
4		being an underground portion of the Project,
5		the consultants here have inventoried or made
6		a list of those historic features that are in
7		or near the direct APE; so, in or near the
8		20 feet from pavement. And in this case, I
9		want you to take a look at the middle photo
10		or item. And it's talking about mature
11		trees. Can mature trees be a
12		character-defining feature of a cultural
13		landscape?
14	A.	Absolutely.
15	Q.	And would impacts to those trees diminish the
16		integrity of the cultural landscape?
17	A.	It would.
18	Q.	So at least in this instance we have one
19		example, and I would posit there are others,
20		of mature trees that are a character-defining
21		feature very close to the edge of the
22		roadway. Would you agree with that?
23	A.	I do. In fact, each of these images shows
24		sizable trees. "Mature" is a soft term. But
	SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

		•
1		once a tree is 25 years old, it starts to get
2		considerable scale. A pine's life span is
3		about 80 to 100 years. So they become
4		important features in the landscape.
5	Q.	And from a historic resources perspective, in
6		terms of assessing the effects on cultural
7		landscapes, would it be important for the
8		Applicant to avoid impacts to these kinds of
9		character-defining features?
10	A.	The answer is yes. I grew up in Buffalo at
11		the time when we lost the elms, and the
12		character of the city completely changed. So
13		if these particular corridors were denuded of
14		their large trees, there would be no scale
15		relationships between vegetation. There
16		would be more "urban heat island effect," but
17		there would also be a big character shift.
18		The architecture wouldn't have its related
19		vegetation and scale.
20	Q.	Okay. Thank you. And we were just talking
21		about trees. Would that same issue be true
22		for any character-defining feature within the
23		vicinity of the roadway where the Project is
24		going to be buried?
	(ana	

1	A.	You would speak to each one in its
2		preservation or protection differently. But
3		the third image shows and notes, I believe, a
4		field stone wall, random, looks hand-built;
5		so, another such feature close to the road.
6	Q.	And again, things that would need to be
7		avoided in terms of reducing or avoiding
8		adverse effects to the cultural landscape as
9		a whole.
10	A.	Correct.
11	Q.	I want to turn to the Programmatic Agreement
12		which was executed by the Applicant and DOE
13		and DHR and some others this summer. It's
14		Applicant's Exhibit 204. There's been a fair
15		bit of discussion about this document in the
16		record.
17		Would you agree that within the 106
18		process this document more or less governs
19		the interaction of the parties, the Section
20		106 parties, as they move through that 106
21		process?
22	A.	Right. Section 106 is a consultation
23		process, and the consulting parties work
24		together toward resolution.
	Jerc	2015-06 Day 53 AFTERNOON Seggion ONLY 1/10-27-17

 $\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{10-27-17\}$

			66
1	Q.	So there is a	
2	A.	It's not an SEC process.	
3	Q.	Right. And I want to focus on the portion of	
4		this document that appears at Roman V, called	
5		"Resolution of Adverse Effects." And we're	
6		going to go to APP68691.	
7		And so do you see Section V, Resolution	
8		of Adverse Effects?	
9	A.	I do.	
10	Q.	And would it be fair to say that this is a	
11		section of the Programmatic Agreement that	
12		deals with the handling of adverse effects	
13		that are going to be that haven't been	
14		avoided or minimized through the 106 process?	
15	Α.	It establishes a process.	
16	Q.	Okay. So I want to take a look at section,	
17		or Paragraph C, I guess. And it says if	
18		historic properties will be adversely	
19		affected by the proposed project, DOE will	
20		direct NPT to prepare and implement an HPTP	
21		that addresses the direct and indirect	
22		cumulative and reasonably foreseeable adverse	
23		effects of the proposed project on historic	
24		properties in the APE, and it goes on.	

1		Is this type of a well, do you know
2		what "HPTP," what that stands for?
3	Α.	It's a historic preservation do they use
4		treatment as the "T"? Historic properties
5		treatment plan. "Treatment" is the word
6		that's used in preservation. Sounds like
7		medical or something. But it's the word
8		that's used in preservation to indicate an
9		intervention on behalf of the historic
10		elements, character-defining features that is
11		intended to protect and preserve. So the
12		definition of the word "treatment" is protect
13		and preserve.
14	Q.	And having let me start with this. You're
15		familiar with this Programmatic Agreement?
16	A.	I have read it.
17	Q.	Okay. Is it your understanding that the HPTP
18		is a plan essentially for how to address or
19		treat historic features that are impacted by
20		the Project?
21	Α.	It's not entirely clear to me that the HPTP
22		is that. This Programmatic Agreement has
23		three headings that indicate what's in the
24		HPTP, and they're called: Monitoring Plan,
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		Unanticipated Discovery Plan and a Training
2		Plan.
3	Q.	And you're looking
4	A.	At the next pages directly after this one, 28
5		and 29, monitoring, unanticipated discovery
6		and training. That, to me, doesn't say
7		determine if there's an adverse effect,
8		figure out how to avoid it, figure out how to
9		preserve and protect the element that's going
10		to be impacted. That's not what this is
11		saying.
12	Q.	Okay.
13	Α.	This is saying train the people, monitor the
14		people, and find out how you deal with an
15		unanticipated discovery.
16	Q.	And so in this context
17	Α.	It's a framework.
18	Q.	It's a framework. And are you aware of
19		whether an HPTP has been created at this time
20		for this project?
21	A.	My understanding is this is the guidance in
22		order to create such a plan, but that plan
23		has not yet been created. I may be wrong.
24	Q.	Well, I would agree that I haven't seen it
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			0
1		either. So	
2	Α.	I haven't seen it.	
3	Q.	And as a sort of direct corollary to that,	
4		the monitoring plan, unanticipated discovery	
5		plan, and the training plan that are part of	
6		the HPTP are also not yet part of the record	
7		in this proceeding.	
8	Α.	Correct.	
9	Q.	This Programmatic Agreement, and the HPTP	
10		more specifically, are part of the 106	
11		process and, therefore, limited to the	
12		one-mile APE in that process; correct?	
13	A.	[No verbal response]	
14	Q.	So, to the extent that the HPTP will address	
15		how to treat adverse impacts to historic	
16		properties, will it address those impacts to	
17		any historic properties outside the APE?	
18	A.	No.	
19	Q.	And in your review of this section, the	
20		Resolution of Adverse Effects section, and	
21		the sort of definition or explanation of what	
22		the HPTP will cover, do you see any	
23		discussion of specific mitigation practices	
24		or activities for individual resources that	
ı	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

			7
1		are adversely impacted?	
2	А.	No. I think it's interesting, too, because	
3		the Section 106 process establishes four	
4		strategies for mitigation: Avoid, minimize,	
5		mitigate, compensate. I don't actually even	
6		see that here, that there's actually a	
7		four-step process. And the first and best is	
8		avoidance of the impact.	
9	Q.	And would I be correct that avoidance would,	
10		in most cases, happen before you got to the	
11		level of mitigation under an HPTP?	
12	А.	Yes. I think that your avoidance would	
13		happen with an adequate inventory and then an	
14		adequate monitoring plan. I still think it's	
15		important in any project to have an	
16		unanticipated discovery plan, so you know	
17		what you do when you find things you didn't	
18		think were there. But you also have other	
19		state laws, like if you encounter human	
20		remains and if you encounter archeological	
21		sites. So you have other controls on these	
22		elements. Except that this is a 106 process;	
23		it's not a New Hampshire law-based process.	
24	Q.	Now, in Ms. Widell's supplemental testimony,	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

1		and also in her testimony before the
2		Committee, she's urged or suggested that the
3		Committee should rely on this Programmatic
4		Agreement and the 106 process to resolve any
5		adverse effects, and essentially to govern
6		the mitigation process of adverse effects to
7		historic resources.
8		Based on your understanding of what's in
9		the Programmatic Agreement and your
10		understanding of the Section 106 process in
11		general, do you agree that that is an
12		appropriate way for the Committee to rely on
13		or to address mitigation of adverse impacts
14		in this SEC process?
15	A.	No.
16	Q.	Why not?
17	A.	This is a framework, and it's a consultation
18		process. And it indicates watchdog and
19		monitoring roles from consulting parties, as
20		well as the DOE, and then gives the
21		daily-work monitoring and efforts directly to
22		the Applicant. So, essentially, the
23		Applicant is being tasked with reporting out
24		on any findings. It's very, in my opinion,
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		high risk that, first of all; you don't know
2		everything. And second of all, the Applicant
3		has indicated that there's less than a dozen
4		adverse impacts on this entire 192-mile
5		corridor to historic and cultural resources.
6		And then thirdly, we have these very small
7		distances off the corridor for the whole
8		underground section with adjacent resources
9		unknown. So I think you could list a whole
10		series of unknowns that this Programmatic
11		Agreement isn't helping you get closure on.
12		So I'm not sure I would not feel it's an
13		effective safety net in the way that it's
14		currently stated.
15	Q.	And looking at the 106 process more broadly,
16		is it correct well, let me ask you.
17		What's your understanding of the extent to
18		which those resources that have an adverse
19		effect, the extent to which that adverse
20		effect will actually be mitigated through the
21		106 process?
22	Α.	In my opinion, the 106 process is not a good
23		mitigator once you've gone to construction.
24		I think, in general, a Programmatic Agreement
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			7.
1		is based on good work in advance of the	
2		intervention. And the good work in advance	
3		means that your knowledge is very high and	
4		your level of assurance in the work that	
5		you've done is quite complete.	
6	Q.	Are there instances within the 106 process	
7		where an adverse impact may have been	
8		identified and the mitigation that's	
9		identified for that adverse impact doesn't	
10		actually avoid the adverse impact in any way?	
11	Α.	Yes.	
12	Q.	Can you give me an example?	
13	Α.	Well, in our work at St. Elizabeth's	
14		Hospital, which is being rehabilitated and	
15		reused as the Homeland Security headquarters	
16		under the General Services Administration	
17		this is in Washington, D.C we developed a	
18		detailed plan of the cultural landscape as	
19		shaped and the guidance to all the people who	
20		intervened, all the design teams and all the	
21		contractors, to be able to account for all of	
22		the character-defining features that we had	
23		mapped and described in their work. So the	
24		pre-work was the template for their next	
	[and	201E OGIDER ES AEREDNOON dession ONIVI (10 27 1)	ר ה

1		steps, and the capture was as complete as we
2		could make it. It was very complete. So, in
3		this case, some of the impacts from the
4		build-out of Homeland Security were more than
5		simply replacing and reusing historic
6		buildings, replacing new buildings, altering
7		the overall setting. And the determination
8		was that documentation, Historic American
9		Buildings Survey, Historic American
10		Landscape the HALS, the Historic American
11		Landscape Survey work we carried out, and a
12		public education program would be considered
13		mitigation. So, not a physical. The impact
14		was not avoided. It was well designed,
15		integrated as best as possible. But further
16		mitigation was requested and required that
17		aided public education through documentation.
18	Q.	So, in that case, the impact happened.
19	Α.	Correct.
20	Q.	But the mitigation was to create a record of
21		the resource for future education?
22	Α.	And then to interpret that actively to the
23		public with tours and so forth.
24	Q.	But if I'm understanding you, the mitigation
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			/5
1		wasn't to lessen the impact in any way to the	
2		actual physical resource.	
3	А.	They had already done their best with the	
4		design to fit it in, but it had an impact.	
5	Q.	So in the context of this project, where	
6		there are going to be or where there would	
7		be adverse impacts to historic resources if	
8		the Project is constructed, the 106 process	
9		wouldn't necessarily	
10	Α.	Avoid.	
11	Q.	minimize or avoid those, and the end	
12		result might be simply to document that there	
13		used to be a nice, historic feature here.	
14	Α.	That's possible.	
15	Q.	Okay. Ms. Widell, in her supplemental	
16		testimony, also criticized your report or	
17		rather, your suggestion about back up and	
18		try this again.	
19		Ms. Widell criticized your critique of	
20		her report as having not adequately	
21		identified minimization and mitigation of the	
22		Project. And she states in her supplemental	
23		testimony	
24	Α.	This is Day 40 or Day 41?	

1 Q. No, this is her testimony.

2 A. Right. Okay.

She states on Page 10 of her supplemental 3 Q. testimony, at Line 26, in response to your 4 critique about inadequate minimization and 5 avoidance, she says, "The Project has 6 7 substantially avoided impacts and minimized effects to historic resources by locating 8 99.5 miles of the line in existing 9 transmission rights-of-way (ROW), most of 10 11 which have existed for 50 to 75 years. Further, placing 60.5 miles of the line 12 underground has meant that the Project has 13 eliminated visual effects over long distances 14 15 and large area historic properties." 16 In your opinion, is co-locating the 17 Project in an existing right-of-way -- well, first, is that a type of minimization? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 In your opinion, is it an effective or 0. 21 adequate minimization? 22 If the materials, visuals and scale were Α. 23 similar to what's already in the corridor, I 24 would say it would be quite a good

{SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		minimization. But with the size, scale and
2		pervasive quality of these new elements of
3		the electric transmission line, it makes a
4		very strong shift in scale because the new
5		lines are generally or often above the
6		highest trees, which make them much more
7		broadly visible.
8	Q.	And so when Ms. Widell touts this co-location
9		as sort of "look at all the minimization
10		we've done," acknowledging that that is a
11		benefit, that it's better than the
12		alternative, is it your opinion, then, that
13		it's not enough to avoid adverse impacts to
14		historic resources?
15	Α.	My opinion is that simply locating this new,
16		larger electrical transmission system within
17		the current right-of-way is not a sufficient
18		mitigation.
19		MR. ASLIN: Thank you, Mr.
20		Chairman. Ms. O'Donnell is available for
21		cross-examination.
22		CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's go
23		off the record for a minute.
24		CROSS-EXAMINATION
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1 BY MS. BOEPPLE: I have a cold. 2 0. Good afternoon. Excuse me. But I think I can get through this pretty 3 quickly and my voice will stay with me. Beth 4 Boepple for the Forest Society. 5 So, Ms. O'Donnell, most of my questions 6 7 have to do with documents that have come in subsequent to you filing your supplemental 8 prefiled testimony. 9 10 Would you agree that, with respect to 11 the cultural landscape reports and any analysis that's been done by the Applicant, 12 that is all subsequent to your prefiled 13 testimony? That's all come in subsequent to 14 15 your --16 Oh, yes. All of the cultural landscape Α. studies and their assessments are 17 post-prefiled testimony and supplemental. 18 Okay. Now, I know Mr. Aslin discussed the 19 Q. 20 cultural landscape reports with you, but I don't believe he asked you whether you can 21 22 opine, based on your field work and extensive 23 experience with cultural landscapes, why the 24 Applicant would have focused on 11 cultural

landscapes and not more than that. 1 Can you 2 opine on that, based on your experience? Well, we had the opportunity in the 3 Α. development of our report to do a quick field 4 review. We didn't actually do the kind of 5 studies that we're often doing for cultural 6 landscapes to define them, to review their 7 historic research, to consult primary source 8 documents. So I think that I would be 9 overstepping if I were to say that I know a 10 11 lot about the cultural landscape of New Hampshire. I think my sense is that there 12 are many sites, historic sites and resources 13 14 that are relevant to the lives of the people 15 of New Hampshire that are categorized 16 potentially as cultural landscapes. The 17 simplest definition of a cultural landscape is the combined works of humanity and nature. 18 Most of the forests in New Hampshire are 19 20 tended, replanted or volunteer third cut, 21 fourth cut, whatever. We don't have any 22 virgin. The human hand is here pretty much everywhere. So I would say, in the broadest 23 definitional sense, these are cultural 24

SEC 2015-06 [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-17\}$

			8(
1		landscapes.	
2	Q.	Well, with respect to my question which had	
3		to do with why there were only 11 as opposed	
4		to more, in your experience, I believe in	
5		your direct testimony you recommended a	
6		10-mile APE, which would have been a 20-mile	
7		corridor. Now that the Applicant has	
8		reviewed and done a determination of cultural	
9		landscapes, is it possible that had they used	
10		a broader APE from the beginning, that they	
11		might have identified additional cultural	
12		landscapes?	
13	A.	I'm not sure I would want to state that from	
14		their position. I think from our position,	
15		looking at the 20-mile, the 10 to each side,	
16		we found many landscapes of cultural value	
17		not necessarily listed or listable, but	
18		hundreds and thousands of acres of	
19		conservation lands in current use or in	
20		private conservation. Clearly a societal	
21		value here. Many recreation areas. But in	
22		addition, lots of small town centers and	
23		other features that are culturally valuable.	
24		Pretty pervasive I would say. Our mapping	
·	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17	7}

showed that. 1 Q. 2 Okay. Would they have found more? Depends on what 3 Α. criteria they used for their studies. 4 But certainly if you extend from a 1-mile APE 5 Q. to a 10-mile APE, you're likely to discover a 6 7 lot more. Yes. And in their studies, just so we're 8 Α. absolutely factual, the study boundaries were 9 well beyond the APE. They chose a valley and 10 11 river system, various typologies, and they actually did say, "look at these, look at our 12 Great North Woods, not just one mile beyond 13 our corridor." And interestingly, in every 14 one of their five studies, they found -- they 15 16 defined cultural landscapes partially within 17 or within, as well as outside of the one-mile APE. So, in fact, their findings answer your 18 19 earlier question: Are there cultural 20 landscapes beyond the one-mile APE? Even in 21 these studies directed on behalf of this 22 project by DHR and the consulting parties, 23 the findings are beyond the APE. Thank you. Now I'd like to ask you, in 24 Q. {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			02
1		addition to the cultural landscape reports	
2		and the historic properties effects tables	
3		and the Programmatic Agreement, did you see	
4		other materials related to cultural	
5		landscapes that have come in subsequent to	
6		your prefiled testimony for example, the	
7		letter dated August 25th that was filed, that	
8		was directed a letter sent from the New	
9		Hampshire Division of Historical Resources to	
10		the Subcommittee?	
11	A.	I have that letter.	
12	Q.	Okay.	
13	A.	It's directed to the Subcommittee, and it's	
14		dated October 25th. You have a question	
15		about it?	
16	Q.	Yes, I do. So you are familiar with this.	
17		You've seen it.	
18	A.	I read it.	
19	Q.	Okay. Thank you.	
20		MS. BOEPPLE: Dawn, can I have	
21		the ELMO, please?	
22		MR. IACOPINO: Ms. Boepple, can	
23		you confirm the date on the letters?	
24		MS. BOEPPLE: 25 August 2017.	
l	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17	7}

			83
1		MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.	
2	A.	Subject: Northern Pass Transmission, LLC and	
3		Public Service of New Hampshire, d/b/a	
4		Eversource Energy, Docket No. 2015-06.	
5	BY N	AS. BOEPPLE:	
6	Q.	That's the same letter that was also	
7		submitted as SPNF Exhibit 223, Bates numbers	
8		SPNHF 07235 through 07256.	
9		I've put up on the screen the second	
10		page of the letter, and I'd like to direct	
11		your attention to the section with the	
12		heading Cultural Landscapes. Are you	
13		familiar with that paragraph?	
14	Α.	Yes.	
15	Q.	Okay. And would you agree that that's	
16		basically a definition of cultural landscapes	
17		that DHR considers a definition for cultural	
18		landscapes?	
19	Α.	There is a quotation. The sentence does cite	
20		the National Park Service as the source. I	
21		believe that it's from Cultural Resource	
22		Management Guidelines of the National Park	
23		Service, MPS28.	
24	Q.	So are you familiar with that definition?	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17	7}

			84
1	A.	Yeah.	
2	Q.	And would you agree with that definition of	
3		cultural landscapes?	
4	Α.	Oh, I do. Sure. It's MPS. It's one of the	
5		foundations of the work we do.	
6	Q.	And would you agree that DHR's letter, having	
7		read it, also talks about using that	
8		definition in the Section 106 process?	
9	Α.	They do talk about that.	
10	Q.	Okay. And do you also see the highlighted	
11		section at the bottom of the second paragraph	
12		of that section of the letter where it says	
13		"potentially eligible National Register	
14		cultural landscapes of varying size and	
15		significance are proposed"?	
16	Α.	Yes, I do see that.	
17	Q.	And I believe earlier you were testifying	
18		under Mr. Aslin's questioning about historic	
19		resources and definitions under New Hampshire	
20		law.	
21	Α.	Hmm-hmm.	
22	Q.	And would you also agree that New Hampshire's	
23		definition is broader than resources that are	
24		eligible for the listing on the National	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17	7}

1		Register?
2	A.	It is.
3	Q.	Okay. Thank you.
4	A.	It is broader.
5	Q.	How broad?
6	A.	Well, it's interesting. In the introduction
7		to our report of 15 November, we cited the
8		SEC rules and definitions and New Hampshire
9		Historic Preservation law, which actually
10		both of which were foundational to the
11		approach we took. We were often, if not
12		always, working on National Register
13		properties, national landmarks, heritage
14		areas that have already been designated. But
15		when you read the New Hampshire guidance,
16		legal guidance, and the rules of the SEC, the
17		language broadens the capture of resource
18		types and it broadens the values. So the
19		issue here is that the values as stated, and
20		I think I've said it several times today,
21		value to the people of New Hampshire is
22		clearly indicated.
23		The other thing that's in New Hampshire
24		law as it indicates is that the heritage
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		values include their social and economic and
2		educational values and that those values are
3		important to the people of New Hampshire and
4		its economics and its fruitfulness going
5		forward and its roots, broadly stated. I am
6		not using the terms in the law. But this
7		definition led us to look beyond the simple
8		106 process of saying it's got to be on the
9		Register or eligible for.
10		I think our understanding of our study
11		of those documents led us to look at the
12		actions of society. And those actions
13		included conserving land. Most of the
14		conservation lands are not NR-eligible or
15		NR-listed, but it's clearly a widespread
16		societal value.
17	Q.	So why is that important? Why is that an
18		important distinction?
19	A.	Because the Applicants have considered
20		history and culture, in terms of its
21		resources, as those that are NR-eligible and
22		listable listed or eligible. So, if we
23		narrow our capture of historic and cultural
24		value of place to only those that go on the
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			0
1		National Register, we're not really looking	
2		at the society, its economic values, its	
3		roots, its meanings. And your laws in New	
4		Hampshire appear to re-focus in a broader way	
5		what those resources are.	
6	Q.	And is that a similar problem with the	
7		Programmatic Agreement?	
8	A.	Absolutely, because the Programmatic	
9		Agreement views historic and cultural	
10		resources as only those that are listed on	
11		the National Register or eligible for the	
12		National Register.	
13	Q.	So, therefore, by its very definition, would	
14		it be fair to say that the Programmatic	
15		Agreement is not designed to protect anything	
16		beyond that?	
17	A.	The Programmatic Agreement aligns to	
18		Section 106. It doesn't align to the SEC	
19		rules or the laws of the state of New	
20		Hampshire.	
21	Q.	Okay. Thank you.	
22		MS. BOEPPLE: No other	
23		questions.	
24		CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Percy.	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17	'}

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION	
2	BY MS. PERCY:	
3	Q. Good afternoon, members of the Committee an	nd
4	Ms. O'Donnell. My name is Susan Percy. I	am
5	an intervenor for the Percy Summer Club,	
6	representing a fairly small group of people	9
7	who have camps on Christine Lake, and the	
8	spokesperson for the combined Dummer, Starl	٢,
9	Northumberland Group. And I also like to	
10	think that I represent the public because t	the
11	public has access through the Percy Summer	
12	Club to all the Nash Stream Forest, the	
13	Kauffmann Forest, the Percy Forest and	
14	Christine Lake. So I think I play multiple	9
15	roles.	
16	So, with that said, I just have a coup	ple
17	of questions, and partly because I have not	t
18	been able to read the cultural landscape	
19	report that was done on the Upper Ammonoos	JC
20	area in its entirety, as I think you said y	you
21	haven't as well.	
22	A. Yeah. Let me just correct that I think the	эу
23	called all these "studies."	
24	Q. Studies?	

{SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

 A. They call them "cultural landscape studies" and "study areas." I may be wrong, but a "cultural landscape report" is a bit of a pejorative term because the Federal Government, through the National Parks Service, says what the content of those reports is supposed to be. Q. Just for my purposes, can you tell me, typically in a study, would there be contact with the community at large that either lives in the area or has greater familiarity of that area? A. Depends. Q. And what would it be dependent upon? A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of the Project. Q. So if we think about this project with Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 			
 "cultural landscape report" is a bit of a pejorative term because the Federal Government, through the National Parks Service, says what the content of those reports is supposed to be. Q. Just for my purposes, can you tell me, typically in a study, would there be contact with the community at large that either lives in the area or has greater familiarity of that area? A. Depends. Q. And what would it be dependent upon? A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of the Project. Q. So if we think about this project with Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 	1	Α.	They call them "cultural landscape studies"
 4 pejorative term because the Federal 5 Government, through the National Parks 6 Service, says what the content of those 7 reports is supposed to be. 8 Q. Just for my purposes, can you tell me, 9 typically in a study, would there be contact 10 with the community at large that either lives 11 in the area or has greater familiarity of 12 that area? 13 A. Depends. 14 Q. And what would it be dependent upon? 15 A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of 16 the Project. 17 Q. So if we think about this project with 18 Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the 19 way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, 20 would you think that this and looking at 21 cultural landscapes within this area, would 	2		and "study areas." I may be wrong, but a
 Government, through the National Parks Service, says what the content of those reports is supposed to be. Q. Just for my purposes, can you tell me, typically in a study, would there be contact with the community at large that either lives in the area or has greater familiarity of that area? A. Depends. Q. And what would it be dependent upon? A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of the Project. Q. So if we think about this project with Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 	3		"cultural landscape report" is a bit of a
 6 Service, says what the content of those 7 reports is supposed to be. 8 Q. Just for my purposes, can you tell me, 9 typically in a study, would there be contact 10 with the community at large that either lives 11 in the area or has greater familiarity of 12 that area? 13 A. Depends. 14 Q. And what would it be dependent upon? 15 A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of 16 the Project. 17 Q. So if we think about this project with 18 Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the 19 way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, 20 would you think that this and looking at 21 cultural landscapes within this area, would 	4		pejorative term because the Federal
 reports is supposed to be. Q. Just for my purposes, can you tell me, typically in a study, would there be contact with the community at large that either lives in the area or has greater familiarity of that area? A. Depends. Q. And what would it be dependent upon? A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of the Project. Q. So if we think about this project with Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 	5		Government, through the National Parks
 8 Q. Just for my purposes, can you tell me, typically in a study, would there be contact with the community at large that either lives in the area or has greater familiarity of that area? 13 A. Depends. 14 Q. And what would it be dependent upon? 15 A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of the Project. 17 Q. So if we think about this project with Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 	6		Service, says what the content of those
 9 typically in a study, would there be contact 10 with the community at large that either lives 11 in the area or has greater familiarity of 12 that area? 13 A. Depends. 14 Q. And what would it be dependent upon? 15 A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of 16 the Project. 17 Q. So if we think about this project with 18 Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the 19 way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, 20 would you think that this and looking at 21 cultural landscapes within this area, would 	7		reports is supposed to be.
 10 with the community at large that either lives 11 in the area or has greater familiarity of 12 that area? 13 A. Depends. 14 Q. And what would it be dependent upon? 15 A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of 16 the Project. 17 Q. So if we think about this project with 18 Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the 19 way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, 20 would you think that this and looking at 21 cultural landscapes within this area, would 	8	Q.	Just for my purposes, can you tell me,
 in the area or has greater familiarity of that area? A. Depends. Q. And what would it be dependent upon? A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of the Project. Q. So if we think about this project with Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 	9		typically in a study, would there be contact
 that area? A. Depends. Q. And what would it be dependent upon? A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of the Project. Q. So if we think about this project with Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 	10		with the community at large that either lives
 13 A. Depends. 14 Q. And what would it be dependent upon? 15 A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of the Project. 17 Q. So if we think about this project with 18 Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, 20 would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 	11		in the area or has greater familiarity of
 14 Q. And what would it be dependent upon? 15 A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of the Project. 17 Q. So if we think about this project with Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 	12		that area?
 15 A. It depends on the scoping and the purpose of 16 the Project. 17 Q. So if we think about this project with 18 Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the 19 way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, 20 would you think that this and looking at 21 cultural landscapes within this area, would 	13	A.	Depends.
16 the Project. 17 Q. So if we think about this project with 18 Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the 19 way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, 20 would you think that this and looking at 21 cultural landscapes within this area, would	14	Q.	And what would it be dependent upon?
17 Q. So if we think about this project with 18 Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the 19 way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, 20 would you think that this and looking at 21 cultural landscapes within this area, would	15	Α.	It depends on the scoping and the purpose of
 Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, would you think that this and looking at cultural landscapes within this area, would 	16		the Project.
 19 way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, 20 would you think that this and looking at 21 cultural landscapes within this area, would 	17	Q.	So if we think about this project with
20 would you think that this and looking at 21 cultural landscapes within this area, would	18		Northern Pass using the right-of-way all the
21 cultural landscapes within this area, would	19		way through Dummer, Stark, Northumberland,
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	20		would you think that this and looking at
	21		cultural landscapes within this area, would
22 you think that that would warrant some public	22		you think that that would warrant some public
23 comments and participation from the study	23		comments and participation from the study
24 group?	24		group?

1	A.	I wouldn't want to offer an opinion on it. I
2		know that in our work, 85, 90 percent of the
3		time there are public engagement, community
4		engagement components.
5	Q.	Okay. Great. Thank you.
6		So I see in your report that you
7		reference RSA 227-C, that clearly establishes
8		the importance of the environmental assets of
9		New Hampshire; is that correct?
10	А.	Yeah. What page are we on?
11	Q.	Three. Page 3 of your report. I didn't
12		bring my pages.
13	Α.	Absolutely.
14	Q.	And in this RSA it was determined that it is
15		critical, and I quote here, "to engage in a
16		comprehensive program of historic
17		preservation to promote the use and
18		conservation of such property for the
19		education, inspiration, pleasure and
20		enrichment of New Hampshire citizens
21		[sic]." Is that correct?
22	А.	You're very close to an exact quote. You
23		flipped citizen, but it's all good.
24	Q.	Oh, thank you. Citizens of oh, well,
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1 whatever. Would you agree that this statement of 2 public policy in the public interest is 3 particularly important to citizens in the 4 5 North Country, where large areas are either undeveloped or conserved through efforts of 6 7 private and public partnerships? I would suggest that this statement is 8 Α. relevant to everyone in the state of New 9 10 Hampshire. And I think that the resources in 11 the north are special, but it's not irrelevant to those in other areas. 12 Thank you. Well, this one's a little harder 13 Q. 14 to sort of put in that context, because do 15 you believe that the newly offered cultural 16 landscape reports -- studies adequately 17 address this conservation and protected views 18 in the North Country? 19 Α. I haven't had the opportunity to study the 20 history and evolution of the North Country 21 landscape the way they did in the study. The 22 methodology of the Public Archeology Lab 23 looks quite sound. Their history looks quite 24 thorough. I think the report -- the study {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

work itself is quite good. I'm not 1 completely clear on their methodology for 2 keeping certain properties in and other 3 properties taken out. So I think I would 4 need to know more to be able to comment on 5 the boundaries of the cultural landscapes as 6 7 defined. But I think one of the things that these studies point out is that there's 8 more -- there are more resources with more 9 value than were originally included in the 10 Applicant's materials. 11

12 Q. Thank you.

Just going to your point about the 13 14 boundaries. In looking at -- I know the 15 Counsel for the Public brought up the map of 16 the Stark area with Christine Lake outlined. 17 And in the boundary, the Nash Stream Forest and the Kauffmann Forest are left out. 18 So the boundary line is drawn simply around 19 20 Christine Lake and extends out to the east 21 and the west, but it doesn't extend north and 22 Did you think that -- I'm sorry. south. It 23 extends south. It doesn't extend north, so it leaves out a good chunk of the Nash Stream 24

1		Forest.
2		Do you think that that's an appropriate
3		boundary to leave out an area that has hiking
4		trails all the way through the forest and is
5		used by the public?
6	Α.	Again, I think if we look at the boundary of
7		each of these cultural landscapes, my
8		impression is that they follow property
9		lines. I think they look like parcel
10		boundaries that turn east, west, drop
11		north-south, head east-west again, go up,
12		come over. So they may have looked at
13		historic land ownership and brought that
14		forward.
15		I was recently in a mountainous area
16		where we were talking about boundaries, shall
17		remain unnamed because it was a confidential
18		mission about world heritage. And we talked
19		about the reasons why we should go up the
20		valleys and along the ridges and include the
21		landscapes facing the core resource area.
22		Another way of considering it, that's a
23		visual way. Doesn't follow a property
24		boundary. It follows geography. Another way
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		of considering it would be a land use
2		approach. If you used a land use approach,
3		you would likely connect to those properties
4		that were interconnected. So if the trails
5		of the adjacent Kauffmann Forest connected to
6		Christine Lake and the Percy Summer Camp, you
7		would look carefully at those connections.
8		So when you're looking at recreation areas,
9		you look at access and you look at
10		circulation and you look at perception. So I
11		think we have different ways of defining
12		boundaries. It appears to me that the
13		cultural landscape studies as presented
14		followed property boundaries rather than use
15		or geographic boundaries.
16	Q.	Oh, great. Thank you.
17		Just one more question on that. The
18		Percy Summer Club was established in the late
19		1880s, and the trails to the Percy Peaks and
20		to Devil's Slide and other areas that
21		connected to the town of Stark were
22		established in the late 1888s. Would that
23		have historic significance
24	Α.	Yes.
	ι	

 Q to the Nash Stream Forest, because those trails clearly go into the Nash Stream Forest? A. I think the trails have significance as establishing a continuity of historical use. Q. Great. Thank you. Are you aware that the entire lake itself, Christine Lake, is protected from development forever? A. Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation easement on Christine Lake. Q. And that also all around the lake, it's over I mean, it's many thousands of acres that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the cultural landscape and protected areas, is a 			
 Forest? A. I think the trails have significance as establishing a continuity of historical use. Q. Great. Thank you. 7 Are you aware that the entire lake itself, Christine Lake, is protected from development forever? A. Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation easement on Christine Lake. Q. And that also all around the lake, it's over I mean, it's many thousands of acres that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	1	Q.	to the Nash Stream Forest, because those
 A. I think the trails have significance as establishing a continuity of historical use. Q. Great. Thank you. 7 Are you aware that the entire lake itself, Christine Lake, is protected from development forever? A. Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation easement on Christine Lake. Q. And that also all around the lake, it's over I mean, it's many thousands of acres that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	2		trails clearly go into the Nash Stream
 sestablishing a continuity of historical use. Q. Great. Thank you. Are you aware that the entire lake itself, Christine Lake, is protected from development forever? A. Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation easement on Christine Lake. Q. And that also all around the lake, it's over I mean, it's many thousands of acres that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	3		Forest?
 6 Q. Great. Thank you. 7 Are you aware that the entire lake itself, Christine Lake, is protected from development forever? 10 A. Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation easement on Christine Lake. 12 Q. And that also all around the lake, it's over I mean, it's many thousands of acres that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? 16 A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. 20 Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	4	A.	I think the trails have significance as
 Are you aware that the entire lake itself, Christine Lake, is protected from development forever? A. Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation easement on Christine Lake. Q. And that also all around the lake, it's over I mean, it's many thousands of acres that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	5		establishing a continuity of historical use.
 8 itself, Christine Lake, is protected from 9 development forever? 10 A. Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation 11 easement on Christine Lake. 12 Q. And that also all around the lake, it's 13 over I mean, it's many thousands of acres 14 that are now protected. Do you think that's 15 significant in the North Country? 16 A. I think that that, along with all the other 17 protected acreage in the North Country, is 18 very significant in terms of an action that 19 expresses the values of people. 20 Q. So do you believe that simply using an 21 existing corridor, without regard for the 	6	Q.	Great. Thank you.
 9 development forever? 10 A. Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation easement on Christine Lake. 12 Q. And that also all around the lake, it's 13 over I mean, it's many thousands of acres 14 that are now protected. Do you think that's 15 significant in the North Country? 16 A. I think that that, along with all the other 17 protected acreage in the North Country, is 18 very significant in terms of an action that 19 expresses the values of people. 20 Q. So do you believe that simply using an 21 existing corridor, without regard for the 	7		Are you aware that the entire lake
 10 A. Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation 11 easement on Christine Lake. 12 Q. And that also all around the lake, it's 13 over I mean, it's many thousands of acres 14 that are now protected. Do you think that's 15 significant in the North Country? 16 A. I think that that, along with all the other 17 protected acreage in the North Country, is 18 very significant in terms of an action that 19 expresses the values of people. 20 Q. So do you believe that simply using an 21 existing corridor, without regard for the 	8		itself, Christine Lake, is protected from
 easement on Christine Lake. Q. And that also all around the lake, it's over I mean, it's many thousands of acres that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	9		development forever?
 Q. And that also all around the lake, it's over I mean, it's many thousands of acres that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	10	A.	Yeah, I was aware there was a conservation
 over I mean, it's many thousands of acres that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	11		easement on Christine Lake.
 14 that are now protected. Do you think that's significant in the North Country? 16 A. I think that that, along with all the other protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. 20 Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	12	Q.	And that also all around the lake, it's
 15 significant in the North Country? 16 A. I think that that, along with all the other 17 protected acreage in the North Country, is 18 very significant in terms of an action that 19 expresses the values of people. 20 Q. So do you believe that simply using an 21 existing corridor, without regard for the 	13		over I mean, it's many thousands of acres
 16 A. I think that that, along with all the other 17 protected acreage in the North Country, is 18 very significant in terms of an action that 19 expresses the values of people. 20 Q. So do you believe that simply using an 21 existing corridor, without regard for the 	14		that are now protected. Do you think that's
 protected acreage in the North Country, is very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	15		significant in the North Country?
 very significant in terms of an action that expresses the values of people. Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	16	A.	I think that that, along with all the other
 19 expresses the values of people. 20 Q. So do you believe that simply using an 21 existing corridor, without regard for the 	17		protected acreage in the North Country, is
 Q. So do you believe that simply using an existing corridor, without regard for the 	18		very significant in terms of an action that
21 existing corridor, without regard for the	19		expresses the values of people.
	20	Q.	So do you believe that simply using an
22 cultural landscape and protected areas, is a	21		existing corridor, without regard for the
/ / /	22		cultural landscape and protected areas, is a
23 sound argument for the construction of the	23		sound argument for the construction of the
24 proposed project?	24		proposed project?

1 A. No.	
----------	--

2	Q.	Thank you. Can you tell me why not?
3	A.	Why is it not a sound argument? Well, the
4		issue with this particular upgrade is its
5		scale and intensity, I would say. So, even
6		going through a wooded landscape, you will
7		continually encounter this very large utility
8		corridor. And that corridor is going to be
9		considerably more noticeable in the North
10		Country because much of it rises above the
11		height of surrounding trees. So I think it's
12		a big shift. I think it's a big difference
13		because it's big.

14 Q. It is big.

The other question I have on that is I 15 believe you mentioned that the cumulative 16 17 impact of seeing the transmission corridor is something that we haven't paid as much --18 that the Applicant did not pay close enough 19 20 attention to. And can you explain that a little bit more? 21 22 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. It's 23 just asking to repeat testimony in the record. 24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Percy,

1 this is --2 MS. PERCY: New. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 3 -- this is literally what they said. 4 5 MS. PERCY: Right. Thank you. So my last two questions are actually repeats 6 7 as well, so I'm not going to ask them. Thank 8 you very much. You're welcome. 9 Α. 10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kimball. 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. KIMBALL: 13 14 (Kimball) Ms. O'Donnell, Kenneth Kimball from Q. 15 the Appalachian Mountain Club. And I just 16 have a few questions here since most of my 17 other questions have already been asked. In your prefiled testimony, you stated 18 19 that your conclusions were prepared without 20 the benefits of three studies currently 21 underway as part of the U.S. Department of 22 Energy Section 106 process. Did this include 23 the identification of specific cultural 24 landscapes that were just submitted by the {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			98
1		Applicant as Exhibits 196 and 211?	
2	A.	Yes.	
3	Q.	And are there others still pending?	
4	A.	Not that I know of.	
5	Q.	Understanding that the Section 106 is a	
6		consultation process and not the same as the	
7		SEC rules, in your prefiled and supplemental	
8		prefiled testimony you describe groups of	
9		resources that is, registered historic	
10		features, protected and recreation lands,	
11		scenic roads, trails, graveyards and so	
12		forth. You then summarize these in your	
13		initial report town by town. Your report did	
14		not appear to identify specific cultural	
15		landscapes with respect to geographic	
16		boundaries. Could you please clarify, at	
17		least conceptually, what you consider to be	
18		cultural landscapes under the New Hampshire	
19		SEC rules and how that differs from the	
20		proposed cultural landscape districts with	
21		specific boundaries that the Applicant just	
22		submitted to New Hampshire DHR under the	
23		Section 106 process?	
24	A.	So your question is related to defining	
	∫ ৫ দ ে	2015-06 Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY 1/10-27-1	71

1		cultural landscapes first, and then, second,
2		what does that mean in relationship to those
3		cultural landscapes defined in the current
4		studies
5	Q.	Correct.
6	А.	that have been recently received?
7	Q.	That is correct.
8	А.	So, in our report, because we were not asked
9		to define cultural landscapes, we looked at
10		the typology of elements that make up the
11		landscape of New Hampshire, adding those that
12		we felt were defined through the actions of
13		the people beyond those simply listed on the
14		National Register, which you just enumerated
15		saying graveyard, cemeteries, conservation
16		lands, recreation lands and so forth. Those
17		are in our testimony. So we didn't define
18		those as cultural landscapes in the global
19		sense. We indicated that these were
20		landscapes that had cultural imprints and
21		that, because of the status that they were
22		in, as developed for the uses that they were
23		being used for, they had a cultural value
24		apart from saying they're cultural landscapes
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1	individually or they worked together as a
2	group. We simply said all these typologies
3	have cultural value. So that's unlike the
4	brief that these studies had, because the
5	studies were specifically defined to look at
6	a study area the Ammonoosuc, the Great
7	North Woods, et cetera as defined by DHR
8	and the consulting parties. And the outcome
9	of that is directed by those definitions,
10	including the federal definition of cultural
11	landscape.
12	Now, we just went through a question on
13	how you establish boundaries, so I don't
14	think I should repeat that. But I think that
15	the studies are well founded. I already
16	stated earlier this afternoon that I am not
17	convinced that if we looked at the same data
18	and the same history we would find the exact
19	same cultural landscapes or their boundaries.
20	We would be unlikely, in fact, to use a
21	parcel boundary kind of edge because it's a
22	legal, invisible edge. It doesn't relate to
23	the geomorphology or cultural use of a place.
24	So, are they adequate? I would say they're

			-
1		very good and they've added to the record of	
2		what the resources are that are out there.	
3	Q.	Let me just follow up with what I think is	
4		the last question I have here.	
5		You touched on, I think it was in the	
6		response you just gave as well as to Ms.	
7		Percy, that the cultural landscape districts	
8		that were submitted under Exhibits 196 and	
9		211 may have some deficiencies relative to	
10		the boundaries because they seem to have	
11		followed parcels. The follow-up question I	
12		would have is: Is it your assessment and	
13		understanding and you've had minimal time	
14		to review those cultural landscapes but do	
15		you believe that there's other cultural	
16		landscape districts, just using the process	
17		that they used, that should also be	
18		considered for further studies?	
19	A.	I would think that there are very likely.	
20		And that's based not on my review of their	
21		studies but on the mapping we did and	
22		presented in our supplemental testimony and	
23		in our original testimony.	
24	Q.	And I realize you said you hadn't had time to	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}	

		10
1		really study this area in great depth. But
2		are there any other areas you could at least
3		generically suggest at this point?
4	Α.	I don't think I'd like to speculate on those
5		areas.
6	Q.	All right. That's all the questions I have.
7		Thank you.
8		CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are any of
9		the other intervenors in a position to go?
10		We've got Muni Groups. I've got Ms. Bradbury
11		and I think Ms. Crane are the others I see in
12		the room who could go. Ms. Pacik?
13		MS. PACIK: Yes, I'm ready to
14		go. Thank you. We just need the Apple TV,
15		please.
16		CROSS-EXAMINATION
17	BY M	IS. PACIK:
18	Q.	Good afternoon. My name is Danielle Pacik.
19		I'm sitting over here. I'm the attorney for
20		the City of Concord, and I am also the
21		spokesperson for Municipal Group 3 South.
22		And I just have a few questions for you.
23		I'd like to start by looking at the
24		letter that Attorney Boepple referenced
	SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		earlier, which is the letter from New
2		Hampshire DHR, dated August 25th, 2017. I
3		had it as previously marked as Counsel for
4		the Public Exhibit 443. I think she also had
5		a separate exhibit number for SPNF. Oh, I
6		think it was also SPNF 143. Oh, my
7		apologies. Counsel for the Public 143. I
8		don't think we're up to 443 yet.
9		All right. So what I'm showing you is
10		Page 12 of that exhibit. And on it you can
11		see the five different study areas that were
12		analyzed for the Section 106 process; is that
13		correct?
14	A.	Yeah, I do see those.
15	Q.	Starting out with the Great North Woods,
16		which is the northern section of the proposed
17		project, and then it goes down to the
18		Ammonoosuc River Valley Study Area and then
19		southerly to the Pemigewasset River Valley
20		Study Area, and then there's an area between
21		Franklin and Concord where there is no study
22		area. Do you see that?
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	And my question is: Why wasn't that region

			10
1		between Franklin and Concord included in a	
2		study area?	
3	Α.	I don't think I could speculate on that.	
4		What we did I don't know what the	
5		directives from DHR and the consulting	
6		parties were in regard to the definition of	
7		the study areas. I know that, from what I	
8		see, many of them are located on or surround	
9		river systems, which are historic	
10		transportation routes, which is maybe part	
11		of, just an observation, maybe part of the	
12		reasoning of their selection. I know that in	
13		our town-by-town review of the host towns and	
14		the few that are within the one-mile APE, the	
15		towns that are between the Pemigewasset and	
16		the Suncook had good densities of historic	
17		features and historic resources that we were	
18		able to map.	
19	Q.	Okay. So I guess that brings me to my next	
20		question, which is these study areas were	
21		dictated by the Section 106 process; is that	
22		correct?	
23	Α.	They were framed within that process, yes.	
24	Q.	Okay. And the SEC process is different than	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	_7}

			105
1		the 106 process; right?	
2	А.	It is.	
3	Q.	Okay. So in terms of the lack of study area	
4		between Franklin and Concord, does that mean	
5		that there are no cultural landscapes in that	
6		area relevant for the Site Evaluation	
7		Committee's review?	
8	Α.	No, I wouldn't draw that conclusion.	
9	Q.	Okay.	
10	A.	That there are no cultural landscapes? No, I	
11		think that there are quite likely cultural	
12		landscapes within Franklin and Concord.	
13	Q.	Okay. So if there are likely cultural	
14		landscapes and they haven't been studied,	
15		then would it be fair to say that the Site	
16		Evaluation Committee does not, as of this	
17		date, have that relevant information before	
18		it?	
19	Α.	I would answer by saying that the combined	
20		work of the Applicants, including the	
21		original work by Preservation Company and its	
22		assessment, and these studies, do not	
23		actually capture a high percentage of the	
24		historic cultural resources that we mapped	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	.7}

and presented in our study. So we think that 1 there's a lot of capture that's missing in 2 the work of the Applicant. 3 MS. PACIK: Okay. I have no 4 5 further questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 6 Ms. 7 Bradbury. Oh, I'm sorry, there was somebody else. Ms. Bradbury, wait. 8 Mr. Whitley, you have 9 questions, too? 10 11 MR. WHITLEY: Yes, I do, Mr. Chair, just a few. 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. WHITLEY: 14 15 Good afternoon, Ms. O'Donnell. My name is ο. 16 Steven Whitley. I'm counsel to several 17 communities along the route: Deerfield, Pembroke, New Hampton, Littleton, and the 18 19 Water and Sewer Department of the Town of 20 Ashland. And I just have a couple of quick 21 questions to go over. 22 Earlier this morning you had a 23 conversation with Mr. Aslin, and you were talking about avoidance, minimization and 24 {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			107
1		mitigation. Do you recall that conversation?	
2	А.	I do. It was this afternoon.	
3	Q.	Yeah, you're right, this afternoon. Thank	
4		you.	
5		And I want to turn your attention to	
6		your supplemental testimony. And this is	
7		Counsel for the Public 141. And we're on	
8		Pages 8 and 9. Do you see that on the	
9		screen?	
10	A.	I do.	
11	Q.	And just to follow up on what Mr. Aslin was	
12		discussing and the comment that you make here	
13		about the Applicants, that if they had begun	
14		the Project with the intent of avoiding	
15		historic sites and cultural landscapes, there	
16		would have been a different project design.	
17		And I'm wondering what you meant by	
18		"different" design in terms of a mitigation	
19		proposal.	
20	Α.	As a cultural resource specialist, I see a	
21		project that, in my opinion, has unreasonable	
22		adverse effects, as I've stated in my	
23		testimony. My issue is that the scale of it	
24		and the extent of it will really radically	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	L7}

1		alter the landscape of New Hampshire. So if
2		I were working on a design team, which is
3		where I am most often working, on a design
4		team, I would have started with how do we
5		retain the qualities and character of New
6		Hampshire, and I wouldn't have proposed a
7		project of this type. The project that would
8		have been proposed would have been one that
9		would have avoided more impacts. So if you
10		begin with avoiding impacts rather than
11		developing the project that you can build and
12		then mitigate it, you wind up with a
13		different project.
14	Q.	Right. And I understand that's your
15		testimony here. But I think my question was
16		a little more specific, in that I wasn't
17		clear if you had a specific alternative
18		design in mind or if your opinion was just as
19		generic as you just stated.
20	Α.	Well, I think the SEC can only look at the
21		Project that the Applicants bring before
22		them, which is where my commentary came from.
23		We've done work in places where power
24		poles have been an issue, historic districts
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1		in particular, and often finding a way to
2		route them in less visible areas. Keeping
3		them low and putting more portions of them
4		underground solves the problems more
5		effectively and impacts fewer resources. I
6		think it would be overly speculative to say I
7		had some design in mind. Certainly the
8		mitigation of undergrounding through the
9		northern forests, particularly the national
10		forest, has been a very important
11		modification to the Project to limit its
12		adverse impacts.
13	Q.	Thank you. Now I want to turn to a different
14		topic, and I want to talk about some
15		testimony that was provided by Mr. DeWan and
16		Mr. Varney during the hearings and how they
17		relate to orderly development. But first I
18		just wanted to do a little background here.
19		I'm going to put up just for your
20		benefit this is from your Exhibit B of
21		your prefiled testimony. And this is Counsel
22		for the Public 140, Exhibit B, and we're
23		looking at Pages 115 and 116. Do you see
24		that there on the screen?

1	A.	I do.
2	Q.	So here you rendered an opinion on orderly
3		development, stating the Project would result
4		in an unreasonable adverse impact. Do I have
5		that right?
6	Α.	Yeah.
7	Q.	And in making that determination, it was your
8		opinion that the visibility of the Project
9		near historic sites and cultural landscapes
10		is what rendered the Project unreasonably
11		adverse. Again, is that basically correct?
12	Α.	Yeah, I specifically stated that "affecting
13		the experience of historic sites and cultural
14		landscapes was contrary to the long-adopted
15		planning in the vast majority of the host
16		towns."
17	Q.	Okay. I want to put up now some testimony
18		from the earlier proceedings. And this is
19		from Day 32 in the afternoon. And this
20	A.	Which I haven't seen before.
21	Q.	Yeah. So, thank you. You have not seen this
22		before, so I'm putting it up for you now.
23		And I've highlighted a portion here.
24		And you see there that Mr. DeWan
I	SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

		11.
1		testified that he did not offer an opinion on
2		orderly development in this proceeding;
3		correct?
4	A.	Yes. "You weren't analyzing orderly
5		development?" is the question. And he said,
6		"That is not our area of expertise."
7	Q.	Could you speak into the microphone, please?
8	Α.	The text indicates that he wasn't analyzing
9		orderly development.
10	Q.	And is it your understanding that his review
11		was limited to what he considered to be
12		scenic resources under the SEC rules?
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	I now want to put up some testimony with
15		Mr. Varney. And let me just ask you, have
16		you seen any of the transcripts of Mr.
17		Varney's appearance?
18	A.	I have not reviewed them.
19	Q.	Okay. So I put up now, this is Day 37, the
20		afternoon session, and this is Page 20.
21		MR. WHITLEY: And just for the
22		record, let me just go back and say the prior
23		testimony that I put up from Day 32 was Pages
24		110 to 111.
	c	

1 BY MR. WHITLEY: But now back to Mr. Varney's testimony here. 2 0. Do you see there that Mr. Varney testified 3 that as part of his expert opinion on orderly 4 5 development, he did not do any sort of visual assessment as part of that opinion? 6 7 Right. Α. 8 0. Okay. So as you sit here today, Ms. O'Donnell, based on what you've seen in the 9 record to date, do you believe that the 10 11 Applicants have adequately analyzed how visibility of the Project will impact orderly 12 development as it relates to your stated 13 14 goals of preserving and protecting historic 15 sites and cultural landscapes? 16 Can you restate? You've got, like, four Α. 17 factors at work there. 18 Yeah, I can say it again. Q. 19 As you sit here today, based on what 20 you've seen to date, do you believe that the 21 Applicants have adequately analyzed how 22 visibility of the Project will impact orderly 23 development as it relates to the goals of 24 preserving and protecting historic sites and {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

cultural landscapes? 1 2 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Calls for generic testimony and things that are 3 already in the record. 4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 5 Mr. Whitley. 6 7 MR. WHITLEY: I'm asking Ms. 8 O'Donnell to respond to some testimony that was 9 provided by the Applicant's experts previously in the proceeding. 10 11 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't think it's a response to the testimony at all. 12 13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, that 14 question was not. I mean, if you want to ask a 15 question along the lines of "anything that 16 you've heard or read or seen changed your 17 opinion," which is clearly stated in her own report, you can ask that. I think we all know 18 19 what the answer is. But I mean, if you want to 20 tie it to something that you were just asking about, that's fine. But the question you asked 21 22 was a request to restate her existing 23 conclusion, I think, or her prefiled 24 conclusion.

 $\{\text{SEC 2015-06}\}$ [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-17\}$

1 BY MR. WHITLEY: Ms. O'Donnell, based on the portions of 2 0. transcripts that I've shown you, does that 3 change at all the opinion you provided 4 earlier in your prefiled testimony? 5 6 Α. No. 7 Okay. Have you seen anything in the 0. 8 supplemental testimony that you reviewed that would change your opinion? 9 10 Α. No. 11 MR. WHITLEY: I've got nothing further. Thank you. 12 13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Fillmore, do you have 14 15 anything? 16 MS. FILLMORE: Nothing. 17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Now, Ms. Bradbury. 18 19 MS. PACIK: Just as a point of 20 order, can I --21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes, Ms. 22 Pacik. 23 MS. PACIK: I apologize for 24 interrupting. But just in terms of the {SEC 2015-06} [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] {10-27-17}

1	objections, I understood that Attorney Walker
2	would be examining this witness, and I
3	understood that Attorney Needleman would be
4	objecting on issues for friendly cross
5	witnesses. But where this is Counsel for the
6	Public's witnesses, I'm wondering why Attorney
7	Walker is not objecting.
8	MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, I think
9	this is precisely the issue that I've tried to
10	cover with I think six different attorneys and
11	then reported to Mr. Iacopino, which is I was
12	going to handle procedural objections,
13	notwithstanding whether I was examining
14	witnesses or not.
15	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik,
16	is this a significant issue?
17	MS. PACIK: I do think it's a
18	problem. I mean, I think we all need to play
19	by the same rules at some point. And I was
20	under the impression that this was for the
21	intervenors, not Counsel for the Public.
22	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't
23	have any understanding about this. Is there
24	some understanding that this arrangement that
	{SEC 2015-06} [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-17\}$

you all talked about didn't apply to the 1 friendly cross of Counsel for the Public's 2 witnesses? 3 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Certainly not 4 5 from my perspective. And as I've said before, just because these are Counsel for the Public 6 7 witnesses doesn't mean cross can't be friendly 8 if it's not, for example, trying to tease out things that are already in the record or are 9 consistent with issues where the parties agree. 10 11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, it 12 was clearly friendly cross, Ms. Pacik. So if the rule was friendly cross, then that's the 13 rule. Are you prejudiced in some way by what's 14 15 going on? 16 MS. PACIK: I'm just trying to 17 get a point of order and clarification on that. I think that's a fair question to be asking. 18 19 And, you know, just --20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are you 21 satisfied with the response? 22 MS. PACIK: Yeah, I just wanted 23 clarification on this. Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Ms. {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

Г

		1	.17
1		Bradbury.	
2		MS. BRADBURY: Thank you, Mr.	
3		Chairman.	
4		CROSS-EXAMINATION	
5	BY I	MS. BRADBURY:	
6	Q.	Ms. O'Donnell, I am Jo Anne Bradbury, and I	
7		live in Deerfield. I do have a few questions	
8		in respect of Counsel for the Public's	
9		Exhibit 464.	
10		MS. BRADBURY: So, Jeanne, if	
11		you'd just hand those out. When we put those	
12		up on ELMO, there's a glare, and there's such a	
13		shiny thing, I got a copy for everybody.	
14	BY I	MS. BRADBURY:	
15	Q.	This is Counsel for the Public Exhibit 464.	
16		It is a map of historic sites in Deerfield	
17		that was created as part of Deerfield's 250th	
18		anniversary celebration last year. So, would	
19		you take a look at the map on there.	
20	A.	I've seen this map before.	
21	Q.	Oh, good. Okay. We've heard testimony that	
22		the Northern Pass historic expert witnesses	
23		did not reach out to local historical	
24		societies in an effort to locate historic	
	{SEC	2015-06 [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] {10-27-17	}

			11
1		sites in New Hampshire. Would you agree that	
2		such a resource would have been useful in her	
3		evaluation of historic sites?	
4	A.	Any inventory is useful. This one being a	
5		town-based one would have been helpful,	
6		certainly.	
7	Q.	And do you agree that Ms. Widell's focus on	
8		the number of historic sites in New Hampshire	
9		was limited?	
10	A.	I don't believe that. I think that they did	
11		a very good capture of sites of architectural	
12		value, but that was their nearly exclusive	
13		lens.	
14	Q.	Understood. So they were	
15	Α.	And they had a lot of sites. I mean, they	
16		were up toward 1200 and something. So what	
17		they inventoried was architecture, often not	
18		relevant to setting. There were a few	
19		bridges, one or two agricultural districts.	
20		But it was quite focused on architecture. I	
21		would not say that it was limited. I think	
22		it was big, but focused.	
23	Q.	Okay. But if you were considering all of the	
24		possible historic sites in the entire state	
L	SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	.7}

			119
1		where they're locally known and cherished and	
2		not considered, then that would be a factor	
3		that would have been helpful?	
4	Α.	That's a larger universe, yes.	
5	Q.	Yeah. Okay. Thanks.	
6	Α.	So if you were considering all the historic	
7		sites and elements that were valuable	
8		historic sites, let's leave it at that, that	
9		were valuable to the communities of New	
10		Hampshire, you would have a much more dense	
11		map.	
12	Q.	Thank you. Okay. So we'll just keep that	
13		map handy for a second, Counsel for the	
14		Public 464.	
15		Now, our next exhibit, we'll mark this	
16		Deerfield Abutter Exhibit No. 154.	
17		MS. BRADBURY: Jeanne, you're	
18		going to put the atlas up.	
19	BY M	S. BRADBURY:	
20	Q.	This is the New Hampshire Atlas and	
21		Gazetteer, Pages 28 and 29, and that's	
22		beautiful, scenic, historic Deerfield.	
23		MS. BRADBURY: Jeanne, can you	
24		get that better situated on there so that it	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	.7}

1 shows more? And if not, we can cut it. Oops, 2 too small. She's got it. It's okay. 3 Α. BY MS. BRADBURY: 4 5 Can you see the roads, the road names on Q. there? 6 7 Maybe not the names. Α. 8 0. Yeah, okay. We're going to cut it. (Discussion off the record) 9 Okay. So I'm going to ask you to clarify 10 Q. 11 something in your prefiled testimony where you note that the proposed project corridor 12 essentially bisects the town of Deerfield, 13 14 running south of and parallel to Mount 15 Delight Road and Nottingham Road. We'd like 16 to get a little clarification of that, and 17 that's the purpose of this exhibit. The town of Deerfield is highlighted in 18 19 yellow, and the existing right-of-way where 20 Northern Pass towers and lines are proposed 21 to be built is also highlighted in yellow. 22 Can you see that? 23 Α. Yes. Okay. So the existing right-of-way crosses 24 Q. {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			12
1		the following roads, and I'd like you to see	
2		if you can see these roads as we go through.	
3		Mount Delight Road at the	
4		Allenstown-Deerfield line. Got it?	
5	A.	Right.	
6	Q.	Far left. Thurston Pond Road?	
7	A.	Right.	
8	Q.	Haynes Road?	
9	A.	Yeah, I see that.	
10	Q.	Lang Road?	
11	A.	Following. Go ahead.	
12	Q.	Church Street, which I believe is it was	
13		formerly known as Old Center Road, and on	
14		this atlas it's listed and Old Center Road.	
15	Α.	I see that.	
16	Q.	North Road, which was also known as, and	
17		still is known as Route 43.	
18	A.	Right.	
19	Q.	Mountain Road.	
20	Α.	Yup.	
21	Q.	The area just south of Deerfield Parade	
22	Α.	Right.	
23	Q.	and Nottingham Road.	
24	A.	Right.	

Q.	And do you see where the right-of-way leaves	
Deerfield after Cate Road?		
A.	Right.	
Q.	Okay. All right. Good.	
	Now, would you please take a look at	
	those very same roads which are marked on	
	MS. BRADBURY: And Jeanne, we're	
	going to need this map back up, counsel for the	
	Public Exhibit 464, which is the map of	
	Deerfield's historic sites.	
BY M	IS. BRADBURY:	
Q.	And you'll see on there to the left at the	
	Allenstown-Deerfield line, Mount Delight	
	Road the same roads. Thurston Pond Road,	
	that's not they didn't write Thurston Pond	
	in. It's the light gray mark that heads into	
	Thurston Pond from Mount Delight.	
A.	I see that.	
Q.	Okay. Church Street again. North Road,	
	that's also 43.	
A.	Right.	
Q.	Mountain Road, the area just south of	
	Deerfield Parade, and Nottingham Road, and	
	then it crosses right out, same town, right	
{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}	
	А. Q. ВУ М Q. А. Q.	

		123
1		out after Cate Road.
2		So you can see from looking at where the
3		power lines cross on the atlas and looking at
4		the historic map that there is a significant
5		number of historic sites along the proposed
6		route in Deerfield.
7	Α.	As mapped on your map.
8	Q.	Yes.
9	Α.	Yup.
10	Q.	Do you agree that, given the size, scale and
11		nature of the proposed project, it will have
12		an unreasonable adverse effect on historic
13		sites throughout Deerfield?
14		MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This
15		calls for reiteration of testimony, generic
16		testimony.
17		CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
18		Bradbury.
19		MS. BRADBURY: Well, we would
20		like to bring the general, generic testimony
21		down to the level of the specific because it
22		has an impact on the people who live and the
23		tourists who come to see the historic sites in
24		Deerfield. So we're trying to just give it
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

1	life	as showing what it's doing to these
2	histo	ric sites. And Ms. O'Donnell's testimony
3	was g	eneric
4		CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Her
5	testi	mony was generic as contemplated by
6	Couns	el for the Public.
7		MS. BRADBURY: Well, can I just
8	add?	I do believe that it's quite helpful.
9	And w	e've already looked at it. But the point
10	is to	bring up full and true disclosure of the
11	facts	, obviously. And we think that these
12	quest	ions are doing that.
13		CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled.
14		an answer.
14 15	You ca	an answer. Your map shows a density of specific
	You ca A. Okay.	
15	You ca A. Okay. sites	Your map shows a density of specific
15 16	You ca A. Okay. sites histo:	Your map shows a density of specific in Deerfield that you have mapped as
15 16 17	You ca A. Okay. sites histo: build	Your map shows a density of specific in Deerfield that you have mapped as rically important. Most of these are
15 16 17 18	You ca A. Okay. sites histo: build more :	Your map shows a density of specific in Deerfield that you have mapped as rically important. Most of these are ings. I would suggest to you there are
15 16 17 18 19	You ca A. Okay. sites histo: build more : build	Your map shows a density of specific in Deerfield that you have mapped as rically important. Most of these are ings. I would suggest to you there are resources out there that are not
15 16 17 18 19 20	You ca A. Okay. sites histo: build more : build commun	Your map shows a density of specific in Deerfield that you have mapped as rically important. Most of these are ings. I would suggest to you there are resources out there that are not ings. And I would suggest to any
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	You ca A. Okay. sites histo: build more : build commu: own i:	Your map shows a density of specific in Deerfield that you have mapped as rically important. Most of these are ings. I would suggest to you there are resources out there that are not ings. And I would suggest to any nity that they should be active in their
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	You ca A. Okay. sites histo: build more : build commu: own i: that	Your map shows a density of specific in Deerfield that you have mapped as rically important. Most of these are ings. I would suggest to you there are resources out there that are not ings. And I would suggest to any nity that they should be active in their nventory process and continue the work

ſ

		12	5
1		that there is a considerable density of	
2		historic resources, those shown and those not	
3		yet inventoried in Deerfield.	
4	Q.	Thank you. And I'd like now to show you,	
5		there is at least one there are a number	
6		of mill sites on here as well, and I'd like	
7		to show you the mill, the historic mill at	
8		Thurston Pond Dam, the stone work.	
9		MS. BRADBURY: And that would	
10		be Jeanne, would you put up Deerfield	
11		Abutter 77.	
12	BY M	IS. BRADBURY:	
13	Q.	That's the historic Thurston Pond Dam looking	
14		at the stone work from underneath. Okay.	
15		That's on the historic	
16	Α.	This is an existing photo?	
17	Q.	Yes, this was taken in April of this year.	
18	Α.	Okay.	
19	Q.	And this is that dam is located on the	
20		historic map as No. 69.	
21		MS. BRADBURY: Jeanne, would you	
22		put up Deerfield Abutter 79.	
23	BY M	IS. BRADBURY:	
24	Q.	This is the mill stone found at this mill	
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}	

1 site that we've just put up. MS. BRADBURY: And finally, can 2 we put up, Jeanne, Deerfield Abutter 76. 3 BY MS. BRADBURY: 4 This is the view from historic Thurston Pond 5 Q. Dam in Deerfield, which is No. 69 on the 6 7 historic map we gave you. 8 Do you see the top of the existing tower for the 115 kV line that's been circled? 9 Yes, I do. 10 Α. Okay. You can just barely see it. 11 0. If I hadn't pointed it out to you, would you have 12 been able to tell me that there was something 13 14 intruding there? 15 No, because of the height of the trees and Α. 16 the topography. 17 Q. Right. Okay. So the existing --It's relatively integrated as it exists. 18 Α. 19 0. Thank you. 20 The Applicant has informed us that 21 existing towers in this area are 75 feet 22 tall. And the August 2017 project maps show 23 that the new towers will range across this vista from 130 feet in height to 140 feet in 24 {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

		12				
1		height. So that's roughly 55 feet to 65 feet				
2		taller than the one that you see there that's				
3		circled. So the towers and lines, the new,				
4		higher towers and lines, will be clearly				
5		visible at that height; correct?				
6	Α.	Given the perspective that you're showing				
7		from the view, I believe the south shore of				
8		Thurston Pond here looking north, because the				
9		line runs north of Thurston.				
10	Q.	Yes, from the dam, standing on the dam. That				
11		photo was taking standing that we put up				
12		earlier, that photo was taken standing on the				
13		dam.				
14	A.	Yes, I would suggest that if they did a				
15		simulation of the heights here, you would see				
16	them against the sky.					
17	Q.	Okay. Do you agree that very visible 130- to				
18		140-feet-tall towers above the tree line				
19		running across the vista, less than half a				
20		mile away from this historic dam site, would				
21		create an unreasonable adverse effect in this				
22		popular location?				
23		MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This				
24		is all old information that should have and				
	{SEC	2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}				

could have been evaluated. 1 2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Bradbury. 3 MS. BRADBURY: Well, the project 4 5 maps from August couldn't have been evaluated prior to her prefiled testimony. And there was 6 7 no photo simulation provided by the Applicant. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 8 What are you talking about in August? 9 MS. BRADBURY: Oh, well, let me 10 11 just put this up. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 12 You're talking about new construction maps? 13 14 MS. BRADBURY: Yeah, 15 construction maps. 16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is there 17 something different in those maps about what was going to be in this location? 18 19 MS. BRADBURY: Well, I assume so 20 because they filed a new set of them that 21 included this. 22 Jeanne, can we put that up? Τ 23 think you'll see the date on there is August 24 of 2017. That's Thurston Pond.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 1 Mу understanding is they filed an entire new set 2 of maps in August. 3 MS. BRADBURY: Yeah, and I don't 4 have all of them. 5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And I could 6 be wrong, but my understanding is that they 7 8 don't show any changes in this area. 9 Mr. Needleman, are there changes in this area? 10 11 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I believe there's one small change in Deerfield that 12 resulted from a request from Ms. Bradbury of 13 the construction panel to move one structure 14 15 away from a vernal pool. Other than that, I don't think there are any changes in Deerfield. 16 17 MS. BRADBURY: We're not talking about the vernal pool here. 18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 19 I didn't 20 think so. And if there's been no opinion from 21 this witness about this visual impact prior to 22 now, you're not going to elicit it at this So I guess the objection is sustained. 23 stage. 24 MS. BRADBURY: Okay. Moving on. {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

Well, could I ask that as a hypothetical 1 2 question? CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Give it a 3 whirl. 4 BY MS. BRADBURY: 5 If you could see the towers and lines from 6 ο. 7 the dam, hypothetically, from a historic site, would you consider that an adverse 8 impact to a historic site? 9 10 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection. 11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, that's a very generic question as asked. 12 And I think her entire testimony is about that very 13 14 If you can see towers from historic topic: 15 sites, what's the effect. Now, it's hundreds 16 and hundreds of pages, but that's in large 17 measure what this witness's testimony is about. 18 MS. BRADBURY: Right. And we're 19 simply trying to bring it down into a very hard 20 look at a very beautiful place, that it takes 21 it beyond the general and into a specific site. 22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And you've 23 been given some leeway on that, but you've now gotten too granular and gone into an area that 24 {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

if Counsel for the Public and the witness chose 1 2 not to go, we're not going to go there right 3 now. MS. BRADBURY: All right. 4 Okay. BY MS. BRADBURY: 5 All right. So, next question. 6 ο. Would 7 multiple views of a transmission project upon approach to a rural historic district create 8 an impact to the overall integrity of the 9 district? 10 11 Same objection. MR. NEEDLEMAN: CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 12 And that's again -- Ms. Bradbury, that sounds like her 13 14 report, her testimony. 15 MS. BRADBURY: Well, on Page 12 16 of Ms. Widell's supplemental testimony, we 17 looked at her response to Mr. Newman's 18 testimony regarding the Project effects on 19 Nottingham Road Rural Historic District, and 20 she only spoke of views within the district. 21 And we would like to get this witness's opinion 22 of approaching public view impacts within, as 23 well as outside the district. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 24 Is there {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

	132
1	something that Ms. Widell said that was new or
2	that was said here that you want this witness
3	to respond to?
4	MS. BRADBURY: I'm sorry? Yeah,
5	in her supplemental testimony.
6	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And what
7	did Ms. Widell say?
8	MS. BRADBURY: She spoke only of
9	views within a district, not outside the
10	district.
11	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You're
12	telling you're describing I don't even
13	know if you're paraphrasing. What did she say?
14	What is it you want this witness to respond to?
15	Let's find out if it's something that is an
16	appropriate area for you ask about. I don't
17	know what she said.
18	MS. BRADBURY: What Ms. Widell
19	said?
20	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: What did
21	Ms. Widell say?
22	MS. BRADBURY: Okay. We don't
23	have it handy. Yeah, maybe we do.
24	This is Ms. Widell's
I	{SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

	13.					
1	supplemental testimony, Page 12, Lines 18 to					
2	25. And this is in response to Mr. Newman,					
3	the Deerfield Abutters' historic expert, and					
4	his testimony regarding project effects on					
5	Nottingham Road Rural Historic District. And					
6	she's considering only the views within the					
7	district. And we would like an opinion of					
8	approaching the district from outside the					
9	district.					
10	A. Okay. I've read					
11	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Wait, wait					
12	just a moment.					
13	WITNESS O'DONNELL: Sure.					
14	MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, I'd just					
15	like to understand the specific question.					
16	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, I					
17	don't think we've got a question.					
18	WITNESS O'DONNELL: We don't.					
19	BY MS. BRADBURY:					
20	Q. The question is: Would multiple views of a					
21	transmission line project on approach to a					
22	rural historic district create an impact to					
23	the overall integrity of the district?					
24	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. The					
	{SEC 2015-06} [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-17\}$					

	134					
1	objection to that is sustained. Is there a					
2	question about the supplemental testimony that					
3	you want to ask this witness?					
4	MS. BRADBURY: Yeah, that					
5	supplemental testimony, she is speaking					
6	she's disagreeing with Mr. Newman's prefiled					
7	testimony in respect from within the district.					
8	(Chairman and counsel conferring.)					
9	MS. BRADBURY: I can rephrase					
10	this question.					
11	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That would					
12	be a good idea.					
13	MS. BRADBURY: I would simply					
14	ask this witness if she agrees with this					
15	statement in Ms. Widell's supplemental					
16	testimony					
17	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.					
18	MS. BRADBURY: on Lines 18 to					
19	25.					
20	(Witness reviews document.)					
21	A. The Widell testimony here is reflecting on					
22	visibility and identified historic resources.					
23	So she's got two subjects: The visibility					
24	and the visibility from identified historic					
	{SEC 2015-06} [Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-17\}$					

1	resources. What she's suggesting is that			
2	those views are minimal.			
3	My position would be there are areas			
4	throughout Deerfield where these new towers			
5	will be visible. I do not think that they			
6	are limited to small areas. I do not believe			
7	this is really extremely discrete and you're			
8	only going to catch a glimpse of it here and			
9	there. I think the height of the towers and			
10	the wires in particular across the sky			
11	because of that height is going to be well			
12	above tree line.			
13	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm sorry,			
14	Ms. O'Donnell, but			
15	WITNESS O'DONNELL: So I just			
16	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: the			
17	question really is do you agree			
18	WITNESS O'DONNELL: Do you agree			
19	with this statement? The answer is no, I do			
20	not agree with her disagreement with the Newman			
21	assessment. Is that sufficient?			
22	MS. BRADBURY: Thank you.			
23	BY MS. BRADBURY:			
24	Q. When a historic resource is identified and			
ļ	{SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-17\}$			

adverse effects are deemed unreasonable, how 1 is the Applicant held accountable in 2 memorializing efforts to avoid the adverse 3 effects? 4 5 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. 6 Same --7 WITNESS O'DONNELL: Generic 8 question. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This is 9 very efficient. The witness is lodging her own 10 11 objection to the questions. This is great. 12 WITNESS O'DONNELL: Sorry. Ι got it. 13 14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. 15 Bradbury, what we'd like you to do is focus on 16 things that have happened, witnesses' 17 testimony, documents that have been presented in the course of this proceeding that are new. 18 19 And if you want her to react to or respond to 20 them, that's what we're trying to do here. 21 MS. BRADBURY: Understood. One 22 second. 23 (Pause) 24 MS. BRADBURY: I should have {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

		137
1	noted these questions pertain to the	
2	Programmatic Agreement.	
3	BY MS. BRADBURY:	
4	Q. So in respect to adverse effects on a	
5	historic resource that's been identified, and	
6	they are considered unreasonable, how does	
7	the Applicant how is the Applicant held	
8	accountable for keeping a record,	
9	memorializing efforts made to avoid them, the	
10	adverse effects?	
11	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do you	
12	understand the question?	
13	WITNESS O'DONNELL: Yeah. I	
14	think the question actually misinterprets the	
15	Programmatic Agreement.	
16	BY MS. BRADBURY:	
17	Q. All right. In your experience, at what time	
18	would discussions of avoidance, minimization	
19	or mitigation be held with affected parties	
20	for a project of this scale?	
21	MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.	
22	MS. BRADBURY: This relates to	
23	the Programmatic Agreement. All of these next	
24	two questions relate to that.	
	$\int dEC 2015_06 \int Day 52 AETERNOON Section ONLY \int 10_{-27-1}$	רד

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How exactly 1 2 do they relate to the Programmatic Agreement? MS. BRADBURY: The Programmatic 3 Agreement deals with these issues of avoidance, 4 minimization or mitigation. And the question 5 is when do you have those discussions with 6 7 affected parties --8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How does --9 MS. BRADBURY: In her experience 10 as an expert --11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So is the 12 question how does the Programmatic Agreement work to make things happen? Is that what 13 you're trying to get at? 14 15 MS. BRADBURY: Specifically, when they are involving the affected parties 16 17 for a project of this scale. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm not 18 19 sure I understand what you're asking. 20 Ms. O'Donnell, do you 21 understand what Ms. Bradbury is asking? 22 WITNESS O'DONNELL: I think 23 she's asking about the function of the Programmatic Agreement in resolving the adverse 24 {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

			139
1		impacts. The Programmatic Agreement, as it	
2		stands, it establishes a process. It doesn't	
3		actually establish methods or schedules.	
4	BY N	IS. BRADBURY:	
5	Q.	Okay. Thank you.	
6		And who's the final arbiter of	
7		determining if avoidance effects are	
8		sufficiently rigorous?	
9	A.	All those that participate and are signators	
10		of the Programmatic Agreement. And it's	
11		under the Section 106 guidance.	
12	Q.	Right. And is that a negotiation that takes	
13		place among all of the affected parties?	
14	Α.	It's specifically called a "consultation,"	
15		which means often dialogue and meeting and	
16		resolution.	
17	Q.	Well, what if it couldn't be resolved? What	
18		if some people feel that the avoidance	
19		efforts simply aren't sufficient? In your	
20		experience, has that ever happened that they	
21		could not resolve, that one party felt that	
22		their avoidance efforts were enough and	
23		another party thought that they were not?	
24	A.	I don't have experience in that case.	
	∫ a ₽ a	$2015-06$ [Dove 52 AFTERNOON Goggion ONLY] $\int 10-27-1$	רפ

			140				
1	Q.	No?					
2	Α.	No.					
3	Q.	Okay. Now, you did state that the					
4		Programmatic Agreement may not be a					
5		sufficient safety net for the SEC. Would you					
6		share that same view in respect to private					
7		property owners who have National					
8		Register-eligible properties?					
9	А.	The question as stated engages the statement					
10		that I made about the SEC safety net, and					
11		then your final phrase was for National					
12		Register-eligible properties.					
13	Q.	Right.					
14	Α.	I think that the eligible properties and					
15	those that are listed are actually, usually						
16	well treated and included in Programmatic						
17		Agreements. Those historic and cultural					
18		sites and resources that are not listed or					
19		eligible are less likely, fairly unlikely to					
20		be treated effectively under a Programmatic					
21		Agreement through Section 106 because Section					
22		106 applies to registered, listed and					
23		eligible properties.					
24		MS. BRADBURY: Okay. All right	:•				
	{ SEC	$2015-06$ [Dav 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] $\{10-27-1$	7}				

That's all I have. Thank you very much. 1 2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Crane, are you good to take 10, 15 minutes, or do you 3 want to wait? 4 5 MS. CRANE: You've had experience with me last on a Friday now twice. 6 7 I really don't think you want to ask me again 8 for last, end of day on Friday. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 9 I'm not going to misinterpret that. 10 11 MS. CRANE: Oh, please do. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, I think 12 there's enough people who are going to need to 13 14 question the witness when we resume next 15 Thursday, right, that we'll have you go on 16 Thursday. There's a few other intervenor 17 groups that have to go then. That's fine with me. 18 MS. CRANE: 19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. 20 Is there anything else we need to do before we 21 adjourn for the day? 22 Ah, yeah, I think there's a 23 decent chance that next Thursday we probably 24 won't start until 10. Commissioner Bailey {SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}

		142
1	and I are probably going to have to do a	
2	hearing at the PUC starting at 8:00.	
3	So, with that, we will	
4	adjourn.	
5	(Whereupon the Day 53 Afternoon	
6	Session was adjourned at 4:49	
7	p.m., with the Day 54 hearing to resume	
8	on November 2, 2017 commencing at 9:00	
9	a.m.)	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
L	{SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-1	7}

1	CERTIFICATE						
2	I, Susan J. Robidas, a Licensed						
3	Shorthand Court Reporter and Notary Public						
4	of the State of New Hampshire, do hereby						
5	certify that the foregoing is a true and						
6	accurate transcript of my stenographic						
7	notes of these proceedings taken at the						
8	place and on the date hereinbefore set						
9	forth, to the best of my skill and ability						
10	under the conditions present at the time.						
11	I further certify that I am neither						
12	attorney or counsel for, nor related to or						
13	employed by any of the parties to the						
14	action; and further, that I am not a						
15	relative or employee of any attorney or						
16	counsel employed in this case, nor am I						
17	financially interested in this action.						
18							
19	Gugen I Debider I (D/DDD						
20	Susan J. Robidas, LCR/RPR Licensed Shorthand Court Reporter						
21	Registered Professional Reporter N.H. LCR No. 44 (RSA 310-A:173)						
22							
23							
24							
	{SEC 2015-06}[Day 53 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]{10-27-17}						

SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-06 NORTHERN PASS TRANSMISSION, LLC DAY 53 - AFTERNOON SESSION ONLY ADJUDICATORY HEARING October 27, 2017

ADJUDICATORI IIEA	AKING			October 27, 2017
	137:14;139:3;140:15	affected (5)	121:4;122:13	14:4
г	add (1)	66:19;137:19;	almost (2)	APP81564 (1)
[- 124:8	138:7,16;139:13	16:7;36:12	16:19
	added (5)		along (7)	APP81684 (1)
[No (1)		affecting (1)		8:4
69:13	39:2,8;50:10;	110:12	25:19;34:18;93:20;	
[sic] (1)	58:15;101:1	afternoon (15)	95:16;106:17;	APP81688 (2)
90:21	adding (1)	4:13,14;49:4;	113:15;123:5	10:7;22:1
	- 99:11	60:17,18;78:2;88:3;	alter (2)	APP81886 (1)
Α	addition (2)	100:16;102:18;	62:22;108:1	26:20
	80:22;82:1	106:15;107:2,3;	alteration (12)	APP81950 (1)
able (9)	additional (8)	110:19;111:20;142:5	30:18,20,24;31:12,	41:20
7:11;49:11,20;	10:11,12;14:5,14;	Again (25)	20;40:14;46:18,21;	APP82554 (1)
62:9;73:21;88:18;	15:8,13;16:16;80:11	14:4,14,17;16:4,	55:12,17;57:4,5	15:20
92:5;104:18;126:13	address (6)	18;20:19;21:22;29:6;	altered (4)	Appalachian (1)
Above (5)	6:18;67:18;69:14,	31:3;46:8,18;47:3,	39:4;40:13;56:4,5	97:15
22:12;77:5;96:10;	16;71:13;91:17	24;53:9,18;54:19;	altering (1)	appear (6)
	addressed (2)	65:6;75:18;93:6,11;	74:6	6:9;7:10;17:6;
127:18;135:12	18:8;40:5	110:11;112:18;	alternative (2)	42:10;87:4;98:14
above-ground (1)	addresses (1)	122:19;131:13;141:7	77:12;108:17	appearance (1)
53:1	66:21	against (1)	always (3)	111:17
Absolutely (5)	adequate (4)	127:16	30:23;36:12;85:12	appears (5)
32:23;63:14;81:9;			· · · ·	
87:8;90:13	70:13,14;76:21;	ago (5)	American (5)	16:24;18:6;41:5;
Abutter (4)	100:24	8:15;21:23;44:4;	50:15,21;74:8,9,10	66:4;94:12
119:16;125:11,22;	adequately (5)	50:12;61:2	Ammonoosuc (9)	Appellant (1)
126:3	18:8;75:20;91:16;	agree (31)	9:6;13:13;41:15,	6:10
Abutters' (1)	112:11,21	7:8;12:6;13:5;	23;45:18;48:3;88:19;	Apple (1)
133:3	adjacencies (1)	16:21;23:1;32:4;	100:6;103:18	102:14
access (3)	43:5	37:11,13;38:1,5;	among (1)	Applicant (20)
43:19;88:11;94:9	adjacent (11)	45:4;49:15;55:6;	139:13	52:16;59:9;61:12;
account (1)	9:10;12:8;13:20;	63:22;65:17;68:24;	amount (1)	64:8;65:12;71:22,23;
73:21	14:22;16:12;36:6,13;	71:11;78:10;83:15;	51:3	72:2;78:12,24;80:7;
accountable (2)	52:8;59:22;72:8;94:5	84:2,6,22;91:2;	analysis (2)	96:19;98:1,21;106:3;
136:2;137:8	adjourn (2)	116:10;118:1,7;	22:18;78:12	126:20;128:7;136:2;
accurate (4)	141:21;142:4	123:10;127:17;	analyzed (3)	137:7,7
17:8;28:12,14;41:5	adjourned (1)	135:17,18,20	103:12;112:11,21	Applicants (13)
acknowledging (1)	142:6	Agreement (26)	analyzing (2)	20:23,24;37:4;
77:10	Administration (1)	59:16;65:11;66:11;	111:4,8	47:4;52:7;57:9;58:2;
acreage (1)	73:16	67:15,22;69:9;71:4,	Anne (1)	86:19;105:20;
95:17	admit (1)	9;72:11,24;82:3;	117:6	107:13;108:21;
acres (2)	6:12	87:7,9,15,17;137:2,	anniversary (1)	112:11,21
80:18;95:13	adopt (1)	15,23;138:2,4,12,24;	117:18	Applicants' (1)
across (3)	5:22	139:1,10;140:4,21	anticipated (1)	57:13
126:23;127:19;	advance (2)	Agreements (1)	60:13	Applicant's (20)
135:10	73:1,2	140:17	apart (1)	6:10;8:2;10:7;
action (1)	advantages (1)	agrees (1)	99:24	13:11;16:18;25:9;
95:18	47:22	134:14	APE (45)	26:19;27:19;31:10;
actions (3)	Adverse (46)	agricultural (8)	7:2,2;8:9;10:18;	33:22;45:20;46:8;
86:12,12;99:12	28:16,19;29:3,6;	19:4;27:2,6;28:3;	11:17;12:3,4,8,9,13,	52:2,13;53:11;54:20;
active (1)	30:3;34:5,10;37:10,	33:11;34:14;37:19;	18,20;13:3,20;14:6,	62:6;65:14;92:11;
124:21	16;38:2;48:1;51:21;	118:19	22;15:12;16:3,12,13;	113:9
actively (1)	52:19,20;54:22;65:8;	agriculture (1)	20:7,8,10;22:2;	applies (1)
74:22	66:5,8,12,22;68:7;	39:15	23:15;25:20;54:7,8;	140:22
activities (1)	69:15,20;71:5,6,13;	Ah (1)	58:7;59:11,15;61:9;	apply (1)
69:24	72:4,18,19;73:7,9,10;	141:22	63:7;66:24;69:12,17;	116:1
actual (2)	75:7;77:13;107:22;	ahead (2)	80:6,10;81:5,6,10,18,	applying (1)
44:19;75:2	109:12;110:4,11;	15:6;121:11	20,23;104:14	29:16
	123:12;127:21;	aided (1)	apologies (1)	approach (8)
actually (22) 5:14:24:18:27:10:	130:8;136:1,3;137:4,	74:17	103:7	38:12,18;50:18;
5:14;24:18;27:10;	10;138:24	align (1)	apologize (2)	85:11;94:2,2;131:8;
35:10;43:12,14;	adversely (2)	87:18	53:9;114:23	133:21
44:17;45:3;55:20;	66:18;70:1	aligns (1)	APP68691 (1)	approaching (2)
57:18;70:5,6;72:20; 73:10:70:5:81:12:	affect (1)	87:17	66:6	131:22;133:8
73:10;79:5;81:12; 85:9;97:6;105:23;	40:24	Allenstown-Deerfield (2)	APP81301 (1)	appropriate (3)
03.7,97.0,103.23;		(-)		

ADJUDICATORY HEA	ARING			October 27, 2017
71:12;93:2;132:16	56:23	68:8;70:4;73:10;	29:4	37:14;55:1,15;57:9
April (2)	ASLIN (12)	75:10,11;77:13;	benefit (2)	boy (1)
5:3;125:17		136:3;137:9		27:19
	4:9,12;49:2,6;51:7,		77:11;109:20	
arbiter (1)	13,15,17;77:19;	avoidance (10)	benefits (1) 97:20	Bradbury (63)
139:6	78:19;106:23;107:11	70:8,9,12;76:6;		102:10;106:7,8;
archeological (1)	Aslin's (1)	106:24;137:18;	best (3)	114:18;117:1,2,5,6,
70:20	84:18	138:4;139:7,18,22	70:7;74:15;75:3	10,14;119:17,19,23;
Archeology (2)	aspects (8)	avoided (6)	Beth (1)	120:4;122:7,11;
9:18;91:22	28:21;29:1;33:21;	57:11;65:7;66:14;	78:4	123:18,19;124:7;
Architects (1)	35:2;38:20,24;40:3,4	74:14;76:7;108:9	better (4)	125:9,12,21,23;
50:16	assess (2)	avoiding (3)	50:4,5;77:11;	126:2,4;128:3,4,10,
Architectural (2)	24:15;38:6	65:7;107:14;	119:24	14,19;129:4,13,17,
5:10;118:11	assessed (4)	108:10	beyond (18)	24;130:5,18;131:4,5,
architecture (5)	30:1;31:7;35:6;	aware (5)	12:17,20;14:7;	13,15;132:4,8,18,22;
21:1;43:18;64:18;	52:6	43:15;61:12;68:18;	25:20;36:10,13,16,	133:19;134:4,9,13,
118:17,20	assessing (2)	95:7,10	21;44:8;59:14;81:10,	18;135:22,23;136:15,
area (84)	28:10;64:6	away (4)	13,20,23;86:7;87:16;	21,24;137:3,16,22;
6:19,24;8:11,11,13,	assessment (12)	27:8;61:9;127:20;	99:13;130:21	138:3,9,15,21;139:4;
16;9:14,24;10:9,17,	24:19;26:9;28:5,	129:15	big (13)	140:24
18,24;11:15;13:13,	17;29:19;30:13;		38:16;39:5,17,19;	Branch (2)
14,19;14:8,15,17,18,	38:18;49:16;101:12;	В	52:19,22;54:17;	13:23;53:7
19,24;15:11,15,20,	105:22;112:6;135:21		64:17;96:12,12,13,	breadth (1)
21;16:2,6,17,21;17:1,	assessments (1)	back (6)	14;118:22	34:4
5,19;21:5;23:2,5,5;	78:17	21:21;23:10;75:17;	bigger (3)	break (2)
26:15,24;27:3,5,15;	assets (1)	111:22;112:2;122:8	31:20;39:6;58:13	51:8,10
28:15;31:17;32:17;	90:8	background (3)	bisecting (1)	Bridge (2)
34:13;36:4,5,13;	assigned (1)	36:23;51:3;109:18	46:2	5:13,14
	54:4			bridges (3)
42:1;43:9,16;47:15;		bad (1)	bisects (1)	
53:14,15,20;54:3;	association (2)	53:9 D : (1)	120:13	5:12,15;118:19
57:22;76:15;88:20;	28:24;39:14	Bailey (1)	bit (4)	brief (1)
89:11,12,21;92:16;	assume (2)	141:24	21:14;65:15;89:3;	100:4
93:3,15,21;100:6;	15:18;128:19	bar (1)	96:21	bring (5)
102:1;103:18,20,20,	assurance (1)	40:13	black (7)	90:12;108:21;
22;104:2;105:3,6;	73:4	bare (3)	8:10,13;9:15;	123:20;124:10;
111:6;121:21;	atlas (4)	12:16;22:18;23:17	13:15;14:19;41:21;	130:19
122:22;126:21;	119:18,20;121:14;	barely (2)	53:19	brings (1)
129:8,10;130:24;	123:3	61:23;126:11	blanket (2)	104:19
132:16	atmospheric (1)	base (1)	57:24;62:17	broad (3)
areas (37)	35:15	25:12	blasting (1)	7:3;33:12;85:5
6:23;7:1,3,5,13,15,	attached (2)	based (12)	58:21	broadens (2)
16;12:17;13:8;16:9;	4:23;5:19	11:10;28:20;51:3;	blue (2)	85:17,18
17:6,23;18:13;19:8;	attachment (1)	61:2;71:8;73:1;	16:23;17:5	broader (5)
21:3;23:8,22;24:10;	22:10	78:22;79:2;101:20;	BOEPPLE (8)	20:7;80:10;84:23;
42:5,22;44:14;80:21;	attention (5)	112:9,19;114:2	78:1,5;82:20,22,	85:4;87:4
85:14;89:2;91:5,12;	58:14;62:10;83:11;	basic (1)	24;83:5;87:22;	broadest (1)
94:8,20;95:22;102:2,	96:20;107:5	45:10	102:24	79:23
5;103:11;104:7,20;	attorney (5)	basically (3)	both (8)	broadly (4)
109:2;135:3,6	102:19,24;115:1,3,	62:3;83:16;110:11	5:23;12:14;13:24;	18:15;72:15;77:7;
argument (2)	6	Bates (1)	23:12;36:10,16;	86:5
95:23;96:3	attorneys (1)	83:7	54:16;85:10	brought (3)
arise (1)	115:10	beautiful (2)	bottom (4)	62:20;92:15;93:13
52:18		119:22;130:20		
	audible (1)	· ·	22:15;46:1;60:6;	Buck (1)
around (8)	35:16	become (2)	84:11	16:1 D-ff-1-(1)
19:6;35:3;36:4;	August (8)	38:16;64:3	boundaries (13)	Buffalo (1)
43:9;44:20;51:5;	82:7,24;103:2;	begin (2)	81:9;92:6,14;	64:10
92:19;95:12	126:22;128:5,9,23;	19:10;108:10	93:10,16;94:12,14,	build (3)
arrangement (1)	129:3	beginning (1)	15;98:16,21;100:13,	11:12;108:11;
115:24	availability (1)	80:10	19;101:10	124:23
art (1)	62:22	begun (1)	boundary (10)	building (1)
8:20	available (2)	107:13	15:16;16:23,24;	47:19
Ashland (1)	51:4;77:20	behalf (2)	45:4;92:17,19;93:3,6,	buildings (6)
106:20	avoid (11)	67:9;81:21	24;100:21	33:16;74:6,6,9;
aside (1)	30:12;57:17;64:8;	below (1)	box (4)	124:18,20

			I	0000001 21,201
build-out (1)	catch (1)	38:19;39:1,11,12;	116:17,23;120:16	15;89:10;90:3;
74:4	135:8	40:21;47:1;114:4,9;	clarify (3)	124:21
built (1)	Cate (2)	129:12	24:17;98:16;	Company (7)
120:21	122:2;123:1	changed (4)	120:10	24:15;26:7;27:7,
buried (1)	categories (2)	16:22;39:1;64:12;	clear (4)	22;28:8;29:16;
64:24	29:5;46:15	113:16	36:15;67:21;92:2;	105:21
C	categorized (1)	changes (5)	108:17	compensate (1)
С	79:15	38:22,23;129:8,10,	clearly (9)	70:5
	category (8)	16	45:3;80:20;85:22;	complete (3)
call (1)	29:21;30:18;32:22;	character (8)	86:15;90:7;95:2;	73:5;74:1,2
89:1	34:21;35:9,14;46:18;	9:23;32:18;33:1;	113:17;116:12;127:4	completed (1)
called (7)	50:11	44:2,11;64:12,17; 108:5	close (5)	28:8
7:21;17:10;33:4;	cause (2)		52:19;63:21;65:5;	completely (2)
66:4;67:24;88:23;	55:9,12 cautioned (1)	character-defining (15)	90:22;96:19	64:12;92:2
139:14 Calla (2)	4:6	30:6,24;33:2,18;	closure (1) 72:11	component (5) 33:12;38:7;43:13,
Calls (2)	celebration (1)	35:11;38:10,13,19;	Club (8)	22;44:24
113:3;123:15	117:18	45:12;63:12,20;64:9, 22;67:10;73:22	43:8;44:19,22,23;	components (7)
came (2) 25:4;108:22				L ()
,	cemeteries (1) 99:15	characterization (1) 48:15	88:5,12;94:18;97:15	25:16;42:20;44:1, 7,9,16:90:4
Camp (1) 94:6	Center (6)	characterize (2)	cohesive (3) 9:22;15:17;21:2	comprehensive (1)
	14:12;18:3;25:17;	46:21;47:8	, , ,	90:16
camps (1) 88:7	48:5;121:13,14	characterized (1)	cold (1) 78:2	comprising (1)
Can (54)	centers (1)	7:5	Colebrook (1)	37:18
9:12;20:13;23:1;	80:22	cherished (1)	9:5	concept (1)
24:6;27:9;29:2;30:1,	Centre (1)	119:1	collaboration (1)	51:4
20;32:21;36:10,16,	50:9	chose (2)	28:7	conception (1)
18;38:2,6;44:21;	certain (1)	81:10;131:1	co-locating (1)	19:1
48:13;55:6,8,11;	92:3	chosen (1)	76:16	conceptually (1)
56:5;58:17;60:6;	certainly (7)	17:22	co-location (1)	98:17
62:15,21;63:11;	12:12;18:23;55:8;	Christine (9)	77:8	concern (2)
73:12;78:3,21;79:1;	81:5;109:7;116:4;	43:9;47:20;88:7,	color (2)	52:1;59:7
82:20,22;89:8;96:2,	118:6	14;92:16,20;94:6;	16:23;42:8	concerns (3)
20;103:10;108:11,	cetera (1)	95:8,11	colors (1)	51:24;52:12;61:24
20;112:16,18;	100:7	chunk (1)	42:10	conclude (1)
113:18;114:20;	CFP (2)	92:24	combined (3)	37:8
119:23;120:1,5,22;	22:11;60:10	Church (2)	79:18;88:8;105:19	conclusion (6)
121:2;123:2;124:7,	CFP5756 (1)	121:12;122:19	commencing (1)	18:10;25:4;52:23;
14;126:2,11;128:22;	22:14	circled (2)	142:8	105:8;113:23,24
130:14;134:9	CFR (1)	126:9;127:3	comment (5)	conclusions (1)
capture (13)	29:8	circular (1)	17:18;20:13;38:6;	97:19
20:16,16;24:11;	Chair (1)	48:21	92:5;107:12	Concord (5)
32:22;34:3;58:7;	106:12	circulation (3)	commentary (1)	102:20;103:21;
59:14;74:1;85:17;	CHAIRMAN (62)	33:13;35:1;94:10	108:22	104:1;105:4,12
86:23;105:23;106:2;	4:3,10;51:7,9,13,	circumstances (1)	commented (1)	condition (2)
118:11	16;77:20,22;87:24;	56:16	21:23	57:23;60:12
captured (2)	96:24;97:3,10;102:8;	citation (1)	comments (1)	conditions (1)
61:15,17	106:6;113:5,13;	40:11	89:23	23:17
care (1)	114:13,17,21;115:15,	cite (1)	commercial (1)	conducted (1)
62:10	22;116:11,20,24;	83:19	34:18	7:18
carefully (4)	117:3;123:17;124:4,	cited (2)	commissioned (1)	conferring (1)
45:8;55:19,20;94:7	13;128:2,8,12,16;	29:11;85:7	43:1 Commission on (1)	134:8
carried (1) 74:11	129:1,6,19;130:3,11,	cites (1) 29:7	Commissioner (1)	confidential (1) 93:17
	22;131:12,24;132:6,		141:24	
case (13)	11,20;133:11,16,24;	citizen (1) 90:23	Committee (7) 9:12;50:16;71:2,3,	confirm (3) 45:21;60:20;82:23
10:2;13:17;16:4;	134:8,11,17;135:13,			
19:7;35:21;37:3;	16;136:9,14;137:11; 138:1,8,11,18;141:2,	citizens (3) 90:20,24;91:4	12;88:3;105:16 Committee's (1)	connect (1) 94:3
42:2;54:21;57:8; 63:8;74:3,18;139:24	9,12,19	90:20,24,91:4 city (2)	105:7	connected (2)
cases (1)	(1)	64:12;102:20	communities (2)	94:5,21
70:10	141:23	claiming (1)	106:17;119:9	Connecticut (1)
cataloged (1)	Change (12)	30:12	community (8)	24:2
19:3	30:23;32:17;33:24;	clarification (3)	18:19,24;21:14,15,	connections (1)
	50.25,52.11,55.27,		10.17,21,21.17,10,	

ADJUDICATORY HEA	4KI
94:7	
connectivity (1)	col
45:8	
conservation (8)	co
42:12;80:19,20;	
86:14;90:18;91:17;	col
95:10;99:15	0
conserved (1)	col
91:6	
conserving (1)	col
86:13	
consider (4)	col
20:17;22:4;98:17;	
130:8	col
considerable (2)	
64:2;125:1	col
considerably (3)	
12:17;50:3;96:9	col
consideration (1)	
13:3	col
considered (7)	,
33:19;74:12;86:19;	col
101:18;111:11;	co
119:2;137:6	co
considering (5)	co
93:22;94:1;118:23;	co
119:6;133:6	coj
considers (1)	col
83:17	COL
consistency (2)	Co
31:1;43:18	Cu
consistent (2)	col
41:9;116:10	
constructed (1)	col
75:8	
constructed-related (1)	col
60:14	
construction (11)	col
55:3;58:10,12;	
60:21,24;62:14;	col
72:23;95:23;128:13,	
15;129:14	co
consult (1)	
79:8	co
consultants (7)	
31:10;33:22;46:8;	col
52:3,14;57:10;63:5	,
consultation (4)	
65:22;71:17;98:6;	
139:14	,
consulting (10)	
7:17;8:18,19;10:1;	
43:2;65:23;71:19;	col
81:22;100:8;104:5	
contact (1)	Co
89:9	4
contemplated (1)	
124:5	
content (1)	
89:6	
context (9)	
32:16;36:2;43:20;	
48:7;50:1;56:8;	co
,,	

68:16:75:5:91:14 ntextual (1) 49:21 ntiguous (1) 43:6 ntinually (1) 96:7 ntinue (2) 19:16;124:22 ntinuity (2) 45:13;95:5 ntractors (2) 62:6;73:21 ntrary (1) 110:14 ntributes (1) 32:20 ntributing (3) 33:4,7;34:9 ntrols (1) 70:21 nversation (2) 106:23;107:1 nvinced (1) 100:17 py (1) 117:13 re (1) 93:21 orev (1) 17:23 rner (1) 60:6 rollary (1) 69:3 rrecting (1) 35:13 rrection (2) 5:18.21 rrections (1) 5:6 rrespond (1) 11:24 rresponds (1) 23:2 rridor (21) 24:4,6;25:15,19; 30:9;31:23;32:6,12; 33:6;46:22;47:10; 72:5,7;76:23;80:7; 81:14:95:21:96:8.8. 17:120:12 rridors (2) 13:24;64:13 ounsel (20) 4:20;5:2;60:2; 92:15;103:3,7; 106:16;107:7; 109:21;115:5,21; 116:2,6:117:8,15: 119:13;122:8;124:6; 131:1:134:8 unt (1)

51:21 counterintuitive (1) 21:7
country (7) 50:24;91:5,18,20; 95:15,17;96:10
couple (6) 7:14;46:16;51:18; 53:1;88:16;106:20
course (2) 62:21;136:18 Court (1)
4:6 cover (2) 69:22;115:10
covered (4) 23:3;34:4;35:8,10 covers (1)
23:4 craft (1) 56:14
Crane (5) 102:11;141:2,5,11, 18
create (5) 68:22;74:20; 127:21;131:8;133:22
created (4) 5:9;68:19,23; 117:17
Criteria (4) 28:16;31:3;51:22; 81:4
critical (1) 90:15 criticized (3)
20:7;75:16,19 critique (2) 75:19;76:5
cross (6) 115:4;116:2,7,12, 13;123:3
crosses (3) 16:3;120:24; 122:24
cross-examination (7) 77:21,24;88:1; 97:12;102:16;
106:13;117:4 Crossing/North (1) 48:3
cultural (215) 6:4,8,23;7:6,8,21; 8:3,8,24;9:5,7,8,11,
16,22;10:9,12,15,23; 11:3,10,13;12:1,7; 13:1,18,22,23;14:5,
11,12,15,21,24;15:2, 10,17,23,24;16:1,4, 10,20;17:7,10,16,19;
18:1,4,11,15,17;19:1, 13,20;20:10,13,15, 20:21:6 24:22:6 12

14,21;24:16,20;25:6, 21:26:12.16.18.21. 24;27:11,13,23; 28:11:29:20:30:10: 31:15;32:6,10,16,24; 33:11;36:18,19;37:3, 11,18,21;38:3,6,8,17; 40:17,20,21;41:12, 15,18,21,23;42:6,16, 18:43:6.10.12.22: 44:1,5,15,16;45:5,11, 19,22;46:3,9,11,16, 24;47:7,15;48:5,8,23; 49:8,13,14,15;50:8, 10,18,19;51:19; 52:15,22;53:6,13,16, 19;63:3,12,16;64:6; 65:8;72:5;73:18; 78:11,16,20,23,24; 79:6,11,16,17,24; 80:8,11,16;81:16,19; 82:1,4;83:12,16,17, 21;84:3,14;86:23; 87:9;88:18;89:1,3, 21;91:15;92:6;93:7; 94:13;95:22;97:23; 98:14,18,20;99:1,3,9, 18,20,23,24;100:3, 10,19,23;101:7,14, 15:105:5.10.11.13, 24;107:15,20;110:9, 13:112:15:113:1: 140:17 culturally (1) 80:23 culture (1) 86:20 cumulative (2) 66:22:96:16 current (4) 33:6;77:17;80:19; 99:3 currently (2) 72:14;97:20 cut (4) 79:20,21;120:1,8 D d/b/a (1) 83:3 daily (1) 43:24 daily-work (1) 71:21 **Dam** (10) 15:2;125:8,13,19; 126:6;127:10,10,13, 20;130:7 damage (5) 29:22;30:22;55:10, 13,16 damaged (1)

56:3 Danielle (1) 102:18 dark (1) 24:5 data (2) 25:12;100:17 date (6) 62:5;82:23;105:17; 112:10,20:128:23 dated (3) 82:7,14:103:2 Dawn (1) 82:20 Day (10) 49:3;75:24,24; 110:19;111:19,23; 141:8,21;142:5,7 DC (1) 73:17 deal (1) 68:14 dealing (1) 56:9 deals (2) 66:12;138:4 decades (1) 49:23 decent (1) 141:23 deemed (1) 136:1 deeper (1) 43:2 **Deerfield** (32) 16:20;17:15;18:2, 3.6.7.19:19:9.11; 106:17;117:7,16; 119:16,22;120:13,18; 121:21;122:2,23; 123:6,13,24;124:16; 125:3,10,22;126:3,6; 129:12,16;133:3; 135:4 Deerfield's (2) 117:17;122:10 deficiencies (1) 101:9 define (3) 79:7;99:9,17 defined (15) 7:10,17,20;8:8,16; 9:24;25:22;26:13; 27:5;81:16;92:7; 99:3,12;100:5,7 defining (3) 21:5;94:11;98:24 definition (18) 11:10,19;20:1; 28:2:43:24:67:12: 69:21;79:17;83:16, 17,24;84:2,8,23;86:7; 87:13;100:10;104:6

20;21:6,24;23:6,13,

definitional (1) 79:24 definitions (4) 9:21:84:19:85:8: 100:9 degrade (2) 29:2;30:23 Delight (4) 120:15;121:3; 122:13,17 dense (2) 19:3:119:10 densities (1) 104:16 density (3) 25:24;124:15; 125:1 denuded (1) 64:13 **Department** (2) 97:21;106:19 departments (1) 50:4 dependent (1) 89:14 **Depends** (3) 81:3;89:13,15 depth (2) 37:2;102:1 describe (3) 9:12:32:21:98:8 described (3) 12:21:31:22:73:23 describing (1) 132:12 description (3) 28:12:35:7:62:18 design (11) 28:22;39:1;57:12; 73:20;75:4;107:16, 18:108:2.3.18:109:7 designated (1) 85:14 designation (1) 21:12 designed (2) 74:14;87:15 desirable (1) 57:2 destroying (1) 30:4 destruction (6) 29:22:30:21:31:11; 55:2,9,14 detailed (3) 11:13,18;73:18 determination (3) 74:7:80:8:110:7 determine (1) 68:7 determined (3) 12:13:59:15:90:14 determining (1)

139:7 develop (1) 61:20 developed (5) 9:20;43:16,16; 73:17;99:22 developing (1) 108:11 development (10) 79:4:95:9:109:17; 110:3;111:2,5,9; 112:5,13,23 Devil's (1) 94:20 DeWan (2) 109:15;110:24 **DHR** (14) 7:17;8:16;9:24; 25:10;28:9;43:1; 49:20;65:13;81:22; 83:17;98:22;100:7; 103:2:104:5 **DHR's** (1) 84:6 dialogue (1) 139:15 dictated (1) 104:21 difference (1) 96:12 differences (1) 56:2 different (22) 6:18.19:17:2: 30:21:31:5:32:3; 39:2,2;41:12;45:17; 51:19,24;53:4;94:11; 103:11:104:24: 107:16,18;108:13; 109:13:115:10; 128:17 differentiation (1) 17:12 differently (3) 34:12;45:6;65:2 differs (1) 98:19 difficult (2) 49:10,11 **Dilution** (1) 48:19 diminish (3) 35:16:37:6:63:15 **DIRECT (16)** 4:11,22;5:23; 29:24;30:12;31:6; 54:7,7;55:7;57:10; 63:7;66:20,21;69:3; 80:5;83:10 directed (6) 43:1.18:81:21: 82:8,13:100:9 directives (1)

104:5 directly (4) 36:13:43:5:68:4; 71:21 disagree (1) 52:23 disagreeing (1) 134:6 disagreement (1) 135:20 disagreements (2) 52:2,13 disassemble (1) 56:23 disassembled (2) 55:18;56:4 disassembly (1) 56:7 discernible (1) 9:23 disclosure (1) 124:10 discounting (1) 22:21 discover (1) 81:6 discoveries (1) 59:18 **Discovery** (5) 68:1,5,15:69:4; 70:16 discrete (6) 6:23;7:1,5;42:5; 44:9:135:7 discuss (1) 29:14 discussed (1) 78:19 discussing (2) 12:1:107:12 discussion (7) 48:21:49:3,7:55:1; 65:15;69:23;120:9 discussions (2) 137:18;138:6 distance (3) 47:9,12;59:6 distances (2) 72:7;76:14 distinction (6) 12:6;18:13:31:16; 48:6,22;86:18 distinguish (1) 49:12 district (22) 18:14;27:2;28:3; 34:14;37:20;42:22; 43:10;47:11;131:8, 10,19,20,23;132:9, 10:133:5.7.8.9.22.23; 134:7 districts (9)

98:20:101:7.16; 108:24:118:19 disturb (1) 57:17 disturbance (1) 58:20 disturbed (1) 57:22 diverse (1) 24:11 **Division** (1) 82:9 Docket (1) 83:4 document (10) 10:7;17:21;27:24; 40:6,7;65:15,18; 66:4;75:12;134:20 documentation (3) 50:20;74:8,17 documents (5) 5:7;78:7;79:9; 86:11:136:17 **DOE** (4) 12:21;65:12;66:19; 71:20 dominance (1) 41:6 done (16) 24:14:26:10:27:21; 28:17:29:18:30:14: 41:4:55:19:60:13: 73:5:75:3:77:10: 78:12:80:8:88:19: 108:23 **DOT** (3) 59:2,23:60:22 **DOT's** (1) 60:4 double (1) 39:19 down (13) 9:15;29:4;32:13; 33:12,16;34:22; 35:14;45:7,23;50:17; 103:17;123:21; 130:19 downloaded (1) 25:11 dozen (1) 72:3 draw (1) 105:8 drawn (1) 92:19 drilling (1) 58:21 drop (2) 34:22;93:10 dropping (1) 45:1 dry-laid (1) 56:12

due (2) 24:1:49:22 dug (1) 43:2 duly (1) 4:5 Dummer (3) 41:16:88:8:89:19 duplications (1) 56:2 during (1) 109:16 during-construction (1) 59:19 Е earlier (9) 22:3;81:19;84:17; 100:16;103:1; 106:22;110:18; 114:5;127:12 earth (1) 12:16 easement (1) 95:11 east (3) 45:1;92:20;93:10 eastward (1) 15:15 east-west (1) 93:11 economic (2) 86:1:87:2 economics (1) 86:4 edge (6) 14:23;54:10,15; 63:21;100:21,22 editing (1) 5:8 education (4) 74:12,17,21;90:19 educational (1) 86:2 Effect (26) 10:19;11:15;14:8; 28:2,16,20;29:3; 30:3;37:10,17;38:2; 48:1,10:52:20,20; 54:3.7.22:55:7: 64:16;68:7;72:19,20; 123:12;127:21; 130:15 effective (2) 72:13;76:20 effectively (2) 109:5;140:20 effects (43) 6:4:24:15.19: 27:20;28:6;29:6; 31:6:34:10:35:9:

42:6,9;44:6,7;

40:15,19;46:10;48:8;

51:19,22;52:5;54:19; 57:10:58:5.9:59:7: 63:2,2;64:6;65:8; 66:5,8,12,23;69:20; 71:5,6;76:8,14;82:2; 107:22;131:18; 133:4;136:1,4;137:4, 10:139:7 efficient (1) 136:10 effort (1) 117:24 efforts (6) 71:21;91:6;136:3; 137:9;139:19,22 eight (4) 10:22;29:5,11; 51:21 either (6) 5:6;34:2;54:4; 69:1;89:10;91:5 electric (1) 77:3 electrical (2) 35:3;77:16 element (4) 39:1,8;47:21;68:9 elements (12) 33:17;35:1,16; 37:6,9:39:17:45:11; 67:10:70:22:77:2; 99:10:119:7 elicit (1) 129:22 eligible (10) 20:2;37:23;84:13, 24;86:9,22;87:11; 140:14.19.23 eliminated (1) 76:14 Elizabeth's (1) 73:13 **ELMO (2)** 82:21;117:12 elms (1) 64:11 else (3) 48:19;106:8; 141:20 employer (1) 4:16 encompasses (1) 44:6 encounter (3) 70:19,20;96:7 end (5) 15:3;40:12,18; 75:11:141:8 endorse (1) 7:11 Energy (2) 83:4:97:22 engage (1)

90:15 engagement (2) 90:3,4 engages (1) 140:9 enough (5) 58:4;77:13;96:19; 139:22:141:13 enrichment (1) 90:20 entire (7) 38:17:48:24:72:4; 95:7;118:24;129:2; 130:13 entirely (2) 16:7;67:21 entirety (2) 49:14;88:20 enumerated (1) 99:14 envelope (2) 31:3:58:19 environmental (1) 90:8 error (1) 5:9 essentially (9) 29:24;30:8;35:20; 38:21;52:20;67:18; 71:5,22;120:13 establish (2) 100:13:139:3 established (2) 94:18.22 establishes (4) 66:15;70:3;90:7; 139:2 establishing (1) 95:5 et (1) 100:7 evaluated (3) 51:23;128:1,5 evaluating (1) 48:8 **Evaluation (15)** 27:21;29:14,17; 30:8;31:9;33:23; 35:9;40:5;46:9,19; 49:9;63:2;105:6,16; 118:3 even (6) 30:9;62:16;70:5; 81:20;96:5;132:12 eventually (1) 9:20 **Eversource** (1) 83:4 everybody (1) 117:13 everyone (2) 30:20;91:9 everything's (1)

31:24 everywhere (1) 79:23 evolution (2) 44:11:91:20 exact (4) 40:10;56:2;90:22; 100:18 Exactly (3) 8:22;36:22;138:1 **EXAMINATION (1)** 4:11examining (2) 115:2,13 example (12) 34:4,10;40:17; 43:8;55:21;56:11; 57:5;61:21;63:19; 73:12;82:6;116:8 examples (3) 29:6:46:16:51:21 excavation (1) 56:19 Except (1) 70:22 exclusive (1) 118:12 Exclusively (2) 20:4.5 Excuse (1) 78:2 executed (1) 65:12 Exhibit (33) 4:21;5:3,19;6:10; 8:2;10:7;13:11,12; 14:16:16:18:22:11, 16;23:16;26:19;44:2; 45:20;53:8,11;54:20; 60:2:65:14:83:7; 103:4.5.10:109:20. 22;117:9,15;119:15, 16;120:17;122:9 exhibits (3) 5:4;98:1;101:8 existed (1) 76:11 existence (1) 59:10 existing (11) 32:4:76:9,17; 95:21:113:22: 120:19,24;125:16; 126:8,17,21 exists (4) 44:12;47:2;56:22; 126:18 expensive (1) 55:21 experience (14) 39:16,19;47:16; 58:6.13:78:23:79:2:

138:9:139:20,24; 141:6 expert (4) 112:4;117:22; 133:3:138:10 expertise (1) 111:6 experts (1) 113:9 explain (1) 96:20 explanation (2) 47:5;69:21 express (1) 45:14 expresses (2) 26:2;95:19 extend (4) 16:5;81:5;92:21,23 extended (1) 15:14 extends (3) 54:15;92:20,23 extensive (1) 78:22 extent (6) 43:14;44:4;69:14; 72:17,19:107:24 extremely (1) 135:7 F facing (2) 44:22;93:21 fact (3) 63:23;81:18; 100:20 factor (1) 119:2 factors (1) 112:17 facts (1) 124:11 factual (1) 81:9 fair (7) 30:13;58:4;65:14; 66:10;87:14;105:15; 116:18 fairly (3) 19:8;88:6;140:19 fall (1) 18:21 Falls (3) 15:2,5,24 false (2) 47:17;48:15 familiar (4) 67:15:82:16:83:13. 24 familiarity (1) 89:11

far (6) 36:7:44:21:50:2: 57:12:59:13:121:6 farther (1) 50:3 feature (9) 30:24;56:8,21; 61:9;63:12,21;64:22; 65:5;75:13 features (32) 32:19,20;33:2,4,8, 19:34:9:35:11.18; 38:10,13,19;45:12; 55:17,22;56:3;57:11, 15;59:8,10;61:8; 62:9,12;63:6;64:4,9; 67:10,19;73:22; 80:23;98:10;104:17 federal (9) 28:18;29:8,12,17; 32:23;36:2,9;89:4; 100:10 feel (3) 39:10;72:12; 139:18 feeling (3) 28:23;39:8,12 feet (23) 54:4,9,15;56:17; 58:6,15,22,24:59:6, 11;60:13,23;61:9,10, 11.22:62:8:63:8: 126:21,24,24;127:1,1 felt (2) 99:12:139:21 few (11) 10:3;21:22;42:3; 61:2;97:16;102:22; 104:14;106:12; 117:7;118:18;141:16 fewer (1) 109:5 field (11) 7:19;9:19;11:11; 25:13;26:14;39:4; 45:9;51:5;65:4; 78:22;79:4 fields (3) 33:8;34:1,12 figure (11) 8:6.23:14:18:15:7; 17:6:22:1:23:13: 41:17;53:10;68:8,8 filed (4) 6:6;82:7;128:20; 129:2 files (1) 24:9 filing (1) 78:8 Fillmore (2) 114:14,16

80:4;110:13;137:17;

filter (1)

ADJUDICATORY HEA	ARING			October 27, 2017
21.12	12.02.17 18.02.1 4.	f	alahal (1)	
21:13	13;92:17,18;93:1,4;	fruitfulness (1)	global (1)	guess (6)
final (4)	94:5;95:1,3;109:10	86:4	99:18	10:11;18:12;51:20;
5:11;37:14;139:6;	forested (1)	full (4)	goals (2)	66:17;104:19;129:23
140:11	34:19	4:15;25:20;34:3;	112:14,23	guidance (8)
finally (1)	forests (2)	124:10	goes (3)	36:9;58:21;62:1;
126:2	79:19;109:9	fully (2)	31:21;66:24;	68:21;73:19;85:15,
find (6)	forever (1)	7:11;35:6	103:17	16;139:11
49:4;56:1;68:14;	95:9	function (1)	gold (1)	guided (1)
70:17;100:18;132:15	form (4)	138:23	42:8	28:17
Finding (7)	28:8;29:5;54:18;	funded (1)	Golden (3)	Guidelines (1)
37:15,16;39:24;	58:2	50:5	9:3,4;27:3	83:22
47:23,24;54:21;	format (1)	funding (1)	Good (29)	
109:1	17:3	49:23	4:13,14;5:21;7:18;	н
findings (4)	formerly (1)	further (10)	12:18;50:18,19;51:8;	
26:6;71:24;81:18,	121:13	11:17;18:5,9;	56:11;59:14;62:2;	half (3)
23	forth (4)	42:24;74:15;76:12;	72:22;73:1,2;76:24;	16:8,8;127:19
fine (3)	58:11;74:23;98:12;	101:18;106:5;	78:2;88:3;90:23;	HALS (1)
31:24;113:21;	99:16	114:12;124:24	92:1,24;101:1;	74:10
141:18 first (12)	forward (3)	Future (2)	102:18;104:16;	Ham (2)
first (12)	56:6;86:5;93:14	11:23;74:21	106:15;117:21;	13:23;53:7
19:12;26:15;27:20;	found (7)	C	118:11;122:4;	Hampshire (47)
28:15;29:21;34:21;	12:17;15:16;25:18;	G	134:12;141:3	6:20;12:23;18:21;
55:1;70:7;72:1;	80:16;81:3,15;		govern (1)	21:8,11,17,19;23:19;
76:18;99:1;109:17	125:24	Gale (4)	71:5	25:12,18,22;36:23;
fit (1)	foundation (2)	13:22;53:5,15;63:3	Government (1)	49:10,19;50:2;51:2;
75:4	56:13;124:23	G-A-L-E (1)	89:5	59:2;60:4,21,22;
five (7)	foundational (1)	13:22	governs (1)	70:23;79:12,15,19;
6:8,17;17:6;41:2,3;	85:10	gave (3)	65:18	82:9;83:3;84:19;
81:15;103:11	foundations (2)	34:11;101:6;126:7	Grange (2)	85:8,15,21,23;86:3;
flip (2)	58:10;84:5	Gazetteer (1)	28:4;34:15	87:4,20;90:9,20;
14:3;15:6	founded (1)	119:21	Granit (1)	91:10;98:18,22;
flipped (1)	100:15	general (6)	25:12	99:11;103:2;108:1,6;
90:23	four (13)	23:18;71:11;72:24;	granular (1)	118:1,8;119:10,20
flipping (1)	8:24;10:3,11,12,	73:16;123:20;130:21	130:24	Hampshire's (1)
15:19	12;13:1;16:9;21:24;	generally (2)	graveyard (1)	84:22
Focus (8)	23:14,21;48:11;70:3;	23:22;77:5	99:15	Hampton (1)
5:11;20:23;30:10;	112:16	generic (8)	graveyards (1)	106:18
43:17;47:3;66:3;	four-step (1)	108:19;113:3;	98:11	hand (4)
118:7;136:15	70:7	123:15,20;124:3,5;	gray (1)	56:15;58:16;79:22;
focused (8)	fourth (1)	130:12;136:7	122:16	117:11
19:2;20:9;35:21;	79:21	generically (1)	Great (18)	hand-built (1)
50:7;55:13;78:24;	fragile (1)	102:3	7:22;8:3,14;10:8;	65:4
118:20,22	58:11	geographic (2)	21:21;23:3,5,13;	handle (1)
follow (5)	framed (1)	94:15;98:15	41:18;42:1;81:13;	115:12
59:4;93:8,23;	104:23	geography (1)	90:5;94:16;95:6;	handled (1)
101:3;107:11	framework (3)	93:24	100:6;102:1;103:15;	33:15
followed (3)	68:17,18;71:17	geomorphology (2)	136:11	handling (1)
19:20;94:14;	Franconia (2)	33:14;100:23	greater (1)	66:12
101:11	14:24;53:21	gets (1)	89:11	handwriting (1)
following (4)	Franklin (6)	10:2	green (1)	53:9
60:10;62:7;121:1,	15:1,4;103:21;	GIS (2)	42:12	handy (2)
11	104:1;105:4,12	24:10;25:12	grew (1)	119:13;132:23
follows (2)	frequently (1)	Given (5)	64:10	happen (3)
40:8;93:24	33:5	47:9;61:3;123:10;	Ground (8)	70:10,13;138:13
follow-up (1)	Friday (4)	127:6;130:23	22:12,18;23:17;	happened (4)
101:11	60:17,18;141:6,8	gives (1)	43:21;44:18;58:20;	28:13;74:18;
foreground (1)	friendly (5)	71:20	62:7,21	136:16;139:20
36:22	115:4;116:2,7,12,	giving (1)	group (5)	hard (1)
foreseeable (1)	13	57:4	88:6,9;89:24;	130:19
66:22	front (1)	glare (1)	100:2;102:21	harder (1)
forest (16)	5:1	117:12	groups (3)	91:13
34:20;42:12,13;	frontage (1)	glimpse (1)	98:8;102:10;	harvest (1)
44:14;78:5;88:12,13,	34:18	135:8	141:17	34:21
	2			

ADJUDICATORY HEA	ARING	I	Т	October 27, 2017
Howyor (1)	25:6,21;27:2;32:14,	host (2)	38:14;58:8;67:19;	individually (3)
Harvey (1) 9:5	20;35:17;36:2,11;			
		104:13;110:15	68:10;70:1	9:15;45:14;100:1
hay (2)	37:19;42:6,9,17;	house (2)	impacts (29)	industry (1)
34:1,12	44:7;49:17;50:4,16,	5:16;17:24	25:1,5;30:13;	62:3
Haynes (1)	21;55:7,17;56:9;	HPTP (11)	39:23;40:8;46:10;	influence (1)
121:8	57:14;58:10;59:7,21;	66:20;67:2,17,21,	47:4;48:22,24;49:12,	52:22
head (3)	61:4,7,23;62:9,12;	24;68:19;69:6,9,14,	13;55:4,6;63:15;	information (3)
19:6;50:15;93:11	63:6;64:5;66:18,23;	22;70:11	64:8;69:15,16;71:13;	51:3;105:17;
heading (2)	67:3,4,9,19;69:15,17;	human (2)	72:4;74:3;75:7;76:7;	127:24
45:1;83:12	71:7;72:5;74:5,8,9,	70:19;79:22	77:13;108:9,10;	informed (1)
headings (1)	10;75:7,13;76:8,15;	humanity (1)	109:5,12;131:22;	126:20
67:23	77:14;79:8,13;82:2;	79:18	139:1	initial (3)
headquarters (1)	84:18;85:9;86:23;	hundred (1)	implement (1)	11:18;12:15;98:13
73:15	87:9;90:16;93:13;	60:17	66:20	initially (1)
heads (1)	94:23;98:9;104:9,16,	hundreds (5)	importance (2)	20:22
122:16	17;105:24;107:15;	11:9,9;80:18;	41:7;90:8	innovative (2)
hear (1)	108:24;110:9,13;	130:15,16	important (14)	49:9,16
32:8	112:14,24;117:16,22,	hypothetical (1)	21:11;25:8;35:12;	input (1)
heard (2)	24;118:3,8,24;119:6,	130:1	47:18,19;64:4,7;	8:18
113:16;117:21	8,22;122:10;123:4,5,	hypothetically (1)	70:15;86:3,17,18;	inscribed (1)
Hearing (5)	12,23;124:2;125:2,7,	130:7	91:4;109:10;124:17	50:14
4:2;35:5;51:12;	13,15,20;126:5,7;	т	impression (3)	inscription (1)
142:2,7	127:20;130:7,9,14;	Ι	11:7;93:8;115:20	50:11
hearings (1)	131:8,19;133:3,5,22;		imprints (1)	insertion (2)
109:16	134:22,24;135:24;	IACOPINO (3)	99:20	31:19;39:12
heat (1)	137:5;140:17	82:22;83:1;115:11	inadequate (2)	inspiration (1)
64:16	historical (4)	idea (1)	59:6;76:5	90:19
height (7)	44:11;82:9;95:5;	134:12	include (3)	instance (1)
96:11;126:15,24;	117:23	identification (2)	86:1;93:20;97:22	63:18
127:1,5;135:9,11	historically (3)	61:5;97:23	included (5)	instances (1)
heights (1)	18:20;35:12;	identified (33)	86:13;92:10;104:1;	73:6
127:15	124:17	9:15;10:13,17,22;	128:21;140:16	integrated (2)
held (3)	history (7)	11:16;12:2;13:2,18;	includes (1)	74:15;126:18
136:2;137:7,19	38:12;43:3;45:13;	14:22;15:10;16:5,11;	62:18	integrity (23)
help (1)	86:20;91:20,23;	22:1;23:15,21;26:21;	including (4)	28:20,21;29:1,2;
36:3 holmful (3)	100:18	27:1;37:22;41:22;	5:12;48:4;100:10; 105:20	30:7;33:20,21;35:16;
helpful (3)	HL (2) 5:13,15	42:5,24;43:4;44:14;		37:6;38:21,24;39:23;
118:5;119:3;124:8		51:23;53:15;73:8,9;	incorrect (1) 5:14	40:3,4,8,12,12,14;
helping (1)	Hmm-hmm (3)	75:21;80:11;134:22,		42:17;55:19;63:16;
72:11 Heritage (7)	17:4;31:8;84:21 Homeland (2)	24;135:24;137:5	indeed (1) 55:9	131:9;133:23 intended (1)
4:18;50:9,9,11;	73:15;74:4	identifies (1) 33:1	indicate (7)	67:11
			25:8;34:23;36:15;	intensification (1)
85:13,24;93:18	homes (1) 62:17	identify (4) 6:23;19:20;62:9;	45:3;58:22;67:8,23	32:9
high (3) 72:1;73:3;105:23	HONIGBERG (56)	98:14	43:5;58:22;67:8,25 indicated (7)	intensifying (1)
higher (2)	4:3;51:9,13;77:22;	identifying (1)	17:23;37:4;43:3;	32:11
31:19;127:4	87:24;96:24;97:3,10;	20:15	61:21;72:3;85:22;	intensity (2)
highest (1)	102:8;106:6;113:5,	II (2)	99:19	32:2;96:5
77:6	13;114:13,17,21;	31:17,17	indicates (8)	intent (1)
highlighted (4)	115:15,22;116:11,20,	image (1)	18:6;28:1,19;36:9;	107:14
84:10;110:23;	24;123:17;124:4,13;	65:3	61:1;71:18;85:24;	interaction (1)
120:18,21	128:2,8,12,16;129:1,	images (1)	111:8	65:19
hiking (1)	6,19;130:3,11,22;	63:23	indicating (4)	interconnected (1)
93:3	131:12,24;132:6,11,	impact (25)	42:9,11,23;52:21	94:4
Hill (6)	20;133:11,16,24;	26:2;28:10,24;	indication (1)	interest (1)
14:11;15:2;17:24;	134:11,17;135:13,16;	29:24;35:21;38:17;	24:9	91:3
24:3;44:24;53:21	136:9,14;137:11;	48:16;58:20;70:8;	indirect (1)	interesting (3)
hills (1)	138:1,8,11,18;141:2,	73:7,9,10;74:13,18;	66:21	16:22;70:2;85:6
44:20	9,12,19	75:1,4;96:17;110:4;	individual (12)	interestingly (2)
hillside (1)	hopefully (2)	112:12,22;123:22;	20:24;24:20,21;	15:14;81:14
36:24	7:22;23:11	129:21;130:9;131:9;	25:2;26:9;29:19;	Interior (1)
historic (110)	Hospital (1)	133:22	36:11;42:15,20,22;	31:4
5:16;18:7;24:21;	73:14	impacted (5)	44:8;69:24	Interior's (1)
,, - ,		F ()		~ (-)

Min-U-Script®

ADJUDICATORY HEA	AKING			October 27, 2017
31:2	126:3;128:22	lands (7)	36:8;39:13;64:14;	82:23
interpret (1)	Jo (1)	34:19,20;80:19;	76:15;89:10;91:5;	level (8)
74:22	117:6	86:14;98:10;99:16,	96:7;130:16	19:13;25:1,2,15;
interpretation (1)	judge (1)	16	larger (9)	43:21;70:11;73:4;
29:15	45:5	landscape (133)	9:24;21:2;31:19;	123:21
interrupting (1)	judged (1)	6:4,8,23;8:3;9:5,7,	39:16;40:16;41:24;	levels (1)
114:24	28:20	9,11;10:9;13:23,24;	43:24;77:16;119:4	18:18
intervened (1)	judging (1)	14:11,12;15:1,2,23,	last (7)	life (2)
73:20	31:3	24;16:2,20;17:11,16;	5:20;17:14;97:6;	64:2;124:1
intervenor (2)	judgment (1)	19:1,13;20:11,14,20;	101:4;117:18;141:6,	light (1)
88:5;141:16	47:17	21:17;23:13;24:2,20;	8	122:16
intervenors (3)	junction (1)	25:1,18;26:17,18,21,	late (2)	likely (9)
61:18;102:9;	17:24	24;27:12,13,23;	94:18,22	24:1;34:17;62:8;
115:21		28:11;29:20;30:10;	later (1)	81:6;94:3;101:19;
intervention (2)	Κ	31:15;32:6,10;35:23;	12:4	105:11,13;140:19
67:9;73:2		36:18,19;37:2,4,11,	law (8)	limit (2)
into (11)	Kauffmann (3)	18,21;38:3,4,7,17;	12:23;18:22;21:8;	29:1;109:11
26:4;31:15;32:10;	88:13;92:18;94:5	39:17;40:17,20,21;	25:22;84:20;85:9,24;	limitation (1)
43:2;46:24;95:2;	keep (1)	41:15,18,21,23;42:7,	86:6	38:1
111:7;122:16;	119:12	16,19;43:6,11,13,23;	law-based (1)	limitations (1)
130:19,21,24	keeping (3)	44:1,5,15,16;45:5,11,	70:23	49:23
introduced (2)	92:3;109:2;137:8	19,22;46:3,10,11,17,	laws (3)	limited (10)
37:9;46:24	Kenneth (1)	24;47:7,15,21;48:6,9,	70:19;87:3,19	47:7,8;54:3;56:13;
introduction (4)	97:14	13,23,24;49:8,13,14,	lay (1)	58:23;69:11;111:11;
31:13;35:15;37:5;		16;50:15,19,20,21;	13:8	118:9,21;135:6
	Kimball (4)			
85:6	97:11,13,14,14	53:6,13,16,19;63:3,	layered (2)	limiting (1)
intruding (1)	kind (8)	13,16;64:4;65:8;	37:1;45:12	21:6
126:14	29:13;30:16;41:1;	73:18;74:10,11;	layman's (1)	line (24)
intrusion (1)	43:23;48:20;57:24;	78:11,16,20;79:11,	38:12	8:13;12:18;24:6;
32:10	79:5;100:21	17;82:1;88:18;89:1,	layperson (1)	31:14;32:5,5;39:20;
inventoried (3)	kinds (4)	3;91:16,21;94:13;	35:19	45:23;46:23;47:2;
63:5;118:17;125:3	32:21;34:7,8;64:8	95:22;96:6;98:20;	least (9)	52:22;59:16;76:4,9,
inventories (1)	knowledge (2)	99:11;100:11;101:7,	27:12;35:6;49:11;	12;77:3;92:19;121:4;
49:22	28:14;73:3	16;108:1	58:1;60:23;63:18;	122:13;126:9;127:9,
inventory (9)	known (4)	Landscapes (100)	98:17;102:2;125:5	18;133:21;135:12
50:1;59:13;61:6,7;	119:1;121:13,16,	4:18;7:6,9,21;8:8;	leave (2)	linear (1)
62:11,12;70:13;	17	9:1,16,22;10:12,16,	93:3;119:8	13:24
118:4;124:22	kV (1)	23;11:4,10,14,16,23;	leaves (2)	lines (10)
invisible (1)	126:9	12:1,7;13:2,18;14:5,	92:24;122:1	77:5;93:9;113:15;
	120.9			
100:22	T	15,21;15:10,17;16:5,	led (3)	120:20;123:3;127:3,
involving (1)	L	11;17:7,20;18:1,4,11,	21:1;86:7,11	4;130:6;133:1;
138:16		15,17;19:5,5,7,21;	leeway (1)	134:18
irrelevant (1)	Lab (2)	20:15;21:6,24;23:6,	130:23	linked (1)
91:12	9:18;91:22	14,21;24:16;25:6;	left (4)	44:10
island (1)	lack (3)	26:13;32:16,24;	27:4;92:18;121:6;	list (4)
64:16	61:3,4;105:3	33:11;38:8;41:7,12;	122:12	33:17;34:11;63:6;
issue (9)	laid (2)	50:8,10;51:19;52:3,	legal (2)	72:9
			85:16;100:22	listable (3)
31:1;33:20;64:21;	9:17;56:13	15,23;64:7;78:23;	<i>,</i>	
85:19;96:4;107:23;	Lake (13)	79:1,7,16;80:1,9,12,	lengthy (1)	50:10;80:17;86:22
108:24;115:9,16	43:9,19;44:24;	16;81:16,20;82:5;	6:13	listed (13)
issues (6)	47:20;88:7,14;92:16,	83:12,16,18;84:3,14;	lens (1)	5:13;20:2;28:22;
52:18;53:4;62:23;	20;94:6;95:7,8,11,12	89:21;92:6;93:7,21;	118:13	29:5;50:14;80:17;
115:4;116:10;138:4	Lancaster (3)	97:24;98:15,18;99:1,	less (8)	86:22;87:10;99:13;
item (1)	9:9,11;28:4	3,9,18,20,24;100:19;	19:2;36:15;46:2;	121:14;140:15,18,22
63:10	land (16)	101:14;105:5,10,12,	65:18;72:3;109:2;	listing (1)
items (1)	13:9;19:13;33:9,	14;107:15;110:9,14;	127:19;140:19	84:24
5:17	10;34:13,16,17,18,	112:15;113:1	lessen (1)	lists (1)
	22;35:2;42:11,12;	Lang (1)	75:1	5:17
J	86:13;93:13;94:1,2	121:10	letter (9)	literally (1)
	Landaff (1)	language (2)	82:7,8,11;83:6,10;	97:4
Jeanne (8)				
Jume (0)	14.11	30.19.85.17	84.6 17.107.7/1	Inffie (10)
	14:11 londmorks (1)	30:19;85:17	84:6,12;102:24;	little (10) 25:18:26:6 14 15:
117:10;119:17,23;	landmarks (1)	large (11)	103:1	35:18;36:6,14,15;

ADJUDICATORI IIEA			1
108:16;109:18;	loss (2)	76:22;82:4;92:11	20:9;81:13
120:16	28:20;55:18	mature (4)	miles (3)
Littleton (1)	lost (1)	63:10,11,20,24	20:9;76:9,1
106:18	64:11	may (20)	mill (5)
live (2)	lot (5)	18:4;19:16;20:16;	125:6,7,7,2
117:7;123:22	30:19;79:11;81:7;	31:10;38:14;39:14;	mind (2)
lives (2)	106:2;118:15	42:15;44:19;45:2;	108:18;109
79:14;89:10	lots (1)	51:14;56:1,18;61:12;	minimal (2)
LLC(2)	80:22	62:10;68:23;73:7;	101:13;135
4:18;83:2	low (1)	89:2;93:12;101:9;	minimization
local (1)	109:3	140:4	48:10,15;7
117:23	lower (2)	maybe (10)	76:5,18,21
locally (1)	15:1;27:4	20:19;42:3;48:18;	106:24;137
119:1		51:24;58:17;61:4;	minimize (3)
locate (1)	\mathbf{M}	104:10,11;120:7;	48:16;70:4
117:24		132:23	minimized (2
located (2)	Main (1)	Meadow (1)	66:14;76:7
104:8;125:19	61:22	9:11	minute (4)
locating (2)	majority (1)	mean (11)	17:17;23:1
76:8;77:15	110:15	19:9;31:22;56:3;	77:23
Location (7)	makes (1)	95:13;99:2;105:4;	minutes (4)
28:22;32:14;38:24;	77:3	113:14,19;115:18;	21:23;51:1
45:21;56:21;127:22;	making (3)	116:7;118:15	141:3
128:18	18:13;26:8;110:7	meanings (1)	misinterpret
locations (1)	managed (1)	87:3	141:10
48:11	55:20	means (3)	misinterpret
lodging (1)	Management (1)	56:14;73:3;139:15	137:14
136:10	83:22	meant (3)	misses (1)
long (2)	many (11)	27:8;76:13;107:17	61:23
50:12;76:14	5:17;19:3;21:2;	measure (1)	missing (1)
long-adopted (1)	41:9;48:14;49:23;	130:17	106:2
110.14	70 12 00 16 21		• • (1)
110:14	79:13;80:16,21;	medical (1)	mission (1)
look (33)	95:13;104:8	67:7	93:18
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20;	95:13;104:8 map (30)	67:7 Meeting (2)	93:18 misspoke (1)
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3,	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3)
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1)
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5)	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17)	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107:
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137:
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6)	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1)
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22;	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1)
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8)	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29)	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7. 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1)
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15,	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7. 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7. 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1)	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21; 37:1;47:14;58:18;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1) 4:17	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5) 9:8;11:22;27:11;	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11 moment (2)
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21; 37:1;47:14;58:18; 60:23;62:8;68:3;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1) 4:17 mark (2)	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5) 9:8;11:22;27:11; 31:21;63:9	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11 moment (2) 8:15;133:1
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21; 37:1;47:14;58:18; 60:23;62:8;68:3; 72:15;80:15;87:1;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1) 4:17 mark (2) 119:15;122:16	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5) 9:8;11:22;27:11; 31:21;63:9 mid-ground (1)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11 moment (2) 8:15;133:1 monitor (1)
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21; 37:1;47:14;58:18; 60:23;62:8;68:3; 72:15;80:15;87:1; 89:20;92:14;94:8;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1) 4:17 mark (2) 119:15;122:16 marked (5)	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5) 9:8;11:22;27:11; 31:21;63:9 mid-ground (1) 36:22	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11 moment (2) 8:15;133:1 monitor (1) 68:13
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21; 37:1;47:14;58:18; 60:23;62:8;68:3; 72:15;80:15;87:1; 89:20;92:14;94:8; 102:23;109:23;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1) 4:17 mark (2) 119:15;122:16 marked (5) 4:20;5:2;60:2;	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5) 9:8;11:22;27:11; 31:21;63:9 mid-ground (1) 36:22 might (11)	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11 moment (2) 8:15;133:1 monitor (1) 68:13 monitoring (
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21; 37:1;47:14;58:18; 60:23;62:8;68:3; 72:15;80:15;87:1; 89:20;92:14;94:8; 102:23;109:23; 123:2,3;125:13;	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1) 4:17 mark (2) 119:15;122:16 marked (5) 4:20;5:2;60:2; 103:3;122:6	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5) 9:8;11:22;27:11; 31:21;63:9 mid-ground (1) 36:22 might (11) 19:9,10;22:7;	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11 moment (2) 8:15;133:1 monitor (1) 68:13 monitoring (58:14,19;5
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21; 37:1;47:14;58:18; 60:23;62:8;68:3; 72:15;80:15;87:1; 89:20;92:14;94:8; 102:23;109:23; 123:2,3;125:13; 127:8	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1) 4:17 mark (2) 119:15;122:16 marked (5) 4:20;5:2;60:2; 103:3;122:6 material (1)	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5) 9:8;11:22;27:11; 31:21;63:9 mid-ground (1) 36:22 might (11) 19:9,10;22:7; 36:20;45:5;51:8;	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11 moment (2) 8:15;133:1 monitor (1) 68:13 monitoring (58:14,19;5 60:8,22;62
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21; 37:1;47:14;58:18; 60:23;62:8;68:3; 72:15;80:15;87:1; 89:20;92:14;94:8; 102:23;109:23; 123:2,3;125:13; 127:8 Looks (7)	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1) 4:17 mark (2) 119:15;122:16 marked (5) 4:20;5:2;60:2; 103:3;122:6 material (1) 39:2	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5) 9:8;11:22;27:11; 31:21;63:9 mid-ground (1) 36:22 might (11) 19:9,10;22:7; 36:20;45:5;51:8; 55:9;58:8;62:19;	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11 moment (2) 8:15;133:1 monitor (1) 68:13 monitoring (58:14,19;5 60:8,22;62 67:24;68:5
look (33) 7:14;10:21;12:20; 13:7;19:10;26:15; 29:13;30:16;32:24; 33:19;41:14;45:8; 53:5;59:23;60:9; 63:9;66:16;77:9; 81:12,12;86:7,11; 93:6,9;94:7,9,9,10; 100:5;108:20; 117:19;122:5;130:20 looked (17) 6:15;12:16;20:8; 21:22;24:24;25:9,13; 33:23;51:18;52:4,24; 60:19;93:12;99:9; 100:17;124:9;131:17 looking (29) 12:11;19:8;21:16; 22:7,23;23:12,20; 29:4;31:13;36:18,21; 37:1;47:14;58:18; 60:23;62:8;68:3; 72:15;80:15;87:1; 89:20;92:14;94:8; 102:23;109:23; 123:2,3;125:13; 127:8	95:13;104:8 map (30) 10:13;11:4,6;14:3, 7;23:1,4,8,23;24:8; 25:15;26:18,23;27:4; 45:18;53:22;92:15; 104:18;117:16,19,20; 119:11,13;122:8,9; 123:4,7;124:15; 125:20;126:7 mapped (5) 17:23;73:23; 105:24;123:7;124:16 mapping (6) 12:16;17:12;19:11; 25:14;80:24;101:21 maps (8) 10:21;25:11; 126:22;128:5,13,15, 17;129:3 Marie (1) 4:17 mark (2) 119:15;122:16 marked (5) 4:20;5:2;60:2; 103:3;122:6 material (1)	67:7 Meeting (2) 17:24;139:15 meetings (1) 21:15 Megan (1) 58:17 members (1) 88:3 memorializing (2) 136:3;137:9 mentioned (3) 44:13;56:7;96:16 methodology (4) 9:17;26:6;91:22; 92:2 methods (2) 56:14;139:3 microphone (1) 111:7 middle (5) 9:8;11:22;27:11; 31:21;63:9 mid-ground (1) 36:22 might (11) 19:9,10;22:7; 36:20;45:5;51:8;	93:18 misspoke (1) 60:15 mitigate (3) 48:17;70:5 mitigated (1) 72:20 mitigation (1 69:23;70:4 71:6,13;73 16,20,24;7 77:18;107: 109:8;137: mitigator (1) 72:23 mobile (1) 62:17 modern (1) 58:12 modification 109:11 moment (2) 8:15;133:1 monitor (1) 68:13 monitoring (58:14,19;5 60:8,22;62

39:7 1:13:127:20 more (50) 10:3;11:13;12:22; 6:9,12 18:15;19:2;20:21; 7,7,24,24 21:14;23:24;24:11, 13;30:19;34:15; 3;109:7 35:18;36:15;38:15; (2) 39:14,15,16,22; 42:19;43:20;44:6; ;135:2 ation (11) 46:2;48:2;58:11,12; 15;75:21; 64:16;65:18;69:10; 8,21;77:1,9; 72:15;74:4;77:6; 4;137:18;138:5 79:1;80:4;81:3,7; 92:5,9,9,9;94:17; e (3) 70:4;75:11 96:9,21;108:9,16; ed (2) 109:3,4;119:10; 76:7 120:1;124:19 morning (1) 23:10;44:4; 106:22 most (11) 30:3;52:5;61:23; 51:10;61:2; 70:10;76:10;78:6; 79:19;86:13;97:16; pret (1) 108:3;124:17 Mount (5) 9:10;120:14;121:3; prets (1) 122:13,17 mountain (4) 37:1;97:15;121:19; 122:22 mountainous (1) 93:15 mountains (1) e (1) 39:21 move (3) 47:15;65:20; (3) 70:5;108:12 129:14 moved (2) d (1) 41:8;56:18 on (17) moving (3) 70:4.11: 34:24;50:21; 3;73:8;74:13, 129:24 24;75:21; **MPS** (1) 107:1,18; 84:4 137:19;138:5 MPS28 (1) r (1) 83:23 much (10) 6:2;7:20;47:11; 77:6;79:22;96:10,18; 97:8;119:10;141:1 muddy (1) tion (1) 36:15 multiple (3) 88:14;131:7; (2) 33:12 133:20 Muni (1) 102:10 Municipal (1) ing (13) 19;59:3; 102:21 2;62:2,23; Must (2) 68:5;69:4; 60:17,18 71:19,21 le (1)

	New (70)	120:12	offered (1)	24:3
Ν	6:19;12:22;18:21;	noted (1)	91:15	option (2)
11	21:8,11,17,19;23:18;	137:1	office (1)	56:22;57:2
name (5)	25:11,18,22;36:23;	notes (1)	43:24	orange (1)
4:15;5:15;88:4;	39:1,6,8;41:6;49:9,	65:3	Often (11)	9:1
102:18;106:15	10,16,19;50:2;51:2,2;	noticeable (1)	33:10;36:24;56:15;	order (3)
named (1)	59:2,17;60:3,20,22;	96:9	58:11;77:5;79:6;	68:22;114:20;
5:14	70:23;74:6;77:2,4,	Nottingham (5)	85:11;108:3;109:1;	116:17
names (2)	15;79:11,15,19;82:8;	120:15;121:23;	118:17;139:15	orderly (8)
120:5,7	83:3;84:19,22;85:8,	122:23;131:19;133:5	old (4)	109:17;110:2;
narrow (3)	15,21,23;86:3;87:3,	notwithstanding (1)	64:1;121:13,14;	111:2,4,9;112:4,12,
14:9;61:22;86:23	19;90:9,20;91:9;	115:13	127:24	22
Nash (5)	97:2;98:18,22;99:11;	November (4)	once (3)	organization (2)
88:12;92:17,24;	103:1;106:18;108:1,	4:22;5:10;85:7;	48:1;64:1;72:23	19:14;33:10
95:1,2	5;118:1,8;119:9,20;	142:8	one (38)	orient (2)
Nation (4)	126:23;127:3;	NPT (1)	8:24;16:7,16,17,	41:17;54:17
9:8;26:16;27:23;	128:13,20;129:2;	66:20	24;18:19;20:19;	original (3)
40:20	132:1;135:4;136:18	NR-eligible (2)	23:24;24:17;29:24;	15:15;101:23;
National (19)	newly (1)	86:14,21	35:18;38:15,23;	105:21
5:12;18:22;20:3;	91:15	NR-listed (1)	41:11;44:24;53:2;	originally (1)
21:9;33:3;83:20,22;	Newman (2) 133:2;135:20	86:15 number (9)	56:22;57:20;58:18;	92:10 others (7)
84:13,24;85:12,13;	Newman's (2)	25:23;38:9;49:4;	62:16;63:18;65:1; 68:4;81:13,15;84:4;	8:17;18:2;19:3;
87:1,11,12;89:5;	131:17;134:6	51:23;58:17;103:5;	92:7;94:17;108:8;	63:19;65:13;98:3;
99:14;109:9;140:7,	next (13)	118:8;123:5;125:5	118:4,5,19;125:5;	102:11
11	32:17;35:14;39:4,	numbers (1)	127:2;129:12,14;	out (35)
natural (1)	5;45:2;68:4;73:24;	83:7	136:21;139:21	8:1,2;9:17;11:5;
33:13	104:19;119:15;	00.1	one-mile (14)	16:8;20:8;27:6;41:3,
nature (2) 79:18;123:11	131:6;137:23;	0	7:1,2;8:9;10:18;	17;52:18;54:9;60:23;
near (4)	141:14,23		12:18;16:12,13;	62:8;63:1;68:8,8,14;
39:20;63:7,7;110:9	nice (1)	objecting (2)	20:10;22:2;25:20;	71:23;74:11;92:4,8,
nearby (1)	75:13	115:4,7	69:12;81:17,20;	18,20,24;93:3;101:2;
62:19	nominations (1)	Objection (11)	104:14	103:15;116:8;
nearly (1)	50:19	96:22;113:2;	ones (2)	117:11,23;122:24;
118:12	non-contributing (1)	123:14;127:23;	7:10,12	123:1;124:19;
necessarily (4)	33:7	129:23;130:10;	one's (1)	126:12;132:15
18:22;21:12;75:9;	none (2)	131:11;134:1;136:5,	91:13	outcome (2)
80:17	31:18;46:19	11;137:21	only (14)	17:18;100:8
necks (1)	normal (1)	objections (2)	7:12;30:11;37:17;	outer (1)
45:7	38:18	115:1,12	47:6,18,19;80:3;	16:23
need (9)	North (38)	observation (1)	86:24;87:10;108:20;	outline (2)
38:15;62:10;65:6;	8:3,14;9:8;10:8;	104:11	131:20;132:8;133:6;	14:20;53:18
92:5;102:14;115:18;	14:23;21:21;22:12;	obviously (2)	135:8	outlined (7)
122:8;141:13,20	23:3,5,13;25:17;	7:19;124:11	Oops (1)	8:11;9:1,14;13:14;
needed (1)	26:16;27:22;28:3,4;	occur (2)	120:1	14:19;41:21;92:16
49:5	34:3,14,15;37:19;	39:7;56:9	open (1)	outside (22)
needing (1)	40:19;41:18;42:1;	October (1)	33:8	7:3;10:18;11:16;
56:18	81:13;91:5,11,18,20; 92:21,23;95:15,17;	82:14 O'DONNELL (24)	opine (2) 78:22;79:2	12:2,4,9,12;13:2; 14:6;15:11;16:6,7,
NEEDLEMAN (15)	96:9;100:7;103:15;	4:5,8,13,17;51:18;	opinion (25)	13;22:2;23:15;59:10;
96:22;113:2,11;	121:16;122:19;	77:20;78:6;88:4;	13:1;23:20;25:23;	61:8;69:17;81:17;
115:3,8;116:4;	127:8,9	97:14;106:15;112:9;	34:5;35:5;71:24;	131:23;132:9;133:8
123:14;127:23;	Northern (7)	113:8;114:2;117:6;	72:22;76:16,20;	over (7)
129:9,11;130:10;	26:3;83:2;89:18;	133:13,18;135:14,15,	77:12,15;90:1;	19:11;49:23;76:14;
131:11;133:14;	103:16;109:9;	18;136:7,12;137:13;	107:21;108:18;	93:12;95:13;102:19;
136:5;137:21	117:22;120:20	138:20,22	110:2,8;111:1;112:4,	106:21
needs (1) 56:20	north-south (1)	O'Donnell's (1)	6;113:17;114:4,9;	overall (3)
56:20 negative (1)	93:11	124:2	129:20;131:21;133:7	74:7;131:9;133:23
52:21	Northumberland (3)	off (6)	opportunity (2)	overhead (3)
negotiation (1)	9:9;88:9;89:19	6:7;54:4;61:22;	79:3;91:19	15:5;27:15;46:5
139:12	Notch (3)	72:7;77:23;120:9	opposed (2)	overlay (1)
net (3)	14:24;15:3;24:6	offer (3)	36:20;80:3	47:10
72:13;140:5,10	note (1)	59:20;90:1;111:1	opposite (1)	overly (1)
72.13,140.3,10			· · · · ·	• ` `

ADJUDICATORY HEARING October 27, 2017				
109:6	101:11	novement (3)	pick (2)	127:22
	Park (4)	pavement (3) 54:10,15;63:8		porch (1)
Overruled (1)			21:2;55:23	L
124:13	18:4;50:17;83:20, 22	Pawtuckaway (1)	picture (2) 27:10;54:18	47:18
overstepping (1)		18:3	<i>,</i>	portion (14)
79:10	Parks (1)	pay (1)	pieces (2)	14:16;23:4,18;
own(7)	89:5	96:19 Dealer (1)	19:15;42:15	27:12,16;38:3;45:20;
21:16;27:1;42:18;	parsing (1)	Peaks (1)	pine's (1)	46:5;49:12;53:24;
43:21;113:17;	19:15	94:19	64:2	54:24;63:4;66:3;
124:22;136:10	part (23)	pejorative (1)	pink (2)	110:23
owner (1) 5:15	16:18;26:19;28:5,	89:4 Dombro (1)	23:8,23	portions (5)
	9;29:22;30:5;36:17,	Pembroke (1)	place (5)	53:1,21;54:8;
owner/principal (1)	20;37:18;38:9;48:23,	106:18	39:10;86:24;	109:3;114:2
4:17	24;49:3,7;69:5,6,10;	Pemigewasset (4)	100:23;130:20;	posit (1)
owners (1)	97:21;104:10,11;	14:17;53:13;	139:13	63:19
140:7	112:4,6;117:17	103:19;104:15	places (3)	position (6)
ownership (1) 93:13	partial (1) 35:4	pending (1) 98:3	45:15;48:14;	12:19;48:12;80:14,
93:13			108:23	14;102:9;135:3
Р	partially (4)	people (14)	placing (1)	possess (1)
F	7:2;8:9;11:14;	21:11,19;68:13,14;	76:12	18:1
D_{-} , (12)	81:16	73:19;79:14;85:21;	plan (15)	possible (6)
Pacik (13)	participate (1)	86:3;88:6;95:19;	12:11;24:5;67:5,	19:9;30:4;74:15;
102:12,13,17,18;	139:9	99:13;123:22;	18,24;68:1,2,22,22;	75:14;80:9;118:24
106:4;114:19,22,23;	participation (1)	139:18;141:13	69:4,5,5;70:14,16;	possibly (1)
115:15,17;116:12,16,	89:23	per (1)	73:18	34:19
22	particular (10)	47:13	planning (1)	post-prefiled (1)
Page (24)	21:1;28:11;29:19;	percent (1)	110:15	78:18
5:9,18;8:1,2;10:6;	43:15;48:22;54:21;	90:2	play (3)	potential (14)
11:21,22;13:10;	64:13;96:4;109:1;	percentage (1)	50:22;88:14;	9:16;10:19,23;
17:14;27:19,20;49:4;	135:10	105:23	115:18	11:15;14:8;17:7;
54:20;58:17;60:10;	particularly (8)	perception (1)	please (7)	22:17;23:16;25:5;
63:1;76:3;83:10;	6:14;25:14;26:12;	94:10 P error (15)	4:15;82:21;98:16;	26:3;54:3;57:4,5; 58:1
90:10,11;103:10;	45:6;49:20;61:18;	Percy (15)	102:15;111:7;122:5;	
111:20;131:15;133:1	91:4;109:9	43:8;44:19;87:24;	141:11	potentially (4)
pages (8)	parties (17) 7,17,9,19,10,10,1	88:2,4,5,11,13;94:6,	pleasure (1)	18:15;31:6;79:16;
11:9;68:4;90:12;	7:17;8:18,19;10:1;	18,19;96:24;97:2,5;	90:19	84:13
107:8;109:23;	43:2;65:19,20,23;	101:7	plural(1)	power (7)
111:23;119:21; 130:16	71:19;81:22;100:8;	perform (1)	11:8	31:14;32:5,12;
	104:6;116:10;	24:18	pm (4) 4:2;51:11,12;142:7	39:13,19;108:23; 123:3
paid (1)	137:19;138:7,16;	performed (2) 31:9;46:9		
96:18	139:13		point (14)	practice (2)
PAL (6)	$\operatorname{partly}_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}s$	perhaps (1) 19:1	7:16,23;38:14; 45:10;48:23;50:13;	32:24;50:7
6:11,22;7:18;12:3;	88:17	person (1)	61:16;92:8,13;102:3;	practices (1) 69:23
19:4;33:15	partnerships (1) 91:7			
panel (1) 129:14	91:7 parts (3)	39:4 perspective (4)	114:19;115:19; 116:17;124:9	precisely (1) 115:9
panoramas (1)	36:19;38:7;47:16	41:13;64:5;116:5;	pointed (1)	pre-construction (2)
33:12		127:6	126:12	57:23;60:12
Parade (3)	party (2) 139:21,23	pertain (1)	points (1)	prefiled (14)
18:2;121:21;	Pass (6)	137:1	47:14	4:22;5:23;78:9,13;
122:23	26:3;27:10;83:2;	pervasive (8)	poles (6)	82:6;97:18;98:7,8;
Paragraph (8)	89:18;117:22;120:20	18:20;23:9;25:23;	31:19;39:6,13;	109:21;113:23;
5:20;17:17;40:11;	passed (1)	39:18;41:10;47:20;	41:6,7;108:24	114:5;120:11;128:6;
57:19;59:17;66:17;	56:24	77:2;80:24	policy (1)	134:6
83:13;84:11	passes (1)	photo (7)	91:3	prejudiced (1)
parallel (2)	30:9	40:18;55:24;63:9;	Pond (10)	116:14
52:17;120:14	pasture (2)	125:16;127:11,12;	9:11;121:6;122:14,	prepare (1)
paraphrase (1)	34:1,13	123.10,127.11,12, 128:7	15,17;125:8,13;	66:20
12:24	PATRICIA (3)	phrase (1)	126:5;127:8;128:24	prepared (1)
paraphrasing (1)	4:5,8,17	140:11	pool (2)	97:19
132:13	patterns (2)	physical (9)	129:15,18	pre-planning (1)
parcel (2)	19:16;33:9	29:21;30:21;31:11;	pools (1)	59:20
93:9;100:21	Pause (1)	32:18;44:9;55:2,9;	62:16	present (1)
parcels (1)	136:23	74:13;75:2	popular (1)	7:12
	150.25	71.13,73.2	Popular (1)	···12

ADJUDICATORY HEARING OCTODER 27, 2017				
presented (4)	124:22;139:2	Prospect-Martin (1)	78:4	recognize (2)
94:13;101:22;	produced (1)	9:10	quite (14)	8:10;26:20
106:1;136:17	6:5	protect (4)	23:9;25:22;32:3;	recognized (2)
Preservation (14)	productive (1)	67:11,12;68:9;	33:12;51:5;55:21;	18:23;58:1
24:15;26:7;27:7,	34:20	87:15	73:5;76:24;91:23,23;	recognizing (1)
22;28:8;29:16;50:16;	program (2)	protected (6)	92:1;105:11;118:20;	29:18
65:2;67:3,6,8;85:9;	74:12;90:16	91:17;95:8,14,17,	124:8	recommend (1)
90:17;105:21	Programmatic (27)	22;98:10	quotation (1)	17:22
preserve (3)	59:16;65:11;66:11;	protecting (2)	83:19	Recommendations (3)
67:11,13;68:9	67:15,22;69:9;71:3,	112:14,24	quote (2)	6:16;17:15;28:2
preserving (2)	9;72:10,24;82:3;	protection (2)	90:15,22	Recommended (4)
112:14,24	87:7,8,14,17;137:2,	59:21;65:2	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	11:23;37:15;47:24;
pretty (5)	15,23;138:2,3,12,24;	provided (4)	R	80:5
50:12;52:9;78:3;	139:1,10;140:4,16,20	109:15;113:9;		recommends (1)
79:22;80:24	project (64)	114:4;128:7	radically (1)	60:22
previously (4)	12:19;13:4;22:17;	Public (31)	107:24	record (15)
37:22;42:23;103:3;	24:19;25:5;26:3;	4:21;5:2;9:18;	random (1)	4:16;22:14;49:2;
113:9	27:10,16;28:10;32:9;	42:13;60:2;74:12,17,	65:4	65:16;69:6;74:20;
pre-work (1)	35:20;45:22;46:6,22;	23;83:3;88:10,11;	range (1)	77:23;96:23;101:1;
73:24	48:5;53:2,3,24;54:9;	89:22;90:3;91:3,3,7,	126:23	111:22;112:10;
primarily (1)	56:20,24;57:11;63:4;	22;92:15;93:5;103:4,	rather (7)	113:4;116:9;120:9;
48:2	64:23;66:19,23;	7;107:7;109:22;	16:21;25:1,7;56:2;	137:8
primary (1)	67:20;68:20;70:15;	115:21;116:6;	75:17;94:14;108:10	recorded (2)
79:8	75:5,8,22;76:6,13,17;	117:15;119:14;	reach (1)	20:22;24:10
prior (8)	81:22;89:16,17;	122:9;124:6;131:1,	117:23	recreation (4)
11:5,21;17:12;	95:24;103:17;	22	react (1)	80:21;94:8;98:10;
27:7;43:4;111:22;	107:14,16,21;108:7,	Public's (3)	136:19	99:16
128:6;129:21	7,11,13,21;109:11;	115:6;116:2;117:8	read (9)	recreational (3)
private (3)	110:3,8,10;112:12,	PUC (1)	17:17;30:20;67:16;	19:5;34:20;43:17
80:20;91:7;140:6	22;120:12;123:11;	142:2	82:18;84:7;85:15;	red (1)
probably (5)	126:22;128:4;131:7,	pull (1)	88:18;113:16;133:10	24:5
27:9;32:15;44:17;	18;133:4,21;137:20;	16:17	ready (2)	reducing (1)
141:23;142:1	138:17	pulled (1)	4:4;102:13	65:7
problem (2)	Project's (1)	27:6	realize (1)	reduction (1)
87:6;115:18	25:1	purple (1)	101:24	15:22
problems (1)	promote (1)	45:23	really (9)	reference (2)
109:4	90:17	purpose (2)	18:12;19:6;55:13;	5:8;90:7
procedural (1)	proper (1)	89:15;120:17	87:1;102:1;107:24;	referenced (1)
115:12	62:11	purposes (2)	135:7,17;141:7	102:24
proceed (1)	properties (17)	12:9;89:8	realm (1)	referring (1)
51:14	20:24;36:8;66:18,	put (18)	58:13	54:7
proceeding (8)	24;67:4;69:16,17;	12:14;31:23;83:9;	reasonably (1)	reflecting (1)
6:5;7:6;22:5;36:7;	76:15;82:2;85:13;	91:14;109:19;	66:22	134:21
69:7;111:2;113:10;	92:3,4;94:3;140:8,12,	110:17;111:14,19,23;	reasoning (2)	re-focus (1)
136:18	14,23	117:11;119:18;	47:13;104:12	87:4
proceedings (2)	property (19)	125:10,22;126:1,3;	reasons (1)	regard (3)
48:18;110:18	29:2,23;30:19,21;	127:11;128:11,22	93:19	58:5;95:21;104:6
process (60)	31:7,12,21;32:14,19;	putting (2)	reassemble (1)	regarding (2)
8:21;9:13;11:19;	35:8,12;36:12;46:19;	109:3;110:22	56:24	131:18;133:4
12:14,21;19:19,22,	55:13;90:18;93:8,23;	0	reassembled (2)	region (1)
24;20:1,11,18;21:5;	94:14;140:7	Q	55:18;56:4	103:24
26:11;28:9,18;29:17;	property's (2)		reassembly (1)	Register (12)
30:17;40:14;49:17;	32:18;35:17	qualified (3)	56:8	5:12;18:23;21:9;
50:20;51:2;54:6;	proposal (2)	37:16,17;48:1	rebuild (1)	33:3;84:13;85:1,12;
59:12,19;61:16; 65:18 21 23:66:2 14	57:13;107:19	qualifying (1)	55:24	86:9;87:1,11,12;
65:18,21,23;66:2,14,	proposed (15) 12:19;32:8;35:20;	47:6	recall (2)	99:14 registered (2)
15;69:11,12;70:3,7, 22,23;71:4,6,10,14,	66:19,23;84:15;	qualities (3)	37:20;107:1	registered (2) 98:9;140:22
18;72:15,21,22;73:6;	95:24;98:20;103:16;	18:1;43:21;108:5	received (1) 99:6	Register-eligible (2)
75:8;84:8;86:8;	108:6,8;120:12,20;	quality (1) 77:2	recently (2)	140:8,12
97:22;98:6,23;	123:5,11	quick (3)	93:15;99:6	Registry (1)
101:16;103:12;	proposing (1)	13:7;79:4;106:20	Recess (1)	20:3
104:21,23,24;105:1;	57:13	quickly (1)	51:11	regular (1)
101.21,23,27,103.1,	57.15	Yuring (1)	J 1 . 1 1	guiut (1)

ADJUDICATORI HEA	AKING	1
62:14	75:16,20;79:4;85:7;	101:2;104:17;
rehabilitated (1)	88:19;89:3;90:6,11;	105:24;109:5;
73:14	91:24;98:13,13;99:8;	111:12;124:19;
reiteration (1)	113:18;131:14	125:2;134:22;135:1;
123:15	reported (1)	140:18
relate (7)	115:11	respect (9)
12:22;45:13,13;	Reporter (1)	37:17;48:2;78:10;
100:22;109:17;	4:7	80:2;98:15;117:8;
137:24;138:2	reporting (1)	134:7;137:4;140:6
related (9)	71:23	respond (4)
11:11;33:14;38:10;	reports (14)	113:8;132:3,14;
39:12;43:5;55:1;	6:9,15,18,22;11:8,	136:19
64:18;82:4;98:24	13;19:4;20:14;33:15;	response (8)
relates (6)	78:11,20;82:1;89:7;	52:16;55:15;76:4;
30:6;44:20;47:23;	91:16	101:6;113:12;
112:13,23;137:22	represent (1)	116:21;131:17;133:2
relationship (7)	88:10	response] (1)
32:2;33:9;38:20;	representing (1)	69:13
39:5;42:21;57:20;	88:6	restate (2)
99:2	request (2)	112:16;113:22
	113:22;129:13	
relationships (5)		restoration (1)
9:23;14:1;34:23;	requested (1)	57:14
39:3;64:15	74:16	restore (1)
relative (1)	require (1)	57:18
101:9	18:5	restored (1)
relatively (2)	required (4)	57:23
U V V		
51:1;126:18	50:1;56:19;58:14;	result (3)
relevant (9)	74:16	29:3;75:12;110:3
13:3;20:17;22:4;	research (7)	resulted (1)
34:9;79:14;91:9;	7:19;9:19;11:11,	129:13
105:6,17;118:18	19;25:10;43:3;79:8	resume (3)
rely (2)	residential (1)	4:4;141:14;142:7
71:3,12	34:17	resumed (2)
remain (3)	residents (1)	4:2;51:12
13:3;35:2;93:17	62:20	retain (1)
remains (2)	resolution (5)	108:5
40:12;70:20	65:24;66:5,7;	reused (1)
	69:20;139:16	73:15
remember (1)		
27:9	resolve (2)	reusing (1)
removal (3)	71:4;139:21	74:5
30:11;32:13;57:14	resolved (1)	review (15)
rendered (2)	139:17	9:20;12:9;13:4;
110:2,10	resolving (1)	18:11;24:14;48:7;
repeat (2)	138:24	61:3;69:19;79:5,7;
96:23;100:14	resource (15)	101:14,20;104:13;
repeats (1)	25:2;30:4;36:4,5,	105:7;111:10
97:6	21;37:23;74:21;75:2;	reviewed (11)
rephrase (1)	83:21;85:17;93:21;	6:8;8:12;17:7;
134:9	107:20;118:2;	18:14;27:24;52:3,14;
replaced (1)	135:24;137:5	
		61:20;80:8;111:18;
56:18	resources (56)	114:8
replacement (1)	18:7,20;20:1,16,	reviewing (2)
47:2	22;21:10;24:12,21;	17:9;34:10
replacing (2)	25:7,20,24,24;26:1,9;	reviews (2)
74:5,6	36:2;42:18;43:4;	17:21;134:20
		-
replanted (1)	49:18;50:4;52:6;	ridges (1)
79:20	55:7;56:10;57:15;	93:20
report (32)	58:8;59:8,21;61:8;	right (49)
4:23;5:10,19;8:4,	64:5;69:24;71:7;	4:19;6:2;8:14;9:2;
··=-,-···,-/,-/,···,		
12.11.8 21.12.15 15.		
12;11:8,21;12:15,15;	72:5,8,18;75:7;76:8;	14:6;15:21;16:6,7,
13:12;16:20;17:16;	72:5,8,18;75:7;76:8; 77:14;79:13;82:9;	14:6;15:21;16:6,7, 14;17:9;19:22;34:8;
13:12;16:20;17:16; 18:6;24:11;33:23;	72:5,8,18;75:7;76:8; 77:14;79:13;82:9; 84:19,23;86:21;87:5,	14:6;15:21;16:6,7, 14;17:9;19:22;34:8; 37:14,24;42:2;52:1;
13:12;16:20;17:16;	72:5,8,18;75:7;76:8; 77:14;79:13;82:9;	14:6;15:21;16:6,7, 14;17:9;19:22;34:8;

76:2:97:5:102:6; 48:4;106:17;109:2; 103:9;105:1;107:3; 121:17:123:6 108:14:110:5:112:7; routes (1) 121:5,7,18,22,24; 104:10 **ROW** (1) 122:3,4,21,24,24; 126:17;130:18; 76:10 131:2,4,6;137:17; **RSA** (2) 90:7,14 139:12:140:13,24; 141:15,19 rule (2) right-hand (1) 116:13,14 24:5 rules (13) right-of-way (8) 12:22;28:18;29:8, 34:2;35:4;76:17; 12,17;36:3;85:8,16; 77:17;89:18;120:19, 87:19;98:7,19; 24;122:1 111:12;115:19 rights-of-way (1) running (2) 76:10 120:14;127:19 rigorous (1) runs (1) 139:8 127:9 rises (1) rural (4) 96:10 131:8,19;133:5,22 risk (1) 72:1 **River** (21) 9:7;13:13,22,23; safety (3) 14:17;15:19;24:2; 72:13;140:5,10 36:24;39:21;41:15, same (21) 23;45:18;48:3;53:5, 10:6;17:15;23:17; 13,15;63:3;81:11; 31:24;45:18;52:17; 103:18,19:104:9 54:18:64:21:83:6; Road (41) 98:6;100:17,18,19; 9:8:16:1:17:24: 115:19;122:6,14,24; 26:16:27:23:28:3,4, 130:10;131:11; 4;34:3,14,15,15,18; 136:6;140:6 37:19;40:20;48:3,4; sat (1) 50:17 54:5,12;65:5;120:5, satisfied (1) 15,15;121:3,6,8,10, 13,14,16,19,23; 116:21 122:2,14,14,19,22, saving (10) 23:123:1:131:19; 12:3;32:8;35:2; 133:5 38:22;68:11,13;86:8; Road-Lost (4) 99:15,24;105:19 scale (19) 9:8;26:16;27:22; 40:19 15:23;32:1,11; roads (7) 36:14;39:3,3,5;41:5; 54:14;98:11;120:5; 64:2,14,19;76:22; 121:1,2;122:6,14 77:1,4;96:5;107:23; roadside (2) 123:10;137:20; 55:22;56:17 138:17 roadway (2) scenic (3) 63:22:64:23 98:11;111:12; roles (2) 119:22 71:19;88:15 schedules (1) Roman (4) 139:3 31:17;35:14;47:5; scoping (1) 66:4 89:15 room (1) screen (6) 102:12 7:23;10:6;26:17; roots (2) 83:9;107:9;109:24 86:5:87:3 screening (2) roughly (2) 22:22,22 23:2;127:1 se (1) Route (5) 47:13

S

ADJUDICATORI IIEA	AKING			
SEC (17)	set (4)	139:9	94:20	speak (2)
12:10,22;13:4;	33:1;56:23;128:20;	significance (4)	slightly (4)	65:1;111:7
20:17;59:9;66:2;	129:2	42:17;84:15;94:23;	15:15;17:2;34:12;	speaking (2)
71:14;85:8,16;87:18;	setting (16)	95:4	53:4	23:22;134:5
98:7,19;104:24;	21:18;28:22;32:19;	significant (7)	slopes (2)	special (2)
108:20;111:12;	35:22;36:1,3,10,12,	26:2;35:17;58:19;	43:20;44:22	62:10;91:11
140:5,10	20;37:2,7;38:23,23;	95:15,18;115:16;	small (11)	specialist (1)
second (18)	39:3;74:7;118:18	123:4	19:8,15;22:14;	107:20
10:4;11:12,12;	settlement (1)	sim (1)	39:4;45:7;72:6;	specific (15)
15:7;19:14;21:4,21;	19:7	40:18	80:22;88:6;120:2;	24:13;25:10;26:8;
22:8;30:18;50:6;	settlements (1)	similar (3)	129:12;135:6	44:1;53:14;69:23;
57:20;59:1;72:2;	19:2	52:12;76:23;87:6	smaller (2)	97:23;98:14,21;
83:9;84:11;99:1;	seven (9)	simple (1)	7:20;15:21	108:16,17;123:21;
119:13;136:22	28:21,24;33:20;	86:7	small-scale (1)	124:15;130:21;
Secretary (2)	38:20;40:2,4,24,24;	simplest (1)	33:17	133:15
31:2,4	41:3	79:17	social (1)	specifically (5)
Section (46)	several (2)	simply (12)	86:1	69:10;100:5;
6:15;8:20;12:13, 21;13:21;14:9;15:4,	85:20;106:16 Sewer (1)	40:9;47:1;74:5;	societal (2)	110:12;138:15; 139:14
5;19:21,24;20:8;	106:19	75:12;77:15;92:19; 95:20;99:13;100:2;	80:20;86:16 societies (1)	specification (3)
28:9,19;29:7;33:24;	shall (1)	130:19;134:13;	117:24	61:1;62:2,7
40:9;53:3,11;59:17;	93:16	139:19	Society (4)	specifications (4)
60:3,7,9;65:19,22;	shape (1)	simulation (3)	50:15;78:5;86:12;	59:2;60:4,5;62:3
66:7,11,16;69:19,20;		41:4;127:15;128:7	87:2	specifics (1)
70:3;71:10;72:8;	shaped (1)	sit (2)	soft (1)	26:5
83:11;84:8,11,12;	73:19	112:8,19	63:24	specifies (1)
87:18;97:22;98:5,23;	share (1)	Site (7)	solves (1)	60:11
103:12,16;104:21;	140:6	105:6,15;126:1;	109:4	speculate (2)
139:11;140:21,21	Sheet (1)	127:20;130:8,9,21	somebody (1)	102:4;104:3
sections (1)	22:12	sites (28)	106:7	speculative (1)
61:19	shift (4)	18:21;25:21;70:21;	somewhat (4)	109:6
Security (2)	32:2;64:17;77:4;	79:13,13;107:15;	13:24;15:21;21:7;	SPNF (3)
73:15;74:4	96:12	110:9,13;112:15,24;	45:6	83:7;103:5,6
seeing (6)	shiny (1)	117:16;118:1,3,8,11,	sorry (8)	SPNHF (1)
10:5;11:20;27:18;	117:13	15,24;119:7,8;	24:20;40:10;60:16;	83:8
45:17;60:1;96:17	shore (1)	122:10;123:5,13,23;	92:22;106:7;132:4;	spoke (2)
seem (4)	127:7	124:2,16;125:6;	135:13;136:12	131:20;132:8
18:12,16;47:6;	Short (1) 15:24	130:15;140:18	sort (8)	spokesperson (2)
101:10 seems (3)	show (7)	siting (1) 48:10	30:3;44:9;51:22; 69:3,21;77:9;91:14;	88:8;102:21 square (1)
18:24;35:18;37:15	10:3;38:11;59:1;	48.10 sits (1)	112:5	18:16
selection (1)	125:4,7;126:22;	44:23	sound (5)	squashy (1)
104:12	129:8	sitting (3)	16:14;28:12;91:23;	39:9
sense (7)	showed (2)	44:20;47:18;	95:23;96:3	St (1)
18:10;31:16;32:15;	25:16;81:1	102:19	Sounds (2)	73:13
48:6;79:12,24;99:19	showing (11)	situated (1)	67:6;131:13	staffed (1)
sent (1)	8:1,7;10:8;22:9,16;	119:24	source (4)	50:5
82:8	23:14,16;63:1;103:9;	six (4)	58:18,23;79:8;	staffing (1)
sentence (3)	124:1;127:6	15:8,9,13;115:10	83:20	49:22
5:11,20;83:19	shown (7)	sizable (1)	sources (2)	stage (1)
separate (2)	8:13;11:5;23:23;	63:24	58:22;60:13	129:23
13:11;103:5	40:5;53:22;114:3;	size (4)	south (9)	standard (4)
separated (1)	125:2	32:11;77:1;84:14;	15:3;25:17;92:22,	59:2,24;60:4,21
11:4	shows (7)	123:10	23;102:21;120:14;	standards (4)
series (2)	14:7;24:8;41:6;	skimmed (1)	121:21;122:22;127:7	31:2,4;32:23;62:4
25:11;72:10	63:23;65:3;120:1;	6:14	southerly (1)	standing (3)
Service (5)	124:15	skimming (1)	103:19	127:10,11,12
50:17;83:3,20,23; 89:6	side (7)	11:7 skinning (1)	space (1) 34:23	stands (2)
	24:3,5;34:2;45:1; 48:3;54:4;80:15	skipping (1) 32:13		67:2;139:2 Stark (6)
Services (1) 73:16	48:3;54:4;80:15 sides (2)	32:15 sky (2)	spacial (1) 19:14	9:7;41:16;88:8;
session (2)	32:1;54:16	127:16;135:10	span (1)	89:19;92:16;94:21
111:20;142:6	signators (1)	Slide (1)	64:2	start (6)
111.20,172.0	5-5-14013 (1)		01.2	

6:3,7:39:18:67:14; 102:23:141:24 started (2) 50:20;108:4 Starting (2) 103:15:142:2 starts (2) 9:19:64:1 state (14) 4:15:6:19:18:3; 23:18;34:11;49:22; 56:5:62:1:70:19; 80:13;87:19;91:9; 118:24:140:3 stated (13) 33:18;39:23;72:14; 85:19;86:5;97:18; 100:16;107:22; 108:19;110:12; 112:13;113:17;140:9 statement (8) 37:12;49:8;57:24; 91:2,8;134:15; 135:19:140:9 statements (2) 57:16,19 states (4) 49:24;50:3;75:22; 76:3 stating (3) 42:14:57:10:110:3 status (1) 99:21 stay (1) 78:4 step (1) 11:12 steps (1) 74:1 Steven (1) 106:16 Stewartstown (1) 9:6 still (3) 70:14;98:3;121:17 stone (7) 55:22;56:11,22; 65:4;125:8,14,24 strategies (1) 70:4 Stream (5) 88:12;92:17,24; 95:1.2 Street (3) 61:22;121:12; 122:19 **Street-Batchelder (1)** 16:1 stretching (1) 53:20 strike (1) 48:18 stripe (1)

42:11 strong (1) 77:4 structural (1) 22:22 structure (4) 19:12;40:9,16: 129:14 structures (6) 31:14:33:16:44:8; 46:23;61:24;62:18 studied (3) 6:13:59:11:105:14 studies (26) 6:4,11;20:14,20; 43:13;49:21;78:17; 79:6;81:4,8,15,21; 88:23,24;89:1;91:16; 92:8;94:13;97:20; 99:4;100:4,5,15; 101:18,21;105:22 study (73) 6:8,19,24;7:3,13, 14.16:8:4.11.13.16: 9:14,24;10:9,17,24; 11:11,18,23;12:3; 13:8,13,14,19;14:14, 17,18,23;15:11,14, 15,20,21;16:2,6,9,17, 20.21;17:1.5,16,19; 18:5,9:19:13:20:11; 21:5:23:5:41:19.24: 42:24:44:18:53:14: 81:9:86:10:89:2.9. 23;91:19,21,24; 100:6;102:1;103:11, 18,20,21;104:2,7,20; 105:3:106:1 style (1) 52:16 Styles (2) 5:13,15 Subcommittee (2) 82:10,13 subject (2) 11:17;83:2 subjects (1) 134:23 submitted (5) 6:9;83:7;97:24; 98:22:101:8 subsequent (4) 78:8,13,14;82:5 subset (1) 37:21 subsets (2) 42:3,4 substantial (1) 56:1 substantially (1) 76:7 sufficient (5) 58:7;77:17;135:21;

139:19:140:5 sufficiently (1) 139:8 Sugar (2) 14:10:53:21 suggest (11) 39:11,22;44:10; 47:12:59:18:91:8: 102:3;124:18,20,24; 127:14 suggested (1) 71:2 suggesting (1) 135:1 suggestion (1) 75:17 sum (2) 20:20;42:19 summarize (1) 98:12 summarized (1) 46:11 summary (4) 8:7;17:14;28:1; 40:7 Summer (7) 43:8;44:19;65:13; 88:5,11:94:6,18 Suncook (2) 15:19:104:16 supplemental (22) 5:4.24:12:15:20:6: 22:10:58:15:70:24; 75:15.22:76:3:78:8. 18:98:7:101:22: 107:6;114:8;131:16; 132:5;133:1;134:2,5, 15 supposed (2) 9:21:89:7 sure (9) 34:7:39:7:52:9; 57:6;72:12;80:13; 84:4;133:13;138:19 surround (1) 104:8 surrounding (1) 96:11 Survey (4) 50:22;62:14;74:9, 11 surveys (1) 60:12 Susan (1) 88:4 sustained (2) 129:23;134:1 swear (1) 5:22 Swell (1) 9:5 swimming (1) 62:16

sworn (2) 4:6.8 system (2) 77:16:81:11 systems (3) 19:15:33:13:104:9 Т table (4) 40:19;46:12;47:13; 63:2 tables (5) 6:4;51:20;52:5; 54:19;82:2 talk (3) 30:17;84:9;109:14 talked (3) 50:17;93:18;116:1 talking (12) 36:8,11:40:15,22; 41:1;63:10;64:20; 93:16;106:24;128:9, 13:129:17 talks (1) 84:7 tall (1) 126:22 taller (1) 127:2 task (1) 11:12 tasked (1) 71:23 team (2) 108:2,4 teams (1) 73:20 tease (1) 116:8 techniques (1) 58:10 telling (1) 132:12 template (1) 73:24 temporary (1) 55:3 tended (1) 79:20 term (6) 8:20:34:8:36:1: 43:12:63:24:89:4 terminology (1) 33:3 terms (12) 17:19;18:11;38:7; 49:24;64:6;65:7; 86:6,20;95:18;105:3; 107:18:114:24 testified (5) 8:15;22:3;46:20; 111:1:112:3

testifying (1) 84:17 testimony (63) 4:22;5:4,22,23,24; 6:6;20:6;22:10;28:6; 58:16;70:24;71:1; 75:16,23;76:1,4;78:9, 14,18;80:5;82:6; 96:23;97:18;98:8; 99:17:101:22.23; 107:6,23;108:15; 109:15,21:110:17; 111:14,23;112:2; 113:3,8,12;114:5,8; 117:21;120:11; 123:15,16,20;124:2, 5;128:6;130:13,17; 131:14,16,18;132:5; 133:1,4;134:2,5,7,16, 21;136:17 Thanks (1) 119:5 therefore (2) 69:11;87:13 thereof (1) 30:5 third (2) 65:3:79:20 thirdly (1) 72:6 thorough (3) 49:21.22:91:24 thoroughly (1) 6:13 though (2) 21:24;30:9 thought (1) 139:23 thousands (2) 80:18:95:13 three (7) 8:24;18:2;25:16; 48:11;67:23;90:11; 97:20 throughout (5) 41:10;49:21;52:18; 123:13;135:4 Thursday (3) 141:15,16,23 Thurston (10) 121:6:122:14,15, 17;125:8,13;126:5; 127:8,9;128:24 thus (1) 59:13 tie (1) 113:20 times (1) 85:20 title (1) 17:11 today (7) 5:22;32:3,6;44:12;

ADJUDICATORY HEA	ARING
85:20;112:8,19	30:9;3
together (7)	12;33:
10:22;20:21;25:13;	40:16;
26:1;43:16;65:24;	76:10;
100:1	96:17;
took (1)	transpor
85:11	104:10
top (5)	transpos
9:6;28:15;46:1;	5:16
57:9;126:8	treat (2)
topic (2)	67:19;
109:14;130:14	treated (
topography (6)	140:16
22:23;24:1;33:14;	treatmen
34:24;47:9;126:16	67:4,5
total (1)	tree (3)
16:10	64:1;1
touch (3)	135:12
19:18;46:15;53:2	trees (10
touched (1)	63:11,
101:5	64:14,
tourists (1)	126:15
123:23	trellis (1
tours (1)	39:6
74:23	tried (1)
touts (1)	115:9
77:8	true (2)
toward (8)	64:21;
9:7;15:3;39:14,15,	try (3)
16;43:19;65:24;	26:8;5
118:16	trying (7
towards (1)	32:22;
48:5	123:24
tower (3)	136:20
39:4,5;126:8	turn (6)
towers (10)	24:13;
120:20;126:21,23;	93:10;
127:3,4,18;130:6,14;	TV (1)
135:4,9	102:14
town (11)	twice (1)
19:12;25:15;62:20;	141:6
80:22;94:21;98:13,	two (21)
13;106:19;120:13,	8:24;1
18;122:24	14:4,7
town-based (1)	17:22;
118:5	23:20;
town-by-town (1)	35:2;5
104:13	118:19
towns (4)	137:24
25:19;104:13,15;	type (6)
110:16	29:24;
traditional (1)	67:1;7
56:14	types (3)
trails (6)	21:10;
93:4;94:4,19;95:2,	typical (
4;98:11	21:16
train (1)	typically
68:13	89:9
Training (3)	typologi
68:1,6;69:5	81:11;
transcripts (2)	typology
111:16;114:3	99:10
transmission (17)	

20.0.21.14.22.5	
30:9;31:14;32:5, 12;33:6;34:2;35:3;	U
40:16;46:22,23;	U
76:10;77:3,16;83:2;	
96:17;131:7;133:21	ultimately (1)
ansportation (1)	37:8 Uponticinated (5)
104:10	Unanticipated (5) 68:1,5,15;69:4;
cansposed (1)	70:16
5:16	unclear (1)
reat (2)	36:7
67:19;69:15	under (18)
reated (2)	5:10;28:16;29:17;
140:16,20	31:17;36:2;37:14;
reatment (4)	59:15;70:11;73:16;
67:4,5,5,12	84:18,19;98:18,22;
ree (3)	101:8;111:12;
64:1;127:18;	115:20;139:11;
135:12	140:20
rees (10)	underground (12)
63:11,11,15,20,24;	13:21;14:9;15:4;
64:14,21;77:6;96:11;	53:3,23;54:8,24;
126:15 •ellis (1)	61:19;63:4;72:8;
39:6	76:13;109:4
ried (1)	undergrounding (1)
115:9	109:8
rue (2)	underneath (1)
64:21;124:10	125:14 understandable (1)
ry (3)	35:19
26:8;53:8;75:18	understood (5)
ying (7)	57:7;115:1,3;
32:22;116:8,16;	118:14;136:21
123:24;130:19;	underway (1)
136:20;138:14	97:21
rn (6)	undeveloped (1)
24:13;41:11;65:11; 93:10;107:5;109:13	91:6
V (1)	UNESCO (1)
102:14	50:9 uniform (1)
vice (1)	9:22
141:6	unique (1)
wo (21)	44:2
8:24;10:21;13:17;	universe (1)
14:4,7,21;15:16,24;	119:4
17:22;18:18;20:19;	unknown (1)
23:20;31:5;34:16;	72:9
35:2;57:16,18;97:6;	unknowns (1)
118:19;134:23; 137:24	72:10
/pe (6)	unless (1)
29:24;38:1;40:21;	55:19
67:1;76:18;108:7	unlike (1) 100:3
vpes (3)	unlikely (2)
21:10;31:6;85:18	100:20;140:19
pical (1)	unnamed (1)
21:16	93:17
pically (1)	unreasonable (6)
89:9	107:21;110:4;
/ pologies (2) 81:11;100:2	123:12;127:21;
pology (1)	136:1;137:6
99:10	unreasonably (1) 110:10
	up (40)
	чР (чо)

16:17;21:2;23:10;
38:9;44:21;45:11;
55:24;56:5;59:4;
62:4,20;64:10;75:17;
83:9;92:15;93:11,19;
99:10;101:3;103:8;
107:11;108:12;
109:19;110:17,22;
111:14,19,23;117:12;
118:16;119:18;
122:8;124:10;
125:10,22;126:1,3;
127:11;128:11,22
upgrade (1)
96:4
upon (2)
89:14;131:7
Upper (6)
9:6;14:23;41:14,
22;45:18;88:19
urban (1)
64:16
urged (1)
71:2
use (16)
32:18;33:24;34:7,
22;35:2;43:12;48:19;
67:3;80:19;90:17;
94:1,2,14;95:5;
100:20,23
used (17)
20:10;21:13;36:1,
12;40:9;43:14;48:17;
54:19;67:6,8;75:13;
80:9;81:4;93:5;94:2;
99:23;101:17
useful (2)
118:2,4
uses (10)
19:14;33:9,10;
34:13,16,17,18;35:7;
42:11;99:22
using (9)
20:7;22:18;33:1;
43:23;84:7;86:6;
89:18;95:20;101:16
usually (5)
44:10;47:14;55:20;
56:12;140:15
utility (1)
96:7
\mathbf{V}
•
vacuum (1)
31:23
Valley (9)
13:13;14:17;15:20;
36:24;44:23;53:13;
81:10;103:18,19
valley-hill (1)
14:1
valley-hill-mountain (1)

21:18 valleys (1) 93:20 valuable (3) 80:23;119:7,9 value (9) 80:16,21;85:21; 86:16,24;92:10; 99:23;100:3;118:12 valued (2) 18:20;21:18 values (8) 21:14;85:18,19; 86:1,2,2;87:2;95:19 vantages (1) 41:9 variable (1) 54:12 various (3) 21:10;47:22;81:11 Varney (3) 109:16;111:15; 112:3 Varney's (2) 111:17;112:2 vary (1) 54:14 varying (1) 84:14 vast (1) 110:15 vegetation (6) 30:11:33:13:34:24: 47:9:64:15.19 vegetative (1) 22:21 verbal (1) 69:13 vernal (2) 129:15,18 version (1) 60:5 vibration (12) 55:3,6;57:21;58:5, 8,20;59:3,7;60:7; 62:1,21,23 vibrations (1) 60:14 vicinity (1) 64:23 view (9) 39:20,21;48:4,13, 16;126:5;127:7; 131:22;140:6 viewed (1) 48:12 views (11) 37:7;43:19;47:7; 87:9;91:17;131:7,20; 132:9;133:6,20; 135:2 viewshed (1) 12:16

ADJUDICATORY HEA	ARING		1	October 27, 2017
Village (1)	wava (2)	104.14 22.105.12.		109:23
Village (1)	ways (2)	104:14,23;105:12;		
15:2	48:17;94:11	131:20,22;132:9;	Y	12 (4)
virgin (1)	welcome (1)	133:6;134:7		16:13;103:10;
79:22	97:9	without (2)	year (2)	131:15;133:1
visibility (12)	wells (1)	95:21;97:19	117:18;125:17	1200 (1)
12:18;22:17;23:9,	62:21	Witness (19)	years (4)	118:16
16,23;26:1;110:8;	weren't (1)	17:21;115:2;	50:23;64:1,3;76:11	130 (1)
112:12,22;134:22,23,	111:4	129:21;131:1;132:2,	yellow (3)	126:24
24	west (4)	14;133:13,18;134:3,	27:3;120:19,21	130- (1)
visible (5)	14:10;27:4;92:21;	14,20;135:15,18;	Yup (2)	127:17
77:7;109:2;127:5,	93:10	136:7,10,12;137:13;	121:20:123:9	13489 (1)
17;135:5	westernmost (1)	138:22;141:14	121.20,123.9	60:10
vista (2)	24:2	witnesses (6)	Z	140 (4)
126:24;127:19	what's (12)	115:5,6,14;116:3,	L	4:21;5:19;109:22;
visual (15)	4:20;5:1;20:10;	7;117:22		126:24
33:10;34:23;35:15,	34:4;59:11;60:1;	witnesses' (1)	zone (2)	140-feet-tall (1)
22,22;37:5,8;38:22;	67:23;71:8;72:17;	136:16	27:6;56:19	127:18
39:15;41:6;47:4;	76:23;116:14;130:15	witness's (2)	zones (2)	127.10
		130:17;131:21	7:20;23:9	
76:14;93:23;112:5;	WHEREUPON (2)			5:3;22:11;107:7
129:21	4:5;142:5	WMA (1)	0	143 (2)
visuals (1)	whirl (1)	17:23		103:6,7
76:22	130:4	wondering (2)	07235 (1)	15 (3)
voice (1)	Whitley (10)	107:17;115:6	83:8	4:22;85:7;141:3
78:4	106:9,11,14,16;	wooded (2)	07256 (1)	150 (5)
voices (1)	111:21;112:1;113:6,	43:20;96:6	83:8	58:22;60:15,23;
21:16	7;114:1,11	Woods (12)		61:10;62:8
volume (1)	whole (3)	8:3,14;10:9;21:21;	1	154 (1)
41:20	65:9;72:7,9	23:3,5,13;41:18;		119:16
volunteer (1)	who's (1)	42:1;81:13;100:7;	1 (3)	15th (1)
79:20	139:6	103:15	5:20;20:9;22:12	5:10
	Widell (15)	word (6)	1:25 (1)	17 (1)
\mathbf{W}	20:6;24:14;26:6;	42:4;48:19;52:1;	4:2	5:3
	27:21;28:6;29:15;	67:5,7,12	10 (11)	18 (2)
wait (4)	48:20;75:15,19;77:8;	work (30)	5:9,18;16:10;20:9;	133:1;134:18
106:8;133:11,11;	132:1,7,18,21;134:21	7:18;9:18;12:14,	51:10;52:9,17;76:3;	1880s (1)
141:4	Widell's (5)	20;27:7;33:5;38:21;	80:15;141:3,24	94:19
walked (1)	70:24;118:7;	43:14;50:1,7;65:23;	100 (3)	1888s (1)
40:1	131:16;132:24;	73:1,2,4,13,23;74:11;	60:13;61:9;64:3	94:22
Walker (2)	134:15	78:22;84:5;90:2;	106 (41)	192-mile (1)
115:1,7	widespread (1)	92:1;105:20,21;	8:20,20;12:13,21;	72:4
walking (1)	86:15	106:3;108:23;	19:21,24;20:8;28:9,	196 (2)
48:13	width (2)	112:17;124:22;	18,19;40:10,14;54:6;	98:1;101:8
wall (2)	54:12,14	125:8,14;138:13	61:15;65:17,20,20,	196b (3)
56:22;65:4	wind (2)	worked (1)	22;66:14;69:10;70:3,	27:19:45:20:54:20
walls (3)	56:5;108:12	100:1		1983 (1)
55:22;56:11;62:19	wires (2)	working (3)	22;71:4,10;72:15,21,	50:7
warrant (1)	39:13;135:10	85:12;108:2,3	22;73:6;75:8;84:8;	1984 (1)
89:22	within (65)	workmanship (2)	86:8;87:18;97:22;	50:14
warrants (1)	6:19,22,24;7:1,2,3,	28:23;39:8	98:5,23;103:12;	1992 (1)
18:9	12;8:8,9;9:23;10:17,	works (1)	104:21;105:1;	50:12
Washington (1)	23;11:14,15;12:7;	79:18	139:11;140:21,22	1-mile (1)
73:17	13:12,19;14:22;	world (5)	10-mile (2)	81:5
watchdog (1)	15:11;16:12;17:5;	49:17;50:8,9,11;	80:6;81:6	81.5
71:18	19:4,21,24;20:2;	93:18	11 (2)	2
			78:24;80:3	2
water (2)	21:6;23:22;26:24; 32:5,15,19;34:1,13;	worry (1) 55:23	110 (1)	2 (3)
62:22;106:19			111:24	
way (21)	36:10,16;40:16;	write (1)	110/Stark (1)	30:16;46:18;142:8
28:10;31:22;38:11;	41:24;42:6;43:20,22;	122:15	48:4	2:33 (1)
44:2,21;51:24;52:2,	44:6,14,20;49:17;	writing (1)	111 (1)	51:11
13;71:12;72:13;	50:6;52:8;56:17,19;	50:18	111:24	2:51 (1)
73:10;75:1;87:4;	58:2;60:13;64:22;	wrong (5)	115 (2)	51:12
89:19;91:21;93:4,22,	65:17;73:6;77:16;	42:4;53:8;68:23;	109:23;126:9	20 (12)
23,24;109:1;116:14	81:16,17;89:21;	89:2;129:7	116 (1)	54:4,9,15;56:17;

ADJUDICATORT HEA	ANIIO	1	1	Octobel 27,
59 6 15 04 59 6 11	12 (2)	107.0		
58:6,15,24;59:6,11;	43 (2)	107:8		
61:22;63:8;111:20	121:17;122:20	9:00 (1)		
2015-06 (1)	443 (2)	142:8		
83:4	103:4,8	90 (1)		
2016 (3)	464 (4)	90:2		
4:22;60:5;62:4	117:9,15;119:14;	99.5 (1)		
2017 (6)	122:9	76:9		
5:3;82:24;103:2;	49 (1)	70.9		
126:22;128:24;142:8	60:3			
204 (1)	-			
65:14	5			
20-foot (3)				
58:6;59:14;61:8	5 (1)			
20-mile (2)	6:15			
80:6,15	50 (1)			
21 (1)	76:11			
41:17	500-foot (1)			
211 (11)	58:19			
6:10;8:2;10:7;	53 (1)			
13:11;14:16;16:19;	142:5			
26:19;53:11;60:3;	54 (1)			
98:1;101:9	142:7			
22 (2)	55 (1)			
61:11,12	127:1			
223 (1)				
83:7	6			
227-C (1)		-		
90:7	60.5 (1)			
25 (4)	76:12			
64:1;82:24;133:2;	65 (1)			
134:19	127:1			
250th (1)				
	69 (2)			
117:17	125:20;126:6			
25th (3)	7			
82:7,14;103:2	7			
26 (1)				
76:4	75 (2)			
28 (2)	76:11;126:21			
68:4;119:21	76 (1)			
29 (2)	126:3			
68:5;119:21	77 (1)			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	125:11			
3	79 (1)			
	125:22			
3 (2)		-		
90:11;102:21	8			
3.4 (1)				
5.4 (1) 60:9	8 (1)			
	8 (1)			
30-plus (1)	107:8			
50:23	8:00 (1)			
32 (2)	142:2			
110:19;111:23	80 (1)			
37 (1)	64:3			
111:19	800 (1)			
	40:10			
4	800.5a2 (1)			
	29:7			
4:49 (1)	85 (2)			
142:6	50:14;90:2			
40 (2)		-		
49:3;75:24	9			
49:5;75:24 41 (1)	7			
41 (1) 75:24	0 (1)			
13.24	9 (1)			
	•		•	