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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]

## PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good morning, everyone. We're here for Day 54.

Ms. Saffo is in position to start her questioning. Is there anything we need to do before we let her grab the microphone?
[No verbal response.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Saffo, you may proceed.
(Continuation of the
cross-examination of
Patricia O'Donnell.)
MS. SAFFO: Thank you. Good morning. I'm just going to be focusing on one issue this morning, and that's stone walls. I know you touched upon this on Friday, and then also your prefiled testimony talks about it. So, I don't want to reiterate that, but wanted to just go into a little more detail.

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q Is it fair to say that the first step, the first needed step, now that the underground portion of the route is appearing to be more adjacent to the road than under the road, do
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you agree that the first step will be to inventory existing stone walls that might be impacted by this Project?

A Yes.
Q And could you tell us a little bit about how you would recommend inventorying stone walls in the underground portion? Like what do you do to inventory stone walls?

A The standard steps in an inventory of anything is to observe and map, and then calculate what your findings are.

Q And to your knowledge that has not been done yet, correct?

A I haven't found any evidence of that inventory of stone walls, no.

Q And, so, as far as the current plans that you've had the opportunity to see, you haven't seen this inventory?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Okay. So, this is a photograph that I'll represent is on Route 116 , in Franconia, one recently taken on October 28th, 2017. If, on the bottom of that, there's -- that's actually pavement, would that be a stone wall close
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within the purported right-of-way that would need to be included in an inventory?

A It appears to be close, yes.
Q Exhibit 58 , do you agree it's the same?
A This one is definitely within the 20 feet.
MS. SAFFO: And, for the record, that one is in Sugar Hill, on Route 18 , on the proposed path.

This is Exhibit 60 uploaded in the exhibits, Track 2, under "Grafton".

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q Route 302 , in Bethlehem, again would that be a stone wall that should be part of an inventory?

A This one is very close to the road.
Interestingly, this is -- looks like a historic wall that's fallen over. So, it's an interesting case.

Q And what do you mean by that?
A Well, the other two that you showed looked like they were what we would call "standing walls".

Q Uh-huh.
A That their integrity of construction was in place. All of these are appearing to be hand-built and no mortar.
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]

Q And why is that significant, the "hand-built/no mortar" designation or notation?

A The issue with hand-built walls is that they're normally built without a foundation, often on a narrow bed of gravel or broken rock.

Q Uh-huh.
A And they are crafted, essentially. It's a stone mason skill. So, disturbance to them can result in a loss of their original craft and style and appearance, what we would call, in a cultural landscape, its "defining features", its "character-defining features".

Q And, so, put another way, you just can't rebuild a wall like this?

A It's difficult. We've done projects where historic walls had to be taken down and reconstructed. And it requires very good documentation, and then what we would call "site supervision", "construction administration" during the rebuild, with the photos and the documentation in place, and willing masons to do the work with a high degree of accuracy.

Q And those past projects that you're
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referencing, would that reflect like a single location, as opposed to 52 miles of potential locations?

A Generally, it's a single location, yes.
Q So, just for a single location it's very work-extensive?

A It's a quality control issue during construction.

Q Thank you. Then, Exhibit 59, and now we're in Campton, New Hampshire. And again, is that another stone wall?

A It certainly is. Don't know what it's exact distance off the road edge is.

Q Now, do you even know at this point categorically which side of the road they're planning on burying this underground line?

A I have not seen documentation of the exact location of the underground line. No.

Q So, that would make it hard to evaluate the impacts if we do inventory these stone walls, correct?

A The location of the line will predict potential impacts. The inventory should, as the Applicant has stated, knowing where things are,
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 54/Morning Session ONLY]\{11-02-17\}
they will try to be avoided. But you need to know where they are.

Q So, the first step is know where they are. And I presume that would be a recommendation that would include putting it on a survey, and the construction details as well, so you can match up construction and the stone wall, correct?

A You should be showing it on the construction drawings so that you know where it exists. Okay. Now, and then you said "avoidance". Tell us about avoidance as the next step.

A My understanding of the documentation on the underground route is that there will be a trench cut from 8 to 10 feet wide, and $I$ believe it's 6 feet deep. When you do that type of excavation, you're going to have disturbance at the margins or you're going to be moving material away, to take away what's in the trench so that you can work with the trench. So, in construction practices, the documents would need to guide how those means and methods were pursued. Where it was okay to put the material, where it was okay to bring a truck. Because the activity of digging the
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trench, or even the activity of directional drilling, has a sphere of where people are moving and machines are moving and trucks are moving. So, it needs to be a guided process. And a guided process, because, just the drilling, even if you're not drilling a location where you have to actually dismantle the stone wall, the drilling nearby can impact the stone wall. Is that what you're trying to say?

A What I'm actually trying to say is that you -your point is well taken, yes. The drilling could disturb the wall. The excavation can disturb the wall. As I mentioned earlier, these walls generally have no foundation. So, any alteration of grades nearby, what often happens in working with a trench is what you do is called "laying back the slope".

Q Uh-huh.
A So, the profile doesn't look perpendicular to the surface. You lay back the edges. So, it's not clear to me exactly how they're thinking about this trench, 8 to 10 feet wide, 6 feet deep. It may be a V-shape, not a U-shape.
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Q So, at this point in time, we can't analyze how much avoidance can occur under their current plans, because we just don't have the information?

A No, we can't. But it's hampered by the fact that we don't have a complete inventory of the features. Our position is that stone walls are a remaining feature of the interactions of a person with the land building the wall. It's a feature of the cultural landscape.

Q And, so, if we can't avoid it, and we're taking it away altogether, we're impacting cultural landscape, correct?

A That question is complicated.
Q Okay.
A The first one is "can it be avoided?" We're not sure.

Q Yes.
A What we're saying is we don't have enough information to be able to avoid in the current situation.

The second part of your statement, which
is "taking it away", I think that what the Applicant has been saying is everything
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that's -- they will avoid, and if not they will restore. So, the question of taking it away actually hasn't arisen in any of the documents that I've looked at.

Q Uh-huh.
A But changing the wall, impacting the wall, is impacting a feature of the cultural landscape.

Q So, basically, put another way, we don't have an inventory.

A Uh-huh.
Q So, we don't what walls are even there to start as a baseline data. Once we get the inventory, we then next need to see the walls against the construction plan to see what needs to be avoided. And then, if they can't avoid it, we need to make sure they build it with the thought that it's a cultural landscaped item, so it needs to be rebuilt as close in time to exactly the way it looked?

A Correct. The term in preservation would be "restoration" and "reconstruction". So,
"reconstruction" is a well-defined term in historic preservation. It implies well-documented materials available, skills and
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|  | knowledge available to do an accurate rebuild of a feature. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q | Uh-huh. |
| A | So, those modifiers are important to state. It |
|  | implies what you indicated, which is accuracy |
|  | of reconstruction. |
| Q | Now, I believe this is Exhibit 60. Yes. |
|  | Exhibit 60 in front of you. If they have to go |
|  | on this side of the road, and they can't go on |
|  | the other side of the road, what would they |
|  | have to do to restore that wall? |
| A | Well, just to start with saying it's a bit |
|  | speculative. The issue there would be to look |
|  | at the length of the wall, see if there are |
|  | standing portions of it that are fully built |
|  | up, and to reconstruct the wall as it |
|  | originally was, as opposed to in its partially |
|  | fallen down state. |
| Q | Now, Exhibit 61 is a document, I have the first |
|  | 13 pages marked, is the "2017 Stone wall Policy |
|  | Guidelines". Are you familiar with that |
|  | document? |
| A | I am not. |
| Q | Oh. Okay. |
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MS. SAFFO: For the record, this is a February 2017 document issued by the New Hampshire Department of Transportation Bureau of the Environment. It's a detailed document. BY MS. SAFFO:

Q I've put on Page 2, the Table of Contents, which outlines their purpose, their policy prior to 2016, the Stone Wall Policy Guidelines \& the Bureau of Environment, and then a methodology of phased screening and evaluation, and then it goes on to other topics as well, and there's 15 pages there. Are you familiar with anything in here?

A The process is not unfamiliar.
Q Okay.
A This particular document is not familiar.
Q Okay. So, what is the process?
A It looks like it's looking at an assessment of the standing walls to determine feasibility of rebuild.

Q Now, if this was a New Hampshire Department of Transportation project, and not a utility project, and you are coming upon a historic cultural stone wall, would that affect your
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actual design to avoid it or your recommendation for them?

A I think that your question is a bit
complicated. But $I$ think what you're asking -maybe you can restate it and clarify.

Q Let me restate it, sorry. That was a poor question. As far as the Division of Historic Resources, when someone comes to you from the New Hampshire Department of Transportation, and the State of New Hampshire what's to modify a roadway. And then, through the process, you learn about a stone wall, like the one we saw in Exhibit 60. What does the Division of Historic Resources do?

A It would be speculative for me to answer that, I think. Appropriate practice would be walking through this kind of process, --

Q Uh-huh.
A -- evaluating --
Q Uh-huh.
A -- what the wall is, where it is, if it can be avoided, if it has the proper offset distance from the road when the road is finished, and sorting all that out and determining the way
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forward that works for, I mean, the idea always, in these kinds of discussions, is to find the solution that retains the historic feature and provides the needed accessway for the transportation corridor.

Q And, when you balance that on a smaller project, that's one thing. But, when you're balancing it for 52 miles, fair to say that's a whole different workload for you?

A I think the level of effort is considerable, and it begins with the inventory. Okay. Which we don't have yet? I'm sorry, for the record you have to answer.

A Correct.
MS. SAFFO: Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is Mr. Palmer here or someone from his group?

ADMIN. MONROE: Dr. McLaren is here.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Does that group have any questions, Dr. McLaren?

DR. McLAREN: No, sir.
MS. SAFFO: I apologize. I realize I
forgot one exhibit. May $I$ ask one more
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question?
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sure.
BY MS. SAFFO:
Q This is Exhibit 55, which is a New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources document. Do you recognize that document?

A $\quad$ No.
Q And, so, for the record, $I$ think it speaks for itself. But it talks about -- it's a document from the Division of Historic Resources, talking about "Stone walls are a New Hampshire resource too often "taken for", and they say "granite", "literally", and it talks about the importance of stone walls, from the Division of Historic Resources' purposes. That's been your testimony all along, correct, that these are important features?

A They're character-defining features of cultural landscapes, which make them significant.

Q And also makes them a value-added item for property as well, correct?

A I would say not "value-added", but certainly a value of properties.

MS. SAFFO: Thank you. Thank you for
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letting me ask that additional question.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It looks like Ms. Crane is up.
(Short pause.)
MS. CRANE: Good morning. My name is
Charlotte Crane. I represent the Ashland to Deerfield Non-Abutters.

BY MS. CRANE:
Q We are looking at the first page of our exhibit that will be marked "59". It is a Google Earth map showing a region of the Pemigewasset Valley across from Ashland, a few miles south of Plymouth. I want to go back and get your help in understanding the Applicants' approach to the inventories of historical sites that do exist.

Is it your understanding that the Applicants' historical expert started with a list of addresses, and then used the Applicants' other experts to determine visibility, and only examined further those historic sites that had visibility? Is that consistent with your understanding?

A That seems to be the general approach used,
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yes.
Q And $I$ know that visibility is not your only concern, is that correct?

A Correct.
Q Okay. But $I$ want to talk about visibility for just a minute anyway. And again, if there was no visibility, there was probably no further analysis of the historic site. Is that consistent with your understanding?

A That's the way they -- that is the method that they used.

Q Yes. Okay.
A They used visibility mapping to determine which resources required further study in the field.

Q Okay. And I'm hoping that you will help me understand a little bit better what they meant when they filtered out historic sites for lack of visibility.

This is very close to the same view. The territory outlined in blue is more or less the boundaries of the property owned by the combined members of the Webster family group that were included in the Southern Non-Abutters.
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Do you have an understanding of where they would have made their determination of visibility given a tract like this?

A You're asking a site-specific question. And I don't have sufficient information, because your image doesn't show their comparable visibility map. But they used a visibility mapping process that included trees and structures, as well as topography, in terms of -- and developing which properties were visible. Okay. And I haven't really been able to figure that out myself either. So, I do want to focus on the place where there's a yellow circle, which is approximately the location of the Bridgewater town-maintained recreation area known as "Sahegenet", where we were shown where they analyzed it, a location about 5 feet above the water level at that shore. And there, the visibility expert concluded that there might, in fact, be visibility, at least partially, depending upon the vegetative buffer shown here on this map, that's Page 2 of Exhibit 59, where -- on the eastern shore. The towers in question are marked in blue circles running
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roughly parallel to Route 93 in this location. Do you recall whether there was any analysis of the visibility in relationship to the toll bridge abutments that are at this location?

A I do not recall a site-specific visibility study of this area.

Q Okay. I want to now turn to some historic views, and see if we can figure out a little bit more about what the methodology might or might not have been. But, first, we need to get a better understanding of the topography at this location.

This is a map that includes the contours taken from the Bridgewater town maps. And the river is at about 460 , it was a good day. And the height of land is at roughly 450--540, that's give or take quite a bit, as the road goes along what -- these are commonly referred to as the "height of land" in this area. On this map, related to the property that was shown earlier, there is a height that goes at least to 900, and maybe further, depending upon how much you want to scramble up the cliffs to
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the left of the river, to the west of the river on this map.

So, this is a view that was contained in a post -- in a photograph that was reproduced as a postcard. It was also included in a Granite Monthly article in 1908. It's caption says "Looking across the Pemigewasset to Ashland." I want to point out that the toll bridge, which no longer exists except as its abutments, is marked, as is the Town of Ashland. The whole point is the vista from the west side of the river, to the Town of Ashland.

I don't know exactly where this view was taken from. But my best guess is somewhere within the yellow circle. And that there are a number of towers that would be visible from this vista on the western shore of the Pemi. Does that seem plausible to you?

A Your depiction of it here is something you created?

Q It is. Indeed, it started with the Project maps, and I added the -- tried to locate as best $I$ could, given the current state of the Project maps and the Alteration of Terrain maps
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where the towers were likely to be.
A So, the depiction here shows the towers in red, the former one in blue. Your toll bridge is identified. And then the vantage point of this 1908 historic view is identified. So, your question in regard to that is?

Would there be a -- if the historic expert had had access to the visibility data from this location, would they have been able to conclude that there would be no visibility?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr. Chair. There's nothing new here. This could have and should have been evaluated earlier.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Crane.
MS. CRANE: I am glad to have this objection. Thank you.

Perhaps others in my intervenor group were well aware of the questions about the conclusions regarding visibility from historic locations. The smaller group of individuals who filed as the Webster family assumed in good faith that determinations about visibility would have been made by the Applicants' experts.
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It wasn't until the rather confusing nature of Mr. DeWan's memory lapses regarding the location of the bridge and the bridge abutments at Sahegenet, and his similar inability to recall the current uses of another historic resource, the $B \& M$ Railroad tracks, that we realized that we should not have taken for granted that the visibility determinations would have been made in good faith.

We also have some doubts about the way the methodology included vegetative buffers at many of these locations.

We only became aware of these potential problems with the visibility analysis as the result of Mr. DeWan's direct testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm not sure what in that was a response to the objection. Other than that you are glad to have received it.

Can you refine what you just said into a response to the objection, that this is not new information, that, if it was to be included, needed to be included in this witness's direct testimony?
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MS. CRANE: I believe that this witness had no better access to the problems associated with the visibility analysis than we did. And we learned of it only on cross of Mr. DeWan.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Was Mr. DeWan part of a technical session where people could ask him any questions they wanted about his analysis?

MS. CRANE: I believe that --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think the answer to that is "yes". I mean, if someone will correct me if I'm wrong. But I believe that all the witnesses appeared for technical sessions where the witnesses could ask them about what they had done, and so the --

MS. CRANE: But we couldn't anticipate the memory lapses that occurred in the cross-examination at that point in time. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Needleman. MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm going to object to those characterizations.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. I'm sorry, Ms. Crane. I don't yet understand how you've
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responded to the objection. So, I'm going to sustain the objection. And, if you want to make an offer of proof as to what Ms. O'Donnell -- what you think Ms. O'Donnell would say, if you were allowed to ask the questions, feel free.

MS. CRANE: If we continued, my only question would be whether the filtering of historic sites as a result of visibility was something that she might have examined more intensely, had she been aware?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Then, why don't we get an answer to that question. Do you understand the question, Ms. O'Donnell?

WITNESS O'DONNELL: Yes. I believe the question is that, did I -- do I have an understanding of the fact that historic sites were filtered out of the visibility assessment by the Applicant? Is that correct?

BY MS. CRANE:
Q And whether, had you had more information about the reliability of the visibility analysis, you might have addressed some of the filtered out properties a little more? Or, examined that
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part of the presentation?
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Don't gild the lily, Ms. Crane. I think she's going to give you an answer.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A Well, I think the answer to the first question is, we have made statements in our testimony and in our full report that, firstly, historic sites are recognized as scenic in New Hampshire law. And that they do then fall into the visibility assessment realm. And we indicated that we suggest that the durability of the Project, its lifespan, calls into question whether or not vegetation should be used as a screen, because of the lifespan of vegetation and the potential lifespan of the Project. We put forward a bare-earth method, because we thought it was more conservative and effective. So, in a site-specific application, we would suggest that there are many sites, likely this one as well, that, in a bare-earth analysis, would have been classified as "visible" or "highly visible" to the line, as proposed.
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BY MS. CRANE:
Q Okay. Thank you. And this is essentially another similar view from the same property. I don't know that we need to look at it more specifically, other than to get a sense of how -- would you agree with me that historically the vegetative buffers have been less present, in fact, if this is a view from the peaks that were pointed out on the initial map?

A I don't have sufficient information to indicate that vegetative buffers were less present across history, because history is big. It's many, many centuries. But it's clear to me that the hill and valley landscape of New Hampshire, this area and others, is covered or partially covered with successional forest that has regrown, because it was taken down at some point in the past.

Q And, so, for the period of history that is about 100 years, from when $I$ understand this picture was taken, you would say that the vegetative buffer has varied from what it is now?
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A I'd have to look at the existing view, in relationship to this historic view, to actually answer that question in the affirmative. Okay. Thanks. And I don't have that available, so...

Moving to other concerns about historic resources, can you remind me what some of the concerns besides mere visibility might be?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Sounds like it's calling for repeating testimony. MS. CRANE: Okay.

WITNESS O'DONNELL: I was going to ask for the reframing of that question.

MS. CRANE: Okay.
WITNESS O'DONNELL: It's too broad.
BY MS. CRANE:
Q Then, $I$ will say that, is it, in fact, true that there might be concern for historic sites, even if there isn't visibility, if the presence of a project changes the nature of its environment, such that it is unlikely to be recognized as a historic site in the future?

A I think the way $I$ could answer that is to say that, throughout our testimony and our report,
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we talked about the impact to setting feeling and association. Those are three of the seven aspects of integrity that are used to measure the identifiability of historic sites.
"Integrity" is defined as the ability to still identify the site in the character and qualities that it had when it became historically important.

Q And --
A So, setting, feeling, and association we think have a potential for impact from this Project.

Q And, in your experience, what happens to historic sites once they lose their integrity? And with each initial degradation, what is likely to happen to the historic site?

A I think that's a question that's quite broad. A simple answer might be that degradation of integrity compromises the value of those historic sites.

Q And, when the value is compromised, is the owner of the site more or less likely to want to reinstate its historic features?

A Very speculative. I don't think I'd want to venture a response to that question.
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Q Okay. Here is one identified historic property. It is the former Bridgewater Train Station. It is located on Route 3, immediately proximate to where Transition Station 6 is going to be. The expert's conclusion regarding this space said that "There were no views of the Project in the main public views of the building."

I don't think $I$ can expect you to unpack what that statement actually means. Let's assume that through some strange development there are no views. Would you nevertheless say that the industrialization represented by the introduction of the Project there would change whatever integrity may exist for that location now?

A I think that question is a little too leading. Could you reframe?

Q Can you make any conclusions about what the introduction of the Project at this location might mean for this historic site?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Again, could have and should have been included.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Crane.
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MS. CRANE: I believe that the exact location and structure of the transition station was not included until relatively recently. It certainly wasn't available to me. I continue to be confused about which parts of this location are already owned by the Applicant, which are owned by the state, because of the presence of the railroad. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Objection sustained.

MS. CRANE: Okay.
BY MS. CRANE:
Q I have one more historic site. These are the houses on Foster Street, in Plymouth, immediately adjacent to the Common Man Inn. They are occupied as housing now. This is on a location in Plymouth where Route 3 will be under construction for a considerable period of time, because there's a need for accommodating both water bodies and major intersections.

It's my understanding that at least some of these houses are now rental property. Do you have any experience with what happens when historic properties become rental properties?
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A Not relevant to my work.
Q Okay. If the prospective tenants are apprehensive about access to a property, will you accept that they are less likely to want to rent the property?

A I think use of the historic property is outside of the realm of the expertise that $I$ offer here.

Q Okay. But, if they can no longer be rented, do you have any opinion, you may not, about whether the landlord will continue to invest in the historic site?

A No opinion.
MS. CRANE: Okay. That's all my questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I have no other intervenor groups signed up to question Ms. O'Donnell. Have we missed anybody?
[No verbal response.]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Mr. Walker, Mr. Bisbee, who's going to be grabbing the microphone?

MR. WALKER: I am.
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WITNESS O'DONNELL: Could we have a short break before we start please?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Absolutely.
We'll break for ten minutes.
WITNESS O'DONNELL: Thank you.
(Recess taken at 10:46 a.m.
and the hearing resumed at 10:58 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Mr. Walker, you may proceed.
MR. WALKER: Good morning, Ms. O'Donnell.

WITNESS O'DONNELL: Good morning.
MR. WALKER: We've met before. My
name is Jeremy Walker. I am counsel for the Applicant.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q I want to start off by making sure that we all understand the limits of your testimony in this case. Your review was related to the aboveground historic sites only, correct?

A Correct.
Q You did not perform any assessment of archeological resources?
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A We provided an overview, based on our experience of archeological sensitivity on projects that we've undertaken over three decades.

Q But you did not provide an assessment or an identification of archeological sites for this particular project, right?

A $\quad$ No.
Q And you did not -- you do not offer any opinion with regard to Dr. Bunker's findings in this case?

A No.
Q You have reviewed, though, Ms. Widell's testimony and her report or the report of the Preservation Company, and her finding that this Project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on historic sites. You disagree with that, right?

A We also reviewed the Bunker materials. So, the way you stated the question, it assumed we did not review the Bunker materials, but we did.

Q But you have no opinion on the findings by
Dr. Bunker?
A No, we did not offer an opinion. And your
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specific question in this case was? Did I review the widell testimony and her conclusion? We did.

Q And you disagree with her conclusion of "no unreasonable adverse effect"?

A We do disagree.
Q Before $I$ get into that, $I$ want to ask you a little bit about your experience. And you are -- I understand you're the founder of Heritage Landscapes. And I pulled up from your website -- Dawn, if you could pull up your home page from your website?

A That's correct. It's the home page from our website.

Q Right. And hopefully you can read it, I can't see it on my screen yet.

MR. WALKER: Is yours on?
(Short pause.)
MR. WALKER: There it goes. Thank
you.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q So, Ms. O'Donnell, that -- you can see the area that's blown up. And it provides your overview of what your company does. And it seems to me,
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from your website, that your primary expertise is in the planning and design of urban and rural landscapes, is that fair? Based on this description?

A Not really.
And why not?
First of all, when you're looking at a website, you're looking at statements that are under 50 words. So, they don't necessarily encapsulate everything you do.

But, in this case, what we're indicating is that we work at this intersection of cultural, nature, people, and place, community and land, and that we partner with our clients. And it's not only planning and design. What we say is "effective planning, design, construction, management, and stewardship". Okay. Fair enough. So, let me ask you then, pulling up your resumé that was attached or your CV that was attached to your prefiled testimony.

MR. WALKER: And, Dawn, that's Bates 4538 please.

BY MR. WALKER:
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Q And, on the second page of that, Ms. O'Donnell, you have -- you start with a two-page list of "Planning \& Implementation Projects". Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And, other than this Project, the Northern Pass Project, which is listed first, I did not see any other project on there where you performed a historic resource assessment for a proposed project. Have you done that before this project?

A The term you're using, "historic resource assessment", is not necessarily the standard terminology. Work scopes engage many descriptions. But historic resource assessment is a baseline work that's undertaken in nearly every project.

Q Well, how about for purposes, let's say, on the 106 process? The historic resource assessment, under the 106 process, is a defined assessment. In other words, you identify properties, you assess for eligibility, you assess for adverse effects, and then resolution of adverse effects. Is that right?
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A Essentially, yes.
Q Have you done an historic resource assessment under the 106 process for a proposed project, prior to this one?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And have you done one for a linear transmission project?

A $\quad$ No.
Q So, if I looked through your two pages here, and you said you have done one under the 106 process, does that show up on your CV, on these two pages?

A We don't usually list 106 as a component of a project, because it's one piece of a scope. So, we list the title of the project. But the projects that we've had components of Section 106 compliance related to federal funding, include, in Washington, D.C., St. Elizabeths, the National Mall, the Jefferson Memorial, Meridian Health Park, and the White House. Q So, on that project, though, did you --

A Excuse me, I'm not finished.
Q No, but can I ask you about that one project, since you mentioned --
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A Well, that was five, by that's okay.
Q Okay. But, for those -- and, no, I appreciate you pointing it out. Did you, for those, perform a historic resource assessment for purposes of the 106 , meaning identification of all historic sites, analysis of eligibility, analysis of adverse effects, effects tables, all of that? Did you do that for that project?

A What you're listing is a series of tasks that accompany projects. We usually are doing one, two, or three of those tasks. So, to equate the three steps I believe you just spoke to to all of those projects, I would need to give you a little chart. So, yes, we've done assessment of historic resources, and whatever is required in that particular compliance arena.

Okay. So, you've done portions of those things for different projects, it sounds like, is that correct?

A Correct.

Q Okay. How about with regard to a linear transmission project like this one? Have you done a historic resource assessment?

A I think you just asked that two minutes ago.
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Q Well, --
A Go right ahead.
Q And I'm sorry, I didn't get your answer, or $I$ don't remember.

A I said "no".
Thank you. In your prefiled testimony, particularly on Page 4, Line 17, and, Dawn, if you could pull that up please. Starting at Line 17, you seem to have two very fundamental criticisms of Ms. Widell's work, or her approach in this case. The first, and you can read it, but it says "inconsistent use of SEC definitions and conflated terminologies limited the consideration of resources to unnecessarily narrow subset of National Register properties". Now, we've been talking about that. That's your criticism that she was limiting herself to eligible or listed properties, right?

A Correct.
Q And then your second criticism is "the selection of the narrow APE, also inconsistent with SEC rules, further eliminated numerous candidates from initial consideration". That's your second primary criticism, right?
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A Right.
Q So, I want to take each of these in parts. I want to take first your definition of "historic sites", or the definition that's used by the SEC in this case, and your interpretation of that and what you used in this case.

It's your position, you've made it clear,
that the SEC definition is broader than the
"historic site" definition used in the 106 process, right?

A We have definitely made that statement.
Q And you would agree that, under the 106 process, a historic site is "any property that is listed or eligible for the National

Register"?
A Under the Section 106 process, listed or eligible.

Q Right. So, when you came to the conclusion that the SEC rule dealing with historic sites should be construed more broadly, did you reach that conclusion on your own or did you consult with others when you came to that conclusion?

A Is that relevant?
Q It is. I'm trying to understand how you came
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to that conclusion.
A We read the New Hampshire law. We looked at the SEC rules. And our interpretation of the construction of the sentences, and the way the words are assembled, is that National Register listing and eligibility is not the only value being expressed.

Q But did you consult with anyone else? I understand you --

A No, we did not.
Q Okay. Now, this is the first time or the first project that you've been involved in that required you to interpret and assess that SEC rule?

A Yes.
Q Did you take any steps to determine how the SEC, this Committee, has applied these rules in the past?

A We did not.
Q Did you review -- I take it that you did not review the Committee's rulemaking deliberations when they were considering what that definition of "historic sites" means?

A We reviewed the rule itself.
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Q But not the deliberations?
A Not the pre-deliberations.
Q Have you -- and you have not reviewed prior decisions by the SEC on other projects where that rule was applied, right?

A No, we have not.
Q As you sit here today, would you agree that reviewing those would be helpful to you?

A Not necessarily.
Q You don't think it would be helpful to understand how the SEC has interpreted its rule in the past?

A I think the interpretation of the rule for each project is relevant to the project, as well as the rulemaking process.

Q I'm not sure what you mean by that. What do you mean "relevant to the rulemaking process"?

A I think the rule and its application to the project is more central than understanding the SEC's prior uses.

Q But you're not suggesting that the SEC would apply the rule differently in one project from another?

A The SEC may be faced with different issues
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Subcommittee that presided over that case included Dr. Richard Boisvert. Do you know who he is?

A Nope.
Q He's the Deputy Director of the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources. So, he's the Deputy SHPO. And I'll represent to you, he has also been on past subcommittees with the SEC dealing with other infrastructure projects. And, in the deliberations in that case, there was some discussion of what "historic site" means, under the new rule. So, under the same rules that apply in this case, the 102.23.

MR. WALKER: And, Dawn, if you could pull up --

BY MR. WALKER:
Q I'm going to show you some pages from those deliberations, because Dr. Boisvert, who is the Deputy SHPO in New Hampshire, had some discussion of it. And particularly on Page 85, and this is Applicants Exhibit 366. It's the deliberations. And I will represent to you that the highlighted part is from Dr. Boisvert. So, Dr. Boisvert, one of the Committee members,
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 54/Morning Session ONLY]\{11-02-17\}
is testify -- or, testifying in
deliberations -- speaking in deliberations.
And you'll see that he says "It is important to note that, for the purposes of this application process, the definition of "Historic Sites" in the SEC rules", the same rules that apply today, "follows the definition of "Historic Properties" in the federal regulations, eligible for listing on the National Register." You see that?

A I do see it.
MR. WALKER: And, Dawn, I'm going to ask you if you could also go to Page 101, at the very bottom, and it continues on to the next page down.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q And, again, this is Dr. Boisvert. And, at the first page it says -- Dawn, if you can go back?
"Historic", and he's got it in quotes, "here means that whatever makes it eligible for listing on the National Register." That is quite different than the way you are interpreting that rule, is that right?

A Let me suggest that you're excerpting from a
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longer deliberation, and there may be other quotes that equally could be pulled from that deliberation. And, yes, of course, the few that you pulled are indicating eligibility for the Register.

Q Okay. So, I understand that. And that's fair. You haven't read the deliberations. But, based on those two excerpts, the Deputy SHPO of this state is equating the SEC rules with
"eligible", correct, "for the National Register"?

A I hear what you're saying. I answered previously. I will not necessarily, categorically, say "correct", because I haven't read all of the Deputy SHPO's quotes in this document or any others.

Okay. Moving on then. Did you -- when the rules became effective in December 2015, the DHR also issued a Policy Memorandum talking about SEC review of applications before this Committee, the SEC.

A Uh-huh.
Q Have you seen that Policy Memo? Do you know what I'm talking about?
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A I think I have it.
Q Okay.
MR. WALKER: So, Dawn, if you could pull that up please. And that's dated in January of 2016 . Applicants Exhibit 116.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A Yes.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q You have that in front of you, Ms. O'Donnell?
A Correct.
Q Had you reviewed that prior to when you rendered your opinion?

A It was reviewed after my direct testimony and supplemental testimony.

Q But not before you issued your opinion?
A After.
Q Okay. Is there any reason you did not review
it before issuing your opinion?
A Just the wealth of materials to review, I believe.

Q Fair enough. But this is the policy coming from the DHR. And, if you turn to the first page -- or, I'm sorry, the first paragraph of Page 2 of that memo. And, in that memo, the
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very first sentence of that paragraph says that "Throughout the SEC rules, 36 C.F.R. refers to the federal regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties." So, again, there's a reference that the SEC rules have throughout it the federal regulations.

And, in the last sentence of that paragraph, it says "With rare exception, proposed energy projects seeking a certificate from the SEC are reviewed under the Section 106 regulations." Again, more guidance from the DHR equating the identification of sites under the 106 process with the SEC rules. Is that right?

A Correct. And my reading of this sentence would be focused more on the "rare exception" than the generic application.

Q Okay. Let me turn you as well to the third page of that memo, the very first paragraph. It states "In New Hampshire, above-ground historic properties meeting the definition at
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Site 102.23 are identified through the preparation" -- oh, I'm sorry -- "preparation and submission of area and individual inventory forms". Now, these are the forms that have been prepared in this case, and that's pursuant to the 106 process, right?

A As it states, yes.
Q And the third sentence in that same paragraph, it says "Information gathered and analyzed in individual inventory forms and historic district area forms provides a recommendation of whether a property is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and therefore considered historic for section 106 purposes". But, again, you have that reference to the SEC rule, and equating with the federal regulations. I realize you didn't read this.

A And you also have the reference in the sentence to "inventory forms and historic district area forms", which we've positioned in our testimony as being incomplete.

Q Right. But that's a completely different point, right? I mean, your -- the issue is, those are the forms that are used in the 106
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process, and this Policy Memo from the DHR is equating that to the definition under SEC
rules. That's --
A I do read that, yes.
Q Okay.
A That is what the reading is.
Q And $I$ realize, since you don't know
Dr. Boisvert, you did not consult with him
before you rendered your opinion. Did you
consult with anyone else working at the DHR
with regard to --
A I believe we --
Q Well, let me just finish my question.
A Go right ahead.
Q Did you consult with anyone at the DHR with regard to how that agency applies the SEC rule about -- on historic sites?

A Not that specific issue, no.
Q Do you agree, sitting here now, that it would have been helpful to do that?

A No, not necessarily.
So, let's now talk about how you identified sites for purposes of your review. And I've
read your prefiled testimony and your
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supplemental testimony and your report. And throughout your prefiled testimony and throughout your testimony before this Committee, you've explained your opinion that the Project is going to have a pervasive visual influence. And you reference at times, and I'm quoting at different times from your prefiled testimony, "widespread counts of historic sites" and "acreages of historic sites", as you interpret the $S E C$ definition, correct?

A I think you're generalizing. But $I$ think, in general, you're correct.

Q In your --
A So, you're not asking me to affirm my testimony.

Q Well, I can turn you to those pages that talk about "widespread counts" and "acreages", or, you know, "acreages of historic sites", if you'd like me to do that? I was just trying to move us along.

A No. That's okay. Go ahead.
Fine. And, when you were doing this and you were categorizing and identifying the number of sites, did you look back at the two prior
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projects that have gone before this SEC to see how many sites were identified and how that process went?

A $\quad \mathrm{No}$.
Q Okay. So, I take it you have no idea how many sites were identified for those projects?

A Which two projects are you talking about?
Q Antrim Wind, I'll represent to you, and then another one, MVRP, Merrimack Valley Reliability Project.

A No. We haven't looked at those.
Q Okay. In your Table 2, and I realize you corrected it in your supplemental testimony. So, let me bring that up.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could bring that up please. It's Bates 5764 .

## BY THE WITNESS:

A Yes.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q Just give me a minute to get -- so, this is
your Summary Table. And you've identified, for
this Committee and for us, 13,170 historic sites that could be affected by this Project. Is that right?
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A That's what the totals show.
Q Well, and $I$ will represent that adds the 3,024 historic sites, and then you have 10,146
current use. And I'm going to break that apart in a minute. But that totals 13,170. So,
that's where I'm getting that number from.
A Yes. That's where you're getting it from.
Q And that supports your opinion of the widespread counts and the pervasive historic sites throughout the Project area?

A Correct.
Q Now, you know that Ms. Widell and the
Preservation Company, in their years of work on
this, identified dramatically less. It was
somewhere around 1,284 historic sites within
the 1 -mile APE that they used for this Project.
You'd agree, quite a difference from what you
found in this case?
A Under a different methodology, yes.
Q Right. I mean, a different methodology, for
one, you used a 10-mile APE, and I'll talk with
you about that. But also a very -- a much
broader definition, which you've described?
A We have described that in our testimony, and
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 54/Morning Session ONLY]\{11-02-17\}
[WITNESS: O'Donnell]
we've cited the text where we take that opinion from.

Q And it's from the rule?
A Yes.
Q Now, I want to ask you about these tallies in your Table 2. Because you've described earlier in your testimony that you looked at these on a landscape level, and then all of these different categories on the landscape level, you've identified them if they fit into that category within a 10 -mile APE. Then, you tallied them up on a townwide basis. And this table shows 35 towns. And I'm correct that that's the 31 towns that the Project actually goes through, --

A Host towns.
Host towns, okay. Thank you. And then four additional towns that don't host the Project, but are within the 1 -mile APE that the Project has used?

A Correct. The same metric used by the Preservation Company.

Q Okay. So, let me turn you to Page 21 -- I'm going to come back to this table. But Page 21
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of your report, which is Bates 5466. In the middle of that page, you describe the three general categories that make up your Table 2 of the historic sites that you've identified, the 13,170. The first category is the properties "eligible or listed on the National Register or state register", right?

A You're reading it, yes.
Q Yes. I just want to make sure that we all understand and the Committee understands, so, when I go through your Table 2, we're all on the same page.

The second category is the "additional categories of resources as historic resources and cultural landscapes". And down below you've listed, in that same page, B1 through B7. These are the graveyards, land conservation, current use properties, recreation lands, scenic roads, trails, and public waters and such. Those -- that grouping makes up your second general category, correct? A Correct.

MR. WALKER: And then, Dawn, back up
to that. Right.
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BY MR. WALKER:
Q The third general category are "historic and scenic resources identified" at what you called these "community meetings"? And we can talk about those, and you've already testified a bit about those.

A Yes.
Q So, to make sure, turning back now to that Table 2. Once you've identified a historic property that fits into one of those categories, you tally it up on a town by town basis, and you put it into this table.

Correct?
A That's a simplification of the methodology, yes.

Q But you did not go out and individually analyze each of them to assess their eligibility or whether they would be affected by the Project, right?

A It's the Applicants' responsibility to do those tasks.

Q Sure. But I'm just asking you how this table was made up. That's what you did?

A We did identify them by mapping sources, and
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map them and count them.
Q Let me ask you about that. Because some of these are -- you had mapping data available. So, for instance, these different categories, "Recreation", "Public Lakes", "Public Waters", "Conservation Lands". You had mapping data available, so you could look to see if they were within the 10 -mile $A P E$ that you're applying. And, if they were, you tallied it. Am I right about that?

A The mapping data resources are indicated for each of the maps and each of the categories. And, yes, if the mapping was available, we mapped it and counted it.

Q Sure. And I'll want to ask you about some of your maps after. But the "Current Use", let's turn to that category. Because you'll agree with me that, of the 13,170 of the widespread counts and pervasive counts, 10,146 of those are on this list simply by the fact that they are a current use parcel, right?

A Yes. And they're not mapped.
Right. So, they're not mapped. And, so, you include them if they are -- you looked at town
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records. You count up the number of current use parcels in that town, and you include them. It has no relation to where they're located in relation to the Project, whether they're within 1 mile, whether they're within 10 miles. If they're in the town data, and they're a current use parcel, you count them as an historic site for purposes of this table?

A The data actually came from the state report on current use.

Q But it's -- somehow you got it on a town-by-town basis, right?

A It's in that state report --
Q Okay.
A $\quad-\quad$ on a town-by-town basis.
Q Thank you. But you'd agree with me that the 10,146 - -

A These are within the 10 -mile, that's the only criteria.

Q They are within the 10 -mile? You know that for sure?

A They are within the 10 miles. Or, no. They're within these towns.

Q Right.
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A They're within these towns.
Q Okay. That's --
A There's no other filter that you can use, because the report isn't specific in terms of the mapping.

Q Okay. That's the data you had --
A It's a town-by-town, that's all it is.
Q And it's your position that current use parcels qualify as a historic site under the SEC definition just by virtue of them being in current use, because they have a goal of preserving open space, and that's valued by the people of New Hampshire. Is that your position?

A We wrote up our thinking on current use in our report on Page 22 , paragraph 3 .

Well, and I'm taking it from that. Am I paraphrasing that correctly?

A You're simplifying. So, that's why I'm point to the report.

Q Okay. I'm sorry. Page 22?
A Paragraph 3.
MR. WALKER: Are you able to pull
that up, Dawn?
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BY MR. WALKER:
Q But, while she's pulling that up, and maybe she can't, you can tell me, if I'm simplifying it, Ms. O'Donnell, why is it that a current use parcel, in your opinion, fits into the SEC definition of "historic site" just by virtue of it being in current use?

A Our thinking on this topic is that it appears to us that the people of New Hampshire have made individual actions that signify value. And those individual actions particularly revolve around the conservation of land. And the current use is one of those categories. The land conservation use is another of those categories. And what we're saying, on Page 22, is that "Current use is a de facto conservation process by landowners that includes their property in the program".

And what we've heard in anecdotal evidence in the community meetings was that people put their lands into current use because of the value that they place on their land and the value that it offers to the community, and their intent to conserve it.
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Q Okay. Thank you. I mean, I think I simplified it, but basically said the same thing. Which is, you included it because people of New Hampshire value that, and so, therefore, in your opinion, historic site. Let me ask you, you, in considering whether to put a current use parcel or include that in the 10,146 on your list, did you consider how long any of those parcels had been in current use?

A That data was not available.
Q Well, you understand that the current use law came into effect in 1973?

A We did read the background of the current use law, yes.

Q Right. So, there is no parcel in this state that has been in current use for up to 50 years, which $I$ understand is the eligibility requirement under the 106 and the federal regulations, but --

A I don't agree.
Q Okay.
A The 50 year rule is a guideline. And it indicates the need to assess the property in
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order to determine its longevity and it's value. "Significance" and "integrity" is the common terminology.

That's fair enough.
A But the issue of current use lands, simply because the law was enacted in the early '70s, doesn't mean that those parcels weren't in private hands and had been conserved earlier.

Q But they weren't -- they weren't in current use?

A They weren't in current use. But they could have been conserved.

Q And you make a fair point. I understand, under the federal regulations, there is a 50 year requirement, $I$ call it a "requirement", you're saying "that's a guideline". And there are exceptions to the 50 years. So, that's a fair point.

A Yes.
Q But you don't know, on the 10,146 parcels, how long any of those have been in current use. And $I$ want to just pull up, you cited in your testimony a guide that is issued by New Hampshire.
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MR. WALKER: And, Dawn, if you could pull it up.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q It's our Exhibit 330, which it's "A layperson's Guide to New Hampshire Current Use", issued by the Statewide Program of Action to Conserve our Environment, $I$ think it's an acronym "SPACE". You cited that throughout your report, and you rely on some of the data.

And I want to turn to Page 8 of that report. And, if you look at the pie chart in the upper right-hand corner, where it says "Years Land Enrolled in Current Use", and I understand this was in 2007 , but not requiring a whole lot of math here, 9 percent of the land in New Hampshire that's been in current use has been 16 years or more. Which, by simple math, 91 percent of the current use parcels at that time had not even been in current use 15 years. So, when you look at the age component, that is not something that is critical to your inclusion of these parcels on your list, right?

A It is not critical that it's only been in current use for a period of time. What is
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important is that it's open land that is in a conservation -- de facto conservation category.

Q Sure. But you're calling these "historic sites". And, if I'm a landowner, and I decide to put my land in current use last week, you would call that an "historic site", based on your methodology?

A I think it's about the motivation. And I think that our interest in it was sparked, in part, by the amount of land covered in current use. Many towns -- the percentages, which we have on the second chart, are 32 percent to 93 percent of the land area of the town.

Q No, I understand. But just back to my
question, --
A And the --
Q I just want to get to my question.
A And the mean of that is 51 percent. So, half of all the towns that are host towns, the area -- half the area of the towns is in current use.

Q Right. Thank you. But, again, so, if $I$ put my land in current use last week, becomes an historic site under your methodology?
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A I think what we're saying is current use is worthy of looking at.

Q I think you're saying "yes"?
A Yes.
Q Yes. All right. Back on -- and one thing that's interesting is, so, the landowner controls whether his or her property goes into current use. And, on Page 27 of your report, Bates 5607 , it's in the middle of the page. And you say, that first paragraph, it says "The details of the land use change tax are stringent in that once land is accepted into the current use program it remains."

That's not accurate, though, is it, Ms. O'Donnell?

A Well, it's an excerpt, because what I'm saying is there's a penalty in the next sentence.

Q Okay. But land does go into current use, and it comes --

A Comes back out, sure.
Q Right. And I will -- and we don't have to go to the report, but $I$ will represent to you that that report, that SPACE report, referred to how much current use acreage is taken out. So,
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 54/Morning Session ONLY]\{11-02-17\}
there's a cite to 10,000 acres being taken out in 2005. So, once it's in current use, it doesn't always remain in current use. That's up to the individual landowner?

A Correct.
Q All right.
MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up that report again, and Page 3 .

BY MR. WALKER:
Q And I think this is in line with what you were just describing, Ms. O'Donnell. Almost 60 percent of the land in New Hampshire is estimated to be in current use. So, based on your methodology, and your inclusion of these current use parcels, any time the $S E C$ Committee must consider an infrastructure project or has one before it, it's going to have to assess about 60 percent of the property within the APE of historic sites -- or, for historic sites, right?

A You're implying that the methodology that we used is transferable to the SEC's future methodology. I think that what we said was conservation lands, and including those in
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current use, need to be considered when you're looking at the values of property to the people of New Hampshire as historically important, culturally valued.

All right. Let me take that in pieces. You're not suggesting that the Committee applies its rules one way for this case and then another way for another case, are you?

A No. What we're actually saying is that, in our opinion, the methodology we applied was to indicate that the Applicants were incomplete in their inventory, because these categories were not considered in any manner, and many of those properties that would have been eligible or listed were also dismissed.

So, what we're -- what we are building conceptually is a case that shows that the Applicant has reduced and reduced and reduced the number of properties to be considered for adverse effects. And, in that process, they have limited the adverse effects, because they have focused it on a very, very small number of properties.

Q But you're not saying, and $I$ will represent to
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you, there are current use parcels that have been identified by the Applicant in their assessment, not just because they're in current use, but there are current use parcels that are identified as part of their assessment?

A Yes.
Q I mean, there would have to be, --
A Relatively few, yes.
Q -- if 60 percent is in current use. But your methodology, and it is important, because your opinion of unreasonable adverse effect talks about "pervasive and widespread counts", 10,146 of those are on there just because they're current use. That we can agree on?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Are you aware of any other SEC reviews in New Hampshire under these new rules where current use parcels were considered historic sites just because they're current use?

A No.
Q I will represent to you that, in the Antrim Wind Project and the MVRP Project, there were a number of towns that were within the APE. And we've gone through and we've looked at all the
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number of current use parcels. I will represent to you that, in the rulemaking -- or, I'm sorry, the decision for those two, and even the deliberations, there is no reference to current use parcels being considered simply because they are in current use.

Do you have any reason to disagree with that?

A No.
Q All right. So, let me move on. On Table 2, going back to your table, there are -- it's in the far right, the gray one, "Community ID Historic", and you have "468" historic sites. And these were identified by participants in the community workshops. And I'll paraphrase those workshops, tell me if I'm wrong. But you held six different workshops. You were working in conjunction with the T.J. Boyle, Counsel for the Public's visual impact expert. And you invited residents from 108 towns. And I believe that's because they were within a 10-mile APE, is that right? Those towns that were invited to come to the community workshops?
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]

1

A Yes. Let me just suggest that your subject of your sentence is incorrect, because we didn't invite. The Counsel for the Public invited.

Q Okay. All right. Thank you.
A And that they were the host of the meetings.
Q In fact, I think you explained to me at the technical session that this was Public Counsel's idea, not your idea?

A The concept of Public Counsel was to have direct voice of citizens.

But that -- and Public Counsel set up these community workshop meetings, and you attended, along with T.J. Boyle, right?

A We didn't simply attend. We were actors within that milieu. We were asked to aid community members to walk through the process. There was a script, and it was very clearly articulated.

Q Okay.
A The point was to have scenic and historic resources identified by the public.

Q Right. And I know there were six of those meetings, and $I$ attended a few of them. And I've reviewed the attendance sheets. And there were some people that attended more than one
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meeting. So, some of the participants that showed up at one meeting also showed up at another meeting, is that right?

A I haven't actually reviewed the attendance sheets. So, I wouldn't be able to answer that. Are you aware that some of those who attended those meetings are also intervenors in this case?

A I think maybe a couple of people indicated that to me. But it wasn't by reviewing attendance sheets.

Q Okay. And I'll let you describe the process to me. But $I$ understand that you, you and T.J. Boyle, asked the participants to identify resources that were significant to them, either as a historic resource or a scenic resource. So, everybody who showed up at these meetings you asked them to identify within a 10-mile APE, is that what you did?

A We gave them the maps for the 10 -mile.
Q And then people would identify whatever historic resource or scenic resources they felt they were, that was important to them, what did they do? They put them on the map?
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A It could have been scenic, historic, or both. And they mapped them with a unique number, and they filled out a form. We had a two-sided form, "scenic" on one, "historic" on the other side. And there were a series of questions about what it was and how they valued it.

Q And when people identified, they showed up on your list and your tally, and I understand this tally of 468 doesn't include those that were identified -- identified just as "scenic", but only ones that were identified as "historic" or "historic and scenic"?

A Correct. And it also doesn't conflate multiple people.

Q I see.
A So, if it's a single site, if it was recommended three times, it was only counted once.

Q Is that right? Okay.
A Yes.
Q Because I want to ask you about that, because I saw some that show up on a number of different ones, but --

A I don't think that summary is conflated.
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Q Okay. When you considered those, that people showed up and put them on your map, did you consider, did you do any type of analysis of the age of the resource that was identified?

A We were not -- we were specifically not asked to filter in any way the public's views.

Q You were asked by Public Counsel?
A Public Counsel said "Just let them identify, let them do the forms, and we'll counsel them and we'll locate them."

Q Okay. So, somebody shows up, says "This is an historic site. I value it." It shows up?

A Or scenic, or both.
Q Right. And I appreciate that. You didn't do any filtering. So, you don't know, of these 468, whether they have a view of the Project from where they're located?

A No. None of those. Again, that would be a further filter.

Q Right. And you don't know view, you don't know distance. You didn't do any assessment of whether they are significant or have integrity, and all the jargon that we've been using?

A No. Anecdotally, we did find that several that
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are -- that were considered in the inventory by Preservation Company were also included here. But we didn't do any direct. Just because we knew the name, because we've read the other report.

I see. So, some that Cherilyn Widell and they found --

A The Preservation Company had done their inventory on were also here. Okay. Good. Let me show you, you provided a spreadsheet from the community workshops of the different resources that were identified.

MR. WALKER: And, Dawn, if you could pull up Exhibit 369 please.

WITNESS O'DONNELL: This is Page 34 of our report?

MR. WALKER: I have no idea. It's
not in your report, actually. This is a spreadsheet that was provided in a data request. We've marked this as "Exhibit 360" -I'm sorry, is that 360 --

MS. GAGNON: 369.
MR. WALKER: 369, sorry.
WITNESS O'DONNELL: So, excuse me,
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Jeremy.
MR. WALKER: Sure.

WITNESS O'DONNELL: Is there more than one page of this?

MR. WALKER: I'm sure there is, and I'll scroll down.

WITNESS O'DONNELL: Okay. Just so I know what we're looking at.

MR. WALKER: Yes. No, that's fair.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q We asked in our data request to provide the different community-identified resources that were included in your tallies, the 468, we asked for a spreadsheet, or you provided a spreadsheet showing all of them. And that's what this is. Do you recognize this?

A Yes.
Q Did you prepare this?
A Megan Turner, in our office, and support staff, probably Thomas --
[Court reporter interruption.]
CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:
A -- Helmkamp, $H-e-l-m-k-a-m-p, \quad$ also worked on it.
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BY MR. WALKER:
Q Okay. So, this is something that your company prepared, based on the community resource -community meetings?

A I actually think it was also derived from the T.J. Boyle work of summarizing the meetings.

Q Okay. Because there --
A Because we had compatible roles, we didn't overlap each other. But we assembled the data from the community meetings between the two firms.

Q I see. Thank you. Let me turn you to Page 3. And I'm not going to go through much of this. But I do want to ask you about a few of them that show up on here.

MR. WALKER: And, actually, the second one down, Dawn, if you can do the whole thing?

MS. GAGNON: The second one down?
MR. WALKER: Yes. The "Conkling
Family Homestead", the second highlighted one. MS. GAGNON: Okay.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q All right. Hopefully, you can read this. This
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is -- I was going through and looking at this, and I see on there "Conkling Family Homestead", and this is in New Hampton. Somebody -- the reason given, that right-hand column is the reason given by the participant, and you can see that -- well, I'll represent to you the participant, it doesn't show up on these columns, was indeed Sam Conkling. And why he thought this was important, it says "I live there."

So, Mr. Conkling comes into these meetings, he says "it's historic, I live there." It ends up on your list, right?

A Jeremy, I think there's a bit of a misrepresentation of this list happening. Because the right-hand columns are the -- the farthest right-hand column is a write-in box. But the form itself has a number of items to be checked. So, this is only one -Okay. Let me just make sure we see what the right-hand column --

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you can go back up. And I don't have it in front of me, so we can't --
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A I think the right-hand column title, again, you're looking at a multipage spreadsheet, so the column titles are on the top. I think that's the write-in --

BY MR. WALKER:
Q Well, the column title says "Reason for
Choosing". So, the reason -- you're saying
that the reason for choosing isn't your reason, it is the person who filled out or identified the resource?

A Apologies, Jeremy. We probably need the form in front of us. But $I$ think the final question or one of the last questions on the form was:
"What reason is this place important to you?"
And it was -- they were able to write in their reasoning.

Q Okay.
A But it was preceded by a series of other questions.

Q Well, fair enough. For whatever reason, somebody put, on this chart, the reason being "I live there"?

A For them it was because they live there.
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Q Yes. So, I understand. There may be other reasons that may have been identified. But, regardless, you didn't do any filtering, you didn't do any assessment of whether the sam Conkling Family Homestead has any historic significance or integrity?

A Not at all.
Q Okay. Thank you. Let me turn to Page 3 of that same --

MR. WALKER: Or, I'm sorry, the same page, Dawn, but the yellow highlighted, the first one.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q "Grey Knob Camp" is on there. And it looks like multiple reasons were taken and put on there. But are you aware that the Grey Knob Camp, and we've looked at this, this is about 13 miles from the proposed Project. And it's also in the White Mountain National Forest, therefore 13 miles from where the Project goes underground. Are you aware of that?

A I was certainly aware that there were community members from the underground portions of the corridor that were present.
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BY MR. WALKER:
Q The last one $I$ want to talk about on this is Loudon Road. Loudon Road is on there. And it's -- the reason given, at least on this form, is "stores". Based on just that, on the face of it, because it's "stores". In your opinion, does that make it an historic site?

A It wasn't my position to judge. It was the community's input.

Q Well, and I will represent to you that, on this form, Loudon Road actually shows up two more times. On Page 11, Dawn, you can see that. Which suggests to me that -- right. Again, it shows up. And if these are all counted in your 468, do you have some double or triple counting in this case?

A Well, the Loudon Road count is likely not duplicated, but the Loudon Street Concord Christmas Parade is an intangible heritage event that people are valuing. So that is different than saying the road itself. So, we did look at the titles, and we did try not to conflate.

Q Okay. All right. Let me look at your -- I'm
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not going to go through all of these different categories, the "Conservation Lands", the "Recreation Lands" and such. But, to make sure that this Committee understands what you have in your report, you attached to Appendix 1 of your report eight different maps. And they're labeled "HL1" through "HL8".

MR. WALKER: I think it's CFP5700, Dawn. And this is -- whoops, it's upside-down. I don't know if you can --

WITNESS O'DONNELL: These are the overall corridor maps, right?

MR. WALKER: Right.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q And, $I$ won't go through each one. But, if you -- they're all the same in the sense that they show a corridor, they show the Project corridor, and they show your 10 -mile APE. And then, for your different categories, your broad categories that you've identified, you show where they fit in on the 10 miles, correct?

A We show the available mapped data. And $I$ think we're clear in our text that we didn't create the mapping. That it came principally from the
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New Hampshire GIS database, and it also came from an historic database.

Q Okay. So, if I look at these, even -MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up HL3. So, two pages beyond.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q Just to give the Committee some sense of what these show, HL3 is conserved land. So, again, that's another category.

A And these are the mapped lands available.
Q Right. And you don't have, on these maps, you don't have any viewshed analysis whatsoever. It's just, if they show up within the 10 miles, then you included it?

A And it's described in the report as "conserved public lands and those available to the public". That it's a combination of state and national parks -- I may be misstating, I should look at the report, and the mapping provided by the New Hampshire Forest Preservation Society.

Q Sure. And I understand. Each one of these portrays something different, as far as your categories?

A Uh-huh.
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Q Then, the last map that you provide, HL9, -MR. WALKER: Which is 5708, Dawn. WITNESS O'DONNELL: Seven is the one that shows the community inputs.

MR. WALKER: The community meetings, sure.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q But 5 -- I'm sorry, HL9, this is the same corridor diagram, the $10-m i l e$ APE. But what you've done now is just highlighted areas with potential views to the Project. And you did that, and it's described in here, you do that using the bare-earth modeling done by T.J. Boyle?

A Correct.
Q And you used the bare-earth viewshed because that's what's used for purposes of, you know, information provided for the visual impact analysis as it relates to the effects on aesthetics, right?

A We used the bare-earth model, because it portrays potential visibility to the Project. Q Sure. But that's -- and that's used in the aesthetics realm. There's nothing in the
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rules --
A It's the visual assessment work.
Q Okay. Okay. Nowhere --
A But, as you realize, the definition of "scenic" includes the historic category.

Q Well, I'll ask you about that. But you used
this because it's part of the aesthetic
analysis or the visual impact?
A We used it, as I've stated, because it shows the potential for visibility.

Q But you also, and in your report, and we can go to it if you want, but you're critical of Ms. Widell for not using a bare-earth model for her assessment of historic sites?

A The Preservation Company and Widell considered vegetation, structures, and other objects that, in the lifespan of the Project, may or may not remain. And we felt that the bare-earth model was a more conservative approach that needed to be shown.

Q So, that's a basis of your criticism of Ms. Widell, correct?

A Correct.
Q You say in your report that "all historic sites
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are by definition scenic"?

A Well, $I$ don't -- $I$ think "all" maybe is a misstatement, but we're --

Q All right. Well, let me just turn to your report.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { [Court reporter interruption - } \\
& \text { multiple parties speaking.] }
\end{aligned}
$$

## BY THE WITNESS:

A It's an excerpt.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q Well, and I'll turn to it. I'm not trying to -- I'm just trying to move it along. But we'll go to Page 112 of your report, which is Bates 5694. And, in the middle of that page, right under 2, it says "As historic sites are by definition scenic". You see that?

A Yes. And then it's followed with the citation of the "Site $301.14(a) "$.

Q Well, when you say "by definition", I assume you're relying on the SEC definitions, right?

A Uh-huh.
Q And, actually, scenic resources are defined in Site Rule 102.45.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull
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that up please?
BY MR. WALKER:
Q And your interpretation of this is that
"historic sites are by definition scenic".
But, if you look at that, "scenic resources" are "resources to which the public has a legal right of access". You would agree with me that not all historic sites have a legal right of -a public right of access?

A No, they don't have an access onto the land.
The historic structures and historic farms are often viewed from the public road.

Q But the --
A They don't get to enter.
Q So, if there is a historic site that does not
have public right of access, by this
definition, it's not a scenic resource, right?
A Can you indicate what document you're pulling this from?

Q This is from -- I'm sorry. This is from the SEC rules, Site 102.45.

A Okay. I have --
Q I have a copy.
I have excerpts of it in front of me, but I
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don't have that section.
Q Okay. Well, if you look at --
MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull
that up again.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q And I won't quibble with you too long here.
But it defines "scenic resources", meaning
"resources which have" -- "to which the public
has a legal right of access". And I just want
to make sure we're in agreement, that not all
historic sites have a legal right of access?
A Correct.
Q A public right of access?
A Correct.
Q So, not all scenic sites are historic?
A Correct.
Q Not all historic sites are scenic, by this definition?

A By that definition.
Q And, also, as you go down in that definition, --

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could go
down.
BY MR. WALKER:
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Q And $I$ understand why you've included historic sites under the scenic resource category, because it's listed under as (e). It says "Historic sites that possess a scenic quality". So, again, that's another limitation. It has to be an historic site that possesses a scenic quality. Do you agree?

A Yes.
Q So, when you say that "all historic sites are by definition scenic", you would agree with me, not by this definition, not by the SEC definition?

A I would suggest that the SEC is categorizing and defining more closely. So, the use of the term "all" would be incorrect. Point taken.

Q In your report, starting at Chapter 4, which is the bulk of your report, and it starts at Page 38, you provide a narrative town-by-town summary of the historic sites for those 35 towns that show up in your table.

A Let me suggest something, Jeremy.
Q Sure.
A You characterized it as "the bulk of the report". The issue is that the town reports
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are longer.

Q Okay. That's fine.
A But that it isn't necessarily the conceptual strength. I think that Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 5 lay out the concepts of our position. All right. That's a fair point. I said "bulk" based on the number of pages.

I mean, ultimately, though, your opinion is based on all of the counts that show up in the 35 towns, and then you go through a very thorough description.

A Actually, our report is based on the 10-mile APE, which I'm sure you'll have some questions about at some point.

Q I do.
A And the towns -- we chose to map the host towns and those within the 1 mile, and show them in these reports as examples. Because, when you're looking at the maps of the entire corridor, due to the scale of the corridor, you don't see the density of resources. So, our conceptual point is there's a density of resources that's present.

Q All right. I think I understood all that. Let
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me pull up an exhibit.
MR. WALKER: If you could pull up 368, Dawn.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q Just to make sure that $I$ do understand what you're saying. I'll represent to you, this is a map showing the corridor and the host towns. So, you can see there's also a legend of where it's overhead and where it's underground?

A Correct.
Q And, if you look at that, you'll see that, for some towns, it goes through sort of the edge of the town, for instance, Pittsburg. It might go through a corner of Pittsburg, or Franconia, for instance. And your mapping includes all the resources townwide for those towns, right?

A Absolutely.
Q Okay. So, let me look at -- I'm just going to go through a couple of the towns. Let's look at Pittsburg. And that's covered in Page 39 and 40 of your report. So, Bates 5619.

A And on a map.
Q And on a map. And we're going to get to the maps. But let's look at your summary. So, for
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each of the towns, and we'll use Pittsburg as an example, it provides a summary of the resources that you identified in that town. And, in Pittsburg, are you aware of the makeup of the line, you know, what it is?

A Yes.
Q Okay. It's --
A Yes. Partial underground/partial overhead.
Q Sure. About two miles of overhead and --
A At the lower southwest corner.
Q Right. About two miles overhead and some underground.

MR. WALKER: And, Dawn, if you could pull up the map that was attached, you provided in your appendix, 5710.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q And this gives -- this is your depiction of, first of all, in the lower right corner, you see where the route goes, and red is the overhead, and then there's a very small, 3,700 feet, of underground in the dotted line. Do you see that?

A Yes. This is our map.
Q Okay. And, in your report, we don't have to
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keep flipping back and forth, I'll represent to you, in your report, in your narrative, you describe that the Preservation Company and Ms. Widell identified 11 historic sites that could be potentially impacted within Pittsburg, and they assessed those for effects?

A Correct.
Q Those were within the 1 -mile APE, though. You know that's how they did it. Not townwide?

A Yes.
Q Now, looking at the map, and the location of the line, it's clear, and if you look at the scale on the bottom, the bottom right, it's clear that many areas of Pittsburg are outside the 1-mile APE that Heritage -- I'm sorry, Preservation Company and Ms. Widell used?

A And we show the 10 -mile, it's the dash line that's coming midway. If you look on the left edge, it's about midway up.

Q Sure. But you would map your resources townwide. So, regardless of whether they're within the 1 -mile, whether they're within the 10-mile?

A Absolutely. The filter is what's available and
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what's within the town.
Q And your counts on these maps don't take into account any visibility, any viewshed analysis?

A They do not.
Q So, there are -- some of your counts may show up on these maps with no view of the Project?

A That's possible.
Q And I will represent to you, from your
narrative, of your 13,170, you have 407 counts from Pittsburg, 252 of those are current use properties. And --

A And those are shown on the revised Table 2 chart.

Q Right. But the current use parcels, you don't have any mapping. So, you don't know where those are?

A No. But I'm just saying, the Chart 2 that we've been looking at is by --

Q Table 2.
A -- is by town.
Q Right. But $I$ guess my point is, on this map of Pittsburg, where you have the line in the lower left-hand portion of the town, you may have current use parcels, and we know about
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60 percent of the town, on average, may be in current use, very far corners of Pittsburg, upper right-hand corner of this map, that are current use, and they're on your tally?

A I just wanted to go back a second, Jeremy, --
Q Well, I just want to make sure you understand that question, just so we have it.

A Yes.
Q That's a "yes". All your current use show up?
A No. The current use shows up on the tally, but not on the mapping.

Q Right. And there may be current use --
A Because there is no mapping of current use.
Q And there may be current use parcels that are many miles away from the corridor in Pittsburg, but they show up in your tallies?

A Your prior question was about "visibility", and supplemental testimony, Sheet 1 , $I$ don't know which exhibit number it is, takes the image that you showed on Map 9 and overlays it.

Q And I will get to that. I want to ask you about those.

A But you were making a point about things may or may not be visible. I'm just saying there's a
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graphic that indicates.
Q I understand. But we can agree, and so the Committee has it, all of your numbers that show up on your Table 2 have no filter for visibility?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Okay. All right. Let me just ask you about one more of these maps that you provided. And it is, when you go through each town, let's go to Franconia.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull
that up please.
WITNESS O'DONNELL: It's an
underground town.
MR. WALKER: Right.
MS. GAGNON: The map?
MR. WALKER: Yes. The map please, 5725.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q So, you're right. This is underground. It's
5 miles, about 5 miles of underground along public roads. And Ms. Widell and the Preservation Company identified no historic sites, aboveground historic sites that would be
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visually impacted in that town, because it's underground. Yours, though, were townwide. Your counts were townwide. You have 220 historic sites within the town, because they're parcel -- because they're current use only. So, you have 220 , because they're current use. You have 65 other counts of your different categories. And many, you would agree with me, based on the scale, many of your counts are outside the 1 -mile APE that's used even for overhead lines, right? I mean, if you took a townwide survey of all the current use parcels?

A Correct.
Q So, help me understand. How is it that a current use parcel, how is that possibly, and you've designated it as a historic site in this town, how would a current use in Franconia, where the line goes underground, and in some cases many miles away, how would that be impacted by --

A It would not.
Q It would not be impacted, and it certainly wouldn't be adversely affected, right?

A Our methodology was to show the towns in a
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consistent manner along the entire corridor. We recognize that eight of those towns have underground portions.

Q But, when you look at your Table 2 and the 13,170, and all the current use parcels that are in the towns where it's underground, those should be removed. Because, like you just said, can't see how they could be impacted. Is that fair?

A I don't agree. It's the methodology that we applied, and we applied consistently. We described the methodology. It was to indicate that there were resource categories, entire categories of resources that had not been considered. And we mapped those consistently as examples. Not to say that those were impacted by the Project, but to indicate the wealth of resources that is present.

Q Present, even if there's no chance of them being impacted?

A Present.
Q All right. Let's turn to -- you just
referenced that, in your supplemental
testimony, you provided three new exhibits
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]
where there -- you overlay the sites that you've identified within the 10 -mile APE with
the bare-earth viewshed. Is that fair --
A Correct.
Q -- characterize those three?
A Correct. So, we use the town-by-town and 10-mile corridor mapping.

Q Right.
A And symbols that we used at the town level, and provided three maps, the north section, the underground section, and the south.

Q Thank you. That's helpful. So, let me - MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up 5757 .

BY MR. WALKER:
Q This is your sheet 2, which is the central
Underground portion of the route. Is that
right?
A Correct.
Q And, so, for the Committee's benefit, I
understand that the pink shading in this
diagram is where the Project could be in view
based on a bare-earth model?
A There's one little caveat that the mapping
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]
explanation indicates. When we showed the pink over the top of the green, it screened the conservation lands. So, we put the pink layer under the green layer.

Q Okay. But it still shows up as pink over the green?

A Sort of.
Q It's just more of a mauve color or something, right?

A Right. Right.
Q So, looking at this --
A What this one indicates is the visibility of the north and south end of the underground.

Q And there are still some areas, even though it's underground, in the north and south, that are within a bare-earth viewshed, because there's a view of the overhead line outside of that. Is that what you're saying?

A There would be -- there's a potential view using a bare-earth model. I think that's the way I would say it. And the reason we mapped it was to show the density of the little yellow triangles and dots and conservation lands, all the other categories, together with the
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]
viewshed model. So that this viewshed model, bare-earth, against the mapping of the resources, is some something that the Applicant has not created, because they didn't use the bare-earth.

Q Right. And, in this, so $I$ can understand, where you have the yellow markers, which identify the different historic sites, --

A Yes. Yellow, green, blue, all these colors on the left.

Okay. Sure. But the yellow individual dots? Correct.

Q And I know we don't have current use on there, because there's no mapping.

A Correct.
Q But you would agree with me that, particularly in the middle of this section, the middle of this diagram, there are a number of yellow dots and triangles that represent historic sites that are not even within a bare view -- or, bare-earth viewshed of the Project?

A Correct.
Q They still show up and they still show up in your tallies? Those weren't removed?
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A Yes. But the issue here, Jeremy, is that the map doesn't only show visibility. It also shows the density of resources. So, for example, along the underground section, there are a lot of these purple pentagrams, and those are community-valued resources, and they're layering right on top of the corridor.

Q Okay. And that's helpful.
A Yes.
Q But, I mean, I guess my point is --
A So, these are summary maps. They're not trying to show one thing. They're glomerations.

Q Right. But, again, we talked about, with current use, you have a lot of conserved land here in the area of the underground --

A There's no current use shown.
I understand. But you have here, in green, "conserved public land", and there's quite a bit of it shown on this, that make up your counts, that even on your viewshed, your bare-earth viewshed, it is not -- it's not in view of the Project. And I think, like current use, you would say "it can't be impacted", right?
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]

A I think the issue here is the -- as you know, the underground portion is the nearest resources.

Q I know. But, Ms. O'Donnell, I'm just making that same point. You've included this on here, it's not even in the bare-earth viewshed, --

A Because it's underground. Got it.
Q Right.
A I've already said "yes".
Q And it's not impacted, but -- okay. And you've included it on this map?

A Yes.
Q And you've included it in your tally?
A Well, this map doesn't actually relate to the tally. The town summaries are what relates to the tally.

Q But all those --
A This map goes beyond the -- I just want to be clear. This map goes beyond the host town corridor.

Q But everything that shows up on this map as a yellow dot --

A No, because some of them are outside of the host towns.
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Q Okay. Fair enough.
A Just trying to be clear.
Q So, when -- let's talk about your --
A We mapped the 10 -mile corridor, and then we showed -- we portrayed the maps in GIS at the town level as well.

Q All right. Let me -- let's turn to your use of a 10-mile APE, because we've talked a lot about this, and we've talked about your diagrams and the 10 -mile APE. And this is a -- as we talked about earlier, your second -- one of your fundamental criticisms of Ms. Widell's approach is that she used, and I think you called it "a more narrow $A P E$ than what is required in the SEC rules"?

A Correct.
Q And your position is that the SEC rule requires, when you're analyzing and assessing impacts on historic sites, a 10-mile APE, is that right?

A We used SEC Rule $301.05(\mathrm{~b})(1)$, which states requires the Applicant to identify all areas where the project would be visible, "based on both bare ground conditions using topographic
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]
screening only and with consideration of screening by vegetation or by other factors".

Q And that's the basis for using your 10-mile APE?

A It's the basis for looking -- our basis for using the $10-m i l e$ APE was our review of the topography of the corridor.

Q Okay.
A Understanding the form of ground, and that much of this corridor aligns through valley and low hillsides within a valley and mountainous environment. There are, in many places along the corridor, panoramic views of some dimension, 360 degrees, 180 degrees.

Q But let me ask you to look at --
A So, our judgment of using the $10-m i l e$ was based on the landforms that we observed.

Q And I know you haven't reviewed prior application of the rules by the SEC. You haven't reviewed prior dockets. Would it surprise you that in no case utilizing these rules has there been a $10-m i l e$ APE for a transmission corridor?

A It wouldn't surprise me. But I'm not aware of
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it.
Q Let me ask you to look at the SEC Rule 301.06, which is the "Effects on Historic Sites". And I know you're aware of this. In subsection --

A Yes. We cited it in our -- I think Chapter 5.
Q Right. Subsection (b) discusses the "Identification of all historic sites and areas of potential archeological sensitivity located within the area of potential effects, as defined in 36 C.F.R. 800 ". And, in turn, the area of potential effect is determined by the DOE, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer for the 106 process. Would you agree with that?

A You're excerpting from the rule. And $I$ think you're focusing on the 106 and the relationship between the DOE and the SEC undertakings.

Q Right. But you would agree, that's how it works under the 106 process?

A That's what the -- the excerpts lead to that conclusion.

Q And, in this case, the DOE, in consultation with the DHR, determined that, pursuant to that regulation, the federal regulation, the APE for
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this Project would be a corridor 1 mile on either side of the Project?

A For the Section 106 DOE process, 1 mile was clearly articulated.

Q And that's something that the New Hampshire DHR concurred with?

A For the 106.
Q Do you think they got it wrong when they came up with the 1-mile APE?

A I think the SEC rules guide in a slightly different direction.

Despite what we looked at earlier with the Policy Memorandum and equating it to the 106 process?

A My opinion is that the SEC rules guide in a slightly different direction. In that a corridor, where $I$ think it specifically states the "size and intensity of the corridor increases", I should get the citation. Well, let me help you. MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up, in your report, on Page 8 of your report -WITNESS O'DONNELL:

BY THE WITNESS:
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]

A Let me just suggest it's Site 301.05, under "Effects on Aesthetics".

Q Right. And that's what $I$ was going to. So, in your report, on Page 8, it's --

MR. WALKER: Well, if you can't find it, Dawn, I --

BY MR. WALKER:
Q -- about two-thirds of the way down, it's in the last sentence of the paragraph. It says "the SEC rules require a 10-mile APE" -- I'm sorry -- "10-mile APE for undertakings of this size to account for impacts to scenic resources not the 1 mile to each side applied by the Applicant". And you cite to "301.05 4d.2", which I think is what you were just describing, right?

A Correct.
MR. WALKER: Can we go to that, Dawn, Site 301, please?

WITNESS O'DONNELL: It's 301.05.
It's under the heading "Effects" --
MR. WALKER: Right.
WITNESS O'DONNELL: -- "Effects on
Aesthetics".
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MR. WALKER: Agree.
WITNESS O'DONNELL: And 4.2. And it's about the selection of the area of potential effect.

BY MR. WALKER:

Q Well, wait a minute. I want to ask you about that, and we've lost it here on the screen. You say it's a 10-mile -- it requires a 10-mile APE for aesthetics?

A Yes. Our opinion -So, let me just finish. I want to make sure -Go right ahead.

Q It actually refers, in that section -- let me see where that is. It talks about an area, and I'm sorry, it's in (b) (5) --

A We were looking at (b) (4). 2 . Yes. I'm looking at --

A (b) (4)d. 2 .
Q I'm looking at $301.05(\mathrm{~b})(5)$. It says "An identification of all scenic resources within the area of potential visual impact", because you've been using the term "APE", which is a defined term for historic sites. There is also a separate defined term of "area of potential
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visual impact".
A Correct.
Q You agree they're different?
A They're different.
Q And again, $I$ realize that you didn't review prior SEC deliberations. But $I$ want to review with you some of the comments that were made by Elizabeth Muzzey during --

A Excuse me, Jeremy. I'm a little befuddled. Because you started this with the $10-m i l e ~ A P E$, now you're off in another direction. And I'm not following, --

Q Yes. No, no, no. This is why --
A I'm not following. So, --
Q All right.
A Could you be clear.
You've referred to a $10-\mathrm{mile} A P E$ as required by the rules. I've just shown you the rule that you cited talks about an "area of potential visual impact" used for aesthetics. The point I'm making is, the rules define an "APE" as set forth for historic sites, "APE", "area of potential effect". You're using "APE", and you cite to a regulation that talks about "area of
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 54/Morning Session ONLY]\{11-02-17\}
potential visual impact". And I'm asking -and that's a different -- that's a different term. "APE" and "area of potential visual impact" is different. That's the point I'm making. Would you agree with me?

A I think, while they may vary, they are not completely separate.

Q Okay. By their definition, though, and this is what I'm getting to. I want to ask you about a prior deliberation. Because you're critical of Ms. Widell for not using the 10 miles that's defined as area of potential visual impact for aesthetics. And you're equating it with the APE that you used for historic sites. And I'm going to ask you to look at the deliberations, the rulemaking deliberations regarding these SEC rules.

MR. WALKER: And, Dawn, if you could pull up Exhibit 372 .

BY MR. WALKER:
Q Which are, I'll represent to you, the rulemaking deliberations. And I'm going to show you some testimony by Elizabeth Muzzey during the deliberations. Do you know who
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]

Elizabeth Muzzey is?
A $\quad$ No.
Q Elizabeth Muzzey is the Director of the Division of Human Resources. So, she is our State SHPO. I take it that you would agree with me that her interpretation of what these rules mean would inform your opinion?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Just before you go there.

MR. WALKER: Sure.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think you
misstated Ms. Muzzey's title. I think you gave her title associated with "Human Resources".

MR. WALKER: I'm sorry, Historical
Resources. That would be more relevant. Thank you.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q So, does that make a difference? Do you know who she is?

A No. She holds a particular office in the
Historic Resources Division.
Q She's the state SHPO.
A That's right.
Q But you would agree with me that her
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[WITNESS: O'Donnell]
interpretation could inform your opinion as to what an area of --

A It's always useful to know what others have interpreted.

Q All right. Well, let's look at hers then. On Page 16 of that transcript, and this is when they're discussing this particular issue. And you can read that. But she's making a point of clarification during the deliberations. And it says "We have an "area of visual potential
effect", I believe -- "potential visual
effect", and then we have an "area of potential effect". And the phrase that incorporates "visual" is used for aesthetic consideration. And then the shorter "area of potential effect" is used for historical considerations." She's making a distinction between those two, correct?

A I have read the text. And I think it has some merit. But $I$ don't necessarily agree with it. Q Okay. Fair enough. You disagree with Director Muzzey's position on that distinction. That's fair.

A I don't think they're making a fine point.
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They're just saying they added "visual". I think one of the issues in this particular work on this Project is that many of the historic resources have a potential visual effect. And the term "visual" is used throughout the Preservation Company and Widell, the Preservation Company report and Widell's testimony.

So that the process that you've just gone through to strike the word "visual" from the area of potential effect is not fully relevant to this case, because your -- the Applicants' experts are using the term "visual" throughout.

Q I'm trying to understand why you use the "area of potential visual impact" --

A In part, by reading the Widell and Preservation Company work, and having their constant use of "visual" in their record of how they looked at the sites.

Q I think it's fair to say that you and Ms. Widell agree -- or, disagree on the interpretation of what's required under the rules?

A Correct.
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|  | 34/2 34/8 114/7 | 32/10 33/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADMIN. | 114/10 117/3 <br> DR. McLAREN: | MS. GAGNON: [4] 76/21 78/18 |
| MONROE: [1] | DR. McLAREN: <br> [1] $16 / 21$ | [4] 76/21 78/18 78/21 98/15 |
| 16/18 | MR. | MS. SAFFO: [6] |
| WAL | NEEDLEMAN: [4] | 4/12 6/5 13/24 |
| 34/16 36/20 37/23 | 23/10 25/20 29/8 | 16/14 16/22 17/23 |
| 46/15 47/15 49/7 | 31/21 | WITNESS |
| 54/18 57/24 61/24 | MR. WALKER: | O'DONNELL: [17] |
| 65/2 68/8 77/9 | [49] 33/23 34/10 | 26/14 29/11 29/14 |
| 77/24 78/22 80/5 | 34/13 36/16 36/18 | 33/24 34/4 34/12 |
| 81/12 82/17 82/24 | 37/21 46/13 47/11 | 76/14 76/23 77/2 |
| 84/13 85/5 86/6 | 49/2 54/14 57/22 | 77/6 84/10 86/2 |
| 88/9 89/1 90/4 | 61/22 64/24 68/6 | 98/12 109/22 |
| 90/23 93/3 94/15 | 76/12 76/16 76/22 | 110/19 110/22 |
| 98/18 101/14 110/6 | 77/1 77/4 77/8 | 111/1 |
| 111/4 113/19 | 78/15 78/19 79/21 | ' |
| 114/16 | 81/9 82/11 82/22 $84 / 7$ 84/12 85/3 | '70s [1] 64/6 |
| BY MS. CRANE: | 86/1 86/4 88/23 |  |
| [5] 18/7 26/19 | $90 / 290 / 2193 / 1$ |  |
| 27/24 29/15 32/11 | 94/12 98/10 98/14 | . 2 [1] 111/16 |
| BY MS. SAFFO: | $98 / 16 \quad 101 / 12$ | 0 |
| [4] 4/19 6/10 14/4 | 109/20 110/4 | 02 [1] 3/7 |
| 17/2 <br> CHAIRMAN | 110/17 110/21 | 04 [1] 3/14 |
| HAIRMAN <br> ONIGBERG: | 110/24 113/17 | 052 [1] 1/24 |
| 4/1 4/7 16/1 | 114/9 114/13 | 06 [1] 1/7 |
| 16/19 17/1 18/1 | 116/24 | 08-18-15 [1] 3/14 |
| 23/13 24/15 25/5 | MS. CRANE: [11] | 1 |
| 25/10 25/19 25/22 | 18/4 23/14 24/24 | 1,284 [1] 55/15 |
| 26/11 27/1 31/23 | 25/9 25/16 26/6 | 1-3 [1] 3/15 |
| 32/8 33/15 33/20 | 29/10 29/13 31/24 | 1-mile [7] 55/16 |


| 1 | 89/21 | 3/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-mile... [6] 56/19 | 106 [23] 38/19 | 18 [3] 2/7 3/4 6/7 |
| 95/8 95/15 95/22 | 38/20 39/3 39/1 | 180 degrees [1] |
| 99/10 109/9 | 39/13 39/17 40/5 | 107/14 |
| 10 [4] 60/22 84/21 | 42/9 42/12 42/16 | 1908 [2] 22/6 23/5 |
| 85/13 113/11 | 50/4 50/13 50/16 | 1973 [1] 63/13 |
| 10 feet [2] 9/14 | 51/6 51/14 51/24 | 1:30 [1] 117/6 |
| 10/23 | 63/19 108/13 | 2 |
| 10 miles [1] 60/5 | 108/16 108/19 109/3 109/7 109/13 | 20 feet [1] $6 / 5$ |
| 10,000 [1] 68/1 | $109 / 3$ 109/7 109/13 108 [1] 71/20 | 2005 [1] 68/2 |
| $10,146[6] 55 / 3$ $59 / 1960 / 15 / 3 / 8$ |  | 2007 [1] 65/14 |
| 59/19 60/17 63/8 $\mathbf{6 4 / 2 0} 70 / 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1 0 : 4 6}[1] \\ & \mathbf{1 0 : 5 4}[1] \\ & 34 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | 2014-04 [1] 3/14 |
| 64/20 70/12 <br> 10-mile [29] 55/21 | 10:58 [1] 34/8 <br> 11[2] 83/12 95/4 | 2015 [1] 48/18 |
| 10-mile [29] 55/21 56/11 59/8 60/18 | 11 [2] 83/12 95/4 | 2015-02 [1] 3/7 |
| 196/11 59/8 60/18 | 11-14-17 [1] 1/6 <br> 112[1] 88/13 | 2015-06 [1] 1/7 |
| 60/20 71/22 73/18 $73 / 2084 / 18$ 86/9 | 112 [1] 88/13 <br> 113 [1] 3/13 | 2016 [2] 14/8 49/5 |
| 73/20 84/18 86/9 92/12 95/17 95/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 113[1] \\ & 116[2] \\ & 5 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | 2017 [7] 1/3 2/19 |
| 92/12 95/17 95/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 116[2] 5 / 2149 / 5 \\ & 12-07-16[1] 3 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | 2/20 3/11 5/22 |
| 101/2 101/7 106/4 | $\begin{aligned} & 12-07-16[1] 3 / 8 \text { 3/8 } \\ & 12: 29[1] ~ 117 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | /20 14/2 |
| 106/8 106/10 | $13[7] 2 / 192 / 20$ | 21 [2] 56/23 56/24 |
| 106/19 107/3 107/6 |  | 22 [3] 61/16 61/21 |
| 107/16 107/22 |  | 62/15 |
| 110/10 110/11 |  | 220 [2] 99/3 99/6 |
| 111/8 111/8 112/10 |  | 252 [1] 96/10 |
| 112/17 | 55/5 57/5 59/18 | 27 [1] 67/8 |
| 100 [1] 28/21 |  | 28th [1] 5/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 100-102[1] 3 / 8 \\ & 101[1] 47 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | $65 / 19$ | 3 |
| 102 [1] 3/8 | 16[3] 3/8 65/17 | 3,024 [1] 55/2 |
| 102.23 [2] 46/13 | 115/6 | 3,700 [1] 94/20 |
| 51/1 | 16-17 [1] 3/15 | 301 [1] 110/19 |
| 102.45 [2] 88/23 | 17 [6] 1/6 2/6 2/21 | 301.05[5] 106/21 |


| 3 | 45 [1] 117/2 | 5764 [1] 54/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 301.05... [4] 110/1 | 450 [1] 21/17 | 58 [2] 2/14 6/4 |
| 110/14 110/20 | 4538 [1] 37/23 | 59 [5] 2/17 3/4 8/9 |
| 111/19 | 46 [1] 3/6 | 18/10 20/22 |
| 301.06 [1] 108/2 | 460 [1] 21/16 | 6 |
| 301.14 [1] 88/18 | 468 [5] 71/13 74/9 | 6 feet [2] 9/15 |
| 302 [1] 6/12 | 75/16 77/13 83/15 <br> 49 [1] 1/4 | 10/23 |
| 31 [1] 56/14 $310-\mathrm{A} \cdot 173$ [1] | 4d. 2 [1] 110/15 | 60 [6] 2/16 6/9 13/7 |
| 310-A:173 [1] 118/19 |  | 13/8 15/13 70/9 |
| 118/19 | 5 | 60 percent [3] |
| 32 percent [1] | 5 feet [1] 20/17 | 68/12 68/18 97/1 |
| 66/12 | 5 miles [2] 98/21 | 61 [2] 2/19 13/19 |
| 330 [1] 65/4 | 98/21 | 65 [1] 99/7 |
| $34[2] ~ 2 / 876 / 15$ $35[3] ~ 56 / 1391 / 19$ | 50 [5] 37/8 63/17 | 7 |
| 35 [3] 56/13 91/19 | 63/23 64/14 64/17 | 76 [1] 3/9 |
| 92/10 | 51 percent [1] | 76 [1] 3/9 |
| 36 [2] 50/2 108/10 | 66/18 | 8 |
| 360 [2] 76/20 76/21 | 52 [2] 16/8 118/18 | 800 [1] 108/10 |
| 360 degrees [1] | 52 miles [1] 8/2 | 85 [1] 46/20 |
| 107/14 | 54 [4] 1/3 4/3 117/8 | 85-86 [1] 3/8 |
| $366[2] 3 / 646 / 21$ | 117/12 | 86 [1] 3/8 |
| 368 [2] $3 / 1293 / 3$ $369[4]$ $3 / 976 / 14$ | 540 [1] 21/17 | 9 |
| $369[4] ~ 3 / 976 / 14$ $76 / 22$ 76/23 | 5466 [1] 57/1 | 9 |
| 76/22 76/23 | 55 [2] 2/21 17/4 | 9 percent [1] 65/15 |
| 372 [2] 3/13 113/19 | 5607 [1] 67/9 | 900 [1] 21/23 |
| 38 [1] 91/18 | 5619 [1] 93/21 | 91 [1] 65/18 |
| 39 [1] 93/20 | 5694 [1] 88/14 | 93 [2] 3/12 21/1 |
| 4 | 57 [1] 2/13 | 93 percent [1] |
| 4.2 [1] 111/2 | 5708 [1] 86/2 | 66/12 |
| 40 [1] 93/21 | 5710 [1] 94/15 | 9:00 [1] 1/3 |
| 407 [1] 96/9 | $\begin{aligned} & 5725[1] \\ & 5757[1] \\ & \mathbf{9 8} / 18 \\ & 101 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |


| A | 113/9 | acreages [3] 53/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A:173 [1] 118/19 | $\underset{\text { above [2] 20/17 }}{ }$ | 53/17 53/18 |
| ability [2] 30/5 | 50/23 above-ground [1] | acres [1] 68/1 acronym [1] 65/7 |
| 118/8 | above-ground [1] 50/23 | across [3] 18/12 |
| 23/9 61/23 73/5 | aboveground [2] | 22/7 28/13 |
| 80/16 | 34/21 98/24 | Act [1] 50/4 |
| about [74] 4/17 5/5 | Absolutely [3] 34/3 | action [3] 65/6 |
| 9/11 10/23 15/12 | 93/17 95/24 | 118/12 118/15 |
| 17/9 17/11 17/13 | ABTRS [1] 3/4 | actions [2] 62/10 |
| 19/5 20/17 21/10 | abutments [3] 21/4 | 62/11 |
| 21/16 23/18 23/22 | 22/9 24/4 | activity [2] 9/24 |
| 24/10 25/8 25/16 | Abutters [2] 18/7 | 10/1 |
| 26/21 28/21 29/6 | 19/24 | actors [1] 72/14 |
| 30/1 31/19 32/5 | accept [1] 33/4 | actual [1] 15/1 |
| 33/3 33/10 36/8 | accepted [1] 67/12 | actually [18] 5/23 |
| 38/18 39/23 40/21 | access [10] 23/8 | 10/7 10/11 12/3 |
| 41/16 48/20 48/24 | 25/2 33/3 89/7 89/9 | 29/2 31/10 56/14 |
| 52/17 52/22 53/17 | 89/10 89/16 90/9 | 60/9 69/9 73/4 |
| 54/7 55/22 56/5 | 90/11 90/13 | 76/18 78/5 78/16 |
| 58/5 58/6 59/2 | accessway [1] 16/4 | 83/11 88/22 92/12 |
| 59/10 59/15 66/8 | accommodating [1] | 105/14 111/13 |
| 68/18 70/12 74/6 | 32/19 | AD [1] 3/4 |
| 74/21 78/14 81/17 | accompany [1] | added [4] 17/20 |
| 83/2 87/6 92/14 | 40/10 | 17/22 22/22 116/1 |
| 94/9 94/11 95/19 | account [3] 50/6 | additional [3] 18/1 |
| 96/24 97/17 97/22 | 96/3 110/12 | 56/18 57/13 |
| 97/23 98/7 98/21 | accuracy [2] 7/23 | addressed [1] 26/23 |
| 104/13 106/3 106/8 | 13/5 | addresses [1] 18/19 |
| 106/9 106/11 110/8 | accurate [3] 13/1 | adds [1] 55/2 |
| 111/3 111/6 111/14 | 67/14 118/5 | adjacent [2] 4/24 |
| 112/19 112/24 | acreage [1] 67/24 | 32/15 |



104/13 112/5 against [2] 12/13 103/2
age [2] 65/20 75/4 agencies [1] 50/5 agency [1] 52/16 ago [1] 40/24 agree [28] 5/1 6/4 28/6 42/12 44/7 52/19 55/17 59/17 60/16 63/21 70/14 82/19 89/7 91/7 91/10 98/2 99/8 100/10 103/16 108/14 108/18 111/1 112/3 113/5 114/5 114/24 115/20 116/21 agreement [1] 90/10
ahead [4] 41/2 52/14 53/21 111/12 aid [1] 72/15
aligns [1] 107/10 all [63] 6/23 15/24 17/16 25/14 33/14 33/16 33/21 34/9 34/18 37/7 40/6 40/8 40/13 48/15 56/8 57/9 57/11 61/7 66/19 67/5 68/6 69/5 70/24

71/10 72/4 75/23 77/15 78/24 81/7 83/14 83/24 84/1 84/16 87/24 88/2 88/4 89/8 90/10 90/15 90/17 91/9 91/15 92/6 92/9
92/24 92/24 93/15
94/18 97/9 98/3
98/7 99/12 100/5
100/22 102/23
103/9 105/17 106/7
106/22 108/7
111/20 112/15
115/5
allowed [1] 26/5
Almost [1] 68/11
along [9] 17/16
21/19 53/20 72/13
88/12 98/21 100/1
104/4 107/12
already [3] 32/6 58/5 105/9
also [30] 1/18 4/16 17/20 22/5 24/10 35/19 41/21 46/8 47/13 48/19 51/18 55/22 69/15 73/2 73/7 74/13 76/2 76/9 77/23 78/5 81/19 82/13 82/15 82/19 85/1 87/11

| A |
| :--- |
| also... [4] 90/20 | 93/8 104/2 111/23 alteration [2] 10/16 22/24

altogether [1]
11/12
always [4] 16/2 45/6 68/3 115/3
am [10] 13/23
23/15 33/24 34/15
45/20 59/10 61/17
118/10 118/12
118/14
amount [1] 66/10 analysis [14] 19/8 21/3 24/14 25/3
25/9 26/22 27/22
40/6 40/7 75/3
85/12 86/19 87/8 96/3
analyze [2] 11/1 58/16
analyzed [2] 20/17 51/9
analyzing [1] 106/18
anecdotal [1] 62/19 Anecdotally [1] 75/24
another [15] 7/13 8/11 12/8 24/5 28/3

44/23 54/9 62/14 69/7 69/8 73/3 85/9 91/5 112/11 117/2 answer [11] 15/15
16/13 25/12 26/13
27/4 27/6 29/3
29/23 30/17 41/3 73/5
answered [1] 48/12 anticipate [1] 25/18 Antrim [3] 45/17 54/8 70/21 any [37] 5/14 10/16 12/3 16/21 21/2 25/8 31/19 32/23
33/10 34/23 35/9 38/8 42/13 43/16 48/16 49/17 63/9 64/21 68/15 69/13
70/16 71/7 75/3
75/6 75/15 75/21
76/3 81/3 81/4 81/5
82/15 85/12 96/3
96/3 96/15 118/11 118/13
anybody [1] 33/19
anyone [3] 43/8 52/10 52/15
anything [3] 4/5 5/9 62/8
14/13
anyway [1] 19/6
apart [1] 55/4

APE [37] 41/21
55/16 55/21 56/11
56/19 59/8 68/18
70/23 71/22 73/19
84/18 86/9 92/13
95/8 95/15 99/10
101/2 106/8 106/10 106/14 106/19
107/4 107/6 107/22 108/24 109/9
110/10 110/11
111/9 111/22
112/10 112/17
112/21 112/22
112/23 113/3
113/14
Apologies [1] 80/12 apologize [1] 16/23
APP [4] 3/6 3/9
3/12 3/13
appearance [1] 7/10
Appearances [1] 1/23
appeared [1] 25/14 appearing [2] 4/23 6/23
appears [2] 6/3
appendix [2] 84/5 94/15
Applicant [10] 8/24

| A | 15/16 | 9/11 10/14 12/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applicant... [9] | approximately [1 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 12/18 13/16 } & 13 / 17 \\ 14 / 11 & 15 / 7 & 15 / 7\end{array}$ |
| 11/24 26/19 32/7 | archeological [4] | $\begin{array}{lll} 14 / 11 & 15 / 7 & 15 / 7 \\ 17 / 21 & 20 / 8 & 20 / 9 \end{array}$ |
| 34/16 69/18 70/2 | $34 / 2435 / 235 / 6$ | 20/16 21/18 21/20 |
| 110/14 | 108/8 | 22/4 22/9 22/10 |
| Applicants [3] | are [121] | 22/22 23/21 24/15 |
| 46/21 49/5 69/11 | area [30] 20/15 | 26/3 26/9 27/9 |
| Applicants' [6] | 21/7 21/20 28/16 | 27/14 27/21 27/22 |
| 18/14 18/18 18/20 | 36/22 51/3 51/11 | 27/23 29/22 30/5 |
| 23/23 58/20 116/12 | 51/19 55/10 66/13 | 32/16 39/13 44/7 |
| application [6] 1/8 | 66/20 66/20 104/15 | 44/14 44/14 45/2 |
| 27/19 44/18 47/4 | 108/9 108/11 111/3 | 50/21 51/7 51/21 |
| 50/20 107/19 | 111/14 111/21 | 53/9 57/14 60/7 |
| applications [1] | 111/24 112/19 | 61/9 69/3 70/5 |
| 48/20 | 112/22 112/24 | 73/16 74/10 74/11 |
| applied [6] 43/17 | 113/3 113/12 115/2 | 76/20 85/15 85/22 |
| 44/5 69/10 100/11 | 115/10 115/12 | 85/22 86/19 87/4 |
| 100/11 110/13 | 115/15 116/11 | 87/9 88/15 90/20 |
| applies [2] 52/16 | 116/14 | 91/3 91/23 92/18 |
| 69/6 | areas [5] 86/10 | 94/1 99/16 100/16 |
| apply [3] 44/22 | 95/14 102/14 | 102/5 105/1 105/21 |
| 46/13 47/6 | 106/22 108/7 | 106/6 106/10 108/9 |
| applying [1] 59/9 | arena [1] 40/16 <br> arisen [1] 12/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112/17 112/21 } \\ & 113 / 12115 / 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| appreciate [2] 40/2 | arisen [1] 12/3 <br> around [2] 55/15 | 113/12 115/1 117/11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 75 / 14 \\ & \text { apprehensive [1] } \end{aligned}$ | around [2] 55/15 $62 / 12$ | 117/11 ${ }^{\text {Ashland [5] 18/6 }}$ |
| 33/3 | article [1] 22/6 | 18/12 22/7 22/10 |
| approach [5] 18/14 $18 / 2441 / 1187 / 19$ | 72/17 109/4 | ask [25] 16/24 18/1 |
| 106/12 | $\begin{array}{ccc} \text { as }[80] & 1 / 13 & 5 / 16 \\ 5 / 16 & 8 / 2 & 8 / 23 \\ 9 / 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 25 / 8 & 25 / 15 \\ 29 / 13 & 36 / 7 \\ 37 / 18 \end{array}$ |



| B | 22/16 23/1 23/7 | 70/10 70/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bare-earth... [10] | 23/10 24/22 24/23 | 71/6 71/21 |
| 87/18 101/3 101/23 | 26/8 27/14 29/8 | 74/21 74/21 76/3 |
| 102/16 102/20 | 29/18 29/21 30/17 | 76/4 78/7 78/8 |
| 103/2 103/5 103/21 | 31/5 32/5 32/17 | 79/16 80/24 83/6 |
| 104/21 105/6 | 33/9 33/22 42/20 | 86/16 86/21 87/7 |
| based [14] 35/1 | 44/8 44/10 44/24 | 87/9 91/3 92/18 |
| 37/3 48/7 66/6 | 48/1 48/2 50/19 | 97/13 99/1 991 |
| 68/13 78/3 83/5 | 54/23 58/18 68/1 | 99/5 99/6 100/7 |
| 92/7 92/9 92/12 | 69/1 69/19 70/7 | 102/16 103/4 |
| 99/9 101/23 106/23 | 73/5 75/18 79/18 | 103/14 105/7 |
| 107/16 | 81/1 85/18 87/20 | 105/23 106/8 |
| baseline [2] 12/12 | 91/6 91/15 | 111/21 112/10 |
| 38/16 | 97/1 97/1 | 113/10 116/12 |
| basically [2] 12/8 | 97/24 98/24 99/19 | become [1] 32/24 |
| 6/2 | 99/22 99/23 100/7 | becomes [1] 66/23 |
| basis [8] 56/12 | 100/8 101/22 | bed [1] $7 / 5$ |
| 58/12 60/12 60/15 | 102/19 104/23 | been [36] 5/12 |
| 87/21 107/3 107/5 | 105/18 106/2 | 11/24 17/15 20/11 |
| 107/5 | 106/23 109/1 | 21/11 23/9 23/13 |
| Bates [6] | 112/16 114/15 | 23/23 24/9 26/11 |
| 54/16 57/167/9 | became [3] 24/13 | 27/22 28/7 31/23 |
| 88/14 93/21 | 30/7 48/18 | 1/16 43/12 46/8 |
| be [88] 4/14 4/23 | because [62] 9/24 | 51/5 52/20 63/9 |
| 5/1 5/2 5/24 6/2 6/3 | 10/5 11/3 20/5 | 63/17 64/8 64/12 |
| 6/12 6/13 6/23 7/16 | 27/15 27/18 28/13 | 64/21 65/16 65/17 |
| 9/1 9/4 9/8 9/13 | 28/18 32/8 32/19 | 65/19 65/23 69/14 |
| 9/18 10/4 10/24 | 39/14 46/18 48/14 | 70/2 74/1 75/23 |
| 11/16 11/20 12/14 | 56/6 59/2 59/17 | 1/2 96/18 100/14 |
| 12/18 12/20 13/13 | 61/4 61/11 62/21 | 107/22 111/22 |
| 15/15 15/16 15/21 | 63/3 64/6 67/16 | before [14] 4/6 34/2 |
| 18/10 18/24 20/20 | 69/12 69/21 70/3 | 34/14 36/7 38/10 |

before... [9] 45/18 48/20 49/15 49/18
52/9 53/3 54/1 68/17 114/8
befuddled [1] 112/9 begins [1] 16/11 being [8] 43/7
51/21 61/10 62/7 68/1 71/5 80/22 100/20
believe [12] 9/15
13/7 25/1 25/10
25/13 26/15 32/1
40/12 49/20 52/12
71/21 115/11
below [1] 57/15
benefit [1] 101/20
besides [1] 29/8
best [3] 22/14 22/23 118/7
Bethlehem [2] 2/16 6/12
better [3] 19/16 21/12 25/2
between [3] 78/10 108/17 115/17 beyond [3] 85/5 105/18 105/19 big [1] 28/13
Bisbee [1] 33/22
bit [10] 5/5 13/12

15/3 19/16 21/10 21/18 36/8 58/5 79/14 104/19
blended [1] 82/15
blown [1] 36/23
blue [4] 19/20
20/24 23/3 103/9
bodies [1] 32/20
Boisvert [6] 46/2
46/18 46/23 46/24
47/17 52/8
both [5] 3/10 32/20
74/1 75/13 106/24
bottom [4] 5/23
47/14 95/13 95/13
boundaries [1]
19/21
box [1] 79/17
Boyle [5] 71/18
72/13 73/14 78/6
86/14
break [5] 34/2 34/4
55/4 117/3 117/5
Brennan [1] 1/20
bridge [5] 21/4 22/8
23/3 24/3 24/3
Bridgewater [3]
20/15 21/15 31/2
bring [3] 9/23
54/14 54/15
broad [3] 29/15
30/16 84/19
broader [2] 42/8 55/23
broadly [1] 42/20
broken [1] $7 / 5$
brought [1] 45/19
buffer [2] 20/21
28/23
buffers [3] 24/11
28/7 28/12
build [1] 12/16
building [3] 11/9
31/8 69/16
built [5] 6/24 7/1
7/3 7/4 13/15
bulk [3] 91/17
91/23 92/6
Bunker [3] 35/19
35/21 35/23
Bunker's [1] 35/10
Bureau [3] 2/19
14/3 14/9
burying [1] 8/16
Business [1] 1/15
C
C.F.R [2] 50/2 108/10
calculate [1] 5/10
call [5] 6/20 7/10 7/18 64/15 66/6
called [3] 10/18 58/3 106/13
calling [2] 29/10

| C | Caron [1] 1/20 | 99/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66/3 | case [23] 6/17 34/20 | certificate [2] 1/10 |
| calls [1] 27/13 | 35/11 36/1 37/11 | 50/12 |
| came [8] 42/18 | 41/11 42/5 42/6 | certify [2] 118/4 |
| 42/22 42/24 60/9 | 45/22 46/1 46/10 | 118/10 |
| 63/13 84/24 85/1 | 46/13 51/5 55/18 | CFP5700 [1] 84/8 |
| 109/8 | 69/7 69/8 69/17 | Chair [1] 23/11 |
| camp [3] 81/14 | 73/8 83/16 107/2 | Chairman [1] |
| 81/17 82/2 | 108/22 116/12 | 117/1 |
| Campton [2] 2/18 | 118/14 | chance [1] 100/19 |
| 8/10 | cases [1] 99/19 | change [2] 31/14 |
| can [38] 7/8 9/6 | categorically [2] | 67/11 |
| 9/19 10/8 10/13 | 8/15 48/14 | changes [1] 29/20 |
| 11/2 11/16 15/5 | categories [17] 56/9 | changing [1] 12/6 |
| 15/21 21/9 24/20 | 57/3 57/14 58/11 | Chapter [2] 91/16 |
| 29/7 31/9 31/19 | 59/4 59/12 62/13 | 108/5 |
| 33/9 36/15 36/22 | 62/15 69/12 84/2 | Chapter 4 [1] 91/16 |
| 39/23 41/11 47/18 | 84/19 84/20 85/23 | Chapter 5 [1] 108/5 |
| 53/16 58/4 61/3 | 99/8 100/13 100/14 | Chapters [1] 92/4 |
| 62/3 70/14 78/17 | 102/24 | character [3] 7/12 |
| 78/24 79/5 79/22 | categorizing [2] | 17/18 30/6 |
| 83/12 84/10 87/11 | 53/23 91/13 | character-defining |
| 89/18 93/8 98/2 | category [10] 56/11 | [2] 7/12 17/18 |
| 103/6 110/18 115/8 | 57/5 57/13 57/21 | characterizations |
| can't [12] 7/13 11/1 | 58/2 59/17 66/2 | [1] 25/22 |
| 11/5 11/11 12/15 | 85/9 87/5 91/2 | characterize [1] |
| 13/9 36/15 62/3 | caveat [1] 101/24 | 101/5 |
| 79/24 100/8 104/23 | central [2] 44/19 | characterized [1] |
| /5 | 101/16 | 91/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { candidates [1] } \\ & 41 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | centuries [1] 28/14 certainly [5] 8/12 17/22 32/4 81/22 | Charlotte [1] 18/6 chart [6] 40/14 65/11 66/12 80/22 |


| C | 109/4 | 84/4 85/7 98/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| chart... [2] 96/13 | clients [1] 37/14 | Committee's |
| 96/17 | cliffs [1] 21/24 | 43/21 101/20 |
| checked [1] 79/19 | close [5] 5/24 6/3 | common [2] 32/1 |
| Cherilyn [1] 76/6 | 6/14 12/18 19/19 | 64/3 |
| choosing [2] 80/8 | closely [1] 91/14 | commonly [1] |
| 80/9 | Cmsr [1] 1/14 <br> color [1] 102/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21/19 } \\ & \text { community [21] } \end{aligned}$ |
| chose [1] 92/16 | colors [1] 103/9 | 3/9 37/13 58/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Christmas [1] } \\ & 83 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | column [6] 79/4 | 62/20 62/23 71/12 |
| Christop | 79/17 79/21 80/2 | 1/15 71/23 72/12 |
| /15 | 1/4 80/7 | 7/15 76/11 77/12 |
| Chrmn [1] 1/13 | columns [2] 79/8 | 7/3 78/4 78/ |
| circle [2] 20/13 | 79/16 | 81/22 82/7 82/17 |
| 22/15 | combination [1] | 81/4 86/5 10 |
| circles [1] |  | community's [1] |
| citation [2] 88/17 | combined [1] 19/2 | 83/9 |
| 109/19 | 6/24 | community-ide |
| cite [3] 68/1 110/14 |  | ed [1] 77/12 |
| 112/24 |  | community-value |
| cited [5] 56/1 64/22 | 67/19 67/20 79/11 | [1] 104/6 |
| 65/8 108/5 112/19 | coming [3] 14/2 | company [15] 1/9 |
| citizens [1] 72/10 | 49/21 95/18 | 5/15 36/24 55/1 |
| ification | Comm [2] 1/13 | 2 76/2 76/8 |
| /9 | 1/14 | 78/2 87/15 95/3 |
| clarify [1] 15/5 | comments [1] | /23 116/6 |
| classified [1] 27/22 | 112/7 | 116/7 116/17 |
| clear [9] 10/22 | COMMITTEE [15 | comparable [1] |
| 28/14 42/7 84/23 | 1/2 1/12 43/17 | 6 |
| 95/12 95/14 105/19 | 45/14 46/24 48/2 | comp |
| 106/2 112/16 | 53/4 54/22 57/10 | complete [1] 11/6 |
| clearly [2] 72/17 | 68/15 69/6 82/9 | completely [2] |


| C | 108/21 | consider [4] 45/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| completely... [2] | conclusions [2] <br> 23/19 31/19 | 63/9 68/16 75/3 |
| 51/22 113/7 | 23/19 31/19 | considerable [2] 16/10 32/18 |
| compliance [2] | Concord [2] 1/4 $83 / 18$ | consideration [4] |
| 39/17 40/16 | concurred [1 | 41/14 41/23 107/1 |
| complicated [2] <br> 11/14 15/4 | 109/6 | 115/14 |
| componen | conditions [2] | considerations [1] |
| 39/13 65/20 | 106/24 118/8 | 115/16 |
| components [1] | conflate [2] 74/13 | considered [10] |
| 39/16 | 83/23 | 51/14 69/1 69/13 |
| compromised [1] | conflated [2] 41/13 | 69/19 70/18 71/5 |
| 30/20 | 74/24 | 75/1 76/1 87/15 |
| compromises [1] | confused [1] 32/5 | 100/15 |
| 30/18 | confusing [1] 24/1 | considering [2] |
| concept [1] 72/9 | conjunction [1] | 43/22 63/6 |
| concepts [1] 92/5 | 71/18 | consistent [3] 18/23 |
| conceptual [2] 92/3 | Conkling [5] 78/20 | 19/9 100/1 |
| 92/22 | 79/2 79/8 79/11 | consistently [2] |
| conceptually [1] | 81/5 | 100/11 100/15 |
| 69/17 | conservation [11] | consisting [4] 3/4 |
| concern [2] 19/3 | 57/18 59/6 62/12 | 3/4 3/8 3/14 |
| 29/18 | 62/14 62/16 66/2 | constant [1] 116/ |
| concerns [2] 29/6 | 66/2 68/24 84/2 | construction [11] |
| 29/8 | 102/3 102/23 | 6/22 7/19 8/8 9/6 |
| conclude [1] 23/9 | conservative [2] | 9/7 9/8 9/20 12/14 |
| concluded [1] | 27/18 87/19 | 32/18 37/17 43/4 |
| $20 / 19$ | conserve [2] 62/24 | construed [1] 42/20 |
| concludes [1] 117/8 | 65/6 | consult [5] 42/21 |
| conclusion [8] 31/5 | conserved [6] 64/8 | 43/8 52/8 52/10 |
| 36/2 36/4 42/18 | 64/12 85/8 85/15 | 52/15 |
| 42/21 42/22 43/1 | 104/14 104/18 | consultation [2] |


| C | 74/13 82/21 84/21 | 100/8 101/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| consultation... [2] | 86/15 87/22 87/23 | 101/22 109/21 |
| 108/12 108/22 | 90/12 90/14 90/16 | 112/16 113/18 |
| contained [1] 22/3 | 93/10 95/7 99/13 | 115/1 |
| Contents [1] 14/6 | 101/4 101/6 101/19 | couldn't [1] 25/17 |
| Continuation [1] | 103/12 103/15 | counsel [12] 1/19 |
| 10 | 103/22 106/16 | 1/19 34/15 71/18 |
| continue [2] 32/5 | 110/17 112/2 | 72/3 72/9 72/11 |
| 33/11 | 115/18 116/24 | 75/7 75/8 75/9 |
| continued [3] 3/2 | corrected [1] 54/13 | 118/11 118/14 |
| 26/7 77/22 | correctly [1] 61/18 | Counsel's [1] 72/8 |
| continues [2] 47/14 | corridor [22] 16/5 | count [4] 59/1 60/1 |
| 7/10 | 81/24 84/12 84/17 | 60/7 83/17 |
| ours [1] 2 | 84/18 86/9 92/20 | counted [3] 59/1 |
| rol [1] 8/7 | 92/20 93/7 97/15 | 74/17 83/14 |
| trols [1] 67/7 | 100/1 101/7 104 | counting [1] 83/15 |
| copy [1] 89/23 | 105/20 106/4 107/7 | counts [15] 53/8 |
| corner [5] 65/12 | 107/10 107/13 | 53/17 55/9 59/19 |
| 93/14 94/10 94/18 | 107/23 109 | 59/19 70/12 82/10 |
| 97/3 | 109/17 109/18 | 92/9 96/2 96/5 9 |
| corners [1] 97/2 | could [41] 5/5 | 99/3 99/7 99/9 |
| rrect [54] 5/13 | 10/13 22/23 23/12 | 104/20 |
| 1 9/7 11/13 | 25/7 25/15 29/23 | couple [2] 73/9 |
| 1/20 16/14 17/16 | 31/18 31/23 3 | 93/19 |
| 1 19/3 19/4 | 36/11 41/8 46/14 | course [2] 45/3 48, |
| 25/13 26/19 34/21 | 47/13 48/2 49/3 | COURT [5] 1/24 |
| 34/22 36/13 40/19 | 54/15 54/23 59/7 | /21 88/6 118/4 |
| 40/20 41/19 48/10 | 64/11 65/1 68/7 | 8/18 |
| 48/14 49/10 50/18 | 74/1 76/13 82/12 | cover [1] 117/10 |
| 53/10 53/12 55/11 | 82/23 85/4 88/24 | covered [4] 28/16 |
| 56/13 56/21 | 90/3 90/2 | 28/17 66/10 93/20 |
| 57/22 58/13 68/5 | 94 | craft [1] 7/9 |


| C | 62/21 | 76/19 77/11 78/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| crafted [1] 7/7 | 63/12 63/14 63/17 | 84/22 |
| Crane [7] 2/7 18/3 | 64/5 64/9 64/11 | database [2] 85/1 |
| 18/6 23/14 25/24 | 64/21 65/5 65/13 | 85/2 |
| 27/3 31/24 | 65/16 65/18 65/19 | te [1] 118/7 |
| create [1] 84/23 | 65/24 66/5 66/10 | dated [1] 49/4 |
| created [2] 22/20 | 66/21 66/23 67/1 | Dawn [33] 36/11 |
| 103/4 | 67/8 67/13 67/18 | 37/22 41/7 46/14 |
| criteria [1] 60/19 | 67/24 68/2 68/3 | 47/12 47/18 49/3 |
| critical [4] 65/21 | 68/13 68/15 69/1 | 54/15 57/23 61/24 |
| 65/23 87/12 113/10 | 70/1 70/3 70/4 70/9 | 65/1 68/7 76/13 |
| criticism [4] 41/17 | 70/14 70/18 70/19 | 78/17 79/22 81/11 |
| 41/20 41/24 87/21 | 71/1 71/571/6 | 82/12 82/23 83/12 |
| criticisms [2] 41/10 | 96/10 96/14 96/2 | 84/9 85/4 86/2 |
| 106/12 | 97/2 97/4 97/9 | 88/24 90/3 90/22 |
| cross [6] 2/6 2/7 2/8 | 97/10 97/12 97/13 | 93/3 94/13 98/11 |
| 4/11 25/4 25/19 | 97/14 99/5 99/6 | 101/13 109/21 |
| ss-examination | 99/12 99/15 99 | 110/6 110/18 |
| ${ }^{\text {[5] }}$ 2/6 2/7 2/8 4/11 | 100/5 103/13 | 113/18 |
| 25/19 | 104/14 104/16 | day [6] $1 / 3$ 3/6 4/3 |
| cultural [9] 7/11 | 104/22 | 21/16 117/8 117/12 |
| 11/10 11/12 12/7 | cut [1] 9/14 | de [2] 62/16 66/2 |
| 12/17 14/24 17/18 | CV [2] 37/20 39/11 | dealing [2] 42/19 |
| 37/13 57/15 | D | 46/9 |
| culturally [1] 69/4 | d. 2 [1] 111/18 | decades [1] 35/4 |
| current [79] 5/16 | D.C [1] 39/18 | December [1] |
| 11/2 11/20 22/23 | d/b/a [1] 1/9 |  |
| 55/4 57/18 | dash [1] 95/17 | mber 2015 |
| 59/16 59/21 60/1 | data [14] 12/12 |  |
| 60/6 60/10 61/8 | 23/8 59/3 59/6 |  |
| 61/11 61/15 62/4 | 59/11 60/6 60/9 | decision [1] 71/3 <br> decisions [1] 44/4 |
| 62/7 62/13 62/16 | 61/6 63/11 65/9 |  |

deep [2] 9/15 10/24 Deerfield [1] 18/7 define [1] 112/21 defined [8] 12/22 30/5 38/20 88/22 108/10 111/23
111/24 113/12 defines [1] 90/7 defining [4] 7/11 7/12 17/18 91/14 definitely [2] 6/5 42/11
definition [26] 42/3 42/4 42/8 42/9
43/22 47/5 47/7
50/24 52/2 53/10
55/23 61/10 62/6
87/4 88/1 88/16
88/19 89/4 89/17
90/18 90/19 90/21
91/10 91/11 91/12 113/8
definitions [2]
41/13 88/20
degradation [2]
30/14 30/17
degree [1] 7/23
degrees [2] 107/14 107/14
deliberation [3] 48/1 48/3 113/10
deliberations [18] 3/7 43/21 44/1 44/2 45/22 46/10 46/18 46/22 47/2 47/2 48/7 71/4 112/6 113/15 113/16
113/22 113/24 115/9
density [4] 92/21 92/22 102/22 104/3 Department [3] 14/3 14/21 15/9 depending [2] 20/21 21/23
depiction [3] 22/19 23/2 94/17
Dept [2] 1/15 1/16 Deputy [5] 46/5 46/7 46/19 48/8 48/15
derived [1] 78/5 describe [3] 57/2 73/12 95/3
described [6] 55/23
55/24 56/6 85/15
86/12 100/12
describing [2]
68/11 110/16
description [2] 37/4DeWan's [2] 24/2 92/11
descriptions [1] 38/15
design [4] 15/1 37/2 37/15 37/16
designated [1]

## 99/16

designation [1] 7/2
Designee [2] 1/15
1/16
Despite [1] 109/12 detail [1] 4/19
detailed [1] 14/4
details [2] 9/6 67/11
determination [1] 20/2
determinations [2] 23/22 24/8
determine [5]
14/19 18/20 19/13 43/16 64/1
determined [2] 108/11 108/23
determining [1] 15/24
developing [1] 20/10
development [1] 31/11
DeWan [2] 25/5 25/6 24/15
DHR [8] 48/19
49/22 50/15 52/1

| D | 55/20 56/9 59/4 | dismissed [1] 69/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DHR... [4] 52/10 | 71/17 74/22 76/12 | distance [3] 8/13 |
| 52/15 108/23 109/5 | 77/12 83/21 84/1 | 15/22 75/21 |
| diagram [3] 86/9 | 84/6 84/19 85/22 | distinction [2] |
| 101/22 103/18 | 99/7 103/8 109/11 | 115/17 115/22 |
| diagrams [1] 106/9 | 109/16 112/3 112/4 | district [2] 51/11 |
| did [45] 25/4 26/16 | 113/2 113/2 113/4 | 51/19 |
| 34/23 35/5 35/9 | differently [1] | disturb [2] 10/13 |
| 35/20 35/21 35/24 | 44 | 10/14 |
| 36/1 36/3 38/7 | difficult [1] 7/15 | disturbance [2] |
| 39/21 40/3 40/8 | digging [1] 9/24 | 9/17 |
| 42/20 42/21 43/8 | dimension [1] | Division [9] 2/21 |
| 43/10 43/16 43/19 | 107/14 | 15/7 15/13 17/5 |
| 43/20 43/20 45/22 | direct [6] 24/15 | 17/10 17/14 46/6 |
| 45/23 48/17 49/17 | 24/24 49/13 72/10 | 114/4 114/21 |
| 52/8 52/9 52/15 | 76/3 82/7 | do [63] 4/5 4/24 5/7 |
| 53/24 58/16 58/23 | direction [3] | 5/7 6/4 6/18 7/22 |
| 58/24 63/8 63/14 | 109/11 109/16 | 8/14 8/20 9/15 |
| 73/19 73/23 75/2 | 112/11 | 10/17 13/1 13/11 |
| 75/3 75/24 77/18 | directional [1] 10/1 | 15/14 17/5 18/15 |
| 83/22 83/22 86/11 | Director [3] 46/5 | 20/1 20/12 21/2 |
| 83 | 114/3 115/21 | 21/6 26/13 26/16 |
| didn't [13] 41/3 | disagree [6] 35/17 | 27/10 32/22 33/9 |
| 51/17 72/2 72/14 | 36/4 36/6 71/7 | 35/9 36/6 37/10 |
| 75/14 75/21 76/3 | 115/21 116/21 | 38/3 40/8 44/16 |
| 78/8 81/3 81/4 | discusses [1] 108/6 | 45/12 46/2 47/11 |
| 84/23 103/4 112/5 | discussing [1] | 48/23 52/4 52/19 |
| difference [2] 55/1 | 115/7 | 52/20 53/19 58/20 |
| 114/18 | discussion [3] | 71/7 73/24 75/3 |
| different [28] 16/9 | 45/19 46/11 46/20 | 75/9 75/14 75/21 |
| 40/18 44/24 47/22 | discussions [1] 16/2 | 76/3 77/16 78/14 |
| 51/22 53/7 55/19 | dismantle [1] 10/7 | 78/17 81/3 81/4 | don't [51] 4/17 8/12 13/18 28/18 47/15 11/3 11/6 11/19

12/8 12/11 16/12
20/5 22/13 25/24
26/13 27/2 28/4
28/11 29/4 30/23
31/9 37/9 39/13
41/4 44/10 45/16
52/7 56/18 63/21
64/20 67/21 74/24
75/15 75/20 75/20
79/23 84/10 85/11
85/12 88/2 89/10 89/14 90/1 92/21
94/24 96/2 96/14
96/15 97/18 100/10
103/13 115/20
115/24 117/4
done [13] 5/12 7/15 25/16 38/10 39/2 39/6 39/10 40/14 40/17 40/23 76/8 86/10 86/13
Donovan [1] 1/4
Dore [1] 1/19
dot [2] 2/19 105/22
dots [3] 102/23 103/11 103/18 dotted [1] 94/21 double [1] 83/15 doubts [1] 24/10
down [12] 7/16 57/15 77/6 78/17 78/19 84/9 90/20 90/23 110/8
DR [3] 3/11 16/19 16/21
Dr. [8] 35/10 35/23
46/2 46/18 46/23
46/24 47/17 52/8
Dr. Boisvert [5]
46/18 46/23 46/24 47/17 52/8
Dr. Bunker [1] 35/23
Dr. Bunker's [1] 35/10
Dr. Richard [1] 46/2
dramatically [1]
55/14
drawings [1] $9 / 9$ drilling [5] 10/2 10/6 10/6 10/8 10/12
due [1] 92/20
duplicated [1] 83/18
durability [1] 27/12 during [5] 7/20 8/7 112/8 113/24 115/9

| E | effort [1] 16/10 | enough [7] 11/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| earlier [7] 10/14 | eight [2] 84/6 100/2 | 37/18 49/21 64/ |
| 21/22 23/13 56/6 | either [3] 20/12 | 80/21 106/1 11 |
| 64/8 106/11 109/12 | 73/15 109/2 | Enrolled [1] 65/13 |
| early [1] 64/6 | Electronically [1] | enter [1] 89/14 |
| earth [18] 3/5 18/10 | 1/6 |  |
| 27/17 27/21 86/13 | eligibility [6] 38/22 | 100/1 100/13 |
| 86/16 86/21 87/13 | 40/6 43/6 48/4 | environmen |
| 87/18 101/3 101/23 | 58/17 63/18 | 2/19 14/4 14/9 |
| 102/16 102/20 | eligible [9] 41/18 | 29/21 65/7 107/12 |
| 103/2 103/5 103/21 | 42/14 42/17 47/9 | equally [1] 48/2 |
| 104/21 105/6 | 47/20 48/10 51/12 | equate [1] 40/11 |
| eastern [1] 20/23 | 57/6 69/14 | equating [6] 48/9 |
| Economic [1] 1/15 | eliminated [1] | 50/15 51/16 52/2 |
| edge [3] 8/13 93/12 | 41/22 | 109/13 11 |
| 95/19 | Elizabeth [4] 112/8 | Esq [2] 1/19 1/19 |
| edges [1] 10/21 | 113/23 114/1 114/3 | essentially [3] 7/7 |
| effect [13] 35/17 | Elizabeths [1] | 28/2 39/1 |
| 36/5 63/13 70/11 | 39/18 | estimated [1] 68/13 |
| 108/11 111/4 | else [2] 43/8 52/10 | etc [1] 3/5 |
| 112/23 115/11 | employed [2] | evaluate [1] 8/19 |
| 115/12 115/13 | 118/11 118/14 | evaluated [1] 23/13 |
| 115/15 116/4 | employee [1] | evaluating [1] |
| 116/11 | 118/13 | 15/19 |
| effective [3] 27/19 | enacted [1] 64/6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { evaluation [3] } 1 / 2 \\ & 1 / 1214 / 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 37/16 48/18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { encapsulate [1] } \\ & 37 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | 1/12 14/10 <br> even [15] 8/14 10/1 |
| effects [14] 38/23 | end [1] 102/13 | even [15] 8/14 10/1 $10 / 6 \quad 12 / 1129 / 19$ |
| 38/24 40/7 40/7 | ends [1] 79/13 | 45/14 65/19 71/3 |
| 50/6 69/20 69/21 | $\text { energy [2] } 1 / 10$ | 85/3 99/10 100/19 |
| 108/9 110/2 110/21 | 50/12 | 102/14 103/20 |
| 110/23 | engage [1] 38/14 | 104/20 105/6 |


| E |
| :--- |
| event [1] 83/20 |

Eversource [1] 1/9 every [1] 38/17 everybody [1]

## 73/17

everyone [1] 4/3 everything [3]
11/24 37/10 105/21 evidence [2] 5/14 62/19
exact [3] 8/12 8/17 32/1
exactly [4] 10/22 12/19 22/13 82/11 examination [5] $2 / 6$ 2/7 2/8 4/11 25/19 examined [3] 18/21 26/10 26/24
example [2] 94/2 104/4
examples [2] 92/18 100/16
excavation [2] 9/16 10/13
except [1] 22/9 exception [2] 50/11 50/19
exceptions [1] 64/17
excerpt [4] 3/6 3/13 67/16 88/9

## excerpting [2] <br> 47/24 108/15

excerpts [3] 48/8
89/24 108/20
excuse [3] 39/22
76/24 112/9
exhibit [21] 2/12
3/3 6/4 6/9 8/9 13/7
13/8 13/19 15/13
16/24 17/4 18/9
20/22 46/21 49/5
65/4 76/14 76/20
93/1 97/19 113/19
Exhibit 58 [1] 6/4
Exhibit 59 [2] 8/9 20/22
Exhibit 60 [4] 6/9
13/7 13/8 15/13
Exhibit 61 [1]
13/19
exhibits [2] 6/10 100/24
exist [2] 18/16
31/15
existing [2] 5/2 29/1
exists [2] 9/9 22/9
expect [1] 31/9
experience [4]
30/12 32/23 35/2
36/8
expert [4] 18/18
20/19 23/7 71/19
expert's [1] 31/5 expertise [2] 33/7 37/1
experts [3] 18/20
23/24 116/13
explained [2] 53/4
72/6
explanation [1]
102/1
expressed [1] 43/7
extensive [1] 8/6
face [1] 83/6
faced [1] 44/24
Facility [1] 1/10
fact [7] 11/5 20/20
26/17 28/8 29/17
59/20 72/6
facto [2] 62/16 66/2
factors [1] 107/2
fair [18] $4 / 2116 / 8$
37/3 37/18 48/6
49/21 64/4 64/13
64/17 77/9 80/21
92/6 100/9 101/3
106/1 115/21
115/23 116/20
faith [2] 23/22 24/9
fall [1] 27/10
fallen [2] 6/16 13/18
familiar [5] 13/21

F
few [5] 18/12 48/3
70/8 72/22 78/14 field [1] 19/14
figure [2] 20/11
21/9
filed [2] 1/6 23/21
filled [2] 74/3 80/10
filter [5] 61/3 75/6
75/19 95/24 98/4
filtered [3] 19/17
26/18 26/23
filtering [4] 26/8
75/15 81/3 82/5
final [1] 80/13
financially [1]
118/14
find [3] 16/3 75/24
110/5
finding [1] 35/15
findings [3] 5/11
35/10 35/22
fine [3] 53/22 92/2
115/24
finish [2] 52/13
111/11
finished [2] 15/23
39/22
firms [1] 78/11
first [24] 4/21 4/22
5/1 9/3 11/16 13/19
18/9 21/11 27/6
37/7 38/7 41/11

42/3 43/11 43/11
47/18 49/22 49/23
50/1 50/22 57/5
67/10 81/12 94/18
firstly [1] 27/8
fit [2] 56/10 84/21
fits [2] 58/10 62/5
five [1] 40/1
flipping [1] 95/1
focus [1] 20/12
focused [2] 50/19
69/22
focusing [2] 4/14 108/16
followed [1] 88/17
following [2]
112/12 112/14
follows [1] 47/7
foregoing [1] 118/4
forest [3] 28/17
81/19 85/20
forgot [1] 16/24
form [8] 74/3 74/4
79/18 80/12 80/14 83/5 83/11 107/9
former [2] 23/3
31/2
forms [8] 51/4 51/4
51/10 51/11 51/19
51/20 51/24 75/9
forth [3] 95/1
112/22 118/7

| F | [2] 73/20 | 67/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| forward [2] 16/1 | 114/12 | 79/22 84/1 84/1 |
| 27/17 | general [5] 18/24 | 87/11 88/139 |
| Foster [1] 32/14 | 53/12 57/3 57/21 | 9/22 92/10 93 |
| found [3] 5/14 | 58/2 | 93/19 97/5 98/9 |
| 55/18 76/7 | generalizing [1] | 98/9 110/18 111 |
| foundation [2] 7/4 | 53/11 | 114/9 |
| 10/15 | generally [2] 8/4 | goal [1] 61/11 |
| founder [1] 36/9 | 10/15 | goes [12] 14/11 |
| four [1] 56/17 | generic [1] 50/20 | 21/19 21/22 36 |
| Franconia [5] 2/13 | get [13] 12/12 18/13 | $67 / 781$ |
| 5/21 93/14 98/10 | 21/12 26/13 28/5 | 3/12 94/19 99/18 |
| /17 | 36/7 41/3 54/20 | 105/18 105/19 |
| free [1] 26/6 | 66/17 89/14 93/23 | going [26] 4/14 |
| Friday [1] 4/16 | 97/21 109/19 | 9/16 9/17 25/21 |
| front [5] 13/8 49/9 | getting [3] 55/6 | 6/1 27/3 29/1 |
| 79/23 80/13 89/24 | 55/7 113/9 | 33/22 4 |
| full [1] 27/8 | gild [1] 27/2 | 45/12 46/17 47/12 |
| fully [2] 13/15 | GIS [2] 85/1 106/5 | 55/4 |
| 116/11 | give [5] 21/18 27/3 | 68/17 71/11 78 |
| fundamental [2] | 40/13 54/20 85/7 | 79/1 84/1 93/18 |
| 41/9 106/12 | given [5] 20/3 22/23 | 110/3 1 |
| funding [1] 39/17 | 79/4 79/5 83/4 | 113/22 |
| further [9] 16/15 | gives [1] 94/17 | gone [4] 45/18 |
| 18/21 19/7 19/14 | glad [2] 23/15 | 70/24 116/9 |
| 21/23 41/22 75/19 | 24/18 | good [10] 4/2 4/ |
| 118/10 118/12 | glomerations [1] | 17 18/5 21/1 |
| future [2] 29/22 | 104/12 | 3/21 24/9 34/11 |
| 68/22 | go [30] 4/18 1 | 1376 |
| G | $13 / 918 / 13$ 41/2 $47 / 1347 / 1852 / 14$ |  |
| gathered [1] 51/9 | 53/21 57/11 58/16 | got [5] 47/19 60/11 |



## H

haven't... [2]
107/18 107/20
having [1] 116/17 he [5] 46/3 46/7 47/3 79/8 79/12 he's [3] 46/5 46/6 47/19
heading [1] 110/21 Health [1] 39/20 hear [1] 48/12 heard [1] 62/19 hearing [3] 1/11 34/7 117/9
height [3] 21/17
21/20 21/22
held [2] 3/7 71/17
Helmkamp [1]
77/23
help [4] 18/13
19/15 99/14 109/20
helpful [5] 44/8 44/10 52/20 101/12 104/8
her [12] 4/4 4/6
35/14 35/15 36/2
36/4 41/10 67/7
87/13 114/6 114/13 114/24
here [27] 4/3 14/13 16/18 16/19 20/21
22/19 23/2 23/12

31/1 33/8 39/9 44/7
45/13 47/19 52/19
65/15 76/2 76/9
78/15 86/12 90/6
104/1 104/15
104/17 105/1 105/5
111/7
hereby [1] 118/4
hereinbefore [1]
118/7
heritage [4] 3/11
36/10 83/19 95/15
hers [1] 115/5
herself [1] 41/17
high [1] 7/22
highlighted [4]
46/23 78/21 81/11
86/10
highly [1] 27/23
hill [3] 2/15 6/7 28/15
hillsides [1] 107/11
him [2] 25/8 52/8
his [4] 16/18 24/4 25/8 67/7
historic [132]
historical [7] 2/22
17/5 18/15 18/18 46/6 114/14 115/16
historically [3] 28/7 30/8 69/3
history [3] 28/13

28/13 28/20
HL1 [1] 84/7
HL3 [2] 85/5 85/8
HL8 [1] 84/7
HL9 [2] 86/1 86/8
holds [1] 114/20
home [2] 36/11
36/13
Homestead [3]
78/21 79/2 81/5
Honigberg [1] 1/13
hopefully [2] 36/15
78/24
hoping [1] 19/15
host [10] 3/12 56/16
56/17 56/18 66/19
72/5 92/16 93/7
105/19 105/24
hour [1] 117/2
House [1] 39/20
houses [2] 32/14
32/22
housing [1] 32/16
how [31] 5/5 9/21
10/22 11/1 21/24
25/24 28/6 38/18
40/21 42/24 43/16
44/11 45/14 52/16
52/22 54/2 54/2
54/5 58/22 63/9
64/20 67/23 74/6
95/9 99/14 99/15

| H | 86/8 88/11 88/12 | 77/12 80/10 81/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| how... [5] 99/17 | 89/20 92/13 93/18 | 82/2 84/20 94/3 |
| 99/19 100/8 108/18 | 95/15 96/17 97/24 | 95/4 98/23 101/2 |
| 116/18 | 105/4 107/24 | identify [9] 30/6 |
| huh [11] 6/21 7/6 | 110/10 111/15 | 38/21 58/24 73/14 |
| 10/19 12/5 12/10 | 111/17 111/19 | 73/18 73/21 75/8 |
| 13/3 15/18 15/20 | 112/9 112/11 | 103/8 106/22 |
| 48/22 85/24 88/21 | 112/14 112/21 | identifying [1] |
| Human [2] 114/4 | 113/1 113/4 113/9 | 53/23 |
| 114/13 | 113/14 113/22 | image [2] 20/6 |
| I | 114/14 116/14 | 97/19 |
| I'd [2] 29/1 30/2 | 52/23 72/23 87/9 | 31/3 32/15 |
| I'll [15] 5/20 45/24 | 105/9 112/18 | impact [13] 10/8 |
| 46/7 54/8 55/21 | Iacopino [2] 1/19 | 30/1 30/11 71/19 |
| 59/15 71/15 73/12 | 1/20 | 86/18 87/8 111/21 |
| 77/6 79/6 87/6 | ID [1] 71/12 | 112/1 112/20 113/1 |
| 88/11 93/6 95/1 | idea [5] 16/1 54/5 | 113/4 113/12 |
| 113/21 | 72/8 72/8 76/17 | 116/15 |
| I'm [64] 4/14 10/11 | identifiability [1] | impacted [10] 5/3 |
| 16/12 19/15 24/16 | 30/4 | 95/5 99/1 99/20 |
| 25/13 25/21 25/23 | identification [5] | 99/22 100/8 100/17 |
| 26/1 39/22 41/3 | 35/6 40/5 50/15 | 100/20 104/23 |
| 42/24 44/16 45/10 | 108/7 111/20 | 105/10 |
| 46/17 47/12 48/24 | identified [33] 3/10 | impacting [3] 11/12 |
| 49/23 51/2 53/6 | 23/4 23/5 31/1 51/1 | 12/6 12/7 |
| 55/4 55/6 56/13 | 52/22 54/2 54/6 | impacts [4] 8/20 |
| 56/23 58/22 61/17 | 54/21 55/14 56/10 | 8/23 106/19 110/12 |
| 61/19 61/21 62/3 | 57/4 58/3 58/9 70/2 | Implementation [1] |
| 66/4 67/16 71/3 | 70/5 71/14 72/20 | 38/3 |
| 71/16 76/21 77/5 | 74/7 74/10 74/10 | implementing [1] |
| 78/13 81/10 83/24 | 74/11 75/4 76/12 | 50/3 |


| I | 115/13 | infrastructure [2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| implies [2] 12/23 | incorrect [2] 72/2 | 46/9 68/16 |
| 3/5 | 91/15 | initial [3] 28/9 |
| implying [1] 68/21 | increases [1] | 30/14 41/23 |
| importance [1] | 109/19 | Initiatives [1] |
| 17/14 | indeed [2] 22/21 | Inn [1] 32/15 |
| important [10] | 7918 | input [2] 82/7 83/9 |
| 13/4 17/17 30/8 | indicate [5] 28/11 | inputs [2] 82/17 |
| /366/1 69/3 | 69/11 89/18 100/12 | 86/4 |
| 70/10 73/23 79/9 | 100/17 | instance [3] 59/4 |
| 0/15 | indicated [4] 13/5 | 93/13 93/15 |
| inability [1] | 27/11 59/11 73/9 | intangible [1] 83/19 |
| include [7] 9/5 | indicates [4] 63/24 | integrity [9] 6/22 |
| 39/18 59/24 60/2 | 98/1 102/1 102/12 | 30/3 30/5 30/13 |
| 63/7 74/9 82/4 | indicating [2] 37/11 | 30/1831/15 64/2 |
| included [18] 6/2 | 48/4 | 75/22 81/6 |
| 19/23 20/8 22/5 | individual [6] 51/3 | intensely [1] 26/1 |
| 14/11 24/23 24/23 | 51/10 62/10 62/11 | intensity [1] 109/18 |
| 31/23 32/3 46/2 | 68 | intent [1] 62/24 |
| 63/3 76/2 77/13 | individually [1] | interactions [1] |
| 85/14 91/1 105/5 | 58/16 | 11/8 |
| 105/11 105/13 | individuals [1] | interest [1] 66/9 |
| includes [4] 21/14 | 23/20 | interested [1] |
| 2/17 87/5 93/15 | industrialization [1] | 118/15 |
| including [1] 68/24 | 31/13 | interesting [2] 6/17 |
| inclusion [2] 65/22 | influence [1] 53/6 | 67/6 |
| 68/14 | inform [2] 114/7 | Interestingly [1] |
| incomp | 11 |  |
| 1 | information [8] | interpret [2] 43 |
| (1) | 11/4 11/20 20/5 | 53/10 |
| 4 | 24/22 26/21 28/11 | interpretation |
| incorporates [1] | 51/9 86/18 | 42/5 43/3 44/13 |


| I | invite [1] 72/3 | 66/1 66/8 67/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| interpretation... [5] | invited [3] 71/20 | 67/16 68/2 68/17 |
| 45/13 89/3 114/6 | 71/23 72/3 | 74/16 7 |
| 115/1 116/22 | involved [1] 43/12 | /18 |
| interpreted [2] | Iryna [1] 1/19 | 82/15 83/4 83/6 |
| 44/11 115/4 | is [294] | 8/884/9 8 |
| interpreting [1] | isn't [5] 29/19 61/4 | 85/15 85/17 88 |
| 47/23 | 80/9 82/15 92/3 | 87/2 87/7 88/9 |
| interruption | issue [11] 4/147/3 | 88/17 89/17 91/3 |
| 77/21 88/6 | 8/7 13/13 51/23 | 93/9 93/9 94/7 |
| intersection [1] | 52/18 64/5 91/24 | 95/12 95/13 95/17 |
| 37/12 | 104/1 105/1 115/7 | 95/19 98/13 98/20 |
| intersections [1] | issued [5] 14/2 | 99/1 100/6 100/10 |
| 32/20 | 48/19 49/15 64/23 | 102/8 102/15 |
| intervenor [2] | 65/5 | 104/21 105/6 105/7 |
| 3/17 33/17 | issues [2] 44/24 | 105/10 107/5 110 |
| intervenors [1] | 116/2 | 110/4 110/8 110/ |
| 73/7 | issuing [1] 49/18 | 110/21 111/3 |
| introduction [2] | it [228] | 1/15 115/3 |
| 31/14 31/20 | it's [97] 6/4 6/16 | 116/20 |
| inventories [1] | 7/7 7/15 8/4 8/5 8/7 | It's the [1] 100/10 |
| 18/15 | 8/12 9/15 10/21 | item [2] 12/17 |
| inventory [19] 5/2 | 11/5 11/9 12/17 | 17/20 |
| 5/8 5/9 5/14 5/18 | 13/12 14/4 14/18 | items [1] 79/18 |
| 6/2 6/13 8/20 8/23 | 17/9 22/6 28/13 | its [11] 7/11 7/12 |
| 11/6 12/9 12/12 | 28/14 29/10 29/15 | 13/17 22/9 27/13 |
| 16/11 51/3 51/10 | 32/21 36/13 37/15 | 29/20 30/22 44/ |
| 51/19 69/12 76/1 | 39/14 42/7 45/6 | 44/18 64/1 69/6 |
| 76/9 | 46/21 54/16 56/3 | itself [4] 17/9 43/2 |
| inventorying [1] | 58/20 60/11 60/13 | 79/18 83/21 |
|  | 61/7 61/8 64/1 65/4 |  |


| J |
| :--- |
| January of [1] 49/5 | jargon [1] 75/23 Jefferson [1] 39/19 Jeremy [8] 34/15

77/1 79/14 80/12 91/21 97/5 104/1 112/9
Joint [1] 1/8
judge [1] 83/8 judges [3] 45/7 45/8 45/10
judgment [1]
107/16
just [60] 4/14 4/18
7/13 8/5 10/5 11/3
13/12 19/6 24/20 40/12 40/24 49/19
52/13 53/19 54/20
57/9 58/22 61/10
62/6 64/22 66/14 66/17 68/11 70/3
70/13 70/19 72/1
74/10 75/8 76/3
77/7 79/20 83/5
85/7 85/13 86/10
88/4 88/12 90/9
93/5 93/18 96/17
97/5 97/6 97/7
97/24 98/7 100/7
100/22 102/8 105/4 105/18 106/2 110/1

110/15 111/11
L
labeled [1] 84/7 lack [1] 19/17
Lakes [1] 59/5 land [23] 11/9
21/17 21/20 37/14 57/17 62/12 62/14
62/22 65/13 65/15 66/1 66/5 66/10
66/13 66/23 67/11
67/12 67/18 68/12
85/8 89/10 104/14 104/18
landforms [1] 107/17
landlord [1] 33/11 landowner [3] 66/4 67/6 68/4
landowners [1] 62/17
lands [11] 57/19 59/6 62/21 64/5 68/24 84/2 84/3
85/10 85/16 102/3 102/23
landscape [7] 7/11 11/10 11/13 12/7 28/15 56/8 56/9 landscaped [1] 12/17
landscapes [5] 3/11 17/19 36/10 37/3

landscapes... [1] 57/15
lapses [2] 24/2 25/18
last [7] 50/10 66/5 66/23 80/14 83/2 86/1 110/9
law [5] 27/10 43/2
63/12 63/15 64/6 laws [1] 45/4
lawyer [1] 45/3
lay [2] 10/21 92/5
layer [2] 102/3
102/4
layering [1] 104/7
laying [1] 10/18
layperson's [1] 65/4
LCR [3] 1/24
118/17 118/18
lead [1] 108/20
leading [1] 31/17
learn [1] 15/12
learned [1] 25/4
least [4] 20/20
21/23 32/21 83/4 left [4] 22/1 95/18 96/23 103/10
left-hand [1] 96/23 legal [4] 89/6 89/8 90/9 90/11
legend [1] 93/8 Lenehan [1] 1/20 length [1] 13/14 less [6] 19/20 28/8
28/12 30/21 33/4
55/14
let [34] 4/6 15/6
37/18 47/24 50/21
52/13 54/14 56/23
59/2 63/6 69/5
71/10 72/1 73/12
75/8 75/9 76/10
78/12 79/20 81/8
83/24 88/4 91/21
92/24 93/18 98/7
101/12 106/7
107/15 108/2
109/20 110/1
111/11 111/13
let's [11] 31/10
38/18 52/22 59/16
93/19 93/24 98/9
100/22 106/3 106/7
115/5
letting [1] 18/1
level [6] 16/10
20/18 56/8 56/9
101/9 106/6
Licensed [2] 118/3
118/18
lifespan [4] 27/13
27/15 27/16 87/17
like [16] 5/7 6/15 6/19 7/14 8/1 14/18 15/12 18/2 20/3 29/10 40/18 40/22
53/19 81/15 100/7 104/22
likely [6] 23/1
27/21 30/15 30/21
33/4 83/17
lily [1] 27/3
limb [2] 45/11
45/12
limitation [1] 91/5
limited [2] 41/13
69/21
limiting [1] 41/17
limits [1] 34/19
line [14] 8/16 8/18
8/22 27/23 41/7
41/9 68/10 94/5
94/21 95/12 95/17
96/22 99/18 102/17
linear [2] 39/6 40/21
lines [1] 99/11
list [11] 18/19 38/2
39/13 39/15 59/20
63/8 65/22 74/8
79/13 79/15 82/4
listed [8] 38/7 41/18
42/14 42/16 57/6
57/16 69/15 91/3
$\mathbf{L}$
listing [5] 40/9 43/6 47/9 47/21 51/12 literally [1] 17/13 little [11] 4/19 5/5 19/16 21/9 26/24 31/17 36/8 40/14 101/24 102/22 112/9
live [4] 79/9 79/12 80/23 80/24
LLC [1] $1 / 8$
locate [2] 22/22
75/10
located [4] 31/3
60/3 75/17 108/8
location [19] 8/2
8/4 8/5 8/18 8/22
10/7 20/14 20/17
21/1 21/5 21/13
23/9 24/3 31/15
31/20 32/2 32/6
32/17 95/11
locations [3] 8/3
23/20 24/12
long [3] 63/9 64/21 90/6
longer [4] 22/9 33/9 48/1 92/1
longevity [1] 64/1 look [29] 10/20
13/13 28/4 29/1

45/3 45/3 45/4
45/22 53/24 59/7
65/11 65/20 83/22
83/24 85/3 85/19
89/5 90/2 93/11
93/18 93/19 93/24
95/12 95/18 100/4 107/15 108/2
113/15 115/5
looked [12] 6/19
12/4 12/19 39/9
43/2 54/11 56/7 59/24 70/24 81/17 109/12 116/18 looking [19] 14/18 18/9 22/7 37/7 37/8 45/14 67/2 69/2 77/8 79/1 80/3
92/19 95/11 96/18 102/11 107/5
111/16 111/17 111/19
looks [4] 6/15 14/18 18/2 81/14
lose [1] 30/13
loss [1] 7/9
lost [1] 111/7
lot [4] 65/15 104/5 104/14 106/8
Loudon [5] 83/3
83/3 83/11 83/17 83/18
low [1] 107/10 lower [3] 94/10 94/18 96/22
lunch [2] 117/5 117/7
machines [1] 10/3 made [9] 20/2
23/23 24/9 27/7
42/7 42/11 58/23 62/10 112/7
main [1] 31/7 maintained [1] 20/15
major [1] 32/20
make [18] 8/19
12/16 17/19 26/3
31/19 57/3 57/9
58/8 64/13 79/20
83/7 84/3 90/10
93/5 97/6 104/19 111/11 114/18
makes [4] 17/20 47/20 57/21 82/8 makeup [1] 94/4 making [9] 34/18 45/13 97/23 105/4 112/21 113/5 115/8 115/17 115/24 Mall [1] 39/19
Man [1] 32/15
management [1]
management... [1] 37/17
manner [2] 69/13 100/1
many [16] 24/12
27/20 28/14 28/14
38/14 54/2 54/5
66/11 69/13 95/14
97/15 99/8 99/9
99/19 107/12 116/3
map [32] 3/12 5/10
18/11 20/7 20/22
21/14 21/21 22/2
28/10 59/1 73/24
75/2 86/1 92/16
93/7 93/22 93/23
94/14 94/23 95/11
95/20 96/21 97/3
97/20 98/16 98/17
104/2 105/11
105/14 105/18
105/19 105/21
mapped [9] 59/14
59/22 59/23 74/2
84/22 85/10 100/15 102/21 106/4
mapping [18] 19/13 20/7 58/24 59/3
59/6 59/11 59/13
61/5 84/24 85/19
93/15 96/15 97/11

97/13 101/7 101/24 103/2 103/14
maps [18] 21/15
22/22 22/24 22/24
59/12 59/16 73/20
84/6 84/12 85/11
92/19 93/24 96/2
96/6 98/8 101/10
104/11 106/5
March [1] 3/11
margins [1] 9/17
marked [5] 13/20
18/10 20/24 22/10
76/20
markers [1] 103/7
Martin [1] 1/13
mason [1] 7/8
masons [1] 7/22
match [1] 9/6
material [2] 9/18 9/23
materials [4] 12/24
35/19 35/21 49/19
math [2] 65/15 65/17
mauve [1] 102/8
may [21] 4/9 10/24
16/24 31/15 33/10 34/10 44/24 48/1 81/1 81/2 85/18 87/17 87/17 96/5 96/23 97/1 97/12

97/14 97/23 97/24 113/6 maybe [5] 15/5 21/23 62/2 73/9 88/2
McLaren [2] 16/19
16/21
me [65] 10/22 15/6
15/15 18/1 19/15
25/13 28/6 28/14
29/7 32/4 36/24
37/18 39/22 47/24
50/21 52/13 53/14
53/19 54/14 54/20
56/23 59/2 59/18
60/16 62/3 63/6
69/5 71/10 71/16
72/1 72/6 73/10
73/13 76/10 76/24
78/12 79/20 79/23
81/8 83/13 83/24
88/4 89/7 89/24
91/10 91/21 93/1
93/18 98/7 99/8
99/14 101/12
103/16 106/7
107/15 107/24
108/2 109/20 110/1
111/11 111/13
112/9 113/5 114/6 114/24
mean [18] 6/18

| M | memory [2] 24/2 | 26/10 26/23 29/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mean... [17] 16/1 | 25/18 | 29/18 30/17 31/21 93/13 |
| 25/12 31/21 44/16 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { mentioned [2] } \\ 10 / 1439 / 24 \end{array}$ | mile [41] 55/16 |
| 44/17 45/2 45/6 | mere [1] 29/8 | $55 / 2156 / 1156 / 1$ |
| 64/7 66/18 70/7 | Meridian [1] 39/20 | 59/8 60/5 60/18 |
| 92/8 99/11 104/10 | merit [1] 115/20 | 60/20 71/22 73/18 |
| 114/7 | merits [1] 1/11 | 73/20 84/18 86/9 |
| meaning [2] 40/5 | Merrimack [1] | 92/12 92/17 95/8 |
| 90/7 | 54/9 | 95/15 95/17 95/22 |
| means [5] 9/21 | met [1] 34/14 | 95/23 99/10 101/2 |
| 31/10 43/23 46/12 | method [2] 19/10 | 101/7 106/4 106/8 |
| 47/20 | 27/17 | 106/10 106/19 |
| meant [1] 19/16 | methodology [16] | 107/3 107/6 107/16 |
| measure [1] 30/3 | 14/10 21/10 24/11 | 107/22 109/1 109/3 |
| meeting [4] 50/24 | 55/19 55/20 58/14 | 109/9 110/10 |
| 73/1 73/2 73/3 | 66/7 66/24 68/14 | 110/11 110/13 |
| meetings [12] 58/4 | 68/21 68/23 69/10 | 111/8 111/8 112/10 |
| 62/20 72/5 72/12 | 70/10 99/24 100/10 | 112/17 |
| 72/22 73/7 73/17 | 100/12 | miles [17] 8/2 16/8 |
| 78/4 78/6 78/10 | methods [1] 9/22 | 18/12 60/5 60/22 |
| 79/12 86/5 | metric [1] 56/21 | 81/18 81/20 82/3 |
| Megan [1] 77/19 | Michael [1] 1/19 | 84/21 85/13 94/9 |
| Member [1] 1/16 | microphone [2] 4/6 | 94/11 97/15 98/21 |
| members [4] 19/22 | 33/23 | 98/21 99/19 113/11 |
| 46/24 72/16 81/23 | middle [5] 57/2 | milieu [1] 72/15 |
| memo [5] 48/23 | 67/9 88/14 103/17 | minute [4] 19/6 |
| 49/24 49/24 50/22 | 103/17 | 54/20 55/5 111/6 |
| 52/1 | midway [2] 95/18 | minutes [3] 34/4 |
| Memorandum [2] 48/19 109/13 | might [11] 5/2 <br> 20/19 21/10 21/11 | 40/24 117/2 misrepresentation [1] 79/15 |

missed [1] 33/18 misstated [1]

## 114/12

misstatement [1] 88/3
misstating [1]
85/18
model [7] 86/21
87/13 87/18 101/23 102/20 103/1 103/1 modeling [1] 86/13 modifiers [1] 13/4 modify [1] 15/10 Monroe [1] 1/21 Monthly [1] 22/6 more [26] 4/19 4/23
16/24 19/20 21/10
26/10 26/21 26/24
27/18 28/4 30/21
32/13 42/20 44/19
50/14 50/19 65/17
72/24 77/3 83/11
87/19 91/14 98/8
102/8 106/14
114/15
morning [9] 1/4 3/6 4/2 4/13 4/15 18/5 34/11 34/13 117/9 mortar [2] 6/24 7/2 motivation [1] 66/8 Mountain [1] 81/19
mountainous [1] 107/11
move [3] 53/20
71/10 88/12
moving [6] 9/18
10/3 10/3 10/4 29/6 48/17
Mr [4] 2/8 16/17
23/11 117/1
Mr. [9] 24/2 24/15
25/5 25/6 25/20
33/22 33/22 34/10 79/11
Mr. Bisbee [1]
33/22
Mr. Conkling [1]
79/11
Mr. DeWan [2]
25/5 25/6
Mr. DeWan's [2]
24/2 24/15
Mr. Needleman [1]
25/20
Mr. Walker [2]
33/22 34/10
Ms [21] 2/6 2/7 4/4
4/8 23/14 26/3 26/4
26/14 33/18 34/11
36/22 38/1 49/9
67/14 68/11 87/12
87/21 105/4 113/11
114/12 116/20

Ms. [12] 18/3 25/24 27/3 31/24 35/13 41/10 55/12 62/4 95/4 95/16 98/22 106/12
Ms. Crane [4] 18/3
25/24 27/3 31/24
Ms. O'Donnell [1]
62/4
Ms. Widell [4]
55/12 95/4 95/16
98/22
Ms. Widell's [3]
35/13 41/10 106/12 much [6] 11/2
21/24 55/22 67/24
78/13 107/9
multipage [1] 80/3 multiple [3] 74/13 81/15 88/7
must [1] 68/16
Muzzey [4] 112/8
113/23 114/1 114/3
Muzzey's [2]
114/12 115/22
MVRP [2] 54/9
70/22
my [25] 9/12 18/5
22/14 23/17 26/7
32/21 33/1 33/14
34/14 36/16 49/13
50/18 52/13 53/14

| M | 9/1 9/21 12/13 | 5/15 5/19 6/24 7/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| my... [11] 66/5 | 12/16 21/11 28/4 | 8/18 10/15 11/5 |
| 66/14 66/17 66/22 | 32/19 40/13 45/1 | 16/15 16/22 17/7 |
| 82/1 83/8 96/21 | 63/24 69/1 80/12 | 19/7 19/7 22/9 |
| 104/10 109/15 | needed [4] 4/22 | 23/10 25/2 31/6 |
| 118/5 118/7 | 16/4 24/23 87/19 | 31/12 33/9 33/13 |
| myself [1] 20/12 | Needleman [1] | 33/17 33/20 35/8 |
| N | 25/20 | $35 / 1235 / 22 ~ 35 / 24$ $36 / 439 / 839 / 23$ |
| N-ABTRS [1] 3/4 | 12/14 12/18 | 40/2 41/5 43/10 |
| N.H [1] 118/18 | neither [1] 118/10 | 44/6 45/16 45/23 |
| name [3] 18/5 | nevertheless [1] | 52/18 52/21 53/21 |
| 34/15 76/4 | 31/12 | 54/4 54/5 54/11 |
| narrative [3] 91/18 | new [34] 1/1 1/4 1/9 | 60/3 60/22 61/3 |
| 95/2 96/9 | 8/10 14/2 14/21 | 63/16 66/14 69/9 |
| narrow [4] 7/5 | 15/9 15/10 17/4 | 70/20 71/4 71/9 |
| 41/15 41/21 106/14 | 17/11 23/12 24/22 | 75/18 75/24 76/17 |
| national [12] 39/19 | 27/9 28/15 43/2 | 77/9 89/10 96/6 |
| 41/15 42/14 43/5 | 46/5 46/12 46/19 | 96/17 97/10 97/13 |
| 47/9 47/21 48/10 | 50/23 61/13 62/9 | 98/4 98/6 98/23 |
| 50/4 51/13 57/6 | 63/3 64/23 65/5 | 100/19 103/14 |
| 81/19 85/18 | 65/16 68/12 69/3 | 104/16 105/23 |
| nature [3] 24/2 | 70/17 70/17 79/3 | 107/21 112/13 |
| 29/20 37/13 | 85/1 85/20 100/24 | 112/13 112/13 |
| nearby [2] 10/8 | 109/5 | 114/2 114/20 |
| 10/16 | next [4] 9/11 12/13 | 118/18 |
| nearest [1] 105/2 | 47/15 67/17 | Non [2] 18/7 19/24 |
| nearly [1] 38/16 | NH [3] 2/19 2/21 | Non-Abutters [2] |
| necessarily [7] 37/9 | 3/9 | 18/7 19/24 |
| 38/13 44/9 48/13 | no [83] 1/7 1/23 | None [1] 75/18 |
| 52/21 92/3 115/20 | 1/24 2/3 2/12 2/12 | Nope [1] 46/4 |
| need [14] 4/5 6/2 | 3/3 3/3 3/7 3/14 4/7 | normally [1] 7/4 |


| $\mathbf{N}$ | 88/11 89/8 89/15 | 0/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| north [3] 101/10 | 90/10 9 | 69/19 69/22 70/23 |
| 102/13 102/15 | 90/17 91/11 91/11 | 71/1 74/2 7 |
| Northern [2] 1/8 | 95/9 96/4 97/11 | /18 82/9 |
| 38/6 | 97/24 99/21 99/22 | 119103 |
| 112] 5/128/1 | 100/14 100/16 | numbers [1] 98/3 |
| 10/6 10/22 10/24 | 103/4 103/20 | numerous [1] 41 |
| /1712/1 13/2 |  | 0 |
| 14/14 14/16 14/22 | 104/21 105/6 | O'DONNELL [14] |
| 17/22 19/2 21/6 |  | 2/4 4/12 26/4 26/4 |
| 1/11 24/7 24/16 |  | 26/14 33/18 34/12 |
| 24/22 27/14 32/3 |  | 36/22 38/1 49/9 |
| 33/1 33/10 34/23 |  | 62/4 67/15 68/11 |
| 35/5 35/9 35/9 |  | 105/4 |
| 35/21 35/2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { notation [1] } \\ & \text { note [1] } 47 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | object [1] 25/21 |
| 37/6 3 | noted [1] 117/ | objection [9] 23/11 |
| 38/7 38/13 39 |  | 23/16 24/17 24/21 |
| 43/6 43/10 43/19 |  | 26/2 29/9 |
| 43/20 44/1 44/2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { nothin } \\ 86 / 24 \end{gathered}$ | 31/22 32/9 |
| 4/3 44/6 44/9 | November [1] 1/3 | objects [1] 87/16 |
| 6 44/21 45/21 | now [23] 4/22 8/9 | observe [1] 5/10 |
| 3 | $8 / 149 / 1013 / 7$ | observe |
| 17 52/8 52/18 | 13/19 14/21 $21 / 8$ | 107/17 |
| 2/21 53/14 58/16 | 28/24 31/16 32/1 | occupied [1] 32/16 |
| 59/23 63/11 |  | occur [1] 11/2 |
| 65/14 65/19 65/21 |  | occurred [1] 25/18 |
| 65/23 67/14 69/6 |  | October [1] 5/22 |
| 69/13 69/24 70/3 |  | October 28th [1] |
| 72/8 75/5 75 | 86/10 95/11 11 | 5/22 |
| 76/18 78/13 81/ |  | off [3] 8/13 |
| 82/5 83/17 83/22 $84 / 187 / 1387 / 17$ |  | 112/11 |
| 84/1 87/13 87/17 | number [15] 22/16 | offer [5] 26/3 33/7 |


| 0 | 77/7 78/2 78/7 | ones [2] 74/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| offer... [3] 35/9 | 78/22 79/20 80/18 | 74/23 |
| 35/24 45/9 | 81/8 82/1 82/6 | only [19] 1/4 3/7 |
| offers [1] 62/23 | 83/24 85/3 87/3 | 18/21 19/2 24/13 |
| office [2] 77/19 | 87/3 89/22 90/2 | 25/4 26/7 34/21 |
| 114/20 | 92/2 93/18 94/7 | 37/15 43/6 60/18 |
| Officer [2] 1/13 | 94/24 98/7 102/5 | 65/23 74/11 74/17 |
| 108/13 | 103/11 104/8 | 79/19 99/5 104/2 |
| offset [1] 15/22 | 105/10 106/1 107/8 | 107/1 117/12 |
| often [4] 7/4 10/16 | 113/8 115/21 117/4 | open [2] 61/12 66/1 |
| 17/12 89/12 | Oldenburg [1] 1/16 | opinion [23] 33/10 |
| oh [2] 13/24 51/2 | once [6] 12/12 | 33/13 35/9 35/22 |
| okay [88] 5/20 9/10 | 30/13 58/9 67/12 | 35/24 45/9 49/12 |
| 9/22 9/23 11/15 | 68/2 74/18 | 49/15 49/18 52/9 |
| 13/24 14/15 14/17 | one [52] 4/14 5/21 | 53/4 55/8 56/1 62/5 |
| 16/12 19/5 19/12 | 6/5 6/7 6/14 11/16 | 63/5 69/10 70/11 |
| 19/15 20/11 21/8 | 15/12 16/7 16/24 | 83/7 92/8 109/15 |
| 26/12 28/2 29/4 | 16/24 23/3 27/21 | 111/10 114/7 115/1 |
| 29/11 29/14 31/1 | 31/1 32/13 39/4 | opportunity [1] |
| 32/11 33/2 33/9 | 39/6 39/10 39/14 | 5/17 |
| 33/14 37/18 39/6 | 39/23 40/10 40/22 | opposed [2] 8/2 |
| 40/1 40/2 40/17 | 44/22 46/24 54/9 | 13/17 |
| 40/21 43/11 45/2 | 55/21 58/10 62/13 | order [1] 64/1 |
| 45/17 48/6 48/17 | 67/5 68/17 69/7 | original [1] 7/9 |
| 49/2 49/17 50/21 | 71/12 72/24 73/2 | originally [1] 13/17 |
| 52/5 53/21 54/5 | 74/4 77/4 78/17 | other [26] 6/19 |
| 54/12 56/17 56/23 | 78/19 78/21 79/19 | 13/10 14/11 18/20 |
| 60/14 61/2 61/6 | 80/14 81/12 82/8 | 24/18 28/5 29/6 |
| 61/21 63/1 63/22 | 83/2 84/15 85/21 | 33/17 38/6 38/8 |
| 67/18 70/16 72/4 | 86/3 98/8 101/24 | 38/21 44/4 46/9 |
| 72/18 73/12 74/19 | 102/12 104/12 | 48/1 61/3 70/16 |
| 75/1 75/11 76/10 | 106/11 116/2 | 74/4 76/4 78/9 |

## 0

other... [7] 80/19 81/1 82/16 87/16 99/7 102/24 107/2 others [5] 23/17 28/16 42/22 48/16 115/3
our [36] 11/7 18/9 27/7 27/8 29/24
29/24 35/1 36/13
37/14 43/3 45/19
51/20 55/24 61/15 61/15 62/8 65/4
65/6 66/9 69/9
76/16 77/11 77/19
84/23 92/5 92/12
92/21 94/23 99/24
107/5 107/6 107/16
108/5 111/10 114/4
$117 / 5$
out [18] 15/24
19/17 20/12 21/9
22/8 26/18 26/23
28/9 40/3 45/10
45/12 58/16 67/20 67/24 68/1 74/3 80/10 92/5
outlined [1] 19/20 outlines [1] 14/7 outside [5] 33/6 95/14 99/10 102/17 105/23
over [5] 6/16 35/3 46/1 102/2 102/5 overall [1] 84/12 overhead [7] 93/9 94/8 94/9 94/11 94/20 99/11 102/17 overlap [1] 78/9 overlay [1] 101/1 overlays [1] 97/20 overview [2] 35/1 36/23
own [1] 42/21
owned [3] 19/21 32/6 32/7
owner [1] 30/21
P
p.m [1] 117/8
page [44] 2/3 2/12
3/3 14/6 18/9 20/22
36/12 36/13 38/1
38/2 41/7 46/20
47/13 47/15 47/18 49/23 49/24 50/22
56/23 56/24 57/2
57/12 57/16 61/16
61/21 62/15 65/10
67/8 67/9 68/8
76/15 77/4 78/12
81/8 81/11 82/24
83/12 88/13 88/14
91/17 93/20 109/22 110/4 115/6

Page 101 [1] 47/13 Page 21 [1] 56/24 Page 27 [1] 67/8 Page 3 [2] 68/8 78/12
Page 34 [1] 76/15 Page 39 [1] 93/20 Page 5 [1] 82/24 pages [15] 2/20 3/4 3/6 3/8 3/11 3/13
3/15 13/20 14/12
39/9 39/12 46/17
53/16 85/5 92/7
Palmer [1] 16/17 Pamela [1] 1/21 panoramic [1]
107/13
Parade [1] 83/19 paragraph [9] 49/23 50/1 50/11 50/22 51/8 61/16 61/22 67/10 110/9 parallel [1] 21/1 paraphrase [1] 71/15
paraphrasing [1] 61/18
parcel [7] 59/21 60/7 62/5 63/7 63/16 99/5 99/15 parcels [18] 60/2 61/8 63/9 64/7

| $\mathbf{P}$ | past [6] 7/24 28/19 | performed [1] 38/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| parcels... [14] | 43/18 44/12 45/10 | Perhaps [1] 23/17 |
| 64/20 65/18 65/22 | 46/8 | period [3] 28/20 |
| 68/15 70/1 70/4 | path [1] 6/8 | 32/18 65/24 |
| 70/18 71/1 71/5 | Patnaude [3] 1/24 | perpendicular [1] |
| 96/14 96/24 97/14 | 118/3 118/17 | 10/20 |
| 99/12 100/5 | Patricia [3] 1/16 | person [2] 11/9 |
| Park [1] 39/20 parks [1] 85/18 | 2/4 4/12 <br> pause [2] 18/4 | 80/10 <br> pervasive [5] 53/5 |
| part [10] 6/13 | 36/18 | 55/9 59/19 70/12 |
| 11/22 25/7 27/1 | pavement [1] 5/24 | \| 82/9 |
| 46/23 66/9 70/5 | peaks [1] 28/9 | phased [1] 14/10 |
| 82/19 87/7 116/16 | Pemi [1] 22/17 | photograph [6] |
| partial [2] 94/8 | Pemigewasset [2] | 2/13 2/14 2/16 2/17 |
| 94/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18/11 22/7 } \\ & \text { penalty [1] } 67 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 / 2022 / 4 \\ & \text { photos [2] 3/5 7/21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { partially [3] } 13 / 17 \\ 20 / 20 ~ 28 / 17 \end{array}$ | pentagrams [1] | phrase [1] 115/13 |
| participant [2] 79/5 | 104/5 | picture [1] 28/22 |
| 79/7 | people [15] 10/2 | pie [1] 65/11 |
| participants [3] | 25/7 37/13 61/13 | piece [1] 39/14 |
| 71/14 73/1 73/14 | 62/9 62/20 63/3 | pieces [1] 69/5 |
| particular [6] | 69/2 72/24 73/9 | pink [4] 101/21 |
| 14/16 35/7 40/16 | 73/21 74/7 74/14 | 102/1 102/3 102/5 |
| 114/20 115/7 116/2 | 75/1 83/20 | Pittsburg [11] |
| particularly [4] | percent [9] 65/15 | 93/13 93/14 93/20 |
| 41/7 46/20 62/11 | 65/18 66/12 66/12 | 94/1 94/4 95/5 |
| 103/16 | 66/18 68/12 68/18 | 95/14 96/10 96/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { parties [2] 88/7 } \\ & 118 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 70/9 97/1 percentages [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 97 / 2 \text { 97/15 } \\ & \text { place [7] } 6 / 237 / 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| partner [1] 37/14 <br> parts [2] 32/5 42/2 | 66/11 <br> perform [2] 34/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20/13 37/13 62/22 } \\ & 80 / 15 \text { 118/6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Pass [2] 1/8 38/6 | 40/4 | places [2] 51/13 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- |
| places... [1] 107/12 | plan [1] 12/14 planning [5] 8/16 37/2 37/15 37/16 38/3

plans [2] 5/16 11/3 plausible [1] 22/18 please [10] 34/2
37/23 41/8 49/4
54/16 76/14 89/1
98/12 98/17 110/19
Plymouth [3] 18/13 32/14 32/17
point [26] 8/14
10/12 11/1 22/8
22/11 23/4 25/19
28/19 51/23 61/19
64/13 64/18 72/19
82/1 91/15 92/6
92/14 92/22 96/21
97/23 104/10 105/5
112/20 113/4 115/8 115/24
pointed [1] 28/9 pointing [1] 40/3 policy [9] 2/19
13/20 14/7 14/8 48/19 48/23 49/21
52/1 109/13
poor [1] 15/6 portion [5] 4/23 5/7

96/23 101/17 105/2 practices [1] 9/20 portions [4] 13/15 40/17 81/23 100/3 portrayed [1] 106/5 [1] 44/2 portrays [2] 85/22 preceded [1] 80/19 86/22
position [9] 4/4
11/7 42/7 61/8
61/14 83/8 92/5
106/17 115/22
positioned [1] 51/20
possess [1] 91/4 possesses [1] 91/6 possible [1] 96/7 possibly [1] 99/15 post [1] 22/4 postcard [1] 22/5 potential [27] 8/2 8/22 24/14 27/16 30/11 86/11 86/22 87/10 102/19 108/8 108/9 108/11 111/4
111/21 111/24
112/19 112/23
113/1 113/3 113/12
115/10 115/11
115/12 115/15
116/4 116/11
116/15
potentially [1] 95/5
practice [1] 15/16
pre [1] 44/2
pre-deliberations predict [1] 8/22 prefiled [6] 4/17 37/20 41/6 52/24 53/2 53/7
preparation [3] 45/20 51/2 51/2 prepare [1] 77/18 prepared [2] 51/5 78/3
presence [2] 29/19 32/8
present [10] 1/12 1/18 28/8 28/12
81/24 92/23 100/18 100/19 100/21
118/8
presentation [1] 27/1
preservation [17]
12/20 12/23 35/15
50/4 55/13 56/22
76/2 76/8 85/20
87/15 95/3 95/16
98/23 108/13 116/6
116/7 116/16
preserving [1]
61/12

## P

presided [1] 46/1 Presiding [2] 1/13

## 1/13

presume [1] 9/4 previously [1] 48/13
primary [2] 37/1 41/24
principally [1]
84/24
prior [11] 14/8 39/4 44/3 44/20 49/11
53/24 97/17 107/18 107/20 112/6
113/10
private [1] 64/8 probably [4] 19/7 77/20 80/12 117/1 problems [2] 24/14 25/2
proceed [2] 4/9 34/10
proceedings [1]

## 118/6

process [30] 10/4 10/5 14/14 14/17 15/11 15/17 20/8 38/19 38/20 39/3 39/11 42/10 42/13 42/16 44/15 44/17 47/5 50/16 51/6

52/1 54/3 62/17
7/24 35/3 38/3
69/20 72/16 73/12 108/13 108/19
109/3 109/14 116/9 profile [1] 10/20 program [3] 62/18 65/6 67/13
project [67] 5/3
14/22 14/23 16/7
22/21 22/24 27/13 27/16 29/20 30/11 31/7 31/14 31/20 35/7 35/16 38/6 38/7 38/8 38/10 38/11 38/17 39/3 39/7 39/14 39/15 39/21 39/23 40/8 40/22 43/12 44/14 44/14 44/19 44/22 45/1 45/1 45/18 45/21 53/5 54/10 54/23 55/10 55/16 56/14 56/18 56/19 58/18 60/4 68/16 70/22 70/22 75/16 81/18 81/20 84/17 86/11 86/22 87/17 96/6 100/17 101/22 103/21 104/22 106/23 109/1 109/2 116/3
projects [14] 7/15

39/16 40/10 40/13 40/18 44/4 46/9 50/12 54/1 54/6 54/7
proof [1] 26/3 proper [1] 15/22 properties [17]
17/23 20/10 26/24
32/24 32/24 38/21
41/15 41/18 47/8
50/7 50/24 57/5
57/18 69/14 69/19 69/23 96/11
property [17] 17/21 19/21 21/21 28/3 31/2 32/22 33/3
33/5 33/6 42/13
51/12 58/10 62/18
63/24 67/7 68/18 69/2
proposed [6] 6/8 27/24 38/9 39/3 50/12 81/18 prospective [1] 33/2
Protect [1] 2/22 provide [4] 35/5 77/11 86/1 91/18 provided [10] 35/1 76/10 76/19 77/14 85/19 86/18 94/14

| $\mathbf{P}$ | purposes [8] 17/15 | 25/8 26/5 33/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| provided... [3] 98/8 | 38/18 40/5 47/4 | 74/5 80/14 80/20 |
| 100/24 101/10 | 51/15 52/23 60/8 | 92/13 |
| provides [4] 16/4 | 86/17 | quibble [1] 90/6 |
| 36/23 51/11 94/2 | pursuant [2] 51/5 | quite [5] 21/18 |
| proximate [1] 31/4 | 108/23 | 30/16 47/22 55/17 |
| public [25] 1/9 1/13 | pursued [1] 9/22 | 104/18 |
| 1/14 1/16 31/7 | put [15] 7/13 9/23 | quotes [3] 47/19 |
| 57/20 59/5 59/5 | 12/8 14/6 27/17 | 48/2 48/15 |
| 72/3 72/7 72/9 | 58/12 62/20 63/7 | quoting [1] 53/7 |
| 72/11 72/20 75/7 | 66/5 66/22 73/24 | R |
| 75/8 85/16 85/17 | 102/3 | railroad [2] 24 |
| 89/6 89/9 89/12 $89 / 1690 / 890 / 13$ | putting [1] $9 / 5$ | 32/8 |
| 89/16 90/8 90/13 |  | rare [2] 50/11 |
| 98/22 104/18 | Q | 50/19 |
| public's [2] 71/19 | qualify [1] 61/9 | rather [1] 24/1 |
| 75/6 | qualities [1] 30/7 | RE [1] 1/7 |
| pull [20] 36/11 41/8 | quality [3] 8/7 91/4 | reach [1] 42/20 |
| 46/15 49/4 61/23 | 91/7 | read [13] 36/15 |
| 64/22 65/2 68/7 | question [29] 11/14 | 41/12 43/2 48/7 |
| 76/14 82/23 85/4 | 12/2 15/3 15/7 17/1 | 48/15 51/17 52/4 |
| 88/24 90/3 93/1 | 18/1 20/4 20/24 | 52/24 63/14 76/4 |
| 93/2 94/14 98/11 | 23/6 26/8 26/13 | 78/24 115/8 115/19 |
| 101/13 109/21 | 26/14 26/16 27/6 | reading [4] 50/18 |
| 113/19 | 27/13 29/3 29/13 | 52/6 57/8 116/16 |
| pulled [3] 36/10 | 30/16 30/24 31/17 | realize [6] 16/23 |
| 48/2 48/4 | 33/18 35/20 36/1 | 51/17 52/7 54/12 |
| pulling [3] 37/19 | 52/13 66/15 66/17 | 87/4 112/5 |
| 62/2 89/18 | 80/13 97/7 97/17 | realized [1] 24/7 |
| purple [1] 104/5 | questioning [1] 4/5 | really [2] 20/11 |
| purported [1] 6/1 <br> purpose [1] 14/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { questions [10] } \\ & 16 / 16 ~ 16 / 21 ~ 23 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | $37 / 5$ |

realm... [2] 33/7
86/24
reason [14] 45/2
49/17 71/7 79/4
79/5 80/7 80/8 80/9
80/9 80/15 80/21
80/22 83/4 102/21
reasoning [1] 80/17 reasons [2] 81/2 81/15
rebuild [4] 7/14
7/20 13/1 14/20
rebuilt [1] 12/18
recall [3] 21/2 21/6 24/5
received [1] 24/18 recently [2] 5/22 32/4
recess [2] 34/6 117/7
recognize [3] 17/6 77/16 100/2
recognized [2] 27/9 29/22
recommend [1] 5/6 recommendation
[3] 9/4 15/2 51/11 recommended [1] 74/17

## reconstruct [1] 13/16

reconstructed [1] 7/17
reconstruction [3]
12/21 12/22 13/6 record [5] 6/6 14/1 16/13 17/8 116/18 records [1] 60/1
recreation [4]
20/15 57/19 59/5 84/3
red [2] 23/2 94/19 reduced [3] 69/18 69/18 69/18
reference [5] 50/8
51/15 51/18 53/6
71/4
referenced [1]
100/23
referencing [1] 8/1 referred [3] 21/19 67/23 112/17
refers [2] 50/2
111/13
refine [1] 24/20
reflect [1] 8/1
reframe [1] 31/18 reframing [1] 29/13
regard [5] 23/6
35/10 40/21 52/11
52/16
regarding [4] 23/19

24/2 31/5 113/16 regardless [2] 81/3 95/21
region [1] 18/11 register [10] 41/15 42/15 43/5 47/9 47/21 48/5 48/11 51/13 57/6 57/7 regrown [1] 28/18 regulation [3]
108/24 108/24
112/24
regulations [8] 45/4 47/8 50/3 50/9
50/14 51/17 63/20 64/14
reinstate [1] 30/22 reiterate [1] 4/18 relate [1] 105/14 related [4] 21/21 34/20 39/17 118/11 relates [2] 86/19 105/15
relation [2] 60/3 60/4
relationship [3]
21/3 29/2 108/16 relative [1] 118/13 relatively [2] 32/3 70/8
relevant [6] 33/1
42/23 44/14 44/17

## R

relevant... [2]
114/15 116/11
reliability [2] 26/22 54/9
rely [2] 45/8 65/9 relying [1] 88/20 remain [2] 68/3 87/18
remaining [1] 11/8 remains [1] 67/13 remember [1] 41/4 remind [1] 29/7 removed [2] 100/7 103/24
rendered [2] 49/12 52/9
rent [1] 33/5
rental [2] 32/22
32/24
rented [1] 33/9
repeating [1] 29/10 report [40] 27/8 29/24 35/14 35/14
53/1 57/1 60/9 60/13 61/4 61/16 61/20 65/8 65/11 67/8 67/22 67/23 67/23 68/8 76/5 76/16 76/18 84/5 84/6 85/15 85/19 87/11 87/24 88/5

88/13 91/16 91/17 91/24 92/12 93/21 94/24 95/2 109/22 109/22 110/4 116/7 reporter [5] 1/24 77/21 88/6 118/4 118/18
reports [2] 91/24 92/18
represent [18] 5/21
18/6 45/24 46/7
46/22 54/8 55/2
67/22 69/24 70/21
71/2 79/6 83/10
93/6 95/1 96/8
103/19 113/21
represented [1] 31/13
reproduced [1] 22/4
request [2] 76/20 77/11
require [1] 110/10 required [6] 19/14 40/15 43/13 106/14 112/17 116/22
requirement [3]
63/19 64/15 64/15
requires [5] 7/17
50/5 106/18 106/22 111/8
requiring [1] 65/14 responsibility [1]
residents [1] 71/20 resolution [1] 38/23 resource [18] 17/12 24/6 38/9 38/12 38/15 38/19 39/2 40/4 40/23 73/16
73/16 73/22 75/4
78/3 80/11 89/17
91/2 100/13
resources [43] 2/22
15/8 15/14 17/5
17/10 19/14 29/7
34/24 40/15 41/14
46/6 57/14 57/14
58/3 59/11 72/20
73/15 73/22 76/12
77/12 88/22 89/5
89/6 90/7 90/8
92/21 92/23 93/16
94/3 95/20 100/14 100/18 103/3 104/3
104/6 105/3 110/13
111/20 114/4
114/13 114/15
114/21 116/4
Resources' [1]

## 17/15

responded [1] 26/1 response [5] 4/7
24/17 24/21 30/24 33/20
-
$\mathbf{R}$
responsibility... [1] 58/20
restate [2] 15/5
15/6
restoration [1] 12/21
restore [2] 12/2 13/11
result [3] 7/9 24/15 26/9
resume [1] 117/5 resumed [2] 2/4 34/7
resumé [1] 37/19 retains [1] 16/3 review [12] 34/20 35/21 36/2 43/20 43/21 48/20 49/17 49/19 52/23 107/6 112/5 112/6 reviewed [11]
35/13 35/19 43/24 44/3 49/11 49/13 50/13 72/23 73/4 107/18 107/20 reviewing [2] 44/8 73/10
reviews [1] 70/16 revised [1] 96/12 revolve [1] 62/12 Richard [1] 46/2
right [113] 6/1
33/16 33/21 34/9 35/7 35/18 36/15 38/24 41/2 41/18 41/24 42/1 42/10 42/18 44/5 47/23 50/17 51/6 51/22
51/23 52/14 54/24
55/20 57/7 57/24
58/19 59/10 59/21
59/23 60/12 60/24
63/16 65/12 65/22 66/22 67/5 67/21 68/6 68/20 69/5
71/10 71/12 71/22 72/4 72/13 72/21 73/3 74/19 75/14 75/20 78/24 79/4 79/13 79/16 79/17
79/21 80/2 82/8
82/10 83/13 83/24
84/12 84/13 85/11 86/20 88/4 88/15 88/20 89/7 89/8 89/9 89/16 89/17 90/9 90/11 90/13 92/6 92/24 93/16 94/11 94/18 95/13 96/14 96/21 97/3 97/12 98/7 98/15 98/20 99/11 99/23 100/22 101/8

101/18 102/9
102/10 102/10
103/6 104/7 104/13
104/24 105/8 106/7
106/20 108/6
108/18 110/3
110/16 110/22
111/12 112/15
114/23 115/5
right-hand [7]
65/12 79/4 79/16
79/17 79/21 80/2
97/3
right-of-way [1] 6/1
river [4] 21/16 22/1
22/1 22/12
road [16] 4/24 4/24 6/14 8/13 8/15 13/9
13/10 15/23 15/23
21/18 83/3 83/3
83/11 83/17 83/21 89/12
roads [2] 57/19
98/22
roadway [1] 15/11 rock [1] 7/5 roles [1] 78/8
roughly [2] 21/1
21/17
route [10] 4/23 5/21 6/7 6/12 9/13 21/1

| $\mathbf{R}$ | Sahegenet [2] | says [19] 22/6 41/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| route... [4] 31/3 | 20/16 24 | 47/3 47/18 |
| 32/17 94/19 101/17 | said [12] 9/10 24/20 | 50/11 51/9 65/12 |
| RSA [1] 118/19 | 31/6 39/10 41/5 | 67/10 75/11 79/9 |
| rule [20] 42/19 | 45/10 63/2 68/23 | 79/12 80/7 82/16 |
| 43/14 43/24 44/5 | 75/8 92/6 100/8 | 88/15 91/3 110/9 |
| 44/11 44/13 44/18 | 105/9 | 111/19 115/10 |
| 44/22 46/12 47/23 | Sam [2] 79/8 81/4 | scale [3] 92/20 |
| 51/16 52/16 56/3 | same [15] 6/4 19/19 | 95/13 99/9 |
| 63/23 88/23 106/17 | 28/3 46/12 47/6 | scenic [28] 3/10 |
| 106/21 108/2 | 51/8 56/21 57/12 | 27/9 57/19 58/3 |
| 108/15 112/18 | 57/16 63/2 81/9 | 72/19 73/16 73/2 |
| rulemaking [6] | 81/10 84/16 86/8 | 74/1 74/4 74/10 |
| 43/21 44/15 44/17 | 105/5 | 74/12 75/13 87/4 |
| 71/2 113/16 113/22 | saw [2] 15/12 74/22 | 88/1 88/16 88/22 |
| rules [27] 41/22 | say [25] 4/21 10/10 | 89/4 89/5 89/17 |
| 43/3 43/17 46/13 | 10/11 16/8 17/12 | 90/7 90/15 90/17 |
| 47/6 47/6 48/9 | 17/22 26/5 28/22 | 91/2 91/4 91/6 |
| 48/18 50/2 50/8 | 29/17 29/23 31/12 | 91/10 110/12 |
| 50/16 52/3 69/7 | 37/16 38/18 45/7 | 111/20 |
| 70/17 87/1 89/21 | 45/8 48/14 67/10 | scope [1] 39/14 |
| 106/15 107/19 | 87/24 88/19 91/9 | scopes [1] 38/14 |
| 107/22 109/10 | 100/16 102/21 | scramble [1] 21/24 |
| 109/15 110/10 | 104/23 111/8 | screen [3] 27/15 |
| 112/18 112/21 | 116/20 | 36/16 111/7 |
| 113/17 114/7 | saying [18] 11/19 | screened [1] 102/2 |
| 116/23 | 11/24 13/12 48/12 | screening [3] 14/10 |
| running [1] 20/24 | 62/15 64/16 67/1 | 107/1 107/2 |
| rural [1] 37/3 | 67/3 67/16 69/9 | script [1] 72/17 |
| S | 93/6 96/17 97/24 | SEC [55] 1/6 1/7 |
| Saffo [3] 2/6 4/4 4/8 | 102/18 116/1 | 1/18 1/19 1/19 1/21 |


| S | 111/13 | 1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEC... [49] 3/7 3/14 | see [29] 5/17 12/13 | session [6] 1/4 3/6 |
| /12 41/22 42/5 | 12/14 13/14 21/9 | 25/7 72/7 117/9 |
| /8 42/19 43/3 | 36/16 36/22 38/4 | 117/12 |
| /13 43/17 44/4 | 38/7 47/3 47/10 | sessions [1] 25/15 |
| 44/11 44/21 44/24 | 47/11 54/1 59/7 | set [3] 72/11 112/ |
| 45/18 45/24 46/8 | 74/15 76/6 78/12 | 118/7 |
| 47/6 48/9 48/20 | 79/2 79/6 79/20 | setting [2] 30/1 |
| 8/21 50/2 50/8 | 83/12 88/16 92/21 | 30/10 |
| 0/13 50/16 51/16 | 93/8 93/11 94/19 | seven [2] 30/2 86/3 |
| 2/2 52/16 53/10 | 94/22 100/8 111/1 | several [1] 75/24 |
| 161/9 62/5 | seeking [1] 50/12 | shading [1] 101/21 |
| 15 70/16 88/20 | seem [2] 22/18 41/9 | shape [2] 10/24 |
| /21 91/11 91/13 | seems [2] 18/24 | 10/24 |
| 6/15 106/17 | 36/24 | she [8] 26/10 2 |
| 106/21 107/19 | seen [3] 5/18 8/17 | 41/17 62/2 106/1 |
| 108/2 108/17 | 48/23 | 14/4 114/1 |
| 109/10 109/15 | selection [2] 41/21 | 114/20 |
| 110/10 112/6 | 111/3 | she's [5] 27/3 62/ |
| 17 | sense [3] 28/5 84/16 | 114/22 115/8 |
| SEC's [2] 44/20 | 85/7 | 115/17 |
| 68/22 | sensitivity [2] 35/2 | Sheet [2] 97/18 101/16 |
| second [12] 11/22 | sentence [8] 50/1 | sheets [3] 72/23 |
| 38/1 41/20 41/24 <br> $\mathbf{5 7 / 1 3} 57 / 2166 / 12$ | sentence [8] 50/1 $50 / 1050 / 1851 / 8$ | 73/5 73/11 |
| 57/13 57/21 66/12 | 51/18 67/17 72/2 | shore [3] 20/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78/17 78/19 78/21 } \\ & 97 / 5106 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 110/9 | 20/23 22/17 |
| section [13] 39/16 | sentences [1] 43/4 | short [3] 18/4 34/ |
| 42/16 50/3 50/13 | separate [3] 111/24 | 36/18 |
| 51/14 82/3 90/1 | 113/7 117/10 | shorter [1] 1151 |
| 101/10 101/11 | series [3] 40/9 74/5 | Shorthand [1] |
| 103/17 104/4 109/3 | 80/19 | 118/3 |


| S | 97/10 102/5 104/3 | site [36] 1/2 1/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| should [12] 6/13 | 105/21 | 7/1919/8 |
| 8/23 9/8 23/13 24/7 | SHPO [5] 46/7 | 21/6 27/19 29/2 |
| 27/14 31/23 42/20 | 46/19 48/8 114/5 | /6 30/15 30 |
| 85/18 100/7 109/19 | 114/22 | 31/21 32/13 33/12 |
| 117/2 | SHPO's [1] 48/15 | 42/9 42/13 46/11 |
| show [30] 20/6 | side [7] 8/15 13/9 | 51/1 60/7 61/9 6 |
| 39/11 46/17 55/1 | 13/10 22/11 74/5 | 63/5 66/6 66/24 |
| 74/22 76/10 78/15 | 109/2 110/13 | 4/16 75/12 83/7 |
| 84/1 | sided [1] 74/3 | 88/18 88/23 89/1 |
| 18 84/20 84/22 | signed [1] 33/17 | 89/21 91/6 99/16 |
| 85/8 85/13 91/20 | significance [2] | 0/1 110/1 |
| 92/9 92/17 95/17 | 64/2 81/6 | site-specific [3] |
| 96/5 97/9 97/16 | significant [4] 7/1 | 20/4 21/6 27/19 |
| 98/3 99/24 102/22 | 17/19 73/15 75/22 | sites [65] 3/10 |
| 103/23 103/23 | signify [1] 62/10 | 18/15 18/22 19 |
| 104/12 | similar [2] 24/4 | 26/9 26/17 |
| 11 | 28/3 | 27/20 29/18 |
| showed [9] 6/19 | simple [2] 30/17 | 30/13 30/19 34/2 |
| 73/2 73/2 73/17 | 65/17 | 35/6 35/17 40/6 |
| 74/7 75/2 97/20 | simplification [1] | 42/4 42/19 43/23 |
| 102/1 106/5 | 58/14 | 47/5 50/15 52/17 |
| showing [4] 9/8 | simplified [1] 63/1 | 52/23 53/9 53/9 |
| 1 77/15 | simplifying [2] | 53/18 53/24 54/2 |
| shown [8] 20/16 | 61/19 62/3 | 54/6 54/23 55/3 |
| 20/21 21/22 87/20 | simply [4] 59/20 | 55/15 57/4 |
| 96/12 104/16 | 64/5 71/5 72/14 | 66/4 68/19 68/1 |
| 104/19 112/18 | since [2] 39/24 52/7 | 70/19 71/13 87/14 |
| shows [14] 23/2 | single [4] 8/1 8/4 | 87/24 88/15 89/4 |
| 56/13 69/17 75/11 | 8/5 74/16 | 90/11 90/15 |
| 75/12 82/20 83/11 | sir [1] 16/22 | 90/17 91/2 91/4 |
| 83/14 86/4 87/9 | sit [1] 44/7 | 91/9 91/19 95/4 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 93/12 94/11 96/5 | southwest [1] 94/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sites... [13] 98/24 | 99/18 102/14 103/3 | space [4] 31/6 |
| 98/24 99/4 101/1 | 105/23 107/13 | 61/12 65/7 67/23 |
| 103/8 103/19 | 112/7 113/23 | sparked [1] 66/9 |
| 106/19 108/3 108/7 | 115/19 | speaking [2] 47/2 |
| 111/23 112/22 | somebody [4] 75/11 | 88/7 |
| 113/14 116/19 | 79/3 80/22 82/2 | speaks [1] 17/8 |
| sitting [1] 52/19 | somehow [1] 60/11 | specific [6] 20/4 |
| situation [1] 11/21 | someone [3] 15/8 | 21/6 27/19 36/1 |
| six [2] 71/17 72/21 | 16/18 25/12 <br> something [9] | 52/18 61/4 |
| size [2] 109/18 | $22 / 19 \text { 26/10 65/21 }$ | specifically [3] 28/5 75/5 109/17 |
| 110/12 | 78/2 85/22 91/21 | speculative [3] |
| skill [2] 7/8 118/8 <br> skills [1] 12/24 | 102/8 103/3 109/5 | 13/13 15/15 30/23 |
| slightly [2] 109/10 | somewhere [2] | sphere [1] 10/2 |
| 109/16 | 22/14 55/15 | spoke [1] 40/12 |
| slope [1] 10/18 | sorry [17] 15/6 | spreadsheet [5] |
| small [2] 69/22 | 16/12 25/23 41/3 | 76/11 76/19 77/14 |
| 94/20 | 49/23 51/2 61/21 | 77/15 80/3 |
| smaller [2] 16/6 | 71/3 76/21 76/23 | St. [1] 39/18 |
| 23/20 | 81/10 86/8 89/20 | St. Elizabeths [1] |
| so [138] | 95/15 110/11 | 39/18 |
| Society [1] 85/20 | 111/15 114/14 | staff [1] 77/19 |
| solution [1] 16/3 | sort [2] 93/12 102/7 | standard [2] 5/9 |
| some [33] 21/8 | sorting [1] 15/24 | 38/13 |
| 24/10 26/23 28/18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sounds [2] 29/9 } \\ & 40 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { standing [3] 6/20 } \\ 13 / 1514 / 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| 29/7 31/11 32/21 46/11 46/17 46/19 | sources [1] 58/24 | $\text { start [6] } 4 / 4 \text { 12/1 }$ |
| 46/11 46/17 46/19 | $\text { south [4] } 18 / 12$ | 13/12 34/2 34/18 |
| 59/2 59/15 65/9 | 101/11 102/13 | 38/2 |
| 74/22 76/6 83/15 | 102/15 | started [3] 18/18 |
| 85/7 92/13 92/14 | Southern [1] 19/23 | 22/21 112/10 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | still [6] 30/5 82/4 | subsection [2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| starting [2] 41/8 | 102/5 102/14 <br> 103/23 103/23 | 108/4 108/6 <br> subset [1] 41/15 |
| 91/16 starts [1] $91 / 17$ | stone [26] 2/13 2/14 | successiona |
| starts [1] 91/17 <br> state [15] 1/1 13/4 | 2/16 2/17 2/19 2/23 | 28/17 |
| 13/18 15/10 22/23 | 4/15 5/2 5/6 5/8 | such [3] 29/21 |
| 32/7 48/9 57/7 60/9 | 5/15 5/24 6/13 7/8 | 57/20 84/3 |
| 60/13 63/16 85/17 | 8/11 8/20 9/7 10/8 | sufficient [2] 20 |
| 108/12 114/5 | 10/9 11/7 13/20 | 28/11 |
| 114/22 | 14/8 14/24 15/12 | Sugar [2] 2/15 6/7 |
| stated [3] 8/24 | 17/11 17/14 | suggest [7] 27/ |
| 35/20 87/9 | stores [2] 83/5 83/6 | 27/20 47/24 72/1 |
| statement [3] 11/22 | strange [1] 31/11 | 91/13 91/21 110/1 |
| 31/10 42/11 | Street [3] 1/4 32/14 | suggesting [2] |
| statements [2] 27/7 | 83/18 | 44/21 69/6 |
| 37/8 | strength [1] 92/4 | suggests [1] 83/13 |
| states [4] 50/23 | strike [1] 116/10 | summaries [1] |
| 51/7 106/21 109/17 | stringent [1] 67/12 | 105/15 |
| Statewide [1] 65/6 | structure [1] 32/2 | summarizing [1] |
| station [3] 31/3 | structures [3] 20/8 | 78/6 |
| 31/4 32/3 | 87/16 89/11 | summary [6] 54/21 |
| statutes [1] 45/3 | study [2] 19/14 | 74/24 91/19 93/24 |
| stenographic [1] | 21/7 | 94/2 104/11 |
| 118/5 | style [1] 7/10 | supervision [1] |
| step [5] 4/21 4/22 | SUBCOMMITTEE | 7/19 |
| 5/1 9/3 9/11 | [2] 1/12 46/1 | supplemental [5] |
| steps [3] 5/9 40/12 | SUBCOMMITTEE | 49/14 53/1 54/13 |
| 43/16 | /SITE [1] 1/12 | 97/18 100/23 |
| Steven [3] 1/24 | subcommittees [1] | support [1] 77/19 |
| 18/3 118/17 | 46/8 | supports [1] 55/8 |
| stewardship [1] | subject [1] 72/1 | sure [31] 11/17 |
| 37/17 | submission [1] 51/3 | 12/16 17/2 24/16 |


| S | 21/18 42/2 42/3 | 82/16 97/4 97/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sure... [27] 34/18 | 43/16 43/20 5 | 105/13 105/1 |
| 44/16 45/5 57/9 | 54/5 56/1 69/5 96/2 | 105/16 |
| 58/8 58/22 59/15 | 114/5 117/5 | tasks [3] 40/9 40 |
| 60/21 66/3 67/20 | taken [17] 1/23 | 58/21 |
| 77/2 77/5 79/20 | 5/22 7/1610/12 | $\boldsymbol{t a x}$ [1] 67/11 |
| 84/3 85/21 86/6 | 17/12 21/15 22/14 | technical [3] 25/7 |
| 86/23 90/10 91/22 | 24/7 28/18 28/22 | 25/14 72/7 |
| 92/13 93/5 94/9 | 34/6 67/24 68/1 | tell [4] 5/5 9/11 |
| 95/20 97/6 103/11 | 81/15 91/15 117/7 | 62/3 71/16 |
| 111/11 114/10 | 118/6 | ten [1] 34/4 |
| surface [1] 10/21 | takes [1] 97/19 | tenants [1] 33/2 |
| surprise [2] 107/21 | taking [4] 11/11 | term [10] 12/20 |
| 107/24 | 11/23 12/2 61/17 | 12/22 38/12 91/15 |
| survey [2] 9/5 | talk [7] 19/5 52/22 | 111/22 111/23 |
| 9/12 | 53/16 55/21 58/4 | 111/24 113/3 116/5 |
| tain [1] | 83/2 | 116 |
| sustained [1] 32/10 | talked [5] 30/1 | terminologies [1] |
| symbols [1] 101/9 | 104/13 106/8 106/9 | 41/13 |
| T | 106/10 ${ }_{\text {talking [5] } 17 / 11}$ |  |
| T.J [5] 71/18 72/13 | 41/16 48/19 48/24 | terms [2] 20/9 61/4 |
| 73/13 78/6 86/13 | 54/7 | Terrain [1] 22/24 |
| table [19] 14/6 | talks [7] 4/17 17/9 | territory [1] 19/20 |
| 54/12 54/21 56/6 | 17/13 70/11 111/14 | testified [1] 58/5 |
| 56/13 56/24 57/3 | 112/19 112/24 | testify [1] 47/1 |
| 57/11 58/9 58/12 | tallied [2] 56/12 | testifying [1] 47/1 |
| 58/22 60/8 71/10 | 59/9 | testimony [30] 4/17 |
| 71/11 91/20 96/12 | tallies [4] 56/5 | 17/16 24/15 24/24 |
| 96/19 98/4 100/4 | 77/13 97/16 103/2 | 27/7 29/10 29/24 |
| tables [1] 40/7 | tally [10] 58/11 | 34/19 35/14 36/2 |
| take [13] 9/18 | 74/8 74/9 82/8 | 37/21 41/6 49/13 |


| T | 49/4 51/5 51/22 | 59/24 60/2 60/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| testimony... [17] | 52/3 53/21 | 61/10 72/22 73/15 |
| 49/14 51/20 52/24 | 55/6 55/7 56/14 | 73/18 73/20 73/23 |
| 53/1 53/2 53/3 53/8 | 58/14 58/23 60/18 | 73/24 74/2 75/2 |
| 53/15 54/13 55/24 | 61/2 61/6 61/7 | 75/8 75/9 75/9 |
| 56/7 64/23 82/21 | 61/12 61/19 64/4 | 75/10 77/15 78/14 |
| 97/18 100/24 | 64/16 64/17 65/16 | 80/24 92/17 100/19 |
| 113/23 116/8 | 67/6 67/14 68/3 | 105/23 |
| text [3] 56/1 84/23 | 71/21 77/9 77/15 | then [37] 4/16 5/10 |
| 115/19 | 80/5 82/2 85/9 | 7/18 8/9 9/10 12/13 |
| than [13] 4/24 | 86/17 86/23 86/23 | 12/15 14/9 14/11 |
| 24/18 25/3 28/5 | 87/21 91/5 92/2 | 15/11 18/19 23/4 |
| 38/6 42/8 44/19 | 92/6 92/23 93/20 | 26/12 27/10 29/17 |
| 47/22 50/19 72/24 | 95/9 95/18 96/7 | 37/18 38/23 41/20 |
| 77/4 83/21 106/14 | 97/9 99/10 101/12 | 48/17 54/8 55/3 |
| Thank [19] 4/13 | 102/20 104/8 107/3 | 56/8 56/11 56/17 |
| 8/9 16/15 17/24 | 108/18 108/20 | 57/23 69/7 73/21 |
| 17/24 23/16 28/2 | 109/5 110/3 113/2 | 84/19 85/14 86/1 |
| 34/5 36/19 41/6 | 113/2 113/4 113/11 | 88/17 92/10 94/20 |
| 56/17 60/16 63/1 | 114/23 115/22 | 106/4 115/5 115/12 |
| 66/22 72/4 78/12 | their [23] 6/22 7/9 | 115/15 |
| 81/8 101/12 114/15 | 11/2 14/7 14/7 20/2 | there [69] 4/5 9/13 |
| Thanks [1] 29/4 | 20/6 30/13 50/6 | 12/11 13/13 13/14 |
| that [524] | 55/13 58/17 62/17 | 14/12 19/6 19/7 |
| that's [81] 4/15 | 62/21 62/22 62/24 | 20/18 20/19 21/2 |
| 5/23 6/16 12/1 16/7 | 69/12 70/2 70/5 | 21/22 22/15 23/7 |
| 16/8 17/15 19/10 | 76/8 80/16 113/8 | 23/10 27/20 29/18 |
| 20/22 21/18 30/16 | 116/17 116/18 | 29/19 31/6 31/12 |
| 30/16 33/14 36/13 | them [33] 7/8 15/2 | 31/14 36/19 38/8 |
| 36/23 37/22 38/16 | 17/19 17/20 25/15 | 46/10 48/1 49/17 |
| 40/1 41/16 41/23 | 56/10 56/12 58/17 | 63/16 64/14 64/16 |
| 42/4 45/18 48/6 | 58/24 59/1 59/1 | 70/1 70/4 70/7 |

there... [37] 70/13 70/22 71/4 71/11 72/16 72/21 72/23 74/5 77/3 77/5 78/7 79/2 79/10 79/13 80/23 80/24 81/1 81/14 81/16 81/22 83/3 89/15 96/5 97/12 97/13 97/14 100/13 101/1
102/14 102/19 103/13 103/18 104/4 107/12 107/22 111/23 114/9
there's [22] 5/23
14/12 20/13 23/12 32/19 50/7 61/3 67/17 68/1 79/14 86/24 92/22 93/8 94/20 97/24 100/19 101/24 102/17 102/19 103/14 104/16 104/18 therefore [3] 51/14 63/4 81/20 these [55] 6/23 8/20 10/15 16/2 17/16 21/19 24/12 24/13 32/13 32/22 39/11 42/2 43/17 51/4

56/5 56/7 56/8
57/17 58/4 59/3
59/4 60/18 60/23 61/1 65/22 66/3 68/14 69/12 70/17
71/14 72/11 73/17 75/15 79/7 79/11 82/16 83/14 84/1 84/11 85/3 85/8 85/10 85/11 85/21 92/18 96/2 96/6 98/8 103/9 104/5 104/11 107/21
113/16 114/6 118/6 they [87] 6/20 7/7 9/1 9/2 9/3 12/1 12/1 12/15 12/16 13/8 13/9 13/10 17/12 19/10 19/11 19/13 19/16 19/17 20/1 20/7 20/17 23/9 25/8 25/16 27/10 30/13 32/16 33/4 33/9 37/9 43/22 45/1 45/6 55/16 56/10 58/18 59/7 59/9 59/20 59/24 60/20 60/22 61/11 62/22 64/9 64/9 64/11 64/11 69/20 69/21 71/6 71/21 72/5 73/22

73/23 73/24 73/24
74/2 74/3 74/6 74/7
75/16 75/22 76/6 80/16 80/24 84/17 84/17 84/18 84/21 85/13 89/10 89/14 95/6 95/9 96/4
97/16 100/8 103/4 103/23 103/23
109/8 109/8 113/6
113/6 116/1 116/18 they're [33] 7/3 8/15 10/22 17/18 59/22 59/23 60/3 60/4 60/5 60/6 60/6 60/22 61/1 70/3 70/13 70/19 75/17 84/6 84/16 95/21 95/22 97/4 99/4 99/5 99/6 104/6 104/11 104/12 112/3 112/4 115/7 115/24 116/1 thing [5] 16/7 63/2 67/5 78/18 104/12 things [3] 8/24 40/17 97/23
think [64] 11/23
15/3 15/4 15/16 16/10 17/8 25/11 26/4 27/3 27/6 29/23 30/10 30/16

| T | 40/3 40/11 40/13 | 57/16 70/24 72/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| think... [51] 30/23 | 40/17 44/8 46/17 | 78/13 79/1 84/1 |
| 31/9 31/17 33/6 | 48/8 51/24 53/16 | 84/7 84/15 92/10 |
| 40/24 44/10 44/13 | 54/6 54/11 57/20 | 93/12 93/14 93/19 |
| 44/18 45/6 45/12 | 58/5 58/6 58/10 | 98/9 107/10 116/10 |
| 49/1 53/11 53/11 | 58/20 59/19 62/11 | throughout [10] |
| 63/1 65/7 66/8 66/8 | 62/13 62/14 63/9 | 29/24 50/2 50/8 |
| 67/1 67/3 68/10 | 64/7 64/21 68/24 | 53/2 53/3 55/10 |
| 68/23 72/6 73/9 | 69/13 70/13 71/3 | 65/8 82/20 116/5 |
| 74/24 78/5 79/14 | 71/16 71/22 72/21 | 116/13 |
| 80/2 80/4 80/13 | 73/6 73/7 74/9 75/1 | time [9] 11/1 12/18 |
| 84/8 84/22 88/2 | 75/18 85/16 91/19 | 25/19 32/19 43/11 |
| 92/4 92/24 102/20 | 92/17 93/16 95/6 | 65/19 65/24 68/15 |
| 104/22 105/1 | 95/8 96/10 96/12 | 118/9 |
| 106/13 108/5 | 96/16 97/22 100/2 | times [4] 53/6 53/7 |
| 108/15 109/8 | 100/6 100/15 | 74/17 83/12 |
| 109/10 109/17 | 100/16 101/5 | title [5] 39/15 80/2 |
| 110/15 113/6 | 103/24 104/5 | 80/7 114/12 114/13 |
| 114/11 114/12 | 105/17 115/17 | titled [2] 2/22 3/9 |
| 115/19 115/24 | though [8] 35/13 | titles [2] 80/4 83/22 |
| 116/2 116/20 | 39/21 67/14 92/8 | today [2] 44/7 47/7 |
| thinking [3] 10/22 | 95/8 99/2 102/14 | together [1] 102/24 |
| 61/15 62/8 | 113/8 | toll [3] 21/4 22/8 |
| third [3] 50/21 51/8 | thought [3] 12/17 | 23/3 |
| 58/2 | 27/18 79/9 | too [4] 17/12 29/15 |
| thirds [1] 110/8 | three [9] 30/2 35/3 | 31/17 90/6 |
| this [186] | 40/11 40/12 57/2 | took [1] 99/11 |
| Thomas [1] 77/20 | 74/17 100/24 101/5 | top [3] 80/4 102/2 |
| thorough [1] 92/11 | 101/10 | 104/7 |
| those [62] 7/24 9/21 | through [22] 15/11 | topic [1] 62/8 |
| 13/4 18/21 25/22 | 15/17 31/11 39/9 | topics [1] 14/11 |
| 30/2 30/18 40/2 | 51/1 56/15 57/11 | topographic [1] |

topographic... [1] 106/24
topography [3] 20/9 21/12 107/7 total [1] 82/19 totals [2] 55/1 55/5 touched [1] 4/16 towers [4] 20/23 22/16 23/1 23/2 town [38] 2/22 3/12 20/15 21/15 22/10 22/12 58/11 58/11 59/24 60/2 60/6 60/12 60/12 60/15 60/15 61/7 61/7 66/13 91/18 91/18 91/24 93/13 94/3
96/1 96/20 96/23
97/1 98/9 98/14 99/1 99/4 99/17
101/6 101/6 101/9 105/15 105/19 106/6
town-by-town [5] 60/12 60/15 61/7 91/18 101/6 town-maintained [1] 20/15 towns [27] 56/13 56/14 56/16 56/17 56/18 60/23 61/1

66/11 66/19 66/19
66/20 70/23 71/20
71/22 91/20 92/10
92/16 92/16 93/7
93/12 93/16 93/19
94/1 99/24 100/2
100/6 105/24
townwide [7] 56/12
93/16 95/9 95/21
99/2 99/3 99/12
Track [1] 6/10
tracks [1] 24/6
tract [1] 20/3
trails [1] 57/19
Train [1] 31/2
transcript [5] 3/6
3/13 115/6 117/11 118/5
transferable [1] 68/22
transition [2] 31/4 32/2
transmission [4]
1/8 39/7 40/22
107/23
transportation [5] 1/16 14/3 14/22
15/9 16/5
trees [1] 20/8
trench [6] 9/14 9/19 two-thirds [1]
9/20 10/1 10/17 10/23
triangles [2] 102/23 103/19
tried [1] 22/22
triple [1] 83/15 truck [1] 9/24 trucks [1] 10/3 true [2] 29/17 118/5
try [2] 9/1 83/22
trying [9] 10/9
10/11 42/24 53/19
88/11 88/12 104/11
106/2 116/14
turn [14] 21/8
49/22 50/21 53/16
56/23 59/17 65/10
78/12 81/8 88/4
88/11 100/22 106/7 108/10
Turner [1] 77/19
turning [1] 58/8
two [19] 6/19 38/2
39/9 39/12 40/11 40/24 41/9 48/8
53/24 54/7 71/3
74/3 78/10 83/11
85/5 94/9 94/11
110/8 115/18
two-page [1] 38/2
two-sided [1] 74/3
110/8
type [2] 9/16 75/3

U-shape [1] 10/24 Uh [11] 6/21 7/6 10/19 12/5 12/10 13/3 15/18 15/20 48/22 85/24 88/21 Uh-huh [11] 6/21 7/6 10/19 12/5 12/10 13/3 15/18 15/20 48/22 85/24 88/21
ultimately [1] 92/8 under [31] 4/24
6/10 11/2 32/18 37/8 38/20 39/3 39/10 42/12 42/16 46/12 46/12 50/13 50/15 52/2 55/19 61/9 63/19 64/13 66/24 70/17 88/15 91/2 91/3 102/4 108/19 110/1 110/21 116/22 117/10 118/8 underground [27] 4/22 5/7 8/16 8/18 9/13 81/21 81/23 82/3 93/9 94/8 94/12 94/21 98/14 98/20 98/21 99/2 99/18 100/3 100/6 101/11 101/17

102/13 102/15
unlikely [1] 29/21 104/4 104/15 105/2 105/7
underground/parti al [1] 94/8
understand [29]
19/16 25/24 26/14
28/21 34/19 36/9 42/24 43/9 44/11 48/6 57/10 63/12 63/18 64/13 65/14 66/14 73/13 74/8 81/1 85/21 91/1 93/5 97/6 98/2 99/14 101/21 103/6 104/17 116/14 understanding [11] 9/12 18/14 18/17 18/23 19/9 20/1 21/12 26/17 32/21 44/19 107/9
understands [2] 57/10 84/4
understood [1] 92/24
undertaken [2]

## 35/3 38/16

undertakings [3] 50/6 108/17 110/11 unfamiliar [1] 14/14
unique [1] 74/2
unnecessarily [1] 41/14
unpack [1] 31/9 unreasonable [3] 35/16 36/5 70/11 until [2] 24/1 32/3 up [75] 9/7 13/16 18/3 21/24 33/17
36/10 36/11 36/23 37/19 39/11 41/8 45/19 46/15 49/4 54/14 54/16 56/12 57/3 57/21 57/23 58/11 58/23 60/1
61/15 61/24 62/2 63/17 64/22 65/2
68/4 68/8 72/11
73/2 73/2 73/17
74/7 74/22 75/2
75/11 75/12 76/14
78/15 79/7 79/13
79/23 82/8 82/20
82/24 83/11 83/14
85/5 85/13 89/1
90/4 91/20 92/9
93/1 93/2 94/14
95/19 96/6 97/9
97/10 97/16 98/4
98/12 101/14 102/5 103/23 103/23
104/19 105/21
up... [3] 109/9
109/22 113/19
uploaded [1] 6/9 upon [4] 4/16 14/23 20/21 21/23
upper [2] 65/12 97/3
upside [1] 84/9 upside-down [1] 84/9
urban [1] 37/2 us [6] 5/5 9/11
53/20 54/22 62/9 80/13
use [86] 33/6 41/12
55/4 57/18 59/16
59/21 60/2 60/7 60/10 61/3 61/8 61/11 61/15 62/4 62/7 62/13 62/14 62/16 62/21 63/7 63/10 63/12 63/14 63/17 64/5 64/10 64/11 64/21 65/5 65/13 65/16 65/18 65/19 65/24 66/5 66/10 66/21 66/23 67/1 67/8 67/11 67/13 67/18 67/24 68/2 68/3 68/13 68/15 69/1 70/1

70/4 70/4 70/9
70/14 70/18 70/19
71/1 71/5 71/6
91/14 94/1 96/10
96/14 96/24 97/2
97/4 97/9 97/10
97/12 97/13 97/14
99/5 99/6 99/12
99/15 99/17 100/5
101/6 103/4 103/13
104/14 104/16
104/23 106/7
116/14 116/17
used [32] 18/19
18/24 19/11 19/13
20/7 27/14 30/3
42/4 42/6 42/9
51/24 55/16 55/21
56/20 56/21 68/22
86/16 86/17 86/21
86/23 87/6 87/9
95/16 99/10 101/9
106/13 106/21
112/20 113/14
115/14 115/16 116/5
useful [1] 115/3
uses [2] 24/5 44/20
using [13] 38/12
75/23 86/13 87/13 102/20 106/24
107/3 107/6 107/16

111/22 112/23

## 113/11 116/13

usually [3] 39/13 40/10 45/7
Utilities [2] 1/13 1/14
utility [1] 14/22 utilizing [1] 107/21
V
V-shape [1] 10/24 valley [5] 18/11 28/15 54/9 107/10 107/11
value [13] 3/11
17/20 17/22 17/23
30/18 30/20 43/6
62/10 62/22 62/23
63/4 64/2 75/12 value-added [2] 17/20 17/22
valued [5] 61/12 69/4 74/6 82/7 104/6
values [1] 69/2 valuing [1] 83/20 vantage [1] 23/4 varied [1] 28/23 vary [1] 113/6 vegetation [4] 27/14 27/15 87/16 107/2
vegetative [5] 20/21

| V | 18 | walking [1] 15/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vegetative... [4] | 19/7 19/13 19/18 | Il [26] 2/13 2/14 |
| 24/11 28/7 28/12 | 20/3 20/6 20/7 | $162 / 172 / 19$ |
| 23 | 20/19 20/20 21/3 | 6/13 6/16 7/14 8 |
| enture [1] 30/24 | 21/6 23/8 23/10 | 10/8 10/9 10/13 |
| verbal [2] 4/7 33/20 | 23/19 23/22 24/8 | 0/14 11/9 12/6 |
| very [16] 6/14 7/17 | 24/14 25/3 26/9 | 13/11 13/ |
| 8/5 19/19 30/23 | 26/18 26/22 27/11 | 13/16 13/20 14/8 |
| 41/9 47/14 50/1 | 29/8 29/19 86/22 | 14/24 15/12 15/ |
| 50/22 55/22 69/22 | 87/10 96/3 97/17 | walls [17] 2/23 |
| 69/22 72/17 92/10 | 98/5 102/12 104/2 | 5/2 5/6 5/8 5/15 |
| 94/20 97/2 | visible [6] 20/10 | 6/20 7/3 7/16 8/20 |
| view [16] 19/19 | 22/16 27/23 27/23 | /712/1 |
| 22/3 22/13 23/5 | 97/24 106/23 | 3 14/19 17/1 |
| 28/8 29/1 29/2 | vista [2] 22/11 | 17/14 |
| 75/16 75/20 96/6 | 22/17 | want [33] 4/18 |
| 1/22 102/17 | visual [21] 53/5 | 18/13 19/5 20/12 |
| 2/19 103/20 | 71/19 86/18 87/2 | 21/24 22/8 |
| 22 | 87/8 111/21 112/1 | 26/2 30/21 30/23 |
| viewed [1] 89/12 | 112/20 113/1 113/3 | 34/18 36/7 |
| views [7] 21/9 31/6 | 113/12 115/10 | 42/3 56/5 |
| 31/7 31/12 75/6 | 115/11 115/14 | 59/15 64/22 65/10 |
| 13 | 116/1 116/4 116/ | 974/21 78/10 |
| viewshed [11] | 116/10 116/13 | 872 87/12 90/9 |
| 85/12 86/16 96/3 | 116/15 116/18 | 97/21 105/18 |
| 101/3 102/16 103/ | visually [1] 99/1 | 111/11 1 |
| 1 103/2 | voice [1] 72/10 | 13/9 |
| 20 104/2 | W | wanted [3] 4/18 |
| 105/6 <br> virtue [2] 61/10 62/6 <br> visibility [34] 18/21 | wait [1] 111/6 walk [1] 72/16 Walker [4] 2/8 33/22 34/10 34/15 | was [77] 6/22 9/22 9/23 13/17 14/21 15/6 19/6 19/7 21/2 |


| W | 59/5 | 23/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| was... [68] 21/16 | way [17] 1/15 6/ | week [2] 66/5 66/23 |
| 21/21 22/3 22/4 | 7/13 12/8 12/19 | well [43] 6/19 9/6 |
| 22/5 22/13 24/17 | 15/24 19/10 24/11 | 10/12 12/22 12/24 |
| 24/22 25/6 26/9 | 29/23 35/20 43/4 | 13/12 14/11 17/21 |
| 27/18 28/18 28/22 | 47/22 69/7 69/8 | 20/9 23/18 27/6 |
| 29/12 32/3 34/20 | 75/6 102/21 110/8 | 27/21 38/18 40/1 |
| 36/1 37/19 37/20 | we [142] | 41/1 44/14 45/24 |
| 40/1 41/17 44/5 | we'll [6] 34/4 75/9 | 50/21 52/13 53/16 |
| 45/19 46/11 49/13 | 75/10 88/13 94/1 | 55/2 61/17 63/12 |
| 53/19 55/14 58/23 | 117/5 | 67/16 79/6 80/7 |
| 59/13 62/20 63/11 | we're [17] 4/3 8/9 | 80/21 82/19 83/10 |
| 64/6 65/14 66/9 | 11/11 11/12 11/16 | 83/17 87/6 88/2 |
| 68/23 69/10 72/7 | 11/19 37/11 57/11 | 88/4 88/11 88/19 |
| 72/9 72/16 72/17 | 62/15 67/1 69/9 | 90/2 97/6 105/14 |
| 72/19 73/23 74/6 | 69/16 77/8 84/23 | 106/6 109/20 110/5 |
| 74/16 74/17 75/4 | 88/3 90/10 93/23 | 111/6 115/5 |
| 76/19 78/5 79/1 | we've [19] 7/15 | well-defined [1] |
| 79/8 79/9 80/14 | 34/14 35/3 39/16 | 12/22 |
| 80/16 80/19 80/24 | 40/14 41/16 51/20 | well-documented |
| 81/22 82/7 83/8 | 56/1 62/19 70/24 | [1] 12/24 |
| 87/19 94/14 97/17 | 70/24 75/23 76/4 | went [1] 54/3 |
| 99/24 100/12 | 76/20 81/17 96/18 | were [62] 6/20 9/22 |
| 102/22 107/6 | 106/8 106/9 111/7 | 19/23 20/10 20/16 |
| 107/16 109/3 110/3 | wealth [2] 49/19 | 23/1 23/18 26/5 |
| Washington [1] | 100/18 | 26/18 28/9 28/12 |
| 39/18 | Weathersby [1] | 31/6 43/22 53/22 |
| wasn't [4] 24/1 | 1/16 | 53/23 54/2 54/6 |
| 32/4 73/10 83/8 | website [5] 36/11 | 59/8 59/9 68/10 |
| water [2] 20/18 | 36/12 36/14 37/1 | 69/11 69/12 69/15 |
| $\mathbf{3 2 / 2 0}$ | 37/7 | 70/18 70/22 70/23 |
| waters [2] 57/20 | Webster [2] 19/22 | 71/14 71/17 71/21 |

were... [33] 71/23
72/5 72/14 72/15
72/21 72/24 73/15
73/23 74/5 74/9
74/11 75/5 75/5
75/7 76/1 76/2 76/9
76/12 77/13 80/16
81/15 81/22 81/24
82/5 95/8 97/23
99/2 99/3 100/13
100/16 110/15
111/16 112/7
weren't [5] 64/7
64/9 64/9 64/11
103/24
west [2] 22/1 22/11 western [1] 22/17 what [90] 5/7 5/10 6/18 6/20 7/10 7/18 8/12 10/9 10/11 10/16 10/17 11/19 11/23 12/11 12/14 13/5 13/10 14/17 15/4 15/13 15/21 19/16 21/10 21/19 24/17 24/20 25/16 26/3 26/4 28/23
29/7 30/12 30/14 31/10 31/19 32/23 36/24 37/11 37/15 40/9 42/6 43/22

44/16 44/16 45/6 45/7 45/9 46/11 48/12 48/24 52/6 55/1 55/17 58/3 58/23 62/15 62/19 65/24 67/1 67/16 68/10 68/23 69/9 69/16 69/16 73/19
73/23 74/6 77/8 77/16 79/20 80/15 84/4 85/7 86/9 89/18 93/5 94/5 102/12 102/18 105/15 106/14
108/20 109/12
110/3 110/15 113/9 114/6 115/2 115/3 what's [6] 9/18
15/10 86/17 95/24 96/1 116/22 whatever [5] 31/15 40/15 47/20 73/21 80/21
whatsoever [1]
85/12
when [32] 9/15
15/8 15/23 16/6 16/7 19/17 28/21 30/7 30/20 32/23 37/7 42/18 42/22 43/22 48/17 49/11 53/22 57/11 65/20

69/1 74/7 75/1 88/19 91/9 92/18 98/9 100/4 102/1 106/3 106/18 109/8 115/6
where [45] 7/15
8/24 9/2 9/3 9/9
9/22 9/23 10/2 10/7
15/21 20/1 20/13
20/16 20/16 20/22
22/13 23/1 25/7
25/15 31/4 32/17
38/8 44/4 55/6 55/7
56/1 60/3 65/12
70/17 75/17 81/20
84/21 93/8 93/9
94/19 96/15 96/22
99/18 100/6 101/1
101/22 103/7
106/23 109/17

## 111/14

whether [16] 21/2 26/8 26/21 27/14 33/11 51/12 58/18 60/4 60/5 63/7 67/7 75/16 75/22 81/4 95/21 95/22
which [41] 8/15 11/22 13/5 14/7
16/12 17/4 17/19
19/13 20/10 20/14
22/8 32/5 32/7 38/7

| W | 87/15 87/22 95/4 | 103/20 107/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| which... [27] 50/5 | 95/16 98/22 113/1 | 108/9 111/20 |
| 51/20 54/7 55/23 | 116/6 116/16 | without [3] 7/4 |
| 57/1 63/2 63/18 | 116/21 | 45/9 45/13 |
| 65/4 65/17 66/11 | Widell's [4] 35/13 | witness [10] 2/4 |
| 82/20 83/13 86/2 | 41/10 106/12 116/7 | 25/2 27/5 49/6 |
| 88/13 89/6 90/8 | widespread [5] | 54/17 77/22 80/1 |
| 90/8 91/16 92/13 | 53/8 53/17 55/9 | 82/14 88/8 109/24 |
| 97/19 101/16 103/7 | 59/18 70/12 | witness's [1] 24/24 |
| 106/21 108/3 | will [25] 5/1 8/22 | witnesses [2] 25/14 |
| 110/15 111/22 | 9/1 9/13 12/1 12/1 | 25/15 |
| 113/21 | 18/10 19/15 25/13 | won't [2] 84/15 |
| while [2] 62/2 | 29/17 32/17 33/3 | 90/6 |
| 113/6 | 33/11 35/16 46/22 | word [1] 116/10 |
| White [2] 39/20 | 48/13 55/2 67/21 | words [3] 37/9 |
| 81/19 | 67/22 69/24 70/21 | 38/21 43/5 |
| who [9] 23/21 46/2 | 71/1 83/10 96/8 | work [13] 7/22 8/6 |
| 46/18 73/6 73/17 | 97/21 | 9/19 33/1 37/12 |
| 80/10 82/2 113/24 | William [1] 1/16 | 38/14 38/16 41/10 |
| 114/19 | willing [1] 7/22 | 55/13 78/6 87/2 |
| who's [1] 33/22 | Wind [3] 45/17 | 116/2 116/17 |
| whole [4] 16/9 | 54/8 70/22 | work-extensive [1] |
| 22/10 65/15 78/17 | within [33] 6/1 6/5 | 8/6 |
| whoops [1] 84/9 | 22/15 55/15 56/11 56/19 59/8 60/4 | worked [1] 77/23 <br> working [3] 10/17 |
| why [11] 7/1 26/12 | 56/19 59/8 60/4 | working [3] 10/17 |
| 37/6 61/19 62/4 | 60/5 60/18 60/20 | 52/10 71/17 |
| 79/8 82/15 91/1 | 60/22 60/23 61/1 | workload [1] 16/9 |
| 112/13 116/14 | 68/18 70/23 71/21 | works [2] 16/1 |
| 117/4 | 72/14 73/18 85/13 | 108/19 |
| wide [2] 9/14 10/23 | 92/17 95/5 95/8 | workshop [2] 3/10 |
| Widell [13] 36/2 | $\begin{array}{ll} 95 / 22 ~ 95 / 22 ~ 96 / 1 \\ 99 / 4 & 101 / 2 \\ 102 / 16 \end{array}$ | 72/12 <br> workshops [5] |


| W | 99/23 107/24 | 81/1 82/22 88/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| workshops... [5] write [3] 79/17 80/5 91/8 94/6 94/8 |  |  |
| 71/15 71/16 71/17 | 80/16 | 94/23 95/10 97/8 |
| 71/24 76/11 | write-in [2] 79/17 | 97/9 98/17 103/9 |
| worthy [1] 67/2 | 80/5 | 104/1 104/9 105/9 |
| would [73] 5/6 5/24 | wrong [3] 25/13 | 105/12 108/5 |
| 6/1 6/12 6/20 7/10 | 71/16 109/8 | 111/10 111/17 |
| 7/18 8/1 8/19 9/4 | wrote [1] 61/ | 2/13 |
| 9/5 9/21 12/20 | Y | 5/13 |
| 13/10 13/13 14/24 | year [2] 63/23 |  |
| 15/15 15/16 17/22 | 64/14 | vou'd [3] 53/19 |
| 20/2 22/16 23/7 | years [7] 28/21 |  |
| 23/9 23/10 23/23 | 55/13 63/18 64/17 | you'll [4] 47/3 |
| 24/9 26/4 26/8 | 65/13 65/17 65/19 | 59/17 92/13 93/ |
| 27/20 27/22 28/6 $\mathbf{2 8} / 22$ 31/12 31/14 | yellow [9] 20/13 | you're [48] 7/24 |
| 28/22 31/12 31/14 | 22/15 81/11 102/22 | y/16 9/17 10/6 10/9 |
| 40/13 42/12 44/7 | 103/7 103/9 103/11 | $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 4 & 16 / 7 & 20 / 4 & 36 / 9\end{array}$ |
| 44/8 44/10 44/21 $\mathbf{5 0 / 1 8} 52 / 1958 / 18$ | 103/18 105/22 | 37/7 37/8 38/12 |
| 50/18 52/19 58/18 | yes [63] 5/4 6/3 8/4 | 40/9 44/21 45/12 |
| 66/6 69/14 70/7 | 10/12 11/18 13/7 | 47/24 48/12 53/11 |
| 73/21 75/18 89/7 $\mathbf{9 1 / 1 0} 91 / 1391 / 15$ | 19/1 19/12 25/12 | 53/12 53/14 55/7 |
| 91/10 91/13 91/15 $95 / 2098 / 2499 / 8$ | 25/23 26/15 38/5 | $57 / 859 / 861 / 19$ |
| 95/20 98/24 99/8 | 39/1 39/5 40/14 | 64/15 66/3 67/3 |
| 99/17 99/19 99/21 99/22 102/19 | 43/15 48/3 49/7 | 68/21 69/1 69/5 |
| 99/22 102/19 | 51/7 52/4 54/18 | 69/24 80/3 80/8 |
| 102/21 103/16 | 55/7 55/19 56/4 | 87/12 88/20 89/18 |
| 107/20 108/14 | 57/8 57/9 58/7 | 92/19 93/6 98/20 |
| 108/18 109/1 113/5 | 58/15 59/13 59/22 $\mathbf{6 3 / 1 5} 64 / 1967 / 3$ | 102/18 106/18 |
| 114/5 114/7 114/15 | 67/4 67/5 70/6 70/8 | 108/4 108/15 |
| 114/24 | 70/15 72/1 74/20 | 108/16 112/11 |
| wouldn't [3] 73/5 | 77/9 77/17 78/20 | 112/23 113/10 |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |

