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PROCEEDINGS
(Hearing resumed at 1:38 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Draper,
you may proceed.

MS. DRAPER: Okay.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. DRAPER:

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Dodson. I'm Gretchen Draper, and I represent the team from the Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee. So we'll be talking about river questions.

A. Okay.

Q. I was wondering, when you were doing your analysis, if you considered the Pemigewasset River as a whole going from Franconia to Franklin.

A. No, we considered a specific section of the river, but we didn't do an analysis of the whole river.

Q. Okay. So, like when you divided up the Great Northern Woods and the Lakes Region, which part of the river did you focus on the most?

A. We focused on the Lakes section of the river.

Q. Okay. All right. And when you came to the
Lakes Region to look at the river, what additional features did you -- were you looking at or found that raised the visual impact on the river?

A. We were --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman,
I'm going to object. There's a full description on Page 49 of his assessment of the Pemi.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Draper.

MS. DRAPER: I guess what I'm looking at is more the process and the procedure; so, what happens when you go to look at a river, what kinds of things are you looking for. Now, that may not be what --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think as a general question you can do a little bit of exploration with him about how he does what he does. A lot of it is in his report.

MS. DRAPER: Yes, I know that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So if you start asking questions that start asking him to repeat what's in his report --

MS. DRAPER: Yup.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- Mr. Needleman is probably going to have a problem with that, and I'll probably stop you.

MS. DRAPER: I'm not going to do that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

MS. DRAPER: I'm really looking at more the process.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

MS. DRAPER: Thank you.

BY MS. DRAPER:

Q. So as someone in your field, you come to a river, what sort of things are you looking at in terms of the visual impact?

A. Well, we're looking at the length of the river, the condition of the banks of the river, what the watershed of the river is, things like flow rates and water levels. This project was strictly visual, so we looked at terrain, vegetation, the water features of the river. We would have liked to have done a comprehensive study of the visual characteristics of the whole river, but we were limited to looking at specific...
viewpoints.

Q. Okay. Thank you. That's fine.

   Now, you also are looking at the tourist
value in these different areas. Would you
give me your opinion of what you consider the
Pemigewasset River and how does that rank as
its tourist value in the Lakes Region?

A. I think it varies. I'm familiar with the
Upper Pemigewasset in the Wilderness area,
where it's a beautiful stream, so that's
hikers, bikers, snowmobilers, and I'd say
it's an important part of the tourism region
up there.

   As it flows further south, we start
getting the paddlers, the canoes, the kayaks.
In some portions there's trails along the
river, so there's hiking. And I think
further south, as the river gets bigger, the
paddling and boats get bigger. I'm not
familiar with it further south.

Q. All right. Thank you.

   And I was interested when you were
speaking earlier today about comparing the
linear river with roadways. And I guess I
was wondering what different points of view
would you want to take, 'cause like you were
saying, you would take pictures or look at
different features from a different route to
whatever. Now, if you put that into the
river context, how would you look at a river
from different points of view?

A. I would divide the river into regions, and
depending on the type of study you were
doing, there could be hydrogeologic features,
there could be wildlife features. Our focus
is visual, so I would divide the river
landscape up into different visual zones,
which could be a factor of topography,
vegetation, water features, unique historic
or cultural elements. We were focused on
where the transmission line would cross the
river or parallel the river, so that narrowed
our focus.

Q. Right. And I'm thinking, too, that you would
want to look at things like the view if you
were a canoeist's, if you were a fisherman on
a bank, if you were driving by; is that
correct?
A. Yeah. Hmm-hmm.

Q. And what did you find when you -- did you take those different perspectives when you stopped at those key points?

A. Yeah. A key point that we did involved a pretty active canoe/kayak route. It had an informal area where people got in and out and portaged their canoes. And it included some very steep banks, which made it scenic.

Q. All right. Was this on Coolidge Woods Road? Is that in New Hampton? Would it have been part of the Army Corps of Engineers floodplain? Is that what --

A. No, it wasn't.

Q. Okay.

A. I'm drawing a blank now on the town it was in.

Q. That's fine. And I guess finally what I'm looking at is that there's nothing that you have seen since you've put in your reports that would change your opinion as to the visual impacts of this project?

A. No, I haven't seen since the report and the supplemental.
Q. Okay. Well, thank you very much. That was easy; right?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I have no other intervenors who have indicated that they have questions. Is that right? Am I missing anybody?

[No verbal response]

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

Mr. Needleman.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. Mr. Dodson, hello. I'm Barry Needleman. I represent the Applicant here. I want to start off with a couple of general questions. It's my understanding that you've never conducted a VIA in New Hampshire. Is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. And you haven't reviewed other VIAs that have been submitted to the Site Evaluation Committee in the Antrim case or the Merrimack Valley case; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. And my understanding is that prior to the
time you did your work here you didn't review any of the SEC's prior decisions; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. And my understanding also is that you didn't participate in any way in the development of the SEC rules recently; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. And at the tech session, I think you told me you had no experience conducting VIAs for electric transmission lines.

A. That's right.

Q. And you were engaged here by SPNHF and Appalachian Mountain Club to, quote, "analyze the aesthetic impacts of the Northern Pass transmission project"; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. Earlier today when Ms. Connor was questioning you, she asked you whether the work you did here was a VIA or just a critique of DeWan, and you said it was just a critique of DeWan. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. I want to call up SPNHF Exhibit 69 and ask
you some questions about that.

This is the corrected report that you've
done in this case; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. So, to be clear, you originally filed a
version of this in December, and then between
December and April you made numerous
corrections, to it, and what we're looking at
here is that corrected version; right?

A. That's right.

Q. Despite that, this version still has the
original December 28th date on it. Do you
see that?

A. Yes.

Q. So I just want to make sure we're not
confused. I will generally refer to this,
but there are going to be times when I will
refer to the original version as well.

Now, the title page of this document
that you created says "Visual Impact
Assessment – Northern Pass Transmission
Project"; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. If we look at the introductory page and
numerous other pages, I see the same
description. You call it a "Visual Impact
Assessment for the Northern Pass Project";
right?

A. Yes.

Q. And let me turn, for example, to Page 11.
And this is getting into a portion of your
analysis. Again, you style this section as
your visual impact analysis. And your very
first sentence talks about your visual impact
analysis. In fact, I looked at this, and I
saw that on every single page in this
document you refer to it as a visual impact
analysis. Were you aware of that?

A. Yes.

Q. So why, then, given that during the entire
course of this proceeding, right up until
today, have you referred to this as a visual
impact analysis, and then today you're now
calling it just a critique?

A. It's a Visual Impact Assessment that's based
on DeWan & Associates Visual Impact
Assessment. So we used the DeWan &
Associates VIA as a basis for our work. But
what we were doing is a critique of his work, and then we were adding considerable information and analysis in our own right to supplement the critique. So, in a way, it was a visual impact assessment, but it was based on, as a foundation, the DeWan & Associates VIA.

Q. In fact, the purpose of a visual impact assessment is to identify and evaluate scenic resources, determine impacts on them and discuss potential mitigation; right?
A. That's right.

Q. And that's exactly what you did here; right?
A. That's right.

Q. Okay. So when you told Ms. Connor that you would do this differently if you were doing a VIA, I guess I don't understand what you meant, because you did do a VIA, and you had every opportunity to do whatever you needed to do in order to present this to the Committee; right?
A. Right.

Q. Okay. I want to call up SPNHF Exhibit 62, which is your prefiled testimony. And I'd
like to look at Page 9, Line 14 to 17. And this is where you're summarizing your general methodology. And you say that you employed a similar methodology as the Applicant's Visual Impact Assessment, but you modified it as necessary to address scenic viewpoints that were ignored or incorrectly rated and reflected a broader range of issues and aesthetic criteria. Does that sound generally; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. So I want to focus on this issue by looking at your VIA. Let me begin by looking at the places where you actually agreed with aspects of DeWan's approach and were complimentary of it. So let's go to Page 8 of your VIA. And here you said that you did field work and confirmed that the Applicant's methodology was, quote, "thorough and professionally presented"; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. But you go on to note that there are shortcomings with it which you speak about later.
You also were complimentary of the viewshed mapping that the Applicant did; isn't that correct?

A. That is.

Q. Let me call up Applicant's 374. There are a number of places throughout your work where you make statements, and I tried to summarize them here. I am happy to go to any of those locations if you'd like me to. But in your Appendix C, you said that the viewshed mapping and computer modeling were relatively accurate technologies. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. In fact, you said, I think, that it was conservative because it used only a 40-foot tree height. Does that sound right?

A. Yeah.

Q. On Appendix C, 5, you said that the Applicants produced excellent viewshed data. Does that sound right?

A. Yes.

Q. And overall, the representation of the visual impacts in the proposed project was excellent based on the viewshed data. Does that sound
right?

A. Yes.

Q. And in Appendix C, 2, you said you didn't attempt to fully analyze or redo the Applicant's viewshed analysis, but you considered it a useful guide and tool; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And in fact, I think we heard earlier, and we can see here, that you relied on the Applicant's viewshed maps in the work that you did; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, another area of similarity which we can see on Appendix D, Page 5, is the way in which you did your overall approach to this.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, SPNHF 69 Appendix D.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. Here you said the determination of whether the site and facility may have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics is evaluated for each sub area and the Project as a whole; right?

A. Which document is this coming from?
Q. We are looking at SPNHF Exhibit 69, which is your VIA. This is your Appendix D on Page 5.

(Witness reviews document.).

Q. Is that your conclusion?
A. Yes.

Q. And I think you're aware Mr. Dodson essentially took the same approach to this. Does that sound right?
A. Yes.

Q. And then on Appendix C, Page 4, you said the Applicant's aesthetic quality evaluation process is sound. It is based on a method developed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and is similar to a procedure that is used in many aesthetic assessments; right?
A. Yes.

Q. And you more or less took the same quantitative approach to aesthetic assessment here that Mr. Dodson took; is that right?
A. We did, but we made important modifications to it.

Q. Understood. And we've seen some of those. And I will get back to some of those a little bit later.
And then on scenic significance rating, you have it as a combination of cultural value and scenic quality. And that's in your Appendix E at Page 3. Does that sound right?

A. It does. We have an enhanced definition of "cultural."

Q. And DeWan used cultural value as well, though you disagreed with him about how he later used it as a screening tool; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And then finally, you're a proponent of evaluating scenic resources from multiple viewpoints; isn't that correct?

A. Could you repeat that, please?

Q. Yeah. I said you're a proponent of evaluating a scenic resource from multiple viewpoints, not a single point; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And again, that's something that DeWan did as well; is that right?

A. At times he did, other times he didn't.

Q. And then with respect to photo simulations at Appendix C, Page 2, you said that, with few
exceptions, the visual simulations that DeWan did are professional and well crafted. Do you remember saying that?

A. Yes.

Q. But you took issue with his interpretation of those simulations; right?

A. Yes, I did. Some of the photo simulations I felt were from perspectives that would enhance the visual impacts -- would enhance the capability of the Project to blend in with its environment. And then a few of them had structures and conductors that were silhouetted against the sky where we felt that the lighting and the contrast of the structures on the background were inadequate. So we took our own similar photographs and own photo simulations to show the sky lighting.

Q. Understood. I'd like to look at Page 8 now of your VIA. And this contains your methodology flow chart. I'm looking on the upper right-hand side there where you compare your methodology to DeWan's methodology. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

Q. And in both of them, underlying the description of the methodology in that gray box is the phrase "potentially visible sites"; is that right?

A. Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And on Page 8, Dawn, if you could zoom back out.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. You said in that middle paragraph that scenic resources with potential visibility were identified based on a review of cartographic data and site visits; right?

A. Right.

Q. And I think you told me at the tech session that when you did this work, and I think you repeated it this morning, you didn't use bare earth maps. You used the viewshed maps with vegetative screening that were prepared by Mr. DeWan; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, earlier today when Ms. Connor was questioning you, she asked you about whether you had used those vegetative maps. You said
you did. She asked you, if you were doing a full VIA, would you have used bare earth maps, and you said you would. I'm curious as to why you just didn't use the bare earth maps. You had them available to you. You could have used them if you wanted to. You chose not to. Why?

A. We used the maps that were available. Are you referring to viewshed maps?

Q. No, I'm referring to the fact that I think it was in February of 2016 Mr. Dodson updated his materials, pursuant to the new SEC rules, and provided bare earth maps. So you had those accessible to you at the time you did your work, but you chose not to use them; is that correct?

A. We didn't use them in our main report which came out in December of 2015, I think it would have been.

Q. I think it was 2016?

A. 2016.

Q. Right. But you could have if you wanted to; right?

A. We could have if we had had access to them.
But I'm assuming if it says February submission, it only dealt with leaf-off and private property sites.

Q. Well, let's assume this: If Mr. Dodson provided bare earth maps in February of 2016 and you filed your first report in December of 2016, you could have had access to those bare earth maps; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And in fact, in the work you did here, as you were analyzing resources, you screened out certain resources based on lack of visibility. And let me pull up your Appendix E to remind you of that.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: If we could go there, Dawn, and start on Page 2.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. So this is Appendix E, Page 2. And Resource No. 24, which is Smith Hill Road, in that fifth column over you have an "N" there indicating there was no visibility; right?

A. Right.

Q. And we don't have to go through them, but there are two others; there's Resource 64 and
Resource 82 where you also had no visibility. And then if we went over to Appendix F, we would see that they dropped out of your assessment because they weren't visible; is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. So, like DeWan, you were doing some screening in your resource assessment for lack of visibility; right?

A. Right.

Q. Now, there are also places in the work you did where it seems to disagree with the way in which T.J. Boyle approached certain issues, and I'd like to ask you about that.

The first one is the use of cultural value in assessing a scenic resource. I think we saw earlier that you did that. And in fact, in response to a question this morning, you said to somebody that the use of cultural value is, quote, "a legitimate way to assess resources." Do you remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. So what I want to do is put up CFP Exhibit 138. And this is T.J. Boyle's report
at Page 20 -- or their testimony. I'm sorry.

Now, T.J. Boyle takes the view that there is no justification in Site 301.05 for the use of cultural value to evaluate scenic resources. Were you aware that that was their opinion?

A. No.

Q. So I guess my question to you is: Do you stand by what you did and do you think that T.J. Boyle is wrong, or do you want to change your view?

A. No, I think cultural value is a legitimate standard to use. But I feel that DeWan & Associates' definition of cultural value is much too narrow. And I described this morning that I think, in addition to official designation and number of visitors, it's important to consider historic resources, historic land uses such as farming and forestry, and some of the other aspects of human interaction with the land that have shaped New Hampshire's landscape.

Q. Understood. So, just getting back to my question then with respect to this yellow...
highlighting, you think T.J. Boyle is wrong.

(Witness reviews document.)

A. Yeah, I think so.

Q. Okay. Now, also in your report we talked about a minute ago that your approach was to analyze the Project by regions and as a whole. Do you recall that?

A. I do.

Q. And you're aware of the fact that T.J. Boyle didn't do that regional assessment for the SEC portion of their analysis; is that right?

A. I wasn't aware of it.

Q. Does that surprise you now that you know about it?

A. I think that taking a regional approach identifying the different regions that the Project goes through is important.

Q. And that's what Mr. Dodson did as well; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And then we looked at this a moment ago. But you praised the Applicant's use of a BLM-based methodology. Do you recall that?

A. Hmm-hmm. Yes.
Q. And I just wanted to put up a document that probably, likely you're familiar with this. This is a BLM guidance document. It's Applicant's 375. And this is BLM Document 8410, which is guidance for filling out scenic quality forms. I take it you've seen this before?

A. Yes.

Q. Yeah. And I want to direct your attention to Page 4, and in particular, this quote which says you have to evaluate these SQRUs, which I believe are scenic quality rating units, by observing the area from several important viewpoints. The score should reflect the evaluator's overall impression of the area. I take it you agree with that?

A. Yes.

Q. And to the extent that T.J. Boyle did not take this approach and look at multiple viewpoints, but only looked at single viewpoints, I take it you would disagree with their approach?

A. Not necessarily. I think what they were doing is considering different points along a
linear feature -- a road, a river, a large lake -- and considering each one of those as its own scenic resource. That was their way of addressing several viewpoints. My feeling is that, if you take a river, for example, it can have, as we were discussing before, different reaches or different segments, one where there's steep banks and dense vegetation and rocky shoreline, another separate reach would be shallow banks, open fields, sandy shorelines, and each one of those would be the equivalent of a separate scenic area or separate scenic resource.

Q. SPNHF Exhibit 66 is your supplemental prefiled testimony. I'd like to turn to that for a minute.

You filed your original testimony and report in late December; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And then you amended it on January 11, a few days later. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. And at the same time you filed your original report, T.J. Boyle filed their report; right?
A. Yes.

Q. And you're aware of the fact that they also amended their report on January 20th?

A. Yes.

Q. And you reviewed all of their materials and then subsequently filed your supplemental testimony on April 17th; is that right?

A. Right.

Q. And I want to call up Page 4, Lines 12 through 14 of your supplemental testimony where you say that you found it a noteworthy conclusion of T.J. Boyle that more than 18,000 potential visual resources within the Project's area of potential visual impact should be further evaluated. Do you recall saying that?

A. Yes.

Q. And then on Page 5, Lines 20 to 22, you said that the very large number of potential scenic resources identified by T.J. Boyle "confirms my conclusion that DeWan & Associates greatly underestimated the sweeping extent of the Project's visibility and impact on scenic resources." Do you
recall saying that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you didn't originally identify scenic resources anywhere close to that 18,000 number that T.J. Boyle came up with; right?
A. Right.
Q. And in your January 11 supplemental testimony, and I'll call that up now, on Page 5, at the bottom, and we're going to carry over to Page 6, you said that in addition to viewpoints identified and evaluated by DeWan and DOE, Dodson & Flinker identified 57 viewpoints where the proposed transmission line and corridor would be visible. These are the resources identified by SEC rules. Do you remember saying that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now I want to go to Page 7 of SPNHF 69, your revised VIA.

So, looking at what you did here --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Are we on the right place, Dawn? I just want to be certain.

Oh, right. Okay. Yeah, the second full paragraph that starts the methodology.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. This says the methodology identifies scenic resources within a 10-mile radius of the Project, including sites identified by the Applicant, U.S. Department of Energy, and additional sites identified by Dodson & Flinker. Visibility of the Project from public vantage points, especially from scenic, cultural, recreational or natural areas, is then determined based on analysis of the Applicant's viewsheds, digital modeling and field work. And then the last sentence says, "This process yields a total number of sites for further analysis." So that's what you said in December of 2016; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And then I want to look at Applicant's 377. That is the original version of your report. And I want to look at Appendix E. And the reason I'm going to the original version is because the title of Appendix E changed in your later version. But the title of Appendix E in your original version was "D&F
Scenic Resources - Full List." Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So when we received this VIA in December and we saw that throughout the entire document you represented that it was a VIA, and we saw in that description that you just read to us that the process you described yields the total number of sites for further analysis, and then we saw here that you were calling this your full list of D & F scenic resources, don't you think it would have been reasonable for us to conclude at that point that what we've got here is what you believed to be the complete set of scenic resources?

A. Given the time and budget that we were working with, it was the full extent of what we could do. But we didn't imply by that, that there weren't many other sites that would be worth looking into, including up into the thousands that T.J. Boyle identified. It just wasn't possible for us at that moment to do that amount of
Q. Is there anywhere in your December 30th document where you tell us or anybody else reading it that because of budget limitations this is the most you could do?
A. No.
Q. So we couldn't have known that; right?
A. Right.
Q. So when we got this document and saw all those things we just went through, it would certainly be reasonable for us to conclude on December 30th that, according to what you say here, that was your full list of scenic resources; right?
A. It was the list of resources that we were able to evaluate in the amount of time that we had. But we never said that it was a comprehensive list of resources for the whole study area, for the full 132 miles. I don't think that T.J. Boyle was able to evaluate the thousands of resources that it identified.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, could we go back to SPNHF 69 for a minute?
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. I want to have in mind the title you use here, and then I want to look at the April 17th version for the title of Appendix E.

So, there is Appendix E. In the April 17th version you changed the title, and now it says "D&F Sites Visited – Full List." Why did you change the title?

A. I think it more accurately describes what we actually did. We visited, I think it was 102 sites, and documented them with photographs. And Appendix E is a list of all those sites. I think that's a more accurate way of describing it.

Q. Who decided to change that title?

A. Honestly, I don't remember. It could have been me. It could have been Nate Burgess, my associate.

Q. Are you aware of the fact that after T.J. Boyle's initial filing and identification of those 18,000 resources, they subsequently reduced that number?

A. Yes.
Q. And do you know how much they reduced it to?
A. I think they came down to about 8,000.
Q. Yeah, it was about 7400 or so.

And I think when we discussed this earlier, you disagreed that it's appropriate to screen resources using vegetative screening; right? That's how you did it here.

A. To screen resources with vegetative screening?

Q. Right. To assess them considering vegetative screening; right?

A. To assess them based on vegetative screening as opposed to bare earth?

Q. Let me take a step back. With the work you did here, you used vegetative viewshed maps and screened out resources based on vegetation; right?

A. Yes, that was what we were working with.

Q. And were you -- I don't think you were present when I cross-examined T.J. Boyle, were you?

A. No.

Q. Did you have an opportunity to look at those
transcripts?
A. No, I didn't.

Q. Were you aware that the Applicants pointed out that, with respect to that Boyle list of 7400 or so, we believed that there were duplicates on that list and many resources that didn't necessarily qualify as scenic resources? Did you know that?
A. It was my understanding that the list of 18,000 was edited down partially due to duplicates.

Q. I'm referring to the list of 7400. Were you aware of what I just told you?
A. No.

Q. So, regarding Boyle's list of 7400 -- I want to call that up for a moment. This is Counsel for the Public's Exhibit 139. It's T.J. Boyle's supplemental report, and this is Appendix G, at Page 4. Is this familiar to you?
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A. Yes, I've seen this.

Q. Is it your belief that T.J. Boyle properly applied the definition of "scenic resources"
in the regulations with respect to all the work they did?

MS. BOEPPLE: Objection. He's calling for speculation on the part of this witness, in terms of what the thought process was and analysis was in the T.J. Boyle report.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't think there's anything speculative about it. He's testified extensively today about his view of T.J. Boyle and the application of this. I'm asking him if he thinks they did it right.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I thought that was the question, "Do you think he did it right?" That was the question. Yeah, objection's overruled.

A. Could you repeat the question?

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. Sure. Do you believe that T.J. Boyle properly applied the definition of "scenic resource" in all of the work that they did?

A. Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So I want to look at, Dawn, if you can highlight partway up Site 102.45(c), scenic drives.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. See that?
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Q. So, of the 7417 resources here, T.J. Boyle identified over half of them as "scenic drives" pursuant to this regulatory site. Are you familiar with that?

A. Yes.

Q. And it's your opinion that they did that correctly?

A. I believe that they did. And "scenic drives and rides" are one of the SEC's criteria under 102.45.

Q. Under 102.45(c); is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. I want to come back to that in a minute. I also want to ask you, earlier you were asked about how T.J. Boyle -- I think it was Ms. Connor asked you about how T.J. Boyle identified certain current-use parcels as scenic resources, and I think you said you agreed with that approach; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And you're aware that those parcels aren't
even included among the 7400; is that right?

A. I wasn't aware of that.

Q. In reaching your conclusion that T.J. Boyle properly included those current-use parcels, what analysis are you relying on?

A. In terms of evaluating their impact on the roadway?

Q. Well, no. You're offering the opinion that T.J. Boyle correctly includes current-use parcels in the definition of scenic resource. And I didn't see anything in any of your materials where you talk about current use. So I'm wondering what analysis you did or what analysis you're relying on to reach your conclusion.

A. I think the focus shouldn't be on current use necessarily. I think it should be based on the actual physical and visual reality of that particular scene. If you're traveling on the road and you see a hillside, a meadow and a stream, you would evaluate that as a visual resource, regardless of the taxation or ownership issues involved.

Q. Do you know how the New Hampshire current use
program works?

A. I'm assuming that it's a tax abatement program.

Q. Did you do any work to understand how it works?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Let me go back to your Exhibit 69, Page 5. This is your VIA again. And you say on Page 5, under No. 1, that the filtering methodology which the Applicants used eliminates many viewpoints and scenic districts that contribute to the aesthetic quality of New Hampshire tourism regions; right?

A. Right.

Q. I asked you a little bit earlier about Antrim and Merrimack Valley. I just want to go back to that for a minute.

Were you aware that the filtering process that DeWan used here was very similar to the filtering process that the visual experts used in Merrimack Valley and Antrim?

A. No.

Q. Were you aware that the way in which DeWan
identified resources here was similar to the way in which the experts in Antrim and MVRP identified scenic resources?

A. No, I wasn't.

Q. If it turned out that DeWan's approach to filtering and identifying scenic resources was in fact the same as those other two cases and yours was different, would that be a cause of concern for you?

A. No.

Q. And why is that?

A. Because I think this project is unique and because I think that it would benefit from a different perspective. I know I haven't evaluated transmission projects before, but I've done very many other types of projects in a number of different states. So I think that it's useful to have a fresh perspective on this current situation, all of it under the terms and conditions of the SEC rules.

Q. Do you think applying the SEC rules consistently from case to case would be important?

A. Yes.
Q. If in the Antrim and MVRP VIAs they didn't assess public roads the way you did, would that be important to you?

A. I think some variation is natural and healthy, actually, as long as it conforms to the SEC rules. I think there are different ways of interpreting some of these rules, and, you know, again, with a fresh perspective.

Q. Given that view that you just expressed, that there are different ways of interpreting these rules, don't you think, as someone who's never done a VIA in New Hampshire, it might have benefited you to see how these other experts did their VIAs in the previous SEC cases?

A. It would have. But on the other hand, again, as I say, I think it's important to follow the SEC rules carefully. But I think within the rubric of those rules there's room for a unique focus on the particularly unique characteristics of the current project.

Q. Did you take any time to look at how the Site Evaluation Committee reacted to the VIAs in
Antrim and MVRP and how they went about making their decision on visual resources in those cases?

A. No.

Q. Don't you think it would have been beneficial to you to have done that and understood how the Committee thinks about those issues?

A. Yes.

Q. And so the fact that you didn't do it, is that now a cause of concern for you?

A. I think it would have benefited my work. I'm not sure if it would have changed my opinions or my approach because we've been careful to follow the SEC rules. But we do it, again, with our own unique perspective.

Q. Going back to your VIA, SPNHF 69, Page 5, under No. 2, you said that the DeWan VIA, quote, "ignores numerous impacts to valued local, regional and state scenic resources."

Do you recall saying that?

A. Yes.

Q. So I want to understand that point a bit better by looking at how you did some of your work here. And let's start by turning to
your Appendix E. So this is, I think, five pages long. And my understanding is that Appendix E is the list of the 102 resources that you identified here; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. And so if we look at Column 1, it says "Log ID," and then we just run our eyes down, and you're sort of numerically identifying each resource; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. So I want to jump to Page 5 for a minute. And I'm going to ask you to just look toward the bottom. Do you see where you count 90, 91, 92, and then it jumps to 100?

A. Yes.

Q. So there's a gap there, I think. Just so we're talking about the same number of resources, am I correct to say that you actually didn't evaluate 102 resources, but you actually evaluated a total of 93 resources?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. And with respect to those 93 resources, when you look at this chart in the
second column, it says "Duplicate Resource."
I think that's what it means; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And in this column, I think what you're doing
is you are identifying resources that DeWan
also evaluated versus resources that only you
evaluated.
A. Right.
Q. Right? And so I want to put up Applicant's
Exhibit 373.

We went through your list very
carefully, and what we found is, in addition
to the 33 resources that you said DeWan
evaluated, there are an additional 15 which
he evaluated and you didn't give him credit
for. And I realize this is new to you, but
we've included all the citations here. And
I'll give you a minute to look at it. But
what I'm going to ask you to do is to assume
this is true. Let me know when you're ready.
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A. And what are we looking at on the screen now?
Q. So in your Appendix E you listed the exhibits
[sic] that you acknowledged DeWan reviewed.
Do you recall that?

A. Hmm-hmm. Yeah.

Q. And in fact, DeWan reviewed more resources than you acknowledged on your chart. That's what we're saying. And these are the additional 15 resources that we're saying he in fact did review that you didn't acknowledge on your chart. Do you understand?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And I realize you haven't had time to look at this, so what I'm going to do is ask you, for purposes of my questions, to just accept that this is true. Can you do that?

A. Well, I'm not sure it is true in all cases. For example, Nottingham Road, Deerfield, we evaluated that from a distance of probably three quarters of a mile. Another half a mile from that, the transmission line intersects the road. I believe that's where Mr. Dodson took his simulation from.

Q. Well, let's do it this way so we don't have to have a dispute about it: We've identified every place in here where we're saying DeWan
did the evaluation. I will ask you hypothetically to assume that this chart is correct. Okay?

A. And is the list of location names a complete list of duplicates?

Q. They're not duplicates. This is simply 15 resources on your chart that we think DeWan evaluated, that you said he didn't. And I'm just asking you, for purposes of this discussion, to assume --

MS. BOEPPLE: Chair, I'm going to object because I can tell the witness is confused by what it is that this represents, and I don't think he's laid a foundation sufficient for him to be able to respond to questions on this.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It may be that we haven't gotten the witness and the lawyer on the same page yet, but I think he can get there. But I guess I want to tell Mr. Dodson about hypotheticals.

Assuming what Mr. Needleman represents to you is true, we're going to ask you to accept that and answer questions
assuming that it's true. If it's not true, then, of course, all your answers won't make sense and somebody will deal with that later. It appears that you have some other concerns about what is on this list. But the notion of hypotheticals is one you can deal with; right?

MR. DODSON: I would prefer to handle it on a case-by-case basis.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We do ask witnesses to play the game, play the hypothetical game. Now, maybe you'll need to do it one by one. But let's see if Mr. Needleman can get you to a point where you're working together to get him answers to the questions he's asking. Okay?

THE WITNESS: Sure.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. All right. So we start with your universe of 93 resources, and then we give credit to DeWan for the 33 that you acknowledge he evaluated. Fair enough?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So, 93 minus 33 is 60. Do you agree?
A. Yes.

Q. And then we say, based on this exhibit, that there are 15 more that DeWan evaluated that you didn't give him credit for.

A. And you prepared this exhibit?

Q. Correct. If you assume that to be true, then there are only 45 resources on your list of 93 that you evaluated which DeWan did not evaluate; correct?

A. I'm not sure about that. On the Appendix E list, those included sites that we photographed and evaluated. It also included photo simulations from DeWan & Associates' VIA that we critiqued.

Q. Let's do it this way, Mr. Dodson: In Appendix E, which you created, do you acknowledge that of the 93 resources you listed there, next to 33 of them you wrote "DeWan," which means you acknowledged that DeWan evaluated those resources?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So that means that you've acknowledged that DeWan evaluated 33 of the 93 resources. Are we on the same page?
A. Yes.
Q. Which means there are 60 resources left that you maintain he didn't evaluate; right?
A. That's right.
Q. And then, if you take these 15 resources, and I asked you to assume that in fact DeWan did evaluate them for purposes of these questions, that would mean that there are 45 left on your list; is that right?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. So I want to focus on those 45. Can we do that?
A. Sure.
Q. Sure. Great.
   So now I want to pull up Applicant's 376.
A. Could I just make one more comment about this?
Q. Sure.
A. I've been looking at some of these locations, and I think what's going on is that, you know, at least the ones that I've identified, we may have both photographed and evaluated sections along the same road or the same
river, but at considerably different
distances, similar to what I described about
Nottingham Road where our evaluation points
were probably a mile or more apart. So you
could say that we both evaluated Nottingham
Road, but it was at very different locations
and perspective.

Q. Understood. And I'm sure the lawyers will
argue about that at a later date. What I
want to do is focus on the 45 we've got left,
okay. And I want to pull up Applicant's 376.
So these are the 45 remaining resources.
And I take it that generally that list is
familiar to you. Those are your resources;
right?

A. Yes.

Q. On this list, 43 of these 45 resources are
roads. Does that sound right to you?

A. Yes.

Q. And I believe that there's not a single road
on this list that's a designated scenic road
at a local, state or federal level. Does
that sound right?

A. No, it doesn't.
Q. Okay. Which roads on this list are designated scenic roads?
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A. I don't see any on this list, but I know that a number of our simulations were on scenic roads -- for example, the Moose Path Trail.

Q. Sure. And that's on the other list which we talked about a moment ago. And now I want to focus on these 43 roads.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And Dawn, I'm going to ask you to call up Site 102.45(c).

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. I'm sure this is something you're very familiar with. This is the Site Evaluation Committee's definition of "scenic resources." You've seen this before; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And when we were talking earlier about Counsel for the Public's identification of roads and you said you agreed with their list of 3900, that was in reference to 102.45(c), which is what's highlighted here. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.
Q. And I take it that, with respect to the roads you identified, you also identified them in reliance on 102.45(c); is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. So the 43 roads that are on that list are on your list because you believe this definition requires them to be there.
A. Yes, especially scenic drives and rides.
Q. Okay. So when you look at that list, it says "lakes, ponds, rivers, parks, scenic drives and rides, and other tourism destinations that possess a scenic quality." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. There isn't any discussion anywhere in your VIA or anywhere in any of your supporting materials that talks about why you consider those 43 roads to be a tourism destination; isn't that correct?
A. Not necessarily a tourist destination, but certainly a scenic drive and ride.
Q. In fact --
A. I think tourism destination is an additional qualifier. But I think the underlying
characteristic of those roads is that many of them are scenic drives and rides.

Q. So, in fact, you'd agree with me that, of those 43 roads on your list, none of them are tourist destinations; right?

A. They are if you consider the way people tour New Hampshire, both New Hampshire residents and visitors from out of state. They don't necessarily seek out the official scenic byways. A lot of people drive through the countryside, interested in the overall character of the New Hampshire landscape.

Q. So is it your testimony that tourists identify one of those 43 roads on your list as a destination that they would like to visit?

A. I would say that those roads are part of the itinerary that a tourist would have to explore one of the tourist regions of this state.

Q. And aside from what you're saying here today, is there anything in any of the documents that you've created in this case that support the assertions you're making? Any page you
can point us to that lends support to what
you're saying?

A. That lends support to the fact that these
roads are driven by --

Q. Are tourism destinations.

A. I don't think we specifically identified them
as "tourism destinations." But I think the
way I read the sentence is that some of the
issues -- some of the landscape types that
are to be considered are lakes, ponds,
rivers, parks, scenic drives and rides, and
other tourism destinations that possess a
scenic quality. So the way I read it is
scenic drives and rides can be independent of
tourism destination.

Q. So you don't think the word "other" in that
sentence has any meaning.

A. I don't think it applies to the other
features in that sentence.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay. So, Dawn,
can we go back to the list of 45?

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. Now, setting aside those 43 roads we just
talked about, the only two resources left on
this list are Alton Woods in Concord and the Concord Municipal Airport. And we've highlighted those in yellow. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Why is the Concord Municipal Airport on your list as a scenic resource?

A. Because we visited that site and photographed it, but determined that the Project would have very limited or no visibility there.

Q. But it's still on your list as a scenic resource.

A. This is a list of sites that we visited, not scenic resources.

Q. It was originally a full list of scenic resources, and then it became a list of sites you visited; right?

A. It's a little unclear to me how you created these lists. I'm used to seeing the full list of all the sites we visited.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay. Dawn, can we pull up Appendix E? Yeah, first one, Appendix E, SPNHF 69 I think.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So there's your full list. And let's go down now to No. 34. Do you see No. 34 on your full list?
A. Yes.

Q. That's Alton Woods. I think No. 50 was the Concord Airport. Let's go to that one. See that?
A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So now we're looking at the list you created.

Just back to my question. How did the Concord Airport end up on this list as a scenic resource?
A. Because it was in the viewshed that we were working from.

Q. Okay. And same question for Alton Woods. Why is Alton Woods on your list as a scenic resource?
A. Similarly, it was in the viewshed map.

Q. Do you understand that Alton Woods is a collection of privately-owned residences?
A. Yes. I believe there's a public way that services them.

Q. And so, notwithstanding the fact that it's
essentially a collection of private residences, you include them as a scenic resource?

A. Yes. I think, again, to not be comparing apples with oranges, we looked at each of the physiographic zones, and within those, each of the land types as areas to be evaluated for what their characteristics are. And when you're working in Concord, you're dealing with urban and suburban qualities. But I think those can be judged based on suburbs and city centers. So that's why something like Alton Woods can be a scenic resource, because we're evaluating it based on other suburban resources.

Q. Let's go to your VIA at Page 5.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, this is SPNHF 69, Page 5. And if you could just blow up all of No. 2, Dawn.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. The last sentence there says, again, criticizing DeWan, that his methodology also ignores the impacts to numerous residences.

And so I take it, based on that statement and
based on what you just said about Alton
Woods, that you believe the SEC rules require
the assessment of visual impacts at private
residences.

A. I don't think uniquely focusing on private
residences is justified. I don't believe our
analysis was just based on the private
residences, but on the street. And certainly
in other cases, like the one I mentioned this
morning, where the view of the landscape
includes a mountain, a road that are in
public domain, and then a field and a
farmstead and some woods around the farmstead
that are private property, I think the
private components of that and the public
components of that are both part of the
scenic resource. So I think just because
something's a private residence doesn't
eliminate it from consideration, as long as
there are other components in the view.

Q. So I want to ask you about that. What you're
essentially saying, I think, is if someone's
driving along the road, which is not a
designated scenic resource, and there's a
beautiful historic farmhouse sitting there in
the distance which is private, and in the
distance beyond the farmhouse maybe you can
see the transmission line, what you're saying
is that you have got to account for the view
from that undesignated road of that private
residence; right? You're saying "views of
resources" are important to you, not just
"views from resources"; right?

A. That's right.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay. Dawn, I
want to call up -- well, first, let's call up,
what is this exhibit number? Applicant's
Exhibit 347.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. So this is composite of just various SEC
rules. And what I've done is highlighted
places in these rules where it talks about
visibility from scenic resources. Let me
start by ask you: How carefully did you read
the SEC rules before you went about doing
your work here?

A. Very carefully.

Q. And so you see on this page, when it talks
about how visual impact assessments are done, it talks in a couple places about scenic resources, visibility from the scenic resource, scenic resources from which the proposed facility would be visible. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Let's go over to the next page. And there's a bunch of yellow highlighting there, and again there are a lot of descriptions talking about "from the scenic resource." Do you see all those?

A. Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Let me jump to the last page here, Dawn, Page 4.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. And these are four of the seven SEC criteria, the criteria that the Site Evaluation Committee needs to apply in order to make determinations about whether there are adverse effects. And Criteria No. 4 talks about the scope and scale of the change in the landscape visible from affected scenic resource. Do you see that?
Q. And the last one talks about assessing a dominance and prominence view from scenic resources. Do you see that?
A. Yup. Yes.
Q. It doesn't say anything there about "views of scenic resources," does it?
A. It doesn't. But if you're on a road that looks out over this beautiful view of the historic farmstead, the woods and then the mountains, your road is by definition "scenic." It doesn't have to have that official designation to be part of the DeWan & Associates eligibility list. That road is a typical example of one of our regional or local roads that has very scenic characteristics that should be considered, regardless of whether it's an officially designated road. So what I'm describing is the view also applies to the road. So, in essence, you are in the scenic resource.
Q. So when you read No. 4, you understand it to mean that non-designated road. It would be a road like we looked at before under your
A. Yes.

Q. And you would say the same thing for No. 6, I assume; right?

A. Yes. You're standing on a road. You're seeing a very beautiful, typical New Hampshire scene. And my take on it would be that that road is also scenic, regardless of whether it's officially designated.

Q. I want to call up Applicant's Exhibit 377. This is the original VIA that you prepared and provided to us back in December. And I want to start by looking at Appendix F, which was your assessment data. Do you recall this?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And according to what you said, this reflects your assessment of the Project's visual characteristics and impacts using a quantitative analysis; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And you used this to form the basis for your ratings for things like cultural value, aesthetic quality, et cetera; right?
A. Yes, we used the SEC criteria.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And Dawn, if we can just jump over to the next page.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. And if you look at the sixth column over, that's your rating column for aesthetic quality. See that?

A. Yes.

Q. And I think you acknowledged earlier today that, in your view, the way that DeWan went about doing their aesthetic quality evaluation was sound; right? That was the BLM process.

A. Yes.

Q. But you went on to say that the problems with DeWan's analysis lie mainly in the way he applied his method to specific landscapes; right?

A. Right.

Q. So, in essence, what you're saying is you're challenging DeWan's conclusions. You're saying sound methodology, poor conclusions; right?

A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So I want to look at Appendix F, Page 2. Are you there? This is the spreadsheet. And there are multiple pages to it, but they're all styled the same way. This is the spreadsheet that you provided in December of 2016 to us. And under Aesthetic Quality, you have scores of 1, 3 or 5; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And in this December 30th report, in this spreadsheet, you didn't provide any assessment at all of the individual categories that make up that BLM methodology we were talking about earlier, things like land form, vegetation, water bodies, color, view, uniqueness, impact of human development. None of that was here when you did your work originally in December of 2016; correct?
A. Well, this was based on a separate document which is our working sheets, which is a very detailed Excel document --
Q. Right.
A. -- that addresses the various aesthetic
quality components.

Q. And I want to talk about that because this sheet in the April report that you prepared looks very different, doesn't it? It now actually has all those BLM categories in it; correct?

A. Are you talking about this sheet that's on the screen here?

Q. No, I'm talking about when you revised this sheet and gave us your April report, you added a bunch of columns to it. Right?

A. I don't believe so.

Q. All right. We're going to look at that in a minute and then I'll come back to this.

Do you recall, after you provided this report to us, we had a lot of difficulty understanding how you assessed aesthetic quality, and so we asked you for further information on that? Do you remember that?

A. Yes. Yeah.

Q. And in February we sent some data requests to you on that specific point. Do you remember that?

A. Yes.
Q. And I want to pull that data request up. It's Applicant's Exhibit 378. And in this data request we asked you to provide all the matrices that you used to assess aesthetic quality for all resources and landscapes in your original list. Do you remember us asking you for that?

A. Yes.

Q. And you told us to look at Appendix D and F in order to find that information; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And we just looked at Appendix F, and the only thing in Appendix F that we could find, the only thing there were those ratings, 1, 3 and 5; is that right?

A. Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And then Appendix D, we can call that up right now. And let's go to the next page, Dawn, of Appendix D.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. And when we were trying to understand what you did here on this issue, this is all we have in Appendix D; right? It's the Aesthetic Quality Evaluation Chart. There's
nothing else; right? There's no raw data
here, no worksheets, nothing; right?

A. Hmm.

Q. Is that correct?

A. Yeah.

Q. And so we got to the technical session on
March 23rd, 2017, and we again raised this
issue with you. Do you remember that? We
asked you for these matrices and this
underlying data so we could understand how
you did this analysis. Do you remember me
asking you that?

A. Yes.

Q. And we made a data request at the technical
session and again asked for that material.
Do you remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. And you answered that data request. Do you
recall doing that?

A. I think it may have been my associate, Nate
Burgess.

Q. Okay. Well, let's pull that answer up and
maybe that'll refresh your memory.

MS. BOEPPLE: I'm going to
object to the introduction of anything from the technical session which was not recorded and is not part of an official record.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: These are data responses.

MS. BOEPPLE: Are they part of the record here?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Not yet. I think it's a data response he's about to make part of the record.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So let's pull that up. It's Applicant's 379.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. Look at No. 3, please. We asked you again to provide worksheets identifying the work to eliminate 36 of 57 resources. And then go to No. 5, and again we asked you for Excel spreadsheets containing all the evaluated sites. Do you remember that?
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Q. Mr. Dodson, do you remember that?

A. No.

Q. Is this not familiar to you?

A. Can you zoom out to the whole document?
Q. Sure. Have you seen this before? We can go to the first page.

A. Yeah, the first page would be great.
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Q. Were you consulted regarding the responses to this?

A. No, I don't think I've seen this.

Q. All right. Well, I'm going to ask you about the substance of one of the responses because I think it does relate to your work.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Let's go to No. 5, Dawn.

MS. BOEPPLE: I'm going to object again. Mr. Dodson has just testified that he hasn't seen this. He's not familiar with it.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, let's see if he's familiar with the substance.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. So when we again asked for these spreadsheets, which we did request of you directly at the technical session, we were told, notwithstanding the foregoing objections, the Forest Society is in the
process of preparing a document that will be part of the supplemental prefiled testimony which will be responsive to this data request. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. So is it correct to say that, as of this date in late March when this answer was provided to us, there were no underlying spreadsheets in existence that supported the analysis that you did in those charts in your December report? It didn't exist; right?

A. The charts exist. I was under the assumption that they had been sent to you.

Q. No, I'm not talking about the charts. I'm talking about the underlying spreadsheets which we requested multiple times, were never provided, and then here we were told they were being created and would be provided to us. Do you see that?

A. Yes. They already existed.

Q. Well, then, why weren't they given to us, Mr. Dodson? We asked for them multiple times. Do you know why they weren't given to us?

MS. BOEPPLE: So what's the
relevance of this at this point?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, I think you've got a "he doesn't know" objection, too.

MS. BOEPPLE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. Are you --

MS. BOEPPLE: Don't answer that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think he's going to start another question.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. So are you saying that the spreadsheets that we were told here were being created actually already existed when we asked for them?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you believe that you have now provided those spreadsheets?

A. I assumed that my associate had sent them to you.

Q. Where are they?

A. They're in our --

MS. BOEPPLE: I'm going to make another objection. We've had a -- we've gone
back and forth on this. There's clearly some information Mr. Needleman is looking for that Mr. Dodson doesn't have a response to, and he's testified to that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, I think Mr. Needleman can ask where or who has them, who has control of the spreadsheets that apparently exist.

MS. BOEPPLE: Assuming there's something like that that exists. We haven't even established that because Mr. Dodson doesn't know anything about what he's talking about.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, he testified that they do exist, that he assumed that his associate had provided them. So he's testified that they exist.

MS. BOEPPLE: If he's clear on what "this" is.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Mr. Needleman, why don't you run that to ground to make sure that there's no ambiguity about that.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. It's your testimony that at the time you
prepared your report on December 30th and
provided it to us, there were underlying
spreadsheets that explained in detail how you
came up with your ratings for things like
aesthetic quality. You were saying those
existed.

A. Yes.

Q. And so when we requested those in our
original data requests and you told us to see
Appendices D and F, why didn't you instead
provide those sheets to us?

A. I had assumed that the sheets had been
provided to you because I recall you asking
for them at the technical session, and I
suppose you asked a second time in discovery.
And my assumption was that those documents,
those Excel spreadsheets, had been sent to
you.

Q. Would it surprise you to learn that at no
point in the process did I ever see those
documents?

A. Yes, I am surprised.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, let's go
to Applicant's Exhibit 380.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We'll take a ten-minute break.

(Recess was taken at 2:54 p.m. and the hearing resumed at 3:13 p.m..)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Needleman.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. Mr. Dodson, I want to move on to asking you some other questions about your analysis chart.

You also, in the work you did here as part of analyzing these resources, looked at the extent, nature and duration of use; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And in Applicant's Exhibit 377, which again is your original VIA, and I believe this is Appendix D, this is your description here of what you were looking at in order to determine whether you would give extent,
nature and duration of use a 5, a 3 or a 1;
is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you -- I think there's a typo
here, because in each one of these, even
though they're supposed to deal with high,
medium and low impacts, every one of them
talks about high impacts; is that right?
A. That's typo.
Q. But I take it we should, just for the middle
one, for example, read it as "Proposed
facility will have a medium impact due to the
extent, nature, duration and use of existing
resources"; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So, somebody looking at the material you
provided to us in December of 2016, if they
wanted to understand how you went about
making determinations of extent, nature and
duration of use, they'd look here; is that
right?
A. That's right.
Q. And then if we go to Appendix F, the first
page, this was the chart that accompanied
that. And there's a column there for Extent, Nature and Duration of Use. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. So you would plug a number into that column for each resource based on the chart we just saw a moment ago; right?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, again, my understanding is that you're telling us that there is backup information for all of this. And I think you understand we never saw it. Let me move past that.

I want to pick a particular resource, for example. Let's look at Northside Road, which is No. 13. Do you see Northside Road? I'm sorry. Dawn's pulling up Exhibit 381. We talked about this earlier. This was the exhibit that you created to accompany your supplemental testimony, which was a revised version of that December chart; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And it had an expanded set of categories.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Could we call that up, Dawn, Applicant 381. It's Appendix F,
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. Okay. So if we look at -- that's the original one still. Oh, okay. That is the updated one. Okay.

So if we look at Appendix F, Page 2, we see where you're rating extent, nature and duration of use. If you look about three quarters of the way down, do you see Northside Road? Do you see that Northside Road in Stark?

A. Yes.

Q. And for extent, nature and duration of use for Northside Road in Stark, you gave it a 5, which is the highest of your categories; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. So what was that based on?

A. That was based on the fact that it is a small road where people would be traveling slowly. And the road is fairly long, and it goes along a beautiful agricultural valley surrounded by steep hills with views of distant mountains. So you would be on that road for a number of minutes experiencing
that landscape because you'd be going slowly, and it's a long, linear visual feature.

Q. And what information specifically did you rely on to make determinations about the extent or the nature of use there, other than your own observations?

A. By being there and driving on the road.

Q. That was it?

A. Yeah. We also stopped and took photographs.

Q. And in the original report that you provided to us, aside from the references that we saw in Appendix D and Appendix E, there was no other information about extent, nature and duration of use of this resource; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. I want to look at two others here, one is Nottingham Road, and the other is Mount Delight Road. Those are both in Deerfield. For Nottingham Road, you gave it a 5 for extent, nature and duration of use; for Mount Delight Road, you gave it a 1. Why that dramatic difference between these two roads in Deerfield?
A. Well, Mount Delight Road is a 90-degree crossing of the road by the Project, and it occurs at a bend in the road. So the Project is really only visible for 10 seconds, 15 seconds; whereas, Nottingham Road in Deerfield is a road that winds through wooded hills with agricultural fields, and the Project is visible for up to a mile in length along that road. It's also a small paved road, so speeds are lower. So your views of the Project from that road are fairly extensive over a considerable stretch of the road.

Q. And it sounds like, again, your rating there was based exclusively on your visit.

A. Excuse me?

Q. The rating that you gave those two roads was based exclusively on your visit?

A. Yes.

Q. And again, there's no information anywhere in the material that you provided to us in December where we could see how you reached those ratings; is that right?

A. That's right.
Q. Okay. I want to talk about scope and scale for a minute. Before I do, I just want to make one correction.

    Earlier on when I was asking you about Mr. DeWan's bare earth maps, I indicated to you that I thought they were provided in February of 2016, and I was mistaken. They were provided in discovery in October of 2016. So I apologize for that mistake.

    Let me talk to you about Scope and Scale of Landscape Change. That's another category that you have here in your ratings; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. I asked you at the tech session about this and about applying numerical ratings to this. And I think you told me it was challenging to do that, but you made an effort nevertheless. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. And in fact, again we've got the same ratings based on your Appendix D for scope and scale; is that right?

A. Yes.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: And if we could, Dawn, just go back to the original Appendix D and highlight "Scope and Scale" up in the box.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. So, someone trying to understand how you went about doing this analysis of scope and scale would come to this part of your VIA, and this is what they would see and this is what they would have to rely upon in order to understand how you made those judgments; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And this is the information that was contained in your original report. And so if one was an objective third-party observer that wanted to try to understand what you were doing, this is where they would look with respect to scope and scale; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And in that original Appendix F of the resources, the 31 sites that you evaluated, by my count, 19 of them received a 5; 12 received a moderate, and only one received a low. Does that sound about right to you?
A. I don't have the ability to recall that.

Q. Okay. And I'm not going to ask you to engage in a memory test. But assume for the sake of argument that those numbers are correct. That means that in your original report, 61 percent of the resources that you evaluated you concluded had a high scope and scale impact; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And is it fair to say that without a lot more information about how you went about doing this work, an objective third-party observer looking just at this chart really would not be able to accurately recreate your work?

A. I think that there's a basic level of information here. I think that, ideally, it would be more detailed. There are limitations of space in this particular matrix --

Q. Well, why are there limitations of space? I think you told somebody earlier, maybe it was Ms. Connor or somebody else, that the methodology that you applied here is one that you've used many times before. So,
presumably, you would have had many
opportunities to refine it and get it right.
So why wouldn't you put your best foot
forward here?

A. I think, you know, this is the highest degree
of specificity that we could get at the time.
I think ideally we would have gone into more
detail.

Q. It's actually not the highest degree of
specificity, is it, though, because in your
April 17 supplemental you really
significantly changed your descriptions here,
didn't you?

A. Yes.

Q. Yeah, so I'm going to come back to that in a
minute and look at those.

But I also want to talk about dominance
and prominence for a minute because, again,
you did the same thing here; right? If
someone were looking at how you went about
doing an assessment of dominance and
prominence, this is the information they
would review in your Appendix D; is that
correct?
A. Yes.

Q. And again, you rated 31 sites, I believe -- or was it 31 -- some high percentage as having a high dominance and prominence. And again, would you agree with me that, with respect to dominance and prominence, we have the same issue: An objective third-party observer looking at this and trying to recreate your work would have a pretty tough time given these scant descriptions; fair to say?

A. Yes. Well, I must add that it would be challenging even with more space and more detail. It would still be challenging to determine the different levels of dominance and prominence. We need to get involved with the aspect ratio of the view, the extent that the proposed project would occupy in the frame. It's a complicated process that's pretty difficult to condense into one chart.

Q. And do you recall that you and I discussed these issues at the tech session?

A. Yes.

Q. And you gave us your report in December and
the tech session happened in March and we talked about this and then you gave us your supplement in April; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And when you gave us your supplement, which we'll call up as Applicant 381, that's where you made significant changes to these descriptions; right?

A. Right.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So, Dawn, if you could just pull the box up and highlight it. Yeah, the whole thing.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. Now, when you go back and look at these things we just looked at, extent, nature and duration, scope and scale, dominance and prominence, now you've got much more lengthy descriptions of those things; isn't that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And there was nothing preventing you from including these types of descriptions in your original work; right?

A. Right.
Q. I mean, it seems to me that what you did is you revised this based on the criticisms we had regarding that original work; is that fair to say?

A. It's also our ability to go into more detail with the benefit of reviewing other testimony and, yes, talking to you about the shortcomings of the earlier version.

Q. So, looking now at the difference between the two of these that we just reviewed, do you believe that in the December table that you provided that you really had adequate information on these topics?

A. No, we didn't. That's why we did the supplement. We wanted to go into more detail based on our review of the Project. Based on your comments, based on some of the other supplemental reports, we felt it was best to give a little bit more thought and detail to this particular question.

Q. And this morning when Ms. Boepple was doing the direct examination of you, she spent a lot of time asking you to provide explanations of the criticisms that Mr. DeWan
directed at your work in his April 17th filing. Do you remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. And, in fact, you also had an April 17th filing as we see here; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And prior to the time you filed this, Mr. Dodson certainly didn't have an opportunity to review this, did he?

A. I'm not sure.

Q. Did you give it to him?

A. No.

Q. Okay. So when Mr. Dodson was giving the criticisms of your work, he was criticizing this original work that you did, the December work; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. The same work that you just acknowledged had a variety of deficiencies; right?

A. Right.

Q. Okay. So I want to ask you about another topic. Let's go to SPNHF 62. This is your prefiled testimony.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And Dawn, I'd
like to look at Pages 5 and 6.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. And starting at the bottom of Page 5, on Line 21, you say, In addition to the viewpoints identified and evaluated by DeWan and DOE, Dodson & Flinker identified an additional 57 viewpoints -- and these are what you determined to be qualified scenic resources -- where the proposed transmission corridor would be visible. And then you go on to say, "Nineteen of these additional sites will experience a moderate to severe degradation of views which will accumulate over the many miles of landscape the Project traverses"; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And I asked you about this at the tech session, and you told me that what you were talking about was the overall cumulative impacts that one would experience in viewing the Project. Does that sound right?

A. Yes.

Q. And then this morning, when Mr. Cote was questioning you, you said, quote, "Cumulative
impacts should play a very important role with respect to this kind of analysis." Do you remember saying that?

A. Yes.

Q. So, based on all of this, my understanding is that when you make determinations about unreasonable adverse effects with regard to this project, cumulative impacts are an important component to you.

A. Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So I want to call up, Dawn, if you could put the regulation exhibit up.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. I want to start by directing your attention to the top. This is Site 102.18 which defines "cumulative impacts." I take it you've looked at this before?

A. Yes.

Q. And we don't have to read the whole thing. But take a minute to look at it, and what I'm going to ask you is: Do you agree with me that this SEC definition of "cumulative impacts" refers only to wind energy
A. Yes. We used the term "overall impacts."

Q. Okay. Well, we just talked about "cumulative impacts," but we'll come back to that in a minute.

Then, if you look at the other number down here, 301.03(h)(6) talks about wind energy facilities; correct? And again it focuses on sequential observation of wind energy facilities. So in these two places in the SEC regulations, this cumulative impact concept is really only related to wind energy facilities. Do you agree with me?

A. Yes.

Q. These were the only references I found to cumulative impacts in the Aesthetic portion of the SEC rules. Are you aware of any others?

A. I think there was a section dealing with overall impacts, but I couldn't tell you where it is.

Q. I'm not sure what you're referring to. But I guess if there is something there, someone will point it out to us.
I also want to call up Applicant's 382.

This is a portion of a transcript of rulemaking deliberations from November 18th that the SEC was conducting. And I wanted to take you to Page 115 and 116. And I'm going to ask you to take a look at the bottom of 115 and 116, if you would.

(Witness reviews document.)

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And then, Dawn, if you could continue down on 116.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

A. That's why we used the word "overall impacts." We realized that "cumulative" was specifically for wind energy. But I still think on a project this large that it's important to look at the entirety of the impact.

Q. So you agree with me that it would be inappropriate when assessing a transmission line project in front of this Committee to consider "cumulative impacts" in an aesthetic analysis.

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.
A. We were aware of that. I don't believe we did it.

Q. Well, I did ask you a moment ago, and you told Mr. Cote specifically that you included cumulative impacts in your analysis, which is why I was concerned about that.

A. Though I do remember also pointing out that "cumulative" was for wind and that we were using the term "overall" to deal with a similar thing, really, the composite of all the impacts over 132 miles.

Q. So, even though cumulative impacts in here only relate to wind energy systems, and even though in this discussion during the rulemaking the Committee seemed to believe it only had authority to look at those kinds of impacts in relation to wind energy projects, your view is still that they should be looking at the totality of those impacts, those cumulative impacts.

A. Yes, I think it's important to do both. I think it's important to look at the individual site scale impacts, but it's also important to see how the individual site
level impacts add up in a sequence that can be up to 132 miles long.

Q. I'd like to go back to your prefilled testimony now if we could.


BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. And on Line 6 you say, "The Project's scope and scale are so extensive that available mitigation measures will be ineffective in achieving a significant reduction in aesthetic impacts. Burial of the Project offers the only means of significantly reducing the Project's unreasonable adverse aesthetic impacts"; correct?

A. Correct.

Q. And you said earlier that you have no experience doing visual impact assessments of electric transmission lines; right?

A. Yes.

Q. So would it be correct to conclude that you have no experience assessing or recommending mitigation measures for electric transmission lines?
A. Not for electric lines. We've come up with it for other types of development.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So, Dawn, if you could call up 301.14(a)(7).

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. And in (a)(7), it says that the Committee must consider the best practical measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate unreasonable adverse effects. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. And then if we could go over to Site 102.12. Oh, it's right below it. That defines "best practical measures," which means available, effective and economically feasible on-site or off-site methods, et cetera. See that?

A. Yes.

Q. Am I correct that you didn't conduct any analysis to determine if burial of the Project is economically feasible?

A. No, we didn't.

Q. And can you point to any analysis at all that you are relying on in support of the notion that burial of the Project is economically feasible?
A. I do know that there are two current projects similar or greater in length than Northern Pass, the New England Clean Energy Link Project and the Champlain-Hudson Express Project, both of which go under Lake Champlain and then go underground through various above-ground sections of New York and New England. So it is being done by other projects.

Q. Have those been built?

A. They've been approved --

Q. Have they been built?

A. -- approved relatively quickly.

Q. Have they been built?

A. I couldn't tell you that.

Q. So when you offered the opinion that burial of the Project offers the only means of significantly reducing the unreasonable adverse effects, the only evidence you had to rely upon that it would be economically feasible to do so would be those two projects.

A. That's right. But my field of expertise isn't economic.
Q. But you didn't do any economic analysis; right?
A. No.
Q. When you -- were you aware of this SEC rule at the time you offered your opinion about economic feasibility?
A. I don't believe I did have an opinion on economic feasibility.
Q. Well, that was a poor question. Let me try it again.
   When you offered the opinion that the only appropriate mitigation here would be to bury the entire project, were you aware that the SEC rule for best practical measures requires a consideration of economic feasibility? Did you have that in mind?
A. No. I'm not an economist.
Q. So if you didn't have that in mind, my understanding was that somebody in your profession would typically read the governing rules before you did an analysis and offered opinions. Isn't that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. And don't you think it would have been a good
idea for you to read these rules and
understand what the requirements were before
you offered that opinion?

A. Well, I did read the section that you've
highlighted here. You know, it mentions best
available, effective and economically
feasible. My assumption is that, because
there are two major projects that were
recently approved that are of similar length,
going from Canada down to, I think Orange
County in New York, and then going from
Canada down to Massachusetts, I assumed that
because those projects were proposed by
electric utilities that the economics would
have been carefully thought out. So I'm
assuming based on those two projects that
it's economically viable to underground a
project.

Q. As a professional in this field, when you
typically do your work, do you just generally
make assumptions like that? In other words,
you just generally look at other projects,
and if it seems like they're capable of doing
something, you just assume the project you're
analyzing is capable of doing it?

A. I analyze things very carefully within my area of expertise, which is aesthetics. I acknowledge economic conditions and cost-benefit analyses, but I'm not qualified to do them. So the best I can do is to do research on similar projects that are currently underway. And when I saw that there were two very lengthy transmission projects in New England and New York State that were being put underground, I assumed that the companies promoting it had done their financial research and decided to go ahead.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, could you pull up Applicant's 383.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. So your testimony is that the only way to address these project impacts is to bury the entire project. This is one location where the Project will go through. So it's your opinion the Project needs to be buried here?

A. I think it's much more feasible to screen facilities like substations because we're
talking about a relatively small area, and
we're talking about heights that are less
than the transmission tower heights. So I
think in cases like this, and you can see the
effect of the trees in this image, you're
able to accomplish a fair amount of screening
for something that's a discrete project
that's not too small and within a
well-defined area. I think it's a completely
greater challenge to screen 132-mile-long
transmission corridor with towers up to
160 feet in a cleared corridor up to 315 feet
wide. That's very, very difficult to screen
with little trees.

Q. So it turns out it doesn't have to be buried
everywhere, like places like this, for
example; right?

A. Substations and, to a certain extent,
transition stations, though they have a
component that's fairly high. I think when
you're talking about a structure or
substation that has a discrete size, yes, you
can screen it. The other thing about the
substation is you don't have limitations on
vegetation height the way you would have with
a transmission line above ground.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, let's go
to the next one.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. So here's another crossing. Has to be buried
here? Is that your opinion?

A. I'm assuming if it's feasible, it would. And
I'm assuming the two existing New England and
New York projects are confronting similar
road crossings.

Q. But your testimony wasn't feasibility. Your
testimony was it had to be buried. So I'm
curious what scenic resource is being
impacted that would require burial here.

A. You have a wooded landscape. I wouldn't call
it high scenic value. But it's not a
negative scenic value by any means.

Q. So you're aware that there's 24 miles of new
corridor in the North Country that's going to
go through the Wagner Forest?

A. Yes.

Q. And you're aware that the landowner there is
comfortable with the line being overhead?
A. I wasn't aware of that.

Q. But you still believe the line has to be buried on that private forest.

A. If it's visible from surrounding public land or rights-of-way.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, could we go one more.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:

Q. So this is the location of the transition station in Bridgewater. You think it has to be buried if it comes out here, too; right?

A. Well, like I said, a transition station or a substation is relatively small and compact compared with the long transmission line. So I do think mitigation is possible there, and I don't think that they would need to be buried. In fact, I don't know of cases where transfer stations are or substations are buried.

Q. So, beyond suggesting that the Project should be buried along the entire route, you actually didn't do any specific mitigation measure assessment. For example, you didn't look at whether monopoles would be helpful
anyplace. You didn't look at whether weathering steel versus galvanized steel would be helpful, or non-specular conductor or relocation away from roads. None of that is in your analysis; right? You simply just said you've got to bury it all; right?

A. Because the Project is so large and so visible that I think going from galvanized lattice to weathering steel monopole is a slight improvement, but it's really not going to mitigate the visual impact of the Project in a meaningful way.

Q. Are you aware of the fact that the Applicants have proposed and agreed to a wide range of mitigation measures? Do you know about that?

A. Yeah.

Q. Are you familiar with the fact that I asked the T.J. Boyle panel about mitigation, and they acknowledged that things like structure relocation, vegetative screening, monopoles, different kinds of monopoles, could be effective mitigation measures?

A. Yes, I'm aware of that. I don't necessarily agree with it.
Q. Are you aware that in their report, T.J. Boyle suggested a whole range of potential mitigation measures in various locations that would include co-location, weathering steel, monopoles, relocation, things like that? Did you have a chance to look at that?

A. I did, and I don't believe that it would be effective in mitigating the visual impacts of the Project in any meaningful way.

Q. So when the Applicant proposes that full range of mitigation measures, and when T.J. Boyle agrees that those could be effective in places, and T.J. Boyle proposes their own mitigation measures, your view is that T.J. Boyle and the Applicants are wrong about that.

A. Yes.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay. I think I'm all set. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Members of the Committee. Who has questions for Mr. Dodson? Mr. Oldenburg, why don't you start us off.

MR. OLDENBURG: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.

QUESTIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SEC COUNSEL:

BY MR. OLDENBURG:

Q. Good afternoon. I just have a few questions.

   Earlier on, I think it was during cross
   by Ms. Boepple, you talked about something,
   symbolism and meaning --

A. Yes.

Q. -- of the landscape --

A. Yes.

Q. -- and you used the example of Profile Lake,
   the Old Man of the Mountain. And even though
   the Old Man is gone, there's still symbolism
   and meaning on that mountain.

A. Still on the license plate.

Q. Right. So does the setting get included in
   that, or is it a stand-alone?

   So here's an example: About five years
   ago I went to Washington, DC, and in our
   travels we went to Ford's Theater where
   Lincoln was shot. I don't know if you - have
   you ever been there?

A. I've been outside it, but not inside it.

Q. As a theater it's not much. Actually, the
Capital Center here in Concord and the Palace Theater in Manchester are better examples of theaters. But it's the symbolism, right, of that place?

A. Exactly. Yes, it has an impact well beyond just being a building that has a theater in it.

Q. So after we visited Ford's Theater, we went next door and ate at the Hard Rock Cafe. So the theater itself is a setting, but around it is modernization.

A. Yeah.

Q. So how does that get broken down? And my real question is: So you used the example of Profile Lake and the Old Man of the Mountain, but if you go a few hundred yards down the road, there's the Cannon Mountain Aerial Tramway and the Cannon Mountain Ski Areas which have towers and cables, and they've cleared trees. How does that affect the aesthetics, and how is the ski area and everything tolerable, if you call it, and this isn't?

A. I think different symbolic landscapes have
different scales. The smallest one I can think of is something like the Flume, which is a very small, compact space with woodlands surrounding it. So it's very small. Profile Lake I see as medium, hundreds of acres perhaps, but then Cannon Mountain is right next door. And then the view of Mount Washington I think is much larger. Mount Washington and the Presidents have a huge visual footprint. And I know a lot of different visual features are located in that very large viewshed, but it's still possible to see the symbolic White Mountains and Mount Washington from quite a range around it. So I think the extent of it really varies according to the size and the character of the symbolic resource.

Q. And so how did you include, like, the symbology and the meaning of that place, and what are the criteria? Was it a specific one that you mixed that into or -- because that isn't one of the lines in the table; right?

A. Yeah, yeah. We did it partly by researching the literature, reviewing the scenic tourism
bureau's data information. We used some of the knowledge we have of New Hampshire. I lived in New Hampshire for two years and frequently would go up to the Mount Washington area for skiing. So I'm familiar with the state. And we talked to people. So there were different ways to get the information on symbolism.

Q. Okay. I'd like to move on. And I'm just going to take one example out of your visual impact assessment that you did, and it was Little Diamond Pond. And you put in parentheses that it's in Coleman State Park. Did you review Coleman State Park as a whole or just Little Diamond Pond?

A. We also did the entranceway and the headquarters and did some photography, hiked around the headquarters building complex. I know it's 10,000 acres or more, so we weren't able to cover the whole thing.

Q. Because I know DeWan & Associates, and I think T.J. Boyle, they did it from multiple locations within the park. And there's a boat launch, the campground, the entrance,
the visitor center, the lake and trails and
stuff like that. So you only -- you did
those three.
A. Yes. We should have done more, but we were
only able to do two or three.
Q. Okay. So there was discussion previously
with the other panels about surveying people
and finding out uses, like at a state park.
A. Hmm-hmm.
Q. And so previously I had asked questions about
the uses, and I'm assuming you just -- did
you do any research into the uses, or did you
just do what the other folks had assumed for
uses at the state park?
A. We visited the site with Larry Garland of the
Appalachian Mountain Club, who is very
familiar with the site. We looked at the
brochures and maps that were available on the
park. But unfortunately, we weren't able to
visit many other sites in the park.
Q. So let me play this assumption game that we
talked about, I think with Mr. Needleman.
Let's assume all these uses are at the
state park. So we have ATVs or snowmobiles,
depending on the season, and they're going up and down the trails. And the impact of that power line -- you know, they're going 20, 30 miles an hour or faster up the trail. They may catch glimpses of the line. So the impact to them, say, is considered low.

A. Hmm-hmm.

Q. Then you have the campground. And from the campground there's a lot of trees from the campground, and maybe you can't see from the direct campground. So let's just assume that it's a medium impact for them. At the boat launch it might be a medium if you're out on the lake and you're fishing; you might look up and see it. It might be medium or high. And if you're a hiker there to see the scenic beauty and on the trail, you're looking at the mountains and the scenery, so maybe it's high. So how do you take all those different uses that have different impacts and culminate them into one, one impact for that resource?

A. Well, I think the ideal way would be to treat each of those locations and activities you
mentioned and treat each one as its own visual resource, and that way you wouldn't be mixing apples and oranges. You would be evaluating what the snowmobilers experience, how they use it, how often they see it, how important the visual quality is to them. You'd then be separately evaluating the lake, and the fishermen and the boaters who use it. I think a facility that large, 10,000-plus acres, really needs to be looked at in different components. That's the way we would have done it in the ideal world. And I wish I'd had the time to do it, but we were pretty constrained. So we just did Little Diamond Pond and the headquarters area. And I wish we'd done more.

Q. So the numbers matter depending on those uses? Some of the uses might be lower than others, some might be higher.

A. Yeah.

Q. Is it quality or quantity?

A. Well, I agree with what you said, that the person on the dirt bike is probably paying attention to the rocks in front of the bike
and not to the surrounding scenic landscape. The fisherman probably has got a much better view of the surrounding land and might be more concerned about the Project. And the hikers probably are potentially the most close to the site. So I think it would vary, and ideally, each of those groups in each of those locations would be studied.

Q. So when you talked to Mr. Needleman just a few minutes ago about the cumulative impacts, about the cumulative impacts of the whole project -- but I think you just said that you would look at the individual uses of the state park and not the cumulative uses.

A. Yeah.

Q. So how do you differentiate that?

A. I think the way you address the cumulative, or as we described it as "overall impacts," is you would aggregate all the individual scenic resource scores into one combined score. So you would take all the separate visual resource areas within Coleman State Park -- I don't know if it's 5, 10, 15 -- and then you would aggregate them along with
those in the surrounding area to come up with
an overall visual impact.

Q. All right.

MR. WAY: Mr. Oldenburg?

QUESTIONS BY MR. WAY:

Q. Just so I understand, you did not do that.
   You did not separate all the activities out
   into their own --

A. No, we just made two different visual
   resource areas.

Q. Two visual resource areas. And did you
   combine those for a total?

A. No, we didn't.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. OLDENBURG (resumes):

Q. My last series of questions is you found the
   Project had an unreasonable adverse effect on
   aesthetics. And that was based upon how many
   sites that you found would have an adverse
   effect?

A. It was our 57 sites; it was the 70 or so
   DeWan & Associates sites; it was the T.J.
   Boyle work, both for the -- I'm drawing a
   blank on the name of the group -- in addition
to the Department of Energy. And we looked at the very early David Raphael sites.

Q. So of all those, how many total did you have in your pool? I mean, we've thrown, you know, 12,000, 18,000, 1200. You know, we have a huge number of differences. So how many did you use as a total?

A. Approximately 450 different sites. I know that T.J. Boyle estimated something like 7500. But we didn't have access to that information.

Q. And so to find an unreasonable adverse effect, how many sites would you consider? Just one?

A. For the entire project?

Q. For the entire project.

A. You know, in the ideal world you would have thousands and you would aggregate them. But I think, given the time and resources for this project, what we were able to do is to look at our work, compare it to the work that the other consultants did and, you know, view their photo simulations and their data on the Project's visual characteristics and make a
decision based on that.

Q. But how many sites would have to have a high impact for you to consider it to be an unreasonable adverse effect? One? Two? A dozen? Or does it depend on what the impact is?

A. I think it depends on what the impact is. But I think the large number of sites, the fact that they're distributed pretty much throughout the 132 miles of above-ground facility speaks to, you know, adverse overall impacts.

Q. Okay. All right. I think that's all the questions I have. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.

Dandeneau.

QUESTIONS BY MS. DANDENEAU:

Q. Hello, Mr. Dodson.

A. Hello.

Q. I have one sort of area I'd like to get a little more clarification on, and that's the area that Attorney Needleman was talking to you about in terms of your methodologies for rating your scenic resources. And do I
understand correctly that you would drive to
a location and just look, and then based on
your subjective opinion you would rate it a
5, 3 or 1?

A. We would take notes in the field and
photographic documentation. We'd go back to
the office and look at the viewshed maps and
topographic maps, the air photos, the various
geographic information system programs. So,
back in the office we would pull all that
together, and then my colleagues and I would
begin to come up with draft impact
statements. We'd review those, do some
editing and then come up with a final
evaluation of each site.

Q. So you weren't applying those rankings in the
field.

A. No.

Q. Okay.

A. I mean, you do get an impression on the first
visit. But you need to look at all the other
factors and not make a snap decision based on
first impression.

Q. Okay. But there wasn't a rubric or a
checklist of things that you were looking for
that ended up contributing to the ranking
that you gave a site.
A. No, not in the field.
Q. So can you give me an example of some of the
notes you took when you were in the field?
A. We took notes relative to the location, the
conditions, the weather, the time of day,
written impressions of some of the site
features, terrain vegetation, water, and some
notes on the character and extent of the
views.
Q. Okay. And then you mentioned the draft
impact statement just a moment ago. Was it
that writing that basically became the
different sections of your report for those
different sites?
A. Yeah, they were the foundation for that work.
Q. Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Way.

QUESTIONS BY MR. WAY:
Q. Good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I apologize for not being here this morning, and I look forward to reading your testimony later. So, hopefully this hasn't been covered.

But in listening to what Mr. Needleman was asking you about, I had some of the same questions. And going on what was just asked of you as well by Ms. Dandeneau, in terms of ratings, when I look -- the one that did catch my eye was extent, nature and duration of use. So when I see a rating system 1 to 5, so that that quantification isn't subjective, it's got to be based on something. I mean, there's something that constitutes a 1 and something that constitutes a 5. Everything else compares so it I would think.

A. Yes.

Q. So it is that how -- it wasn't that every single road or every place you went to you just sort of assigned it something. You must have based it on some standard. Or did you?

A. For extent, duration and view?

Q. Correct.
A. Yeah, we based it on the standard that eventually became that revised matrix for extent and duration of view. And it had to do with understanding the nature of how one sees that resource. Are you driving at 70 miles an hour past a short view of it? Are you walking along a path or canoeing down a river? So we took notes and made comments about what the experience of visiting that site is so we could understand the extent, which would be lengthy in a canoe and would be very short in a car going 70 miles an hour. And that would cover duration.

The extent would be our experience at the site and later analyzing other data over dealing with the width and breadth of the view. And the distance would also be determined that way, by initial notes in the field and then followed with analysis of air photos and geographic information system information to determine how distant and wide the view is.

Q. Okay. That's helpful. And so when you get back, I would imagine you have this big pile
of data. Are you then coming up with the
ratings, comparing one to the other? Or did
you assign these ratings in the field? And I
guess what I'm trying to say is that, if I go
out and I'm on a scenic road and I see
transmission lines for a mile, I might say
that's a 4 or a 5, I don't know, just
hypothetically, until I go to another road
where I see it for five miles. Well, do I
adjust backwards, or are they both 5s or 3s
or whatever? How are we -- I still don't
understand how you're coming up with that
rating system, that actual number.

A. Yeah. Well, it's a combination of things.
You know, in terms of distance, we used the
Forest Service, U.S. Forest Service
standards. They do very excellent work with
visual resource. So we used their distance
standards of a quarter-mile is foreground;
middle ground is a quarter to four miles, and
distance is everything beyond four miles.
That was a pretty universal standard for
distance.

For extent, in the field we took the
photos; in the office, consulting with photos and maps. We determined the degree of angle of the Project's visibility. So if it went from the very left-hand side of the image to close to the right-hand side, it would have an extent of maybe 80 percent, for example. That would be the amount of the image that you would see in width.

And duration is really based on understanding how people get around the site. Do they drive through quickly? Do they stop and enjoy the scenery? Do they go fishing? Those we didn't really have standards for. We were able to describe those uses, but it was harder to develop a quantitative standard for analyzing those.

Q. And duration was one I was sort of wondering about. I would think that ends up being very subjective, very activity-focused.

A. Yeah. Unless you spend days and weeks there with a stopwatch, it's hard to calculate. So you have to do it based on the typical duration of somebody going fishing, of somebody taking a walk around the lake, of
somebody driving by in a car. So it's harder to quantify. But it's still possible to get a pretty good sense of what people are doing there and how long they're going to be staying.

Q. And you did not use any intercept surveys. So you feel like you've got a pretty good handle on what those activities would be that people would be using at the sites?

A. Yeah, from preliminary visits, talks with park rangers, people in the area, maybe looking at some of the literature about what is available at the park. The parks all have brochures, and they describe what people do in the park.

Q. Would intercept surveys have been helpful to you?

A. They would have. I wish we could have done those.

Q. And just one last question on the concept of "cumulative" versus "overall." Did you say that you had -- it was your impression that "overall" was allowed under the SEC rules?

A. Yes, that was my impression.
Q. Because I did see under 301:14(a)(5) the
evaluation of the overall daytime and
nighttime visual impacts. Was that what you
were referring to?
A. That's one of them, yeah. Also, the fact
that when we're evaluating a wind turbine
complex, it's a specific complex in a
well-defined, large, but well-defined area.
A power plant, likewise, can be evaluated in
its entirety within, say, a couple square
miles of the facility. A transmission line,
132 miles above ground, you know, ideally is
evaluated both at the individual site scale,
but also, like the wind turbine complex or
the power plant, is evaluated as a whole. So
I think the overall statement in the rule,
and also the fact that at some point you need
to step back and evaluate the 132 miles as a
continuum, speaks to why we think overall
ratings are important.

Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

I don't think there's any other questions from
the Committee. Ms. Boepple, do you have any
redirect?

MS. BOEPPLE: I do. Thank you, Chair.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. BOEPPLE:

Q. Mr. Dodson, just a few questions following up on some confusion I think that might have been created by terminology.

Mr. Needleman has been asking -- asked you a series of questions regarding the term that you used regarding your Visual Impact Assessment and a response that you gave to Attorney Connor earlier today regarding what it was that you produced. Could you just be very clear about what it was, what your visual -- what we are calling your Visual Impact Assessment? What was that?

A. It's a Visual Impact Assessment based on the foundation of the DeWan & Associates VIA. We felt there were a number of positive and very useful elements in the DeWan & Associates work. We wanted to take advantage of those, but also point out where we thought there were deficiencies and omissions.
Q. So is it fair to say that in your profession there can be different approaches to conducting or preparing a visual impact assessment?

A. Yes.

Q. And so yours was one example of that. And it took some material from Mr. DeWan's, but also did a critique of his; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. Now, with respect to some of the questions that he asked you regarding interpretation of the new SEC rules, it appeared to me, anyway, from his questioning that he sort of made the assumption that you might have been interpreting those in a vacuum. But isn't it true that the clients who retained you to do the work on this were the Forest Society -- the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests and the AMC? Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you were aware that both organizations were involved when the new rules were being drafted, weren't you?
Q. And so did you have discussions with your clients about what the SEC rules meant --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and how to apply them in your VIA?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. With respect to several questions regarding worksheets, let's try and be specific. There was a discovery request that was made during the technical sessions, and there was a subsequent discovery request. I'm going to show you a couple of documents and then ask you if you might be familiar with those.

So do you see this on your screen?
A. No.
Q. It should be up in a minute.
A. There it is.
Q. Okay. So you see an Excel spreadsheet in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, during the break did we have a discussion with your office?
A. Excuse me?
Q. During the break did we have a discussion with your office?
A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And in that discussion, did we confirm that there was a spreadsheet that contains the information that Mr. Needleman said was not provided to them?
A. Yes.

Q. And does this look like the spreadsheet that we were -- that we discussed?
A. It does. Just to be sure, can you scroll it to the right?

(Witness reviews document.)

A. Yes, that's it. We called it the "working sheet."

Q. Okay. And do you also recall that in that discussion your office indicated that that had been provided?
A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. And I assumed from discussions with my associates, Nate Burgess, that it had been forwarded to you.

Q. Okay. Now, do you see -- you may or may not
be familiar with this. I'll scroll up to the
top of the page. Do you see a date at the
top of this page?


Q. And does this appear to be a Word document?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And it's captioned -- how is it
captioned? What's the caption on the page?

A. "Northern Pass Discovery Response Narrative."

Q. Okay. Does this look familiar to you? Is
this something you might have reviewed when
reviewing discovery requests before they were
delivered to the Applicant?

A. I just need to look at this.

Q. Sure.

(Witness reviews document.)

A. So these are answers to discovery requests.

Q. Correct.

A. Can you scroll down?

Q. Yup.

(Witness reviews document.)

Q. Does this generally look familiar to you?

A. Yes. It's a summary of our discovery
submission.
Q. Right.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Beth, are you representing that these were provided to us?

MS. BOEPPLE: Yes, I am.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I think we're going to need to have a conversation.

MS. BOEPPLE: Okay.

A. Oh, Beth, can you stop and go back up to the previous page? Right there is fine. Under Northern Pass Visual Evaluation at the bottom, the first item is Evaluation Working Sheet 2016. That's the working sheet that you showed recently.

BY MS. BOEPPLE:

Q. That's what I was going to ask you. This indicates that that worksheet was provided. And I believe there's another response further on that indicates, again, that the worksheet was provided.

I believe Mr. Needleman also was wondering why the Concord Municipal Airport was included as a scenic resource. Isn't it true that that was included because it's a site that's listed on the National Register?
A. That was one factor. But the main factor was that it was in the viewshed of the Project.

Q. Right. But just being in the viewshed, it also has to be a scenic resource; does it not? And wouldn't it qualify as a scenic resource if it was listed on the National Register?

A. Well, not necessarily. It would depend on the scenic quality, the cultural value, other factors.

Q. If a historic property is listed on the National Register, is it likely to qualify as a scenic resource?

A. It is more likely to.

Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Needleman was also asking you -- let me just take this down off the screen.

I just want to go back for one second to the spreadsheet. And I just want to be clear. The spreadsheet that was produced during discovery, this does encompass all of the various ratings and the criteria you used to arrive at the valuations that you placed on scenic resources; correct?
A. Yes, it does.

Q. Okay. This is why I have two devices. I was trying not to show you my two e-mails at the same time.

Let's see. Mr. Needleman also was asking you about mitigation. Were you retained to conduct a full review and analysis of potential mitigation for this project? Was that part of the scope of work that you were asked to do?

A. No.

Q. So, in fact, your suggestion for burial, was that a general recommendation based on the scale, size and scope of the Project?

A. Well, mitigation is one of the SEC rule requirements. And we addressed it possibly a little bit too concisely by saying that we didn't feel that there was really meaningful mitigation without burial. So we were responding to the SEC rule with that statement.

Q. But isn't it also true that the burden of providing measures for mitigation is on the Applicant? Correct?
A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So, in doing at least your review and in the conduct of your Visual Impact Assessment, in the scope of what you were asked to do, you didn't do, you know, a Canadian-border-down-to-Deerfield review of mitigation measures all the way along the route; correct?

A. Correct.

MS. BOEPPLE: Okay. No other questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, Mr. Dodson. I think we're done with you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: With that, we will adjourn and see you next time.

(Whereupon the Day 55 Afternoon Session was adjourned at 4:31 p.m., and the Day 56 hearing to resume on November 6, 2017, commencing at 9:00 a.m.)
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