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A. I will supplement that, if I may, with the process, based on the supplemental testimony given by Mr. Chalmers in response to mine.
Q. Okay. Proceed.
A. Okay. Now, is this -- I thought it was going to be all questions and answers. Should I just begin speaking?
Q. Well, if you have something you'd like to add to your testimony based upon what Mr . Chalmers said in his supplemental prefiled testimony or when he testified on cross-examination --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, actually, let's find out. Is Counsel for the Public prepared to question the witness to elicit this testimony?

MR. PAPPAS: Yes, but I don't intend to use Mr. Chalmers with him. But I am going to ask questions. In other words, I don't intend to look at Mr. Chalmers'
supplemental testimony and go off of that. I'm just going to ask questions that $I$ think relate to this witness's testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
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Let's circle back then. If you have things you specifically want to respond to things Mr . Chalmers said, then now would be the time to do it.

WITNESS POWELL: I think I will be asked questions that will draw some of this out. But $I$ can, off the cuff, begin to discuss some of it, if I may.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. It would be helpful if you could point to that portion of Dr. Chalmers' testimony that you're responding to, to let the Committee know, and then give us your response.
A. I will direct you to Page 12 where reference was made --
Q. Which testimony?
A. I'm sorry. The supplemental testimony by Mr. Chalmers.
Q. Thank you.
A. On Page 12 of his testimony he was asked a question relative to a comment by Skip

Sansoucy, who said that retrospective
analyses as a basis for determining value in
a case like this was irrelevant. And his
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> response was that he did not agree, and he said that argument makes no sense. And he went on to discuss the way in which he approaches these issues, the methodology, which was also challenged and has been challenged off and on as I understand it through the proceeding, and talked about the various controls and items that he would look to in order to determine whether or not this project would have an impact on property, which is indeed why I'm here.

> He objected to Skip Sansoucy's comment because it really shakes at the foundation of all of his work, his industry and this report because by looking at property sales that are in no way related directly to the areas which I am responsible for representing here, and which do not take into account either the introduction of a new right-of-way or drastic changes in an existing right-of-way, by failing to find examples which are directly related to the region and directly related to the changes that will take place on this right-of-way, he fails to come up with
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analysis that can be considered relevant.
And in my prepared testimony, my written testimony, $I$ went on at a lot of length talking about the uniqueness of our region, how people behave as buyers in that marketplace, what their expectations are, how they respond to various things, and the importance overall of the natural resources, the beauty, the scenery, what can be seen from the property, what can be seen of the property when looking at it. The whole experience there and the whole behavior of the market is based upon a very unique level of scenic beauty and attraction, and I guess it creates in our buyers a high level of expectation and an attitude where they will simply not accept when they come there what they might expect where they live or someplace where they work. They come there for different reasons than what they've been exposed to. And Sondra Brekke addressed that very directly when she spoke earlier today about what brought them here from New Jersey, why they purchased what they purchased and
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what it meant to them. This is by no means an out-of-the-ordinary comment. It is an everyday comment. It is an everyday experience for me to understand the uniqueness of the area and the uniqueness of the appeal and the absolute responsibility we have to protect and maintain and continue the level and quality of the environment that we have up there.

So, this project doesn't exist in the North Country. There is no tower, no transmission line equal to what would be built in that location or elsewhere through the state. There are no sales, therefore, that can be directly related to the impact of that project on that region. And there are no sales that have taken place elsewhere along the line to our south that are at all relevant of existing HVTL lines because they are not in our region and because even those lines are --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm going to object at this point. This sounds to me like just a recitation of things already in
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
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his testimony and certainly things that were in Mr. Chalmers' original report.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, I
guess the problem with asking for a narrative like this is you can sort of veer off into things that are probably beyond what's appropriate at this stage.

The purpose of what we're
doing here, Mr. Powell, at this point, and you're going to get a lot of questions by a lot of people following up on this, is if there are things you feel you need to do to respond to specific things Mr. Chalmers said after the last thing you filed. So it's not to rehash what's in your initial filing or supplemental filing or any other thing you've already made, but it's really for new things at this point.

WITNESS POWELL: Yeah. Well, I think what I'll do is try to be succinct and then see if things can come out during the questioning. But the succinct thing is that behavior is the issue, not comparable analyses, and that will be expanded upon. The quality of
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the information that went into his opinions was very low, and in some cases irrelevant and misjudged as to their significance and misused. Therefore, much of what he responded to me and what he said is simply off base, and I'll explain that. And it all I'm sure will come out more succinctly when I try to answer questions than sit here off the cuff. So forgive me for that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Why don't we set up the questioning then. Mr. Pappas, looks like you're ready to go.

MR. PAPPAS: I am.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PAPPAS :
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Powell. My name is Tom Pappas, and I'm Counsel for the Public in this proceeding, so I'm going to ask you questions on behalf of Counsel for the Public.

Let me just start very briefly with your background. I understand that you've been a realtor in Coos County and Northern Grafton County for the last 43 years?
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A. Yes.
Q. And do $I$ understand that you focus primarily on residential properties? Is that right?
A. Primarily. But we do a little bit of everything.
Q. A little of everything. Okay.

And you are familiar with the various local real estate markets in those two counties, Coos County and Northern Grafton County?
A. Yes. Many more intimately than others.
Q. Okay. So in your direct testimony you talk about two distinct markets. You talk about a village market and a rural market. So I want to ask you questions about those two markets that you discuss in your direct testimony. So let me start with the village markets.

Are the village markets geographically located in or near town centers?
A. They are basically the town center.
Q. So, for example, would the town center around Lancaster be considered a village market?
A. Yes.
Q. And would the same be true, for instance, of
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the town center around Whitefield or Bethlehem or Franconia?
A. Yes.
Q. Are those individual town village markets, in your opinion, distinct themselves? So, for instance, would the village market in Lancaster be different than the village market, let's say in Bethlehem?
A. To a degree. There will be varying degrees of difference. But generally speaking, they have the same demographic, the same sorts of issues in common.
Q. Now, you also indicate in your prefiled testimony that buyers in these village markets have interests that are defined by the local economy wages. Do you recall that?
A. Their capacity is defined by that, yes.
Q. Is that because those buyers tend to work in those local village markets in those towns?
A. They're local people who have local work and are subject to local income, local wages, local economy.
Q. And do they tend to come from local towns in which they work and live?
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
A. When they're purchasing property, they usually are purchasing within the town where they've already lived or in close proximity.
Q. Okay. So let me ask you some questions about the second market you identified, which is the rural market. And you state that the buyers in the rural market have a broader appeal. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you mean by that?
A. The market is broader. When you're dealing with rural property, you're dealing with amenities that do not exist in town, and people come from far afield. They may come, as I said, from Southern New Hampshire, New England, New York, anywhere in the country, or on a rare occasion you could say the world. But the things that bring them to New Hampshire do not bring them into the village of Lancaster or Whitefield or Groveton or Bethlehem. Generally speaking, they are looking for the amenities that people seek when they go to that rural environment.
Q. So would I be correct in saying that the
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buyers in this rural market aren't tied to the local wages or their income working in town?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. And would I also be correct in saying that the buyers in this rural market tend to buy things like retirement homes, second homes, country homes, that type of property?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Now, I should say that there are those, as I said in my testimony, who are local, who can participate in the rural market for one reason or another. But it's driven largely by its appeal to the broader market.
Q. Okay. Now, you indicated in your direct testimony that these two markets have separate values. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me what are the different values, in your view?
A. The capacity of local people to purchase is by and large limited as compared to people who are able to buy from other places. When
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
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you come from someplace else, you come because you're successful or successful enough to make an investment. You may have equity from a sale that occurred someplace else. But you come basically north for the amenities, and in fact, sometimes probably when you get up to where I am, you expect to pay a little bit less for a little bit more. People who are working in the area are less able to pay what to them would be an extraordinary price to gather together additional amenities. So, in town you'll have a cap of some sort, not artificially. But you can expect -- you can't expect to get anywhere near the money for a home in town that you would if it were out of town, even a lesser home out of town on land with views and other amenities.
Q. Okay. Now, is the fact that these buyers in rural districts aren't tied to the local wages or the local economy given more flexibility in terms of where they buy?
A. Yes. They're not tied -- where they come from, they have homes that are located where
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they are because of work, family or some other connection. When they come north, they have a free rein to choose whatever they're looking for, unless they have some prior experience with a community and they just adore it in some way and want to be within that community. But basically, if they can't find something that suits them in that location, they'll go to another, or they'll go to an entirely different region.
Q. So, in other words, buyers in this rural market might look at Sugar Hill, Franconia, Bethlehem. They may look at several towns in the general area until they find what they want?
A. Yes.
Q. Whereas, in your view, buyers in the village district really are confined to whatever village they're interested in?
A. That's where they can find what they're looking for.
Q. So you also indicated in your direct testimony that there are a number of things common to both markets, so $I$ just want to ask
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
you a few questions about that.
Now, one of the things you testified about is that a home's location and its view are at the core of the home's value. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is that true for both homes in the village market as well as the rural market?
A. The view rarely is a factor in a village home. Once in a while you'll have a view, and that will add something to it, but not as it would outside with land and that sort of thing. Two distinct expectations.
Q. Okay. And you also testified that when you're advising sellers of land, you advise them to provide the buyer with an opportunity for views and privacy. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And why is that?
A. Because that's what will create interest and lead to a sale.
Q. So let me ask you some questions about what you termed a moment ago, and you also
discussed this in your prefiled testimony,
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about "buyer behavior" and its impact on value.

Now, you testified in your prefiled testimony about measuring buyer behavior in terms of Northern Pass's impact on property values. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, would I be correct in saying that a buyer's behavior is their decision to either buy or not buy a property? Is that what you mean by "buyer behavior"?
A. Yes. Whether they will select a property depends upon whether it meets their desire for the kind of property they want.
Q. But that's what you mean by "buyer behavior" is essentially they make a decision to buy or make a decision not to buy.
A. Yes, and then from there you get into price issues and all that sort of thing.
Q. Okay. Now, is it your belief that a view of the Northern Pass transmission line can be a determining factor for some buyers whether to buy or not to buy?
A. Absolutely.
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
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Q. Is it your view that that is the determining factor for all buyers or just some buyers?
A. I would not be able to come up with a percentage small enough to exclude anybody who would not be concerned if the Northern Pass were part of their viewshed.
Q. So is it then your view that, for the vast majority of buyers, if the property they're looking at has a view of Northern Pass, that will affect their behavior; in other words, they'll decide not to buy?
A. Correct.
Q. In your direct testimony you talked about this buyer behavior and it reducing the pool of potential buyers. In other words, you indicated in your direct testimony that if a property has a view of Northern Pass or the proposed Northern Pass Project, that will reduce the pool of potential buyers to that property. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is it your view that by the pool being reduced, that has some effect on the value of that property?
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
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A. Absolutely. And that's in keeping with any negative influence, external influence on any property. I can expand on that if you wish.
Q. Sure.
A. I very often say to people when I'm working with them to decide how to market and value their home, that if they have something which is way out of the ordinary and would eliminate certain people from the market, then it will narrow that market, and that can affect not only the marketing time, but also the ultimate price. So I often spread arms and say we start out talking to the world and then we talk bout Northern New Hampshire and then Coos County and then the communities we are in and then various and sundry other factors unique to their property that may in some cases indicate that our target for their property is very narrow indeed. Northern Pass would even narrow that down to the point of nothing for many people; whereas, without it, they'd still have some market, not the world, but our share of it.

And I often think of our market as the
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experience of driving out of Logan Airport on a Friday night when you can barely move, and when you get to New Hampshire you can move a little easier, and then Manchester and Concord and Exit 20, Waterville Valley, Loon. And then you're in the Notch and you look around and it's you and a few other people. That's our share, in a sort of a visual way, of what we compete for, the folks who are willing to go back north to get what they're looking for.
Q. Okay. Now, if there are still some buyers that would remain in the pool to provide -to purchase a property that had a view of Northern Pass, would I be correct in saying that there's still then some value for that property?
A. I think in any given case when you have a negative that is so severe as this, that as I think $I$ said in my testimony, something to the effect that eventually price will become a competing factor, so that at some price, somebody will be willing to pay something and take a risk before it's constructed, or who
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knows what might happen after it's constructed. But if they need shelter and the price is right, they'll put up with things that others might consider not worth the investment.
Q. Would I be correct, putting it a different way, that in your view, the view of the Northern Pass Project would reduce the value of a property, but for a certain segment it wouldn't reduce it to zero? It's just a matter of whether the price gets low enough and then they're willing to buy.
A. Right. I have a property I mention in my testimony of 61 acres on Route 2 across from Roger's Campground. It's iconic, absolutely gorgeous view of the mountains. And the right-of-way goes across the bottom. The towers would grow exponentially in the mind of the eye. And that is impossible to sell right now. I haven't been able to get anybody to look once the disclosure is made. And I expect that if this thing were built, it would impact it dramatically.
Q. Can you see that property from that little --
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across the street from Roger's Campground, that little lookout area?
A. You are basically in the property from that lookout area.
Q. Now, you testified in your prefiled testimony that if a property is tainted by Northern Pass, the loss in value to that property due to Northern Pass can range from 35 to

40 percent and as high as 75 percent for raw land. Do you recall that?
A. Yes. Raw land, yeah, I think I gave an example of that.
Q. Yeah. Now, when you talk about "tainted by Northern Pass," are you referring to the impact from view; in other words, the aesthetic impact, the impact from aesthetics from the property?
A. Yes. It's an emotional thing. Doesn't have to be rational. It's emotional, and it's how they view the property and how they feel about the threat of it.
Q. But when you talk about "taint," though, is enough of it visibility? In other words, if you can see or will be able to see the
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}

Northern Pass Project from the property, that's the "taint"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. And am I correct in saying that you base that opinion on a number of things: You're experience with buyers, your conversations with other realtors in northern New Hampshire, and some of the specific examples you gave in your prefiled testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you base it on anything other than those three things $I$ just listed?
A. It's a constant experience to present properties, to answer questions about whether Northern Pass is going to affect this, where is it going to go, will it have any impact on this if I purchase it. It's a huge deterrent.
Q. Now, other than the view of Northern Pass, in addition to that, or perhaps separately from that, but other than that, in your view, does proximity to the transmission line have any
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## [WITNESS: PETER POWELL]

impact on a property's value?
A. I think it is not the sole determinant. Distance is understated entirely by Mr. Chalmers. I can think of views that go tremendous distances and still affect people's willingness to either accept it if they own it or purchase it if they're thinking of buying something. But proximity does obviously create greater discomfort in many cases. And in some cases it's the belief of the consuming public that it's a health concern, or could be a health concern. So all of those things get rolled up into one bundle when you're absolutely close to it.
Q. Let me ask it this way then: Is it your opinion that the closer a property is to the proposed Northern Pass Transmission Line, the greater impact on value?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr.
Chair, I don't think this was discussed at all in his testimony, so it sounds like a new opinion.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Pappas.
MR. PAPPAS: Well, he testified
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that view was a driving force, and I'm just trying to drill down, if you will, what other factors may be relevant to view, whether or not a view close up versus a view far away. I think this is all within the realm of what he testified about the decrease in property value. And I think clearly proximity is an element of view, and so I think it's a natural follow-up to his opinion to flesh out more what his opinion is.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled. You can continue.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you.
BY MR. PAPPAS:
Q. So, frankly, Mr. Powell, I don't remember my question, so let me try it again.

Is it your view that if a property is closer to the proposed Northern Pass Transmission Line, that that will have a greater impact on its value? I'm trying to get a sense of proximity, closeness to the line.
A. It's a very big factor. It is not the sole factor. I think that's what $I$ want to
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## [WITNESS: PETER POWELL]

emphasize in my response, that I think if you have an otherwise lovely home and this thing was to land on your doorstep, that it would be a dramatic and devastating impact. But the same may be true if you were a mile or half-mile away. It may be a question of some degree, but a significant degree. And if you were next to it, as I said, you begin to compound the problem with other impacts of the line or perceived impacts of the line.
Q. Okay. Let me ask it this way: The mention of "view lots" was in your prefiled testimony. And would you agree with me that a view lot is a property that has an advantageous view of something, whether it's a mountain range or a nice valley or a nice river view or something? That's generally considered what a view lot is?
A. Yes.
Q. I take it you believe that for view lots, if the advantageous view is now going to have the Northern Pass Project in it, that's going to affect value.
A. Yes.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY] \{11-09-17\}
Q. And that's going to negatively affect value.
A. Correct.
Q. Does it make a difference to you how close that view lot is to the line?
A. If it's in the view, it's going to have an impact.
Q. Okay. So, although you indicated earlier that proximity can have some other factors, and you mentioned potential health concerns or health factors, in terms of view, proximity doesn't make -- isn't the driving force; it's what you can see. And proximity, it goes to other factors?
A. Referring to Dr. Chalmers?
Q. Well, actually, I'm more interested in your opinion. I'm not tying it to Dr. Chalmers.

I understand what Dr. Chalmers testified about, and I asked him some questions. But I'm really interested in your view.
A. Visibility is the key factor.
Q. Okay. Now, earlier you indicated that New Hampshire is a unique market with unique appeal. And you had indicated that different markets have some distinctions, so let me
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just follow-up on that a little bit.
Do you think that despite -- well, despite the uniqueness of the New Hampshire market, and perhaps uniqueness among individual local markets within Northern New Hampshire, that view of Northern Pass transcends that? In other words, does the view, in your view, have the same impact across the different markets in New Hampshire?
A. I'm addressing Northern New Hampshire --
Q. Northern New Hampshire, yes.
A. -- with which I am most familiar?
Q. Correct.
A. I cannot think of an area where I service that would not be impacted in the same way that it would in every other part of the area.
Q. Okay. So the fact that some of the local markets might have some distinctions, in your view, that doesn't have an impact on how the view of the Northern Pass Project affects property values, in your view.
A. No.
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Q. Now, you also testified that the loss of value to a property from the Northern Pass Project can be measured obviously at the sale of the property by the sales price; correct?
A. Yes, it would be.
Q. But you also mentioned in your prefiled testimony that when a property is a change -and obviously a change in view from no view of a, you know, high-voltage transmission line to now a view of a high-voltage transmission line is a change; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you testified about a loss of value even though there isn't a sales price. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you mean? Describe for me that loss of value.
A. Well, you heard it from Sondra Brekke, and you would hear it from across the board. If you wake up some morning and the things that you treasured and held dear, the things you thought would be in your family forever, the way in which you took pride and pleasure in
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your place were affected by something that offended you greatly, then that would rob you of the peaceful use and enjoyment of your property. And I think that would be a tragedy across the board for people who have no intention of selling, no desire to sell, but would somehow get less from what they have than they ever did before.
Q. Now, do you base that -- what do you base that on?
A. Emotion.
Q. No, no. That may have been a poorly worded question.

Do you base that on conversations you've had with buyers, with other realtors, your experience in selling property? I want to know what you base that view on.
A. This Committee and all the hearings leading up to it have heard it constantly, a loud voice of people who are expressing as though they were the market, therefore they are market, exactly how they feel about this thing and how it would impact them. You cannot have ears and not hear what's being
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said and how people feel about it.
Q. Okay. Now, in your prefiled testimony you gave a number of examples of properties that had their value affected by the proposed Northern Pass Transmission Line. Are you aware of any studies that have looked at that?
A. For those properties?
Q. No, for any just in general.
A. No. The only studies that I'm aware of are the things that I've been able to read something of, the ones before the Committee.
Q. Okay. Now, you've mentioned in your prefiled testimony your discussion with somebody at Peabody \& Smith, for instance. Have you had other similar discussions with other realtors in your area?
A. $O h$, sure.
Q. And give me an example of somebody specific and a specific example where they have relayed to you --
A. Tammy Dubreuil, I mentioned in my -- I don't by name, but in my written testimony, talked to me about the difficulty of selling homes
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in a mobile home park, a very nice one with a view of the line. The Ramsdell property, she tried to show, to no avail.

Denise Boynton talked to me about two of the properties that $I$ mentioned in my testimony regarding a constant rejection of properties because of the line and the difficulty of marketing them and the time it takes to do so.

Andy Smith, his whole crew, much larger than my own, covering Franconia and south, talked about the inability to sell certain properties in their market until the decision to bury a part of it through some portions of his marketplace again made certain of those properties viable again because they were not so threatened. It's a constant conversation and a common conversation, and people would just like it to go away.
Q. Could you tell us the communities in which these various realtors sell property, or attempt to sell property? I want to get a geographic sense.
A. Sure. Same as myself, essentially. Andy
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}

Smith goes further south than I do. But the market area that we all deal with immediately would be Stratford, Groveton, Stark, stretching over once in a while over to Milan, down to Lancaster, Jefferson, Whitefield, Randolph, Bethlehem, Littleton -less focus of my market area, but I do business there on occasion with representing buyers, not so much with listings. Jump over across the river a little bit, most of us do because we're on the border. And then for certain kinds of properties we may go to Colebrook or Pittsburg, depending upon the nature of what we're looking for or what somebody's asking us to consider selling for them.
Q. Yeah, let me interrupt you for a minute. But in terms of the conversations that you relayed about other brokers dealing with properties that have an impact by Northern Pass, are those in the various markets you just described?
A. Yes.
Q. Finally, let me ask you this: When you list
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a property, I assume you do some kind of sales comparison to come up with a proposed listing price.
A. Yes.
Q. And if you list a property that is going to be potentially impacted by Northern Pass and you have to disclose that, do you still look for comps to try to get a sales price?
A. At this point we understand the inherent value, the basic core value of a property based on comps. But we have to speculate and reveal to the seller the potential difficulty, or the certain difficulty right now of being able to market it to a large part of the market. And depending upon their situation, we may suggest they hold, defer if they don't need to.

But when you talk to someone about their property, I think I mentioned I have a bigger role than just appraising. I have to understand not what happened yesterday, but what's going on today and what might be happening tomorrow, not only with respect to disclosures but with the dynamics of the
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marketplace itself. And I have to understand thoroughly and interview carefully the needs of my client to understand the needs of the client. And if the needs of the client require that the property be sold, then it has to be made very, very competitive in order to get any attention at all if factors external to the property are going to inhibit our capacity to sell it or to achieve what might otherwise be a full market value. And they have to make the decision about whether they want to offer it now or offer it later or bite the bullet, whatever their circumstances dictate.
Q. Okay. And if you were going to list a property because the seller wants to sell now, and that property potentially is impacted by Northern Pass and you have to disclose that, does that affect the price that you recommend the seller list it at?
A. It will. The fact that they want to sell immediately will impact that price as well.
Q. Sure.
A. But the fact that it's going to be burdened
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by Northern Pass would require a deeper discount in order for us to make it look like something that somebody else would want to take the risk and invest in for whatever purpose.
Q. So when you're giving your recommendation to a seller on the sales price for their property that might be potentially impacted by Northern Pass, is it your recommendation to discount the price because of potential impact to Northern Pass?
A. Yes. I see no alternative; otherwise, you simply add days to the market and pain to the process.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Powell. I have no other questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do the Muni
Groups have questions? Ms. Fillmore?
MS. FILLMORE: We do not.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who else is
here? Ms. Boepple, do you have questions?
MS. BOEPPLE: No, thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Baker,
do you? Looks like you do. While Mr. Baker is
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coming up, off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You may proceed.

MR. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. BAKER:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Powell. Nice to see you here.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I'm going to be very brief. When I had a chance to cross-examine Mr . Chalmers on Day 25 of these proceedings -- seems like years ago, but it was just a few months ago -- I asked him about the 32 miles of the project in the far North Country of New Hampshire where there was no existing transmission corridor and where a new transmission corridor was planned to be built. And specifically on Page 148 of the Day 25 Afternoon transcript I asked him this question: "You didn't mean to suggest that in that 32 miles of North Country where there
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is no existing corridor, that there would be an absence of property loss or property damage by the presence of the new line there, did you?"

And he responded as follows, and I have that in front of you now on Lines 4 through 16 of Page 149 of that transcript. His answer was, "Basically the answer would be in the affirmative there, that that is the implication, that there is no proximate -- or there's very scattered residential development in relationship to that 32 miles. And in fact, none, I think, within 500 feet, and certainly none within a 100 feet. Therefore, based on the analysis that I've described in my testimony, there wouldn't be any adverse impact on residential property values anticipated with that section of the line, and that's the one section that's not in an existing corridor." Do you see that? Do you understand what he was saying?
A. I understand what he said.
Q. Do you agree with what he said?
A. I don't understand why he said it. No, I
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don't agree.
Q. Could you tell us -- well, I'm going to open it up to you now. Would you give us the reasons why you disagree with what he said?
A. What he's trying to do is stand behind his study, which is a false construct. It assumes that only within a certain distance will you have an impact because of proximity, visibility and encumbrance. The impact goes far beyond that, in our region especially. You do not have to be up against it to feel the pain of its presence and you will do so financially and in your own use and enjoyment of the property. We are a place of mountains, hillsides, valleys, rivers, streams, vast vistas of uninterrupted beauty. And I talked to Charlie Jordan the other day, the editor of The Colebrook Chronicle, and he recalled for me his first written lines in October 2010 when he got a call and learned about this thing. The headline was, "Are You Kidding?" Who in the world came up with this idea? Who would put something like this through an area like ours and mar it in
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that way? For what purpose? To what good end? I'm not quoting him there. But the direct quote was, "Are You Kidding?" But that would be a devastating impact on a region. And you've got to understand and emphasize that the impact of this line in an area like that, in an area like all of the North Country, is a property-specific impact for those who own property who see it. But it's something that you share with everyone and the effect on your overall economy in the various ways in which I referenced in my testimony, including tourism. And if people are affected by this thing with a constant view of it and constant exposure to it, that incremental exposure builds up and tends to drive people away where you would encounter that sort of thing.

And I think one of the members of the House, in reference to the Northern New Jersey Turnpike -- we cannot compete with other regions if we allow ugly objects in a beautiful landscape that will somehow change it. We are all going to be impacted by this
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thing. One business who suffers or fails or does more poorly than it would otherwise impacts all of us. It's a tight community, a small community, a very dispersed population. We are not divorced, one from the other. We are all impacted by the same thing. So it isn't just the people who are going to be proximate are encumbered by it, it is the people who are even a distance away and see it. And it is those who will be impacted negatively by it and whose businesses may be affected, as well as their use and enjoyment of land and recreation and everything else you can think of. We will all suffer together, whether we are within 100 feet, 500 feet, 2 miles, or whether it's our friend who is. There is going to be a broad community impact if this thing is built.

MR. BAKER: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Van
Houten, are you going to ask questions from where you are?

MR. VAN HOUTEN: I'll ask my
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question from right here.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Can you see him? He's out there.

MR. VAN HOUTEN: I'm over here. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. VAN HOUTEN:
Q. We were all looking at my property on the map a little while ago, and there's some distance between my --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt. I thought Mr . Powell was Mr. Van Houten's expert.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think they're just part of the same group. I don't really know.
(Discussion off the record.)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's not clear to me, Mr. Van Houten, that it's appropriate for you to ask questions at this point because, as I am reminded, Mr . Powell is an expert for your group. He's not himself a party to this.

MR. VAN HOUTEN: Correct. It was suggested that $I$ give it a shot. Thank
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you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Shot taken. Ms. Menard.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Powell.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Jeanne Menard, from Deerfield Abutters, and my trusty assistant; this is Eric Berglund, also from Deerfield.

So I'd like to start off with questions about land values, and in particular, just jumping off the point that Mr. Chalmers was limited -- his land analysis was limited to his subdivision studies, and he rendered a "no price or timing effect impact" conclusion on lot sales. And in your -- in his supplemental testimony he was very critical of your analysis of Project impacts on land, and so I wanted to get your opinions on an important piece of evidence that he uses in his subdivision study, and that is the "back land/front land analysis" that we were talking about earlier today, and also just
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contrast that with some of the methodology criticisms that he was applying to your analysis.

So I'd like to just -- I'm just going to get you very quickly up to speed with -- I don't know if you've had an opportunity to look at any of the subdivision studies. So I've chosen a study from Canterbury. It's out of your area. And I'm going to give you a quick overview.

So, basically what Mr. Chalmers did was he took a typical subdivision and he tried to get different subdivisions from different parts of the state and he made a collection of lots.

MS. MENARD: And then if you go to the next page, Eric.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. He prepared a table. And he made a note on this particular table that it was summarizing eight fair market sales, and those are those particular lots that he analyzed. And then also on this chart you can note basically he's compiled the date and the price and the
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acreage which was critical to his analysis. And if you go to his findings page, you can see that he acknowledges the general absence of timing and pricing effects evident here. And he indicates that there is no consistent, measurable effect of the high-voltage tension line on the marketability of affected lots. So it is for this reason, then, that he is bringing into the discussion about the back land/front land analysis.

MS. MENARD: So can we go back to the picture of the subdivision, please?

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. So when you -- if you're looking at land value and you're doing a pricing analysis for a potential seller or buyer, how critical is using only fair market sales?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr.
Chair. This is all material that was in his original report.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sounds like you're asking him to talk about what's in his report.

MS. MENARD: In his --
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
[WITNESS: PETER POWELL]

## CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: His

testimony has within it descriptions of what's important.

MS. MENARD: And this is directly going to go to understanding a methodology difference.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm not sure I understand.

But Mr. Needleman, you want to say something else?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes. Everything that Ms. Menard just went through is all in Mr. Chalmers' original report. So anything having to do with this could have and should have been covered in the testimony. There's nothing new here.

MS. MENARD: What we didn't know at the time of writing our testimonies is the representation that, given the nature of the work, that they're arm's-length sales, and anyone reading this report would assume that. And in a cross-examination fairly recently, he reaffirmed his position of the importance of an arm's-length sale. So I want to ask Mr. Powell
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how difficult this is. This is a problem, and I need his input.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think it
would be helpful in setting this up if you would describe to us what Mr. Chalmers has said recently that you're looking for this witness to respond to, because it's -- there were too many "he's" in the original questions and Conversations. But I think Mr. Needleman's position or his objection was based on the belief that you were talking about Mr. Chalmers' work generally, back to his original report or his written, whatever he's done in writing. It seems like you are asking the witness to talk about something that's happened more recently while Mr . Chalmers was testifying. Am I right about that? MS. MENARD: I think my problem is I'm trying to be efficient and bring two issues together to get to the sale price of frontage land/back land question, while helping people understand how Mr. Chalmers got there himself. And so that's where I think we're crossing paths here.
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So I have two goals: One, to ask questions about the sale price of front land/back land analysis, which Mr. Chalmers stated in his testimony on Page 134 in a cross-examination. He said that this is -he felt very strongly this was an apples-to-apples comparison, okay. So that's one goal.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. MS. MENARD: And then as we go along, I would like to elicit how important methodology is to arrive at these conclusions. And right now I'm not sure how to separate that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, I'm not sure you need to. But if you lay the groundwork of the first part, you will then get to the second part I think. But I think that the key is to start with what Mr . Chalmers said in cross-examination on Page 134 to give everyone a starting point that makes it apparent you're springboarding off of something that happened recently that Mr . Chalmers said. That will obviate most of what Mr. Needleman
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would object to. There may be others. I'm not quite sure. But that initial objection he made I think will be obviated if you use Mr. Chalmers' cross-examination testimony as your starting point.

MS. MENARD: Okay.
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. Welcome to 50 Donovan Street, Mr. Powell.

I will see if I can locate the testimony and restart.

MS. MENARD: Thank you for your help.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. So, this is, for the record, Day 24 , July 31st, Page 134, and we are talking about conclusions for subdivision studies. And he has -- in response to a question about frontage land having far greater value and looking at an assessment that we were discussing about Deerfield, I asked him if he -- if he felt that using assessing data from 2015 falsely diminished the percentage of back land, and he didn't understand the point $I$ was trying to make. And we went
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through an analysis. And basically I was asking him for an apples-to-apples comparison, and he disagreed when we got to the end of the discussion. It's a lengthy discussion. He basically disagreed that this was an inappropriate -- he disagreed that his analysis was inappropriate.

So, with that, to understand the
analysis for what we have here in Canterbury, I was wondering if you could answer a few questions in which you would undertake if you were doing a pricing analysis. And one of the foundations, would you agree, is how critical is using a fair market sale in arriving at that analysis?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman,
I'm sorry. I still have the same objection. It doesn't seem to me like -- I appreciate what Ms. Menard is trying to do, but I don't see any correlation between the $Q \& A$ she had during crossing Mr. Chalmers and this document and why whatever is being asked regarding this document could not have been included in Mr. Powell's prior work.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard. MS. MENARD: The reason it
couldn't be included is because his evidence of the analysis is totally irrelevant. And we never would have come up with it on our own for him to have brought that into a discussion about marketability of subdivision. So I think it's completely unfair to have premeditated conversation about the importance of the one thread of evidence that Mr. Chalmers has given to support his no pricing, no market effect conclusions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Your goal is to convince us that Chalmers is wrong, that Chalmers' analysis has no basis, okay. Why don't you just ask him if he agrees with what he said on Page 134 that you were just referring to. Isn't that ultimately what you're trying to get to?

MS. MENARD: Yes. But I think it's unfair because $I$ don't think -- this is standard -- this is what he does every day. But he's not seen this report, so I think it's unfair for me to ask him that question when he
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hasn't had a chance to understand.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: But you're
looking for him to offer an opinion --
MS. MENARD: An opinion, yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- about
areas he didn't get into. He said it during his testimony, during the questioning he was just going through with Mr. Pappas, that he focused on the North Country. That's where he works. That's what he knows about. That's his knowledge base. So you're looking for him now, I think, to get into a discussion about a subdivision in Canterbury.

MS. MENARD: He did very explicitly in his supplemental talk about land value. This is a key piece of his supplemental testimony. And just because Mr. Chalmers -and I'm sorry. I don't mean to argue, but -CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This is exactly what you should be doing. MS. MENARD: Oh, okay. You know, Mr. Chalmers' piece is his subdivision study. That's his land platform. Mr. Powell's land platform is in his supplemental testimony.
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And there's common ground here in the methodology.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Was Mr.
Chalmers' subdivision not part of his subdivision work -- not part of his original testimony?

MS. MENARD: It was.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, then,
Mr. Powell had every opportunity to respond to the methodology flaw, if there was one, in Mr . Chalmers' work. No?

MS. MENARD: He chose not to.
But Mr. Chalmers chose to criticize his analysis.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And so --
MS. MENARD: And it totally
undermines Chalmers' position. It's contradictory.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So I'll circle back. Then why don't you ask him what he thinks about what Chalmers said on Page 134. He doesn't -- what else does he need to know? MS. MENARD: That's not a fair question to ask him with no background.
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Actually, you know what? Maybe I'll get right to that, and I'm going to trust that he understands -- I'm going to trust that he knows what I am asking. I'll try to get right to that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's funny, just as you were agreeing with me, I was going to get ready to let you ask a few more background questions to get there. But you've convinced me. See if you can get the answer that you want from him.

MS. MENARD: Thank you. We're going to skip over the arm's-length sale.

Do you have Page 84,
Mr . Berglund?
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. So, Mr. Chalmers did some satellite imagery of properties. And he concluded that the excess acreage to the rear of the lot appears to have little or no utility or value to the property as a whole. A property's value appears to depend on the acre or so devoted to the home site, with little utility or value going to the remaining acreage. Okay?
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So I would like to put back up the first Canterbury subdivision. And we're in a lot-size situation here, about an acre to an acre and a half. Average lot, 1.3 acres, in that range. And using his -- what do you think about his opinion about having a back land/front land discussion in this subdivision?
A. In my experience, the amount of land that you have surrounding your home is important. It shields you, provides you with some degree of privacy. The amount of land that you own makes a difference to the quality, very often the quality of the site which you occupy. It can provide protection. It can provide additional use value. And it gives you a sense, a grander sense of ownership in some cases. I have no perspective from my work of what it may mean to have an acre versus an acre and a half. But $I$ can tell you that's not a ton of land. And if somebody took a half-acre away from me, I would be very upset about it. Or if they did something to it that rendered it less useful or less
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
[WITNESS: PETER POWELL]
attractive or exposed my view from my home of something $I$ didn't want to see, then that would upset me a great deal. And if somebody, in the case of an existing utility, put a tower right smack dab outside my bedroom window, I would be extremely upset and I would consider that to be an affront to my rights of ownership. And I can only imagine that if you are surrounded by just basically the curtilage around your home, you have little to defend there. And I think the back of an acre or two is extremely important in a parcel of that size, just as I do if it's 15 or 20 or 40 acres. When you have greater amounts of land, it all takes on additional character. It adds to the value of the place. People up where I am like larger acreage if they can have it. And it gives an extra element to your home that involves you with the woods, the trees, the management of all that, and the additional protection it affords.

And in the case of David Van Houten, he has a lot of land out behind his house
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between where he lives and the power line. Half of that area behind his house belongs to someone else. If they cut those trees, they would expose him to the power line. If he cut his trees, it would expose him to the power line. If a microburst, which I have experienced, came down and blew down a lot of trees, it would expose him to the power line, then he would no longer have that shield. In addition to that, he is restricted from practicing land management on his property for fear of exposing his house to the power land behind. So he cannot utilize, manage or otherwise take advantage of the trees that are growing on his land, and he lies there in threat of exposure.

So, whether it's large or whether it's small, whether it's front or whether it's back, it always has something to do with the ownership of your property and your use and enjoyment of it. I can't separate it.

Assessors do all the time. Assessors have different roles, different responsibilities.
Q. Thank you. I'd like to get to the
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apples-to-apples question here with regards to the chart.

MS. MENARD: Can you -- what is the exhibit number for the record?

MR. BERGLUND: Abutter 158A.
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. So this is the tax record. It's from the warrant from the Town of Canterbury from 1985. And the lot that I have highlighted there is Lot 37 in the subdivision. Can you see during this time period when people would have been buying into this particular subdivision -- this is a 1.33-acre lot -that there is not a breakdown of the front land, back land?
A. I see no such --
Q. And I even think we have the tax card from 1996. They still were not in that -- they weren't thinking about land in that way. You can see the acreage is not split out the way that Mr. Chalmers has used in his summary analysis.

Do you have any opinions as to how -what relevance that piece of information is
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bringing to the discussion about the timing of lot sales and the pricing of lot sales? That's the whole premise of his subdivision study. What does this -- what does his analysis of this front/back land bring to this discussion?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm going to object again. This is now plainly calling for a new opinion that is directly tied to the work that Mr . Chalmers originally did and Mr. Powell clearly could have looked at.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard, this does seem now to no longer be related to the cross-examination questioning on Page 134. That's the only thing I can remember about -MS. MENARD: Apples-to-apples comparison?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: But he chose -- Mr. Powell chose not to do that, whatever it is you would like him to do now. He chose not to do that.

MS . MENARD: Okay.
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. Would it have occurred to you to discuss
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assessment values from 2015 in your analysis of land values of a subdivision that was -that had price and sales data from 1985? Would that have occurred to you to do that?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection.
In what context? I still don't understand the question.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, I'm going to let him try to answer that.

Do you understand the
question?
WITNESS POWELL: Well, if she's asking me whether $I$ would use 2015 data of any kind to analyze an assessment or a sale that happened 30 years before, I cannot imagine doing that.

MS. MENARD: Thank you.
Do you have, Mr. Berglund,
Page 13 of Mr. Chalmers' supplemental testimony? Actually I can give you a page right now.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. I'd like to read an answer that Mr. Chalmers has provided that $I$ think is pretty
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self-explanatory. "The only practical way in which high-voltage tension lines effects on the market" -- excuse me -- "effects on the value of nearby properties can be studied by looking at fair market sales of properties potentially influenced by high-voltage tension lines and comparing them to the sales of otherwise similar properties without high-voltage tension lines influence.

Methodologically" -- yeah, can you help me out with that one?
A. Methodologically.
Q. Yeah, thanks. "...that can be done using the case study approach which relies heavily on retrospective appraisals to meet the 'otherwise similar property.'"

Now, I know Mr. Pappas touched on this a little bit with you, but $I$ was wondering if you could -- if you had wanted to -- if you care to comment specifically about his analysis here.
A. Relative to retrospective studies?
Q. Yes.
A. Not all HVTL lines are created equal. I
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don't know of anything in my experience that is now the same as what could be if this line were built. Therefore, any study of something which is not directly the same in an area, that is different from the one where I am is false at its core because it is analyzing something unlike what we would have to live with if it were built. And I think Skip Sansoucy said at one point that the only way you can figure out what might happen is to let it happen and go back and figure it out afterwards. We are instead thankfully in the position of trying to predict what might happen.

And can you use retrospective studies looking back at information derived heretofore in areas that are not like those to be in the experience of experiencing these lines, nor will they be of the same kind that he's assessing the impact of? We cannot go back to those studies and use them to predict what might happen if this new and larger and more obnoxious line were to be built. And we are talking about behavior.
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And I would like to interject something because we're talking methodology. And methodology is at the core of our issue, of our problem here. We have someone who has used these old standards of looking back and making comparisons to try and tell us that there will be no impact of this line. But it's irrelevant, as Skip Sansoucy says, because, as I said, different lines, different place, different time, not to apply to us. And low and behold, science is advancing.

And it was only a few weeks ago, a month and a half, when Richard Thaler was given the Nobel Prize for Economics because of his contributions to economic behavioralism. And he observed that the old standards and models and theorems of classical economic theory were no longer relevant; that rational mankind does not dwell in those classical methods, but instead, mankind is driven by psychological prejudices or leanings, and he acts not on the basis of rational thought, but on the basis of emotion and often
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irrationality. And they gave him the Nobel Prize for that because he contributed to that science. And now, economists are beginning to be valued more than as bean counters because they're affecting public policy through an understanding of human behavior. And it's human behavior that drives markets, not the analyses. We cannot expect that when the Committee went to look at the North Country and where these poles may appear, or when an appraiser from a distant desk looks at someone else's work can dispassionately review things as though they were the people in the marketplace. Not until you have "skin in the game," not until you bring your cash or you face the prospect of changing your financial circumstance by the incurrence of debt and exchanging what you have and what you earn for what you want do you begin to understand how mankind will act when he goes to another place such as ours and begins to part with what he has for what he wants. That is a behavioral issue. And those who understand behavior begin to understand the
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impact on the market and even how to influence the market.

Mr. Thaler was rewarded with a prize because he took it a step further to say that understanding this behavior allows you to nudge or incite people to do certain things which might be in their better interest than irrationally responding without influence. So, government and industry tries to apply that to the good. But he also acknowledged that you can nudge people to the bad.

So, what nudges somebody in the real estate market? It's a response -- it's an emotional process. You like what you like. You don't like what you don't like. I know what my buyers want. I know what makes them happy. I know what makes them upset. I know what they'll turn down and I know what they'll accept. And I know there's a price point to everything. Everything has a certain value based upon all the factors that are poured in a pot. But $I$ also know that we are in trouble in marketing our property and finding satisfied customers if we do
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something to destroy the very core values that give us the advantage we have.

We are in a tough spot up north. We have suffered tremendous economic transition. And I think I referred to this in my testimony. I do not know why --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I think we're well beyond the question.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do you remember the question?

WITNESS POWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: What was the question? What was the question?

WITNESS POWELL: It's whether or not basically his methodology is applicable, and I'm telling you that it isn't.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, I think we got that.

Ms. Menard.
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. On Day 26, in the afternoon, on Page 100, in a conversation with Mr. Chalmers we were talking about appraisals and bad comps. And basically if you pull one out -- I'll read it
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where if we can't find something to look to for a comparable sale, we may go to Littleton or Franconia or someplace else, as I alluded to in my testimony, in order to find a comp and then adjust it for the difference in markets. But it's pretty hard not to find a comp for something. Even when it's tough, you can do it.
Q. So when an appraiser is doing their job and looking for comps, do they typically go out and take pictures of those comps?
A. Typically.
Q. And the reason for doing that is why?
A. Well, I don't know. Good question. I guess to make a representation of the property to those who may look at it and maybe even to show they've been there.
Q. Correct. So if the concern of needing to pull comps -- if the concern was that inappropriate comps were in the appraisals due to, for example, choosing a comp sale that was located next to a substation when you have your subject property and you're trying to find properties that are not
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influenced by high-voltage tension line or infrastructure.

So had the appraisers gone out and done their site visits, as would be typical, would you agree that we probably wouldn't be in a situation where they would have to be relying on two comps?
A. I agree.
Q. In your supplemental testimony, you refer to some -- you made some comments on the Town of Lancaster Case Study No. 23, and I'd like to ask you a few questions about that.

Before we do that, would you agree that the accuracy of the data that goes into these case studies drives the reliability of the case study?
A. Absolutely.
Q. So you have some familiarity with

224 Portland Street?
A. Yes.
Q. And how so?
A. I listed that property back in 2010, I believe. Had the listing for 18 months.

During the course of that time, our awareness
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of Northern Pass came to the fore, and we began to experience the consequence of disclosure of the existence of Northern Pass as it may impact that property. And we continued with our efforts to sell it. The history of it is that the sellers had purchased it --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm going to object.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I know this is in his testimony. This is in the prefiled testimony, this story.

MS. MENARD: Right. And I'm --
WITNESS POWELL: Not the part where I'm involved because --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This story is in your prefiled testimony. I just read it.

WITNESS POWELL: Oh, I'm sorry. My prefiled. I thought you meant Dr. Chalmers. Sorry.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. So my questions have to do with the interview that was represented in this case study. And there's representations that were not yours,
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}

## [WITNESS: PETER POWELL]

is that correct, because you were not the listing broker at the time of this case study?
A. Right. Correct.
Q. Have you had an opportunity to review the transaction interview and --
A. I have, and I've spoken to the other agent.
Q. And what did she relay to you?
A. She just --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. If
this was relevant information, it should have been included and could have been included. This is simply adding to the testimony now. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard. MS. MENARD: I think we're going to have to move on.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. Have you -- no, $I$ can't ask that one either.
A. Several people have referred to my -- and forgive me for this because I may be the dumbest guy on earth, but --
Q. Excuse me, Mr. Powell, can you move closer to the --
A. Several people have referred to my
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WITNESS POWELL: No, I did not.
MR. IACOPINO: Correct?
WITNESS POWELL: Correct.
MS. MENARD: No, this is Mr.
Chalmers' --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That's
okay. Mr. Powell, I think we're just trying to clarify terminology. Mr. Chalmers did file supplemental testimony. You did not. So I think people have been referring to his supplemental, not yours.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. I apologize for the delay here.
A. It's Page 18.
Q. Thank you. Page 18. Can you read the question relating to your discussions about --
A. Well, he basically -- in my testimony, I referred to his case study. And honestly, I could pull mine out and see what my references were. But I basically disagreed with his conclusion, which was that the line had no impact, that it did not affect the
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time on the market or the ultimate price. And so $I$ have a lot of trouble with his case study and his reaction to what $I$ had to say about it, which was much more informed.

And there were several problems with his case study, one of them being an understatement of the square footage of the property which caused his appraiser, his contract appraiser to go out and look for smaller homes and draw improper conclusions. This home does consist of a footprint of about 1400 square feet. But there is a largely finished walk-out basement which is all entirely full-time living space, including bathroom, bedrooms, family room and other space. And there is also not mentioned in the response to my testimony, there is not mentioned a detached garage which has a finished apartment of 375 square feet. So the actual finished living space in this property and the basis for comparison is over 3,000 feet. And when you begin to look at comparable sales, he narrowed his sales search to very few properties that are not
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very comparable for various reasons and omitted a number of sales which I put in leading up to the date of sale and came out with a half-dozen or eight in those immediate towns around my market area that were above 300,000 that would be better standards for adjustment, with more accurate information than what he chose to do. In fact, his appraiser said this property which sold for $\$ 317,500$ was actually appraised and worth $\$ 290,000$. I do not understand how an appraiser can go and look at a property that was just sold and say that it was worth less if that's what the market produced for the sale price. He did it by using the wrong information, and Mr. Chalmers depended upon him for that information. There were also misrepresentations about the interview with the agent who he said told him that it did not affect the time on the market, as I recall, and it did not affect -that the line did not affect value. But he never interviewed me after $I$ went through 18 months of this. And I can tell you that it
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affected both.
Q. Thank you.
A. She also went on to very specifically say how the buyer may have misinterpreted the potential for impact by only looking in one direction along the course of the ownership of the land and comparing the height above the potential exposure to power lines, but neglected to look across the adjoining property where the view of Mount Washington can be seen, and with it the field that is conserved on the adjoining property and beyond it the existing power line that will be impacted by tower heights more than two times what's there right now, as I understand it. So there is exposure. And when disclosed, that has turned the market away from this property over a long period of time until finally someone convinced themselves this direction was fine, didn't look at that direction, and said let's buy it and offered 300, and they ended up at 317,500 .
Q. Okay.
A. I had priced it at --
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$\square$ .
potential
-
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Stop, stop. There's no pending question right now. You've answered the question three different ways $I$ think. Ms. Menard will ask you another question if she has one.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. There's another question raised also from Mr . Chalmers' supplemental on Page 14, down at the bottom of the page. And it basically is he's asking is it a shortcoming of your approach that you only analyze properties that have sold. What about properties that cannot be sold due to the Project? And I think you've already weighed in using this past example, so we'll not bring that up again.

But in -- I do have a question regarding the days on market with a sold property when it was clear that Mr. Chalmers was selecting properties that were fair market sales. That was the purpose, and I think it was achieved, that you would not be bringing in, in your case studies, a subject property that was not a fair market sale. Agreed?
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A. Yes.
Q. So when you're analyzing sold properties and you're making a determination of days on market, if you use a days-on-market average for the town, that average would be -- would have a collection of fair market and foreclosure properties, all property types. Would you agree?

Again, we're back to an apples-to-apples question for you. Do you feel that, given the nature and the significance and the importance of this report, do you think that taking that extra step of diligence would be the right thing to do, and by not pulling foreclosed properties out of the days-on-market average that it could influence and again diminish impacts? MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. We're back to just general comments on the original report.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard. MS. MENARD: I understand. Just a few more questions, more miscellaneous in nature.
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BY MS. MENARD:
Q. The Applicant has provided a program offer for properties that may exhibit all the characteristics of having an impact on value. And for would-be sellers who may want to market their property, the Applicant has offered them a program, a guaranty buy program that was mentioned earlier today. One of the components of this program is that the seller give the Applicant, I'm not sure if it's Eversource or NPT in this case, but give them a right of first refusal for 30 days. So I wanted you to comment on whether that right of first refusal -- how that might impact the seller's position.
A. Anything that can delay the process or interrupt the process for that period of time would be an obstruction and could be well served to "clear the deal," as they say.
Q. Okay. My last question is actually a difficult one for me to ask, and the reason it's difficult is because I have felt people not know how to respond to it. And it always has been a very short conversation, and I
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feel like we need to get past it and have the conversation of the reality of the fact that people have bought properties along a right-of-way and the responsibility to know about what might happen in the right-of-way. And it often comes back to folks, "Well, you know, didn't you know that the right-of-way was there when you purchased the property?" And then the conversation stops.

So do you have any insight about what you might say, given that reality, I mean, "buyer beware"? You know, can you offer any insight?
A. I'd say --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This
is --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Hang on,
Mr. Powell.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: This is calling
for general testimony. This is --
MS. MENARD: This is along this
topic, Mr. Chairman. But twice now in
cross-examination that question has come back.
It has come out that -- and it's not, you know,
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we against them. It's "Didn't you know that the power line was there?" And I want to know what Mr . Powell -- how he would respond to that.

## CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I

understand it's a general question. I'm going to let him answer the question briefly.
A. First of all, "buyer beware" is no longer a part of this industry or anything related to it. The responsibilities are greater. Mine are greater. Everybody's are greater. And there has to be a disclosure of all that is known and the possibility of what is known. But when a buyer buys a right-of-way and it's relatively benign, as your family did, as I understand from your testimony, back in the '50s, and then all of a sudden that formerly benign right-of-way becomes the subject of something totally non-benign, as would also be the case with David Van Houten, then it is no longer the same animal. And did they have a responsibility when they bought it in 1950, in your case, to know that someday Northern Pass would come rolling through? No. There
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is no responsibility that can be designed to look that far in the future. Instead, we have a process such as this that is intended to help I think that which was not foreseen and represent the interests of the landowner and the community and the people who would be affected by it to see whether it is indeed a fair intrusion or not. And I think that's the hope of this whole process is that will not happen to people who bought something not knowing the exposure that they had to that kind of change.
Q. Thank you.

MS. MENARD: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't see the Pemi River Group here. Did I miss any intervenors?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Needleman, Ms. Walkley, who's going to be doing the questioning? Oh, actually, I am reminded we should probably take a ten-minute break.
(Recess was taken at 3:20 p.m.
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and the hearing resumed at 3:35 p.m.) CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If folks could take their seats, we will resume presently.

Whenever you're ready, Ms. Walkley.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. WALKLEY:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Powell, my name is Rebecca Walkley. I am an attorney for the Applicants.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I wanted to ask you some questions to start off just about background and the basis for your testimony. And I apologize if some of this has already been stated, but it's just easier for me to ask again.

So, the basis for your testimony is that you're relying on your experience in the North Country as a real estate agent for 43 years; is that accurate?
A. Correct.
Q. And you reviewed the abutters properties in this case and came up with comparable sales that you've evaluated in the course of
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preparing your testimony; correct?
A. Comparable to what? I gave examples of sales that $I$ felt demonstrated a reduction in value as the result of the threat of Northern Pass.
Q. Sure. Okay.
A. I did not appraise these folks' properties.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

You did not perform as part of your analysis in this case a study of literature or a review of any sort of reports that have been prepared in this context related to impacts of transmission lines on property values; correct?
A. Not true. Over the course of seven years I have reviewed a number of studies, I think many of which were referenced by Mr .

Chalmers. I did not do an exhaustive
analysis, but whenever I began to look at something that involved another community in another state, another country, another region, nothing to do with the North Country, nothing to do with the towers as they would appear in our community. And that's the only place where a study becomes relevant.
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Q. Sure. And I also take it that, as part of your charge in this case, you did not review Dr. Chalmers' full report and testimony and critique his full report and testimony; is that correct?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. You have no professional experience evaluating impacts of transmission lines on real estate values; correct? That's not your professional background?
A. Correct.
Q. And I understand from the technical session that your degree from Colby College is in Government; correct?
A. It's a B.A. Right.
Q. And you're not licensed -- I'm sorry. Did you have something else?
A. It just simply was my major, not a degree.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And you're not a licensed appraiser or an assessor in the state of New Hampshire; is that correct?
A. No. We all had to make a decision decades ago as to whether we wanted to hang our
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shingle as a broker or as an appraiser, and I chose to remain in the sales end of things.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. I did appraisals up to that time for various reasons.
Q. But you're not a licensed appraiser in New Hampshire.
A. No, I'm not, no. They all ask me questions so they can do their appraisals. Some of them.
Q. In addition to discussing issues relating to property values in your testimony, you've also raised -- and this hasn't really been brought up today -- but you've also raised other concerns related to tourism, the economy in general. And I believe you also discussed aesthetics in your testimony; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You're offering those opinions again based on your experience as a resident of the North Country and your experience as a real estate agent in the North Country; correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. You don't have any professional experience or background in evaluating impacts of transmission lines on tourism, for example?
A. I have read some studies. I have not prepared reports. So, done studies, no, because they don't exist, thank God, where I live and work.
Q. Okay. And I'd like to turn to a section of your prefiled testimony. Page 4 of your prefiled testimony, in the top full paragraph you state that natural resources and the economy which supports our property values may be threatened no matter how NP may be constructed. Do you see that sentence?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. So I take it from that sentence that you oppose the construction of a transmission line in the North Country, no matter how it's constructed; correct?
A. I would hate to see an expansion of the existing line, and I would hate to see a new line brought in from Canada down to Northumberland. I would oppose that, yes.
Q. Okay. So your concern is just about a
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transmission line in general, not necessarily this particular configuration that Northern Pass is proposing --
A. Oh, of course --
Q. -- in this particular docket. (Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. I am opposing that particular configuration in this particular docket.
Q. Sure. But I understand from your statement that virtually any transmission line would be a concern for you. Is that what you're saying there?
A. What's the rest of the sentence? We kind of cut in at the word "proposed."
Q. Frankly, I'm not sure.

MS. WALKLEY: Dawn, can you turn to the previous page?
A. What page is that?

BY MS. WALKLEY:
Q. Page 3 of your prefiled testimony.
A. "This testimony is intended to explain and demonstrate how private property has already been and will continue to be negatively impacted by NP if constructed as proposed,
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and how our natural resources and the economy which supports our property values may be threatened, no matter how NP may be constructed."
Q. Correct. So my assumption from that
statement is that you're both opposing the Northern Pass as it's being proposed, as well as any configuration of Northern Pass;
correct?
A. Any conceivable configuration to bring that amount of power down from that amount of distance across this amount of land, right.
Q. Thank you. Turning to Page 7 of your prefiled testimony, the bottom paragraph. You can feel free to read it again, but I'll represent to you that you're discussing "visual blight" and "buyer behavior" in this paragraph.
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And you state that any power line, not just HVT lines, present visual blight. Do you see that particular statement?
A. You're on Page 7.
Q. Yeah. And actually, I may have paraphrased
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your statement. It says "not only by HVT lines, but by any power line" is your actual wording.
A. Right.
Q. Do you see the statement there?
A. Yes.
Q. So my understanding again from your statement here is that any particular buyer -- you're saying that any particular buyer in any particular circumstance, whether it be a distribution line, transmission line, may have concerns associated with the presence of that particular type of structure.
A. I said "in many circumstances."
Q. Okay.
A. Any power line, not just a high-voltage line, but in many circumstances, any power line can be objectionable. It can be removed. People pay to remove them all the time. People bury them to avoid what they consider to be a visual degradation of their property.

Developers do that all through the state. My neighbor did it at some expense as it passed in front of his house.
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Q. Okay. Thank you.

I'd like to ask you some questions about your methodology and the basis for your opinions. And again I'd like to look at Page 4 of your testimony, the second paragraph from the bottom. And you're discussing your method for assisting clients market in assessing market value for their property. And in this paragraph you note that comparable sales is just one component of your analysis. Do you see that statement?
A. Yes. I already referenced this today, in fact.
Q. Yeah. So, I take it from that paragraph, as well from the discussion we just had above, that you would agree that many factors influence the value of a particular parcel and that people may be influenced differently by different factors.
A. Yes.
Q. Turning to the bottom of Page 6. And I take this to be effectively your conclusions, or your conclusion for your testimony. In bold print you note, "In my experience, if indeed
a property tainted by NP is able to be sold at all, the loss in value due to $N P$ can range from 35 or 40 percent to as high as

75 percent." And you attribute the higher percent to what you call "raw land." Is that an accurate statement of your conclusion of your testimony?
A. Based on my experience, yeah.
Q. And just to reiterate, you didn't review any literature to come up with those statistics, that 30 to 45 percent or the 75 percent for raw land?
A. I related that to my experience, and I used a specific example, which Mr. Chalmers refuted. And I need to refute his refutation in order to verify my conclusion, which I'd be happy to do.
Q. Well, we're going to go through your examples in a little bit, so it may come up. But I just want to focus again on this statement at the bottom of Page 6 here.

So my understanding from the technical
session is that that range comes from the examples that you provided in your testimony,
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the four, depending on how count them, four or five examples you provide in your testimony with respect to impacts to property values; is that right?
A. I derived those numbers from the samples that I chose. But they're reflective of my experience. They're not the total of my experience. And they somehow try to bring into consideration, as I envision the impact of this project, those properties which produce zero return because they can't be sold and are taken off the market. It's very, very difficult to measure that degree of loss. I did not say a hundred percent. I could have for those people who cannot sell. But I think that's a range that has been commonly experienced around the region by people who have had to sell and take the hit as a result of Northern Pass.
Q. In terms of the testimony that you provided for this Committee here today, the basis for those, that range that you provided, though, in terms of quantified data, that's based on the four or five examples that you provided
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in your testimony. And I understand that you're adding additional experiences to your conclusions --
A. It's supported by those four. I won't say it's -- I think it's more accurate to say that it's supported by those sales. I chose them as examples of what I felt was going on in the marketplace. Andy Smith, down in Franconia, has publicly said he thought it was between 25 and 50 --
Q. Sure. Mr. Powell, sorry. I just want to get back to what I am asking about, which is with respect to this testimony that you provided for this Committee. You haven't done any additional reports, prepared any additional documentation that supports that range other than providing this Committee with the four to five examples in your testimony.
A. That's correct. That's correct.
Q. Thank you.

In preparation for your testimony today, did you meet with anyone or discuss with anyone your testimony beyond the individuals in the Whitefield to Bethlehem Group?
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A. Yes, I spoke with Jeanne Menard.
Q. Okay. Did you speak with anyone else beforehand?
A. Dave and my group. I don't think anybody else, no.
Q. When did those discussions take place?
A. In the days --

MS. MENARD: Objection.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard.
MS. MENARD: Yes, I'm wondering
about the relevance of this question in terms of who Mr. Powell may have spoken with.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Walkley.
MS. WALKLEY: Well, I think,
first, it relates to the credibility of this witness; but second off all, and I think we discussed this earlier, there are pending motions in this case. It's been an ongoing issue in this case what constitutes friendly cross-examination. And I think these questions are fair to discuss the discussion of that issue.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik.
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MS. PACIK: Thank you, Mr.
Chair. Just to add to the objection, if I could. First of all, friendly cross has already been completed by Ms. Menard. But more importantly, during the first prehearing conference, we had a discussion with Attorney Iacopino and the Applicants about the request for parties to work together and the Common Interest Doctrine and whether they would be performing discovery, asking for information that was exchanged between the parties opposing this project. And we were told by the Applicants that they wouldn't be seeking that type of information. And I think that to the extent the Deerfield Abutters have worked with other witnesses in this case, it would fall under the Common Interest Doctrine.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think Mr.
Needleman has a different view he'd like to express.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I most certainly
do. Any discussions that related to those parties working together to coordinate efforts so things would be more efficient is
\{SEC 2015-06\}[Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}

## [WITNESS: PETER POWELL]

dramatically different from parties who are supposed to be adverse to each other conducting cross-examination. I think the idea of parties who are cross-examining each other, working together to prepare that cross is really fundamentally inappropriate and totally unrelated to the Common Interest Doctrine. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm going to overrule the objection and allow the question and answer.

Do you remember the question? WITNESS POWELL: Did I talk with anyone else?

BY MS. WALKLEY:
Q. My question was when did those conversations take place.
A. In the days leading up to today. We've talked in the days leading up to today and over the past occasionally. Just rarely over the past several months.
Q. And during the course of this, can you just briefly explain what was discussed during the course of those discussions?
A. Well, just conversation about the
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proceedings, the process of the proceedings, what she was doing relative to her analysis of things, what she thought about my testimony, that sort of thing. She's been deeply involved in this. I've been -because of my business and the rest of life, and the fact that I'm here pro bono, I've only been doing this when I could, and I needed a touchstone to keep in touch. And it's been not frequent, but occasional. Just occasional.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

I'd like to run through the five examples that you provided in your prefiled testimony, starting with the Wesson Road property in Lancaster and the discussion that begins on Page 9 of your testimony. And my understanding is that this particular property is comprised of three separate parcels; is that right?
A. Talking about the land --
Q. Yes.
A. -- portion. Yes, it is.
Q. And you were the listing agent for these
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A. A portion of it would not be able to be developed. But essentially all of it, as it's now constituted, could be used in some fashion for recreation, that sort of thing --
Q. Okay.
A. -- as a complement to whatever building site you chose.
Q. You stated on Page 9 of your testimony that you believe this parcel has an overall value of $\$ 99,000$ without Northern Pass; correct?
A. When you add up the three separate lots with the market value that we estimated to be fair at that time, based on other sales of similar lots in the area, they added up to that amount. It is not to say that as a whole they would be sold for that amount. But that's why big ones are made into little ones so that you can get more money per acre. And that's the nature of lot sales.
Q. And you ultimately listed this property for 35 -- or not you, but someone in your organization listed this for $\$ 35,000$ in 2012; correct?
A. Correct.
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Q. And it was ultimately sold for $\$ 27,500$ ?
A. Correct.
Q. And you attribute, or you state at the bottom of Page 9 that there is a 72 percent reduction, and you attribute that entire loss to Northern Pass; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. My understanding from the technical session was that you had not reviewed, or anyone else from your company had not reviewed the parcels with comparable sales at the time you submitted your testimony for this particular property; is that correct?
A. I don't recall that, no. That I didn't look at comparable sales? I mean, I know --
Q. With respect to this particular property.
A. At that time, $I$ knew then -- I mean, I'm doing this every day -- what properties were selling for. I knew what the town assessed it for, which was far higher than $I$ then said it could be sold for, even without Northern Pass. So it was with the understanding and the experience of an everyday participation in the market, and $I$ can't imagine that I did
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not also look at comparable sales to reinforce that.
Q. You didn't have an appraisal done for this property.
A. I never have an appraisal done for the property.
Q. Okay. I understand from the technical
session that you felt that the price per acre of this particular property was very low. Is that correct?
A. As a result of Northern Pass.
Q. Okay.
A. And the only way to sell it was not to sell it as individual lots. That would be
impossible. And the center lot in particular would be impossible. So, in order to sell the property, that would have to be combined with another parcel. And the most sensible way, in view of the difficulty that Northern Pass would present for each parcel, it was best to lump them together. As I said, we'd been talking to this party for a number of years. They had not wanted to go to market. It was not an estate sale. It was not a push
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sale. It was simply that the family had found that their father's land which they held dear was not going to be something they would access and enjoy, so they decided to sell it. We told them that in the intervening time this project has been proposed. We would not be successful in lot sales. Our recommendation, if they wanted to unload the property because it's no longer of use and what value it had would be better placed elsewhere, invested elsewhere, this is what should happen. And that was our advice.
Q. Just to follow up on something you just said previously, so your assertion is that the central parcel would be difficult to sell solely because of Northern Pass. That's what you said.
A. It would be impossible to sell by itself because of Northern Pass.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

I'd like to take a look at Dr. Chalmers' supplemental testimony, which is Applicant's Exhibit 104. And I take it you've reviewed at least portions of this supplemental
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Do you recall that?
A. No. You can clarify what you're getting to.
Q. Well, just as a general proposition, it was discussed with Ms. Menard earlier that it's important to consider arm's-length transactions when you're looking at comparable sales. Would you agree with that statement?
A. Yes, and also each and every property chosen for comparison intimately.
Q. I think you also noted at the technical session that the buyer's last name in this case was Ranfos. Is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And I think you're aware, without having to pull up the document, that your client's name in this case was also Ranfos.
A. Client's case?
Q. Your client's name in this case was Ranfos.
A. No.
Q. It's not?
A. No.
Q. Okay. We can pull up a document --
A. No, there was a trust --
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Q. -- if that would be helpful.
A. A trust sold these lots to Ranfos. A family by the name of $S l y$ sold the cabin to Ranfos.
Q. We can pull up the document if you'd like. It's Bates APP54237. And unless I'm reading this incorrectly, it says at the top that the owner's last name is Ranfos; correct?
A. Correct. That's the owner since the purchase. This tax card does not relate to the condition of the property prior to their purchase. It's since their purchase.
Q. Okay. Well, let's go then back down to a second portion of this particular tax card that deals with the sales information.

MS. WALKLEY: If you can just
blow up the sales section, Dawn.
BY MS. WALKLEY:
Q. And the central sale that's listed for March 7th, 2013, my understanding is that's the sale date that you were referencing in your prefiled testimony; correct?
A. That's the sale date.
Q. So you would agree that based on this tax card, this is not a qualified sale; right?
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A. Absolutely it is. What are you talking about? What's your point?
Q. It states under "Qualified," "No"; correct?
A. What does "qualified" mean?
Q. Whether or not this is a qualified sale.
A. What's a "qualified sale"?
Q. It's not an accurate -- can you explain to me, please, what a "qualified sale" is?
A. No, I can't. I'm not familiar with the use of that word on a tax card. I've never paid any attention to it --
Q. So you've never --
A. -- I don't know what it means.
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. So you've never heard the term "qualified sale" with respect to a fair comparison to fair market value. You've never heard that terminology used.
A. Are you -- is this a judgment as to whether it was an arm's-length transaction? I mean, this is apparently an opinion expressed by an assessor and with whom I had no communication.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Powell,
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do you remember the question Ms. Walkley just asked you?

WITNESS POWELL: Whether I know what a "qualified sale" is.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Actually, I think she was one question beyond that.

Want to repeat the question, please, Ms. Walkley?

BY MS. WALKLEY:
Q. I asked, You've never heard the phrase "qualified sale" used to describe a transaction, whether or not it constitutes the equivalent of fair market value?
A. Not in the -- I mean, I'm familiar with the entire subject to discussion, but I've not associated that with the tax card. And I don't know that it would be applicable or accurate or a true reflection of what happened here. It is not --
Q. So you --
A. -- except for the influence of Northern Pass, which is causing --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. That sounds like a no, you're not
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familiar with what she just asked you.
WITNESS POWELL: Yeah, I am not
if it means that somehow this is not a sale to be acknowledged as relevant in some way. I don't know how this is being used here. I suggest that it's being used inappropriately.

BY MS. WALKLEY:
Q. When an assessor is doing -- when you're assessing a piece of property, would you agree that you need to look at arm's-length transaction sales?
A. Well, I see a notation here, if I may. "No MPC. Can sell separately." That is not the judgment that $I$ had, that it could be sold separately because of the influence of Northern Pass. The assessor is not taking that into account, nor does he particularly have the responsibility to do so. I did have that responsibility.
Q. Mr. Powell, I understand your position. But you would agree that based on this tax information, this has been identified as not a qualified sale.
A. I disagree --
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Q. I understand you disagree.
A. -- with the conclusion.
Q. I'm asking, would you agree this document states this is not a qualified sale?
A. Yes, just as I would agree --
Q. Thank you.
A. Well, I'll keep my mouth shut.
Q. I'd like to move on to your second example which is for 53 Wesson Road, which is on Page 10 of your prefiled testimony. And I take it that you represented the seller in this case, or someone from your office.
A. Someone from my office.
Q. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: One moment, Ms.
Walkley. What was the number on that last exhibit?

MS. WALKLEY: It's part of
Dr. Chalmers' supplemental testimony, which is 104.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. BY MS. WALKLEY:
Q. I'd like to again turn to the tax card that's also been attached to Dr. Chalmers'
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A. I think so.
Q. And you attribute this entire reduction to Northern Pass.
A. I do.
Q. So you don't believe that the fact that this took place as part of an estate sale or the fact that it's an unqualified sale had any bearing on the reduction in that value.
A. It did not. Foreclosures, yes. Estate sales, no. I've negotiated many estate sales at full value --
Q. So it's your --
A. -- that has nothing to do with it.
Q. So it's your position that an unqualified sale, an unqualified sale would not result in any sort of change compared to market value.
A. This is an incorrect designation. He did no consulting whatsoever with me or my office that I'm aware of. He drew that conclusion himself. And it's necessary for him to do so I think because he needs to explain why his assessment was incorrect. I think this is all --
Q. I believe that this document is actually a
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tax card. This wasn't created by Dr. Chalmers.
A. No, I understand that. But, you know, assessors have different goals and responsibilities and needs than the market or those of us who observe it and work in it. He is trying to maximize things for the community. And if he allows this as an arm's-length transaction, he'll have to downplay other properties, where in fact the comparables that were used by Mr. Chalmers, of which there were two, were both irrelevant. One was a foreclosure; the other was a village home, which we discussed earlier --
Q. I think you're past what my question was.
A. I'm sure. Sorry.
Q. I apologize. I'm just trying to limit the amount of time we spend here.
A. Yeah.
Q. I'd like to move on to the third example that you've provided on Page 10 of your testimony which we talked about briefly. This is the 224 Portland Street in Lancaster property.
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And you discussed this briefly with Ms.
Menard, and I had some other questions about it.

So you initially listed this property in 2010 for $\$ 397,300$; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the history you've given here is quite extensive. But just to sort of summarize, there was a lot of changes to the list price, and ultimately it was sold for $\$ 317,500$ after it was relisted with RE/MAX; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. In this case, you also note that substantial improvements were made to the property. And I think you noted their eventual investment reportedly approached $\$ 550,000$; is that correct?
A. That's what they told me, yeah.
Q. It's also noted in your testimony that this property was originally purchased in 2005; right?
A. I don't know that that's the case.
Q. Well, I'll point you to Page 10 of your prefiled testimony. It says "Purchased by
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seller in February 2005 for $\$ 319,500 " ;$ right?
A. It probably is, yes. Yeah.
Q. Would you agree with me that in 2005, the real estate market was close to at its peak?
A. Yes.
Q. So you would agree that this parcel -- it's conceivable that this parcel may have been overpaid for.
A. Not in terms of the time it was purchased perhaps. But it may have been over-improved. They spent a lot of money making changes and additions and a new septic and wells and all that sort of thing.
Q. That was actually going to be my next question. But okay. Thank you.

At the bottom of Page 10 you again attribute the entire claimed 20 percent loss in value to NPT. Wholly to NPT; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. My understanding is that you did not have an appraisal done for this property.
A. No.
Q. At the time that you filed your prefiled
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testimony, you didn't have an appraisal done --
A. No. I had --
Q. -- to support your conclusions here?
A. No, I don't -- no. No reason to.
Q. And I understand from your discussion with Ms. Menard that you are aware that Dr.

Chalmers, as part of his supplemental
testimony, did have an appraisal done for this property.
A. Hmm .
Q. And I would like to pull up one page from that appraisal. It's at Bates APP24475. And I wanted to just focus in because I think you mentioned earlier that Dr . Chalmers may have gotten the price -- the square footage incorrect for this property; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So if we can just focus in on I think called living space here, "Living Area."
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And I understand when you're saying the 1400 square feet is listed there. But if you go across that column there, you would agree
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that the comparable properties that have been included in this appraisal are between 3,000 square feet and approximately 2300 square feet?
A. Right.
Q. So that's well above the 1400 square feet --
A. But it's not well above the actual square feet of the home. This was incorrect information.
Q. My understanding from your prior testimony earlier today is that it was in the ballpark of 3,000 square feet.
A. Hmm .
Q. So you would agree that that's fairly close to what the comparable properties are here, 3,000 to 2300 square feet?
A. Actually, it turns out to be 3,075, and it's higher than any of the comparables.
Q. Okay. Fair enough.

And towards the bottom of that page you can see obviously that the appraised value was $\$ 290,000$. And 1 obviously take it that you disagree with that assessment.
A. Yes. And I don't know how one can do that,
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but --
Q. But again, my understanding is that you haven't actually completed an appraisal of this property; correct?
A. Completing appraisals as you may have suggested during your testimony [sic] in the process of listing and selling homes is not done until a lender is involved or a buyer requests one. It's not part of the process of creating -- determining value and listing property.
Q. Sure. But as part of your testimony before this Committee, you haven't created or prepared an appraisal for this property.
A. No.
Q. I'd like to take a look at another page of Dr. Chalmers' supplemental testimony, which is at Bates APP54266. And this is again showing market data for Lancaster. And you would agree, looking at this data, that both the price and price per square foot for this particular home are quite high compared to the mean; correct? The bottom section there.
A. No. May I please? There's an old saying,
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"garbage in, garbage out." This means nothing. If the square footage of the property should be 3,000-plus and they're using 1400, that calculation is useless. The data is incorrect, therefore the conclusion is incorrect.
Q. Mr. Powell, you would agree with me that some of the properties that are included in this comparison sheet have building square footage of up to 3400 square feet; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I'd like to --
A. Well, actually -- right. Yeah.
Q. I'd like to turn to the fourth example that you provide in your testimony, which is 260 North Road in Lancaster, which starts on Page 11 of your prefiled testimony. And in this case you and your office were not the selling agents; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You noted at the technical session that you also did not speak to the buyer in this case; is that correct?
A. I did not personally, no. I know the buyer.
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Q. Were you aware at the time that you filed your testimony that this property was being sold out of probate?
A. I believe I did, yeah. I don't know if it's out of probate or by the heirs --
Q. We can pull it up if you'd like. But it basically just provides a notation on the tax card that it's being sold out of probate.

Would you agree with that?
A. I don't know. The heirs began this process in 2009, and I had an agent called out to look at the property in either '09 or ' 10. And Betsy looked at the property and concluded, if I remember correctly, and I think I do, that the value at that time, without the introduction of Northern Pass, would have been 125 to 130. They listed it far above that amount, and it was a terrible mistake to do so. But the history thereafter is corroborated by --
Q. Mr. Powell, I apologize, but I think my question is just whether or not you're aware it was being sold out of probate. So I think you've answered my question.
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A. Yeah, and I don't know whether that was the final disposition or whether it was through probate and sold by heirs. So over that period of time it's likely that could have been the case.
Q. For purposes of this discussion, if you would assume that I'm correct that it's being sold out of the probate, would you agree that that's not considered a qualified sale?
A. No.
Q. You would not agree that --
A. No.
Q. -- that's an unqualified sale?
A. I'm sorry, but probate as opposed to foreclosure does not automatically create a market disadvantage. The implication that you have in this is that it does, and it doesn't. Foreclosure does. The second a bank owns a property, it's worth less. Not true with heirs.
Q. Mr. Powell, so your position is that a sale out of probate is a qualified sale?
A. It is if all other circumstances are also qualified.
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Q. Right. But my understanding is that the purpose for classifying something as a "qualified" versus "unqualified" sale is because you can't know for certainty that that's an accurate representation of fair market value because there are other circumstances at play. So, something like a sale out of probate would not be considered a qualified sale; correct?
A. Well, I'm not sure that I agree with that designation, as I've said before. I'm sorry. But I do not see any reason, except for the service of some other purpose to indicate that a probate sale is an unqualified sale.

What happened to this property was that during the course of its offering, they listed -- they rented it to someone who did not take very good care of it. It suffered wear and tear. It was difficult to show. There were all sorts of things that happened during the course of this, including as Dr. Chalmers said, the fact they were chasing a market. But at one point, at some point between 2009 or ' 10 and 2015 -- was that not
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the sale date finally?
2. 2015.
A. The market turned, and it was going up; yet, this property continued to go down. And the problem was, in the words of the listing agent, the impact of everybody who --
Q. Mr. Powell --
A. -- considered it for Northern Pass --
Q. Mr. Powell, I'm sorry. Again, my question was just about qualified sales and whether or not a sale out of probate is considered a qualified sale. And I think you've answered my question. Thank you.

With regard to this property, on Page 11 you note an estimated 45 percent loss for this particular parcel; correct?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And you're attributing that entire reduction to Northern Pass; correct?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And you just discussed several different
factors relating to this particular property, relating to its condition, the fact that they had rented it out to somebody and they caused
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damage. And you don't think any of those things are attributable to this reduction in value --
A. There were other --
Q. You think it's solely due to Northern Pass. That's what your testimony states; correct?
A. There were other factors that influenced the sale. But the reduction from what should have been to what was, was due to Northern Pass because that too contributed to the length of time. It stacked up the numbers of rejections, the people who even refused to go through the property because of it. This is testimony of my office, testimony of the listing agent. So there were many factors. But if I start with the figure of 125, which might have been the value before all of this additional information came in, then that's -- because the reason why you get to a point where you have to lease a property is because you can't sell the property. And even though pricing was a problem, Northern Pass, and the perception of those who called and inquired about it, according to our
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office and according to the listing agent, led to time after time people refusing to even consider a look.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Powell.

One other question on this particular property. The property was first listed for sale in 2008; is that right? I think you actually noted in your testimony it was 2009.

But looking at the tax records, I believe it was 2008. Would you agree with that?
A. Well, that's what's in the tax records now. For some reason, when I looked at it, the tax card that $I$ looked at from a number of years ago, that wasn't in there for information. Or at least I missed it. But that's what's in it now.
Q. Okay. So you --
A. The listing record no longer exists, as far as I could determine on MLS.
Q. And I think you would agree, based on your testimony, that the effects that you're claiming with respect to Northern Pass you started to see around the 2010 time frame; correct?
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A. We started to be aware of it around 2010, which I think is when it was introduced with some fanfare. I'm not sure.
Q. So you would agree that this property was listed from 2008 to 2010 before Northern Pass was really even a consideration in the public eye; correct?
A. Yes. And at that point it was simply a pricing problem.
Q. So, again, you're attributing this entire 45 percent loss to Northern Pass. But there was a two-year span of time in which this property -- the property value of this particular parcel was reduced --
A. But I'm not --
Q. -- and you don't believe that that was an overall factor attributable to this 45 percent reduction.
A. A lot of factors brought it down. Where I started from my reduction was not from 195 and not 159, 49, 39 or anything else. It was from that 125 or 129, whatever figure that Betsy had established, which is what it should have been in my view. But all of
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these things, yes, all of them were influences. But the dramatic one, the one that kept it from being seen, shown, considered, was Northern Pass.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

I'd just like to turn quickly to your
last example, which I think is somewhat different than the last four we discussed.

This is the U.S. Route 2 property in
Lancaster, which is discussed on Page 11 of your prefiled testimony. And you note on Page 11 that the sellers of this parcel purchased the property for $\$ 170,000$ in 2006 ; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And I believe we talked about this a little bit earlier. But you would agree, again, that 2006 was around the peak of the real estate market; correct?
A. It was just going past, yeah.
Q. So it's conceivable, again, that the current owners may have overpaid for this particular parcel; correct?
A. They may have at that time, but not relative
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to the market. It was not overpaid at that time. They lost value during ensuing years and it's been compounded. Now, one measure of value might be --
Q. Mr. Powell, I'm sorry. I just wanted to limit your answer. My question was a pretty simple one, I think, about the value of the property at the time they purchased it. And I think you've answered my question.
A. It was in that fair market value at that time.
Q. Okay. And this property I understand was listed for $\$ 184,500$; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And my understanding from Googling is that it's still for sale; correct?
A. It is.
Q. Again, you have not had an appraisal done for this particular property.
A. No. I would not. It's not -- again, it's not part of the process.
Q. So you have no way of knowing, as you sit here today, if any impacts, if any, what the impact will be with this property related to
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the value; correct?
A. I can tell you that $I$ have received a half-dozen enthusiastic inquiries based on the presentation of the property. And when I disclose the existence of Northern Pass, they do not look. One person was very, very intimately familiar with it because of their frequency at the Roger's Campground across the street. She was horrified to know about it. She was going to write letters and do all sorts of stuff. I don't know if she did. That was someone from New York.

But basically, when they'd find out about Northern Pass, they would not consider the property. They're not frightened by the price. They know the location in many cases. They're attracted by the view and the many wonderful features of it. It's iconic. It's just something everybody knows when they're going through that territory. But nobody is going to consider it under these circumstances.
Q. So, in comparison to the last four examples we provided, though, you don't have a sale
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price to compare to what you're asserting is fair market value in order to determine whether or not your range that you provided in your testimony of 35 to 40 percent is accurate in terms of this particular property; correct?
A. This is not part of any analysis by me as to market value. It is not part of any analysis by me as to the amount of loss. All I'm telling you is that it's on the market. That's the price that the sellers finally decided to put it on for to see what might happen, as I think I may have said. Nothing has happened. Nobody wants to consider it. I'm not saying that that's the current fair market value, because with the influence of Northern Pass it isn't. It's just what they wanted to put it on for. I befriended them. I did it for them. But nothing's happening. I'm not using it to say conclusively what the amount of reduction will be. I can tell you, though, that if it's built, it won't be much. Q. Thank you.

MS. WALKLEY: I have no other
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questions.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Questions
from the Committee. Mr. Way looks like he's grabbing the microphone.

QUESTIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SEC COUNSEL: BY MR. WAY:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Powell.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. So on that last point, I was a little bit interested, looking at the Route 2 property, beautiful piece of property in Lancaster.

When someone approaches you and they say they're interested, there's a disclosure that Northern Pass will be going through that area in the right-of-way; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. How is that described to them? How do they -- particularly if it's someone from out of state and they may have no idea what Northern Pass is, no idea of the extent, how is it described? Do you describe it? Do you have documents? Are there plans? Or is it simple enough, as I think you seem to suggest, that it's a very large transmission
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project, and that's the deal killer right there?
A. It is. But you'd be amazed at how many people from so many places know about this project and are forewarned and ask about it. If somebody doesn't know that this particular property is involved, $I$ do let them know. I describe all the wonderful attributes. But before I would drag somebody from New York, in one case, or Boston in another, $I$ have to let them know that when they come, they're going to see a utility line at the bottom, which is unoffensive at this time and not particularly in the way of the most beautiful part of the property. But it is the location of what may be the Northern Pass Transmission Project that you may have read about or know about. And if they don't know about it, I tell them briefly what I can tell them about it. I try to first interest them in the property, but then disclose it. If I brought somebody up under false pretences, the first question would be, "Well, why didn't you tell me this before you drove me all the way out
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here?" So I do what's appropriate. It's a disclosure. It's important.
Q. Thank you.

And the next question I have, as I was going back to some testimony earlier this morning from Mr. Ramsdell -- were you here for that?
A. I was, yeah.
Q. And this isn't necessarily directly in your wheelhouse, but I'm just interested in your opinion on the re-valuation that he had, I think like $\$ 45,000$. And $I$ was somewhat interested that when you have a re-valuation that takes off an amount like that, that there's no -- there didn't seem to be any level of support or written support for that. Do you know if that's typical?
A. I don't think it's typical for any reduction to have been done except in Whitefield at this point. And it may have been done as a result of solicitation among -- it's a small town. Somebody may have spoken to the selectmen or the assessor or someone. It's a very real concern and a fright for that town.
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[WITNESS: PETER POWELL]

MR. IACOPINO: Just two
questions.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Iacopino. Oh, I'm sorry. You did, Patty?
MS. WEATHERSBY: Yes, I do. I said "thank you" and I was about to start. QUESTIONS BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Thank you for letting me speak and ask my questions.

Mr. Powell, in your testimony you gave a range of loss of value that you attribute -of property value that you attribute to Northern Pass. Did you prepare any charts or other documents to help you get to that, or was that based just on those, the case studies that you put in your testimony?
A. I felt that those particular properties supported that range.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And I'll kind of jump around a little bit.

My understanding of qualified versus non-qualified properties is that qualified -that when multiple properties are sold, that would be a non-qualified transaction. Do you
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agree with that? And is that what happened in that Wesson Road --
A. Well, that's a different question, isn't it, from what $I$ was asking for. And I frankly don't run into this, obviously. And when I go to look at properties and evaluate them, we look at assessments, but we are not bound or driven or influenced by them. They can be years old. So when you look at a card, you look for certain information. Frankly, I have never been stunned like I was today by coming across that. But when you sell several lots together, multiple lot sales, I'm sure in all cases it would produce a discount in and of themselves. So if the implication is that it's not qualified because they were all sold together, then yes, as an individual assessment, given that per-acre amount and multiplying it by the acreage of each lot, that would result in a value on each lot that would be inaccurate because of that discount.
Q. Right. Okay. In your testimony here today, you said the visibility of the Northern Pass
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Project is the key factor affecting a property's marketability and price. I'm paraphrasing.
A. Sure.
Q. Do you then believe that properties along the underground portion of the route that won't have a view of above-ground towers will also have their market price affected?
A. I think that is not a particular concern of mine in the same way that the above-ground lines are. I think in some individual properties it could have a negative effect. But overall, no. We had a pipeline go through Stark and other areas up there, and there was no human cry. Nobody had fits about it. It was just done. And there's a pipeline through Lancaster. I go over it every day when I go to work. It's not offensive.
Q. Okay. Do you agree with Dr. Chalmers who testified that single-family owners are the best indicator of market effects?
A. I would say so, in my region.
Q. Do you feel that other types of properties
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other than single-family homes will also be affected by proximity and views of the Northern Pass?
A. Yes, primarily from the standpoint of tourism.
Q. So you're referring to businesses then?
A. Business properties, commercial properties in some cases, yes.
Q. Vacant land?
A. Vacant land, yes.
Q. Residential condominiums?
A. I'm sure.
Q. So is there any type of property that you can think of that perhaps would not be affected?
A. An ugly industrial park, a junkyard, something which is already degraded.
Q. But other than that, pretty much anything used for hotels, campgrounds, places that people come and stay or live you believe will be affected.
A. Anything associated with the pleasure and satisfaction and joy of being in that place would be affected, and therefore the property that they might use to seek that enjoyment
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## [WITNESS: PETER POWELL]

would be affected.
Q. The Applicant has offered a Property Value Guaranty which I think you said you were somewhat familiar with.
A. No, I'm just learning about it today, actually.
Q. Oh, I'm sorry. So they have offered a Property Value Guaranty Program, that certain properties that meet certain criteria can, if they're -- can get some compensation if the market value is decreased. Some of the criteria are that -- actually, I'm going to skip that.

One of the criteria is that, to be compensated under the program, the property sale -- the person has to sell their property within five years of the time the Project is completed.

Do you feel as though the market effect of Northern Pass will have dissipated in five years, or will it continue on in your opinion?
A. It will continue on.
Q. I have nothing further.
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## CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: NOW Mr.

Iacopino.
QUESTIONS BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. I just have two questions. The first one is I was a little confused when you answered Ms. Walkley about your licensure as a realtor or appraiser. Have you ever been licensed as a real estate appraiser?
A. No. When $I$ was doing a certain amount of appraising, there wasn't even a license available.
Q. Okay. And the other question $I$ have is with respect -- forgetting about Northern Pass for right now. But with respect to the existing transmission line and properties that either there's a right-of-way or they're close to the right-of-way, what kind of disclosure do you make to potential sellers?
A. About the impacts of the existing line?
Q. Right. Before Northern Pass was on your radar.
A. No, if it constitutes a real intrusion and I feel that it impacts value and it's going to be an issue for the property, then I'll tell
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## [WITNESS: PETER POWELL]

them, just like having a barn in the middle of collapse or anything else. It's physical and economic, as I said in my thing. It's an issue that would need to be factored in some way.
Q. Would I be right to characterize that as a subjective determination on your part?
A. I think the entire process is subjective. And an appraisal in general is an attempt to put science to subjectivity sometimes and search for data that helps you through it.
Q. So the answer is yes?
A. Yeah, 43 years of it.
Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I just have
one area $I$ want to clarify in one of the exchanges you had with Ms. Walkley about properties purchased in 2005 or 2006. I think she asked you the question did the buyers overpay. And I want to make sure I understood what your answer was. I think what you were saying was, no, they didn't overpay maybe at the moment they bought it, but the market as it developed caused the property to lose value.
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And so when they turned around the next time, the market was lower than where it was when they bought it. Is that essentially right?
A. The market declined. But in our area, we got a little bit of a recovery in 2012, and then we began on the road to recovery in 2014. So we're going in the other direction.
Q. Right. But just in terms of your exchange with Ms. Walkley when the two of you at one point were talking past each other --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- you were saying, no, they didn't overpay --
A. Right.
Q. -- they paid the right amount at the time, but then the market did damage to their investment.
A. Yes, they'd been impacted by that. Yeah.
Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard, what can I do for you?

MS. MENARD: I was wondering if
I could ask one redirect question regarding unqualified sales.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, this isn't your witness.

MS. MENARD: I realize that, so that's why I'm asking.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Would there be an objection if Ms. Menard asked that question?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: There would.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. The objection procedurally would be correct, Ms. Menard, and I think I'd be obligated to sustain it. That said, he's not represented, or he doesn't have a lawyer here to ask him questions.

So now would be the time when we would turn to you, Mr. Powell, and say, in light of the questions that you've been asked by all the people sitting here today, are there any questions or answers that you feel you need to follow up on to clarify, to give additional information about?

WITNESS POWELL: Yes, there are a couple that come to mind. One has to do with those lots and Mr . Chalmers' response to my
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
[WITNESS: PETER POWELL]
assertions and my testimony. And he supplied in his --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Hang on one sec.

WITNESS POWELL: Okay.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think Mr.
Needleman's going to want to object to this.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I would just
hope that Mr. Powell would tie this to questions that were asked and not just general commentary.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Right.
You understand, Mr. Powell,
we're talking specifically about things that happened today.

WITNESS POWELL: It relates to
the exchange between -- forgive me --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Walkley?
WITNESS POWELL: -- Ms. Walkley, yes, and myself.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Go ahead.

WITNESS POWELL: I talk too
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much, but this is one $I$ didn't squeeze in. I just need to say that he took that sale and went out and looked at sales that were 10 acres up to 87. The 87-acre sale, which is totally irrelevant, was actually sold 30 days later in an arm's-length transaction by me for $\$ 119,000$ because the guy who sold it the first time got gypped and this fellow didn't have an opportunity to purchase. So information is information, right. That information of sales from 10 to 87 acres was totally erroneous and misused because it is irrelevant to the fact that even though we lump together all three lots for the reasons I discussed, there were still three lots. And yes, indeed, they were being discounted. But if you look at sales between 5 and 10 acres around the region during that time leading up to the date of that sale, you find that the average per-acre price was $\$ 5,196$. And if you multiply that out, all of those lots would add up to 118. I didn't use that information because $I$ don't feel that these
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## [WITNESS: PETER POWELL]

particular lots would have sold for that much. And I put the price on them that I put on them as what they would sell if they could be sold individually. But I surmised they could not be. The appraisal -- or the assessment for town was even greater than that, as I recall. And I mention it in my piece. But basically the number I gave was a responsible number as the discounted price of three lots. And if they were individually assessed as they should have been, the evidence in the marketplace that I found as opposed to that which they used was far more appropriate as the basis for an analysis.

The comps that he used, incidentally, were ridiculous if you looked at them on a case-by-case basis, which you have to do when you know the market and you're intimate with the community and you know the particular sales that took place. You've got to look at them. One of them was over the side of the bank of a highway. There was a foreclosure sale there. Not only there, but also in the figures -- I think
[WITNESS: PETER POWELL]
they gave me two sales for the cabin, if I'm remembering correctly. One was in town, which is irrelevant, and the other one was a foreclosure. I pulled up a series of comps so --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. You're indignant about that.

WITNESS POWELL: Yeah, the problem is the data.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
WITNESS POWELL: And if you don't get good data, you don't get accurate results. You need to understand the market and you need to understand the properties. And when you're dispassionate and you're removed, that's impossible from the set of books that get put on your desk by somebody who himself did not know or understand what was going on there. That's pretty important.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Any other questions, answers you want to follow up on?

WITNESS POWELL: We're all
tired. I, too, appreciate everybody's patience
and tolerance and commitment to this process, and I'm thankful for it.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Powell. You can step down.
Let's go off the record for a minute.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
(WHEREUPON, PETER SCOTT was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. PACIK:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Scott. Could you please state your full name and title for the record, please.
A. Peter Scott. I'm the Vice-President and General Counsel of Sabbow \& Company, Inc.
Q. Could you very briefly just describe your role for Sabbow in reviewing the proposed project.
A. I reviewed the plans that were presented to me, or a small subset of them, with our engineering people and with our logistics
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people. Does that answer your question?
Q. Sure. Okay. And I've given you Joint Muni Exhibit 130, which is your prefiled testimony dated November 15th, 2016. Do you have that exhibit in front of you?
A. I do.
Q. And with respect to that prefiled testimony, do you have any corrections to it that you would like to make today?
A. No, I do not.
Q. With respect to your prefiled testimony, do you adopt all of that testimony and swear to it today?
A. I do.
Q. Since the filing of your prefiled testimony on November 15th, 2017, which was approximately a year ago, have you had communications with Northern Pass representatives to address the construction concerns that you raised?
A. Yes, I've had several.
Q. And were some of the communications between November 15th and April 15th?
A. The earliest ones may have been. But the
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most recent ones certainly were not.
Q. Well, as of April 15th, 2017, were the concerns you raised resolved?
A. No.
Q. And since April 15th, 2017, have you continued in your communications?
A. Yes, we have.
Q. Would you generally describe what those communications have been since April?
A. Primarily they've been exchanging plans. We gave Northern Pass plans, as we read their plans and how it would affect both storage and travel within our property. And they have sent us plans detailing, the most recent one, how they would propose to alleviate some of the problems we thought we would encounter. There's also been a draft of a Memorandum of Understanding that was sent to us.
Q. Okay. So in terms of the most recent plan that you received from Northern Pass, if the Project was built as it is currently shown on that particular plan, would you be satisfied with at least the concerns you raised in your
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testimony about being able to continue to use and access the various areas of your property?
A. Yes. The property that we have is -- I don't know if it's clear from the material that's in front of the Committee, but the right-of-way basically bisects our property. And we need to get from the construction area to the storage area, obviously, and from the maintenance area to other parts of our property. If that travel is cut off, we can't really do business without going out on public streets, a very circuitous route. And the most recent plan that has been filed -not filed, but given to us, addresses those I would say satisfactorily. I'm not excited about them, but they're satisfactory.
Q. Okay. Now, one of the concerns you raised in your original prefiled testimony was the use of guy wires on poles and the fact that it would take up additional square footage that would interfere with access roads. Has Northern Pass, in their recent communications with you, told you that the proposal does not
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A. Yes, they have told us that. I believe that there are going to be two sets of structures that would continue to have guy wires. One is the small, relative distribution line that will continue to have guy wires, and the other one is there's an existing set of poles that will not be moved that have guy wires. And I assume those guy wires will remain if the poles remain.
Q. Okay. So, now, in terms of the plan that you recently received from Northern Pass, do you have any concerns that the Project can actually be built as it's shown on the plan that you received?
A. It's been our concern for a long period of time that the soil that we have on our property is very sandy. And we are not entirely -- we're not engineers of the sort of structural engineers. We make concrete products. So we have engineers who are used to making concrete products. We don't build tall structures. But if there are no guy wires on a tall structure, then the
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footing -- the base has to be responsible for keeping it from tipping over. If you don't have guy wires that are forcing or protecting the pole from toppling in one way, then that base has to be deep enough and wide enough in order to counterbalance the forces that pull it over.

I don't know if it's clear to the Committee from the materials that are in front of you, but we're at a corner. We're not on a straight line. On the straight line, the forces of the two wires going out counterbalance each other, and there's really not that much problem with the structures falling over. But if you're on a corner, the forces tend to pull it in that third direction, or a different direction away from the two wires that are coming in, and so you need guy wires going the other way in order to counterbalance that. But here, there are no guy wires, so there has to be -- it's all in the base. And if the base is sandy -- if the soil is sandy, it's not going to provide as much support, we don't think, as -- there
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we go -- we're not as confident as Northern Pass is that it will work.

So I just put on the screen the site plan. Wow, it just got zoomed in a little too close, but we're going to zoom out for a moment. And this is the site plan for your parcel which was recently provided as Applicant's Exhibit 201. And I'll represent to you that this is still the original configuration that was proposed by Northern Pass for the pole locations for your site, which I understand you've received updated plans.

But at least to describe the concerns that you just referenced about the corner and the angle of those poles and the ability for those poles to be constructed without guy wires, looking at least at like the 3132 line, is one of your concerns the distance between 3132-150 and 3132-151 and the angle that will then occur?
A. Thirty-one... okay. The distance -- yes. Well, the angle that's between the two, the major ones creating the angle there creates
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forces going in a different direction, going more or less splitting that angle. The problem is that the next pole for the new construction is quite a bit further down than the other ones are. You can see it. On mine it looks like the yellow one is now across a little beaver bond; whereas, the poles for the other ones line up. You can see the blue line has a purple pole on our property; the gray line has a white pole on our property; the dotted line has a green pole on our property, but the yellow line does not have one on our property. Now, we're not -- trust me, we're not looking to get more poles on here. But what that means is the longer the stretch, the more the pole -- at least I've got to believe that because there's more weight, there's got to be more tension in the line. So it's going to be putting force on that pole, pulling it over, which means the base has to be sturdier, deeper, wider.
Q. Okay. So in terms of the new plans that have been submitted to you, before you would feel comfortable signing off on them, what type of
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plan would you want to see to confirm that Northern Pass can actually build a project as they're proposing?
A. I guess $I$ want to see an engineering plan following some soil sampling, testing, test pits.
Q. Are you aware of whether any soil sampling has been conducted on your particular property yet?
A. I would have assumed they would have asked. And they haven't asked, so...
Q. Okay. Now, you had previously indicated that Northern Pass sent you a Memorandum of Understanding to address the new plans. At this point have you signed that?
A. No, we have not.
Q. Why not?
A. It really didn't promise us anything. In other words, it didn't make any firm commitments. It was a document that suggested they would exercise best efforts to do what was reasonable, which I would have thought they would have done anyway, and so we didn't sign it. We're in discussions with
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Northern Pass. And if they present us a document that satisfies our concerns, then we'd be happy to sign it. But to date we haven't got one.
Q. So if you were to sign something, you'd want a firm commitment that they will construct the Project per the new plans that you've been looking at?
A. Those plans or some other plans that met our needs, yes.
Q. Okay. In terms of the concerns that you've raised, not only about the location of the poles on your property, but interruptions to your business, has Northern Pass over the last few months during your recent communications offered any solutions to impacts to your business during construction?
A. During construction? No. We've mentioned it off hand, but we're more concerned first with the long term. And the short term just seems less immediate, but no less concerning. I don't know how long it's going to take. I don't know when it's going to get started. I mean, we're a construction business. We do
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construction. We service our construction customers in the summer, so we'd prefer it to be in the winter. I assume everybody would prefer it to be in the winter when we could pretty much handle it. But if it took a month out of the summer, we'd be pretty much in trouble.
Q. Okay. So, before the Site Evaluation Committee, if they were to approve this project, before the approval would you want at least your construction impact concerns to be fully addressed?
A. Oh, absolutely.
Q. Okay. Now, there's been discussion by Northern Pass representatives that they have a program where they could potentially make payment to businesses to address financial repercussions resulting from construction impacts. Have you to date received any communications from Northern Pass regarding this business claim form?
A. No.
Q. And to the extent that you were to get reimbursement for lost profits during
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construction, would that address your concerns?
A. If the construction didn't shut us down, it might. If it shut us down and we couldn't do any deliveries, of course we'd be losing profit. But we may also be losing customers, and that might be something we couldn't easily recover from and would have sort of external, long-term -- I'm not saying we couldn't be compensated for that. But it's probably not the sort of direct compensation that people would be looking at.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. PACIK: I have no further questions. We can pass the witness on. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Pappas. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. PAPPAS :
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Scott. My name's Tom Pappas. I represent Counsel for the Public in this matter. I just have a few questions.

In your prefiled testimony, you describe some inconsistencies between the Applicant's project maps and the existing conditions out
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in the field. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And did I hear you correctly that -- or am I correct that the latest project maps which are on the screen now that show your company's location, they do not address the inconsistencies that you raised? Or do they?
A. To be honest with you, the inconsistencies only concerned the level of attention, from our position, the level of attention they paid to our property and were really not an ongoing concern. We're far more concerned with how they're actually going to build it in the future. So we have not been paying much attention to any errors that may or may not exist. I mean, I assume people can, you know, look on our property and verify or not whether it's accurate. But again, it's going forward that we care about.
Q. So, sitting here today, your company's no longer concerned with inconsistencies on the plans that we have in front of us?
A. Only to the extent that it suggests a lower level of attention to detail than we would
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like.
Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier the guy wires and lack of guy wires that you are concerned about. I take it that Northern Pass hasn't provided you with any engineering analysis to date about whether or not that structure requires guy wires.
A. That is correct. We're not looking for guy wires. Guy wires are a pain in the neck for us, and they're a pain in the neck I assume for Northern Pass, too.
Q. Okay. And I take it that Northern Pass hasn't provided you with any engineering analysis to satisfy you that that corner structure can be constructed without guy wires to your company's satisfaction.
A. They have assured me that it can, but --
Q. They haven't provided you with the engineering analysis.
A. That's correct.
Q. Has your company retained a structural engineer to review what Northern Pass has proposed to date?
A. No, they haven't.
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Q. Do you intend to?
A. No.
Q. Do you intend to rely on in-house abilities to eventually analyze what Northern Pass provides to you to determine whether you're satisfied?
A. We're sort of more the "proof is in the pudding." If they give us something that they say they will build to this specification, we're not going to ask them, "How deep are you going to go, and what are you going to do if you hit bedrock in the process?" But if you tell us that it's going to be here and, you know, we're going to put our bollards here to protect it, that's what we care about. We just want to make sure that they've crossed their Ts and dotted their Is so they'll actually do that.
Q. Now, you also testified that, although it's not your immediate concern, you still have concerns about impacts during construction; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And I understand you're in ongoing
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discussions with Northern Pass about that?
A. We have not progressed to that point. I believe at one point they did give us a plan that shows areas impacted during construction, and it pretty well cuts our property in half. So we'll have to figure it out at some point. But the primary one has been the access, the two-way access through the site upon completion.
Q. What's on the screen now is a page from the Alteration of Terrain Permit Plan submitted by the Applicant as Exhibit 200 or 199 or 201, one of those three. This is the page dealing with your company. Do you recognize that?
A. I recognize our company. I'm not familiar with this plan.
Q. If you look at that plan, do you see the red lines that go within the right-of-way?
A. Yes.
Q. Those are proposed access roads within the right-of-way in order to construct the towers that you see.
A. So these are their temporary roads or maybe
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permanent roads. I guess we can ask them, but --
Q. These are roads they intend to use to construct the towers.
A. To construct. Okay.
Q. And I'm told this is Exhibit 200.

So, looking at those roads used to construct, does that interfere with the operation of your company?
A. Well, looking at this, it looks like the yellow area is the construction area, and the plan that we were given shows a similar area there. And yes, during construction we will not be able to get the -- we will not be able to drive trucks between the area which is on my right, I assume it's on everybody else's right, that has below it our maintenance building and our office building, and the building on the left, which is our construction, our plant, our manufacturing facility.
Q. So, to summarize, if the roads shown on this plan, the temporary roads for construction are used, it will interfere with the
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operation of your company.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So that's something that you -- is that something that your company intends to discuss with Northern Pass?
A. Oh, absolutely.
Q. Okay. And is that something that you hope to include in any MOU, if you eventually sign one?
A. Oh , yes.
Q. But as you sit here today, that's still an open issue.
A. Yes.
Q. As you sit here today, do you have any concerns about permanent impacts to the operation of your company from the construction of Northern Pass?
A. Yes, the long-term impacts. But you can see from this exhibit you've got up here that there are currently two roads, if you will, going across that sort of yellow blocked area. We had worried that under the original plans one of those would be eliminated, and that's what we are discussing with Northern
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questions.
A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who else has questions for Mr. Scott? I see lots of shaking heads among the intervenors.

All right. Mr. Needleman.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Hi, Mr. Scott. I'm Barry Needleman. I represent the Applicants in this matter. I just have a couple of questions for you.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, if you could put the agreement up.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. You mentioned a couple of minutes ago efforts between your company and the Applicant to work on a Memorandum of Understanding. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, your business, I believe, started operating on the site around 1990. Is that generally correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And the transmission lines that ran through
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that area predated your business locating there.
A. That is correct.
Q. And PSNH had an easement on the site at the time you located there to operate the lines; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So at the time that you located on the site, your company and PSNH entered into a Joint Use Agreement; is that right?
A. Yeah. It's ten years after, but yes.
Q. Have you ever looked at that agreement? Are you generally familiar with it?
A. I've looked at it, yes.
Q. Okay. I've put it up on the screen here, and I want to just quickly refer to that agreement.

So this is the document that governs the relationship between your company and PSNH; is that right?
A. That's one of them, yes.
Q. And Paragraph 4 of this document requires both parties to cooperate with each other in good faith to resolve any issues regarding
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the use of the land; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you understand that Eversource, in its operation of the lines on the easement, is subject to certain regulatory requirements?
A. I would assume they are, yes.
Q. And when you signed this agreement -- and I mean your company -- you agreed that you would operate your business consistent with the requirements of the Joint Use Agreement; is that fair to say?
A. Well, the document does speak for itself. And it was before my time, but yes.
Q. And you mentioned a few minutes ago, and I think you mentioned in your testimony as well, that the new line would bisect your site; is that right?
A. Well, the current lines do. So, yes.
Q. That was my question. The current
transmission and distribution lines also do as well; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Also in your prefiled testimony, I think on Page 5, you mentioned a concern you
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had about these lines potentially adding an additional burden to the easement. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. It's correct, though, that there's no language in the easement document for this area that puts any limitation on the number of lines that can be constructed there; isn't that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And the Joint Use Agreement also speaks to this in Paragraph 2. And when PSNH entered into it, they specifically said that it doesn't waive any of their easement rights; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Is it fair to say that even though you still have continuing issues that you would like to have addressed and worked out, that you believe the Company has been operating in good faith up to this point to try to hear your issues and address those concerns?
A. To address our concerns with the location of the poles and our use, yes, absolutely.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [Day 59 AFTERNOON Session ONLY]\{11-09-17\}
Q. Okay.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Any
members of the Committee have questions for Mr. Scott? Commissioner Bailey does.

CMSR. BAILEY: Dawn, could you
put the ELMO back on, please?
QUESTIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SEC COUNSEL: BY COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
Q. Good evening.
A. Good evening. Is it evening already?
Q. I'm Kate Bailey from the Public Utilities Commission.

I'm trying to understand on this map exactly which parcels are your properties. So I assume the one at the corner, 8212, is yours; is that right?
A. Well, if we zoom out a little bit $I$ can tell you exactly where our properties are. I'm not familiar with the numbering there.
Q. Okay.
A. But we own the entire corner. It used to be two parcels of land. The original one was on Industrial Park Drive, and that's where we
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started. And then the one that is on Regional Drive we acquired maybe ten years later.
Q. So the one on Industrial Park Drive, do you see the number that's circled that says "8211"?
A. Yeah, that's probably ours.
Q. That's probably where your manufacturing plant is?
A. If that's a building, yes. This is... I think it's E.D. Swett is the next one over. E.D. Swett is the name of the company that owns property next to us. One moment, please.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Well, I've seen better pictures, but yes, that looks like our manufacturing building, 8211.
Q. And then if you move --
A. And then 8212 would be our other property on Regional Drive.
Q. All right. So most of your property is encumbered by the right-of-way; is that right?
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A. Yes.
Q. And do you know what the structures are proposed to be on your property, Northern Pass structures?
A. Well, what we've been told, yeah, they're going to be tall, metal structures.
Q. Lattice towers?
A. Yeah, I believe so. I mean, I guess we don't really care what they look like. I mean, I know that's a little different from most people.
Q. No, that's not what I'm asking about. I'm asking you how much space they're going to take up on your property because there's two different kinds of towers. There's a monopole which has a smaller footprint and then a lattice tower which has a bigger footprint.
A. I'd love to ask Tom Getz to give me a hand here, but I believe we were told that the diameter of the footing would be about eight feet. So whether that's the breadth of the base of the tower or not, $I$ don't know. All we care about is how big the footing is.
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Q. I'm guessing that's going to be a monopole so it will take up less space.
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So the blue line with the purple squares, that's there today. And the new Northern Pass line is going to be almost in the location where the existing line that they're going to move is today, right, the yellow?
A. Yeah, the yellow line is the -- well, the P145 I believe is a new, taller, more powerful line.
Q. Right.
A. And the top line there is the existing one I believe that at this point is not being moved.
Q. Right. So are there guy wires on the top line being 182 --
A. You know, in my direct testimony I said I thought they were. Now I'm sort of backing off on that. I couldn't swear to it. I believe there are, but that's a part of the property that we don't really use to store stuff. It's kind of out of the way. The
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access road is approximately where the yellow line is. And so that's a part that the guy wires would be closer to Industrial Park Drive, and they would take an area that was pretty much inaccessible anyway to us and not of concern.
Q. Are there guy wires on the existing 115 line that's going to be moved?
A.
115...
Q. Those are the white squares that have the Xs in them.
A. The existing ones are both the same. To be honest with you, I couldn't tell you. I didn't really think about that coming in today because that's going to be moved and going to a monopole. So I don't really... I'm not really concerned.
Q. Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.
A. And just to follow up on that, the distribution line, which is the furthest one down, will continue to have guy wires. But again, it's going to be at the base of the other pole, so it's not an additional concern for us.
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Q. And that's not changing?
A. That's not changing. Well, the pole location is changing, but the fact that there are guy wires there is not changing.
Q. The distribution wires?
A. Distribution pole is being moved.
Q. It is or is not?
A. Is.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Oldenburg.
QUESTIONS BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. Good evening.
A. Good evening.
Q. It's late, I'm tired, and curiosity's got the best of me. Do you know if in the manufacturing process of your products you use fly ash?
A. We do when it's available. We're now using slag, which is a different thing, but same idea. It helps in the curing process. We do use fly ash, yes.
Q. So have you ever had complaints of using fly ash? Because driving by, I notice you make,
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like, infiltration basins, catch basins. You make things that retain and release water. Have you ever heard of any concerns about fly ash leaching like heavy metals into groundwater or anything?
A. I'm not aware of that. That's all I can say is I'm not aware of it.
Q. All right. Thank you.

MR. OLDENBURG: That's all.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Way.
QUESTIONS BY MR. WAY:
Q. Good evening. Has Eversource given you an idea of lead time for your operations before construction begins?
A. You mean how much notice they'd give us?
Q. Right.
A. They may have. I wasn't worried that they wouldn't give us adequate notice. I would assume we'd have a long discussion about timing and length. But they have not made a specific commitment, if that's your question.
Q. That wasn't put into the draft MOU?
A. No.
Q. Something that might be put into the draft
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MOU?
A. Yeah. I mean, like I say, we've been focusing mostly on what the final one is going to look like. But yeah, in an MOU we will uncover some of that.
Q. As $I$ walk by your business because my office isn't too far from you, you're not making widgets; you're making very large products.
A. Very large.
Q. And so I'm just trying to think. I know you're thinking long term, but I'm also thinking in the short term. Everything seems to be very well organized for such large product. Where is it going to go? Will you be able to keep it all on site? Will you have to move to other sites? How will that work?
A. You mean during --
Q. During construction.
A. During construction? I guess it depends on how long construction is going to take. We have to move a certain amount of product, obviously, out of the way. You know, so that's going to take some -- if it's done,
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well, say at the beginning of winter -- we go in cycles. We're a construction company. So towards the end of summer, beginning of winter, we've sort of depleted supplies of where we are, of what we need, of what we have on hand. And then during the winter we build it back up again. So if you came in April, our yard would be full. But if you come in November, our yard is not so full. So, to a certain extent it would depend on when they come.
Q. And are you getting a sense from them that they're willing to complement your sell cycle and build when it's most opportune for your company?
A. We really haven't gotten that far yet. I think the comment, which was a reasonable comment, was "Everybody wants us to come in winter." So...
Q. Good point. The guy wires discussion. One of the -- for my understanding, the removal of the guy wires -- and I know you were saying you're not lobbying for more guy wires. Do you get the sense they were not
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included or removed more to appease you or because it was just an engineering decision?
A. I would guess, and it's only a guess, that it was an engineering decision. If you've got a structure that's over 100 feet tall, a guy wire at any useful angle is going to be way out there. So I've got to believe that once you get up to a certain level that the guy wires are not really a feasible solution. But I'm not an engineer.
Q. And then I think you even mentioned about the impact to the public roads. Is that being a consideration for them, for Eversource, as they're designing this?
A. You mean our impacts to roads that we have to move --
Q. Right, your large vehicles.
A. Yeah. It's slightly more complicated than just, yeah, we have to move from one side to the other. We have manufacturing on this plan, we'll say on the left, and a parking and storage facility on the right. We load -- we take the trucks in the evening, load them all up and then move them to the
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storage facility or the parking area, if you will, on the right. And right now we have yard people to do that. They are not licensed commercial drivers, but they can do it on our property if they don't go off into the streets. If we have to go the long way "around Robin Hood's barn" in order to get back to where we park the vehicles, then we have to have CDL drivers there to do it. And they don't really like to work at night. They work pretty hard during the day. We have multiple shifts.

So it's a logistical nightmare that's going to impact the city roads because there are access roads on Industrial Park Drive just to the left as we're looking at this map. The left of our facility there's an access point. And we would drive from there all the way to Regional Drive, down Regional Drive, and then approximately where the 8212 is circled is our entrance to the parking lot. So you can see how...
Q. But the turn ratio is doable for the trucks?
A. I assume so. I mean, they don't have trouble
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going onto Regional Drive. They don't really have much occasion to go onto Industrial Park Drive, but we do get deliveries for the manufacturing from trucks, sand trucks, dump trucks. So I assume that's not a problem on Industrial Park Drive.
Q. And the next discussion point for the MOU, when do you see that coming?
A. Well, the sooner, the better. I talked to Northern Pass either this week or late last week, and they wanted to continue talks. Didn't think they'd be able to do it before the testimony today. So I'm --
Q. It's an active discussion.
A. Active discussion, yes.
Q. One last question. In terms of your product, is there any opportunities for your product in this project --
A. Yes.
Q. -- or your labor?
A. Yes. We make trench for -- or we have in the past made trench for Public Service. I assume that we are certainly capable of making trench for the buried portion of the
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Project. I've sort of assumed they want to keep us in business because they're going to need us. But we haven't used that as leverage yet.
Q. Maybe there's discussions there.

MR. WAY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Anything
else from members of the Committee?
[No verbal response]
Ms. Pacik, do you have any redirect?

MS. PACIK: Yes, just very brief. Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. PACIK:
Q. Mr. Scott, I want to clarify a couple things that came up during the questions asked of you.

In terms of your concerns about temporary construction impacts, Mr. Pappas asked you about access roads and whether the access roads were what was leading your concerns about your ability to continue using this project -- your property during
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construction. And it's not necessarily just the access roads, but actually the location of the construction pads that have you concerned that it's going to block your ability to get your trucks from one end of the property to the other; is that correct?
A. Yeah. We've been -- there's been an area blocked out that basically we've been told we won't be able to use. I don't think that's an issue. I mean, it's an issue for us obviously, but $I$ don't think it's a factual issue about which there's any dispute.
Q. So currently it's undisputed that you're not going to get your trucks from one end of the property to the other during construction if modifications are not made; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And in terms of the construction impacts, obviously an MOU is ideal to address how to resolve those issues. But if you cannot agree, what is your opinion on whether the Project should be approved?
A. Well, I'd like assurances before the Project's approved. I mean, you know, we
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want to know what's going on. We just can't kind of live in uncertainty.
Q. Okay. In terms of the permanent construction concerns that you've raised, I think you had referenced in response to Attorney Pappas's question that some of your concerns dealt with the impacts of your ability to store product. And you mentioned Wi-Fi. But I want to clarify that if the poles are not relocated as they're currently shown on the proposed site plan submitted to the Site Evaluation Committee, you would have poles basically cutting off all of your ability to use your access roads; is that right?
A. If there are no changes to the plans, my understanding is that, yes, they would interfere. No, they wouldn't -- you're talking about permanent now, not temporary.
Q. Permanent, yeah.
A. Permanent, they leave us one. They cut off the other one.
Q. And one, is that sufficient for you to conduct your business?
A. Not really. We don't have a lot of space to
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store trucks or turn them around in the yard. We have a circuit that we go. And, you know, trucks will go in one road, pick up their stuff, turn around and come back through the other road. And we have seven or eight trucks, so...
Q. And you mentioned also that you were not going to hire a structural engineer to confirm that these new plans could actually be built. And is that because you'd want engineered plans to be submitted by Northern Pass to you first?
A. Well, yes. We have no plans. I think the question was do we have plans to, and at this point we do not have plans to hire a structural engineer. Yeah, if we had concerns with an engineered drawings that was stamped and ready to go with stuff, you know, with details of how it would be constructed, and if we had concerns at that time, then perhaps we would. But we're not going to tell Northern Pass how to build their structures. We just want to make sure they put their structures in a place that doesn't
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interfere with our business.
Q. So you want to see engineered plans, basically.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, you were asked about the fact that you already have poles and wires going through your yard. And I'm not asking you to render a legal opinion, but you are -- is it your opinion that the easement cannot overburden the property to the extent that you can't access all areas of it with your trucks?
A. Well, at some point, I mean, they can't put 50 structures up there. I think that would be a clear overburdening. So at some point they can't just willy nilly do anything they want.
Q. And would that include cutting off access from one end of your property to the other?
A. Oh, I think if they effectively built a wall, then that would be beyond what they could do.
Q. And the current plan that you see on the overhead, which is their proposed plan, is that effectively building a wall?
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A. Well, we're not working off the proposed plan anymore. But what it does is it --
Q. Let me back up. Sorry. Just to be clear, their original plan that they provided to you, would that effectively build a wall?
A. Oh, that would build a wall that would cover about 90 percent of the thing. They would allow us one access road. That was fairly early on it was determined --
Q. And you had indicated that that one access road would not be sufficient for your needs; is that right?
A. That is correct.

MS. PACIK: Okay. I have no further questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Scott. I think we're done.
I also think we're done for the day and the week. So the next time we're together will be a week from today, next Thursday.

MS . MONROE: No.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No?
MS. MONROE: Oh, today's
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Thursday.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes, Pam, today is Thursday.

So we'll adjourn.
(Whereupon the Day 59 Afternoon
Session was adjourned at 5:35
p.m., with the Day 60 hearing to resume on November 16, 2017
commencing at 9:00 a.m.)
[WITNESS: PETER SCOTT]
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