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PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good
morning. It's a new week, a short week, and we have a new witness panel. Do we have anything we need to do before they get sworn in?
[No verbal response]
(WHEREUPON, CHRISTOPHER THAYER, KENNETH KIMBALL AND LARRY GARLAND were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Plouffe.

MR. PLOUFFE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, I'm Attorney Bill Plouffe, representing the Appalachian Mountain Club. So I'm going to start -- and we have a three-person panel this morning. I'm going to start with the introductory questions for Mr. Thayer.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PLOUFFE:
Q. Mr. Thayer, would you please state your name and your place of employment.
A. (Thayer) Christopher Thayer, AMC's Highland
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Center, Crawford Notch, Route 302 in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire.
Q. Where do you live?
A. (Thayer) I live in Sugar Hill. I've been a resident for 15 years.
Q. What's your position at the Appalachian Mountain Club?
A. (Thayer) I'm the Club's Director for North Country Programs and Outreach, and those responsibilities include oversight of our guided teen, family and adult programs; oversight of our hospitality operations at the Highland Center at Crawford Notch; oversight of volunteer programs throughout AMC's network of facilities, as well as community relations and work on policy initiatives in the region.
Q. What work have you done for the Appalachian Mountain Club relative to this Northern Pass Project?
A. (Thayer) I reviewed the Northern Pass Application materials relative to my experience in 28 years working in the outdoor recreation and tourism in the region.
Q. And with respect to what particular aspect of the Application?
A. (Thayer) With visitor expectations to the region.
Q. And you've submitted prefiled testimony in this docket, dated December 30th, 2016, which has been marked as NGO Exhibit 102; is that correct?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Do you have that testimony before you today?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Are there any corrections to your prefiled testimony or errata that you want to make?
A. (Thayer) No.
Q. Do you adopt your prefiled testimony in this docket, dated December 30, 2016, which has been marked as NGO Exhibit 102?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Are there any other changes that you want to make or additions or modifications based on information that's come before this body since April?
A. (Thayer) No.
Q. Now, Dr. Kimball, would you state your name \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
and place of employment.
A. (Kimball) Yes. Kenneth Kimball. I work for the Appalachian Mountain Club, Pinkham Notch Office on 316 Route 16 in Gorham, New Hampshire.
Q. And where do you reside, Mr. Kimball?
A. (Kimball) I've lived in Jackson, New Hampshire for the last 34 years.
Q. We're calling you "Dr. Kimball" in these proceedings. Why do we call you "Dr.

Kimball"?
A. (Kimball) Because I have a Ph.D.
Q. In what?
A. (Kimball) Actually, in ecology.
Q. Thank you. And what is your position at Appalachian Mountain Club, and what does that position involve that's relevant to this docket?
A. (Kimball) I've been the Research Director at AMC since 1983. And a lot of my role has been involved in the licensing of energy generation facilities, including hydropower. I've been involved in a lot of re-licensings and settlement agreements that happened in \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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the state, as well as reviewing a lot of wind power projects across New England with my staff. I co-authored -- excuse me. I authored the settlement agreement in Antrim relative to the requirement for radar-activated lighting. I was a co-author of the settlement agreement with Granite Reliable, and I also participated as a team member with AMC during the revisions of the SEC rules.
Q. Those rules you're referring to are those that are applicable to this project?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. Mr. Garland, could you state your name and place of employment.
A. (Garland) My name is Larry Garland, and I work at the Appalachian Mountain Club, 361 Pinkham Notch, Route 16, Gorham, New Hampshire.
Q. Where do you reside?
A. (Garland) I live in Jackson, New Hampshire.
Q. What's your position with the Appalachian Mountain Club, and what does that position involve that's relevant to this docket?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
A. (Garland) My title is cartographer. My principal responsibilities are creating the hiking and trail maps that are included with the AMC Guide Book publications. In addition to that, or as part of that, $I$ also have to do a lot of on-the-ground inventory of recreational trail systems, which leads me to travel throughout the state. And I've climbed a lot of the peaks, the 3,000-footers in New Hampshire, and traveling around the country to get to some of the backcountry locations that we publish.
Q. Do you have familiarity with the route of the Northern Pass Project?
A. (Garland) I have traveled the route of the Northern Pass a number of times in both leaf-on and leaf-off conditions.
Q. Dr. Kimball and Mr. Garland, you submitted joint prefiled testimony in this docket dated December 30, 2016, which has been marked as NGO 103. And on April 17, 2017, you filed joint prefiled supplemental testimony which has been marked as NGO 104; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
Q. And do you both have that testimony before you today?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. What was the purpose of the testimony of the Appalachian Mountain Club?
A. (Kimball) The purpose of our testimony was to review the assumptions used in the VIAs submitted by the Applicant and determine how they were applied and to assess the overall completeness of the work that was provided. I would want to emphasize we did not conduct a full VIA or do a full data search on all scenic resources impacted.
Q. Are there any errata to your joint prefiled testimony or your supplemental joint prefiled testimony that you wish to make?
A. (Kimball) No.
Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to your testimony based on information that has become involved in the record subsequent to April 17, 2017, the deadline for filing of supplemental prefiled testimony?
A. (Kimball) Yes, we do.
Q. What are those corrections?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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A. (Kimball) I have two corrections. Based on a review of the information provided in the DeWan and Kimball supplemental report to the VIA, which is their Exhibit 093, and further analysis, we correct and update our prefiled testimony, Appendix 2, from 82 to 50 scenic resources that we had originally identified that they had missed within the three-mile corridor. This change carries throughout the rest of our testimony. And those changes are listed -- if you want, I can read now through what the new set of numbers are.
Q. Those are up on the ELMO now?
A. (Kimball) They are up on the Elmo now. And then the second one is in our prefiled testimony at Page 7, starting at Line 14. We had a sentence that read, "For example, Mount Monadnock would have received a medium rating under Mr. DeWan's scheme but is clearly a scenic resource of high value and sensitivity within New Hampshire," and that should be corrected to read, "For example, Mr. DeWan's cultural rating definitions rate all state-designated scenic
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
byways as having medium cultural value and only federally-designated scenic byways are rated as having high cultural value."
Q. So those are the corrections to your prefiled testimony?
A. (Kimball) That's correct.
Q. So, with those corrections, Dr. Kimball and Mr. Garland, do you adopt your prefiled and supplemental prefiled testimony with those corrections?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. Dr. Kimball and Mr. Garland, do you have additions to your testimony that respond to statements made in the supplemental testimony of DeWan \& Associates dated April 17, 2017, or in their oral testimony before the Subcommittee?
A. (Kimball) Yes, we do.
Q. So let's go through those. And those will be entered into the record.

MR. PLOUFFE: But as I did with
Dr. Publicover, Mr. Chairman, I will go through these one at a time, as you asked me to do with him.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
BY MR. PLOUFFE:
Q. So, the first question is, DeWan and Kimball -- and I'm just going to say "DeWan," with no offense to Jessica -- during cross-examination, the Applicant made the case that the SEC should be consistent, in that a bare earth analysis and identification of scenic resources visually exposed under those conditions was neither required nor had any -- had been provided in previous applications. Since the implementation of the new SEC rules, in your experience, were they correct in that statement?
A. (Kimball) No, they are not. We went back and reviewed those projects that became subject to the revised SEC rules.

WITNESS KIMBALL: And if we can
have Exhibit 133, which is from the Visual
Assessment from the Antrim Wind Project. And if I can have Exhibit 134. And Susan, if you can, actually, on -- no, not that. No, no.

Just take the map and turn it. That's it.
There we go.
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A. (Kimball) This is half of the map. But if you take a look at this map that was put in, it says "topography only," which means bare earth. And if you go over and look at where the arrow is on the right-hand side, you'll notice, if you can read it, it says "scenic resources." And all those little numbers around there are the identified scenic resources. They submitted both a bare earth and the scenic resources impacted under the bare earth condition as required by the rules.
Q. And that was done by what organization?
A. (Kimball) That was done by LandWorks.
Q. On behalf of the Applicant?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.

WITNESS KIMBALL: And if I can have Exhibit 134, which is from Eversource's Merrimack Valley Reliability Project.
A. (Kimball) And the VIA that was conducted there by EDR --

WITNESS KIMBALL: Again, if you can just move it up a little bit. Yeah.
A. (Kimball) You can read where it says
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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"topographic viewshed analysis" on the lower left at Figure 7A. That's a bare earth analysis.

WITNESS KIMBALL: And if I can have next one, please, Susan. And you're going to have to bring that down just a little bit. Thank you.
A. (Kimball) You will see that there's a list on the left-hand side of scenic resources. And you will see that it's -- they are looked at both from the topographic viewshed as well as the vegetative screening or topographic vegetation screening. So, in these two here, which are some of the most recent ones in front of the SEC, both the bare earth analysis as well as the required scenic resources were provided in those hearings.

BY MR. PLOUFFE:
Q. A second question. DeWan, in their
supplemental prefiled at Page 10, Line 13 --
MR. PLOUFFE: Susan, could you
put that up?
BY MR. PLOUFFE:
Q. They state that, to consider wholesale loss \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
of tree cover in evaluation of potential visual impacts would be analogous to looking at land forms that now block views of a project that could be the subject of mountaintop mining in the future, thus opening up areas of visibility.

Are changes in topographic features such as mountaintop removal even closely analogous to forest harvesting?
A. (Kimball) No, they're not. This is an extreme overreach. And I think the point we really want to make is they frequently misrepresent the points we made in our testimony. We've never inferred that the bare earth condition would happen across the whole landscape at once. Tree cutting in this state has gone anywhere from roughly 30 percent -- excuse me. Roughly 70 percent of the tree cover had been removed in the early 1900s, so today we have about just under 90 percent of tree cover. And that is actually starting to decline again.

Views out there are actually a shifting mosaic, and that is the purpose of the bare
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earth analysis, to try to understand those areas that may be opened up in the future, even though they may be blocked today. I mean, $I$ would just give a quick example.

Mitzpah Hut was built by the AMC in the 1960s. There was an excellent view because it was built at a time when logging had actually come up very close. The trees grew up. And this month, with this major storm, those trees have all been blown down again, and the --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Kimball) The trees were blown down, and the view was back to Mitzpah Hut. But this is a classic example which also happens with forest harvesting and so forth. Views open up, close up, open up.
Q. So in DeWan's supplemental prefiled at Page 18, they state, quote, "While this cultural value [sic] filtration system assisted us in determining which scenic resources required an individual impact assessment -- and similar methods have been used in prior NHSEC proceedings -- our system
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
should also assist the NHSEC in their determination of significance." Then, later in their critique of the AMC's prefiled testimony, at Page 70, Line 17, they state, "Not only does our" -- that is, DeWan's -- "approach to cultural resources relate very closely to the D \& F" -- that be the Dodson and Flinker report -- "our approach is very similar to the methodology used in prior visual assessments submitted to NHSEC."

Do you agree that DeWan's approach is consistent with prior visual assessments submitted to the SEC?
A. (Kimball) No, we don't. Again, we went back and looked at the Seacoast Reliability Project and just took a look at how they rated cultural resource versus how DeWan rated them here.

WITNESS KIMBALL: And if I can have NGO Exhibit 135, which is from the Visual Impact Assessment of the Seacoast Reliability.
A. (Kimball) And if you take a look, and you may have to -- what I've done here is the upper
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part here, the "low," "moderate," "high," are the ratings in Seacoast Reliability. On the lower part, I've just cut that out so that it's on one page, is the definitions that were used and the rankings that were used by DeWan. And you can see --

WITNESS KIMBALL: You're going to have to move that or adjust because I can't read it. Thank you.
A. (Kimball) You will see that many of the resources that DeWan gave a low cultural value either ranked low, moderate or high. And I can go through these one by one if that's desired. But just as a quick example --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Kimball) You will notice that state scenic byways are rated high. They're only rated as moderate by DeWan. But there seems to be an overwhelming underrating in the cultural values given by DeWan versus what was used in this study here also for the Applicant's parent company, Eversource.

When we went through and just looked at
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the statistics, we also noticed that 65 percent of their identified scenic resources were ranked as low cultural value, and only 11 percent were ranked as having high cultural values. It seems rather atypical for a state that advertises itself as a scenic state for tourists would have so few high-rated cultural resources out there.
Q. In the DeWan supplemental prefiled testimony at Page 57, on Line 8, they state, quote, "Dr. Kimball and Mr. Garland claim cultural value should not be considered at all," end quote. Is that statement correct?
A. (Kimball) That is false. They provide no evidence that we made such a statement. And on the contrary, we only pointed out that DeWan and Kimball's ranking of New Hampshire scenic resources was very low compared to other visual experts and similar other kinds of state ranking systems. Its use as a first reductive tool was both unique and not supported based on manuals in this profession.
Q. So in the supplemental joint testimony of
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DeWan and Kimball at Page 72, Line 7, in their critique of the AMC's prefiled testimony they state, quote, "The National Conservation Easement was used to learn more about each conservation easement, determine ownership and serve as an indicator of public access," close quote. In your opinion, is the National Conservation Easement Database a good indicator if one is trying to determine public access?
A. (Garland) I will answer that using that National Conservation Easement Database is very problematic. The first reason is because reporting to that database is strictly voluntary. There is no requirement that any easement holder report to that database. And I confirmed that by calling the executive director of our regional land trust who I know because I've worked on that board for a number of years. And he said that he was not even aware of this easement database and has never reported to it.

The second point is that in that
database you can call up a state profile.
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And if you call up the state profile for the state of New Hampshire, it gives a specific breakout on access, access status to those conservation easements listed in the state. And on that web page it states that access status for the state of New Hampshire, "access unknown," is about 60 percent of the parcels in that database for the state of New Hampshire. Sixty percent of the easements have unknown access. And yet, the way Mr. DeWan chose to use that is to eliminate records that were "unknown" rather than investigate them and use the ones that perhaps -- where access was required.

I did a comparison to the New Hampshire Conservation Lands Database that's available for the state GIS office, the Conservation Lands Database 2017. They do have a specific attribute for public access in that database. And if I look at the statistics on how many conservation easements have an access of "unknown" in that database, it's only 29 percent.
Q. So you would conclude, I assume, that the
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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latter database is a more reliable database to use?
A. (Garland) The National Conservation Easement database is much less reliable with respect to public access.
Q. Thank you.

So, in the DeWan supplemental prefiled at Page 14, Line 13, they describe the New Hampshire official list of public waters as the database they used to identify what water bodies, lakes and ponds, qualified as scenic resources for further consideration under the SEC rules in their VIA.

Dr. Kimball, I'm going to ask you, based on your experience and your professional experience, is the New Hampshire list of official waters comprehensive?
A. (Kimball) The answer is no. I've been long a long-time member of the state's Rivers Management Protection Program's Advisory Committee, chairperson for quite a while, and the New Hampshire official list of public waters --

WITNESS KIMBALL: Susan, if I
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have NGO 136?
A. (Kimball) If you take a look at the caveats, it says right off in the beginning that this is a partial list of freshwater public rivers. You can go to lakes and find similar kinds of language. And if you go down to the second arrow, it says "fourth order or higher rivers." This list was primarily put together relative to the Shoreline Protection Act. A "fourth order or higher river" has to be a fairly large river. If you went to a town like $I$ live in, in Jackson, the Wildcat River would not even make it on this list. This was intended for a purpose. It is not a comprehensive list at all. It's part of the reasons why we differed in part with DeWan. For example, he missed Phillips Brook because he said it was not designated in this list. It is a recognized paddling opportunity in AMC's river guide. But it is a very incomplete list of water bodies for the state. And it's recognized if you read the full report.
Q. Why did -- other than the fact that you live
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in Jackson, is there something special about the Wildcat that made you use that as an example?
A. (Kimball) Yeah. I mean, well, actually, the Wildcat River is in the National Wild and Scenic Program.
Q. Thank you.

So, in DeWan's supplemental, on Page 72, Line 17, they state, "The development of an existing visibility analysis or delta viewshed map is not required by NHSEC regulations." Do you concur with this statement? And I direct that question to Mr. Garland.
A. (Garland) Well, the SEC regulations are quite specific in site 301.14 , that criteria relative to findings of unreasonable adverse effects, that the Committee shall consider, No. 1 , the existing character of the area of potential visual impact. And it would be very difficult or not possible to consider the existing character of the landscape without consideration of the existing corridor.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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Furthermore, Line 4 under that same rule states the scope and scale of the change in the landscape that's visible from the affected scenic resource. Again, you can't look at the scope and scale of the change of the landscape unless you were looking at both the existing and the proposed conditions.
Q. And finally, in the supplemental testimony of DeWan at Page 74, Line 3, DeWan observes, quote, "They," meaning the AMC, "determined potential visual impacts on scenic resources is based on the number of structures theoretically visible from various distance zones," quote close, and then they go on to conclude, quote, "This is an approach that we have never encountered before," close quote. In fact, is this approach unique and undocumented?
A. (Kimball) It is not. Essentially using some sort of rating system as to the number of towers you can see as you move back from distance is not unusual.

WITNESS KIMBALL: If I can have
Exhibit NGO 137, which again is from the
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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LandWorks Visual Assessment for the Seacoast Reliability Project. Susan, you're actually going to have to bring up yellow...
A. (Kimball) You'll see that their scoring of prominence used a point system, and it was based on --

WITNESS KIMBALL: You're going to have to move the -- adjust the zoom. Yeah.
A. (Kimball) You will see that essentially they used a system that was analogous to the one we used, which is the number of structures versus the distance as you move back changed. It is not an unusual approach.
Q. Thank you.

MR. PLOUFFE: With that, this panel is ready for questions, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, Mr. Plouffe.

Mr. Aslin.
MR. ASLIN: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
MS. MERRIGAN: Dawn, could I
have the system, please?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Good morning. My name's Chris Aslin. I'm designated as Counsel for the Public in this proceeding.

I'm going to touch on a few spots in your testimony to get a little better understanding of your position and what analysis you performed. And I'm going to start with Mr. Thayer this morning.

Good morning.
A. (Thayer) Good morning.
Q. In your testimony, you make -- sorry. Go back. You include in your Professional Experience section that you were the Chair of the New Hampshire Grand Tourism Development Team and that that's an ongoing position; is that correct?
A. (Thayer) Yeah, it's a position -- it's part of a destination tourism project that's affiliated with the Northern Community

Investment Corporation. So I serve in that capacity for AMC as a volunteer on that advisory board.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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Q. Okay. And then you also referenced that later in your testimony the work that's been done by the New Hampshire Grand in developing a regional brand. And I wanted to understand a little more about that organization.

It sounds -- if I understand correctly, it's a group of different stakeholders in the North Country have come together to help develop marketing for the North Country?
A. (Thayer) Yeah, it's made up of businesses, tourism-related businesses, both large and small, as well as the four chambers of commerce in the region. When we say "North Country," it's targeting the areas primarily north of the White Mountains, which is well known for its tourism and scenic values. But the North Country as well, north of Route 2 ; that is equally well known as the Great North Woods Region. That's the area of focus for New Hampshire Grand.
Q. And in your testimony you reference their branding as an example of some of the important things that people look to in the North Country. Is -- I'll step back.

This is not a state organization. This is a group of private and non-profit entities; is that correct?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Okay. And as far as the branding goes, the purpose is to attract people to the North Country?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And do I understand correctly that it's not focused specifically on recreational opportunities, but on all kinds of attractions in the North Country?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Okay. So, to the extent you're offering up the New Hampshire Grand marketing as an example in this proceeding, would you agree that it's limited to, or it's a way of showing what local businesses and other stakeholders deem to be of interest to people coming to New Hampshire?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

In your testimony you also make reference on Page 6 to a number of statistics \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
about tourism and its important to the North Country. And I'm specifically looking at Lines 10 through about 16. And you cite a number of statistics here, including that tourism is New's Hampshire second largest industry in terms of jobs supported by dollars from out of state, and then you have some other numbers here. Is this data from the New Hampshire Division of Travel and Tourism?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Okay. I wasn't clear on that. And it looks to be 2014 data; is that correct?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Has there been any update of that data since --
A. (Thayer) Not that I -- I referred back to the web site, and there has not been any update. And those are broad or statewide. I mean, obviously with a region like the North Country, it would be even more important as an industry, as the region has gone through transition.
Q. Okay. That was going to be my follow-up. To \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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the extent these are state-level statistics, do you have any knowledge of the breakdown of what portion of that would be relevant to the areas that the Project passes through?
A. (Thayer) I know that in 2012 and 2013 there was an exponential increase in meals and rooms taxes in Coos County, which is one of the matrix for measuring tourism growth. And the New Hampshire Grand initiative started in 2009. And while weather can be an impact to that, I think it's also recognized, recognized by businesses in the region, that the promotion of the product of what is offered in the region is resonating with people. The growth exponentially year over year in social media and followers for New Hampshire Grand is attributable to that as well.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

But there's not, to your knowledge, any specific breakdown that focuses on the regions that are impacted directly by the Project for these kinds of statistics.
A. (Thayer) Only what is pulled from the
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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available data, the Institute for New Hampshire Studies, which in some cases is granular but in many cases is statewide. Okay. Thank you.

You also make reference to the North Country Council, which, if I understand correctly, you are a member of the North Country Council?
A. (Thayer) I served on the board when $I$ was a planning board representative for the Town of Sugar Hill. I was on the board and vice-chair of the board through 2016.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And you referenced the North Country Council's plan for New Hampshire's North Country as a document that demonstrates the areas of importance from the plan perspective. And I believe the document you're referencing is from 2014 as well?
A. (Thayer) Yeah.
Q. And that hasn't been updated further since that time?
A. (Thayer) No. Typically planning resources are -- they're not often as deep as you would \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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want. So that was a regional plan that was done actually throughout the State of New Hampshire with EDA money, and it was updated for our region as well of the North Country.
Q. And were you on the board during the time frame that this plan for the North Country was being adopted, this version?
A. (Thayer) Yeah.
Q. You quote on Page 10 of your testimony a section from that plan that references scenic drives. And it states that they are one of the leading activities with visitors to New Hampshire. And I wanted to ask you a couple questions about how scenic drives are used in the plan as it relates -- as it may relate to how that term is used in the SEC rules.

When the plan references "scenic
drives," is it referencing specifically roadways that have been designated by a town or state for their scenic quality?
A. (Thayer) Not necessarily. In the North Country, it's widely known that almost any road is probably considered a scenic drive because of the resources that it passes
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through. But certainly having served on the Scenic Byways Council, there are certainly state-designated byways called out in the plan as well. But any community would highlight beyond those state-designated scenic byways additional routes that are driven by tourists on a regular basis.
Q. And so when the plan for New Hampshire's North Country references scenic drives as an important aspect for tourism, I believe you're saying that they're looking much more broadly than just to designated roadways.
A. (Thayer) Yeah, it's a recognition that the scenic resources are important for the region. And whether that's designated by a state body or not, they are a critical element to what a community is putting forward.
Q. And in that context, would I be correct that you would agree that those scenic drives, whether designated or not, could constitute a tourist destination?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. You make reference in your testimony and you
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | included as an exhibit to your testimony New |
| 2 |  | Hampshire's Image as a Travel Destination |
| 3 |  | Report from 2003. And as I understand it, |
| 4 |  | that was commissioned by the New Hampshire |
| 5 |  | Division or Department or Travel and Tourism. |
| 6 | A. | (Thayer) New Hampshire Division of Travel and |
| 7 |  | Tourism Development. |
| 8 | Q. | And this was commissioned by that state |
| 9 |  | agency. |
| 10 | A. | (Thayer) Yes, in 2002. The report came out |
| 11 |  | in 2003. |
| 12 | Q. | Yes. And has there been, to your knowledge, |
| 13 |  | any subsequent follow-up on that report? Has |
| 14 |  | it been updated in any way or -- |
| 15 | A. | (Thayer) Not to my knowledge. |
| 16 | Q. | Okay. Thank you. |
| 17 |  | Again, as I reviewed that report, it |
| 18 |  | seems to focus on aspects of New Hampshire |
| 19 |  | that are attractive to tourists. Is that a |
| 20 |  | fair statement? |
| 21 | A. | (Thayer) Yes. |
| 22 | Q. | And it's your position and your testimony |
| 23 |  | that those are the scenic characteristics of |
| 24 |  | New Hampshire that would be affected by the |
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|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Project? |
| 2 | A. | (Thayer) Yes. |
| 3 | Q. | And I think your -- well, would you agree |
| 4 |  | that your overall opinion, based on your |
| 5 |  | experience, is that the Project will |
| 6 |  | negatively affect visitor experiences in New |
| 7 |  | Hampshire? |
| 8 | A. | (Thayer) Yes. And that's from my direct |
| 9 |  | experience of 28 years talking to guests and |
| 10 |  | visitors that come to our region, working |
| 11 |  | with businesses across the region and tourism |
| 12 |  | development, and the reports put out to date |
| 13 |  | that are grounded, whether it's at the state |
| 14 |  | level in terms of the 2003 report that you |
| 15 |  | note or the regional plans that highlight |
| 16 |  | tourism as a critical piece of economy. And |
| 7 |  | scenic resources is a critical piece of |
| 18 |  | tourism. |
| 19 | 2. | Okay. Thank you. |
| 20 |  | You aren't -- if I understand correctly, |
| 21 |  | though, you're not trying to quantify in your |
| 22 |  | testimony the direct impact of the Project on |
| 23 |  | viewer expectations; is that correct? |
| 24 | A. | (Thayer) That's correct. |
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Q. But you have an overall opinion that it will be a negative impact?
A. (Thayer) Correct, based on, yeah, my experience in the region for over two decades.
Q. Okay. And I believe you testified that most of your experience is sort of in the Great North Woods or the North Country. Is your opinion different at all for the portions of the Project that are south of the Notches?
A. (Thayer) My opinion wouldn't be different, just founded in terms of knowing some of those business enterprises, attending Governor's tourism conferences, that tourism in general is a critical aspect to the state. And that's true in the Lakes Region as it is in the North Country.
Q. And would you agree that your opinion is based on a general understanding or belief that transmission lines are unattractive as opposed to specific studies that address the visual impacts of transmission lines?
A. (Thayer) Yes, I'd agree with that.
Q. You haven't performed any surveys or done \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
any --
A. (Thayer) I have not performed any surveys or studies.
Q. Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr, Thayer. I'm going to turn to Dr. Kimball and Mr. Garland and their testimony. Broadly, your testimony is a critique of the DeWan VIA and the methodology that was used; is that a fair statement?
A. (Kimball) That is a fair statement.
Q. And I believe you said earlier today that you did not attempt to perform your own VIA, but rather to critique the one that was done by the Applicant's consultant.
A. (Kimball) That is correct. And it would have been very difficult, too, because we had requested their Intermap data, and we were told we would have to pay $\$ 32,000$ to get it. So it was rather difficult to try to perform anything past that.
Q. And I believe, Mr. Garland, you testified a little earlier with Attorney Plouffe regarding the concern raised in your testimony about the use of the NCED, the \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]

National Conservation Easement Database. And I wanted to get a better understanding of what your testimony is on this issue.

In your original testimony, you critiqued DeWan's use of that data. And I believe you're looking specifically at the code for the public -- or not public purpose, but the... let me get the right language here -- the scenic quality code -- sorry -the open space code.
A. (Garland) I was looking at the parameters for public access.
Q. Okay. But in your initial testimony on Page 6 --
A. (Garland) Is this in the prefiled?
Q. Yes, your prefiled testimony on Page 6, which is the December 30th testimony, you reference on Line 13 that TJD eliminated many conservation lands as not having scenic quality if their conservation purpose classification was other than "open space" in the NCED. Do you see that testimony?
A. (Garland) I do see that.
Q. Okay. And then earlier today you were
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
referencing public access as a factor under the NCED. And I want to understand which, if it's both of those were concerns or there's been a shift in what --
A. (Garland) No, I think they're both concerns.
Q. Okay. And the NCED is -- well, back up. Who maintains that database?
A. (Garland) It's maintained by a collaboration of different organizations. I do know that one organization that's tasked with collecting easement data for public agencies is Ducks Unlimited, and the agency tasked with collecting easement data for NGOs is the Trustees for Public Lands.
Q. So is this database a state or federally maintained database, or is it something that's created by interested stakeholders?
A. (Garland) No, it is not federally or state-maintained. It is maintained by a collaboration of these organizations.
Q. And do I understand correctly that the database contains a list of identified conservation easements that has different attributes specified for each one?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
A. (Garland) Yes. I mean, there are individual records for each conservation easement, yes. But the records specifically do not include landowner identification information. So if you're using it as a basis for research, you could look up that there is a conservation easement, but it would not tell you who the landowner is.
Q. But it would tell you the location.
A. (Garland) It would tell you the location, yes.
Q. So you can cross-reference to specific conservation easements in New Hampshire.
A. (Garland) Yes, it would if you were doing it strictly spatially or visually because oftentimes the names of an easement aren't directly related.
Q. Okay. And your critique here, at least at the time of your prefiled testimony, was that DeWan was using the "open space" classification. Is that an attribute that is listed for different conservation easements under the database?
A. (Garland) The database would likely identify
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
the primary purpose of the easement. But the primary purpose is not always, you know, every purpose. There could be secondary purposes.
A. (Kimball) I believe their coding system is based on the IRS rules.
Q. Okay. Thank you. That's mentioned in your testimony as well.

And so there's a "Purpose" classification, and it may list a number of different things for different conservation easements. And it appears here in your testimony that you are raising a concern that DeWan \& Associates was using open space as a criteria that would indicate a scenic quality for these conservation easements. Is that a fair statement, paraphrasing?
A. (Kimball) Yeah. In the IRS codes, the "open space" specifically has language I believe about scenic as one of the purposes. The other values in the IRS code are for other purposes, but that does not preclude that they do not have scenic values as well.
Q. And if $I$ understand your critique here, you
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
don't believe that the Purpose classification is the appropriate filter to apply to conservation easements when determining scenic quality?
A. (Garland) The open space purpose could apply to lots of different kinds of lands, such as golf courses. A lot of people play golf because of the scenic beauty of the golf course, but that's not listed as the primary purpose of the easement. So there are a lot of different types of land use under that general category.
A. (Kimball) And I would just add as well, for example, agricultural easements would not be listed in that data file.
Q. Wouldn't be?
A. (Kimball) And I don't believe that the wetland reserve easements are listed in that data file either.
Q. When you said they wouldn't be listed in that data file, they wouldn't be captured in the database at all or they wouldn't have --
A. (Kimball) They're a different kind of -(Court Reporter interrupts.)
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Q. They wouldn't have an open space designation for the primary purpose?
A. (Kimball) Correct.
Q. All right.
A. (Garland) To clarify, the agricultural easements are not included in the National Conservation Easement Database at all. They're not even included.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So your critique is that they were using this inappropriately and that it would underrepresent the number of conservation easements that may have a scenic quality?
A. (Kimball) It's a limited tool.
Q. And then this morning you were also speaking or testifying about the "Public Access" classification. So that's a separate critique?
A. (Garland) Yes. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. And if I understood your testimony this morning, your concern was that they were, DeWan \& Associates, were using the Public Access classification in this database to determine whether a conservation easement
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
has public access to meet the Site Evaluation Committee rule?
A. (Garland) Yeah, the DeWan testimony seemed to indicate they were referencing this National Conservation Easement Database as a preliminary look, as one tool in determining public access.
Q. And your testimony is that would be inappropriate because --
A. (Garland) I believe I said that it was less reliable because it indicated that 60 percent of the conservation easements in New Hampshire had public access status of "unknown"; whereas, the Conservation Lands Data later distributed through the state had less than 30 percent of access unknown.
Q. I believe you said that that state database was the more reliable for that criteria.
A. (Garland) As it pertains to this particular example, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

In your testimony, you also criticized DeWan \& Associates for failing to consider the public comments that had been filed in
this docket as an indicator of viewer expectation. Is that a fair statement?
A. (Kimball) That is correct. I think we put in an exhibit before that a number of standard manuals in this profession recommend taking it into consideration. We have seen no evidence that's been presented by the Applicant, and there's literally been thousands and thousands of comments filed between this and the DOE process. When we last looked in April, there were over a thousand-plus comments that had been filed with the SEC, plus a number of petitions that had thousands of names listed there as well. So, with such an overwhelming amount of public input, as well as a number of years that people have put their own private time and money, I would think it would have been worth going and finding out what these people thought as part of that analysis, as recommended by the manuals, including the manual that was written by Mr. DeWan.
Q. And in regard to that position, do you -- is it your opinion that public comments in
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general are indicative of viewer expectation or that they're a potential resource to look at your expectations in more detail?
A. (Kimball) I think in this case the public knows what high-voltage transmission lines look like. It's not a theoretical. I suspect most of these people have passed by them before. So it is a very good index of what visitor and public expectations are about the landscape and the impacts that it will have.
Q. In using public comments to assess viewer expectations, would you agree that the VIA contemplates that viewer expectations would be assessed on a resource-by-resource basis?
A. (Kimball) Could you repeat the question? I'm sorry. I'm not sure I totally absorbed it.
Q. Not a problem. Would you agree that when performing a visual impact assessment under the SEC rules, the concept of your expectations is contemplated to be assessed on a resource-by-resource basis rather than on a global basis?
A. (Kimball) I think you have to do both.
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Q. Okay. And so I understand your testimony that the public comments in general should have been considered. Is it also your position that public comments could be used to look at specific viewer expectations at individual scenic resources?
A. (Kimball) I think under that scenario you would have to bring the public out to that spot to do it. But the public has had an opportunity to look at the photo simulations and so forth, and so it's not like when they were commenting that they were blind to what this would potentially look like.
Q. Okay. So, to the extent that comments referenced a particular resource, it would be potentially more relevant than a general comment against the Project?
A. (Kimball) Well, I think if you read through the comments, you'll see a number of comments just came in and just simply objected. You will find another subset of those comments, which is what we tried to tabulate in our supplemental prefile up through April. We went through and tried to weed out where an
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individual had commented more than one time. Then we also went through and read the comments and then scored them, if they had talked -- that their concern was particularly about visual, we scored that. And I think it was around 58 percent. I don't have the numbers, but they are in our supplemental. And in other cases, you know, they might have had other concerns that were listed out there. But a lot of them were comments that were just simply opposed to the Project.

I think it's a fair assumption, even though they didn't particularly emphasize whether they were opposed to it because of the scenic or road construction or other things, that a good percentage of those that just simply said "I'm opposed" obviously had aesthetics on the mind. I don't think that's an unreasonable assumption.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

In your testimony you also raise a concern that DeWan \& Associates misapplied the vegetative screening analysis by using a mean height. You specifically are concerned
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about assigning a mean height to various land cover types incorrectly? And this is in your testimony at Page 11. I wanted to understand sort of the scope of your critique.

Is it your position that entire land cover types were misassigned a height across the board, or is it specific locations where the assigned height is inappropriate?
A. (Garland) There were instances where a land type across the board was not evaluated properly.
Q. Okay. And would that -- is that the general concept of your critique, or are there also -- you have an example of Percy Peak, which in your testimony references it's bare rock.
A. (Garland) That's slightly different. Yeah, we had commented that in the original VIA that they did not take into account -- or they misrepresented the height of what is classified as bedrock. They did not look at areas that were classified as bedrock. In their supplemental, when they filed a correction that they did look at bedrock,
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they missed North Percy Peak, which is well documented as being open, panoramic vista views on bedrock. So there are two aspects to that comment. One is the general misclassification of bedrock across the board, and then we offered North Percy Peak as a specific example that they simply missed in their analysis altogether.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So, for the land cover types that you are contending that they used an inappropriate height, do you have a list of those, or have you specified the specific land covers that were inappropriately assigned?
A. (Garland) Yes, we did in our prefiled. It's on Page 12 of our prefiled.
Q. Oh, yes. Okay. So, for each of those, it's your position they applied that incorrectly across the board for those land cover types?
A. (Garland) Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. That clarifies it for me.

You also have a critique about their delta visibility mapping. And $I$ was having a
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little trouble understanding what you were getting at with the pixel size. And I'll give it a shot and then you can correct me if I've gotten it incorrect.

If $I$ understand what your testimony is, and this is on Page 15 of your prefiled testimony, that the scale of the mapping that was used is too big or too far away to accurately show locations where the Project may be visible?
A. (Garland) That particular issue was scale. Yes, they were trying to illustrate locations where towers would be visible. And that's represented by individual pixels which represent areas on the ground. At the scale of these delta maps, those pixels are represented in a very small dot. Now, those visibility maps include a lot of gray shading and a lot of color background for conservation lands and water and other forms. So if you're trying to represent singular dots of where there's visibility, those individual dots get lost in the background of the gray shading of the map, and they're very
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difficult to pick out by eye at this scale.
Q. Okay. So at least one of the issues is that there could be isolated locations that are just not visible on the mapping as showing visibility of the Project.
A. (Garland) Well, it's not dissimilar from if you're in a Google map or some interactive application. As you zoom in, there's more data that becomes visible, more detailed. And the same would be the case in these maps. If we had the ability to zoom in, we'd be able to see more distinct dot patterns, clustering groupings of dots representing visibility.
Q. Okay. And so your larger point here is that the maps would underrepresent the amount of visibility, or at least make it hard to understand the extent of the visibility of the Project?
A. (Garland) Yes, I believe that they do underrepresent.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

In your testimony, you also have a review of the evidence submitted, kind of run \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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through the criteria that the SEC has to review when considering unreasonable adverse effects on aesthetics. And one of the areas under the rules is the extent and duration of public uses. And on Page 17 you have a critique, or you have a statement that the duration of visual impact of this project on the public would last for decades to centuries. And I wanted to understand your reason for making that statement in the context of an extent, nature and duration analysis, because this seems to be talking about the length of time the Project will exist as opposed to the duration of public use of a particular scenic resource. So could you help me understand the relevance of the --
A. (Kimball) Yeah. I think you have to look at various scales to get a proper assessment. Obviously, there is a scale if you're coming up to a visual -- to a viewpoint, what its impact is going to be at that particular location. But you also have to ask the scale question: Is this something where it's
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always going to be there, or is it something that's going to be temporarily there? Sometimes with construction it's temporarily there. This will be there permanently on the landscape of New Hampshire. And as we, you know, noted here, it can be experienced, anything from people that have to drive by it every single day if they lived in that area or if they're tourists coming up to their second home. Their interaction with it may be very short time intervals every time they pass it, but the frequency of those at some point adds up to a collective impact, as opposed to just saying because they drive by very quickly, as indicated by the visual consultants for the Applicant, that it's a pretty minor impact because it only takes a few seconds to drive by it.
Q. So the longevity of the Project, in your opinion, is relevant to duration of view because of repeated encounters with the Project?
A. (Kimball) I don't know how you reasonably could not ask what the impact is out over
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time. If we tried to freeze all of our decisions just on the conditions that are based here at this very moment, at least from our professional opinion, that would be a very inappropriate scale to apply.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Now, you included in your testimony two appendices, and the first represents to be your identification of scenic resources using DeWan \& Associates viewshed maps. Is that correct?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And I want to go through this a little bit in some detail because $I$ was having some trouble understanding exactly what was performed here.

From sort of a macro perspective, I understand you used the data from the Applicant's viewshed analysis to identify resources that you believed would be scenic resources under the SEC rules.
A. (Kimball) Yeah. Actually, what we're trying to do here is when you look at a project like this, one normal way of looking at it is to
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pick specific viewpoints, or KOPs as they're called here, and go out and do a photo simulation. But those are just particular points. This is a way of trying to take a look and ask what is the overall area, whether it be linear distances because you're a road or river, or what's the overall acreages being impacted. And what we tried to do and the reasons why we called it conservative is we used a screen that basically said, if that resource had less than a 100 feet if it was a linear resource, we wouldn't even count it when we went through this. And if this particular resource had less than an acre that was showing up as visible in the map, and that's also partly visible because of the resolution of the data, then we would exclude it from the data set.

And then if you just take, for example, state-designated rivers, what we did is we broke this out category by category, as listed in the definitions in the SEC rules. And there are five scenic rivers that would
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be impacted. You can start to get a sense of the overall impact just on all the state's designated rivers. There's 7 where there would be river crossings.

And then if you move across to the right, essentially we said if the impact was in the foreground, that is 300 -- I'm sorry -- in the immediate foreground, that is, zero to 300 feet out, how many linear miles of the state-designated were in that. And then we moved over into how many linear miles would be impacted if it's 300 feet to a half-mile. But when we moved out, we said now it's not that you can just see one tower. When you got into that, what's called the "foreground," we said we had to at least see two towers. And then when you move out from a half-mile to three miles, we said we wouldn't even count it unless you could see at least six towers. This goes back to the exhibit that we just demonstrated during direct. It is a technique that is used by others. And then if it was from three miles to 10 miles because the visibility of these
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becomes much more difficult to see, we only counted it if you could see greater than 11 towers. So this was our attempt to try to take into consideration that the further back you moved, you would have to see a lot more towers before we would even count it in this analysis.

I do want to point out, and it is in our footnotes here so that we're very transparent about it, there can be resources that meet different categories. You could be a designated bike way or an identified bike way and you could also be a scenic road. We tabulated these up by each of the individual resources coming down. So there are some resources that could show up in different categories because the SEC rules have different categories. That's not totally inappropriate because there are different user groups using it for different purposes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So I want to unpack that a little bit.
Let's take the state-designated rivers since that's what you were just talking about. To
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identify those, I assume you used a database of state-designated rivers and then cross-referenced that with the viewshed maps --
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. -- where it would be visible.
A. (Kimball) And we did this using their viewshed maps.
Q. Okay. Great.

And then you have this column named "Number of Features." Is that the number of scenic, state-designated rivers --
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And then Corridor Crossings I think is self-evident.
A. (Kimball) Yeah.
Q. Total Impacted Units --
A. (Kimball) Yeah. I'm sorry. Did you finish?
Q. What does that represent?
A. (Kimball) Okay. The units are because when you look at different features, you have to use different units, otherwise you're trying to do an apple to apple. If you just do raw numbers of a feature, a scenic feature, you
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can actually come up with some inappropriate conclusions. Linear features we measured in miles. When we got into a spacial feature such as a state park or a lake, then it was a question of how many acres within that lake or how many acres within that state park, or whatever the condition may be, would be visible. So this is an attempt to try to understand the combined effect of all of these impacts that are happening, which is different than looking at it from a single, let's do a KOP and then use two or three of those or whatever as representative of the whole region. They're both appropriate tools.
Q. So in this case, for state-designated rivers, there's a total of five rivers that are within the viewshed area.
A. (Kimball) Correct.
Q. And 15 miles of those five rivers have visibility of the Project?
A. (Kimball) No. There are 5 rivers, there are 7 crossings of those rivers, and then there are 15 impacts. And that is if you take the
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four numbers to the right of the 15 would add up to give you the accumulation of those.
Q. I see. Okay. And then for each of the different distance zones you've rated the number of units that are impacted visibly by the Project with the filtering that you just described about the number of towers visible for different vistas.
A. (Kimball) That is correct. And that's why we called it conservative. We didn't say, okay, you can see it. It is equal when you move from very close to far out.
Q. And when you're assessing the visibility of the Project in each of those distance zones, is it simply some amount of the tower is visible in order to check the box for Tower Visibility?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. So this doesn't capture the intensity of the visibility in any particular vista.
A. (Kimball) It does not.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And then it appears that while your units are miles, you do break it down into
tenths of miles in certain circumstances?
A. (Kimball) Yeah. Again, because of the coarseness of the data and so forth, we did not want to say that if it was only like it was showing up as only 15 feet of that distance was visible. That's why we used a filter of a 100 feet, slightly over a 100 feet, as a reasonable distance. That is if you're driving by it or paddling down a river, you had to see it for at least 100 feet before it would get on this list. And that's based on the quality of the data.
Q. Okay. And then you tallied all these resources that you've identified using this methodology and you reached 240?
A. (Kimball) Yeah, and that's -- you know, I would point out this is not a complete list. This was just what we could find that was in their databases. And then, because we found some additional, we added them in. But it is not a comprehensive list.
Q. And with regard to these identified 240 resources, are you making any -- giving any opinion about the magnitude of the impact?
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A. (Kimball) I think when you look at these, you can see that there's a lot of scenic resources. And when you take something like the Diamond Ponds and Coleman, it's not that you can just see it from a particular viewpoint and do a KOP. There's actually a percentage of that lake if you were paddling around where the Project would be visible. This, as $I$ mentioned earlier, is a way of trying to quantify to get a broader perspective of the impact of this project over its whole length as opposed to an individual point.
Q. So I'm going to assume that, based on your testimony as a whole, your opinion is that 240 is a large number and represents an unreasonable impact; is that fair?
A. (Kimball) We think this is a contributing factor as to the reasons why. And if you take a look at, you know, some of the photo simulations and other data that have been presented by others and you put these together, yes.
Q. But this appendix itself is not meant to say
that each of the 240 resources identified will have an unreasonable adverse effect.
A. (Kimball) No, it does not go in and do a scenic evaluation to take that into consideration. As I said, this is one of several tools that can be used to try to understand this.
Q. And then Appendix 2 is, as $I$ understand it, a list of resources that you contend DeWan \& Associates missed in their analysis. And this, in contrast to Appendix 1, is limited to just the three-mile area outside of the Project?
A. (Kimball) Yeah, this was -- we basically said let's just take a look. We don't agree with that three-mile, but that's what they used. Let's just take a look at that three-mile and see did they capture a lot of them, or were there a number of them missing that should have been in the list. And this was our way of sort of asking ourselves, you know, how good was this database that we were looking at.
Q. And are these 82 -- I know it's been amended
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in your testimony this morning, but are these 82 also captured in your 240?
A. (Kimball) Yes, there is some carryover. And I would have to -- I should have pointed this out during the corrections. Because we have removed some of these here, it would change some of the numbers in the first appendix.
Q. Okay. And with regard to these, I guess what I'm trying to understand is how you determined these resources were not included in DeWan's review.
A. (Kimball) Well, some of them, for example, were conservation easements, and we went back and looked. And some of the lands here are agricultural easements, or they were rated as not having public access when we went back and took a look. Like some of the agricultural lands have snowmobile trails across them, so obviously you're getting public access during part of the year. So those were some of the reasons why there's differences.

As I pointed out, they were using the
list of public waters in the state of New
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Hampshire. So resources like Phillips Brook were left out which should not have been left out. So I'm just giving those as a few examples of where we differ with them.
Q. Is it your position that these resources you've identified in Appendix 2 were not identified at all by DeWan \& Associates or were not evaluated further?
A. (Kimball) Well, there's an interesting combination that happens. In some cases you have conservation easements that came in under, I think it was the Amy Family -- I could check my records here to see if this is the right example -- where one member of the family gave a conservation easement and then later another member of the family gave a conservation easement. They were held by different entities, and it's a question of whether you treat those as two because there are actually two separate legal transactions, or you treat them as one and the same. They tended to homogenize these. We looked at them and separated them out because they are two separate easements.
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Q. Okay. But you're not -- this list is not meant to represent, if I understand correctly, resources that were identified by DeWan but then pushed aside or filtered out.
A. (Kimball) No, these were not like all of the resources that they ranked as low cultural. They pushed them out of the analysis. These were just simply resources we looked -- we did not do any ranking or rating of them.
Q. And you've reduced the total number down here to 50. Is there a list of what these 50 resources are?
A. (Kimball) Yeah, I could go through those. There's a number, for example, of the historic sites where I did ask our GIS person, who's not here today, to go back and take a look. And I asked her to take a look. And if the scenic -- if the historic site was located where you could look at it from a road, we considered it to have public access. I know there's a lot of debate here as to whether or not that constitutes legal access or not. But we do know that Mr. DeWan, in his report for the -- in his publication for
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the State of Maine did consider it in that case. And we considered it here, that a historic site, if you can look at it from a public point, it is visible. I did ask our GIS person, for example, to go back and look at these sites. And if you were looking from a public viewpoint such as a road, add a historic building as a quick example, and the power line was behind it, we kept it in the list. If it turned out that it was showing up in the visibility maps, but the power line was to the back of the person, we went back and purged those out. So there's a number of those that we purged out for that reason, because the context of that building would actually be whether the power line was behind it or to the viewer, from the public access point, was to the back.
Q. Thank you.

And you're referencing historic resources. Does your analysis here of resources that were missed include cultural landscapes?
A. (Kimball) It does not. We're still waiting
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as to where the DHR is on that.
Q. Okay.

MR. ASLIN: Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next couple groups on my list don't appear to be in the room right now. Ms. Boepple.

MS. BOEPPLE: Yes.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. BOEPPLE:
Q. Good morning.
A. (Panel) Good morning.
Q. Beth Boepple for the Society -- for the Forest Society. Just a few questions.

So I believe in your testimony, Ken
Kimball, you testified that you participated in both the Granite Reliability Project and the Antrim Wind Energy Project, and you also participated in the SEC Rulemaking process; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And in participating in those cases, and in the rulemaking process, have you been specifically involved in the interpretation
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of the new SEC rules?
A. (Kimball) Well, obviously the final interpretation is made by the SEC, not by me. But there was a lot of debate about those. Dr. Publicover on our staff, actually, was the chair of the subcommittee for aesthetics, which Mr. DeWan and Mr. Needleman were involved in. And in a number of those elements that we had put forth during that we drew from like the U.S. Forest Service Manual and so forth. We didn't try to create something new. We went back and looked at the standard manuals and made those recommendations to the SEC.
Q. And so did you also hear the testimony and read the testimony that was provided specifically in these hearings by Mr. DeWan and Ms. Kimball related to their interpretation of the rules?
A. (Kimball) Yes, I have.
Q. Okay. And just in general, do you agree with their interpretation of the rules?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This
is calling for a rehash and general testimony.
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And I'd also note that AMC says in its testimony that it meant to supplement the Visual Impact Analysis done by Harry Dodson. Mr. Dodson is a jointly sponsored witness between AMC and SPNF. And so this is really, in this context, truly the definition of "friendly" cross-examination.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Boepple.

MS. BOEPPLE: So I'm trying to explore some of the testimony that was provided during Mr. DeWan's and Ms. Kimball's testimony and get input from Mr. Kimball on that. This is not in the nature of rehashing anything that was in the testimony at all.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I believe the pending question was: Do you agree with the interpretation of the rules? Did I remember the question correctly?

MS. BOEPPLE: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why is that relevant?

MS. BOEPPLE: It's relevant because Mr. DeWan has offered an opinion of the
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rules in his testimony, that he's offering -and I want to get to some of the specific interpretations that he has made of those rules and offered that to the Subcommittee as the way you should be looking at it.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We have that in their testimony. It's throughout their testimony, the explanation of how their analysis complies with the rules and how DeWan's does not. What else do you want to do based on something that's new from DeWan, testified here or something new that was in the supplemental?

MS. BOEPPLE: So what I am trying to solicit here is information particular to the public right of access issue. We heard a lot during Mr. DeWan's testimony that their clear interpretation of that is that the public must be able to actually enter upon the land. And I don't believe that we've covered that kind of detail in the testimony. And that only came out during Mr. DeWan's testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And their
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opinion of whether DeWan is right is irrelevant.

MS. BOEPPLE: That's correct. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's irrelevant.

MS. BOEPPLE: No, it's --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Their opinion about whether DeWan is right about his interpretation of the rules is irrelevant. We'll decide what the rules say and require.

MS. BOEPPLE: I understand that.
I understand that. What I'm seeking is if they have an opinion on it, what is the basis of that, and has that contributed in their involvement when the SEC rules were created. That is relevant to how the SEC now looks at those rules and interprets them.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
I'm going to sustain the objection to the question that you asked. You may be able to ask some questions that go to what you just talked about, but it's got to be tied to something that DeWan testified to here or is new information in the supplemental testimony.
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MS. BOEPPLE: I understand.
BY MS. BOEPPLE:
Q. In listening to Mr. DeWan's testimony, did you hear specific testimony with respect to elimination of properties because the public could not actually enter upon them? Did you hear that testimony?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. Okay. And in your review of properties and listening to that testimony, did you agree that that is a correct interpretation?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
First of all, it's now calling for legal interpretation. But more importantly, this was an issue that could have and was the subject of their testimony. We specifically went through "public access" at the technical sessions with these witnesses.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained. MS. BOEPPLE: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Baker. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BAKER:
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Q. Good morning, gentlemen.
A. (Panel) Good morning.
Q. I represent four individual landowners who have properties in the North Country and Coos County.

During the course of the presentation of the Applicant's case, we've had testimony from witnesses who have talked about mitigation, and I'd like to just quickly address to you this question based on their previous responses on ideas of how this project could be mitigated if it was permitted and built. And specifically, I'd like to know if you're familiar with the Applicant's Project plans for construction of transmission towers in Pittsburg, from the Halls Stream River crossing to the Connecticut River crossing. Are you familiar with that area? Have you visited it?
A. (Kimball) Yes, we visited the area. And Mr. Garland has, in particular.
A. (Garland) I have.
Q. The testimony of the Applicant and what's
shown on the project maps is that the
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Applicant owns the land on which these transmission towers are proposed to be built.

What specific mitigation could be conducted there if these towers were permitted to the built, in your opinion?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This is calling for an expansion of the testimony. These witnesses already discussed mitigation and their views of that in the testimony, and this is nothing new.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Baker.
MR. BAKER: I asked Ms. Widdell
that question. She gave a response, which I believe was her honest response, but I think it was something that $I$ should be permitted --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So there's something that Ms. Widell said that you'd like these gentlemen to respond to.

MR. BAKER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't we see what Ms. Widdell said.

MR. BAKER: I don't have that in
front of me. She did answer --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't
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you represent what Ms. Widell said and assume that she said it and then we can get a reaction to it.

MR. BAKER: I believe Ms. Widell said that the towers that are proposed to be built could be shortened. She also talked about the trees that are in that area that would screen the transmission towers. That's my belief of what she said.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Assuming that's what she said, which doesn't sound like something Ms. Widdell would have said, 'cause that doesn't sound like it would have been her area of expertise, but assuming she said it, what question do you have for these gentlemen about it?

MR. BAKER: What could be done in that area in Pittsburg where these transmission towers are proposed to be built to mitigate the visual impact that would be presented by the construction of these towers?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection.
If Ms. Widell said that, and I don't believe she did, but if she did, it would have been
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with respect to $I$ think an historic resource. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, that's what she was testifying about.

MR. BAKER: Oh, that's my -- I am mixing up witnesses. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who are we thinking of then?

MR. BAKER: We are thinking, I believe, of the -- no, it was Ms. Widell. We were talking about the Indian Stream Republic, which is in Pittsburg. And she was asked specifically what could be done to mitigate the impact of these transmission towers on the Indian Stream Republic, I believe. It's my fault. I do admit that I should have brought that up with me.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. So, assuming she said that there's some mitigation that could be done using trees, what is it you want to know from them?

MR. BAKER: I want to know if they have any further thoughts on what could be done beyond what Ms. Widell said.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, I'll allow them to answer. We're pretty far afield, but go ahead.
A. (Kimball) I don't have in front of me the exact proposed tower heights. But if it's like the picture in front of us, it would be very difficult in this scenario to screen it with trees.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q. Where the Applicant owns the land on which the towers are proposed to be built, could a condition be set by this Committee that no further tree cutting be done within a certain distance from the towers be required of the Applicant?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Oh, there's other objections to that, too. Sustained. This isn't what these guys are here to testify about, what the Committee's -- the scope of Committee conditions regarding private tree cutting. I think that's where you're going --

MR. BAKER: You're sustaining
the objection. I understand.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, on any number of grounds, starting with relevance, legal conclusion, new opinion. Take your pick. MR. BAKER: I understand.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q. North Country Council. Mr. Thayer, you were on the North Country Council, I believe, according to your resume, from 2010 to the -is it to the present or to the time you filed your prefiled testimony?
A. (Thayer) 2016 I went off the board. Yeah, in October.
Q. Were you on the board when the North Country Council voted to object to the Northern Pass?
A. (Thayer) I was on the board when the board voted. As my prefile or maybe supplemental noted, I did not attend the exact meeting, but I was at board meetings in the lead-up to those discussions of the final vote.

MR. BAKER: The purpose of this testimony, Mr. Chair, is simply to authenticate a previous exhibit that was introduced by the Clarksville Stewartstown Group, CS 101.

BY MR. BAKER:
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Q. Mr. Thayer, can you identify what's on the screen in front of you as CS 101 is a true copy of the resolution of the North Country Council Board of Directors?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And as far as you know, has the position of the North Country Council on this matter changed since it adopted this resolution in 2011?
A. (Thayer) No.

MR. BAKER: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Cote. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COTE:
Q. I'm over here. Bob Cote with the Deerfield Abutters, and I just have one question.

In general, would you agree that minimizing or mitigating visual impacts in an area where there's a high degree of conservation easement land, should that be a priority do you think?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Draper.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. DRAPER:
Q. Good morning.
A. (Panel) Good morning.
Q. I'm Gretchen Draper, and I represent part of the Pemigewassett River Local Advisory Committee. And my first questions are for Dr. Thayer.
A. (Thayer) That's Mr. Thayer.
Q. Mr. Thayer.
A. (Thayer) No Ph.D.
Q. Thank you.

You had mentioned in your testimony how you meet with tourists regularly and talk with people about their impressions of the North Country. Have visitors been asking you about Northern Pass when they've been coming recently?
A. (Thayer) Over the past several years I would say I've gotten questions, but it's not consistent. More often than not, they're coming because they're drawn by the scenic vistas. That's their --
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Q. So they're not speaking of their concerns or -- would you say that that's partly because they're not aware of what's happening or --
A. (Thayer) I would say that's partly because they're not aware of it, based on where the visitor is coming from, from southern New England predominantly. Southern New Hampshire, but really southern New England. And I think also just by the nature of their arrival, they're awestruck with what's surrounding them on their drive.
Q. Okay. When did you first hear about the Northern Pass Project?
A. (Thayer) I first heard about the Northern Pass Project from our former beloved Executive Councilor Raymond Burton. He pulled me aside after he'd had a private meeting. This goes back over seven years ago. And we had occasion to spend time together and update each other on things in the North Country that the AMC was working on and how he could be helpful or how he wanted to share his opinion about those things, as
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the councilor often did.
Q. Oh, thank you. And so then you have been moving on with the different organizations, and I'm sure Northern Pass comes up regularly.

Did the Applicant come and present to any of these organizations that were particularly interested in tourism?
A. (Thayer) No, not to my knowledge.

No. Okay. And now I'd like to talk a little bit of -- I want to follow up on what Attorney Aslin was talking about with public interest and public comments. And I just have a question. Is it your understanding that "in the public interest" is now a legal requirement for the SEC process? Is that true?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Calls for a legal conclusion.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Draper.
MS. DRAPER: I guess I just
wanted -- okay. I just wondered what their opinion is of how important "in the public interest" is to this process, and I will say no
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legal part.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, the statute provides what the SEC requirements are and what standard they need to meet. It's laid out in the statute, and "public interest" is in there.

MS. DRAPER: Is in there. All right.

BY MS. DRAPER:
Q. Then my next question would be how important are public comments part of that "in the public interest"? Do you see that?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That's also in the statute, Ms. Draper. What is it you want to know from them?

MS. DRAPER: I guess I just want to know how important -- so these folks get public comments all the time. We all do. I want to know what the weight of the public comments are going to be. I also know we have questions in this proceedings about what "in the public interest" really means.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And all of
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those questions are legal questions that are going to get -- that are being litigated in this entire process. There's nothing these witnesses can give you that would be relevant to that.

MS. DRAPER: All right. Fine.
BY MS. DRAPER:
Q. I guess my last question, then, is about -and Dr. Kimball, maybe this is for you. I'm wondering what research the AMC does on the value of natural places in nature as sort of a stress -- in relationship to stress in today's world.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Relevance.
MS. DRAPER: I talked with Mr.
DeWan about this same question.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, I'm going to let him answer.

MS. DRAPER: Thank you.
A. (Kimball) I mean, the short answer is there is a body of evidence out there that says being able to go to natural places is actually conducive to better health.
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Q. Right. And does the --
A. (Kimball) We encourage that as an organization in a big way.
Q. So the AMC, then, you know, recognizes that as important research?
A. (Kimball) I would say it's more than we recognize it. We put a lot of effort into land protection efforts across Greater New England. We were one of the lead organizations in the northern forest effort and so on and so forth.
Q. And Mr. Thayer, do you agree with that from the tourism point of view?
A. (Thayer) Yes, I agree with that.

MS. DRAPER: All right. Thank
you. I have no further questions.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Are there any intervenor groups we've skipped over who have questions?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Needleman. Oh, off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Back on the
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record. Rather than Mr. Needleman, we're going to take a ten-minute break and then Mr .

Needleman.
(Recess was taken at 10:44 a.m.
and the hearing resumed at 10:58 a.m.)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Whenever
you're ready, Mr . Needleman.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Good morning, gentlemen. I'm Barry

Needleman. I represent the Applicant in this matter.

Mr. Thayer, I think I want to start with your testimony, and then I'll move on to Dr. Kimball and Mr. Garland.

Do you have your prefiled testimony in front of you?
A. (Thayer) I do.
Q. So, on Page 4, Lines 2 through 4, I just want to capture your key opinions here. You say you conclude that visitors will experience unreasonable adverse effects on their
aesthetic enjoyment of New Hampshire's
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landscape from impacts of the Project.
And then on Page 10, Lines 9 through 11, you say, "I submit that the construction of Northern Pass as proposed will be detrimental to the scenic landscape of our region and will adversely affect our regional tourism economy." Is that right?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Now, Mr. Thayer, am I correct that you participated in the creation of two videos about the Northern Pass Project, and you appeared in one of those videos?
A. (Thayer) That's correct. I believe my son was the main star.
Q. I was going to ask you that. He was in those as well. The first one I think was done in 2014, and the second video was in 2015; is that right?
A. (Thayer) That sounds correct.
Q. And the 2014 video included the message, quote, "Why trash the outdoors for hungry energy markets elsewhere." Does that sound familiar?
A. (Thayer) Please repeat that?
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Q. "Why trash the outdoors for hungry energy markets elsewhere." Do you remember the video saying that?
A. (Thayer) Yes, I do.
Q. And at the conclusion of the 2014 video, viewers are invited to follow a link and sign a petition to, quote, "Bury or stop Northern Pass," close quote. Does that sound right?
A. (Thayer) That sounds right.
Q. And in the 2015 video you stated, quote, "New Hampshire doesn't want to just serve as the extension cord," close quote. Does that sound right?
A. (Thayer) That sounds right.
Q. And in the 2015 video, it ended with the same message, quote, "Bury or stop Northern Pass"; is that correct?
A. (Thayer) That's correct.
Q. And then in December of 2016, after both of these videos were created and disseminated, you filed your prefiled testimony in this matter; is that right?
A. (Thayer) Yes, that's the right timing.
Q. So in this case, then, you're not suggesting \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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that the opinions you offer in your testimony are actually objective; correct?
A. (Thayer) I'm suggesting that the opinions in my testimony are formed around 28 years of spending time with guests and visitors. Obviously, I live in a region where there is quite a bit of opposition against the Project as currently proposed, including a community. But my testimony is grounded in the 28 years of time spent with guests and visitors, as well as being asked to represent AMC and serve as a public representative on additional boards and promotional efforts related to tourism.
Q. Do you think it would be fair for somebody to conclude, looking at your roles in these videos, that maybe you approached your testimony with a predetermined outlook?
A. (Thayer) I think it's hard in this case because I'm surrounded by community members and businesses and guests and visitors who have a certain sense about what they value in the North Country.
Q. Now, I think you told me at a tech session
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that you don't have any experience preparing visual impact assessments; is that right?
A. (Thayer) That's correct.
Q. So you're not familiar professionally with any of the typical methodologies that are used for VIAs; correct?
A. (Thayer) No, not unlike my colleagues.
Q. And you haven't done any work specifically related to understanding and quantifying visitor expectations generally regarding electric transmission lines in New Hampshire; is that right?
A. (Thayer) No. Largely because I've spent my time talking to visitors and guests directly about their perceptions of why they come to the state of New Hampshire, and the North Country specifically.
Q. And you didn't do any specific work to quantify visitor expectations directly related to Northern Pass; is that right?
A. (Thayer) I did not do any specific work.
Q. On Page 102 -- or on Page 7, Line 4 of your prefiled testimony, you referred to a 2003 study prepared for the New Hampshire Division \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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of Travel and Tourism Development; is that right?
A. (Thayer) That's correct.
Q. And on Lines 13 and 14, you cite it because it is a, quote, "third-party study commissioned by the state's tourism officials using actual visitor comments"; right?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And the study was relied on by the State of New Hampshire to advance its appeal to tourists and visitors; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And on Page 7, Line 4, you state that Nichols Gilstrap, the entity that prepared the study, is one of the nation's leading tourism research and strategic planning firms; correct?
A. (Thayer) Yes, that's what they say.
Q. And the lead author of that report, Mitch Nichols, is in fact the tourism expert for Northern Pass in this case; is that right?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And in the report which you attached as Attachment B to your prefiled testimony,
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}

Page 1 of that report refers to Dr .
Fesenmaier's involvement with the development of that report. Do you recall that?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And the 2003 report notes, quote, "Dr.

Fesenmaier is a well-known tourism image study expert and the director of the National Laboratory for Tourism and eCommerce at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign"; is that right?
A. (Thayer) Yes. He's based in the midwest. Correct.
Q. And at the tech session you told me that you weren't aware that Dr. Fesenmaier assisted with the Northern Pass report and assisted with the literature search in this case; is that correct?
A. (Thayer) I recall that.
Q. And on Page 7 of your testimony, Line 13 to 15, you said, "Such third-party studies commissioned by the state's tourism officials using actual visitor comments... should be considered...," close quote; right?
A. (Thayer) Yeah.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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Q. When you wrote your testimony, were you aware that Mr. Nichols also performed listening sessions in his more recent report, which included discussions and comments with actual visitors in the New Hampshire tourism industry.
A. (Thayer) I was not aware when I wrote that.
Q. And are you aware that on Page 30 -- well, have you reviewed the Nichols report and testimony since you wrote --
A. (Thayer) Yes, I have.
Q. So are you aware that on Page 30 Nichols said, quote, "A variety of key influencing factors have consistently been noted by representatives of Plymouth State University as impacting shifts in visitor demand. Large infrastructure projects like power lines have never been noted in these explanations." You didn't have that idea in mind when you wrote your testimony; is that correct?
A. (Thayer) Say again?
Q. You didn't have that concept in mind when you wrote your testimony since you didn't review the Nichols report; correct?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
A. (Thayer) That's correct.
Q. And Nichols also said on the same page, quote, "Participants noted a mix of factors influencing visitor demand that were similar to those noted by the Plymouth State University. And again, power lines were not identified as a factor influencing past performance." You didn't consider that point either; is that correct?
A. (Thayer) That's correct. But my recall of Mitchell's testimony, both in rereading it and being here in person, was that the sample groups that he spoke to were somewhat small, and I'm not sure exactly representative of the entire breadth of the region, especially the region that the power line is proposed to go through.
Q. And you told me at the technical session that you reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement before filing your testimony; is that right?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. Have you since had an opportunity to review the final Environmental Impact Statement?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
A. (Thayer) I have not had the opportunity. Q. Both the draft and the final discuss a concept called the "substitution effect." Do you remember us talking about that?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And you told me at that time at the tech session that you weren't familiar with the "substitution effect"; is that right?
A. (Thayer) That's correct.
Q. And the substitution effect essentially means that, as the result of some sort of a project or disruption in one area, tourists may simply move to another nearby area. That's generally how it was described in the EIS; is that correct?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And since you weren't aware of that concept, it's also true you didn't account for that in any way in the work you did here; is that right?
A. (Thayer) That's correct, because my work is based on just daily what $I$ do, both for the AMC and in the region related to tourism.
Q. And I understand that when you went about
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
doing your work here, you weren't able to identify any examples anywhere of high-voltage transmission lines actually having an adverse effect on tourism; is that right?
A. (Thayer) I'm not sure that's exactly correct. I know that there are existing transmission corridors that are in the area, and I think that the scale of this development is such that I'm not sure you can compare it right now with what's existing in the area.
Q. Is there anyplace in your work, Mr. Thayer, where you specifically point to a high-voltage transmission line that was demonstrated to have an adverse effect on tourism?
A. (Thayer) No, there's nothing in my work.
Q. And there's also no reports or studies cited in your work that conclude that transmission lines have an adverse effect on tourism; is that right?
A. (Thayer) No quantitative reports. Correct.
Q. And were you here when I cross-examined Counsel for the Public's tourism witnesses,
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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Mr. Kavet and Mr. Rockler?
A. (Thayer) I was not here.
Q. I assume, though, you've had an opportunity to look at that examination and the exhibits that were used?
A. (Thayer) I did review some of it.
Q. Good. So I want to put up an exhibit quickly. This Applicant's Exhibit 312 from that cross-examination. It's a series of photos. And we can go through a couple of them. But the point of these is that these are transmission lines that I showed to Mr . Kavet and Mr. Rockler which exist in well-recognized tourist areas. For example, this is one that was recently built in the Delaware Water Gap.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And Dawn, if we could just go one or two more.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. This is one transmission infrastructure project in Washington State near a scenic vista.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Maybe one more.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
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Q. This is in Alaska, south of Anchorage. I don't need to go through them all. But my question to you is: When you went about doing your work in this case and trying to gain an understanding of the impacts, if any, that transmission lines would have on tourism, did you consider these types of areas? Did you go and look at these other types of locations and try to determine whether they had impacts in places like this?
A. (Thayer) Well, $I$ know in the case of the Delaware Water Gap, the AMC was an intervenor in that particular project because of its visual impacts. I have not been to the other sites. And no, I did not travel as part of my planning for this process. Little tough to do with the responsibilities that I have on a daily basis for my employer, as well as in the region.
Q. Sure. But travel wouldn't be necessary; right? These things are readily available on the Internet. And if this is something you wanted to do, it's certainly something you could have done from your desktop; correct?
A. (Thayer) That is true with the Worldwide Web. On Page 5, Line 12 of your testimony, you make reference to AMC's huts, lodges, shelters and campsites. Do you recall that?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And am I correct that the Project is not going to be visible from any of those places, the lodges, huts, shelters and campsites?
A. (Thayer) That is correct. Greenleaf Hut off of Mount Lafayette is not on the summit of Mount Lafayette. And of course, the Applicant has chosen to bury the line around the White Mountain National Forest, around and through.
Q. And I assume you've had the opportunity to review that underground portion of the route from Bethlehem to Bridgewater?
A. Yes.
Q. So you're aware that the underground design was chosen specifically to protect the views in and around the White Mountain National Forest; right?
A. (Thayer) I would, yes, my understanding was it was chosen to protect it. And of course,
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
that's one part of a larger tourism region. It's admittedly a large scenic resource in the region, the White Mountain Region. But I would argue, and am fairly certain that others would agree with me, that there are additional scenic resources farther north as well where burial is not currently proposed.
Q. Certainly, though, to the extent that the Appalachian Mountain Club had concerns about the Project's impacts on its huts, lodges, shelters and campsites, that concern has been addressed; correct?
A. (Thayer) As it relates to the Appalachian Mountain Club's delivery, yes.
Q. On Page 13, Line 9 of your testimony, you also referred to impacts on recreational trails. Do you recall that?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And at the tech session I asked you what you were referring to, and you told me to the Cohos Trail, including sections off of Bell Hill Road and off of Woodland Heritage Trail in Stark. Do you remember that?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
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Q. And are you aware that there is existing transmission infrastructure present along the Cohos Trail?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. You're aware that there's existing transmission infrastructure present at the section near the section off of Bell Hill Road?
A. (Thayer) Yes, and it's curved, formed below the tree canopy.
Q. And you're also aware that there's transmission infrastructure near the section of trail that you expressed concern about, the Woodland Heritage Trail in Stark?
A. (Thayer) Yes.
Q. And there's no place in any of your materials where you talk about or evaluate that existing transmission infrastructure on the trails; is that right?
A. (Thayer) That's correct. I did not do an exhaustive study.
Q. Thank you. I think now I want to turn to Dr.

Kimball and Mr. Garland, if I could.
I think you said earlier that the
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specific work that AMC performed here, or that you performed, was a critique of NPT's VIA, but you didn't conduct a full assessment yourself; is that right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. I think at the tech session you told me you read through the DeWan VIA and asked yourself if there were missing elements and how the ranking systems worked. Does that sound familiar?
A. (Kimball) That sounds familiar.
Q. You did rely on DeWan's viewshed mapping; correct?
A. (Kimball) Yes, we did.
Q. And you didn't do any photo simulations yourself; is that right?
A. (Kimball) We did not.
Q. Now, earlier this morning when Mr. Aslin was questioning you, he asked you something akin to why didn't you do your own assessment. And I think, Dr. Kimball, you said that, in part, it was because you didn't have access to critical data; is that right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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Q. Okay. And the critical data you were referring to is what's known as the "Intermap data"; is that right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And Intermap data is proprietary data regarding very detailed land information which is created by some third-party company; is that right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct. But we find it hard to participate in a process where you've got to pay to look at the data.
Q. And this third-party data is data that, in order for anyone to gain access to, they have to purchase a license for it; is that right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And Northern Pass and its consultants purchased licenses to get access to this data; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) Yes. There's different ways of negotiating those purchases. Correct.
Q. And that's actually what $I$ want to ask you about.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, can we put
up Applicant's 441?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So during the course of this proceeding, we went back and forth, and Appalachian Mountain Club expressed its frustration with Northern Pass about not being able to get access to this data. Do you recall that?
A. (Kimball) Correct.
Q. And eventually Northern Pass, in this letter that I sent to Attorney Plouffe, tried to bring closure to this issue and proposed three ways that the Appalachian Mountain Club might get access to the data. Do you recall that?
A. (Kimball) Yes, I do.
Q. And you mentioned this morning the third way, which is on the next page that I'll get to in a minute, but that would have been for you to purchase your own license for something like \$32,000; right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. But the other two ways we offered to try to resolve this were: One, we would have given you a PDF of the data, which I understood was something that you didn't consider to be \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
sufficient; is that right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And we also specifically worked with Appalachian Mountain Club and Intermap and agreed that we could find a way to put you on our license so you could get full access to the data. And if you look at the next page, that would have only cost Appalachian Mountain Club \$7199; is that right?
A. (Kimball) We felt that it was unfair.
Q. Well, answer my question first. It would have only cost $\$ 7199$; correct?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. Okay. So, all things being equal, you could have had access to this third-party data if you chose to get it; is that right?
A. (Kimball) At a price.
Q. And that had nothing to do with Northern Pass not providing the data to you. You just decided not to spend the money to get it; correct?
A. (Kimball) We were uncomfortable setting a precedence to access data that is being submitted by the Applicant, that one had to \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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pay for it.
Q. Do you think there's anything anywhere that requires Northern Pass to provide you with this data at its own cost?
A. (Kimball) Could you repeat the question, please, again?
Q. Do you think there's any requirement anywhere in the SEC rules that requires Northern Pass to provide you with this data at Northern Pass's cost?
A. (Kimball) I think that's for the SEC to answer.
Q. Well, it may be, but I'm asking you if you think there is.
A. (Kimball) I think normally in a public process like this that there should be reasonable access to look at the data. Sometimes you may need to look at it in a confidential arena. But it's hard to assess the data without being able to look at it. And the Intermap data, for example, was used in part to determine vegetation heights, and we had difficulty trying to understand how they came up with their values without
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looking at Intermap.
Q. Okay. Let me move on to a different topic. With respect to the work you've done on VIAs in the past, it's my understanding that you've never actually prepared a visual impact assessment under the SEC rules; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And you don't have experience formally conducting VIAs, just informal ones for Appalachian Mountain Club; is that right?
A. (Kimball) Partially correct. We are not, and we've never tried to be VIA experts. But I think you've got to understand that when you do a visual impact assessment, one of the tools is to do the vegetative screening and topographic screening. We have a fair amount of experience in that arena.
Q. Am I correct that you have no experience preparing photo simulations?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And neither you nor Mr. Garland has ever testified as an expert on aesthetics; is that right?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. Now, AMC and SPNF jointly sponsored a witness in this case, Mr. Dodson, whose specific role was to provide very detailed expert testimony on aesthetics analysis; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. So, given that you offered Mr. Dodson as an expert witness on aesthetics, and given your own lack of expertise in aesthetics, what then is the purpose of this additional testimony that the two of you are offering?
A. (Kimball) We have put together a lot of ranking systems relative to prioritizing lands in the northern forests. We, I think, feel fairly comfortable when we look at how ranking systems are applied, whether they're biased in certain directions or whether there's absence of data, those types of things, we do feel like we have expertise to look at the data and to see how it's being used and whether there's bias in the data or whether we're really comfortable that the full data set was there. That's not an unusual kind of set of expertise that's just
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limited to aesthetics.
Q. But these are all visual impact issues in this context. Did you not have faith in Mr. Dodson to analyze these correctly?
A. (Kimball) We were involved with Mr. Dodson to have him do an independent analysis of the parts where we did not have expertise.
Q. You, in the work you did here, on Page 5, Line 23 of your testimony, say that DeWan and Kimball -- that the VIA, quote, "contains errors and uses criteria contrary to those intended by the SEC rules." Remember that?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. And your specific criticisms flow from that assertion. So what $I$ want to do is spend a little bit of time focusing on those criticisms.
A. (Kimball) Yeah.
Q. With respect to cultural value ratings, you say on Page 7 , Line 4 to 11 , that DeWan's cultural value ratings are inconsistent with --
A. (Kimball) I'm sorry. Could you give me the lines again.
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Q. Yeah, I'm sorry. It's Page 7, Lines 4 to 11. You said that DeWan's cultural value ratings are inconsistent with other similar rating systems; right?
A. (Kimball) Right.
Q. Now, you don't have experience doing -creating visual impact assessments that use other methodologies like the BLM, Corps of Engineers, Forest Service, DOT, things like that; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) We've read through those and we've seen other VIAs using them.
Q. So, other than your lay assessment of those, you don't have professional experience with those rating systems; fair to say?
A. (Kimball) You mean developing them?
Q. Developing them and using them in a professional context to prepare VIAs.
A. (Kimball) No.
Q. And on Line 8, you said the cultural value of a site to rank "high" under the DeWan VIA had to be, with few exceptions, of national significance -- i.e., a national forest, national scenic byway, national scenic trail
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or the like; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) Correct.
Q. But in DeWan's VIA -- and it's on Page M8, and I can pull it up if we need to -- it actually provides that resources are designated with a high cultural value if they are, quote, "resources of national or state significance"; correct?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. So you'll have to forgive me. I was a little confused with some of the corrections you offered this morning. But do you now agree that in fact DeWan would look at both state and national resources and potentially rate them as high and not just limit it to the ones that you initially identified?
A. (Kimball) That's correct. But as I also pointed out this morning, for example, if it's a state-designated, it got a medium score; if it was national it got a high score.
Q. But there are a whole array of resources within DeWan's VIA that specifically focused on state resources and the cultural analysis
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
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Let's start with SRP. That's a case that's currently pending before the Site Evaluation Committee but actually hasn't gone through hearings yet; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) I'll take your word for it.
Q. And in SRP, you were focusing on the cultural values analysis that the visual impact assessor did in that case; right?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. Do you know who the visual impact assessor is in SRP whose report you were referring to?
A. (Kimball) It was LandWorks.
Q. Yeah. And do you know who particularly at LandWorks did that?
A. (Kimball) I believe it was Mr. Raphael.
Q. It was David Raphael.

And are you aware when you put up the Antrim VIA, who did that VIA?
A. (Kimball) Same person.
Q. Yes. And are you aware that it was also Mr. Raphael who did that VIA?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. And so are you aware of the fact that the cultural resource approaches in both VIAs are
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actually the same?
A. (Kimball) I had not -- that could be.
Q. So when you made references to those VIAs earlier this morning, did you actually take the time to read through them completely and understand them in relation to the work that was done here, or did you just skim sections of them?
A. (Kimball) I did not read them in great depth.
Q. Do you understand that the review that the Applicant's expert did in the Antrim case and in the MVRP case with respect to the cultural resources was actually quite similar to the review Mr. DeWan did here?
A. (Kimball) Yeah. I think the point we were making here is the rating of cultural values was quite different between those.
Q. Well, the ratings were different because ratings are always different. But I'm talking about the methodology. I'm talking about a methodology that in part screened out resources by using cultural value. And that methodology was similar across all those cases. Did you discern that when you did
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A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And what you were really saying is that both of them provided maps that showed visibility using bare earth; correct?
A. (Kimball) They showed the impacted area. Correct.
Q. And do you understand why they included those maps?
A. (Kimball) I can't get inside their head. But it is required. And some of that, if I recall correctly, was submitted. I'd have to go back and look at the actual dates because the new rules were kicking in.
Q. Yeah, that's essentially correct. The applications were filed, the new rules became effective, and so the applications were supplemented to include those maps.
A. (Kimball) Right.
Q. Does that sound right?
A. (Kimball) That sounds correct.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that neither Mr .

Hecklau nor Mr. Raphael in those cases
actually analyzed scenic resources using the bare earth approach?
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A. (Kimball) The rules require that they be submitted.
Q. I'm not asking what the rules require. I'm asking you as a factual matter. Are you aware that neither of those experts actually reviewed scenic resources using the bare earth approach?
A. (Kimball) What I recall, and I'd have to go back and see which of those two, that they do have text which goes through and describes that the bare earth is a helpful tool in trying to understand some of the impacts that could go out into the future. Did they go into a level of detail? The answer is no.
Q. Correct. In fact, they supplemented their original VIAs by including those maps, but they didn't redo their analysis of the scenic resources in these VIAs; correct?
A. (Kimball) I'll take your word for that.
Q. In fact, if you look at those VIAs, you really couldn't identify a single scenic resource that either of them evaluated using the bare earth analysis; is that right?
A. (Kimball) I'm not sure that that's right.
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I'd have to go back and look.
Q. But as you sit here today, you can't identify one resource; correct?
A. (Kimball) As I sit here today, that is correct.
Q. And while you were going back and doing your review of these other cases, did you take the opportunity to look at the work that the Counsel for the Public's visual expert did in the Antrim matter, Ms. Connolly?
A. (Kimball) I did not.
Q. And would it surprise you that Ms. Connolly focused on 14 critical resources for her evaluation in that case?
A. (Kimball) I'll take your word for it because I did not look at it, as I said before.
Q. Were you aware of the fact of those 14 resources that Ms. Connolly looked at, none of those were bare earth resources?
A. (Kimball) I did not. As $I$ say, if I didn't look at it, it's hard for me to contradict.
Q. I want to talk to you about the 82 resources that you identified here. And I tried quickly to look at the correction that you
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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provided to us this morning where you narrowed this list down to 50 , and I'm sorry to say I wasn't able to harmonize the two. And so what I'm going to do is focus on the original 82, and as we walk through these, if you can identify for us which ones need to be removed based on the way $I$ walk through this, that would be helpful; otherwise, we'll just figure it out a different way.
A. (Kimball) I can go right and read the list right off.
Q. Well, I think reading the list is not going to be a good use of our time. But let's approach it this way and see if we can harmonize our views here.

So, on Page 6, Line 13 of your testimony, you talk about these 82 resources. And then you have a table which is -- well, I think you provided a table with respect to those resources, or you identified them in the context of a data request. Does that sound familiar?
A. (Kimball) I'll take your word for it.
Q. And then as a consequence of that, DeWan took
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your spreadsheet and in the supplemental testimony went through and analyzed those 82 resources. Does that sound familiar to you?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And that was Applicant's Exhibit 93, Table No. 3, where he did that analysis. And what I want to do is focus on that for a minute.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So, Dawn, if you could call that up.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. And the issue here is that it was your
initial contention that these are 82
resources that DeWan failed to consider; is that right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. I think if you look at Page 21 of this, this is DeWan's response to that.
A. (Kimball) Wait a minute. Yeah.
Q. So in the middle of the passage, you know, he has identified "in project VIA." And he listed a series of resources, and I think there are 11 of them which he actually shows were correctly identified and analyzed in the VIA. So this was initially a mistake on your
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part. And I guess my question is: Is this one of the things you've now corrected?
A. (Kimball) Blood was. I do recognize the Blood one.
Q. I think, actually, what I'm going to do is suggest -- rather than us consume a lot of time going back and forth here, I'm going to walk through this, and then when we're all done, if there's some way that we could work together to clarify it to help the Committee, that would probably be a good idea.
A. (Kimball) Okay.
Q. But for now I'm going to rely on this document that DeWan put together. And he has citations showing where in his work he identified these 11 resources. And then underneath he also has another three that were also eligible historic sites that were included in his original VIA. Does that look familiar?
A. (Kimball) Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. So we've got 14 resources here that DeWan actually did evaluate, which means if you subtract 82 from 14 [sic], there would be \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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68 left on your list; is that right?
A. (Kimball) I'll take your word for it.
Q. Okay. And DeWan concludes with respect to those other 68 that, except for three of them, which he has addressed in his supplemental testimony, all of the rest are not scenic resources. And there are three reasons why he said that. He said there's either no public access, they don't qualify under the regulatory definition, or they weren't eligible for listing on the National Register. Does that sound familiar?
A. (Kimball) Yes, and we don't agree with all of those.
Q. And I want to go through those in a minute. But before I do, I have one other question.

Mr. Garland, earlier on you said that Mr. DeWan missed certain critical resources, like Percy Peaks, for example. Do you recall saying that?
A. (Garland) Yes, I do.
Q. Did you take time to actually read the DeWan VIA?
A. (Garland) I did.
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Q. Because Percy Peaks was actually discussed in depth in that VIA on Pages 196 and 197. There's a specific analysis of it, and there actually is a photo taken from one of the Percy Peaks, looking at the other part of the analysis. Is that just something you missed?
A. (Garland) No, I saw that it was used as a context photo. It was not identified and evaluated as a scenic resource. MR. NEEDLEMAN: Let's pull up Applicant's Bates No. 14424 and 14425. MR. IACOPINO: What exhibits are these from?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: This is from the DeWan VIA, Exhibit 1, Appendix 17. And I'm going to ask you, Dawn, to just highlight the first couple of paragraphs in that first column.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. So this is the DeWan analysis of the Nash Stream Forest, Cohos Trail as scenic resources. Do you see that?
A. (Garland) Yes.
Q. And do you see the description in here about,
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
specifically in the second paragraph, "notable mountain peaks in the forest include North and South Percy Peak," et cetera?
A. (Garland) Yes, I see that.
Q. And then they go on to talk about the recreational opportunities in this area. Do you see that?
A. (Garland) Yes, I do.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, can you zoom that back out?

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. And so this whole page and the following page are devoted to analyzing these resources, and the photograph at the bottom of the page is actually a photo that they took from one Percy Peak looking at the other Percy Peak; is that right?
A. (Garland) The view from South Percy facing north to North Percy, yes.
Q. So is it still your contention that they didn't look at this resource and evaluate it?
A. (Garland) I'm not saying they didn't look at it. I'm saying they didn't identify it as a scenic resource. And specifically when I was
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referring to the vegetative models, the DSM, that bare rock you can see in the photo right there in front of you was not identified as bare earth or bedrock in the DSM. They missed it in the DSM.
Q. So, in other words, they didn't identify it as a scenic resource, but they did evaluate it.
A. (Garland) I don't know that they did evaluate it.
Q. Okay. Well, the evaluation is right here and we can let the record speak for itself.
A. (Garland) I don't see -- I see a picture. I don't see an evaluation.
Q. Okay. So let's go on, then, Dr. Kimball, back to the list of 82 which we boiled down to 68. In that list --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, I'm going
to ask you to go back there for a minute.
MR. IACOPINO: Can we get that exhibit number, too?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure. It's
Applicant's Exhibit 93, Table 3, and I think it begins at 53817 Bates Stamp.
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BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So part of what $M r$. DeWan did when he went back to look at your list of resources was to focus on resources with respect to -- that were identified as historic resources on your list. Do you recall that?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. And you allege that DeWan missed a number of sites that were eligible for listing; is that right?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. And you didn't provide any documentation showing that these sites had actually been determined as eligible; is that right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And if we look at Pages 22 and then over to 23, DeWan begins by going through each one of these sites. Do you see that?
A. (Kimball) Yup.
Q. And with respect to all of these sites, DHR actually looked at all 34 of them and concluded that they didn't require further assessment. Were you aware of that?
A. (Kimball) Yes. But you're leaving off the
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last part of the sentence, which is, "per the survey in a Section 106 process," which is different than this process.
Q. All right. But with respect to these resources you identified, we all agree that DHR looked at them and concluded that they didn't need further assessment; right?
A. (Kimball) I believe what the statement here says they concluded it did not need a further survey for the Section 106 process --
Q. And where in --
A. (Kimball) -- which is a different definition than historic sites in the SEC rules.
Q. And given that that's your contention, where in the material you provided here is any analysis of your view about the difference between the processes and why, despite DHR's statement here, you still think that these are scenic resources that need to be evaluated? Did you provide that?
A. (Kimball) We believe that they met the definition of "historic sites" within the Section 106 rules.
Q. Did you provide that analysis anywhere in any \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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of your materials?
A. (Kimball) Well, I think that you can see as you go down, most of these have been on a state list because they've been coded as green, blue, red, et cetera.
Q. Not my question. My question is: Did you provide the analysis you were just describing in any of your written materials?
A. (Kimball) Could you please re-describe what you mean by "analysis"?
Q. Yes. DHR has indicated that these didn't require further assessment. You're saying that's only in the context of the 106 process. You seem to be suggesting that they still need to be looked at, at the state level. I'm interested in knowing is there any analysis anywhere in the materials you provided that explains that difference and indicates why you still think these should be scenic resources?
A. (Kimball) Because the DHR process and where they've been working up to this point, at least from the way I understand it, was looking out only part of the distance. The
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rules say that you should look at historic sites out to 10 miles.
Q. Where in your materials, what page and which document do you talk about this?
A. (Kimball) I don't think that we described that.
Q. And as part of this analysis, did you factor in the memo that DHR has prepared which offers their discussion and interpretation of how historic resources should be addressed in the SEC context?
A. (Kimball) I guess I'd have to ask to see it first.
Q. Well, I'm asking if you recall seeing it and considering it in the work you did.
A. (Kimball) No.
Q. And let me talk about public accessibility for a minute.

You're aware that the SEC definition of "scenic resources" requires that they be publicly accessible; is that right?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And at the tech session, you agreed that if something wasn't publicly accessible, it
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should be screened out from this kind of analysis; is that right?
A. (Kimball) The way that the rules state it, yes.
Q. And at the tech session, when I asked about you about your 82 resources, you told me that you didn't do any analysis of the 82 for public accessibility; is that right?
A. (Kimball) If that's what I said, that's -I'm sorry. Go back and ask the question again. I'm confusing two things in my mind.
Q. Sure. I asked you about this at the tech session, and you told me that when you went about doing your work here, you did no analysis to determine if these 82 resources were publicly accessible; is that right?
A. (Kimball) We asked whether they would potentially be visible from a road, which we believe to be the public access. Obviously, there's a difference of opinion as to whether that qualifies or not.
Q. Right. But you didn't actually determine whether each of these resources were publicly accessible; is that right?
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A. (Kimball) Actually, we did. And one of them that we deleted, I believe it was a cabin that was on its own road and not publicly viewable from a public road, if I recall correctly.
Q. So, where in the written work you did here is the assessment of which of these are publicly accessible and why?
A. (Kimball) I did have our GIS person who actually did this work go back and ask, you know, based on the maps and whether you were on a road, whether the potential was there to see it, and she used Google Earth as a screen.
Q. Is it in your written testimony or any written reports you prepared here?
A. (Kimball) No, it's not.
Q. And in fact, Mr. DeWan looked at this list and found that 28 of the resources weren't publicly accessible; is that right?
A. (Kimball) Based on his definition of "publicly accessible."
Q. And you continued to maintain, the way others have, that "public accessibility" in this
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context does not mean that the resource itself is public, but if you can stand somewhere public and look at the resource, that's good enough for the SEC definition.
A. (Kimball) Yes. And as I say, in Mr. DeWan's manual in Maine, he sort of takes the same position.
Q. And that would be under -- well, I don't have that in front of me. But that would be with respect to Maine law and not New Hampshire law; correct?
A. (Kimball) Actually, his report there, which we used as an earlier exhibit, is not about Maine law. It was -- he was writing a plan for the State of Maine, and he defined "public access" in those terms.
Q. So is it your contention that Mr. DeWan agrees with your interpretation of "public access" with respect to this project?
A. (Kimball) I would contend that his opinion here is different than what it was in Maine.
Q. I want to talk about the concept of "net impact" and "intensity," which is something that you used in your testimony.
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On Page 15, Lines 17 to 20, I think we talked about this a little bit earlier on, but --
A. (Kimball) Again you'll have to let me catch up.
Q. Sure. I'm on Page 15 --
A. (Kimball) Of prefiled?
Q. What is that?
A. (Kimball) Prefiled?
Q. Yeah, NGO Exhibit 103.
A. (Kimball) Okay.
Q. You said that the delta maps that DeWan provided failed to account for how many new towers would be visible at locations presently impacted and that the maps failed to, quote, "illustrate the intensity of the visual impacts by masking the increased number of structures that would be visible at any location." Do you remember saying that?
A. (Kimball) I'll let Mr. Garland answer this question.
Q. Mr. Garland, do you recall that?
A. (Garland) It's stated in the testimony.
Q. And I think earlier Mr. Aslin asked you about \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]
this, and $I$ wanted to focus on it a little bit more specifically.

When you say that, it sounds like you're implying that there was something that DeWan was supposed to provide in accordance with the rules that they failed to provide; is that right?
A. (Garland) We had said in our testimony that the delta maps failed to illustrate the intensity of the visual impacts. That was our statement.
Q. So you'd agree with me that there's nothing anywhere in the SEC rules that actually requires an Applicant to provide these delta maps; right?
A. (Garland) Well, as I mentioned earlier, I think there is a requirements in the rules that the Applicant adequately address the change from existing to proposed. And so when we're talking about "intensity," I'm referring to that necessity of accounting for the change.
Q. And of course there are many ways to do that; right? But the rules don't say to provide
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minute.
In your prefiled testimony on Page 16, Lines 26, you state that the only mitigation measures DeWan offered were very limited, close quote. Do you recall that?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. Mr. Dodson, your witness, testified that the only acceptable mitigation for this project is all underground. I assume you're aware of that?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. And at the technical session you stated that AMC's position is that the only mitigation that's appropriate is to underground the whole project; is that right?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. So I assume, at least with respect to the underground sections of the Project, the 60-plus miles, AMC is supportive of those portions of the Project; is that fair to say?
A. (Kimball) Yes. I mean, there's been a number of issues raised since then that we were not aware of in the beginning because it was our understanding it was to be buried under the
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road.
Q. And then focusing on the remaining overhead portions of the Project, it's AMC's position that there is no mitigation that's sufficient with respect to those overhead portions; is that right?
A. (Kimball) We had three terms here: Avoid, minimize and mitigate. So I just want to get clarity on how you're using these terms.

Well, I thought it was straightforward. I think AMC is saying you got to bury the whole thing. So it seems black and white to me.
A. (Kimball) Okay.
Q. Is it not black and white?
A. (Kimball) Ask the question again, then, please.
Q. AMC says bury the whole thing. So my question is: AMC believes there's no acceptable mitigation for the above-ground sections other than burial?
A. (Kimball) We believe the technologies today allow for that mitigation.
Q. So, in other words, you agree with me. That's the only acceptable approach.
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A. (Kimball) For this particular project.
Q. And when you offer that opinion, I assume you have in mind Site 102.12 which defines "best practical measures," and in doing so talks about "available, effective and economically feasible on-site and off-site methods."
A. (Kimball) Yup.
Q. You accounted for that?
A. (Kimball) Yes, because that site also in the end says, effectively, avoid, minimize or mitigate.
Q. Right. And you're familiar with the Applicant's position here that it's uneconomical to bury the entire project; is that right?
A. (Kimball) Yes. I would want to point out that the Applicant met with us, I think back in 2010 or 2011, and we suggested that they go back because part of these rules also start off and say --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Kimball) It says it means available, effective and economically feasible on-site or off-site methods or technologies used \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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during, and the emphasis here would be on siting. If you site a right-of-way that is not compatible with burial, then, yes, it is going to be very expensive.
Q. You said the emphasis is on siting. In fact, it's not; right? It says, "siting, design, construction and operation"?
A. (Kimball) I was putting my emphasis on siting.
Q. All right. But the Committee, when it interprets this rule, is going to have to read all of those. You agree with that?
A. (Kimball) I don't disagree.
Q. Now, given that it's the Applicant's position that full burial isn't economic, I'm wondering if the Appalachian Mountain Club has done any cost-benefit analysis to support its position that full burial is economic.
A. (Kimball) I think we can look at the neighboring state of Vermont to see that there is a proposal in the Mass. RFP that it seems to think it is economical.
Q. That's not my question. I'll come back to that in a minute.
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My question is: Have you done any cost-benefit analysis to counter Northern Pass's position that burial of this project is uneconomic?
A. (Kimball) Depends on what you're using for a scale of cost-benefit. Relative to an economic return to Eversource, it may not be. Relative to the broader question of what's also the benefit to society, et cetera, that's a different question.
Q. Is there anything anywhere in the written materials that you've provided to us that offers any kind of cost-benefit analysis regarding this underground issue?
A. (Kimball) I mean, we did not do -- in fact, we did not have access to that kind of data to even do that relative to the construction costs.
Q. And going back to your statement a moment ago, it sounds like what you are relying on to say it's economic is other projects elsewhere.
A. (Kimball) Yes. And I think you can also go back and ask are there potentially other
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routes that might have been selected?
Q. All right. So you're also thinking about completely different alternative routes.
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. Like routes that were analyzed and rejected in the Environmental Impact Statement?
A. (Kimball) There's some in addition that were never looked at.
Q. Well, I'm not going to ask. Never mind.

So, on Page 19, Line 16, you say that the proposed buried section --
A. (Kimball) Excuse me. Just give me a second and let me catch up.
Q. Sure.
A. (Kimball) Go ahead.
Q. I'm on Page 19, Line 16.
A. (Kimball) Yup.
Q. You say, "The proposed buried segments in the Great North Woods are not designed to minimize aesthetic impacts, but rather to circumvent landowners who refuse to accept this project on their properties; right?
A. (Kimball) That is our understanding, yes.
Q. So I want to -- it won't surprise you that \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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Northern Pass disagrees with that. But I want to assume for the sake of discussion that you're correct with regard to that statement. So, is it AMC's position that when the Site Evaluation Committee has to assess compliance with the rules, they don't just look at compliance, but they actually have to look at the motivation for why something was done?
A. (Kimball) I don't think the rules talk about motivation.
Q. So, then, if burying the Project in a segment has the effect of minimizing or eliminating visual impacts, it doesn't matter why it was done. The fact that it minimizes and eliminates those impacts is all this Committee has to consider; right?
A. (Kimball) I think you're missing one element when you simplify it the way you do, because these burials are going to require the development of transition stations, which in themselves have some fairly -- I mean, they're going to be very visual on the landscape.
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Q. Sure.
A. (Kimball) They're not small structures. So when you go short distances and bury them and come back up again, there are secondary effects that are coming. And the more frequently that you're doing it, those secondary effects are going to be more frequent.
Q. And the Committee has a very full record on those transition stations and the visual impacts; isn't that right?
A. I would agree with that. I think that we've only seen VIAs for one transition station. And the Applicant's photos sims were somewhat different than some of the other photo sims that were put in by other visual experts.
Q. So back to my original question. Do you still argue that the Committee has to consider the motivation for why it was buried and not just the effects of burial?
A. (Kimball) If I'm interpretating your question, because I'm having difficulty understanding your question, are you asking me to assume that the primary reasons why \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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Eversource -- or Northern Pass decided to bury in this section was for aesthetics mitigation?
Q. It's actually a simple question. You said in your testimony that Northern Pass did it to circumvent landowners who refused to accept the Project.
A. (Kimball) That was our understanding of why these locations were selected.
Q. You said it, so it must have mattered to you. And I'm trying to understand why that matters. Assuming it's true, burial still has the effect of mitigating impacts. So why would that matter?
A. (Kimball) In that case it does, except -- it does have additional impacts of the frequency, as I mentioned a few seconds ago.
Q. Okay. So I want to move to Page 19, Lines 11 and 12 of your testimony, where you said that the Applicant will be using only, quote, minimal and limited vegetative screening. Do you recall that?
A. (Kimball) Correct.
Q. I assume you're aware that the Applicant has \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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committed to work with willing landowners for purposes of vegetative screening?
A. (Kimball) A commitment is different than understanding whether it's actually going to happen when a decision is made here.
Q. You understand that the Applicant can't do any vegetative screening on private property if the landowner doesn't want it.
A. (Kimball) That may indeed be the problem.
Q. Well, so tell me what options the Applicant has if the landowner says, "We don't want screening." What if it were your property and we offered screening and you said no? Should we force it on you?
A. (Kimball) No, you can't force it on me.
Q. Are there any particular locations where you concluded that vegetative screening is necessary?
A. (Kimball) We did not do that kind of assessment.
Q. So you actually have no analysis, then, on this point?
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. Did you have a chance to look at Ken Bowes'
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supplemental testimony, and also DeWan and Kimball's supplemental testimony as it relates to mitigation?
A. (Kimball) Yes, I did.
Q. They both testified that they considered a whole range of additional mitigation measures and are willing to consider all those measures to reduce impact. Do you understand that?
A. (Kimball) Yes, I do.
Q. Would Appalachian Mountain Club be supportive of any of those mitigation measures?
A. (Kimball) That's a hypothetical question. But our feeling is these should have been offered so that people could look at it and understand what was being offered and how effective it might be.
Q. Well, I'm not sure what's hypothetical about it. It's been in the testimony for a long time. In fact, Counsel for the Public's own experts looked in detail at this whole range of additional mitigation. They made specific recommendations in specific locations. And so I guess given how long this has now been \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
in the record and that this is the subject of your testimony, I think it's fair to ask would Appalachian Mountain Club be supportive of any of these mitigation measures?
A. (Kimball) There's a difference between supporting some of the mitigations as opposed to asking whether what is actually going to happen for minimization or mitigation would actually have enough effectiveness to make a difference. And I think when look at towers that are up to 160 feet, et cetera, it's hard for us to envision how you're going to screen those.
Q. So, to the extent the Applicants have proposed these measures, to the extent that Counsel for the Public's experts have proposed these measures, you simply don't agree with any of them because you think it's too difficult --
A. (Kimball) No. In fact, what struck me is Mr. DeWan's testimony frequently referred over to -- excuse me -- Mr. DeWan's supplemental testimony, when he got into mitigation, frequently referred over to Mr. Bowes' \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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supplemental prefiled, and Mr. Bowes, in many cases, went through and said, "Well, we can't do it."
Q. Okay. Page 8 and 9. You criticized DeWan's analysis of viewer expectation. And on Page 9, Lines 4 and 5 --
A. (Kimball) Again, you've got to give me a second to catch up.
Q. Okay. Let me know when.
A. (Kimball) Go ahead.
Q. On Page 9, Lines 4 and 5, you said DeWan made no effort to gather evidence directly related to the expectation of viewers of the proposed Project; is that right?
A. (Kimball) I'm sorry. I'm on my prefiled. Are you on my prefiled? Because I'm not reading the same thing.
Q. Yes, NGO 103, Page 9, Lines 4 and 5.
A. (Kimball) I'm confused... oh, I'm sorry. Larry's helped me get caught up. Thank you.
Q. So the assertion you made is that DeWan made no effort to gather evidence about viewer expectation; right?
A. (Kimball) If he did, we haven't seen it.
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Q. So in Applicant's Exhibit 1, Appendix 17, the VIA, DeWan actually talks about user expectation as an entire category in the VIA. Do you recall that?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. And in Section 8.4.1, the methodology specifically calls for an analysis of user expectations. Do you remember that?
A. (Kimball) Yup.
Q. And both of these you'd agree are consistent with the SEC rules requiring this type of analysis; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) Yes. But the way that they did it was basically a formula by individuals on that team and did not reach out to truly understand visitor expectations and viewer expectations.
Q. Well, in Section 8.5 of the methodology, consideration of, quote, viewer effect which combines extent, nature and duration of public use ratings and effect on continued use and enjoyment, according to DeWan's methodology, actually makes up two thirds of the overall visual impact rating; is that \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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right?
A. (Kimball) Not entirely because you have a culture filter that's beginning in the beginning that kicks out a lot of examples.
Q. Regardless of where the culture filter is applied, though, that's two thirds of their analysis for this category. Do you agree with that?
A. (Kimball) If you can get that far in the analysis.
Q. And this includes consideration what a viewer would expect to see at these resources in their methodology; correct?
A. (Kimball) Yes. Then the question is: How do they go out to try to understand as opposed to just simply using their own opinion and nothing else?
Q. So you agree their methodology is sound. You just don't like the way they applied it.
A. (Kimball) I think you need two components here. One is they sort of go through, I believe it was the standard BLM kind of approach going down through this. But if you read the BLM manuals and read the forest
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service manuals, et cetera, they also expect you to go out and test out some of your assumptions with the real world. We didn't see that.
Q. Well, you said that the NPT VIA didn't conduct any form of public outreach to measure viewer expectations, and you said that an intercept survey should be performed; right?
A. (Kimball) We suggested that as one way, and it's something that has been done before.
Q. And you understand there's no requirement in the SEC rules to do that; right?
A. (Kimball) I think the rules ask you to understand viewer expectations. And there are different ways of doing it, and some are better than others.
Q. That wasn't my question. You said you'd like to see intercept surveys. But we all agree they're not required by the rules; right?
A. (Kimball) I do agree that the rules do not specifically require them.
Q. And in fact, you were talking a moment ago about other accepted visual methodologies,
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|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | like BLM, forest service. They also don't |
| 2 |  | mandate those types of surveys; correct? |
| 3 | A. | (Kimball) They don't mandate. They are not |
| 4 |  | mandates. But they do, and we used these in |
| 5 |  | our NGO exhibits during cross-exam. They all |
| 6 |  | highly recommend to go out and talk with the |
| 7 |  | real public that's going to be impacted. |
| 8 | 2. | And did you spend time to actually look in |
| 9 |  | detail at the way in which DeWan went through |
| 10 |  | their analysis of user expectations at |
| 11 |  | individual resources? |
| 12 | A. | (Kimball) On the score sheets? |
| 13 | $Q$. | On the score sheets and with respect to the |
| 14 |  | individual resource. |
| 15 | A. | (Kimball) We did look at the score sheets. |
| 16 | Q. | Okay. So I want to move on, then, to |
| 17 |  | determination of unreasonable adverse |
| 18 |  | effects. And on Page 10 of your testimony, |
| 19 |  | you were critical of how DeWan made the |
| 20 |  | determination regarding unreasonable adverse |
| 21 |  | effects. Do you recall that? |
| 22 | A. | (Kimball) Yes, I do. |
| 23 | $Q$. | And I guess I want to start by asking, when |
| 24 |  | you offered that criticism, did you have the |
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requirements of Site $301.14(\mathrm{a})$ in mind, which are the seven criteria that the SEC needs to apply to make this determination?
A. (Kimball) Give me that site again?
Q. $301.14(\mathrm{a})$.
A. (Kimball) $301.14(\mathrm{a})$, yes. Yup.
Q. So you had that in front of you, and you were considering it when you were offering these criticisms of DeWan.
A. (Kimball) Hmm-hmm.
Q. On Page 11, Lines 1 and 2 of your testimony, you create your own standard here, which says, "The question for the SEC is what level of diminished aesthetic experience leads to an unreasonable adverse effect." Do you see that?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. That standard's no place in the SEC rules, is it?
A. (Kimball) I don't think the SEC rules either say that if people -- if there's enough damage to the landscape, then people don't come back. That's the final test, which is what Mr. DeWan put forth as his only
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description. And we did ask him in the tech session his definition of "unreasonable," and we could not get a definition.
Q. Actually, DeWan didn't say that anywhere in his analysis. Those are your words, not his.
A. (Kimball) I'm sorry. Say which words?
Q. DeWan did not offer this view of unreasonable adverse effect anywhere in his analysis. The view that, quote, "The question for the SEC is what level of diminished aesthetic experience leads to an unreasonable adverse effect," that's your words.
A. (Kimball) I believe that's the whole purpose of the VIA.
Q. So you're characterizing that as the purpose of his VIA, but you're not actually saying DeWan said that; right?
A. (Kimball) No, he didn't say that.
Q. So I want to finish up here by looking at what DeWan actually did instead of talking about what we think he did.

On Page 10, Line 29, you say that
DeWan's standard of unreasonable adverse effect essentially requires the effects of a
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project on aesthetics to be so severe, that people who enjoyed the scenic resource's view before the Project was built will not return to the view after the Project is built; right?
A. (Kimball) Yes. That was based on what he put in his prefiled.
Q. So that's your interpretation of his work in this case; right? You're saying he didn't apply the SEC standards here. He came up with this approach.
A. (Kimball) It's not an interpretation. Those are the words he used in his prefiled.
Q. Well, I guess maybe you'll point it out to us, because what $I$ want to do is I want to go through the work.

So I'm going to pull up Applicant's Exhibit 431. What we've done here is on the right side -- or on the left side --
A. (Kimball) I'm sorry. This is so small, I can hardly read it.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, if you can
blow that up.
A. (Kimball) Goes with old age.
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BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So, on the left side we've got the seven SEC criteria in 301.14(a), and then on the right side we correlate DeWan's work to that particular criteria. And we go right down this list, and we show every place in DeWan's work where what he did and where he did it correlates directly to this SEC criteria. Do you see that?
A. (Kimball) Yes, I do.
Q. I didn't see any effort anywhere in your work to do this type of analysis and explain why you think the work he did doesn't correlate to this criteria. Did you do anything like that?
A. (Kimball) No, we did not, but --
Q. Why not?
A. (Kimball) Because we didn't do a full VIA.
Q. But you don't need to do a VIA. What you did was a critique of DeWan's work.
A. (Kimball) That is correct.
Q. And I would assume if you're critiquing his work and making the assertion that he didn't analyze unreasonable adverse effect based on
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the SEC standards, you'd prepare a simple chart like this and show us all the places where he failed to do that. I don't see anything like that in your work.
A. (Kimball) We criticized a lot of the steps that he used on the right-hand side.
Q. So you don't agree that DeWan failed to address any of these. You just feel that in particular places you don't like the way he did it.
A. (Kimball) And we have some real serious problems, as I mentioned, about the way the stuff was filtered in a very reductive method to get to the conclusions that get you to the right-hand side.
Q. All right. One other question. You're also critical of the elements that DeWan included in his analysis which allowed him to then draw these conclusions that we see here; is that correct?
A. (Kimball) we were critical of them? Yes.
Q. So I want to call up Applicant's 432. Site $305(b)(6)$ is the portion of the SEC rules that specifically says what professionals \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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like Mr. DeWan need to include in their visual impact assessment. Are you familiar with that?
A. (Kimball) $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And it specifically articulates the factors. Are you familiar with that?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. So, again, what we did is we listed every factor in the SEC rules, and then we correlated those exactly to the places in Mr. DeWan's work where he addressed those factors. Do you see that?
A. (Kimball) Yes. Again, those are the steps that are presented, but we have difficulty with the way that some of those steps were done.
Q. Same question: So you never actually prepared a document like this to support your assertions that he in fact didn't do what the SEC rules required with respect to inclusion of particular elements of a VIA.
A. (Kimball) I'll give you the same answer I gave you just a minute ago, which is, no, we did not develop a table like this.
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Q. So you don't disagree that he in fact did deal with every one of these requirements that the SEC imposes; right?
A. (Kimball) He did fill in the boxes, yes.
Q. And of this particular list, as you looked down it, are there any of those boxes that you can point to that you think are actually specifically deficient?
A. (Kimball) No. 1 is $I$ can't analyze this instantly, just as if you put up a photo sim and ask me to analyze it right on the spot. But I think, as I look down through some of these, for example, if I go down to $G$, he talks about duration of view. When we look at his method, to get a "high" for duration -- I mean extent, nature and duration of the public view, to get a "high" in his duration of view, you have to sit at that resource for four hours, based on his decision. Most people would not climb to the summit of a mountain and sit there for four hours.
Q. Is there someplace in his methodology that says that?
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A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. That you have to sit up there for four hours?
A. (Kimball) Yes, it does. It's right in his criteria.
Q. And that's how he analyzes duration of view.
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. At each resource?
A. (Kimball) Yes. If you go to DeWan M15 -- do you have that in front of you?
Q. No, but $I$ know what you're talking about.
A. (Kimball) It says activities where the general public may be expected to spend the equivalent of at least a morning or afternoon, greater than four hours, pursuing an outdoor activity, e.g., fishing, camping, hiking --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Slow down,
slow down.
A. (Kimball) -- to get a "high."
Q. Right. So that's with respect to certain resources, depending on the particular type of use, like sitting on a mountain summit or paddling in a lake, as opposed to, for example, driving a highway; correct?
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A. (Kimball) It doesn't differentiate the way that you're describing it.
Q. But he did differentiate it in his analysis, didn't he?
A. (Kimball) If he did, it's not transparent. We're going by the definition that he put in his methodology.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Members of the Subcommittee, who has questions for the panel? Mr. Way.

QUESTIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SEC COUNSEL: BY MR. WAY:
Q. Good morning. Just a few questions.

Mr. Thayer, always interested in data that's up to date, and so I'm looking at the 2003 study that you did -- or that you looked at. Is that still considered a living document in the tourism industry?
A. (Thayer) I think it's a document that forms what New Hampshire is known for, so it's an aggregate. You know, $I$ don't know if it's "living," but it forms what the State puts \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
out there as a brand.
Q. And so the last time -- and when was the last time you may have contacted the Travel and Tourism Division?
A. (Thayer) Related to another project, I contacted them in the last couple of weeks about Canadian visitors into the region and into the North Country related to human-powered recreation.
Q. Sure. And so with regards to this project, when was the last time that you contacted them?
A. (Thayer) I have not contacted them --
Q. Not contacted them. So when you got to numerous conferences, this study that you're looking at, is this still toted as relevant? Is it still -- my understanding is there's been some updating to this type of information since that point. I'm just trying to get a sense of whether the conclusions reached then are still relevant now.
A. (Thayer) I haven't seen this study pulled up as an example at Governor and Tourism
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: THAYER|KIMBALL|GARLAND]

Conferences.
Q. Fair enough. One of the things that you mentioned, or I think Mr. Needleman mentioned, was that there were no -- there was no areas, no corridors where you could definitively say that it impacted tourism. Is that what I heard, that there was no locations in the right-of-way or whatever where it impacted tourism to this point?
A. (Thayer) To this point, perhaps. But I can think of two crossings, that as you approach a resource like Mountain View Grand in Whitefield, that there's currently a transmission line crossing, and this project as proposed will make that more substantial.
Q. You're getting close to my next question, and that was you seem to suggest that you thought there were areas that you didn't know for sure, but you seemed to suggest that there were areas that you thought have impacted tourism, and I'm interested to hear where those areas might be that you think might be impacted.
A. (Thayer) That they would be impacted?
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Q. Yes. You seem to imply that when you --
A. (Thayer) Yeah, I can think of Routes 3 and 116, both of which the transmission line crosses over both of those two different entrances to the Mountain View Grand on Mountain Road in Whitefield, and I can think of Big Diamond Road as the proposed line comes across on the drive up to Coleman State Park, which is a terrific resource in the North Country. And I know there's photo sims done of that. But having been up to Coleman State Park and the approach to Coleman State Park, it's somewhat representative of broad scenic resource that is the North Country as you approach the state park looking over those ridge lines.
Q. Thank you. And the great debate is: Is the Mountain View Grand considered public or not?
A. (Thayer) I would believe it's public, both in terms of what I have seen and experienced, but also knowing that -- yeah, I mean, there are certainly people who stay overnight there. But $I$ know for a fact that there are people who drive Mountain View Road and stop \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
on the veranda to capture that view of Cannon and Franconia Notch all the way across to the Presidentials.
Q. You represent New Hampshire Grand; is that fair to say or --
A. (Thayer) It's fair to say I'm on the team for New Hampshire Grand, yes.
Q. Are you representing their opinion as well, or do they accept your opinion or -- strike that. That's not a fair question to ask.

But one question $I$ do have on New
Hampshire Grand, the main sponsor is NCIC; correct?
A. (Thayer) Correct. Although, funding is received through foundations, as well as USDA Rural Development, as well as the Joint Promotional Program with the State of New Hampshire that's put --
Q. The JPP Program.
A. (Thayer) The JPP Program.
Q. And one question $I$ had on NCIC, since they're a funding entity for loans and grants, have they been involved with any utility projects -- obviously not this one -- but in \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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their normal operations?
A. (Thayer) That's a better question for them, but I believe they have a portfolio that includes broadband technology and the funding of that.
Q. Very good.

Mr. Garland -- is it Dr. Garland or Mr. Garland?
A. (Garland) Mr. Garland.
Q. All right. And Dr. Kimball, you had mentioned the Intermap data?
A. (Kimball) Yes.
Q. And the three scenarios that were brought up, I understand about the $\$ 32,000$ being prohibitive. I'm trying to get a sense, though, of the other two options, of why they don't work. Tell me why the PDF does not work for you.
A. (Kimball) I'll let Larry answer that.
A. (Garland) The PDF is an image of the data. It is not the data. In other words, you cannot interrogate it. I can't query it. You can't use it in any form of GIS analysis. It's almost like a photograph of a map rather \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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than the data contained in the map, if that makes sense.
Q. It does. So I'm trying to get a sense of how real a concern -- if you had full access to the data as opposed to getting the PDF of the data, the PDF would be of no value to you?
A. (Garland) PDF would be of no value.
Q. And the other option, $\$ 7200$ for the user fee, that was more of a philosophical thing that I'm sort of taking away.
A. (Kimball) Well, it's both philosophical, as well as, you know, we don't budget for those kinds of expenses when we get into this. And we've never, in any other proceedings that we've been involved in, had to pay for data that is submitted as part of a public record.
Q. Submitted data as part of the public record or just the PDFs in your --
A. (Kimball) I think as we've seen with economic experts and others, normally you get to see how they did it. And the data that they used here, you can't. I mean, let me just give you a quick example with the Intermap.

DeWan \& Associates used that in part to
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calculate out what tree height was. It's where they made their error when they decided that water actually blocked visibility and ROW crops actually blocked visibility. That's where we picked up that there were some serious errors. We wanted to better understand it. You do that with the Intermap. We used a bootstrapped way to try to figure out why they were making the errors.
Q. The challenge would probably be, and we've had a few studies that have ever been presented to us, where they're user-based license activities and someone has to pay for that license. And if everybody asked for that access to the data, I guess that would be -- I guess I'm editorializing now.
A. (Kimball) I think that's an SEC decision as to how they want to treat that.
Q. I agree.

Did you have access with the Trails Bureau, Mr. Thayer, at any point in the near past?
A. (Thayer) Related to this? No. I mean, I had \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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access based through AMC, as well as the Trails Bureau in terms of understanding the trails in the region.
Q. And so in your facility when visitors come, they have not -- they've not been inquiring about the Northern Pass very much. They're more interested in the experience that they're going to get. Is that what I'm hearing from you?
A. (Thayer) Well, to be clear, certainly our members have, members of the Appalachian Mountain Club. But we host, you know, over a 140,000 bed nights and 500,000 day visitors a year. So, certainly there's the range of folks who stop in who are aware of the Project as proposed, and there are those from beyond New England, southern New England, that are less aware. But they're all equally drawn by the scenic resource. That's why they come here. It's different from what they have at home.
Q. Because it's interesting. When we talked, for example, in the real estate market, the contention is that the very discussion of
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this project, certainly over an extended period of time, has been prohibitive for people interested or coming to the state. And I'm just wondering if in your experience that you're seeing that. It doesn't sound like you are at your facility. Am I correct?
A. (Thayer) Keep in mind where our facilities are located. Attorney Needleman called out that, you know, we are within and surrounding the immediate vicinity of the White Mountain National Forest. So, in terms of that being accurate, that is true because it's a protected resource, and the Applicant has proposed to bury around and through the scenic resource.
Q. All right. Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.

Weathersby.
QUESTIONS BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Just a couple of follow-up questions.

You had mentioned that in 2010 and 2011 the AMC met with the Applicant. Do you recall who originated that, how that meeting came about?
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A. (Kimball) Yup. It was Mr. Varney came as a representative, as well as some folks from the Applicant, and they called for the meeting.
Q. Is that the only time that AMC has met with Northern Pass?
A. (Kimball) To the best of my recollection. And Susan Arnold is here as well, and she may say there's another time. But she's not the witness up here, but --
Q. And can you tell me just in a little brief summary of the meeting you did have with Mr. Varney and kind of what was discussed and how it was left?
A. (Kimball) They laid out some of the routes here and asked us which one was our favorite one.
Q. Did AMC express concerns, and were those listened to and was your --
A. (Kimball) Yes, we did express concerns. And we had suggested trying to pick a more burial-friendly route.
Q. You indicated that the Project won't be visible from the campgrounds and lodge
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maintained by AMC. But I'm guessing that there's a number of AMC-maintained hiking trails from which it will be visible. Is that true, and do you have any idea how many?
A. (Kimball) Yes. Remember that our membership is not just interested in our facilities. It's part of the reason why our membership is very much interested in just what was going to happen in what's known as the 26 million acres of the northern forests, which includes most of the North Country north of the White Mountains. So our interests and our mission is to, you know, protect and provide for the wise stewardship of those types of landscapes.
Q. And are there AMC-maintained hiking trails that as you hike along will have a view of the Project? Has that been analyzed?
A. (Kimball) Mr. Garland has hiked probably every hiking trail in New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine. I will let him answer.
A. (Garland) You're asking specifically about AMC-maintained trails? And that's an important qualifier because we work on a \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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cooperative basis with other hiking clubs and other trail-maintaining clubs.

So, in terms of those that are, strictly speaking, maintained by the Appalachian Mountain Club, that would probably be limited to the trails that are on the northern end of the Franconia range, where if you look northward, you know, they're a section of the National Forest. But other than that, the AMC-maintained trails, probably not. There were some trails up on Cherry Mountain where you have views looking north at the Project. But I don't recall specifically if those are maintained by the AMC. Probably by the RMC, the Randolph Mountain Club.
Q. That's fine. I was just curious.
A. (Garland) Okay. Yes.
Q. When I have the opportunity, I also lace up my hiking boots and head up the mountains. And a month or so ago $I$ was on the top of $M$. Eisenhower. And my hiking experience has been changed as a result of being involved in this project. And instead of just taking in the magnificence of the 360-degree views, I'm
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looking for man-made structures and noticed that there's --
A. (Kimball) Isn't that a nightmare now?
Q. -- at least two wind farms noticeable from that peak, as well as highways that serpentine through the valleys and ski areas and other man-made changes to the landscape. And I'm wondering if you have an opinion -I'm wondering if any of your members comment on the man-made elements presently seen from the viewpoints, whether those take away from the experience at all or whether -- I'll leave it there.
A. (Kimball) Actually, $I$ think you bring up some interesting points, because even when you're in the White Mountains, you can look down and see like Bretton Woods or Wildcat Ski Area, some man-made impacts on the landscape. The interesting part is when you get north of the White Mountains, that's greatly diminished. And that is one of the few remaining places in New Hampshire where that still exists. That's what this debate is all about, in part.
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Q. Does the fact that the Northern Pass Transmission Project will transmit hydropower rather than fossil-fuel-generated power make any difference to you or your members, do you think?
A. (Kimball) Well, I think an interesting answer to that question is, if this project is not permitted here, there are, I believe, 46 bids in the Mass. RFP, and they all have to have those same attributes. So if this project is turned down, those attributes are just going to come from another source. It's not like if you turn this down, it won't happen. It will happen. It's a question of who's going to do it and what impact that one is going to have.
Q. Thank you. I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Wright.
QUESTIONS BY DIR. WRIGHT:
Q. Good morning, folks. Craig Wright with DES.

Dr. Kimball, I think my questions are
few. I was trying to follow the discussion that you and Mr. Needleman were having on Appendix 2, and I just wanted to see if I
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understand the math correctly here.
You started with 82 resources that you believe the Applicant missed.
A. (Kimball) Right.
Q. You narrowed it down today to 50, I believe.
A. (Kimball) Correct.
Q. Okay. Mr. Needleman went through a series of questions with you, starting with your 82.

He identified, I think, 14 that Mr. DeWan did look at. Did you agree that Mr. DeWan did look at those 14 in getting to your 50?
A. (Kimball) I don't think we put ours side by side, but let me --
Q. Okay. That's what I'm trying to understand is what the side-by-side comparisons are.
A. (Kimball) Yeah. I mean, we did take -- you know, when they came back and provided more information in their April supplemental prefiled, we went back and looked at that. That's part of what made us remove some of these because they were presenting some additional information that was not available before. So we looked at that and we agreed with them, and that's part of what we did to
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remove some of the ones that we put in.
Q. Okay. So you agreed with some of their analysis, that they did look at them, and that's how you got down to your 50. Or did you combine some other resources or combine some together as well?
A. (Kimball) Well, yeah. In some of these -let me just give you a quick example, if I can find it quick.

Well, like the Goldstar sod farm, they say it's a conservation easement, privately-owned dairy farm. When we went and looked at this, we disagreed with them because there's a snow machine trail that crosses that. It's not unusual that ag lands may serve another purpose. They took the blanket "it's ag, it's out."
Q. Okay. So when he went through his analysis, it sounded to me like he got down from 82 to 3. And you're still at 50, in your opinion?
A. (Kimball) Yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. (Kimball) And I think, you know, we've had this debate going on for days here. We might
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end up being at 37 or we might be back up to 53. The point is there were a number of them, like Phillips Brook, et cetera, that were obvious that were based on the way they applied the public water list. I mean, there's a number of these that just should have been there that weren't.
Q. Okay. So, in summary, then, $I$ think the bulk of the differences are probably how we define "public access"?
A. (Kimball) On the historic.
Q. On the historic. Okay.
A. (Kimball) But only on the historic.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Oldenburg.
MR. OLDENBURG: Thank you.
QUESTIONS BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. One of the things that the AMC does, one of the many things AMC does, is publishes guides and maps; correct?
A. (Kimball) That's correct.
Q. And I think, Mr. Garland, you say you worked on the maps.
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A. (Garland) That's a major responsibility of my job is to produce the recreational trail maps for the AMC-published guide books.
Q. And if I remember right, the guide books have information about each trail, like length, grade increase, difficulty. And view is one of them; correct?
A. (Garland) Oftentimes views are described if they're of interest, yes.
Q. Have either of you or any of you worked on rating those views for the guide books?
A. (Garland) I have not. And I will clarify that the narrative in the guide book, the text is written by someone else. That's not written by me. But I do know the person that writes the narrative, and oftentimes we talk about a trail and exchange notes and opinions. So we will talk about perhaps whether a viewpoint that existed years ago may or may not still have the same visual quality, if you will, because as we have discussed earlier, trees over time grow up, and over time they blow down. So, views are dynamic and they can change. So, with each
new addition of the guide book, that kind of information is being reviewed and updated.
Q. Is there a set criteria that you use to rate the views, or is it, you know, many people get together and offer personal preferences?
A. (Garland) No, I think it's probably the "wow" factor, whether it's something that would attract people, or if you're hiking along a trail, they might want to take a moment to pause and appreciate that view as they're going by.
Q. So, nothing like the criteria you used to rate the views --
A. (Kimball) Actually, if I could just add something here. I think you're seeing an evolution in that direction. We currently have a project in the Greater Philadelphia Area looking at the trails there and then going out and asking which of the privately-owned lands now are offering the views that make those trails enjoyable, to prioritize those so that they will be protected into the future. And that's driven in part because with the LIDAR data, et
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cetera, that's now becoming available. We are actually using LIDAR there. So I think you're going to see more and more in that direction.

But you know, relative to the question you asked Mr. Garland, I think when you read it, because a lot of our trails are "green tunnels," for all practical purposes, they're normally identifying where you can get up to a prominent point to get the view. It has never been intended to rank views, this one is better than the other.
Q. All right. That's all I have. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Iacopino. MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

QUESTIONS BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. I'm going to actually direct the first question to Mr. Thayer because I think he was the best person to answer Ms. Weathersby's question, which I don't think actually got answered.

Do you receive comments from the folks that use your facilities regarding the
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existing man-made elements in the landscape? Dr. Kimball referred Ms. Weathersby to areas north of the White Mountains. But with respect to your assets where you work, is that a common refrain that you hear from hikers and climbers and folks that use your facilities?
A. (Thayer) I wouldn't say it's common. I mean, we get folks who arrive at the Highland Center who are amazed with the size of the Mount Washington Hotel and Resort and the landscape. And I don't think they confuse us before they arrive at the Highland Center. But that does sort of strike them as an example. I've heard that before about the Mount Washington Auto Road as well, the eastern slopes of Mount Washington over to Pinkham Notch.
Q. Okay. And then my other question is for Mr . Garland.

You had mentioned the two different databases, the NCED, and then you mentioned using a state database. Is that the New Hampshire Granit database that you're talking \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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about?
A. (Garland) It's the database that's distributed through the Granit web site, yes. But to be clear, Granit does not compile that database. They're simply the archiver that distributes it.

The data, it's interesting how that data comes together. There's a very strong coalition of people within the state of New Hampshire that contribute to that database. And it's encouraged through very strong activity in the University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension, for example. They host the annual Land Trust Conference in the state of New Hampshire. Discussion about that data is always important and popular among people that participate in those conferences, whether they be land trusts or town conservation commissions or other agencies, because they all rely on that data to do their work. So there's a very strong sense of obligation to contribute data to that database, to review it and make sure it's up to date.
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Q. And you compared the -- in your analysis, you compared that in the NCED they indicated it was -- for 60 percent of the conservation properties in New Hampshire, it was unknown whether there was public access. And in the state database, that figure is 29 percent. Am I correct in understanding that was the comparison that you did?
A. (Garland) Yes. That's the way -- if you look at the database distributed through Granit, the New Hampshire agency, there is a specific attribute in that table that says "public access." So it's -- and some of those entries say "unknown." But it's an explicit attribute. It's not inferred or assumed the way it is in the National Conservation Easement.
Q. But it's an attribute that you were able to determine that 29 percent of what's contained in the state database, the public access to those conservation lands was unknown; correct?
A. (Garland) Twenty-nine percent of conservation easements. That's not looking at other forms \{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 62 MORNING SESSION] \{11-20-17\}
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of land that are protected.
Q. Okay. Is there a -- could you determine from that database how much of those conservation easements actually allow public access?
A. (Garland) Well, as I say, for many records there's an explicit attribute that says public access is or is not allowed. But for those that access is unknown, it may be simply that it's not reported by the easement holder.
Q. So you say there is an attribute that says public access is allowed. What percentage of the conservation easements in that database indicate that public access is allowed?
A. (Garland) I haven't calculated that percent, but it's easily available. I could do it in two minutes.
Q. And of course, that would be on a statewide basis, not just the lands that are affected by Northern Pass.
A. (Garland) A simple query could be on the database as a whole. Or if we clipped it to the Northern Pass AVPI [sic], we could get a statistic for that, for the easements in that
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area as well. It's not a very difficult exercise at all. It would only take a couple minutes.
Q. But it's not one you chose to do before preparing your testimony, though.
A. (Garland) No. I was concentrating on comparing the two databases, which is why I did what I did.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are there any other questions from the Committee?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Plouffe, do you have any redirect?
MR. PLOUFFE: I do not, Mr.
Chairman.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Thank you, gentlemen.
We will now break for lunch.
Commissioner Bailey and I have business at the PUC, so we'll be back here at quarter of two.
(Lunch recess taken at 12:36 p.m. and concludes the Day 62 Morning Session.
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The hearing continues under separate cover in the transcript noted as Day 62 Afternoon Session.)
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