STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

November 21, 2017 - 1:52 p.m.
DAY 63
49 Donovan Street AFTERNOON SESSION Concord, New Hampshire
\{Electronically filed with SEC on 12-6-2017\}

IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-06 Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy for a Certificate of Site and Facility.
(Hearing on the merits)

PRESENT FOR SUBCOMMITTEE/SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE: Chrmn. Martin P. Honigberg Public Utilities Comm. (Presiding as Presiding Officer)

Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey
Christopher Way, Designee

Public Utilities Comm.
Dept. of Resources \& Economic Development
William Oldenburg, Designee Dept. of Transportation Patricia Weathersby Public Member Rachel Dandeneau Public Member

ALSO PRESENT FOR THE SEC:
Michael J. Iacopino, Esq., Counsel to the SEC (Brennan, Lenehan, Iacopino \& Hickey) Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator
(No Appearances Taken)
COURT REPORTER: Susan J. Robidas, NH LCR No. 44
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 63 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-21-17\}

[WITNESS: MARTLAND]

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { P R OCEE D I N G S } \\
\text { (Hearing resumed at } 1: 52 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m} . \text { ) } \\
\text { CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. }
\end{gathered}
$$

Needleman, whenever you're ready.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Martland.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I'm Barry Needleman. I represent the Applicant in this matter.

Let me start off with background. My understanding is you're an engineer by profession; is that right?
A. I'm a engineer in the sense of a systems engineer, civil, environmental engineering systems, not a professional construction engineer.
Q. You don't have a professional real estate license, nor have you ever; is that correct?
A. No.
Q. No professional certifications in real estate appraisal; is that right?
A. Correct.
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Q. Never testified on either one of those topics; is that correct?
A. No.
Q. No professional experience valuing homes or real estate --
A. Excuse me. You asked --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. Why don't we go back to that. Is there something you wanted to add?
A. You asked the question about have you ever testified in a real estate matter, 1 believe.
Q. No. I said have you ever testified as an expert in real estate issues or appraisal issues.
A. Okay. Not as an expert.
Q. And you don't have any professional experience valuing homes or changes in real estate values; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you have no professional experience preparing visual impact statements; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And no professional experience testifying
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regarding visual impact issues; is that correct?
A. I haven't even done that in this case.
Q. So, earlier when Mr. Pappas asked you if you agreed with experts' opinions regarding unreasonable adverse effects on aesthetics and you said did, you're simply offering your view as a layperson; is that correct?
A. I believe I said I was using their
assessment. And I guess I mean I was agreeing with it, yes.
Q. And at the technical session I asked you at the time you filed your testimony whether you had reviewed the Applicant's Visual Impact Assessment or the Visual Impact Assessment prepared by Counsel for the Public's witness, and you told me that you did not; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so your initial testimony in no way accounted for the findings in either one of those VIAs; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And earlier today when Mr . Pappas showed you
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the various view simulations of the Moose Path Scenic Byway done by the Applicant's expert, it would also be true, then, that you in no way relied on those view simulations when you prepared your testimony; is that correct?
A. I believe I relied on the simulations that were done for the draft EIS. That's what I had at the time.
Q. But not the ones Mr. Pappas put in front of you; correct? Those came from the Applicant's VIA.
A. Can Tell you that even for me who hasn't been here much, the timing when everything was done is a little bit hazy. I believe I just had, I believe, the prefiled testimony. Filed testimony went in after that trip to the North Country where I took those pictures or photographs. So some of those may. But I believe all the ones I used in my KOP analysis were taken directly from the draft EIS.
Q. Understood. At the time you filed your initial testimony, you in fact had reviewed
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that draft EIS; right?
A. Yes, I had.
Q. And so your conclusions regarding visual impacts at that point, in terms of relying on documents, were based solely on your reliance on the draft EIS; is that right?
A. I believe my analysis of the KOP and the Visual Impact was based upon reviewing the EIS. My testimony reflected discussions, many discussions that we had within the North Country Scenic Byway Council about the effect of the towers, and my participation and, you know, other discussions of the towers. There was a tremendous amount of material available as to what people perceived as a perception of the towers.
Q. Understood. Did I hear you say earlier today that you didn't actually review the final EIS?
A. I did review portions of the final EIS. I didn't review the whole document, of course, but...
Q. All right. I have a question about that, and you can tell me whether you looked at this
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portion or not.
Are you familiar with the fact that in the final EIS there was a road-based analysis done of potential effects?
A. Yes.
Q. And in fact, I think that this road-based analysis that was added to the final EIS was included, in part, based on comments that you filed in response to the draft EIS; is that fair to say?
A. Yes. I believe for the roads, they went to the aggregate impact as opposed to the average impact.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: So, Dawn, I want to pull up Applicant's 205, which is the final EIS, and we're going to look at Table 4-75 there. So it's at the bottom of the page, if you could highlight that, please. BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. This is that roads-based analysis for the proposed alternative in the final EIS; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And if you look at the second line down, it
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talks about "average visual magnitude." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And for existing conditions, it rated it as 2.16, which was parenthetically set as "low" to "moderate." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you move further over, it shows the proposed alternative, which is Alternative 7, and it rates it as 2.53 , and it still considers it "low" to "moderate"; is that correct?
A. That is correct, but misleading, because in the existing conditions for 22 miles the impact is none.
Q. So I take it, then, you are saying you disagree with the conclusion in the final EIS regarding this issue.
A. I didn't say that. What I said is that in that line of that table, the 2.53 refers to 43 miles of road, and the 2.16 compares to 21 miles, no inclusion on that line.
Q. Right. So, in fact, it's actually -- in the final version it's adding the additional
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roads, and it's still finding the same type of impact; isn't that correct?
A. It says that you have doubled, more than doubled the impact. And in the area that was added, you added 22 miles. And you more than doubled the impact because the average has gone from 2.16 to 2.53.
Q. Let me ask it this way, Mr. Martland: In both cases, existing conditions and with the proposed project, the conclusion here is that the average visual magnitude will be low to moderate. Do you agree with that conclusion?
A. No -- well, the average visual magnitude would be low to moderate.
Q. Simple question: Do you agree with that conclusion?
A. Where exactly is this conclusion?
Q. It's right on the screen in front of you from the final Environmental Impact Statement.
A. That's not a conclusion. The result is the average visual magnitude increases from 2.16 to 2.53. That's a result.
Q. That's correct. And in both cases it says it's low to moderate. And my question to you
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is --
A. That is also correct. That is also not a conclusion.
Q. In your initial testimony, Historic No. 12, on Page 8 you mention several scenic byways that were of particular concern to you: The Presidential Range Trail, the Woodland Heritage Trail, the Moose Trail, the River Heritage Trail. Does that sound familiar?
A. That's Page 8 of my prefiled?
Q. Yes, your initial testimony.
A. Yes.
Q. And I take it that you're referencing those because those are ones that are -- those are either examples or ones of particular concern to you that you wanted to be sure were evaluated; is that correct?
A. That refers to overhead lines crossing scenic byways in the region. And the other trails, the River Heritage Trail and the White Mountains Trail, are not crossed by --
Q. And because this was your original testimony filed on November 15th, when you wrote this particular section focusing on these
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resources, you weren't aware of the fact that the Applicant had actually evaluated all of these resources; is that correct?
A. Are you saying had I read Mr. DeWan's testimony where he evaluated these resources?
Q. What I'm saying is you told me earlier that prior to preparing this testimony you didn't look at DeWan's VIA. And so is it correct to say that because you did not look at his VIA when you wrote this, you weren't aware that Mr. DeWan actually did evaluate all these resources?
A. Well, I did hear from a number of people who had been in these hearings that Mr. DeWan was evaluating and was referring to scenic roads again and again. To that extent, I was probably aware. I don't remember the exact dates.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, can we call up -- what's the exhibit number? MS. GAGNON: 444 .

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Exhibit 444. So what I did here is I
captured the four resources of concern to
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you, and then I highlighted exactly where in Mr. DeWan's Visual Impact Assessment he addressed these four specific resources. And just to be clear, with respect to each one of these, when you wrote this, you weren't aware that Mr. DeWan evaluated these resources and reached conclusions about them; is that right?
A. No. As I said, I was aware that he had evaluated them and reached conclusions. What I said is $I$ had not read his evaluation or his conclusions.
Q. Okay. And were you aware that Mr. DeWan and Ms. Kimball, in April of 2017, supplemented their testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you review that supplement?
A. I either quickly skimmed it or did not. I did not review it in detail.
Q. So, looking at your supplemental testimony, which is Historic Exhibit 13, and I'm focusing on Page 4, No. 1 -- let me know if I need to slow down -- but you said at the bottom of that, you said that representatives
showed a photo simulation -- representatives of Northern Pass showed a photo simulation of a steel lattice structure near Hall Stream Road during a site visit, but it was not included in Mr. DeWan's testimony. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that it was actually included in Mr. DeWan's supplemental testimony as Photo Simulation 8-5?
A. I guess I was not.
Q. And on the bottom of Page 7 of your supplemental testimony --
A. Excuse me. My testimony was submitted in March, and you said he submitted his in April? If that's the correct chronology, then $I$ obviously was not aware of it.
Q. Right. I'm asking you if you are aware of it now.
A. Yes. You just told me.
Q. Well, I'm just assuming. That's why I asked if you read his supplemental testimony, because $I$ assume if you were aware of it, you might have corrected it. But I'm just trying
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to establish the time line.
So let me go back to the bottom of Page 7 of your supplemental testimony. It says the question is, "Can you give an example of something that was left out?" referring to the above DeWan's report, and you said, "DeWan did not include a single simulation of any structure that would be visible from a distance of less than 1,000 feet." Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And we talked a moment ago about the one on Hall Stream Road, which I think is within 800 feet. But I wanted to -- well, before I do this, I assume that you said this because you considered that to be a significant issue, that he didn't include one within 1,000 feet; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I would assume that because you considered it to be a significant issue, the lack of any within 1,000 feet is something that you would be especially critical of DeWan for not evaluating; is that right?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 63 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-21-17\}
A. That is correct.
Q. So let's call --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, is this 445?

MS. GAGNON: 443.
Q. -- 443. In fact, we went back and we looked at DeWan's VIA and identified at least five photo simulations that are all within 1,000 feet, and they're actually all less than 700 feet away. And I guess my question is: At any point in this process did you come to learn of these view sims?
A. No.
Q. So, now that you're aware of these, does that change your testimony on the bottom of Page 7?
A. No. My testimony on the bottom of Page 7 was responding to the question you asked me in the technical session which was referring to Mr. DeWan's original testimony. It does not say I was responding to anything in his supplemental prefiled testimony. If you want me to respond to these, I haven't seen these pictures. And if I had the time to look, I'd
be happy to respond. But --
Q. I think, Mr. Martland, I'm focusing on the question that you were asked in your supplemental testimony in March. And the question you were asked is, can you give examples of things that were left out? And you testified DeWan did not include a single simulation of any structure that would be visible from a distance of less than 1,000 feet.
A. That's correct. And if you read the beginning of my testimony, $I$ was referring to your question that you asked me in a technical session, had I read Mr. DeWan's testimony. And since that was months before he filed the prefiled [sic] testimony, I was clearly referring to what was in the original testimony, which is what I read in detail in response to your request and I gave you detailed responses. I did not respond to his supplemental yet.
Q. However we got there, this is the testimony that you've sworn to and adopted today. And my question to you is: Now that you've been
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made aware of these five examples, do you still stand by that testimony?
A. If these examples were in his supplemental -Q. They were not in his supplemental. This is the original VIA.

MS. WALKLEY: That's the
February update.
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Okay. I apologize. My mistake. It was not the original VIA. It was the February update.
A. I did not read the February update. I was not aware there was a February update.
Q. But you would agree with me the February update was available to you before you filed your March testimony.
A. Well, yes. But as you keep reminding us all, I am not a visual impact expert. So I'm not sure why I'm being asked about all these visual impact assessments. What I said was, in the original set of photo simulations that were in Mr. DeWan's initial testimony, before it was revised apparently in February and supplemented later on, I did not find what
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I'm quoting, "a single simulation of any structure that would be visible from a distance of less than 1,000 feet."
Q. You attached to your supplemental testimony various view simulations from the draft Environmental Impact Statement; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And I think you actually looked at a number of those this morning with Mr. Pappas; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And these were views that you included in your testimony as having what you understood to be unreasonable adverse effects on aesthetics; right?
A. They included the characterization as "adverse," "unreasonably adverse" or whatever. It was not my characterization. That was taken directly from the draft Environmental Impact Statement.
Q. At the time you filed your supplemental testimony, were you aware of the fact that many of those view sims that you included
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were for Alternatives 2 and variations of Alternative 5, which are not the proposed project at issue here?
A. Yes.
Q. And is there anyplace in your testimony where you actually explain that those view sims had no bearing on this current proposal?
A. I didn't explain that because that's not true. The photo sims have a bearing because, the way I presented them, I said that you could use the KOP analysis, the ones that were used in the draft EIS -- and I may have included some others from the final EIS -could be used to compare to any site where there would be a visual impact of a tower. So the KOP analysis, when organized properly, would allow someone to look out at their perspective, from their house or their roadway or scenic byway, overlook or anyplace and say, well, there's three towers going across a field, and it's 700 feet away. That's likely to have an unreasonable adverse impact unless it's blocked by a hill or, you know, big building or something else.
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: Let's call up Applicant's 352, Dawn.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So what I've done is pulled together a collection of some of the photos sims that were included in your supplemental testimony, and I want to walk through them. This is one that Mr. Pappas showed you this morning.
A. That's correct.
Q. And I didn't hear you at that time explain that this is actually a photo simulation of a portion of the route which is now underground. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So when we look at this photo simulation, that simulation has nothing to do now with the proposal that's before the Committee; right? That doesn't represent the current proposal.
A. I believe this morning I said you would not get that view in New Hampshire, with the possible exception -- I mean, you wouldn't get a roadside view like that except from the Auto Road or the Weeks Estate.
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: Let's go to the next one, Dawn.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. This is another one that was included in your materials. These are from Interstate 93 near Woodstock. Again, the Project is underground through this area. So that doesn't represent the proposal that's before the Committee; is that correct?
A. That is correct.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Next one, please, Dawn.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. Again, this one is, I think it says on the side, I'm not sure, new Hampton. No?

MS. WALKLEY: Easton.
A. Easton.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Easton. I'm sorry. I missed that. So this is the original proposal to go overhead through Easton, not too far from what was originally proposed near your home in Sugar Hill. Of course, this doesn't represent the current proposal either; is that right?
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A. This location does not represent the current proposal. This type of location would be what you would find, say east of Lancaster, on I think it's called North Road, and in Stark, on Northside Road, where you have a row of towers going across a field. And the intent of this whole approach is to say, if Northern Pass is proposing to build something like this across your field, then the visual impact will very likely be unreasonably adverse when evaluated by a VIA expert.
Q. Don't you think it would be more appropriate to actually look at view sims from the specific locations rather than pull out generic view sims and speculate how they might look in those locations?
A. I think when you are hired by a firm with unlimited resources, the answer to that question might be yes. When you are a volunteer putting in hundreds of hours in order to fight this project, the answer is no.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, could we have the next one, please?
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BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Again, this is another view sim included in your materials where the Project is now underground. So this doesn't depict what's in front of the Committee; is that right?
A. That's correct.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And Dawn, one more, please.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Same issue here; is that correct?
A. It's the same view you would have where the towers cross the trail, which is why it is in my testimony.
Q. And you also included some view sims where the Project is overhead, but you didn't reflect the current structure configuration.

So let's go to the next one. I want to ask you about that. This is at Loudon Road. And you've got a structure configuration there which is lattice. Are you aware of the fact that that's not the current proposal here?
A. I'm aware of the fact that in many cases the Northern Pass has suggested slightly
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different structures, slightly different locations, slightly different alignments.
Q. So would you agree with me that with respect to the five view sims that $I$ just showed you, not counting this Loudon Road one, where the Project is now underground in all of those locations, the visual impacts that would have resulted from the view sims that you included in your testimony have now been completely eliminated?
A. The purpose of that portion of my testimony was to show the impacts of certain types of situations. That particular presentation, that series of slides you've shown, could be used for a project in Montana or Rhode Island or Tennessee. The fact that they are no longer part of the Northern Pass Project is, in the terms of my testimony, irrelevant.
Q. Let's go back to my question, Mr. Martland.
A. Okay.
Q. Again, with respect to those five locations, would you agree with me that, now that the Project is underground in all of those areas, the visual impacts in those specific
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locations have now been eliminated?
A. If you bury the Project or move it from these locations, you will have no visual impact from the towers. If you're expanding a right-of-way or knocking down stone walls or rows of pine trees by burying it, then you will have some different kind of impact.
Q. One other set of questions. Earlier today, Ms. Saffo was speaking to you about the White Mountain Northern Loop. Do you recall that?
A. The White Mountain Trail?
Q. She put up something from the Scenic Byway that referred to it as the "White Mountain Northern Loop." Do you remember that?
A. $O h$, yes.
Q. And she talked about the views from this loop being "gorgeous" and made reference to the "Frost Home." Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is another example of where the Project is now underground, and so the visual impacts that might have resulted from it being overhead in this area have now been eliminated; is that right?
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A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Martland. I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Members of the Committee, who has questions for Mr . Martland? Ms. Weathersby.

QUESTIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SEC COUNSEL: BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Couple quick questions. Do you consider scenic drives and rides to be tourism destinations?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your opinion, does a scenic road in New Hampshire have to be designated as a "scenic ride or drive" to be a tourist destination?
A. No.
Q. I notice in the DOT web site that was up there was a spot where people could nominate a scenic drive and had to fill out a form and the route and all that.

So my question is: Do you know of any additional cultural or scenic byways that are under consideration by DOT or the North
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 63 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-21-17\}

Country Scenic Byways Council?
A. I know that there was one. I'm not sure if I'll get the name right. But there was one in the southern portion of the state that was extended from one town into a second town last June. I don't remember the name of the byway, but it was a new one last year. And I believe there are applications for some new ones right now.
Q. Do you know if any of those involve the areas where the Northern Pass Transmission Project is proposed?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. If built, do you believe that the Northern Pass Project could cause any scenic byway to be de-designated or have otherwise affected its listing?
A. I think there are two kinds of effects. This Committee has often heard about the "construction period effect" and then the "long-term effects." So the construction will be a major issue from the entire burial portion, because from Bethlehem down to Plymouth it almost is entirely in scenic
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byways. And portions of that, especially I think in Easton, there's a danger that the burial moves off the right-of-way and you take down pine trees, stone walls, 100-year-old lilacs and things like that. So there's a danger that some of what is really scenic there will be gone. So that's certainly a disruption for the businesses along the route for a couple of years. The long-term effect is it's a small
[sic] detriment to the scenic quality of New Hampshire, that if you put in a gash 200 feet wide for 120 -- well, 40 new miles up north and expanding it below, you are certainly having a major impact on the scenery of New Hampshire. Will nobody climb Mount Washington after that? Of course people will come. Will nobody go to Weeks State Park? Of course they will go. Will the busloads come here in the fall? All those things are true. But that busload of people going on their three-day trip see these towers six or seven times will ask, you know, "What's going on? I thought this was wild New Hampshire."
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So I think one of the experts said there will be a . 15 percent reduction in tourism, which could actually lead to an impact that would amount to many millions of dollars, and where it will have the biggest impact is on second homes and retirees.
Q. But the presence of the towers, say in the North Country along a scenic byway, it's probably not a tipping point to begin a process to de-designate that as a scenic byway. I think you said, you know, 1,000 cuts, the "death by 1,000 cuts" analogy.
A. Right.
Q. But it just will degrade the experience, in your opinion.
A. The lines going across the ridge a half-mile away is a degradation. If you drive across the boarder and go up to Canada where you have two or three lines continuing for 20 miles glistening in the setting sun, that would prevent that road I think from ever being called a scenic byway.
Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Way.
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QUESTIONS BY MR. WAY:
Q. Mr. Martland, just to follow up on that last question. For de-designation, is the criteria written down anywhere that would cause the de-designation process?
A. There are the rules of the New Hampshire Scenic Byway Committee is what you would want to look at. That's accessible through the web site that Ms. Saffo showed. And I think there were three conditions. One is if the municipality doesn't want it, then the New Hampshire Council will say, okay, no. And I don't believe that has ever happened.
Q. Why would a municipality not want it?
A. The only reason $I$ can think of is if they have -- the residents decided they want to put up a hundred billboards and they couldn't do it because it was called a scenic byway. And I don't think there's reason why someone that had a scenic byway would want to downgrade it. The second is a situation like I mentioned from Berlin to West Milan. If you drive 110 out of Berlin, it's not just that
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 63 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-21-17\}
you have a lot of retail and auto sales type of stuff, it's completely filled on both sides of the road and parking lots and trucks parked there. You know, it's part of the economy of the region. It's nothing against the City of Berlin to have an area where there's a people working all the time. But there's no scenery. I think the criteria in the rules say that if there are more than five industrial or commercial establishments per mile, then that could be considered a detriment.
Q. Can I assume, too, that in the rules there's a process for review and --
A. Yes.
Q. -- periodic review?
A. Exactly. If there is some question, then it would be -- oh, go back.

The third reason -- so, the first reason is the town doesn't want it. The second reason is that it gets so developed that, say my council in the North Country, the North Scenic Byway Council, says this is no longer appropriate.
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The third reason is if there's no longer what's called a "management entity," some group that can provide information and answer questions about it, and there is not a corridor management plan for it. So as long as you have a plan and there's an active group that's reporting and you're in contact with DOT and the New Hampshire Scenic Byway Council, everything is copacetic.

Somebody can recommend that a road be de-designated or that it be considered for de-designation, but the decision can only be made by New Hampshire Scenic Byway Council. They act with authority. But they must involve the municipalities and the management entities, and if there's a group like North Country Council that would be involved.
Q. One last question. I noticed on the application on the DOT site, that's a pretty in-depth application.
A. Yes.
Q. Has it always been that way?
A. I don't know for sure. I know that at the beginning, sometime in the late '90s, they
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came in with more stringent rules. So I don't -- all I know is apparently they weren't quite that specific at the beginning. The federal legislation of 1992 laid out very detailed rules, like 14 criteria. You had to have the corridor management plan. You had to have a committee. You had to have scenic and cultural resources listed that had to be safe. And New Hampshire adopted similar rules and said you must meet the federal criteria as well. So there was -- the legal requirement has always been very thorough. What the actual practice was in 1994, I don't know.
Q. Very good. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:

Commissioner Bailey.
QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
Q. Thank you. Good afternoon.
A. Hi .
Q. The examples that Mr. Needleman went through with you to show you that Mr . DeWan evaluated resources that were less than 800 feet away, were any of those in the North Country?
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A. $O h, I$ don't recall.
Q. Okay.
A. We saw the list. I didn't --
Q. All right. Are you aware of any lattice structures that are going to be located on or near the road in the North Country, somewhere in the North Country, or are those truly just examples of if they're near the road, this is what they're going to look like?
A. I believe that you go to places like crossing the Northside Road in Stark and North Road leading toward Lost Nation Road in Lancaster, these are highly scenic roads where the leaf peepers might go and casual visitors might go. You would have situations where there are towers. And whether they're towers or monopoles, at close range it's not going to make a tremendous difference. So I think there are locations throughout the North Country that are similar to the simulations that I had shown.
Q. Okay. I want to understand a little bit better about your idea about the aggregate of the visual impacts rather than the average.
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And when you were talking with Mr. Pappas, he quickly took you through something, and you said you looked at the miles of road that had exposure to the existing transmission lines, and you compared that to the miles of exposure of roads if the Project is approved, and you took the difference between those two and you multiplied it by something; is that right?
A. Right.
Q. What did you --
A. You want me to go through that again?
Q. No. Well, if that's all right, tell me what you multiplied it by?
A. In the table that we just saw, I took the miles of roads, multiplied by the average scenic impact. So it's 20 miles times 2.16 in the base case. And then --
Q. Wait, wait. And 2.16 was?
A. The average scenic impact --
Q. Which was --
A. -- along those roads.
Q. -- weak or whatever?
A. That was low or low to moderate.
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Q. Okay.
A. And then we said, okay, we now have expand -put the Project in and you're going to see the towers from more places. So, instead of 20 miles, now it's 45 miles. So we take 45 and multiply it by the new average, which was 2.53. So we started at, call it 20 times 2 gives you 40, and now we're changing to 40 times 2-1/2, which is a 100 .
Q. Okay.
A. So if you look at the aggregate measure, you see things are more than doubling. That's in the aggregate. But if you look at the average, it could even -- it could be the same.
Q. I understood that point. Thank you. Okay. I think that's all I have. Thank you.
A. Okay.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are there other questions from the Subcommittee? Mr. Oldenburg.

MR. OLDENBURG: I do.
QUESTIONS BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. Just one question about the simulations that
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 63 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-21-17\}
you included. Some of the pictures -- I get the North Country. I can see the impact. But like the Loudon Road picture that you included, the configuration being right or wrong, and then also the towers running up I-93, the expectation is different in those settings, isn't it? In the North Country, yeah, you're on a scenic drive, you're leaf-peeping. But the Loudon Road picture, you know, you got the Shaw's and the Home Depot and everything else. The expectation isn't a scenic expectation. And then driving along I-93 and seeing the lines up, I'm not on I-93 for a scenic drive, I don't think. Am I -- is there a difference?
A. Well, my recollection when I used to come up to climb Mount Washington from Rhode Island as a kid, when I-93 came in and we could drive up that for the first time, that was cited as the most scenic interstate highway in the country. So there is an expectation driving up I-93 that it will be scenic.

The other one, the Loudon Road, I guess that's the one by all the shopping and the
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double row of towers.
Q. Correct.
A. Again, the reason $I$ had those KOP simulations of range is to show what it meant to have a progression from no impact to weak, to moderate, to strong, to severe impact. It's to put an image by it that could be used in Deerfield, that could be used wherever the towers are found, you know. And there may not be many locations like that in the North Country. And certainly if you have a location that has all that built-up area, it's not a scenic area. But it's an impact for people who are going shopping or driving by, going home, commuting, whatever. So I'm not trying to say that was a scenic area. I'm just trying to show an example of what it took to get a rating of, you know, I think that was like 42 or 43 on a scale zero to 45 .
Q. Because on the picture it's "unreasonably adverse," the one on Loudon Road. But when you got up to the view of Dummer Pond, it was "adverse, probably unreasonable." And that just in my mind is totally opposite.
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A. Oh, it should be the opposite. Again, this is -- Mr. Needleman keeps asking me if I'm a visual impact analyst, and I keep saying, no, I am not. But the people who are do study these, and they look at what they call "contrast dominance" and look -- they have a scale, and they say that one across Dummer Pond had towers sticking up and were visible, but they weren't dominating. They weren't that close. So it wasn't like the Loudon Road one. But when they do -- that's the visual, the straight visual impact, if I have this correct.

Then there's a second level, and they say, well, what's the importance of this site? Is this a scenic area? And there are two or three criteria that are used. So that would be one of the other criteria that would way boost Dummer Pond above the Loudon Road.
Q. Okay. All right. Great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Any other
questions from the Subcommittee?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
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[WITNESS: MARTLAND]

Reimers, do you want to help the witness with redirect?

MR. REIMERS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. REIMERS:
Q. Mr. Martland, you've been asked questions by a lot of different parties and the Committee. In response to the questions you've been asked and the answers you've given, do you have anything that you would like to correct, clarify or add?
A. I would just like to note that there were a couple questions asked where there was objections because it wasn't in my testimony. I think I did have some testimony that said if the trees grow up, you block the view. Kind of common sense, but... there was one other thing which I can't remember.

But I guess I would like to thank this group here because you've been sitting through this now for 56 or 57 days. I just had to read the transcripts. I didn't have
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 63 AFTERNOON SESSION] \{11-21-17\}
[WITNESS: MARTLAND]
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[WITNESS: MARTLAND]
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| 34:17,18 | Couple (3) | 24:4 | downgrade (1) | establishments (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Committee (8) | 27:9;29:9;41:15 | Depot (1) | 31:21 | 32:10 |
| 21:17;22:8;24:5; | course (4) | 38:11 | draft (8) | estate (7) |
| 27:5;28:19;31:7; | 7:21;22:23;29:17, | designated (1) | 6:8,21;7:1,6;8:9; | 3:19,22;4:5,11,13, |
| 34:7;41:9 | 19 | 27:14 | 19:5,20;20:12 | 18;21:24 |
| common (1) | Court (1) | destination (1) | drive (7) | evaluate (1) |
| 41:19 | 4:7 | 27:16 | 27:15,20;30:17; | 12:11 |
| commuting (1) | criteria (6) | destinations (1) | 31:24;38:8,14,19 | evaluated (7) |
| 39:15 | 31:4;32:8;34:5,11; | 27:11 | drives (1) | 11:17;12:2,5;13:6, |
| compare (1) | 40:17,18 | detail (2) | 27:10 | 10;23:11;34:22 |
| 20:14 | critical (1) | 13:19;17:18 | driving (3) | evaluating (2) |
| compared (1) | 15:23 | detailed (2) | 38:12,22;39:14 | 12:15;15:24 |
| 36:5 | cross (1) | 17:20;34:5 | Dummer (3) | evaluation (1) |
| compares (1) | 24:12 | detriment (2) | 39:22;40:7,19 | 13:11 |
| 9:21 | crossed (1) | 29:11;32:12 | during (1) | even (3) |
| completely (2) | 11:21 | developed (1) | $14: 4$ | 5:3;6:13;37:14 |
| 25:9;32:2 | CROSS-EXAMINATION (1) | 32:21 |  | everybody's (1) |
| concern (3) | 3:6 | DeWan (8) | E | 42:3 |
| 11:6,15;12:24 | crossing (2) | 12:11,14;13:6,13; |  | exact (1) |
| conclusion (7) | 11:18;35:10 | 15:7,24;17:7;34:22 | earlier (5) | 12:17 |
| $9: 17 ; 10: 10,12,16$ | cultural (2) | DeWan's (10) | $5: 4,24 ; 7: 17 ; 12: 6$ | exactly (3) |
| 17,20;11:3 | 27:23;34:8 | 12:4,8;13:2;14:5,9; | 26:8 | 10:17;13:1;32:17 |
| conclusions (4) | current (6) | 15:6;16:7,20;17:14; | east (1) | EXAMINATION (1) |
| 7:3;13:7,10,12 | 20:7;21:18;22:24; | 18:22 | 23:3 | 41:6 |
| conditions (4) | 23:1;24:16,21 | difference (3) | Easton (5) | example (3) |
| 9:4,14;10:9;31:10 | cuts (2) | 35:18;36:7;38:15 | 22:16,17,19,21; | 15:5;26:20;39:17 |
| configuration (3) | 30:12,12 | different (6) | 29:2 | examples (6) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:16,19;38:4 } \\ & \text { consider (1) } \end{aligned}$ | D | 25:1,1,2;26:7;38:6; $41: 9$ | $\underset{\text { economy (1) }}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 15 ; 17: 6 ; 18: 1,3 ; \\ & 34: 21 ; 35: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $27: 9$ | D | directly (2) | effect (3) | except (1) |
| consideration (1) | danger (2) | 6:21;19:20 | 7:11;28:20;29:10 | 21:23 |
| 27:24 | 29:2,6 | disagree (1) | effects (5) | exception (1) |
| considered (4) | dates (1) | 9:17 | 5:6;8:4;19:15; | 21:22 |
| 15:16,21;32:11; | 12:18 | discussions (3) | 28:18,21 | Excuse (2) |
| 33:11 | Dawn (8) | 7:9,10,13 | EIS (15) | 4:6;14:14 |
| considers (1) | 8:14;12:19;16:3; | disruption (1) | 6:8,22;7:1,6,9,19, | excused (1) |
| 9:11 | 21:2;22:2,12;23:23; | 29:8 | 20;8:3,7,9,16,21; | 42:12 |
| construction (3) | 24:7 | distance (3) | 9:17;20:12,13 | exhibit (3) |
| 3:17;28:20,21 | Day (3) | 15:9;17:9;19:3 | either (5) | 12:20,23;13:21 |
| contact (1) | 42:8,24;43:2 | document (1) | 4:1;5:21;11:15; | existing (4) |
| 33:7 | days (1) | 7:21 | 13:18;22:24 | 9:4,14;10:9;36:4 |
| continuing (1) | 41:23 | documents (1) | eliminated (3) | expand (1) |
| 30:19 | death (1) | 7:5 | 25:10;26:1,24 | 37:2 |
| contrast (1) | 30:12 | dollars (1) | else (3) | expanding (2) |
| 40:6 | December (3) | 30:4 | 20:24;38:11;42:16 | 26:4;29:14 |
| copacetic (1) | $42: 20,23 ; 43: 3$ | dominance (1) | engineer (4) | expectation (4) |
| 33:9 | decided (1) | 40:6 | 3:13,15,16,18 | 38:6,11,12,21 |
| corrected (1) | 31:16 | dominating (1) | engineering (1) | experience (5) |
| 14:24 | decision (1) | 40:9 | 3:16 | 4:4,17,20,24;30:14 |
| corridor (2) | 33:12 | done (7) | entire (1) | expert (5) |
| 33:5;34:6 | de-designate (1) | 5:3;6:2,8,15;8:4; | 28:22 | 4:13,15;6:3;18:18; |
| Council (8) | 30:10 | 21:4;42:6 | entirely (1) | 23:11 |
| 7:11;28:1;31:12; | de-designated (2) | DOT (4) | 28:24 | experts (1) |
| 32:22,23;33:9,13,17 | 28:16;33:11 | 27:18,24;33:8,19 | entities (1) | 30:1 |
| Counsel (2) | de-designation (3) | double (1) | 33:16 | experts' (1) |
| 5:16;27:7 | 31:3,5;33:12 | 39:1 | entity (1) | 5:5 |
| counting (1) | Deerfield (1) | doubled (3) | 33:2 | explain (3) |
| 25:5 | 39:8 | 10:3,4,6 | environmental (4) | 20:6,8;21:10 |
| Country (14) | degradation (1) | doubling (1) | 3:16;10:19;19:6,21 | exposure (2) |
| 6:18;7:11;28:1; | 30:17 | 37:12 | especially (2) | 36:4,6 |
| 30:8;32:22;33:17; | degrade (1) | down (6) | 15:23;29:1 | extended (1) |
| 34:24;35:6,7,20;38:2, | 30:14 | 8:24;13:23;26:5; | establish (1) | 28:5 |
| 7,21;39:11 | depict (1) | 28:23;29:4;31:4 | 15:1 | extent (1) |


| 12:16 | four (2) | Hearing (2) | 26:22;35:24 | 26:7;41:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F | 12:24;13:3 | 3:2;43:2 | importance (1) | kinds (1) $28: 18$ |
|  | 6:10;10:18;24:5 | 12:14 | include (3) | knocking (1) |
| fact (11) | Frost (1) | help (1) 41:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 7,17 ; 17: 7 \\ & \text { included (14) } \end{aligned}$ | 26:5 |
| 6:24;8:2,6;9:23; | 26:18 |  |  | KOP (5) |
| 12:1;14:8;16:6; | further (2) | Heritage (3) <br> 11:8,9,20 | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 8 ; 14: 5,9 ; 19: 13 \\ & 17,24 ; 20: 13 ; 21: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 20 ; 7: 7 ; 20: 11,16 ; \\ & 39 \cdot 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19: 23 ; 24: 21,23 ; \\ & 25: 16 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { fair (1) } \\ 8: 10 \end{gathered}$ | G | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{H i}(\mathbf{1}) \\ 34: 20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 4 ; 24: 2,14 ; 25: 8 \\ & 38: 1,4 \end{aligned}$ | L |
|  |  | $\underset{8 \cdot 18}{\text { highlight (1) }}$ | inclusion (1) | lack (1) |
| fall (1) | GAGNON (2) |  | 9:22 |  |
| 29:20 | 12:21;16:5 | 8:18 <br> highlighted (1) | increases (1) | 15:22 |
| familiar (2) | gash (1) | 13:1 | 10:21 | laid (1) |
| 8:2;11:9 | 29:12 | highly (1) | in-depth (1) | 34:4 |
| far (1) | gave (1) | 35:13 | 33:20 | Lancaster (2) |
| 22:21 | 17:19 | highway (1) | industrial (1) | 23:3;35:12 |
| February (6) | generic (1) | 38:20 | 32:10 | last (4) |
| 18:7,10,12,13,14, | 23:15 | hill (2) | information (1) | 28:6,7;31:2;33:18 |
| 23 | gets (1) | 20:23;22:23 | 33:3 | late (1) |
| federal (2) | 32:21 | hired (1) | initial (5) | 33:24 |
| 34:4,10 | given (1) | 23:17 | 5:20;6:24;11:4,11; | later (1) |
| feet (11) | 41:11 | Historic (2) | 18:22 | 18:24 |
| 15:10,14,18,22; | gives (1) | 11:4;13:21 | instead (1) | lattice (3) |
| $16: 9,10 ; 17: 10 ; 19: 3$ | $37: 8$ | home (4) | 37:4 | $14: 3 ; 24: 20 ; 35: 4$ |
| $20: 21 ; 29: 12 ; 34: 23$ | glistening (1) | 22:22;26:18;38:10; | intent (1) | layperson (1) |
| field (3) | 30:20 | 39:15 | $23: 7$ | 5:8 |
| $20: 21 ; 23: 6,9$ | Good (4) | homes (3) | interrupts (1) | lead (1) |
| fight (1) | 3:8,9;34:15,19 | 4:4,17;30:6 | 4:7 | 30:3 |
| 23:21 | gorgeous (1) | HONIGBERG (12) | Interstate (2) | leading (1) |
| filed (8) | 26:17 | $3: 3 ; 27: 4 ; 30: 24$ | 22:5;38:20 | 35:12 |
| 5:13;6:17,23;8:9; | Great (1) | 34:16;37:19;40:21, | into (1) | leaf (1) |
| 11:23;17:16;18:15; | 40:20 | $24 ; 41: 4 ; 42: 4,7,18,22$ | $28: 5$ | $35: 13$ |
| $19: 22$ | group (4) | hours (1) | involve (2) | leaf-peeping (1) |
| fill (1) | 33:3,7,16;41:22 | 23:20 | 28:10;33:15 | 38:9 |
| 27:20 | grow (1) | house (1) | involved (1) | learn (1) |
| filled (1) | $41: 18$ guess (5) | 20:18 | 33:17 irrelevant (1) | 16:12 |
| $32: 2$ final (10) | guess (5) | hundred (1) | irrelevant (1) | least (1) |
| final (10) <br> 7:18,20;8:3,7,16 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 10 ; 14: 11 ; 16: 10 ; \\ & 38: 23: 41: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31: 17 \\ \text { hundreds (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25: 18 \\ \text { Island (2) } \end{gathered}$ | $16: 7$ leave (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 18,20 ; 8: 3,7,16 \\ & 21 ; 9: 17,24 ; 10: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $38: 23 ; 41: 21$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { hundreds (1) } \\ 23: 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Island (2) } \\ \text { 25:15;38:17 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { leave (1) } \\ 42: 10 \end{array}$ |
| 20:13 | H | I | issue (6) | left (2) |
| find (2) | half-mile (1) |  | $9: 18 ; 15: 17,21 ;$ | 15:5;17:6 |
| 18:24;23:3 finding (1) |  | I-93 (5) | $20: 3 ; 24: 10 ; 28: 22$ | legal (1) |
| finding (1) | $30: 16$ |  |  | 34:11 |
| 10:1 <br> findings (1) | Hall (2) | 38:6,13,14,18,22 | 4:13,14;5:1 | legislation (1) |
|  | 14:3;15:13 | idea (1) |  | $34: 4$ |
| 5:21 |  | 35:23 | J | less (5) |
| firm (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 21 ; 27: 14 ; 29: 12, \\ & 16,24 ; 31: 6,12 ; 33: 8 \end{aligned}$ | identified (1) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 9 ; 16: 9 ; 17: 9 ; \\ & 19: 3 ; 34: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| first (2) | $13 ; 34: 9$Hampton (1) | image (1) | 28:6 | level (1) |
| 32:19;38:19 |  | 39:7 |  | 40:14 |
| five (5) | 22:15 | impact (33) | K | license (1) |
| 16:7;18:1;25:4,21; | happened (1) | 4:21;5:1,14,15;7:8; |  | 3:20 |
| 32:10 | 31:13 | 8:12,13;9:15;10:2,4, | keep (2) | likely (2) |
| focusing (3) | happy (1) | 6,19;13:2;18:18,20; | 18:17;40:3 | 20:22;23:10 |
| 11:24;13:22;17:2 | 17:1 | 19:6,21;20:15,23; | keeps (1) | lilacs (1) |
| follow (1) | hazy (1) | 23:10;26:3,7;29:15; | 40:2 | 29:5 |
| 31:2 | 6:15 | 30:3,5;36:17,20; | kid (1) | line (4) |
| form (1) | hear (3) | 38:2;39:5,6,13;40:3, | 38:18 | $8: 24 ; 9: 20,22 ; 15: 1$ |
| 27:20 | 7:17;12:13;21:10 | . 12 | Kimball (1) | lines (5) |
| found (1) | heard (1) | impacts (6) | 13:14 | 11:18;30:16,19; |
| 39:9 | 28:19 | 7:4;25:7,12,24; | kind (2) | 36:4;38:13 |


| list (1) | 41:8;42:11 | 19:10;21:8,20 | $34: 24 ; 35: 6,7,11,19$ | $18: 5,10,21 ; 22: 20$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35:3 | material (1) | most (1) | 38:2,7;39:10 | originally (1) |
| listed (1) | 7:14 | 38:20 | Northern (8) | 22:22 |
| 34:8 | materials (2) | Mount (2) | 14:2;23:8;24:24; | others (1) |
| listing (1) | 22:5;24:3 | 29:16;38:17 | 25:17;26:10,14; | 20:13 |
| 28:17 | matter (2) | Mountain (3) | 28:11,15 | otherwise (1) |
| little (2) | 3:11;4:11 | 26:10,11,13 | Northside (2) | 28:16 |
| 6:15;35:22 | may (3) | Mountains (1) | 23:5;35:11 | out (7) |
| located (1) | 6:19;20:12;39:9 | 11:21 | note (1) | 15:5;17:6;20:17; |
| 35:5 | mean (2) | move (2) | 41:14 | 23:14;27:20;31:24; |
| location (3) | 5:10;21:22 | 9:8;26:2 | notice (1) | 34:4 |
| 23:1,2;39:12 | meant (1) | moves (1) | 27:18 | over (1) |
| locations (9) | 39:4 | 29:3 | noticed (1) | 9:8 |
| 23:14,16;25:2,7, | measure (1) | much (1) | 33:18 | overhead (4) |
| 21;26:1,3;35:19; | 37:11 | 6:14 | November (1) | 11:18;22:20;24:15; |
| 39:10 | meet (1) | multiplied (3) | 11:23 | 26:23 |
| long (1) | 34:10 | 36:8,14,16 | number (3) | overlook (1) |
| 33:5 | Members (2) | multiply (1) | 12:13,20;19:9 | 20:19 |
| longer (3) $25: 17: 32: 23: 33: 1$ | $27: 4,7$ mention | $37: 6$ municipalities | 0 | P |
|  | mention <br> $11 \cdot 5$ | municipalities 33:15 | 0 | P |
| 28:21;29:10 | mentioned (1) | municipality (2) | objections (1) | page (8) |
| look (15) | 31:23 | 31:11,14 | 41:16 | 8:18;11:5,10; |
| 8:16,24;12:8,9; | might (6) | must (2) | obviously (1) | 13:22;14:12;15:3; |
| 16:24;20:17;21:15; | 14:24;23:16,19; | 33:14;34:10 | 14:17 | 16:16,17 |
| 23:13,16;31:8;35:9; | 26:22;35:14,14 |  | off (2) | Pappas (6) |
| 37:11,13;40:5,6 | Milan (1) | $\mathbf{N}$ | 3:12;29:3 | 5:4,24;6:10;19:10; |
| looked (4) | 31:23 |  | offering (1) | 21:8;36:1 |
| 7:24;16:6;19:9; | mile (1) | name (2) | 5:7 | parenthetically (1) |
| 36:3 | 32:11 | 28:3,6 | often (1) | 9:5 |
| looking (1) | miles (12) | Nation (1) | 28:19 | Park (1) |
| 13:20 | 9:14,21,22;10:5; | 35:12 | Oldenburg (3) | 29:18 |
| Loop (3) | 29:13;30:20;36:3,5, | near (5) | 37:21,22,23 | parked (1) |
| 26:10,14,16 | 16,17;37:5,5 | 14:3;22:5,22;35:6, | one (30) | 32:4 |
| Lost (1) | millions (1) | 8 | 4:1;5:21;13:4; | parking (1) |
| 35:12 | 30:4 | need (3) | 15:12,17;21:7;22:2,4, | 32:3 |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o t }}(2)$ | mind (1) | 13:23;42:10,16 | 11,14;23:24;24:7,17; | part (3) |
| 32:1;41:9 | 39:24 | Needleman (23) | 25:5;26:8;28:2,3,5,7; | 8:8;25:17;32:4 |
| lots (1) | misleading (1) | 3:4,5,7,10;8:14,19; | 30:1;31:10;33:18; | participation (1) |
| 32:3 | 9:13 | 12:19,22;16:3;18:8; | 37:24;38:23,24; | $7: 12$ |
|  | missed (1) | 21:1,3;22:1,3,11,13, | 39:21;40:7,11,18; | particular (4) |
| $24: 18 ; 25: 5 ; 38: 3,9,$ | 22:19 | 18;23:23;24:1,7,9; | 41:19 | 11:6,15,24;25:13 |
| 23;39:21;40:10,19 | mistake (1) | 34:21;40:2 | ones (6) | parties (1) |
| low (7) | 18:9 | New (15) | 6:10,20;11:14,15; | 41:9 |
| 9:5,11;10:11,14, | moderate (7) | 21:21;22:15;27:14; | 20:11;28:9 | Pass (6) |
| 24;36:24,24 | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 6,11 ; 10: 12,14, \\ & 24 ; 36: 24 ; 39: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 7,8 ; 29: 11,13,15 \\ & 24 ; 31: 6,11 ; 33: 8,13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { only (2) } \\ 31: 15 ; 33: 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 2 ; 23: 8 ; 24: 24 \\ & 25: 17 ; 28: 11,15 \end{aligned}$ |
| M | moment (1) | 34:9;37:6 | opinion (2) | Path (1) |
|  | 15:12 | next (4) | 27:13;30:15 | 6:2 |
| magnitude (4) | monopoles (1) | 22:2,11;23:24 | opinions (1) | peepers (1) |
| 9:1;10:11,13,21 | 35:17 | 24:17 | 5:5 | 35:14 |
| major (2) | MONROE (1) | nobody (2) | opportunity (1) | people (8) |
| 28:22;29:15 | 42:20 | 29:16,18 | 42:2 | 7:15;12:13;27:19; |
| management (4) | Montana (1) | nominate (1) | opposed (1) | 29:17,21;32:7;39:14; |
| 33:2,5,15;34:6 | 25:15 | 27:19 | 8:12 | 40:4 |
| many (5) | months (1) | none (1) | opposite (2) | per (1) |
| 7:10;19:24;24:23; | 17:15 | 9:15 | 39:24;40:1 | 32:11 |
| 30:4;39:10 | Moose (2) | nor (1) | order (1) | perceived (1) |
| March (3) | 6:1;11:8 | 3:20 | 23:21 | 7:15 |
| 14:15;17:4;18:16 | more (8) | North (17) | organized (1) | percent (1) |
| Martland (9) | 10:3,5;23:12;24:8; | 6:18;7:10;23:4; | 20:16 | 30:2 |
| $3: 8 ; 10: 8 ; 17: 2$ | 32:9;34:1;37:4,12 | $27: 24 ; 29: 13 ; 30: 8$ | original (7) | perception (1) |
| 25:19;27:2,6;31:2; | morning (3) | 32:22,22;33:16; | 11:22;16:20;17:17; | $7: 15$ |


| period (1) | 33:19 |  | 7:5 | Rhode (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28:20 | prevent (1) | $\mathbf{R}$ | relied (2) | 25:15;38:17 |
| periodic (1) |  |  |  |  |
| 32:16 | prior (1) | Range (3) | relying (1) | 27:15 |
| perspective (1) | $12: 7$ | $11: 7 ; 35: 17 ; 39: 4$ | 7:4 | rides (1) |
| 20:18 | probably (3) | rated (1) | remember (4) | 27:10 |
| photo (8) | 12:17;30:9;39:23 | 9:4 | 12:17;26:14;28:6; | ridge (1) |
| 14:1,2,10;16:8; | process (4) | rates (1) | 41:20 | 30:16 |
| 18:21;20:9;21:11,15 | 16:11;30:10;31:5; | 9:10 | reminding (1) | right (31) |
| photographs (1) 6:19 | $\begin{array}{r} 32 \\ \text { profe } \end{array}$ | rather (2) | 18:17 report | $3: 14,23 ; 7: 1,6,23$ |
| photos (1) | $3: 14$ | rating (1) | 15:6 | $13: 8 ; 14: 18 ; 15: 18,24$ |
| 21:5 | professional (7) | 39:18 | Reporter (1) | 19:7,11,16;21:18; |
| picture (3) | 3:17,19,22;4:4,16, | reached (2) | 4:7 | 22:24;24:5;26:24; |
| 38:3,9;39:20 | 20,24 | 13:7,10 | reporting (1) | 28:3,9;30:13;35:4; |
| pictures (3) | progression (1) | read (8) | $33: 7$ represent (5) | 36:9,10,13;38:4; |
| 6:18;16:24;38:1 | 39:5 | $12: 4 ; 13: 11 ; 14: 22$ | represent (5) | 40:20;42:9,19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { pine (2) } \\ & 26: 6 ; 29: 4 \end{aligned}$ | project (16) <br> 10:10;20:3 | $17: 11,14,18 ; 18: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 10 ; 21: 18 ; 22: 7, \\ & 23 ; 23: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{26: 5: 29: 3}{\text { right-of-way (2) }}$ |
| places (2) | 23:21;24:3,15;25:6, | ready (1) | representatives (2) | River (2) |
| 35:10;37:4 | 15,17,23;26:2,21; | $3: 4$ | 13:24;14:1 | 11:8,20 |
| plan (3) | 28:11,15;36:6;37:3 | real (6) | request (1) | road (24) |
| 33:5,6;34:6 | properly (1) | 3:19,22;4:5,11,13, | $17: 19$ | 9:21;14:4;15:13; |
| please (4) | 20:16 | $17$ | requirement (1) | 21:24;23:4,5;24:18; |
| 8:18;22:12;23:24; | proposal (8) | really (1) | $34: 12$ residents (1) | 25:5;27:13;30:21; |
| 24:8 | 20:7;21:17,19; | 29:6 | residents (1) | 32:3;33:10;35:6,8,11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plymouth (1) } \\ & \text { 28:24 } \end{aligned}$ | 22:8,20,24;23:2; | reason (7) | 31:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 11,12 ; 36: 3 ; 38: 3,9,23 ; \\ & 39: 21: 40: 11.19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 28:24 } \\ \text { pm (5) } \end{array}$ | proposed (6) | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 15,19 ; 32: 19,19 \\ & 21 ; 33: 1 ; 39: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $12: 1,3,5,12,24 ;$ | road-based (2) |
| 3:2;42:21,23;43:2, | 8:21;9:9;10:10; | recall (3) | 13:3,6;23:18;34:8,23 | 8:3,6 |
| 4 | 20:2;22:22;28:12 | $26: 10,18 ; 35: 1$ | respect (3) | roads (7) |
| point (4) | proposing (1) | recollection (1) | 13:4;25:3,21 | $8: 11 ; 10: 1 ; 12: 15$ |
| 7:4;16:11;30:9; | $23: 8$ | $38: 16$ | respond (3) | $35: 13 ; 36: 6,16,22$ |
| 37:16 | provide (1) | recommend (1) | 16:23;17:1,20 | roads-based (1) |
| Pond (3) | 33:3 | $33: 10$ | responding (2) | 8:20 |
| 39:22;40:8,19 | Public's (1) | record (1) | 16:18,21 | roadside (1) |
| portion (5) | $5: 16$ | $42: 8$ | response (3) | 21:23 |
| $8: 1 ; 21: 12 ; 25: 11$ | pull (2) | redirect (2) | $8: 9 ; 17: 19 ; 41: 10$ | roadway (1) |
| 28:4,23 | 8:15;23:14 | $41: 2,6$ | response] (2) | $20: 19$ |
| portions (2) | pulled (1) | reduction (1) | 40:23;42:17 | route (3) |
| 7:20;29:1 | 21:4 | 30:2 | responses (1) | 21:12;27:21;29:9 |
| possible (1) | purpose (1) | reference (1) | 17:20 | row (2) |
| 21:22 | 25:11 | 26:17 | result (2) | 23:6;39:1 |
| potential (1) | put (6) | referencing (1) | 10:20,22 | rows (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} 8: 4 \\ \text { practice (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:10;26:12;29:12; } \\ & 31: 17: 37: 3 ; 39: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $11: 13$ | resulted (2) 25:8;26:22 | $\begin{gathered} 26: 6 \\ \text { rules (6) } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { practice }(\mathbf{1}) \\ 34: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 31:17;37:3;39:7 } \\ & \text { putting (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { referred (1) } \\ 26: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:8;26:22 } \\ & \text { resume (2) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rules (6) } \\ & 31: 6 ; 32: 9,13 ; 34: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| prefiled (4) | 23:20 | referring (5) | $42: 19 ; 43: 2$ | $5,10$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6: 16 ; 11: 10 ; 16: 22 \\ & 17: 16 \end{aligned}$ | Q | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 15 ; 15: 6 ; 16: 19 ; \\ & 17: 12,17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { resumed (1) } \\ & 3: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { running }(1) \\ 38: 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| prepared (2) 5:16:6:5 |  | refers (2) 9:20;11:18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { retail (1) } \\ 32 \cdot 1 \end{gathered}$ | S |
| preparing (2) | $29: 1$ | 9:20;11:18 |  |  |
| cepar $4: 21 ; 12: 7$ | quick (1) | $24: 16$ | retirees 30:6 | safe (1) |
| presence (1) | 27:9 | reflected (1) | review (7) | $34: 9$ |
| 30:7 | quickly (2) | 7:9 | 7:18,20,21;13:17, | Saffo (2) |
| presentation (1) | 13:18;36:2 | regarding (4) | 19;32:14,16 | 26:9;31:9 |
| 25:13 | quite (1) | $5: 1,5 ; 7: 3 ; 9: 18$ | reviewed (2) | sales (1) |
| presented (1) | 34:3 | region (2) | $5: 14 ; 6: 24$ | 32:1 |
| $20: 10$ | quoting (1) | $11: 19 ; 32: 5$ | reviewing (1) | same (4) |
| Presidential (1) | 19:1 | Reimers (5) | 7:8 | 10:1;24:10,11; |
| $11: 7$ |  | $41: 1,3,7 ; 42: 5,6$ | revised (1) | $37: 15$ |
| pretty (1) |  | reliance (1) | 18:23 | saw (2) |


| 35:3;36:15 | sides (1) | southern (1) | 13:17 | 30:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| saying (4) | 32:3 | 28:4 | supplemental (13) | today (4) |
| 9:16;12:4,6;40:3 | significant (2) | speaking (1) | 13:20;14:9,13,22; | 5:24;7:17;17:23; |
| scale (2) | 15:16,21 | 26:9 | 15:3;16:22;17:4,21; | 26:8 |
| 39:19;40:7 | $\operatorname{sim}(1)$ | specific (4) | 18:3,4;19:4,22;21:6 | together (1) |
| scenery (2) | 24:2 | 13:3;23:14;25:24; | supplemented (2) | 21:4 |
| 29:15;32:8 | similar (2) | 34:3 | 13:14;18:24 | told (3) |
| Scenic (38) | 34:9;35:20 | speculate (1) | sure (5) | 5:17;12:6;14:20 |
| 6:2;7:11;11:5,18; | Simple (1) | 23:15 | 11:16;18:19;22:15; | took (5) |
| 12:15;20:19;26:12; | 10:15 | spot (1) | 28:2;33:23 | 6:18;36:2,7,15; |
| 27:10,13,15,20,23; | simply (1) | 27:19 | sworn (1) | 39:18 |
| 28:1,15,24;29:7,11; | 5:7 | stand (1) | 17:23 | topics (1) |
| 30:8,10,22;31:7,18, | sims (10) | 18:2 | systems (2) | 4:2 |
| 20;32:23;33:8,13; | 16:12;19:24;20:6, | Stark (2) | $3: 15,17$ | totally (1) |
| 34:7;35:13;36:17,20; | 9;21:5;23:13,15; | 23:5;35:11 |  | 39:24 |
| 38:8,12,14,20,22; | 24:14;25:4,8 | start (1) | T | tourism (2) |
| 39:13,16;40:16 | simulation (9) | 3:12 |  | 27:10;30:2 |
| screen (1) | 14:1,2,10;15:8; | started (1) | Table (3) | tourist (1) |
| 10:18 | 17:8;19:1;21:11,15, | 37:7 | 8:16;9:20;36:15 | 27:15 |
| SEC (1) | 16 | state (2) | talked (2) | toward (1) |
| 27:7 | simulations (9) | 28:4;29:18 | 15:12;26:16 | 35:12 |
| second (6) | 6:1,4,7;16:8;18:21; | Statement (3) | talking (1) | tower (1) |
| 8:24;28:5;30:6; | 19:5;35:20;37:24; | 10:19;19:6,21 | 36:1 | 20:15 |
| 31:22;32:20;40:14 | 39:3 | statements (1) | talks (1) | towers (16) |
| section (1) | single (3) | 4:21 | 9:1 | 7:12,13,16;20:20; |
| 11:24 | 15:7;17:7;19:1 | stay (1) | technical (3) | 23:6;24:12;26:4; |
| seeing (1) | sit (1) | 42:13 | 5:12;16:19;17:14 | 29:22;30:7;35:16,16; |
| 38:13 | 42:1 | steel (1) | Tennessee (1) | 37:4;38:5;39:1,9; |
| sense (2) | site (6) | 14:3 | 25:16 | 40:8 |
| 3:15;41:19 | 14:4;20:14;27:18; | sticking (1) | terms (2) | town (3) |
| series (1) | 31:9;33:19;40:16 | 40:8 | 7:4;25:18 | 28:5,5;32:20 |
| 25:14 | sitting (1) | still (3) | testified (4) | Trail (8) |
| session (4) | $41: 22$ | 9:10;10:1;18:2 | 4:1,11,12;17:7 | 11:7,8,8,9,20,21; |
| 5:12;16:19;17:14; | situation (1) | stone (2) | testifying (1) | 24:12;26:11 |
| 43:1 | 31:22 | 26:5;29:4 | 4:24 | trails (1) |
| set (3) | situations (2) | straight (1) | testimony (44) | 11:19 |
| 9:5;18:21;26:8 | 25:13;35:15 | 40:12 | 5:13,20;6:5,16,17, | transcripts (1) |
| setting (1) | six (1) | Stream (2) | 24;7:9;11:4,11,22; | 41:24 |
| 30:20 | 29:22 | 14:3;15:13 | 12:5,7;13:15,20;14:5, | Transmission (2) |
| settings (1) | skimmed (1) | stringent (1) | 10,13,14,22;15:3; | 28:11;36:4 |
| 38:7 | 13:18 | 34:1 | 16:15,17,20,22;17:4, | trees (3) |
| seven (1) | slides (1) | strong (1) | 12,15,16,18,22;18:2, | 26:6;29:4;41:18 |
| 29:23 | 25:14 | 39:6 | 16,22;19:4,14,23; | tremendous (2) |
| several (1) | slightly (3) | structure (6) | 20:5;21:6;24:13; | 7:14;35:18 |
| 11:5 | 24:24;25:1,2 | 14:3;15:8;17:8; | 25:9,11,18;41:16,17 | trip (2) |
| severe (1) | slow (1) | 19:2;24:16,19 | third (2) | 6:17;29:22 |
| 39:6 | 13:23 | structures (2) | 32:19;33:1 | trucks (1) |
| Shaw's (1) | small (1) | 25:1;35:5 | thorough (1) | 32:3 |
| 38:10 | 29:10 | study (1) | 34:12 | true (3) |
| shopping (2) | solely (1) | 40:4 | thought (1) | 6:3;20:9;29:21 |
| 38:24;39:14 | 7:5 | stuff (1) | 29:24 | truly (1) |
| show (4) | Somebody (1) | 32:2 | three (4) | 35:7 |
| 25:12;34:22;39:4, | 33:10 | SUBCOMMITTEE (3) | 20:20;30:19;31:10; | trying (3) |
| 17 | someone (2) | 27:7;37:20;40:22 | 40:17 | 14:24;39:16,17 |
| showed (6) | 20:17;31:19 | submitted (2) | three-day (1) | two (4) |
| 5:24;14:1,2;21:8; | sometime (1) | 14:14,15 | 29:22 | 28:18;30:19;36:7; |
| 25:4;31:9 | 33:24 | Sugar (1) | throughout (1) | 40:17 |
| shown (2) | somewhere (1) | 22:22 | 35:19 | type (3) |
| 25:14;35:21 | 35:6 | suggested (1) | times (4) | 10:1;23:2;32:1 |
| shows (1) | sorry (1) | 24:24 | 29:23;36:17;37:7,9 | types (1) |
| 9:8 | 22:19 | sun (1) | timing (1) | 25:12 |
| side (1) | sound (1) | 30:20 | $6: 14$ |  |
| 22:15 | 11:9 | supplement (1) | tipping (1) |  |



