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A. (L. Cumbee) Lydia Cumbee.
Q. Please tell us where you live.
A. (R. Cumbee) Oh, Franconia.
A. (L. Cumbee) Franconia.
A. (Thibault) Robert Thibault, Easton.
A. (Meyer) Barbara Meyer, Easton.
A. (Lakes) Carl Lakes, Easton.
A. (Ting) Kathryn Ting, Franconia.
A. (Palmer) Walter Palmer, Franconia.
A. (Grote) Peter Grote, Franconia.
Q. Thank you. Now, I understand that as a group you filed prefiled direct testimony which is marked as APOBP1. Do you all, for our purposes here today, adopt that testimony?
A. (Panel) Yes.
Q. Is there anybody who does not adopt the testimony?
[No verbal response]
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Are there any corrections to be made to APOBP1?
A. (Meyer) Yes.
Q. Ms. Meyer, why don't you tell us what the corrections are for that exhibit.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
A. (Meyer) Right. Okay. On Page 4 we needed to change the number of signatures on the petitions that we describe on Page 4. The number that is shown there was "2,250 signatures as of December 26, 2016," that should be changed to "6,554 as of December 14, 2017."
Q. Are there any other corrections that need to be made to APOBP1?
A. (Meyer) Yes, I have another one. This is on Page 6 -- no, Page 5. Page 5, the second to the last paragraph, third line from the bottom, the "60 percent" number is in error. It needs to be changed to "41 percent." What that is about is we were discussing handfit stone foundations, and we said that that was the type of foundation reported by 60 percent of respondents to the survey. There were actually some respondents that owned more than one stone foundation structure on their property. So the correct way -- there are actually 41 structures that fit that description, but they were owned by 28 respondents. So the correct percentage
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
should be 41 percent.
Q. Okay. And any other corrections to APOBP1? [No verbal response]
Q. Okay. I'm now going to go down through the individual testimonies that $I$ have on my list from you. So the first person that I have who's here is Mr. Lakes. And I have noted that you have filed prefiled testimony which has been marked as APOBP5. Am I correct in that?
A. (Lakes) Yes, that's correct.
Q. Do you adopt that as your individual testimony for our purposes here today?
A. (Lakes) I do.
Q. Do you have any corrections to make to what's contained in APOBP5? I'm not asking for new information at this point, just any corrections to APOBP5.
A. (Lakes) I do.
Q. Okay. Please tell us what the corrections are.
A. (Lakes) And there will be a point where we can add to that; correct?
Q. I will -- when we're done getting all of the
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]
testimonies adopted, we will ask each of you if there is anything you need to add.
A. (Lakes) Okay.
Q. If you could tell us the page where you're making the correction.
A. (Lakes) Well, it's all on one page, and mine was very short and sweet, for some, anyway.

I would like to correct a misstatement in my prefiled testimony in Section 3. The sentence reads, "The three members of the PUC which negotiated this deal sit on the SEC." The "three" should be changed to "two," as two members of the PUC sit on the SEC.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And
Mr. Lakes, that's the only thing you want to change in that paragraph or any of the other statements you've made in your prefiled testimony?

MR. LAKES: Well, some of the things I need to change are also additions, so I'm not sure where that comes in.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Just wondering if you were going to be withdrawing any of your prefiled testimony. The answer may
well be "No." I'm just interested in whether you're going to withdraw any of your prefiled testimony.

MR. LAKES: No, I don't plan on withdrawing anything.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. With that, then I'll move on to the direct testimony of Walter Palmer and Kathryn Ting, which has been marked as APOBP6.

Ms. Ting and Mr. Palmer, do you adopt that testimony here today?
A. (Palmer) Yes.
A. (Ting) Yes.
Q. Are there any corrections that need to be made to APOBP6?
A. (Palmer) No.
Q. Now turning to Mr. Grote. Mr. Grote, I have a document marked as APOBP10, entitled "Supplemental Testimony of Peter Grote, dated April 17, 2017." I'm a little confused because it's entitled "Supplemental." Is that meant to supplement APOBP1?
A. (Grote) No, it's testimony, direct testimony.
Q. Is this the only direct testimony that you
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filed individually?
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. And do you adopt that as your testimony here today?
A. (Grote) Yes, I do. But I do have a correction.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You need to turn your microphone on.
A. (Grote) There were some typo corrections that were not material that $I$ made. And I also changed the name of the party to "Mr. X." So in the first paragraph, wherever you see the person $I$ was referring to, that has been changed to "Mr. X." That's not a material change.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Any other corrections for that document, Exhibit 10?
A. (Grote) Not that I recall, except for typos.

I don't withdraw any of the testimony.
Q. I'm sorry. I should have done this with Mr. Palmer and Ms. Ting.

APOBP11 is supplemental testimony filed by Ms. Ting and Mr. Palmer; is that correct?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
A. (Palmer) Yes.
Q. And do you adopt that supplemental testimony as part of your testimony here today?
A. (Palmer) Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections to -- and that's marked as APOBP11. Do you have any corrections to that document?
A. (Palmer) No.
Q. Thank you. That's all of the individual prefileds that I have. Have I missed anybody?
[No verbal response]
Q. Okay. What I'd like to do first is, as a group, was there any additions to APOBP1 that the group wanted to make? And if you could explain to us precisely why you're seeking to add testimony with respect to that particular testimony.
A. (Meyer) Yes, both Walter and I will be making additions based on things that have happened during the hearings.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Meyer) So I guess I will go first and then Walter. And we have some exhibits that will
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]
be shown as well.
First, I would ask the Committee, when you're considering what should happen on the underground portion of the route on 116 , keep in mind Mr. Oldenburg's explanation of the narrow shoulders on unbuilt roads. And the first exhibit $I$ wanted to show is Exhibit 100. This is in front of my house, obviously. And you can see the shoulder that I'm standing on there. It's about a foot, maybe a foot and a half. That is characteristic of the kind of shoulders that we have in this part of Easton and Franconia where we're talking about undergrounding and potentially using part of that shoulder. There really isn't much space to be used in the shoulder. Beyond that is undisturbed land. And so that's why we found in our surveys there are a lot of mature trees growing very close to the roads in Easton and Franconia.

The next picture is also on my property. It shows a tree that looks like it's got about a 24-inch diameter, and it's within
[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]

8 feet of the pavement.
Q. And that picture has been marked as APOBP101?
A. (Meyer) Yes. The previous one was 100 for us, and this is Exhibit 101.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Meyer) The second thing I'd like to mention is there has been a tendency to exaggerate how much of this project is going into an existing right-of-way. I'd like you to take a look at Exhibit 103. It's an article from the Colebrook Chronicle, dated 12/8/17. And on Page 2 of this article it shows a quote from Governor Sununu saying that 90 percent of this is going to be built within an existing right-of-way. And there have been some comments like that here also, you know, as testimony was going on.

And I just wanted to point out that along 116 we were blindsided by considering that there was any kind of a right-of-way or possibility of a transmission line being placed in front of our houses along 116.

Nobody knew to expect that a project like this could be built there. And I have to say
that's probably one of the reasons why we expect property values to decline. It's not as if we bought a property that had a transmission line easement on it and so you would expect at some point a line would be put in. No. As far as we were concerned, there was no easement. So it's particularly galling when we see articles like this where 90 percent is being built within an existing right-of-way. We didn't know or didn't think there was any kind of existing right-of-way for a transmission line in front of our houses.

Another thing I wanted to highlight for the Committee is again something Mr .

Oldenburg mentioned. This is when he was talking to Mr. Varney on 9/26/17. It was in the morning. This is when they were talking about sufferance. And I guess I'll just try to paraphrase. And Mr. Oldenburg I'm sure will correct me if I'm getting his comments wrong.

But basically for this underground portion of the route, Eversource has no
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[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]
roadside property rights. They don't hold any easements. They've purchased no rights-of-way. And this project along our roads is being done based on the sufferance of the DOT. If I'm reading correctly, what Mr. Oldenburg then went on to say is that the placement of this line is guided by the Utility Accommodation Manual and by state law.

So, looking further at that,
Exhibit 105, this is in the Applicant's Application, and they say the authority to erect electric transmission lines and underground cables in state and local highways is codified at RSA 231:160. So if you compare the UAM and 231:160, it seems those two documents are actually at odds about the placement of the lines. The UAM says that these kinds of lines should go at the outer edge of the right-of-way. There's Exhibit 106 showing where it says that in the UAM. But 231:160 says under the highway, placed under any such highway. "Highway" doesn't look like a defined term.
[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]

I couldn't find any definitions within this section --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, if there was a question leading to these answers, I would object for calling legal conclusions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, this is kind of legal argument here, Ms. Meyer. Up to this point we had been -- you'd been giving us facts associated with statements from Mr. Oldenburg and his examination of somebody. Right now you're in a legal argument regarding the meaning of the statute --

MS. MEYER: Okay. All I want to show is the difference between these two documents, between 231:160 and the UAM. There's a disparity.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Then just show us the documents. You can argue them at the end of the case, but right now just show us the documents.

MS. MEYER: Okay. I'm showing these two documents, and I'm saying that it seems the UAM is inconsistent with what the state legislature intends --
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Right.
You're making an argument right now. Just show us the documents right now, okay.

MS. MEYER: All right. So I've showed them. I guess I'm done with that topic.
A. (Meyer) There are two other ways in which the Project seems to be inconsistent with what the state legislature intends, and one of them is that eminent domain cannot be used in situations in non-reliability energy projects like Northern Pass. And in this case, we have no ability to object to the Project. We have no -- we're receiving no compensation. So, in essence, we're being treated worse than eminent domain. So the point is, again, the intention of the state is not to allow eminent domain to be used; yet, here we find ourselves in a situation where we're being treated worse than under eminent domain.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Meyer, that's another legal argument. MS. MEYER: All right. Let me just show -- can I show testimony related to this topic?
[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]
A. (Meyer) Mr. Bowes, on 4/17/17, in the afternoon -- let's see. Did I give you something to show? No, I don't have that one. I'll just have to make the reference to that.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Do you have the page number and the line number, please?
A. (Meyer) Yes, I do. It was 4/17/17, in the afternoon, Page 30 to 32. And in that conversation he agreed that if this project were running perpendicular along my fence line, they'd have to pay for an easement. They'd have to negotiate with the homeowner. But because that same strip of land is now being taken in the front of the property running parallel to the road, they have to pay nothing, and I have no way to object to the Project.

The last thing I wanted to
mention is one more way that this project
seems to run contrary to what the state intends, and that is in the use of I-93. The state designated 93 as an energy corridor.
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Instead, this project, if it goes through as proposed --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Wait, wait,
Ms. Meyer.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: I object for the same reason.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, it sounds like you're about to make a legal argument about what's permitted or what should be permitted in the interstate right-of-way. The fact is that this proposal doesn't propose to use it, and that is where we sit today. There is no proposal to use it, to use the corridor. You may think it's a better corridor. You can make that argument for reasons that are within the state -- within the rules that should be significant to the Committee. But right now is an opportunity to provide us with facts. And the fact is there's no proposal to use the right-of-way. If you want to make an argument based on it, now is not the time to do that. You want to do that at the end of the case in your post-hearing memo.

MS. MEYER: Okay. But I just
[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]
need to get out the other part of the argument, which is that now transmission lines can be run down every road in the state, making all the state roads transmission line corridors. That's it. That's what $I$ wanted to --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That's your argument.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. And you're free to make that argument in your closing brief. I mean, there's a difference between providing facts to the Committee, which is what you're supposed to be doing now, and making legal arguments, or asking the Committee to draw conclusions from the facts that you've presented. Those conclusions are argued in your final briefs.
A. (Meyer) Okay. All right. Well, that's what I wanted to go through.
Q. Mr. Palmer, you had some addition to the group testimony as well?
A. (Palmer) Yes, I do. And this is in response to something that transpired in these hearings last week when Society for the Prevention -- for the Protection of New
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}

Hampshire Forests was testifying. They made the point that Franconia Notch was a perfectly feasible route for this power line and that there were no impediments to the use of Franconia Notch. Mr. Needleman responded in his cross-examination by putting up some language from House Bill 626 establishing a energy infrastructure corridor. And this is the language that Mr . Needleman put up there. And he especially highlighted the fact that there is a section of the I-93 corridor which is excepted from the corridor, excepting approximately 1.7 miles located within the White Mountain National Forest north of Franconia Notch State Park. I just wanted to provide a few facts to the Committee to clarify something about this. If I could put up the next diagram, Exhibit 91. This is Franconia State Park. The excepted 1.7 miles are north of Franconia State Park. If you look closely, you can see that all of the natural features which are generally referred to as being within Franconia Notch are actually contained
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
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within Franconia National Park. That park is open to use as an energy infrastructure corridor, according to the House Bill 626. The 1.7 miles that are excepted, if we could just zoom out a little bit...

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That machine has a mind of its own.
A. (Palmer) The 1.7 miles that are excepted are highlighted in blue above the border of Franconia Notch State Park, and they are not within Franconia Notch. These 1.7 miles are, if I could --

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Mr. Palmer, do we have a number for this exhibit that you're showing us right now?
A. (Palmer) Yes, this is APOBP91.
Q. Thank you.

MR. PALMER: And if we could go to Exhibit 92, please and turn it -- thanks.
A. (Palmer) There's the 1.7 miles again.

Starting at the lower part, at the border of the northern border of Franconia Notch State Park and running to the edge of White Mountain National Forest. This 1.7 miles is
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
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within White Mountain National Forest and is actually land owned by White Mountain National Forest. Everything south of this 1.7 miles on Route 93 is all owned by the State of New Hampshire. The only portion of I-93 not owned by the State of New Hampshire, land under I-93 not owned by the State of New Hampshire is this 1.7-mile section which is within White Mountain National Forest. The only reason that was excepted from the statute establishing --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection, Mr.
Chair. This is now legal argument.
MR. PALMER: I'm sorry?
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't know what it is yet, but it does sound like you're about to make an argument.

MR. PALMER: Okay. I will
strike --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: What was
your -- I want to hear the rest of your sentence. The only reason...

MR. PALMER: The only reason that that 1.7 miles was excepted from the energy
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corridor is because the State of New Hampshire does not have jurisdiction over that 1.7 miles. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

That is a pure legal argument. Okay. What's your next point?
A. (Palmer) My final point is I'd just like to show Exhibit 93. This is that 1.7-mile stretch. It's not within Franconia National Park -- I mean, it's not within Franconia Notch. It's not within the Notch at all. In fact, it's already come down out of the mountains and you're starting to get into the level land.

So the point I'm making is that this 1.7 miles that are excepted from the energy infrastructure corridor are not within Franconia Notch, and there is no impediment to the Northern Pass going through Franconia Notch. If 1.7 miles in the national forest were to be an impediment, then we would have to ask how Northern Pass is proposing to conduct to site their project within 10 miles of the national forest --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection,

Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And now you're making an argument.

Can I ask you a question about this exhibit, 'cause it's disconcerting to be looking down the left lane of an interstate. Am I correct that we are standing on the southbound lanes of $I-93$ ? The northbound lanes are off to the right in this picture?
A. (Palmer) We are standing on the northbound lane looking downhill towards Franconia -looking north towards Franconia.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So that's the southbound lane. Okay. If we're looking north, we're standing in the southbound lane because traffic in this country travels on the right.

MR. PALMER: I'm sorry. Yes, you're right.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Good.
MR. PALMER: Standing southbound
lane looking north.
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. And this is a Google Earth image or some
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
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similar process?
A. (Palmer) Yes.

Anyway, the purpose was to show that we're out of the mountains. The 1.7-mile stretch which is excluded from the energy infrastructure zone is not in Franconia Notch.
Q. Did you have any other additions to the group testimony?
A. (Palmer) That's it.
Q. Was there any other additions to APOBP1, the group testimony?
[No verbal response]
Q. Okay. I'm now going to turn to Mr. Lakes.

Mr. Lakes, you've adopted APOBP5, your direct prefiled testimony. You gave us a couple corrections. Do you have additions based upon things that have occurred during the course of this proceeding, the adjudicative proceeding?
A. (Lakes) Yes.
Q. Okay. If you do, if you could just identify them by subject material and then address them one by one.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
A. (Lakes) Well, this would be for No. 1 in my prefiled, and this is regard to the changes -- is this on? Yeah. This is regard to ongoing changes by Northern Pass in conjunction with DOT, the continuation of alignment, changes of alignment and non-establishment of boundaries. And so I'd like to add the following to No. 1, basically after where I say, "The Application was submitted as incomplete," I wish to add the following: "The underground alignment was not firmly established and called preliminary, did not meet minimum UAM standards, and boundaries were not firmly established. In addition, the Application as submitted with regard to the underground portion appears to have been hastily prepared, full of glaring deficiencies that did not delineate firm boundaries and did not meet or even try to meet the DOT Utility Accommodation Manual standards. This document, in addition to town meetings with Northern Pass, reinforced the false idea that most, if not all, of the transmission
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
lines" --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm going to object. This is all argument.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: This is a pure argument, Mr. Lakes, pure argument, which is something you can do at the end of this case in your post-hearing submissions. But right now you're just stating an argument.

MR. LAKES: I'm stating fact.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You're making an argument. If you've got another one to make, let's hear it. If you've got facts, that's what we want to hear right now.

MR. LAKES: I can still -- okay.
Let me just read through this. Yup, that's all I have.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Thank you.

So now I'm going to turn to Ms. Ting and Mr. Palmer. You have adopted APOBP6 and APOBP11 as your direct testimony and supplemental direct testimony. Do you have additions that you would like to make to those testimonies based on things that have
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
occurred since the commencement of the adjudicative hearing?
A. (Palmer) Yes, I do.
Q. Did you want to go first? Ms. Ting's down here. Do we need to have her go up there?
A. (Ting) No.
Q. No. Okay. Okay, Mr. Palmer, go ahead.
A. (Palmer) I'll go first.

Okay. The addition that I'd like to make, and I'd like to bring some more facts before the Committee, relate to the portion of my testimony in which I state that I am concerned about the threat of the proposed project to surface water and groundwater quality.
Q. Please keep that microphone close to you.
A. (Palmer) Okay. I'm concerned about the threat to surface water and groundwater quality. And in particular, the additions that I would like to make pertain to the use of coal fly ash as a fluidized backfill material which has been proposed by Northern Pass. We were not aware that coal fly ash was going to be a constituent of the
fluidized thermal backfill until around May of this year. So this is new information, and I would like to bring some facts about this before the Committee if possible.

The first point that I'd like to make is that numerous representations have been made during this adjudicative hearing that coal fly ash is not toxic and poses no threat to the environment. Specifically, I can point to Day 3 of the hearing, Mr. Bowes' testimony which starts on Page 146, in which he states that coal fly ash is not toxic. And Mr.

Needleman himself, in numerous objections to some of the things that I've said, has repeatedly stated that coal $f l y$ ash is not toxic. I would like to correct that on a factual basis. Coal fly ash is in fact a toxic material, and I have numerous exhibits that demonstrate that, both U.S. Government documents and peer-reviewed journal documents.

I could start with Exhibit No. 76, the U.S. Geological Services, the highlighted portion. Coal ash contains minor amounts of
trace elements, including chromium, nickel, zinc, arsenic, selenium, cadmium, antimony, mercury and lead. In addition, uranium is commonly present.

If I could go to Exhibit 78. This is a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency document. If we could go to the highlighted portion of that document, the U.S. EPA states that fly ash contains contaminants like mercury, cadmium and arsenic associated with cancer and various other serious health effects. The Environmental Protection Agency's estimates of potential risk and evaluation of damage cases demonstrate that, without proper protections, these contaminants can leach into groundwater and can potentially migrate to drinking water sources, posing significant public health concerns. This is the EPA.

If you go on the Internet, the Internet is rife with peer-reviewed documents stating that there are toxic elements in coal fly ash. I just picked one at random. If we could go to Exhibit 79, this is from peer
review, Journal of Environmental Quality. And the highlighted section of the abstract of this article says, "The major potential impacts of ash disposal on terrestrial ecosystems include: Leaching of potentially toxic substances into soils and groundwater," and "increased mobility and accumulation of potentially toxic elements throughout the food chain."

So, using just those three quick examples from the possible thousands you can find from the Internet, $I$ just wanted to make clear the fact, the simple fact that coal fly ash is a toxic material which contains the toxic elements of heavy metals, including arsenic, lead, mercury, et cetera.

Now, the next point $I$ wanted to make is that these heavy metals are hazardous to human health. And if we look at Exhibit 77, a document by the Physicians for Social Responsibility, looking at the highlighted portion, "Coal ash typically contains heavy metals, including arsenic, lead, mercury, cadmium, chromium and selenium." "If eaten,
drunk or inhaled, these toxicants can cause cancer and nervous system impacts such as cognitive deficits, developmental delays and behavioral problems. They can cause heart damage, lung disease, respiratory distress, kidney disease, reproductive problems, gastrointestinal illness, birth defects and impaired bone growth in children."

So there's no question that the elements that are in coal fly ash and that the U.S. EPA says are leachable from coal fly ash do cause human health damage or do present a risk to human health.

The last point I'd like to make in this part of it is if we could go to Exhibit 88.
Q. Did you say 88?
A. (Palmer) Did you have a question?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Confirming the number.
A. (Palmer) And this is a peer-reviewed manual entitled, "Fuel Journal." And if we could go to the highlighted section of this article. Trace elements are present in coal fly ash. These elements tend to be weakly associated
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with ash material and contribute with a high risk factor to the soil contamination due to their leachability. The elements that could be potentially a problem for soil contamination are arsenic and the same list we talked about before.

So, again, this just points to the fact that not only are these elements present in coal fly ash, but they are highly leachable from the coal fly ash, and when in contact with water can be leached out, the coal fly ash into the water system.

Now I'd like to go to Exhibit 80, please. This is United States Environmental Protection Agency's guidance document which they have developed and promulgated in combination with their recent 2015 rulemaking on the control of coal fired -- coal ash from coal-fired power plants. If we can turn to the next page on that, Page 2 -- or Page 1, what this document is, is it provides Best Management Practices for the use of coal fly ash in engineered structural fill, which is what basically
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Northern Pass is proposing to do with the coal fly ash is to put it in -- use it as structural fill. I've highlighted that this document does include fly ash.

The first Best Management
Practice that EPA suggests is that the project proponent should characterize and test the fly ash material or the ash material that they intend to use as structural fill and provides a detailed list of testing that should be carried out, especially the leaching potential -- the potential for leaching of heavy metals from the coal fly ash. And there are detailed instructions later on in this document for the type of procedure that should be used to test the leachability of heavy metals from the material.

MR. PALMER: Can we go to the next page?
A. (Palmer) The next thing EPA recommends is that the project proponent should assess the project's suitability and qualification for the use of coal fly ash. And the project
proponent should look at local zoning and land use plans, environmental characteristics of the proposed site, engineering aspects and proximity in relation to landowners and neighbors. The soil, geology and groundwater of the proposed site should be evaluated. Site geology should be assessed for any conditions such as sinkholes. Groundwater quality and quantity, location of groundwater users, groundwater flow direction and depth to the groundwater should be assessed.

Evaluation should be done in a manner consistent with, and it gives the standards for the evaluation system that should be used. Site from surface waters, including wetlands, should be -- I'm sorry. Distance from surface waters, including wetlands, should be assessed. Structural fill project -- the other things that should be assessed in a structural fill project is whether it's within a floodplain or floodway, in or near a wetland area, near an active fault --

MR. PALMER: Turn the page,
please.
A. (Palmer) -- in an unstable area, within a Wellhead Protection Area, near a drinking water well or public water supply, well reservoir or water treatment facility or near a surface water body such a lake, stream, river or pond.

As appropriate, landowners should be advised of the presence or the intention to put coal fly ash into the ground near their property. And the presence of coal fly ash should be acknowledged on the deed to provide notice to subsequent purchasers of the site. In other words, it's considered to be -well, $I$ won't... I won't try to draw conclusion. I want to just present the facts.

At the bottom of Page 3, Community Outreach, it shows -- they discuss how the project proponent should conduct some extensive community outreach before considering putting coal fly ash into a backfill project.

MR. PALMER: Go to the next page,
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please.
A. (Palmer) Another concern is transportation on public roadways. Transporting coal fly ash on public roadways poses a threat for air-quality impacts because of the possibility of dust blowing out of trucks carrying coal fly ash. So they provide a fairly detailed list of the factors that should be considered and measures that should be taken to prevent impacts from transport on roadways.

MR. PALMER: Go to the next page.
Okay. Just the page that shows the testing methods, which I think is the third to the last page. Okay. Doesn't matter.
A. (Palmer) Basically, this document also lists a series of testing procedures that should be used to assess the coal fly ash before it's considered for use as a backfill material.

So my point there is Best Management Practices call for a great deal of study to be carried out before any proposal is carried out to use coal fly ash as a backfill material.

The Northern Pass proposal is to use coal fly ash as a backfill in a duct bank or a trench which would be approximately four feet wide down to about a seven-foot depth below the surface of the ground. This material, once placed in the duct bank or in the trench, would set to a soft cement consistency but would remain porous. This material will be porous, as shown in Exhibit 63. This was a conference conducted by New Hampshire Department of Transportation.

MR. PALMER: If we can go to the highlighted portion.
A. (Palmer) This is Eversource experts speaking, and they said that the fluidized thermal backfill is water-permeable, similar to DOT gravels; it does not create a water dam and instead behaves as a french drain in porous soils. Now, if you're familiar with a french drain, it's basically a very porous conduit used to drain water, allow water to move easily through it. So, basically the
statement is that the fluidized thermal
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backfill, once in the trench, will be highly porous.
Q. And could we see the front page of the exhibit just so everybody knows where it's from? Thank you.
A. (Palmer) The fact that this fluidized thermal backfill will be highly porous once installed in the trench was confirmed by Mr. Tinus, a Northern Pass environmental expert, on Day 18 in the Afternoon Session, Page 55, Line 18, and confirmed again by Mr. Bowes, Day 3, Afternoon Session, Page 146, Line 10. Yeah, this is Mr. Tinus's quote right here.
Q. Okay. You've given us the references. You can keep going.
A. (Palmer) All right.

So, the combination of the fact that -the two facts that, or the three facts that this material contains toxic heavy metals, the toxic heavy elements are readily leachable from this material if they're in the presence of water, and that this material will be water-permeable once installed all points to the fact that if there is any water
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present in Northern Pass's installation, heavy metals will be leached out of the installation and into the surrounding groundwater.

Now, I have series of documents showing --

MR. PALMER: If you can go to Exhibit 82.
A. (Palmer) This is Franconia at the very top. This is the Franconia -- or Easton Valley south of Franconia. The very top of the diagram is the center of Franconia. The bottom of the diagram, you can see the dotted line going across, that's the town line with Easton. This is a stratified drift aquifer which has been located underneath Easton Valley. And if you look at the blue line running down through which has the number 116 on it at one point and has red and green dots on it, that is the proposed route of Northern Pass. So you can see it passes directly over an important stratified drift aquifer. I'll just add quickly that this outline shown at the bottom of the page is my farm. So I am
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using that aquifer. I have an active well drawing water from that aquifer. My active well is within 75 feet of the proposed route and within the Wellhead Protection Area. The proposed route goes right through the Wellhead Protection Area from my well. It also goes through the Aquifer Protection Zone for the entire aquifer.

MR. PALMER: If we can go to
Exhibit 83, please.
A. (Palmer) This one has been shown before in these proceedings. This is the town of Easton. I'm sorry. It's fairly small in this copy I have here. But the dark line which goes through sort of an $S$ shape through the center of the diagram from top to bottom is Northern Pass's proposed route along Route 116. All of the pink dots that you see up and down this proposed route are all wells. These are active wells being used for drinking water in the town of Easton by Easton residents. If I had another -- I don't have another aquifer map. But there is another stratified drift aquifer under

Easton, very similar to the one I showed you under Franconia. All of these wells draw from that aquifer. The proposed route goes right through the Wellhead Protection Zone and the Aquifer Protection Zone for all these aquifers.

So, now we have assembled a number of facts that toxic material is leachable if in the presence of water. It will be in a porous substrate. And now we see we are over top of aquifers --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm going to object at this point. That's argument, not fact.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, we just transitioned into argument there.

MR. PALMER: I thought I was just
listing the facts that I had previously established. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You moved into an argument there at the end.
A. (Palmer) All right. I showed you --

MR. PALMER: Let's go back to the other, the previous diagram.
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A. (Palmer) This stratified drift aquifer, which is a fairly deep aquifer -- you see my property there at the bottom of the page. I have put a fence line along the road. And every time I sink a fence post, when I get down to 2-1/2 feet of depth I hit the water table, a shallow water table, which flows basically from right to left across this screen, from Kinsman Ridge down to the Ham Branch, flows right through my farm and is transected by the proposed Northern Pass route. In fact, if Northern Pass is going to construct a duct bank four feet wide and down to depth of seven feet, the upper portion of that duct bank will be, as DOT has required, at least four feet below the surface of the road. What this means is the duct bank will be entirely submerged within the shallow water table on my farm in Easton Valley. It's not something that one might periodically have water wash through it. It will be submerged permanently within the aquifer in Easton Valley and in other areas all up and down the proposed route.
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I rely on this shallow aquifer to draw water to water my animals. My business is predicated on the fact that I'm producing organic, grass-fed beef which is free of contaminants. And now I'm expected to draw water from an aquifer which is likely to be contaminated.

I'd also like to point out, if we can go to -- okay. This shows a map of my farm, and it shows the conservation plan that was developed by USDA. We had extension agents from that service come to my farm and conducted quite an extensive study and developed a conservation plan for my farm. And it's also a pasture development plan, and it proposes the development water supplies for my animals. If you look at the lower part down here where the pen is pointing, there's an X . This is where these experts determined that a shallow water well should be put in for watering my animals on that side of the highway.

MR. PALMER: If we can go to the next diagram.

MR. PAPPAS: Could you identify the exhibit number on that?

MR. PALMER: I'm sorry?
MR. PAPPAS: Eighty-five. Thank you.
A. (Palmer) Okay. If we go to Exhibit 86, this is the Exception Request No. 115 that shows the latest plan for Northern Pass on my property. If we go to the map at the end of the document, the highlighted areas are entry areas for horizontal direction drilling.

Those areas will be basically surrounded by a huge construction zone. There won't be two small squares. There will be a large construction zone. The circled area is where NRCS experts determined would be the best place for me to put the shallow water well for my farm. As you can see, they're practically on top of each other. There's a great deal of concern that when horizontal direction drilling starts and when this work is carried out, there's going to be contamination of groundwater in that area making that well unusable.
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Q. The well is there.
A. (Palmer) The well is not there.
Q. Okay. It's just an identified site?
A. (Palmer) It's where the NRCS expert determined would be the best place to put the well. Basically, $I$ have put all of these plans on hold because I'm waiting to see what happens with Northern Pass.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Palmer) All right. The other point I'd like to make is that, in contaminating groundwater, the proposal also has the potential to contaminate soil. And it's located -- the proposal is located in the area of prime agricultural land and soils of agricultural importance. And I'd like to put up a map --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, does this testimony in any way relate to something new?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Not sure.
What does that relate to?
MR. PALMER: It's new in the
sense of we were not aware up until now of the
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potential of contamination of these soils by coal fly ash.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
You may continue.
A. (Palmer) Okay. If you look on this map, the areas that are circled -- this is a soil map of my farm. The areas that are circled, or the perimeter that's been drawn around are all soils of importance, farming of prime farmland importance. The red lines encircle prime farmland; the green lines encircle land of statewide importance, and the orange lines encircle farmland of local importance. All of these are considered to be good farm lands. And this --

MR. PALMER: All right. Can we go to Exhibit 87, please.
A. (Palmer) Before we finish our discussion of the previous diagram, I'd just like to point out that Northern Pass goes directly through the middle of that. You can see the line for Route 116 flows from the upper right corner of that picture down to the bottom. That's the Northern Pass route, and it goes right
through all this prime farmland and excellent agricultural soils.

MR. PALMER: Next page, please.
A. (Palmer) Next document is a USGS document. No, I'm sorry. That's the wrong one. Exhibit 86.

MS. TING: 86 is the exception. MR. PALMER: I'm sorry. Do you have 87 there? Okay. Yes. This is the geology and soils report. Can you show the map on that page?
A. (Palmer) This is hard to see because it's so small. But you can see the Northern Pass route down 116 and 112 highlighted in yellow up in the top of the map. All of the areas that are highlighted in orange, purple and blue on this map are soils of importance, of agricultural importance. You can see that the upper portion of the proposed route on Route 116 is almost entirely within orange, purple and blue soils. The lower portion goes through White Mountain National Forest, and those soils are not categorize. Those are just green. But the point is there are
important agricultural soils which are under threat of contamination as a result of the proposed project. Not only that, but this diagram demonstrates the Project going to go through 10 miles of White Mountain National Forest, and because of the leaching potential of heavy metals from the thermal backfill, poses the potential of contamination of groundwater, surface water, soils and the food chain within the White Mountain National Forest.

All right. Those are the facts that I want to present about coal fly ash.
Q. Okay. Did you have something further you wanted to present, Mr. Palmer?
A. (Palmer) No, that's it. Thank you.
Q. Ms. Ting, my notes from Ms. Monroe said you had something additional?
A. (Ting) I do.
Q. You're going to have to find a microphone.

MR. PAPPAS: Here.
MS. TING: Thank you.
MR. PAPPAS: You're welcome.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
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(Pause)
A. (Ting) I would just like to add to our testimony some remarks on the Forward NH Fund, and this pertains to the testimonies of Mr. Auseré from Eversource and also from Mr. Quinlan as well on the Forward NH Fund.

So, on Page 10, Line 12 through 17 of Mr. Auseré's testimony, he identified the source of the funding for Forward NH Fund as a Transmission Service Agreement, or TSA. And then Mr. Quinlan presented documents showing that the receiver of those monies would be a non-profit entity created by Eversource. So the implication was that Eversource would donate the money that it received through the TSA to the Section 5013c [sic] entity. And as we know, those monies would be $\$ 10$ million per year over 20 years. And even if you took that amount of money and deducted operating costs for the 5013c entity, and say that were 10 percent, and then the $\$ 2$ million going to be administered by the PUC, there's still a sizeable amount of money each year under the Forward NH Fund,
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let's say seven, high seven, north of seven million, close to eight million.

Mr. Auseré also presented a graphic on where the TSA fits into the corporate structure. And if you look here, you see this is a TSA, and it leads this way to Eversource and then here through HRE to Hydro-Quebec and the Province of Quebec. And I believe that Northern Pass has argued in the document that it is only through the operation of the Project -- that means the actual transmission line -- that funding for the Forward NH Plan -- Forward NH Fund is possible.

So the additional comment I want to make, and I'll try to keep this very short, is that just the observation that the benefits that the Applicant is adding through the Forward New Hampshire Fund are coming either from the ratepayers here on this side or through Hydro-Quebec, which is ultimately the government of quebec. And, you know, looking at that, if it were the ratepayers, you could argue there's really no net benefit
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because it's just a redistributing of money for households and businesses who are ratepayers into the fund. But if it were the government of quebec, then somehow it seems like this doesn't create a really level playing field for the citizens of New Hampshire. And the fact $I$ bring is, you know, we've --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I object. This is argument.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You've moved into an argument.
A. (Ting) I'm going present a fact now. In our testimony, we did not mention the fact that on our property -- I think we highlighted the impacts on us as property owners. But we also have a six-unit rental apartment there, and we do rely on the income from that business to pay for our mortgage and also to cover some of our property taxes. And the concern I'm bringing is that it's difficult for us to deal with the fact that, you know, we're potentially -- the cost of benefits of the Project and the cost to us as residents
of New Hampshire might be weighed against whatever money is coming from the government of Quebec here. And it just seems like that if this is allowed, then the math will always come out in favor of the Applicants. And that's all I have to say.
Q. Thank you. Any other additions on the Palmer and Ting testimony?
[No verbal response]
Q. Okay. Mr. Grote, I'm going to turn to you. Do you have any additions to your prefiled testimony which has been marked as APOBP10, based upon things that have occurred during the course -- new things that have occurred during the course of the adjudicative proceedings?
A. (Grote) Yes, I do. I have two schedules to add. I'm going to hand them over to Kathy so she can put them on the ELMO.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Grote) First is Schedule G. This is new information that we received from the DOT, from some of their recent testimony. And I believe it's pertinent to the property values
particularly on Route 116, but also Route 18. The second exhibit, I'm really not sure I need to show it. It's a Northern Pass document. I'm not sure that it's part of the docket. It probably is. But if you can -if somebody can tell me if that second document is part of the docket, then we don't need to add it. Can you show that?
Q. Have you given it a number?
A. (Grote) It was one of the first presentations. It's a flyer that shows a number of maps. They're important, particularly contour maps on the back side. It's two pages, one --

MR. GROTE: Kathy, have you got it there? Yes, there's the document. I don't know that it has a number.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Why don't we give that a number. I believe that the last number we have for $A P O B P$ is 19 -- no, it can't be that. Can anybody on the panel help me?

MR. PALMER: Yes. We're up to 125, so we can call this 126.
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MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. If you could mark that as APOBP126. Thank you. BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Anything else, Mr. Grote?
A. (Grote) That's all. Thank you.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I guess we're ready for cross-examination.

MR. ASLIN: Before we do that, are we going to mark the prior additional exhibit? Mike, do you want to have him mark the prior additional exhibit he put up as well?

MR. IACOPINO: I guess we should.
I thought it had been marked. Okay. I guess we'll call that $A P O B P 127$. It won't be in chronological order, but the reference is in the record.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Whenever you're ready, Mr. Aslin.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. My name's Chris Aslin. I've been designated as Counsel for the Public in this proceeding. I'd like to ask you a few questions following up on your testimony. I'll start with the
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group as a whole. Whoever is the appropriate person to answer can answer.

In your prefiled testimony and as referenced in the video you submitted, you make reference to a survey that was -- you called it a "survey." And if I understand it correctly, and I just want to make sure that I have this correct, the survey was conducted by sending a letter to the residents along the section of the Project that you are speaking to in this testimony?
A. (Meyer) Yes, that's correct. It was sent to abutting property owners in Easton and Franconia.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And if I understand it, there were 188 recipients of that letter, and you received 68 responses?
A. (Meyer) Yes, that's right.
Q. Okay. And the questions that were in that survey or in that letter were factual questions, if I understand it correctly?
A. (Meyer) We can show you an example if you'd like.
Q. That's okay. I think I'll run through them
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briefly.
I understand that there were questions about structures that were within proximity of the right-of-way and how far away they were from the right-of-way. Is that fair?
A. (Meyer) Most of the information that was in the video about proximity related to houses was because of a sort of a photographic survey that our group did.
Q. Okay.
A. (Meyer) You know, the video shows the distance between the houses. What we realized when we did that video was that there were things that were important that couldn't be seen, like a location of a well. And so that's why we decided to send out the survey to elicit more of that information about things that couldn't be seen, like wells, like stone foundations -- you know how houses have handmade stone foundations dating back to 1700 s, 1800s. We asked people about a number of trees on their property, stone walls, the age of the structure. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. So this survey was just to
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gather factual information, if I understand what your purpose of the survey was?
A. (Meyer) Yes. And in part, we thought that was information that the Applicant quite frankly should have been gathering. We thought that if you were interested in public safety and that sort of thing, that in choosing a route you would want to know in advance how many wells are there, how close are they to the place where we're going to be doing our excavation, what are the structures like on this route, how close are they to the route, what is their foundation like? Now, I understand the Company does plan to do pre-blasting surveys, at which time they will do things like take videos of wells or videos of foundations. But that's really just to prove, you know, after the fact, you know, when a homeowner wants to make a claim, you know, so the Company can show them the video and say, no, that crack was there before. And what we were interested in is more sort of a preventive kind of approach or a public safety kind of approach where we were trying
to provide what information we thought the Applicants should be providing that would help the Committee evaluate alternative routes -- "routes" meaning that routes that had fewer wells would probably be preferable than a route that had more wells.
Q. Okay. Thank you. In your survey, in the letter that went out, how did you identify yourselves?
A. (Meyer) "Abutting Property Owners." I could pull up an example of it if you'd like.
Q. Sure, we can take a look.
A. (Meyer) We identified ourselves as "Abutting Property Owners from Easton and Franconia," to answer your specific question.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. (Meyer) And if you wanted to see the cover letter itself --
Q. Sure.
A. (Meyer) And while she's putting that up, I can find a copy of the survey page that we asked people to fill out.

MR. ASLIN: Dawn, if we can just
switch over to the ELMO for a moment. Thank
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you.
BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Has this document been marked as an exhibit by anyone at this point?
A. (Meyer) No, I don't think so.

MR. ASLIN: So I think we'll mark this as a Counsel for the Public exhibit so we have it in the record.

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. And this answers my next question, which was about whether the survey indicated your position on the Project in any way. And I see it does indicate that you're opposed to the Project in the first paragraph.

MR. ASLIN: So we'll mark this as
Counsel for the Public 661.
A. (Meyer) And then this is an example of the survey, and it's filled out for my property. And I would point out that that cover letter and all of these survey results were presented to the Applicant during the technical sessions. And I think you folks got a copy, too.
Q. I expect so.
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MR. ASLIN: So why don't we mark this page as well. It's an example of the survey itself. And we'll mark that as Counsel for the Public 662.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Meyer, can you move that microphone closer to your mouth, please?

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. So, thank you for those clarifications.

Your sort of general point with the survey was to identify the location of structures and other features, such as trees and wells that were in the proximity to the proposed project. Do you have an opinion about whether any of those specific features are going to be impacted by the Project?
A. (Meyer) Yes. Actually, all of them. That's why we put them on the survey. We're concerned about wells. We're concerned about stone walls, about stone foundations.
Q. And is your concern affected in any way by the specific location of the burial of the Project, you know, one side of the road or the other?
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A. (Meyer) Not so much one side of the road or the other. But, you know, under the pavement would be a preferable situation to outside of the pavement. But as Mr. Palmer pointed out, we still have significant concerns under the pavement. There's still water effects to be concerned about. But the Project, in our opinion, has gotten worse rather than better as it's migrated out from under the pavement.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.
A. (Meyer) Actually, I would also point out that in the video, when you see those distances marked from the house, it's measured to the pavement because that was done at the time when we thought this project was going to be basically under the pavement. But those distances would shorten, depending upon how far out into the right-of-way they moved the Project.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Meyer. In the video itself, you show a significant amount of information about the Project route and structures and other things we've been talking about. You also show a depiction of travel down the I-93
corridor. But I noted that the portion of I-93 that was displayed stops short of the area that Mr. Palmer was discussing earlier, which is the 1.7 miles that's exempted from the energy corridor. It also stops short of the Notch. Is there a particular reason why those portions of $I-93$ were not included in the video?
A. (Meyer) No, there's several reasons. You know, just the fact we had to stop it somewhere, and it does get more complicated as you get through the Notch. My understanding is it's not that it's impossible to go through the Notch or it's infeasible, it's just more complicated.

Among our group, we've heard conversations about possibly using the bike path route or, you know, using the available road edges that are going through the Notch, or using a former railway bed or some remnants of

Route 3. I mean, we've heard lots of
alternative ways to go through the Notch. So things get complicated once you get to the Notch. So that's basically a principal
reason why we stopped there. Also, just the timing. The number of houses we had to show,
the timing was right, you know, to drive that timing. The number of houses we had to show,
the timing was right, you know, to drive that distance down 93.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I think that's all the questions I have for the group testimony. So I'll run through the other more individual testimonies that were presented as well. Why don't we start with Mr. Grote.

Is it Grotee or Grota?
A. (Grote) As if there's an $A$ on it.
Q. Grota. I will try to get it correct.

So, Mr. Grote, I'll start with you and
ask you questions first about where your
So, Mr. Grote, I'll start with you a
ask you questions first about where your property is located.
A. (Grote) Would you like me to show it on the map?
Q. I'm going to pull up a map for you to look at on the screen, see if we can orient ourselves.
A. (Grote) We don't have a signal yet.
Q. Yeah, it should come up in just a minute.

I understand you own a number of parcels in this area?
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A. (Grote) That's correct.
Q. And so you should be seeing the map now, Applicant's Exhibit 201, which is Bates Stamped APP67919. And is this the location of some of your parcels?
A. (Grote) No, this is not. The parcel we're talking about is on the left of the intersection of Lafayette Road --
Q. Well, let me stop you there for a minute. I'm talking about your --
A. (Grote) Oh, my own property.
Q. Yes.
A. (Grote) Oh, we're way over on the right.
Q. So some of your parcels are over on the right-hand side.
A. (Grote) That's right. We have both sides of the road. You see Wells Road way over on the right. And essentially we have -- it continues basically off the map around the corner, yes.
Q. And do you see the small numbers that are indicated in blue here? If I understand correctly, your parcels are labeled "3914," which is to the left --
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A. (Grote) I really have to look at this closely here.

MR. ASLIN: If you can zoom it on the top there?
A. (Grote) Very hard to read.
Q. Is that better? I think you have 3914, 3196 and 3920 that are shown here on the --
A. (Grote) 3920 is part of the property. The one -- and that's as far as I see.
Q. Do you own -- I think you said you own the two parcels to the left and right of Wells Road as well?
A. (Grote) That's correct.
Q. Okay. There's a small lot tucked in there that's labeled 3918. That's not yours; correct?
A. (Grote) That does not belong to us. No, wait a minute. I'm sorry. Is that... that's correct. I see the orientation. That's correct.
Q. And then on the far right-hand side in the lot labeled "3920," there's two yellow dots. Is that where your actual home is?
A. (Grote) We're on the home that's higher up.
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Both of those homes are ours, yes.
Q. Okay. So that's your property. And then you should be seeing now the next map in the series, which is Bates APP67921. Now, your properties are on the left-hand side of the map; is that correct?
A. (Grote) Well, basically if we start at 3920, to the right of that is our property, which is 3922, and then below that is 3917.
Q. And that's the triangular lot?
A. (Grote) That's the triangular lot, right.
Q. And is that the entirety of your property in this area?
A. (Grote) Well, no, we also own property above that's not labeled.
Q. So, non-abutting property?
A. (Grote) Not abutting, right.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. So, basically the properties we have are, as I see it, if it --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. It's 3916, 3920, 3922, 3917. And then there is a property on the other side of Wells Road by the airport.
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Q. Okay.
A. (Grote) That isn't labeled.
Q. Great. Thank you very much. And your testimony -- well, before I do that, let's take a look at an exception request,

Exception Request 114. So we'll start with the photos, I guess. This is part of

Exception Request No. 114. And we'll look at the map in a second. But if I have my orientation correctly, your property is located -- so the photo on the top is the entry area. And we're facing north. And I believe, if I'm correct where we are, your property is located on the right-hand side of the road and behind the photo?
A. (Grote) It's located on the right, but really on the immediate right. I believe there's a camper... it looks like there's a camper behind the tree. That is not -- that is a small one-acre lot that does not belong to us. But our property is basically on the right. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then the bottom photo is the exit area, which again we'll take a look at the
map in a moment.
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. And here we're facing north as well. So I believe your property in this location is on the right-hand side?
A. (Grote) Correct. And I don't know where the property line is from the photograph. But the property that abuts us on the other side, that we have on the other side, I believe is also included in a corner of that photograph.
Q. Okay. So the triangular parcel that's on --
A. (Grote) That's correct, the triangular parcel.
Q. Okay. So one of the questions I had was in regards to the proposed project. Just for reference, and we'll come back to it, there's a fair bit of tree cover here along the edge of the road; is that correct?
A. (Grote) That's correct.
Q. Okay. So this is another page from the exception request, which for the record is Counsel for the Public 556. And we're looking now at page Bates Stamp CFP014041. And the top right-hand corner shows the exit
work area space. Looking at the photo facing north from the exit pits -- so you see the red dashed line coming in?
A. (Grote) Yes, I do, over on the left of the image.
Q. And it ends in two little squares?
A. (Grote) Correct.
Q. Those are the exit pits, and that's the photo that we were looking at on the bottom of the screen was --
A. (Grote) I see it, yes.
Q. -- on the left as oriented here, which is north. And we saw the trees on both sides of the road here.

Do you see that there's a long, 300-foot work area shown in this part of the Project, the hashed line, rectangular area?
A. (Grote) Oh, all right. Are we talking about in the triangle area?
Q. No, across the street. Within the right-of-way there's a work area shown here, which is the long stretch --
A. (Grote) Oh, it's a long ribbon?
Q. Yes.
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A. (Grote) Yes, I see that.
Q. Now, are you able to see, it's a faint line, but in the middle of the work area is the edge of pavement?
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. And would you agree that this work area extends to the outside of the edge of the pavement?
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. And we saw the photo of the area at the exit pits. As you move farther south on Route 116, does there continue to be a wooded portion along that side of the road to the east side of the road?
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. Okay. And then would it be your understanding that they would have to cut down some of those trees in order to have a work area that extends beyond the pavement on that side of the route?
A. (Grote) I would. And I'd also be concerned -- the root systems of many trees extend well under the proposed route.
Q. Okay.
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A. (Grote) We also have stone walls on the edge.
Q. Which part of your parcel has stone walls?
A. (Grote) As you're looking south, it would be on the left-hand side --
Q. Is it in the vicinity --
A. (Grote) -- in other words, abutting my property.
Q. And is it along your entire property?
A. (Grote) Parts of the property.
Q. Okay.
A. (Grote) It's also part of our neighbor's property.
Q. Do you see what's shown on the page now? We're on the exhibit Bates 014042. You see the triangular parcel that you own on the bottom?
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. And you own the parcels along the top of this curve of the road?
A. (Grote) That's correct.
Q. And do you see the green line that's indicated on the right-hand side?
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. Do you understand that to be the proposed
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location of the trench for burial of the Project, moving it out of the roadway and into the edge of the right-of-way?
A. (Grote) I hadn't noticed -- I hadn't equated that before. But now that you mention it, if you say so, I certainly believe it.
Q. Okay. And again do you see that -- you testified a minute ago that there are trees lining that portion of the road. Do you see they're indicated here with sort of a squiggly line along the side?
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. And the proposed trench appears to go through those trees; is that correct?
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. Okay. And you indicated a minute ago that you had stone walls. Is it along this portion of your property?
A. (Grote) I'm not quite sure. Actually, I'm not quite sure. I know there's a stone wall further down. In the past there very well may have been. But I know there's a very visible stone wall that extends at my neighbor, yes.
Q. Okay. And sort of the primary concern you raised in your testimony was the effect of the Project on property values.
A. (Grote) That's correct.
Q. Seeing this proposal with trenching and a work area along the right-of-way through what's currently a wooded area, does that confirm or validate your concerns about property impacts?
A. (Grote) This definitely confirms it, yes.
Q. In your testimony, you also give an example of another property, so we're going to take a look at that briefly.

So you gave an example of a parcel that had been recently sold; is that correct?
A. (Grote) That's correct.
Q. And is it the parcel that's located on the left-hand side of the page labeled as "3901" and --
A. (Grote) That's correct.
Q. Adjacent to Lafayette Road?
A. (Grote) Yes.
Q. And in your testimony you provide some information about the sale price of this
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parcel and how it was listed and the reasons for the reduction in the sale price; is that correct?
A. (Grote) I listed what I thought -- I basically stuck to the facts. The facts have to be interpreted in the context, yes.
Q. And you provided as an exhibit to your testimony a memo dated May 19, 2016. It was unclear to me who the author of that memo was.
A. (Grote) I'm the author of that memo.
Q. You are.
A. (Grote) Those are my notes. I took some notes during these conversations, and that memo was written after I reviewed my notes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And were you involved in the sale of that property directly?
A. (Grote) No, I was not involved in the sale. The background information was very plain. That property was not listed by a realtor, and the party that was interested in it, the gentleman that was the out-of-state gentleman that was interested in it, contacted our staff at town hall. And she called me and
asked that $I$ call the gentleman and respond to his inquiry.
Q. I see.
A. (Grote) I proceeded to call him that evening. We had a number of conversations over the next two days. As I have indicated in my memo, essentially the gentleman expressed to me the fact that he's interested in buying the property. He noted that the price had come down --
Q. Okay. We can read through that --
A. (Grote) Oh, sure. Absolutely. Sorry about that.
Q. I wanted to make sure I understood the source of the information. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Grote. That's all the questions I have for you, so you can relax. I'm going to turn to Mr. Lakes next.

Good afternoon, Mr. Lakes.
A. (Lakes) Hello.
Q. You should be seeing on the screen another project map from Applicant's Exhibit 201. And this is Bates APP67927. And I believe, if I am oriented correctly, that your
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parcel -- well, Loop Road is shown here as sort of left of center; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Aslin, how is this part of or related to Mr . Lakes' testimony which I have in front of me and can read? So I'd be interested in which paragraph this relates to.

MR. ASLIN: Well, $I$ was trying to understand his relationship to the Project as an abutter.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I believe he's provided no information in his testimony that would give you a basis to ask a question along those lines. He's stated a number of opinions --

MR. ASLIN: He has.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- none of which relate to where he lives.

MR. ASLIN: Okay. I will move on.

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Your primary -- well, one of the concerns that you raised in your testimony, Mr. Lakes, is that you believe the Application in this
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proceeding was incomplete; is that correct?
A. (Lakes) That's correct.
Q. Do you believe that the Subcommittee at this point, after 68-plus days of hearings, and all the documents that have been submitted, now has adequate information to decide the case?
A. (Lakes) I do not believe that's true. We're still going through iteration after iteration after iteration with regard to the underground alignment. The boundaries have not been defined. And the reason why I said that the Application was incomplete was because this material should have been provided at the time of Application, not two years later.
Q. Okay. So your opinion remains the same. Thank you.
A. (Lakes) Yes.
Q. You also raised impact -- raised a concern with the impact to scenic roads and tree removal. Do you have -- is that -- let me rephrase.

Based on the information you've heard in
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
this proceeding so far, has your concern about tree removal been clarified in any way?
A. (Lakes) Well, I think, again, because the alignment has not been firmly decided, and because DOT has stated they want as much of the line off the road as possible, that I'm actually more concerned now, in light of the fact that we understand better what's going to happen with the laydown areas for horizontal direction drilling. We know that the trench is going to be deeper and wider than originally specified. And so we know there's going to be a lot more trees coming down. And anybody who lives along Route 116 in particular knows that the aesthetics and the beauty of that road is so much determined by the trees and the tree line and some of the older trees that are there. And as somebody who loves that road and loves the views on that road, I believe it will be severely impacted with gashes up and down the road with land being leveled, and basically the beautiful properties of that road will be severely destroyed.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Now, you've also raised a concern about a bias by the members of this Committee who also sit on the PUC, based on different a docket and a payment made as a settlement in that proceeding; is that correct?
A. (Lakes) That is correct. Myself and everybody I spoke to after we heard of the PUC decision and the negotiated settlement with Northern Pass that there would be a $\$ 20$ million settlement, that in and of itself was disturbing. But when I learned that two of the members on the PUC sit on the SEC, I feel that that is an extreme conflict of interest, and I believe in a regular courtroom setting this would be grounds for recusal of those persons involved.
Q. Mr. Lakes, do you understand that the Commissioners of the PUC are going to receive some portion of that $\$ 20$ million personally?
A. (Lakes) Absolutely not. I want to make clear that I am not here to impugn the integrity of the people sitting on this panel. But I am here impugning the process that has been
established by the State of New Hampshire to legalize basically what $I$ consider to be a potential bias, conflict of interest, and a potential bribe to a government organization.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Needleman.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, I don't know of any evidence at all in the record to support testimony like that. It seems entirely inappropriate to me, and I would move that it be struck.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm inclined to agree with Mr. Needleman. Does anyone want to make a contrary argument?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We'll strike that testimony.

Mr. Aslin, what's your next question?

MR. ASLIN: I have no further questions for Mr. Lakes.

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Mr. Palmer and Ms. Ting, just a few questions for you as well.
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Mr. Palmer, you have raised in your testimony this afternoon the concerns about coal fly ash being used in the fluidized thermal backfill; correct?
A. (Palmer) Right. Yes.
Q. During the course of these proceedings, after you learned of the proposed use of coal fly ash in the FTB, have you raised your concerns with either New Hampshire DES or New Hampshire DOT?
A. (Palmer) I have raised with DES in letters, or in e-mails and letters. The DOT, probably not.
Q. And were your submissions to DES made prior to their issuance of their permit in this case?
A. (Palmer) No.
Q. So, afterwards --
A. (Palmer) My e-mail to DES was after they had issued their finding. My purpose was to question how they could issue findings of no threat in view of the fact that coal fly ash was now proposed to be used.
Q. Okay.
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A. (Palmer) I don't feel that DES, either, was aware that coal fly ash was proposed to be used when they made their findings.
Q. Do you have any specific knowledge to that fact?
A. (Palmer) No.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. (Palmer) Just timing.
Q. You showed us in your supplemental testimony your location of your property and your farm along 116, so we don't need to go over that.

You've raised an issue in your prefiled testimony that the right-of-way width as shown in the Project maps is four rods. And you've said that there are some areas along 116 that is less than four rods. But I didn't see --
A. (Palmer) I'm sorry. Some are --
Q. The right-of-way is actually less than four rods; is that correct?
A. (Palmer) The entire route through my farm is three rods.
Q. Okay. That was my question. Because it was unclear from your testimony whether you had
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specific locations that you claimed were less than four rods. And it sounds like the --
A. (Palmer) I can show you a historical document dated in 1838, a town meeting in Franconia in which it was established that the road from the center of Franconia to the Easton town line would be a three-rod road.
Q. Was that one of the documents you included in your testimony?
A. (Palmer) Yes, I believe it's included with our first, our initial prefiled testimony.
Q. I think so as well, so we don't need to look at it again. It's already in the record.

But your testimony is that specifically
a portion of the road through your property is only three rods.
A. (Palmer) Exactly.
Q. And that's the basis for your concern of encroachment into your private property outside the right-of-way, based on the current project maps?
A. (Palmer) Yes, absolutely. The diagram that I put up earlier from the exception request, which is the most recent plan made available
by Northern Pass for the work on my property, if you use the distance markers on that diagram and measure carefully, they are still showing a right-of-way width of approximately 3.6 rods. Now, I'm not sure where 3.6 comes from. It's neither 3 nor 4, but it's certainly greater than 3. So if they intend to use the full width of that right-of-way, they will be encroaching on my property because the right-of-way there is only three rods.
Q. Do you understand that there is a current survey underway by the Applicant? They're conducting further survey activities?
A. (Palmer) Yes, $I$ understand that.
Q. And you haven't at this time seen their final survey at the intersection of 116; is that right?
A. (Palmer) No, I haven't.
Q. I think you covered all my other questions in your supplemental discussion, but just give me one minute.
(Pause)
Q. Yes. Thank you very much.
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A. (Palmer) Thank you.

MR. ASLIN: I have no other questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Saffo.
Yes, Ms. Schibanoff?
MS. SCHIBANOFF: She's right outside and --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And she's bursting through the door as you speak. MS. SAFFO: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. SAFFO:
Q. My goal will be not to reask questions. So if I ask something I need to put in context, just let me know.

I first wanted to talk to Ms. Meyer about the survey and the questions asked in the survey. And you had just testified that you felt that should have been done up front by the Applicant and not be something that you had to do as citizens. Why is that?
A. (Meyer) Because I thought they would, out of concern for public health and safety being one of the criteria that's required of the

Project, that it just seemed natural that if you're choosing among different routes, you would want to choose a route that was less impactful on the people adjacent to the route. And certainly when it comes to things like their well water, the quality of the foundation of their homes, things like that, that you would want to have that information in advance of making your route selection and not find out after you chose the route that, you know, you've got whatever, you know, a thousand wells to deal with or something like that.
Q. And on 116, and this can be for anybody in the group, but if your well is impacted, what are your options? And if we could even -- if Mr. Thibault, if you want to address that.
A. (Thibault) I think basically bottled water or try to drill a new well somewhere. But if the whole aquifer is contaminated, it's basically bottled water.
Q. And have you seen something else in the state that would cause you concern?
A. (Thibault) Yeah. I wouldn't like people to
think that this is a long shot that wells could be contaminated. If we just look at the Litchfield-Merrimack area, last year they had a well contamination issue. It's on the DES web site. It was Saint Gobain. Found elevated levels of PFCs I think they are, and only 40 parts per trillion. They found a sample in their tap water, which is not at the threshold of safety. But they notified the DES anyway. The DES had put out requests for over 800 wells to be tested. Obviously in Litchfield-Merrimack area, these people are living off wells as well. And the DES got 774 tests back, and over 100 of those were over the safety threshold for that chemical. Now, that was 29 percent.

Now, the main point there is if you looked at the map that's on the DES web site that shows the location of all those wells, they show an area that's one and a half miles from the concentrated site. And many of those wells are contaminated, undrinkable and are right on the edge of that one and a half miles. Many of them are over a mile away.

So the point we're concerned about is it's not an unrealistic concern. It happens. And the water there carried that contaminant over a mile away. And here we're talking about Northern Pass being right on top of our aquifers. Even if we didn't have the aquifer there, our wells, as you saw in the map today and last week, our wells run all up and down 116 on both sides, many of them less than a 100 feet away from the edge of the road. So our concern is a valid concern. It's not a concern that, oh, this might happen. It has happened right here in New Hampshire.
Q. And this coal fly ash situation was brought to your attention when? Like when did all of a sudden the existence of coal fly ash, if you can remember --
A. (Thibault) Actually, it was from a member of our own group.
Q. So it wasn't part of the original Application, to your knowledge?
A. (Thibault) No, I never saw that. I think it was one of the iterations that came out.
Q. The situation at Saint Gobain was one source
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of contamination. Is it your understanding that coal fly ash is going to be in all 52 miles?
A. (Thibault) That's correct.
Q. Now, has anybody, to anybody on the panel here, shown you exactly where the excavation is going to be and made a commitment that that's where the excavation is going to be? We can start at the end with Mr. Cumbee.
A. (R. Cumbee) Absolutely not.
Q. So, Mr. Cumbee, as far as your property is concerned, has anybody told you what's going to happen to your property?
A. (R. Cumbee) Again, absolutely not. I have no idea. I have no idea which side of the road is going to be used to bury this monstrosity. You know, we haven't been given any information, really.
Q. And then you can go down the group. Does anybody else know of where the hole's going to be dug? We can start with Ms. Cumbee.
A. (L. Cumbee) Absolutely no information other than the general flyers that we get in the mail that everything will be just fine.
Q. And do the general flyers tell you where a hole is going to be dug?
A. (L. Cumbee) No.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Thibault) I have no for-sure idea either based on the maps I've seen so far.
Q. And Ms. Meyer.
A. (Meyer) No, I don't know. And I would just add that during the time that geotechnical borings were being done, there was a public outreach person there with the crew. And he walked my property with me and took a look at how, in the photograph I showed, there's just a very short shoulder and then the land rises up sharply with mature trees on it. The power lines are on that side of the street. We've got a lighted sign in front of the building. It also then, as it runs along the road frontage, it eventually drops down into a culvert. And he said, "I really don't think they'd want to put it on this side of the road," because of all those things that I mentioned.

I got an e-mail from him several days,
or a couple weeks after that, and he had indicated then it would be a project under the pavement. Then I saw some drawings that had it basically straddling the edge of the pavement, which would, because of that short shoulder, put it a few feet into the undisturbed area. And then, now the latest drawing that I've seen has some green markings that indicate that they have -they're not asking for an exception request anymore. And it looks like the Project will be further into the vegetative area on the side of the road on our side, but I'm not quite sure exactly how far. It's hard to tell from the drawing.
Q. So it's hard to tell from the drawings. Has anybody given you a survey yet?
A. (Meyer) No, no survey. And nobody has talked to me about these changes. In fact, I tried to send a letter to Eversource asking
about -- to present the packet of information I had about what I thought should happen in terms of an exemption request related to our property. And I asked for contact
information through their info line and didn't get a response back. But I did send a packet to the DOT and got a response from Melody Esterberg that they would hold on to that for the time when the exemption requests are resurrected.

So, things keep going back and forth. And do $I$ have an answer of where it will be? No.
Q. And it seems to be going more and more into your land as time goes on; correct?
A. (Meyer) That's what I'm afraid of.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Lakes.
A. (Lakes) I'm not sure exactly at this point where it's going to be. I have concerns, however, that $I$ have an engineered septic system which is about 15 to 20 feet off the road on a fairly steep hill, and I'm afraid that any kind of blasting or trenching or vibratory work, or whatever they do when they do all of this work, could affect that septic system.

I'd also like to add on to what Bob said earlier regarding contamination of wells, et
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cetera, that if in fact we had to get to a point where there was a lot of contamination of wells and we needed to find clean water somewhere, even putting in a engineered water system would be very difficult because of the obstruction of the transmission line with it crisscrossing the road as opposed to staying on one side of the road or the other.
Q. And you noted you have an engineered septic system. And why is that?
A. (Lakes) Well, it's on a hill and it's also -I have a small property. And it's not your typical, really big leach field type of thing. It's a system that's different, and it's built up this way (indicating) as opposed to spread out widthwise. So I have a lot of concerns that a lot of that action around my property could impact that septic system.
Q. And it's not an easily-moved septic system to a different location on your property.
A. (Lakes) No. It would be very expensive. And I basically have a one-acre lot there, so I don't have a lot of land.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Ting.
A. (Ting) No, we have no idea where the final line will be. And as I mentioned earlier, we do have this rental unit that we rely on for a good part of our income. And it would be nice -- it's hard for us to explain what the full impact of the underground line would be on us because we don't know where it's going to be. We don't know how close it's going to be to the front porch of the old farmhouse, for example.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Palmer.
A. (Palmer) As Kathryn alluded to, we have only the most recent design plans provided by Northern Pass. But they're all still listed as "preliminary," even the exception requests. We're still waiting to see whether the exception requests will be granted and what that does in terms of location. So, no, we don't know where the line will be located on our property.
Q. And the most recent design plans are preliminary, anyway, and can be subject to change.
A. (Palmer) Everything we've seen is preliminary.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And lastly, I think it's Grote?
A. (Grote) Yes. As I testified earlier this afternoon, $I$ am aware of where the HDD entrance pits and exit pits are. And there's a red line that apparently indicates where the line is. So, to the extent that that's accurate, $I$ know where it's going. But as far as where the line goes on other aspects of our property, I'm oblivious to that. And I should add that the person who contacted me about buying the property, his main concern was exactly your point. He was very concerned about the location of the proposed line. And that was quite a while ago. And he basically turned away because we couldn't give him an answer.
Q. So when you heard that there was no assessment as to a decrease in property value due to the burial line, was that a concern of yours?
A. (Grote) I'm sorry. Could you speak up a
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[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]
little bit?
Q. Yes. I apologize.
A. (Grote) My hearing isn't that good.
Q. That's okay.

So there's been testimony that, while experts have analyzed the impact on property values for the above-ground transmission lines, a similar assessment wasn't done for burial. And what do you think about that?
A. (Grote) I think there's a major impact on the underground as we've heard today, on the scenery.

And I'd also like to mention I've had experience with reclaiming mineral rights, quieting titles. And, you know, the first thing that Phelps Dodge did when they wanted to lease my property on Gardner Mountain was to make sure we had absolutely bullet-proof title to the land and mineral rights. Took us three years to get them. But it was only after we had clear title that they were satisfied with that we were able to enter a lease with them for their exploration. So, clear title I think is absolutely critical,
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particularly for a project of this order, complexity, magnitude and duration. And I just don't understand how the Applicants could proceed as far as they have and still not know what property rights they need to get, need to acquire.

And as far as the land for you abutting landowners for this particular area, and we can start with Mr. Cumbee, what is your understanding of the Applicant's property rights in front of your residence, and I guess adjacent to, on top of your property?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Calls
for a legal conclusion. This has been specified repeatedly.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Saffo. MS. SAFFO: I definitely think this particular group, because this plan keeps modifying and changing, and that's been a part of the record certainly since their pretrial trial testimony has been presented, I think their understanding of what is on their property as far as, $I$ guess it be DOT easements, is vital for this group to understand.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained.
BY MS. SAFFO:
Q. So as far as the -- Ms. Meyer, you just testified about pre-blasting surveys, but not excavating surveys and no location surveys. Why is that a concern of yours?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. This is expansion of testimony at this point.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled.
You can answer.
A. (Meyer) I didn't -- rephrase the question? BY MS. SAFFO:
Q. Absolutely. You talked about how the Northern Pass was going to be doing surveys for the pre-blasting. They're going to be doing the assessments of whether there's cracks in foundations, cracks in wells and so forth before blasting, but not before excavating, and you indicated that as a concern. Can you elaborate on why that's a concern to you as a property owner?
A. (Meyer) Well, I wouldn't make the distinction so much on excavating. I think before the Project begins in any way, before the route
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is selected, I thought they should have done some investigation as to where there would be wells or where there would be sensitive structures and choose your route based on that preliminary information before you got to the point where you're actually knocking on somebody's door and saying we're going to be blasting this afternoon, you know, we'd like to video your well.
Q. And then if the -- back to the survey. The fact that -- is it fair to say that nobody here has seen a survey outlining what people believe to be the easement on their property?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained. MS. SAFFO: The fact of whether they've seen a survey? Earlier there's been testimony by Northern Pass that they're going to be seeking to do the survey, do it in increments, in 12 -week increments, and they'd be releasing it as they were doing it. So I think it's important to know if as of today's date anybody here has actually seen one of those updated surveys that Northern Pass said they
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would be doing.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So you want
to ask a "Yes" or "No" question?
MS. SAFFO: "Yes" or "No."
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Then these
are "Yes" or "No" answers.
MS. SAFFO: "Yes" or "No" answers.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Go ahead.
BY MS. SAFFO:
Q. As of today's date, have you seen a survey indicating the easement line?
A. (R.Cumbee) No.
A. (L. Cumbee) No.
A. (Thibault) No.
A. (Meyer) I have seen survey workers out there, but they did not leave any kind of markings and didn't -- you wouldn't know that they were there after they left.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Lakes) No.
A. (Ting) No.
A. (Palmer) No.
A. (Grote) No.
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Q. Now, lastly -- or actually, I have two more questions. You talked about how Northern Pass -- there's been testimony about Northern Pass and their ability to hear your input and work with you and meet with towns,

Memorandums of Understanding and so forth. Has anybody responded to your input in response to questions about Northern Pass and what you think about Northern Pass on 116? And I believe there's been earlier testimony by you that your input is that 116 is an inappropriate road for this project to be located on, and it should be located on the energy corridor on I-93.

Has any of you gotten a response other than that's not the Application in front of you?
A. (Thibault) No.
Q. Did that question make any sense? $I$ know it got long.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think you got "Noes" across the board, Ms. Saffo. BY MS. SAFFO:
Q. Okay. So you can give input, but you can
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only -- the only input that you can talk about is modifying it going down 116, whether you like it or not; right?
A. (Lakes) That is correct.
A. (Meyer) Yeah.
Q. So, Mr. Lakes, you had talked about what's going to be disturbed and undisturbed on your property. Has Northern Pass made a commitment as to what they plan to do on your property?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. That's expansion of his testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained.
BY MS. SAFFO:
Q. Mr. Palmer, you talked a lot about the coal fly ash. I apologize. You answered those questions.

You pointed out that your farm is organic. If the water is contaminated on your property, can you still market your farm as organic?
A. (Palmer) I'm sorry. You said if the water is contaminated what?
Q. If your water is contaminated by the coal fly
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ash, can you still market your meat as organic?
A. (Palmer) No, I could not. I think the perception by the public, if it was contaminated, it would drive customers away from my product.
Q. And do you think there's a decrease in value of your property caused by burial of lines that might be surrounded by a permeable substance containing coal fly ash?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection.
Expansion of testimony.
MS. SAFFO: Coal fly ash is new.
I think it's a fair question for Mr. Palmer.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled.
You can answer.
A. (Palmer) I think it pretty much destroys the value of the property as a farm for organic farming. And also, I think it will drive people away from our apartment complex and reduce the value of the apartment complex.
Q. Do you think people move to the Franconia area where you are to get away from those sorts of concerns?
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A. (Palmer) Yes. Absolutely. That's why we bought the land we did. We wanted a pristine environment to conduct the business that we wanted to conduct.
Q. So if somebody from Boston, for example, is moving to Grafton County, do you think they would look at other property over property along the Northern Pass route with a burial transmission -- with a transmission line buried?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Objection. Calls for speculation.

MS. SAFFO: I think his opinion
is --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained.
MS. SAFFO: Thank you. No
further questions.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
(Recess was taken at 3:31 p.m.
and the hearing resumed at 3:45 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Pacik,
we'll have you go first.
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MS. PACIK: Actually, over the break I determined that I do not need to ask my questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Maybe we can take another break and maybe all the other questions will disappear.

Off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard, whenever you're ready.

MS. MENARD: Thank you.
Ms. Meyer actually answered my question in her direct testimony, so I'm going to have to pass. I tried to let you know that before the break, but you moved on.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're going to take more breaks. All the questions are going to disappear. It's going to be great.

All right. I think, Mr.
Needleman, you're up.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So, Mr. Lakes, let me start with you. I'm
looking at your testimony, Paragraph 2. And
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at the end of that you say, "The opposition has no legal recourse to even the scale." You're aware of the fact that this PUC settlement docket that you're making reference to was an open docket?
A. (Lakes) As far as it taking place in public you're talking about?
Q. Correct.
A. (Lakes) Yes.
Q. You're aware of the fact that people could petition to intervene in that docket if they wanted to?
A. (Lakes) Yes, I'm aware of that.
Q. You're aware that there's actually a party in the SEC docket who did petition to intervene in that docket and was granted intervention?
A. (Lakes) Well, let me just say that --
Q. It's a "Yes" or "No" question, sir.
A. (Lakes) What was the question again?
Q. Are you aware of the fact that an attorney representing a party in this SEC docket intervened in that settlement docket and participated in it?
A. (Lakes) I guess I'm not.
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Q. Are you aware of the fact that the Consumer Advocate participated in that document and represented the interests of the consumers in the state?
A. (Lakes) I'm not going to answer that question until I can make a statement.
Q. It's a "Yes" or "No" question, sir. Please answer.
A. (Lakes) Then I don't have an answer.
Q. Do you know the answer to the question?
A. (Lakes) I do not know the answer.
Q. Would it surprise you to learn that the

Consumer Advocate did participate in that docket?
A. (Lakes) Makes no difference to me.
Q. So when you say that the opposition had "no legal recourse," in fact you're wrong about that, aren't you?
A. (Lakes) No. The statement that I'm making about the "no legal recourse" is that the opposition doesn't have a way to balance the $\$ 20$ million that Eversource is paying to the PUC. That is what I meant by that statement, that there's no monetary balance between the
two. It's totally uneven.
Q. With respect to the statements that you've made in Paragraph 2 and 3 of your paragraph, am I correct that those are lay opinion?
A. (Lakes) What's a "lay"?
Q. Are you an attorney?
A. (Lakes) No, I'm not.
Q. Did you seek the advice of an attorney before you wrote these opinions?
A. (Lakes) No, I did not.
Q. Did an attorney review these opinions before you submitted them?
A. (Lakes) No.
Q. Do you have any evidence that you presented in this docket that anyone can look at that supports any of these opinions?
A. (Lakes) Say that again?
Q. It's correct that you presented no evidence in this docket that supports any of the opinions you offered in Paragraph 2 and 3 of your testimony; correct? Those are simply assertions.
A. (Lakes) I haven't heard anything.
Q. Okay. Let me move on to you, Mr. Palmer,
please.
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, can we call up Applicant's 158.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Mr. Palmer, this exhibit was previously introduced. You're aware of the fact that EPA determined that it was going to regulate coal ash as a non-hazardous material?
A. (Palmer) That is a very simplistic and misleading characterization of that rule.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that EPA made that determination?
A. (Palmer) That is not exactly what EPA determined, no.
Q. Well, we'll let the record speak for itself. It's right here.

To the extent that EPA made that
determination, do you have any evidence that they have since changed it?
A. (Palmer) Who wrote this article? What is the source of this article?
Q. Mr. Palmer, can you answer my question, please? Do you have any evidence --
A. (Palmer) Well, you said we're letting the
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record stand for itself, and I'm just trying to clarify the record. What is the source of this article?
Q. The article is already in the record. It's published on Lexis. It talks about the EPA determination in depth.

My question to you, sir, is: Are you aware of any intention on EPA's part to change the determination it made with respect to this ruling?
A. (Palmer) The EPA has never said that this material is non-hazardous. In fact, I put up a document earlier today in which EPA states quite clearly that the material is toxic and hazardous and poses a threat to human health. MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, highlight the bottom, please?

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Do you see what's on the screen, sir?
A. (Palmer) Yes.
Q. "The final rule also supports the responsible recycling of coal ash by distinguishing safe, beneficial use from disposal." Do you see that?
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A. (Palmer) You are picking and choosing from this final rule. The final rule makes a very clear distinction --
Q. Do you see that, sir?
A. (Palmer) The final rules makes a very clear --
Q. Mr. Palmer, please answer my question. Did you see the statement?
A. (Palmer) I see it. It does not characterize the final rule.
Q. Do you understand the difference in the law between "disposal" and "beneficial use"?
A. (Palmer) Yes, sir, I understand the difference.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Okay. Dawn, could you --
A. (Palmer) The EPA makes a very clear distinction on beneficial use --
Q. I'm going to turn to that right now.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, can you turn the ELMO on, please?

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Mr. Palmer, this is a document directly from

EPA's web page. Have you seen this before?
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A. (Palmer) Can't see it yet.
A. (Grote) No signal.
Q. Let me know when it's on, please.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: We've marked this
as Applicant's 494.
Q. Is it on the screen now?
A. (Palmer) It is on the screen now.
Q. All right. So in the first sentence that $I$ highlighted, do you see where EPA says, "Coal ash can be beneficially used to replace virgin materials..., thus conserving natural resources"?
A. (Palmer) $I$ see that, yes.
Q. Okay. And then do you see the bullet points underneath where it EPA lists some of those beneficial uses?
A. (Palmer) Before we can continue in this discussion, $I$ need a few minutes to describe what "beneficial use" is, as defined by U.S. EPA.
Q. We're going to get to that on the next page. I'm asking you if you see these statements.
A. (Palmer) "Beneficial use" is encapsulated, not unencapsulated.
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Q. Well, thank you for saying that. Let's go to the next page. That's exactly what EPA talks about here is "encapsulated beneficial use." And if we look at the first paragraph, it specifically talks about encapsulated beneficial use that includes the use in concrete. Do you see that? The two largest encapsulated uses as reported by ACAA in fly ash are for concrete and concrete products. Do you see that?
A. (Palmer) Yes, which is a hardened material, portland cement or some form of hardened, non-porous material.
Q. Portland cement. Let's come back to that in a moment.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Needleman, can you grab the microphone, please? MR. NEEDLEMAN: Sure.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. And do you see in Paragraph 3 below that how EPA describes the methodology that it developed in order to assess the encapsulated use of coal ash to make a determination about its safety?
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A. (Palmer) What Northern Pass is proposing is not encapsulated use.
Q. Do you see that?
A. (Palmer) I see that, yes.
Q. And then in the final paragraph it says that EPA used the methodology to evaluate potential environmental impacts associated with fly ash as a direct substitute for Portland cement in concrete, what you just said. And the final conclusion there in the last sentence is that EPA's evaluation concluded that the beneficial use of encapsulated CCR in concrete and wallboard is appropriate because environmental releases are comparable to or lower than those from analogous non-CCR products or are at or below the relevant regulatory and health-based benchmarks. Do you see that?
A. (Palmer) I don't understand your point because this is not what Northern Pass is proposing. You're not proposing concrete or wallboard. You're proposing unencapsulated use in a trench --
Q. Your understanding --
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A. (Palmer) -- under water. Under water.
Q. Your understanding is it's unencapsulated. In fact, that's not the position of Northern Pass, is it?
A. (Palmer) I had not heard any position of Northern Pass other than to say that the material will be porous and will act like a french drain. That is not encapsulated.
Q. Do you have any documents you can point to that show this material is not encapsulated.
A. (Palmer) I put documents up earlier today.
Q. Those didn't relate to the use of this specific material, did they?
A. (Palmer) Yes, they did. They were --
Q. The material that Northern Pass --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. I apologize. Mr. Palmer, which exhibit number that you put up today relates specifically to the material that Northern Pass will be using in this project?
A. (Palmer) You'll have to give me a moment.
(Pause)
A. (Palmer) That was APOBP63.
Q. And what does that document say about
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Northern Pass's use of this material?
A. (Palmer) It says the Northern Pass -- the fluidized thermal backfill is water-permeable, similar to DOT gravels, does not create water dams and behaves as a french drain --
Q. Who wrote the document?
A. (Palmer) This was a statement by Eversource in a meeting held by New Hampshire Department of Transportation.
Q. And is there anywhere in there that it says the material is not encapsulated?
A. (Palmer) The description given is the very definition of unencapsulated.
Q. In fact, unencapsulated is free fly ash, like in coal piles, which is what EPA was regulating, isn't it?
A. (Palmer) No. No. Encapsulated means hardened, like hardened cement or in gypsum wallboard. Unencapsulated is material that is unhardened and is able to be -- and is porous. That's the simple definition --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, let's go to
Applicant's 160, please.
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BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Mr. Palmer, we saw this exhibit earlier. This is from the New Hampshire DOT web page, which is encouraging --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Go to the next one, please, Dawn.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. This is with respect to the DOT construction initiatives. It's encouraging the use of fly ash from foundries in concrete. Do you see that? Do you recall seeing this exhibit before?
A. (Palmer) I'm sorry. What is this from again?
Q. From New Hampshire DOT's web page. Do you remember seeing this exhibit previously?
(Witness reviews document.)
A. (Palmer) No, I can't say I remember seeing this before.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Dawn, just one other, Applicant 159.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. The first page of this, this organization -MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, back, Dawn.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
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Q. AASHTO, do you know who that organization is?
A. (Palmer) I'm sorry. What was the question?
Q. Do you know what this organization is? Do you know what that acronym stands for?
A. (Palmer) No.
Q. It's the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And Dawn, if we can go over to the next page, please.

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Do you recall seeing this exhibit which was previously introduced?
(Witness reviews document.)
Q. Mr. Palmer, have you seen this previously?
A. (Palmer) I have not.
Q. And do you see where it says that, among other things, 46 state DOTs responded to this survey and indicated that they use fly ash as structural concrete or in concrete pavements?
A. (Palmer) In structural concrete or concrete pavements. In hardened concrete, encapsulated form.
Q. And so do you think that EPA would find the encapsulated use of this material acceptable
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and environmentally beneficial, New Hampshire DOT would promote its use, and these 46 other DOTs would promote its use, if they had the same concerns about environmental impacts from the material that you do?
A. (Palmer) You're talking about encapsulated use, and what you're proposing is not encapsulated use.
Q. Do you have a single example of encapsulated fly ash causing the type of environmental issues that you've posited here?
A. (Palmer) I don't have any examples of encapsulated fly ash causing problems, no.
Q. And so my last question, sir. If it turns out that in fact you're not correct and that the fly ash that's proposed to be used here is encapsulated, would that address all your concerns?
A. (Palmer) If it was not -- no, it would not because I don't believe it is encapsulated. It's going to be unencapsulated. It's going to be --
Q. That wasn't my question.
A. (Palmer) -- porous, as stated by several of
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]
the Northern Pass experts.
Q. We'll make it a hypothetical.

Hypothetically, if it turns out that in fact Northern Pass's proposed use of this material is encapsulated, would it then address all your concerns?
A. (Palmer) I would still have concerns about toxic substances leaching out of it.
Q. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
Oldenburg.
QUESTIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SEC COUNSEL: BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. Ms. Meyer, I think it was you that showed a picture of you standing in front of your property along Route 116; correct?
A. (Meyer) Yes.
Q. And I think your point was if the line is required to go off the pavement, as close to the right-of-way as possible, that would have an impact to your -- to trees and everything else that we saw in the picture.
A. (Meyer) Yes.
Q. And it's been stated in the Utility
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Accommodation Manual, the UAM, that was the statement from the DOT, that the line needs to be close as to the right-of-way "as practical" is the statement. And that -fair to say it's your understanding that manual isn't just for the Northern Pass Project, that's statewide?
A. (Meyer) Hmm-hmm.
Q. So after that line in the paragraph, there's dozens of qualifiers to that statement that say, but if you have to go under the pavement, this is the case, and that if you have to go under the pavement, that's where all these exemption requests come from. And there's been testimony that there's been quite a few. But if I heard you right when Ms. Saffo was asking you, you haven't seen or are aware of an exemption request in front of your property; is that correct?
A. (Meyer) There was an exemption request, and then apparently it was withdrawn. And the most recent drawing that I saw had green lines that then apparently removed the exemption request and showed that there would
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be more advancement into the, $I$ guess you'd call it the undisturbed area.
Q. But your preference would be, if it went anywhere, under the road would be the least impact --
A. (Meyer) Under the pavement is better than outside of the pavement. But obviously, when we thought the Project was completely under the pavement, we still became intervenors. So that doesn't completely mitigate our concerns about the Project. But I would have to say it's better than being outside the pavement and in what we consider our front yards.
Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. OLDENBURG: I guess that's
all the questions $I$ have. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms.
Weathersby.
QUESTIONS BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Good afternoon. Mr. Grote, you had testified about that land across the street from you that sold after it had been on the market awhile and the price had dropped and it
ultimately sold for around $\$ 25,000$. Is that a price that's lower than what you believed to market value -- it's fair market value would be if the Northern Pass Transmission Project was not proposed?
A. (Grote) I'm not a real estate expert, but I do know that a property that abuts us -excuse me. Is this working? Yeah. The property that abuts us, a one-acre lot that was shown on the map, I believe several years ago sold for approximately $\$ 35,000$.
Q. Okay.
A. (Grote) And that was a smaller property that didn't have views, that did not face south. It was certainly -- and it was basically the end of the runway for the airport. I consider that a much less desirable property than the one that was sold. Thank you, yes.
Q. Thank you.

In your video, there was a number of -all kinds of structures and walls and things in there. But it showed some -- there was a geothermal structure and underground gas pumps. Do you know if any of those types of
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structures, or even septic systems, are actually located in the right-of-way or just -- your point was that they were near. But do you know if there's anything actually located within the right-of-way?
A. (Meyer) No, we didn't look at an analysis of where the right-of-way is in that part of Franconia where those structures are.
Q. Okay. Thanks.

And Ms. Meyer, I seem to recall from something that your property was a bed and breakfast?
A. (Meyer) Yes, that's correct.
Q. Do you still run the bed and breakfast?
A. No. We made it a private home for a while, but now we're thinking of taking it back to being a $B \& B$ again.
Q. Okay. But not you're operating it as a bed and breakfast now.
A. (Meyer) No, no. My elderly mother was living with us, and it just wasn't practical to have it as a B \& B at that point.
Q. Understood.

Mr. Palmer, you talked about, I think it
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was you, the Route 93 corridor and the 1.7 miles that is the federal lands. If they were to use the 93 corridor, just hypothetically because it's not what's before us, but I'm just exploring this, if a project was to use the 93 corridor and there'd be that 1.7-mile gap, it seems as though there would have to be a detour around that. Would that detour most likely be Route 18 through Franconia?
A. (Palmer) No, I don't think there would have to be a detour around it because that
1.7 miles is owned by the White Mountain National Forest. The Project is already proposing to go through 10 miles of the White Mountain National Forest and has applied for a permit to do so with the White Mountain National Forest. So they could do the same thing with this 1.7 miles. And in fact, White Mountain National Forest has already made a draft record of decision to grant that permit. So they could do the same thing with the 1.7 miles.
A. (Meyer) If I could add something? The White
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Mountain Forest is a good part of Easton, and that's what he was referring to; if they were to grant permission to go through the White Mountain Forest in Easton, presumably they would as well on 93.

MR. OLDENBURG: Can I butt in and ask a question?

MS. WEATHERSBY: Sure.
QUESTIONS BY MR. OLDENBURG (CONT'D):
Q. So this is the question I didn't ask. But since she started, I'll ask anyway.

So you pointed out the 1.7 miles in the legislation. But in the paragraph above that it says, insofar as they do not -- so let me go back.

So it talks about the energy corridors themselves and that the state has the exclusive right to use these corridors, "insofar as they do not conflict with any federal statute, rule or regulation."
A. (Palmer) Right.
Q. Do you know of any federal statute, rule or regulation that would probate the use?
A. (Palmer) No, I do not. I think the only
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reason the 1.7 was left out is because the state has no jurisdictions, and therefore can't put in their law anything about that 1.7-mile stretch. They don't own it.
Q. Okay.

MR. OLDENBURG: Just for the record, that's 162-R:2 in the RSAs.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. So this project had to get a federal permit through the Department of Energy. A highway project in the interstate system is governed by the Federal Highway Administration. So you don't know of any federal highway rules that would prohibit the use through --
A. (Palmer) My understanding is that the Federal Highway Administration delegates authority over the use of the interstate highways to the state governments, and to DOT in this case.
Q. So you don't know of any special permitting or anything else that went on to get the Project -- I-93 through Franconia Notch --
A. (Palmer) No.
Q. -- that would prohibit the use of the
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corridor?
A. (Palmer) No.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

QUESTIONS BY MS. WEATHERSBY (CONT'D):
Q. And I just had one last question about the fluidized thermal backfill and the fly ash.

I seem to recall that before they use the fly ash, it needs to be tested and make sure that it doesn't exceed minimum -- or maximum contaminant levels. If I'm remembering correctly and that's the case, would that satisfy your concerns, or mostly alleviate them?
A. (Palmer) If it were tested and it was shown that there were absolutely no heavy metals in it that could be leached out of it, that would go a long way towards alleviating my concerns. I find that to be highly unlikely, in that all coal fly ash has been shown to contain heavy metals, which are readily leachable.

MS. WEATHERSBY: Thank you.
Nothing further.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Any other
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questions from the Committee?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
In light of the questions you've been asked today, is there anything you need to follow up on in the way of factual information to clarify or supplement an answer? Mr. Palmer.
A. (Palmer) Yes, I want to follow up on the issue of whether EPA has designated coal fly ash as hazardous. I have just a few facts that I'd like to put out there about that.

This was actually the decision made by EPA in 2015 for the regulation of coal combustion residuals, including fly ash. And this was a very nuanced decision by U.S. EPA. It did not at any point identify coal fly ash as "non-hazardous." What it does is it establishes the regulation of coal fly ash under Subtitle $D$, which is generally a waste management rule for non-hazardous wastes, rather than Subtitle C. And the reason it did that is because EPA was eager to make sure that coal fly ash could still be recycled and reused. If it was regulated as
a hazardous waste, it would not be able to be recycled and reused. However, EPA makes a very clear distinction between safe reuse of coal fly ash and the unconsolidated use of coal fly ash that is being proposed here. They stated that when coal fly ash is used in a solid material such as Portland cement or gypsum wallboard, it's safe. They stated that when it's used in an unconsolidated form and placed in the earth, there's not enough data to say whether it's safe or not.

However, they pointed to several damage cases in which unconsolidated coal fly ash was placed in the earth, similar to the proposal here, and it resulted in contamination of groundwater above drinking water standards.

So, even though they, EPA, made it very clear that they feel coal fly ash is a toxic and hazardous material that has the potential for leaching, they still regulated it under Subtitle D. Basically, they created a new category of waste which behaves in the manner of toxic waste but is regulated in such a way that it can be recycled under safe
conditions. EPA never stated that coal fly ash is not hazardous. In fact, I put up a document earlier today in which EPA clearly states that coal fly ash does contain materials which can be leached and which pose a definite threat to human health. And that document is a very recent document.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Anything
else? Yes, Mr. Thibault.
A. (Thibault) We talked about that, well and well contamination, and the discussion was centered on coal fly ash. But we have to remember also that there will be a couple of miles of HDD drilling in this route between Franconia and Easton. The HDD drilling will put bentonite and some form of chemicals also in the ground, and actually much deeper than the trenching. So we had that concern, too, that it's not just coal fly ash, but it's also chemicals and bentonite that will go into the ground that's not there now. And my property -- I border Ham Branch, and Kendall Brook runs through my property. And I have a pond on my property. All of these are right
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alongside the road. When they drill under Kendall Brook, they're going to drill past my pond which is fed from across the street by streams. They're going to go through that water flow underground and block it with bentonite. Hopefully the water will flow above it and below it, but we don't know. Also, there'll be chemicals I believe in that bentonite because $I$ don't think they can do all their drilling without adding additives to the slurry. So now they're going to drop the chemicals in underground, maybe 35 feet deep, even closer to our aquifer. So it's -and then they're going to go under Ham Branch, which also borders my property. And it's like that all the way up and down the road. There will be about 10 streams they have to do this to.

So, again, as $I$ said earlier, the concern about contaminated wells is real. It's not theoretical. It's very possible. The other point I'd like to make, totally unrelated to that, is when we all started out at the initial public hearings
that the Applicant was required to have, the story was, yes, we're going to build this under the road. And there was no mistaking at those meetings that "under road" meant under the hot top. We have video evidence of that. It's in transcripts. People were saying 99 percent of this will be under the hot top. So that was quite misleading. I don't know how many hundreds, if not thousands, of people attended those public hearings and walked away with that belief. Obviously, there aren't thousands of people attending these hearings, so there's many people out there that still harbor the impression that, oh, yeah, this is going under the road. And I know for a fact that I've spoken to people in my own area who still believe that.

The point I want to make is that
Northern Pass puts this misinformation out there; yet, there's been in all this time no effort or no outreach by Northern Pass to correct that misinformation --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
[CUMBEE|THIBAULT|MEYER|LAKES|TING|PALMER|GROTE]

Thibault, what question are you following up on or clarifying?

MR. THIBAULT: (Thibault) I'm just answering the question of is there anything that we'd like to add to our testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, that wasn't the question. The question was: In light of what you've been asked today, specific questions and answers, is there anything you need to clarify or follow up on?

MR. THIBAULT: Nothing further. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Is there anything else?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Thank you very much. You can return to your seats. We'll go off the record while we turn over a witness.
(Recess was taken at 4:16 p.m.
and the hearing resumed at 4:22 p.m..) CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

If people could reassemble. We have a witness in place.
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prefiled testimony?
A. I don't.
Q. And do you adopt and swear to this prefiled testimony you filed as your testimony today?
A. I do.
Q. Okay.

MS. DORE: Ms. Menard, it's my understanding you have some questions?

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Newman.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Thank you for making the trip down this afternoon.
A. Sure.
Q. So, a few questions. You state in your testimony that the new power poles will represent a 500-percent increase in profile. How did you arrive at that statement?
A. I simply measured the existing poles versus the new poles. And I know Ms. Widell spoke to this same assertion. Thinking I must have been referring to the lattice towers when $I$ said 500 percent, in fact $I$ was referring to
[WITNESS: D. SCOTT NEWMAN]
the steel monopoles, which are several times the profile of the existing steel poles, and in instances up to 70 percent higher; that's how I arrived at my 500 percent.

If you were talking about the lattice structures versus the existing wooden poles, the difference would be in the many thousands-of-percent increase in profile.
Q. Thank you. There is a reference in an exchange between Attorney Whitley and the Applicant's historic expert, Ms. Widell, where she says that the views outside the historic district for Deerfield are not considered. What is your view regarding this exchange and Ms. Widell's assertion that power poles behind a historic church have no impact because this view is purportedly not considered in the National Registry nomination?
A. Well, this line of reasoning makes no sense to me. I've never heard it used by any party in a historic preservation review in over 25 years of reviewing properties. Of course, structures built beside or behind historic
[WITNESS: D. SCOTT NEWMAN]
properties would impact those properties, especially when industrial-scale infrastructure is built behind a community church. In the case of the Deerfield Center Church that you were referring to, the pole behind the church presently is 83 feet, and a 50-percent increase in height as proposed, bringing the equipment up to around 120 feet, I believe that's a monopole in that instance, that new equipment would backdrop the historic church from multiple vantage points from within the district.

MS. MENARD: And Jo Anne, can you
put up the next exhibit with the pink lines?
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. This exhibit that we have here is Page 5 of your supplemental testimony, and it's a district map with the district of the Nottingham Road Rural Historic District with the pink lines. And you note in your supplemental testimony that the NHDHR established the boundaries of the Nottingham Road Rural Historic District after your original testimony. Please explain the
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impact of this boundary change on your assessment of the Project's impact on historic sites.
A. Well, in my original testimony, at that time -- and this is after I believe the Applicant had made their determinations of effect in this area, but the boundaries of that district, the potential district at that time were unknown. So I conservatively estimated for my determination of effect that the boundary of the district would abut the right-of-way for the proposed transmission line. After my testimony, before my supplemental, the Division of Historic Resources defined the boundaries of the historic property. And you can see them on this exhibit. And they extend -- so, like this is the official boundary now. They extend north and south of the Nottingham Road Historic District, which has been determined eligible by DHR for the National Register, such that the changes that instead of abutting the historic district, the Project now bisects the National Registered historic
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district.
Q. Can you explain briefly what you mean by "degrade the character of the district"?
A. So I do point --

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair, objection. Sounds like this is repetition of existing testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard.
MS. MENARD: I think that the phrase "degrade the character of the district," we have an expert witness that is offering this. And I was hoping that he would clarify from a professional standpoint exactly what that means. I think we all have a general appreciation for what that might mean. But specifically, and briefly, if he could clarify that, I'm hoping that it would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I like
"briefly." Yeah, why don't you have him clarify that. But again, this is information that is in his testimony which we all have access to. But go ahead, as far as you said.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. Do you understand my question, Mr. Newman?
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A. I do. You're asking me to clarify briefly what I mean by "degrade the character of the district." And it's fairly simple. Building lattice towers and power poles and suspending wires above a tree canopy in a National Registered historic district is inherently negative. This explains why historic communities around the country are spending millions advocating for building the wires in and around the communities. The views of this infrastructure bisecting this historic district would, in my opinion, alter the fundamental rural, scenic and historic characteristics of the Nottingham Historic District. The proposed project is not an off-in-the-distance view. It would physically bisect the historic district, introducing prominent views of industrial-scale infrastructure and scarring the skyline from views within the district.
Q. Thank you. How many infrastructure projects have you reviewed in New England to determine effects of historic sites?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection,
[WITNESS: D. SCOTT NEWMAN]

Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained.
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. Could we take a look at your Figure 6 from your original testimony.

MS. MENARD: And for the record,
we have labeled this as Deerfield Abutter Exhibit 46C. He had three photo simulations, and this is just to help identify this for the record.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. So, once again, how did you arrive at the lines that are shown in this and other photo simulations?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Same objection,
Mr. Chair. All in his testimony.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard.
MS. MENARD: There's been some criticism of Mr. Newman's methodology, if you will, in the supplemental testimony of Ms. Widell and various -- and no less than three locations in this testimony, in hearings, in transcripts, has this been raised as a criticism of Mr. Newman's work.
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't you refresh all of us on what that criticism is and have him respond to it, which I think is what you're ultimately intending to do; right?

MS . MENARD: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't we get to that rather than the setup which is in his testimony. What did Ms. Widell say about it? Or what did others testify about that was critical of the work that he did?

MS. MENARD: May I take a ten-second break and go get my transcript?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You may. MS. MENARD: Thank you. (Pause)

MS. MENARD: I apologize. I'm going to have to take more time than I asked for, so I'm going to move on, and hopefully we'll be able to come back.

BY MS. MENARD :
Q. There's a footnote on Applicant's Exhibit 95 at the bottom of Page 11 where Ms. Widell is addressing her response to your "unreasonable adverse effects" conclusion regarding
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Deerfield Center and Nottingham Road Historic District. And she states, "The assessment of unreasonable adverse effect is for the Project as a whole. While that includes evaluation of individual historic properties, the findings of unreasonable adverse effect is not applied to discrete individual
resources." How would you respond to Ms.
Widell's statement?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chair,
doesn't that call for a legal conclusion? MS. MENARD: I'm sorry. I didn't hear him.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: He said it called for a legal conclusion. Can you repeat the question?

MS. MENARD: Yes. I would like
for Mr. Newman to respond to Ms. Widell's
footnote explanation as to why she evaluated the Project as a whole with the determination of unreasonable adverse effect applies to the Project as a whole, whereas Mr. Newman's conclusion was very specific about two distinct, individual historic resources. And this
footnote is just explaining the differences between the two.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't you ask him why he did it the way he did it. BY MS. MENARD:
Q. Mr. Newman, why did you choose to evaluate two individual historic resources and render an opinion, contrary to Ms. Widell's approach?
A. Sure. There is very little guidance in the SEC rules about what constitutes the magic number, where the number of adverse effects combined create an unreasonable adverse effect. And in my experience, $I$ apply a test which I've used for a number of years, and the test for me is if this project were shorter, if this project was taking place just within Deerfield, from one side of Deerfield to the other, given the number of adverse effects to dozens of properties within two historic districts, that's my conclusion, that the Project would have an unreasonable adverse effect, given the proportion of properties affected. Now, I
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see no reason as a regulator to discount or disqualify or dilute that conclusion just because the Project happens to be longer.
Q. Thank you.

During cross-examination of Ms. Widell by Mr. Whitley on Day 28 in the afternoon, starting on Page 31, there was a discussion about the existing modern intrusion of utility poles in Deerfield Center as compared with the modern intrusion of the Project outside the historic district. Do you agree with Ms. Widell's assertion that there's a difference?
A. Sorry. Could you repeat that, please?
Q. Yes. Ms. Widell was referring to existing infrastructure within Deerfield Center as a "modern intrusion." And she viewed the proposed project similarly as being a modern intrusion to the district. Do you agree with that assessment?
A. No. In fact, the National Register nomination for the Deerfield Center Historic District calls out, it mentions the utility infrastructure, which is a small-scale
[WITNESS: D. SCOTT NEWMAN]
distribution network for homes and businesses in that community. And it calls it "typical" in the nomination. Effects on historic districts from infrastructure equipment, or really from anything, have a lot to do with viewer expectations, reasonable expectations of somebody who's passing through or living there. And it's entirely reasonable to expect you have small-scale utility poles running up and down the side of the street shows the evolution electrification of that community. Having the community backdropped by an industrial-scale transmission line, which as I've shown exists above the tree canopy, and specifically in the case of the Deerfield Church sort of looms behind that historic property, that is not -- you could not consider that -- or I would not consider that view to be reasonably expected by somebody visiting a historic district, that there would be lattice towers or large monopoles and sagging wires across the sky in the district.
Q. Thank you.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
[WITNESS: D. SCOTT NEWMAN]

And finally just a few questions regarding the Programmatic Agreement and Section 106. You state in your supplemental testimony the following: "The Applicant has not completed the Section 106 process, rendering NHDHR unable to make official effects findings under the Section 106 as required under the SEC rules." What rules are you referring to?
A. I'm referring to the SEC rules governing the determination of unreasonable adverse effect on historic districts, specifically the fourth, I think that's Site . 14 (b). The rules, if you have them there --
Q. Actually, could you take a look at this. And I've highlighted what I believe -- could you confirm these are the rules you are referring to?
A. I'm referring to these rules. And specifically I'm referring to (4) at the bottom of that page.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Can the Programmatic Agreement take the place of the required findings and
[WITNESS: D. SCOTT NEWMAN]
deliberations in accordance with the (4)?
A. In my opinion, under no circumstances could it take the place of required findings and determinations.
Q. Why not?
A. Because there are no findings and determinations in that PA. Programmatic agreements and memorandum agreements are typically formed because you do not have findings and determinations, and those two types of agreements set forth the process to make those findings and determinations in the future.
Q. And you have been involved in -- how many Section 106 PAs have you drafted for infrastructure projects in New England?
A. Well, several hundred MOAs and at least a dozen programmatic agreements.
Q. So, finally, what do you believe are the risks to the site selection process of not having the findings and determinations as required in the rules?
A. Well, I should point out I'm not a lawyer, so

I can't comment specifically on what would
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happen if the SEC rules are not followed. But I can say this: The 106 process spelled out in the PA could result in changes to the Project, potentially significant changes as that process is undertaken. I believe that's the reason the $S E C$ rules call for these findings and determinations to be in hand so that they can deliberate on the unreasonable adverse effects to historic sites.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Newman.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record) CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Aslin. MR. ASLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Newman. My name is Chris Aslin. I've been designated as Counsel for the Public in this proceeding. I'll ask you a few more questions to follow up on your testimony.

To start off, you testified briefly just now that you looked only at Deerfield for
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this project. I assume that was part of your scope of work?
A. Correct.
Q. And you were retained by the Deerfield Abutters to perform that work; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it your -- well, I'll ask it this way: You did not identify all the historic sites in Deerfield, did you, as part of your work?
A. Because of funding, my scope was limited. So I made the conservative choice to evaluate the resources and effects to those resources within a mile of the transmission corridor, and only those resources that were eligible or listed in the National Register. There are certainly a far greater number of historic resources in Deerfield that this scope really couldn't contemplate.
Q. Since the time of your initial review, are you aware of any additional resources that have been identified as eligible within that one-mile area in Deerfield?
A. Well, the boundary is the Nottingham Road
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Historic District. That changing to encompass on either side of the transmission line is probably the biggest change. So they've increased the amount of contributing historic property to extend on either side of the proposed project now.
Q. Okay. But you're not aware of any other resources within the one-mile APE that --
A. I am not.
Q. You testified -- or in your testimony you state that you used the one-mile APE and considered it to be a conservative area of review. Do $I$ understand that to mean that you believe that a larger APE would be appropriate?
A. Yes, I think it would be appropriate considering that that project is within the view of multiple vantage points in that community which my scope didn't allow me to evaluate. I certainly visited some of them informally. But again, as my scope was funded -- this is an out-of-pocket project by the Deerfield Abutters.
Q. Okay. Much of your testimony deals with the
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critique of the Applicant's work. And you assert that the Applicants used a method of assessment without any regulatory basis, and then you go on to note specifically the failure to use a bare earth analysis and the reliance on leaf-on vegetative screening.

Was that the extent of your critique in terms of an assessment that was without any regulatory basis?
A. No, I believe I also mentioned the fact that there was little, if any, attention given to a major part of the Project, which is the suspended wires.
Q. Okay. So that was part of that initial critique?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

With regard to the wires, you note, I believe it's on Page 4 of your original report attached to your prefiled testimony, that the conductors have a prominent visual element within the historic district. At what distance or what level of visibility do the conductors become prominent, in your
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opinion?
A. The conductors?
Q. Yeah, the wires.
A. Oh, okay. At what distance? I think at a distance that a reasonably sighted person would notice them on the landscape. I think it really depends how the big the wires are, you know, what your vantage point is from above, from below, at what level. So, really, I'd need to make that on case-by-case scenarios. Certainly within the historic districts that I looked at, the wires would be prominently visible in each one of those.
Q. Okay. And in regard to the Nottingham Road District, it's a fairly large district.

Would you agree that the prominence of the wires is different from different parts of the district?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it your opinion that they're prominent from all places within the district or certain areas?
A. No. Some areas are -- I think the wires would be more prominently visible in certain
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areas depending on the topography. In a couple of simulations that I generated, you can see where the towers and wires would be located above the tree canopy. Those are taken from vantages in the historic district. You know, I took a couple. I could have taken six or ten.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

I want to go back to your calculation of tower profile. And I believe you testified earlier to Ms. Menard that your calculation of a 500-percent increase in tower profile applied to monopoles. Do I have that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you explain what you mean by "tower profile"? I'm having a hard time understanding how you get to 500 percent.
A. Sure. It's what you would see silhouetted against a background. So if a pole is a foot wide by 10 feet tall, you'd have a profile of, you know, 10 square feet against the backdrop. So, similarly, you know, something 3 feet by 10 feet, you'd have 30 feet; so that would be, you know, 300-percent increase
and so on.
Q. Is your calculation based on the entirety of the tower or just the portion that will be visible above the tree line?
A. No, the entire tower.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. Well, when I say "tower," I should say "pole" because the 500 percent was an approximation for the poles. The towers, again, I didn't assess that. But the change in profile would be in the thousands of percent.
Q. Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

You found, in your opinion, an unreasonable effect on both the Nottingham Road Historic District and the Deerfield Center Historic District. And you state with regard to Nottingham Road that, make sure I get this right, the proposed transmission line will be clearly and prominently visible from multiple locations within the Deerfield Center and Nottingham Road Historic

Districts. How did you make that
determination? Did you go to multiple
locations in each district and do visual
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simulations or --
A. I did. I spent roughly 12 hours traveling in both of these districts. And you can see the existing poles. If you look carefully, they're just about even with the tree canopy, but they can be made out if you're really looking. And so you could clearly see where the new poles would be. And then scaling off the existing poles, you could determine the height of the new poles to inform the simulation. The data is there. For example, behind the church we know the existing one is 83; we know the proposed is 120 . So it's just simply scaling off with a ruler -- low tech, but effective -- scaling off with a ruler to determine the new height.
Q. And is that how you came to the blue lines in your figures showing the proposed height of the line?
A. Yeah. The blue line or the yellow line would be the tops of the towers. And, you know, those are conservative estimates. In some instances, you know, depending on where you look, that line might be higher. For
example, in the area just directly south of Parade Road, the towers are 73, 67 and 53 percent higher. A little further east, the towers are, you know, 37, 36 and 40 percent higher. So it depends, again, where you are on that road exactly and what the topography is.
Q. Okay. Would you agree that the topography of the right-of-way is not perfectly flat and that the actual heights will vary somewhat rather than being a straight line?
A. It will, yes.
Q. So this is an approximation, and you said a conservative one?
A. Right.
Q. Thank you.

After your testimony was filed, the Applicant's consultants submitted effects tables for these two districts to the New Hampshire DHR. Were you aware of that?
A. Yes, I'm aware that they were submitted, though I haven't seen them myself. A lot of this is kind of late-breaking for me.
Q. So you haven't reviewed those at this point?
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A. No. And it's my understanding neither has DHR. So those were proposed effect findings.
Q. Yes, these are recommendations by the consultants for the Applicant.

Would it surprise you to know that the Applicant's consultants found no adverse effects for both of these districts in the effects table?
A. No. I think that was the original -- I saw a preliminary table and I saw those effects. They won't stand the scrutiny of Section 106. They will be changed.
Q. All right. Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There were no other intervenor groups that indicated they had questions for Mr. Newman.

Mr. Walker.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. WALKER:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Newman.
A. Good afternoon, sir.
Q. My name's Jeremy Walker. We met at your
technical session.
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A. We did.
Q. I'm counsel for the Applicant. Good to see you again.
A. Good to see you.
Q. I just want to be clear. You are not and you did not offer any opinion with regard to below-ground resources in this case; right?
A. Correct.
Q. I want to ask you a little bit about your background. And I know you spent about 15 years with the DOT in Vermont; correct?
A. Right.
Q. In fact, the majority of your career has been with the DOT?
A. About half.
Q. And when you reference in your prefiled testimony that you worked on 2200 projects, I think you told me at your tech session about 75 percent of those were highway improvements, about 25 percent were rail, and another five percent -- is that about right?
A. Correct.
Q. And most of those projects did not involve high-voltage transmission corridors; right?
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A. Well, utilities lines, but a few high-voltage lines.
Q. And since you started 106 Associates, you have not done any assessment of a high-voltage transmission line; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you also served as the treasurer of the Isle La Motte Fire Department until the summer; correct?
A. Right.
Q. I want to ask you a little bit about your methodology, and then I'm going to ask you your opinions.

In this case, you mentioned that you used the one-mile APE, and you found two resources, historic resources, in Deerfield within that one-mile APE; right?
A. Yes. Two concentrations of National Register properties, yes.
Q. And you were looking at properties that were eligible for the National Register; right?
A. Or listed.
Q. Or listed.
A. Yeah.
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Q. And those are the only properties, historic properties, you identified in Deerfield?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you review, prior to providing your prefiled testimony, the analysis that was done by the Applicant's consultants, Preservation Company, with regard to Deerfield?
A. Yes.
Q. You reviewed the assessments both of the Deerfield Historic Center District?
A. I read their assessment of the Center District. And I believe I saw their recommendations for eligibility of the Nottingham Road District.
Q. And did you review the boundaries that they recommended for the Nottingham Road District?
A. Yeah. There was, I think, a KMZ Google file that had some recommended boundaries.
Q. And the boundary that they recommended for Nottingham Road actually was bisected by the right-of-way; correct?
A. Their recommendation, yes.
Q. It was broader than the boundary that you
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recommended?
A. Correct. Without a determination by DHR, I took a conservative approach.
Q. And did you read the 15 to 20 pages of analysis and photographs and photo simulations that accompanied their assessment?
A. I read through it, yes.
Q. Okay. But I heard you say earlier that you had read the effects tables they provided.
A. Not the recent ones. I think they've had a couple of iterations of those tables.
Q. And for each of the two historic districts that you've focused on, you've identified -or you've opined that there will be an unreasonable adverse effect for each of
those; correct?
A. That's my opinion, yeah.
Q. And you base that on your photo simulations that you provided or your visual simulations.

But you also said in your prefiled testimony, "The Applicant has not availed themselves of readily available tools (undergrounding) to mitigate the --"
A. Right. Correct.
Q. Did I hear you say earlier that you thought there were dozens of adverse effects within the town of Deerfield?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I want to get to something that Attorney Aslin asked you about, your criticism of the methodology by Ms. Widell and the Applicants. And in your prefiled testimony you're critical that they failed to follow the SEC rules requiring a bare earth visual impact analysis. Do you recall that?
A. Correct. Yeah.
Q. But that requirement for a bare earth analysis, and you cite to the rule -- it's SEC $301.05(\mathrm{~b})(1)$-- that deals with the effect on aesthetics; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. It's not required for the analysis on the effects on historic sites.
A. Are you asking me or are you --
Q. I'm asking you that. Do you agree with me?
A. No.

MR. WALKER: Okay. Dawn, if you
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could pull up SEC $301.05(\mathrm{~b})(1)$, please.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q. And you see the requirement of the bare ground analysis is with regard to a visual impact assessment; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware that in this case the Applicants did provide a visual impact assessment that included a bare ground analysis?
A. I'm not aware they did that in Deerfield, no.
Q. So you have not reviewed that impact analysis for Deerfield?
A. If they did a bare earth analysis in Deerfield, I did not see it.
Q. Do you think that would be important to review for purposes of your analysis?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And you're aware that there is an entirely separate section in the rules dealing with the effect on historic sites.

MR. WALKER: And if you could
pull up 301.06, please, Dawn.
BY MR. WALKER:
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[WITNESS: D. SCOTT NEWMAN]
Q. Mr. Newman, I assume you've seen this rule with regard to what the Applicant has to provide with regard to effects on historic sites?
A. Yes.
Q. You reviewed that prior to preparing your opinion in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. You would agree with me that in there, there is no reference to a bare ground assessment in this section; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you mentioned earlier that 301.14 (b) which provides the criteria for determining whether the Project will have an unreasonable adverse effect -- and I know you have that before you. Is there anyplace in that rule that requires the Applicant to provide a bare ground analysis when determining the effects on historic sites?
A. No. But you did not show all of 301.05. You left out the part (3) referencing historical and cultural features of the landscape required -- inventory of those features
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required when undertaking effects on aesthetics.
Q. Right, but that's the section on visual
impact analysis. And I will represent to you that the Applicant has provided that impact analysis in this case, visual impact analysis. But it's a different section that deals with aesthetics. The section that we're talking about is the section on historic sites. Do you agree with me?
A. No, I don't. Historic and cultural sites are mentioned in the effects on aesthetics.
Q. And again, you have not reviewed the photo simulations and the impact analysis for the town of Deerfield that the Applicant has provided in this case.
A. Yes, I've seen some. I have one right in front of me that looks, for example, looks at the Deerfield Center Church.
Q. Have you reviewed any others?
A. I have. I've seen others. I don't find them to be compelling. I think this is an example of one where, instead of looking at the church, it looks down the road, I mean, to my
[WITNESS: D. SCOTT NEWMAN]
mind, purposely minimizing the impact of the poles in the historic community.
Q. Okay. We'll put some of those up to talk about them.

Before you rendered your opinion in this matter, had you gone back to look at any decisions by the SEC since these rules became in effect in 2015?
A. I did an online search. I couldn't find any deliberations on "unreasonable adverse effects to historic sites" in what I looked at.
Q. Have you found any decision in which the Site Evaluation Committee required a bare ground analysis when considering the effect on historic sites?
A. I don't know if one exists or not.
Q. Okay. Is it your position that the SEC must not consider trees and other screening vegetation in assessing effects on historic sites?
A. No.
Q. That's not your position?
A. No. It's simply my position that they need
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to take into account the ephemeral nature of vegetation and not count on it as mitigation.
Q. In this case, you did not provide a visual impact analysis, and I don't think you're suggesting that you have, for the town of Deerfield.
A. A visual impact analysis, no.
Q. Right.
A. I mean, there are visual effects. Certainly visual effects are part of Section 106. And visual effects to historic sites are part of effects on aesthetics in Site 301.05.
Q. Right. And the rules by the SEC also define what photo simulations are for purposes of the SEC review.
A. Right.
Q. Have you seen that definition?
A. Yes.
Q. And it requires professionally accepted software that illustrates visual effects; right?
A. I would have to see the actual rule to agree with you or not. Do you have a --

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could
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pull up 102.35, please, which is the definition of "photo simulations."

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. All right. Well, Mr. Newman, this is a definition that requires photo simulations in this case to be, for visual impact analysis, requires professionally-accepted software. That's not what you used to --
A. I haven't seen that reference, sir. Do you have it or --
Q. We'll pull it up.

Do you have any experience or expertise preparing photo simulations using professional software that's typically used for a visual impact analysis?
A. Sure. I've done over 2,000 Section 106 reviews. Many of them I've used relied on other staff members to produce visualizations.
Q. Do you personally have an opinion -- I'm sorry. Do you personally have experience preparing those?
A. Sure .
Q. Okay.
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> MR. WALKER: Any luck, Dawn? MS. GAGNON: I'm looking.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. We'll move on, and I'll get back to that, Mr . Newman.

Deerfield Center. I asked you about the effects tables. But I want to look at your analysis. And in your analysis of the Deerfield Historic District, you included only one photograph, and that's Figure 4 which is attached to your prefiled testimony. Sorry, Mr. Newman. I want to...
A. Figure 4, yeah.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, can you pull up that Figure 4, please, Mr. Newman's prefiled testimony, Figure 4?

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. You have that in front of you on the screen, Mr. Newman?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you drew a bold line in your prefiled.

It's a yellow bold line across. That is what you are saying is showing the height of the new infrastructure?
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A. That's correct.
Q. But that's not an actual photo simulation of how the structures are going to appear from that particular vantage point, is it?
A. No. It shows the -- it shows exactly what I say it shows, which is the height of the equipment.
Q. Well, where -- how far is any of the structures or conductors from where you took that photo?
A. They're about 30 feet behind the property line of the church.
Q. Did you use any -- I heard you say you did not consider topography as to where the structures would be, and the height based on topography; correct?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by that exactly.
Q. Well, is this -- where did you measure on this picture to draw your line? Did you measure right in the foreground?
A. To get that line?
Q. Yeah.
A. I measured the height of the pole and then scaled it off with a ruler showing the
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increase to 120 feet.
Q. From the ground right at that spot?
A. Yeah. In actual fact, that line is probably a little too low, because if you took into account the entire pole which drops down below that horizon and that pavement a little bit, that line probably would be above the addition to the church on the right.

But my lines, I purposely put them low in all cases just to be conservative and make sure there wouldn't be, you know, some sense that I was exaggerating the height.
Q. Let me just --

MR. WALKER: Can I approach, Mr. Chairman?

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. This is Site Rule 102.35. I want to go back to that definition of "photo simulation."

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do you want to put it on ELMO?

MR. WALKER: Yeah, maybe.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q. Have you had a chance to look at it?
A. No.
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(Witness reviews document.).
BY MR. WALKER:
Q. Let me just jump back to that question. Are you suggesting that these photo simulations that you provided meet that standard?
A. They simply show the height of the equipment.

If I was going to superimpose a pole or a lattice tower on there, that would require use of more and better technology. But simply to show the height of a line, it's a fairly simple endeavor. You don't need -there's not a lot of software required for that.

Secondly, we have to keep in mind that $I$ think this project is one and a half billion dollars, and the Deerfield Abutters are having to pay for my evaluation out of pocket. So I think that there should be accommodation of two things: One is the fact that they have limited resources in order to fund me; and the second thing is all of this probably should have been done by the Applicant by now because of the Section 106 information that $I$ referred to earlier that
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
should be done is not done. And if it were done, they wouldn't be counting on me to do this. This would have already been done by the Applicant.
Q. Mr. Newman, did you review the requirements for what photo simulations must include --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in the SEC rules?
A. Yeah.
Q. You did.

MR. WALKER: So, Dawn, could you
pull up 301.05, please? Do you have that?
BY MR. WALKER:
Q. There are certain things the rules require, Mr. Newman, that I'll represent to you, in other words, including what focal length these were taken at, the distance. It seems to me that these photo simulations are not that. You did not include all that information to provide an accurate depiction of what the line or the structure would look like when you provided these pictures. Would you agree with me?
A. I would agree, yes. And that should have
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been prepared by the Applicant, as required under the rules, so that the community of Deerfield would have had access to it.
Q. Okay. And let me show you the photographs that were provided not only by the Applicant, but by the visual impact experts from Counsel for the Public, as well as other experts in this case. Have you reviewed those?
A. No.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up APP68180, please.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. Now, this is a -- these are photographs taken of Church Street in Deerfield. These are not photo simulations but photographs that were taken. And you would agree with me that these photographs show the various distribution lines within the town and are visible within the town?
A. Yes.

MR. WALKER: And Dawn, if you could also pull up 68188, which is the photo of the road adjacent to the town hall.

BY MR. WALKER:
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Q. Again, various distribution poles and utility lines are visible?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your prefiled testimony you talk about the Project and the impact on Deerfield, noting that the new infrastructure would be jarring and offend the expectations of the typical viewer within the district boundaries.
A. Correct.
Q. You also say that the visual intrusion would extend east and west as far as the viewer could see. But you note that there are other distribution lines and poles that are visible within the town. And other than providing this one photograph, this Figure 4, you don't present any other photo simulations. So I want to ask you to look at the ones that the other experts, the photo simulation experts have provided.
A. Like the one I'm looking at now?
Q. No, that's not a photo simulation. That's an existing picture of Deerfield.
A. All right.
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
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MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up 68192, please.
A. What is the arrow pointing to?

MR. WALKER: If you could
highlight this picture.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q. This is a photo simulation. I'll represent to you, Mr. Newman, this was presented by the Applicant's visual expert.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull it back a little bit so the description is showing below.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. I'll give you a minute to look at this, Mr. Newman .
(Witness reviews photograph.)
Q. This is the photo simulation provided by the Applicant's consultant. And this is a view that you would see driving through the district; correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. And you see where that black arrow shows?
A. I see it.
Q. Okay. And you'll see that the note that the new structure -- that black arrow is pointing to where the new structure will be; correct? And it's even shown in --
A. That's what it says.
Q. Let me show you a similar viewpoint from the expert for Counsel for the Public.

MR. WALKER: And Dawn, if you could pull up 68193, please.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. This is a different vantage point in leaf-on conditions. Do you see that?
A. I see it.
Q. Had you seen this before you rendered your opinion?
A. I saw the previous one.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.

MR. WALKER: And then the last one, Dawn, if you could pull up 68194.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. And this was prepared by the visual expert
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presented by the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. See that?
A. Right.
Q. Is it your position that these photographs and these simulations show that the new infrastructure would be jarring and offend the expectations of typical viewers in Deerfield?
A. Well, this one certainly does. The other two don't. But I wouldn't accept either of the other two photo simulations if they came to my office.
Q. You wouldn't accept them even though these are two experts that --
A. Doesn't matter --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. You wouldn't accept these other two --
A. I would not have accepted either of the other two photo simulations as indications of the effects, no.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
BY MR. WALKER:
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Q. Did I hear you earlier testify that the wires will be prominently visible throughout the district?
A. Not sure I said those exact words, but I said they would be prominently visible from multiple vantage points within the district.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up the last one I showed, which was 68193, please.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. Now, this is for the Counsel for the Public's expert. Is it your opinion that the wires from the proposed project would be prominently visible from this vantage point?
A. No, but that's one of the simulations $I$ wouldn't accept.
Q. Do you agree that from this vantage point the distribution wires are more prominent?
A. Are you saying the wires -- which wires are you referring to?
Q. The distribution, the local utility poles.
A. Are they more prominent than the wires --
Q. In this viewpoint.
A. -- in the background? Yes.
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Q. I want to turn to your evaluation of the Nottingham Road District. Now, in your original assessment, you recommended that this district was potentially eligible for listing; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the Applicants also noted that, correct --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in their assessment?

And I asked you this earlier. The Applicants actually recommended a broader boundary than you did in their original assessment; correct?
A. I wasn't recommending a boundary.
Q. Well, you did provide a boundary when you made your opinion. When you rendered your opinion, you provided a boundary; correct?
A. Yeah, a conservative approach to effects on the district. I mean, that's a boundary that's straight, delineated, would not be a National Register boundary. So I just took a conservative approach until the boundaries were determined and approved by DHR. I think
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everybody was just proposing boundaries; right?
Q. But I read your prefiled testimony to say you submitted your prefiled testimony, then you submitted you're supplemental testimony. And you said in your supplemental testimony that it's even more severe now that the right-of-way bisects the boundaries determined by the DHR.
A. Correct.
Q. But did you read the original analysis by the Applicants' consultants, because they already had boundaries that were bisected; correct?
A. Yeah, they were saying there was no adverse effect.
Q. Right. But they had it pictured as bisecting the district.
A. Yes. Sure.
Q. So, for this district, the Nottingham Road District, you also submitted two photos.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up Figure 5, please, from Mr. Newman's prefiled testimony on Page 16 of the PDF.

BY MR. WALKER:
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Q. And that bold line, Mr. Newman, you've explained that represents the height, or what you claim represents the height of the new equipment?
A. Right.
Q. Do you know how many structures will be visible from this particular photo?
A. Give me a second. That's from 15?
(Pause)
A. About five.
Q. Five?
A. Yup.
Q. Do you know how far away those structures will be from where this picture was taken?
A. About a third of a kilometer.
Q. Where are you getting that from?
A. From the scale on my map.
Q. And you note in this figure that the existing power pole is barely visible. Where is that in your pictures?
A. It's just right of center. It's about even with -- you see there's kind of a trough that goes down just right of center? It's in the middle of that.
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Q. Okay. And you're saying that that's a third of a kilometer away?
A. That's what the map scale indicates, yeah.
Q. I want to show you a picture from the effects tables. And I realize you haven't reviewed the effects tables of that same location.

But before I do that, there's a house on the right side of your picture.
A. Right.
Q. Do you know when that house was built?
A. I don't. I'm not claiming that building is historic.
Q. I'll represent to you that that house was built in 2007.
A. Yeah, makes sense.
Q. If that's accurate, that represents what you would call a "modern intrusion", is that right, into the historic district?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Because it's a single-family-house-sized building that $I$ consider to be more or less compatible with the qualities of the district.
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MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up 68175, please.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. And actually, this is a different photo, obviously, but it's from the Nottingham Road Historic District. And these are existing conditions pictures. And in this one on the bottom, I'll let you take a minute to look at that.

MR. WALKER: And Dawn, if you could include the description, please.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. That one is showing the black arrow is where the existing monopole structure is visible. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Is that what you were referring to in the earlier picture, that structure?
A. That appears to be the same one. I mean, I can't be a hundred percent certain. It's from a different angle and there's several poles in that area.
Q. And that's the corridor where the new project would go; correct?
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A. Right.
Q. And that's that same blue house I referred to as a "modern intrusion" and that you just disagreed --
A. You referred to --
Q. I understand. But this is the same house. This is the same picture --
A. Yes.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could back up to the photo above it, please.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. And this is an existing photograph of the Nottingham Road District. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And once again there's views of these distribution lines, the local utility lines.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Would you consider that a modern intrusion --
A. No.
Q. -- that affects the view? No?
A. No, I would not. These lines and distribution networks, just as they are called out in the National Register
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nomination in the Deerfield Center District, are typical and expected.
Q. Mr. Newman, throughout your prefiled testimony and your supplemental prefiled testimony you support your finding of unreasonable adverse effect by noting, again, that the Applicant "has not availed itself of readily available tools (undergrounding) to mitigate the unreasonable adverse effects."
A. Yeah, that was one of the things, yes.
Q. And you're basically saying, if they can bury it elsewhere, they should be burying it in

Deerfield; correct?
A. Not quite what I said.
Q. Well, you note that -- and I'm referring to your prefiled testimony. It says, "The

Applicant has not availed themselves of
readily available tools (undergrounding) to
mitigate the unreasonable adverse effect
which they plan to deploy elsewhere in the project, specifically in the White Mountain area." So is that what you're saying,
because they did it in the White Mountain
area, they should be doing it in Deerfield?
A. I'm saying it should have been considered and evaluated.
Q. Did you conduct any type of feasibility analysis for the burying in Deerfield? You didn't do that; right?
A. No. No.
Q. You made some comments today about the requirement that the Committee consider the 106 findings; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you commented that the Programmatic Agreement -- well, have you reviewed the Programmatic Agreement?
A. I have.
Q. And have you reviewed prior decisions by the SEC with regard to the status of the Programmatic Agreement and how that implicates the SEC --
A. I'm not sure what your question is. I'm sorry.
Q. Well, have you reviewed any prior cases that the SEC has ruled on and determined how the SEC relies on the 106 process in considering whether to issue a certificate?
\{SEC 2015-06\} [DAY 68 AFTERNOON ONLY SESSION]\{12-18-17\}
A. I've heard testimony in this process about that. I've heard that it has been relied on. My understanding is the rules were changed in 2015 and that there is sort of a lack of jurisprudence on that issue right now.
Q. Do you recall which testimony that was?
A. Whose?
Q. Right.
A. Cherilyn Widell. I'm sorry I can't tell you the date. But when she was asked about this same issue, you know, why isn't the 106 done, she said, "Well, they'll rely on the 106 Programmatic Agreement."
Q. Let me ask you this: Have you reviewed the DHR's August 25th, 2017 status summary to the members of this Committee?
A. No.
Q. I'll represent to you that it was drafted by Dr. Boisvert. Do you know who Dr. Boisvert is, Dr. Richard Boisvert?
A. I do.
Q. He's deputy director of the DHR; correct?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$. Yes.
Q. Have you worked with the DHR before?
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A. Many times.
Q. And I take it you would -- his opinion on this matter would be important to you?
A. Yes.

MR. WALKER: Let me ask, Dawn, if you could pull up that status summary, please. And this is, again, the summary that Dr. Boisvert provided to the SEC. And if you could highlight that 106 section.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. And Mr. Newman, I'm going to give you a chance to take a quick look at that, okay.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Okay. I've read it.
Q. Okay. Particularly in that last paragraph where he's noting that the DHR would appreciate the opportunity to continue working with the SEC to specify certificate conditions, assuming such conditions, do you agree that the SEC could take comfort in that 106 process and the Programmatic Agreement and the DHR's continued involvement?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by "take comfort."
Q. Do you think the SEC could take comfort
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knowing that the DHR, as Mr. Boisvert noted here, will be involved to ensure that any conditions will be implemented and to resolve adverse effects?
A. I said his opinion was important. I mean, I see what he's doing here. If the SEC approves the Project prior to the 106 being done, we'd appreciate the opportunity to continue to work on it. Yeah.
Q. And he's also saying that there be conditions that the DHR would remain, continue to remain involved.
A. Yeah, they would have to. The Programmatic Agreement would require their continued involvement.
Q. And that would provide some level of assurance, that the DHR is going to work to ensure that any adverse effects are resolved.
A. See, I'm not sure on the "taking comfort" and "some assurance." I really don't know how you mean those terms. I mean, the rule seems clear to me that findings and determinations -- they use the word "shall." They "shall" have DHR's findings and
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determinations to inform that deliberation. So how that's mitigated by the SEC taking comfort or finding some assurance, I'm not sure what to make of that. I'm not sure how to respond to that.
Q. Okay. Let me just ask you a couple more questions, Mr. Newman, on that same issue with regard to the Programmatic Agreement. I want to -- I asked you if you looked at prior decisions by the SEC. I don't think you have with regard to this particular issue and the use of the Programmatic Agreement. I want to refer you to the Groton Wind Project. Are you aware of that project?
A. No.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could pull up Exhibit 218, please, Applicant's Exhibit 218.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. And I'll represent to you that this was a project that was before this SEC back in 2010, and there was a certificate issued by this Committee.

MR. WALKER: And if you could
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pull up Page 83263, please, Dawn.
BY MR. WALKER:
Q. And if you look at the very first paragraph, that sentence that begins with "However..."

I'll let you look at that, okay.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Hmm-hmm. Yeah.
Q. Also $I$ want to continue on.

MR. WALKER: Dawn, if you could
pull up 83295, please.
A. Was $I$ supposed to have read that last bit?
Q. I'm sorry. I thought you had.
A. No. It was only up there for about a second.
Q. All right. Let me just read to you what it
says. It says, "However, review under
Section 106 of the National Historic
Preservation Act has a direct bearing on our
decision whether construction and operation
of the Facility will have an unreasonable
adverse effect on historic sites in the
region." That was that prior page.
Now I'm jumping to this page, Mr.
Newman. So in the past -- you've had a
chance to read that Mr . Newman?
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A. Yes.
Q. In the past, the SEC has made decisions while the 106 process is ongoing. Do you see that?
A. If I could just have another minute.
Q. Sure.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. I see it, but I don't see that it says what you're saying. I'm not sure, unless it's stated elsewhere. It says there will be continued involvement of the DHR through the construction of the facility to make sure that impacts are not unreasonably adverse.
Q. Well, you saw that in that prior exhibit that I showed you --

MS. MENARD: Excuse me, Mr.
Chairman. I'd like to object. It seems that Mr. Newman is uncomfortable just grabbing a little snip-it of an overall conclusion. And I'm sensing that he doesn't have enough information in order to be rendering or answering the question being asked.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You may well be right. Mr. Walker I think will have to work through it with Mr. Newman so that the two of
them get on the same page. I think Mr. Walker is prepared to do that.

BY MR. WALKER:
Q. Mr. Newman, I'm asking now, having seen it -and I realize you've not seen the whole opinion, and I understand that. But based on what you have seen, it's clear that the SEC has made its decisions in past dockets while the 106 process is ongoing; correct?
A. I mean, do you have anything that says that? Because this is -- you know, you could understand that from this. But I could simply understand, as in most projects, that 106 findings and determinations aren't made in advance. But the role of the DHR continues through construction on most of these projects. So I don't -- do you have anything that states it categorically?
Q. That's fair enough. If you're not getting -have you worked with the SEC? You have not testified before this SEC before?
A. No, I have not.
Q. And you've explained you haven't reviewed prior decisions by this Committee on this
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topic; right?
A. No, but I am an expert in 106, and that's what this is about, seems to me a lot of it. Q. This is a decision by the SEC. It's not a decision in the 106 process. It's a decision specific to this SEC.

MR. WALKER: Nothing further. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Members of the Committee. Ms. Weathersby. QUESTIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SEC COUNSEL: BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Good afternoon. Just a couple questions. The Nottingham Road Historic District that's -- has an application been filed yet for a National Register listing?
A. I don't believe there's an actual nomination in place. The DHR determined that the district is eligible based on the boundary that's on the previous exhibit.
Q. And if the Northern Pass Transmission Project is built, will that endanger its eligibility?
A. I think it would remain eligible for the National Register.
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Q. Okay. We've had a couple visual folks here before us that have suggested a couple of ways that impacts can be reduced, and I'm just curious as to your opinion as to things called "non-specular conductors," nonreflective wires, different finishes on the poles, non-glass insulators, those sort of things. In your experience, do any of those help reduce the impacts on historic properties?
A. I don't think those would necessarily have a great impact in this case with the equipment above the tree line.
Q. Okay. My last question is, did you in any way assess any properties in Deerfield, as the line runs from the Deerfield Substation to Scobie Pond, sort of -- it's not really part of the Project, but it extends, as the Project connects --
A. Others may have looked at that. I did not. My scope was pretty limited.

MS. WEATHERSBY: Thank you.
Nothing further.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr.
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Oldenburg.
MR. OLDENBURG: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
QUESTIONS BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. Good evening. Just a few quick questions.

I noticed in your CV or your resume that you've actively completed projects in New Hampshire, that you worked on the Section 106 for Salem Bike-Ped Corridor Phase 2 and the Wilton Kings Brook Bridge Improvements. Were you working to develop the 106 project, or were you working for a client opposed to the Project?
A. I was working for the engineering company.
Q. In support of the project? Or developing --
A. I don't know.
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. So you were developing the documents in support of the project?
A. I'm not sure how you mean "support" or "oppose." Those projects are not adversarial situations with a pro and con. I was just developing Section 106 documentation to satisfy DHR and the consulting parties.
Q. So you weren't hired by an abutter to oppose the --
A. No, I was not an advocate for or against the project. I was there to facilitate construction of the project by generating acceptable documentation.
Q. How much of your work -- as 106 Associates, how much of your work is developing those and doing exactly what you did for those two projects?
A. Most of it $I$ would say. It is generating agreements among parties to facilitate infrastructure construction.

MR. OLDENBURG: Okay. That's all
I have.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Wright.
QUESTIONS BY MR. WRIGHT:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Newman. When Mr. Walker was showing you the three photo simulations around the Deerfield Church prepared by other professionals, you seem to have an objection to two of them. I don't think I heard an explanation as to what your objection to two of those was.
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A. My objections were that they were a long road photo sims which to me minimized the visual impact of the infrastructure. I mean, if you looked at -- photos can tell you a lot of different things depending on which angles they're taken from. And in review of over, as I said, a couple thousand of these, I've seen engineers and architects come in with a variety of photo simulations trying to prove one thing or another. And in my experience, photo simulations of a long road are intended to minimize -- or they're not intended to -they do minimize the appearance of that infrastructure in the district.
Q. Okay. Thank you for that explanation.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Any other questions from members of the Committee? CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Menard, do you have any redirect? Looks like you do.

MS . MENARD: Yes.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. MENARD :
Q. Mr. Newman, $I$ just have one question for you.

If you were to put your lack of bare earth
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argument aside, would that change your conclusions regarding the unreasonable adverse effects on historic resources in Deerfield by the Project?
A. No. I think the adverse effects on the districts are clear: It's an industrial-scale infrastructure project bisecting a National Registered historic district.
Q. Thank you.

MS. MENARD: That's all I have.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, thank you, Mr. Newman.

So that's it for today. We'll adjourn, and we will be coming back tomorrow at 1:00, I believe, and Ms. Monroe will be sending out a status report to tell us what we'll all be doing. So with that, we'll adjourn. Thank you all.
(Whereupon the Day 68 Afternoon
Session was adjourned at 5:40
p.m., with the Day 69 hearing to resume on December 19, 2017
commencing at 1:00 p.m.)
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| $141: 23 ; 149: 15 ;$ |
| $164: 11$ |
| yellow (4) |
| $51: 14 ; 69: 22 ;$ |
| $161: 20 ; 175: 22$ |
| Yup (2) |
| $30: 15 ; 188: 12$ |
|  |
| $\mathbf{Z}$ |
| zinc (1) |
| $33: 2$ |

SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-06 NORTHERN PASS TRANSMISSION, LLC DAY 68 - AFTERNOON SESSION ONLY ADJUDICATORY HEARING

| ```zone (6) 28:6;44:7;45:4,5; 48:13,15 zoning (1) 38:1 zoom (2) 24:5;69:3``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:4;15:19,22; } \\ & \text { 43:18;44:18;50:22; } \\ & \text { 51:14,20;57:1;74:12; } \\ & \text { 82:14;86:11,16; } \\ & \text { 88:17;90:14;92:9; } \\ & \text { 105:9,11;106:2; } \\ & 124: 16 \\ & \mathbf{1 2}(\mathbf{2}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 4 \\ & 20(3) \\ & 53: 18 ; 96: 17 ; 167: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 159: 24 \\ \mathbf{3 0 1 . 0 5}(\mathbf{3}) \end{array}$ | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 170:21;173:12; |  |
|  |  | 2007 (1) | 179:12 | 5 (4) |
|  |  | 189:14 | 301.05b1 (2) | 8:11,11;142:16; |
|  |  | 201 (3) | 168:16;169:1 | 187:22 |
|  |  | 3:2;68:3;79:22 | 301.06 (1) | 5:40 (1) |
|  |  | 2010 (1) | 169:23 | 206:21 |
| 0 | 53:7;161:2 | 197:22 | 301.14b (1) | 500 (4) |
|  | 12/8/17 (1) | 2015 (4) | 170:13 | 140:24;141:4; |
| 014042 (1) | 15:11 | 36:18;133:13; | 31 (1) | 159:17;160:8 |
| 75:14 | 120 (3) | 172:8;194:4 | 150:7 | 500-percent (2) |
|  | 142:8;161:13; $177 \cdot 1$ | 2016 (2) | 3196 (1) | 140:18;159:12 |
| 1 | 177:1 | 80:5;78:8 | 69:6 | 5013c (2) |
|  | 125 (1) | 2017 (4) | 32 (1) | 53:16,20 |
| 1 (3) | 57:24 | 8:7;11:20;194:15; | 20:10 | 50-percent (1) |
| 29:1,8;36:21 | 126 (1) | 206:23 | 35 (1) | $142: 7$ |
| 1.7 (19) | 57:24 | 203 (1) | 136:12 | $52 \text { (1) }$ |
| 23:13,20;24:4,8,11, | 12-week (1) | 3:3 | 36 (1) | $93: 3$ |
| 20,24;25:4,24;26:2, | 103:20 | 204 (1) | 162:4 | 53 (1) |
| 15,19;66:4;129:2,13, | 14 (1) | 3:4 | 37 (1) | 162:3 |
| 19,23;130:12;131:1 | 8:7 | 206 (1) | 162:4 | 55 (1) |
| 1.7-mile (5) | 146 (2) | 3:5 | 3901 (1) | $42: 10$ |
| 25:8;26:7;28:4; | 32:11;42:12 | 2-1/2 (1) | 77:18 | $556 \text { (1) }$ |
| 129:7;131:4 | 14b (1) | 46:6 | 3914 (2) | 72:22 |
| 1:00 (2) | 152:13 | 218 (2) | 68:23;69:6 |  |
| 206:16,24 $\mathbf{1 : 2 7 ( 1 )}$ | 15 (4) 96:17;164:10; | 197:17,18 | 3916 (1) | 6 |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{1 : 2 7}(\mathbf{1}) \\ 6: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 17 ; 164: 10 ; \\ & 167: 4 ; 188: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 164:17 | 3917 (2) |  |
| $10 \text { (11) }$ | 158 (1) | 231:160 (4) | 70:9,22 | $8: 11 ; 146: 4$ |
| $12: 18 ; 26: 22 ; 42: 12$ | 113:3 | 17:15,16,22;18:15 | $3918 \text { (1) }$ | $6,554 \text { (1) }$ |
| 52:5;53:7,21;129:15; | 159 (1) | 24-inch (1) | 69:15 | 8:6 |
| 136:17;159:20,21,23 | 121:20 | 14:24 | 3920 (5) | $60(2)$ |
| 100 (4) | 16 (1) | 25 (2) | 69:7,8,22;70:7,22 | $8: 13,17$ |
| 14:8;15:3;91:14; | 187:23 | 141:22;164:20 | 3922 (2) | 626 (2) |
| 92:10 | 160 (1) | 25th (1) | 70:9,22 | 23:7;24:3 |
| $101(1)$ $15: 4$ | 120:24 | 194:15 $\mathbf{2 6 ~ ( 1 ) ~}$ | 4 | $63(1)$ $41: 10$ |
| 102.35 (2) | 131:7 | 26(1) | 4 | $\begin{gathered} 41: 10 \\ \mathbf{6 6 1}(\mathbf{1}) \end{gathered}$ |
| 174:1;177:17 | 17 (2) | 28 (2) | $4(11)$ | 661 63 (16 |
| 103 (1) | 11:20;53:7 | 8:23;150:6 | 8:1,3;88:6;152:20; | $662 \text { (1) }$ |
| 15:10 | 1700s (1) | 29 (1) | 153:1;157:19; | 64:4 |
| 105 (1) | 60:21 | 91:16 | 175:10,13,15,16; | 67 (1) |
| $17: 11$ $106(28)$ | 18 (4) |  | $181: 16$ $\mathbf{4 / 1 7 / 1 7}$ | 162:2 |
| 106 (28) | 42:9,10;57:1;129:9 | 3 | 4/17/17 (2) | 68 (2) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17: 21 ; 152: 3,5,7 ; \\ & 153: 15 ; 154: 2 ; \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 1800s (1) } \\ 60: 21 \end{array}$ | 3 (12) | $20: 1,9$ $4: 16$ (1) | 59:17;206:20 68175 (1) |
| 163:11;165:3; | $1838 \text { (1) }$ | 10:9;32:10;39:18; | 4:16 (1) ${ }^{138: 20}$ | 68175 (1) |
| 173:10;174:16; | 87:4 | 42:11;66:21;88:6,7; | 4:22 (1) | 68188 (1) |
| 178:23;193:9,23; | 188 (1) | 112:3,20;117:20; | 138:21 | 180:22 |
| 194:11,12;195:9,21; | 59:16 | 159:23;170:22 | 40 (2) | $68192(1)$ |
| 196:7;198:16;199:3; | 19 (3) | 3.6 (2) | 91:7;162:5 | $182: 2$ |
| 200:9,14;201:2,5; | 57:21;78:8;206:23 | 88:5,5 | 41 (3) | 68193 (2) |
| 203:8,11,23;204:7 |  | 3:31 (1) | 8:14,22;9:1 | 183:11;185:8 |
| $11 \text { (1) }$ | 2 | 108:21 | 46 (3) | 68194 (1) |
| 112(1) | 2 (6) | 3:45 (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 122: 17 ; 123: 2 ; \\ & 139: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $183: 22$ 68-plus (1) |
| 51:14 | 15:12;36:21; | 30 (3) | 46C (1) | 81:4 |
| 114 (2) | 109:24;112:3,20; | 20:10;159:23; | 146:8 | 69 (1) |
| 71:6,8 | 203:9 | 176:11 | 47 (1) | 206:22 |
| 115 (1) | 2,000 (1) | 300-foot (1) | 139:22 |  |
| 48:7 | 174:16 | 73:15 | 494 (1) | 7 |
| 116 (20) | 2,250 (1) | 300-percent (1) | 116:5 |  |



