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PROCEEDING
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: We're here this morning in Docket 2019-02, which is the Chinook Solar, LLC Application for a Certificate of Site and Facility. And we're here today to continue the hearing on the Application. I want to remind everyone that I made the findings required for this hearing to be held remotely during the last session, and also that if there is a problem during the hearing, you should call (603) 271-2431. And in the event the public is unable to access the hearing, the hearing will be adjourned and rescheduled.

Okay. Let's start by taking roll call attendance of the Committee. When each Committee member identifies him or herself, please also state if anyone else is in the room with you, and if so, please identify them. My name is Dianne Martin. I'm the Chairwoman of the Site Evaluation Committee, and I am alone.

Mr. Arvelo.
DIR. ARVELO: My name is Will
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Arvelo, and I am home alone.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Mr. Pelletier.

MR. PELLETIER: My name is Rene Pelletier, and I'm alone in my office in Concord.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Duprey.
MS. DUPREY: I'm Susan Duprey, public member, and I'm in my home. At the moment I'm alone, but my son and daughter-in-law are in the house.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Oldenburg.
MR. OLDENBURG: Bill Oldenburg, DOT representative, and I am alone in my office in Concord.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you.

And Mr. Wilson.
DIR. WILSON: Ben Wilson, Division
of Historical Resources, state historic
preservation officer, and I'm in my office alone.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Great. Thank you.

Now let's take appearances, starting with Attorney Patch.

MR. PATCH: Good morning. Doug Patch, with the law firm of Orr \& Reno on behalf of Chinook Solar, LLC.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Attorney Geiger.

MS. GEIGER: Good morning. Susan Geiger, with the law firm of Orr \& Reno, representing Chinook Solar, LLC.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Good morning. Attorney Neville.

MS. NEVILLE: Good morning.
Heather Neville, Assistant Attorney General, here as Counsel for the Public.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Attorney Iacopino.
MR. IACOPINO: Good morning. Mike
Iacopino, counsel to the Committee. I am in my home in Weare. My wife may roam through
the room at some point or another.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you.

And last time I overlooked Attorney Lavallee. Would you like to introduce yourself?

MR. LAVALLEE: Good morning. J.D. Lavallee, Assistant Attorney General, and also counsel to the Committee. And I'm in my office alone.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. So we were in the middle of the Applicant's case when we recessed for the day. Is there anything we need to cover before we proceed? Attorney Patch?

MR. PATCH: I don't know of anything. We did submit yesterday the letter with regard to the subdivision and proposed language for the order. And it has not yet been marked as an exhibit, but it was submitted I believe to the Chair. And we'll make sure that it gets sent around as an exhibit this morning.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay.

Excellent. And we did receive that. It was forwarded to the Subcommittee. So thank you for that.

MR. PATCH: And maybe the only other thing to mention quickly, it was taken as a record request, but we may be able to cover it in testimony today, basically the question about whether decommissioning assumed the waiver had been granted. And the panel of Mr. Persechino and Mr. Delallo can address that. But if the Committee still wishes for us to provide a record request -a response on that, then we'd be happy to do that.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Then why don't we see where we are after the testimony and how Mr. Oldenburg feels about the request at that time.

MR. PATCH: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay.
MR. IACOPINO: Also, Madam Chair, I believe there's a change in our schedule today from the schedule that was published on the web site. I believe we're going to start
[WITNESS PANEL: KAREN MACK, STEPHEN OLAUSEN]
with the Applicant's historical resources panel. At least that was my understanding at the end of the day yesterday. And if that's still the case, I assume we'll then go back into the regular order.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney Patch. MR. PATCH: Yes, that's correct. We exchanged e-mails with Mr. Iacopino and Counsel for the Public, and that's fine with us. And we're planning to go ahead with the historical resources panel.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Then why don't we proceed with that.

Ms. Robidas, could you swear in the witnesses.

And Corrine, you'll need to bring those witnesses up. It's Ms. Mack and Mr. Olausen -- am I saying that right?

MR. PATCH: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay.
MR. PATCH: And Ms. Geiger is going to do the direct examination.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Olausen, can you turn on your video, please? Can you
hear us? You're also on mute. You may need to unmute.

Attorney Geiger, do you have a way to communicate with your witness to find out what's going on with him?

MS. GEIGER: Sure.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: We'll go off the record for a minute until we can straighten it out.
(Discussion off the record.)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Let's go back on the record. We can proceed. We just need to swear in the witnesses.

MR. OLAUSEN: I apologize. I
cannot hear anyone.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: He may need to turn his volume up, Attorney Geiger, on his device.

Let's go off the record again. (Discussion off the record)
(WHEREUPON, KAREN MACK AND STEPHEN
OLAUSEN were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

KAREN MACK, SWORN
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STEPHEN OLAUSEN, SWORN CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Attorney Geiger.

MS. GEIGER: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Ms. Mack, we'll begin with you this morning. Please state your name, spell your last name, and provide your address.
A. (Mack) My name is Karen Mack. Last name is M-A-C-K. And my address is 1356 Washington Street, Bath, Maine, 04530.
Q. By whom are you employed, and in what capacity are you employed?
A. (Mack) I'm employed by TRC as their principal archeologist and office manager for our Bath office.
Q. Could you please provide the Committee with a brief summary of your qualifications.
A. (Mack) Sure. I finished my undergraduate degree in anthropology at the University of New Hampshire, and I did my master's degree at the University of Maine in archeology, at the Institute for quaternary Studies, now the

Climate Change Institute. I meet the qualifications under 36 CRF 61, the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standard for Archeology, and I also meet the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources additional qualifications for conducting archeology in the state of New Hampshire. I've been directing cultural resource management work in New Hampshire and New England and New York since 1995.
Q. Thank you. Are you the same witness who submitted prefiled testimony in this docket dated October 14, 2019, filed on October 18th of that same year --
A. (Mack) Yes.
Q. -- along with one attachment that's been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 9?
A. (Mack) Yes.
Q. Are you the same witness who submitted prefiled supplemental testimony in this docket dated August 31st, 2020, which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 74?
A. (Mack) Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to \{SEC 2019-02\} [Day 2] \{09-18-2020\}
either your prefiled testimony or your supplemental prefiled testimony?
A. (Mack) Yes. I would like to update my written testimony to add that Counsel for the Public -- (connectivity issue)
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. Yeah, I want to update my written testimony to add that the Counsel for the Public has agreed in a stipulation, marked as Applicant's Exhibit 81, that the Applicant has provided information sufficient to support a finding that the site and facility will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on historic sites.
Q. Ms. Mack, with the update you just described, if you were asked the same questions contained in your prefiled testimony and your prefiled supplemental testimony today under oath, would your answers be the same?
A. (Mack) Yes.
Q. Could you please provide the Subcommittee with a brief summary of your testimony.
A. (Mack) Yes. My testimony describes the Phase 1A Archeological Assessment of the Project
which was conducted in accordance with the guidelines established by NHDHR. The results of the Phase 1 assessment were accepted by NHDHR, which then requested the preparation of a Phase 1B Archeological Study. My testimony describes how that Phase 1B study was conducted and states that the conclusions based on that study were that there are no sensitive areas, or no areas that are sensitive for cultural resources within the Project area. In a letter marked as Applicant's Exhibit 32, NHDHR noted that the Phase 1B studies were complete, and they determined that no additional archeological studies were required.

As my prefiled direct testimony indicates, based on our archeological studies, as well as consultation with NHDHR, it is my opinion that the Project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on archeological resources.

My supplemental prefiled testimony discusses communications with the NHDHR that occurred after my prefiled direct testimony
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was submitted, and these communications are related to an additional survey that was conducted for potential laydown areas and an associated access road. So our survey of these additional areas didn't identify any culturally sensitive locations within that additional Project area, and NHDHR concurred with that finding.

We also provided additional information about a 19th Century schoolhouse that was identified as an area of concern by the Town of Fitzwilliam's archeological consultant. And upon further investigations, it was determined that the schoolhouse location actually fell outside of the Project boundaries, and NHDHR agreed with that finding. NHDHR's progress reports submitted to the Committee on April 17th, 2020, indicates that NHDHR's findings of no historic properties affected still stands.

In addition, NHDHR has recommended three conditions to the Committee if a certificate is granted for the Project, all of which Chinook agrees to. These conditions are:

One, if a change in plans for the Project leads to newly discovered effects on historic properties, that the Applicant must consult with NHDHR to resolve any adverse affect to such properties; second, if any unanticipated archeological resources, historic properties, or other cultural resources are discovered as a result of the Project planning or construction, Applicant must consult with NHDHR to determine the need for appropriate evaluative studies, National Register eligibility, and/or mitigation to resolve an adverse effect if needed. And then finally, NHDHR is authorized to specify the use of any appropriate technique, methodology, practice or procedure associated with archeological, historical or cultural resources affected by the Project; however, any enforcement action must be brought before the Committee. And that concludes my summary.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Mack. We'll turn now to Mr. Olausen.

Mr. Olausen, are you unmuted? Could you please state your name, spell your last name,
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and provide your address.
A.
(Olausen) Stephen, with a $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{H}$, Olausen, O-L-A-U-S-E-N. 20 Queensfort Way, North Kingstown, Rhode Island, 02852.

WEB MODERATOR LEMAY: Mr. Olausen, can you shut your speakers off on your computer since you're using the phone?

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Now you're on mute. You need to be unmuted to be heard.

Corrine, you may need to be more clear about what you want him to turn off.

WEB MODERATOR LEMAY: Sir, are you
still calling in through the phone? Unmute your computer, please.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Let's go off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Then why don't we go on the record, and we'll take the questions from the Committee related to the letter that was filed.

Which Committee members had questions? If you could put your hand up, I will recognize you. I don't see anybody.
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Do you know who, Attorney Iacopino, had the questions? You're on mute.

MR. IACOPINO: I understand that Ms. Duprey had some questions about the letter.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Ms. Duprey, do you have questions?

MS. DUPREY: You know, I read the letter a couple of days ago, but let me try to remember what $I$ was thinking, and Attorney Patch can respond to it.

My recollection of the letter, which I read briefly, was that because the planning board was willing to sign the plan, that that was a sufficient -- that was sufficient for subdivision approval to be granted. Am I correct about that, Attorney Patch?

Madam Chair, do you want to -- I guess I should direct my question to you. I'm not sure who I'm supposed to direct it to.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: No, that's fine. You can go ahead.

MR. PATCH: I think what we were saying in the letter, which actually just got sent around as an exhibit this morning, just within the last few minutes, but the actual letter from the planning board was an exhibit that was submitted I think earlier this week -- anyway, what we were saying was that, in order to register the deeds that will result from the subdivision, the Register of Cheshire County Registry of Deeds told us she needed to have a signature from the planning board.

MS. DUPREY: Okay.
MR. PATCH: So we believe, now that we have language in the MOU, as well as the letter from the planning board, that we should be all set with that issue --

MS. DUPREY: So here's my concern: My concern is that, in order for a planning board to grant subdivision approval, they have to hold a public hearing. So I don't see how the Town can just waive all those procedures and agree to sign a plan. I don't see that as a procedurally correct method.

MR. PATCH: I understand your point. I think from our perspective we were hoping to avoid having the Committee have to rule that it has preemptive authority over the planning board. I mean, I happen to think that's pretty clear under RSA 162-H, you know, because it's been understood for years that the Site Evaluation Committee essentially preempts the need for any local approvals. But, of course, you know, the Register looks at it as, you know, this is kind of a ministerial function on their part, and the only way they can do it is to essentially get a signature from the planning board. And so --

MS. DUPREY: Okay. I think I need to go back and look at the statute again then because $I$ didn't know that it referred to any local approvals. I thought it was more of a zoning approval. But I'll go back and look at the statute again.

MR. PATCH: Okay. The statute that we cite in the letter $I$ think is the one that creates the -- here I guess I'll call it the
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register -- because it makes it a misdemeanor if she were to register without the signature of the planning board --

MS. DUPREY: I'm not concerned
about the signature piece. I'm concerned about whether we're circumventing the Town's processes. And I think I was looking at it from the point of view of things like DES and those sorts of things, where they go through their process, and then we agree or we don't agree. And that hasn't happened here, and that's what was concerning me. But maybe town approvals are different than state approvals, and I'll go look at that.

Has the Committee in the past ever, in effect, granted subdivision approval?

MR. IACOPINO: No, they have not. This became an issue in the original Antrim Wind docket. Ultimately that certificate was denied for other reasons. And when they came back in Antrim Wind II, subdivision approval had already been granted by the town prior to their Application, so it was not an issue in the Application that was ultimately granted
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with respect to Antrim Wind. I do have -and I can get it over to you, Ms. Duprey -- I do have what was filed by the parties in that docket. I believe there was some written filings addressing the issue.

MS. DUPREY: Let me speak to zoning for a minute.

If the Project was being placed in an area where a variance was required in order for the zoning, is it counsel's position that this board has the authority to grant a variance?

MR. IACOPINO: There would be no need to grant a variance, per se.

MS. DUPREY: I'm actually not asking you. I'm sorry, Attorney Iacopino. I'm asking Attorney Patch. I apologize. I realize it's not necessary here. I'm just asking the question.

If the Project needed a variance to be located in a certain area, is it your position that this body could grant that variance?

MR. PATCH: I believe you could if
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you were asked that question squarely. I don't think we're asking it in this case. But I think --

MS. DUPREY: No, no. I recognize that. I'm just trying to understand what your interpretation of the statute is.

MR. PATCH: Well, I think the statute $162-\mathrm{H}$ makes it very clear that it's basically a state decision that is made. And so if you were to allow a municipality, a zoning board or a planning board, whoever, to be able to, in effect, stand in the way of a certificate that was approved by the Committee, then I believe that would be inappropriate because $I$ think it would defeat the purpose of $162-\mathrm{H}$.

MS. DUPREY: Okay. So you're reading of $162-\mathrm{H}$ is that one of these types of facilities could go anywhere in a town and that it's the State's job to determine whether that's an appropriate site or not.

MR. PATCH: I believe that's the case. But obviously there is the provision in $162-\mathrm{H}$ that requires that you take into
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account the views of local planning --
MS. DUPREY: Right.
MR. PATCH: -- and municipal
governing bodies and so forth.
MS. DUPREY: Okay. I'll go back and look at the statute.

MR. PATCH: Okay. Thank you.
MS. DUPREY: I take it that the Committee has never directly ruled in the place of either a zoning board or a planning board, to anyone's knowledge so far.

MR. IACOPINO: As far as I can remember, the zoning -- the Site Evaluation Committee has never specifically ruled on that, Ms. Duprey. However, I believe that there has been various determinations made in other cases and has been expressed in other orders that the Site Evaluation Committee process preempts any zoning ordinance that a town may have, and therefore a variance or conditional use or whatever is not necessary from the town in those circumstances.

MS. DUPREY: Okay. So you're distinguishing -- Counsel Iacopino, you're
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distinguishing between subdivision and zoning, I take it, or planning board and zoning board.

MR. IACOPINO: What I'm differentiating is the fact that the local ordinances are preempted. The difficulty with the subdivision becomes, in my opinion, that you're creating a new property that has effect on title. And I do not believe that the Site Evaluation Committee has the authority to do anything that affects the title of a property.

MR. PATCH: I think Ms. Geiger has something to say. I don't know if she could be recognized.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney
Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: Yes. And I apologize for interrupting, but $I$ just wanted to, in the hopes that it might be of assistance on the preemption issue, just provide a cite to a New Hampshire Supreme Court case. That would be Public Service Company of New Hampshire versus Town of Hampton. And the
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cite is 120 NH 68. It's a 1980 case, but that's sort of the landmark, seminal case that establishes that the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee's authority preempts, you know, local zoning and planning functions.

MS. DUPREY: Okay. Could you get us a copy of that case?

MS. GEIGER: Sure. Be happy to.
MS. DUPREY: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: And I had similar concerns, just to follow up, so I'll read the case. I was not so concerned about the signatures for that so much as what the duties of the Committee were related to its authority in place of the planning board. So I'll read the case, and if there are additional questions from the Committee, we may actually need -- (connectivity issue)
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: We may need oral argument or briefing on the issue.

Ms. Duprey.
MS. DUPREY: My question flew out
of my head. Oh, I guess -- yes. I actually had two questions. One is if we're supplanting the process of the town, or preempting it, as you say, do we need to follow the process of the town? And secondly, are the two lots, or however many lots that are being created here, do they conform to the town's regulations? Are they lawful lots under the town's ordinances? MR. PATCH: Well, I'll answer the first question. It seems to me that the procedures you have to follow are dictated by the statute that governs what you can and can't do. So I think it's 162-H and the rules you've adopted under that. And so those procedures I think are somewhat different than what the local procedures would be. But I don't think you have to go back and follow procedures that may be in statutes that relate to the planning board or zoning board. So that's the first part.

And then the second question $I$ believe was along the lines of whether or not these particular pieces of property, sort of
post-subdivision, would meet local requirements. I'm not sure, to be perfectly honest with you, that they would a hundred percent. But clearly the planning board, and the zoning board perhaps, would have the authority to be able to waive some of those requirements is my understanding. And so they have, in effect, done that, I believe, by signing the MOU and by sending the letter indicating the position that they're taking on this.

MS. DUPREY: The Town has, in my view, no authority to create legal lots without some process. So the fact that they're willing to sign something really doesn't mean anything to me, particularly.

And in addition to that, I'm troubled by the fact that it's your position that we don't have to follow any of the regulations of the town to create these lots. Because normally in a town you would apprise the abutters, and they would be able to come in and say what they liked or didn't like, and here we don't have any of that
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notification process. And that, just as a land-use lawyer, bothers me.

MR. PATCH: Well, I guess the one thing that $I$ would say about that is that abutters have been notified about this Project. Obviously, there's a lot of detail associated with the Project. But all of the information about the Project has been made available through the web site, at least, to the abutters.

MS. DUPREY: And how were the abutters notified? I'm sorry. I just want to remind myself of that.

MR. PATCH: I mean, I'd have to go back and look at the notifications. But I believe the notifications were provided as part of the original Application.

MS. DUPREY: Is it a mail-in to them?

MR. PATCH: Yes.
MS. DUPREY: And does it tell them that there's going to be a subdivision?

MR. PATCH: I don't believe it specifies that. But, again, I have to go
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back and double-check that to be sure. I can make sure we file that or note where it is in the record for the Committee.

MS. DUPREY: Okay. Well, I think I would agree with the Chairwoman, that I just think we're going to need some briefing on this. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Did any other Committee members have questions related to that?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I don't see anybody.

Attorney Neville, did you have anything you wanted to add to that?

MS. NEVILLE: No. I just wanted to clarify with Attorney Patch.

Is the Applicant seeking subdivision approval from this Committee?

MR. PATCH: We're not because we're taking the position that we have sufficient approval from the Town, essentially, and that it would satisfy the requirements for the Register. And I would urge you to look at
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the letter that we just submitted which spells that out in more detail.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you.
MS. DUPREY: Madam Chair, could I just make a comment related to that?

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Yes.
MS. DUPREY: So I'm clearly
confused. I thought we were just having a whole discussion about how this body had the authority to grant subdivision approval, and now I believe I've just heard Attorney Patch say we're not asking you for subdivision approval because the town's agreed to sign this plan. The town has no authority to just sign a plan without going through its processes. So, to me, it's got to be one or the other; either the town has to go through this or we have to go through this. The town can't just say -- it's like hide the beans sort of -- we'll sign because you're asking us to, SEC. And SEC is saying we don't have to make a subdivision approval because the town's saying they're going to sign. That just doesn't seem right to me.

MR. PATCH: Yeah, I'm not sure what more I can say other than what I've said and we've said in the letter. Obviously, if the Committee would --

MS. DUPREY: I'll --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MR. PATCH: What I said is I don't know that there's anything more $I$ can say other than what $I$ said in response to your questions and what we put in the letter. But, you know, obviously if it's the Committee's desire, you know, for us to brief this further, we'd be happy to do that. I think our letter spells out in detail what our position is. And so --

MS. DUPREY: I'll look at it again.
MR. PATCH: -- whether or not the Committee agrees with that or not, obviously that's up to you folks. But we'll be happy to brief anything else that you'd like to.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney
Iacopino.
MR. IACOPINO: Just for the benefit of the rest of the Committee, the letter was
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sent out to you yesterday. It was received, and I tried to e-mail it to everybody yesterday afternoon. I'm hoping you all received it.

The letter, in the last paragraph, does quote the language that the Applicant asks for us to actually use in our decision and certificate. So, just informational-wise. And of course, I'm happy to discuss this with the Committee at an appropriate time in a non-meeting at the Chair's call.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: My suggestion I think at this point is, given that we've just gotten the letter, some folks may not have gotten to read it, and we have some case law to look at, that we all do that and then come prepared to the next session to determine whether or not we would like to request briefing or argument on that, and also have a non-meeting with our counsel as well.

Okay. Attorney Geiger, what's the status of the witness?

MS. GEIGER: Thank you. I did
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receive a phone call from Mr. Olausen a few minutes ago. He indicated that he was able to enter the Webex meeting. So I would ask -- I don't see him, but I would ask whether others can and whether others can hear him.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I cannot. But Ms. Lemay, can you bring him up?

WEB MODERATOR LEMAY: Yeah, he's in as an attendee. One moment. Mr. Olausen, are you there?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Let's go off the record for a minute while we check to get video and audio.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Back on the record.

MS. GEIGER: Thank you.
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Mr. Olausen, could you please state your name, spell your last name, and provide your address.
A. (Olausen) Stephen, with a P-H, Olausen,
[WITNESS PANEL: KAREN MACK, STEPHEN OLAUSEN]

O-L-A-U-S-E-N. 20 Queenfort Way, North Kingstown, Rhode Island, 02852.
Q. By whom are you employed, and in what capacity are you employed?
A. (Olausen) I am the executive director and senior architectural historian with the Public Archeology Laboratory in Pawtucket, Rhode Island.
Q. Could you please give the Committee a brief summary of your qualifications.
A. (Olausen) I hold a master's degree in applied history from the University of South Carolina and have been working in the field of cultural resource management for more than 30 years. My particular expertise is the identification and evaluation of historic or above-ground historic properties. And I fully meet the Secretary of Interior Professional Qualifications Standards for history and architectural history at 36 CFR Part 61. I have completed hundreds of projects in New England, including many in New Hampshire, that have required compliance with state and federal historic preservation
laws.
Q. And are you the same witness who submitted prefiled direct testimony in this docket dated October 14, 2019, but filed on October 18, 2019, along with an attachment which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 10?
A. (Olausen) Yes.
Q. Did you submit any prefiled supplemental testimony in this docket?
A. (Olausen) No.
Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to your prefiled testimony?
A. (Olausen) As Ms. Mack did, I would like to update my written testimony to add that Counsel for the Public has agreed in a stipulation, marked as Applicant's Exhibit 81, that the Applicant has provided information sufficient to support a finding that the site and facility will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on historic sites.
Q. And with that update, if you were asked the same questions contained in your prefiled
testimony today under oath, would your answers be the same?
A. (Olausen) Yes.
Q. Could you please provide a brief summary of your testimony.
A.
(Olausen) My prefiled testimony describes and presents the results of the investigations to identify historic architectural properties. My testimony also discusses the steps taken to assess whether the Project would adversely affect the Fitzwilliam Common Historic District, which was the only historic property identified during my study as having a potential to be affected by the Project. The effects assessment found that the district is more than one mile from the Project and will not have any views of the new facilities that will alter any of the characteristics that make the district historically significant. Because the Project has no potential to cause direct or indirect effects on the district, I recommended a finding for the Project of no historic properties affected. NHDHR
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concurred with that finding in a letter marked as Applicant's Exhibit 37. This finding establishes that the Project has no potential to cause any unreasonable adverse effects on historic sites.
Q. Thank you.

MS. GEIGER: Both Ms. Mack and Mr.
Olausen are available for cross-examination.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Thank you.
Attorney Neville.
MS. NEVILLE: I do not have any
questions for these two witnesses.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Let's
see if the Committee has questions.
Mr. Wilson.
DIR. WILSON: I do not have any
questions for these two witnesses.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay.
Mr. Oldenburg.
MR. OLDENBURG: I have no questions
for the two witnesses.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Mr.
Pelletier.
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CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
A. (Mack) I am not aware of training that's in place for people working on site.
Q. Second question $I$ had for you is, in the process that you employed in consultation with the New Hampshire -- NHDR, is that the same process that would be employed on any type of project, whether it's an energy project or other large construction project?
A. (Mack) Yes.
Q. And Mr. Olausen, I have the same question for you with respect to the architectural aspects. The process that you went through with the New Hampshire Division of Historic Resources, is that the same process that any developer would go through with a large construction project?
A. (Olausen) Yes.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. I don't have any further questions, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank
you. And the witnesses are now excused.
Attorney Patch and Attorney Geiger,
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are we moving on to Mr . Persechino at this point?

MS. GEIGER: I believe so.
MR. PATCH: Yes, Mr. Persechino and Mr. Delallo are as a panel. So I think if they can be given access, they can -- we can start with them.

WEB MODERATOR LEMAY: What were the names again?

MR. PATCH: Joseph Persechino and Keith Delallo.

WEB MODERATOR LEMAY: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Delallo, can you turn on your video? There you go. And can you unmute yourself so we can make sure we hear you?

WITNESS DELALLO: Can you hear me?
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: We can.
And when Mr. Persechino reappears, we will swear in the witnesses.
(WHEREUPON, JOSEPH PERSECHINO AND KEITH DELALLO were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

JOSEPH PERSECHINO, SWORN
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## KEITH DELALLO, SWORN

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney Patch. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PATCH:
Q. Okay. Good morning, Mr. Persechino and Mr. Delallo. I'm going to start with you, Mr. Persechino. Could you please state your name and address.
A. (Persechino) Sure. My name is Joseph Persechino, and my business address is Tighe \& Bond, 177 Corporate Drive, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, 03801.
Q. And Mr. Delallo, could you state your name and address.
A. (Delallo) Yeah. My name is Keith Delallo, spelled $D-E-L-A-L-L-O$. And my business address is 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida, 33408.
Q. And Mr. Persechino, by whom are you employed and in what capacity?
A. (Persechino) I'm a senior -- sorry. I'm a senior project manager at Tighe \& Bond. Tighe \& Bond is a company that specializes in engineering and environmental services,
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including renewable energy, site/civil design, permitting and planning, geotechnical and structural, electrical --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Persechino) So we provide permitting and planning, site assessment, health and safety, regulatory compliance, wetland and ecological services, transportation engineering -traffic, roadway -- and wastewater and stormwater engineering.
Q. And Mr. Delallo, by whom are you employed and in what capacity?
A. (Delallo) I am employed by NextEra Energy Resources, Inc. as a project engineer.
Q. And Mr. Persechino, could you give the Committee a brief summary of your qualifications.
A. (Persechino) Sure. I have over 17 years of experience in civil design, including solar array design and permitting and stormwater design. I'm a professional engineer licensed in New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Maine. And I am a New Hampshire -- a licensed designer of --
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(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Persechino) -- subsurface disposal systems, as well as a LEED-accredited professional. And I have a bachelor's degree in science from the University of New Hampshire.
Q. And Mr. Delallo could you give the Committee a brief summary of your qualifications.
A. (Delallo) Yes. I have a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering and a bachelor of business administration in marketing sales from the University of Toledo in Ohio. I joined NextEra Energy in March of 2020 and have had this position within NextEra Energy since.

Within NextEra I am currently the project manager of approximately 130 megawatts of AC in development throughout the central and Northeast region, which includes this Project. I have over eight years of commercial and residential experience throughout the country. Overall, I have extensive experience in designing, engineering and construction of over 12 megawatts of AC residential solar Projects \{SEC 2019-02\} [Day 2] \{09-18-2020\}
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within 19 states and 5 megawatts AC of commercial solar projects in two states, and current with 130 megawatts of AC development now.
Q. Mr. Persechino, were you the same witness who submitted prefiled testimony in this docket dated October 14th of 2019, filed on the 18th, which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 6?
A. (Persechino) Yes.
Q. And are you the witness who submitted prefiled supplemental testimony dated August 31 of 2020 , which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 71?
A. (Persechino) Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections to either of those prefiled testimonies?
A. (Persechino) My original testimony describes an overview of the design of the Project, including the civil design and Alteration of Terrain Permit, the stormwater design and the decommissioning plan.

In my supplemental testimony I covered generally the design changes as a result of
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further discussions with DES, Counsel for the Public, and the Town of Fitzwilliam. These changes include eliminating one internal road to reduce wetland buffer impacts, slight movement of the substation to avoid another wetland buffer. Since the original testimony was submitted, we have had extensive discussions with the Alteration of Terrain Bureau at DES.

As a result of those discussions, DES submitted its final recommendation to the SEC on August 31st, 2020. Those recommendations require that we resubmit revised plans by September 4th, 2020. We submitted those plans, which included modifications to the hydraulic -- hydrologic analysis and stormwater design, a waiver of the channel protection volume requirements based on our commitment to use stormwater Best Management Practices, and the incorporation of the recommendations by Fish \& Game Department into the revised plans. The wetlands delineation plans included the seal of a certificated wetlands scientist.

Since then, we had a request related from the NHDES for an updated cover sheet for the site plans. This was provided on September 16th, 2020, via e-mail on the same day as the request.
Q. And have you received any feedback from DES as to whether what you filed on September 4th and the subsequent filing you just described is sufficient?
A. (Persechino) Yes. After we provided the updated cover sheet of the site plans, we then received an email response from Bethann McCarthy, from the NHDES Alteration of Terrain Bureau, on September 16th, 2020, saying that they are all set with respect to the hydrology and design, and that they're only waiting on concurrence by New Hampshire Fish \& Game. It is our understanding that Melissa Dombrowski from the New Hampshire Fish \& Game provided an e-mail to Bethann McCarthy on September 15th, 2020, stating that the New Hampshire Fish \& Game had received the most recent wildlife habitat assessment by September 15th, 2020, and it
caused no further comments.
Q. Mr. Persechino, on the first day of these hearings, a member of the Committee asked whether the decommissioning amount of $\$ 900,432$ was prepared assuming that the decommissioning waivers which were requested by Chinook were granted. Can you answer that question?
A. (Persechino) Sure. The decommissioning plan, which has been marked as Exhibit 48, assumed the waivers would be granted. If the Committee does not grant the waivers, the amount required could increase depending on if bedrock and/or large boulders are encountered during construction, which would prevent the burial of the electric conduit to a depth greater than 48 inches, and/or require the piles to be pre-drilled into the rock below. Therefore, if shallow rock is encountered, this could increase the cost of decommissioning. However, the intent of the waiver is to reduce the amount of disturbance required during the decommissioning process.
Q. Now, with the updates that you have just
described, Mr. Persechino, if you were asked the same questions contained in your prefiled testimony and supplemental testimony today under oath, would your answers be the same?
A. (Persechino) Yes.
Q. Okay. Mr. Delallo, are you the same witness who submitted supplemental prefiled testimony in this docket dated August 31st of 2020, which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 76?
A. (Delallo) Yes.
Q. And in that supplemental testimony, did you adopt the prefiled testimony of Paul Callahan, which was submitted in October of 2019, which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 4?
A. (Delallo) Yes.
Q. And do you have any corrections to either Mr .

Callahan's prefiled testimony or your
prefiled supplemental testimony?
A. (Delallo) No.
Q. Now, do you have anything that you wish to add with regard to decommissioning?
A. (Delallo) Yeah. I would like to note that we
now have benefit of the additional geotechnical engineering report, which was attached to my supplemental testimony, Exhibit 76. Based on this report and the original geotechnical investigation reports submitted as Appendix 9A to the Application, Exhibit 22, we think it's quite unlikely that the piles for the solar panels will be driven into bedrock. But it could be possible. In the event that the pile experiences a rock or hits bedrock and cannot meet the depth required by the racking manufacturer, these will need to be pre-drilled and inserted into the rock. Based on the geotechnical reports submitted as Appendix 9A, these rocks are too large to install the racking piles and are approximately about four feet underground. This means that when the pilings are removed during the decommissioning process, there will be a significant amount of disturbance to remove them at depths of four feet. This is why we have requested a waiver that would allow us to cut the pilings off at the point at which they were installed in the rock. We
believe it may be necessary to blast the rocks to remove the pilings based on our current understanding of the solar and bedrock at this site.

If the Committee denies the waiver, we believe that there are several ways to remove the piling. One will be the actual removal of the rock, which would range between 1-1/2 feet to 4 feet in size, into which they are then inserted; or two, by removing them with hammers; and in case that they're in the bedrock, blast them out, which would cause significant disturbance.
Q. And could you provide a brief summary, then, of your testimony.
A. (Delallo) Mr. Callahan's testimony, which I have adopted, describes the experience that NextEra has in developing renewable energy projects. It also discussed the process of hiring and monitoring and engineering and procurement of a construction contractor who will be responsible for managing the construction of the Project. The testimony described a number of details about the
construction process.
My supplemental testimony describes the possibility of a change in the solar panels to a bifacial module, which is indicated on Page 22 of the original Application, that the specific panel and supplier of the module will be finalized closer to the construction of the solar panels as we identified in the Application.

Finally, I mentioned that the provisions in the MOU, Memorandum of Understanding, with the town related to construction.
Q. And with the updates you just described, Mr . Delallo, if you were asked the same questions contained in Mr. Callahan's prefiled testimony and in your supplemental testimony today under oath, would your answers be the same?
A. (Delallo) Yes.

MR. PATCH: The witnesses are available for cross-examination. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney

Neville.
MS. NEVILLE: Thank you.
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(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MS. NEVILLE: With the testimony that has come in today with the updates, and information that we have, I do not have questions for these witnesses.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Then we will go to the Committee and see if there are questions.

Mr. Wilson.
DIR. WILSON: I have no questions for the two witnesses.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Oldenburg.
MR. OLDENBURG: I do.
QUESTIONS BY SEC MEMBERS AND COUNSEL:
BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. Good morning, gentlemen. Just so you know, my name's Bill Oldenburg. I work at the Department of Transportation. I'm an engineer. So when you stick a schedule and plans in front of me, I feel obliged to look at them. So I have some questions.

In looking at the schedule, could someone explain to me the term "total float" that's shown in the Project schedule, how
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it's used and why?
A. (Persechino) Keith, did you want to start with the answer on that one?
A. (Delallo) Yes, I guess I can.

I'm not quite sure what you mean by the "float" of the Project, but I can speak about the scheduling of this particular project.
Q. So each milestone or each item in the schedule has a start date and a finish date, and then the next column is "Total Float," and it's a number of days. My interpretation is it's sort of the number of days of "slush." So if it's not on the critical path, you would -- your start to finish is 21 days. But with the float of 7 days, you could actually go another 7 days without it becoming critical.
A. (Delallo) Yeah, I believe that's the way the schedule is written.
Q. Okay.
A. (Delallo) We do have kind of a critical path aspect of the schedule. So one thing needs to be completed before the other.
Q. Okay. So I'll just assume that my
understanding of "total float" is correct, that there's some sort of additional days that are built into the schedule to make it work.

So the next point. In the plans and in DES's final approval letter, which was Applicant's Exhibit 86, the fourth bullet talks about the Project is to be phased as shown on the approved plans, and the area of disturbance within each phase shall be stabilized before disturbance of subsequent phases in each area. And then it goes on in Applicant's Exhibit 82, which is the DES plans that were supplied, on the plan set, on Page C. 101 and C.501, there's notes. One is a demolition note that says, "Erosion control measures shall be installed prior to the start of any clearing and demolition. Refer to the detailed Project phasing plans prepared by Tighe \& Bond for additional details." And then on Page C.501, the construction sequence, it has the same exact note. And $I$ could not for the life of me find any plan that was labeled "Detailed
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Project Phasing Plan." Is that just the construction plans?
A. (Persechino) Keith, I think I Can help answer this one.

So there were plans -- there are plans that were prepared that are a detailed phasing plan as part of the Application to the DES. So those plans show different areas throughout the site that break out each individual phase to a maximum area of 10 acres. And then the adjacent phase is also 10 acres. There are five separate areas. So in theory, the contractor can be working on five different 10-acre areas at the same time, just spread out through the site so they are not connected. The idea is that they don't want to have any area that is unstable greater than 10 acres at one time.

So the process would be that they would go in and install erosion control measures, disturb the 10 acres, re-stabilize it before moving on to the adjacent 10 -acre phase, if that makes sense.
Q. No, that makes perfect sense. I just
couldn't -- I don't think, not that I could find, we were supplied with that. But that makes sense. So I understand that.

So part of that, and you mentioned it, is prior to tree clearing, erosion control measures are needed to be in place. And that includes the installation of silt fence around the perimeter of each area. So on the schedule it shows starting the clear -- the tree clearing in January, you have to -- and with the bat issue and some of the other issues, you know, you've been basically restricted to doing the tree clearing in the winter.

How do you install the silt fence, which needs to be embedded 6 inches in the ground, in the middle of winter around a 10-acre site?
A. (Persechino) Carefully. It's going to -- you know, it will be a process that we'll have to use probably smaller equipment to get in there and do that. And there may need to be limited tree clearing to allow the machines to get in there to help install the silt
fence.
Q. But if you got a certificate in November, would you envision being able to go in before, you know, the middle of winter when there's snow on the ground and everything else to try to install the silt fence --
A. (Persechino) I think that would be up to the contractor, when they're selected, on when their specific time line for implementation of the plan would be.

Keith, perhaps you can speak to how soon you'd be looking to get on an EPC contractor.
A. (Delallo) Yeah, so typically with an EPC contractor we get a little bit farther along within our process. We try to get it hired on somewhere around the 90 percent. In this case, because the tree clearing needs to happen prior to the construction of the site, we'll be kind of hiring a very specific tree-clearing EPC for this site and then hiring a different contractor to actually install the site, because we currently won't have detailed engineering completed for this Project until basically tree clearing is
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completed.
Q. Okay. So that sort of leads me to the next question. So you're going to hire a local logging group to do this, or several maybe.
A. (Delallo) Definition of "local." We try to stay within the same state. And then if not within the same state, the same region.
Q. Okay. So if you have -- when you start work, you can start clearing trees on five non-adjoining 10-acre sites. So that means if it's 129 acres of panels or tree clearing, that means you have to have three different groupings of tree clearing; right? So you're going to do 50 acres in one bunch before you move on, generalized, you know, five 10-acre sites; erosion control set up; cut the trees; stump the trees; re-establish or restabilize the existing ground, and then move on to probably what is five more 10-acre sites, and then somehow finish up after that's done with the remaining 29 acres or whatever, if I understand the sequencing correct.
A. (Persechino) Keith, perhaps I can help answer this one.

So in the eyes of the Alteration of Terrain Bureau, ground disturbance doesn't kick in until the stumps are being removed and earth is being disturbed. So the tree clearing itself doesn't have to follow that same phasing of the 10 acres. They can go in and clear, you know, more than 10 acres at a time, as long as the ground itself is not disturbed by removal of stumps or earthmoving activities.
Q. Okay. So for the erosion control, do you have to have the sedimentation ponds constructed when the ground is disturbed? Because my understanding -- my understanding is the sedimentation ponds are where all the runoff's going to be collected. And the whole idea is to have the erosion control measures in place and then stump and disturb them. That runoff is going to be directed at the sedimentation basins, I'm assuming.
A. (Persechino) That's correct. Yes, that's correct. So the tree clearing would happen. Then they would go in and install the rest of the erosion control measures, such as
sedimentation basins, et cetera, and then they would go into removal of stumps and any earthmoving activities that would be required for that.
Q. Okay. So all of that's got to happen. And in the schedule you have 21 days to cut the trees and do that work. I'm just -- I just -- it just seems like a lot to do in that short period of time to be sequenced: Do the erosion control, build the ponds, go in and cut the trees, stump the trees, re-establish and then move on to the next area in that short a time frame. So it didn't seem to me that the time frame jived with the amount of work that needed to be done.
A. (Persechino) I would like to make one correction. The tree clearing itself, with the exception of stump removal, so just cutting the trees, can happen before the sedimentation basins are installed. So the sedimentation basins and additional erosion control measures, that needs to happen -- or that would happen after tree cutting, but
before stump removal and any other earth disturbance. So that gives you a little more time in that schedule.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Oldenburg,
I apologize for the interrupting, but I cannot see Mr. Delallo right now. Oh, there he is. Okay. He's back. You can proceed.

WITNESS DELALLO: I am currently called in. So I'll at last be able to hear constantly, but I might be having some network issues.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Well, to the extent you're testifying, we want to see you. So I'll pause until we see you. MR. DELALLO: Can you see me now? CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: We can see you now.

Go ahead, Mr. Oldenburg.
MR. OLDENBURG: Thank you.
BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. In the geotechnical report, it appeared to me, if I understand it right, the original geotechnical report that came with the Application was for the entire site. The
supplemental geotechnical report was more for the substation. Is that correct?
A. (Delallo) That's correct. That's correct.
Q. Okay. So in the original geotechnical report, there were only four -- or 11 borings taken, if I remember right; two of them were at the substation. So, nine for the entire 129-acre site. So that's only one boring for every 12 acres. It seems like a low sample size when you're so concerned about hitting ledge and boulders.

But I do remember -- I could not find it again, but there was an assumption that was made that about 10 percent of the posts were anticipated to hit ledge or boulders. Is that an accurate amount?
A. (Delallo) From our understanding of the geotech and basically external satellite images, that is my understanding of how many we expect to hit.
Q. Okay. And those posts go, if I remember the plans right, between 6 and 10 feet in depth?
A. (Delallo) For the solar array, yes. For the substation, we have not gotten that far. But
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they might -- they will be significantly deeper than that.
Q. I was more concerned about the solar panel arrays because, if $I$ got the numbers right -let me see. So there's 116,000 solar panels, 10 solar panels per rack. So that's 11,600 racks. And two posts per rack, so that's 23,000 posts. That sound right?
A. (Delallo) It's a little high. Typical industry standard is one post per seven modules. So that would come in at about 16,400 and some change. So we're looking at about 16,500 total posts.
Q. Okay. I was going off the detail in one of the construction plans and it showed two posts per rack and I was making that assumption.

So I go back to the schedule, and I see 49 days to install the posts. It just seems like if $I$ do the math at 23,000 posts, that's 476 posts per day. That just seems like a lot of -- not a lot of time. So I'm wondering how accurate the schedule -- or how specific the schedule is and how -- you know,
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how do they do that? How many crews do you have that come in and do that? And are they installed? Are they augured? Are they pounded in, or are they dug holes? I'm just curious on the whole sequencing.
A. (Delallo) Yeah, so I could start with your first question. I can provide a couple of examples of projects that we have completed or are under construction within the Northeast region.

There's a project called Nutmeg Solar in Connecticut. It is a 20-megawatt AC, a little bit smaller than this one. It has a current eight-month construction. So phasing from mobilization to what we call COD, which is construction, basically when construction's complete, it's an eight-month process. Within there they've got several construction schedules. But overall, it's from mobilization to complete, and that's in eight months.

There's another project within Vermont, called Coolidge Solar. That's a 20-megawatt AC. We have a construction schedule of five
months. The reason why that one is significantly less than the Nutmeg site and this one is because we don't have to do the phasing in Vermont for that site. We don't have to do, like, one phase and then the next phase and the next phase. We're able to install that entire site in five months.

We have a portfolio of New York projects. They're 5-megawatt AC, and those are scheduled for three months.

And this Project, which is a 30-megawatt AC, is also scheduled for eight months.

So I do want to provide a couple of examples of projects within the Northeast area in which we have and are currently under construction within those accelerated time lines.

To answer your second question, which I believe is how do we do it, typically what we do is when we hire a contractor, because ourselves at NextEra aren't physically building the Project, we send out scopes of work and other contractors build the site.

We'll send out a contract with the schedule
out there and say, hey, this is what we need to complete the Project in time. The contractor will then put the adequate amount of labor, manpower, machinery, et cetera, to be able to hit those time lines. If they don't hit the time lines, then there's kind of consequences in not hitting those time lines. But in general, like they provide the manpower and the machines to be able to hit it in the time lines in which we expect. So when we put out an eight-month time line for a construction project, they will apply as many people to the site and machinery as possible to hit those time lines.

I believe your third question was how do they do it, or how do they install the piles. So typically there are two types of piles that get called installed as racking. There's what's called a H-pile or -(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Delallo) Sorry. The two types of piles are what's called H-piles and ground screws. H-piles are your standard I-beams. They're approximately -- they will be approximately
between 10 and 12 feet long, and they will be driven in with basically a giant hammer. So they will kind of hit the mark, their spot, with a GPS coordinate, and then they'll take their massive hammer and literally pile it into the ground. What we call "refusals" basically means that no matter how many times they hit that hammer, the pile just doesn't move. That either is indicated by we hit a boulder or we hit bedrock. The geotech reports that we've reviewed basically tell us there are boulders roughly about 4 feet underground. So if we hit that, what we end up doing is we pull the pile back out, we take a giant drill bit and we drill that boulder until we hit dirt again, then put the pile back in and then reinsert that pile until we hit the depths that we need.

With the grounds screws, which it could be a possibility here, some of them have a sharp point at the end, and you can actually just drill right through the boulder or drill right through the bedrock. A little bit of predrilling might be needed for that. But if
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the rock is soft enough, we can kind of just go right through it.

So those are the two typical, standard types of piles. We have not determined which one we're going to use quite yet. But those will probably be the two we would be looking at. Does that answer your question, sir? That does, and it makes sense. I would just offer my two cents, being in the construction industry, that our contractors in New Hampshire, there's a very low unemployment rate, and they are all short-staffed. And so to get -- when we put out projects like what you're talking about, we see -- we pay a premium when there are schedule deadlines and disincentives and things like that, just because the contractors are so short on staff.
A. (Delallo) Yeah, and we do end up playing that game of if we make it an expedited schedule, the costs are too high. But then you have to look at we have our incentives up for rebates, and then we play that game of, like, okay, how fast do we really need to do this?

Because you're absolutely right, sir, that there's an additional cost the quicker you make that time line.

One thing I do want to add is many of the racking manufacturers like to install their own posts. So we hire the construction company to install the solar project. A lot of the warranty part of the solar racking requires them to install their own posts. So they have a specialized crew within their own organization that will install the posts. It isn't just any sort of contractor that comes in and installs the posts. They have their own certified installers for the posts.
Q. And I have to assume the time frame and the scheduling for that contractor is all based upon the tree-clearing operation being done at a certain time so that they can start. So if something happens with the tree-clearing operation and it's not done by, like, March 31st when you're cut off to cut trees, then you have to wait an entire season to get that section cleared. And that would be sort of a bad thing.
A. (Delallo) Yup, you're absolutely right. Yeah. Think about it as kind of like the Henry Ford of construction a little bit. Joe, correct me if I'm wrong on this. But they will do all of the sediment stuff. But once all of the erosion control is done, they will, like, install the posts. They work their way through and then install the racking, work their way through. It's not like they install all the posts, all the racking, all the modules. They will, like, be ahead of each other and almost create like a train to get the modules on there as well, because of the same concern with installing 16,000 posts, we have to install 116,000 modules.
Q. So the second the first five 10-acre tree-clearing or grubbing operations are done, those posts can be installed; right? Okay.
A. (Delallo) Yeah. And the sediment controls need to be in place as well, and then we can install the posts.
Q. So one of the things $I$ saw is the site is
sort of bisected by wetlands, and there's a bridge that's required to be constructed across the wetlands. And I didn't see that anywhere in the schedule or in the timing. Is there -- and I also notice that there's a temporary construction access off of Route 12 to gain access to that lower portion, you know, the bottom portion of the array that seems to be cut off by the wetlands.

So is it your -- is it the thought that, you know, from Folsom [sic] Road or whatever, you'll be able to access the northern portion, and then from Route 12 be able to access the southern portion so that the bridge construction isn't so critical?
A. (Delallo) I could speak about the bridge construction, but I might need to lean on Joe for the access road.

The reason the bridge construction isn't detailed in our plans is we haven't figured out exactly how we're going to build that bridge. We have quotes out and engineering out for a couple of companies to be able to build that bridge for us. But we are still
in, I guess, the engineering phase for that bridge.

Joe, do you mind speaking about the temporary access road?
A. (Persechino) You're exactly right about the access road. So the thought is that that bridge construction will be time-consuming and require access from both sides to build the footings for it because of the large span. So the idea is that from the majority of the site from the north will off of Fullam Hill Road, and then the southern portion of the site will be off that. I believe it's Route 12 that is mentioned.

The land on the south also includes some laydown area so that they can use that existing field that is not going to be developed as solar, but can use that as a staging area and laydown area for materials, so they can go in and build that southern section at the same time that the north section is ongoing, which, as you know, the northern section is much larger. It has room for, you know, access to all the other areas
from that Fullham Hill Road access.
Q. So your intent would be to basically turn this into two sites from an access location: Laydown, construction, tree clearing. Without that bridge being built, the loggers aren't going to cross through the wetlands to get from one side to the other. You're going to basically separate the site into two.
A. (Persechino) Right. That was the thought in flexibility to make sure that that could happen. Depending on timing of the bridge, the connection could be made much earlier. So, again, we're leaving a little bit of flexibility up to the final selected contractors on how they approach that. They may decide at the end of the day that coming from the north makes sense without going to the south and just using the south for access to construct the other side of the bridge and then going from the north. But we still have the flexibility to use that area in the south as laydown and access.
Q. Okay. My only other -- well, the trenching for the electrical conduit. So the
electrical conduit that connects the racks to the inverters, I think I read somewhere that that is typically placed three feet below grade.
A. (Delallo) It depends on the voltage of what's coming out. So the NEC 300.5 dictates basically what your depth is going to be between zero and 1,000 volts. That's a table, about six tables long. The NEC 300.50 tells you what you can do between ranges of 1,000 volts from 40 kilovolts. So it depends on where we're at in that table. We anticipate that the DC side, which is about 1500 volts, will be less than three feet underground, while the high-voltage or medium voltage lines going from the transformers to the substation will be below four feet.
Q. So on the decommissioning plan, that was sort of my question about whether or not the decommissioning -- the valleys in the decommissioning plan included or didn't include the waiver.

So I know you've mentioned the posts.
You know, the intent is not to disturb the
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area again and remove the posts. But would that conduit also be included, I mean, if it's below -- you know, the difference is, is it three feet down or four feet down? So you're asking for that four-foot dimension to be changed to three feet. So does that now include a whole myriad of conduit that could be left in place as part of the decommissioning as well?
A. (Delallo) That is correct. So one of the main conduit lines that would run through, according to code, would be 42 inches. So it kind of falls right between the 36 and 48 inches. We estimate -- or I estimated up to two miles, depending on the situation, if we go through bedrock, if we have to go around it. A lot of site conditions make it very hard to estimate exactly how much conduit will be left in the ground. But your assessment, if we aren't granted the waiver -- or if we are granted the waiver, we would have conduit and conductors left in the ground.
Q. So it sounds like the $\$ 900,000$ includes the \{SEC 2019-02\} [Day 2] \{09-18-2020\}
waiver. But if you don't get the waiver, that's miles of conduit that you'd have to remove, plus 16,000 -- a foot more of 16,000 posts, or all the 16,000 posts. How much more would that be? Do you have an idea?
A. (Delallo) Joe might have to chime in on how much that would add to specific costs.
Q. Because I look at it as the only -- if you leave the posts in place, and I'm assuming they're metal, eventually they'll corrode. They're sort of inert. But the miles of conduit, it's plastic PVC. It's going to be there for centuries. And the next property owner, or whoever owns this property, if it's ever sold, has got miles of plastic in the ground that isn't removed.
A. (Delallo) Yeah, so PVC is one option for trenching. One of the other options is what's called directional bore, which basically just means like the same way an oil company bores into the ground. It creates a one-inch or two-inch hole, and you actually just put the conductor straight through. So if we have that as an option, what would be
left in the ground would be the copper of the wires themselves, or aluminum, depending on what we use -- could be copper or aluminum -and the PVC kind of wrapping that goes around those conductors.

Another option that we have in our arsenal of options is not to do any sort of trenching underground, but do something that's called a cap system or a hanger system, where all the conductors are above ground and they run up above ground. That could be an option as well.

Another option is to use kind of metal conduits. So it would be the same conduit you'd see in a house, much, much more expensive. And then the one you're saying, the PVC.

Most of our conduit that is called out is actually a directional bore conduit, so it wouldn't have any -- or a directional bore trench, which wouldn't have any PVC or metal conduit in there. That's what we would be using for the roughly two miles, or at least my estimate of two miles of medium-voltage
line. That would be a directional bore. So what would be left in the ground is just the copper wires and I guess the PVC jacketing around those copper wires.
Q. So what you're asking in the waiver for is just to leave it in place because of the disturbance, the ground disturbance that will happen, that will have to -- and, you know, the potential for erosion or whatever, you know, and the re-stabilization. I can see that. But there's a -- I mean, the other side is it's going to save you money in not having to remove that. So I think what we have to weigh is: Does the benefit of not disturbing it outweigh, you know, the cost?
A. (Delallo) Yeah, and that's why we want to emphasize -- and Joe, with his testimony -that we're not looking at it for the cost-savings aspects of it. We're looking at the ground disturbance. We know this Committee is very committed to the least amount of ground disturbance. And if we do install the conduit in that range between 36 and 42 inches, we would have to dig all of
that up. And it could get to a point where we're in some sort of bedrock. We don't anticipate it, but it could happen. So we would have to then blast and remove that as well.

So from our perspective, we're not looking at it from a cost, we're looking at it from ground disturbance.
Q. And this stuff that you would leave, it isn't going to leach or anything? You know, this conduit, if you leave the conduit, I mean, this isn't over time hazardous; right?
A. (Persechino) Right.
A. (Delallo) Yeah, go ahead, Joe.
A. (Persechino) Yeah, I might be able to help a little bit on the conversation.

So PVC conduit is essentially inert. As you know, there's miles and miles of PVC conduit that has been installed throughout New Hampshire and the region. It's often abandoned in place for the same reasons that we're requesting this waiver, which is digging up the conduit just to take it out often doesn't make sense from a disturbance
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standpoint. Of course, cost is -- you know, can be a consideration as well.

I think the options that would be considered if the waiver wasn't granted, though, would be to avoid that future disturbance, that the initial conduit installation would therefore be install it at 48 inches or greater, if possible, so that you don't have to come back 20 years from now and dig up two miles of conduit. So that would be part of the consideration.

The ledge or bedrock is a compounding situation, where if you now encounter -- or shallow rock -- the cost to install it four feet deep now, or greater than 48 inches now, becomes an issue. But the same consideration of further disturbance in the future is still part of that consideration. Does it make sense to try to install it deeper now, or, you know, is it left for that piece of run in the shallow bedrock and just come back and just remove that portion?

Regarding your comments on the -- or your question on the piles. You know, the
idea is that most of those piles, if possible, would just be pulled out, right, so you're not having to excavate down three or four feet; you'd cut them off. Because that's extremely time-consuming and creates a considerable lot more disturbance and therefore site restoration. I mean, that's the intent of decommissioning is to restore the site, you know, to an undisturbed site and removing everything from the landscape. So, again, you know, if it was 10 percent, say, as an example, of piles that were -- that encountered bedrock at a depth that is less than, you know, four feet deep, that's where the issue kind of arises, where if we hit bedrock at three feet, you have to excavate down to three feet and cut the pile off because you're not going to be able to pull the pile out of the ground. You just excavate down to three feet and cut it off. That assumes the waiver is granted. If the waiver is not granted, then you'd be stuck with excavating down three feet. And for that last foot, is the effort and
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additional disturbance worth it, really, to, like you said, remove an inert metal pile an additional foot out of that potential bedrock or large boulder, which would create, you know, blasting, hammering it out, or if it's a large boulder, excavating a large cubic yard of boulder out of the ground just to get that last foot?
Q. So besides the posts and potentially conduit, is there anything else that, you know, would fall within what would be left in the ground, not decommissioned?
A. (Persechino) I don't believe so.

Keith, anything in the substation that would be deeper than that? I don't recall.
A. (Delallo) The piles for the substation are going to be quite large. But it's going to be the same material, same H-beam or I-beam that's going in there. I can't think of anything.
A. (Persechino) And those would still be excavated down to at least a three-foot mark if the waiver is granted and cut off at three feet versus four feet if they were -- you
know, if the waiver was not granted. So we're still -- we would still be removing that same section, regardless.
Q. I mean, to me, the posts, whether it's three feet or four feet, you're removing the posts. It's that extra foot. To me, the issue is the conduit. So if we keep it at four feet, you could potentially be removing all the conduit. If we made it three feet, there's potentially miles of conduit that could stay in place. And my thought, my concern, was in 30 years from now when the solar panels are gone, what does the future property owner do, you know, with this conduit? They're going to remove it, and they're going to disturb the site potentially and do exactly what you don't want to do just because they have to deal with the conduit now. That was my only thought is, you know, are we just kicking the can down the road and saying we're not going to allow you to disturb the site when it's decommissioned, but a future property owner that does anything with that property is going to have to deal with the conduit?
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So that was my only thought. I get the posts. The posts, you know, three feet, four feet, it doesn't matter because there's still going to be some left. But to me, it was more are we leaving more stuff there that should be removed, which is the conduit.
A. (Persechino) Got you. I think the last thing I guess I would say to that is I understand your point. And you're right. If somebody was doing a different project there in the future and had to install something, that conduit may need to be removed. But it depends on that future use. And we're all unaware of what that future use would be. If it was -- if it went back to an agricultural field, they wouldn't have to do anything. You know, that conduit at three feet or four feet would be unimpacted. And if it was -- you know, say it was a subdivision or housing project. They could potentially leave most of the conduit in and just remove the ones that come into conflict with any other utilities that they would be installing, or house foundations, et cetera.
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So you're -- (connectivity issue)
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Persechino) I think I said the rest of the conduit would be undisturbed and could remain in place.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Oldenburg, before you go on, can $I$ just ask a clarifying question?

MR. OLDENBURG: Sure.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I don't mean to interject, but $I$ don't want to come back to it later.

I heard a couple of comments about options that are available. And the PVC was mentioned initially, and then there was mention of the directional bore. And I'm not clear. It sounded as though there was a decision that had been made to use directional bore. Is that correct? Or is it still a series of options that you've yet to decide on?

WITNESS DELALLO: There are still a series of options. It really depends. It wouldn't be all or nothing. It wouldn't be
all directional bore. It wouldn't be all PVC conduit. It wouldn't be all metal conduit. There could be sections in which we would do all three of those. Let's say on the DC side, which would be the modular inverter, that could be conduit. Then going from the transformers to our step-up transformer, that could be above ground. And then from our transformer to what we call "point of common coupling," which is getting it onto the grid, that might be directional bore. So we could be using all three of those, presumably, within the site.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Oldenburg.
MR. OLDENBURG: Actually, reviewing my notes, I think I'm all set. Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Mr.
Pelletier, do you have questions? We can't hear you for some reason. Looks like you're off mute. We can't hear you.

Ms. Lemay, any ideas?
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WEB MODERATOR LEMAY: I just... I
feel like we can kind of hear something. Can you try again?

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Ms. Robidas, let's go off the record for a minute.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. You can go ahead.

MR. PELLETIER: Yes, I have no further questions of the witnesses.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Ms. Duprey.

MS. DUPREY: I have no questions, but I would just comment that I had some of the same concerns raised regarding decommissioning. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: And Mr. Arvelo.
DIR. ARVELO: Mr. Oldenburg asked all my questions, so no questions at this point.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. I think I have a few questions left.

BY CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN:
Q. We had discussed leaving the questions about
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how the bond amount was arrived at for Mr. Persechino. So I would ask if you know what data was relied on to arrive at the $\mathbf{\$ 9 0 0 , 2 3 4}$ [sic] for the bond amount of decommissioning.
A. (Persechino) So we put together that bond amount based on our experience throughout New England, preparing decommissioning plans in Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut. Those numbers are consistent with similar projects that were also looked at in New York as part of the NYSERDA organization. And we found that to be consistent with those numbers as well, which equates to approximately $\$ 30,000$ per megawatt of AC.
Q. And if you are -- if you do not get the waiver and you have to do the blasting or some of the other things that were described here, would the $\$ 900,000$ bond need to be raised to cover that? Did you take that into account?
A. (Persechino) So the $\$ 900,000$ bond amount would have to be increased. We would likely use the assumption of 10 percent of piles for that, which could result in approximately
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1600 cubic yards of additional material being removed or so if blasting or excavation was required to remove that additional foot from the piles. That being said, the number, the ballpark number could be, you know, \$200,000 or so.

The question of the conduit would again be more of a decision up front on would it make more sense to install the conduit lower now to be below the requirement of the 48 inches versus having to go back and then remove anything that was less than 48 inches deep if the waiver was not granted.
Q. Okay. So I want to make sure I understand you. You're saying if you were not granted the waiver, you've done an estimate, and you believe it would be potentially an additional $\$ 200,000$.
A. (Persechino) Approximately, yes. We haven't done a detailed analysis of that. Again, we would have to verify our assumptions for that. But that's the approximate amount, yes.
Q. Okay. And a question on the DES permit and
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the conditions that were included in that permit. You have submitted additional information because of those conditions. Have you heard from DES as to whether they're satisfied with those submissions, or are you waiting for that?
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Persechino) Sorry. You broke up a little bit on that last question. Could you please repeat the question?
Q. Yes. I'm wondering on the DES permit and the conditions that were attached to it. You've submitted additional information pursuant to those conditions, and I'm wondering if you've heard from DES as to whether they are satisfied with those submissions.
A. (Persechino) Yes. We heard from Bethann McCarthy in an e-mail this week, September $16 t h$, stating that the DES is satisfied with the hydraulic and stormwater design as presented in the response on September 4th.
Q. Okay. I think that answers all my remaining questions.
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CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney
Iacopino, did you have questions?
MR. IACOPINO: Just a couple, Madam Chair. But first, did you want the Applicant to submit that e-mail as a record request for the record?

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Yes, I think that would be helpful.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Okay. So, for both of the engineers, when we issue a certificate of site and facility, one of the conditions is generally that the site in the Project will comply with the plans. And I just want to get something straight.

We have Exhibit 82, which are the revised civil drawings. Is it my understanding that they are to replace Exhibit 8A, which I forget which appendix that was?

MR. PATCH: I think 8A is the exhibit -- is the appendix number. The exhibit number is 20.

BY MR. IACOPINO:
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Q. So am $I$ correct that Exhibit 82 should replace Exhibit 20?
A. (Persechino) The answer to that is I believe so. The latest plans submitted to the DES from September 4th would replace the prior plans that were submitted in October of 2019, yes.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Madam Chair, I would ask that they just, in writing, confirm that for us so that our certificate and any decision that's written, if a decision is to grant the Project, that we make sure we're referencing the right documents as conditions.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Attorney Patch, can you provide that, please?

MR. PATCH: Yup. Certainly.
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Okay. Mr. Delallo, during your testimony today, in answer to some questions from Mr . Oldenburg, you set out five -- four or five other projects and what the length of their construction schedule was. I was confused as to whether or not you were asserting that
each of those projects met those construction schedules, or was that just an example of how your construction schedules are put together? For instance, you -- go ahead.
A. (Delallo) No. Sorry, sir.
Q. Well, for instance, you referenced Nutmeg Solar, which had an eight-month construction plan. But I didn't understand whether or not that Project met that construction schedule. Same thing with Coolidge. I understand Coolidge has been built. So am I correct in understanding that Coolidge met the five-month construction schedule?
A. (Delallo) So to answer the first one, Nutmeg, that is under construction currently, and it is meeting the construction schedule. We are currently three months into the build, and we are on time. That Coolidge Project has been built, and it did meet the five-month time.
Q. And what about the New York projects that you had referenced?
A. (Delallo) The New York projects are on schedule as of right now, but they are only
one week old. So I don't have a great depth for hitting on that one as well. But smaller time lines.
Q. All right. You referenced that the, $I$ assume it's the construction plans for the bridge that's going to cross the wetlands -- that was discussed I think with both Mr. Delallo and Mr. Persechino -- that they have not been finalized at this point. They are out to an engineering contractor.

And I guess my question about that is, I assume you're going to consult with DES with respect to whatever construction plans are derived with respect to that crossing?
A. (Persechino) Sure.

Keith, I think I can answer this one.
So with respect to the bridge, we put out a performance spec, essentially, that a design contractor will have to meet those requirements on the plans. If the design build contractor varies from the performance specification that we put out for that bridge and it does not meet those requirements, then we would, yes, have to go back to DES and
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discuss any changes from the plan with them.
Q. Okay. And just for the record, we don't currently have construction plans in the record; correct?
A. (Persechino) I guess I can answer that one. The construction -- the current plans are permit-level design plans. The construction-level design plans would include additional details and specifications for some of the undefined components of the Project, such as the structural design for the racking systems that support the solar PV panels and the substation design, similar electrical design that has not been included with this permitting package. The site plans that were approved by DES were permit-level design plans that meet their requirements.
Q. Okay. I ask that because it's typical for us to require as a condition of a certificate that when the construction plans are prepared, that they be filed with the Committee. So I just want to make sure we wouldn't be asking you to do something that you believe you've already done.
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And then finally, the second geotechnical survey that focused primarily on the substation, $I$ understand that you've actually moved the substation by 23 feet because there was a new wetlands delineated. I'm not sure what the timing was there. Did the geotechnical report take that into account, or was that -- or not, and does it make any difference?
A. (Delallo) I can answer that one, Joe.

So, no. We contracted to have the geotechnical report for that area prior to the decision of moving the substation. So where the geotechnical report is currently located is where it was proposed and not moved.

To your question of does it matter, I believe that is an interpretation based on a P.E. My opinion is it does not matter based on 23 feet. When you're doing some sort of geotechnical report, you have to interpolate and extrapolate data between data points anyways. So having that moved 23 feet, in my opinion, does not matter.
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MR. IACOPINO: I don't have any further questions, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
MR. OLDENBURG: Madam Chair, could I ask a question, a follow-up question?

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Sure. Of course.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. The detailed phasing plan that you discussed, did $I$ just miss the location of that in the Application, or was it an exhibit? If it wasn't included, could we get it included for the record? Because I think the construction phasing that's proposed should be part of the plan set.
A. (Persechino) It definitely was included to the DES. I'll work with Attorney Patch to make sure that you get a copy as well. It should be in there, but we'll make sure you get a copy.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: So we could take that as an additional record request for the detailed phasing plan.

MR. PATCH: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Oldenburg, before we move away from you, I just want to confirm with you that your questions were answered related to the waiver and that you do not need the record request at this point.

MR. OLDENBURG: Correct. I don't need any more information. I was looking for a number as well. If 900,000 is what it's going to cost to decommission the Project if the waiver is granted, what would the bond be if we didn't grant the waiver I guess was my other part of the question.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Yes, and I think that was my question as well. I did hear from the witness some information about that, but I think it might be useful to have a record request that provides the information supporting their estimate that was testified to today. Do you agree with that, Mr. Oldenburg? Mr. Oldenburg, would that satisfy you as well?

MR. OLDENBURG: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: So that's two
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additional record requests there, Mr. Patch.
MR. PATCH: Okay. We understand. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Great. Thank you. And back to you if you have any redirect.

MR. PATCH: Yes, I do have a few questions.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. And this is actually either one or both of this can answer this question.

There was a discussion about two different contractors that would be hired, as I understood it. One would be for the tree removal, and the other one would be for the actual construction of the Project, the grading and installation of the solar panels and so forth. Is that correct?
A. (Delallo) It can be up to two, or it could be the same one. We could have up to three. We could have one that does the electrical, one that does the civil and one that does the tree clearing. But $I$ wanted to emphasize
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that contractors will be hired based on the need and the time line in which it needs to be completed.
Q. And so the eight-month time line that you provided, is that -- does that include the tree clearing or not?
A. (Delallo) It does not.
Q. So that's really from the time after the tree clearing has been done, the time from thereon that it would take to actually do the grading -- well, first create the sedimentation ponds, do the grading and then install the panels; correct?
A. (Delallo) That is correct. What I would like to add is the stumping. So we would have to do the stump removals, then the sediment ponds, then site stabilization, then we can go in and install the rest of the Project.
Q. And I think there was a question about 21 days to cut the trees down or to remove the trees. And are either of you familiar with the Fish \& Game recommendations that were submitted to DES, which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 84? I think they're also
included as Applicant's Exhibit 82, which is the response to DES. And in that recommendation it talks about tree clearing for the Project to occur between November 1 and March 31 to avoid potential impacts to roosting bats during the summer season. Is that your understanding of when the tree clearing would have to be done?
A. (Delallo) That is my understanding.
Q. So depending on if and when a certificate is issued, because you couldn't begin any of that until the certificate is issued -- but once a certificate is issued, assume for a minute it's sometime in November, possibly December, then you would have from thereon until March 31st to do the tree clearing; correct?
A. (Delallo) That's correct.
Q. There were a few questions about the site, sort of post-decommissioning. And I know both of you at least are generally familiar that Chinook has signed a memo of understanding with the Town of Fitzwilliam, which has been marked as an exhibit. I
believe it's Exhibit 67. And I want to ask you a question about the proposed use of the Project lands, not the non-Project lands -in other words, the lands that will be disturbed by the Project after decommissioning. There's a provision, and it's provision Roman X, Paragraph B in the MOU. It's on Page 9 of Exhibit 67. And it says, "Within one year of decommissioning, Chinook Solar shall either, (a), convey a conservation easement to a qualified organization burdening the remainder of the land it purchased for the Project; or (b), it could continue the same project or a similar renewable energy generating facility with similar vertical, horizontal and subsurface footprint and impact, subject to relevant regulatory approval."

So is that your understanding of how the land could be used, or does that govern how land could be used post-decommissioning? And again, when $I$ say "the land," I'm talking about the area disturbed for the Project,
[WITNESS PANEL: JOSEPH PERSECHINO, KEITH DELALLO]
which I think the estimate at this point is approximately 150 acres. Is that correct?
A. (Delallo) That is my understanding.
Q. And just one quick question about the current bond amount and the detail associated with it. It can be found -- is it your understanding it can be found in the decommissioning plan that was filed with the Application last fall, and as an appendix to that, Appendix 16C, which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 48? Is it your understanding that that contains more detail about how the $\$ 900,432$ figure was arrived at?
A. (Persechino) That's correct.

MR. PATCH: That's all the questions I have. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Attorney Neville, do you have anything else?
MS. NEVILLE: No.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. So the witnesses are excused.

It's currently 11:30. Ms. Robidas, how are you doing?
(Discussion off the record.)
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[WITNESS: MARC WALLACE]

|  | 106 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Patch, do |
| 2 | you have your next witness ready to proceed? |
| 3 | MR. PATCH: Yes, I believe so. Ms. |
| 4 | Geiger is actually going to be doing the |
| 5 | direct. |
| 6 | MS. GEIGER: It would be Mr. |
| 7 | Wallace, Marc Wallace. |
| 8 | (Discussion off the record) |
| 9 | CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Back on |
| 10 | the record. Ms. Robidas, could you swear the |
| 11 | witness in, please. |
| 12 | (WHEREUPON, MARC C. WALLACE was duly |
| 13 | sworn and cautioned by the Court |
| 14 | Reporter.) |
| 15 | MARC C. WALLACE, SWORN |
| 16 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 17 | BY MS. GEIGER: |
| 18 | Q. Good morning, Mr. Wallace. Could you please |
| 19 | state your name, and spell your first and |
| 20 | last names for the record. |
| 21 | A. My name is Marc C. Wallace. M-A-R-C, middle |
| 22 | initial C, Wallace, W-A-L-L-A-C-E. |
| 23 | Q. Mr. Wallace, what is your address? |
| 24 | A. My business address is 303 Wyman Street, |
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Suite 295, Waltham, Massachusetts, 02451.
Q. And Mr. Wallace, by whom are you employed, and in what capacity are you employed?
A. I am the vice-president at Tech Environmental.
Q. Could you please provide the Subcommittee with a brief summary of your qualifications.
A. I have over 30 years of experience addressing air quality and noise concerns in New England. I am a qualified environmental professional for the past 18 years, and I'm also a member of the Institute of Noise Control. I have performed both air quality and noise monitoring and modeling analyses for municipalities, government agencies and industry on projects in the transportation, wastewater, solid waste disposal and industrial market sectors.
Q. And Mr. Wallace, did you submit prefiled direct testimony in this docket dated October 14, 2019, and filed October 18th that same year, along with an attachment which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 8?
A. Yes.
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Q. And did you also submit prefiled supplemental testimony in this docket dated August 31st, 2020, along with three attachments, which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 73?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to either your prefiled testimony or your prefiled supplemental testimony?
A. Yes. I would like to update my written testimony to add that the Counsel for the Public has agreed, in Paragraph 7 of a stipulation, marked as Applicant's Exhibit 81, that the sound information submitted by the Applicant is sufficient to support a finding that the site and the facility will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on sound.
Q. Mr. Wallace, with the update that you just described, if you were asked the same questions contained in your prefiled testimony, as well as your supplemental prefiled testimony today under oath, would your answers be the same?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you please provide a very brief summary of your testimony.
A. My prefiled direct testimony provides a description of the acoustic study for the Project and summarizes the results of that study. A written report of that study is contained in Applicant's Exhibit 47, which is Appendix 16B of the Application.

My supplemental prefiled testimony presents information regarding additional sound monitoring conducted as a follow-up to concerns expressed during the public information session and public hearing in this docket. This additional study included baseline sound monitoring performed near existing electrical transmission lines in the approximate location of the Project's proposed transformer.

We also updated our June 2019 acoustic model with sound power data from the Coolidge Solar transformer in Ludlow, Vermont, which revealed that the sound impacts from the Chinook Solar Project will be imperceptible and will not generate tonal sound impacts at
the nearest residences to the Project site. In addition, we performed additional acoustic modeling to investigate the effectiveness of certain sound mitigation alternatives.

Based upon our acoustic studies and modeling, it is my opinion that the Project will not have unreasonable adverse effects upon public health as a result of the sound that the Project is expected to generate.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Wallace.

MS. GEIGER: This witness is available for cross-examination.

MS. NEVILLE: I do not have any
questions for this witness.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson, do you have questions?
DIR. WILSON: I do not have any questions.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Oldenburg,
do you have any questions?
MR. OLDENBURG: I do not have any questions.
[WITNESS: MARC WALLACE]

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Mr. Pelletier, do you have questions?

MR. PELLETIER: I do not, Madam Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Ms. Duprey, do you have questions?

MS. DUPREY: I don't. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. And Mr. Arvelo, do you have questions?

DIR. ARVELO: I have one question for Mr. Wallace.

QUESTIONS BY SEC MEMBERS AND COUNSEL:
BY DIR. ARVELO:
Q. In your study, Mr. Wallace, is there any consideration for how sound from the transmission lines might impact bat populations?
A. No, it does not.
Q. Follow-up. Is there any reason for that? I mean, can you explain -- so I'm assuming that such sound does not have an impact on bats.
A. I can't answer that question. I don't have that sort of experience about the impacts on wildlife. Our study was focused primarily on
[WITNESS: MARC WALLACE]
demonstrating compliance with the New Hampshire siting and environmental noise limits, as well as the Town of Fitzwilliam. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. I don't have any questions.

Attorney Iacopino, do you have questions?

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. And just so we understand, your basic conclusion on your sound study is that, as modeled, it will be well within the sound standards set forth in our rules and by the Town of Fitzwilliam's ordinance?
A. That is correct.

MR. IACOPINO: No other questions.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Attorney Patch, I've lost you on my screen. Do you have any redirect?

MS. GEIGER: I don't have any
redirect. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney
Geiger. Sorry about that.
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[WITNESS: MICHAEL J. BUSCHER]
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is spelled $B-U-S-C-H-E-R$. My business address is 301 College Street, Burlington, Vermont.
Q. Mr. Buscher, by whom are you employed, and in what capacity are you employed?
A. I am the principal landscape architect and owner of T.J. Boyle Associates, landscape architects and planning.
Q. Could you please provide a brief summary of your qualifications.
A. I'm a professional landscape architect. I have a bachelor of landscape architecture from the Department of Landscape Architecture at Penn State University; it's an accredited five-year program. I'm licensed in the state of Vermont. As part of my career, I have specialized in visual impact assessment. And doing that, I've worked for private developers, municipal, state and federal review agencies for a variety of energy and utility-related projects.
Q. And Mr. Buscher, did you submit prefiled testimony in this docket dated October 14, 2019, and filed on October 18, 2019, which,
along with an attachment, was marked as Applicant's Exhibit 7?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you the same witness who submitted prefiled supplemental testimony in this docket dated August 31st, 2020, which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 72?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to either your prefiled testimony or your supplemental prefiled testimony?
A. I do. In my supplemental testimony, Applicant's 72, at Page 3, Line 1, the word "not" should be deleted so that the sentence reads, "However, no visibility was detected."
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Buscher, can you just repeat what word is to be deleted?

WITNESS BUSCHER: The word "not" should be deleted.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay.
A. I'd also like to update my written testimony to add that Counsel for the Public has
agreed, in Paragraph 5 of a stipulation, marked as Applicant's Exhibit 81, that the information submitted by the Applicant regarding the Project's visual impacts is sufficient to support a finding that the site and facility will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics.
Q. Mr. Buscher, with the corrections and updates you just described, if you were asked the same questions contained in your prefiled testimony and your prefiled supplemental testimony today under oath, would your answers be the same?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you please provide the Committee with a brief summary of your testimony.
A. Again, my prefiled testimony describes the visual impact assessment, or VIA, that I conducted in conjunction with others at T.J. Boyle, as well as the results of that assessment. The VIA included identifying scenic resources in the surrounding area, preparing viewshed analyses to identify areas where the Project would be potentially
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visible, conducting field investigations to confirm viewshed mapping, preparing visual simulations from certain viewpoints, and assessing potential visual impacts. Detailed analysis of the Project's potential visual impact indicated that only two resources, the Pinnacle hiking trails and Mount Monadnock, would be adversely affected by the Project; however, our analysis concluded that the Project would not have an unreasonable adverse effect on either resource. A user-intercept survey of 84 hikers on Mount Monadnock revealed that 50 percent of those hikers could not identify any difference between photo simulations of the Project and photos that did not show the Project, and none could identify that the Project was a solar facility. In addition, the survey documented that the Project would have no discernible effect on the expectations of persons using the resource.

My supplemental testimony discusses efforts to assess the Project's potential impacts on private properties and whether
[WITNESS: MICHAEL J. BUSCHER]
photo simulations of the Project from private properties would be appropriate. We determined that while the viewshed results indicated minor isolated views on private properties in the area, field investigation results and a desktop review of the viewsheds led us to conclude that the likelihood of significant visibility of the Project from private properties was so limited that site visits would be unlikely to result in meaningful photographic images or photo simulation.

My supplemental testimony also discusses the Project's use of different solar panels than those identified in the Application and concluded that, so long as the solar array configurations are at 25 degrees tile or less, and a 12-foot height or less, my visual assessment work will still be valid.

As indicated in my prefiled testimony, it's my opinion that the Project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on the aesthetics of the surrounding area.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Buscher.
[WITNESS: MICHAEL J. BUSCHER]

MS. GEIGER: This witness is available for cross-examination.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney Neville.

MS. NEVILLE: I do not have any questions for this witness.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson, any questions?
DIR. WILSON: I have none.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Mr. Oldenburg?

MR. OLDENBURG: I have no questions. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Pelletier.
MR. PELLETIER: I have none either, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Ms. Duprey.

MS. DUPREY: No questions. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Arvelo.

DIR. ARVELO: No questions.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. I have no questions.

Attorney Iacopino.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
QUESTIONS BY SEC MEMBERS AND COUNSEL:
BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. I just have questions about the Pinnacle hiking trails, Mr. Buscher. You spent a lot of attention in both your report and in your testimony to Mount Monadnock. I'm not all that familiar with the Pinnacle hiking trails. But you do have an opinion that there will be visibility from them; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do they actually go, or do they -- is that -do they actually abut the property for the Project?
A. They do not. They're slightly, if $I$ have my directions correct, northeast of the village of Fitzwilliam.
Q. And these are trails that are maintained by the Town of Fitzwilliam for hiking and
cross-country skiing?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Can you explain to us what the visibility is from these trails and why you haven't addressed it in greater detail?
A. We didn't give it a lot of detail. Unlike Mount Monadnock, where there's a variety of different locations because of the vegetative nature at the top of Mount Monadnock, for the majority of the hiking trails there won't be any -- (connectivity issue)
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. There won't be any visibility for the majority of the hiking trails at Pinnacle. The area that we did identify a view is an isolated location on what's known as Telemark Hill. So it's a very isolated location. You would see it when at that point, but as soon as you move off -- (connectivity issue) (Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. When you would proceed on, you would -- any visibility of the Project would be lost.
Q. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: I have no further
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questions, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Attorney Geiger.

MS. GEIGER: I have nothing
further. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney
Neville?
MS. NEVILLE: Nothing. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
This witness is excused.
And is your last witness ready to proceed?

MS. GEIGER: Our last witness is Matthew Magnusson, and so I would ask that he be allowed into the hearing.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Back on the record. Ms. Robidas, swear in the witness, please.
(WHEREUPON, MATTHEW MAGNUSSON was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

MATTHEW MAGNUSSON, SWORN
DIRECT EXAMINATION
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BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Magnusson. Could you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.
A. Sure. My name is Matthew Magnusson.

M-A-G-N-U-S-S-O-N.
Q. Mr. Magnusson, what is your address?
A. It's 144 County Farm Cross Road in Dover, New Hampshire.
Q. And by whom are you employed, and in what capacity are you employed?
A. I am the owner of Seacoast Economics. It's a economic analysis firm.
Q. Could you please provide a brief summary of your qualifications.
A. Yes. I have a master's of business administration from the University of New Hampshire. I have a master's of computer science from Georgia Tech, both of which are areas that are important to economic analysis. I have over 15 years of experience providing economic research, including four years -- sorry -- including four projects in New Hampshire that were wind facilities, \{SEC 2019-02\} [Day 2] \{09-18-2020\}
[WITNESS: MATTHEW MAGNUSSON]
doing economic impact assessments of those facilities. I've also worked on projects in the state of New Hampshire, including New Hampshire Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Fund, the Renewable Portfolio Standard, and worked for the New Hampshire building program related to energy efficiency.
Q. Mr. Magnusson, did you submit prefiled testimony in this docket dated October 14, 2019, and filed on October 18, 2019, which, along with an attachment, has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 11?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you submit prefiled supplemental testimony in this docket dated August 31st, 2020, which has been marked as Applicant's Exhibit 75?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections or updates to either your prefiled testimony or your supplemental prefiled testimony?
A. I would just like to update my testimony to add that Counsel for the Public has agreed to stipulate, under two stipulations, marked
[WITNESS: MATTHEW MAGNUSSON]

Exhibit 80 and 81 --(connectivity issue)
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. -- that the Applicant has provided information sufficient to support a finding that the site and facility will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region.
Q. And Mr. Magnusson, with that update, if you were asked the same questions contained in your prefiled testimony and your supplemental prefiled testimony today under oath, would your answers be the same?
A. Yes, they would be.
Q. And could you please provide a very brief summary of your testimony.
A. Sure. So when I looked at the economic impact of the Project on the local economy, the regional economy, and the overall state of New Hampshire, what I found was that over a 20-year period the Project is expected to bring 19.5 million in economic value added to the state of New Hampshire. During the development phase, which the Project is currently in, it's expected to support 11
[WITNESS: MATTHEW MAGNUSSON]
full-time-equivalent jobs in New Hampshire. During the construction phase, the Project would be expected to support 95 full-time-equivalent jobs and add $\$ 8$ million in economic value to the state. So that's the period of time where it will have the greatest economic impact. But even after that period, it still has ongoing benefits during its operations period. It's expected to add six to seven full-time-equivalent jobs to the New Hampshire economy.

Based on my analysis, it's my opinion that the Project will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region. The Project has a positive economic impact on both the actual economy and employment, and it also does not adversely impact local or regional property values, tourism or recreation.

In addition, the Project is expected to have a positive impact, economic impact on the Town of Fitzwilliam through the PILOT payment. And that PILOT payment agreement exceeds any potential costs in community
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services or infrastructure to the town.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Magnusson. I have no further questions.

MS. GEIGER: The witness is available for cross-examination.

MS. NEVILLE: I do not have any questions of this witness.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson.
QUESTIONS BY SEC MEMBERS AND COUNSEL:
BY DIR. WILSON:
Q. Could you explain the PILOT payment a little more.
A. Sure. So for the PILOT payment in the economic analysis, the estimate was $\$ 300,000$. So that would be a payment in lieu of taxes. And so that is, based on my understanding, is one that is a reasonable assumption to use. I do understand that there hasn't been an actual PILOT agreement signed with the Town, but that was the figure that seemed appropriate at the time of the economic analysis. And I haven't received any
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information that that still is not a reasonable estimate. Does that help answer your question or...
Q. It does. Is this standard practice with a project like this?
A. How do you mean? To have a PILOT payment or --
Q. Yes.
A. So, in fact, $I$ believe every renewable energy project I've looked at, the PILOT payment is what's used for taxation.
Q. Great.

DIR. WILSON: I have no further questions.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Mr.
Oldenburg.
MR. OLDENBURG: Just a question or two.

BY MR. OLDENBURG:
Q. In the Application, just for reference, on Page ES8, under Economy of the Region, it says that an estimated $\$ 10.4$ million in added economic value to the overall state economy is anticipated as a result of jobs created
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for project construction. And then in your prefiled testimony I think there was a series of corrections or adjustments to that, that now changed the wording to, "During construction, the Project is expected to support 127 full-time-equivalent New Hampshire-based jobs, paying approximately $\$ 10.4$ million in economic value in New Hampshire."

So if I understand right, the Application said we're going to create jobs and add $\$ 10.4$ million in economic value to New Hampshire, but now it's been changed to we're going to support jobs and still have $\$ 10.4$ million in economic value. So how does it -- we're not creating --
A. Oh, sorry. Yeah, that's a good question. I think the appropriate language to use, and probably what should be used consistently, and sometimes it's easy to say "create," but really "support" is the correct term to use. And the reason for that is there may already be firms with existing jobs who get those jobs. So the idea is it does create that
kind of work volume. But whether it actually creates a brand new job or just supports the existing job, you know, that's where I think "support" is the more appropriate term to use. But, you know, it's not really -- I don't think "create" was meant to be misleading. It's more like it creates that work volume. But it could come from new jobs or existing jobs in New Hampshire.

As far as for your question about the discrepancy, so one thing that we did do was work with Counsel for the Public. They hired some economic analysts to review the work, and they provided some good feedback. And based on that feedback, it didn't change any findings materially, but we did adjust the numbers based on some suggestions they made about methodology. We also got new information from NextEra, you know, based on their feedback. And I think that we still got to the same conclusion. We have a number that, you know, what $I$ would say is better refined at this point.
Q. Great. Thank you.
[WITNESS: MATTHEW MAGNUSSON]

MR. OLDENBURG: That's all the questions I have.
A. Yeah, you're welcome.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Mr. Pelletier.

MR. PELLETIER: I'm fine. Thank you. All set.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Ms. Duprey.

MS. DUPREY: No questions. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. And Mr. Arvelo.

DIR. ARVELO: No questions.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I have no questions.

Attorney Iacopino, do you have questions?

BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Just have one question based on Mr. Wilson's request about you to explain the PILOT.

If I understand correctly, the Applicant will seek a PILOT agreement that is going to be something different than what they would

## [WITNESS: MATTHEW MAGNUSSON]

normally pay in ad valorum taxes to the town. Did you have any of that information to determine whether the town would be better off, be receiving more money or less money in taxes through the PILOT?
A. Yeah. So for the purpose of the study, the only assumption made was that 300,000 in PILOT payment. So I didn't look at any alternative scenarios.
Q. So you didn't consider what they might receive if it was not a PILOT and the Applicant paid the standard property tax for Fitzwilliam?
A. That's correct.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I don't have any other questions. I just wanted to make sure that was clear, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Attorney Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: Yes, I have just one follow-up question for clarification.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. GEIGER:
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Q. Mr. Magnusson, $I$ believe in your conversation -- your response to questions from Mr. Wilson, as well from Attorney Iacopino, you talked about a PILOT, or payment in lieu of taxes, made to the Town of Fitzwilliam in the amount of $\$ 300,000$. Is that your testimony?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that would be -- would that be an annual payment, or would that be a total payment?
A. So that's a good question. In the modeling, it was assumed to be an annual payment. That's a good clarification.
Q. Thank you.

MS. GEIGER: I have no further questions.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney
Neville.
MS. NEVILLE: Nothing. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank
you. This witness is excused.
All right. I think that we are done with the Applicant's witnesses. And we had scheduled for Monday at 1:00 another
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[WITNESS: MATTHEW MAGNUSSON]
session.
Attorney Iacopino, is that something that we should cancel at this point, seeing that we're set to resume with Counsel for the Public's witnesses on Tuesday?

MR. IACOPINO: That's correct. We had reserved Tuesday for Counsel for the Public's witnesses. They had, I guess, other obligations, so they could not be here on any of the days that we've scheduled before then. So it looks like we would not have any witnesses to testify on Monday.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. So do either of the parties want to be heard on that, or shall we cancel Monday?

MR. PATCH: Madam Chair, we have no issue with canceling Monday. I think there's an issue, though, on Tuesday, when at least one of the three joint testimony filers for Counsel for the Public can testify. I think Dr. Reynolds can't testify until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, if I understand the communications we've had with Counsel for the Public.
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MS. NEVILLE: That's accurate. So we had scheduled him for 2:00.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: And does that impact the schedule for the day, or can we proceed to start at 9:00?

MR. PATCH: Well, if you were to start at 9:00, I mean, it sounds like we would -- even though the testimony was filed jointly by all three witnesses, we would do a cross on two of the three witnesses, and then presumably -- you know, the estimate I gave for cross at the prehearing conference was two hours for the whole panel. I don't think I'm going to need that much time, given developments since then. But I assume there would be a pretty big gap if we started at 9:00, between 9:00 and 2:00. So I think the question in my mind would be whether we could start, say, at 1 p.m. and finish with that panel on Tuesday afternoon.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney
Neville, does that give you time --
MS. NEVILLE: That's --
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: What was that?
[WITNESS: MATTHEW MAGNUSSON]

I'm sorry.
MS. NEVILLE: Yes, that would be fine.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Starting Tuesday at 1:00 instead of 9:00?

MS. NEVILLE: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Attorney Iacopino, any issue with
that?
MR. IACOPINO: I have no issue with that. I just have a question whether -- will the same invitation that we received for Tuesday work?

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Corrine, my understanding is that it will work all day.

WEB MODERATOR LEMAY: Yes, it will still work. You might get an updated invitation with the change in time.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Is there anything else we need to do before we conclude for the day?
[No verbal response]
MR. PATCH: Madam Chair, could I
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just clarify one thing?
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Yes.
MR. PATCH: In terms of that panel
then on Tuesday, assume that we start with the two panelists that can make it at 1 p.m. and I do the cross of them, would we then proceed to questions, you know, from Committee members, and then presumably at 2:00, or maybe once all of those questions were done, we would bring Dr. Reynolds in, and then $I$ would do the -- obviously, there would be direct first, but then I'd do the cross of Dr. Reynolds, and then questions of him? Is that how we would intend to proceed? I just would like to know for planning purposes.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney
Neville, do you have any thoughts on that? That sounds like it would be the normal procedure to me.

MS. NEVILLE: That's how I
anticipated. Dr. Reynolds will only be speaking to bats. So if it's easy to dissect what you're going to be crossing on, bats
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would be the only thing that he's speaking to, the last witness.

MR. PATCH: Okay. That's fine. I just wanted that clarified.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Attorney
Iacopino, anything on that?
MR. IACOPINO: No.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Well, thank you, everyone. Then we will continue this hearing on Tuesday, September 22nd, at 1 p.m.

MR. PATCH: Madam Chair, sorry to interrupt again. But could we just clarify the record requests that came in today --

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Sure.
MR. PATCH: -- to make sure we have those straight?

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Yes.
MR. PATCH: As I understand it, the Committee would still like a response on the decommissioning amount. But the response at this point is really the additional amount that would be created in the event a waiver wasn't granted.
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CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: That's right.
MR. PATCH: That's one of the record requests.

The second one that I have from my notes is with regard to the phasing plan; is it anywhere in the record. And so that's what I understand to be the second record request. And then --

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Let me just interrupt you quickly. Is it in the record, and if not, if you would submit it, please.

MR. PATCH: Okay. Yes.
And the third one I have, and maybe this is the same as the first, but I have information supporting more than $\$ 900,000$ for the decommissioning.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: That is the same as the first.

MR. PATCH: And then the other one actually came prior to these. But I think Attorney Iacopino asked that we provide the e-mail from DES to confirm that they have the information they needed.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: That's right.
[WITNESS: MATTHEW MAGNUSSON]

That's what I have.
MR. PATCH: Okay. All right. And that's all I have.

MR. IACOPINO: Madam Chair, I thought there was also a record request that they confirm in writing which plans were being replaced by Exhibit 82.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Yes, you had asked that they put it in writing.

MR. PATCH: That's right.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Do you have that one?

MR. PATCH: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Anything else?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Seeing nothing, then we are adjourned for today. Thank you, everyone.
(Whereupon the Day 2 Hearing was
adjourned at 12:10 p.m.)
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