1	
2	Maine Land Use Regulation Commission
3	
4	Public Hearing Concerning
5	Development Permit DP 4889
6	Champlain Wind, LLC
7	Bowers Mountain Wind Project
8	Carroll Plantation, Penobscot County
9	Kossuth Township, Washington County
10	
11	
12	Wednesday, July 6, 2011
13	
14	
15	
16	Held at the Spectacular Event Center
17	
18	395 Griffin Road
19	
20	Bangor, Maine
21	
22	
23	
24	Don Thompson & Associates
25	Court Reporting

(This hearing was taken before Angella D. Clukey,
 Notary Public, at the Spectacular Event Center, 395 Griffin
 Road, Bangor, Maine, Wednesday, July 6, 2011, beginning at
 9:36 a.m.)

* * * * *

6 MS. HILTON: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to -- I 7 guess this is a reconvening of the hearing that we had last 8 week up in Lincoln and it's on Development Permit DP 4889, 9 Champlain Wind LLC's proposed Bowers Mountain wind power 10 project.

5

My name is Gwen Hilton and I'm the commission 11 12 chairperson and presiding officer for this hearing. And I'd like to introduce everyone -- staff and commissioners 13 14 here at the table. And I'm going to ask -- Angella, why 15 don't you introduce yourself as well. 16 MS. CLUKEY: Angella Clukey, court reporter. 17 MR. HAMMOND: Toby Hammond, Naples, Maine. 18 MR. LAVERTY: Ed Laverty, Medford, Maine. 19 MS. KURTZ: Rebecca Kurtz, Phillips, Maine. 20 MR. NADEAU: Jim Nadeau, Winterville Plantation. 21 MR. TODD: Fred Todd, LURC staff. 22 MS. HILTON: Gwen Hilton, Starks. 23 MS. MILLS: Amy Mills, AG's office. 24 MS. CARROLL: Good morning. My name is Catherine Carroll and I am the Commission staff director. 25

MS. HORN OLSEN: Samantha Horn Olsen, LURC staff. MS. HILTON: And we also have Scott Perrow who is providing our recording services here, and Jim Palmer, our scenic expert, over in the -- near the windows there. I think we're going to -- since there's so many folks here, we're going to forego having introduction of individuals in the audience.

8 I do want to thank everyone for being here and, I 9 guess, in particular our State agency representatives who 10 have come here today to assist us in review of this 11 application.

I have my formal opening statement here. Today's hearing is being held pursuant to the provisions of 14 12 M.R.S.A. Section 685-B. The hearing will be conducted 15 in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act and 16 Chapter 5 of the Commission's rules for the conduct of 17 public hearing.

Today's hearing is a continuation of the hearing begun in Lincoln on June 27th and 28th, 2011 to receive testimony on the matter of Development Permit DP 4889 submitted by Champlain Wind, LLC to construct a 69.1 megawatt wind energy development in Carroll Plantation, Penobscot County and Kossuth Township, Washington County.

The purpose of today's session is to provide an opportunity for the commission, staff and parties to ask

questions of review agencies and consultants to assist the commission in determining whether the development proposal meets the criteria for approval as specified in 12 M.R.S.A. Section 685-B(4) and (4-B) of the Commission statutes and the Commission's Land Use Districts and Standards.

6 Representatives of the applicant will first provide a 7 summary of the proposal. Questioning of witnesses may be 8 conducted first by the commission, then by the staff, next 9 by the applicant and then by the intervenors. However, 10 commission members, staff and counsel for the commission 11 may ask questions at any time.

12 All witnesses must be sworn and will be required before 13 they give testimony to state for the record their name, 14 residence, business or professional affiliation, the nature 15 of their interest in the hearing and whether or not they 16 represent another individual, firm or other legal entity 17 for the purpose of the hearing.

In addition to being transcribed, we will be recording the proceedings today, so I request that you speak clearly and not too quickly. All questions and testimony must be relevant to the Commission's criteria for approval for this proposal. Irrelevant or unduly repetitious materials or questions will be excluded.

24The record of this hearing will remain open until25Monday, July 18th to receive written statements from the

interested public and for an additional seven days until
 Monday, July 25th for the purpose of receiving rebuttal
 comments. No additional evidence or testimony will be
 allowed into the record after the closing of the record.

5 Persons attending the hearing who wish to receive a 6 copy of the final action taken by the Commission as a 7 result of this hearing may leave the their names and 8 address with the staff.

9 At this time I would like to swear in any witnesses who 10 plan to testify today. And I guess if you could please 11 stand up and raise your right hand. Is that everyone? All 12 right. Do you solemnly swear to tell the whole truth and 13 nothing but the truth?

14 PARTICIPANTS: I do.

MS. HILTON: All right. Thank you very much. Okay.
So I guess the applicant -- we're looking for a
presentation from you folks. Who's going to do that?

18 MS. PRESCOTT: I am.

19 MS. HILTON: You are. Okay.

20 MS. PRESCOTT: Good morning. I'm Joy Prescott with 21 Stantec. I'm going to provide a brief overview of the 22 project, which will be similar to that which you heard last 23 week.

24 Bowers is being proposed by Champlain Wind, which is a 25 subsidiary of First Wind, who has constructed and is

operating several grid scale projects throughout Maine.
 And it is located in Carroll Plantation in Kossuth
 Township, as you can see on this map here. Unfortunately,
 I don't have my pointer, but it's the same map we showed at
 the hearing last week.

6 But it will be up to 27 turbines located on three lower 7 elevation ridge lines which range in elevation from 750 to 8 1,100 feet. And it will -- each of the turbines will be 9 connected by access roads and there will be 9.8 miles of 10 existing roads and 1.8 miles of improvements to -- sorry, 11 9.8 miles of new roads and 1.8 miles of improvements to 12 existing roads.

And Champlain has conducted a full suite of 13 14 environmental surveys including two seasons of radar bird 15 surveys, two seasons of raptor surveys, three seasons of bat surveys. And these results showed consistent with 16 17 surveys conducted at other locations both in Maine and 18 New England. And we also conducted a full suite of both 19 wetland delineation surveys and vernal pool surveys. And 20 from those surveys there was -- the design was able to 21 avoid most of the impacts to any wetland or vernal pool 22 resources. There is 0.10 acres of wetland fill and 3.79 23 acres of clearing in wetlands, primarily under the 24 electrical collector line.

And the electrical collector line collects power from

25

each of the turbines and then runs north across Route 6 for approximately 5.2 miles to a substation that's located adjacent to Line 56, which was the -- which Line 56 was built for the existing Stetson project.

In addition to those surveys, a suite of both historic 5 architecture and precontact archeological surveys were done 6 7 and found that there would be no impacts to resources in 8 those areas. And in addition, a visual impact assessment 9 was conducted by LandWorks in which they evaluated the 10 scenic resources in the area. And there are two types of 11 scenic resources. One is great ponds of scenic 12 significance, either outstanding or significant. And there is also one historic -- historic -- location on the 13 historic register which does not have visibility. 14

15 There are a total of 14 lakes with scenic significance 16 within 8 miles. And this is probably a good point to point 17 out that at last week's hearing there was a question raised 18 about Pug Lake. And the applicant has consulted with LURC 19 since last week and established that although initially we 20 did not think that -- we thought that Pug Lake was a 21 separate lake and was not scenic significance, we've worked 22 with LURC and Palmer to identify that it is. And yesterday 23 we provided an initial analysis of the visual impact from 24 that location.

And overall there are nine lakes that would have

visibility of turbines within 8 miles, there are four lakes within 3 miles that would have visibility, and there are four lakes within the 3 to 8 miles that would have visibility, and then there are six lakes that would have no visibility within the -- within 8 miles of turbines.

6 LandWorks conducted the analysis and looked at the 7 scenic -- the scenic significance and character of each of 8 those lakes, the existing use and the likely impact of the 9 turbines on those uses. And in summary concluded that 10 there would be no undue adverse effect on any of those uses 11 from the presence of those turbines.

12 In addition to the environmental considerations for the project, Champlain must also demonstrate significant 13 tangible benefit for the host communities and for the 14 15 state. And in this case there are several specific 16 benefits that are included as part of the package. There 17 is a community benefits agreement with Carroll Plantation 18 for \$92,000 for the life of the project and for Kossuth --19 and with Washington Township it's 10,000 for the life of 20 the project. And there will also be an energy fund that is 21 set up for the residents of Kossuth Township that would be 22 funded at \$20,000 initially and then \$15,000 for the life of the project. And, finally, there will be a conservation 23 24 fund that's set up in cooperation with the Forest Society of Maine that is funded at \$120,000 initially and then 25

1 \$20,000 for the life of the project.

And overall the total benefits for the -- this -- for the tangible benefits package over the life of the 20 years of the project would be \$2,845,000.

5 And so in summary, Champlain has developed a project 6 that has limited environmental impact but will provide 7 significant economic impact to both the local community --8 local and regional economy directly and immediately. And 9 with that we look forward to additional discussion this 10 morning.

11 MS. HILTON: Thank you for that presentation. So I'm 12 going to work with Fred here. I guess what we want to do 13 is ask our consultants to -- or our State agency reps to 14 come up to the table and --. I'll let you take it away.

15 MR. TODD: Well, intervenors had an opportunity, as 16 well as the applicant, to request agency representatives or 17 our consultants to be present today for questioning and 18 cross-examination. Intervenors requested the presence of I 19 F & W staff and Jim Palmer. At last week's session in 20 Lincoln there was some question raised by Intervenor 21 Corrigan about potential groundwater impacts from 22 construction activities on Bowers Mountain to the watershed 23 to the south of it. So I posed some questions to both DOC 24 and DEP staff about that potential.

25 I'm going to pass out to the Commission an e-mail that

went to Bob Marvinney and John Hopeck -- Bob Marvinney is with the -- is a state geologist and John Hopeck is at DEP -- regarding the -- the potential for adverse groundwater quality impacts from construction activities on the mountain. I supplied a copy of that e-mail to the parties. I did not bring a lot of copies with me, I just had copies for the Commission.

8 But what I would suggest is the order to proceed here 9 is that we have John Hopeck come up and, basically, 10 articulate what he responded -- how he responded to my 11 question about potential groundwater impacts, and then that 12 we go to I F & W staff on wildlife issues and then to Jim Palmer on scenic issues. I think potentially the questions 13 14 of Jim Palmer will probably take up most of the time today, 15 so I would rather get what I think will be the lesser time-consuming questions out of the way before we go to the 16 17 scenic issues.

18 I would point out that Dave Rocque is also in the 19 audience from the Department of Agriculture, the State soil 20 scientist. The -- none of the intervenors or the applicant 21 asked for him to be here, but he is here in case Commission 22 or intervenors have a question of him. I will not ask him 23 to come up unless somebody says that they actually have a 24 -- they have a question of him. You do, Ed? MR. LAVERTY: Just a quick question. 25

1 MR. TODD: So, actually, maybe we can start with --2 with Dave Rocque. Dave, if you would be willing to come 3 up?

4 MR. ROCQUE: Good morning.
5 MS. HILTON: Good morning. Thank you for being here.
6 MR. ROCQUE: It's hot outside.

8 BY MR. LAVERTY:

7

EXAMINATION OF DAVID ROCQUE

9 Q Dave, I've just got a couple of really quick questions.
10 One came up and as -- I believe it was testimony from the
11 public that was -- concern was raised about blasting in the
12 area associated with various projects that have been
13 approved and the potential for creating or contributing to
14 a major earthquake in Burlington in the recent past.

I know you're -- I mean, you're a soil scientist, but do you see any relationship between blasting on these project sites and earthquakes in the area?

18 I'd have to say that that's not an area that I have any Α 19 expertise in. So I probably would defer that to the state 20 geologist and -- but not -- not be able to answer that. 21 Okay. Thank you very much for that. Could we get in the Q 22 record something from the State geologist? I mean, this 23 really ought to be put to rest, either that or explored. 24 But it just seems that that ought to be --. I had a couple 25 other things.

1 In your review comments you requested -- yeah, you 2 requested that -- well, again, you requested that there 3 should be additional blasting of rock for fill, that that 4 would be taken care of that -- that's why I sort of thought you were the person to answer the blasting question, but I 5 6 understand it. The other is that with regard to rock 7 sandwiches, you -- I love this rock sandwiches and rock 8 burrito thing. Whoever makes these terms up --

9 A Food is good.

10 Q They're wonderful. But you suggested that there be additional rock sandwiches and perhaps burritos used and replace culverts.

13 A Right.

14 Q In your view, were your comments responded to sufficiently 15 by the applicant?

16 The comments that I made regarding those two features I Α 17 think were addressed. One of them was that they didn't really indicate where the rock sandwich was going to be 18 19 used. And they revised their plans and that detail 20 explaining where it should be used, which was something I 21 was very concerned with. I mean, I could look on the maps, 22 figure out where I thought might be a good location, but 23 when you get out into the field, it may be different and 24 there may be places that weren't identified.

25 So they conditioned it to be used in certain locations,

- which was as appropriate. So I -- I think that was
 addressed properly.
- 3 Q Okay. So you feel comfortable with the application as it 4 stands today?

For the most part. There were still a couple of minor 5 Α 6 I -- I did get in touch with the -- the project details. 7 engineer about the lay-down areas because there was no 8 provision for where or how those lay-down areas are going 9 to be constructed. Erosion sediment control, storm water 10 and that kind of stuff and there should have been 11 something.

12 And the engineer indicated that that would be addressed 13 before the project went out for construction.

14 Q And you feel comfortable with that?

15 A Yeah. I mean, it's not rocket science, but it just needs 16 to make sure that there is a procedure and they're not just 17 built inappropriately.

18 Q Okay. So you don't see any loose ends here that need to be 19 addressed, everything seems to be --

20 A I feel pretty -- yeah.

21

MR. LAVERTY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HILTON: I don't have any questions, but I do want to say that we very much appreciate your attention to those details and thorough review that you give of it.

25 MR. LAVERTY: Yeah, it would be hard for us to do this

1 without you.

2 MR. ROCQUE: Well, I am glad to be able to be of 3 service.

MS. HILTON: I think -- do you have anything else?
Anybody else? Okay. Thank you, Dave.

6 MR. LAVERTY: Just another -- no, this is not to Dave. 7 Thank you. I just wanted to say to Fred, there was another 8 issue raised by the public comment and -- that I really --9 I think we need to, again, lay it to rest or pursue. And 10 that was the idea that -- that there's been a number of forest fires -- or fires associated with wind power 11 12 projects where turbines somehow burst into flame and create fire. Either this is an issue or it isn't an issue. And 13 for the public in the Lincoln area, I think we owe to them 14 15 to allay their fears about earthquakes and fires, if those can be allayed. If not, we need to address them. 16

17 MR. TODD: Okay. I did pose that question to the Maine 18 Forest Service. And they have a -- a letter on file that 19 was submitted prior to the record saying that they feel 20 they can deal with potential forest fire danger from any 21 activities around this development site. I put the 22 question to them again because it came up in Lincoln. I 23 said, you know, given -- and there was some recent press 24 coverage about turbines catching fire. And they, 25 basically, said their comments stand, they're not in the

business of fighting -- if a turbine catches on fire, they're not going to rush to put it out. If it starts burning in the brush, that's what they'll pay attention to. But they feel that -- that they're able to deal with what they perceive as potential woods fire from -- from this construction.

7 MR. LAVERTY: So they -- they feel that they're in a
8 position to sufficiently provide for public safety.

9 MR. TODD: Right.

10

MR. LAVERTY: Thank you.

11 MR. TODD: I mean, I -- if you would like, I could get 12 them to put that in writing, but they, basically, said, our 13 opinion is as stated on the record, we don't see the need 14 to add to it.

MR. LAVERTY: That's fine for me. I just -- you know, it was brought up by the people in Lincoln and I think, you know, we needed to make sure it's addressed. And it's been addressed and I think that's sufficient for our purposes. Don't you? Unless somebody else wants to do something.

20 MR. NADEAU: No, I had concerns, too, Ed. And I'm glad 21 to hear that they're the ones that are going to be 22 providing the fire protection because I don't believe that 23 the communities in that area could do that because I don't 24 think they would have the right equipment.

25 MS. HILTON: Is there anywhere in the application where

there is any statement on the part of the applicant as to what the protocols are if there is a fire associated with one of turbines? I don't know --.

4 MR. TODD: I couldn't say off the top of my head. You 5 could pose that to the applicant.

6 I don't think -- is this on -- I don't MS. BROWNE: 7 think there's anything specific in the application, but 8 it's certainly something we could follow up on during the 9 post-hearing comment section, because it's something we've 10 actually addressed in some of the very early hearings 11 before the Commission. But I think in particular the Kibby 12 project there was substantial discussion about it. So we 13 could certainly provide follow-up on that question.

14 MS. HILTON: I think that would good.

15 MR. LAVERTY: Yeah, that would be good.

16 MS. HILTON: Yeah. Thank you.

MS. MILLS: Amy Mills, AG's office. I just wanted to make sure that the State agency representatives don't leave until we're done with the hearing because the other parties, other than the commissioners and staff, might have questions for you. So if you could just stick around for the morning, that would be great.

MS. HILTON: Is there anything else on either of those two topics that we just spoke about? Okay. Fred, what's next? MR. TODD: I would suggest that we have John Hopeck come up. As I mentioned earlier, I've passed out the -the series of e-mails back and forth between myself and John and Bob Marvinney. The commissioners have that in front of them, the parties have seen it before.

And I do appreciate John coming as a last-minute
arrangement. I didn't contact him until late last week
after we got back to Lincoln. So thanks for coming, John.
MR. HOPECK: Thanks, Fred.

10 MR. TODD: I guess what I would -- what I would suggest 11 we do is if you could just articulate your response to my 12 question.

13 MR. HOPECK: Sure. The sort of general issues related 14 to water quality impacts of construction, particularly with 15 regard to the blasting and other bedrock effects, what 16 we've seen historically, not so much in Maine but in other 17 states where there are larger construction projects, is 18 that groundwater contamination due to blasting itself --19 MS. HILTON: John, I'm sorry to stop you. Can you

state your name and -- for the record and your agency?
 MR. HOPECK: Sure. John Hopeck with the Department of
 Environmental Protection.

MS. HILTON: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry.
MR. HOPECK: Groundwater impacts from blasting usually
have to do with nitrogen compounds in the -- in the

explosives. And typically where we see those, it's improper storage of the explosives, improper disposal of explosive cartons or of wastes, failure to clear up misfires, other things like that that have to do not with the explosives afterward, but more to do with -- with the waste and how that soluble and -- gets into the groundwater there.

8 There was recently a major problem in New Hampshire 9 that was associated with a long duration construction of a 10 road cut and they had some groundwater contamination from the blasting in those areas. But, again, that was an 11 12 explosives storage issue and not an explosives use issue. Certainly there are issues with emissions plants in federal 13 facilities that we know of this Cape Cod and Oregon and 14 15 other places like that where there are nitrate issues and also where there's perchlorate issues. 16

We don't see those -- or have not seen those historically in Maine simply because the volume of explosives used and stored aren't anywhere near what they are and because we do monitor the sites -- we and the fire marshal's office monitor those sites pretty carefully.

ANFO is a very common explosive, it does use fuel oil. So, again, storage is potentially a problem. Usually that's mixed offsite, it's delivered to the site in a truck, loaded into the holes and fired that day, so there's

not a storage issue on site. Again, the actual sort of storage and transport of that is dealt with through the fire marshal's office, but it is routine in -- in Maine for that all to be done offsite. And there are, you know, except for the quarry operation, obviously, not a lot of explosives storage on the site itself.

7 So we don't really anticipate, if the blasting is 8 conducted according to the principles that we go by and 9 that we've recommended to the Commission, that the blasting 10 itself is a major groundwater contamination issue. One 11 thing we do have some concerns about in particular -- not 12 so much down in the flat territories, but in these steeper environments where there's a potential for extended fill 13 14 slopes, where there's the usage for the rock sandwiches, 15 rock burritos, just general slopes of rock fill, is whether or not there's the potential for encountering reactive rock 16 17 in some areas. And -- which is to say rock that could 18 generate acidic drainage or that could leach metals.

We don't have anywhere -- you know, this is not -- it's not West Virginia, it's not Tennessee, it's not the portions of the Miramichi in New Brunswick where that's been an issue. Although, the reason we're concerned is that that belt in the Miramichi area, where in New Brunswick they have had problems, extends down into Maine and, in fact, into some of the area of this project. We

have seen gravel pits and quarries in some areas that have encountered some of this material where it's been a problem. Not a major problem -- again, I say it's not West Virginia, it's not Kentucky, anywhere like that where some of these rocks are major issues, and it's certainly not the mining operations that we see up in New Brunswick.

But it's something we want to be aware of, particularly if those rock types are put into areas where there's a lot of water moving through them, which you have in a fill slope, a rock burrito, a rock sandwich. And so we work with the applicant to do some preliminary surveys, we go out and look at the rock types. And it's not an unmanageable issue. Basically, you have to control the pH.

So where you've encountered them before, it's, 14 15 basically, avoiding putting that into a fill slope, burying that rock type on site. They tend to be pretty discrete, 16 17 small bodies that those rock types can be segregated pretty 18 easily. They tend to be very easily recognized in the 19 field so that the construction crews can recognize them once they're told what to look for. That's what we've seen 20 21 on other sites where this has come up, they're very easy to 22 recognize in the field.

And, again, there are -- there are simple solutions to manage them, whether it's burying them on site so that they're not exposed; if you do have an exposed area, putting limestone rip rap in the drain instead of just other kinds of rip rap so that the limestone will raise the pH and prevent the -- the issues. And, again, it's not a major issue, but it is something that where these rock types might be put into a setting where there's the potential for leaching there is a relatively simple measure we can use to prevent that.

8 So far the -- you know, we haven't had a -- and it's an 9 issue on these slopes, basically, because we're dealing 10 with steep slopes. It's -- when you get down to other types of development in more level parts of the landscape, 11 12 you don't have those extensive fill slopes, you don't have the same needs for things -- and certainly we're not 13 encountering the rock type in many other areas of the 14 15 state.

16 At this particular site, even though it is in that same 17 belt, because of the proximity to the large granite body 18 just off to the south of Bowers Mountain, the heating from 19 that has altered many of these minerals to a -- to a more 20 stable form so that we are less concerned about the 21 potential for leaching that we might be at another setting. 22 But, again, there are -- unusual things happen and so the 23 applicant here is going to be using the same principle, 24 same sort of method, same sort of field review of what they encounter during the project, that we have recommended and 25

1 it's, to our experience, worked successfully on other 2 sites.

3 The general issue as far as temperature, certainly, you know, we know that headwater streams are particularly 4 sensitive, that they may be spring fed. Certainly open 5 6 areas do expose the ground to more sunlight and have the 7 potential for, you know, creating warmer conditions, but in 8 Maine in -- and, again, in most locations most of the 9 groundwater is fed by snow melt. And so while the 10 precipitation as rain on the ground, the temperature --11 that may be elevated somewhat. The temperature of the snow 12 melt is going to be, basically, the temperature of melting water regardless of how open the site is. 13

So our experience is that unless it's influenced by a 14 15 discharge from something, a leaking lagoon or something like that, say, the temperature of the groundwater is not 16 17 going to vary that much and the exposed area, compared to 18 the area of the entire watershed, which is going to be 19 contributing a base flow to the streams, is so large that 20 if you -- Dr. Marvinney addressed this point a little bit 21 more specifically. If you look at the heat balance, the 22 effect of opening up this area is going to be small to 23 negligible on the temperature of groundwater in the 24 streams.

25

The temperatures we worry more about are temperatures

of surface water where you have runoff coming off paved 1 2 areas or developed areas. And that's why in this case --3 in this case and, again, in many other cases we encourage people to divert water to buffers -- to forested buffers so 4 that water can filter through the soil and can, you know, 5 6 be cooled, basically. So anybody who's dug a -- not even 7 too deep a hole knows how cool it gets and you don't have 8 to get down too far.

9 So we like to have that water sheeted off the site, 10 allowed to filter down through the soil structure. And if 11 it does have an elevated temperature because it is coming 12 off an open area, it cools down by contact with that.

And if any member of the Commission or, Fred, you have other specific issues related to that, I would be happy to try and address them.

MS. HILTON: Commissioner questions? Fred? MR. TODD: So the short answer is if -- if the usual construction precautions are taken in terms of controlling runoff, et cetera, that you don't see either groundwater quality or groundwater temperature being an issue with this particular project.

22 MR. HOPECK: No. I think that based on -- you know, if 23 they follow the recommended procedures and operate in 24 compliance with all the other statutes we have, you know --25 I know our standard is unreasonable adverse impact. So I

would never say no impact, but certainly there would be nothing for us that would qualify as an unreasonable impact, nothing that would adversely impact surface water quality. Certainly there are -- there are a small number of wells in the vicinity of the substation, but none in the area of the turbines or the -- except at the very end of the access road where it joins the Brown Road.

8 So I think that we would -- we would, in our case, make 9 a finding of no unreasonable adverse impact, to use the --10 the DEP technical language.

11

MR. TODD: Thank you.

12 MR. LAVERTY: I quess I do have --. Just to be clear, 13 I mean, from a layman's perspective, okay, it seems to me that one of the concerns here is not only wells, but we're 14 15 looking at, you know, feeder streams for some damn high 16 quality fisheries. And what we're concerned about 17 ultimately is the impact on the fisheries. And so what 18 we're saying is if the applicant follows the protocols 19 recommended by DEP, that we have reason to believe that 20 there will be no adverse impacts -- no unreasonable adverse 21 impacts on fisheries?

22 MR. HOPECK: Yes, that's a reasonable conclusion.

23 MR. LAVERTY: That's where we are?

24 MR. HOPECK: Hm-hmm.

25 MR. LAVERTY: Thank you.

MS. HILTON: I guess that's all the questions we have.
 That was very helpful.

MR. HOPECK: Thank you.

3

4 MS. HILTON: Thank you very much. Okay. I guess the 5 next folks we'd like to hear from are Fish & Wildlife.

MR. TODD: Mark and Steve, thanks for making the trip 6 7 to Bangor today. There are three -- three issues that I 8 wanted to pose questions on. The first one is the issue of 9 lynx habitat, which there have been some correspondence amongst ourselves and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 10 11 And most recently there was a report that was put into the 12 record, I think it was dated mid June -- June 15 or 16, from Stantec to U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service in regards to 13 a question they had posed earlier regarding potentially 14 15 impact to lynx habitat.

My understanding is that U.S. Fish & Wildlife has not had a chance to review that report and comment on it, but I wonder if you folks have had any further conversations with U.S. Fish & Wildlife, or if you, yourself, would care to comment on that report.

21 MR. CARON: Mark Caron, Maine Fish & Wildlife out of 22 the Enfield office. Fred, you're referring to the habitat 23 assessment?

24 MR. TODD: Yes.

25 MR. CARON: Okay. I'll just state for the record that

I F & W didn't request this study, so we're -- you know,
The Service is really the ones that ought to be responding
to this and we understand that they haven't as yet.

4 Another point I just wanted to make is this is a standard request, I believe, that comes from The Service 5 6 for these types of projects. And Stantec can correct me if 7 I'm wrong on that. But the methodology used, I guess my 8 question was, has that been worked out between The Service 9 and the applicant and Stantec so that it's kind of routine 10 and they know what they're asking for or is this something I don't know if it was or not. 11 new?

And then I believe last Tuesday Ms. Prescott had asked in a phone conversation with Mark McCollough if he had had a chance to look at it, the data, I don't remember. He hadn't. I also requested back on Monday, June 27th in a phone call with Mark if he had looked at it then and he hadn't gotten to it yet, so here we are.

18 But with that said, I did review it. The habitat types 19 that were focused on are in line with what lynx habitat and 20 snowshoe hare habitat would be. I did not have any 21 concerns with that. I think the wording -- the Stantec 22 information is -- came right out of other documents that 23 The Service has -- had presented when they described lynx 24 habitat. And I have no reason to -- to disagree with it. 25 And I -- I think what Stantec presented here for the type

of habitats that they were reviewing were fine, they - they're acceptable to I F & W.

3 The methodology that they did use is acceptable to I F & W, photo interpretation to delineate stand-type 4 information. It's similar to what we've used with many 5 projects in the past including lynx survey work in the 6 7 eastern lowlands region. When we did some work there in 8 the past, we -- we did -- we used photo interp, habitat 9 modeling, that sort of a thing. So that's in line with 10 that.

The results focused on current conditions within the 11 12 project area and suggest -- and I was not surprised by the results, small patches of conforming habitat-type scattered 13 throughout. It's -- it's really a hardwood dominated area 14 15 to a large extent. So I wouldn't expect to see a lot of lynx, snowshoe-hare-type habitat in large contiguous blocks 16 17 in there. And the discussion about loss of habitat, there 18 may be some minor loss of habitat related to the 19 construction work. Probably gain -- arguably gain a little 20 bit of habitat, too, over time as things are reforested or 21 come on line.

I guess the only other question I had is -- and I'm not familiar with the -- the arrangement that the applicant has made with landowners there, if there's going to be additional harvesting operations in that greater area or

not. And those are all unknowns that could influence habitat over time. But, again, that's -- I mean, based on what was asked for -- and I'm assuming that Stantec provided what Mark McCollough asked for -- I F & W has no major concerns with this report.

6 MR. TODD: Okay. Thanks. I'm told by our timekeeper 7 that our time is running out for the Commission and staff. 8 But just quickly, what's your understanding between you and 9 the applicant on the status of curtailment of operations 10 for -- to avoid bat -- to minimize bat mortality and the 11 post-construction avian fatality studies?

12 MR. TIMPANO: I'm Steve Timpano, environmental coordinator with Maine Inland Fisheries & Wildlife 13 Department. And we -- as I think was pretty well concluded 14 15 at the Bull Hill project hearing, we have made the recommendation for curtailment or not operating the 16 17 turbines until wind speeds are above 5 meters per second, 18 which is the point at which bat activity diminishes in the 19 vicinity of the project turbines -- or bat activity overall 20 regardless of where it would be, but to minimize the risk 21 of impact to bats that were resident in the area. And so 22 we had made that recommendation.

And Stantec and the applicant worked to develop a curtailment study proposal. And it's -- it's modeled after one that is going to be undertaken at a project in Vermont,

the Sheffield project, Sheffield study, is the way we refer to it. At this point in time we're still awaiting -- and on good terms planning to work with the applicant and develop a final study plan to be implemented when the project is ready to go operational.

6 And the way it's set up right now with the Bull Hill 7 project, half the turbines would be operated at all wind 8 speeds, that is, as soon as there was wind enough to turn 9 them, and that half of them would be held stationary until 10 the wind got above 5 meters per second. And then there 11 would be post-construction mortality studies done in connection with that to determine if, in fact, the -- there 12 was a difference -- an observable difference in mortalities 13 14 with those two replicates.

15 And adding the -- the Bowers project to that study would be very beneficial in increasing the sample size, the 16 17 number of turbines that could be studied. So we agreed to 18 the -- as I say, at this point, until the final plan is 19 developed, I consider it at least a conceptual plan. We 20 agreed that the conceptual outline for the Bull Hill 21 project, we're entirely willing to move forward with that 22 same conceptual planning effort for the Bowers project. 23 And I assume that it would be conditioned in any permit 24 that is subject to final approval by you the Commission or staff, however. So that's where we stand with it. 25

1 MR. LAVERTY: So there's no -- you and the applicant 2 are working cooperatively on this now, there's no 3 difference of opinion, the conceptual -- there may be some 4 devil in its details, but the conceptual plan is agreed upon by you and the applicant; that's your understanding? 5 6 MR. TIMPANO: That's the way we are planning to move 7 forward. It will be a collaborative, cooperative effort. 8 MR. LAVERTY: Thank you.

9 MS. HILTON: Any other questions, commissioners? 10 MR. HAMMOND: Just one. Let's say they do these 11 studies and they find out that there is more fatalities for 12 the -- for the turbines that are turning; is there anything 13 that's going to happen once we know that?

14 MR. TIMPANO: You mean in terms of --

15 MR. HAMMOND: Making all the turbines --

16 MR. TIMPANO: -- project operations?

17 MR. HAMMOND: Yes.

18 MR. TIMPANO: Okay. And that -- I guess that is the 19 crux of it. I mean, once you do the study and reach the determinations from it, then what do you do with it? And 20 21 our intent would be that it would be -- the project would 22 be operated such that turbines were not rotating or causing 23 risk up to whatever -- you know, if it's 5 meters per 24 second wind speed or whatever wind speed we study. And that that would be -- become the mode of operation for the 25

1 project curtailment up to asap.

2 MR. HAMMOND: And this is in agreement with the 3 applicant and your --?

4 MR. TIMPANO: Yes, I -- I'm assuming so or they
5 wouldn't be undertaking the studies.

6 MR. HAMMOND: The point is there's no sense having the 7 study if we don't do something with it, right?

8 MR. TIMPANO: Correct.

9 MR. HAMMOND: And so I guess my question would be --10 and perhaps you can help us with it, Fred, but --. If 11 that's the case, I have no problem.

MR. TODD: That's my understanding. I see the applicant shaking -- nodding their head that they're comfortable with that.

15 MR. HAMMOND: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HILTON: I think that is key. And in the Bull Hill project wasn't there such a -- a written agreement? Yeah. Nay.

MS. BROWNE: I mean, just to clarify, in Bull Hill following the hearing the applicant submitted a proposed language for a condition that essentially after the study was completed, the results of the study and any proposed change in operations would be submitted to the Commission for the Commission's review and approval. So there's a mechanism for the Commission to come back and decide ultimately whether adjustments in operation are appropriate
 based on the results of the study.

3 MR. LAVERTY: My assumption is that that similar 4 condition would be attached to this approval; is that 5 correct?

MR. TODD: Yes.

6

7 MR. LAVERTY: Thanks.

8 MS. HILTON: Okay. Any other questions, concerns? 9 Okay. I guess, very good. Thank you very much. So I 10 guess we're going to tackle the scenic issues. And, Jim, 11 if you'd like to come up.

12 So do commissioners want to ask questions first here or 13 shall we have Fred take the lead? I guess we're looking to 14 you to --.

15 MR. LAVERTY: I just wanted to ask -- I had the 16 opportunity to engage, I thought, in pretty interesting 17 dialogue with both Jim and the applicant's visual expert, 18 so I -- at the hearing, previous hearing, I think it was 19 what Tuesday morning, so --. I want to thank you guys for 20 entertaining that kind of -- kind of twisting and curving 21 and up and down, but it was a very interesting discussion I 22 thought, so --. I'm interested in what Fred has to ask.

23 MR. TODD: Okay. I -- I have several questions and I 24 could probably chew up a lot of time. I'm just trying to 25 focus on what seems to be the most important, at least to

1		me.
2		EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER
3	BY N	IR. TODD:
4	Q	Jim, in your report dated June 3rd, the review of the
5		Bowers wind project VIA, there's a table Table 4 on
6		Page 32 which has a number of columns which are there's
7		two columns which are titled VIA. I assume that's
8		LandWorks' VIA; is that correct?
9	A	Yes, that's correct.
10	Q	And the reason I ask that is because the your analysis
11		of the number of turbines visible from the the different
12		lakes there would indicate that there's a potential for
13		visibility from three of the lakes, which they indicate
14		there is no visibility, specifically Horseshoe, Norway and
15		West Musquash.
16		Can you explain why your table has different results?
17	А	Yeah. This table is based solely on a visibility analysis.
18		So in this case, for the VIA column I'm trying to replicate
19		their assumptions. I'm assuming when LandWorks made their
20		final determination it was based on the visibility analysis
21		and fieldwork. And in this table I don't have the
22		benefit of fieldwork. I wouldn't have reported the
23		fieldwork, anyway, it's really related to just the the
24		visibility analysis.
25		But, say, take the the bottom row, the West Musquash

But, say, take the -- the bottom row, the West Musquash

Lake where I'm saying there's one turbine visible, 1 2 somewhere on the lake within the 8-mile distance there's at 3 least one cell where there can be one turbine visible. And it's -- it's actually not likely that that's true because 4 the height that I'm using for vegetation is 45 feet and the 5 6 vegetation along the shoreline is higher than that. So it 7 makes sense to me that LandWorks didn't find any visibility 8 at all.

9 I would be more concerned if I would have found one of 10 these lakes with a dozen -- or a large part of the lake 11 looked like it was going to be visible. Then what would 12 have happened is I would have gone back and asked. And 13 that -- that actually has happened in previous projects 14 where we found errors.

Q Okay. Thank you. On Page 30 of your report, the second paragraph ends with a statement: The guidance to evaluate state or national significant scenic resources with potential views of the turbine tip, as indicated by the topographic visibility analysis, is reasonable and should be adopted by others.

Are you suggesting that the Commission should take the worst case scenario in terms of potential visibility and assume there's no vegetation, that we just simply look at topography.

25 A No. I think -- I think -- what I'm saying here is there's

a procedure the that Maine Historic Preservation Commission is using, which I think originally was posed in Kibby, but I've since checked on and they are doing it. There could be, for instance, a dozen historic sites that are north of this project and we just know they're not going to see anything because of their location.

7 It seems an unnecessary expense to make them go do site 8 evaluations for all of these sites when we -- when we're 9 very confident that because of topography those sites will 10 never have visibility. And that's what I'm saying here, 11 that if a state or nationally significant scenic resource 12 will not be able to see the tip of an upraised blade because of topography -- not vegetation, just topography is 13 going to block it, then we really don't need to do other 14 15 assessments, that that's a pretty simple geometric evaluation and the data -- there's always the potential for 16 17 data error, but the data are pretty reliable for that kind 18 of analysis.

19 Okay. Thank you. One last question. You present an Q 20 intriguing idea on Page 27 in terms of post-construction 21 monitoring. Have you given any thought to how we would do 22 that for scenic impact? Or maybe another way to put it is, 23 do you know of that being done in other -- in other areas? 24 The only study that I know of that made a real attempt to Α 25 use a probability sample for that was done for Searsburg.

1 So there was a survey done before the -- the Searsburg 2 project in Vermont to determine the public's reaction and 3 then a survey done after -- shortly after the project went into operation to see whether or not the original survey 4 was accurate, but also to get an assessment from local 5 6 public how the construction went and were there impacts, 7 for instance, that weren't really being accounted for like 8 trying to get these blades through a village, which in this 9 case -- in the Searsburg case was difficult.

10 In that project people thought that the first survey 11 and the simulations and everything were really quite 12 accurate and had been fairly done and that the project was pretty much what they expected it would be. And it would 13 seem to me useful to at least do that a few more times to 14 15 see whether these methods are working. It's not unlike 16 doing these bird and bat mortality studies, we have no idea 17 whether the calibration is really working or not.

18 Q And really, finally, the big question is, do you feel you 19 could -- you could make a recommendation on whether or not 20 the scenic impact here is unreasonable?

A Well, the -- part of the issue -- I don't feel that the scenic impact to any individual lake is unreasonable. I feel pretty comfortable saying that, understanding that the definition of -- there is no definition of unreasonable that I've been able to find anywhere in court cases or
1 anything. So I guess that really means the Commission gets 2 to decide that -- that definition. The only difficulty 3 that I have is, there's a bunch of lakes here. And I think 4 I criticized the LandWorks' synthesis procedure, which was a simple averaging, just because it -- if you have a couple 5 6 lakes where there's no impact but you've got a dozen lakes 7 where it's really pretty bad, then when you average them, 8 it's not going to reach the level of the -- averaging 9 always will bring the value down.

10 But my, God, oh, ten lakes, a dozen lakes, that's a lot of lakes. And we're starting towards that number in this 11 12 case. We've got a bunch of lakes that are going to get impacted. That's a different kind of cumulative impact --13 or it is a cumulative impact. I don't know how to -- how 14 15 to weigh that. The way that the Wind Act is set up, every 16 significant scenic resource is evaluated separately and 17 there's no guidance on how you do that synthesis.

18 And, I mean, as you know, you're going to talk about 19 cumulative impacts later probably in a different way, but 20 that's not something for which there's a lot of procedures 21 in this country anywhere, let alone for wind turbine 22 projects. So that's a tough one. I don't have a simple 23 answer or a good answer to that. But if we did do 24 follow-up studies, that would be one of things to find out 25 about.

1 And part of the way to look at it might be the extent 2 of exposure, duration. So in these particular lakes, as I 3 understand the opposition's argument, is that they're special because they're linked and that you could get on a 4 three-day trip and, you know, be going through Junior and 5 6 Scraggly Lake and Pug Lake -- the new Pug Lake and, you 7 know, be exposed to it for several days, like, all day 8 long. That's not as bad -- or that's much worse than the 9 Appalachian Trail argument.

10 The Appalachian Trail is just saying that, you know, 11 we're going to get three or four minutes' exposure every hour. And they're, you know, kind of throwing up their 12 hands and did throw up their hands in Redington and that 13 project was turned down. Well, now we've got one where 14 15 there's the -- some potential where there's much longer exposure. And I just don't have -- I don't have enough 16 17 knowledge about use and exposure to be able to evaluate 18 that, we don't have that information. That's the issue, 19 though.

20

MR. LAVERTY: Fred, if I might.

21

EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER

22 BY MR. LAVERTY:

Q Jim, this is a question that obviously we need to -- that Amy needs to address and we need to mull over. But you -you have spent some time with the statute in attempts to

interpret, you know, the terms of art in a -- in a way that
 allows you to do your job.

I just ask you for your opinion, a lay opinion. Do you think that we have the statutory authority under the Wind Power Act to look at cumulative impact -- cumulative visual impact?

7 Well, I certainly think that you have the statutory Α 8 authority within an 8-mile study area to consider 9 cumulative impact the way that I was just talking about it 10 for these linked lakes or, for that matter, in Highland 11 along the Appalachian Trail there's several places, not 12 just Bigelow where it's going to be visible. So within a project you absolutely do. And there may be ways, you 13 know, to, well, stretch it to make it among projects. 14 15 I don't want to get into this now because we need to talk Q 16 -- we don't have time. One side of this whole discussion 17 about cumulative impacts is that the Legislature has 18 already weighed in and said that there are expedited areas 19 for wind energy and there are nonexpedited areas. These 20 expedited areas have addressed this issue because they 21 provide a different standard for evaluation. The Redington 22 project, this was before the Act, and it now is in a 23 nonexpedited area should a project come forward again, so 24 there's a different standard being applied.

25 Some people have argued -- or a very legitimate

1 position is that the Legislature, when they said, these are 2 expedited areas, they said, this is where wind power will 3 take place and has said that we're going to look at issues of cumulative impact in nonexpedited areas and that we're 4 going to accept sort of clustering in expedited areas. 5 And 6 so that's the way we're going to address this, we're going 7 to have areas where there aren't going to be assessments of 8 this type and there are going to be areas where there are 9 going to be assessments of this type. Do you have any 10 comments on that?

I mean, that wasn't my understanding. My understanding was 11 А 12 that expedited areas were identified because they're not close to a couple extremely sensitive receptors like 13 national parks or, I don't know, some city centers. I 14 15 don't know what the thing said they were. But I don't remember them talking at all about things like clustering 16 17 or -- I think that that's stuff that we brought into the 18 discussion later on the notion that that -- and that's what 19 we're going to talk about later.

20 Q We'll talk about later. I apologize --

21 A That's okay.

22 Q -- for leading into that.

23 A I think that this cumulative impact, that is, many lakes 24 all within the study area which one could assume users may 25 travel from one to the other to the other, I think that that's within your purview. I just don't have a way -given the data, I don't have a way to assess that and I don't have the data to assess that. It's two parts. That's really different than project to project to project as you're walking the Appalachian Trail.

6 That's a different kind of cumulative impact, which is 7 also serious, or the notion that the Appalachian Mountain 8 Club study, I guess that's who it was, did the study of 9 what the impact of fulfilling the State's wind energy goal 10 would be, you know, as sort of painting a patina of wind 11 turbines across the whole state, what's that impact going 12 to be like.

13 MR. LAVERTY: Thank you.

MS. HILTON: We're out of time if we're following our 14 15 schedule here. Fred just -- but I do want to mention something that we haven't talked about that has come up and 16 17 that has been the issue of night lighting. We can either 18 take that up now realizing that we're running over on time 19 or we can allow -- listen to what the applicant and some of 20 the intervenors are going to be asking questions of the 21 various State agencies and it may come up as a part of that 22 discussion. There's no reason why the Commission at any 23 point in time can't ask questions.

24 So would you -- do you want to move along or would you 25 like to address the lighting issues right now?

1 MR. LAVERTY: The thing about the lighting issue is 2 that I thought we already pretty much addressed them? I 3 mean, I think -- you know, Toby's questioning, the dialogue we had the applicant at the -- Tuesday morning's portion of 4 the hearing. You know, I think that we collectively could 5 6 see coming perhaps a condition to the permit talking about, 7 you know, as technology improves that the project be 8 reconsidered in that light given technical fees -- I mean, 9 all the important boilerplate language. But I think that 10 -- I mean, if we need to go into that any further --. MS. HILTON: Okay. Good point. I don't know, Fred, 11 12 any of the commissioners want to -- Rebecca? 13 EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER 14 BY MS. KURTZ: 15 I quess I wanted to just add, I quess it was Ed's question Ο 16 that said -- that asked unreasonable impact and you said 17 not for any individual lake there may not be an 18 unreasonable impact, but for the collective there might be, 19 or you expressed some reservation. Did you take into 20 account night lighting on that when you -- the assessment 21 that you just gave us? 22 Α No. No, I didn't -- I didn't. Part of the problem there 23 is that I don't have any knowledge of night use of these 24 lakes. A resident that -- or the gazebo where we were looking at -- I mean, you weren't, but at Lincoln, isn't 25

from a significant scenic resource. So the way that the Act is written, you know, residents aren't protected under the Wind Energy Act, it would be somebody on the lake using the lake. And I don't have any knowledge of that being a significant thing. But I did not -- I mean, the direct answer is, no.

7 Unfortunately, I wasn't at the hearing on Tuesday so I --Q 8 but I'm looking forward to the -- or the -- the auditory 9 record has been made available to me and I'm waiting for 10 the transcription, but --. And I don't know that you're 11 comfortable answering this, but based on what you saw on, I 12 quess it was Monday night, do you believe that your assessment that you have just given would change if you 13 knew more about night use? 14

15 A Yeah, if, for instance, there was a State campground with 16 the view that we had from Lincoln, that would be probably 17 an unreasonable impact, I think. And that would be for two 18 reasons. One is because it's a pretty strong impact, but 19 also because there's a number of -- you know, more than 20 just a very occasional person being exposed to it.

Part of the difficulty in this case -- it's not that there aren't campsites, there are campsites scattered throughout this area, but it appears to be a very small number irregularly used and there's no firm data that would suggest that it's anything other than that so far. If I

had such data, then my opinion might change and I might
 push harder for mitigation.

I mean, it's my understanding that there -- that these are pretty standard lights and there are other lights that have cutoffs and things like that that may or may not work in the wind turbine situation, but conceptually would help mitigate this situation.

8

EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER

9 BY MS. HILTON:

10 I have one last question and I think it's pretty quick. Is 0 there -- you mentioned the -- that one of the unique things 11 12 about these lakes is that they -- they are connected and -which is -- sort of introduces a little bit of complexity 13 14 to how we look at scenic resources. And I may have missed 15 something here, but is there anywhere that you have seen where there is actually a map -- you know, the AT is a very 16 17 well established trail.

18 A That's right.

19 Q And we've heard in testimony that these lakes are used for 20 canoe trips -- multi-day canoe trips. Have you ever seen 21 anything, you know, advertising or showing a map of this 22 canoe trail, if you will?

23 A It's not set up like a trail. And I think that, actually, 24 we had some testimony from that from the guides that they 25 sort of -- because of the nature of what guides are, they

tailor it to the individual client or two that they take out and what they're looking for. So it's -- they kind of customize their trip. I was interested in this, too, because that's sort of the way that Lawrence presented in his visual impact assessment. I couldn't find such a map, but there were blog sites that talked about the general phenomena.

8 All the lakes aren't connected, but clearly several of 9 them are and they're all controlled with the same dam and, 10 I mean, we experienced that, we went through several lakes. 11 Q Right. Okay.

12 A So it's not advertised that way, it's not something that an 13 individual, like I with my kids, would know and just go. I 14 think it's really accessed primarily by guides so far as I 15 understand the description.

16

MS. HILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LAVERTY: Gwen, if I'm not mistaken -- and this could be something for the staff to pursue is that NRCM's testimony during the public session mentioned some -- at some point these -- these lakes and these trips had been addressed or noted by some publication and I think there might have -- I'm not sure what the testimony was, but there may, in fact, be something like that.

24 MS. HILTON: Yeah. Good point.

25 MR. TODD: There is information in the record submitted

by NRCM on, as I recall, two particular canoe trips from different -- starting from different points amongst these lakes.

I think that's the -- maybe the Maine Flat 4 MR. PALMER: Water Canoe Guide or something like that. But I don't see 5 anything that's sort of separate like the -- the watershed. 6 7 I mean, this has been presented as though this is a unit 8 and -- and that's how the Lawrence VIA presented it. And 9 I'm not able to find anything that would suggest that 10 that's -- that that kind of advertising and marketing is actually occurring. That doesn't mean it doesn't -- that 11 12 the opportunity doesn't exist, I'm just not seeing it.

MS. HILTON: Okay. I think that's clear. Any more questions for Jim? Okay. So how do we --? Okay. I guess would the applicant like to do their cross-examination now and who would you like to cross-examine?

MS. BROWNE: I think what I would like to do is start with Dr. Palmer. We have 45 minutes for cross and what I would like to do is take 25 minutes now, if I could, and then reserve 20 minutes for recross at the end after the other parties have gone.

And I think I will, in the interest of time, probably just question Dr. Palmer and potentially I F & W depending on what issues come up when they're questioned by the other parties.

1 MS. HILTON: Okay. That sounds fine. 2 EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER 3 BY MS. BROWNE: So good morning, Dr. Palmer. 4 Q 5 А Good morning. 6 I appreciate the thoughtfulness of your review and your 0 7 comments in both the hearing last week and prior hearings. 8 It's been a little bit of an evolving process through these projects. 9 10 I want to touch on just a few basic points because they 11 may come up in your cross from the intervenors. And some 12 of these are just technical issues. I think in your report -- and I assume you would agree -- that the visual 13 14 simulations that were done by LandWorks are generally 15 accurate, well constructed visual simulations that provide a good sense of what the project will look like when built? 16 17 Α Yes, I would agree with that. 18 And you think they followed best professional practices in Q 19 preparing those simulations? 20 Yes, I do. Α

21 Q And I think you also stated in your report that although 22 there are some differences of opinion on specific matters, 23 that LandWorks' evaluation has led to an evolution in your 24 thinking about how to apply the criterion under the Wind 25 Energy Act?

A Yes, that's accurate. I'm comfortable with that statement.
Q And I assume that you would agree that the report as
prepared overall, not just the visual simulations, but in
accordance with professional standards and provides a
comprehensive body of information for the Commission and
others to rely on for decision-making?

7 A Yeah, that -- my only hesitancy has to do with the survey 8 and the opportunity of using the survey is to gather data 9 about use and things like that, but LandWorks wasn't really 10 involved centrally in that. But, yes, I think that it was 11 a professionally done -- well done report.

12 Q Okay. And then I want to talk a little bit about

13 visibility. Go ahead.

14 A No, good.

15 Q Because this came up in -- in the table of visibility that 16 you had that compared your assessment and LandWorks' 17 assessment and this also came up on the West Musquash Lake. 18 But as I understand it, you think it would be erroneous to 19 include visibility of turbines that are greater than 8 20 miles away from the scenic resource, right?

A As I understand the Wind Energy Act law, the Commission must consider turbines that are further than 8 miles away as insignificant. And if there isn't a way for them to separate out those turbines from turbines that are within 8 miles, then it's very difficult for the Commission to do

1 what it's legally been asked to do. So the way I would 2 suggest doing that is, in the visibility analysis you just 3 separate, you don't include. Yes, that would be the 4 simplest way. I could think of other ways, but --. 5 So it's -- it's possible that your viewshed map might show Q 6 a potential visibility, but then your analysis of 7 visibility would show no visibility because those turbines 8 are more than 8 miles away? 9 That would be one reason or because you went into the field А 10 and you found out that the trees are higher than you 11 modeled them and so they're screening, right. 12 And I think you had some assumptions about vegetation Q height and this came up in the prior Bull Hill proceeding. 13 And I think you -- you use a default of 40 foot for 14 15 vegetation height in this area, right? 16 Α Yep. 17 0 And LandWorks used a different height, right? 18 Yeah, 5 feet higher. Α 19 But --Q 20 But different, yeah. Α 21 But based on fieldwork, which should inform the -- the Q 22 vegetation height you use in the VIA, right? 23 Correct. Well, I don't know that fieldwork should inform Α 24 that, but it should at least validate that you're modeling 25 vegetation height is not higher than the actual height.

- But, yes, fieldwork would suggest that both 45 and 40 are
 below the typical tree height.
- 3 Q So the VIA would be conservative in terms of its 4 assumptions about visibility?
- 5 A For the -- yes, it would. The only exception to that would 6 be that the VIA gave a 45-foot height to a scrub shrub land 7 class, which won't -- won't be that high. But the 8 practical impact to that is very, very low because there 9 isn't very much of that area.
- 10 Q And I think if you compare your table of visibility to 11 theirs, the differences are insignificant, right? 12 A Well, they're very small. And, actually, they're 13 insignificant because they don't really affect the 14 significant scenic resources.
- 15 Q Right. And then I think you've also said in prior 16 proceedings, but also in your June 3rd report, that if you 17 have visibility of just turbine blades as opposed to the 18 hub, that they oftentimes are not noticeable and they will 19 never be visually dominant; is that correct?

20 A Well, there's certainly never -- a blade will never be 21 visually dominant if it's seen, you know, from several 22 miles. The -- you may be able to optically resolve a small 23 portion of a blade tip, but whether you could recognize it 24 as part of a turbine from the distance of several miles --25 I mean, you may not be able to tell that. Yeah, you have to see a larger portion to be able to know that -- what it is you're looking at. Yep. So a hub -- from an impact point of view, a hub -- the center of the hub is a better -- more important.

5 Q It has a greater potential impact on visibility?

A Yeah, because if you can see the hub, people will really
recognize the turbine as a turbine.

8 Q One of the early potential concerns you identified was the 9 potential for the turbines to loom over the viewer. And 10 then you went on your -- and that concern was articulated 11 before your site visit, right?

12 A Maybe. I'm not absolutely sure of that. But it's 13 certainly -- in other contexts it's something that -- that 14 I've thought about and written about in reviews, so 15 possibly, yes.

And then when you went on your field visit, you 16 Q 17 specifically looked at the potential for turbines to have 18 this since of looming over the observer, right? 19 Right. And we talked about that as a boat, as a group of Α 20 four, trying to understand when that feeling would occur 21 for those of us that were in the boat, correct. 22 Q And as I understand it -- and elaborate if I'm off on this, 23 but as I understand it, where you have, you know, large 24 bodies of water as you do here, the potential for looming 25 is reduced?

A Well, I think that that would be only because you're further away from the turbines. It's that distance, I think, that's -- that's really the factor. In some ways it's increased just because it's an open area and, therefore, the visibility of turbines is going to be greater, but the sense of looming starts to occur as you move toward turbines or any big object.

8 For some time they're sensed as something over there. 9 And at some point you sort of get a feeling that you're 10 getting under them, that they're over you. That's the 11 threshold of where they start to feel looming over you. 12 They're no longer out there, they're above you, they have a 13 different kind of presence.

14 So conceptually it would be possible, it's just that I 15 don't think that we're close enough on any of these lakes 16 to be past that threshold.

17 Q Okay. So it wasn't an issue for this particular project18 with visibility on these lakes, right?

19 A Yeah, that's correct.

Q And then, as I understand it, from your evaluation matrix there are, basically, three lakes that have the potential greatest scenic impact if you look at them individually; and that's Pleasant Lake, Scraggly Lake and Shaw Lake, right?

25 A Yep.

1 And I think with each of those lakes and, in fact, for each 0 2 of the scenic resources of state or national significance 3 within the study area, you concluded that the impact of visibility on use and enjoyment would be low, right? 4 Yeah. Yes. And in part that's because it's my 5 Α 6 understanding that use is very low on these lakes -- on 7 these particular lakes.

- 8 Q Okay. So your -- your understanding is that overall use of 9 the lakes is low, right?
- 10 A On these -- on the lakes that -- those particular lakes.
 11 Bottle Lake, for instance, it's high, but the lakes that
 12 we're talking about.
- 13 Q Well, relatively speaking.
- 14 A Yes. Right. Yes. Well, I -- yeah.
- 15 Q But as I understand it, the Wind Energy Act directs us that 16 visibility alone is not a basis for concluding that there's 17 an undue adverse impact, right?

18 A Correct.

19 Q And that the standard is what is the impact of visibility 20 on scenic character and existing uses related to scenic 21 character, right?

22 A Correct.

23 Q And my understanding from your report is that impact on use 24 and enjoyment is -- I think you refer to it as a bottom 25 line criterion for evaluating scenic impact, right? 1 A Certainly one of them, yes.

Q Well, because, for example, I think what you said was if -even if there were significant visibility, if the visibility wasn't adversely impacting use and enjoyment, we certainly wouldn't want to conclude that the scenic impact was unreasonable?

7 A Correct. Yeah.

8 Q So that what we're really trying to get at is what is the 9 impact of visibility on use and enjoyment of these 10 resources?

- 11 A Hm-hmm.
- 12 Q And that for each of the lakes, including the three with 13 the greatest visibility, your conclusion was that the 14 impact on use and enjoyment was low?
- 15 A Yes, but part of that is because there's very little use.
 16 But, yes, that is my conclusion. Right.
- 17 Q Well -- and part of it is also because of the nature of the 18 use. For example --

19 A Yes.

20 Q -- fishing is -- is probably the most significant use?

21 A Yeah, that's my understanding.

Q And I think that you've testified previously and perhaps written that in general there may be a lesser expectation of scenic quality for fishing as opposed to, for example, paddling or canceing or a greater acceptability of turbines 1 or other --

2	A	It's not the reason it's not a primary reason why people
3		go fishing. People go fishing for other reasons and their
4		focus is closer in, it's not on distant mountains, yeah.
5		That's been my experience, right.
6	Q	And then I think you were obviously, heard the testimony
7		and I think have read the testimony of both the owner of
8		Maine Wilderness Camps on Pleasant Lake, Cathy Whitney?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And you understand that her view was that for users of
11		Pleasant Lake the visibility of turbines would not
12		adversely impact their use and enjoyment?
13	A	I yeah, I heard her testify to that. I don't know
14		whether that's accurate or not, but that's what she
15		believes.
16	Q	And she certainly has experience on that lake and has some
17		basis for drawing conclusions, wouldn't you think?
18	A	Well, she has experience on the lake and basis, but I heard
19		from guides who said that it's going to completely destroy
20		their livelihood, too, and they they have a similar
21		experience and basis to her. I'd really rather do a
22		probability sample and find out what people's experience is
23		like.
24	Q	Well, that's a good question. And, I mean, it leads me to
25		another line of questioning. And I appreciate your desire

1 for empirical data. And I quess what I want to sort of 2 focus on -- and you've advocated for intercept surveys with 3 the use of photo simulations and -- to determine actual 4 users' expectations, right? 5 Α Yep. 6 But you agree that's not a requirement of the Wind Energy Q 7 There are other ways to get to the question of impact Act? 8 on use and enjoyment other than through the use of 9 intercept surveys? 10 I won't deny that there's that possibility. Intercept А 11 surveys are one way to do that, but there may be other 12 ways, correct. And did you have a chance to look at all the material that 13 Q LandWorks relied on when they came to their conclusions 14 15 about impact on use and enjoyment? Well, I certainly read through that part of VIA and I'm 16 А

17 familiar with some of the material and I've written some of 18 that material, so, yeah.

19 Q And if includes, for example, the phone survey done by 20 Portland Research Group, the snowmobile survey done by 21 Portland Research Group, a review of State publications, 22 formal, informal interviews with people in the area?

23 So you'd agree that although there weren't intercept 24 surveys with photo simulations on the lake, as you would 25 have in an ideal world prefer, that there was a substantial 1

body of information on which they did rely?

2 А But I -- I'm not very confident in the applicability of a 3 lot of that information. For instance, it's pretty clear that there's a lot of support for renewable energy 4 generation in northeastern states, I don't disagree with 5 6 that. It's pretty clear there's also a huge NIMBY 7 phenomenon -- what's called the NIMBY phenomenon that as 8 soon as it affects me, I'm against it, even though the week 9 before I knew that it was going to be in my back yard I was 10 for it.

So I don't know what the value of a general survey like 11 12 that is worth or the telephone survey. I mean, yeah, all of these people -- or most of the people that answered the 13 telephone survey claimed that they had seen wind turbines 14 15 somewhere, but it's not clear that they're anything like the wind turbines that are going to be here or that they're 16 17 -- that they're the same distance or that they were seen 18 from a lake, which may be important or I --. I mean, 19 there's just so many problematic variables.

20 So I think that the easiest most direct way -- I'd 21 rather have, you know, 12, 20 responses of people that are 22 really on one of these lakes for specific turbines than a 23 large survey of New England users saying that they support 24 wind energy, which isn't very relevant.

25 Q Well, you read the Baskahegan study, right?

That -- and I like that and it's a strong study. 1 А I did. 2 It falls to the same critique that I had of the snowmobile 3 study, that is, if people are going to react as we've heard from a couple of guides that, you know, they've taken 4 clients out and they're never going to return again because 5 6 they're so upset, those people will not be on the lake, 7 right, because there's wind turbines there now. So you 8 miss those people.

9 Nonetheless, you know, 48 respondents, none of whom 10 when asked, you know, what management problems are there 11 say anything about wind turbines. Instead they talk about 12 things like liter. You know, I'd say that that was a 13 pretty powerful finding, yeah.

14 Q I want to talk for a minute about --

15 A I might also add that from that study we can estimate 16 something about what the usage on those lakes are, which is 17 very helpful.

18 Q It's probably the closest thing we have to a -- certainly 19 in Maine a post-construction study of visibility of 20 turbines?

A Yeah. I mean, it would have been nice if we could have asked about -- specific about turbine questions and I understand it wasn't part of the design. But I do agree with the authors of that study that not having anyone mention those turbines is significant.

1 The particular boat launch that's on Baskahegan Lake 2 was beyond 8 miles, so in part that sort of suggests that 3 the 8-mile zone might be a really well chosen zone. 4 There's two other boat launches where they questioned people and they actually weren't on Baskahegan Lake, they 5 6 were part of that lake system. And I don't know the 7 relative numbers, you know, how people were divided among 8 those three boat launches. But that shouldn't -- the way 9 the study gets titled and referred to gets that all 10 confounded, but it was a good study.

11 Right. And there -- okay. So in the interest of time I'll Q 12 move on. There was a discussion about sort of clustering 13 and -- and wind turbine sprawl. And this gets to your question about even though your conclusion that there's no 14 15 undue adverse impacts on any individual lake, you don't know how to address the cumulative experience of moving 16 17 through the lakes. You agree that sort of reducing -- that 18 there is a scenic benefit to locating turbine wind power 19 projects in proximity to other wind power projects and 20 reducing what we sometimes refer to as wind turbine sprawl, 21 right?

22 A Yes. It's both for the turbines and the infrastructure.
23 Q So there's a benefit to locating this project in this area,
24 which is approximate to the Stetson 1 and Stetson 2
25 projects?

1 A Right.

2 Q And that that has a -- a net positive scenic benefit as 3 opposed to locating it in a more remote area of 4 jurisdiction that may also be home to many scenic lakes? Yes. 5 А 6 I've been told I don't have much time left. Just bear with 0 7 me for one minute. 8 On this question of going through the lakes, do you 9 recall the testimony last week that the AMC Ouiet Waters 10 guide identifies 25 canoe trips in this greater region? 11 Yes. Α 12 Q And that only two of those trips go through any portion of the study area? 13 Yes, I do remember that. 14 Α So that would be an indication that, in fact, the 15 Q 16 publicized multi-lake trips are not predominantly within 17 the study area, right? 18 The publicized ones, yes, that's correct. Α 19 And I didn't bring it with me today, but I had last week --0 20 and I wonder if you're familiar with, the Downeast Lakes 21 Land Trust Water Trail Guide; is that something you've 22 seen? 23 I have not seen that. Α 24 Okay. That also identifies water trail trips, none of 0 which go within the study area, but we can follow-up with 25

1 that.

I guess I will save any follow-up for later. And
thanks again for your thoughtful comments.
A You're welcome.
MS. HILTON: Okay. I guess we're looking at

6 cross-examination by CLF. Did you want --? Okay.

EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER

8 BY MR. MAHONEY:

7

9 Q Good morning. Shawn Mahoney with the Conservation Law
10 Foundation. And I have a question and I'm not sure if
11 you'll be able to help me on it, Dr. Palmer.

But in your discussion about empirical data it brought to mind some empirical data that has been gathered in this watershed area. So let me premise by asking if you're familiar with another issue that has arisen in this area with respect to impacts on guiding and lodges with respect to alewives returning to the St. Croix area. Are you familiar with that?

19 A No, I know what alewives are, but I'm not familiar with any20 study about them.

Q Okay. I guess -- I'm interested just because there was empirical data that was gathered to show -- that showed after a study by State agencies that alewives in the watershed would not compete with other freshwater species. And that empirical data was gathered over a long period of 1 time.

2 In the face of that empirical data, though, there was 3 still opposition to introducing alewives to the area. And so I quess my question really goes to your emphasis on 4 gathering empirical data -- something like the Baskahegan 5 6 study is, I think, a very useful and helpful one, not just 7 for individual projects, but for the process. Have you had 8 any experience, though, similar to this one where empirical data says there's no conflict and yet people are still --9 10 are discounting the empirical data and still saying there's 11 a conflict and an impact?

12 А Yeah, we're trying to close down a nuclear plant in Vermont that's like Maine had and -- and got closed down. And we 13 14 keep getting told that there's no empirical data to say 15 that it's safe and a lot of people are upset about it. Well, I guess my question really goes to, I mean, even with 16 Q 17 empirical data, aren't you still going to have these same 18 types of more emotional visceral responses regardless of 19 empirical data, so there's a limit on -- on the empirical 20 data's usefulness?

A Well, it's -- at some point a policy decision needs to be made. And in some ways the population of Maine has to make a determination through their representatives or at the polls or -- or through the Commission or somehow. And a policy decision includes more than just empirical data.

But I -- I think that we could do -- we can do a lot with empirical data. And scenery assessment is an area where you can go to town meetings all through New England and developers will get up and say, well, I think it's beautiful and beauty is in the eye of the beholder and it's different than everybody. And, in fact, that isn't true.

7 Beauty is in the eye of the beholder and, what you do 8 know, most people agree incredibly in -- in that impact in 9 this particular area, social science is more reliable than 10 the science of forestry. And we make all kinds of 11 decisions in forestry about whether to cut down trees or 12 not. But why shouldn't we rely on the social science to make those decisions, too? Anyway, yeah, I'm going on. 13 14 Sorry.

MR. MAHONEY: Okay. No. Thank you. I appreciate it.That's all. Thank you.

MS. HILTON: Thank you very much. All right. I thinkwe're ready for Corrigan.

MR. MAHONEY: I'm sorry, Chairman Hilton, I may have a
-- one or two other questions for the agencies, I just
wanted to reserve that in case I do. Thanks.

MS. HILTON: All right. Sure.

22

23 MR. CORRIGAN: Dave Corrigan, Fletcher Mountain 24 Outfitter and RealWindInfoForMe.com. I've got a lot of 25 questions for I F & W, but since Mr. Palmer is here, I

1		think we'll just start with him.
2		
3		EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER
4	BY N	MR. CORRIGAN:
5	Q	At the June 28th hearing you recall you and I had a rather
6		lively debate concerning the remarks in my testimony where
7		I said that for anyone to suggest that scenic impacts to
8		some of these places cannot be considered unreasonably
9		adverse simply because they see fewer users is to overlook
10		the entire reason that people come to Maine in the first
11		place. Do you remember that conversation?
12	A	I do.
13	Q	Okay. At that time it appeared to me your contention was
14		that the Expedited Wind Law required that the Commission
15		required the Commission to consider the number of users
16		affected, though you seemed to be at something of a loss as
17		to exactly what number of users that had to be before the
18		impact was considered unreasonable. Does that sound
19		correct?
20	А	The Wind Energy Act does not say how many users, it just
21		says that the number of users needs to be considered,
22		that's correct.
23	Q	Okay. I've read Title 35-A, Chapter 34-A, the Wind Energy
24		Act. And I find criteria such as, the primary siting
25		authority shall consider the existing uses of the

surrounding area and the expectations of the typical 1 2 viewer. I find nothing that says that we have to have some 3 exceptionally high number of users before we consider the impact unreasonably adverse. It seems we have ample 4 testimony in the record speaking to the existing uses of 5 6 the surrounding area and the expectations of the typical 7 user. So can you explain your position that the decision 8 somehow hinges on a certain undefined large number of 9 users?

10 A The extent, duration and -- the extent, nature and duration 11 of potentially affected public uses, in that phrase, which 12 is evaluation Criteria E, I'm assuming extent has to do 13 with number.

14 Q Okay. So that's an assumption. Could that not be assumed 15 just as much it could be the extent of one individual user? 16 A I'm not sure what extent of an individual user means. That 17 sounds like duration to me.

18 Q Okay. So what we're saying is there's an interpretation of 19 law here that you and I are not clear on that, perhaps, is 20 for the Commission to -- to deliberate more on?

21 A Well, certainly the Commission is the ultimate arbitrator
22 --

23 Q All right.

24 A -- with this access --

25 Q Thank you. You testified just a little while ago that you

- believe fishermen have lower visual expectations than other users; is that correct?
- 3 А And -- I mean, more to the point is that people engaged in 4 fishing activity tend to have a lower sensitivity to scenery issues compared to, say, people that are hiking. 5 6 That's your opinion, okay. 0 7 Α No, it's not an opinion, it's a research --8 Q Okay. Are you a professional fishing guide, Mr. Palmer? 9 No, I'm not a professional fishing guide. А 10 Have you dealt with thousands of fishermen on these or Q 11 other similar lakes? 12 No, I can't say that I've dealt with them, but I've А certainly surveyed hundreds. 13 Okay. Perhaps -- would you agree that perhaps the 14 Ο 15 full-time professional guides who have already testified might have a better understanding of the visual 16 17 expectations of the typical fishermen on these lakes than 18 you do? 19 No, I wouldn't agree with that. Α
- 20 Q You would not agree with that?

21 A I would not agree with that.

22 Q Okay. And just one final question. It is it true that 23 you're not a legal expert and you're not retained to 24 interpret the law or to provide legal advice to the 25 commissioners; is that correct?

I'm certainly not a legal expert, that's correct. 1 А I am 2 hired by the Commission to, I think, interpret the Wind 3 Energy Act as it applies to the scenery issues. To actually interpret the law or to provide technical 4 Q assistance for their interpretation? 5 6 It seems to me that I have been asked to interpret what А 7 that means within the context of the scenery. 8 Q So you believe that in this case you are being asked to 9 interpret the law? 10 I think that that's how it began, that's correct. А 11 MR. CORRIGAN: Okay. I thank you for your time and I'd 12 like to move on to I F & W, if we could. 13 MS. HILTON: Okay. Hold on just a moment. Okay. That 14 sounds fine. I guess, Jim, you can -- are there any more 15 questions for Jim? And I'm just asking possibly I guess as follow-up on the part of the applicant, right? 16 17 MS. BROWNE: If possible -- I would like to see how 18 much time I need for I F & W. So is it possible to have 19 the intervenor complete their --? 20 MS. HILTON: Okay. Sounds like a good idea. Why don't 21 -- Jim, you can just stay there and we'll bring I F & W up. 22 Do you want both of the folks --23 MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, please. 24 MS. HILTON: -- from I F & W? Okay. MR. CORRIGAN: As we don't have U.S. Fish & Wildlife 25

1		Service, I think it would be good to have both folks from
2		from I F & W.
3		
4		
5		EXAMINATION OF MARK CARON
6	BY M	MR. CORRIGAN:
7	Q	Hi, guys. Thanks for being here today. I know you've done
8		a lot of research on these issues. A few questions and you
9		two can decide who's the best to answer them as we go.
10		Just to lay some basic background, are you aware that
11		lynx are known to use the area around the proposed Bowers
12		project site? Is The Department aware of that?
13	А	What are you calling the I'm Mark Caron of Inland
14		Fisheries & Wildlife. What are you calling around the
15		project site?
16	Q	Say, south on Route 6 in the general Bowers area.
17	А	We have no confirmed sightings in the project area. We
18		have two confirmed sightings in our lynx database from 2006
19		in Kossuth and 2009 down by Fifth Machias.
20	Q	So it would be fair to say there's evidence in the record
21		of lynx using the general area?
22	А	Yes, historically they've come and gone from this area.
23		It's certainly understood that it's not a stronghold by any
24		stretch, but they're capable of traveling great distances,
25		they will disperse, they will make sallies out of core

- 1 areas up north, come down to places and -- and possibly 2 return, possibly not.
- 3 Q All right. That's very helpful. Thank you. So it is true 4 that there's designated critical lynx habitat north of this 5 project area?
- 6 A According to the Fish & Wildlife Service.
- Q Okay. And are you aware that the tribal lands immediately south of the proposed Bowers site are also managed as lynx habitat by the Passamaquoddies?
- 10 A I'm not aware of that.
- 11 Q Okay. Do you have contact with their -- with their tribal 12 biologists and game wardens, who is where I received this 13 information from?
- 14 A Technically, yes, but we don't often discuss issues. I 15 don't -- I've never talked to them about lynx.

16 Okay. So really you haven't done any real studies on that. Q 17 All right. If we assume that there's critical lynx 18 habitat north of the site and that the tribal lands 19 immediately south of the site are being managed as lynx 20 habitat by the Passamaquoddies, would it be safe to say 21 that building an industrial energy facility on and around 22 Bowers, which divides these critical habitats, could 23 possibly lead to a disruption or even disuse of a critical 24 travel corridor for these lynx?

25 A No, that's not I F & W's opinion.

Q Well, if we have critical habitat on one side of the project and critical habitat on the other, what would be your opinion of traveling back and forth? You just said that the lynx travel great distances in and out of different habitats. Would it be unreasonable to expect them to use both habitats with a travel corridor in between?

8 A I don't -- I don't see where this project would be a
9 barrier to movements of a terrestrial animal that's capable
10 of dispersal or routine movements of hundreds of miles.

- 11 Q Okay.
- 12 A And there are very few confirmed sightings of lynx,13 documentation of the lynx in the area.
- 14 Q Well, there are very few in the record. Has The Department 15 ever done any actual studies to find out if they're in the 16 area?

17 A We surveyed the eastern lowlands biophysical region in --18 well, between 2005 and 2007. And we focused our efforts at 19 the northern edge of the biophysical region. We used --20 Q Could you tell me where that northern edge would be in

21 relation to the project?

A I'm getting to that. We worked -- well, I could tell you the towns -- well, I'll just focus through this. What the strategy was, we took a habitat -- regional habitat model put together by someone named Chris Hoving from the 1 university that suggested lynx were unlikely to occur in 2 the eastern lowlands eco region. And historic observations 3 of lynx in the eco region were also rare. We selected 4 survey areas by working southward from known observations of lynx in the adjacent eco regions, so those regions to 5 6 the north. As a result, we aggregated survey areas in the 7 eco region rather than distributing them -- distributing 8 them throughout the eco region.

So what we did was we focused our efforts where we 9 10 thought lynx were more likely to occur using a 2002 land 11 cover map to identify townships with a higher proportion of conifer forest and regeneration. So -- let's see if I have 12 13 a list. The towns surveyed in the region were La Grange, Hershey Town, T8 R2 WELS, Forks Town area, Woodville, 14 Lakeview, Sebois, Plantation area, Glenwood, T2 R4 WELS, 15 16 Upper Molunkus and Yarmouth, Academy, Grant and T2 R9 NWP. 17 0 Okay. But not Bowers or Kossuth? They were specifically 18 not --

19 A No. And for the reasons I've already stated, we didn't 20 feel that there was much there for lynx habitat and we were 21 more interested in -- in looking adjacent to areas that we 22 knew there was more habitat and potentially more lynx to 23 see if they were indeed moving down through.

24 Q All right. I appreciate that. I would move on to a few25 bat questions if we could. Is it true that The Department

is aware that the northern long-eared bat, the small-footed bat and the little brown bat are currently being considered for fast tracking on the federal endangered species list? A That's our understanding.

5 Q Okay. And is it your understanding that these three 6 species are likely to be listed within the next one to 7 three years depending on paperwork and when official 8 projects go through?

9 A I wouldn't say that it's a done deal. It's been identified
10 and it has to go through a process. And so until it does,
11 it's just something that's out there for consideration.
12 Q Okay. Are you aware that there are serious concerns within
13 the scientific community that some of these species could
14 be extinct within the next 15 years?

15 A That opinion has been made.

Q Okay. Knowing that and knowing that I F & W is still considering allowing the applicant, if approved, to use mitigation protocols that could still result in bat mortality, can you tell me just how many bat deaths The Department would consider acceptable at this -- this project site?

22 A No, we couldn't.

Q You couldn't. Maine I F & W and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service seem to be so concerned about mortality in these species that they're issuing statements to the public to
prevent individual bats from being killed in homes, but you're still saying that some level of mortality seems acceptable at wind facilities.

Is there some explanation as to why it would be okay for wind developments to kill endangered bats, but not for homeowners to kill them?

7 A We understand there will be mortality of both birds and 8 bats associated with wind power projects. What we're 9 trying to do -- and we do it through our pre-construction 10 survey efforts and our post-construction efforts -- is get 11 an understanding about activity, abundance, potential for 12 fatalities at the project sites.

13 Q So we're talking all after the fact?

14 A Well, before we get some idea of -- and we can only really 15 get it down to the guild aspect of -- of bat species. But 16 at present -- I mean, we have limited bat survey work,

17 which is why we do these pre-construction and

post-construction mortality studies. And the next step we're doing is this -- this -- what do they call that, the curtailment effort.

Q Okay. I've just got one more question for I F & W. We've heard a lot from the applicant and the DEP about how this project will not affect water quality in any significant way. Since you guys are basically in charge of fisheries, I'd like to ask you specifically, can you tell me

unequivocally that Maine Department of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife has absolutely no concerns about adverse changes to either surface or groundwater relating to quality, quantity or temperature as a result of the Bowers wind project?

6 MR. TIMPANO: For the record, Steve Timpano. And I 7 quess our regional fisheries biologist that evaluated the 8 project application concluded that the findings -- the 9 proposed construction methodologies, et cetera, and the 10 findings of the Maine Department of Environmental 11 Protection -- and you had John Hopeck here this morning --12 seemed to cover our concerns for any adverse impacts on water quality and/or fisheries resources related within the 13 14 -- the project area.

MR. CORRIGAN: Okay. Thank you very much. And I haveno further questions.

MS. HILTON: Okay. Thank you. Just sort of going
backwards a little bit. Shawn CLF, did you want to ask
these folks any questions?

20 MR. MAHONEY: I don't think we have anything at this 21 point.

22 MS. HILTON: Okay. All right.

23 MR. TODD: Mark, if we could have a copy of the -- the 24 studies that you referenced on lynx habitat evaluation for 25 the record? 1 MR. CARON: The eco regional?

2 MR. TODD: Yeah.

MR. CARON: Do you want the entire report or just -the eco regional studies are for all our rare, endangered and threatened. So we go systematically across the state to these various eco regions and we do all the work that we can, we put together a report. So within that report there's the lynx -- lynx and wolf, actually, were done together.

10 MR. TODD: I guess the portions dealing lynx in this 11 approximate area. It doesn't sound like we need the entire 12 -- it sounds like it's fairly voluminous.

MR. CARON: Right. And for the reason I suggested, the decision was made to just focus on the periphery of known lynx populations and much better, more consistent uninterrupted habitat, versus spending time going down through these other areas where they --. The decision was made, based on resources available, that we're going to get the most for our money and -- and focus where we did.

20 MR. TODD: Okay. If I could see the whole thing, then 21 I can tell you what part of it I would like for the record. 22 MR. CARON: Well, my copy is marked up. If you want a 23 clean copy, I can --.

24 MR. TODD: It doesn't have to happen today, just before 25 the -- the end of the record.

1 MS. MILLS: Amy Mills from the AG's office. Just in 2 particular, the portion that you were reading from today, 3 that would be helpful. And Fred can follow up with you on 4 -- to get those portions.

5 MS. HILTON: Okay. I guess, unless we have questions 6 ourselves, I think the applicant wanted an opportunity to 7 ask further questions.

8 MS. BROWNE: I would of Dr. Palmer. I don't have any 9 questions of I F & W.

MR. HAMMOND: Gwen, we need to be recognized over here, I think for --

12 MS. HILTON: A break? All right.

13 (A discussion was held off the record.)

14 MS. HILTON: Okay. We're going to take a ten-minute 15 and then we'll come back with Jim and the applicant.

16 (Whereupon a recess was held at 11:35 a.m., and the 17 hearing was resumed at 11:49 a.m. this date.)

MS. HILTON: I'd like to pick up where we left off and -- with the applicant. I guess they're re-crossing on Jim Palmer, our scenic expert.

21

EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER

22 BY MS. BROWNE:

Q Thank you. I'm not sure this came up in the testimony last week, but it's reflected in your report and I just wanted to confirm. Your understanding is that these lakes are 1 managed -- the water levels are managed, right, there's 2 drawdown of the water levels?

3 А I don't know about drawdown, but the water level is -- is 4 managed in that several of them are -- the connected ones have one dam that manages that level, correct. 5 6 So the management of water levels is a piece of evidence 0 that these resources are used for human needs as opposed to 7 8 being in a remote, pristine environment, right? 9 I would say that it's neither remote, nor pristine, А 10 correct. 11 And then getting back to this discussion about Q 12 connectivity, the Pleasant Lake and Scraggly Lake and Shaw Lake and -- I know you know where they are, but for the 13 benefit of the Commission, Pleasant Lake is there, which we 14 15 went to on the site visit from the boat launch, Shaw Lake 16 is here, Scraggly Lake is here and we went to Scraggly Lake 17 on the site visit. Those three lakes are not 18 interconnected, correct? 19 You can't take a boat from one to the other, correct. А 20 Right. And then to get from about Bottle Lake to Junior 0 21 Lake, as you may recall, on our site visit we took a 22 relatively circuitous path to get from Bottle to Junior to 23 avoid hitting rocks, right? 24 Α Yes.

25 Q In fact, I don't know about your boat, but our boat hit a

1

25

rock on the way back.

2 A Yeah.

3	Q	And that was in June. And your understanding is that later
4		in the summer the water levels are even lower in that
5		passageway, right?
6	A	I didn't understand that, but it's not going to be higher.
7	Q	Right. So there is some difficulty getting from Bottle to
8		Junior, particularly when those water levels are lower,
9		right?
10	A	You have to do it carefully and it takes time I think,
11		yeah.
12	Q	And when you talk about the experience, maybe over several
13		days, of being in these lakes, when you're in you're not
14		always going to be seeing turbines when you're on the
15		lakes, right?
16	A	Well, it depends on what lakes you're on, but certainly if
17		you you come to shore on a northern edge of one of these
18		lakes, you're going to be under the trees' shadow, so, yes,
19		that would be true.
20	Q	So canoeists and paddlers are going to tend to hug the
21		shore more than be out in the middle of these lakes, which
22		often are pretty windy, right?
23	A	I would expect that that's the case.
24	Q	Did you I assume you heard the testimony about the

Borden report last week. Is that anything that you've

1 looked at?

2 A No, I have not seen the Borden report.

3 Q Are you aware that there was a study that was done looking 4 at the sort of economics of the guiding industry in the 5 Grand Lake Stream area around the time that they were 6 looking at some of these conservation options?

- 7 A I've seen reference to it, but I have not been able to find
 8 the report online, so I'm not -- but, yes, I understand
 9 that such a thing was supposedly done.
- 10 Q And would it surprise you if the results of that report 11 indicated that the sort of gentlemen fishing experience was 12 a declining use in this area?

13 A No, that -- that wouldn't surprise me.

- 14 Q And when we -- we heard a lot of testimony from the guides 15 and some of the lodge owners, but you would agree that that 16 is just -- that they represent the perspective of one
- 17 potential user group of these resources, right?

18 A They -- yes, that would be correct.

19 Q And there are snowmobile users that use the resources in 20 the area, right?

A Yes, but I don't know that they're on a state or nationally scenic resource because those are all on water. But, yeah, there are snowmobilers that use the area. I'm not concerned about them, though, unless they go on the lake.
And oftentimes in the winter they do go on the lakes, 1 right?

2 A So in that case then, yes.

3 Q And, in fact, the snowmobile survey identified a number of 4 people that were familiar with and actually use these lake 5 resources in the winter, right?

A I don't -- I can't say whether they said that they used the
lake resources. They used the area is what I remember,
but, yes.

9 Q And they were, by and large, not concerned with visibility10 of turbines in the viewshed, right?

A That's correct. But as -- I mean, as you know, my critique of that study is this is all interviewing people that are, basically, recreating under turbines and so that's the answer I would expect.

15 But even in the snowmobile survey if there were aspects Q 16 that the users objected to, they would have voiced that. 17 So, for example, I may go and recreate in an area because I 18 like to, you know, swim or fish, even though there may be 19 jet skis using the lake. And if I were interviewed, I 20 might say, I object to jet skis, but I'm still recreating 21 in the area. So the simple fact that these snowmobilers 22 are recreating in the presence of turbines doesn't 23 necessarily mean that they have no objection to turbines, 24 that was something that was elicited through an interview, 25 right?

I mean, in principle I agree with you, but as -- my 1 А 2 understanding is that sort of snowmobile rally, I don't 3 know -- event was literally was under, onsite with these turbines. So that's a little different than saying that 4 somewhere on Pleasant Lake there's a jet ski and I'm 5 6 I wouldn't go fishing on a small lake that had fishing. 7 lots of jet skiers and water skiers on it because it 8 disturbs the fish and so you -- you know, you don't go 9 fishing there.

10 Well, I think what it says is we have to be careful about Q 11 drawing generalized conclusions from any of the sources of 12 data that are out there, whether it's the snowmobiler 13 survey or the testimony of the guides, right? Yes. And, I mean, to support your line a bit more, 14 А 15 designing any survey in the real world there's always shortcomings. And so we -- yeah, that's an issue. 16 17 0 And at some level we need to use our experience and 18 deductive reasoning to draw conclusions from what is 19 necessarily imperfect information, right? 20 Well, probably not you and I, but the commissioners are Α

21 certainly going to have to do that. That's what they get 22 paid the big bucks for.

23 Q But that's certainly the nature of the beast, right?24 A That's correct.

25 Q And in addition to snowmobilers which we've talked about,

1 there are also other user groups that would include ATV 2 users, right, that come and recreate in the area? 3 А Again, I don't know if they're on -- ice fishing would be, 4 for instance, another one, yeah. Yeah, perhaps ATV users. Day users who come and fish for a day and might not use 5 Q 6 quides, might not stay at the lodges? 7 Α Correct. 8 Q Other weekend users who, again, might not stay at the 9 lodges or use guides, right? 10 Correct. Α And I think the -- the testimony as I heard it from the 11 Q 12 quides, was their fear that their customers wouldn't return; is that a fair characterization of some of that 13 14 testimonv? That's my understanding of what they were saying, that's 15 А 16 correct. 17 0 And you would agree there are many other options for good 18 fishing in the area other than the lakes within the study 19 area? 20 I suspect that's true, but I don't have enough experience Α 21 to be able to say all that for certain. Yeah, throughout 22 Maine there's good fishing. 23 Do you think it's fair to say that there's a growing body Q 24 of evidence -- and I think this came up in your questioning maybe in the Bull Hill proceeding, but there's a growing 25

body of evidence that visibility of turbines in the viewshed is not adversely impacting continued recreational use of these resources in the way that people may have feared initially?

I think the growing body of evidence is that people 5 Α 6 interviewed onsite don't expect -- that if the turbines are 7 going to look the way the simulations indicate they're 8 going to look, they don't expect that it will keep them 9 from returning and it will have only a very modest 10 depression on the quality of their experience, but they recognize a more significant -- a bigger decrease in scenic 11 12 quality.

So it will affect scenic quality significantly, but it's not going to affect their experience very much and it's not going to affect the likelihood that they'll return at all.

17 Q So that would be good news with respect to the guides, 18 right?

19 A Except that the guides may be dependent on a type of 20 customer that is more sensitive. And I -- I mean, in that 21 respect I've got to agree with Mr. Corrigan, they have more 22 experience about who their customers are than I do. And I 23 don't -- I don't have any sense about the relative numbers 24 of those people compared to all the other types of users 25 that -- that we've talked about. And I don't have any real 1 knowledge of how much that particular gentleman user, which 2 is maybe an overcharacterization, but that group whether 3 it's shrinking rapidly or stagnant or -- or whatever. I 4 mean, that's all information that it would be nice to know 5 more about, but we don't.

6 Q Well, there are studies that have been conducted where 7 projects have been built and that have looked at the impact 8 of the project on continued recreational use of the area, 9 right? For example, the -- some of the studies relied on 10 by LandWorks, the Prince Edward Island study, there was a 11 Scotland study, the Searsburg study that you're familiar 12 with.

I mean, those are sort of attitude survey studies, to the 13 Α 14 best of my knowledge. Certainly that's what the Searsburg 15 study was. And, yeah, so there's a little before and after 16 kind of thing. And to the best of my knowledge, they have 17 not indicated a collapse of use, for instance. And the 18 Baskahegan study didn't have a pre-study, but had an after 19 study and the people that they interviewed were not, 20 obviously, concerned.

Q Well, actually, in the Baskahegan study, the in-depth interviews that they conducted indicated that there had not been a drop in use of the resource since the project was built, right?

25 A Yes, that's correct.

- Q And, in fact, they commented on continued use by, in fact,
 guides among other user groups, right?
- 3 A Correct.

So there was not only no indication of a collapse of 4 0 recreational use, but there was every indication that the 5 6 visibility of the turbines was simply irrelevant to the 7 continued recreational use of that resource, right? 8 Α It was -- irrelevant is exactly -- probably a good 9 descriptor. It's not -- the turbines are not present in 10 the study, nobody mentions them at all. So, I mean, you

11 might ask people and they would say, oh, I'm shocked, but 12 nobody volunteered any information.

13 Q And do you remember hearing Roger Milliken's testimony last 14 week?

15 A You'll have to refresh me who he was.

16 Q He testified about standing at the boat launch seeing the 17 turbines, first thing he would do is count the turbines and 18 then he would go on fishing or boating or whatever and not 19 give them a second thought, right? Do you recall that? 20 A Yeah, I do recall that.

21 Q And do you recall he also testified that he -- when he was 22 -- first learned about the potential project from First 23 Wind had some of the same fears that have been voiced by 24 the guides about the impact the project would have on a 25 resource that was very dear to him. Do you recall that 1 testimony?

2 A Yes, I do recall that.

3 Q And do you recall that his conclusion once the project was 4 built was that, in fact, his fears were not realized, there 5 was visibility of the turbines, but it didn't change the 6 fishing in Baskahegan Lake, right?

7 A Right.

8 Q And it didn't change the other recreational aspects that9 were so dear to him, right?

10 A Correct.

11 Q And wasn't that a similar outcome in the Searsburg study, 12 which was a study that you were the principal author of, 13 right?

14 A I did the whole study.

Q Okay. So if I mischaracterize something, please -- I will count on you to correct me. But as I understand that, there have been some local concerns voiced about the

18 project before it was built, right?

19 A They were very modest, but that's correct.

20 Q And the post-construction surveys indicated that those --

21 you know, that those concerns hadn't been realized?

22 A That's correct. I would also add that the simulations,

23 which were not as high quality as were given in this study,

24 were judged to be very adequate to have made that

assessment, people thought the simulations were accurate

1

and helpful, all black and white, by the way.

Q So do you think it's fair to say there is a growing body of evidence that visibility of turbines oftentimes has less of an impact on recreational users of these resources than we might fear, looking specifically at the Baskahegan and Searsburg studies?

7 Well, the Searsburg study really wasn't oriented towards Α 8 recreation use. But from everything that we've seen so far 9 -- and mostly it's the intercept -- the best evidence that 10 we have is the intercept studies that have been done -- the 11 five intercept studies that have been done this past 12 year -- that's a fair statement -- that's an accurate statement, it's more than fair. Yeah, I would -- the 13 14 anticipation of people onsite is it's not going to 15 significantly affect their use.

16 MR. HAMMOND: Could I interrupt just for a second? Do 17 any of these studies that we're referring to involve the 18 impact of night lights?

19 MR. PALMER: No.

20 MR. HAMMOND: And on your studies that you're referring 21 to?

22 MS. BROWNE: Not -- I don't believe so.

23 MR. HAMMOND: So this whole conversation is regarding 24 daytime observation and usage, which is half the time? 25 MR. PALMER: Well, it's when the most use -- recreation 1 use occurs.

2 MR. HAMMOND: Unless you happen to be a stargazer, 3 right?

MR. PALMER: Well -- or don't sleep during the night.
But, yeah, I get your point. And, no, I'm not aware of any
study that has investigated the night lighting issue at
all.

8 MR. HAMMOND: I just wanted to highlight there is 9 another area.

10 MR. PALMER: Yeah. I'm also not aware of any night 11 lighting studies on com towers, you know, and how that 12 might affect use.

13 BY MS. BROWNE:

14 Q Just a follow-up on that, the Baskahegan -- actually, 15 there's a fair amount of camping on Baskahegan Lake, right? 16 A That's my understanding.

Q Okay. And then also on the question about stargazing, isn't it your understanding that the nature of the turbine lighting doesn't affect the night viewing of the stars? In other words, it doesn't affect the night sky in terms of ability to -- you know, in the same way that building lights and other sources?

23 A Right, it doesn't give that -- that kind of glow that you 24 get from a city area that -- yes, that's -- the problem is 25 that it sort of attracts one's eye the same way that a mosquito bite -- you know, that you pick at it. It's this thing that you can't not look at, I think, is -- is the -the issue.

4 MS. BROWNE: I'm going to take just one minute, if I 5 will, and I think I'm probably all done.

6 A Okay.

MS. BROWNE: I don't have anything further. Thank you.
MS. HILTON: Okay. Thank you, both. Do commissioners
have anything else? I maybe should ask you that before --.
Okay. Fred has a couple things he wants to enter into the
record.

MR. TODD: The material I asked of Mark Caron regarding lynx habitat evaluation I'm entering as Exhibit 7-E3, and the e-mail -- the chain of e-mails that I circulated a copy of to the Commission between myself, Bob Marvinney and John Hopeck I'm entering as Exhibit 7-F4.

MS. HILTON: Also, I just want to say that there are several issues that have arisen during these hearings that may require some follow-up by the Commission. And I will work with the staff to address those issues, in other words, to get things into the record that need to get into the record through procedural orders.

And then I don't think I have anything else other than the closing statement. I wish to remind everyone that the record of this hearing will remain open until Monday, July 18 to receive written statements from the interested public
 and for an additional seven days until Monday, July 25th
 for the purpose of receiving rebuttal comments.

No additional evidence or testimony will be allowed
into the record after the closing of the record. I wish to
remind the parties that the third procedural order
establishes the process for parties to request permission
to submit additional comments into the record following the
close of today's technical session.

- I declare this hearing closed.

11 (Concluded this hearing at 12:10 p.m. this date.)

1			
2	CERTIFICATE		
3			
4	I, Angella D. Clukey, a Notary Public in and for the State		
5	of Maine, hereby certify that on July 6, 2011, a hearing was		
6	held regarding Bowers Mountain, Development Permit DP 4889; and		
7	that this hearing was stenographically reported by me and later		
8	reduced to typewritten form with the aid of computer-aided		
9	transcription; and the foregoing is a full and true record of		
10	the testimony given by the witnesses.		
11	I further certify that I am a disinterested person in		
12	the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action.		
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand and affix my		
14	seal this 27th day of June 2011.		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20	ANGELLA D. CLUKEY, NOTARY PUBLIC Court Reporter		
21			
22			
23			
24	My commission expires: March 17, 2017		
25			

\$	4
\$120,000 [1] - 8:25	4 [1] - 33:5
\$15,000 [1] - 8:22	4-B [1] - 4:4
\$2,845,000 [1] - 9:4	40 [2] - 49:14, 50:1
\$20,000 [2] - 8:22, 9:1	45 [3] - 34:5, 46:18,
\$92,000 [1] - 8:18	50:1
	45-foot [1] - 50:6
0	48 [1] - 58:9
0.10 [1] - 6:22	- 4889 [4] - 1:5, 2:8, 3:20, 91:6
1	5
1 [1] - 59:24	5 [5] - 3:16, 28:17,
1,100 [1] - 6:8	29:10, 30:23, 49:18
1.8 [2] - 6:10, 6:11	5.2 [1] - 7:2
10,000 [1] - 8:19	56 [2] - 7:3
11:35 [1] - 76:16	
11:49 [1] - 76:17	6
12 [3] - 3:14, 4:3,	
57:21	6 [5] - 1:12, 2:3, 7:1,
12:10 [1] - 90:11	68:16, 91:5
14 [1] - 7:15	685-B [1] - 3:14
15 [2] - 25:12, 72:14	685-B(4 [1] - 4:4
16 [1] - 25:12	69.1 [1] - 3:21
17 [1] - 91:23	
18 [1] - 90:1	7
18th [1] - 4:25	7-E3 [1] - 89:13
	7-F4 [1] - 89:16
2	750 [1] - 6:7
2 [1] - 59:24	
20 [3] - 9:3, 46:20,	8
57:21	
2002 [1] - 71:10	8 [9] - 7:16, 8:1, 8:3,
2005 [1] - 70:18	8:5, 48:19, 48:22,
2006 [1] - 68:18	48:24, 49:8, 59:2
2007 [1] - 70:18	8-mile [3] - 34:2, 39:8,
2009 [1] - 68:19	59:3
2011 [5] - 1:12, 2:3,	•
3:19, 91:5, 91:14	9
2017 [1] - 91:23	9.8 [2] - 6:9, 6:11
25 [2] - 46:19, 60:10	9:36 [1] - 2:4
25th [2] - 5:2, 90:2	
27 [2] - 6:6, 35:20	Α
27th [3] - 3:19, 26:15,	a march 0:4 76:16
91:14	a.m [3] - 2:4, 76:16, 76:17
28th [2] - 3:19, 64:5	ability [1] - 88:21
3	able [14] - 6:20, 11:20,
J	14:2, 15:4, 35:12,
3 [2] - 8:2, 8:3	36:25, 38:17, 46:9,
3.79 [1] - 6:22	50:22, 50:25, 51:1,
30 [1] - 34:15	61:11, 79:7, 82:21
32 [1] - 33:6	above-named [1] -
34-A [1] - 64:23	91:12
35-A [1] - 64:23	absolutely [3] - 39:13,
395 [2] - 1:18, 2:2	51:12, 74:2
3rd [2] - 33:4, 50:16	abundance [1] - 73:11
	academy [1] - 71:16

accept [1] - 40:5 acceptability [1] -54:25 acceptable [4] - 27:2, 27:3, 72:20, 73:3 access [3] - 6:9, 24:7, 65:24 accessed [1] - 45:14 accordance [2] - 3:15, 48:4 according [2] - 19:8, 69:6 account [1] - 42:20 accounted [1] - 36:7 accurate [7] - 36:5, 36:12, 47:15, 48:1, 55:14, 86:25, 87:12 acidic [1] - 19:18 acres [2] - 6:22, 6:23 Act [8] - 43:3, 47:25, 48:21, 53:15, 56:7, 64:20, 64:24, 67:3 act [5] - 3:15, 37:15, 39:5, 39:22, 43:2 action [2] - 5:6, 91:12 activities [3] - 9:22, 10:4, 14:21 activity [4] - 28:18, 28:19, 66:4, 73:11 actual [4] - 19:1, 49:25, 56:3, 70:15 add [4] - 15:14, 42:15, 58:15, 86:22 adding [1] - 29:15 addition [5] - 4:18, 7:5, 7:8, 8:12, 81:25 additional [9] - 5:1, 5:3, 9:9, 12:3, 12:11, 27:25, 90:2, 90:4, 90:8 address [8] - 5:8, 14:16, 23:15, 38:24, 40:6, 41:25, 59:16, 89:20 addressed [11] -12:17, 13:2, 13:12, 13:19, 15:17, 15:18, 16:10, 22:20, 39:20, 42:2, 45:21 adequate [1] - 86:24 adjacent [3] - 7:3, 71:5, 71:21 adjustments [1] - 32:1 administrative [1] -3:15 adopted [1] - 34:20 adverse [12] - 8:10, 10:3, 23:25, 24:9, 24:20, 53:17, 59:15, 64:9, 65:4, 74:2,

74:12 adversely [4] - 24:3, 54:4, 55:12, 83:2 advertised [1] - 45:12 advertising [2] -44:21, 46:10 advice [1] - 66:24 advocated [1] - 56:2 affect [9] - 50:13, 73:23, 83:13, 83:14, 83:15, 87:15, 88:12, 88:19, 88:20 affected [2] - 64:16, 65:11 affects [1] - 57:8 affiliation [1] - 4:14 affix [1] - 91:13 AG's [3] - 2:23, 16:17, 76:1 agencies [4] - 4:1, 41:21, 61:23, 63:20 agency [5] - 3:9, 9:13, 9:16, 16:18, 17:20 aggregated [1] - 71:6 ago [1] - 65:25 agree [16] - 47:13, 47:17, 48:2, 56:6, 56:23, 58:23, 59:17, 63:8, 66:14, 66:19, 66:20, 66:21, 79:15, 81:1, 82:17, 83:21 agreed [3] - 29:17, 29:20, 30:4 agreement [3] - 8:17, 31:2, 31:17 Agriculture [1] - 10:19 ahead [2] - 17:23, 48:13 aid [1] - 91:8 aided [1] - 91:8 alewives [4] - 61:17, 61:19, 61:23, 62:3 allay [1] - 14:15 allayed [1] - 14:16 allow [1] - 41:19 allowed [3] - 5:4, 23:10, 90:4 allowing [1] - 72:17 allows [1] - 39:2 alone [2] - 37:21, 53:16 altered [1] - 21:19 AMC [1] - 60:9 amount [1] - 88:15 ample [1] - 65:4 Amy [4] - 2:23, 16:17, 38:24, 76:1 analysis [10] - 7:23, 8:6, 33:10, 33:17, 33:20, 33:24, 34:19,

35:18, 49:2, 49:6 aNFO [1] - 18:22 Angella [4] - 2:1, 2:14, 2:16, 91:4 ANGELLA [1] - 91:19 animal [1] - 70:9 answer [8] - 11:20, 12:5, 23:17, 37:23, 43:6, 68:9, 80:14 answered [1] - 57:13 answering [1] - 43:11 anticipate [1] - 19:7 anticipation [1] -87:14 anyway [2] - 33:23, 63:13 apologize [1] - 40:20 Appalachian [5] -38:9, 38:10, 39:11, 41:5, 41:7 appeared [1] - 64:13 applicability [1] - 57:2 applicant [31] - 4:6, 4:9, 5:16, 7:18, 9:16, 10:20, 12:15, 16:1, 16:5, 20:11, 21:23, 24:18, 26:9, 27:23, 28:9, 28:23, 29:3, 30:1, 30:5, 31:3, 31:13, 31:20, 41:19, 42:4, 46:15, 67:16, 72:17, 73:22, 76:6, 76:15, 76:19 applicant's [1] - 32:17 application [5] - 3:11, 13:3, 15:25, 16:7, 74:8 applied [1] - 39:24 applies [1] - 67:3 apply [1] - 47:24 appreciate [6] - 13:23, 17:6, 47:6, 55:25, 63:15, 71:24 appropriate [2] - 13:1, 32:1 approval [5] - 4:3, 4:21, 29:24, 31:24, 32.4 approved [2] - 11:13, 72:17 approximate [2] -59:24, 75:11 arbitrator [1] - 65:21 archeological [1] - 7:6 architecture [1] - 7:6 area [65] - 7:10, 11:12, 11:17. 11:18. 14:14. 15:23, 19:23, 19:25, 20:25, 22:17, 22:18, 22:22, 23:12, 24:6,

27:12, 27:14, 27:25, 28:21, 39:8, 39:23, 40:24, 43:23, 49:15, 50:9, 52:4, 53:3, 56:22, 59:23, 60:3, 60:13, 60:17, 60:25, 61:14, 61:15, 61:17, 62:3. 63:2. 63:9. 65:1, 65:6, 68:11, 68:16, 68:17, 68:21, 68:22, 69:5, 70:13, 70:16, 71:14, 71:15, 74:14, 75:11, 79:5, 79:12, 79:20, 79:23, 80:7, 80:17, 80:21, 82:2, 82:18, 82:19, 84:8, 88:9, 88:24 areas [26] - 7:8, 13:7, 13:8, 18:11, 19:17, 20:1, 20:8, 21:14, 22:6, 23:2, 35:23, 39:18, 39:19, 39:20, 40:2, 40:4, 40:5, 40:7, 40:8, 40:12, 69:1, 71:4, 71:6, 71:21, 75:17 arguably [1] - 27:19 argued [1] - 39:25 argument [2] - 38:3, 38:9 arisen [2] - 61:15, 89:18 arrangement [2] -17:7, 27:23 art [1] - 39:1 articulate [2] - 10:10, 17:11 articulated [1] - 51:10 asap [1] - 31:1 aspect [1] - 73:15 aspects [2] - 80:15, 86.98 assess [2] - 41:2, 41:3 assessment [10] - 7:8, 25:23, 36:5, 42:20, 43:13, 45:5, 48:16, 48:17, 63:2, 86:25 assessments [3] -35:15, 40:7, 40:9 assist [2] - 3:10, 4:1 assistance [1] - 67:5 associated [5] -11:12, 14:11, 16:2, 18:9, 73:8 Associates [1] - 1:24 assume [8] - 29:23, 33:7, 34:23, 40:24, 47:13, 48:2, 69:17, 78:24 assumed [1] - 65:14

assuming [4] - 28:3, 31:4, 33:19, 65:12 assumption [2] - 32:3, 65:14 assumptions [3] -33:19, 49:12, 50:4 AT [1] - 44:16 attached [1] - 32:4 attempt [1] - 35:24 attempts [1] - 38:25 attending [1] - 5:5 attention [2] - 13:23, 15:3 attitude [1] - 84:13 attracts [1] - 88:25 ATV [2] - 82:1, 82:4 audience [2] - 3:7, 10:19 auditory [1] - 43:8 author [1] - 86:12 authority [3] - 39:4, 39:8, 64:25 authors [1] - 58:24 available [2] - 43:9, 75:18 average [1] - 37:7 averaging [2] - 37:5, 37:8 avian [1] - 28:11 avoid [3] - 6:21, 28:10, 77:23 avoiding [1] - 20:15 awaiting [1] - 29:2 aware [10] - 20:7, 68:10, 68:12, 69:7, 69:10, 72:1, 72:12, 79:3, 88:5, 88:10 В background [1] -68:10 backwards [1] - 74:18 bad [2] - 37:7, 38:8 balance [1] - 22:21 Bangor [3] - 1:20, 2:3, 25.7 barrier [1] - 70:9 base [1] - 22:19 based [8] - 23:22, 28:2, 32:2, 33:17, 33:20, 43:11, 49:21, 75:18 basic [2] - 47:10,

68:10

begun [1] - 3:18 beholder [2] - 63:5, 63:7 believes [1] - 55:15 below [1] - 50:2 belt [2] - 19:23, 21:17 beneficial [1] - 29:16 benefit [6] - 8:14, 33:22, 59:18, 59:23, 60:2, 77:14 benefits [4] - 8:16, 8:17, 9:2, 9:3 best [5] - 47:18, 68:9, 84:14, 84:16, 87:9 better [3] - 51:3, 66:16, 75:15 between [7] - 11:16, 17:3, 26:8, 28:8, 70:7, 70:18, 89:15 beyond [1] - 59:2 big [3] - 36:18, 52:7, 81:22 Bigelow [1] - 39:12 bigger [1] - 83:11 biologist [1] - 74:7 **biologists** [1] - 69:12 biophysical [2] -70:17, 70:19 bird [2] - 6:14, 36:16 birds [1] - 73:7 bit [7] - 22:20, 27:20, 44:13, 47:8, 48:12, 74:18, 81:14 bite [1] - 89:1 black [1] - 87:1 blade [3] - 35:12, 50:20, 50:23 blades [2] - 36:8, basis [4] - 53:16, 50:17 55:17, 55:18, 55:21 blasting [10] - 11:11, Baskahegan [10] -11:16, 12:3, 12:5, 57:25, 59:1, 59:5, 17:15, 17:18, 17:24, 62:5, 84:18, 84:21, 18:11, 19:7, 19:9

88.15

73:16

73:5, 73:8

bear [1] - 60:6

beast [1] - 81:23

began [1] - 67:10

86:6, 87:5, 88:14, block [1] - 35:14 blocks [1] - 27:16 bat [14] - 6:16, 28:10, blog [1] - 45:6 28:18, 28:19, 36:16, boat [10] - 51:19, 71:25, 72:1, 72:2, 51:21, 59:1, 59:4, 72:18, 72:19, 73:15, 59:8, 77:15, 77:19, 77:25, 85:16 bats [4] - 28:21, 73:1, boating [1] - 85:18 Bob [4] - 10:1, 17:4, 89:15 bodies [2] - 20:17, beautiful [1] - 63:5 51:24 beauty [2] - 63:5, 63:7 body [7] - 21:17, 48:5, become [1] - 30:25 57:1, 82:23, 83:1, bedrock [1] - 17:15 83:5, 87:2 boilerplate [1] - 42:9 Borden [2] - 78:25, beginning [1] - 2:3 79.2 bottle [3] - 53:11, 77:22, 78:7 Bottle [1] - 77:20 bottom [2] - 33:25, 53:24 bowers [1] - 1:7 Bowers [14] - 2:9, 5:24, 9:22, 21:18, 29:15, 29:22, 33:5, 68:11, 68:16, 69:8, 69:22, 71:17, 74:4, 91:6 break [1] - 76:12 brief [1] - 5:21 bring [4] - 10:6, 37:9, 60:19, 67:21 brought [3] - 15:16, 40:17, 61:12 Brown [1] - 24:7 brown [1] - 72:2 BROWNE [11] - 16:6, 31:19, 46:17, 47:3, 67:17, 76:8, 76:22, 87:22, 88:13, 89:4, 89:7 Brunswick [3] - 19:21, 19:24, 20:6 brush [1] - 15:3 bucks [1] - 81:22 buffers [2] - 23:4 building [2] - 69:21, 88:21 built [7] - 7:4, 13:17, 47:16, 84:7, 84:24, 86:4, 86:18 Bull [7] - 28:15, 29:6, 29:20, 31:16, 31:19, 49:13, 82:25 bunch [2] - 37:3, 37:12 Burlington [1] - 11:14 burning [1] - 15:3

burrito [2] - 12:8, 20:10 burritos [2] - 12:11, 19:15 burst [1] - 14:12 burying [2] - 20:15, 20.24business [2] - 4:14, 15.1**BY** [11] - 11:8, 33:3, 38:22, 42:14, 44:9, 47:3, 61:8, 64:4, 68:6, 76:22, 88:13 С calibration [1] - 36:17 campground [1] -43:15 camping [1] - 88:15 Camps [1] - 55:8 campsites [2] - 43:22 cannot [1] - 64:8 canoe [6] - 44:20, 44:22, 46:1, 46:5, 60:10 canoeing [1] - 54:25 canoeists [1] - 78:20 capable [2] - 68:24, 70:9 cape [1] - 18:14 care [2] - 12:4, 25:19 careful [1] - 81:10 carefully [2] - 18:21, 78:10 CARON [7] - 25:21, 25:25, 68:5, 75:1, 75:3, 75:13, 75:22 Caron [3] - 25:21, 68:13, 89:12 Carroll [5] - 1:8, 2:25, 3:22, 6:2, 8:17 CARROLL [1] - 2:24 cartons [1] - 18:3 case [16] - 8:15, 10:21, 23:2, 23:3, 24:8, 31:11, 33:18, 34:22, 36:9, 37:12, 43:21, 63:21, 67:8, 78:23, 80:2 cases [2] - 23:3, 36:25 catches [1] - 15:1 catching [1] - 14:24 Catherine [1] - 2:24 Cathy [1] - 55:8 causing [1] - 30:22 cell [1] - 34:3 Center [2] - 1:16, 2:2

center [1] - 51:3

centers [1] - 40:14

centrally [1] - 48:10 certain [3] - 12:25, 65:8, 82:21 certainly [25] - 16:8, 16:13, 18:13, 20:5, 21:13, 22:3, 22:5, 24:1, 24:4, 39:7, 50:20, 51:13, 54:1, 54:5, 55:16, 56:16, 58:18, 65:21, 66:13, 67:1, 68:23, 78:16, 81:21, 81:23, 84:14 CERTIFICATE [1] -91:2 certify [2] - 91:5, 91:11 cetera [2] - 23:19, 74:9 chain [1] - 89:14 Chairman [1] - 63:19 chairperson [1] - 2:12 Champlain [7] - 1:6, 2:9, 3:21, 5:24, 6:13, 8:13, 9:5 chance [3] - 25:17, 26:14, 56:13 change [5] - 31:23, 43:13, 44:1, 86:5, 86:8 changes [1] - 74:2 chapter [2] - 3:16, 64:23 character [3] - 8:7, 53:20. 53:21 characterization [1] -82:13 charge [1] - 73:24 checked [1] - 35:3 chew [1] - 32:24 chosen [1] - 59:3 Chris [1] - 70:25 circuitous [1] - 77:22 circulated [1] - 89:14 city [2] - 40:14, 88:24 claimed [1] - 57:14 clarify [1] - 31:19 class [1] - 50:7 clean [1] - 75:23 clear [7] - 18:3, 24:12, 46:13, 57:3, 57:6, 57:15, 65:19 clearing [1] - 6:23 clearly [2] - 4:19, 45:8 CLF [2] - 61:6, 74:18 client [1] - 45:1 clients [1] - 58:5 close [4] - 40:13, 52:15, 62:12, 90:9 closed [2] - 62:13, 90:10 closer [1] - 55:4

closest [1] - 58:18 closing [3] - 5:4, 89:24, 90:5 club [1] - 41:8 Clukey [3] - 2:1, 2:16, 91:4 CLUKEY [2] - 2:16, 91:19 clustering [3] - 40:5, 40:16, 59:12 cod [1] - 18:14 collaborative [1] -30:7 collapse [2] - 84:17, 85:4 collective [1] - 42:18 collectively [1] - 42:5 collector [2] - 6:24, 6:25 collects [1] - 6:25 column [1] - 33:18 columns [2] - 33:6, 33:7 com [1] - 88:11 comfortable [6] -13:3, 13:14, 31:14, 36:23, 43:11, 48:1 coming [5] - 17:6, 17:8, 23:1, 23:11, 42:6 comment [4] - 14:8, 16:9, 25:17, 25:20 commented [1] - 85:1 comments [10] - 5:3, 12:1, 12:14, 12:16, 14:25, 40:10, 47:7, 61:3, 90:3, 90:8 commission [7] -2:11, 3:25, 4:2, 4:8, 4:10, 91:23 Commission [30] -1:2, 2:25, 4:4, 5:6, 9:25, 10:7, 10:21, 16:11, 19:9, 23:13, 28:7, 29:24, 31:23, 31:25, 34:21, 35:1, 37:1, 41:22, 48:5, 48:21, 48:25, 62:24, 64:14, 64:15, 65:20, 65:21, 67:2, 77:14, 89:15, 89:19 commission's [4] -3:16, 4:5, 4:21, 31:24 commissioner [1] -23:16 commissioners [9] -2:13, 16:20, 17:4, 30:9, 32:12, 42:12, 66:25, 81:20, 89:8

common [1] - 18:22 communities [2] -8:14, 15:23 community [3] - 8:17, 9:7, 72:13 compare [1] - 50:10 compared [4] - 22:17, 48:16, 66:5, 83:24 compete [1] - 61:24 complete [1] - 67:19 completed [1] - 31:22 completely [1] - 55:19 complexity [1] - 44:13 compliance [1] -23:24 compounds [1] -17:25 comprehensive [1] -48:5 computer [1] - 91:8 computer-aided [1] -91:8 conceptual [5] -29:19, 29:20, 29:22, 30:3, 30:4 conceptually [2] -44:6, 52:14 concern [2] - 11:11, 51:10 concerned [9] - 12:21, 19:22, 21:20, 24:16, 34:9, 72:24, 79:24, 80:9, 84:20 Concerning [1] - 1:4 concerning [1] - 64:6 concerns [12] - 15:20, 19:11, 24:14, 26:21, 28:5, 32:8, 51:8, 72:12, 74:2, 74:12, 86:17, 86:21 conclude [1] - 54:5 concluded [5] - 8:9, 28:14, 53:3, 74:8, 90.11 concluding [1] - 53:16 conclusion [5] -24:22, 54:13, 54:16, 59:14, 86:3 conclusions [4] -55:17, 56:14, 81:11, 81:18 condition [3] - 31:21, 32:4, 42:6 conditioned [2] -12:25, 29:23 conditions [2] - 22:7, 27:11 conduct [1] - 3:16 conducted [10] - 3:14, 4:8, 6:13, 6:17, 6:18,

7:9, 8:6, 19:8, 84:6, 84:22 confident [2] - 35:9, 57:2 confirm [1] - 76:25 confirmed [3] - 68:17, 68:18, 70:12 conflict [2] - 62:9, 62:11 conforming [1] -27:13 confounded [1] -59:10 conifer [1] - 71:12 connected [4] - 6:9, 44:12, 45:8, 77:4 connection [1] - 29:12 connectivity [1] -77:12 Conservation [1] -61:9 conservation [2] -8:23, 79:6 conservative [1] -50:3 consider [7] - 29:19, 39:8, 48:22, 64:15, 64:25, 65:3, 72:20 consideration [1] -72:11 considerations [1] -8:12 considered [4] - 64:8, 64:18, 64:21, 72:2 considering [1] -72:17 consistent [2] - 6:16, 75:15 construct [1] - 3:21 constructed [3] -5:25, 13:9, 47:15 construction [21] -9:22, 10:4, 13:13, 15:6, 17:14, 17:17, 18:9, 20:19, 23:18, 27:19, 28:11, 29:11, 35:20, 36:6, 58:19, 73:9, 73:10, 73:17, 73:18, 74:9, 86:20 consultants [3] - 4:1, 9:13, 9:17 consulted [1] - 7:18 consuming [1] - 10:16 contact [3] - 17:7, 23:12, 69:11 contamination [3] -17:18, 18:10, 19:10 contention [1] - 64:13 context [1] - 67:7 contexts [1] - 51:13

contiguous [1] - 27:16 continuation [1] -3:18 continued [4] - 83:2, 84:8, 85:1, 85:7 contributing [2] -11:13, 22:19 control [2] - 13:9, 20:13 controlled [1] - 45:9 controlling [1] - 23:18 conversation [3] -26:13, 64:11, 87:23 conversations [1] -25:18 cool [1] - 23:7 cooled [1] - 23:6 cools [1] - 23:12 cooperation [1] - 8:24 cooperative [1] - 30:7 cooperatively [1] -30:2 coordinator [1] -28:13 copies [2] - 10:6 copy [6] - 5:6, 10:5, 74:23, 75:22, 75:23, 89:14 core [1] - 68:25 correct [36] - 26:6, 31:8, 32:5, 33:8, 33:9, 49:23, 50:19, 51:21, 52:19, 53:18, 53:22, 54:7, 56:12, 60:18, 64:19, 64:22, 66:2, 66:25, 67:1, 67:10, 77:5, 77:10, 77:18, 77:19, 79:18, 80:11, 81:24, 82:7, 82:10, 82:16, 84:25, 85:3, 86:10, 86:16, 86:19, 86:22 correspondence [1] -25:9 corridor [2] - 69:24, 70:6 Corrigan [4] - 9:21, 63:18, 63:23, 83:21 CORRIGAN [7] -63:23, 64:4, 67:11, 67:23, 67:25, 68:6, 74:15 counsel [1] - 4:10 count [2] - 85:17, 86:16 country [1] - 37:21 **County** [4] - 1:8, 1:9, 3:22, 3:23 couple [7] - 11:9,

11:24, 13:5, 37:5,

40:13, 58:4, 89:10 court [2] - 2:16, 36:25 Court [2] - 1:25, 91:20 cover [2] - 71:11, 74:12 coverage [1] - 14:24 create [1] - 14:12 creating [2] - 11:13, 22:7 crews [1] - 20:19 criteria [4] - 4:3, 4:21, 64:24, 65:12 criterion [2] - 47:24, 53:25 critical [6] - 69:4, 69:17, 69:22, 69:23, 70:1, 70:2 criticized [1] - 37:4 critique [2] - 58:2, 80:11 Croix [1] - 61:17 cross [6] - 9:18, 46:15, 46:16, 46:18, 47:11, 61:6 cross-examination [3] - 9:18, 46:15, 61:6 cross-examine [1] -46.16 crossing [1] - 76:19 crux [1] - 30:19 culverts [1] - 12:12 cumulative [11] -37:13, 37:14, 37:19, 39:5, 39:9, 39:17, 40:4, 40:23, 41:6, 59:16 current [1] - 27:11 curtailment [5] - 28:9, 28:16, 28:24, 31:1, 73:20 curving [1] - 32:20 customer [1] - 83:20 customers [2] - 82:12, 83:22 customize [1] - 45:3 cut [2] - 18:10, 63:11 cutoffs [1] - 44:5

D

dam [2] - 45:9, 77:5 damn [1] - 24:15 danger [1] - 14:20 data [24] - 26:14, 35:16, 35:17, 41:2, 41:3, 43:24, 44:1, 48:8, 56:1, 61:12, 61:13, 61:22, 61:25, 62:2, 62:5, 62:9, 62:10, 62:14, 62:17,

62:19, 62:25, 63:2, 81:12 data's [1] - 62:20 database [1] - 68:18 date [2] - 76:17, 90:11 dated [2] - 25:12, 33:4 Dave [7] - 10:18, 11:2, 11:9, 14:5, 14:6, 63.23 DAVID [1] - 11:7 days [4] - 5:1, 38:7, 78:13, 90:2 daytime [1] - 87:24 deal [3] - 14:20, 15:4, 72:9 dealing [2] - 21:9, 75:10 dealt [3] - 19:2, 66:10, 66:12 dear [2] - 85:25, 86:9 deaths [1] - 72:19 debate [1] - 64:6 decide [3] - 31:25, 37:2, 68:9 decision [6] - 48:6, 62:21, 62:25, 65:7, 75:14, 75:17 decision-making [1] -48:6 decisions [2] - 63:11, 63:13 declare [1] - 90:10 declining [1] - 79:12 decrease [1] - 83:11 deductive [1] - 81:18 deep [1] - 23:7 default [1] - 49:14 defer [1] - 11:19 definition [3] - 36:24, 37:2 deliberate [1] - 65:20 delineate [1] - 27:4 delineation [1] - 6:19 delivered [1] - 18:24 demonstrate [1] - 8:13 deny [1] - 56:10 **DEP** [5] - 9:24, 10:2, 24:10, 24:19, 73:22 department [7] -17:21, 28:14, 68:12, 70:14, 71:25, 72:20, 74:1 Department [2] -10:19, 74:10 dependent [1] - 83:19 depression [1] - 83:10 depth [1] - 84:21 described [1] - 26:23 description [1] - 45:15

descriptor [1] - 85:9 design [2] - 6:20, 58:23 designated [1] - 69:4 designing [1] - 81:15 desire [1] - 55:25 destroy [1] - 55:19 detail [1] - 12:19 details [3] - 13:6, 13:24, 30:4 determination [2] -33:20. 62:23 determinations [1] -30:20 determine [3] - 29:12, 36:2, 56:3 determining [1] - 4:2 develop [2] - 28:23, 29:4 developed [3] - 9:5, 23:2, 29:19 developers [1] - 63:4 development [7] - 1:5, 2:8, 3:20, 3:22, 4:2, 14:21, 21:11 Development [1] -91:6 developments [1] -73:5 devil [1] - 30:4 dialogue [2] - 32:17, 42:3 difference [3] - 29:13, 30:3 differences [2] -47:22, 50:11 different [17] - 12:23, 33:11, 33:16, 37:13, 37:19, 39:21, 39:24, 41:4, 41:6, 46:2, 49:17, 49:20, 52:13, 63:6, 70:5, 81:4 difficult [2] - 36:9, 48:25 difficulty [3] - 37:2, 43:21.78:7 diminishes [1] - 28:18 direct [2] - 43:5, 57:20 directly [1] - 9:8 director [1] - 2:25 directs [1] - 53:15 disagree [2] - 26:24, 57.5 discharge [1] - 22:15 discounting [1] -62:10 discrete [1] - 20:16 discuss [1] - 69:14 discussion [11] - 9:9, 16:12, 27:17, 32:21,

59:12, 61:12, 76:13, 77:11 disinterested [1] -91:11 dispersal [1] - 70:10 disperse [1] - 68:25 disposal [1] - 18:2 disruption [1] - 69:23 distance [4] - 34:2, 50:24, 52:2, 57:17 distances [2] - 68:24, 70:4 distant [1] - 55:4 distributing [2] - 71:7 districts [1] - 4:5 disturbs [1] - 81:8 disuse [1] - 69:23 divert [1] - 23:4 divided [1] - 59:7 divides [1] - 69:22 DOC [1] - 9:23 documentation [1] -70:13 documents [1] - 26:22 dominant [2] - 50:19, 50:21 dominated [1] - 27:14 Don [1] - 1:24 done [24] - 7:6, 16:19, 19:4, 29:11, 35:23, 35:25, 36:1, 36:3, 36:12, 47:14, 48:11, 56:19, 56:20, 68:7, 69:16, 70:15, 72:9, 75:8, 79:3, 79:9, 87:10, 87:11, 89:5 down [19] - 13:7, 13:8, 19:12, 19:24, 21:10, 23:8, 23:10, 23:12, 32:21, 37:9, 38:14, 62:12, 62:13, 63:11, 68:19, 69:1, 71:23, 73:15, 75:16 Downeast [1] - 60:20 dozen [4] - 34:10, 35:4, 37:6, 37:10 **DP** [4] - 1:5, 2:8, 3:20, 91:6 Dr [6] - 22:20, 46:18, 46:23, 47:4, 61:11, 76:8 drain [1] - 21:1 drainage [1] - 19:18 draw [1] - 81:18 drawdown [2] - 77:2, 77:3 drawing [2] - 55:17, 81:11 drop [1] - 84:23

39:16, 40:18, 41:22,

due [1] - 17:18 dug [1] - 23:6 duration [5] - 18:9, 38:2, 65:10, 65:17 during [5] - 16:8, 21:25, 45:19, 88:4, 89:18

Ε

e-mail [3] - 9:25, 10:5, 89:14 e-mails [2] - 17:3, 89:14 eared [1] - 72:1 early [2] - 16:10, 51:8 earthquake [1] - 11:14 earthquakes [2] -11:17, 14:15 easiest [1] - 57:20 easily [2] - 20:18 eastern [3] - 27:7, 70:17, 71:2 easy [1] - 20:21 eco [8] - 71:2, 71:3, 71:5, 71:7, 71:8, 75:1, 75:4, 75:6 economic [1] - 9:7 economics [1] - 79:4 economy [1] - 9:8 Ed [3] - 2:18, 10:24, 15:20 Ed's [1] - 42:15 edge [3] - 70:19, 70:20, 78:17 Edward [1] - 84:10 effect [2] - 8:10, 22:22 effects [1] - 17:15 effort [3] - 29:22, 30:7, 73:20 efforts [4] - 70:18, 71:9, 73:10 either [7] - 7:12, 11:23, 14:13, 16:23, 23:19, 41:17, 74:3 elaborate [1] - 51:22 electrical [2] - 6:24, 6:25 elevated [2] - 22:11, 23:11 elevation [2] - 6:7 elicited [1] - 80:24 emissions [1] - 18:13 emotional [1] - 62:18 emphasis [1] - 62:4 empirical [15] - 56:1, 61:12, 61:13, 61:22, 61:25, 62:2, 62:5, 62:8, 62:10, 62:14, 62:17, 62:19, 62:25,

63·2 encounter [1] - 21:25 encountered [2] -20:2, 20:14 encountering [2] -19:16, 21:14 encourage [1] - 23:3 end [3] - 24:6, 46:20, 75.25 endangered [3] - 72:3, 73:5, 75:4 ends [2] - 13:18, 34:16 Energy [8] - 43:3, 47:25.48:21.53:15. 56:6, 64:20, 64:23, 67:3 energy [7] - 3:22, 8:20, 39:19, 41:9, 57:4, 57:24, 69:21 Enfield [1] - 25:22 engage [1] - 32:16 engaged [1] - 66:3 engineer [2] - 13:7, 13:12 England [3] - 6:18, 57:23, 63:3 enjoyment [8] - 53:4, 53:24, 54:4, 54:9, 54:14, 55:12, 56:8, 56:15 enter [1] - 89:10 entering [2] - 89:13, 89:16 entertaining [1] -32:20 entire [4] - 22:18, 64:10, 75:3, 75:11 entirely [1] - 29:21 entity [1] - 4:16 environment [1] - 77:8 Environmental [1] -74:10 environmental [5] -6:14, 8:12, 9:6, 17:22, 28:12 environments [1] -19:13 equipment [1] - 15:24 erosion [1] - 13:9 erroneous [1] - 48:18 error [1] - 35:17 errors [1] - 34:14 essentially [1] - 31:21 established [2] - 7:19, 44.17 establishes [1] - 90:7 estimate [1] - 58:15 et [2] - 23:19, 74:9 evaluate [2] - 34:16, 38:17

evaluated [3] - 7:9, 37:16, 74:7 evaluating [1] - 53:25 evaluation [7] - 35:16, 39:21, 47:23, 52:20, 65:12, 74:24, 89:13 evaluations [1] - 35:8 event [2] - 81:3, 91:12 Event [2] - 1:16, 2:2 evidence [9] - 5:3, 68:20, 77:6, 82:24, 83:1, 83:5, 87:3, 87:9, 90:4 evolution [1] - 47:23 evolving [1] - 47:8 exactly [2] - 64:17, 85:8 EXAMINATION [9] -11:7, 33:2, 38:21, 44:8, 47:2, 61:7, 64:3, 68:5, 76:21 examination [4] -9:18, 42:13, 46:15, 61:6 examine [1] - 46:16 example [6] - 54:2, 54:18, 54:24, 56:19, 80:17, 84:9 except [3] - 19:5, 24:6, 83:19 exception [1] - 50:5 exceptionally [1] -65·3 excluded [1] - 4:23 exhibit [2] - 89:13, 89:16 exist [1] - 46:12 existing [7] - 6:10, 6:12, 7:4, 8:8, 53:20, 64:25, 65:5 expect [6] - 27:15, 70:5, 78:23, 80:14, 83:6, 83:8 expectation [1] -54:23 expectations [5] -56:4, 65:1, 65:6, 66:1, 66:17 expected [1] - 36:13 expedited [6] - 39:18, 39:20, 40:2, 40:5, 40:12, 64:14 expense [1] - 35:7 experience [16] - 22:1, 22:14, 55:5, 55:16, 55:18, 55:21, 55:22, 59:16, 62:8, 78:12, 79:11, 81:17, 82:20, 83:10, 83:14, 83:22 experienced [1] -

expertise [1] - 11:19 expires [1] - 91:23 explain [2] - 33:16, 65.7 explaining [1] - 12:20 explanation [1] - 73:4 explored [1] - 11:23 explosive [2] - 18:3, 18:22 explosives [7] - 18:1, 18:2. 18:5. 18:12. 18:19, 19:6 expose [1] - 22:6 exposed [5] - 20:25, 22:17, 38:7, 43:20 exposure [4] - 38:2, 38:11, 38:16, 38:17 expressed [1] - 42:19 extended [1] - 19:13 extends [1] - 19:24 extensive [1] - 21:12 extent [7] - 27:15, 38:1, 65:10, 65:12, 65:15, 65:16 extinct [1] - 72:14 extremely [1] - 40:13 eye [3] - 63:5, 63:7, 88:25 F face [1] - 62:2 facilities [2] - 18:14, 73:3 facility [1] - 69:21 fact [13] - 19:25, 29:12, 45:23, 53:1, 60:15, 63:6, 73:13, 77:25, 80:3, 80:21, 85:1, 86:4 factor [1] - 52:3 failure [1] - 18:3 fair [7] - 68:20, 82:13, 82:23, 87:2, 87:12, 87:13, 88:15 fairly [2] - 36:12, 75:12 falls [1] - 58:2 familiar [8] - 27:23, 56:17, 60:20, 61:15, 61:18, 61:19, 80:4, 84:11 far [6] - 21:8, 22:3, 23:8, 43:25, 45:14, 87:8 fast [1] - 72:3 fatalities [2] - 30:11, 73:12

45.10

expert [5] - 3:4, 32:17,

66:23, 67:1, 76:20

fatality [1] - 28:11 fear [2] - 82:12, 87:5 feared [1] - 83:4 fears [3] - 14:15, 85:23, 86:4 features [1] - 12:16 fed [2] - 22:5, 22:9 federal [2] - 18:13, 72:3 feeder [1] - 24:15 fees [1] - 42:8 feet [3] - 6:8, 34:5, 49:18 few [6] - 36:14, 47:10, 68:8, 70:12, 70:14, 71:24 fewer [1] - 64:9 field [6] - 12:23, 20:19, 20:22, 21:24, 49:9, 51:16 fieldwork [6] - 33:21, 33:22, 33:23, 49:21, 49:23, 50:1 Fifth [1] - 68:19 fighting [1] - 15:1 figure [1] - 12:22 file [1] - 14:18 fill [7] - 6:22, 12:3, 19:13, 19:15, 20:9, 20:15, 21:12 filter [2] - 23:5, 23:10 final [6] - 5:6, 29:4, 29:18, 29:24, 33:20, 66:22 finally [2] - 8:23, 36:18 findings [2] - 74:8, 74:10 fine [4] - 15:15, 27:1, 47:1, 67:14 fire [9] - 14:13, 14:20, 14:24, 15:1, 15:5, 15:22, 16:2, 18:20, 19:3 fired [1] - 18:25 fires [3] - 14:11, 14:15 firm [2] - 4:16, 43:24 First [2] - 5:25, 85:22 first [8] - 4:6, 4:8, 25:8, 32:12, 36:10, 64:10, 85:17, 85:22 fish [7] - 25:5, 25:10, 25:21, 69:6, 80:18, 81:8, 82:5 Fish [5] - 25:13, 25:16, 25:19, 67:25, 72:23 Fisheries [1] - 68:14 fisheries [8] - 24:16, 24:17, 24:21, 28:13, 73:24, 74:1, 74:7, 74:13

fishermen [3] - 66:1, 66:10, 66:17 fishing [16] - 54:20, 54:24, 55:3, 66:4, 66:8, 66:9, 79:11, 81:6, 81:9, 82:3, 82:18, 82:22, 85:18, 86:6 five [1] - 87:11 flame [1] - 14:12 flat [2] - 19:12, 46:4 Fletcher [1] - 63:23 flow [1] - 22:19 focus [6] - 32:25, 55:4, 56:2, 70:23, 75:14, 75:19 focused [4] - 26:19, 27:11, 70:18, 71:9 folks [7] - 3:5, 5:17, 25:5, 25:18, 67:22, 68:1, 74:19 follow [10] - 16:8, 16:13, 23:23, 37:24, 60:25, 61:2, 67:16, 76:3, 88:14, 89:19 follow-up [7] - 16:13, 37:24, 60:25, 61:2, 67:16, 88:14, 89:19 followed [1] - 47:18 following [3] - 31:20, 41:14, 90:8 follows [1] - 24:18 food [1] - 12:9 foot [1] - 49:14 footed [1] - 72:1 forego [1] - 3:6 foregoing [1] - 91:9 forest [4] - 14:11, 14:18, 14:20, 71:12 Forest [1] - 8:24 forested [1] - 23:4 forestry [2] - 63:10, 63·11 forks [1] - 71:14 form [2] - 21:20, 91:8 formal [2] - 3:12, 56:22 forth [2] - 17:3, 70:3 forward [5] - 9:9, 29:21, 30:7, 39:23, 43:8 Foundation [1] -61:10 four [4] - 8:1, 8:3, 38:11, 51:20 Fred [16] - 2:21, 9:12, 14:7, 16:24, 17:9, 23:13, 23:16, 25:22, 31:10, 32:13, 32:22, 38:20, 41:15, 42:11, 76:3, 89:10 freshwater [1] - 61:24 front [1] - 17:5 fuel [1] - 18:22 fulfilling [1] - 41:9 full [4] - 6:13, 6:18, 66:15, 91:9 full-time [1] - 66:15 fund [2] - 8:20, 8:24 funded [2] - 8:22, 8:25

G

gain [2] - 27:19 game [1] - 69:12 gather [1] - 48:8 gathered [3] - 61:13, 61:22, 61:25 gathering [1] - 62:5 gazebo [1] - 42:24 general [8] - 17:13, 19:15, 22:3, 45:6, 54:23, 57:11, 68:16, 68·21 generalized [1] -81:11 generally [1] - 47:14 generate [1] - 19:18 generation [1] - 57:5 gentleman [1] - 84:1 gentlemen [1] - 79:11 geologist [3] - 10:2, 11:20, 11:22 geometric [1] - 35:15 given [7] - 14:23, 35:21, 41:2, 42:8, 43:13, 86:23, 91:10 glad [2] - 14:2, 15:20 Glenwood [1] - 71:15 glow [1] - 88:23 goal [1] - 41:9 God [1] - 37:10 Grand [1] - 79:5 Grange [1] - 71:13 granite [1] - 21:17 grant [1] - 71:16 gravel [1] - 20:1 great [4] - 7:11, 16:22, 68:24, 70:4 greater [6] - 27:25, 48:19, 51:5, 52:6, 54:25, 60:10 greatest [2] - 52:22, 54:13 grid [1] - 6:1 Griffin [2] - 1:18, 2:2 ground [2] - 22:6, 22:10 groundwater [14] -9:21, 10:3, 10:11,

17:18, 17:24, 18:6, 18:10, 19:10, 22:9, 22:16, 22:23, 23:19, 23:20, 74:3 group [5] - 51:19, 56:20, 56:21, 79:17, 84.2 groups [2] - 82:1, 85:2 growing [4] - 82:23, 82:25, 83:5, 87:2 guess [34] - 2:7, 3:9, 5:10, 5:16, 9:12, 17:10, 24:12, 25:1, 25:4, 26:7, 27:22, 30:18, 31:9, 32:9, 32:10, 32:13, 37:1, 41:8, 42:15, 43:12, 46:14, 56:1, 61:2, 61:5, 61:21, 62:4, 62:16, 67:14, 67:15, 74:7, 75:10, 76:5, 76:19 guidance [2] - 34:16, 37.17 guide [5] - 46:5, 60:10, 60:21, 66:8, 66:9 guides [15] - 44:24, 44:25, 45:14, 55:19, 58:4, 66:15, 79:14, 81:13, 82:6, 82:9, 82:12, 83:17, 83:19, 85:2, 85:24 guiding [2] - 61:16, 79:4 guild [1] - 73:15 guys [3] - 32:19, 68:7, 73:24 Gwen [4] - 2:11, 2:22, 45:17, 76:10 н

habitat [27] - 25:9, 25:15, 25:22, 26:18, 26:19, 26:20, 26:24, 27:8, 27:13, 27:16, 27:17, 27:18, 27:20, 28:2, 69:4, 69:9, 69:18, 69:20, 70:1, 70:2, 70:24, 71:20, 71:22, 74:24, 75:16, 89:13 habitat-type [1] -27:13 habitats [4] - 27:1, 69:22, 70:5, 70:6 half [3] - 29:7, 29:9, 87:24 HAMMOND [14] - 2:17,

30:10, 30:15, 30:17, 31:2, 31:6, 31:9, 31:15, 76:10, 87:16, 87:20, 87:23, 88:2, 88.88 Hammond [1] - 2:17 Hampshire [1] - 18:8 hand [2] - 5:11, 91:13 hands [2] - 38:13 happy [1] - 23:14 hard [1] - 13:25 harder [1] - 44:2 hardwood [1] - 27:14 hare [2] - 26:20, 27:16 harvesting [1] - 27:25 head [2] - 16:4, 31:13 headwater [1] - 22:4 hear [2] - 15:21, 25:5 heard [10] - 5:22, 44:19, 55:6, 55:13, 55:18, 58:3, 73:22, 78:24, 79:14, 82:11 Hearing [1] - 1:4 hearing [32] - 2:1, 2:7, 2:12, 3:13, 3:14, 3:17, 3:18, 4:15, 4:17, 4:24, 5:5, 5:7, 6:5, 7:17, 16:9, 16:19, 28:15, 31:20, 32:18, 42:5, 43:7, 47:7, 64:5, 76:17, 85:13, 89:25, 90:10, 90:11, 91:5, 91:7 hearings [3] - 16:10, 47:7, 89:18 heat [1] - 22:21 heating [1] - 21:18 height [9] - 34:5, 49:13, 49:15, 49:17, 49:22, 49:25, 50:2, 50:6 held [6] - 1:16, 3:13, 29:9, 76:13, 76:16, 91:6 help [3] - 31:10, 44:6, 61:11 helpful [6] - 25:2, 58:17, 62:6, 69:3, 76:3, 87:1 hereby [1] - 91:5 Hershey [1] - 71:14 hesitancy [1] - 48:7 hi [1] - 68:7 high [5] - 24:15, 50:7, 53:11, 65:3, 86:23 higher [6] - 34:6, 49:10. 49:18. 49:25. 71:11, 78:6 Highland [1] - 39:10 highlight [1] - 88:8

hiking [1] - 66:5 Hill [7] - 28:15, 29:6, 29:20, 31:16, 31:19, 49:13, 82:25 Hilton [3] - 2:11, 2:22, 63:19 HILTON [42] - 2:6, 2:22, 3:2, 5:15, 5:19, 9:11, 11:5, 13:22, 14:4, 15:25, 16:14, 16:16, 16:23, 17:19, 17:23, 23:16, 25:1, 25:4, 30:9, 31:16, 32:8, 41:14, 42:11, 44:9, 45:16, 45:24, 46:13, 47:1, 61:5, 63:17, 63:22, 67:13, 67:20, 67:24, 74:17, 74:22, 76:5, 76:12, 76:14, 76:18, 89:8, 89:17 hinges [1] - 65:8 hired [1] - 67:2 historic [6] - 7:5, 7:13, 7:14, 35:4, 71:2 Historic [1] - 35:1 historically [3] -17:16, 18:18, 68:22 hit [1] - 77:25 hitting [1] - 77:23 hm [2] - 24:24, 54:11 hm-hmm [2] - 24:24, 54:11 hmm [2] - 24:24, 54:11 hold [1] - 67:13 hole [1] - 23:7 holes [1] - 18:25 home [1] - 60:4 homeowners [1] -73:6 homes [1] - 73:1 Hopeck [7] - 10:1, 10:2, 10:9, 17:1, 17:21, 74:11, 89:16 HOPECK [8] - 17:9, 17:13, 17:21, 17:24, 23:22, 24:22, 24:24, 25.3HORN [1] - 3:1 horn [1] - 3:1 horseshoe [1] - 33:14 host [1] - 8:14 hot [1] - 11:6 hour [1] - 38:12 Hoving [1] - 70:25 hub [5] - 50:18, 51:2, 51:3, 51:6 hug [1] - 78:20 huge [1] - 57:6

human [1] - 77:7 hundreds [2] - 66:13, 70:10 ice [1] - 82:3 idea [5] - 14:10, 35:20, 36:16, 67:20, 73:14 ideal [1] - 56:25

ice [1] - 82:3 idea [5] - 14:10, 35:20, 36:16, 67:20, 73:14 ideal [1] - 56:25 identified [5] - 12:24, 40:12, 51:8, 72:9, 80:3 identifies [2] - 60:10, 60:24 identify [2] - 7:22, 71:11 immediately [3] - 9:8, 69:7.69:19 impact [55] - 7:8, 7:23, 8:8, 9:6, 9:7, 23:25, 24:1, 24:3, 24:9, 24:17, 25:15, 28:21, 35:22, 36:20, 36:22, 37:6, 37:13, 37:14, 39:5, 39:6, 39:9, 40:4, 40:23, 41:6, 41:9, 41:11, 42:16, 42:18, 43:17, 43:18, 45:5, 50:8, 51:2, 51:5, 52:22, 53:3, 53:17, 53:19, 53:23, 53:25, 54:5, 54:9, 54:14, 55:12, 56:7, 56:15, 62:11, 63:8, 64:18, 65:4, 84:7, 85:24, 87:4, 87:18 impacted [1] - 37:13 impacting [2] - 54:4, 83:2 impacts [16] - 6:21, 7:7, 9:21, 10:4, 10:11, 17:14, 17:24, 24:20, 24:21, 36:6, 37:19, 39:17, 59:15, 61:16, 64:7, 74:12 imperfect [1] - 81:19 implemented [1] -29.4important [4] - 32:25, 42:9, 51:4, 57:18 improper [2] - 18:2 improvements [2] -6:10, 6:11 improves [1] - 42:7 IN [1] - 91:13 in-depth [1] - 84:21 inappropriately [1] -13:17 include [3] - 48:19,

49:3, 82:1 included [1] - 8:16 includes [2] - 56:19, 62:25 including [3] - 6:14, 27:6, 54:12 increased [1] - 52:4 increasing [1] - 29:16 incredibly [1] - 63:8 indeed [1] - 71:23 indicate [4] - 12:18, 33:12, 33:13, 83:7 indicated [6] - 13:12, 34:18, 79:11, 84:17, 84:22, 86:20 indication [3] - 60:15, 85:4, 85:5 individual [10] - 4:16, 36:22, 42:17, 45:1, 45:13, 59:15, 62:7, 65:15, 65:16, 73:1 individually [1] -52:22 individuals [1] - 3:6 industrial [1] - 69:21 industry [1] - 79:4 influence [1] - 28:1 influenced [1] - 22:14 inform [2] - 49:21, 49:23 informal [1] - 56:22 information [11] -26:22, 27:5, 38:18, 45:25, 48:5, 57:1, 57:3, 69:13, 81:19, 84:4, 85:12 infrastructure [1] -59:22 initial [1] - 7:23 inland [3] - 28:13, 68:13, 74:1 insignificant [3] -48:23, 50:11, 50:13 instance [7] - 35:4, 36:7, 43:15, 53:11, 57:3, 82:4, 84:17 instead [2] - 21:1, 58:11 intent [1] - 30:21 intercept [7] - 56:2, 56:9, 56:10, 56:23, 87:9, 87:10, 87:11 interconnected [1] -77:18 interest [3] - 4:15, 46:22, 59:11 interested [6] - 5:1, 32:22, 45:3, 61:21, 71:21, 90:1 interesting [2] - 32:16,

32.21 interp [1] - 27:8 interpret [6] - 39:1, 66:24, 67:2, 67:4, 67:6, 67:9 interpretation [3] -27:4, 65:18, 67:5 interrupt [1] - 87:16 intervenor [2] - 9:20, 67.19 intervenors [7] - 4:9, 9:15, 9:18, 10:20, 10:22, 41:20, 47:11 interview [1] - 80:24 interviewed [3] -80:19, 83:6, 84:19 interviewing [1] -80:12 interviews [2] - 56:22, 84:22 intriguing [1] - 35:20 introduce [2] - 2:13, 2:15 introduces [1] - 44:13 introducing [1] - 62:3 introduction [1] - 3:6 investigated [1] - 88:6 involve [1] - 87:17 involved [1] - 48:10 irregularly [1] - 43:24 irrelevant [3] - 4:22, 85:6, 85:8 island [1] - 84:10 issue [24] - 14:8, 14:13, 18:12, 19:1, 19:10, 19:22, 20:13, 21:4, 21:9, 22:3, 23:20, 25:8, 36:21, 38:18, 39:20, 41:17, 42:1, 52:17, 61:15, 81:16, 88:6, 89:3 knowledge [6] issues [22] - 10:12, 10:13, 10:17, 17:13, 18:13, 18:15, 18:16, known [3] - 68:11. 20:5, 21:3, 23:14, 25:7, 32:10, 40:3, knows [1] - 23:7 41:25, 46:24, 47:12, Kossuth [7] - 1:9, 66:5, 67:3, 68:8, 69:14, 89:18, 89:20 issuing [1] - 72:25 KURTZ [2] - 2:19, itself [3] - 17:18, 19:6, 19:10 Kurtz [1] - 2:19 J jet [4] - 80:19, 80:20, lagoon [1] - 22:15 81:5, 81:7 Jim [15] - 2:20, 3:3,

9:19, 10:12, 10:14,

32:10, 32:17, 33:4,

67:15, 67:21, 76:15, 76.19 **JIM** [8] - 33:2, 38:21, 42:13, 44:8, 47:2, 61:7, 64:3, 76:21 job [1] - 39:2 John [11] - 10:1, 10:2, 10:9, 17:1, 17:4, 17:6, 17:8, 17:19, 17:21, 74:11, 89:15 joins [1] - 24:7 joy [1] - 5:20 judged [1] - 86:24 July [7] - 1:12, 2:3, 4:25, 5:2, 89:25, 90:2, 91:5 June [9] - 3:19, 25:12, 26:15, 33:4, 50:16, 64:5, 78:3, 91:14 junior [3] - 38:5, 77:22, 78:8 Junior [1] - 77:20 jurisdiction [1] - 60:4 Κ keep [2] - 62:14, 83:8 Kentucky [1] - 20:4 key [1] - 31:16 Kibby [2] - 16:11, 35:2 kids [1] - 45:13 kill [2] - 73:5, 73:6 killed [1] - 73:1 kind [13] - 13:10, 26:9, 32:20, 35:17, 37:13, 38:12, 41:6, 45:2, 46:10, 52:13, 84:16, 88:23 kinds [2] - 21:2, 63:10 knowing [2] - 72:16

71:4, 75:14

68:19, 71:17

L

55:8, 55:11, 59:1,

42:14

38:23, 46:14, 67:14,

59:5, 77:12, 77:13,

77:14, 77:15, 77:16,

77:20, 77:21, 79:5,

81:5, 86:6, 88:15

lake [23] - 7:21, 34:1,

34:2. 34:10. 36:22.

42:17.43:3.43:4.

48:17, 52:23, 55:16,

55:18, 56:24, 57:18,

58:6, 59:6, 59:15,

60:16, 79:24, 80:4,

80:7, 80:19, 81:6 Lakes [1] - 60:20 lakes [53] - 7:15, 7:25, 8:1, 8:3, 8:4, 8:8, 33:12, 33:13, 34:10, 37:3, 37:6, 37:10, 37:11, 37:12, 38:2, 39:10, 40:23, 42:24, 44:12, 44:19, 45:8, 45:10, 45:20, 46:3, 52:15, 52:18, 52:21, 53:1, 53:6, 53:7, 53:9, 53:10, 53:11, 54:12, 57:22, 58:16, 59:17, 60:4, 60:8, 66:11, 66:17, 76:25, 77:17, 78:13, 78:15, 78:16, 78:18, 78:21, 79:25, 82:18 lakeview [1] - 71:15 land [3] - 4:5, 50:6, 71:10 Land [2] - 1:2, 60:21 landowners [1] -27.24 lands [2] - 69:7, 69:18 landscape [1] - 21:11 LandWorks [9] - 7:9, 8:6, 33:19, 34:7, 47:14, 48:9, 49:17, 56:14, 84:10 LandWorks' [4] - 33:8, 38:17, 42:23, 43:4, 37:4, 47:23, 48:16 84:1, 84:14, 84:16 language [3] - 24:10, 31:21, 42:9 large [9] - 21:17, 22:19, 27:15, 27:16, 3:23, 6:2, 8:18, 8:21, 34:10, 51:23, 57:23, 65:8, 80:9 larger [2] - 17:17, 51:1 last [17] - 2:7, 5:22, 6:5, 7:17, 7:19, 9:19, 17:6, 17:7, 26:12, 35:19, 44:10, 47:7, 60:9, 60:19, 76:23, 78:25, 85:13 Lake [25] - 7:18, 7:20, last-minute [1] - 17:6 38:6, 52:23, 53:11,

late [1] - 17:7

launch [3] - 59:1,

77:15, 85:16 launches [2] - 59:4, 59:8 LAVERTY [23] - 2:18, 10:25, 11:8, 13:21, 13:25, 14:6, 15:7, 15:10, 15:15, 16:15, 24:12, 24:23, 24:25, 30:1, 30:8, 32:3, 32:7, 32:15, 38:20, 38:22, 41:13, 42:1, 45:17 Laverty [1] - 2:18 law [5] - 48:21, 65:19, 66:24, 67:4, 67:9 Law [2] - 61:9, 64:14 Lawrence [2] - 45:4, 46:8 lay [5] - 13:7, 13:8, 14:9, 39:3, 68:10 lay-down [2] - 13:7, 13:8 layman's [1] - 24:13 leach [1] - 19:18 leaching [2] - 21:6, 21:21 lead [2] - 32:13, 69:23 leading [1] - 40:22 leads [1] - 55:24 leaking [1] - 22:15 learned [1] - 85:22 least [5] - 29:19, 32:25, 34:3, 36:14, 49:24 leave [2] - 5:7, 16:18 led [1] - 47:23 left [2] - 60:6, 76:18 legal [4] - 4:16, 66:23, 66:24, 67:1 legally [1] - 49:1 Legislature [2] -39:17, 40:1 legitimate [1] - 39:25 less [2] - 21:20, 87:3 lesser [2] - 10:15, 54:23 letter [1] - 14:18 level [6] - 21:11, 37:8, 73:2, 77:3, 77:5, 81:17 levels [5] - 77:1, 77:2, 77:6, 78:4, 78:8 life [5] - 8:18, 8:19, 8:22, 9:1, 9:3 light [1] - 42:8 lighting [7] - 41:17, 41:25, 42:1, 42:20, 88:6, 88:11, 88:19 lights [4] - 44:4, 87:18, 88:22

likelihood [1] - 83:15 likely [4] - 8:8, 34:4, 71:10, 72:6 limestone [2] - 21:1, 21:2 limit [1] - 62:19 limited [2] - 9:6, 73:16 Lincoln [9] - 2:8, 3:19, 9:20, 14:14, 14:22, 15:16, 17:8, 42:25, 43:16 line [8] - 6:24, 6:25, 26:19, 27:9, 27:21, 53:25, 55:25, 81:14 Line [2] - 7:3 lines [1] - 6:7 linked [2] - 38:4, 39:10 list [2] - 71:13, 72:3 listed [1] - 72:6 listen [1] - 41:19 liter [1] - 58:12 literally [1] - 81:3 livelihood [1] - 55:20 lively [1] - 64:6 LLC [2] - 1:6, 3:21 LLC's [1] - 2:9 loaded [1] - 18:25 local [4] - 9:7, 9:8, 36:5, 86:17 located [3] - 6:2, 6:6, 7:2 locating [3] - 59:18, 59:23, 60:3 location [4] - 7:13, 7:24, 12:22, 35:6 locations [3] - 6:17, 12:25, 22:8 lodge [1] - 79:15 lodges [3] - 61:16, 82:6, 82:9 long-eared [1] - 72:1 look [17] - 9:9, 12:21, 20:12, 20:20, 22:21, 26:14, 34:23, 38:1, 39:5, 40:3, 44:14, 47:16, 52:22, 56:13, 83:7, 83:8, 89:2 looked [6] - 8:6, 26:16, 34:11, 51:17, 79:1, 84:7 looking [12] - 5:16, 24:15, 32:13, 42:25, 43:8, 45:2, 51:2, 61:5, 71:21, 79:3, 79:6, 87:5 loom [1] - 51:9 looming [4] - 51:18, 51:24, 52:6, 52:11 loose [1] - 13:18 loss [3] - 27:17, 27:18,

love [1] - 12:7 low [5] - 50:8, 53:4, 53:6, 53:9, 54:14 lower [5] - 6:6, 66:1, 66:4, 78:4, 78:8 lowlands [3] - 27:7, 70:17, 71:2 LURC [4] - 2:21, 3:1, 7:18, 7:22 lynx [30] - 25:9, 25:15, 26:19, 26:23, 27:6, 27:16, 68:11, 68:18, 68:21, 69:4, 69:8, 69:15, 69:17, 69:19, 69:24, 70:4, 70:12, 70:13, 71:1, 71:3, 71:5, 71:10, 71:20, 71:22, 74:24, 75:8, 75:10, 75:15, 89:13 Μ M.R.S.A [2] - 3:14, 4:3 Machias [1] - 68:19 MAHONEY [4] - 61:8, 63:15, 63:19, 74:20 Mahoney [1] - 61:9 mail [3] - 9:25, 10:5, 89:14 mails [2] - 17:3, 89:14 maine [2] - 2:17, 64:10 Maine [27] - 1:2, 1:20, 2:3, 2:18, 2:19, 6:1, 6:17, 8:25, 14:17, 17:16, 18:18, 19:3, 19:24, 22:8, 25:21, 28:13, 35:1, 46:4, 55:8, 58:19, 62:13, 62:22, 72:23, 74:1, 74:10, 82:22, 91:5 major [7] - 11:14, 18:8, 19:10, 20:3, 20:5, 21:4, 28:5 manage [1] - 20:24 managed [5] - 69:8, 69:19, 77:1, 77:4 management [2] -58:10, 77:6 manages [1] - 77:5 map [7] - 6:3, 6:4, 44:16, 44:21, 45:5, 49:5, 71:11 maps [1] - 12:21 March [1] - 91:23 MARK [1] - 68:5 mark [8] - 25:6, 25:21, 26:13, 26:16, 28:4,

68:13, 74:23, 89:12

marked [1] - 75:22

64:16

marshal's [2] - 18:21, 19.3 Marvinney [5] - 10:1, 17:4, 22:20, 89:15 material [5] - 20:2, 56:13, 56:17, 56:18, 89:12 materials [1] - 4:22 matrix [1] - 52:20 matter [2] - 3:20, 39:10 matters [1] - 47:22 McCollough [2] -26:13, 28:4 mean [37] - 11:15, 11:22, 12:21, 13:15, 15:11, 24:13, 28:2, 30:14, 30:19, 31:19, 37:18, 40:11, 42:3, 42:8, 42:10, 42:25, 43:5, 44:3, 45:10, 46:7, 46:11, 50:25, 55:24, 57:12, 57:18, 58:21, 62:16, 66:3, 73:16, 80:11, 80:23, 81:1, 81:14, 83:20, 84:4, 84:13, 85:10 means [3] - 37:1, 65:16, 67:7 measure [1] - 21:6 mechanism [1] -31:25 Medford [1] - 2:18 meetings [1] - 63:3 meets [1] - 4:3 megawatt [1] - 3:21 melt [2] - 22:9, 22:12 melting [1] - 22:12 member [1] - 23:13 members [1] - 4:10 mention [2] - 41:15, 58:25 mentioned [3] - 17:2, 44:11, 45:19 mentions [1] - 85:10 metals [1] - 19:18 meters [3] - 28:17, 29:10, 30:23 method [1] - 21:24 methodologies [1] -74:9 methodology [2] -26:7, 27:3 methods [1] - 36:15 mid [1] - 25:12 middle [1] - 78:21 might [21] - 12:22, 16:20, 21:5, 21:21, 38:1, 38:20, 42:18,

marketing [1] - 46:10

44:1, 45:22, 49:5, 58:15, 59:3, 66:16, 80:20, 82:5, 82:6, 82:8, 85:11, 87:5, 88:12 miles [18] - 6:9. 6:10. 6:11. 7:2. 7:16. 8:1. 8:2, 8:3, 8:5, 48:20, 48:22, 48:25, 49:8, 50:22, 50:24, 59:2, 70:10 Milliken's [1] - 85:13 MILLS [3] - 2:23, 16:17, 76:1 mills [3] - 2:23, 16:17, 76:1 mind [1] - 61:13 minerals [1] - 21:19 minimize [2] - 28:10, 28:20 mining [1] - 20:6 minor [2] - 13:5, 27:18 minute [5] - 17:6, 58:14, 60:7, 76:14, 89:4 minutes [3] - 46:18, 46:19, 46:20 minutes' [1] - 38:11 Miramichi [2] - 19:21, 19.23mischaracterize [1] -86:15 misfires [1] - 18:4 miss [1] - 58:8 missed [1] - 44:14 mistaken [1] - 45:17 mitigate [1] - 44:7 mitigation [2] - 44:2, 72:18 mixed [1] - 18:24 mode [1] - 30:25 model [1] - 70:24 modeled [2] - 28:24, 49:11 modeling [2] - 27:9, 49:24 modest [2] - 83:9, 86:19 Molunkus [1] - 71:16 moment [1] - 67:13 Monday [6] - 4:25, 5:2, 26:15, 43:12, 89:25, 90:2 money [1] - 75:19 monitor [2] - 18:20, 18:21 monitoring [1] - 35:21 morning [12] - 2:6, 2:24, 5:20, 9:10, 11:4, 11:5, 16:22,

32:19, 47:4, 47:5, 61:9, 74:11 morning's [1] - 42:4 mortalities [1] - 29:13 mortality [8] - 28:10, 29:11, 36:16, 72:19, 72:24, 73:2, 73:7, 73.18 mosquito [1] - 89:1 most [13] - 6:21, 10:14, 13:5, 22:8, 25:11, 32:25, 54:20, 57:13, 57:20, 63:8, 75:19, 87:25 mostly [1] - 87:9 Mountain [4] - 1:7, 2:9, 9:22, 91:6 mountain [4] - 10:5, 21:18, 41:7, 63:23 mountains [1] - 55:4 move [7] - 29:21, 30:6, 41:24, 52:7, 59:12, 67:12, 71:24 movements [2] - 70:9, 70:10 moving [3] - 20:9, 59:16, 71:23 MR [105] - 2:17, 2:18, 2:20, 2:21, 9:15, 10:25, 11:1, 11:4, 11:6, 11:8, 13:21, 13:25, 14:2, 14:6, 14:17, 15:7, 15:9, 15:10, 15:11, 15:15, 15:20, 16:4, 16:15, 17:1, 17:9, 17:10, 17:13, 17:21, 17:24, 23:17, 23:22, 24:11, 24:12, 24:22, 24:23, 24:24, 24:25, 25:3, 25:6, 25:21, 25:24, 25:25, 28:6, 28:12, 30:1, 30:6, 30:8, 30:10, 30:14, 30:15, 30:16. 30:17. 30:18. 31:2, 31:4, 31:6, 31:8, 31:9, 31:12, 31:15, 32:3, 32:6, 32:7, 32:15, 32:23, 33:3, 38:20, 38:22, 41:13, 42:1, 45:17, 45:25, 46:4, 61:8, 63:15, 63:19, 63:23, 64:4, 67:11, 67:23, 67:25, 68:6, 74:6, 74:15, 74:20, 74:23, 75:1, 75:2, 75:3, 75:10, 75:13, 75:20, 75:22, 75:24, 76:10, 87:16, 87:19, 87:20,

87:23, 87:25, 88:2, 88:4, 88:8, 88:10, 89:12 **MS** [62] - 2:6, 2:16, 2:19, 2:22, 2:23, 2:24, 3:1, 3:2, 5:15, 5:18. 5:19. 5:20. 9:11, 11:5, 13:22, 14:4, 15:25, 16:6, 16:14, 16:16, 16:17, 16:23, 17:19, 17:23, 23:16, 25:1, 25:4, 30:9, 31:16, 31:19, 32:8, 41:14, 42:11, 42:14, 44:9, 45:16, 45:24, 46:13, 46:17, 47:1, 47:3, 61:5, 63:17, 63:22, 67:13, 67:17, 67:20, 74:17, 74:22, 76:1, 76:5, 76:8, 76:12, 76:14, 76:18, 76:22, 87:22, 88:13, 89:4, 89:7, 89:8, 89:17 mull [1] - 38:24 multi [2] - 44:20, 60:16 multi-day [1] - 44:20 multi-lake [1] - 60:16 musquash [1] - 33:15 Musquash [2] - 33:25, 48:17 must [4] - 4:12, 4:20, 8:13, 48:22

Ν

NADEAU [2] - 2:20, 15:20 Nadeau [1] - 2:20 name [4] - 2:11, 2:24, 4:13, 17:20 named [2] - 70:25, 91:12 names [1] - 5:7 Naples [1] - 2:17 national [3] - 34:17, 40:14, 53:2 nationally [2] - 35:11, 79:21 nature [6] - 4:14, 44:25, 54:17, 65:10, 81:23, 88:18 near [2] - 3:4, 18:19 necessarily [2] -80:23, 81:19 need [14] - 13:18, 14:9, 14:16, 15:13, 35:14, 38:23, 38:24, 39:15, 42:10, 67:18,

75:11, 76:10, 81:17, 89.21 needed [1] - 15:17 needs [6] - 13:15, 21:13, 38:24, 62:21, 64:21, 77:7 negligible [1] - 22:23 net [1] - 60:2 never [7] - 24:1, 35:10, 50:19, 50:20, 58:5, 69:15 New [7] - 6:18, 18:8, 19:21, 19:23, 20:6, 57:23, 63:3 new [3] - 6:11, 26:11, 38:6 news [1] - 83:17 next [6] - 4:8, 16:25, 25:5, 72:6, 72:14, 73:18 nice [2] - 58:21, 84:4 night [11] - 41:17, 42:20, 42:23, 43:12, 43:14, 87:18, 88:4, 88:6, 88:10, 88:19, 88:20 NIMBY [2] - 57:6, 57:7 nine [1] - 7:25 nitrate [1] - 18:15 nitrogen [1] - 17:25 nobody [2] - 85:10, 85:12 none [4] - 10:20, 24:5, 58:9, 60:24 nonetheless [1] - 58:9 nonexpedited [3] -39:19, 39:23, 40:4 north [6] - 7:1, 35:4, 69:1, 69:4, 69:18, 71:6 northeastern [1] -57:5 northern [4] - 70:19, 70:20, 72:1, 78:17 Norway [1] - 33:14 NOTARY [1] - 91:19 Notary [2] - 2:2, 91:4 noted [1] - 45:21 nothing [4] - 5:13, 24:2, 24:3, 65:2 noticeable [1] - 50:18 notion [2] - 40:18, 41:7 NRCM [1] - 46:1 NRCM's [1] - 45:18 nuclear [1] - 62:12 number [15] - 14:10, 24:4, 29:17, 33:6, 33:11, 37:11, 43:19,

43:24, 64:15, 64:17,

64:21, 65:3, 65:8, 65:13, 80:3 numbers [2] - 59:7, 83:23 NWP [1] - 71:16 0 object [2] - 52:7, 80.50 objected [1] - 80:16 objection [1] - 80:23 observable [1] - 29:13 observation [1] -87:24 observations [2] -71:2, 71:4 observer [1] - 51:18 obviously [4] - 19:5, 38:23, 55:6, 84:20 occasional [1] - 43:20 occur [4] - 51:20, 52:6, 71:1, 71:10 occurring [1] - 46:11 occurs [1] - 88:1 OF [10] - 11:7, 33:2, 38:21, 42:13, 44:8, 47:2, 61:7, 64:3, 68:5, 76:21 office [6] - 2:23, 16:17, 18:21, 19:3, 25:22, 76:1 officer [1] - 2:12 official [1] - 72:7 offsite [2] - 18:24, 19:4 often [2] - 69:14, 78:22 oftentimes [3] - 50:18, 79:25, 87:3 oil [1] - 18:22 OLSEN [1] - 3:1 Olsen [1] - 3:1 once [4] - 20:20, 30:13, 30:19, 86:3 one [44] - 7:11, 7:13, 11:10, 12:17, 16:3, 19:10, 24:14, 25:8, 28:25, 30:10, 34:1, 34:3, 34:9, 35:19, 37:22, 37:24, 38:14, 39:16, 40:24, 40:25, 43:18, 44:10, 44:11, 49:9, 51:8, 54:1, 56:11, 57:22, 60:7, 62:6, 62:8, 63:20, 65:15, 66:22, 70:1, 72:6, 73:21, 77:5, 77:19, 78:17, 79:16, 82:4, 89:4

one's [1] - 88:25 ones [4] - 15:21, 26:2, 60:18, 77:4 online [1] - 79:8 onsite [3] - 81:3, 83:6, 87:14 open [6] - 4:24, 22:5, 22:13, 23:12, 52:4, 89.25 opening [2] - 3:12, 22:22 operate [1] - 23:23 operated [2] - 29:7, 30:22 operating [2] - 6:1, 28:16 operation [4] - 19:5, 30:25, 32:1, 36:4 operational [1] - 29:5 operations [5] - 20:6, 27:25, 28:9, 30:16, 31:23 opinion [11] - 15:13, 30:3, 39:3, 44:1, 47:22, 66:6, 66:7, 69:25, 70:3, 72:15 opportunity [6] - 3:25, 9:15, 32:16, 46:12, 48:8, 76:6 opposed [4] - 50:17, 54:24, 60:3, 77:7 opposition [1] - 62:3 opposition's [1] - 38:3 optically [1] - 50:22 options [2] - 79:6, 82:17 order [2] - 10:8, 90:6 orders [1] - 89:22 Oregon [1] - 18:14 oriented [1] - 87:7 original [1] - 36:4 originally [1] - 35:2 ought [3] - 11:23, 11:24, 26:2 ourselves [2] - 25:10, 76:6 outcome [2] - 86:11, 91:12 outfitter [1] - 63:24 outline [1] - 29:20 outside [1] - 11:6 outstanding [1] - 7:12 overall [5] - 7:25, 9:2, 28:19, 48:3, 53:8 overcharacterization [1] - 84:2 overlook [1] - 64:9 overview [1] - 5:21 owe [1] - 14:14 owner [1] - 55:7

owners [1] - 79:15

Ρ

p.m [1] - 90:11 package [2] - 8:16, 9:3 paddlers [1] - 78:20 paddling [1] - 54:25 page [3] - 33:6, 34:15, 35:20 paid [1] - 81:22 painting [1] - 41:10 Palmer [13] - 3:3, 7:22, 9:19, 10:13, 10:14, 46:18, 46:23, 47:4, 61:11, 63:25, 66:8, 76:8, 76:20 PALMER [13] - 33:2, 38:21, 42:13, 44:8, 46:4, 47:2, 61:7, 64:3, 76:21, 87:19, 87:25, 88:4, 88:10 paperwork [1] - 72:7 paragraph [1] - 34:16 parks [1] - 40:14 part [19] - 8:16, 13:5, 16:1, 34:10, 36:21, 38:1, 41:21, 42:22, 43:21, 50:24, 53:5, 54:15, 54:17, 56:16, 58:23, 59:2, 59:6, 67:16, 75:21 PARTICIPANTS [1] -5:14 particular [14] - 3:9, 16:11, 19:11, 21:16, 23:21, 38:2, 46:1, 52:17, 53:7, 53:10, 59:1, 63:9, 76:2, 84:1 particularly [4] -17:14, 20:7, 22:4, 78:8 parties [8] - 3:25, 10:5, 16:20, 17:5, 46:21, 46:25, 90:6, 90:7 parts [2] - 21:11, 41:3 pass [1] - 9:25 passageway [1] - 78:5 Passamaquoddies [2] - 69:9, 69:20 passed [1] - 17:2 past [5] - 11:14, 27:6, 27:8, 52:16, 87:11 patches [1] - 27:13 path [1] - 77:22 patina [1] - 41:10 paved [1] - 23:1 pay [1] - 15:3

Penobscot [2] - 1:8, 3:22 people [31] - 15:16, 23:4, 36:10, 39:25, 51:6, 55:2, 55:3, 56:22, 57:13, 57:21, 58:3, 58:6, 58:8, 59:5, 59:7, 62:9, 62:15, 63:8, 64:10, 66:3, 66:5, 80:4, 80:12, 83:3, 83:5, 83:24, 84:19, 85:11, 86:25, 87:14 people's [1] - 55:22 per [3] - 28:17, 29:10, 30:23 perceive [1] - 15:5 perchlorate [1] - 18:16 perhaps [8] - 12:11, 31:10, 42:6, 54:22, 65:19, 66:14, 82:4 period [1] - 61:25 periphery [1] - 75:14 permission [1] - 90:7 Permit [2] - 1:5, 91:6 permit [4] - 2:8, 3:20, 29:23, 42:6 perrow [1] - 3:2 person [3] - 12:5, 43:20, 91:11 persons [1] - 5:5 perspective [2] -24:13, 79:16 pH [2] - 20:13, 21:3 phenomena [1] - 45:7 phenomenon [2] -57:7 Phillips [1] - 2:19 phone [3] - 26:13, 26:16, 56:19 photo [4] - 27:4, 27:8, 56:3, 56:24 phrase [1] - 65:11 pick [2] - 76:18, 89:1 piece [1] - 77:6 pits [1] - 20:1 place [2] - 40:3, 64:11 places [5] - 12:24, 18:15, 39:11, 64:8, 69:1 plan [5] - 5:10, 29:4, 29:18, 29:19, 30:4 planning [3] - 29:3, 29:22. 30:6 plans [1] - 12:19 plant [1] - 62:12 Plantation [5] - 1:8, 2:20, 3:22, 6:2, 8:17 plantation [1] - 71:15 plants [1] - 18:13

Pleasant [4] - 55:8, 55:11, 77:12, 81:5 pleasant [2] - 52:23, 77:14 point [19] - 7:16, 10:18, 22:20, 26:4, 28:18, 29:2, 29:18, 31:6, 41:23, 42:11, 45:20, 45:24, 51:3, 52:9, 62:21, 66:3, 74:21, 88:5 pointer [1] - 6:4 points [2] - 46:2, 47:10 policy [2] - 62:21, 62:25 polls [1] - 62:24 ponds [1] - 7:11 pool [2] - 6:19, 6:21 population [1] - 62:22 populations [1] -75:15 portion [5] - 42:4, 50:23, 51:1, 60:12, 76:2 portions [3] - 19:21, 75:10, 76:4 Portland [2] - 56:20, 56:21 pose [3] - 14:17, 16:5, 25.8posed [3] - 9:23, 25:14, 35:2 position [3] - 15:8, 40:1, 65:7 positive [1] - 60:2 possibility [1] - 56:10 possible [4] - 49:5, 52:14, 67:17, 67:18 possibly [5] - 51:15, 67:15, 69:1, 69:2, 69:23 post [8] - 16:9, 28:11, 29:11, 35:20, 58:19, 73:10, 73:18, 86:20 post-construction [7] - 28:11, 29:11, 35:20, 58:19, 73:10, 73:18, 86:20 post-hearing [1] -16.9potential [27] - 9:21, 9:24, 10:3, 10:11, 11:13, 14:20, 15:5, 19:13, 19:16, 21:6, 21:21, 22:7, 33:12, 34:18, 34:22, 35:16, 38:15, 49:6, 51:5, 51:8, 51:9, 51:17, 51:24, 52:21, 73:11,

79:17, 85:22 potentially [6] - 10:13, 18:23, 25:14, 46:23, 65:11, 71:22 power [8] - 2:9, 6:25, 14:11, 39:5, 40:2, 59:18, 59:19, 73:8 powerful [1] - 58:13 practical [1] - 50:8 practices [1] - 47:18 pre [3] - 73:9, 73:17, 84:18 pre-construction [2] -73:9, 73:17 pre-study [1] - 84:18 precautions [1] -23:18 precipitation [1] -22:10 precontact [1] - 7:6 predominantly [1] -60:16 prefer [1] - 56:25 preliminary [1] - 20:11 premise [1] - 61:14 prepared [1] - 48:3 preparing [1] - 47:19 PRESCOTT [2] - 5:18, 5:20 Prescott [2] - 5:20, 26:12 presence [4] - 8:11, 9:18, 52:13, 80:22 present [4] - 9:17, 35:19, 73:16, 85:9 presentation [2] -5:17, 9:11 presented [5] - 26:23, 26:25. 45:4. 46:7. 46:8 Preservation [1] -35.1 presiding [1] - 2:12 press [1] - 14:23 pretty [19] - 13:20, 18:21, 20:16, 20:17, 28:14, 32:16, 35:15, 35:17, 36:13, 36:23, 37:7, 42:2, 43:18, 44:4, 44:10, 57:3, 57:6, 58:13, 78:22 prevent [3] - 21:3, 21:7, 73:1 previous [2] - 32:18, 34:13 previously [1] - 54:22 primarily [2] - 6:23, 45.14primary [2] - 55:2, 64:24

prince [1] - 84:10 principal [1] - 86:12 principle [2] - 21:23, 81:1 principles [1] - 19:8 pristine [2] - 77:8, 77:9 probability [2] - 35:25, 55:22 problem [7] - 18:8, 18:23, 20:3, 31:11, 42:22, 88:24 problematic [1] -57:19 problems [2] - 19:24, 58:10 procedural [2] -89:22, 90:6 procedure [3] - 13:16, 35:1, 37:4 procedures [3] - 3:15, 23:23, 37:20 proceed [1] - 10:8 proceeding [2] -49:13, 82:25 proceedings [2] -4:19, 50:16 process [4] - 47:8, 62:7, 72:10, 90:7 professional [6] -4:14, 47:18, 48:4, 66:8, 66:9, 66:15 professionally [1] -48:11 Project [1] - 1:7 project [67] - 2:10, 5:22, 7:4, 8:13, 8:18, 8:20, 8:23, 9:1, 9:4, 9:5, 11:17, 13:6, 13:13, 16:12, 19:25, 21:25, 23:21, 27:12, 28:15, 28:19, 28:25, 29:1, 29:5, 29:7, 29:15, 29:21, 29:22, 30:16, 30:21, 31:1, 31:17, 33:5, 35:5, 36:2, 36:3, 36:10, 36:12, 38:14, 39:13, 39:22, 39:23, 41:4, 42:7, 47:16, 52:17, 59:23, 68:12, 68:15, 68:17, 69:5, 70:2, 70:8, 70:21, 72:21, 73:12, 73:23, 74:5, 74:8, 74:14, 84:8, 84:23, 85:22, 85:24, 86:3, 86:18 projects [17] - 6:1, 11:12, 14:12, 17:17, 26:6, 27:6, 34:13,

37:22, 39:14, 47:9, 59:19, 59:25, 62:7, 72:8, 73:8, 84:7 properly [1] - 13:2 proportion [1] - 71:11 proposal [4] - 4:2, 4:7, 4:22. 28:24 proposed [7] - 2:9, 5:24, 31:20, 31:22, 68:11, 69:8, 74:9 protected [1] - 43:2 Protection [1] - 74:11 protection [2] - 15:22, 17:22 protocols [3] - 16:2, 24:18, 72:18 provide [10] - 3:24, 4:6, 5:21, 9:6, 15:8, 16:13, 39:21, 47:15, 66:24, 67:4 provided [2] - 7:23, 28:4 provides [1] - 48:4 providing [2] - 3:3, 15:22 provision [1] - 13:8 provisions [1] - 3:13 proximity [2] - 21:17, 59:19 public [11] - 3:17, 5:1, 11:11, 14:8, 14:14, 15:8, 36:6, 45:19, 65:11, 72:25, 90:1 PUBLIC [1] - 91:19 Public [3] - 1:4, 2:2, 91:4 public's [1] - 36:2 publication [1] - 45:21 publications [1] -56:21 publicized [2] - 60:16, 60:18 Pug [4] - 7:18, 7:20, 38:6 purpose [4] - 3:24, 4:17, 5:2, 90:3 purposes [1] - 15:18 pursuant [1] - 3:13 pursue [2] - 14:9, 45:18 purview [1] - 41:1 push [1] - 44:2 put [10] - 11:23, 14:21, 15:2. 15:12. 20:8. 21:5, 25:11, 35:22, 70:25.75:7 putting [2] - 20:15, 21:1

Q

qualify [1] - 24:2 quality [13] - 10:4, 17:14, 23:20, 24:4, 24:16, 54:24, 73:23, 74:3, 74:13, 83:10, 83:12, 83:13, 86:23 quantity [1] - 74:4 quarries [1] - 20:1 quarry [1] - 19:5 questioned [2] -46:24, 59:4 questioning [5] - 4:7, 9:17, 42:3, 55:25, 82.24 questions [31] - 4:1, 4:11, 4:20, 4:23, 9:23, 10:13, 10:16, 11:9, 13:22, 16:21, 23:16, 25:1, 25:8, 30:9, 32:8, 32:12, 32:23, 41:20, 41:23, 46:14, 58:22, 63:20, 63:25, 67:15, 68:8, 71:25, 74:16, 74:19, 76:5, 76:7, 76:9 quick [3] - 10:25, 11:9, 44:10 quickly [2] - 4:20, 28:8 quiet [1] - 60:9 quite [1] - 36:11

R

R2 [1] - 71:14 R4 [1] - 71:15 R9 [1] - 71:16 radar [1] - 6:14 rain [1] - 22:10 raise [2] - 5:11, 21:2 raised [4] - 7:17, 9:20, 11:11, 14:8 rally [1] - 81:2 range [1] - 6:7 rap [2] - 21:1, 21:2 rapidly [1] - 84:3 raptor [1] - 6:15 rare [2] - 71:3, 75:4 rather [5] - 10:15, 55:21, 57:21, 64:5, 71:7 re [1] - 76:19 re-crossing [1] - 76:19 reach [2] - 30:19, 37:8 react [1] - 58:3 reaction [1] - 36:2 reactive [1] - 19:16 read [4] - 55:7, 56:16, 57:25, 64:23

reading [1] - 76:2 ready [2] - 29:5, 63:18 real [4] - 35:24, 69:16, 81:15, 83:25 realized [2] - 86:4, 86.21 realizing [1] - 41:18 really [30] - 11:9, 11:23, 12:18, 14:8, 19:7, 26:2, 27:14, 33:23, 35:14, 36:7, 36:11, 36:17, 36:18, 37:1, 37:7, 41:4, 45:14, 48:9, 50:13, 51:6, 52:3, 54:8, 55:21, 57:22, 59:3, 62:4, 62:16, 69:16, 73:14, 87:7 realwindinfoforme. com [1] - 63:24 reason [10] - 19:22, 24:19, 26:24, 33:10, 41:22, 49:9, 55:2, 64:10, 75:13 reasonable [2] -24:22, 34:19 reasoning [1] - 81:18 reasons [3] - 43:18, 55:3, 71:19 Rebecca [2] - 2:19, 42:12 rebuttal [2] - 5:2, 90:3 receive [4] - 3:19. 4:25, 5:5, 90:1 received [1] - 69:12 receiving [2] - 5:2, 90:3 recent [2] - 11:14, 14:23 recently [2] - 18:8, 25:11 receptors [1] - 40:13 recess [1] - 76:16 recognize [5] - 20:19, 20:22, 50:23, 51:7, 83:11 recognized [2] -20:18, 76:10 recommendation [3] -28:16, 28:22, 36:19 recommended [4] -19:9, 21:25, 23:23, 24:19 reconsidered [1] -42:8 reconvening [1] - 2:7 record [28] - 4:13, 4:24, 5:4, 11:22, 14:19, 15:13, 17:20, 25:12, 25:25, 43:9,

45:25, 65:5, 68:20, 70:14, 74:6, 74:25, 75:21, 75:25, 76:13, 89:11, 89:21, 89:22, 89:25, 90:5, 90:8, 91:9 recording [2] - 3:3, 4:18 recreate [2] - 80:17, 82.2 recreating [3] - 80:13, 80:20, 80:22 recreation [2] - 87:8, 87:25 recreational [6] - 83:2, 84:8, 85:5, 85:7, 86:8, 87:4 recross [1] - 46:20 Redington [2] - 38:13, 39:21 reduced [2] - 51:25, 91.8 reducing [2] - 59:17, 59:20 refer [3] - 29:1, 53:24, 59:20 reference [1] - 79:7 referenced [1] - 74:24 referred [1] - 59:9 referring [3] - 25:22, 87:17, 87:20 reflected [1] - 76:24 reforested [1] - 27:20 refresh [1] - 85:15 regard [2] - 12:6, 17:15 regarding [6] - 10:3, 12:16, 25:14, 87:23, 89:12, 91:6 regardless [3] - 22:13, 28:20, 62:18 regards [1] - 25:13 regeneration [1] -71:12 region [9] - 27:7, 60:10, 70:17, 70:19, 71:2, 71:3, 71:7, 71:8, 71:13 regional [5] - 9:8, 70:24, 74:7, 75:1, 75.4 regions [3] - 71:5, 75:6 register [1] - 7:14 Regulation [1] - 1:2 related [6] - 17:13, 23:14, 27:18, 33:23, 53:20, 74:13 relating [1] - 74:3 relation [1] - 70:21

relationship [1] -11:16 relative [2] - 59:7, 83:23 relatively [3] - 21:6, 53:13, 77:22 relevant [2] - 4:21, 57:24 reliable [2] - 35:17, 63:9 relied [2] - 56:14, 84:9 rely [3] - 48:6, 57:1, 63:12 remain [2] - 4:24, 89:25 remarks [1] - 64:6 remember [6] - 26:14, 40:16, 60:14, 64:11, 80:7, 85:13 remind [2] - 89:24, 90:6 remote [3] - 60:3, 77:8, 77:9 renewable [1] - 57:4 repetitious [1] - 4:22 replace [1] - 12:12 replicate [1] - 33:18 replicates [1] - 29:14 report [20] - 25:11, 25:17, 25:20, 28:5, 33:4, 34:15, 47:12, 47:21, 48:2, 48:11, 50:16, 53:23, 75:3, 75:7, 76:24, 78:25, 79:2, 79:8, 79:10 reported [2] - 33:22, 91:7 reporter [1] - 2:16 Reporter [1] - 91:20 Reporting [1] - 1:25 represent [2] - 4:16, 79:16 representatives [5] -3:9, 4:6, 9:16, 16:18. 62:23 reps [1] - 9:13 request [5] - 4:19, 9:16, 26:1, 26:5, 90:7 requested [5] - 9:18, 12:1, 12:2, 26:15 require [1] - 89:19 required [3] - 4:12, 64:14, 64:15 requirement [1] - 56:6 research [4] - 56:20, 56:21, 66:7, 68:8 reservation [1] - 42:19 reserve [2] - 46:20, 63:21

residence [1] - 4:14 resident [2] - 28:21, 42:24 residents [2] - 8:21, 43:2 resolve [1] - 50:22 resource [8] - 35:11, 37:16, 43:1, 48:20, 79:22, 84:23, 85:7, 85:25 resources [18] - 6:22, 7:7, 7:10, 7:11, 34:17, 44:14, 50:14, 53:2, 54:10, 74:13, 75:18, 77:7, 79:17, 79:19, 80:5, 80:7, 83:3, 87:4 respect [4] - 61:16, 83:17, 83:21 responded [3] - 10:10, 12:14 respondents [1] -58:9 responding [1] - 26:2 response [1] - 17:11 responses [2] - 57:21, 62:18 rest [2] - 11:23, 14:9 result [4] - 5:7, 71:6, 72:18, 74:4 results [7] - 6:16, 27:11. 27:13. 31:22. 32:2, 33:16, 79:10 resumed [1] - 76:17 retained [1] - 66:23 return [4] - 58:5, 69:2, 82:13, 83:15 returning [2] - 61:17, 83:9 review [11] - 3:10, 4:1, 12:1, 13:24, 21:24, 25:17, 26:18, 31:24, 33:4, 47:6, 56:21 reviewing [1] - 27:1 reviews [1] - 51:14 revised [1] - 12:19 ridge [1] - 6:7 **rip** [2] - 21:1, 21:2 risk [2] - 28:20, 30:23 Road [2] - 1:18, 2:3 road [3] - 18:10, 24:7 roads [4] - 6:9, 6:10, 6:11, 6:12 rock [20] - 12:3, 12:6, 12:7. 12:11. 12:18. 19:14, 19:15, 19:16, 19:17, 20:8, 20:10, 20:12, 20:16, 20:17, 21:4, 21:14, 78:1

rocket [1] - 13:15

```
rocks [2] - 20:5, 77:23
ROCQUE [4] - 11:4,
 11:6, 11:7, 14:2
Rocque [2] - 10:18,
 11.2
Roger [1] - 85:13
rotating [1] - 30:22
route [1] - 68:16
Route [1] - 7:1
routine [3] - 19:3,
 26:9, 70:10
row [1] - 33:25
rules [1] - 3:16
running [2] - 28:7,
 41:18
runoff [2] - 23:1, 23:19
runs [1] - 7:1
rush [1] - 15:2
```

S

safe [2] - 62:15, 69:20 safety [1] - 15:8 sallies [1] - 68:25 Samantha [1] - 3:1 sample [3] - 29:16, 35:25, 55:22 sandwich [2] - 12:18, 20:10 sandwiches [4] - 12:7, 12:11, 19:14 save [1] - 61:2 saw [1] - 43:11 scale [1] - 6:1 scattered [2] - 27:13, 43:22 scenario [1] - 34:22 scenery [4] - 63:2, 66:5, 67:3, 67:7 scenic [36] - 3:4, 7:10, 7:11, 7:15, 7:21, 8:7, 10:13, 10:17, 32:10, 34:17, 35:11, 35:22, 36:20, 36:22, 37:16, 43:1, 44:14, 48:20, 50:14, 52:22, 53:2, 53:20, 53:25, 54:5, 54:24, 59:18, 60:2, 60:4, 64:7, 76:20, 79:22, 83:11, 83:13 schedule [1] - 41:15 science [4] - 13:15, 63:9, 63:10, 63:12 scientific [1] - 72:13 scientist [2] - 10:20, 11:15 Scotland [1] - 84:11 Scott [1] - 3:2 Scraggly [5] - 38:6, 52:23, 77:12, 77:16

scrub [1] - 50:6 seal [1] - 91:14 Searsburg [8] - 35:25, 36:1, 36:9, 84:11, 84:14, 86:11, 87:6, 87.7 seasons [3] - 6:14, 6:15 Sebois [1] - 71:15 second [6] - 28:17, 29:10, 30:24, 34:15, 85:19, 87:16 section [3] - 3:14, 4:4, 16:9 sediment [1] - 13:9 see [24] - 6:3, 11:16, 13:18, 15:13, 18:1, 18:17, 20:6, 23:19, 27:15, 31:12, 35:5, 35:12, 36:4, 36:15, 42:6, 46:5, 51:1, 51:6, 64:9, 67:17, 70:8, 71:12, 71:23, 75:20 seeing [3] - 46:12, 78:14, 85:16 seem [2] - 36:14, 72:24 segregated [1] - 20:17 selected [1] - 71:3 sense [5] - 31:6, 34:7. 47:16. 52:6. 83:23 sensed [1] - 52:8 sensitive [3] - 22:5, 40:13, 83:20 sensitivity [1] - 66:4 separate [4] - 7:21, 46:6, 48:24, 49:3 separately [1] - 37:16 series [1] - 17:3 serious [2] - 41:7, 72:12 service [10] - 14:3, 14:18, 25:10, 25:13, 26:2, 26:5, 26:8, 26:23, 69:6, 72:24 Service [1] - 68:1 services [1] - 3:3 session [4] - 3:24, 9:19, 45:19, 90:9 set [5] - 8:21, 8:24, 29:6, 37:15, 44:23 setting [2] - 21:5, 21:21 seven [2] - 5:1, 90:2 several [12] - 6:1, 8:15, 32:23, 38:7, 39:11, 45:8, 45:10, 50:21, 50:24, 77:4,

screening [1] - 49:11

78:12, 89:18 shadow [1] - 78:18 shaking [1] - 31:13 shall [2] - 32:13, 64:25 Shaw [3] - 52:23, 77:12, 77:15 Shawn [2] - 61:9, 74:18 sheeted [1] - 23:9 Sheffield [2] - 29:1 shocked [1] - 85:11 shore [2] - 78:17, 78.21 shoreline [1] - 34:6 short [1] - 23:17 shortcomings [1] -81:16 shortly [1] - 36:3 show [3] - 49:5, 49:7, 61:22 showed [3] - 6:4, 6:16, 61:22 showing [1] - 44:21 shrinking [1] - 84:3 shrub [1] - 50:6 side [2] - 39:16, 70:1 sightings [3] - 68:17, 68:18, 70:12 significance [5] -7:12, 7:15, 7:21, 8:7, 53:2 significant [14] - 7:12, 8:13, 9:7, 34:17, 35:11, 37:16, 43:1, 43:5, 50:14, 54:3, 54:20, 58:25, 73:23, 83:11 significantly [2] -83:13.87:15 similar [7] - 5:22, 27:5, 32:3, 55:20, 62:8, 66:11, 86:11 simple [6] - 20:23, 21:6, 35:15, 37:5, 37:22, 80:21 simplest [1] - 49:4 simply [4] - 18:18, 34:23, 64:9, 85:6 simulations [10] -36:11, 47:14, 47:15, 47:19, 48:3, 56:3, 56:24, 83:7, 86:22, 86:25 site [20] - 14:21, 18:24, 19:1, 19:6, 20:16, 20:24, 21:16, 22:13. 23:9. 35:7. 51:11, 68:12, 68:15, 69:8, 69:18, 69:19, 72:21, 77:15, 77:17,

sites [10] - 11:17, 18:20, 18:21, 20:21, 22:2, 35:4, 35:8, 35:9, 45:6, 73:12 siting [1] - 64:24 situation [2] - 44:6, 44.7 six [1] - 8:4 size [1] - 29:16 ski [1] - 81:5 skiers [2] - 81:7 skis [2] - 80:19, 80:20 sky [1] - 88:20 sleep [1] - 88:4 slope [2] - 20:10, 20:15 slopes [5] - 19:14, 19:15, 21:9, 21:10, 21:12 small [9] - 20:17, 22:22, 24:4, 27:13, 43:23, 50:12, 50:22, 72:1, 81:6 small-footed [1] - 72:1 snow [2] - 22:9, 22:11 snowmobile [6] -56:20, 58:2, 79:19, 80:3, 80:15, 81:2 snowmobiler [1] -81:12 snowmobilers [3] -79:23, 80:21, 81:25 snowshoe [2] - 26:20, 27:16 snowshoe-hare-type [1] - 27:16 social [2] - 63:9, 63:12 Society [1] - 8:24 soil [4] - 10:19, 11:15, 23:5, 23:10 solely [1] - 33:17 solemnly [1] - 5:12 soluble [1] - 18:6 solutions [1] - 20:23 someone [1] - 70:25 sometimes [1] - 59:20 somewhat [1] - 22:11 somewhere [3] - 34:2, 57:15, 81:5 soon [2] - 29:8, 57:8 sorry [5] - 6:10, 17:19, 17:23, 63:14, 63:19 sort [23] - 12:4, 17:13, 19:1, 21:24, 27:9, 40:5, 41:10, 44:13, 44:25, 45:4, 46:6, 52:9, 56:1, 59:2, 59:12, 59:17, 74:17, 79:4, 79:11, 81:2,

77:21

84:13, 88:25 sound [2] - 64:18, 75:11 sounds [5] - 47:1, 65:17, 67:14, 67:20, 75:12 sources [2] - 81:11, 88.22 south [5] - 9:23, 21:18, 68:16, 69:8, 69:19 southward [1] - 71:4 speaking [2] - 53:13, 65:5 special [1] - 38:4 species [6] - 61:24, 72:3, 72:6, 72:13, 72:25, 73:15 specific [6] - 8:15, 16:7, 23:14, 47:22, 57:22, 58:22 specifically [6] -22:21, 33:14, 51:17, 71:17, 73:25, 87:5 specified [1] - 4:3 Spectacular [2] - 1:16, 2:2 speed [2] - 30:24 speeds [2] - 28:17, 29:8 spending [1] - 75:16 spent [1] - 38:25 sprawl [2] - 59:13, 59:20 spring [1] - 22:5 St [1] - 61:17 stable [1] - 21:20 staff [16] - 2:13, 2:21, 2:25, 3:1, 3:25, 4:8, 4:10, 5:8, 9:19, 9:24, 10:12, 16:20, 28:7, 29:25, 45:18, 89:20 stagnant [1] - 84:3 stand [4] - 5:11, 14:25, 27:4, 29:25 stand-type [1] - 27:4 standard [6] - 23:25, 26:5, 39:21, 39:24, 44:4, 53:19 standards [2] - 4:5, 48:4 standing [1] - 85:16 stands [1] - 13:4 Stantec [8] - 5:21, 25:13, 26:6, 26:9, 26:21, 26:25, 28:3, 28:23 stargazer [1] - 88:2 stargazing [1] - 88:17

Starks [1] - 2:22

stars [1] - 88:19 start [4] - 11:1, 46:17, 52:11, 64:1 starting [2] - 37:11, 46.2 starts [2] - 15:2, 52:6 state [21] - 3:9, 4:13, 8:15, 9:13, 10:2, 11:19, 11:22, 16:18, 17:20, 21:15, 25:25, 34:17, 35:11, 41:11, 41:21, 43:15, 53:2, 56:21, 61:23, 75:5, 79:21 State [2] - 10:19, 91:4 state's [1] - 41:9 statement [7] - 3:12, 16:1, 34:16, 48:1, 87:12, 87:13, 89:24 statements [3] - 4:25, 72:25, 90:1 states [2] - 17:17, 57:5 stationary [1] - 29:9 status [1] - 28:9 statute [1] - 38:25 statutes [2] - 4:4, 23:24 statutory [2] - 39:4, 39:7 stay [3] - 67:21, 82:6, 82.8 steep [1] - 21:10 steeper [1] - 19:12 stenographically [1] -91:7 step [1] - 73:18 Stetson [3] - 7:4, 59:24 Steve [3] - 25:6, 28:12, 74:6 stick [1] - 16:21 still [10] - 13:5, 29:2, 62:3, 62:9, 62:10, 62:17, 72:16, 72:18, 73:2, 80:20 stop [1] - 17:19 storage [6] - 18:2, 18:12, 18:23, 19:1, 19:2, 19:6 stored [1] - 18:19 storm [1] - 13:9 strategy [1] - 70:24 Stream [1] - 79:5 streams [4] - 22:4, 22:19, 22:24, 24:15 stretch [2] - 39:14, 68[.]24 strong [2] - 43:18, 58:1 stronghold [1] - 68:23

structure [1] - 23:10 studied [1] - 29:17 studies [20] - 28:11, 29:11, 30:11, 31:5, 36:16, 37:24, 69:16, 70:15, 73:18, 74:24, 75:4, 84:6, 84:9, 84:13, 87:6, 87:10, 87:11, 87:17, 87:20, 88:11 study [49] - 26:1, 28:24, 29:1, 29:4, 29:15, 30:19, 30:24, 31:7, 31:21, 31:22, 32:2, 35:24, 39:8, 40:24, 41:8, 53:3, 57:25, 58:1, 58:3, 58:15, 58:19, 58:24, 59:9, 59:10, 60:13, 60:17, 60:25, 61:20, 61:23, 62:6, 79:3, 80:12, 82:18, 84:10, 84:11, 84:15, 84:18, 84:19, 84:21, 85:10, 86:11, 86:12, 86:14, 86:23, 87:7, 88:6 stuff [2] - 13:10, 40:17 subject [1] - 29:24 submit [1] - 90:8 submitted [5] - 3:20, 14:19, 31:20, 31:23, 45.25 subscribe [1] - 91:13 subsidiary [1] - 5:25 substantial [2] -16:12, 56:25 substation [2] - 7:2, 24:5 successfully [1] - 22:1 sufficient [1] - 15:18 sufficiently [2] -12:14, 15:8 suggest [9] - 10:8, 17:1, 17:10, 27:12, 43:25, 46:9, 49:2, 50:1, 64:7 suggested [3] - 12:10, 71:1, 75:13 suggesting [1] - 34:21 suggests [1] - 59:2 suite [3] - 6:13, 6:18, 7:5 summary [3] - 4:7, 8:9, 9:5 summer [1] - 78:4 sunlight [1] - 22:6 supplied [1] - 10:5 support [3] - 57:4, 57:23, 81:14 supposedly [1] - 79:9

24:3, 74:3 surprise [2] - 79:10, 79.13 surprised [1] - 27:12 surrounding [2] -65:1,65:6 survey [22] - 27:6, 36:1, 36:3, 36:4, 36:10, 48:7, 48:8, 56:19, 56:20, 57:11, 57:12, 57:14, 57:23, 71:4, 71:6, 73:10, 73:16, 80:3, 80:15, 81:13, 81:15, 84:13 surveyed [3] - 66:13, 70:17, 71:13 surveys [16] - 6:14, 6:15, 6:16, 6:17, 6:19, 6:20, 7:5, 7:6, 20:11, 56:2, 56:9, 56:11, 56:24, 86:20 suspect [1] - 82:20 swear [2] - 5:9, 5:12 swim [1] - 80:18 sworn [1] - 4:12 synthesis [2] - 37:4, 37:17 system [1] - 59:6 systematically [1] -75:5 Т T2 [2] - 71:15, 71:16 **T8** [1] - 71:14 table [9] - 2:14, 9:14, 33:5, 33:16, 33:17, 33:21, 48:15, 50:10 tackle [1] - 32:10 tailor [1] - 45:1 tangible [2] - 8:14, 9:3 technical [5] - 24:10, 42:8, 47:12, 67:4, 90:9 technically [1] - 69:14 technology [1] - 42:7 telephone [2] - 57:12, 57:14 temperature [9] -22:3, 22:10, 22:11, 22:12, 22:16, 22:23, 23:11, 23:20, 74:4 temperatures [2] -22:25 ten [2] - 37:10, 76:14 ten-minute [1] - 76:14 tend [4] - 20:16, 20:18, 66:4, 78:20 Tennessee [1] - 19:20

surface [3] - 23:1,

terms [9] - 12:8, 23:18, 29:3, 30:14, 34:22, 35:20, 39:1, 50:3, 88:20 terrestrial [1] - 70:9 territories [1] - 19:12 testified [5] - 54:22, 65:25, 66:15, 85:16, 85:21 testify [2] - 5:10, 55:13 testimony [24] - 3:19, 4:13, 4:20, 5:3, 11:10, 44:19, 44:24, 45:19, 45:22, 55:6, 55:7, 60:9, 64:6, 65:5, 76:23, 78:24, 79:14, 81:13, 82:11, 82:14, 85:13, 86:1, 90:4, 91:10 theirs [1] - 50:11 therefore [1] - 52:5 they've [2] - 58:4, 68:22 thinking [1] - 47:24 third [1] - 90:6 Thompson [1] - 1:24 thorough [1] - 13:24 thoughtful [1] - 61:3 thoughtfulness [1] -47:6 thousands [1] - 66:10 threatened [1] - 75:5 three [13] - 6:6, 6:15, 25:7, 33:13, 38:5, 38:11, 52:21, 54:12, 59:8, 72:5, 72:7, 77:17 three-day [1] - 38:5 threshold [2] - 52:11, 52:16 throughout [5] - 6:1, 27:14, 43:23, 71:8, 82:21 throw [1] - 38:13 throwing [1] - 38:12 time-consuming [1] -10:16 timekeeper [1] - 28:6 TIMPANO [8] - 28:12, 30:6, 30:14, 30:16, 30:18, 31:4, 31:8, 74:6 Timpano [2] - 28:12, 74:6 tip [3] - 34:18, 35:12, 50:23 title [1] - 64:23 titled [2] - 33:7, 59:9 Toby [1] - 2:17 Toby's [1] - 42:3

today [11] - 3:10, 4:19, 5:10, 9:17, 10:14, 13:4, 25:7, 60:19, 68:7, 75:24, 76:2 today's [4] - 3:12, 3:18, 3:24, 90:9 **TODD** [25] - 2:21, 9:15, 11:1, 14:17, 15:9, 15:11, 16:4, 17:1, 17:10, 23:17, 24:11, 25:6, 25:24, 28:6, 31:12, 32:6, 32:23, 33:3, 45:25, 74:23, 75:2, 75:10, 75:20, 75:24, 89:12 Todd [1] - 2:21 together [3] - 70:25, 75:7, 75:9 took [2] - 70:24, 77:21 top [1] - 16:4 topics [1] - 16:24 topographic [1] -34:19 topography [4] -34:24, 35:9, 35:13 total [2] - 7:15, 9:2 touch [2] - 13:6, 47:10 tough [1] - 37:22 toward [1] - 52:7 towards [2] - 37:11, 87:7 towers [1] - 88:11 town [3] - 63:3, 71:14 towns [2] - 70:23, 71:13 township [1] - 8:19 Township [4] - 1:9, 3:23, 6:3, 8:21 townships [1] - 71:11 tracking [1] - 72:3 trail [9] - 38:9, 38:10, 39:11, 41:5, 44:17, 44:22, 44:23, 60:21, 60:24 transcribed [1] - 4:18 transcription [2] -43:10, 91:9 transport [1] - 19:2 travel [4] - 40:25, 69:24, 70:4, 70:6 traveling [2] - 68:24, 70.3 tree [1] - 50:2 trees [2] - 49:10, 63:11 trees' [1] - 78:18 tribal [3] - 69:7, 69:11, 69.18trip [3] - 25:6, 38:5, 45:3 trips [8] - 44:20,

45:20, 46:1, 60:10, 60:12, 60:16, 60:24 truck [1] - 18:25 true [8] - 34:4, 63:6, 66:22, 69:3, 71:25, 78:19, 82:20, 91:9 Trust [1] - 60:21 truth [2] - 5:12, 5:13 try [1] - 23:15 trying [7] - 32:24, 33:18, 36:8, 51:20, 54:8, 62:12, 73:9 Tuesday [4] - 26:12, 32:19, 42:4, 43:7 turbine [15] - 15:1, 34:1, 34:3, 34:18, 37:21, 44:6, 50:17, 50:24, 51:7, 58:22, 59:13, 59:18, 59:20, 88:18 turbines [54] - 6:6, 6:8, 7:1, 8:1, 8:5, 8:9, 8:11, 14:12, 14:24, 16:3, 24:6, 28:17, 28:19, 29:7, 29:17, 30:12, 30:15, 30:22, 33:11, 41:11, 48:19, 48:22, 48:24, 49:7, 51:9, 51:17, 52:2, 52:5, 52:7, 54:25, 55:11, 57:14, 57:16, 57:22, 58:7, 58:11, 58:20, 58:25, 59:22, 78:14, 80:10, 80:13, 80:22, 80:23, 81:4, 83:1, 83:6, 85:6, 85:9, 85:17, 86:5, 87:3 turn [1] - 29:8 turned [1] - 38:14 turning [1] - 30:12 twisting [1] - 32:20 two [16] - 6:14, 6:15, 7:10, 12:16, 16:24, 29:14, 33:7, 41:3, 43:17, 45:1, 46:1, 59:4, 60:12, 63:20, 68:9, 68:18 type [9] - 20:16, 21:14, 26:25, 27:4, 27:13, 27:16, 40:8, 40:9, 83:19 types [10] - 7:10, 20:8, 20:12, 20:17, 21:5, 21:11, 26:6, 26:18, 62:18, 83:24 typewritten [1] - 91:8 typical [4] - 50:2, 65:1, 65:6, 66:17 typically [1] - 18:1

U U.S [6] - 25:10, 25:13, 25:16, 25:19, 67:25, 72:23 ultimate [1] - 65:21 ultimately [2] - 24:17, 32:1 undefined [1] - 65:8 under [8] - 6:23, 39:4, 43:2, 47:24, 52:10, 78:18, 80:13, 81:3 understood [1] -68:23 undertaken [1] - 28:25 undertaking [1] - 31:5 undue [3] - 8:10, 53:17, 59:15 unduly [1] - 4:22 unequivocally [1] -74:1 unfortunately [2] -6:3, 43:7 uninterrupted [1] -75:16 unique [1] - 44:11 unit [1] - 46:7 university [1] - 71:1 unknowns [1] - 28:1 unless [6] - 10:23, 15:19, 22:14, 76:5, 79:24, 88:2 unlike [1] - 36:15 unlikely [1] - 71:1 unmanageable [1] -20:13 unnecessary [1] -35:7 unreasonable [13] -23:25, 24:2, 24:9, 24:20, 36:20, 36:22, 36:24, 42:16, 42:18, 43:17, 54:6, 64:18, 70:5 unreasonably [2] -64:8, 65:4 unusual [1] - 21:22 up [53] - 2:8, 5:11, 6:6, 8:21. 8:24. 9:14. 10:9, 10:14, 10:23, 11:3, 11:10, 12:8, 14:22, 15:16, 16:8, 16:13, 17:2, 18:3, 20:6, 20:21, 22:22, 29:6, 30:23, 31:1, 32:11, 32:21, 32:24, 37:15, 37:24, 38:12, 38:13, 41:16, 41:18, 41:21, 44:23, 46:24, 47:11, 48:15, 48:17,

69:1, 75:22, 76:3, 76:18, 76:23, 82:24, 88:14, 89:19 upper [1] - 71:16 upraised [1] - 35:12 upset [2] - 58:6, 62:15 usage [3] - 19:14, 58:16, 87:24 useful [2] - 36:14, 62:6 usefulness [1] - 62:20 user [7] - 65:7, 65:15, 65:16, 79:17, 82:1, 84:1, 85:2 users [19] - 40:24, 55:10, 57:23, 64:9, 64:15, 64:17, 64:20, 64:21, 65:3, 65:9, 66:2, 79:19, 80:16, 82:2, 82:4, 82:5, 82:8, 83:24, 87:4 users' [1] - 56:4 uses [6] - 8:9, 8:10, 53:20, 64:25, 65:5, 65:11 usual [1] - 23:17 V validate [1] - 49:24 value [2] - 37:9, 57:11 variables [1] - 57:19 various [3] - 11:12, 41:21, 75:6 vary [1] - 22:17 vegetation [8] - 34:5, 34:6, 34:23, 35:13, 49:12, 49:15, 49:22, 49:25 Vermont [3] - 28:25, 36:2, 62:12 vernal [2] - 6:19, 6:21 versus [1] - 75:16 VIA [9] - 33:5, 33:7, 33:8, 33:18, 46:8, 49:22, 50:3, 50:6, 56:16 vicinity [2] - 24:5, 28:19 **view** [4] - 12:14, 43:16, 51:3, 55:10 viewer [2] - 51:9, 65:2 viewing [1] - 88:19 views [1] - 34:18 viewshed [3] - 49:5, 80:10, 83:2 village [1] - 36:8 Virginia [2] - 19:20,

49:13, 60:25, 61:2,

63:4, 67:16, 67:21,

20:4 visceral [1] - 62:18 visibility [41] - 7:14, 8:1, 8:2, 8:4, 8:5, 33:13, 33:14, 33:17, 33:20, 33:24, 34:7, 34:19, 34:22, 35:10, 48:13, 48:15, 48:19, 49:2, 49:6, 49:7, 50:4, 50:10, 50:17, 51:5, 52:5, 52:18, 53:4, 53:16, 53:19, 54:3, 54:4, 54:9, 54:13, 55:11, 58:19, 80:9, 83:1, 85:6, 86:5, 87:3 visible [5] - 33:11, 34:1, 34:3, 34:11, 39:12 visit [5] - 51:11, 51:16, 77:15, 77:17, 77:21 visual [10] - 7:8, 7:23, 32:17, 39:5, 45:5, 47:13, 47:15, 48:3, 66:1, 66:16 visually [2] - 50:19, 50:21 voiced [3] - 80:16, 85:23, 86:17 volume [1] - 18:18 voluminous [1] -75:12 volunteered [1] -85:12 W W's [1] - 69:25 waiting [1] - 43:9 walking [1] - 41:5 wants [2] - 15:19, 89:10 wardens [1] - 69:12 warmer [1] - 22:7 Washington [3] - 1:9, 3:23, 8:19 waste [1] - 18:6 wastes [1] - 18:3 water [23] - 13:9, 17:14, 20:9, 22:13, 23:1, 23:4, 23:5, 23:9, 24:3, 46:5, 51:24, 60:21, 60:24, 73:23, 74:13, 77:1, 77:2, 77:3, 77:6, 78:4, 78:8, 79:22, 81:7 waters [1] - 60:9 watershed [5] - 9:22,

22:18, 46:6, 61:14,

61.24 ways [6] - 39:13, 49:4, 52:3, 56:7, 56:12, 62:22 Wednesday [2] - 1:12, 2.3 week [12] - 2:8, 5:23, 6:5, 7:19, 17:7, 47:7, 57:8, 60:9, 60:19, 76:24, 78:25, 85:14 week's [2] - 7:17, 9:19 weekend [1] - 82:8 weigh [1] - 37:15 weighed [1] - 39:18 welcome [1] - 61:4 wells [2] - 24:5, 24:14 WELS [1] - 71:14 wELS [1] - 71:15 west [5] - 19:20, 20:3, 33:15, 33:25, 48:17 wetland [3] - 6:19, 6:21, 6:22 wetlands [1] - 6:23 WHEREOF [1] - 91:13 white [1] - 87:1 Whitney [1] - 55:8 whole [6] - 5:12, 39:16, 41:11, 75:20, 86:14, 87:23 Wilderness [1] - 55:8 Wildlife [5] - 25:13, 25:16, 25:19, 67:25, 72:23 wildlife [8] - 10:12, 25:5, 25:10, 25:21, 28:13, 68:14, 69:6, 74:2 willing [2] - 11:2, 29:21 Wind [14] - 1:6, 1:7, 2:9, 3:21, 5:25, 43:3, 47:24, 48:21, 53:15, 56:6, 64:20, 64:23, 67:2, 85:23 wind [33] - 2:9, 3:21, 5:24, 14:11, 28:17, 29:7, 29:8, 29:10, 30:24, 33:5, 37:15, 37:21, 39:4, 39:19, 40:2, 41:9, 41:10, 44:6, 57:14, 57:16, 57:24, 58:7, 58:11, 59:13, 59:18, 59:19, 59:20, 64:14, 73:3, 73:5, 73:8, 74:4 windows [1] - 3:4 windy [1] - 78:22 winter [2] - 79:25, 80:5

winterville [1] - 2:20

wish [3] - 5:5, 89:24, 90:5 WITNESS [1] - 91:13 witnesses [4] - 4:7, 4:12, 5:9, 91:10 wolf [1] - 75:8 wonder [2] - 25:18, 60:20 wonderful [1] - 12:10 woods [1] - 15:5 Woodville [1] - 71:14 wording [1] - 26:21 words [2] - 88:20, 89:21 world [2] - 56:25, 81:15 worry [1] - 22:25 worse [1] - 38:8 worst [1] - 34:22 worth [1] - 57:12 writing [1] - 15:12 written [7] - 4:25, 31:17, 43:2, 51:14, 54:23, 56:17, 90:1

Υ

yard [1] - 57:9 Yarmouth [1] - 71:16 year [1] - 87:12 years [3] - 9:3, 72:7, 72:14 yesterday [1] - 7:22 yourself [2] - 2:15, 25:19

Ζ

zone [2] - 59:3