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MS. HILTON: Good evening, everyone. I would like to call this hearing to order.

This hearing is of the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission and it has to do with Development Permit DP 4886, Blue Sky East, LLC's wind power project in T16 MD. It's otherwise known as the Bull Hill wind project in Hancock County.

My name is Gwen Hilton and I'm the commission chair and presiding officer for this hearing. I'm going to have the commissioners introduce themselves and also our consultants and staff here.

MS. KURTZ: Rebecca Kurtz, Phillips.
MR. SCHAEFER: Steve Schaefer, Grand Lake Stream.
MS. HILTON: Gwen Hilton from Starks.
MS. CARROLL: Good evening. I'm Catherine Carroll, commission staff director.

MR. NADEAU: Jim Nadeau, Winterville Plantation.
MR. MURPHY: Don Murphy, LURC planner.
MS. HORN OLSEN: Samantha Horn Olsen, planning division manager.

MR. PALMER: Jim Palmer, scenic consultant.
MS. HILTON: And we also have Angella Clukey who is our court reporter tonight; Karen Bolstridge who is a LURC staff over at the table here checking everybody in. And if you haven't signed in yet, please do so. And, also, if you want to testify, you need to sign in and indicate that you want to testify.

We also have Scott Perrow who is over here recording this session tonight.

And I have to read an opening statement here:
This evening's hearing is being held pursuant to the provisions of 12 MRSA 685-B. The hearing will conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act and Chapter 5 of the commission's rules for conduct of public hearings. Today's hearing is being held to receive testimony on the matter of Development Permit DP 4886 submitted by Blue Sky East, LLC, to construct a 34-megawatt wind energy development in T16 MD, Hancock County. The proposed wind energy development would consist of 191.8 megawatt wind turbines, up to three meteorological towers, an underground electrical collection system, access roads, a substation and an operations and maintenance building.

The purpose of this public hearing is to allow the public to present direct testimony and evidence as to whether the development proposal meets the criteria for
approval as specified in LURC statute and the Commission's Land Use Districts and Standards.

Those wishing to testify should sign up on the sheets which have been placed on the table just inside the door to the hall. All witnesses must be sworn and will be required before they give testimony to state for the record their name, residence, business or professional affiliation, the nature of their interest in the hearing and whether or not they represent another individual, firm or legal entity for the purpose of the hearing.

In addition to being transcribed, we will be recording the proceedings, so I request that you speak clearly and not too fast.

All questions and testimony must be relevant to the Commission's criteria for approval for this proposal. Irrelevant on unduly repetitious materials or questions will be excluded.

The record of this hearing will remain open for a period of 14 days until Tuesday, May 31st, to receive written statements from the interested public, and for an additional seven days until Tuesday, June 7th, for the purpose of receiving rebuttal comments. No additional evidence or testimony will be allowed into the record after the closing of the record.

Persons attending the hearing who wish to be notified
of the final action taken by the Commission as a result of this hearing may leave their names and addresses with our staff.

At this time I'd like to swear in any witnesses who plan to testify this evening. And if you would please stand up and raise your right hand. Okay. And do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: I do.
MS. HILTON: All right. Thank you. Let's see. Catherine has a list here, and she's going to be reading off the names of those who indicated that they want to testify. And then if you could come up to the microphone and don't forget to say your name, where you're from, and what your affiliation or interest may be.

MS. CARROLL: Is the applicant going to do an opening statement? MS. HILTON: Oops. That's right. MS. CARROLL: And staff? MS. HILTON: That's right. I need to have a -- it's been a long day today, and we had a hearing last night. That's my excuse. Let's see. The staff does a presentation first, and then we'll have the applicant do a short summary. Isn't that the order that we do this?

MR. MURPHY: Yeah. My name is Don Murphy, and I'm the project planner at the commission's Augusta office.

On February 4th, 2011, the application submitted by Blue Sky East, LLC, the applicant, is for a grid scale energy development to be located in T16 MD, Hancock County, and it was accepted for processing at that time.

The proposed wind energy development will be located wholly within the expedited permitting area for the wind energy development. The Bull Hill wind project, as it is known, would be located on Bull Hill and Heifer Hill and would consist of 19 wind turbines, access roads, underground collector lines, a substation, an operations and maintenance building, and up to three permanent met towers. The project would connect to the New England electrical grid using an existing transmission line that runs through the project parcel. The proposal will be fully described more by the applicant.

The state agencies that have reviewed comments that have been submitted are the state soil scientists; Department of Inland Fisheries \& Wildlife; Department of Environmental Protection; Maine Natural Areas Program; Maine Public Utilities Commission; the Bureau of Parks and Lands; and the Maine Historic Preservation Commission. Comments were also submitted by LURC's third-party peer reviewers on scenic and sound assessment.

On March 2nd, 2011, the Commission approved holding this public hearing and granted intervenor status to three
party parties: Concerned Citizens of Rural Hancock County; the Hancock County Commissioners; and the Natural Resources Council of Maine. The Natural Resources Council of Maine, NRCM, has since withdrawn as an intervenor and will not participate as a full status. The Hancock County Commissioners have particularly been -- they've been involved as a governmental agency.

I will now enter -- there is a list of materials that are on file and they're entered into the record.

MS. HILTON: Thank you. The applicant.
MR. BARNS: Good evening. I'm Brooke Barns with Stantec Consulting in Topsham. I'm not the applicant; I'm a consultant for the applicant. And I would like to introduce the Bull Hill project this evening.

As has been noted, it's a 19-turbine wind power project located in Township 16, which is just east of Eastbrook. The application, as Don said, was accepted in February of this year, but that really was the culmination of several years of effort that led up to an application being filed. It's the same -- same way any project like this proceeds.

Initially, there's prospecting that's done by a potential developer trying to find the best location that they can for a potential wind power project.

What are some of the things they're looking for? They're looking for land ownership. What are the -- is it
a number of parcels? Is it a single parcel?
Proximity to transmission. If a project has to be built but you've got to build 120 miles of transmission line, that makes for a much more difficult project.

Existing conditions. What's there on the ground as far as natural resources, infrastructure, roads and things like that.

And finally, of course, what's the wind resource. You can't have much of a wind power project without a good wind resource.

This project has all of those things going for it.
Single ownership of land. There's a transmission line that is noted that runs right through the middle of the project between the northern string and the southern string. It's a commercial forest with existing permanent roads, and there's two years of wind data that have been collected that show it to be a very good, high quality wind resource.

And the elevation? It's not a high elevation project. Between Heifer Hill and Bull Hill where the project is located, the elevation is around 420 to 620 feet. Once the prospecting is done and this site was identified as a good potential for development, then the field studies start, the studies that are included in the two volumes that you have before you and that you're considering today and
beyond.
I think of the studies as of two types. One study is evaluating the natural resources; what are the natural resources in the area, what are their potential impacts; and cultural resources, the things that most affect people. For natural resources, there are wetlands; vernal pools; rare, threatened and endangered species studies; two seasons of avian raptor and bat surveys were done at the project; a work plan was presented to IF \& W and reviewed with them, approved and implemented to evaluate the avian and bat populations in the area; soils mapping was done of the entire project area that's going to be utilized; storm water runoff was calculated; phosphorus analysis was done to determine that the project would be in the allowable limits for the water sheds that it's located in. Those are the kind of natural resources studies that make the volume so thick.

Then there's the cultural studies, as well. That's historic archeology. That's listed properties on the national historic register. It's EuroAmerican archeology as well, old homesteads and things like that.

Shadow flicker analysis is done to determine if the project is going to have any shadow flicker impact on any residences. And a sound analysis is accomplished based on the sound power output of this particular turbine type.

All of those studies get rolled up together, get put in an application which reflects the requirements of LURC to evaluate the project. And the highlights for this particular project are no wetland impacts associated with the project, no vernal pool impacts associated with the project. There's an underground electrical system. That's how we got to no wetlands and, really, no vernal pool impacts, is an underground electrical system to connect the turbines and to run down to the substation. Without roadside poles, we avoid a tremendous number of impacts and are able to really reduce the footprint of the project.

As noted, it's a 19-turbine project. The turbines are Vestas V100 1.8 megawatt machines. The project will have a nameplate capacity of 34.2 megawatts. And the turbines themselves would stand about 476 feet tall with the tip fully extended.

And, of course, the direct connection to transmission, which, of course, I already noted, the substation would be located directly adjacent to existing line 66 and basically be able to plug right into a line that has the capacity to take the generation for this project.

I appreciate the time that you've taken, many days before you got here, the two days yesterday and today, to hear all the comments and testimony and listen to the concerns and really thoroughly evaluate the project.

I believe that this project is very well-conceived and designed, and I look forward to your consideration of it. Thanks very much.

MS. HILTON: Okay. Now we're ready to hear from the public.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. I'm going to read from the list that all of you have signed in, either to testify or just indicating your attendance here, and I'm going to name off the first five names on the list.

And I do have a question, though, for Mary Ann.
Mary Ann, you testified last night; is that right?
MARY ANN JOHN: Yes, I did.
MS. CARROLL: And would you mind if we let others testify before you in order to give these other folks a chance?

MARY ANN JOHN: No, I wouldn't mind at all.
MS. CARROLL: Okay. Appreciate it. Thank you very much, Mary Ann.

So with that, I'm going to list off Jodi Yeo, Dean Beaupain, Steve Fernald, John Fernandez and Duane Jordan. And, actually, I'm going to name off a sixth one, and that's David Corrigan. So Jodi, Dean, Steve, John, Duane and David.

MS. YEO: I'm very nervous, so if I read too fast, I'm sorry. Hello. My name is Jodi Yeo. I live in Eastbrook
and have my whole life. I'm here solely as a concerned citizen.

I would like to start off saying I have not spent countless hours on this cause, but I'm very close to a lot of people who have. The opponents of this project seem to worry a lot about the impact of seeing these turbines -excuse me; turbines, turbines, I'm not sure how you say it -- on our hills. I certainly have seen them in Mars Hill and think they look majestic. They clearly to me are more attractive than cell towers or microwave towers. I don't know the percentage of cell phone owners in Maine, but I can assume they have a cell phone and didn't object as strongly to those towers as they have these.

Do not get me wrong. I don't want anything to happen to our environment. I have always lived in Hancock County and have been all over camping, fishing, hiking. Our scenery is gorgeous, and I agree it should stay that way. But if we don't accept wind towers, we have the stronger possibility of seeing nuclear power plants. Just think of these poor people in Japan. Even though the probability of a tsunami or earthquake of that magnitude along the coast of Maine, New England, or Canada is extremely low if not impossible.

Wind towers are more green and better for the environment than smokestacks and waste from highly
poisonous alternative sources. If not this, then what? If not here, then where?

I could ramble on with my personal opinions that are not based on researched facts, but I won't.

Thank you for listening.
MS. HILTON: Thank you. If you want to leave your written testimony with the staff, we'll --.

MR. BEAUPAIN: Good evening. I'm Dean Beaupain. I'm an attorney. I have an office in Bangor, Maine. I represent Lakeville Shores, the landowner for this project.

Lakeville Shores is owned by the Haynes family from Winn, Maine. It owns several hundred thousand acres of timberland in Maine. We refer to it as a working forest; some would refer to it as an industrial forest. Under no circumstances do we consider it the wilderness. We grow trees. That's our business. We cut trees to supply various industries in Maine. The family has done it for close to 100 years and expects to do it for another hundred years.

This is our fourth project with First Wind. We did Stetson 1, Stetson 2. We have half of Rawlings Mountain, and we have 100 percent of this project.

I have done all those leases. I am very familiar with wind power leases. I have also done them with several other wind power companies. The one thing I can tell you
about First Wind is they have a track record. You've seen Stetson 1, you've seen Stetson 2. I know you were not involved with Rawlings Mountain, but First Wind does what you require it to do; it has a technical capacity; it has a financial capacity; it works closely with you after the permit; and we have successful projects on Stetson 1 and Stetson 2.

I don't know about you commissioners, but as a landowner, we have had absolutely no complaints about Stetson 1 and Stetson 2. Those have been good projects for the environment, good projects for the area, good projects for the landowner.

Lakeville Shores and the Haynes family believes very strongly in public access to their lands, and that will continue in this township. This township is comprised of 20,000 acres of timberland. When this project is done, less than 100 acres will be under the exclusive control of First Wind. 19,9000 acres will still grow trees.

Just for your information, the Haynes family owned the township below Spring River. We own 16,000 acres that we sold to the Nature Conservancy. Before we sold it, we conveyed easements to our leaseholders because they were concerned about access. None of our leases, including camps on Narraguagus Lake, had any road access. They could drive down logging roads, but everything was accessed by
foot for various distances.
On the southwest corner of the township, we also own Township 10. We put the road up into this township. There was no access to any of those camps before we put that road in. None of the camps on Narraguagus Lake have an easement over our road. I assume they use our road to get there. We really don't mind it. But there is very little public use to Narraguagus Lake. It's very difficult to get to. I don't know how you'd get a boat there if you don't have a camp there. Certainly there is an impact if you're out on the lake looking at the project. My point is, I don't think there are very many boats out there at any time.

There were questions this morning about decommissioning. I think we are much more concerned about decommissioning than even the Commission. It's our land. If this project fails and we get stuck with it, we're going to have to clean it up. So it's an issue we're concerned about; however, having been an attorney for 35 years, I've read any number of studies predicting the cost of something, $10,15,20,25$ years in the future. Most of them are nice estimates, but $I$ think the applicant has taken a reasonable approach here. They're going to revisit those numbers periodically in the future and deposit more money if the numbers change in time, and we think that's very reasonable. We think the approach is reasonable, and
since we're the ones that are going to get stuck with it, I don't want you to waste too much time trying to figure out how much money should be put in. As you go in the future and you refine those numbers, the applicant says they'll put more money in. That protects the public, protects you, and it protects us as the landowner.

I do want to emphasize, having listened to the discussion last night and today -- and I want you to know I told Catherine earlier $I$ felt $I$ was at a funeral, $I$ was in the casket, everyone was talking about me not entirely accurately and I couldn't say anything. We leased this land to First Wind. We own the land. The roads you were talking about, we own those roads. We gave them the right to use the road. If they have to move a road or something, we're reasonable people; we'll deal with them.

But if we're using a road that's been in place for 50 years, I don't know why we can't keep using it. We've been cutting in this township for the last three years. We've moved skidders in there, processors in there, graders in there, front-end loaders in there, excavators in there, logging trucks. Some witnesses have pointed out they weigh 120,000 pounds. I don't know what the difference in use is between a flatbed hauling a processer in and a flatbed hauling a crane in or another piece of equipment.

What we usually do on these projects is, when they show
up to start construction, we pull out. So there won't be twice the use on these roads during construction.

After construction, we're going to be the ones using the roads again. We're going to be in there on a regular basis for forestry purposes. This is a land management road. It's used for all kinds of purposes. There will be some construction activity while they construct the project. After that they are not adding a lot of use to any of our roads.

And when the lease is over, they're our roads. We're going to take care of them.

Now, with respect to tangible benefits, there will be a TIF, there will be things of that nature. We believe the construction benefits to this have been proven on Stetson 1, Stetson 2, Rawlings Mountain. I'd love to see the people from Reed \& Reed move right down here and start to work when they're done on Rawlings Mountain.

Maine is in a recession. As President Truman said, if your neighbor is unemployed, it's a recession; if you're unemployed, it's a depression. I think Maine is in between the two, and we need the construction dollars represented by this project and we can use them this year.

Even if we -- just the people from Rawlings Mountain come down here, that's better than being out of work. And there's a multiplier effect to that. Without question,
there are tangible benefits to this landowner. It makes us a stronger company. We employ people all over the state of Maine. Projects like this stabilize our income, allow us to have a strong business. We've bought a lot of timberland. This will help us be a strong company, employ people -- not only in this area, but statewide. We all pay taxes. We think that's a tangible benefit.

We think the public access to this entire township while this project is operating is a tangible public benefit.

We believe in public access to our land and we will continue for the term of this lease to have it open to the public.

Now, last night we heard that Eastbrook enacted an ordinance, which is their right. That ordinance stops at the township line. We were not involved with that process. Our land is not in Eastbrook, and we don't want to be burdened with Eastbrook's ordinance. You folks have enough to do dealing with your own rules and regulations.

I will file some written comments. And in closing, all I would like to say is Stetson 1 and Stetson 2 showed this company can do the job and do it correctly. And when you compare this project to the projects you've looked at in western Maine, the impacts here are negligible.

All we're really talking about is if you climb to the
top of a couple mountains and look north instead of south, you may see a little bit of a turbine. Outside of that, all the impacts are on our property. And believe me, we're willing to accept those impacts. Thank you.

MS. HILTON: Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: Steve?
MR. FERNALD: Good evening. My name is Steve Fernald. I'm a property owner on top of Sugar Hill. I own approximately 100 acres up there. I'm looking forward to building a house up there, possibly several houses.

I'm looking forward to being able to look out and see these wind generators. I think it's something that we really need, and I'm looking forward to it. I do not understand how this is going to obstruct the view. And that's pretty much it. Thank you.

MS. CARROLL: Thank you.
MS. HILTON: Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: John?
MR. FERNANDEZ: Good evening. My name's John
Fernandez, and I'm here on behalf of my wife and I, Linda.
And we are the adjacent property holders to this
development. We own 40 acres on Sugar Hill.
And not that I have anything against windmills; I think it's something that's part of the future. My biggest concern is that we own property on each side of the access
road to this development on the Sugar Hill end, and we are concerned as far as the noise level goes.

Now, I've been told by First Wind, which I respect their opinion, that the decibel level in our area is supposed to be within reason, but there's different seasons where that wind can change a little bit, and I'm just -- my wife and I are concerned very much that this may be a problem for us. We bought this property six years ago in 2004 -- actually almost seven years ago now -- to be a retirement home for us. And it's peaceful and quiet up there, and we don't hear much traffic. We like to do hiking and put trails through our property, you know, just so we can go out and enjoy nature. And not that that's going to be a problem, but my biggest concern is the noise level. Thank you.

MR. NADEAU: John, how far are you from the nearest turbine?

MR. FERNANDEZ: I'm about 3,400 feet, I think it is, isn't it, Dave?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 3,880.
MR. FERNANDEZ: 3,880.
MR. NADEAU: Okay.
MR. FERNANDEZ: I notice they did a resurvey just recently here and put some survey stakes down our driveway, so -- but we are -- we are close on that end.

MR. NADEAU: Okay. Thank you.
MR. FERNALD: Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: Duane is next.
MR. JORDAN: Good evening. My name is Duane Jordan. I manage and own Elliott Jordan \& Son Tree Top Manufacturing. I'm a third generation logger in Down East Maine. I've worked all these areas through the years. 16 before the Haynes family owned it. Township 10 before they owned it. I also own land of our own in Waltham, Eastbrook, Osborne, and we are probably one of the only owners I -- we own 545 acres of land in Township 16, and the Haynes family owns around us. We do have legal access to those lands, and the lands were bought primarily for -- we are loggers, but we also are -- we do raise blueberries.

And we have in -- over the last 25 years or so -- taken about 300 acres out of forestland and put it into blueberries. And our westerly boundary -- our easterly boundary is Spring River. And this is something my dad kind of does in his retirement. And we will have to drive through these Heifer Hill turbines every day, or he will, and to get to his fields and to get back to home. And I'm here to tell you today that's not a problem with us. We feel this is a project for the future, and we stand behind First Wind 100 percent.

One of the only things that $I$ ask from First Wind was I
was really concerned about the overhead power lines. And as you can see on your permit, I don't think it was done strictly for myself, but I do appreciate -- and I want to thank Dave Fowler and First Wind for at least hearing me -and being able to put those power lines underground was a big plus for us. We feel that that's a safety issue with logging equipment. We are loggers, just like Mr. Haynes's family, and we log lands in Eastbrook, Waltham, and Osborne.

I actually live off the grid on the south side of Speck Pond, which is a mile. I live 6 miles in the woods. I definitely don't live without, but I live 6 miles in the woods. And I live approximately a mile from the Bull Hill string. And I'm an avid kayaker. I go kayaking every day when the ice is out. I go cross country skiing when the ice is in. And I -- I look forward to the day that I can go out on Speck Pond and look back and see wind turbines. I believe in this project.

I run a company, we have a tremendous amount of energy issues in this country, and I think that if this state has a wind resource and if we're not willing to use that, shame on us. I have a $\$ 100,000$ a month fuel bill, taking -employing 20, 25 individuals. That's every month. You figure out what that is at the end of the year, just to pay my fuel bill. That tells you that there's an energy issue
in this country. And the only way you fix it is to out supply the demand. That's what business is all about. That's what I've learned over the last 30 years. Supply drives the price. There's plenty of supply, the price goes down. If there's not enough supply, the price goes up.

I think the energy electric bill is a bargain today. I think if we don't get control over what we do, that it would be nothing to see your electric bill double.

People ask me lots of times, well, is the -- is our electric bill go down if we have a wind farm? No, I don't think so. I just think it won't go up as fast.

I'm a biomass contractor. I've worked on paper company lands. I've been -- I haul biomass to the biomass facilities in the local area in Hancock/Washington County. Some of the stand-alone biomass plants are failing. Lots of reasons are they're at the end of their life; they're 20, 25 years, but the biggest reason is that biomass plants depend on chips every day.

Just to give you a -- most of these stand-alone biomass plants will run around 20 -megawatt plants. To put that in layman's terms, they need about one load an hour. You see these chip trailers going down the road? They need one of those an hour, every hour of the day, seven days a week. That's 150 average loads for a 20-megawatt plant. These plants are probably not going to be around for a lot
longer, and the reason for that is the fuel price.
See, it's called green energy, and I agree with it, and I've done it for 20 -some years. And I believe it's a very good forestry tool and we need that, but it's directly tied to our fuel. I don't control the fuel price. So we need to get a handle on our energy. And that's why I'm standing up here today.

Here I am. I'm a biomass contractor. My biomass plants are closing. Don't get me wrong; not all biomass plants are going to close. The ones that are tied with mills, cogeneration, they will survive because those plants have a mill waste, they have a second use. They have to get rid of their mill waste. It either has to go into a landfill or they can burn it. So there are certain facilities that will survive.

If you've read the paper lately, Verso Paper in Bucksport is actually adding. They're putting a -- they're going to be adding capacity. I'm one of their suppliers. I've done a lot of work tying myself to cogeneration plants. We have a plant in Jonesboro. Closed. We have a plant in Deblois. Closed. That's because they're stand-alone energy plants.

To be honest with you, I believe that the wind farms will generate the electricity in their place. I'm not a person that looks away and decides that I'm not going to
look at the facts. I look at wind energy and say that I can't compete.

Now, I hope that I will be able to continue biomass for the forest's sake, but wind energy -- this -- a wind farm being built is going to use lots of fuel to get it built, but once the wind farm is up and running, if the price of diesel fuel goes to 5 dollars and a half, the wind is still blowing and it isn't going to care what the price on the pump says. I care every day. Trust me. I look every day. When that 10,000-gallon trailer rolls into my shop dooryard and fills my tank up, it ruins my day. And it happens often.

So that being said, I don't want -- I do think that we have a lot of things in Maine -- all of us in Maine use our resources; loggers, logging, trees, and we've learned a lot about that. In 1991 we had a Forest Practices Act inflicted on us, and we learned that not -- we had to be a little bit more than loggers; we had to show and explain how we did things. And we've become better loggers because of it. And the loggers today should be patted on the back because they are of the highest standard.

We have -- every -- potato farmers in Aroostook County, they farm the land. Lobstermen off the coast, they're using a resource. I'm a blueberry grower.

Some people may -- we spend a lot of time leveling our
fields and taking care of our crops, and you can say that whether we do it right or not, I'm not sure. Some people will say yes, some people will say no.

I think a lot of this comes down -- from what I can see is a visual thing. These machines are large. And I understand that. I -- I understand there was testimony yesterday about going up on Schoodic Mountain not wanting to look to the north and see a wind farm.

You know, it's a matter of opinion. I went to Schoodic Mountain with one of my sons who just graduated from college Saturday this past summer, and we made a vow that we weren't going to go back until we did see the wind farm because we want to be able to look out there and say, we're using one of our natural resources, and we're proud of that. And we should be. I mean, that's what Maine -Maine has natural resources to offer.

I did some work for Chuck Simpson this spring down on -- I don't know whether you people know anything about Route 9 -- on 52,000, they bought just a few years ago -- I was kind of amazed -- and the reason I bring this up -- of the public lands that we now own, just -- just in Hancock and Washington County alone? Well, let me get back to that.

I want to -- we went down to harvest -- to widen the road for the Machias River Corridor. They just -- in 2008
they spent -- bought 9,000 acres that's now public land. It used to be woodlands. Well, it still is woodlands.

And we cleared that. And we were talking one day about all the acres that are under public use. And he said, you really ought to get on my mailing list because, he said, we have times that they actually do go out and do a certain amount of harvesting in a certain amount of acres.

And I said, so, Chuck, how many acres do you have?
Well, I've got this here if anybody wants to see it.
And I was amazed. In Hancock/Washington County, just in public lands -- just public lands -- they have 138,300 acres. That's not -- that's not counting Acadia National Park, which is 36,000 acres.

And I started adding up all the wildlife habitats. You can do it yourself. You can go to the gazetteer. And I came up with between 200 and 250,000 acres that is set aside for the public. That's great. I love the wilderness. I do all those things --

MS. HILTON: Duane? Can you sort of wrap it up here? I'm not sure -- we've got quite a few other people that want to testify, and we can also take anything that you have in writing as well.

MR. JORDAN: I have nothing in writing. My point -- I guess my point on coming up with the public lands -- I'll get to that, and then I'll be done -- is that we have set
aside lots of acres for the public, whether it be people from away or whether it be for the state people and -- and we have done a very good job at reserving lands.

And I just -- I think that that's a good thing and I agree with it. The rest of some of the other lands, like the Haynes family, like -- I don't need to push that. It's a working forest, and we're very lucky to have them to keep their lands open. And we have a lot of lands open, and we have a lot of land reserved. Thank you.

MS. HILTON: Okay. Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: David, you're next. And if I may, I'm going to name off the next five names on the list. They include Billy Hooper, Steve Blaisdell, Nancy Lowry, Mary Harris, Dave Boulter.

And David, show mercy on the court reporter.
MR. CORRIGAN: I will slow down.
MS. HILTON: She's going to throw daggers at you.
Thanks, David. Appreciate it.
DAVID CORRIGAN: Good evening, commissioners. As you
know, my name is David Corrigan. I run Fletcher Mountain Outfitters in Concord Township. I also run the

RealWindInfoForMe.com website and blog, which a few people who think they're spreading facts might want to have a look at tonight.

This is not the first time I've stood before you folks,
and I'm sure it's not going to be the last. As you're aware, I've studied every wind application that's come along in the last few years. I have to say this one is perhaps the sloppiest that I've ever seen.

There's just too many unanswered questions in this one. Questions that need to be resolved -- these questions that need to be resolved are numerous and serious. The decommissioning plan is, frankly, a joke. To allow this company to put aside such a small amount of money -- amount of cash -- and depend on scrap values that will be reevaluated in year 7 and year 15 is criminal. What happens if they go out of business in year 5? Or if the value of scrap suddenly plunges, as we all know it sometimes does? The people of Maine will get stuck with the bill. And it's your responsibility to make sure that doesn't happen, so I'm asking you to really look into that. We've heard a lot about birds today, more than we have in a lot of other of these projects. It's obvious that no one, including this Commission, really has any idea of what species of birds actually use that area, either to fly over, to nest in or to stop and rest on their migrations. So with that being known, basically admitted today, how do we know this project won't have significant impacts on rare, threatened or endangered species of birds? It's your responsibility to make sure that it won't.

On the subject of scenic impact, I believe that both the applicant and Mr. Palmer are way off base in their assessments. To not consider a scenic impact as significant simply because a resource is difficult to access or because a fishermen or a hiker could look in the other direction is ludicrous. Although I do not spend my time specifically in this area as a full-time guide, I can tell you some of the most important and valuable views to me and my paying clients are the wild places that are hard to access, the ones that don't have easy, public, drive-up access. Those are the ones we want to go see. That's what the value is. To discount the value of these places simply because a paid consultant says so is to do a disservice to every citizen of Maine as well as to every visitor.

It's also to intentionally neglect the duty that you've been charged with. There's a reason that the expedited wind law specifically instructs you to take such places into consideration. These places and their views are important in their own right, they're important to the happiness and livelihood of many, including myself who makes a living from these things, and they're also held in trust for future generations. Things change in 20 years, but we're still going to have these scars up here if we're not careful.

I have a major problem with the user survey that was
presented. Not only was it done at a time of year when they would have likely missed the majority of users, but the interpretation that $I$ heard today of the data was quite flawed in my opinion. When they say that roughly 80 percent of those surveyed were not bothered by the idea of turbines enough to keep them from coming back to a favorite place, they neglect to mention that many were bothered at some level. That's in their survey -- where they list 1 to 4, 1 to 10 -- there was some level of disturbance even among those who said they'd come back.

That also means -- if 80 percent are coming back, that means 20 percent will never return because of significant adverse visual impact. That's huge. 20 percent of those people are basically saying they're not coming back if these things go up. As a guide, if 20 percent of my people don't come back because these things go up, I'm out of business. And forgetting the financial for a minute, how many people are losing what you people have been asked to protect? That 20 percent. Do they not count? And that's what I really want to get across on the visual.

No one seems to want to talk about the effects of blasting on the aquifer and the vernal pools. I guarantee that blasting will have some effect. I don't know exactly what it will be, but to simply brush it off as not likely without first doing the studies is to tell the people of

Maine that no one is watching and no one really cares. That's a really bad message for this Commission to be sending. That's not what the people of Maine want to hear, and that's not what they deserve.

There's absolutely nothing in the law that says that you have to approve a wind permit if it doesn't meet all of the environmental standards that you would demand of any other development, whether it be a housing project or a sawmill. This one doesn't, and I don't believe you should. I'm not going to go on and on about visual. Any of you who have heard my testimony in the past or read my writings know that's not my biggest complaint about these projects, but there was a lot said today about red lights and distances. And as someone who has really looked into these things, and I've traveled the west; I was out in Kansas last fall where I saw hundreds of these things lined up day and night -- I can go just a few miles from my home, drive into a clear-cut and look over 30 miles to my northwest and see the Kibby Project. Day or night those turbines are significant, significant features on the landscape. It's not something that you don't really notice over there in the corner; they're there. And those flashing red lights are there at night. I have seen the same out on the flatlands in Kansas this fall. I saw these things at 30 and 40 miles in the flatlands. I've personally seen them
over 30 miles in our mountains right here, day and night.
So to say -- I realize you're limited with your 8 miles and all of that in the expedited wind law, but to say that, oh, it's 7 and half miles, they're not really visible, they become insignificant, it's absolutely not true to those of us who live in those woods and know what is a significant feature on those landscapes.

So I would like you to keep that in mind when you consider that working inside your eight-mile limit. And as this we hear a lot in this case and in other cases about we can't get good pictures of flashing red lights, if anyone is really interested, $I$ just saw pictures of those flashing red lights in Lincoln taken from the Eggel's camp at the Upper Pond Boat Launch. They're posted on the Friends of Lincoln Lakes website. Those pictures, I can tell you from personal experience, look like the lights look when you're standing there. So anyone who tells you you can't get good nighttime pictures of those red lights is not being honest.

And I won't take up much more of your time. I just want to thank you, and I'd be happy to answer any questions before I go.

MS. CARROLL: All right. Billy, you're next. MR. HOOPER: My name's Billy Hooper, and I live in Franklin. First of all, $I$ would like to say thank you to Mr. Haynes and to Mr. Jordan for not closing their land to
the public. I've hunted and fished into T16 for the last 15 years. Last year I started dealing with First Wind and Mr. Fowler. They have been honest and fair. I can't say a bad word against them. They've done everything they said they were going to do to us and for us. And I think the wind project would be a very good thing for Down East Maine. Thank you.

MR. NADEAU: Could you spell your last name?
MR. HOOPER: H-o-o-p-e-r.
MS. HILTON: Steve.
MR. BLAISDELL: Hi. My name is Steve Blaisdell. I live in Manchester, Maine, and I have a second home in Hancock County. I'm a civil engineer from the University of Maine and I work as the vice-president of engineering for Maine Drilling \& Blasting. My job is to find customers and to manage projects.

Maine Drilling \& Blasting has been very proud and fortunate to work as a subcontractor on many of the wind projects in Maine. We've worked exclusively with Sargent and Reed \& Reed on Mars Hill, Stetson I, Stetson II, Record, Rawlings and Kibby. We're an employee-owned company. Everyone in our company benefits from the years of work that has allowed our families to survive through these difficult economic times. Many of us have retained our jobs purely because of these projects. There isn't any
other work particularly in Maine right now for our 40 people that have been doing these projects. So we -- we are very fortunate to have had the opportunity for this track record.

Some of talking points that Maine Drilling likes to remember -- our economy has being managed as a result of these wind opportunities. We are still among the ranks of the employed; we're not in a recession or depression, thanks to First Wind.

I take pride in contributing to these successful projects. I really enjoy working with the professionals at First Wind solving problems and building high-standard projects. The other construction companies and their employees are primarily Maine people. We work in a stable environment, we work well together, we know how to get to the end in a way that's a collaborative effort.

Our resume and future wind farm projects will make our careers sustainable. Just as an example of that, last week we were recruited -- and I say we; that would be the contractors that have done these projects -- by a major international wind developer to look at projects in Vermont and New Hampshire. We've been hiking mountains for four days throughout their permitted areas. They picked two people in the United States to look at these projects; a company from out west, and the three of us here from Maine.

That's special. And they kept saying, we hear what high standards the projects in Maine were built to and how reasonable the people work together. That's huge.

I'm near retirement. There's nothing I would rather do than leave the young kids from the University of Maine working for these companies with that track record of being able to build projects throughout the northeast because we had a good customer and we had good projects to start with.

It really is rewarding to know there's opportunities out there in this -- this industry. Outside of work, I take great pride in discussing wind projects. Obviously, where do you go that people don't bring it up?

Visual? I didn't -- we weren't involved in building Vinalhaven, but I do sail on the coast of Maine every weekend that I can and always will and always have. Primarily I sail in Jericho Bay and I'm trying to figure out the wind and get dialed in. And as I see those three Vinalhaven wind turbines, they're trying to do the same thing. And you might think my sailboat looks good. I think those wind turbines look good. Because we're all trying to figure out that breeze on that afternoon and enjoy a day without any petroleum.

When I go down to Casco Bay and have to sail with my friends and look at the tower at Cousins Island, it doesn't tell you anything about the wind, but it is a necessary
evil. I think that it's all in the eyes of the beholder. And if you respect the wind and you love the wind and you can see it as a benefit, then you see this thing as another way to connect with the wind. That -- that has beauty to some of us. Thank you very much.

MS. HILTON: Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: Nancy?
MS. LOWRY: Thank you. My name is Nancy Lowry, L-o-w-r-y. I am a year-round resident of Eastbrook. I live just across the street where your tour started yesterday on the Neck Ridge. I have lived there for 18 years. I have a business there. I farm there.

I am a scared citizen. I have been deeply involved in the production of the Eastbrook ordinance for the past year. I have not been a popular person at all. I have contested many things that the townspeople have said because I see this project as much larger than the town or myself making money.

I've not heard enough about the health concerns. I've heard from many experts, many elected officials, many legal officials. I've heard from a sound expert from the Maine Department -- DEP -- Andy Fisk who said we will hear them 4 miles away. I live less than 2 miles from the southern string of turbines. I'm scared. I have a beautiful farm. And if when those turbines become operable and I hear them
and I feel them and I hear people in town, even the landowners who are making money off this project, are starting to get sick or starting to not sleep well or property values are going down, which still hasn't been addressed enough, what is my recourse? What can I do? I have to move? I don't want to move. I have this gorgeous property. This is where I want to live and die.

And because someone else or your committee has decided to bring an energy force -- I am all in favor of alternative energy. I have never heard so many wars, lies, disparaging comments, misconceptions, marketing about any other alternative energy than wind. Why is that? No one says these negative things about solar energy. Bring it on. Put solar panels up, but -- I just can't say it enough. What do I do? What do I do when these things that people are concerned about come true? I don't want to be a guinea pig. Thank you very much.

MS. HILTON: Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: Mary?
MS. HARRIS: I am Mary E. Harris, a resident of the town of Eastbrook, and member of the planning board. I was born and brought up in the town of Eastbrook, and it's been my home for over 80 years. I can't see how these turbines are going to harm the health and welfare of anyone. I'm sure most of you drink or eat out of plastic containers,
and to me that is one of the worst commodities there is around. I can't imagine how these turbines are going to make so much noise that one can't sleep at night. I don't care how close you are. I lay awake a few nights every night -- every week, and it's not because of the turbines, unless I'm hearing it from Stetson Mountain or way away. I can't imagine not being able to hear -- I'm sorry. I can't imagine one being able to hear a noise from the blades especially from a mile away. The wind rustling through the trees would make a much greater noise.

Our planning board worked diligently on our wind ordinance. As was mentioned previously, we are not professionals, just citizens being concerned for the good or the welfare of the town of Eastbrook. We worked with the town lawyer, the Hancock County Planning Commission, a person from LURC, and a windmill -- and a wind noise professional. We read numerous wind ordinances from other towns as well as what we got from the state DEP. And we did the best we could and what we considered would be the needs of the town of Eastbrook.

I personally think windmills are beautiful and will not harm the aesthetic beauty of the town of Eastbrook.

As far as the effect on birds and animals, I believe the poachers do far more damage on our deer and moose population than the turbines ever will. We have heard a
lot about bats, and I will be glad to give you all you want.

Blue Sky East or First Wind has done a great job in doing things the correct way. They have met with town officials, planning board, and citizens owning property within a mile or so of the project. I would urge you to grant their application for the wind farm on Bull Hill and Heifer Hill and ask you to please consider our wind ordinance when granting anything that pertains to the town of Eastbrook.

We have nothing to do with other towns, and our ordinance has nothing to do with them, regardless of what a few think. Just remember, ladies and gentlemen, we cannot stop progress or time as both seem to work on without us. I'm not sure the good outsets the bad, but sometimes it does. We can hope that what we are doing is the correct and the best thing for the future generations to come. At our special town meeting to approve this project, the majority of people attending approved the project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
MS. HILTON: Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: Dave, you're next. After Dave is
Kathleen Donahoe, Terri Cormier.
MR. BOULTER: Good evening. I am David Boulter. And first of all, $I$ want to thank you very much for holding a
hearing here. It means a great deal to the people in this community. I do have some appreciation of the amount of effort that it takes for Commission members to take time off from their regular jobs to wade through the evidence and make tough decisions. And you're here today because it will be, in fact, a tough decision. And I want to thank you and express my appreciation to you.

As I said, I am David Boulter. I am here representing myself and my family and representing no other legal entity. I am a lifelong resident of Maine and reside in Brunswick. I own property with a seasonal residence in the town of Eastbrook, a community that is closest to the wind project site for Township 16.

Eastbrook is a very small community with very little, almost no industry except for the logging activity, and very little commercial activity. It has little experience in industrial development, with the most intensive permitted development over the last 30 or so years being construction of several large buildings to house logging equipment.

My family and I have strong ties to the Eastbrook community, and my family has owned property in Eastbrook since 1931. My grandparents, my father and my aunt, and later my cousins and siblings and I, spent each summer and offseason at Molasses Pond. My immediate family continues
to do so as well. I have been coming to Molasses Pond for over 50 years, and it is here that we learn to appreciate the natural environment and the special places apart from the sights and sounds and distractions of urban life. It has shaped my life. It is a special place, literally, at the end of the road and at the edge of remote, wild areas of Down East Maine. Because of its remote location, it is totally dark at night where starlight is the predominant light at night, and it's an exceedingly quiet place. Especially at night.

Sound measurement taken last year at the water's edge of my property read a mere 20 decibels, which in fact is a very, very quiet area. I'm also familiar with the town of Eastbrook wind energy facility ordinance that was adopted by the town, the residents. The Town of Eastbrook is very proud of that; they took it very seriously. It is an ordinance that, in its view, believes properly regulates wind energy facilities but is not a de facto prohibition as other communities have done.

I think they ought to be very proud of that ordinance and it's -- in my view -- a very workable one.

I was privileged to serve on that ordinance committee, and as member of that committee, I learned a great deal about the benefits and the impacts of the energy facilities. And it's with this background that $I$ offer the
following comments.
First Wind or Blue Sky's immediate proposal is for 19 turbines, but the applicant has stated on numerous occasions in public meetings it intends to develop additional turbines in the immediate area, including in Eastbrook itself totalling 48 to 50 turbines. This is only the Phase I.

And the location of this proposal -- this Phase I -- is just 600 feet or so across the town line, very close to area residents. NRCM in its testimony last night indicated in its view it was a very close call in terms of this application. It has positive points and negative points.

I actually agree with that assessment. I think it is a close call. I think you've got a very difficult decision to make. There are some very positive aspects of the project. First Wind is a very competent and capable company. There are aspects of the project that I think are concerning and that the Commission ought to look at very closely.

And I want to give you information on really seven issues, and I'll treat them quite quickly. The seven being LURC's mission as it relates to the wilderness areas of Down East Maine; wind power facilities as major industrial uses and management of that wind resource; scenic issues; decommissioning; road access; birds and bat resources; and,
finally, noise from wind turbines.
The first point I want to make is really broader than just the First Wind. And I felt from my perspective, I at least wanted to share with you my perspective on how this project relates to your mission.

LURC's mission is to plan for and protect the natural resources, scenic character and existing uses in the unorganized territory. It is, in fact -- as you know -- a very unique charge for state of Maine and a very important one.

Much of the attention lately -- certainly the last few years for development -- has been in the unorganized territories in northern Maine; it's focused on that with this high value lakes and mountains. Of equal value, however, and potentially more development potential, are the undeveloped areas of Down East Maine. There's a good chunk of the unorganized territory that is just east of here that has significant important values that I think need to be protected. It is less remote than northwestern Maine, and with the -- the population increase the way it is with -- Ellsworth, I guess, has the distinction now of being the fastest growing city in the state, and Hancock County one of the fastest growing counties. That development pressure will continue.

To the east, as I indicated, are vast stretches of
forestland. It is used as commercial forestland, but nonetheless, they are remote areas with high value fishing, wildife and habitat resources, and the proposed project by its nature is sprawling; it has to have distance between the turbines, and that has the potential to significantly alter the existing character and diminish the wild character of the jurisdiction.

The concern that I think that the -- the Commission needs to focus on is the leapfrogging effect. Blue Sky's proposal is to erect 476-foot towers on 500-foot hills. These are not ridge lines of mountains; these are hills. And the wind power technology has advanced such that turbines can be placed virtually anywhere now to capture relatively low-generation winds.

And so it's easy to put -- if there's a transmission line -- to put strings of turbines almost anywhere now. Limited not by, necessarily, characteristics within the jurisdiction, but proximity to facilities that the project would use. And so the potential for leapfrogging of these projects throughout the jurisdiction is very great. And you have a unique opportunity, different from -- from environmental protection, because you have planning and zoning that you have the opportunity to place these projects in the context of the jurisdiction that you look at as a whole when you look at 10 and a half million acres,
a good portion of which is Down East.
And I urge you to consider that as you look at this project and other projects about your regulatory authority so that you can put these in context and make sure you preserve the values of the jurisdiction and not take projects in isolation and find yourself, years later, having fragmented the jurisdiction to large sprawling projects without looking at the cumulative effect.

The second issue that I'd like to raise is wind energy facilities as industrial uses. These are major industrial uses with infrastructure associated very much like other industrial uses with road development, transmission lines, maintenance buildings, generating facilities. They are -as with other generating facilities, there are trade-offs. There are no belching air emissions coming from wind facilities, but they're not innocuous as well; there are impacts, and you have to weigh those impacts.

The proposed project on Bull and Heifer Hills is a major industrial project and, in my view, ought to be regulated as such and managed. This includes managing the wind resource, not unlike how hydropower is managed today.

Understandably, Blue Sky proposes to maximize its use of wind resource, including the number and locations of turbines, although hydropower developers some years ago initially resisted decreasing the output of water flow to
manage low flow conditions, low head implements or ice insulation of fishways, regulators now routinely impose those requirements to -- and to manage the resource in a way that protects those public resources. And I urge the Commission to look at wind resources in the same way as water resources.

They are resources that are in the public interest. They can be accommodated, but they also should be managed to protect the public interest. And I encourage the Commission to take that approach, including perhaps limiting the number of turbines proximate to developed areas, limiting tower height, and particularly an application of speed control on turbines to limit noise from certain wind directions or to protect avian or other species.

The Blue Sky proposal utilizes sophisticated and highly computerized wind generation equipment. Turbine direction and speed can be controlled remotely with a high degree of accuracy to minimize impacts on surrounding areas including noise impacts. Just as with hydro power plants, on-site location and operational constraints can, in fact, minimize any undue, adverse effects so they become at acceptable levels. And I -- it's my recommendation that those techniques be employed.

With respect to scenic impacts, the nearly 500-foot
height of the turbines dwarfs the hills on which these towers are proposed, and their proposed strings, as you have heard, will be seen for many miles away.

A particular concern to me, however, are those towers that are less than 4,000 feet from existing residences. I recognize LURC's statutory limitations and constraints with respect to scenic impact and others that have raised those concerns in more detail, and I will defer to them with respect to most of the scenic impacts.

I would add, however, that the lack of professional assessment of the scenic impact of the state's Donnell Pond unit by Parks and Lands seems to me a crucial missing element of the Commission's understanding of the impacts of this important resource.

The Donnell Pond unit is a fantastic natural resource and a wonderful asset to this particular region of the state of Maine. And I encourage you to do your best to try to find that information out so that you have that understanding from the professionals that work that unit.

I also want to indicate, with respect to Mr. Laverty's comments earlier -- I believe it was earlier this morning -- and I believe he is exactly right on point with respect to the Lakes Assessment and the high value scenic resources. This comprehensive plan speaks directly to the wildlands assessment, the lakes assessment, and the lakes
management strategy that's been adopted, and it was done with great deliberateness over a period of years. And I have great respect for the landscape architect that has worked on the project, but $I$ think in this case he has missed the point.

The high value characteristics, whether it's high scenic value or high fisheries value, other values, are intrinsic values; they're intended to be intrinsic regardless of the number of people using them. And the example I have, you have remote ponds -- I think they used to be called Class 6 ponds; is that right -- remote ponds, high value ponds, they are valued because they are remote. And under -- if you accept the applicant's consultant's assessment that they are valuable only if a lot of people use them, it would turn the remote ponds upside down because very few people use the remote ponds.

And under that argument, you could line the remote ponds with towers of some sort, whether they be wind towers or whatever, because they would have low to moderate impact because very few people would use them. They have value because they have intrinsic value. People go to those spots because of those pristine characteristics that it can enjoy. It is no different with a scenic assessment; whether a lot of people use Narraguagus Lake or not, it has high value because of what is there, not because of how
many people look at it.
With respect to decommissioning provisions that have been spoken about, I just want to reinforce that $I$ think the concerns that have been noted by the Commission members are, in fact, on track. The applicant proposes financial obligations to assure a full decommissioning would be met principally, as $I$ understand it, selling in the future discontinued wind turbines for either reuse or salvage. Heavy reliance is placed upon the current price of scrap steel, and scrap steel prices, as you know, have fluctuated over the years and are likely to continue to do so.

Define the proposed shortfall even from the sale of those in the amount of -- I believe in the application is $\$ 35,000$ annually, is after year 7 -- well, well into the project site, probably in all likelihood, after the asset is fully depreciated by the company.

The proposed decommissioning provides insufficient assurance and protection to the public, I believe, in ways that would assure that resources would be available when Blue Sky or its successor abandons the facility.

It is my recommendation to protect the public interest that the -- and not have abandonment of towers -- for example, in California, you can see hundreds of towers that have been abandoned and presumably scrap metal prices are not sufficient to market salvaging of those at least.

I recommend that the Commission, if it approves the application, to require the applicant to provide financial assurance in the form of a performance bond, surety bond, letter of credit or other independently-verified form of assurance, that upon the end of its useful life, a cessation of operation -- even if it's before seven years -- will have sufficient financial assurance to cover 100 percent of the cost. And that -- well, financial assurance being placed in phases, I think, makes sense -- it certainly makes sense from a financial point of view -- it is my recommendation that it should be in place within five years of commencement of operation. Risk for the first five years, I think, is relatively low from the public and the Commission's point of view because a high salvage value can be predicted for that short period of time. Beyond that period of time, it is too speculative to rely upon with any degree of certainty at least for the public interest.

Very quickly, I will speak to inadequacy of the Molasses Pond and Sugar Hill Roads. The applicant has stated on a number of cases that it does not intend to use the Molasses Pond and Sugar Hill Roads. There are two principle ways of access; one from Route 9 and the 7,300 road coming down south from Route 9. It's a major haul road. And then 182 coming up. That's great if they're
going to use, particularly, Route 9. I believe, though, that the Sugar Hill Road and Molasses Pond Road are an easier way, a quick way to get to the site and it will be a natural tendency to use those roads. In my view they're wholly inadequate, would fail the statutory standard you have with respect to the traffic movement on those roads. They are not designed for heavy traffic. The markings on the roads, if you've travelled them -- setting aside the whole frost heave issue that we have to deal with each year -- the shoulders are not equipped. They're compacted. There are not lane markings that would make it safe. It goes right to the head of the pond.

Molasses Pond, where there is a public -- or quasi-public and private beach area that's within 5 feet of the travel area, it's heavily used with pedestrian traffic going back and forth between RV camps, private homes -- and there's snack bar in that immediate area -- it is unsafe for any sense of large amount of -- certainly not heavy traffic, but even an amount of other traffic as well.

And I would urge that you condition, if you grant an approval, a condition that that not be used even for construction purposes or construction crews to use that area. It is totally unsafe in my view. It also terminates at the Sugar Hill Road. You have heard comments from members of the public that live in that area. It
terminates within 25 feet -- or 24 feet, actually -- of the door of residents, and it would be very disruptive to those people to have traffic of that nature going across those roads.

Effect on bird and bat resources. I think people have spoken adequately to that. I just want to reinforce the comments that have been made. From personal observation as well as the application, there are eagles and ospreys in the area. It is not actually an uncommon sight to see them in the Sparrow Hill and Molasses Pond area. Why they cannot seem to find the nest sites, I don't know, but they are definitely a common site.

The bat and bird issue I think you can deal with. You had good testimony on that. I would urge, though, that the measures recommended by $I F \& W$-- and it is unusual what they've recommended, and I think you ought to give great weight to that. They are not recommending a study. This is a permit that you're asking for. It's not a -- a -some sort of research-type study. They're saying to prevent the impact -- undue adverse impact on bats, there ought to be mitigation measures in place, not to measure how many bats may have been killed after a period of one or two years. And I think what they've put in place is a reasonable measure to mitigate damage to the resource that the state -- certainly fish and wildlife -- believes to be
valuable.
The last point I want to make -- and from my perspective, it is probably one of the most, if not the most significant, and that is noise impact. A lot of time has been spent on scenic views. I think noise -- as I have learned -- is a real issue. It is certainly a real issue to people that live approximate to the sites.

Noise from the 19 turbines will be heard, as you've heard. Nobody seems to be able to give us an answer how many miles before the sound goes to the background, but it certainly seems to be well over 2 miles away. I have learned two things particularly from my research and work in the ordinance. And that first one is that regulating noise from wind energy facilities is key to wind turbines' acceptance in communities.

And, secondly, the distance, in fact, does help mitigate the impact. As experienced by bad experiences in Mars Hill and on Vinalhaven Island, noise from wind turbines can be disruptive to individuals and can turn wind power proponents into opponents. And I hope that message is not lost on -- certainly the developer and LURC here. There are many people that come in thinking about wind turbines as a good thing, and they are, in the end, opponents due almost solely to sound impacts.

Adequate distance from the turbines to receptors is
essential. The tower --
MS. HILTON: Dave, are you almost finished?
MR. BOULTER: Yes, I am. I'm sorry to take this time. MS. HILTON: That's okay. I just -- very thorough.

MR. BOULTER: I do want to speak to the -- I will be quick here -- to the DEP ordinances. They were developed for a different time and a different place; basically, for an urban setting, not a rural setting. And you can look at it even by the construction standards, they are not really designed for wind turbines. In my view -- and I think the view of the majority of the people that worked on the wind ordinance -- they are not protective standards, and that's why, although the town of Eastbrook used them as a model, they varied from them in some key ways, some of which you've heard from the applicant tonight. They are, in fact, contrary to what may have been represented there. In fact, quantifiable standards. I think your consultant misunderstood terms and conditions that the Commission could impose as being subjective. They are subjective, yes, in terms of conditions that you may impose, but not the standards themselves.

And very quickly, the standards are within 660 feet of any protected location, 55 decibels between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. and 40 decibels at night between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.; 35 decibels between any location -- excuse me --
from any location greater than 2 miles from a wind turbine. And then there are some, which I won't go into detail, on maximum levels set during construction. DEP standards actually are exempt bearing no standards at all during construction, which would be very disruptive of area residents. The Eastbrook ordinance does impose some.

I would strongly encourage, for a variety of reasons, including community acceptance and including protection of approximate neighbors, to you to not only take official notice, but to apply the Eastbrook ordinances. They are reasonable standards. We believe that they are standards that will protect residents in the area, that the standards will be low enough that it will not drive people from their house; that they are reasonable. We all accept that there will be some noise from the standards -- from the turbines, but it should be at least acceptable levels.

I would raise for your consideration, for staff assessment particularly, Turbines I and II, which are very close to the residents, considering whether those first two should be disallowed or at least alternative -- if not disallowed -- that you use the flexibility you would have to require the developer to dampen peak loads when the wind is blowing towards those residents, which is typically from the east, that it should not significantly interfere with the production of wind energy because the predominant winds
that the developer is trying to capture is from the northwest or the south -- northwest or the southwest, and the risk to the community, including the Molasses Pond area, is from the east. And dampening that down so you don't get peak flows in that will dramatically drop the sound levels, I think, to acceptable levels. And I think that would be a reasonable condition if you felt that all towers should be there.

And finally, Mr. Barns -- on behalf of the applicant -very nicely outlined the criteria First Wind had for pursuing wind development; proximity to transmission lines, willing landowners, ready road access, limited natural resource values that may be impacted, and certainly a valuable wind source. Conspicuously absent from that siting criteria is the project's compatibility to the existing character of the area and to the community. That, I would submit, is your job to look at those -- those characteristics that the applicant has said and look at it with respect to the existing character in the community because that is the charge under the statute which you must judge.

And I expect, given my understanding and past history of the Commission, that you will do a fair and thorough job. And I thank you very much for indulging me tonight.

I will be happy to answer any questions if you have
some.
MS. HILTON: Questions? Thank you.
MR. BOULTER: Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: Kathleen, you're next.
MS. HILTON: I think -- come on up. I just wanted to remind you all that if you have written testimony, please leave it with us. Or they have -- or you have until the record closes to submit testimony.

MS. DONAHOE: Hi. My name is Kathleen Donahoe. I live at the last house on the Sugar Hill Road in Eastbrook, which is designated $P-1$ on the applicant's material. I'm here to just represent myself and my property and to voice my concerns as the closest resident of Eastbrook to the proposed wind project.

I would like to thank all of you for the opportunity to speak today. There hasn't been a lot of opportunity to say a lot of things that $I$ have been thinking over the last year, and I really appreciate this option.

When approaching the subject, it's hard to know where to start. Like many of the residents in the surrounding area, I've been studying all aspects of wind power for over a year now. I moved to Eastbrook seven years ago. When I bought my property, $I$ bought it with the intention of being there for the rest of my life. I promised the former owner, Madeline Merchant, to never subdivide the land or
knock her house down, to maintain our gardens and to leave our woods intact. It was an easy promise to make.

Buying a piece of land that size has always been a dream of mine, and I've walked every inch of it countless times. I have plans there that will take the rest of my life to execute. I own 87 acres and run a business there that keeps me outside all year long. I know where the bear lives, where the deer and moose walk, and where the owls hunt, and the partridge forage. I know where the bobcats cross my blueberry field.

I have the whole piece of memory -- the whole piece of property committed to memory, and I make use of it daily. I have a plan to eventually transform a big part of my land into a native plant sanctuary specializing in different types of ferns. The last year has thrown that plan up into the air completely, and I am faced daily with the question of whether to stay and help maintain the status-quo or to simply sell out and head for the hills. I thought I had already done that.

Over the past year, I've looked for similar property to mine in case $I$ am forced to leave because of the proximity of the turbines. Ironically in the process of looking for land in the surrounding area and Down East, every piece of property that piqued my interest was in an area where wind energy was in the process of leaving its mark. I have
provided you with a map of the many sites in our area that are slated for wind energy. The potential cumulative effect of these industry scale projects is dramatic if you look at this map and consider how our state is being transformed right before our eyes.

Since I moved to Eastbrook, there has been logging all around my property. The right-of-way that those of you on the tour used yesterday passes 24 feet from my house and is one way that loggers enter and leave Township 16.

Some winters the road through my property to the township isn't even plowed. I have never felt there is too much traffic passing by because it's such an unusual event. Wood trucks, camp owners, hunters and fishermen occasionally come back and forth. And during blueberry season, for a few days, truckloads of berries are brought out from the township. Four-wheelers and snowmobilers use it as well, but all is calm and quiet 90 percent of the time. That's why I bought the house at the end of the road. Never in my wildest dreams did I imagine that a massive change was in the works. And when I learned about the proposed wind project, I immersed myself in every aspect of the subject and prepared to protect my property in the best way that I could.

Because the initial indication was that the towers would be in Eastbrook, I focused on the town's ordinance.

During the ordinance process, I asked the town about securing an agreement with the wind company that would ensure that those of us within close proximity to the proposed towers were not at risk of losing the value of our property. I was told that there would not be any negotiation of this sort.

When the wind ordinance was passed, I turned my focus to Township 16 and quickly realized that the proposed turbines just outside of the town's limits would have a worse effect on me than some of the ones that had been proposed in Eastbrook. The wind company did a photo simulation for me of the first set of turbines from my dooryard. The result of the simulation indicated that -and the verbal description indicated that I would see the hub and the blades closest to the Eastbrook line, Turbine No. 1, and the blades from Turbine No. 2. Every window on the east side of my house, the bulk of 14 acres of blueberry fields, and my yard, driveway and gardens are all positioned within this visual field.

Within one day of seeing this simulation, I was offered an easement, a good neighbor agreement, from the company, which was a 45-year commitment. This contract would have silenced me from speaking to you today and every day, for the next 45 years, regardless of any potential negative impact created by the turbines.

The sound data that was created sets my residence at a decibel level of 37.2. Actually, it's ambiguous. It goes -- I thought that was the level, but it could be 500 feet from my house; it could be -- it was hard to read the material to understand exactly which study was what. But that's -- that's what I'm assuming. My house is situated in very close proximity to the 16 turbines, but on the west side of my land. The majority of my land is exposed to higher decibel levels.

The way the proposed project is situated, any noise from the turbines would dissipate as it traveled over my land. My plan for a camp, which I established a spot for years ago, would be in an area of my property that would be too loud to reside in. If the wind company applied the ordinance that was created using all of this data for my house and all the others in this area of town, we would be better protected. There are three other dwellings right at the edge of Eastbrook. It seems to me that proposing to erect 480-foot turbines within hundreds of feet of a town that has worked hard to establish an ordinance that would protect its residents is unfair at best. And this is just the topic of operating sound levels.

The exemption of the construction sound standards in the DEP's Chapter 375.10 leaves the entire area at the end of Sugar Hill Road depending on -- well, it could be four
residences and it could be as many as eight -- at risk of unacceptably high decibel levels.

Adopting Eastbrook's ordinance would be a way to mitigate the negative aspects of this project on local residents. I should also point out that I've been working in the area behind my house, only accessible by logging roads, for almost as long as I have lived in Eastbrook.

I have spent countless hours exploring the area and getting to know where the animals congregate, where the waterways are and learning the lay of the land. I am very uncomfortable with the incredible demolition and destruction that would take place if such a project were executed.

I have seen large areas of trees cut in the surrounding areas and watched the negative effects that this activity has on the landscape, the animals and the waterways, not to mention the destruction of native shrub, herb and forb layers. And I have noticed -- much to my surprise -- that even though there is that wood cutting activity, that things have a way of righting themselves.

But I can't imagine a project of this kind of scale, which would involve blasting and -- what is it -- the addition and removal of 500,000 or 500,000 cubic tons of material could ever right itself.

The idea that Township 16 is a heavily forested area,
it seems like everyone is saying, well, the land is a waste anyway. That seemed to be gist of the conversation today. And to me, even if the land is forested, I see animals out there constantly. It is an area where it's teeming with wildlife, and it's got -- there's -- there are things that live there. It's not a wasteland. It's not an area that's just -- I mean, that's why everybody hunts out there. So it -- to me, the idea that it's all logged over and, you know, it's just -- it just seems strange to me because there's a lot going on.

When I walked through the whole area, I -- I -- since I know the area well, I walked the whole area where I thought the turbines would be. And it turned out that I was accurate within a couple of hundred feet. And in the process of walking from my house out to these turbine sites, I found a deer bed that I had never seen before by the -- one of the site -- tower sites. And I also saw -saw that another tower site was where I yearly have seen bears, every spring and fall, in the same probably half-mile area.

So those are two places that $I$ know specifically that animals live and spend a lot of time that will disappear instantly if this project is to go through.

The occurrences over the past year have led me to think that many of the citizens of the state of Maine have
forgotten to cherish the beauty that's around them, and I ask that they look around with a fresh set of eyes. Deciding to fast track industrial scale projects into remote areas of the state puts us in the same category as the states that ravage their surroundings without regard and realize later that many mistakes could not be corrected.

I've also wondered in the past year or so how many people's lives have been turned upsidedown with the prospect that such a large scale industrial project might affect their surroundings. As I said earlier, I have gone back and forth a thousand times as I educated myself about the pros and cons of wind, about whether to try and move and start over again or to stay and fight seemingly insurmountable odds. I have always been under the impression, since $I$ moved to Maine in the mid '80s, that LURC protects the public and the public's interest. In this case, I urge LURC to protect the wilderness of Township 16 and protect the people, wildlife and habitat from the undue, adverse effects of big industry.

And I'm curious, when all is said and done, which township will keep its original shape and which township will allow people and animals to exist without noise, without the presence of a big industry like wind.

If it isn't LURC, who can we ask to keep these areas
wild? And if, in fact, you do decide to accept the application, I implore you to apply Eastbrook's wind ordinance so that those of us at the edge of the town can enjoy the same protection as the rest of its residents.

The turbines are proposed for Township 16. The noise that they make will be in Eastbrook. The visual field that they obstruct will be all around us. This hearing is an example of the fact that residents and landowners have input. The agonizing process of establishing a wind ordinance in preparation for a wind project in the town of Eastbrook is a similar example. The letters written to county commissioners and to LURC indicate that there are people who live in and own land in the surrounding area that have something to say about big industry landing here. I have learned during this process that in other areas of the state, many people have opposed industrial wind, yet the projects have gone through. Protocol has been observed by LURC during this entire process. Certified letters have been mailed. Responses to inquiries have been provided. This hearing is proof that LURC will hear input from those of us who have something to say.

With all due respect, every wind application has been met with protest, but not enough to return the application. And how could the people's protest be enough? If I had the resources that big industrial companies have, I would
certainly have made greater strides in my opposition. How is a voice like mine heard in this type of climate? The entire process involves big business, massive amounts of money, and teams of lawyers. I have heard lies, observed strategy and manipulation, and I stand bewildered at the huge discrepancy between those of us who are coming -between those who are coming here to attempt to destroy our surroundings and those of us who will be left here to live with it.

And I just want to end by saying that I have had the great fortune of traveling around the world. And I do have experience with wind farms. And I have lived underneath wind towers and around them. And I've -- I did think they were beautiful when I first saw them. And I learned very quickly that the noise was something that I absolutely could not deal with.

And looking at Stetson Mountain and doing a field trip and listening to a CD for 10 minutes are very different than living underneath or around a tower and the constant noise, like dripping. It's really -- it can have a really negative effect, and it's not something that $I$ want to live with. Thank you very much for your time.

MS. HILTON: Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: Terry.
MS. CORMIER: Hi. My name is Terry Cormier, and my
husband Patrick Cormier and I own a camp and property on Spectacle Pond in Osborn, Maine. My husband's family has had a camp on Spectacle since the early 1950 s when there was nothing but skidder trails and jeeps to get into camp. They brought the building parts for the camp over on the ice in winter and built the camp on the point that's still there today. For years the entire family has enjoyed the pristine waters; watching the eagles and ospreys teach their young to fish; the loons raise their chicks from Loon Island; watch moose, deer and bear around the pond; fish the pond, the neighboring streams, of trout and other fish. We deer hunt, we partridge hunt, on all the lands around the pond. We've traveled the ATV trails and enjoyed the peace and quiet of the pond. And we want this special place to be there for future generations with the same peace and quiet and the wildlife we have today. We worry about the effects the wind turbines will have on the wildlife and the waters of the pond from the erosion into the streams that feed into the pond and the road widening and site work, noise levels from the turbines and, in turn, the health and welfare of those that come to the pond to kayak, canoe, enjoy the waters -- enjoy the waters and the views of the rolling hills.

When we first saw the test tower go up on Bull Hill a few years ago, you can imagine our concern and questions
that we had about what this was -- how this was going to affect the pond and the lands around it. This past winter we attended a meeting in Eastbrook at the town office and saw a photo simulation of the proposed turbines from other areas and obtained other information, but we were disappointed that there was not enough information regarding the effect of the Spectacle Pond area or a correct viewshed photo showing what these turbines would look like from Spectacle Pond.

We are not residents in the town of Eastbrook, so we were not able to speak at the town meetings regarding our concern and questions.

We do not think that enough has been done to give a true picture of the effect on the landowners in Osborn and surrounding towns that would be forever affected if this project continues, nor were the camp owners given notice of the meetings other than local papers. Many of the camp owners live far away, so they have not been notified of the development and given an opportunity to speak or write to the Commission about their concerns. We've tried to tell other camp owners on the pond as well to be aware what's going on, but we wanted to be sure and come here tonight to speak regarding our concern about this proposed development and life-long effect on the pond, wildife and the people around it.

There has not been enough research to know the true effect that this kind of development has on wildife and people, not to mention the devaluation of property and potentially decreased property values to all towns that are affected. More research and information must be shared with the surrounding towns before decisions are made when so much is at stake.

We ask the Commission to look deeply at the impact that this development will have on our way of life here in Maine. It's wildlife, it's people, and what we want for our children and the legacy of Maine. Maine has always been pristine and beautiful, with its natural scenery being its greatest asset. Please don't allow this kind of development to deface our beautiful state without knowing all the costs. Thanks.

MS. HILTON: Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: With the exception of Mary Ann and Bruce who testified last night, that exhausts my list of those interested in testifying. Am I correct? Or is there anyone else in the audience who wishes to testify that didn't testify last night?

Then if the chair doesn't mind, we can have Mary Ann and Bruce come back up? They testified last night.

MS. HILTON: Is this new testimony or is this a repeat of what you spoke to us about last night?

MS. JOHN: No. It's not a repeat of last night, but it's just very short. It's --.

MS. HILTON: Okay.
MS. JOHN: My name is Mary Ann John. I'm a resident of Eastbrook. I'm a registered nurse by profession, and I represent no other entity here tonight.

Again, I want to thank you for this forum. I learned a lot today listening to all the testimony, and there's several points I'd like to make.

I was particularly taken with the concern for the potential destruction of our natural remote areas with the siting of the large industrial complex, specifically the discussion of Narraguagus Lake, Myrick Pond, and the Donnell Pond area.

Hancock County, as Dave said, is the fastest growing county in the state. Ellsworth is the fastest growing town. Lots of people in the area will be finding these new -- these natural scenic spots that today we consider remote or little used by the public. These natural beauties should be there unspoiled for them to find.

Second, Molasses Pond is an area enjoyed by many in Eastbrook, full-timers and vacationers. Even though Molasses Pond doesn't qualify as scenic enough for the state guidelines, it provides recreation for many from all over the state and beyond.

At the informational meeting held in Eastbrook that this lady just referenced, we were told that the turbines would certainly be seen from the west side of the pond. Molasses Pond is the major tax base for Eastbrook, and unhappy campers there would not bode for the town.

Lastly, I want to repeat to you what Dave Fowler told us last May; that First Wind plans 48 turbines for the Bull Hill area, including Eastbrook and Township 16, not just 19. I think that the Commission should know that and consider it when deliberating.

Hearing all the unknowns and uncertainties that the technical people have mentioned today, I can only ask you, please deny this permit application.

MS. HILTON: Okay. Thank you.
MS. CARROLL: Same goes with Bruce; he testified last night.

MS. HILTON: New testimony?
MR. MUNGER: Yes.
MS. HILTON: Brief?
MR. MUNGER: I'll try, but I kept mine brief last night and I heard several people go well over the five-minute limit.

I was thinking about this for a long time, but I didn't really prepare notes. I don't have them to give you. I'll mail them to you. Last night I did some hastily-prepared
notes. Tonight are even more hastily prepared.
Frankly, I did not want to come back tonight because I didn't want to put myself through three more hours of what I sat through last night. There's a lot of rudeness and insults. And I felt the way I walked -- people kept asking me, why are you going back -- you know, all my -- people I've been talking to that wanted to come, they're in favor of this, they're really interested in this, I said, well, where were you? Well, we're not going to go listen to that.

I had friends that come up from Freedom. They live in a wind farm, but they would not dare speak. I kept reaching over to try to check Glenn's pulse all night. She was just -- absolutely off; and when we got outside, she was harassed, and -- I won't go into this stuff. Anyway, please try to keep it civil.

MS. HILTON: I --. Did you feel that we were rude to you?

MR. MUNGER: No, no, no. No. Some of the testimony that -- it was completely one-sided last night. I said, why should I go back tonight and hear a one-sided presen -not you, at all. I sincerely appreciate what you're doing, and I like the man that told you that your job sucked last night. I would -- I disagree with the tone, but I don't envy you.

MS. HILTON: Why don't you go ahead. It's been a long couple of days.

MR. MUNGER: Okay. I would consider that insulting. If somebody told me my job sucked, I wouldn't really -even if it does sometimes.

Okay. My name is Bruce Munger. I live on Flanders Pond in Sullivan. Last night I just spoke about oil versus wind, and it was mocked through several other people's testimony that followed, so I want to -- and I heard many personal stories, so I want to tell you my personal story. So that's the new testimony.

My jobs. I'm a husband. Oh, I represent no other entity. I've met people in companies, and if you see me shaking his hand, it's not a conspiracy. I just met the guy last night; I still don't know his name.

I met you people during the Redington project, which was rejected through some misinformation tonight saying that you never rejected a wind farm before. That's when we first met. I went -- I won't get into that either.

So as I say, I don't represent an entity.
My jobs. Is I'm a husband and a father. I take both jobs very seriously. I'm a homeowner on a pond, a nice, remote pond. I live on a dead end road. Flanders Pond is at the foot of Schoodic Mountain. I built my home with my own hands. I have moved there -- my wife wanted to get
further up the dead end road. We sold -- we're still trying to sell -- of course I know about property values, too -- my farm house in Sullivan, which is not selling. So I know all about property values as well.

The farm was an organic farm. We had an organic garden. We raised birds. We lived off the land. I live on the land. I love the land. I'm a teacher. I teach students. A lot of talk about looking to the future and preserving for future generations. I work with them. Have you asked your children what they think? I have.

I'm a volunteer firefighter. A volunteer firefighter. I give my time for free. I've climbed Schoodic Mountain more times than I can imagine. And people talk about access. I never saw cars in the parking lot until they put the Donnell Pond Road in there and the blue signs of the state of Maine.

We used to go in to try to find people who were lost. They'd be trying to find the mountain, they couldn't find the trailhead. Now I climb the mountain to bring them down because they hike with nothing but a cell phone. So I know Schoodic Mountain very well, and I know Black Mountain very well. I live at the foot of Schoodic Mountain. I look at it all the time. I love Schoodic Mountain. I've climbed it all my life. I've climbed many mountains all my life. When I moved onto my road, it was called Dave's Way. I
said, that's pretty egotistical. So when Dave left, we said, should we call it Dave's Gone Away? No. So we call it Eagle Lane because we love the eagles. Okay. That's one of the reasons we chose Flanders Pond, and the loons and the beavers and everybody else that lives there with us. I have a cow -- I have a canoe that looks like a cow. So if you're looking for me, you can look for that. I love cows, too. I've lived on ranches and farms.

I have -- I have traveled. I know the land. I've -it's my goal to see all 50 states before I die. I have two to go. I have been in 48. And I don't count them if you just land in an airport and fly over it. I've walked through this country. I've hitchhiked across this country. I've lived in tents for almost as much time, it seems, as I've lived in houses. I grew up as a boy scout. I know all about camping and living on the land and everything else. All right?

Again, I'm a volunteer firefighter. Many times when I hike in the Schoodic area, it's with a 50-pound pack of water on my back so I can save your -MS. HILTON: Excuse me, Bruce? MR. MUNGER: Yes. MS. HILTON: Are you providing testimony to us? MR. MUNGER: I'm sorry. I'll stop looking that way. MS. HILTON: And can you --

MR. MUNGER: I'm trying. I have heard plenty of other people go over.

MS. HILTON: But this your second time, too.
MR. MUNGER: Yeah, last night was about two minutes.
MS. HILTON: I know. I appreciate that. That's okay.
BRUCE MUNGER: I'm sorry. And this is not all about me.

All right. I know about noise. I live near a beach, a public beach. My wife can't sleep because of the crickets. We talk about the beach. I said, yeah, that's a happy noise. This kid's laughing over there.

I lived in Missouri; it's called the Show Me State. So when $I$ want to find out about wind turbines, $I$ went to visit them. I walked around them. I went there when they were being put in. I stood on them with a decibel meter to look at the noise. I listened to the noise. I went into the valley. I know about these things firsthand because I've seen them, I've touched them, I've listened to them. I don't just go from speculation of things. I read.

I know -- I've been promoting alternative energy since the 1970s -- well, when I experienced the Arab oil embargo. I realized back then, during the 1975 anniversary -- 200th anniversary of the country, we had the Boston Tea Party, throwing the oil barrels and the oil companies, it's all their fault. And I've grown to realize that the oil
companies are not stopping alternative energy. We are. We are the problem.

Nimby has become BANANA: Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near Anything.

I grew up loving the Passamaquoddy Project, tidal power. It was developed in the 1930s. They'll never build it.

I tried to get my own alternative energy project built on the Singing Bridge in Sullivan. The oil companies never came up and stood up against the Singing Bridge Tidal Project, but people who are concerned about the eel grass shut it down.

A turbine on Schoodic Mountain? I wouldn't mind seeing it. I love the pond. I'd look up to say, hey, what's wind doing? Can we take the canoe out or is it too windy? It would be like a flag up there. I'd love to see it.

Somebody said that there's no project -- you don't hear any complaints about solar power projects. That's because there aren't any. There was one proposed in California recently, and they shot it down because of the tortoises in the desert. If you can't build solar power in the desert, where can you build it?

Okay. My students. I'm a technology teacher, I'm a shop teacher. I was going to be a history teacher or an English teacher because I love both of them. I know the
difference between a pronoun and an amateur noun, but I love to create stuff, $I$ love to make stuff, and I love to be independent. I'm a very independent person. Ask anybody at MDI High School where I teach. Okay? I wanted to teach my kids about being independent, about being free, how to not have to depend on someone else to do your stuff when you know you're perfectly capable to do your own. My kids love to create their own stuff. They're very independent kids, and they love this idea.

I've asked them. I've took them to Freedom, took them to the town, says -- when I list my stuff, I say oil, coal, natural gas, what's good about it, what's bad about it. I tell them the truth about both of them, including wind power. I tell them about everything you've said tonight. And I say, you guys choose. Okay? It's your life.

Okay. So I took them to Freedom to see the windmills for themselves. The first thing they said is, where's the noise? The second thing, my Eagle Scout kid got down on the ground and started finding deer droppings everywhere right next to the turbine because they still plow corn next to the turbine. It didn't ruin the land. There's still animals and turkeys and everything all around there. I know that the windmills kill a bird, between one in six a year -- whatever it is? Does anybody own a car? Does anyone own a cat? Okay.

I'm sorry. Again, I'll wrap it up. Okay?
I was a boy scout. And just like being a Marine, you never stop being a boy scout. Be prepared. I got through the ice storm because I had a wood stove and a propane stove and an old farmhouse that was built without electricity, and we had a fine old time. We were golden.

So I want us to be prepared. I remember the 1970 s oil embargo. That's what it was called. It wasn't an energy crisis, it was an embargo.

If somebody shuts off our oil supply, I'm going to be real happy to know that we're making electricity off of this hill, that we don't have to depend on somebody else to do our own stuff when we have great resources right here. Thank you.

MS. HILTON: Thank you. I think we're finished. I've got a closing statement here.

The second and final session to hear testimony from the public is now concluded. I would like to remind everyone that the record of this hearing will remain open for a period of 14 days until Tuesday, May 31st, to receive written statements from the interested public and for an additional seven days until Tuesday, June 7th, for the purpose of receiving rebuttal comments.

No additional testimony or evidence will be allowed into the record after the closing of the record.

And thank you for all coming, and let's adjourn the meeting.
(Concluded this hearing at 8:03 p.m. this date.)

I, Angella D. Clukey, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on May 17, 2011, a hearing was held regarding Pending Development Permit Application DP 4886; and that this hearing was stenographically reported by me and later reduced to typewritten form with the aid of computer-aided transcription; and the foregoing is a full and true record of the testimony given by the witnesses.

I further certify that $I$ am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand and affix my seal this 1st day of June 2011.

ANGELLA D. CLUKEY, NOTARY PUBLIC Court Reporter

My commission expires: March 17, 2017

| \$ | $\begin{gathered} 56: 1,61: 16 \\ 20[9]-15: 20,22: 23, \end{gathered}$ | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:11 } \\ & \text { above-named }[1] \end{aligned}$ | 19:21 adjourn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000{ }_{[1]}-22: 22 \\ & \$ 35,000[1]-50: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:17, 30:22, 31:12, } \\ & 31: 13,31: 15,31: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{5}_{[4]}-3: 14,25: 7, \\ 29: 12,52: 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 12 \\ & \text { absent }[1]-57: 14 \end{aligned}$ | administrative [1] - 3:13 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 12 \\ & 20,000[1]-14: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50[4]-16: 16,42: 2, \\ 43: 6,76: 10 \end{gathered}$ | Absolutely ${ }^{[1]}$ - 78:3 absolutely [5] - 14:9, | admitted [1]-29:22 <br> adopted [2]-42:14, |
| '80s [1] - 65:16 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 20-megawatt [2] - } \\ \text { 23:20, 23:24 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{5 0} \text {-pound }[1]-76: 19 \\ & \mathbf{5 0 0}[1]-62: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 5,33: 5,67: 15, \\ & 73: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:1 } \\ & \text { adopting }[1]-63: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 20-some [1] - 24:3 | 500,000 [2] - 63:23 | Acadia [1]-27:12 | advanced [1] - 45:12 |
| 1 | 200[1]-27:16 | 500-foot [2] - 45:10, | accept [5]-12:18, | adverse [4]-31:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1[9]-13: 21,14: 2, \\ & \text { 14:6, 14:10, 17:15, } \\ & \text { 18:21, 31:8, 31:9, } \\ & 61: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 2004 [1]-20:9 | 47:25 | 19:4, 49:13, 56:14, | 47:22, 53:20, 65:20 |
|  | 2008 [1]-26:25 | 52,000 [1]-26:19 | 66:1 | aesthetic [1]-39:22 |
|  | 200th [1] - 77:22 | $545[1]-21: 10$ | acceptable [3] - | affect $[3]-9: 5,65: 11$, |
|  | $2011[6]-1: 5,2: 3,6: 1,$ 6:24, 82:5, 82:14 | $55[1]-55: 23$ | $47: 22,56: 16,57: 6$ <br> acceptance [2] - | 69:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10[6]-15: 3,15: 20, \\ & 21: 8,31: 9,45: 25, \\ & 67: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $2017[1]-82: 22$ | 6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { acceptance }[2 \\ 54: 15,56: 8 \end{gathered}$ | affected [2] - 69: 70:5 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 24[2]-53: 1,60: 8 \\ & \mathbf{2 5}[5]-15: 20,21: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6[3]-22: 11,22: 12, \\ & 49: 11 \end{aligned}$ | accepted [2] - 6:4, $7: 17$ | affiliation [2]-4:7, $5: 14$ |
| 10,000-gallon [1] -25:10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 22:23, 23:17, 53:1 } \\ \mathbf{2 5 0 , 0 0 0 [ 1 ] - 2 7 : 1 6} \end{gathered}$ | 49:11 600 | $\begin{gathered} \text { access }[17]-3: 21,6: 9, \\ 14: 14,14: 23,14: 24, \end{gathered}$ | affix [1] - 82:13 <br> afternoon [1]-36:21 |
|  | 251 [2]-1:19, 2:2 | $620[1]-8: 21$ | 15:4, 18:8, 18:11, | agencies [1]-6:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 100[6]-13: 18,13: 22, \\ & 14: 17,19: 9,21: 24, \\ & 51: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 2nd [1] - 6:24 | 66[1]-10:19 | 19:25, 21:12, 30:5, | agency ${ }_{[1]}-7: 7$ |
|  |  | 685-B [1]-3:12 | $51: 23,57: 12,75: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ago }[7]-20: 8,20: 9, \\ & 26: 19,46: 24,58: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| 12 [1]-3:12 | 3 | 6:00[2]-55:24 | accessed [1] - 14:25 | $62: 13,68: 25$ |
| $120[1]-8: 3$ | 3,400 [1] - 20:18 | 6:01 [1] - 2:4 | accessible [1] - 63:6 | agonizing [1] - 66:9 |
| 120,000 [1] - 16:22 | 3,880 [2]-20:20, |  | accommodated [1] - | agree [4]-12:17, |
| 138,300[1]-27:11 | 20:21 | 7 | 47:8 | 24:2, 28:5, 43:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14[3]-4: 19,61: 17, \\ & 80: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30[5]-23: 3,32: 18, \\ 32 \cdot 24 \quad 33 \cdot 1 \quad 41 \cdot 18 \end{gathered}$ | 7 [3]-29:11, 33:4, | accomplished $[1]$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { agreement }[2]-61: 2, \\ & 61: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15[3]-15: 20,29: 11, \\ & 34: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $300[1]-21: 16$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50: 14 \\ 7300 \end{array}$ | accordance ${ }_{[1]}-3: 13$ | ahead [1] - 74:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 150[1]-23: 24 \\ & 16[11]-7: 16,21: 7, \\ & 21: 11,41: 13,60: 9, \\ & 61: 8,62: 7,63: 25, \\ & 65: 19,66: 5,72: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 31st [2] - 4:19, 80:20 34-megawatt [1] - | 7,300 7:00 [1] - 51: $55: 23,55: 25$ | accuracy ${ }_{[1]}-47: 19$ | aid [1] - 82:8 |
|  | 34-megawatt $[1]$ - 3:17 | 7th [2] - 4:21, 80:22 | accurate ${ }^{[1]}$ - 64.14 | air [2] - 46:15, 59:16 |
|  | 35 [2] - 15:18, 55:25 | 8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { acres }[20]-13: 12, \\ 14: 16,14: 17,14: 18, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { airport }[1]-76: 12 \\ & \text { allow }[5]-3: 23,18: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| 16,000 [1] - 14:20 | $36,000[1]-27: 13$ $37.2_{[1]}-62: 2$ | 8 [1]-33:2 | 14:20, 19:9, 19:22, | 29:8, 65:23, 70:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17[4]-1: 5,2: 3,82: 5, \\ & 82: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.2[1]-62: 2 \\ & 375.10[1]-62: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80[3]-31: 4,31: 11, \\ & 38: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 27:4, 27:7, 27:8, | allowable [1] - 9:14 <br> allowed [3]-4:23, |
| $18[1]-37: 11$ $182[1]-51: 25$ | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 87[1]-59: 6 \\ & 8: 03[1]-81: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 1,45: 25,59: 6, \\ & 61: 17 \end{aligned}$ | almost [7]-20:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19[5]-3: 19,6: 9,43: 2, \\ & 54: 8,72: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{4}[2]-31: 9,37: 22 \\ & \mathbf{4 , 0 0 0}[1]-48: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 9 | act [2] - 3:13, 25:16 <br> action [2]-5:1, 82:12 | $55: 2,63: 7,76: 14$ <br> alone [4]-23:15, |
| 19,9000 [1] - 14:18 <br> 19-turbine [2] - 7:15, 10:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 40[4]-19: 22,32: 25, \\ & 35: 1,55: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9[4]-26: 19,51: 23, \\ 51: 24,52: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { activity }[5]-17: 7, \\ & 41: 15,41: 16,63: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 19,24: 22,26: 22 \\ & \text { alter }[1]-45: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1930s [1] - 78:6 | 420 $45[1]-8: 21$ $[1]$ | 9,000 [1] - 27:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 19 \\ & \text { add }[1]-48: 10 \end{aligned}$ | alternative $[7]-13: 1$, |
| 1931 [1]-41:23 <br> 1950s | 45-year [1] -61:22 | 90 [1] - 60:17 | adding [4] - 17:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 10,38: 12,56: 20, \\ & 77: 20,78: 1,78: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1950s ${ }^{\text {1970 }}$ [2] - $77.21,80: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 476[1]-10: 15 \\ & 476 \text {-foot }[1]-45: 10 \end{aligned}$ | A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:17, 24:18, 27:14 } \\ & \text { addition }[2]-4: 11, \end{aligned}$ | amateur [1]-79:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1 9 7 5}_{[1]}-77: 22 \\ & \mathbf{1 9 9 1}_{[1]}-25: 16 \\ & \text { 1st }[1]-82: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 48 [3] - 43:6, 72:7, | a.m [2] - 55:23, 55:25 | 63:23 | 27:10 |
|  | 76:11 | abandoned [1]-50:24 | additional [5] - 4:21, | ambiguous [1]-62:2 |
|  | 480-foot [1] - 62:19 | abandonment [1] | :22, 43:5, 80:22 | amount [9]-22:19, |
| 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 4886[4]-1: 14,2: 1 \\ & 3: 16,82: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 50:22 | addressed [1] - $38: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:7, 29:9, 41:2, } \\ & 50: 13,52: 18,52: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2} \text { [10]-13:21, 14:2, } \\ \text { 14:7, 14:10, 17:15, } \\ \text { 18:21, 37:23, 54:11, } \end{gathered}$ | 4th [1] - 6:1 | able [11]-10:11, | addresses [1] - 5:2 | amounts [1]-67:3 |
|  |  | 10:20, 19:11, 22:5, | adequate [1]-54:25 | analysis [3]-9:13, |
|  |  | 25:3, 26:13, 36:7, | adequately [1] - 53:6 | 9:22, 9:24 |
|  |  | 39:7, 39:8, 54:9, | adjacent [2]-10:19, | Andy [1] - 37:22 |

Angella [3]-2:1, 3:2, 82:4
ANGELLA [1] - 82:18 animals [7]-39:23, 63:9, 63:16, 64:3, 64:22, 65:23, 79:22
Ann [6] - 11:10, 11:11, 11:18, 70:17, 70:22, 71:4
ANN [2] - 11:12, 11:16 anniversary [2] 77:22, 77:23 annually [1]-50:14 answer [3]-33:20, 54:9, 57:25 anyway [2]-64:2, 73:15
apart [1] - 42:3
applicant $[17]-5: 15$, 5:22, 6:2, 6:15, 7:10, 7:12, 7:13, 15:21, 16:4, 30:2, 43:3, 50:5, 51:2, 51:20, 55:15, 57:9, 57:18 applicant's [2]-
49:13, 58:11
application [15]-6:1,
7:17, 7:19, 10:2, 29:2, 40:7, 43:12, 47:13, 50:13, 51:2, 53:8, 66:2, 66:22, 66:23, 72:13
Application [2]-1:14, 82:6
applied [1] - 62:14
apply [2]-56:10, 66:2
appreciate [8]-10:22,
11:17, 22:3, 28:18, 42:2, 58:18, 73:22, 77:5
appreciation [2] 41:2, 41:7
approach [3]-15:22, 15:25, 47:10
approaching [1] 58:19
approval [3] - 4:1, 4:15, 52:21
approve [2] - 32:6, 40:18
approved [3]-6:24, 9:10, 40:19
approves [1] - 51:1
approximate [2] -
54:7, 56:9
aquifer $[1]-31: 22$
Arab [1] - 77:21
archeology [2] -9:19, 9:20
architect [1] - 49:3
area [47]-6:6, 9:4, 9:11, 9:12, 14:11, 18:6, 20:4, 23:14, 29:20, 30:7, 42:13, 43:5, 43:10, 52:14, 52:15, 52:17, 52:23, 52:25, 53:9, 53:10, 56:5, 56:12, 57:4, 57:16, 58:21, 59:23, 59:24, 60:1, 62:13, 62:16, 62:24, 63:6, 63:8, 63:25, 64:4, 64:6, 64:11, 64:12, 64:20, 66:13, 69:7,
71:14, 71:17, 71:21, 72:8, 76:19
areas [15]-21:7,
35:23, 42:6, 43:22, 44:16, 45:2, 47:12, 47:19, 63:14, 63:15, 65:4, 65:25, 66:15, 69:5, 71:11
Areas [1]-6:19 argument ${ }_{[1]}$ - 49:17
Aroostook [1] - 25:22 aside [4]-27:17, 28:1, 29:9, 52:8
aspect $[1]$ - 60:22
aspects [4]-43:15,
43:17, 58:21, 63:4
Assessment [1] 48:23
assessment [8]-6:23,
43:13, 48:11, 48:25, 49:14, 49:23, 56:18 assessments [1] 30:3
asset [3]-48:16,
50:15, 70:13
associated [3] - 10:4, 10:5, 46:11
Associates [1]-1:23
assume [2]-12:12, 15:6
assuming [1] - 62:6
assurance [5]-50:18, 51:3, 51:5, 51:7, 51:8
assure [2]-50:6, 50:19
attempt [1]-67:7
attendance [1]-11:8
attended [1] - 69:3
attending [2] - 4:25, 40:19
attention [1]-44:11
attorney [2] - 13:9, 15:18
attractive $[1]-12: 10$
ATV ${ }_{[1]}$ - 68:13
audience $[1]-70: 20$
Augusta $[1]-5: 25$
aunt $[1]-41: 23$
authority $[1]-46: 3$
available $[1]-50: 19$
average $[1]-23: 24$
avian $[3]-9: 8,9: 10$,
47:14
avid $[1]-22: 14$
avoid $[1]-10: 10$
awake $[1]-39: 4$
aware $[2]-29: 2,69: 21$
B
background $[2]-$
$42: 25,54: 10$
bad $_{[5]}-32: 2,34: 4$,
$40: 15,54: 17,79: 12$
BANANA $[1]-78: 3$
Bangor $[1]-13: 9$
bar $_{[1]}-52: 17$
bar [1]-52:17
bargain [1]-23:6
BARNS [1] - 7:11
barns [1] - 57:9
Barns [1]-7:11
barrels [1] - 77:24
base [2] - 30:2, 72:4
based [2]-9:24, 13:4
basis [1] - 17:5
bat $[5]$ - 9:8, 9:11,
43:25, 53:5, 53:13
bats [3] - 40:1, 53:20,
53:22
Bay [1] - $36: 23$
bay [1] - 36:16
beach $[4]-52: 14$,
77:8, 77:9, 77:10
bear [2]-59:7, 68:10
bearing [1] - 56:4
bears [1]-64:19
Beaupain [2]-11:20,
13:8
BEAUPAIN ${ }_{[1]}$ - 13:8
beauties [1] - 71:20
beautiful [5] - 37:24,
39:21, 67:14, 70:12,
70:14
beauty [3]-37:4, 39:22, 65:1
beavers [1] - 76:5
become [5]-25:19,
33:5, 37:25, 47:22,
78:3
bed [1] - 64:16
beginning ${ }_{[1]}-2: 3$
behalf [2]-19:20,
57:9
behind [2]-21:23,
63:6
beholder [1] - 37:1
belching [1] - 46:15
believes [3]-14:13,
42:17, 53:25
below [1] - 14:20
benefit [3]-18:7,
18:10, 37:3
benefits [5] - 17:12,
17:14, 18:1, 34:22,
42:24
berries [1]-60:15
best [6]-7:22, 39:19,
40:17, 48:17, 60:23,
62:21
better [4]-12:24,
17:24, 25:19, 62:17
between [14]-8:14,
8:20, 16:23, 17:20,
27:16, 45:4, 52:16,
55:23, 55:24, 55:25,
67:6, 67:7, 79:1,
79:23
bewildered [1] - 67:5
beyond [3]-9:1,
51:15, 71:25
big [7]-22:6, 59:13,
65:20, 65:24, 66:14,
66:25, 67:3
biggest $[4]-19: 24$,
20:14, 23:17, 32:12
bill [6]-22:22, 22:25,
23:6, 23:8, 23:10,
29:15
Billy $[3]-28: 13$,
33:22, 33:23
biomass [10]-23:12,
23:13, 23:15, 23:17,
23:19, 24:8, 24:9,
25:3
bird [3] - 53:5, 53:13, 79:23
birds [6]-29:17,
29:20, 29:24, 39:23,
43:25, 75:6
bit [3] - 19:2, 20:6,
25:18
Black [1] - 75:21
blades [3] - 39:8,
61:15, 61:16
Blaisdell [2]-28:13, 34:11
BLAISDELL [1] -
34:11
blasting [3]-31:22, 31:23, 63:22
Blasting [2]-34:15,
34:17
blog [1] - 28:22
blowing [2] - 25:8,
56:23
blue [2]-50:20, 75:15
Blue [9]-1:9, 2:10,
3:17, 6:2, 40:3, 43:2, 45:9, 46:22, 47:16
blueberries [2] -
21:14, 21:17
blueberry [4]-25:24,
59:10, 60:14, 61:18
board [3]-38:21,
39:11, 40:5
boat [2] - 15:9, 33:14
boats [1]-15:12
bobcats [1]-59:9
bode [1] - 72:5
bolstridge [1] - 3:3
bond [2]-51:3
born [1]-38:22
Boston [1] - 77:23
bothered [2]-31:5,
31:7
bought [8]-18:4,
20:8, 21:13, 26:19,
27:1, 58:23, 60:18
Boulter [3]-28:14,
40:24, 41:8
BOULTER [4] - 40:24,
55:3, 55:5, 58:3
boundary [2]-21:17,
21:18
boy [3] - 76:15, 80:2,
80:3
breeze [1] - 36:21
bridge [2]-78:9,
78:10
brief [2]-72:19, 72:20
bring [5] - 26:20,
36:12, 38:9, 38:13, 75:19
broader [1]-44:2
Brooke [1] - 7:11
brought [3]-38:22, 60:15, 68:5
Bruce [5] - 70:17,
70:23, 72:15, 74:6,
76:21
BRUCE [1] - 77:6
Brunswick [1]-41:11
brush [1] - 31:24
Bucksport [1]-24:17
build [6]-8:3, 36:7,
78:3, 78:6, 78:21,
78:22
building [6] $-3: 22$,
6:11, 19:10, 35:12, 36:13, 68:5
buildings [2]-41:19, 46:13
built [8]-8:3, 25:5,
36:2, 68:6, 74:24,
78:8, 80:5
bulk $[1]-61: 17$
Bull $[10]-2: 11,6: 7$,
$6: 8,7: 14,8: 20$,
$22: 13,40: 7,46: 18$,
$68: 24,72: 7$
burdened $[1]-18: 18$
Bureau $[1]-6: 20$
burn $[1]-24: 14$
business $[9]-4: 7$,
$13: 16,18: 4,23: 2$,
$29: 12,31: 17,37: 12$,
$59: 6,67: 3$
buying ${ }_{[1]}$ - 59:3

| C |
| :---: |
| calculated |

calculated [1] - 9:13
California [2]-50:23, 78:19
calm [1] - 60:17
camp [12]-15:10, 33:13, 60:13, 62:12, 68:1, 68:3, 68:4, 68:5, 68:6, 69:16, 69:17, 69:21
campers [1]-72:5
camping [2] - 12:16, 76:16
camps [4]-14:24,
15:4, 15:5, 52:16
Canada [1]-12:22
cannot [2]-40:13, 53:11
canoe [3]-68:22,
76:6, 78:15
capable [2]-43:16, 79:7
capacity [5] - 10:14, 10:20, 14:4, 14:5, 24:18
capture [2]-45:13, 57:1
$\boldsymbol{c a r}_{[1]}$ - 79:24
care [5] - 17:11, 25:8,
25:9, 26:1, 39:4
careers [1] - 35:18
careful [1]-30:24
cares [1]-32:1
CARROLL [19]-2:20,
5:15, 5:18, 11:6, 11:13, 11:17, 19:6, 19:16, 19:18, 21:3, 28:11, 33:22, 37:7, 38:19, 40:22, 58:4, 67:24, 70:17, 72:15
Carroll [1]-2:20
cars [1] - 75:14
Casco [1]-36:23
case [4]-33:10, 49:4,
59:21, 65:18

| $\begin{gathered} \text { cases [2] - } 33: 10, \\ 51: 21 \end{gathered}$ | city ${ }_{[1]}-44: 22$ <br> civil [2] - 34:13, 73:16 |
| :---: | :---: |
| cash [1]-29:10 | Class [1] - 49:11 |
| casket ${ }_{[1]}$ - 16:10 | clean [1] - 15:17 |
| cat [1] - 79:25 | clear [1] - 32:18 |
| category [1] -65:4 | clear-cut [1]-32:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Catherine }[3]-2: 20, \\ & 5: 10,16: 9 \end{aligned}$ | cleared [1]-27:3 <br> clearly $[2]$ - 4:12, 12:9 |
| CD [1] - 67:18 | clients [1] - 30:9 |
| cell [4]-12:10, 12:11, | climate [1]-67:2 |
| 12:12, 75:20 | climb [2]-18:25, |
| certain [4]-24:14, | 75:19 |
| 27:6, 27:7, 47:14 | climbed [3]-75:12, |
| certainly [12]-12:8, | 75:23, 75:24 |
| 15:10, 44:11, 51:10, | close [11]-12:4, |
| 52:18, 53:25, 54:6, | 13:18, 20:25, 24:10, |
| 54:11, 54:21, 57:13, | 39:4, 43:9, 43:11, |
| 67:1, 72:3 | 43:14, 56:19, 61:3, |
| certainty [1] - 51:17 | 62:7 |
| CERTIFICATE [1] - | closed [1] - 24:20 |
| 82:2 | Closed [1] - 24:21 |
| certified [1] - 66:18 | closely [2] - 14:5, |
| certify ${ }_{[2]}$ - 82:5, | 43:19 |
| 82:11 | closes [1] - 58:8 |
| cessation [1]-51:6 | closest [3]-41:12, |
| chair [2]-2:13, 70:22 | 58:13, 61:15 |
| chance [1]-11:15 | closing [6] - 4:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { change }[4]-15: 24, \\ & 20: 6,30: 22,60: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 20,24: 9,33: 25, \\ & 80: 16,80: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| Chapter [2]-3:14, 62:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Clukey }[3]-2: 1,3: 2, \\ & 80 \cdot 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| character [5] - 44:7, | CLUKEY [1] - 82:18 |
| 45:6, 45:7, 57:16, | coal [1] - 79:11 |
| 57:19 | coast [3]-12:21, |
| characteristics [4] - | 25:23, 36:14 |
| 45:17, 49:6, 49:22, | cogeneration [2] - |
| 57:18 | 24:11, 24:19 |
| charge [2] - 44:9, | collaborative [1] - |
| 57:20 | 35:16 |
| charged [1] - 30:16 | collected [1] - 8:17 |
| check [1] - 73:13 | collection [1] - 3:21 |
| checking [1]-3:4 | collector [1]-6:10 |
| cherish [1] - 65:1 | college [1] - 26:11 |
| chicks [1] - 68:9 | coming [11] - 27:24, |
| children [2]-70:11, 75:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 6,31: 11,31: 14, \\ & 42 \cdot 146 \cdot 1551 \cdot 54 \end{aligned}$ |
| chip [1]-23:22 | 51:25, 67:6, 67:7, |
| chips [1]-23:18 | 81:1 |
| choose [1] - 79:15 | commencement [1] - |
| chose [1] - 76:4 | 51:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chuck [2]-26:17, } \\ & 27: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { comments }[11]-4: 22, \\ 6: 16,6: 22,10: 24, \end{gathered}$ |
| chunk [1] - 44:17 | 18:20, 38:11, 43:1, |
| circumstances [1] - | 48:21, 52:24, 53:7, |
| 13:15 | 80:23 |
| citizen [3]-12:2, | commercial [3]-8:15, |
| 30:14, 37:13 | 41:16, 45:1 |
| Citizens [1]-7:1 | commission [3] - |
| citizens [3]-39:13, | 2:13, 2:21, 82:22 |
| 40:5, 64:25 | Commission [22] - |

cases [2]-33:10,
51:21
cash [1]-29:10
casket ${ }_{[1]}$ - 16:10
cat [1]-79:25
category [1]-65:4
Catherine [3]-2:20,
5:10, 16:9
CD ${ }_{[1]}$ - 67:18
cell [4]-12:10, 12:11,
12:12, 75:20
certain [4]-24:14,
27:6, 27:7, 47:14
certainly [12]-12:8,
15:10, 44:11, 51:10,
52:18, 53:25, 54:6,
54:11, 54:21, 57:13,
67:1, 72:3
certainty [1] - 51:17
CERTIFICATE ${ }_{[1]}$ -
82:2
certified [1] - 66:18
certify ${ }^{[2]}$ - $82: 5$,
82:11
cessation [1] - 51:6
chair [2] - 2:13, 70:22
chance [1]-11:15
change [4]-15:24,
20:6, 30:22, 60:20
Chapter [2]-3:14,
character [5] - 44:7,
45:6, 45:7, 57:16,
57:19
characteristics [4] -
45:17, 49:6, 49:22,
57:18
charge [2] - 44:9,
57:20
charged [1] - 30:16
check [1] - 73:13
checking [1]-3:4
cherish [1]-65:1
chicks [1] - 68:9
children [2]-70:11,
75:10
chip [1] - 23:22
chips [1] - 23:18
choose [1] - 79:15
chose [1] - 76:4
Chuck [2]-26:17,
27:8
chunk [1]-44:17
circumstances [1] -
13:15
citizen [3]-12:2,
30:14, 37:13
Citizens [1]-7:1
citizens [3] - 39:13
40:5, 64:25
city ${ }_{[1]}-44: 22$
civil [2] - 34:13, 73:16
Class [1] - 49:11
clean [1]-15:17
clear [1] - 32:18
cleared [1]-27:3
clearly [2] - 4:12, 12:9
clients [1] - 30:9
climate [1] - 67:2
climb [2] - 18:25,
75:19
75:23, 75:24
close [11]-12:4,
18, 20:25, 24:10,

43:14, 56:19, 61:3, 62:7
closed [1] - 24:20
Closed [1] - 24:21
closely [2] - 14:5,
43:19
closest [3]-41:12,
58:13, 61:15
closing [6] - 4:24,
18:20, 24:9, 33:25,
80:16, 80:25
lukey [3] - 2:1, 3:2,
CLUKEY [1]-82:18
coal [1] - 79:11
oast [3] - 12:21,
cogeneration [2] -
24:11, 24:19
collaborative [1] 35:16
collected [1]-8:17
collection [1]-3:21
collector [1]-6:10
college [1] - 26:11
coming [11]-27:24,
31:6, 31:11, 31:14, 42:1, 46:15, 51:24,
51:25, 67:6, 67:7,
81:1
51:12
comments [11]-4:22,
6:16, 6:22, 10:24
48:21, 52:24, 53.7
80:23
commercial [3]-8:15,
41:16, 45:1
commission [3]-
Commission [22] -
1:3, 2:9, 5:1, 6:20,
$6: 21,6: 24,15: 15$,
$29: 19,32: 2,39: 15$,
$41: 3,43: 18,45: 8$,
$47: 5,47: 10,50: 4$,
$51: 1,55: 18,57: 23$,
69:20, $70: 8,72: 9$
Commission's $[1]-$
48:13
commission's $[5]-$
$3: 14,4: 1,4: 15,5: 25$
$51: 14$
Commissioners $[2]-$

7:2, 7:6
commissioners [4] -
2:15, 14:8, 28:19,
66:12
commitment [1] 61:22
committed [1] - 59:12
committee [3] - 38:8,
42:22, 42:23
commodities [1] -
39:1
common [1]-53:12
communities [2] -
42:19, 54:15
community [8]-41:2,
41:12, 41:14, 41:22,
56:8, 57:3, 57:16,
57:19
compacted [1] - 52:10
companies [8]-
13:25, 35:13, 36:6,
66:25, 74:13, 77:24,
78:1, 78:9
company [15]-18:2,
18:5, 18:22, 22:19,
23:12, 29:9, 34:22,
35:25, 43:17, 50:16,
61:2, 61:11, 61:21,
62:14
compare [1]-18:23
compatibility [1] -
57:15
compete [1] - 25:2
competent ${ }_{[1]}-43: 16$
complaint ${ }_{[1]}$ - 32:12
complaints [2] - 14:9,
78:18
completely [2] -
59:16, 73:20
complex [1] - 71:12
comprehensive [1] 48:24
comprised [1] - 14:15
computer [1]-82:8
computer-aided [1] 82:8
computerized [1] -

47:17
conceived [1]-11:1
concern [8]-19:25,
20:14, 45:8, 48:4,
68:25, 69:12, 69:23,
71:10
concerned [11] - 7:1,
12:1, 14:23, 15:14,
15:17, 20:2, 20:7,
22:1, 38:16, 39:13,
78:11
concerning [1] - 43:18
concerns [6] - 10:25,
37:19, 48:8, 50:4,
58:13, 69:20
concluded [2]-80:18, 81:3
Concord [1] - 28:21
condition [3]-52:20,
52:21, 57:7
conditions [4]-8:5,
47:1, 55:18, 55:20
conduct [1]-3:14
conducted ${ }_{[1]}-3: 12$
congregate [1]-63:9
connect [3] - 6:12,
10:8, $37: 4$
connection [1] - 10:17
cons [1]-65:13
conservancy [1] 14:21
Conservation [1]-1:2
consider [9]-13:15,
30:3, 33:9, 40:8,
46:2, 60:4, 71:18,
72:10, 74:3
consideration [4]-
11:2, 30:18, 40:20,
56:17
considered [1]-39:19
considering [2] - 8:25,
56:19
consist [2]-3:19, 6:9
conspicuously [1] 57:14
conspiracy [1] - 74:14
constant [1] - 67:19
constantly [1] - 64:4
constraints [2] -
47:21, 48:6
construct [2]-3:17, 17:7
construction [14]-
17:1, 17:2, 17:3,
17:7, 17:14, 17:21,
35:13, 41:19, 52:22,
55:9, 56:3, 56:5,
62:23
consultant [4]-3:1,
7:13, 30:13, 55:17

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { consultant's [1] - } \\ & 49: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { county }{ }_{[2]}-66: 12, \\ & 71: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $76: 2$ <br> David [8]-11:22 | $\begin{gathered} 55: 6,56: 3 \\ \text { DEP's }[1]-62: 24 \end{gathered}$ | disagree [1] - 73:24 <br> disallowed [2] - 56:20, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| consultants [1]-2:15 | couple [3]-19:1, | 11:23, 28:11, 28:15, | Department [4]-1:2, | 56:21 |
| Consulting [1] - 7:12 | 64:14, 74:2 | 28:18, 28:20, 40:24, | 6:18, 37:22 | disappear [1] - 64:22 |
| ntainers [1] - 38:25 | course [4]-8:8, | 41:8 | deposit [1]-15:23 | disappointed [1] - |
| contested [1] - 37:16 | 10:17, 10:18, 75:2 | DAVID [1]-28:19 | depreciated [1] - | 69:6 |
| context [2]-45:24, | court [2]-3:3, 28:15 | days [10]-4:19, 4:21, | 50:16 | discontinued [1] - |
| 46:4 | Court [2]-1:24, 82:19 | 10:22, 10:23, 23:23, | depression [2] - | 50:8 |
| continue [5]-14:15, | cousins [1]-41:24 | 35:23, 60:15, 74:2, | 17:20, 35:8 | discount ${ }_{[1]}$ - 30:12 |
| 18:12, 25:3, 44:24, | Cousins [1]-36:24 | 80:20, 80:22 | described [1] - 6 | discrepancy [1] - 67 |
| 50:11 | cover [1]-51:7 | de [1] - 42:18 | description [1]-61:14 | discussing [1] - 36:11 |
| continues [2]-41:25, | cow [2] - 76:6 | dead [2]-74:23, 75:1 | desert [2]-78:21 | discussion [2]-16:8, |
| :16 | cows [1]-76:8 | deal [6]-16:15, 41:1, | deserve [1] - 32:4 | 71:13 |
| contract [1]-61:22 | crane [1]-16:24 | 42:23, 52:9, 53:13, | designated ${ }_{[1]}$ - 58:11 | disinterested [1] - |
| contractor [2]-23:12, | create [2]-79:2, 79:8 | 67:16 | designed [3]-11:2, | 82:11 |
| 24:8 | created [3]-61:25, | dealing [2]-18:1 | 52:7, 55:10 | disparaging ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| contractors [1] - | 62:1, 62:15 | 34:2 | destroy [1]-67:7 | 38:11 |
| 35:20 | credit [1]-51:4 | Dean [3]-11:19, | destruction [3] - | disruptive [3]-53:2, |
| contrary [1] - 55:16 | crews [1]-52:22 | 11:22, 13:8 | 63:12, 63:17, 71:11 | 54:19, 56:5 |
| contributing [1] - | crickets [1]-77:9 | Deblois [1]-24:21 | detail [2]-48:8, 56:2 | disservice [1] - 30:13 |
| 35:10 | criminal ${ }_{[1]}$ - 29:11 | decibel [5] - 20:4, | determine [2]-9:14, | dissipate [1]-62:11 |
| control [4]-14:17, | crisis [1]-80:9 | 2,2, 62:9, 63:2 | 9:22 | distance [3]-45:4, |
| 23:7, 24:5, 47:13 | criteria [4]-3:25, | 77:15 | devaluation [1] - 70:3 | 54:16, 54:25 |
| controlled [1] - 47:18 | 4:15, 57:10, 57:15 | decibels | develop [1] - 43:4 | distances [2]-15:1, |
| conversation [1] - | crops [1] - 26:1 | 55:23, 55:24, 55:25 | developed [3]-47:11, | 32:14 |
| 64:2 | cross [2]-22:15 | decide [1] - 66:1 | 55:6, 78:6 | distinction [1] - 44:21 |
| conveyed [1] - 14:22 | 59:10 | decided [1] - 38: | developer [5] - 7:22, | distractions [1]-42:4 |
| CORMIER [1] - 67:25 | crucial ${ }_{[1]}$ - 48:12 | decides [1] - 24:25 | 35:21, 54:21, 56:22, | districts [1] - 4:2 |
| Cormier [3] - 40:23, | cubic [1]-63:23 | deciding [1]-65:3 | 57:1 | disturbance [1] - 31:9 |
| 67:25, 68:1 | culmination [1]-7:18 | decision [2]-41:6, | developers [1] - 46:24 | division [1]-2:24 |
| corn [1] - 79:20 | cultural ${ }_{[2]}$ - 9:5, 9:18 | $43: 14$ | Development [4] - | dollars [2]-17:21, |
| corner [2]-15:2, | cumulative [2] - 46:8, | decisions [2] - 41:5 | 1:10, 1:14, 2:9, $82: 6$ | 25:7 |
| 32:22 |  | 70:6 | development [23]- | Don [4]-1:23, 2:23, |
| correct [4] - 40:4, | curious [1] - 65:2 | decommissioning [7] | 3:16, 3:18, 3:19, | 5:24, 7:17 |
| 40:16, 69:8, 70:19 | current ${ }_{[1]}$ - 50 | -15:14, 15:15, 29:8, | 3:25, 6:3, 6:5, 6:7, | Donahoe [2]-40:23, |
| corrected [1] - 65:7 | customer [1] - 36:8 | 43:25, 50:2, 50:6, | 8:23, 19:22, 20:1, | 58:9 |
| correctly [1] - 18:22 | customers ${ }_{[1]}$ - $34: 15$ | 50:17 | 32:8, 41:17, 41:18, | DONAHOE [1] - 58:9 |
| Corridor [1] - 26:25 | cut [3]-13:16, 32:18, | decreased [1] - 70:4 | 44:12, 44:15, 44:24, | done [25]-7:21, 8:22, |
| Corrigan [2]-11:22, | $63: 14$ | decreasing [1] - 46:25 deeply [2] - 37:13 | $46: 12,57: 11,69: 19,$ $69: 23,70: 2,70: 9,$ | 9:8, 9:11, 9:13, 9:22, |
| 28:20 <br> CORRIGAN ${ }_{[2]}$ | cutting ${ }_{[2]}-16: 18$, | deeply $[2]-37: 13$, 70:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:23, 70:2, 70:9, } \\ & 70: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:17, 13:23, 13:24, } \\ & \text { 14:16, 17:17, 22:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $28: 16,28: 19$ |  | deer [6] - 39:24, 59:8, | dialed [1] - 36:17 | $4: 3,24: 19,27: 25$ |
| $\operatorname{cost}_{[2]}-15: 19,51: 8$ costs [1] - 70:15 | D | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 16,68: 10,68: 12, \\ & 79: 19 \end{aligned}$ | die [2]-38:7, 76:10 diesel [1]-25:7 | 8:3, 31:1, 34:4, |
|  | dad [1] - 21:18 | deface [1]-70:14 | difference [2]-16:22 | 1, 59:19, 65:2 |
| count [2] - 31:19, | daggers [1]-28:17 | defer [1]-48:8 | 79:1 | 69:13 |
| 76:11 | daily $[2]-59: 12,59: 16$ | define [1]-50:12 | different [7]-20:5 | Donnell [4] -48:11, |
| counties [1] - 44:23 | damage [2]-39:24, | definitely [2]-22:12 | 45:21, 49:23, 55:7 | 48:15, 71:14, 75:15 |
| counting [1] - 27:12 | 53:2 | 53:12 | 59:14, 67:18 | door [2] - 4:4, 53:2 |
| countless [3]-12:4, | dampen [1]-56 | degree [2] - 47:18 | difficult [5]-8:4, 15:8, | dooryard [2]-25:10, |
| 59:4, 63:8 | dampening [1]-57:4 | 51:17 | 30:4, 34:24, 43:14 | 61:13 |
| country [6]-22:15, | dare [1]-73:12 | deliberateness [1] - | diligently [1] - 39:11 | double [1]-23:8 |
| 22:20, 23:1, 76:13, | dark [1] - 42:8 | 49:2 | diminish [1] - 45:6 | Down [4]-21:6, |
| 77:23 | data [4]-8:16, 31:3, | deliberating [1] - | direct [2] - 3:24, 10:17 | 44:16, 46:1, 59:23 |
| County [15]-2:12, | 62:1, 62:15 | 72: | direction [2]-30:6, | down [25]-10:9, |
| 3:18, 6:3, 7:1, 7:2, | date [1] - 81:3 | demand [2]-23:2, | 47:17 | 14:25, 17:16, 17:24, |
| 7:5, 12:15, 23:14, | Dave [9]-20:19, 22:4, | 32:7 | directions [1] - 47:14 | 20:24, 23:5, 23:10 |
| 25:22, 26:22, 27:10, | 28:14, 40:22, 55:2, | demolition [1] - 63:1 | directly [3]-10:19, | 23:22, 26:4, 26:17, |
| 34:13, 39:15, 44:23, | 71:15, 72:6, 76:1 | deny [1]-72:13 | 24:4, 48:24 | 26:24, 28:16, 34:6, |
| 71:15 | Dave's [2] - 75:25, | DEP [4]-37:22, 39:18, | director ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:21 | 36:23, 38:4, 42:7, |

43:23, 49:15, 51:24,
57:4, 59:1, 75:19, 78:12, 78:20, 79:18
DP ${ }_{[4]}$ - 1:14, 2:9, 3:16, 82:6
dramatic [1]-60:3
dramatically [1] - 57:5
dream [1] - 59:4
dreams [1]-60:19
Drilling [3]-34:15, 34:17, 35:5
drink [1]-38:25
dripping [1]-67:20
drive [5]-14:25,
21:19, 30:10, 32:17, 56:13
drive-up [1] - 30:10
drives [1]-23:4
driveway [2]-20:24, 61:18
drop [1]-57:5
droppings ${ }_{[1]}$ - 79:19
Duane [5] - 11:20,
11:22, 21:3, 21:4, 27:19
due [2]-54:24, 66:22
during [9] - 17:2, 56:3,
56:4, 60:14, 61:1,
$66: 15,66: 18,74: 16$,
77:22
duty ${ }_{[1]}-30: 15$
dwarfs [1] - 48:1
dwellings [1] - 62:17

| $\mathbf{E}$ |
| :---: |

Eagle [2] - 76:3, 79:18
eagles [3]-53:8, 68:8, 76:3
early [1] - 68:3
earthquake [1]-12:21
easement [2]-15:5, 61:21
easements [1] - 14:22
easier [1]-52:3
east $[9]-7: 16,34: 6$,
42:7, 43:23, 44:17,
44:25, 56:24, 57:4,
61:17
East $[9]-1: 9,2: 10$,
3:17, 6:2, 21:6, 40:3,
44:16, 46:1, 59:23
Eastbrook [42]-7:16,
11:25, 18:14, 18:17, 21:9, 22:8, 37:9,
37:14, 38:21, 38:22,
39:14, 39:20, 39:22,
40:10, 41:12, 41:14,
41:21, 41:22, 42:14,
42:15, 43:6, 55:13,

56:6, 56:10, 58:10,
58:13, 58:22, 60:6,
60:25, 61:11, 61:15,
62:18, 63:7, 66:6,
66:11, 69:3, 69:10,
71:5, 71:22, 72:1,
72:4, 72:8
Eastbrook's [3] -
18:18, 63:3, 66:2
easterly $[1]$ - 21:17
easy $[3]-30: 10$, 45:15, 59:2
eat [1] - 38:25
economic [1]-34:24
economy [1] - 35:6
edge [4]-42:6, 42:11, 62:18, 66:3
educated [1] - 65:12
eel [1] - 78:11
effect [12] - 17:25,
31:23, 39:23, 45:9, 46:8, 60:3, 61:10,
67:21, 69:7, 69:14,
69:24, 70:2
Effect ${ }_{[1]}$ - 53:5
effects [5] - 31:21,
47:22, 63:15, 65:20,
68:17
effort [3]-7:19, 35:16,
41:3
Eggel's [1] - 33:13
egotistical [1]-76:1
eight [2]-33:9, 63:1
eight-mile [1] - 33:9
either [5] - 11:7,
24:13, 29:20, 50:8,
74:19
elected ${ }_{[1]}-37: 20$
electric [3]-23:6,
23:8, 23:10
electrical $[4]-3: 21$,
6:13, 10:6, 10:8
electricity [3]-24:24,
80:6, 80:11
element [1]-48:13
elevation [3]-8:19,
8:21
Elliott [1] - 21:5
Ellsworth [4]-1:19,
2:3, 44:21, 71:16
embargo [3]-77:21,
80:8, 80:9
emissions [1] - 46:15
emphasize [1] - 16:7
employ [2] - 18:2, 18:5
employed [2] - 35:8, 47:24
employee [1] - 34:21
employee-owned [1] 34:21
employees [1] - 35:14
employing [1] - 22:23
enacted [1] - 18:14
encourage [3]-47:9,
48:17, 56:7
end $[14]-16: 20,20: 1$,
20:25, 22:24, 23:16,
35:16, 42:6, 51:5,
54:23, 60:18, 62:24,
67:10, 74:23, 75:1
endangered [2]-9:7, 29:24
energy [29]-3:18,
3:19, 6:3, 6:5, 6:7, 22:19, 22:25, 23:6,
24:2, 24:6, 24:22,
25:1, 25:4, 38:9,
38:10, 38:12, 38:13,
42:14, 42:18, 42:24,
46:9, 54:14, 56:25,
59:25, 60:2, 77:20,
78:1, 78:8, 80:8
Energy [1] - 1:10
engineer [1] - 34:13
engineering ${ }_{[1]}$ -
34:14
England [2] - 6:12,
12:22
English [1]-78:25
enjoy [7]-20:13,
35:11, 36:22, 49:23, 66:4, 68:22
enjoyed [3]-68:7,
68:13, 71:21
ensure [1]-61:3
enter [2]-7:8, 60:9
entered [1]-7:9
entire $[6]-9: 12,18: 8$,
62:24, 66:18, 67:3,
68:7
entirely ${ }_{[1]}-16: 10$
entity $[5]-4: 9,41: 10$,
71:6, 74:13, 74:20
environment [5] -
12:15, 12:25, 14:11,
35:15, 42:3
environmental $[2]$ -
32:7, 45:22
Environmental [1] -
6:19
envy [1] - 73:25
equal $[1]-44: 14$
equipment $[4]$ - 16:24,
22:7, 41:20, 47:17
equipped ${ }_{[1]}-52: 10$
erect $[2]-45: 10,62: 19$
erosion [1] - 68:18
Especially [1]-42:10
especially [1] - 39:9
essential [1]-55:1
establish ${ }_{[1]}$ - 62:20
established [1] -
62:12
establishing [1] - 66:9
estimates [1]-15:21
EuroAmerican [1] 9:20
evaluate [3]-9:10, 10:3, 10:25
evaluating ${ }_{[1]}-9: 3$
evening [11]-2:6,
2:20, 5:5, 7:11, 7:14,
13:8, 19:7, 19:19,
21:4, 28:19, 40:24
evening's [1] - $3: 11$
event ${ }_{[2]}-60: 12$,
82:12
eventually ${ }_{[1]}$ - 59:13
everywhere [1] -
79:19
evidence [4]-3:24,
4:23, 41:4, 80:24
evil [1]-37:1
exactly [3]-31:23,
48:22, 62:5
example [5]-35:18,
49:10, 50:23, 66:8,
66:11
excavators [1] - 16:20
exceedingly [1]-42:9
except ${ }_{[1]}-41: 15$
exception [1]-70:17
excluded [1] - 4:17
exclusive ${ }_{[1]}$ - 14:17
exclusively [1] - $34: 19$
Excuse [1]-76:21
excuse [3]-5:21,
12:7, 55:25
execute [1]-59:6
executed [1]-63:13
exempt [1] - 56:4
exemption [1]-62:23
exhausts [1] - 70:18
exist [1] - 65:23
existing [9] - 6:13,
8:5, 8:15, 10:19,
44:7, 45:6, 48:5,
57:16, 57:19
expect [1]-57:22
expects $[1]$ - 13:18
expedited $[3]-6: 6$,
30:16, 33:3
experience [3] 33:16, 41:16, 67:12
experienced [2] -
54:17, 77:21
experiences [1] 54:17
expert ${ }_{[1]}-37: 21$
experts [1]-37:20
expires [1]-82:22
explain [1]-25:18
exploring $[1]-63: 8$
exposed $[1]$ - 62:8
express [1]-41:7
extended $[1]-10: 16$
extremely ${ }_{[1]}$ - 12:22
eyes [3]-37:1, 60:5,
65:2
farms [3] - 24:23,
67:12, 76:8
fast [4] - 4:13, 11:24,
23:11, 65:3
fastest $[4]-44: 22$,
44:23, 71:15, 71:16
father $[2]-41: 23$,
$44: 23,71: 15,71: 16$
father $[2]-41: 23$,

| F |
| :---: |
| faced $[1]-59: 16$ |
| facilities $[11]-23: 14$, |
| $24: 15,42: 18,42: 25$, |
| $43: 23,45: 18,46: 10$, |
| $46: 13,46: 14,46: 16$, |
| $54: 14$ |
| facility $[2]-42: 14$, |
| $50: 20$ |
| fact $[10]-41: 6,42: 12$, |
| $44: 8,47: 21,50: 5$, |
| $54: 16,55: 16,55: 17$, |
| $66: 1,66: 8$ |
| facto $[1]-42: 18$ |
| facts $[3]-13: 4,25: 1$, |

28:23
failing ${ }_{[1]}-23: 15$
fair $[2]-34: 3,57: 23$ 64:19

42:13
families [1] - 34:23

68:7 69:18
faced [1] - 59:16
.25,
54.14
fail $[1]-52: 5$
fails [1]-15:16
fall $[3]-32: 16,32: 24$,
familiar [2]-13:23,
family [14]-13:11,
13:17, 14:13, 14:19,
21:8, 21:11, 22:8, 28:6, 41:9, 41:21, 41:22, 41:25, 68:2,
fantastic [1] -48:15
far $[6]-8: 5,20: 2$,
20:16, 39:23, 39:24,
farm [15]-23:10, 25:4,
25:6, 25:23, 26:8,
26:12, 35:17, 37:12,
37:24, 40:7, 73:12,
74:18, 75:3, 75:5
farmers [1]-25:22
farmhouse [1]-80:5
facilities [11]-23:14,

46:13, 46:14, 46:16,

50:20
fact [10] - 41:6, 42:12, 54.8, $47.21,50.5$,

54:16, 55:16, 55:17,
66:1, 66:8
facto [1] - 42:18
fats [3]-13:4, 25:1,
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$





65.2
,
24
fast $[4]-4: 13,11: 24$,
$23: 11,65: 3$
fastest $[4]-44: 22$,
$44: 23,71: 15,71: 16$
father $[2]-41: 23$,

> _
-
-




$74: 21$
fault $[1]-77: 25$
favor $[2]-38: 9,73: 7$
favorite $[1]-31: 6$
feature $[1]-33: 7$
features $[1]-32: 20$
February $[2]-6: 1$,
$7: 17$
feed $[1]-68: 19$
feet $[13]-8: 21,10: 15$,
$20: 18,43: 9,48: 5$,
$52: 14,53: 1,55: 22$,
$60: 8,62: 4,62: 19$,
$64: 14$
felt $[5]-16: 9,44: 3$,
$57: 7,60: 11,73: 5$
Fernald $[2]-11: 20$,
$19: 7$
FERNALD $[2]-19: 7$, 21:2
Fernandez [2]-11:20, 19:20

## FERNANDEZ ${ }_{[4]}$ -

19:19, 20:18, 20:21, 20:23
ferns [1] - 59:15
few [12]-26:19, 27:20,
28:22, 29:3, 32:17, 39:4, 40:13, 44:11, 49:16, 49:20, 60:15, 68:25
field [5] - 8:23, 59:10, 61:19, 66:6, 67:17
fields [3]-21:21, 26:1, 61:18
fight [1] - 65:14
figure [4]-16:2,
22:24, 36:16, 36:21
file [2] - 7:9, 18:20
filed [1] - 7:19
fills [1] - 25:11
final $[2]-5: 1,80: 17$
finally [3] - $8: 8,44: 1$, 57:9
financial $[7]-14: 5$,
31:17, 50:5, 51:2,
51:7, 51:8, 51:10
fine ${ }_{[1]}-80: 6$
finished [2]-55:2,
80:15
firefighter [3]-75:11, 76:18
firm [1]-4:9
first [15]-5:22, 11:9,
28:25, 31:25, 33:24,
40:25, 44:2, 51:12,
54:13, 56:19, 61:12,
67:14, 68:24, 74:19,
79:17
First [19] - 1:9, 13:20,

16:12, 20:3, 21:24, 21:25, 22:4, 34:2, 35:9, 35:12, 40:3, 43:2, 43:16, 44:3, 57:10, 72:7
firsthand [1]-77:17
fish $[4]-53: 25,68: 9$,
68:10, 68:11
fished [1] - 34:1
fisheries [1] - 49:7
Fisheries [1]-6:18
fishermen [2] - 30:5, 60:13
fishing [2] - 12:16, 45:2
fishways [1] - 47:2
Fisk [1] - 37:22
five $[5]-11: 9,28: 12$,
51:11, 51:13, 72:21
five-minute [1] - 72:21
fix [1] $-23: 1$
flag $[1]$ - $78: 16$
Flanders [3] - 74:6,
74:23, 76:4
flashing [3] - 32:22,
33:11, 33:12
flatbed [2]-16:23
flatlands [2]-32:24, 32:25
flawed [1] - 31:4
Fletcher [1]-28:20
flexibility $[1]-56: 21$
flicker ${ }_{[2]}$ - 9:22, 9:23
flow [2] - 46:25, 47:1
flows [1] - 57:5
fluctuated [1] - 50:10
fly $[2]-29: 20,76: 12$
focus [2]-45:9, 61:7
focused [2] - 44:13, 60:25
folks [3]-11:14, 18:18, 28:25
followed [1] - 74:9
following ${ }_{[1]}-43: 1$
foot $[3]-15: 1,74: 24$,
75:22
footprint [1]-10:11
forage [1]-59:9
forb [1] - 63:17
force [1] - $38: 9$
forced [1] - 59:21
foregoing ${ }_{[1]}-82: 9$
forest [5]-8:15,
13:13, 13:14, 25:16, 28:7
forest's [1]-25:4
forested [2]-63:25,
64:3
forestland $[3]-21: 16$,
$45: 1$
forestry $[2]-17: 5$,
$24: 4$
forever $[1]-69: 15$
forget $[1]-5: 13$
forgetting $[1]-31: 17$
forgotten $[1]-65: 1$
form $[3]-51: 3,51: 4$,
$82: 8$
former $[1]-58: 24$
forth $[3]-52: 16$,
$60: 14,65: 12$
fortunate $[2]-34: 18$, 35:3
fortune [1] - 67:11
forum [1]-71:7
forward [5] - 11:2,
19:9, 19:11, 19:13, 22:16
four [3]-35:22, 60:16, 62:25
four-wheelers [1] 60:16
fourth [1]-13:20
Fowler [3]-22:4,
34:3, 72:6
fragmented [1] - 46:7
Franklin [1] - 33:24
frankly [2]-29:8, 73:2
free [2] - 75:12, 79:5
freedom [2]-73:11, 79:16
Freedom [1]-79:10
fresh [1]-65:2
Friends [1] - 33:14
friends [2] - 36:24,
73:11
front ${ }_{[1]}-16: 20$
front-end [1]-16:20
frost [1]-52:9
fuel ${ }_{[7]}-22: 22,22: 25$, 24:1, 24:5, 25:5, 25:7
full $[5]-7: 5,30: 7$, 50:6, 71:22, 82:9
full-time [1] - 30:7
full-timers [1]-71:22
fully $[3]-6: 15,10: 16$, 50:16
funeral [1]-16:9
future [12]-15:20,
15:23, 16:3, 19:24, 21:23, 30:22, 35:17, 40:17, 50:7, 68:15, 75:8, 75:9

| G |
| :---: |
| garden $[1]-75 \cdot 6$ |

garden [1] - 75:6
gardens [2]-59:1, 61:18
gas [1] - 79:12
gazetteer [1] - 27:15
generate [1]-24:24
generating [2] - 46:13,
46:14
generation [4]-10:21,
21:6, 45:14, 47:17
generations [4]-
30:22, 40:17, 68:15, 75:9
generators [1] - 19:12
gentlemen [1] - 40:13
gist ${ }_{[1]}$ - 64:2
given [4]-57:22,
69:16, 69:19, 82:10
glad [1] - 40:1
Glenn's [1] - 73:13
goal ${ }_{[1]}$ - 76:10
golden [1] - 80:6
gorgeous [2]-12:17,
38:6
governmental ${ }_{[1]}-7: 7$
graders [1] - 16:19
graduated [1] - 26:10
grand [1] - 2:18
grandparents [1] -
41:23
grant [2]-40:7, 52:20
granted [1]-6:25
granting [1] - 40:9
grass [1] - 78:11
great [12]-27:17,
36:11, 40:3, 41:1,
42:23, 45:20, 49:2,
49:3, 51:25, 53:16,
67:11, 80:13
greater [3]-39:10,
56:1, 67:1
greatest [1] - 70:13
green [2] - 12:24, 24:2
grew [2]-76:15, 78:5
grid $[3]-6: 2,6: 13$,
22:10
ground [2] - 8:5, 79:19
grow [2]-13:15,
14:18
grower [1]-25:24
growing [4] - 44:22,
44:23, 71:15, 71:16
grown [1] - 77:25
guarantee [1] - 31:22
guess [2]-27:24, 44:21
guide [2] - 30:7, 31:15
guidelines [1] - 71:24
guinea [1] - 38:17
guy [1] - 74:15
guys [1] - 79:15
Gwen [2]-2:13, 2:19

| $\mathbf{H}$ |
| :--- |
| H-o-o-p-e-r $[1]-34: 9$ |
| habitat $[2]-45: 3$, |
| $65: 19$ |
| habitats $[1]-27: 14$ |
| half $[5]-13: 21,25: 7$, |
| $33: 4,45: 25,64: 20$ |
| half-mile $[1]-64: 20$ |
| hall $[1]-4: 5$ |
| Hampshire $[1]-35: 22$ |
| Hancock $[12]-2: 12$, |





71:15
Hancock/
Washington [2] -
23:14, 27:10
hand $[3]-5: 6,74: 14$,
82:13
handle [1]-24:6
hands [1]-74:25
happiness [1] - 30:20
happy [4]-33:20,
57:25, 77:10, 80:11
harassed $[1]-73: 15$
hard $[4]-30: 9,58: 19$,
harassed $[1]-73: 15$
hard $[4]-30: 9,58: 19$,
62:4, 62:20
harm [2]-38:24,
39:22
Harris [2] - 28:14, 38:20
HARRIS [1] - 38:20
harvest [1]-26:24
harvesting [1] - 27:7
hastily [2]-72:25, 73:1
hastily-prepared [1] -
72:25
haul [2] - 23:13, 51:24
hauling [2]-16:23,
16:24
Haynes [7]-13:11,
14:13, 14:19, 21:8,
21:11, 28:6, 33:25
Haynes's [1]-22:7
head $[3]-47: 1,52: 12$, 59:18
health [3]-37:19,
38:24, 68:21
hear $[15]-10: 24,11: 4$, 20:11, 32:3, 33:10, 36:1, 37:22, 37:25, $36: 1,37: 22,37: 25$,
$38: 1,39: 7,39: 8$,
66:20, 73:21, 78:17,

## -

## H $27: 3$ $-27: 14$

## 

$\qquad$

80:17

$$
2
$$

- 


## .

## 都



.

S




51:19
inadequate [1] - 52:5
inch [1] - 59:4
include [1] - 28:13
included [1] - 8:24
includes [1] - 46:20
including [12]-14:23,
29:19, 30:20, 43:5,
46:23, 47:10, 47:19,
56:8, 57:3, 72:8,
79:13
income [1] - 18:3
increase [1] - 44:20
incredible [1] - 63:11 independent [4]-
79:3, 79:5, 79:9
independently ${ }_{[1]}$ 51:4
independentlyverified [1]-51:4 indicate [3]-3:6, 48:20, 66:12
indicated [5] - 5:11, 43:10, 44:25, 61:13, 61:14
indicating [1] - 11:8
indication [1]-60:24
individual [1]-4:9
individuals [2]-
22:23, 54:19
indulging ${ }_{[1]}-57: 24$
industrial [12]-13:14,
41:17, 43:23, 46:10,
46:12, 46:19, 65:3,
65:10, 66:16, 66:25,
71:12
industries [1] - 13:17
industry [6]-36:10,
41:15, 60:3, 65:20,
65:24, 66:14
inflicted [1]-25:17
information [6] -
14:19, 43:20, 48:18, 69:5, 69:6, 70:5
informational [1] 72:1
infrastructure [2] -
8:6, 46:11
initial [1] - 60:24
Inland [1]-6:18
Inn [2]-1:17, 2:2
innocuous [1] - 46:16
input [2]-66:9, 66:20
inquiries [1] - 66:19
inside [2] - 4:4, 33:9
insignificant $[1]$ - $33: 5$
instantly [1]-64:23
instead [1]-19:1
instructs [1] - 30:17
insufficient [1]-50:17
insulation [1] - 47:2
insulting [1] - 74:3
insults [1] - 73:5
insurmountable [1] -

## 65:15

intact [1] - 59:2
intend [1]-51:21
intended [1] - 49:8
intends [1] - 43:4
intensive [1]-41:17
intention [1] - 58:23
intentionally [1] 30:15
interest [8]-4:8, 5:14,
47:7, 47:9, 50:21,
51:18, 59:24, 65:17
interested [5] - 4:20,
33:12, 70:19, 73:8,
80:21
interfere [1]-56:24
international [1] -
35:21
interpretation [1] 31:3
intervenor [2]-6:25, 7:4
intrinsic [3] - 49:8, 49:21
introduce [2]-2:15, 7:14
involve [1]-63:22
involved [5] - 7:7,
14:3, 18:16, 36:13, 37:13
involves [1] - 67:3
ironically [1] - 59:22
irrelevant [1] - 4:16
Island [2]-36:24, 54:18
island ${ }_{[1]}-68: 10$
isolation [1] - 46:6
issue $[8]-15: 17,22: 6$, 22:25, 46:9, 52:9, 53:13, 54:6
issues [3]-22:20, 43:21, 43:24
itself [2] - 43:6, 63:24

| J |
| :---: |
| Japan $[1]-12: 20$ |
| jeeps $[1]-68: 4$ |
| Jericho $[1]-36: 16$ |
| Jim $[2]-2: 22,3: 1$ |
| job $[8]-18: 22,28: 3$, |
| $34: 15,40: 3,57: 17$, |
| $57: 24,73: 23,74: 4$ |
| jobs $[5]-34: 25,41: 4$, |
| $74: 12,74: 21,74: 22$ |
| Jodi $[3]-11: 19,11: 22$, |

11:25
JOHN [4] - 11:12,
11:16, 71:1, 71:4 John [6] - 11:20, 11:22, 19:18, 19:19, 20:16, 71:4
joke [1] - 29:8
Jonesboro [1] - 24:20
JORDAN [2]-21:4,
27:23
Jordan [4]-11:20,
21:4, 21:5, 33:25
judge [1]-57:21
June [3] - 4:21, 80:22, 82:14
jurisdiction [6] - 45:7, $45: 18,45: 20,45: 24$, 46:5, 46:7

| K |
| :--- |
| Kansas $[2]-32: 15$, |
| $32: 24$ |
| Karen ${ }_{[1]}-3: 3$ |
| Kathleen $[3]-40: 23$, |
| $58: 4,58: 9$ |
| kayak $[1]-68: 22$ |
| kayaker $[1]-22: 14$ |
| kayaking $[1]-22: 14$ |
| keep $[7]-16: 17,28: 7$, |
| $31: 6,33: 8,65: 22$, |
| $65: 25,73: 16$ |
| keeps $[1]-59: 7$ |
| kept $[4]-36: 1,72: 20$, |
| $73: 5,73: 12$ |
| key $[2]-54: 14,55: 14$ |
| Kibby $[2]-32: 19$, |
| $34: 21$ |
| kid $[1]-79: 18$ |
| kid's $[1]-77: 11$ |
| kids $[4]-36: 5,79: 5$, |
| $79: 8,79: 9$ |
| kill $[1]-79: 23$ |
| killed $[1]-53: 22$ |
| kind $[6]-9: 16,21: 19$, |
| $26: 20,63: 21,70: 2$, |
| $70: 13$ |
| kinds $[1]-17: 6$ |
| knock $[1]-59: 1$ |
| knowing $[1]-70: 14$ |
| known $[3]-2: 11,6: 8$, |
| $29: 22$ |
| KURTZ $[1]-2: 17$ |
| Kurtz $[1]-2: 17$ |

lady [1] - 72:2
lake [2]-2:18, 15:11
Lake [5]-14:24, 15:5, 15:8, 49:24, 71:13
Lakes [2] - 33:15, 48:23
lakes [3] - 44:14, 48:25
Lakeville [3]-13:10, 13:11, 14:13
Land [2] - 1:3, 2:8
land [33]-4:2, 7:25,
8:12, 15:15, 16:12,
17:5, 18:11, 18:17,
21:9, 21:11, 25:23,
27:1, 28:9, 33:25,
58:25, 59:3, 59:13,
59:23, 62:8, 62:12,
63:10, 64:1, 64:3,
66:13, 75:6, 75:7,
76:9, 76:12, 76:16,
79:21
landfill ${ }_{[1]}$ - 24:14
landing ${ }_{[1]}$ - 66:14
landowner [5] - 13:10, 14:9, 14:12, 16:6, 18:1
landowners [4]-38:2, 57:12, 66:8, 69:14
Lands [2]-6:21, 48:12
lands [15] - 14:14, 21:12, 21:13, 22:8, 23:13, 26:21, 27:11, 27:24, 28:3, 28:5,
28:8, 68:12, 69:2
landscape [3]-32:20, 49:3, 63:16
landscapes [1] - 33:7
Lane [1]-76:3
lane [1]-52:11
large $[7]-26: 5,41: 19$, 46:7, 52:18, 63:14, 65:10, 71:12
larger [1]-37:17
last $[37]-5: 20,11: 11$, 16:8, 16:18, 18:14, 21:15, 23:3, 29:1, 29:3, 32:16, 34:1, 34:2, 34:8, 35:18, 41:18, 42:11, 43:10, 44:11, 54:2, 58:10, 58:17, 59:15, 70:18, 70:21, 70:23, 70:25, 71:1, 72:7, 72:15,
72:20, 72:25, 73:4,
73:20, 73:23, 74:7,
74:15, 77:4
lastly ${ }^{[1]}$ - 72:6
lately $[2]-24: 16$,

44:11
laughing [1] - 77:11
launch [1] - 33:14
Laverty's [1] - 48:20
law [3]-30:17, 32:5, 33:3
lawyer [1]-39:15
lawyers [1] - 67:4
lay [2] - 39:4, 63:10
layers [1]-63:18
layman's $[1]$ - 23:21
leapfrogging [2] -
45:9, 45:19
learn [1]-42:2
learned [10]-23:3, 25:15, 25:17, 42:23,
54:6, 54:12, 60:20,
66:15, 67:14, 71:7
learning ${ }_{[1]}-63: 10$
lease [2]-17:10, 18:12
leased [1] - 16:11
leaseholders [1] 14:22
leases [3]-13:23, 13:24, 14:23
least [6] - 22:4, 44:4, 50:25, 51:17, 56:16, 56:20
leave $[7]-5: 2,13: 6$, 36:5, 58:7, 59:1,
59:21, 60:9
leaves [1] - 62:24
leaving $[1]$ - 59:25
led [2] - 7:19, 64:24
left [2] - 67:8, 76:1
legacy ${ }_{[1]}$ - 70:11
legal $[4]-4: 9,21: 12$, 37:20, 41:9
less [4] - 14:17, 37:23,
44:19, 48:5
letter [1]-51:4
letters [2]-66:11, 66:18
level [7]-20:2, 20:4, 20:15, 31:8, 31:9, 62:2, 62:3
leveling [1]-25:25
levels [9]-47:23,
56:3, 56:16, 57:6,
62:9, 62:22, 63:2, 68:20
lies [2]-38:10, 67:4
life [12]-12:1, 23:16,
42:4, 42:5, 51:5, 58:24, 59:6, 69:24,
70:9, 75:24, 79:15
life-long [1] - 69:24
lifelong [1] - 41:10
light ${ }_{[1]}$ - 42:9
lights [6] - 32:13,
32:22, 33:11, 33:13, 33:16, 33:18 likelihood [1]-50:15 likely [3]-31:2, 31:24, 50:11
limit [3]-33:9, 47:13, 72:22
limitations [1] - 48:6
limited [3] - 33:2,
45:17, 57:12
limiting [2]-47:11, 47:12
limits [2]-9:15, 61:9
Lincoln [2]-33:13, 33:15
Linda [1] - 19:20
line [10]-6:13, 8:4,
8:12, 10:19, 10:20,
18:16, 43:9, 45:16,
49:17, 61:15
lined [1] - 32:16
lines [6] - $6: 10,22: 1$,
22:5, 45:11, 46:12,
57:11
list $[10]-5: 10,7: 8$, 11:6, 11:9, 11:19,
27:5, 28:12, 31:8,
70:18, 79:11
listed [1]-9:19
listen [2] - 10:24, 73:9
listened [3] - 16:7,
77:16, 77:18
listening [3] - 13:5,
67:18, 71:8
literally [1] - 42:5
live [27]-11:25, 22:10,
22:11, 22:12, 22:13,
33:6, 33:23, 34:12,
37:10, $37: 23,38: 7$,
52:25, 54:7, 58:9,
64:6, 64:22, 66:13,
67:8, 67:21, 69:18,
73:11, 74:6, 74:23,
75:6, 75:22, 77:8
lived [9]-12:15,
37:11, 63:7, 67:12,
75:6, 76:8, 76:14,
76:15, 77:12
livelihood [1] - 30:20
lives $[3]$ - 59:8, 65:9, 76:5
living [3] - 30:21,
67:19, 76:16
LLC ${ }_{[2]}-3: 17,6: 2$
LLC's [1] - 2:10
LLC/Bull [1] - 1:9
load [1] - 23:21
loaders [1] - 16:20
loads [2] - 23:24,

56:22
lobstermen [1] - 25:23
local [3]-23:14, 63:4,
69:17
located $[7]-6: 3,6: 5$,
6:8, 7:16, 8:21, 9:15, 10:19
location [7]-7:22,
42:7, 43:8, 47:21,
55:23, 55:25, 56:1
locations [1] - 46:23
$\log [1]-22: 8$
logged [1] - 64:8
logger [1]-21:6
loggers [7]-21:13,
22:7, 25:15, 25:18,
25:19, 25:20, 60:9
logging [8]-14:25,
16:21, 22:7, 25:15, 41:15, 41:19, 60:6, 63:6
look [38] - 11:2, 12:9, 19:1, 19:11, 22:16, 22:17, 25:1, 25:9, 26:8, 26:13, 28:23, 29:16, 30:5, 32:18, 33:16, 35:21, 35:24, 36:20, 36:24, 43:18, 45:24, 45:25, 46:2, 47:5, 50:1, 55:8, 57:17, 57:18, 60:4, 65:2, 69:9, 70:8, 75:22, 76:7, 77:16, 78:14
looked [3]-18:23,
32:14, 59:20
looking [12] - 7:24,
7:25, 15:11, 19:9,
19:11, 19:13, 46:8,
59:22, 67:17, 75:8,
76:7, 76:24
looks [3]-24:25,
36:19, 76:6
Ioon [1]-68:9
loons [2] - 68:9, 76:4
losing [2] - 31:18, 61:4
lost [2] - 54:21, 75:17
loud [1] - 62:14
love [15]-17:15, 27:17, 37:2, 75:7, 75:23, 76:3, 76:7, 78:14, 78:16, 78:25, 79:2, 79:8, 79:9
loving ${ }_{[1]}-78: 5$
low [7]-12:22, 45:14,
47:1, 49:19, 51:13, 56:13
low-generation [1] -
45:14
Lowry $[2]-28: 13$,
$37: 8$
LOWRY $_{[1]}-37: 8$
lucky $_{[1]}-28: 7$
ludicrous $_{[1]}-30: 6$
LURC $_{[12]}-2: 23,3: 3$,
$4: 1,10: 2,39: 16$,
$54: 21,65: 17,65: 18$,
$65: 25,66: 12,66: 18$,
$66: 20$
LURC's $[4]-6: 22$,
43:22, 44:6, 48:6

| $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :---: |

Machias [1]-26:25 machines [2]-10:13, 26:5
Madeline [1]-58:25 magnitude [1] - 12:21
mail [1] - 72:25
mailed [1] - 66:19
mailing [1]-27:5
Maine [59]-1:1, 1:3,
1:19, 2:3, 2:8, 6:19, 6:20, 6:21, 7:3,
12:11, 12:22, 13:9, 13:12, 13:13, 13:17, 17:18, 17:20, 18:3, 18:24, 21:6, 25:14, 26:15, 26:16, 29:14, 30:14, 32:1, 32:3, 34:7, 34:12, 34:14, 34:15, 34:17, 34:19, 35:1, 35:5, 35:14, 35:25, 36:2, 36:5, 36:14, 37:21, 41:10, 42:7, 43:23, 44:9, 44:13, 44:16, 44:20, 48:17, 64:25, 65:16, 68:2, 70:10, 70:11, 75:16, 82:5
maintain [2]-59:1, 59:17
maintenance [3] -
3:22, 6:11, 46:13
majestic [1] - 12:9
major [7] - 30:25,
35:20, 43:23, 46:10,
46:19, 51:24, 72:4
majority [4]-31:2, 40:19, 55:11, 62:8 man [1] - 73:23 manage [4]-21:5, 34:16, 47:1, 47:3 managed [4]-35:6, 46:20, 46:21, 47:8 management [3] 17:5, 43:24, 49:1 manager [1]-2:25

## managing [1] - 46:20 Manchester [1] -

 34:12 manipulation [1] 67:5manufacturing [1] 21:5
map [2]-60:1, 60:4
mapping ${ }_{[1]}-9: 11$
March [2]-6:24, 82:22
Marine [1] - 80:2
mark [1] - 59:25
market [1] - 50:25
marketing [1] - 38:11
markings [2] - 52:7, 52:11
Mars [3]-12:8, 34:20, 54:18
Mary [9]-11:10, 11:11, 11:18, 28:13, 38:19, 38:20, 70:17, 70:22, 71:4
MARY [2] - 11:12,
11:16
massive [2]-60:20, 67:3
material [3]-58:11, 62:5, 63:24
materials [2]-4:16, 7:8
Matter [1] - 1:12
matter [2]-3:16, 26:9
maximize [1] - 46:22
maximum [1] - 56:3
MD [3]-2:10, 3:18, 6:3
MDI ${ }_{[1]}$ - 79:4
mean [2]-26:15, 64:7
means [3]-31:11,
31:12, 41:1
measure [2]-53:21, 53:24
measurement [1] 42:11
measures [2]-53:15, 53:21
meet [1] - 32:6
meeting [4]-40:18,
69:3, 72:1, 81:2
meetings [3]-43:4, 69:11, 69:17 meets [1] - 3:25
megawatt [2]-3:20, 10:13
megawatts [1] - 10:14
member [2]-38:21, 42:23
members [3]-41:3, 50:4, 52:25
memory [2]-59:11,

59:12
mention [3]-31:7,
63:17, 70:3
mentioned [2]-39:12,
72:12
Merchant [1] - 58:25
mercy [1]-28:15
mere [1]-42:12
message [2]-32:2,
54:20
met $[8]$ - 6:11, 40:4,
50:6, 66:23, 74:13,
74:14, 74:16, 74:19
metal [1] - 50:24
meteorological [1] 3:20
meter [1]-77:15
microphone [1] - 5:12
microwave ${ }_{[1]}$ - 12:10
mid [1] - 65:16
middle [1] - 8:13
might [3]-28:23,
36:19, 65:10
migrations [1]-29:21
mile [6]-22:11, 22:13, 33:9, 39:9, 40:6, 64:20
miles [15]-8:3, 22:11,
22:12, 32:17, 32:18,
32:25, 33:1, 33:2,
33:4, 37:23, 48:3,
54:10, 54:11, 56:1
mill [2] - 24:12, 24:13
million [1] - 45:25
mills [1]-24:11
mind [6]-11:13,
11:16, 15:7, 33:8,
70:22, 78:13
mine [4]-59:4, 59:21, 67:2, 72:20
minimize [2] - 47:19, 47:21
minute [2]-31:17, 72:21
minutes [2]-67:18, 77:4
misconceptions [1] -
38:11
misinformation [1] -
74:17
missed [2] - 31:2, 49:5
missing [1] - 48:12
mission [3]-43:22,
44:5, 44:6
Missouri [1] - 77:12
mistakes [1]-65:6
misunderstood [1] -
55:18
mitigate [3]-53:24, 54:17, 63:4
mitigation ${ }_{[1]}-53: 21$
mocked [1] - 74:8
model [1] - 55:13
moderate [1] - 49:19
Molasses [11] - 41:25,
42:1, 51:20, 51:22,
52:2, 52:13, 53:10,
57:3, 71:21, 71:23,
72:4
money [7]-15:24, 16:3, 16:5, 29:9,
37:18, 38:2, 67:4
month [2]-22:22,
22:23
moose [3] - 39:24,
59:8, 68:10
morning [2]-15:13, 48:22
most [9] - 9:5, 15:20,
23:19, 30:8, 38:25,
41:17, 48:9, 54:3,
54:4
mountain [5]-17:23,
67:17, 75:18, 75:19,
78:13
Mountain [14]-13:21,
14:3, 17:15, 17:17,
26:7, 26:10, 28:20,
39:6, 74:24, 75:12,
75:21, 75:22, 75:23
mountains [6] - 19:1,
33:1, 35:22, 44:14,
45:11, 75:24
move [5] - 16:14, 17:16, 38:6, 65:13
moved [6] - 16:19, 58:22, 60:6, 65:16, 74:25, 75:25
movement [1] - 52:6
MR [35] - 2:18, 2:22,
2:23, 3:1, 5:24, 7:11,
13:8, 19:7, 19:19,
20:16, 20:18, 20:21,
20:22, 20:23, 21:1,
21:2, 21:4, 27:23,
28:16, 33:23, 34:8,
34:9, 34:11, 40:24,
55:3, 55:5, 58:3,
72:18, 72:20, 73:19,
74:3, 76:22, 76:24,
77:1, 77:4
MRSA [1] - 3:12
MS [65]-2:6, 2:17, 2:19, 2:20, 2:24, 3:2, 5:9, 5:15, 5:17, 5:18, 5:19, 7:10, 11:4, 11:6, 11:13, 11:17, 11:24, 13:6, 19:5, 19:6, 19:16, 19:17, 19:18, 21:3, 27:19,

28:10, 28:11, 28:17,
33:22, 34:10, 37:6,
37:7, 37:8, 38:18,
38:19, 38:20, 40:21,
40:22, 55:2, 55:4,
58:2, 58:4, 58:5,
58:9, 67:23, 67:24,
67:25, 70:16, 70:17,
70:24, 71:1, 71:3,
71:4, 72:14, 72:15,
72:17, 72:19, 73:17,
74:1, 76:21, 76:23,
76:25, 77:3, 77:5,
80:15
multiplier ${ }_{[1]}$ - 17:25
MUNGER [9] - 72:18,
72:20, 73:19, 74:3,
76:22, 76:24, 77:1,
77:4, 77:6
Munger [1]-74:6
MURPHY [2]-2:23, 5:24
Murphy [2]-2:23, 5:24 must [4]-4:5, 4:14, 57:20, 70:5
Myrick [1] - 71:13

| $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :---: |
| NADEAU $[5]-2: 22$, |
| 20:16, 20:22, 21:1, |
| $34: 8$ |
| Nadeau $[1]-2: 22$ |
| name $[19]-2: 13,4: 7$, |
| $5: 13,5: 24,11: 8$, |
| $11: 21,11: 25,19: 7$, |
| 21:4, 28:12, 28:20, |
| $34: 8,34: 11,37: 8$, |
| $58: 9,67: 25,71: 4$, |
| $74: 6,74: 15$ |
| name's $[2]-19: 19$, |
| $33: 23$ |
| named $[1]-82: 12$ |
| nameplate $[1]-10: 14$ |
| names $[4]-5: 2,5: 11$, |

11:9, 28:12
Nancy [3] - 28:13, 37:7, 37:8
Narraguagus [5] -
14:24, 15:5, 15:8,
49:24, 71:13
National [1]-27:12
national [1]-9:20
native [2] - 59:14, 63:17
natural [17]-8:6, 9:3,
9:6, 9:16, 26:14,
26:16, 42:3, 44:6,
48:15, 52:4, 57:12,

70:12, 71:11, 71:18, 71:19, 79:12
Natural [3]-6:19, 7:2, 7:3
nature [6] - 4:8, 14:21,
17:13, 20:13, 45:4, 53:3
near [2] - 36:4, 77:8
Near [1] - 78:4
nearest ${ }_{[1]}$ - 20:16
nearly [1] - 47:25
necessarily [1] - 45:17
necessary [1]-36:25
Neck [1] - 37:11
need [12] - 3:6, 5:19,
17:21, 19:13, 23:21,
23:22, 24:4, 24:5,
28:6, 29:6, 29:7,
44:19
needs [2] - 39:20, 45:9
negative [6] - 38:13,
43:12, 61:24, 63:4,
63:15, 67:21
neglect [2]-30:15, 31:7
negligible [1] - 18:24
negotiation [1] - 61:6
neighbor [2]-17:19, 61:21
neighboring [1] 68:11
neighbors [1] - 56:9
nervous [1] - 11:24
nest [2]-29:21, 53:11 never [11]-31:12,
38:10, 58:25, 60:11,
60:19, 64:16, 74:18,
75:14, 78:6, 78:9,
80:3
New [3]-6:12, 12:22, 35:22
new [4]-70:24, 71:18, 72:17, 74:11
next $[9]-21: 3,28: 11$, 28:12, 33:22, 40:22, 58:4, 61:24, 79:20
nice [2] - 15:21, 74:22
nicely [1]-57:10
night $[30]-5: 20$,
11:11, 16:8, 18:14,
32:17, 32:19, 32:23,
33:1, 39:3, 39:5,
42:8, 42:9, 42:10,
43:10, 55:24, 70:18,
70:21, 70:23, 70:25,
71:1, 72:16, 72:20,
72:25, 73:4, 73:13,
73:20, 73:24, 74:7,
74:15, 77:4
nights [1] - 39:4
nighttime ${ }_{[1]}$ - $33: 18$
Nimby [1] - 78:3
nobody [1] - 54:9 noise [26]-20:2, 20:14, 39:3, 39:8, 39:10, 39:16, 44:1, 47:13, 47:20, 54:4, 54:5, 54:8, 54:14, 54:18, 56:15, 62:10, 65:23, 66:5, 67:15, 67:20, 68:20, 77:8, 77:11, 77:16, 79:18
none ${ }_{[2]}$ - 14:23, 15:5
nonetheless [1] - 45:2
north [2] - 19:1, 26:8
northeast ${ }_{[1]}$ - $36: 7$
northern [2]-8:14,
44:13
northwest [3] - 32:18, 57:2
northwestern [1] -
44:19
Notary ${ }_{[2]}-2: 2,82: 4$
NOTARY ${ }_{[1]}-82: 18$
noted [5] -7:15, 8:13,
10:12, 10:18, 50:4
notes [2]-72:24, 73:1
Nothing [1] - 78:3
nothing [9]-5:7, 23:8,
27:23, 32:5, 36:4,
40:11, 40:12, 68:4,
75:20
notice [4]-20:23, 32:21, 56:10, 69:16
noticed [1] - 63:18
notified [2] - 4:25,
69:18
noun [1]-79:1
NRCM ${ }_{[2]}$ - 7:4, 43:10
nuclear ${ }_{[1]}$ - 12:19
number $[7]-8: 1$,
10:10, 15:19, 46:23,
47:11, 49:9, 51:21
numbers [3]-15:23,
15:24, 16:4
numerous [3]-29:7,
39:17, 43:3
nurse [1] - 71:5

| 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { opening } \\ & 5: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| object [1] - 12:12 | operable [1] - 37:25 operating [2] - 18:9, |
| obligations [1] - 50:6 | 62:22 |
| observation [1] - 53:7 | operation [2] - 51:6, |
| observed [2] - 66:17, | 51:12 |
| 67:4 | operational [1] - 47:2 |
| obstruct [2]-19:14, | operations [2]-3:22, |
| 66:7 | 6:10 |
| obtained [1] - 69:5 | opinion [3]-20:4, |
| obvious [1] - 29:18 | 26:9, 31:4 |

obviously ${ }_{[1]}$ - 36:11 occasionally [1] -
60:14
occasions [1]-43:4
occurrences [1] 64:24
odds [1] - 65:15
offer [2]-26:16, 42:25
offered [1] - 61:20
office [3]-5:25, 13:9, 69:3
officer [1] - 2:14
official [1]-56:9
officials [3] - 37:20,
37:21, 40:5
offs [1] - 46:14
offseason [1] - 41:25
often [1] - 25:12
oil [9] - 74:7, 77:21,
77:24, 77:25, 78:9,
79:11, 80:7, 80:10
old [3]-9:21, 80:5,
80:6
OLSEN [1] - 2:24
OIsen [1] - 2:24
on-site [1] - 47:20
once [2] - 8:21, 25:6
one [37]-9:2, 11:21,
13:25, 21:10, 21:25,
23:21, 23:22, 24:18,
26:10, 26:14, 27:3,
29:3, 29:5, 29:19,
31:21, 32:1, 32:9,
38:12, 39:1, 39:3,
39:8, 42:21, 44:10,
44:23, 51:23, 53:22,
54:3, 54:13, 60:9,
61:20, 64:17, 73:20,
73:21, 76:4, 78:19,
79:23
one-sided [2]-73:20,
73:21
ones [6] - 16:1, 17:3,
24:10, 30:10, 30:11, 61:10
Oops [1] - 5:17
open [5] - 4:18, 18:12,
28:8, 80:19
opening [2] - 3:10,
operable [1]-37:25
operating [2]-18:9,
62:22
operation [2]-51:6,
51.12

0praliolin
opinion [3]-20:4, 26:9, 31:4
opinions [1] - 13:3 opponents [3] - 12:5, 54:20, 54:24
opportunities [2] 35:7, 36:9
opportunity [6] - $35: 3$, 45:21, 45:23, 58:15, 58:16, 69:19
opposed [1] - 66:16
opposition [1] - 67:1
option [1]-58:18
order [3]-2:7, 5:23,
11:14
ordinance [22]-
18:15, 18:18, 37:14,
39:12, 40:9, 40:12,
42:14, 42:17, 42:20,
42:22, 54:13, 55:12,
56:6, 60:25, 61:1,
61:7, 62:15, 62:20,
63:3, 66:3, 66:10
ordinances [3] -
39:17, 55:6, 56:10
organic [2] - 75:5
original [1]-65:22
Osborn [2]-68:2,
69:14
Osborne [2]-21:9,
22:9
ospreys [2] - 53:8,
68:8
otherwise [1] - 2:11
ought [6]-27:5,
42:20, 43:18, 46:19,
53:16, 53:21
outcome [1]-82:12
Outfitters [1] - 28:21
outlined [1] - 57:10
output [2]-9:25,
46:25
outsets [1] - 40:15
outside [5] - 19:2,
36:10, 59:7, 61:9, 73:14
overhead [1] - 22:1
owls [1] - 59:8
own [25] - 14:20, 15:2,
16:12, 16:13, 18:19,
19:8, 19:22, 19:25,
21:5, 21:9, 21:10,
26:21, 30:19, 41:11,
59:6, 66:13, 68:1,
74:25, 78:8, 79:7,
79:8, 79:24, 79:25,
80:13
owned [6] - 13:11,
14:19, 21:8, 34:21,
41:22
owner [2]-19:8,
58:25
owners [6]-12:11, 21:10, 60:13, 69:16, 69:18, 69:21
ownership [2]-7:25, 8:12
owning [1] - 40:5
owns [2]-13:12,
21:11
$\mathbf{P}$

P-1 [1]-58:11
p.m [4]-2:4, 55:24,

81:3
pack [1]-76:19
paid [1] - 30:13
PALMER [1] - 3:1
Palmer [2]-3:1, 30:2
panels [1]-38:14
paper [3]-23:12, 24:16
papers [1]-69:17
parcel [2] - 6:14, 8:1
parcels [1]-8:1
Park [1]-27:13
parking [1] - 75:14
Parks [2] - 6:20, 48:12
part [2] - 19:24, 59:13
participate [1]-7:5
particular ${ }_{[4]}$ - 9:25,
10:4, 48:4, 48:16
particularly [7]-7:6,
35:1, 47:12, 52:1,
54:12, 56:18, 71:10
parties [1]-7:1
partridge [2]-59:9,
68:12
parts [1]-68:5
party $[3]-6: 22,7: 1$, 77:23
Passamaquoddy ${ }_{[1]}$ 78:5
passed [1] - 61:7
passes [1]-60:8
passing [1] - 60:12
past [8]-26:11, 32:11,
37:14, 57:22, 59:20,
64:24, 65:8, 69:2
Patrick [1] - 68:1
patted [1]-25:20
pay [2] - 18:6, 22:24
paying [1] - 30:9
peace [2]-68:14,
68:16
peaceful [1]-20:10
peak ${ }_{[2]}-56: 22,57: 5$
pedestrian [1]-52:15
peer [1]-6:22
Pending [2]-1:14,
82:6
people [64]-9:5, 12:5, 12:20, 16:15, 17:16, 17:23, 18:2, 18:6, 23:9, 25:25, 26:2, 26:3, 26:18, 27:20, 28:1, 28:2, 28:22, 29:14, 31:14, 31:15, $31: 18,31: 25,32: 3$, 35:2, 35:14, 35:24, 36:3, 36:12, 38:1, 38:16, 40:19, 41:1, 49:9, 49:14, 49:16, 49:20, 49:21, 49:24, 50:1, 53:3, 53:5, 54:7, 54:22, 55:11, 56:13, 65:19, 65:23, 66:13, 66:16, 69:24, 70:3, 70:10, 71:17, 72:12, 72:21, 73:5, 73:6, 74:13, 74:16, $75: 13,75: 17,77: 2$, 78:11
people's [3] - 65:9, 66:24, 74:8
percent [10] - 13:22, 21:24, 31:5, 31:11, 31:12, 31:13, 31:15, 31:19, 51:8, 60:17
percentage [1] - 12:11
perfectly [1] - 79:7
performance [1] 51:3
perhaps [2]-29:4,
47:10
period [6] - 4:19, 49:2, 51:15, 51:16, 53:22, 80:20
periodically [1] -
15:23
permanent [2]-6:11, 8:15
permit [6]-3:16, 14:6, 22:2, 32:6, 53:18, 72:13
Permit [4]-1:10, 1:14, 2:9, 82:6
permitted [2] - 35:23, 41:18
permitting [1] - 6:6
Perrow [1]-3:8
person [5] - 24:25,
37:15, 39:16, 79:3, 82:11
personal [5] - 13:3, 33:16, 53:7, 74:10 personally [2] - 32:25, 39:21
persons [1]-4:25
perspective [3] - 44:3, 44:4, 54:3
pertains [1] - 40:9
petroleum [1] - 36:22
Phase [2]-43:7, 43:8
phases [1] - 51:9
Phillips [1]-2:17
phone [3]-12:11,
12:12, 75:20
phosphorus [1] - 9:13
photo [3]-61:11,
69:4, 69:8
picked [1] - 35:23
picture [1] - 69:14
pictures [4] - 33:11,
33:12, 33:15, 33:18
piece [5] - 16:24, 59:3,
59:11, 59:23
pig [1] - 38:17
piqued [1] - 59:24
place [12]-16:16,
24:24, 31:7, 42:5,
42:9, 45:23, 51:11,
53:21, 53:23, 55:7,
63:12, 68:15
placed [4]-4:4, 45:13, 50:9, 51:9
places [6] - 30:9,
30:12, 30:17, 30:18, 42:3, 64:21
plan [8]-5:5, 9:9,
29:8, 44:6, 48:24, 59:13, 59:15, 62:12
planner [2]-2:23, 5:25
Planning [1] - 39:15 planning [5] - 2:24,
38:21, 39:11, 40:5, 45:22
plans [2] - 59:5, 72:7 plant [4]-23:24,
24:20, 24:21, 59:14
plantation [1]-2:22
plants [12]-12:19,
23:15, 23:17, 23:20,
23:25, 24:9, 24:10,
24:11, 24:20, 24:22, 47:20
plastic [1] - 38:25
plenty [2]-23:4, 77:1
plow [1] - 79:20
plowed [1] - 60:11
plug [1] - 10:20
plunges [1] - 29:13
plus [1]-22:6
poachers [1] - 39:24
point [11] - 15:11,
27:23, 27:24, 44:2,
48:22, 49:5, 51:10,
51:14, 54:2, 63:5,
68:6
pointed [1] - 16:21
points [4]-35:5, 43:12, 71:9
poisonous [1] - 13:1
poles [1] - 10:10
Pond [19]-22:17,
41:25, 42:1, 48:11, 48:15, 51:20, 51:22,
52:2, 53:10, 57:3,
68:2, 69:7, 69:9,
71:13, 71:14, 71:23,
74:7, 74:23, 75:15
pond [21]-22:11,
33:14, 52:12, 52:13,
68:10, 68:11, 68:13,
68:14, 68:18, 68:19,
68:22, 69:2, 69:21,
69:24, 71:21, 72:3,
72:4, 74:22, 74:23,
76:4, 78:14
ponds [7]-49:10,
49:11, 49:12, 49:15,
49:16, 49:18
pool [2]-10:5, 10:7
pools [2] - 9:6, 31:22
poor [1]-12:20
popular [1] - 37:15
population [2] - 39:25,
44:20
populations [1] -9:11
portion [1] - 46:1
positioned [1]-61:19
positive [2] - 43:12,
43:15
possibility [1] - 12:19
possibly [1] - 19:10
posted [1] - 33:14
potato [1]-25:22
potential [10]-7:22,
7:23, 8:23, 9:4,
44:15, 45:5, 45:19,
60:2, 61:24, 71:11
potentially [2] - 44:15, 70:4
pounds [1] - 16:22
power [19]-2:10,
7:15, 7:23, 8:9, 9:25,
12:19, 13:24, 13:25,
22:1, 22:5, 43:23,
45:12, 47:20, 54:20,
58:21, 78:6, 78:18,
78:21, 79:14
practices [1] - 25:16
predicted [1] - 51:15
predicting [1] - 15:19
predominant [2] -
42:8, 56:25
preparation [1] -
66:10
prepare [1] - 72:24
prepared [5] - 60:22,
$72: 25,73: 1,80: 3$, 80:7
presen [1]-73:21
presence [1] - 65:24
present [1]-3:24
presentation [1] 5:22
presented [2] - 9:9,
31:1
Preservation [1] -
6:21
preserve [1] - 46:5
preserving [1] - 75:9
president [1] - 34:14
President [1] - 17:18
presiding [1] - 2:14
pressure [1] - 44:24
presumably [1] -
50:24
pretty [2] - 19:15, 76:1
prevent [1] - 53:20
previously [1]-39:12
price [8] - 23:4, 23:5,
24:1, 24:5, 25:6,
25:8, 50:9
prices [2] - 50:10, 50:24
pride [2] - 35:10, 36:11
primarily [3] - 21:13, 35:14, 36:16
principally [1] - 50:7
principle [1] - 51:23
pristine [3]-49:22, 68:8, 70:12
private [2] - 52:14,
52:16
privileged [1] - 42:22
probability [1] - 12:20
problem [5] - 20:8,
20:14, 21:22, 30:25, 78:2
problems [1] - 35:12
procedure [1]-3:13
proceedings [1] - 4:12
proceeds [1] - 7:20
process [9]-18:16,
59:22, 59:25, 61:1,
64:15, 66:9, 66:15,
66:18, 67:3
processer [1] - 16:23
processing [1] - 6:4
processors [1] - 16:19
production [2] -
37:14, 56:25
profession [1] - 71:5
professional [3] - 4:7,
39:17, 48:10
professionals [3]-
35:11, 39:13, 48:19

Program [1] - 6:19
progress [1] - 40:14
prohibition [1]-42:18
project [77]-2:10,
2:11, 5:25, 6:7, 6:12,
6:14, 7:14, 7:15,
7:20, 7:23, 8:2, 8:4,
8:9, 8:11, 8:14, 8:19,
8:20, 9:9, 9:12, 9:14,
9:23, 10:3, 10:4,
10:5, 10:6, 10:11,
10:12, 10:13, 10:21,
10:25, 11:1, 12:5,
13:10, 13:20, 13:22,
14:16, 15:11, 15:16,
17:8, 17:22, 18:9,
18:23, 21:23, 22:18,
29:23, 32:8, 34:6,
37:17, 38:2, 40:6,
40:18, 40:19, 41:13,
43:16, 43:17, 44:5,
$45: 3,45: 18,46: 3$,
46:18, 46:19, 49:4,
50:15, 58:14, 60:21,
62:10, 63:4, 63:12,
63:21, 64:23, 65:10,
66:10, 69:16, 74:16,
78:8, 78:11, 78:17
Project [2]-32:19,
78:5
project's [1]-57:15
projects [32]-14:6,
14:10, 14:11, 16:25,
18:3, 18:23, 29:18,
32:12, 34:16, 34:19,
34:25, 35:2, 35:11,
35:13, 35:17, 35:20,
35:21, 35:24, 36:2,
36:7, 36:8, 36:11,
45:20, 45:24, 46:3,
46:6, 46:8, 60:3,
65:3, 66:17, 78:18
promise [1]-59:2
promised $[1]$ - 58:24
promoting ${ }_{[1]}$ - 77:20
pronoun [1]-79:1
proof ${ }_{[1]}-66: 20$
propane [1]-80:4
properly [1] - 42:17
properties [1]-9:19
property [27]-19:3,
19:8, 19:21, 19:25,
20:8, 20:12, 38:4,
38:7, 40:5, 41:11,
41:22, 42:12, 58:12,
58:23, 59:12, 59:20,
59:24, 60:7, 60:10,
60:22, 61:5, 62:13,
68:1, 70:3, 70:4,
75:2, 75:4
proponents [1] 54:20
proposal $[7]-3: 25$,
4:15, 6:14, 43:2,
43:8, 45:10, 47:16
proposed [18] - 3:19, $6: 5,45: 3,46: 18$, 48:2, 50:12, 50:17, 58:14, 60:21, 61:4, 61:8, 61:11, 62:10, 66:5, 69:4, 69:23, 78:19
proposes [2] - 46:22, 50:5
proposing [1] - 62:18
pros ${ }_{[1]}-65: 13$
prospect $[1]$ - 65:10 prospecting [2] 7:21, 8:22 protect [10]-31:19, 44:6, 47:9, 47:14, 50:21, 56:12, 60:22, 62:21, 65:18, 65:19
protected [3] - 44:19, 55:23, 62:17
Protection [1] - 6:19 protection [4]-45:22, 50:18, 56:8, 66:4 protective [1]-55:12 protects [5]-16:5, 16:6, 47:4, 65:17 protest [2]-66:23, 66:24
protocol [1]-66:17
proud [4]-26:14,
34:17, 42:16, 42:20
proven [1]-17:14
provide [1]-51:2
provided [2]-60:1, 66:19
provides [2]-50:17, 71:24
providing [1]-76:23
provisions [2] - 3:12, 50:2
proximate [1]-47:11
proximity [6] - 8:2,
45:18, 57:11, 59:21, 61:3, 62:7
Public [3]-2:2, 6:20, 82:4
PUBLIC [1] - 82:18
public [39]-3:14, 3:23, 3:24, 4:20, 6:25, 11:5, 14:14, 15:7, 16:5, 18:8, 18:9, 18:11, 18:13, 26:21, 27:1, 27:4, 27:11, 27:17, 27:24, 28:1, 30:10, 34:1,

43:4, 47:4, 47:7,
47:9, 50:18, 50:21,
51:13, 51:17, 52:13,
52:14, 52:25, 65:17,
71:19, 77:9, 80:18,
80:21
public's [1] - 65:17
pull ${ }_{[1]}$ - 17:1
pulse [1]-73:13
pump [1]-25:9
purely [1]-34:25
purpose [4]-3:23,
4:10, 4:22, 80:23
purposes [3] - 17:5,
17:6, 52:22
pursuant ${ }_{[1]}-3: 11$
pursuing [1]-57:11
push [1]-28:6
put $[19]-10: 1,15: 3$,
15:4, 16:3, 16:5,
20:12, 20:24, 21:16,
22:5, 23:20, 29:9,
38:14, 45:15, 45:16,
46:4, 53:23, 73:3,
75:14, 77:15
puts [1]-65:4
putting ${ }_{[1]}$-24:17

| $\mathbf{Q}$ |
| :---: |

qualify ${ }_{[1]}-71: 23$
quality $[1]$ - 8:17
quantifiable [1] -
55:17
quasi ${ }_{[1]}-52: 14$
quasi-public [1] -
52:14
questions [10]-4:14,
4:16, 15:13, 29:5, 29:6, 33:20, 57:25, 68:25, 69:12
Questions [1]-58:2
quick [2]-52:3, 55:6
quickly [5]-43:21,
51:19, 55:22, 61:8,
67:15
quiet [6]-20:10, 42:9,
42:13, 60:17, 68:14,
68:16
quite [3]-27:20, 31:3, 43:21
quo [1]-59:17
$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\text { rase }}$
raise [5] - 5:6, 21:14, 46:9, 56:17, 68:9
raised [2] - 48:7, 75:6
Ramada [2]-1:17, 2:2
ramble [1]-13:3
ranches [1]-76:8
ranks [1] - $35: 7$
raptor [1] - 9:8
rare [2]-9:7, 29:24
rather [1]-36:4
ravage [1] - 65:5
Rawlings [6]-13:21,
14:3, 17:15, 17:17, 17:23, 34:21
reaching [1]-73:13
read [10]-3:10, 11:6,
11:24, 15:19, 24:16,
32:11, 39:17, 42:12,
62:4, 77:19
reading $[1]-5: 10$
ready [2] - 11:4, 57:12
real [3] - 54:6, 80:11
realize [3]-33:2, 65:6, 77:25
realized [2]-61:8,
77:22
really [29] - $7: 18,10: 7$,
10:11, 10:25, 15:7,
18:25, 19:13, 22:1,
27:5, 29:16, 29:19,
31:20, 32:1, 32:2,
32:14, 32:21, 33:4,
33:12, 35:11, 36:9, 43:20, 44:2, 55:9, 58:18, 67:20, 72:24, 73:8, 74:4
RealWindInfoForMe.
com [1]-28:22
reason [5]-20:5,
23:17, 24:1, 26:20,
30:16
reasonable [9] -
15:22, 15:25, 16:15,
36:3, 53:24, 56:11,
56:14, 57:7
reasons [3]-23:16,
56:7, 76:4
Rebecca [1]-2:17
rebuttal [2]-4:22, 80:23
receive [3]-3:15,
4:19, 80:20
receiving $[2]-4: 22$,
80:23
recently [2]-20:24, 78:20
receptors [1]-54:25
recession [3]-17:18, 17:19, 35:8
recognize [1] - 48:6
recommend [1]-51:1
recommendation [3] -
47:23, 50:21, 51:11
recommended [2] -
53:15, 53:16

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { recommending [1] - } \\ & 53: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { remote }[14]-42: 6, \\ 42: 7,44: 19,45: 2 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Record [1] - 34:21 | 49:10, 49:11, 49:1 |
| record [13]-4:6, 4:18, | 15, 49:16, 49 |
| 4:23, 4:24, 7:9, 14:1, | 65:4, 71:11, 71:19, |
| 35:4, 36:6, 58:8, | 4:2 |
| 80:19, 80:25, 82:9 | remotely [1] - 47:18 |
| recording [2]-3:8, | removal [1]-63:23 |
| :11 | repeat [3] - 70:24, |
| recourse [1] - 38:5 | 71:1, 72 : |
| recreation [1]-71:24 | repetitious [1]-4:16 |
| recruited [1]-35:19 | reported [1]-82:7 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { red }[5]-32: 13,32: 22, \\ 33: 11,33: 13,33: 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reporter }[2]-3: 3 \text {, } \\ & 28: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| Redington [1] - 74:16 | Reporter [1]-82:19 |
| reduce [1] - 10:11 | Reporters [1] - 1:24 |
| reduced [1]-82:8 | represent [6]-4:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reed }[4]-17: 16, \\ & 34: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:10, 58:12, 71:6, } \\ & 74: 12,74: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| reevaluated ${ }_{[1]}$ | represented [2] - |
| 29:11 | 17:21, 55:16 |
| refer ${ }_{[2]}-13: 13,13: 14$ | representing [2] - |
| referenced [1] - 72:2 | 41:8, 41:9 |
| refine ${ }_{[1]}$ - 16:4 | request [1] -4:12 |
| reflects [1]-10:2 | require [3]-14:4, |
| regard [1] - 65:5 | 51:2, 56:22 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { regarding }[4]-69: 7, \\ 69: 11,69: 23,82: 6 \end{gathered}$ | required [1] - 4:5 requirements [2] - |
| regardless [3] - 40:12, | 10:2, 47:3 |
| 49:9, 61:24 | research [4]-53:19, |
| region [1] - 48:16 | 54:12, 70:1, 70:5 |
| register ${ }_{[1]}-9: 20$ | research-type [1] - |
| registered ${ }_{[1]}$ - 71:5 | 53:1 |
| regular [2] - 17:4, 41: | researched [1]-13:4 |
| regulated [1]-46:20 | reserved [1] - 28:9 |
| regulates [1] - 42:17 | reserving [1] - 28:3 |
| regulating [1] - 54:13 | reside [2]-41:10, |
| Regulation [2]-1:3, 2:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 14 \\ & \text { residence }[3]-4: 7 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |
| regulations [1] - 18:19 | 41:11, 62:1 |
| regulators [1] - 47:2 | residences [3] - 9:24 |
| regulatory ${ }_{[1]}$ - 46:3 | 48:5, 63:1 |
| reinforce [2]-50:3, 53:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { resident }[5]-37: 9, \\ & 38: 20,41: 10,58: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| rejected [2]-74:17, | 71: |
| 74:18 | residents [13] - 42:15, |
| relates [2]-43:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 10,53: 2,56: 6 \\ & 56: 12,56: 19,56: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 58:20, 62:21, 63:5, |
|  | 66:4, 66:8, 69:10 |
| relevant ${ }_{[1]}$ - 4:14 | resisted [1] - 46:25 |
| reliance [1]-50:9 | resolved [2]-29:6, |
| rely ${ }_{[1]}-51: 16$ | 29:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { remain [2] - 4:18, } \\ & 80: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { resource }[14]-8: 8 \text {, } \\ 8: 10,8: 18,22: 21, \end{gathered}$ |
| remember [3]-35:6, | 24, 30:4, 43:24, |
| 40:13, 80:7 | 46:21, 46:23, 47:3, |
| remind $[2]-58: 6$, | 48:14, 48:15, 53:24 $57: 13$ |
|  | Resources [2]-7:2, |

7:3
resources [21] - 8:6, 9:3, 9:4, 9:5, 9:6, 9:16, 25:15, 26:14, 26:16, 43:25, 44:7, 45:3, 47:4, 47:5, 47:6, 47:7, 48:24, 50:19, 53:5, 66:25, 80:13
respect [13]-17:12, 20:3, 37:2, 47:25, 48:7, 48:9, 48:20, 48:23, 49:3, 50:2,
52:6, 57:19, 66:22
responses [1] - 66:19 responsibility [2] 29:15, 29:25 rest [5] - 28:5, 29:21, 58:24, 59:5, 66:4 result [3]-5:1, 35:6, 61:13
resume [1] - 35:17
resurvey [1] - 20:23
retained [1] - 34:24
retirement [3]-20:10, 21:19, 36:4
return [2]-31:12,
66:23
reuse [1] - 50:8
reviewed [2]-6:16, 9:9
reviewers [1]-6:23
revisit [1] - 15:22
rewarding [1] - 36:9
rid [1]-24:13
Ridge [1] - 37:11
ridge [1] - 45:11
right-of-way [1] - 60:7
righting [1] - 63:20
risk [4] - 51:12, 57:3, 61:4, 63:1
river [1] - 21:18
River [2] - 14:20, 26:25
Road [6] - 52:2, 52:24,
58:10, 62:25, 75:15
road [24] - 14:24, 15:3, 15:4, 15:6, 16:14, 16:16, 17:6, 20:1, 23:22, 26:25, 42:6, 43:25, 46:12, 51:24, 51:25, 57:12, 60:10, 60:19, 68:19, 74:23, 75:1, 75:25
Roads [2] - 51:20, 51:22
roads [16] - 3:21, 6:9, 8:6, 8:16, 14:25, $16: 12,16: 13,17: 2$, $17: 4,17: 9,17: 10$,

52:4, 52:6, 52:8,
53:4, 63:7
roadside [1] - 10:10
rolled [1] - 10:1
rolling [1] - 68:23
rolls [1] - 25:10
roughly [1] - 31:4
round [1] - 37:9
Route [4]-26:19,
51:23, 51:24, 52:1
routinely [1] - 47:2
rude [1]-73:17
rudeness [1] - 73:4
ruin [1]-79:21
ruins [1] - 25:11
rules [2]-3:14, 18:19
run [6] - 10:9, 22:19,
23:20, 28:20, 28:21,
59:6
running [1] - 25:6
runoff [1] - 9:13
runs [2]-6:14, 8:13
rural [1]-55:8
Rural [1] - 7:1
rustling [1] - 39:9
RV [1] - 52:16

| $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :--- |
| safe $[1]-52: 11$ |
| safety $[1]-22: 6$ |
| sail $[3]-36: 14,36: 16$, |
| $36: 23$ |
| sailboat $[1]-36: 19$ |
| sake $[1]-25: 4$ |
| sale $[1]-50: 12$ |
| salvage $[2]-50: 8$, |
| $51: 14$ |
| salvaging $[1]-50: 25$ |
| Samantha $[1]-2: 24$ |

Samantha [1] - 2:24
sanctuary [1] - 59:14
Sargent [1] - 34:19
sat [1]-73:4
Saturday [1] - 26:11
save [1]-76:20
saw [9]-32:16, 32:24,
33:12, 64:17, 64:18,
67:14, 68:24, 69:4,
75:14
sawmill [1] - 32:9
scale [5] - 6:2, 60:3,
63:21, 65:3, 65:10
scared [2] - 37:13,
37:24
scars [1] - 30:23
scenery [2]-12:17, 70:12
scenic [16]-3:1, 6:23,
30:1, 30:3, 43:24,
44:7, 47:25, 48:7,

48:9, 48:11, 48:23,
49:7, 49:23, 54:5, 71:18, 71:23
SCHAEFER ${ }_{[1]}-2: 18$
Schaefer [1]-2:18
Schoodic [9]-26:7,
26:9, 74:24, 75:12,
75:21, 75:22, 75:23,
76:19, 78:13
school [1]-79:4
scientists [1]-6:17
Scott [1] - 3:8
Scout [1] - 79:18
scout [3]-76:15,
80:2, 80:3
scrap [5]-29:10,
29:13, 50:9, 50:10,
50:24
seal ${ }_{[1]}-82: 14$
season [1]-60:15
seasonal [1]-41:11
seasons [2] - 9:8, 20:5
second $[7]-24: 12$,
34:12, 46:9, 71:21,
77:3, 79:18, 80:17
secondly [1] - 54:16
securing [1]-61:2
see [29]-5:9, 5:21,
17:15, 19:2, 19:11,
22:2, 22:17, 23:8,
23:21, 24:2, 26:4,
26:8, 26:12, 27:9,
30:11, 32:19, 36:17,
37:3, 37:17, 38:23,
50:23, 53:9, 61:14,
64:3, 74:13, 76:10,
78:16, 79:16
seeing [4]-12:6,
12:19, 61:20, 78:13
seem [3]-12:5, 40:14,
53:11
seemingly $[1]$ - 65:14
sell ${ }_{[2]}$ - $59: 18,75: 2$
selling [2] - 50:7, 75:3
sending $[1]-32: 3$
sense [3]-51:9,
51:10, 52:18
serious [1] - 29:7
seriously [2] - 42:16,
74:22
serve [1] - 42:22
session [2]-3:9, 80:17
set $[5]-27: 16,27: 25$,
56:3, 61:12, 65:2
sets [1]-62:1
setting $[3]-52: 8,55: 8$
seven [8]-4:21, 20:9,
23:23, 43:20, 43:21,
51:6, 58:22, $80: 22$
several $[8]-7: 18, \quad$ site $[9]-8: 22,41: 13$, 13:12, 13:24, 19:10, 47:20, 50:15, 52:3, 41:19, 71:9, 72:21, $\quad 53: 12,64: 17,64: 18$, 74:8
shadow [2]-9:22, 9:23
shaking [1] - 74:14
shame [1]-22:21
shape ${ }_{[1]}-65: 22$
shaped [1] - 42:5
share [1] - 44:4
shared [1]-70:5
sheds [1]-9:15
sheets [1] - 4:3
shop [2]-25:10, 78:24
Shores [3]-13:10,
13:11, 14:13
short [3]-5:23, 51:15,
71:2
shortfall [1] - 50:12
shot ${ }_{[1]}-78: 20$
shoulders [1]-52:10
Show [1] - 77:12
show [4]-8:17, 16:25,
25:18, 28:15
showed ${ }_{[1]}$ - 18:21
showing [1]-69:8
shrub [1]-63:17
shut ${ }_{[1]}$ - 78:12
shuts [1] - 80:10
siblings [1] - 41:24
sick [1] - 38:3
side [5] - 19:25, 22:10,
61:17, 62:8, 72:3
sided [2]-73:20,
73:21
sight $[1]-53: 9$
sights [1] - 42:4
sign [2] - 3:6, 4:3
signed [2]-3:5, 11:7
significant $[8]-29: 23$,
30:4, 31:12, 32:20,
33:6, 44:18, 54:4
significantly [2] -
45:5, 56:24
signs [1] - 75:15
silenced [1] - 61:23
similar [2]-59:20, 66:11
simply [4] - 30:4, 30:12, 31:24, 59:18
Simpson [1]-26:17
simulation [4]-61:12,
61:13, 61:20, 69:4
sincerely [1] - 73:22
singing [2] - 78:9, 78:10
single [2] - 8:1, 8:12

68:20
sites [5] - $53: 11,54: 7$,
60:1, 64:16, 64:17
siting [2]-57:15, 71:12
situated [2] - 62:6,
62:10
six [2] - 20:8, 79:23
sixth [1]-11:21
size [1]-59:3
skidder [1] - 68:4
skidders [1] - 16:19
skiing [1] - 22:15
sky [1] - 50:20
Sky [7]-1:9, 2:10,
3:17, 6:2, 40:3,
46:22, 47:16
Sky's [2]-43:2, 45:9
slated [1] - 60:2
sleep [3] - 38:3, 39:3, 77:9
sloppiest ${ }_{[1]}$ - 29:4
slow [1]-28:16
small [2]-29:9, 41:14
smokestacks [1] -
12:25
snack [1]-52:17
snowmobilers [1] -
60:16
soil [1] - 6:17
soils [1] - 9:11
solar [4]-38:13,
38:14, 78:18, 78:21
sold [3]-14:21, 75:1
solely $[2]-12: 1,54: 24$
solving ${ }_{[1]}-35: 12$
someone [3] - 32:14, 38:8, 79:6
sometimes [3] -
29:14, 40:15, 74:5
Son [1] - 21:5
sons [1]-26:10
sophisticated [1] 47:16
sorry [6]-11:25, 39:7,
55:3, 76:24, 77:6,
80:1
sort [4]-27:19, 49:18,
53:19, 61:6
sound [11]-6:23, 9:24, 9:25, 37:21, 42:11, 54:10, 54:24,
57:6, 62:1, 62:22,
62:23
sounds [1] - 42:4
source [1] - 57:14
sources [1]-13:1
south [4]-19:1, 22:10, 51:24, 57:2 southern [2]-8:14, 37:23
southwest [2] - 15:2,
57:2
Sparrow [1] - 53:10
SPEAKER [1] - 20:20
SPEAKERS [1] - 5:8
speaking [1] - 61:23
speaks [1] - 48:24
special [5] - 36:1, 40:18, 42:3, 42:5, 68:14
specializing [1] 59:14
species [4]-9:7, 29:20, 29:24, 47:15 specifically [4] - 30:7, 30:17, 64:21, 71:12 specified [1] - 4:1
speck [1] - 22:10
Speck [1] - 22:17
Spectacle [4] - 68:2, 68:3, 69:7, 69:9 speculation [1] 77:19
speculative [1] - 51:16
speed [2] - 47:13, 47:18
spell [1] - 34:8
spend $[3]-25: 25$,
30:6, 64:22
spent [5] - 12:3, 27:1, 41:24, 54:5, 63:8 spoken [2]-50:3, 53:6
spot [1] - 62:12
spots [2] - 49:22,
71:18
sprawling [2] - 45:4, 46:7
spreading [1] - 28:23
Spring [1] - 14:20 spring [3]-21:18, 26:17, 64:19 stabilize [1] - 18:3
stable [1] - 35:14
staff [8] - 2:16, 2:21, $3: 4,5: 3,5: 18,5: 21$, 13:7, 56:17
stake [1] - 70:7
stakes [1] - 20:24 stand $[7]-5: 6,10: 15$, 21:23, 23:15, 23:19, 24:22, 67:5
stand-alone [3] 23:15, 23:19, 24:22 standard [3] - 25:21, 35:12, 52:5
standards [15] - 4:2, 32:7, 36:2, 55:9, 55:12, 55:17, 55:21, 55:22, 56:3, 56:4, $56: 11,56: 12,56: 15$, 62:23
standing [2] - 24:6, 33:17
Stantec [1]-7:12
Starks [1] - 2:19
starlight [1] - 42:8
start $[7]-8: 23,12: 3$,
17:1, 17:16, 36:8, 58:20, 65:14
started [4]-27:14, 34:2, 37:10, 79:19 starting [2] - 38:3
state [20]-4:6, 6:16, 6:17, 18:2, 22:20, 28:2, 39:18, 44:9, 44:22, 48:17, 53:25, 60:4, 64:25, 65:4, 66:16, 70:14, 71:16, 71:24, 71:25, 75:16
State [3]-1:1, 77:12, 82:4
state's [1] - 48:11
statement $[3]-3: 10$, 5:16, 80:16
statements [2] - 4:20, 80:21
States [1] - 35:24
states [2] - 65:5, 76:10
statewide [1] - 18:6
status [3]-6:25, 7:5, 59:17
status-quo [1] - 59:17
statute [2]-4:1, 57:20
statutory [2] - 48:6, 52:5
stay [3] - 12:17, 59:17, 65:14
steel [2] - 50:10
stenographically [1] 82:7
Stetson [16] - 13:21, 14:2, 14:6, 14:7, 14:10, 17:15, 18:21, 34:20, 39:6, 67:17
Steve [8]-2:18, 11:20,
11:22, 19:6, 19:7,
28:13, 34:10, 34:11
still [11] - 14:18, 25:7,
27:2, 30:23, 35:7, 38:4, 68:6, 74:15, 75:1, 79:20, 79:21
stood [3] - 28:25,
77:15, 78:10
stop [4]-29:21, 40:14, 76:24, 80:3
stopping [1] - 78:1
stops [1] - 18:15
stories [1] - 74:10
storm [2]-9:12, 80:4
story [1] - 74:10
stove [2]-80:4, 80:5
strange [1] - 64:9
strategy [2]-49:1, 67:5
stream [1] - 2:18
streams [2]-68:11,
68:19
street [1] - 37:10
Street [2]-1:19, 2:2
stretches [1] - 44:25
strictly [1] - 22:3
strides [1] - 67:1
string [4] - 8:14, 8:15,
22:14, 37:24
strings [2] - 45:16,
48:2
strong [3] - 18:4, 18:5, 41:21
stronger [2] - 12:18, 18:2
strongly [3] - 12:13, 14:14, 56:7
stuck [3]-15:16, 16:1, 29:14
students [2] - 75:8, 78:23
studied [1] - 29:2
studies [9]-8:23,
8:24, 9:2, 9:7, 9:16, $9: 18,10: 1,15: 19$, 31:25
study [4] - 9:2, 53:17, 53:19, 62:5
studying [1] - 58:21
stuff $[7]-73: 15,79: 2$,
79:6, 79:8, 79:11,
80:13
subcontractor [1] -
34:18
subdivide [1] - 58:25
subject [3]-30:1,
58:19, 60:22
subjective [2] - 55:19
submit [2] - 57:17,
58:8
submitted [4]-3:17,
6:1, 6:17, 6:22
subscribe [1] - 82:13
substation [4] - $3: 22$,
6:10, 10:9, 10:18
successful [2] - 14:6, 35:10
successor [1] - 50:20
sucked [2]-73:23,
74:4
suddenly ${ }_{[1]}$ - 29:13
sufficient [2]-50:25,
51:7
Sugar [9]-19:8,
19:22, 20:1, 51:20,
51:22, 52:2, 52:24,
58:10, 62:25
Sullivan [3] - 74:7, 75:3, 78:9
summary [1] - $5: 23$
summer [2]-26:11, 41:24
suppliers [1]-24:18
supply [6] - 13:16,
23:2, 23:3, 23:4, 23:5, 80:10
supposed [1] - 20:5
surety $[1]-51: 3$
surprise [1]-63:18
surrounding $[7]$ -
47:19, 58:20, 59:23, 63:14, 66:13, 69:15, 70:6
surroundings [3] 65:5, 65:11, 67:8
survey [3]-20:24, 30:25, 31:8
surveyed [1] - 31:5
surveys [1]-9:8
survive $[3]-24: 11$, 24:15, 34:23
sustainable [1] 35:18
swear ${ }_{[2]}-5: 4,5: 7$
sworn [1] - 4:5
system [3]-3:21,
10:6, 10:8
T

T16 [4]-2:10, 3:18, 6:3, 34:1
table [2] - 3:4, 4:4
tall [1]-10:15
tangible [4]-17:12, 18:1, 18:7, 18:9
tank [1] - 25:11
$\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a x }}[1]-72: 4$
taxes [1]-18:7
tea [1] - 77:23
teach $[4]-68: 8,75: 7$, 79:4, 79:5
teacher [5] - 75:7,
78:23, 78:24, 78:25
teams [1]-67:4
technical [2]-14:4, 72:12
techniques [1]-47:24
technology [2] -
45:12, 78:23
teeming [1] - 64:4
tendency [1]-52:4
tents [1]-76:14
term [1]-18:12
terminates [2]-52:23, 53:1
terms [4]-23:21,
43:11, 55:18, 55:20
Terri [1]-40:23
territories [1] - 44:13
territory [2] - 44:8, 44:17
Terry [2]-67:24,
67:25
test ${ }_{[1]}-68: 24$
testified [4]-11:11,
70:18, 70:23, 72:15
testify [10] - 3:6, 3:7,
4:3, 5:5, 5:12, 11:7,
11:14, 27:21, 70:20,
70:21
testifying [1] - 70:19
testimony [23] - 3:16,
3:24, 4:6, 4:14, 4:23,
10:24, 13:7, 26:6,
32:11, 43:10, 53:14, 58:6, 58:8, 70:24,
71:8, 72:17, 73:19,
74:9, 74:11, 76:23,
80:17, 80:24, 82:10
themselves [5] - $2: 15$,
10:15, 55:21, 63:20, 79:17
they've [4]-7:6, 34:4, 53:16, 53:23
thick [1] - 9:17
thinking [3]-54:22, 58:17, 72:23
third [2]-6:22, 21:6
third-party [1] - 6:22
Thompson [1]-1:23
thorough [2]-55:4, 57:23
thoroughly [1] - 10:25
thousand [2]-13:12,
65:12
threatened [2]-9:7, 29:24
three [8]-3:20, 6:11, 6:25, 16:18, 35:25,
36:17, 62:17, 73:3
throughout [3] -
35:23, 36:7, 45:20
throw [1]-28:17
throwing [1]-77:24
thrown [1] - 59:15
tidal $[2]-78: 5,78: 10$
tied [2] - 24:4, 24:10
ties [1] - 41:21
TIF [1] - 17:13
timberland [3]-13:13, 14:16, 18:5
timers [1] - 71:22
tip [1] - 10:15 today [22]-5:20, 8:25,
10:23, 16:8, 21:22, 23:6, 24:7, 25:20,
29:17, 29:22, 31:3,
32:13, 41:5, 46:21,
58:16, 61:23, 64:2, 68:7, 68:16, 71:8,
71:18, 72:12
today's [1]-3:15
together $[3]-10: 1$, 35:15, 36:3
tone [1]-73:24
tonight [12] - 3:3, 3:9, 28:24, 55:15, 57:24, 69:22, 71:6, 73:1, 73:2, 73:21, 74:17, 79:14
tons [1] - 63:23
took [4]-42:16,
79:10, 79:16
tool [1]-24:4
Top [1]-21:5
top [2]-19:1, 19:8
topic [1] - 62:22
Topsham [1] - 7:12
tortoises [1]-78:20
totalling [1] - 43:6
totally $[2]-42: 8,52: 23$
touched [1] - 77:18
tough [2]-41:5, 41:6
tour [2]-37:10, 60:8
towards [1] - 56:23
tower [7]-36:24,
47:12, 55:1, 64:17,
64:18, 67:19, 68:24
towers [18]-3:20,
6:12, 12:10, 12:13,
12:18, 12:24, 45:10, 48:2, 48:4, 49:18, 50:22, 50:23, 57:8, 60:24, 61:4, 67:13
Town [1] - 42:15
town [27]-37:17,
38:1, 38:21, 38:22,
39:14, 39:15, 39:20,
39:22, 40:4, 40:9, 40:18, 41:12, 42:13, 42:15, 43:9, 55:13, 61:1, 62:16, 62:19, 66:3, 66:10, 69:3, 69:10, 69:11, 71:17, 72:5, 79:11
town's [2]-60:25, 61:9
towns [5]-39:18,
40:11, 69:15, 70:4,

70:6
township [13]-14:15, 14:20, 15:2, 15:3, 16:18, 18:8, 18:16, 21:8, 60:11, 60:16, 65:22
Township [11]-7:16, 15:3, 21:11, 28:21, 41:13, 60:9, 61:8, 63:25, 65:19, 66:5, 72:8
townspeople [1] -
37:16
track [5] - 14:1, 35:4, 36:6, 50:5, 65:3
trade [1]-46:14
trade-offs [1] - 46:14
traffic [8]-20:11, 52:6, 52:7, 52:15,
52:19, 53:3, 60:12
trailer [1]-25:10
trailers [1]-23:22
trailhead [1]-75:19
trails [3]-20:12, 68:4, 68:13
transcribed [1]-4:11
transcription [1] -
82:9
transform [1]-59:13
transformed ${ }_{[1]}$ - 60:5
transmission [8] -
6:13, 8:2, 8:3, 8:12, 10:17, 45:15, 46:12, 57:11
travel [1]-52:15
traveled [4]-32:15,
62:11, 68:13, 76:9
traveling ${ }_{[1]}$ - 67:11
travelled [1]-52:8
treat [1]-43:21
Tree [1]-21:5
trees [6]-13:16, 14:18, 25:15, 39:10, 63:14
tremendous [2] -
10:10, 22:19
tried [2] - 69:20, 78:8
trip [1] - 67:17
trout [1] - 68:11
truckloads [1] - 60:15
trucks [2]-16:21, 60:13
true [5]-33:5, 38:16, 69:14, 70:1, 82:9
Truman [1]-17:18
trust [2]-25:9, 30:22
truth [3]-5:7, 79:13
try $[6]-48: 17,65: 13$,
72:20, 73:13, 73:16, 75:17
trying [9] - 7:22, 16:2, 36:16, 36:18, 36:21, 57:1, 75:2, 75:18, 77:1
tsunami $[1]$ - 12:21
Tuesday [6] - 1:5, 2:3,
4:19, 4:21, 80:20, 80:22
Turbine [2]-61:15, 61:16
turbine [9]-9:25,
19:2, 20:17, 47:17,
56:1, 64:15, 78:13,
79:20, 79:21
Turbines [1]-56:18
turbines [54]-3:20,
$6: 9,10: 9,10: 12$,
10:14, 12:6, 12:7,
21:20, 22:17, 31:6,
32:19, 36:18, 36:20,
37:24, 37:25, 38:23,
39:2, 39:5, 39:25,
43:3, 43:5, 43:6,
44:1, 45:5, 45:13,
45:16, 46:24, 47:11,
47:13, 48:1, 50:8,
54:8, 54:19, 54:23,
54:25, 55:10, 56:15,
59:22, 61:9, 61:12,
61:25, 62:7, 62:11,
62:19, 64:13, 66:5,
68:17, 68:20, 69:4,
69:8, 72:2, 72:7,
77:13
turbines' [1] - 54:14
turkeys [1]-79:22
turn [3]-49:15, 54:19,
68:21
turned [3]-61:7, 64:13, 65:9
twice [1]-17:2
two [14]-8:16, 8:24,
9:2, 9:7, 10:23,
17:21, 35:23, 51:22,
53:23, 54:12, 56:19,
64:21, 76:10, 77:4
tying [1] - 24:19
type [3]-9:25, 53:19, 67:2
types [2]-9:2, 59:15
typewritten [1]-82:8
typically [1] - 56:23

| $\mathbf{U}$ |
| :--- |
| unacceptably $[1]-$ |
| $63: 2$ |
| unanswered $[1]-29: 5$ |
| uncertainties $[1]-$ |
| $72: 11$ |

uncomfortable [1] 63:11
uncommon [1] - 53:9
under [7]-13:14,
14:17, 27:4, 49:13,
49:17, 57:20, 65:15
underground [5] -
3:21, 6:10, 10:6,
10:8, 22:5
underneath [2] -
67:12, 67:19
understandably [1] -
46:22
undeveloped ${ }_{[1]}$ -
44:16
undue [3]-47:22,
53:20, 65:20
unduly [1] - 4:16
unemployed [2] -
17:19, 17:20
unfair [1]-62:21
unhappy ${ }_{[1]}$ - 72:5
UNIDENTIFIED [2] -
5:8, 20:20
unique [2]-44:9,
45:21
unit $[3]$ - 48:12, 48:15,
48:19
United [1] - 35:24
University [2] - 34:13, 36:5
unknowns [1] - 72:11
unless [1] - 39:6
unlike [1] - 46:21
unorganized $[3]$ -
44:8, 44:12, 44:17
unsafe [2]-52:17, 52:23
unspoiled [1]-71:20
unusual [2]-53:15,
60:12
up [47]-3:20, 4:3, 5:6,
5:12, 6:11, 7:19,
10:1, 15:3, 15:17,
17:1, 19:9, 19:10,
20:10, 23:5, 23:11,
24:7, 25:6, 25:11,
26:7, 26:20, 27:14,
27:16, 27:19, 27:24,
30:10, 30:23, 31:15,
31:16, 32:16, 33:19,
36:12, 38:14, 38:22,
51:25, 58:5, 59:15,
68:24, 70:23, 73:11,
75:1, 76:15, 78:5,
78:10, 78:14, 78:16, 80:1
upper [1]-33:14
upside [1] - 49:15
upsidedown [1] - 65:9
urban [2]-42:4, 55:8
urge [6] - $40: 6,46: 2$,
47:4, 52:20, 53:14,
65:18
useful ${ }_{[1]}$ - 51:5
user [1]-30:25
users [1]-31:2
uses [5]-43:24, 44:7,
46:10, 46:11, 46:12
Utilities [1] - 6:20
utilized $[1]$ - 9:12
utilizes [1] - 47:16
V

V100 [1] - 10:13
vacationers [1] -
71:22
valley ${ }_{[1]}-77: 17$
valuable [4]-30:8, 49:14, 54:1, 57:14
value [16] - 29:13,
30:12, 44:14, 45:2, 48:23, 49:6, 49:7, 49:12, 49:20, 49:21, 49:25, 51:14, 61:4
valued [1] - 49:12
values [10]-29:10,
38:4, 44:18, 46:5,
49:7, 49:8, 57:13,
70:4, 75:2, 75:4
varied [1] -55:14
variety ${ }_{[1]}$ - 56:7
various [2]-13:17,
15:1
vast [1] - 44:25
verbal [1]-61:14
verified [1]-51:4
Vermont [1] - 35:21
vernal ${ }_{[4]}-9: 6,10: 5$, 10:7, 31:22
Verso [1]-24:16
versus [1]-74:7
Vestas [1] - 10:13
vice ${ }_{[1]}-34: 14$
vice-president ${ }_{[1]}$ -
34:14
view [11]-19:14,
42:17, 42:21, 43:11,
46:19, 51:10, 51:14,
52:4, 52:23, 55:10,
55:11
views [4] - $30: 8$,
30:18, 54:5, 68:23
viewshed [1]-69:8
Vinalhaven [3] -
36:14, 36:18, 54:18
virtually ${ }_{[1]}-45: 13$
visible [1] - 33:4
visit ${ }_{[1]}-77: 14$

| visitor ${ }_{[1]}-30: 14$ <br> visual ${ }_{[7]}$ - 26:5, | wetlands [2]-9:6, 10:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 24,60: 2,60: 21, \\ & \text { 61:2, 61:7, 61:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yearly }[1]-64: 18 \\ & \text { years }[38]-7: 19,8: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31:13, 31:20, 32:10, | wheelers [1] - 60:16 | 62:14, $65: 13,65: 24$, | 13:18, 13:19, 15:18, |
| 36:13, 61:19, 66:6 | WHEREOF [1]-82:13 | 66:2, 66:9, 66:10, 66:16, 66:22, 67:12, | 15:20, 16:17, 16:18, |
| voice [2] - 58:12, 67:2 <br> Volume [1]-1:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { whole }[7]-12: 1, \\ & 45: 25,52: 9,59: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $66: 16,66: 22,67: 12$, $67: 13,68: 17,73: 12$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:8, 20:9, 21:7, } \\ & \text { 21:15, 23:3, 23:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| volume [1] - 9:16 | 64:11, 64:12 | 74:8, 74:18, 77:13, | 24:3, 26:19, 29:3, |
| volumes [1]-8:24 | wholly [2] - 6:6, $52: 5$ | 78:14, 79:13 | 30:22, 34:2, 34:22, |
| volunteer [3]-75:11, | widen [1]-26:24 | windmill ${ }_{[1]}$ - 39:16 | 37:12, 38:23, 41:18, |
| 76:18 | widening ${ }_{[1]}-68: 20$ | windmills [4]-19:23, | 42:2, 44:12, 46:6, |
| vow [1]-26:11 | wife [4]-19:20, 20:7, | 39:21, 79:16, 79:23 | 46:24, 49:2, 50:11, |
|  | 74:25, 77:9 | window [1]-61:16 | 51:6, 51:12, 51:13, |
| W | $\text { wild }[4]-30: 9,42: 6,$ $45: 6,66: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { winds }[2]-45: 14, \\ & 56: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 23,58: 22,61: 24, \\ & 62: 13,68: 7,68: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| wade [1]-41:4 | wilderness [4] - | windy [1] - 78:15 | Yeo [2]-11:19, 11:25 |
| walk [1] - 59:8 | 13:15, 27:18, 43:22, | Winn [1]-13:12 | YEO [1]-11:24 |
| walked [6]-59:4, | 65:18 | winter [2] - 68:6, 69:2 | yesterday [4]-10:23, |
| 64:11, 64:12, 73:5, | wildest [1] - 60:19 | winters [1] - 60:10 | 26:7, 37:11, 60:8 |
| 76:12, 77:14 | wildlands [1] - 48:25 | winterville [1]-2:22 | young [2]-36:5, 68:9 |
| walking [1]-64:15 | Wildlife [1] -6:18 | wish [1] - 4:25 | yourself [2]-27:15, |
| Waltham [2]-21:9, 22:8 | wildlife [10]-27:14, 45:3, 53:25, 64:5, | wishes [1] - 70:20 <br> wishing $[1]-4: 3$ | 46:6 |
| wants [1]-27:9 | 65:19, 68:16, 68:18, | withdrawn [1] - 7:4 | Z |
| wars [1] - 38:10 | 69:24, 70:2, 70:10 | WITNESS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 82:13 |  |
| Washington [1] - 26:22 | $\begin{gathered} \text { willing [3] - 19:4, } \\ 22: 21,57: 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { witnesses }[4]-4: 5, \\ 5: 4,16: 21,82: 10 \end{gathered}$ | zoning [1] - 45:23 |
| waste [5]-12:25, | Wind [20]-1:9, 1:10, | wondered [1] - 65:8 |  |
| 16:2, 24:12, 24:13, | 13:20, 14:1, 14:3, | wonderful [1] - 48:16 |  |
| 64:1 | 14:18, 16:12, 20:3, | wood [3]-60:13, |  |
| wasteland [1] - 64:6 | 21:24, 21:25, 22:4, | 63:19, 80:4 |  |
| watch [1]-68:10 | 34:2, 35:9, 35:12, | woodlands [2]-27:2 |  |
| watched [1]-63:15 | 40:3, 43:2, 43:16, | woods [4]-22:11, |  |
| watching [2]-32:1, | 44:3, 57:10, 72:7 | 22:13, 33:6, 59:2 |  |
| 68:8 | wind [110]-2:10, 2:11, | word [1] - 34:4 |  |
| water [5] - 9:13, 9:15, | 3:18, 3:19, 3:20, 6:5, | workable [1] - 42:21 |  |
| 46:25, 47:6, 76:20 | 6:6, 6:7, 6:9, 7:15, | works [2] - 14:5, 60:20 |  |
| water's [1]-42:11 | 7:23, 8:8, 8:9, 8:16, | world [1] - 67:11 |  |
| waters [4]-68:8, | 8:17, 12:18, 12:24, | worry [2] - 12:6, 68:17 |  |
| 68:18, 68:22 | 13:24, 13:25, 19:12, | worse [1] - 61:10 |  |
| waterways [2]-63:10, | 20:6, 22:17, 22:21, | worst [1] - 39:1 |  |
| 63:16 | 23:10, 24:23, 25:1, | wrap [2] - 27:19, 80:1 |  |
| ways [3]-50:18, | 25:4, 25:6, 25:7, | write [1] - 69:19 |  |
| 51:23, 55:14 | 26:8, 26:12, 29:2, | writing [2]-27:22, |  |
| website [2]-28:22, | 30:17, 32:6, 33:3, | 27:23 |  |
| 33:15 | 34:6, 34:18, 35:7, | writings [1]-32: |  |
| week [3]-23:23, | 35:17, 35:21, 36:11, | written [6] - 4:20, |  |
| 35:18, 39:5 | 36:17, 36:18, 36:20, | 13:7, 18:20, 58:6, |  |
| weekend [1] - $36: 15$ | 36:25, $37: 2,37: 4$, | 66:11, 80:21 |  |
| weigh [2] - 16:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 12,39: 9,39: 11, \\ & 39: 16,39: 17,40: 7, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| weight [1]-53:17 | 40:8, 41:12, 42:14, | Y |  |
| welfare [3]-38:24, | 42:18, 43:23, 43:24, | yard [1] -61:18 |  |
| 39:14, 68:21 | 44:1, 45:12, 46:9, | year [21]-7:18, 17:22, |  |
| well-conceived [1] - | 46:15, 46:21, 46:23, | 22:24, 29:11, 29:12, |  |
| 11:1 | 47:5, 47:14, 47:17, | 31:1, 34:2, 37:9, |  |
| west [4]-32:15, | 49:18, 50:8, 54:14, | 37:15, 42:11, 50:14, |  |
| 35:25, 62:7, 72:3 | 54:18, 54:19, 54:22, | 52:10, 58:18, 58:22, |  |
| westerly [1]-21:17 | 55:10, 55:11, 56:1, | 59:7, 59:15, 59:20, |  |
| western [1] - 18:24 | 56:22, 56:25, 57:11, | 64:24, 65:8, 79:24 |  |
| wetland [1] - 10:4 | 57:14, 58:14, 58:21, | year-round [1] - $37: 9$ |  |

