

				June 24, 2022
	Page 1			Page 3
1	STATE OF NEW JERSEY	1	ALSO	PRESENT:
2	BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES	2		COZEN O'CONNOR
3	DOCKET NO, QO22020041	3		BY: GREGORY EISENSTARK, ESQ. ONE GATEWAY CENTER
4		4		Suite 910 Newark, New Jersey 07102
5		5		STATE OF NEW JERSEY
6	PUBLIC HEARING:	6		DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL BY: BRIAN LIPMAN, ESQ., Director
7	ORAL ARGUMENT IN THE MATTER OF	7		140 East Front Street, 4th Floor P.O. Box 003
8	THE PETITION OF OCEAN WIND, LLC, PURSUANT TO N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f)	8		Trenton, New Jersey 08625
9	FOR A DETERMINATION THAT EASEMENTS ACROSS GREEN ACRES	9		BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES BY: ANDREA HART, Board Staff
10	RESTRICTED PROPERTIES AND CONSENTS NEEDED FOR CERTAIN	10		44 South Clinton Avenue Trenton, New Jersey 08625
11	ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS IN, AND WITH RESPECT TO, THE CITY OF	11		McCROSSON & STANTON, P.C.
12	OCEAN CITY, ARE REASONABLY NECESSARY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OR	12		BY: DOROTHY F. McCROSSON, ESQ. 200 Asbury Avenue
13	OPERATION OF THE OCEAN WIND 1 QUALIFIED OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT	13		Ocean City, New Jersey 08226
14	<u></u>	14		
15	DATE: FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2022	15		
16	TIME: 10:00 a.m.	16		
17	BEFORE:	17		
18	PRESIDENT JOSEPH L. FIORDALISO	18		
19	COMMISSIONER MARY-ANNA HOLDEN	19		
20	COMMISSIONER DIANNE SOLOMON COMMISSIONER UPENDRA J. CHIVUKULA	20		
20 21	COMMISSIONER OPENDRA J. CHIVUKULA COMMISSIONER BOB GORDON	20		
21 22	J.H. BUEHRER & ASSOCIATES	21		
22		22		
23 24	884 Breezy Oaks Drive	24		
24 25	Toms River, New Jersey 08753	24 25		
25	(732) 295-1975	23		
	Page 2			Page 4
-		-	DDEGI	DENT FIODDALISO, Defere Leave
1		1		DENT FIORDALISO: Before I say
2			• •	I just want to make everyone aware of
3				hat meeting is being recorded. We do cording a court reporter at her site
4 5	TRANSCORTOF of the bearing in the			erything down so that the record is
2	TRANSCRIPT of the hearing in the	E		
6 7	about ambibled mathem, said berning being tille		U	
. /	above-entitled matter, said hearing being taken	6	complete	and will be available for people to
	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil	6 7	complete view.	and will be available for people to
8	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL	6 7 8	complete view. And, a	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of
8 9	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and	6 7 8 9	complete view. And, a you. My	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the
8 9 10	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held	6 7 8 9 10	complete view. And, a you. My President	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public
8 9 10 11	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11	complete view. And, a you. My President Utilities a	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for
8 9 10 11 12	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	complete view. And, a you. My President Utilities a today's pr	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the
8 9 10 11 12 13	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	complete view. And, a you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Argu	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	complete view. And, a you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Argu Ocean W	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	complete view. And, a you. My President Utilities a today's pi Oral Argi Ocean W easement	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	complete view. And, a you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Argu Ocean W easement restricted	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	complete view. And, a you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Argu Ocean W easement restricted certain er	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for avironmental permits in and with
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	complete view. And, a you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Arg Ocean W easement restricted certain en respect to	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for wironmental permits in and with the City of Ocean City, are
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	complete view. And, a, you. My President Utilities a today's pi Oral Argi Ocean W easement restricted certain er respect to reasonabl	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for wironmental permits in and with o the City of Ocean City, are y necessary for the construction or
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	complete view. And, a you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Argu Ocean W easement restricted certain en respect to reasonabl operation	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for avironmental permits in and with the City of Ocean City, are y necessary for the construction or of Ocean Wind 1, Qualified Offshore
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	complete view. And, a, you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Argu Ocean W easement restricted certain en respect to reasonabl operation Wind Pro	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for wironmental permits in and with the City of Ocean City, are y necessary for the construction or of Ocean Wind 1, Qualified Offshore ject. Docket Number QO22020041,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	complete view. And, a, you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Arg Ocean W easement restricted certain er respect to reasonabl operation Wind Pro N.J.S.A	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for rocceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for priorinmental permits in and with the City of Ocean City, are y necessary for the construction or of Ocean Wind 1, Qualified Offshore ject. Docket Number QO22020041, A. 48:3-87, grants the Board the authority
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	complete view. And, a, you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Arg Ocean W easement restricted certain en respect to reasonabl operation Wind Pro N.J.S.A to make a	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for wironmental permits in and with the City of Ocean City, are y necessary for the construction or of Ocean Wind 1, Qualified Offshore ject. Docket Number QO22020041, A. 48:3-87, grants the Board the authority determination on this petition.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	complete view. And, a, you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Argu Ocean W easement restricted certain en respect to reasonabl operation Wind Pro N.J.S.A to make a Since V	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for avironmental permits in and with the City of Ocean City, are y necessary for the construction or of Ocean Wind 1, Qualified Offshore ject. Docket Number QO22020041, A. 48:3-87, grants the Board the authority a determination on this petition. we have all of the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure, by and before MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, held VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, on Friday, June 24, 2022	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	complete view. And, a, you. My President Utilities a today's pr Oral Argu Ocean W easement restricted certain en respect to reasonabl operation Wind Pro N.J.S.A to make a Since V	and will be available for people to gain, good morning to all of name is Joe Fiordaliso and I am the of the New Jersey Board of Public and the presiding Commissioner for roceeding. Today we are here for the ument regarding the petition filed by ind, LLC, for authorization to obtain easements across Green Acres properties and consents needed for wironmental permits in and with the City of Ocean City, are y necessary for the construction or of Ocean Wind 1, Qualified Offshore ject. Docket Number QO22020041, A. 48:3-87, grants the Board the authority determination on this petition.

		-	Julie 24, 2022
	Page 5		Page 7
1	on hand today, this proceeding is a Public	1	Counsel. The parties have indicated that each
	Meeting of the New Jersey Board of Public		argument will take, approximately, 15 minutes.
	Utilities.		After the initial argument, all parties will
4	Adequate notice of this meeting has		have the opportunity for a short rebuttal. As
5	been provided as required by the Open Public		noted, the Commissioners are present today and
	Meetings Act set forth in N.J.S.A. 10:4-6. To		may ask questions at the end of the
7	date, we have the following on the docket. On		presentations.
8	February 3, 2022, Ocean Wind, LLC, filed a	8	I want to remind the parties and the
9	petition seeking determination that certain	9	public that arguments in this proceeding should
10	easements and consents are reasonable	10	be limited to the matter at hand, whether the
11	reasonably necessary for the construction of	11	easements and consents sought by Ocean Wind,
12	Ocean Wind Project. This Petition was	12	LLC, are reasonably necessary for the
13	accompanied by testimony from Pilar Patterson,	13	construction or operation of the project. Not
14	Jason Kalwa and Madeline Urbish.	14	at issue today, let me underline that, not at
15	The Board issued an Order retaining	15	issue today are the desirability of Offshore
	the petition and assigning myself as presiding		Wind, the location of the project in the ocean,
	officer on February 23. I set the initial		or any environmental aspects positive or
	procedural schedule and requested supplemental		negative of the Ocean Wind project as a whole,
	information from the petitioner in an Order on		except as they relate to the easements and
	March 1st. On March 15th, Ocean Wind submitted		consents sought under the petition.
	answers to the request for supplemental	21	1 2
	information. On March 22nd, I issued an Order		speaking, please ensure your camera is on you
	naming Ocean City as a necessary party and		and you are un-muted. When not speaking, please
	updating the procedural schedule.		turn your video and microphone off. On a
25	On April 27, Ocean City filed a	25	personal note, I had hoped that we would be
	Page 6		8 and 8
	Page 6		Page 8
	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response.		doing this procedure in person, but at the
2	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony	2	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it,
2 3	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind	2 3	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure
2 3 4	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage	2 3 4	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need
2 3 4 5	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and	2 3 4 5	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go
2 3 4 5 6	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean	2 3 4 5 6	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along.
2 3 4 5 6 7	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29	2 3 4 5 6 7	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before	2 3 6 7 8 9	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the property interests of Ocean City. The Board	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners Holden, Solomon, Chivukula and Gordon. My name
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the property interests of Ocean City. The Board takes this responsibility very seriously and is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners Holden, Solomon, Chivukula and Gordon. My name is Gregory Eisenstark. I'm with the law firm of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the property interests of Ocean City. The Board takes this responsibility very seriously and is committed to providing a fair and transparent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners Holden, Solomon, Chivukula and Gordon. My name is Gregory Eisenstark. I'm with the law firm of Cozen O'Connor and we represent the petitioner,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the property interests of Ocean City. The Board takes this responsibility very seriously and is committed to providing a fair and transparent process.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners Holden, Solomon, Chivukula and Gordon. My name is Gregory Eisenstark. I'm with the law firm of Cozen O'Connor and we represent the petitioner, Ocean Wind, LLC, in this filing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the property interests of Ocean City. The Board takes this responsibility very seriously and is committed to providing a fair and transparent process. With us today are representatives	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners Holden, Solomon, Chivukula and Gordon. My name is Gregory Eisenstark. I'm with the law firm of Cozen O'Connor and we represent the petitioner, Ocean Wind, LLC, in this filing. I'd just like to start briefly by,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the property interests of Ocean City. The Board takes this responsibility very seriously and is committed to providing a fair and transparent process. With us today are representatives from the parties, Ocean Wind, Ocean City and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners Holden, Solomon, Chivukula and Gordon. My name is Gregory Eisenstark. I'm with the law firm of Cozen O'Connor and we represent the petitioner, Ocean Wind, LLC, in this filing. I'd just like to start briefly by, you know, thanking the Board for this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the property interests of Ocean City. The Board takes this responsibility very seriously and is committed to providing a fair and transparent process. With us today are representatives	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners Holden, Solomon, Chivukula and Gordon. My name is Gregory Eisenstark. I'm with the law firm of Cozen O'Connor and we represent the petitioner, Ocean Wind, LLC, in this filing. I'd just like to start briefly by, you know, thanking the Board for this opportunity to present some additional detail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the property interests of Ocean City. The Board takes this responsibility very seriously and is committed to providing a fair and transparent process. With us today are representatives from the parties, Ocean Wind, Ocean City and the Division of Rate Counsel. Each of the parties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners Holden, Solomon, Chivukula and Gordon. My name is Gregory Eisenstark. I'm with the law firm of Cozen O'Connor and we represent the petitioner, Ocean Wind, LLC, in this filing. I'd just like to start briefly by, you know, thanking the Board for this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	response to Ocean Wind's March 15 response. Also, on April 27, Rate Counsel filed testimony for Maximilian Chang. On April 29, Ocean Wind filed an Amended Petition revising the acreage impact upon or under the proposed Green and Energy diversion down work. On May 11, Ocean Wind filed a rebuttal testimony to the April 29 response from Ocean City. Public hearing was held on May 19, and the Board received written comments before the deadline of June 2nd. On June 16th, Ocean Wind filed a reply to Rate Counsel's comments. This petition represents the first request for authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, because the petition has the potential to affect the property interests of Ocean City. The Board takes this responsibility very seriously and is committed to providing a fair and transparent process. With us today are representatives from the parties, Ocean Wind, Ocean City and the Division of Rate Counsel. Each of the parties will have the opportunity to present their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	doing this procedure in person, but at the request of one of the parties, we are doing it, as you can see, virtually. And it I am sure we will get all of the information that we need in order to make a fair determination as we go along. With that, I will invite Ocean Wind to make their statement. Ocean Wind. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. And I just want to check, can everyone hear me okay? I always like PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very well, yes. MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you. And, thank you President Fiordaliso, Commissioners Holden, Solomon, Chivukula and Gordon. My name is Gregory Eisenstark. I'm with the law firm of Cozen O'Connor and we represent the petitioner, Ocean Wind, LLC, in this filing. I'd just like to start briefly by, you know, thanking the Board for this opportunity to present some additional detail about the filing, put some issues into context

June 24, 2022

oc	EAN WIND, LLC		June 24, 202	2
	Page 9		June 24, 2022 Page 11	
	-		-	
	Board to do here.		explains explained what it needed as far as	
2	I think everyone here is aware, this		locating the cable, property rights,	
	filing concerns the Ocean Wind 1, Qualified		environmental permitting consents. And those	
	Offshore Wind Project. That would be the first		discussions went on for some time.	
	Offshore Wind Project constructed off the coast		Unfortunately, as we sit here today, we could	
	of New Jersey. It's an 1100 megawatt Offshore Wind Project. And why are we here today before		the project was unable to get the necessary property rights or the necessary municipal	
	the Board? Why did Ocean Wind make file this		consents from Ocean City, which necessitated	
9	petition back in February of this year?		this filing. Because I think all the members of	
10	Well, because everyone knows, you		the Board gathered here today are all aware, in	
	have to get the generation that's being		2021 the legislature sought fit to amend the	
	generated 15 miles or more out in the Atlantic		Offshore Wind Economic Development Act, OWEDA,	
	Ocean to the shore and to interconnect with the		to allow the Board, to give the Board some	
	existing electric bulk power system. All the		additional jurisdiction to address situations	
	load the customers that are going to use the		like the one that we're faced with here today.	
	electricity are located on land or, of course,		And that is the siting of the onshore portion of	
	not located out in the ocean. So any Offshore			
	Wind Project, including this one, Ocean Wind 1,	18	I think the legislature acted	
	needs to construct cables from the ocean and		because, while OWEDA was a progressive and	
	make landfall on the land and then across		forward-thinking piece of legislation back in	
	portion of the land and interconnect with the		2010 when it was enacted, it didn't address the	
	existing bulk power system.		onshore portion of what needs to be constructed	
23	For this particular project, for		for a qualified Offshore Wind Project. And,	
	Ocean Wind 1, the project examined a number of		unlike public utilities, electric utilities, gas	
25	what we call points of interconnection, that's a	25	utilities, water and sewer utilities, which have	
	Page 10		Page 12	_
	-		-	
	POI or where the where the project will		some statutory rights to occupy public	
2	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid.	2	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property	
2 3	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation,	2 3	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals,	
2 3 4	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two	2 3 4	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that	
2 3 4 5	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind	2 3 4 5	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021	
2 3 4 5 6	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two	2 3 4 5 6	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and	
2 3 4 5 6 7	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County,	2 3 4 5 6 7	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f)	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of interconnection in Upper Township.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the filing seeks is it's actually there's a	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of interconnection in Upper Township. You know, basically, as the Board is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the filing seeks is it's actually there's a lot of paper in the record in this thing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of interconnection in Upper Township. You know, basically, as the Board is aware, the Board approved Ocean Wind 1, just a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the filing seeks is it's actually there's a lot of paper in the record in this thing. There's extensive testimony, rebuttal testimony	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of interconnection in Upper Township. You know, basically, as the Board is aware, the Board approved Ocean Wind 1, just a little over three years ago. It was in June	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the filing seeks is it's actually there's a lot of paper in the record in this thing. There's extensive testimony, rebuttal testimony and exhibits. But the relief that Ocean Wind is	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of interconnection in Upper Township. You know, basically, as the Board is aware, the Board approved Ocean Wind 1, just a little over three years ago. It was in June 2019. Hard to believe that three years have now	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the filing seeks is it's actually there's a lot of paper in the record in this thing. There's extensive testimony, rebuttal testimony and exhibits. But the relief that Ocean Wind is seeking is actually fairly simple. There are	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of interconnection in Upper Township. You know, basically, as the Board is aware, the Board approved Ocean Wind 1, just a little over three years ago. It was in June 2019. Hard to believe that three years have now passed since that initial approval was granted.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the filing seeks is it's actually there's a lot of paper in the record in this thing. There's extensive testimony, rebuttal testimony and exhibits. But the relief that Ocean Wind is seeking is actually fairly simple. There are really just two or three issues that we're	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of interconnection in Upper Township. You know, basically, as the Board is aware, the Board approved Ocean Wind 1, just a little over three years ago. It was in June 2019. Hard to believe that three years have now passed since that initial approval was granted. Shortly after that initial approval was granted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the filing seeks is it's actually there's a lot of paper in the record in this thing. There's extensive testimony, rebuttal testimony and exhibits. But the relief that Ocean Wind is seeking is actually fairly simple. There are	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of interconnection in Upper Township. You know, basically, as the Board is aware, the Board approved Ocean Wind 1, just a little over three years ago. It was in June 2019. Hard to believe that three years have now passed since that initial approval was granted.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the filing seeks is it's actually there's a lot of paper in the record in this thing. There's extensive testimony, rebuttal testimony and exhibits. But the relief that Ocean Wind is seeking is actually fairly simple. There are really just two or three issues that we're asking the Board to get involved with and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	POI or where the where the project will interconnect with the existing electric grid. Ultimately, after a fair amount of evaluation, it was determined that there's essentially two viable points of interconnection for Ocean Wind 1. One is in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and the other is in Upper Township in Cape May County. Both will be used for this project. The one the point of interconnection we're about talking here, of course, today is the southern one, the one in Cape May County in Upper Township. And what this matter is about is Ocean Wind's attempts to site the onshore cable from where it makes landfall, where the under ocean cable meets land to the point of interconnection in Upper Township. You know, basically, as the Board is aware, the Board approved Ocean Wind 1, just a little over three years ago. It was in June 2019. Hard to believe that three years have now passed since that initial approval was granted. Shortly after that initial approval was granted by the Board, Ocean Wind began discussions with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	some statutory rights to occupy public rights-of-way, to seek condemnation for property rights and to override some municipal approvals, Offshore Wind Projects didn't have any of that before these recent amendments, the 2021 amendments. So those amendments, I believe, and Ocean Wind believes, were necessary to address the type of situation we have here and to allow the siting of Offshore Wind Projects, the onshore portion of it. So, basically, as President Fiordaliso discussed briefly earlier, this petition was filed under those recent amendments. They're N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) Subsections 2 and 3. And, essentially, what the filing seeks is it's actually there's a lot of paper in the record in this thing. There's extensive testimony, rebuttal testimony and exhibits. But the relief that Ocean Wind is seeking is actually fairly simple. There are really just two or three issues that we're asking the Board to get involved with and approve here.	

			June 24, 2022
	Page 13		Page 15
1	underground construction of the electric cable.	1	The way DEP the DEP permitting
	One of those easements is at the beach fall at		process works, the property owner must consent
	35th Street in Ocean City. The second of those		to the applicant to the application and the
	easements is at the point where the underground		issuance of for the DEP to go through the
	line will cross a bay crossing at what's		permitting process. In this case, Ocean City is
	known as Peck's Bay at Crooks Horn Creek at the		the property owner for the two easement areas
	border of where Ocean City meets, you know, on		and the rest of the underground cable route for
	the other side of the bay, it becomes Upper		the project. So absent the recent amendments to
	Township. Those are the two easements the		OWEDA, Ocean City would have had to consent to
	project is asking the Board to approve. The		the DEP permit application. As I alluded to
	total acreage of those easements in total is		earlier, as of now, Ocean City has not consented
	0.647 acres. So just a little bit more than		to those DEP permit applications. So we are
	half an acre. Each of the easements is,		asking the Board to step into the municipality's
	approximately, 30 feet wide. So they're not		place and allow the DEP permit applications to
	very wide. And the easements are simply		be processed and go forward, which hopefully at
	necessary for the installation of the		the end of the day will result in the DEP
17	underground cables.		issuing the permits that are required for the
18	In conjunction with that, both of		project.
	the parcels over which Ocean Wind is seeking	19	I just want to touch on a couple of
	easements are encumbered by Green Acres Green		other things, just in detail. And most of
	Acres restrictions. Green Acres restrictions		this I'm not going to obviously cover
	and I won't go into a great deal of detail about		everything that's in the petition and direct and
	what the Green Acres Program is. But suffice it		rebuttal testimony we filed, because we'll be
	to say, that the state's Green Acres Program		here all day if I tried to do that. I just want
25	provides fund provided funding and for the	25	to make it clear, that Ocean Wind complied with
	Dage 14		Dage 16
	Page 14		Page 16
	acquisition of certain property. And that		the statutory requirements. As I mentioned
2	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland,	2	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we
2 3	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP	2 3	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally
2 3 4	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a	2 3 4	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of
2 3 4 5	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the	2 3 4 5	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to
2 3 4 5 6	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in	2 3 4 5 6	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as
2 3 4 5 6 7	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of	2 3 4 5 6 7	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The acquisition of these two easements.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded to. And that resulted in the petition being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The acquisition of these two easements. The second thing that the project	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded to. And that resulted in the petition being filed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The acquisition of these two easements. The second thing that the project Ocean Wind is asking the Board to approve is to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded to. And that resulted in the petition being filed. I just want to highlight a couple of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The acquisition of these two easements. The second thing that the project Ocean Wind is asking the Board to approve is to essentially override or preempt the municipal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded to. And that resulted in the petition being filed. I just want to highlight a couple of other things. As I said earlier, this briefly
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The acquisition of these two easements. The second thing that the project Ocean Wind is asking the Board to approve is to essentially override or preempt the municipal consents that are required would otherwise be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded to. And that resulted in the petition being filed. I just want to highlight a couple of other things. As I said earlier, this briefly describes the route of the underground cable.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The acquisition of these two easements. The second thing that the project Ocean Wind is asking the Board to approve is to essentially override or preempt the municipal consents that are required would otherwise be required from Ocean City for the NJDEP permits.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded to. And that resulted in the petition being filed. I just want to highlight a couple of other things. As I said earlier, this briefly describes the route of the underground cable. And let me pause for a second here, because I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The acquisition of these two easements. The second thing that the project Ocean Wind is asking the Board to approve is to essentially override or preempt the municipal consents that are required would otherwise be required from Ocean City for the NJDEP permits. As and it's in the record of our filing here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded to. And that resulted in the petition being filed. I just want to highlight a couple of other things. As I said earlier, this briefly describes the route of the underground cable. And let me pause for a second here, because I want to emphasize, all of the electric cable at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The acquisition of these two easements. The second thing that the project Ocean Wind is asking the Board to approve is to essentially override or preempt the municipal consents that are required would otherwise be required from Ocean City for the NJDEP permits. As and it's in the record of our filing here. We discuss in our pre-file testimony, we list	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded to. And that resulted in the petition being filed. I just want to highlight a couple of other things. As I said earlier, this briefly describes the route of the underground cable. And let me pause for a second here, because I want to emphasize, all of the electric cable at issue in this filing will be constructed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	acquisition of certain property. And that property is generally preserved as parkland, unless an application is approved by the NJDEP to divert that. And then if they do approve a diversion, there are various things that the entity that seeks the diversion has to do in order for the DEP to approve the diversion of Green Acres, one of which is obviously to acquire an easement and to pay the property owner the fair value of the easement. The second is to pay into a state Green Acres fund, a sufficient fund that would allow the acquisition three times the acreage to be diverted to be set aside for new Green Acres property. So that's the first thing. The acquisition of these two easements. The second thing that the project Ocean Wind is asking the Board to approve is to essentially override or preempt the municipal consents that are required would otherwise be required from Ocean City for the NJDEP permits. As and it's in the record of our filing here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the statutory requirements. As I mentioned earlier, we've been discussing the needs that we have within Ocean City for, you know, literally close to three years now. On August 11th of last year, the project sent a formal letter to Ocean City, which sometimes is referred to as the 90-day letter, specifically, outlining in writing what we needed as far as easements, property rights and permit consents. At some point after that, Ocean Wind also had an appraisal done for the two easements that it needs. It sent a formal offer letter to Ocean City offering to acquire those easements on a 10-times the appraised value. That offer has not been accepted and even formally responded to. And that resulted in the petition being filed. I just want to highlight a couple of other things. As I said earlier, this briefly describes the route of the underground cable. And let me pause for a second here, because I want to emphasize, all of the electric cable at

June 24, 20	022
-------------	-----

			June 24, 2022
	Page 17		Page 19
1	And where it passes under the beach will be	1	moments on the statutory standard of review.
	installed by what's known as horizontal		And I think President Fiordaliso mentioned this
	directional drilling, which is an underground		in this opening remarks. The standard is for
	drilling process. The line as it passes under		the easements, whether the requested easement
	the beach will be very deep. In parts, a line		right-of-way or other property real property
	would be 60 feet below the surface of the beach		interests are reasonably necessary for the
	to give you an idea of how deep this line would		construction or operation of the qualified
	be. It will then go up and it will then pass		Offshore Wind Project. And I just want to take
	under the beach and come up in the public road		a second. And it's the same standard that
	right-of-way on 35th Street. From that portion		applies to the environmental permit consents as
	within Ocean City, the entire line would be		well.
	most of the rest of the line will be conducted	12	In other context, when the Board has
	in essentially in conduit, in duct vacs, much		had applications or petitions from public
	like any other existing utility underground		utilities to override municipal zoning
	line, gas line, waterline, telecommunication		authority, the Board has had a chance to comment
	lines that are already in place in Ocean City		on what the reasonable reasonably necessary
	and in most other municipalities in the state.		standard is. And I just want to make it clear
	The construction will be no different. It will		here. The reasonable necessity standard doesn't
	be constructed underground within within		mean it's absolutely necessary. It doesn't mean
	volts and it will be constructed much the way		it's the only alternative. It doesn't even mean
	any other facility would be constructed. The		it's the best alternative. It just means that
	only other place that it won't be constructed		the project evaluated different alternatives.
	within the public road right-of-way, as I		And the alternative that is proposed is a
	mentioned earlier, is at the Bay Crossing on		reasonable one. It doesn't have to be the best
	Roosevelt Boulevard where it crosses at Crook		one. It doesn't have to be the lowest cost one.
	Page 18		Page 20
1	-	1	
	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's	1	One other point that I'd like to
2	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at	2	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what
2 3	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath	2 3	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's
2 3 4	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or	2 3 4	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into
2 3 4 5	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will	2 3 4 5	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly,
2 3 4 5 6	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or	2 3 4 5 6	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into
2 3 4 5 6 7	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the	2 3 4 5 6 7	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City Electric's B.L. England substation. It will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind Project. The project, as the Board is well aware, was competitively bid. Ocean Wind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City Electric's B.L. England substation. It will be constructed on a nearby parcel and it will interconnect with the Atlantic City Electric grid at that point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind Project. The project, as the Board is well aware, was competitively bid. Ocean Wind submitted proposed OREC prices. Those OREC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City Electric's B.L. England substation. It will be constructed on a nearby parcel and it will interconnect with the Atlantic City Electric grid at that point. So, again, all of the portions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind Project. The project, as the Board is well aware, was competitively bid. Ocean Wind submitted proposed OREC prices. Those OREC prices were determined three years ago in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City Electric's B.L. England substation. It will be constructed on a nearby parcel and it will interconnect with the Atlantic City Electric grid at that point. So, again, all of the portions within Ocean City will be underground. Once	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind Project. The project, as the Board is well aware, was competitively bid. Ocean Wind submitted proposed OREC prices. Those OREC prices were determined three years ago in the Board's 2019 Order, and they won't be modified
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City Electric's B.L. England substation. It will be constructed on a nearby parcel and it will interconnect with the Atlantic City Electric grid at that point. So, again, all of the portions within Ocean City will be underground. Once construction is completed, the lines wouldn't be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind Project. The project, as the Board is well aware, was competitively bid. Ocean Wind submitted proposed OREC prices. Those OREC prices were determined three years ago in the Board's 2019 Order, and they won't be modified based on anything that happens with in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City Electric's B.L. England substation. It will be constructed on a nearby parcel and it will interconnect with the Atlantic City Electric grid at that point. So, again, all of the portions within Ocean City will be underground. Once construction is completed, the lines wouldn't be visible, you won't see them, you won't hear	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind Project. The project, as the Board is well aware, was competitively bid. Ocean Wind submitted proposed OREC prices. Those OREC prices were determined three years ago in the Board's 2019 Order, and they won't be modified based on anything that happens with in this filing or with this portion of the project. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City Electric's B.L. England substation. It will be constructed on a nearby parcel and it will interconnect with the Atlantic City Electric grid at that point. So, again, all of the portions within Ocean City will be underground. Once construction is completed, the lines wouldn't be visible, you won't see them, you won't hear them, you really won't know that they're there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind Project. The project, as the Board is well aware, was competitively bid. Ocean Wind submitted proposed OREC prices. Those OREC prices were determined three years ago in the Board's 2019 Order, and they won't be modified based on anything that happens with in this filing or with this portion of the project. The risk of cost overruns or, conversely, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City Electric's B.L. England substation. It will be constructed on a nearby parcel and it will interconnect with the Atlantic City Electric grid at that point. So, again, all of the portions within Ocean City will be underground. Once construction is completed, the lines wouldn't be visible, you won't see them, you won't hear them, you really won't know that they're there. Let me pause for a second and just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind Project. The project, as the Board is well aware, was competitively bid. Ocean Wind submitted proposed OREC prices. Those OREC prices were determined three years ago in the Board's 2019 Order, and they won't be modified based on anything that happens with in this filing or with this portion of the project. The risk of cost overruns or, conversely, the benefit of cost underruns from this portion of
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Horn Creek. At that crossing, again, there's the second easement that's required. And at that point, because we have to cross underneath the land and underneath, essentially, the bay or the creek, horizontal directional drilling will be used again. And that takes us that's the end of the portion of the line that's at issue here in Ocean City. The line will then come up on the other side of the bay. It will, again, be constructed in public road right-of-way through up the rest of the way to Upper Township and it will interconnect with a new substation that will be built in Upper Township at the basically, at the location of Atlantic City Electric's B.L. England substation. It will be constructed on a nearby parcel and it will interconnect with the Atlantic City Electric grid at that point. So, again, all of the portions within Ocean City will be underground. Once construction is completed, the lines wouldn't be visible, you won't see them, you won't hear them, you really won't know that they're there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	One other point that I'd like to make is, you know, what this project what this filing is not about. And I think it's important to emphasize this, and I may get into this a bit in rebuttal, you know, quite frankly, depending on what comments Rate Counsel makes. But based on their testimony, which we responded to in rebuttal testimony, there's Rate Counsel raised some alleged concerns about cost of the project. And I just want to make it clear, this filing really isn't about what this underground portion of the project will cost. And that's because this isn't a public utility project. This is a qualified Offshore Wind Project. The project, as the Board is well aware, was competitively bid. Ocean Wind submitted proposed OREC prices. Those OREC prices were determined three years ago in the Board's 2019 Order, and they won't be modified based on anything that happens with in this filing or with this portion of the project. The risk of cost overruns or, conversely, the

OCEAN WIND, LLC	June 24, 2022
Page 21	Page 23
 not impact the cost that ratepayers pay through OREC prices one-way or another. There was some confusion in some of the comments that were filed about the transmission system upgrade called sharing mechanism. That is one of the limited instances in which OREC prices can be adjusted. I just want to make it clear here today, and we have testimony in the record, Matthew Kaplan's rebuttal testimony explains this in some detail. But the transmission system upgrade called sharing mechanism does not apply to the facilities we're talking about here. The TSUC only applies to essentially PJM directed transmission system, bulk system upgrade cost. So when the project has to apply to interconnect and enter into interconnection agreements with, in this instance, Atlantic City Electric for this interconnection, JCP&L for the one in Lacey Township, PJM identifies cost that would be necessary to essentially upgrade the bulk power system to allow the interconnection and the interjection of this amount of electric generation capacity into the system. Those are 	 that from Ocean Wind's perspective, we've clearly satisfied the statutory standard. We filed the Verified Petition. We filed three pieces of direct testimony with supporting exhibits explaining exactly what we need, explaining the outreach we've done to Ocean City prior to filing the petition, explaining what the construction will be like, explaining the what environmental permits we need and explaining in detail what the two easements are. From our perspective, our filing meets the statutory standard and is un-rebutted. The only party to file testimony in response to the the direct testimony of the petitioner was Rate Counsel. Rate Counsel raised a number of issues. You know, I'm not going to put words in Rate Counsel's mouth. I don't think Rate Counsel is opposing the project. They raised what I say a number of concerns. I think we clearly addressed them all in rebuttal testimony are not valid and do not deter from the filing the company has made and the relief that we're
24 the costs that are subject to the TSUC sharing25 mechanism. The cost to run the lines from the	24 requesting.25 So, again, with that, I'm going to
Page 22	Page 24
 turbines out in the ocean to the beach, or to landfall. And the underground portion from the landfall to the new substation is not within the TSUC. So, that is why this is a little bit different than a utility project. You know, often in utility infrastructure projects, when a utility comes in, the Board is interested in how much it's going to cost because the Board knows that eventually utility is going to file a base rate case and seek to include all of the capital costs in its base rate. Here, that's not the case. Ocean Wind isn't a utility. It's not regulate its rates are not regulated by the Board. And at least for the facilities we're talking about here in this filing, they will have no impact on the amount that customers pay. That's already been determined in the Board's 2019 Order. It's not up for reconsideration here or really anywhere else. So I just wanted 	 stop at this point and reserve, you know, a few minutes in case I do need rebuttal. I'd be happy to answer any questions that President Fiordaliso or any of the Commissioners may have. And at this point, that would conclude my direct presentation. Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very good. Thank you very much. We're going to save questions until the end of the presentations and so on, and if anyone has them at that point. I thank you for your statement. I now invite Ocean City to make their statement. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, President Fiordaliso. Good morning to you and to the Commissioners. I'm here PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Good morning. MS. McCROSSON: I'm here on behalf of Ocean City and Mayor Jay Gillian and business administrator George Savastano are with me this morning. Thank you for the opportunity to provide closing argument in this matter. Ocean
 22 One last point, and I know I've been 23 talking for a while, and I don't want to 24 overstay my welcome here and leave time for 25 others' comments. I just want to make it clear, 	 22 City will address five points. 23 Ocean City questions the authority 24 of the BPU to grant the Petition that Ocean Wind 25 has filed in this matter. Ocean City urges the

		June 24, 2022
	Page 25	Page 27
1	BPU to refer this matter to the Office of	1 adjudication concerning rights, duties,
	Administrative Law. Ocean City believes that	2 obligations, privileges, benefits or other legal
	the Board should require Ocean Wind to disclose	3 relations. And third, the hearing involves
	costs of alternative routes prior to making a	
	· ·	4 specific parties rather than a large segment of
	decision in this matter. And Ocean City	5 the public. These three factors are enunciated
	believes that the Board should wait for the	6 in Board of Education of the Upper Freehold
	issuance of a final environmental impact	7 Regional School District versus State Health
	statement prior to making a decision on the	8 Benefits Commission 3:14 NJ Super 486 Appellate
	petition.	9 Division 1998.
10	The City respectively questions the	10 Further, in this matter there is a
	authority of the BPU to consider Ocean Wind's	11 disputed issue of fact. Ocean Wind argues that
	petition seeking authority to obtain an easement	12 the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two
	over the City's fragile beach and wetlands and	13 historic bridges with low clearance making
	its environmental permit consents. The New	14 construction of this project using that route
	Jersey Administrative Code Section 7:36-26.8	15 significantly challenging. Ocean city has taken
	permits local government units to initiate an	16 the position that neither of the bridges
	application for diversion of lands on its	17 spanning Great Egg Harbor route is historic, nor
	recreation and open space inventory. Hastily	18 has low clearance. This issue of fact alone is
	adopted N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) upon which Ocean	19 reason for the Board to refer this matter to the
	Wind relies and pursuant to which the BPU is now	20 Office of Administrative Law, and Ocean City
	proceeding purports to broadly preempt and	21 urges the Board to make that referral.
	supercede all other state laws, rules and	22 N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) treats Ocean
	regulations. It strips elected municipal	23 Wind as if it were a public utility by giving it
	officials of the power to decide whether Ocean	24 the power of eminent domain modified by the
25	Wind, a private corporation, may take municipal	25 requirement of the BPU, an agency charges the
	Page 26	Page 28
1	-	
	Page 26 property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and	1 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its
2	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of
2 3	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May
2 3 4	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to
2 3 4 5	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from
2 3 4 5	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny.	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose
2 3 4 5 6 7	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited language from New Jersey Constitution should be	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the evaluation of the point of interconnection and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited language from New Jersey Constitution should be reason enough for the Board to refer Ocean	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the evaluation of the point of interconnection and preferred route could be mitigated if cost were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited language from New Jersey Constitution should be reason enough for the Board to refer Ocean Wind's petition to the Office of Administrative	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the evaluation of the point of interconnection and preferred route could be mitigated if cost were of no issue. It appears that Ocean Wind is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited language from New Jersey Constitution should be reason enough for the Board to refer Ocean Wind's petition to the Office of Administrative Law as a contested case under N.J.S.A.	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the evaluation of the point of interconnection and preferred route could be mitigated if cost were of no issue. It appears that Ocean Wind is
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited language from New Jersey Constitution should be reason enough for the Board to refer Ocean Wind's petition to the Office of Administrative Law as a contested case under N.J.S.A. 52:14(f)-1 et seq., for hearing and disposition.	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the evaluation of the point of interconnection and preferred route could be mitigated if cost were of no issue. It appears that Ocean Wind is promoting the most economically expedient route.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited language from New Jersey Constitution should be reason enough for the Board to refer Ocean Wind's petition to the Office of Administrative Law as a contested case under N.J.S.A. 52:14(f)-1 et seq., for hearing and disposition. Additionally, there can be no doubt that this is	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the evaluation of the point of interconnection and preferred route could be mitigated if cost were of no issue. It appears that Ocean Wind is promoting the most economically expedient route. This is a self-serving approach at the cost of Ocean City. Until and unless Ocean Wind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited language from New Jersey Constitution should be reason enough for the Board to refer Ocean Wind's petition to the Office of Administrative Law as a contested case under N.J.S.A. 52:14(f)-1 et seq., for hearing and disposition. Additionally, there can be no doubt that this is a contested case under the Administrative	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the evaluation of the point of interconnection and preferred route could be mitigated if cost were of no issue. It appears that Ocean Wind is promoting the most economically expedient route. This is a self-serving approach at the cost of Ocean City. Until and unless Ocean Wind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited language from New Jersey Constitution should be reason enough for the Board to refer Ocean Wind's petition to the Office of Administrative Law as a contested case under N.J.S.A. 52:14(f)-1 et seq., for hearing and disposition. Additionally, there can be no doubt that this is a contested case under N.J.A.C. 1:1-2.1. The	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the evaluation of the point of interconnection and preferred route could be mitigated if cost were of no issue. It appears that Ocean Wind is promoting the most economically expedient route. This is a self-serving approach at the cost of Ocean City. Until and unless Ocean Wind discloses the cost of each of the alternate routes, the Board cannot find that the easements
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	property rights within Ocean City in complete disregard of the will of the governing body and its constituents. N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1 has not yet been tested in the courts. There remains to be seen whether it will survive judicial scrutiny. The Board is likely familiar with the admonition in the New Jersey State Constitution of 1947 that, quote, "Any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties, shall be liberally construed in their favor." Article 4, Section 7, paragraph 11. The novelty of N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f) coupled with the cited language from New Jersey Constitution should be reason enough for the Board to refer Ocean Wind's petition to the Office of Administrative Law as a contested case under N.J.S.A. 52:14(f)-1 et seq., for hearing and disposition. Additionally, there can be no doubt that this is a contested case under N.J.A.C. 1:1-2.1. The case law confirms this.	 oversight of regulated utilities. Find its seizure of property rights from the City of Ocean City and soon to come County of Cape May to be reasonably necessary. Yet according to Ocean Wind, the statute excuses Ocean Wind from the obligations of a public utility to disclose the costs of its preferred route or chosen path, extensively because the cost of construction would be borne by Ocean Wind. The cost of construction is absolutely relevant to the question of whether Ocean Wind's preferred route is reasonably necessary. Realistically, each and every criterion constraint considered in the evaluation of the point of interconnection and preferred route could be mitigated if cost were of no issue. It appears that Ocean Wind is promoting the most economically expedient route. This is a self-serving approach at the cost of Ocean City. Until and unless Ocean Wind discloses the cost of each of the alternate routes, the Board cannot find that the easements and consents which Ocean Wind seeks are

	Page 29		Page 31
	Faye 29		raye 31
1	with its efforts to rest property rights from	1	a more extensive route, but surely not
2	Ocean City against the will of its governing	2	impossible to implement.
	body by pursuing the Great Egg Harbor route.	3	
	The Great Egg Harbor Inlet is sufficiently wide	4	written comments, Ocean Wind explains that it
	to accommodate this route without impacting the		eliminated the Great Egg Harbor route for a
	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers borrow area, which		myriad of reasons, many of which were related to
	is solely on the Ocean City shoreline.		the characteristics of the inlet, which I
	Restriction of other vessels during construction		already addressed. Ocean Wind appears to have
	in this wide inlet does not equate to a closure		overcome similar obstacles in its Oyster Creek
	of the inlet. Navigation would continue during		proposals to install cable crossing Barnegat
	the temporary period of construction as it did		Inlet and/or Barnegat Bay. For that project,
	during the construction of the Ocean City-Long		shallow areas will be dealt with through
	• • •		-
	Port Bridge in and around 2002.		dredging. Target burial depths would be
14	By contrast, the preferred route		determined based on an assessment of the seabed
	would traverse a much, much narrower, but		conditions, seabed mobility and the risk of
	equally heavy traveled Peck's Bay at Crook Horn		interaction with external hazards, such as
	Creek. The reduced distance of the preferred		fishing gear and vessel anchors, while also
	route likely translates into lower costs for		considering other factors such as maintain
	Ocean Wind. However, it requires disturbance of		navigational channels and thermal connectivity.
	the barrier islands beach and wetlands. This		Many of those issues were cited in the decision
	disturbance would be eliminated by using the		to eliminate the Great Egg Harbor route as a
	Great Egg Harbor route. Going through Ocean		possible route.
	City is not reasonably necessary. Disturbance	23	1
	of shellfish habitat Great Egg Harbor Inlet,		burial risk assessment for the Oyster Creek
25	another factor which disqualified the Great Egg	25	project. And in the event cables cannot achieve
	- · · ·		
	Page 30		Page 32
1	-	1	-
	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary		proper burial depths, or if cables would cross
2	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help	2	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean
2 3	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat	2 3	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement,
2 3 4	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C.	2 3 4	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic)
2 3 4 5	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly	2 3 4 5	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number
2 3 4 5 6	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue.	2 3 4 5 6	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are
2 3 4 5 6 7	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that	2 3 4 5 6 7	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor	2 3 4 5 6 7	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 14	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City. The City's pristine beach and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State Park to Oyster Creek is longer than 5.8 miles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City. The City's pristine beach and wetlands would not be disturbed. The streets	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State Park to Oyster Creek is longer than 5.8 miles. And as for the environmental characteristics of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City. The City's pristine beach and wetlands would not be disturbed. The streets would not be excavated. Ocean City would still	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State Park to Oyster Creek is longer than 5.8 miles. And as for the environmental characteristics of the seabed to be traversed to reach the Oyster
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City. The City's pristine beach and wetlands would not be disturbed. The streets would not be excavated. Ocean City would still bear the aesthetic effects of this project and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State Park to Oyster Creek is longer than 5.8 miles. And as for the environmental characteristics of the seabed to be traversed to reach the Oyster Bay substation, according to the BOEM Draft
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City. The City's pristine beach and wetlands would not be disturbed. The streets would not be excavated. Ocean City would still bear the aesthetic effects of this project and whatever consequences they may bring. However,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State Park to Oyster Creek is longer than 5.8 miles. And as for the environmental characteristics of the seabed to be traversed to reach the Oyster Bay substation, according to the BOEM Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Barnegat Bay is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City. The City's pristine beach and wetlands would not be disturbed. The streets would not be excavated. Ocean City would still bear the aesthetic effects of this project and whatever consequences they may bring. However, the island would not be defaced and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State Park to Oyster Creek is longer than 5.8 miles. And as for the environmental characteristics of the seabed to be traversed to reach the Oyster Bay substation, according to the BOEM Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Barnegat Bay is an estuary of national importance and part of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City. The City's pristine beach and wetlands would not be disturbed. The streets would not be excavated. Ocean City would still bear the aesthetic effects of this project and whatever consequences they may bring. However, the island would not be defaced and the activities of the people on the island would not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State Park to Oyster Creek is longer than 5.8 miles. And as for the environmental characteristics of the seabed to be traversed to reach the Oyster Bay substation, according to the BOEM Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Barnegat Bay is an estuary of national importance and part of the national estuarine research reserve system.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City. The City's pristine beach and wetlands would not be disturbed. The streets would not be excavated. Ocean City would still bear the aesthetic effects of this project and whatever consequences they may bring. However, the island would not be defaced and the activities of the people on the island would not be interrupted. It seems clear that the Great	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State Park to Oyster Creek is longer than 5.8 miles. And as for the environmental characteristics of the seabed to be traversed to reach the Oyster Bay substation, according to the BOEM Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Barnegat Bay is an estuary of national importance and part of the national estuarine research reserve system. Four artifical reefs are mapped offshore
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Harbor route can be mitigated with a monetary contribution to the NJDEP's fund for help shellfish habitate (Phonetic) habitat mitigation and restoration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-17.1 et seq. This is another strictly monetary issue. It is surprising to Ocean City that Ocean Wind argued that the Great Egg Harbor route would cross under two historic bridges with low clearance. Both have high clearances 65 and 55 feet respectively. Neither bridge would be an actual obstacle to construction. The overwhelming benefit of utilizing the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City. The City's pristine beach and wetlands would not be disturbed. The streets would not be excavated. Ocean City would still bear the aesthetic effects of this project and whatever consequences they may bring. However, the island would not be defaced and the activities of the people on the island would not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	proper burial depths, or if cables would cross existing infrastructure infrastructure, Ocean Wind has options, including rock placement, concrete mattress placement, fraud (Phonetic) mattress placement, rock bags for five, number five, seabed spacers. These solutions are proposed for the Ocean the Oyster Creek site according to BOEM's Draft Environment Impact Statement, Pages 2-13 to 14. They have not been cited as reasons to reject Ocean City's preferred route in the Oyster Creek substation. Ocean Wind claims that the Great Egg Harbor route would be 5.8 miles within a designated shellfish habitat. It appears that the distance from the edge of Island Beach State Park to Oyster Creek is longer than 5.8 miles. And as for the environmental characteristics of the seabed to be traversed to reach the Oyster Bay substation, according to the BOEM Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Barnegat Bay is an estuary of national importance and part of the national estuarine research reserve system.

			June 24, 2022
	Page 33		Page 35
	1 acres, and one research lease occur in the	1	reasonably necessary. The factual issue
	2 vicinity of Oyster Creek with the primary		regarding the impact of the two bridges which
	3 shellfish grow-out of oysters and hard clams.		Ocean Wind claims to be impediments to the use
	4 The proposed offshore export cable to the		of the Great Egg Harbor route suggests that the
	5 southern most landfill options for Oyster Creek		petition should be referred to the Office of
	6 traverses an aquacultured lease area on the west		Administrative Law at this juncture. In the
	7 side of Barnegat Bay. Barnegat Bay supports		absence of a cost analysis as to the various
	8 invertebrate species such as hard clams, soft		alternate routes, the record is fatally
	9 clams, blue mussels, bay scallops and eastern		deficient. In light of the apparent
	o oyster.		inconsistencies between what is possible and
1			proposed for Oyster Creek, and what is deemed to
1	2 address all of the challenges these conditions		be impracticable and fatal to the Ocean City
	3 present in the Oyster Creek landfall proposals,		situation, and Great Egg Harbor, Ocean Wind's
	4 but would have you believe that the similar		presentation is incomplete or not credible.
1	5 challenges in the Great Egg Harbor route are		Thank you.
1	6 insurmountable. And in its evaluation of the	16	-
1	7 Great Egg Harbor route, Ocean Wind completely	17	your comments. I now invite Rate Counsel to
1	8 disregards the consideration most important to	18	make their statements.
1	9 the most impacted community, the opinions of the	19	MR. LIPMAN. Thank your, President
2	o elected officials of Ocean City and their	20	Fiordaliso. Hello to all the Commissioners.
2	1 constituents. That is not even listed as a	21	Good to see everybody. I, too, actually am glad
	2 relevant factor. The failure of Ocean Wind to		that this is virtual because I'm actually in
	3 even consider the opinion of the elected		Orlando right now. So it makes it a lot easier
	4 officials of Ocean City, the affected community,		to argue from Orlando than from Trenton.
2	5 as the preferred route should be startling to	25	I'm glad that we've stayed focused on what this
	Page 34		Page 36
			-
	this Board when Ocean Wind has other options.		is about, because that's very important, the
	2 The environmental impact statements		issue before the Board today is whether this
	3 which would be required for the project have not4 been finalized. BOEM has not issued a final		easement is reasonably necessary for Ocean Wind to conduct for its line. In order for the BPU
	5 EIS. The National Marine Fisheries Service has		to make that finding, it needs evidence before
	6 not adopted an EIS. And the U.S. Army Corps of		that the line that the easement is reasonably
	7 Engineers has not adopted the EIS. Any one of		necessary and the line is reasonably necessary,
	8 these agencies might determine that the	8	
	9 environmental impact of the proposed route	_	if there's no line, there's no need for an
	• through Ocean City is unacceptable, in which		easement. So the goal of the BPU here is to
	1 case, the easements would not be reasonably		find that this is reasonably necessary.
	2 necessary. Waiting until the environmental	12	
	3 impacts can be addressed and understood would be	13	really take a position on that because we have
	4 prudent. And Ocean City asks the Board to defer		not had the opportunity to fully probe that
	5 any decision in this matter until it can review		issue. Rebuttal testimony was filed answering
1	6 BOEM's EIS and the response thereto of the NMFS	16	some of our concerns. We were not allowed to
1		17	ask discovery about that rebuttal testimony. In
1	8 In conclusion, if N.J.S.A. 48:3	18	fact, there was no discovery in this matter.
1	9 I'm sorry. In conclusion, if N.J.S.A.	19	Ocean Wind we were asked Ocean Wind if
2	48:3-87.1(f) were ultimately found to be	20	they would answer some questions, and they did
2	1 enforceable in this matter, the BPU would be	21	answer some of our questions, but not all of our
1	a required to find sufficient avidence in the	00	quastions. And they didn't have to because

24

- **23** record to support a finding that the easements 24 and consents which Ocean Wind seeks to take from
- **25** Ocean City without Ocean City's consent are

22 questions. And they didn't have to, because

23 there was no discovery in this process.

June 24, 2022

			June 24, 2022
	Page 37		Page 39
1	have liked to have resolved if we had known	1	today, makes it extremely difficult for Rate
	about them through discovery. And would I have		Counsel to take a position on this issue. And,
	Rate Counsel would have very much liked to		again, I want to emphasize, on this issue.
	have taken a position. And I want to be very		Because there's been some comments that Rate
	clear on this, we are not opposed Offshore Wind		Counsel is opposed to Offshore Wind and we are
	and we are not opposed to any of the projects		not. The issue before the Board today is
	that are going on. Our only issue is that we		whether this easement is reasonably necessary.
	want to make sure that this line is reasonably		And our position at this time is, we don't know
	necessary. And in order for us to do that, we		because we don't believe there's sufficient
	need to get certain information which we were	10	evidence in the record for that decision to be
	unable to obtain during the process of this	11	made.
	matter.	12	With that said, that's really all we
13	Also, as far as the cost goes, I'm	13	have to say. We're not going to take a position
14	being told that cost doesn't matter in this		on Ocean City's factual arguments or, quite
15	case. Again, we weren't able to probe that		frankly, Ocean Wind's factual assertions,
	issue. I know that PJM is meeting today and my		because we haven't had the opportunity to probe
	understanding is that the transmission portion		them and we don't feel we're qualified to make
18	of this cost of this line is going to triple.	18	those types of assertions at this time. Thank
19	PJM is going to increase interconnection costs	19	you.
20	significantly. For that reason, Rate Counsel	20	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.
21	wanted to probe where the line was	21	MR. LIPMAN: I kept it short for you
	interconnecting, whether it made sense that this	22	too, President Fiordaliso.
23	interconnection made sense given the cost that	23	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: I'm sorry?
	will be involved. We're taking Ocean Wind's	24	MR. LIPMAN: I kept it short for
25	word that any cost with this project would be	25	you.
	Page 38		Page 40
1	borne by Ocean Wind. Obviously, Rate Counsel is	1	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. I
	going to be paying very close attention, as I	2	appreciate it. I will now invite the parties to
	know will the Board, to that issue to hold Ocean	3	make any rebuttal statements should they wish.
	Wind to the fire feet to the fire, and make		First, Ocean Wind, do you want to make any
	sure that ratepayers are not being charged		rebuttal?
	anything that they're not suppose to be charged.	6	MR. EISENSTARK: Yes, President
	And we're going to hold Ocean Wind to their word	7	Fiordaliso, I do. Thank you. Let me let me
8	in this case. But, again, it's very	8	make I'm going to respond both first to
9	dis-concerning. There was rebuttal testimony	9	Ocean City and then briefly to Rate Counsel's
10	filed. Mr. Eisenstark started off his arguments	10	remarks.
11	by thanking the Board for allowing the	11	With respect to Ocean City, I'm
12	opportunity to provide additional information.	12	going to lodge a formal objection to the
13	Any additional information that was provided	13	statement that Ms. McCrosson appeared to be
14	today, Rate Counsel will not be able to probe,	14	reading into the record. It's entirely
15	nor will the Board. And then Ocean City	15	inappropriate. It's a closing stage of this
	provided significant new information today that		proceeding. We're at the very last stage here
	Rate Counsel cannot probe, and nor can the		today. This is oral argument of counsel. And
	Board, because there's no opportunity to do so.		the purpose of oral argument of counsel, as we
	The process here was different than any other		understood it, and it is most often understood,
	process. And I understand, this is the first		is to sum up the record evidence that has been
	case of its type. And so the process was going		presented before. The problem is, Ocean City
22	to be somewhat different But the lack of	22	has not really participated in this proceeding

- **21** case of its type. And so the process was going **22** to be somewhat different. But the lack of
- **23** ability to probe the petition, to probe the

Min-U-Script®

- 24 answers that we got from Ocean -- from Ocean
- 25 Wind and then to probe what Ocean City just said

22 has not really participated in this proceeding

23 until today. So for Ocean City -- for Ocean

24 City to have its city solicitor appear and be

25 reading from a statement, which she is not an

	D (1)		June 24, 20
	Page 41		Page 4
1	expert on any of those issues, she's just an	1	reasons, interference with marine traffic
2	attorney, to attempt to read stuff in the record	2	through the inlet. There is a better
	that someone else has prepared for her, much of	3	alternative. The alternative is the one that
	which we've never heard before, is entirely	4	we've substantiated through our testimony as the
	inappropriate. So, we can do this by writing		preferred route here. The impacts to Ocean City
	afterwards, but we're going to make a formal		and its residence will be minimal. The line
	motion to have the Board strike most of what Ms.	7	will be underground. Once the construction is
8	McCrosson said. She made some arguments that		completed, you won't see it and you won't hear
	are legal arguments. I think those are fine.	9	it. And, quite frankly, it will be no different
10	But she appeared to be reading factual stuff		than the underground facilities that are already
	that was prepared by someone else. She is not a		in Ocean City. I suggest to you that Ocean
	witness. She did not file testimony. And this		City's famed objection to the route that we have
	also goes to Ocean City's complaints about the		selected has nothing to do with the actual
	process that the Board has filed here.		onshore route, but it has to do with Ocean
15			City's overall objection to Offshore Wind. I'll
	participate in this proceeding. They had the		leave it at that.
	right to file testimony and have sworn testimony	17	Let me respond briefly to Rate
	of a witness, have a witness testimony		Counsel's comments. And, again, you know, I
	considered, exhibits. They chose not to do		don't want to get into a back and forth too much
	that. And that's to their own peril. And to		here with Mr. Lipman. I respect Mr. Lipman.
	appear at the very last stage of this in		Rate Counsel did have an opportunity to fully
	arguments of counsel and attempt to interject		participate in this process. Rate Counsel
	facts that really aren't evidence at all because		served discovery on the Company's direct
	they're not supported by a witness is entirely		testimony. We responded to all of the questions
	inappropriate. And I do not express that		that Rate Counsel asked. Rate Counsel had the
	Page 42		Page 4
1	that comment in a more strong manner than I just		opportunity to file its own testimony of a of
	č	1	
	have. It is entirely inappropriate.	2	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a
3	Secondly, just I want to briefly	2 3	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to
3 4	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations	2 3 4	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to
3 4 5	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of	2 3 4 5	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately
3 4 5 6	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that,	2 3 4 5 6	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You
3 4 5 6 7	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg	2 3 4 5 6 7	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr.
3 4 5 6 7 8	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to
3 4 5 7 8 9	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on the register of historic places. Whether they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs. It's about the it's about the onshore cable
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 13 14 15 16 17 18	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on the register of historic places. Whether they should be or not is a different question. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs. It's about the it's about the onshore cable route from where the project will make landfall
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on the register of historic places. Whether they should be or not is a different question. But there are many, many other reasons why the Great	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs. It's about the it's about the onshore cable route from where the project will make landfall to the substation. There are a limited number
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on the register of historic places. Whether they should be or not is a different question. But there are many, many other reasons why the Great Egg Harbor route was not desirable. I'm not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs. It's about the it's about the onshore cable route from where the project will make landfall to the substation. There are a limited number of places where Offshore Wind can interconnect
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on the register of historic places. Whether they should be or not is a different question. But there are many, many other reasons why the Great Egg Harbor route was not desirable. I'm not going to sit here and read from our testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs. It's about the it's about the onshore cable route from where the project will make landfall to the substation. There are a limited number of places where Offshore Wind can interconnect to the existing grid in New Jersey. There are
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 112 13 115 15 17 18 20 21 22 22	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on the register of historic places. Whether they should be or not is a different question. But there are many, many other reasons why the Great Egg Harbor route was not desirable. I'm not going to sit here and read from our testimony. Our testimony is part of the record. But it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs. It's about the it's about the onshore cable route from where the project will make landfall to the substation. There are a limited number of places where Offshore Wind can interconnect to the existing grid in New Jersey. There are very, very few. And there's going to be, not
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 22 23	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on the register of historic places. Whether they should be or not is a different question. But there are many, many other reasons why the Great Egg Harbor route was not desirable. I'm not going to sit here and read from our testimony. Our testimony is part of the record. But it's clear that the Great Egg Harbor alternative is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs. It's about the it's about the onshore cable route from where the project will make landfall to the substation. There are a limited number of places where Offshore Wind can interconnect to the existing grid in New Jersey. There are very, very few. And there's going to be, not only Ocean Wind 1, but Ocean Wind 2, the
345678901123145171892222324	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on the register of historic places. Whether they should be or not is a different question. But there are many, many other reasons why the Great Egg Harbor route was not desirable. I'm not going to sit here and read from our testimony. Our testimony is part of the record. But it's clear that the Great Egg Harbor alternative is not preferable for a host of reasons;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs. It's about the it's about the onshore cable route from where the project will make landfall to the substation. There are a limited number of places where Offshore Wind can interconnect to the existing grid in New Jersey. There are very, very few. And there's going to be, not only Ocean Wind 1, but Ocean Wind 2, the Atlantic Shore's project that's been approved
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 112 13 14 15 16 18 9 20 22 23 24	Secondly, just I want to briefly touch on a couple of the factual allegations that Ocean City did make which were subject of Ocean Wind's rebuttal testimony. And that, basically, concerns the so-called Great Egg Harbor route. In both Ocean Wind's direct testimony of Pilar Patterson and in her rebuttal testimony, we provided extensive record evidence of why the Great Egg Harbor route was not ultimately pursued. It has much more to do than the fact whether or not the two bridges that it would have to cross under are historic or not. And as we've as we've said in our rebuttal testimony, those two bridges still are listed on the register of historic places. Whether they should be or not is a different question. But there are many, many other reasons why the Great Egg Harbor route was not desirable. I'm not going to sit here and read from our testimony. Our testimony is part of the record. But it's clear that the Great Egg Harbor alternative is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an expert witness, which it did. It raised a number of issues that it felt were important to it. And then Ocean Wind had the opportunity to respond to it. We believe we've adequately addressed all of Rate Counsel's concerns. You know, and I will note, again, you know, Mr. Lipman did refer and, again, this is not evidence, it's just a reference. He referred to something about a PJM meeting and his belief that interconnection costs will go up. I don't know whether that's true. I don't know what the basis for that statement is. But I do know one thing for sure, whether it's true or not, it has nothing to do with this filing. Because this filing isn't about PJM interconnection costs. It's about the it's about the onshore cable route from where the project will make landfall to the substation. There are a limited number of places where Offshore Wind can interconnect to the existing grid in New Jersey. There are very, very few. And there's going to be, not only Ocean Wind 1, but Ocean Wind 2, the

		1	June 24, 20
	Page 45		Page 4
1	likely be approved in the future.	1	all do respect to the Board, but questioning the
2	So, again, if we're going to stay on		propriety of the statute under which the Board
3	what is an issue in here, PJM interconnection		is proceeding today. Ocean City also questioned
4	costs are not an issue here. They may be an	4	whether the Great Egg Harbor route was the
5	issue for PJM in other context, but they are		better route. I was not reading a statement
6	simply not an issue here.	6	prepared by someone else. I was making
7	Finally, one last point, and I don't	7	reference to the Draft Environmental Impact
8	mean to speak too long, I just want to respond	8	Statement prepared by BOEM which came out very
9	again to one other issue that Ocean City did	9	recently, which summarizes Ocean Wind's proposed
0	raise. And that is this suggestion that the	10	course of action with respect to the Oyster Bay
1	Board should wait until the final environmental	11	the Oyster Creek project, in order to explain
2	impact statement is approved by the BOEM. Well,	12	to the Board and highlight the inconsistency in
3	there are a lot of things that have to go on	13	Ocean Wind's approach to these two projects.
4	contemporaneous for an Offshore Wind project to	14	What is possible for Oyster Creek is impossible
5	be constructed. There are state permits. The		in the Great Egg Harbor in the Great Egg
	state permitting process is tied in some part to	16	Harbor Bay.
7	the federal process. But you can't you know,	17	I think that's the only thing that
8	you have to do everything at the same time in	18	Mr. Eisenstark was complaining about. The fact
	order for this project to be constructed		that I was referring to the BOEM draft, EIS,
0	permitted and constructed. We're already three		which has just recently come out. But I can
	years into into the process since the Board		assure you that all of those facts are taken
	approved the project. The first commercial		directly from Ocean Wind's arguments and the
	operation date that is planned is quickly		public filings that Ocean Wind has made,
	approaching in early 2024. You simply		otherwise, I would not have had access to them.
	everything can't wait for everything else to be	25	They're absolutely properly before this Board.
	Page 46		Page 4
1	done first. It has to be done simultaneously.	1	And in this unusual process that is being
	There's no reason and no requirement under New		conducted under what, you know, I'll again
	Jersey State Law or otherwise for the Board to	~	
		3	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that
4	wait for the federal government's environmental	3 4	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and
4 5	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act	3 4 5	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were
4 5 6	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very	3 4 5 6	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound
4 5 6 7	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso.	3 4 5 6 7	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements
4 5 6 7 8	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see
4 5 7 8 9	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and
4 5 7 8 9 0	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement.	3 4 5 7 8 9 10	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will
4 5 7 8 9 0 1	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr.	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? 	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt
45678901234	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned
456789012345	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind.
4567890123456	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a 	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a rebuttal statement?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind projects. This is a statement and an argument
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a rebuttal statement? MS. McCROSSON: Just briefly, 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind projects. This is a statement and an argument focused entirely on the statute under which the
4567890123456789	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a rebuttal statement? MS. McCROSSON: Just briefly, President. Thank you. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind projects. This is a statement and an argument focused entirely on the statute under which the Board is pursuing. And Ocean City objects to
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a rebuttal statement? MS. McCROSSON: Just briefly, President. Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Sure. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind projects. This is a statement and an argument focused entirely on the statute under which the Board is pursuing. And Ocean City objects to property rights being taken away from it against
456789012345678901	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a rebuttal statement? MS. McCROSSON: Just briefly, President. Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Sure. MS. McCROSSON: The points that 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind projects. This is a statement and an argument focused entirely on the statute under which the Board is pursuing. And Ocean City objects to property rights being taken away from it against its will, particularly when there is another
4567890123456789012	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a rebuttal statement? MS. McCROSSON: Just briefly, President. Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Sure. MS. McCROSSON: The points that Ocean City made today were simply an expansion 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind projects. This is a statement and an argument focused entirely on the statute under which the Board is pursuing. And Ocean City objects to property rights being taken away from it against its will, particularly when there is another viable alternative, the objections to which have
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a rebuttal statement? MS. McCROSSON: Just briefly, President. Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Sure. MS. McCROSSON: The points that Ocean City made today were simply an expansion of the points in the letter previously filed 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind projects. This is a statement and an argument focused entirely on the statute under which the Board is pursuing. And Ocean City objects to property rights being taken away from it against its will, particularly when there is another viable alternative, the objections to which have been overcome by the petitioner in another
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a rebuttal statement? MS. McCROSSON: Just briefly, President. Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Sure. MS. McCROSSON: The points that Ocean City made today were simply an expansion of the points in the letter previously filed prior to the hearing in this matter. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind projects. This is a statement and an argument focused entirely on the statute under which the Board is pursuing. And Ocean City objects to property rights being taken away from it against its will, particularly when there is another viable alternative, the objections to which have been overcome by the petitioner in another location. Thank you, sir.
456789012345678901234	 wait for the federal government's environmental impact statement to be finalized in order to act on Ocean Wind's filing here. Thank you very much, President Fiordaliso. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Rate Counsel, would you like to make a rebuttal statement. MR. LIPMAN: You want me to go first or you want Ocean City to go first, Mr. President? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Oh, I'm sorry. You're absolutely correct. My bad, as they say. Ocean City, would like to make a rebuttal statement? MS. McCROSSON: Just briefly, President. Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Sure. MS. McCROSSON: The points that Ocean City made today were simply an expansion of the points in the letter previously filed 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	called a hastily enacted statute, I submit that the Board should give leeway to the City and allow it to present all of the facts that were argued today. This Ocean Wind makes it sound like it's of no moment to take these easements and property consents, because no one will see these cables, no one will hear these cables and no one will smell theses cables. No one will know they're there. Ocean City will know they're there. The Ocean the power of the Ocean City elected officials has been incerpt (Phonetic) by the state legislature and turned over to the BPU for the benefit of Ocean Wind. This is not a commentary on Offshore Wind projects. This is a statement and an argument focused entirely on the statute under which the Board is pursuing. And Ocean City objects to property rights being taken away from it against its will, particularly when there is another viable alternative, the objections to which have been overcome by the petitioner in another

	EAN WIND, LLC	June 24, 2022
	Page 49	Page 51
1	Now, Rate Counsel, do you wish to make a	1 issue. And, you know, perhaps Rate Counsel, you
2	rebuttal?	2 know, as a follow-up to that may want to
3	MR. LIPMAN: Very quickly, Mr.	3 distinguish this proceeding from what is
	President. Just a couple of things. One, I'll	4 traditionally we experienced with what is
	agree with some of the things that Mr.	5 offered in, you know, let's say, municipal land
	Eisenstark said. And I also you know, I have	6 use proceeding for a pipeline or a different
	a lot of respect for Mr. Eisenstark, but a	7 type of line and the information that is
	couple of things I just wanted to point out. One well, Ocean Wind did respond to all	8 garnered for the Board to review in those cases.9 MR. EISENSTARK: Commissioner
	questions. Some of those responses were	10 Solomon, it's Greg Eisenstark. Let me perhaps
	objections and refusal to respond to provide	11 go first and others can go after me if they'd
	an answer. So, we did not get answers to every	12 like. Yeah. I mean, you know, your question
	question we asked. But I agree with him that	13 was, is the time of the OREC prices are set, is
	the issues that Ocean City raises today, they're	14 that the only time the Board should be concerned
15	important issues that I wish they had been	15 with cost. I think that's the primary time the
16	raised earlier, because these are issues that we	16 Board should be concerned with cost or a
	would have probed and we would have liked to	17 Qualified Offshore Wind project, because as I
	have gotten some more information on. I think	18 said earlier, and as everyone is aware, these
	would have made a more robust record before the	19 are competitive solicitations. A lot of you
	Board so the Board have everything in front of	20 know, a lot of work goes into the project's
	it that it needs to make a finding that's	21 submission of its of its proposed OREC
	reasonably necessary.	22 prices. And, you know, there's a lot of
23	And, again, I'm not taking a	23 analysis, there's a lot of assumptions made
	position as to who's right and who's wrong. To	24 about inflation, future costs, you know, and
25	me, what's most important is the Board has a	25 there's a lot of guesswork going in. So I
	Page 50	Page 52
1	Page 50 full record in front of it so they could make a	Page 52 1 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of
	-	
	full record in front of it so they could make a	1 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of
2 3	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman.	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the
2 3	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you.	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances
2 3 4 5 6	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding
2 3 4 5 6	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals.	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time?	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question.	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes.	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes. COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yes. With	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes. COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yes. With respect to discussion on cost, is it the	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes. COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yes. With respect to discussion on cost, is it the position of counsel that the only time that the	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the ability to do that. That means the project if that happens, the project is going to, you know, ultimately earn less on its investment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes. COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yes. With respect to discussion on cost, is it the position of counsel that the only time that the BPU should be interested or explore issues of	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the ability to do that. That means the project if that happens, the project is going to, you know, ultimately earn less on its investment. It's unlike a utility. So it's far different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes. COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yes. With respect to discussion on cost, is it the position of counsel that the only time that the	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the ability to do that. That means the project if that happens, the project is going to, you know, ultimately earn less on its investment. It's unlike a utility. So it's far different than a utility filing under the other statutory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes. COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yes. With respect to discussion on cost, is it the position of counsel that the only time that the BPU should be interested or explore issues of cost is when the OREC is being determined?	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the ability to do that. That means the project if that happens, the project is going to, you know, ultimately earn less on its investment. It's unlike a utility. So it's far different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes. COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yes. With respect to discussion on cost, is it the position of counsel that the only time that the BPU should be interested or explore issues of cost is when the OREC is being determined? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Is that	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the ability to do that. That means the project if that happens, the project is going to, you know, ultimately earn less on its investment. It's unlike a utility. So it's far different than a utility filing under the other statutory scheme which is similar in some ways, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes. COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yes. With respect to discussion on cost, is it the position of counsel that the only time that the BPU should be interested or explore issues of cost is when the OREC is being determined? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Is that directed to someone specifically, Commissioner?	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the ability to do that. That means the project if that happens, the project is going to, you know, ultimately earn less on its investment. It's unlike a utility. So it's far different than a utility filing under the other statutory scheme which is similar in some ways, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	full record in front of it so they could make a good decision on what is reasonably necessary. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Mr. Lipman. MR. LIPMAN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: And I thank all of the attorneys who have made their presentations and their rebuttals. Do any of my colleagues have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes. COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yes. With respect to discussion on cost, is it the position of counsel that the only time that the BPU should be interested or explore issues of cost is when the OREC is being determined? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Is that directed to someone specifically, Commissioner? COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I think	 think, you know not guesswork, but a lot of analytical work going in that's the basis for that. So, yes, that's the primary time, because those OREC prices are set over the life of the project and there's very limited circumstances where they can be adjusted. And this proceeding doesn't involve one of the circumstances under which the OREC price can be adjusted. We ocean Wind doesn't have the ability to come to the Board and say, "Hey, you know what, we thought it was going to cost us X to build the onshore portion of the cable from landfall to the substation. It turns put it's going to cost us twice as much." The project doesn't have the ability to do that. That means the project if that happens, the project is going to, you know, ultimately earn less on its investment. It's unlike a utility. So it's far different than a utility filing under the other statutory scheme which is similar in some ways, but different in other ways, and that is N.J.S.A. 40:55D.19, you know, when an electric or gas

_			June 24, 2022
	Page 53		Page 55
1	with cost in that petition, because it's a	1	the route is reasonably necessary. And, we do
	regulated utility and the utility is going to		believe the Board should have been able to look
	seek to recover all the costs. Here, Ocean		at that in this case. I know that Mr.
	Wind, you know that's not the way OWEDA was		Eisenstark adamantly disagrees with me on that.
	set up and that's not the way the Board did the		And for that reason, we don't have the cost in
	solicitation is the best way I could put it.		front of the Board in this case. So, I don't
	The price was set in 2019 and it really is not		know what else to say. The costs are not
	going to be adjusted here one-way or the other.		available, so we can't determine whether they
	So that's about the best way I could answer your		factor in favor or against or find it reasonably
	question. Thank you.		necessary.
11	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Any other	11	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.
	counsel want to make any comments on the		Anyone else have questions, comments?
	Commissioner's question?	13	COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Yeah.
14	MS. McCROSSON: Yes, sir, I would	_	Thank you, Mr. President. I just have a
	like to respond.		question. I think Ocean City raised a question
16	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Sure.		about the BOEM's environmental impact statement.
17	MS. McCROSSON: An opinion of Ocean		And is that too late to consider? I don't know
	City, the cost is absolutely relevant to whether		what Greg Eisenstark thinks about that. I think
	going through Ocean City is reasonably		this all should be part of the decision-making
	necessary. And going through Ocean City is not		process; is that correct?
	amiss with whether those easements are	21	MR. EISENSTARK: Commissioner, I
	reasonably necessary. To take an extreme		think your question may have been addressed to
	hypothetical, if the Great Egg Harbor route, or		me. I'll try to answer it. You know, the Draft
	any of the other alternate routes that were		Environmental Impact Statement was issued by
	identified by Ocean Wind costs less than going		BOEM just a few days ago. From our perspective,
	raominica of occan wind costs ross than going		Dobin just a ten aufs ago. Trom our perspective,
	Page 54		Page 56
1	-	1	-
	through Ocean City, how could the Board find		it really has nothing to do with this
2	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those	2	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board
2 3	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There	2 3	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based
2 3 4	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route.	2 3 4	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's
2 3 4 5	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be	2 3 4 5	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions
2 3 4 5 6	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs	2 3 4 5 6	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate
2 3 4 5 6 7	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the	2 3 4 5 6 7	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for
2 3 4 5 6 7	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me,	2 3 6 7 8 9	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is not the only factor, and it doesn't mean that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is not the only factor, and it doesn't mean that you necessarily have to take the cheapest route.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a public document. It's publicly posted and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is not the only factor, and it doesn't mean that you necessarily have to take the cheapest route. If there's a better or not better. But if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a public document. It's publicly posted and anyone can certainly look at it. But, again,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is not the only factor, and it doesn't mean that you necessarily have to take the cheapest route. If there's a better or not better. But if I think Mr. Eisenstark actually set the standard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a public document. It's publicly posted and anyone can certainly look at it. But, again, you know, the record in BPU proceedings, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is not the only factor, and it doesn't mean that you necessarily have to take the cheapest route. If there's a better or not better. But if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a public document. It's publicly posted and anyone can certainly look at it. But, again, you know, the record in BPU proceedings, the record is limited normally to the evidence, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is not the only factor, and it doesn't mean that you necessarily have to take the cheapest route. If there's a better or not better. But if I think Mr. Eisenstark actually set the standard earlier. It doesn't have to be the best route, it has to be the reasonable route. But the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a public document. It's publicly posted and anyone can certainly look at it. But, again, you know, the record in BPU proceedings, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is not the only factor, and it doesn't mean that you necessarily have to take the cheapest route. If there's a better or not better. But if I think Mr. Eisenstark actually set the standard earlier. It doesn't have to be the best route, it has to be the reasonable route. But the Board does look pursuant to Supreme Court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a public document. It's publicly posted and anyone can certainly look at it. But, again, you know, the record in BPU proceedings, the record is limited normally to the evidence, the file testimony, the other documentary evidence that's before the Board. And I'm not sure it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is not the only factor, and it doesn't mean that you necessarily have to take the cheapest route. If there's a better or not better. But if I think Mr. Eisenstark actually set the standard earlier. It doesn't have to be the best route, it has to be the reasonable route. But the Board does look pursuant to Supreme Court precedent at how much the cost was for each of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a public document. It's publicly posted and anyone can certainly look at it. But, again, you know, the record in BPU proceedings, the record is limited normally to the evidence, the file testimony, the other documentary evidence that's before the Board. And I'm not sure it would be appropriate for the Board to allow, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	through Ocean City, how could the Board find that going through Ocean City and taking those easements would be reasonably necessary? There would be another viable alternative route. Therefore, taking the easements could not be reasonably necessary. So, of course, the costs are relevant. Even outside consideration of the setting the price of the OREC. MR. LIPMAN: So this is Brian. And I know this was partially addressed to me, so I want to respond to what was asked of me. Under municipal land use law, cost is a factor that the Board considers when looking at whether something is reasonably necessary. What's important to remember, though, is that cost is not the only factor, and it doesn't mean that you necessarily have to take the cheapest route. If there's a better or not better. But if I think Mr. Eisenstark actually set the standard earlier. It doesn't have to be the best route, it has to be the reasonable route. But the Board does look pursuant to Supreme Court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it really has nothing to do with this proceeding. I mean, this the Board there's a record in this proceeding that's based on the testimony filed and the Petitioner's response to the Board's supplemental questions and the Board's, you know, response to Rate Counsel's questions. It's not appropriate for the Board to consider, you know, the record in some other proceeding here. I mean, there are many different issues that BOEM looks at in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It involves, you know, literally dozens of federal environmental laws which, quite frankly, have nothing to do with this filing whatsoever. So, I'm not sure what the suggestion, you know the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a public document. It's publicly posted and anyone can certainly look at it. But, again, you know, the record in BPU proceedings, the record is limited normally to the evidence, the file testimony, the other documentary evidence that's before the Board. And I'm not sure it

		-	Julie 24, 2022
	Page 57		Page 59
1	this project into the record here. The focus,	1	Ocean City. I won't go into details about what
	as President Fiordaliso said here at the outset		they were. I will say that Ocean Wind did make
	in his opening statement, is very narrow. It's		a formal written settlement proposal to Ocean
	under the specific relief requested under these		City as part of that process. But, you know,
	provisions of OWEDA and I think that's what the		obviously because we're here today, there has
	Board should focus on.		been no settlement. So, you know and I think
7	COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you.		we said this in our file petition, Ocean Wind
	I have a question for Rate Counsel. And my		would prefer to reach a voluntary agreement with
	question is that, you had said that Mr.		Ocean City. We would have preferred to have
	Lipman repeatedly said that he didn't have		done that years ago. We tried our best. We
	enough information of not for him to probe		prefer to do it now as we sit here today. But,
	into. And what was the reason? And that not		unfortunately, we've not been the parties
	information not being provided? Was that not		have not been able to reach an agreement and
	enough time to probe into? I'm just curious		that's why we're before the Board.
	about that.	15	
16	MR. LIPMAN: The way this process	16	
	was set up, there was no basis no discovery	17	
	allowed under the process. We were not	18	
	permitted to ask discovery. I reached out to	19	MS. McCROSSON: No, thank you.
	Mr. Eisenstark. Mr. Eisenstark agreed to accept	20	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Okay. Just
	our questions and to answer them, but that was		wanted to give you the opportunity to do so.
	really between the two of us. The procedural	22	
	schedule did not allow for discovery after the	23	
	filing of rebuttal testimony. There was by	_	other questions or comments?
	the Company. Normally, we would have asked some	25	
	Page 58		Page 60
	Page 58		Page 60
	questions, some follow-up questions in a		one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the
2	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the	2	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised
2 3	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would	2 3	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you
2 3 4	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here.	2 3 4	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some
2 3 4 5	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on	2 3 4 5	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that
2 3 4 5 6	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a	2 3 4 5 6	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were
2 3 4 5 6 7	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly,	2 3 4 5 6 7	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly?
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask.	2 3 6 7 8 9	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of approach to that or it just came for the oral	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to the Company respond to Rate Counsel's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of approach to that or it just came for the oral argument?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to the Company respond to Rate Counsel's questions would be extremely helpful for Rate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of approach to that or it just came for the oral argument? MR. EISENSTARK: Yes, Commissioner.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to the Company respond to Rate Counsel's questions would be extremely helpful for Rate Counsel to then formulate some type of position
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of approach to that or it just came for the oral argument? MR. EISENSTARK: Yes, Commissioner. I think that question was addressed to me. And,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to the Company respond to Rate Counsel's questions would be extremely helpful for Rate Counsel to then formulate some type of position so that we have the information in front of us
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of approach to that or it just came for the oral argument? MR. EISENSTARK: Yes, Commissioner. I think that question was addressed to me. And, you know, I won't go into any details about any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to the Company respond to Rate Counsel's questions would be extremely helpful for Rate Counsel to then formulate some type of position so that we have the information in front of us so we would feel comfortable.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of approach to that or it just came for the oral argument? MR. EISENSTARK: Yes, Commissioner. I think that question was addressed to me. And, you know, I won't go into any details about any settlement discussions that may have taken	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to the Company respond to Rate Counsel's questions would be extremely helpful for Rate Counsel to then formulate some type of position so that we have the information in front of us so we would feel comfortable. And, frankly, a lot of the issues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of approach to that or it just came for the oral argument? MR. EISENSTARK: Yes, Commissioner. I think that question was addressed to me. And, you know, I won't go into any details about any settlement discussions that may have taken place, because that wouldn't appropriate in this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to the Company respond to Rate Counsel's questions would be extremely helpful for Rate Counsel to then formulate some type of position so that we have the information in front of us so we would feel comfortable. And, frankly, a lot of the issues raised today by Ocean City would have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of approach to that or it just came for the oral argument? MR. EISENSTARK: Yes, Commissioner. I think that question was addressed to me. And, you know, I won't go into any details about any settlement discussions that may have taken place, because that wouldn't appropriate in this context. But I will say that there have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to the Company respond to Rate Counsel's questions would be extremely helpful for Rate Counsel to then formulate some type of position so that we have the information in front of us so we would feel comfortable. And, frankly, a lot of the issues raised today by Ocean City would have been flushed out in discovery and not come up today
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	questions, some follow-up questions in a different type of proceeding. And then the Company would answer them and then we would proceed. We didn't have that opportunity here. Once rebuttal testimony was filed, we moved on to oral argument. So it was just it was a very different process, one that, quite frankly, we're not used to. And it didn't allow for us to get to ask the kinds of questions we would normally ask. COMMISSIONER CHIVUKULA: Thank you for that. I just have I know my question to Greg Eisenstark is that, I know you're not a utility, because Ocean Wind is not a utility. But, typically, it's usually engage in settlement discussions. Was there any type of approach to that or it just came for the oral argument? MR. EISENSTARK: Yes, Commissioner. I think that question was addressed to me. And, you know, I won't go into any details about any settlement discussions that may have taken place, because that wouldn't appropriate in this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	one more. To, I guess, Rate Counsel and the issue that Commissioner Chivukula raised regarding process. You know, as this is a, you know, case, basically, first impression to some extent, you know, is what you're suggesting that you have concerns about the procedure that were setting forth for future petitions, is that what you're raising in your comments? Am I understanding that properly? MR. LIPMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I think going forward and I know there's another one pending already and I'm certain there will be more. I think building discovery into the process would be extremely useful and even perhaps a discovery conference, some type of ability for Rate Counsel and the Company to the Company respond to Rate Counsel's questions would be extremely helpful for Rate Counsel to then formulate some type of position so that we have the information in front of us so we would feel comfortable. And, frankly, a lot of the issues raised today by Ocean City would have been

_	June 24, 2022				
	Page 61		Page 63		
1	I can't make any promises, but I would hope that	1	MR. EISENSTARK: Yes, President		
	that would be resolved before we got here.		Fiordaliso, and not to prolong it, but I just		
3	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Okay. Any		want to briefly respond to the last statement		
	over questions or comments?		that Ms. McCrosson made. This isn't new		
5	COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: President		evidence. The EIS process has been ongoing for		
_	Fiordaliso?		years now. There have been public documents		
7	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Yes.		filed and available on the BOEM website for		
8	COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: I just have		years. The problem is, Ocean City is did not		
_	one question for Ms. McCrosson. You mentioned		follow the procedures that the Board outline for		
	two historic bridges. Are they listed on the		this process. They had every opportunity to		
	National Register of Historic Places or the		file testimony of a witness raising all of the		
	state register?		issues that Ms. McCrosson claimed she just		
13	MS. McCROSSON: Commissioner, I'm		discovered shortly before this oral argument.		
_	not sure if they are or not, but neither of them		They didn't do so. Had they done so, Ocean Wind		
	exists. Both of them have completely demolished		could have addressed them in its rebuttal		
	and replaced in the last 20 years. And it's		testimony. So to consider those issues now or		
	that kind of criteria or that kind of, I'll call		to delay this proceeding because Ocean City		
	it an excuse, for discarding the Great Egg		simply didn't play along and is now		
	Harbor alternative route. That calls into		interjecting attempting to interject new		
	question the analysis. Isn't Ocean Wind just		issues at the end, is unfair to Ocean Wind and		
	going through Ocean City because it's		it's unfair to the Board and the process that		
	economically expedient? Does that economic		the Board has set out. So we oppose the		
	expedience translate into being reasonably		suggestion that there's new evidence. We were		
	necessary? Or if there's another way that it		not sure, because, again, it's a statement read		
	could be done addressing all of the		by counsel, you know, at the very end of oral		
25	could be done addressing an of the	25	by counsel, you know, at the very end of oral		
	Page 62		Page 64		
	-		-		
	environmental challenges that they're evidently		argument and, you know, we don't know exactly		
	able to address elsewhere, why go through Ocean		what it is or what it's based on. We don't even		
	City? It's not reasonably necessary. You can		know if it's even relevant. So we object to the		
	go somewhere else. And that's the basis for		attempts that Ocean City is apparently making		
	Ocean City's response. And if the Board were		here and to prolong this proceeding based on		
	open to an adjournment so that the arguments		alleged new evidence. It's just completely		
	which counsel believes were made for the first		inappropriate. They had the ability to raise		
	time today could be presented, I'd be happy to		these issues months ago. They failed to do so.		
	present a copy of the BOEM Draft Environmental	9	5 8 11 5		
	Impact Statement issued just a few days ago in		prolong this proceeding because of their own		
	support of Ocean City's arguments. You know, if		inaction.		
	we were in court and new evidence came up	12	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: I'll give		
	-	-			
	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have		Ocean City an opportunity to respond if they'd		
14	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider	14	like.		
14 15	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask	14 15	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr.		
14 15 16	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion	14 15 16	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the		
14 15 16 17	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion its decision and to allow perhaps limited	14 15 16 17	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the Commission feels that the lack of discovery in		
14 15 16 17 18	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion its decision and to allow perhaps limited discovery if Rate Counsel still has unanswered	14 15 16 17 18	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the Commission feels that the lack of discovery in this process has had an impact on the process		
14 15 16 17 18 19	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion its decision and to allow perhaps limited discovery if Rate Counsel still has unanswered questions and to allow Ocean City to	14 15 16 17 18 19	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the Commission feels that the lack of discovery in this process has had an impact on the process and has affected the ability of any of the		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion its decision and to allow perhaps limited discovery if Rate Counsel still has unanswered questions and to allow Ocean City to substantiate the arguments made based on the	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the Commission feels that the lack of discovery in this process has had an impact on the process and has affected the ability of any of the parties, including Rate Counsel, to opine on the		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion its decision and to allow perhaps limited discovery if Rate Counsel still has unanswered questions and to allow Ocean City to substantiate the arguments made based on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the Commission feels that the lack of discovery in this process has had an impact on the process and has affected the ability of any of the parties, including Rate Counsel, to opine on the issue at hand, and if that evaluation is going		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion its decision and to allow perhaps limited discovery if Rate Counsel still has unanswered questions and to allow Ocean City to substantiate the arguments made based on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: Thank you.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the Commission feels that the lack of discovery in this process has had an impact on the process and has affected the ability of any of the parties, including Rate Counsel, to opine on the issue at hand, and if that evaluation is going to result in a change in the process in the		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion its decision and to allow perhaps limited discovery if Rate Counsel still has unanswered questions and to allow Ocean City to substantiate the arguments made based on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the Commission feels that the lack of discovery in this process has had an impact on the process and has affected the ability of any of the parties, including Rate Counsel, to opine on the issue at hand, and if that evaluation is going to result in a change in the process in the future, so that when Cape May County is dragged		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion its decision and to allow perhaps limited discovery if Rate Counsel still has unanswered questions and to allow Ocean City to substantiate the arguments made based on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. Any other counsel want to make any other	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the Commission feels that the lack of discovery in this process has had an impact on the process and has affected the ability of any of the parties, including Rate Counsel, to opine on the issue at hand, and if that evaluation is going to result in a change in the process in the future, so that when Cape May County is dragged through this process there will be a discovery		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	shortly prior to a hearing, a court would have the ability to delay its decision to consider the additional argument or evidence. And I ask the Board to consider delaying its opinion its decision and to allow perhaps limited discovery if Rate Counsel still has unanswered questions and to allow Ocean City to substantiate the arguments made based on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	like. MS. McCROSSON: Thank you, Mr. President. My final point would be that if the Commission feels that the lack of discovery in this process has had an impact on the process and has affected the ability of any of the parties, including Rate Counsel, to opine on the issue at hand, and if that evaluation is going to result in a change in the process in the future, so that when Cape May County is dragged		

			June 24, 202
	Page 65		Page 67
1	opportunity in this process as well, so that	1	MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you.
	there's fairness to the city of Ocean City, the	2	MR. LIPMAN: Thank you, everybody.
	first municipality to go through this new	3	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Take care.
	process.	4	(Concluded at 11:24.)
5	PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you. I	5	(
-	just would like to, and I'm sure I don't have	6	
	to, alert counsel and representatives of the	7	
	various parties, that the Board does not make	8	
	the rules. The Board follows the rules. And	9	
	those laws are passed by the legislature and	10	
	it's then our obligation and duty to follow	11	
	those laws. And we do that in a very prudent,	12	
	transparent and fair way. And I think my	13	
	colleagues will agree that we make every attempt	14	
	to be fair in any deliberation that comes before	15	
	us. And it and it requires reviewing the	16	
	testimony that we have received, taking into	17	
	consideration the oral arguments today and	18	
	that's why everything is taken by court reporter	19	
	so that we have an accurate account of what	20	
	happened today. It's important that everyone	20	
	understand that. It's important that we try to	21	
	come to the best equitable solution as possible.	22	
23 24	Since everyone has been given the	23 24	
	opportunity to present their oral arguments and	24 25	
25	opportunity to present their oral arguments and	25	
	Page 66		Page 68
1	make rebuttal statements, no formal action	1	CERTIFICATE
	today no formal action will be taken today in	2	
	this matter. All arguments made today and all	3	I, MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, a Certified
	recorded materials submitted under the docket	4	Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of
	will be taken into consideration and the Board	5	New Jersey, do hereby certify that prior to the
	will take formal action on the petition at a	6	commencement of the examination, the witness was
	later date to be determined.	7	duly sworn by me to testify the truth, the whole
		8	truth and nothing but the truth.
8	I want to certainly thank my fellow Commissioners, and I also want to thank the	9	I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that the
	representatives of the parties for your	10	foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of
		11	the testimony as taken stenographically by and
	testimony, for your rebuttal. And it's always,	12	before me at the time, place and on the date
	for me, personally, more clarifying to verbally hear the arguments. I think I'm a better verbal	13	hereinbefore set forth, to the best of my
	learner than particularly with the BOEM	14	ability.
	· ·		I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am
112	report that you referred to I baliave it's only		I DU FURIMER CERIIFÍ CHAE I AM
	report that you referred to, I believe it's only	15 16	
16	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is	16	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor
16 17	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is read it from cover to cover, and it's quite a	16 17	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action,
16 17 18	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is read it from cover to cover, and it's quite a document. But as Mr. Eisenstark indicated, our	16 17 18	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of
16 17 18 19	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is read it from cover to cover, and it's quite a document. But as Mr. Eisenstark indicated, our charge is a very narrow one. And so but we	16 17 18 19	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not
16 17 18 19 20	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is read it from cover to cover, and it's quite a document. But as Mr. Eisenstark indicated, our charge is a very narrow one. And so but we take all of this into consideration and, again,	16 17 18 19 20	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of
16 17 18 19 20 21	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is read it from cover to cover, and it's quite a document. But as Mr. Eisenstark indicated, our charge is a very narrow one. And so but we take all of this into consideration and, again, I want to thank you, Ocean Wind. I want to	16 17 18 19 20 21	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is read it from cover to cover, and it's quite a document. But as Mr. Eisenstark indicated, our charge is a very narrow one. And so but we take all of this into consideration and, again, I want to thank you, Ocean Wind. I want to thank you Ocean City and Rate Counsel, for your	16 17 18 19 20	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not
16 17 18 20 21 22 23	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is read it from cover to cover, and it's quite a document. But as Mr. Eisenstark indicated, our charge is a very narrow one. And so but we take all of this into consideration and, again, I want to thank you, Ocean Wind. I want to thank you Ocean City and Rate Counsel, for your participation today. And with that. I will	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action. MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, C.C.R.
16 17 18 20 21 22 23 24	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is read it from cover to cover, and it's quite a document. But as Mr. Eisenstark indicated, our charge is a very narrow one. And so but we take all of this into consideration and, again, I want to thank you, Ocean Wind. I want to thank you Ocean City and Rate Counsel, for your participation today. And with that. I will close today's meeting. Thank you so much. And	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action.
16 17 19 20 21 22 23 24	1400 pages long. And so I assume everyone is read it from cover to cover, and it's quite a document. But as Mr. Eisenstark indicated, our charge is a very narrow one. And so but we take all of this into consideration and, again, I want to thank you, Ocean Wind. I want to thank you Ocean City and Rate Counsel, for your participation today. And with that. I will	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action. MARIBEL SYPNIEWSKI, C.C.R.

27:8 26:12 additional (5) 59:8,13 8:22:11:14:38:12.13: agreements (1) applicant (1) artifical (1) Α 15:332:23 62:15 21:17 Additionally (1) application (4) alert (1) ashore (1) ability (7) 26:20 14:3:15:3.10:25:17 16:25 65:7 38:23;52:9,15;60:16; aside (1) address (6) allegations (1) applications (3) 62:14;64:7,19 11:14,21;12:7;24:22; 15:12,14;19:13 42:4 14:14 able (5) alleged (2) 33:12:62:2 applies (2) aspects (1) 37:15;38:14;55:2; addressed (8) 20:9;64:6 19:10;21:13 7:17 59:13;62:2 23:20:31:8:34:13; assertions (2) allow (11) apply (2) absence (1) 44:6;54:10;55:22; 11:13;12:8;14:12; 21:12,15 39:15,18 35:7 15:14;21:21;48:5; appraisal (1) 58:20:63:15 assessment (2) absent (1) addressing (1) 56:23;57:23;58:8; 16:11 31:14.24 15:8 62:17,19 appraised (1) assigning (1) 61:25 absolutely (5) Adequate (1) allowed (2) 16:14 5:16 19:19;28:11;46:15; 5:4 36:16;57:18 appreciate (2) assume (1) 47:25;53:18 40:2;59:22 adequately (2) allowing (1) 66:16 accept (1) 23:21;44:5 38:11 approach (3) assumptions (1) 57:20 alluded (1) 28:19;47:13;58:17 adjacent (1) 51:23 accepted (1) 32:24 15:10 approaching (1) assure (1) 16:15 adjournment (1) alone (1) 45:24 47:21 access (1) appropriate (3) Atlantic (5) 62:6 27:18 47:24 adjudication (1) along (2) 56:7,23;58:23 9:12;18:14,17;21:17; accommodate (1) 27:18:6:63:18 approval (3) 44:24 29:5 adjusted (4) alternate (3) 10:21,22;12:24 attempt (3) accompanied (1) 21:7;52:6,8;53:8 28:21;35:8;53:24 approvals (1) 41:2,22;65:14 5:13 attempting (1) Administrative (6) alternative (10) 12:3 according (3) 25:2,15;26:17,21; 19:20,21,23;25:4; approve (5) 63:19 28:4:32:8,19 27:20:35:6 42:23;43:3,3;48:22; 12:23;13:10;14:4,7, attempts (2) account (1) administrator (1) 54:4:61:19 18 10:13:64:4 65:20 24:19 alternatives (2) approved (6) attention (1) accurate (1) admonition (1) 19:22:54:24 10:18:14:3:44:24: 38:2 65:20 26:8always (2) 45:1.12.22 attorney (1) achieve (1) adopted (3) 8:11:66:11 approximately (2) 41:2 31:25 25:19:34:6,7 amend (1) 7:2:13:14 attorneys (1) acquire (2) April (4) aesthetic (1) 11:11 50:7 14:9;16:13 Amended (1) 5:25:6:2.3.7 30:19 August (1) acquisition (4) affect (1) aquacultured (1) 16:4 6:4 12:25;14:1,13,16 6:15 amendments (5) authority (7) 33:6 acre (1) affected (2) 4:22;19:15;24:23; 12:5.6.6.14:15:8 area (2) 13:13 33:24;64:19 amiss (1) 29:6;33:6 25:11.12:46:25:52:24 acreage (3) areas (2) afterwards (1) 53:21 authorization (2) 6:4:13:11:14:13 15:6;31:12 amount (3) 4:14;6:14 41:6 Acres (11) again (19) 10:3;21:22;22:17 argue (1) available (3) 4:15;13:12,20,21,21, 4:8;18:1,6,9,19; analysis (3) 35:24 4:6;55:8;63:7 23,24;14:8,11,14;33:1 35:7;51:23;61:20 23:25;37:15;38:8;39:3; argued (3) aware (6) across (2) 28:25;30:8;48:6 analytical (1) 4:2;9:2;10:18;11:10; 43:18;44:7,8;45:2,9; 4:15;9:20 48:2;49:23;56:18; 52:2 20:17;51:18 argues (1) Act (4) 63:24;66:20 anchors (1) 27:11 away (1) 5:6;11:12;26:22; against (3) 31:17 Argument (13) 48:20 46:5 29:2:48:20:55:9 and/or (1) 4:13;6:24;7:2,3; acted (1) B agencies (1) 24:21:40:17.18:48:17: 31:11 11:18 34:8 apparent (1) 58:6,18;62:15;63:13; action (4) agency (2) 64:1 35:9 back (3) 47:10;66:1,2,6 9:9;11:20;43:19 27:25;56:25 apparently (1) arguments (14) activities (1) 7:9;38:10;39:14; bad (1) 64:4 ago (6) 30:22 10:19;20:19;55:25; appear (2) 41:8,9,22;47:22;62:6, 46:15 actual (2) 59:10;62:10;64:8 11,20;65:18,25;66:3,13 40:24;41:21 bags (1) 30:12:43:13 agree (3) appeared (2) Army (3) 32:5 actually (5) 49:5,13;65:14 40:13:41:10 29:6;34:6,17 Barnegat (5) 12:16.20:35:21.22; agreed (1) appears (3) around (1) 31:10,11;32:20;33:7, 54:19 29:13 57:20 28:17;31:8;32:14 adamantly (1)

Appellate (1)

Article (1)

55:4

agreement (2)

barrier (1)

29:20 base (2)22:10,12 based (7) 20:7,21;31:14;56:3; 62:20;64:2,5 basically (5) 10:17:12:11:18:14; 42:7;60:4 basis (4) 44:13;52:2;57:17; 62:4 bay (15) 13:5,6,8;17:24;18:4, 9;29:16;31:11;32:19, 20;33:7,7,9;47:10,16 beach (11) 13:2;16:25;17:1,5,6, 9;22:1;25:13;29:20; 30:16;32:15 bear (1) 30:19 becomes (1) 13:8began (1) 10:23 begin (1) 14:25 behalf (1) 24:17belief (1) 44:10 believes (5) 12:7;25:2,6;33:11; 62:7 below (1) 17:6 benefit (3) 20:24;30:13;48:15 benefits (2) 27:2,8 best (7) 19:21,24;53:6,9; 54:20;59:10;65:23 better (5) 43:2;47:5;54:18,18; 66:13 bid (1) 20:17 bit (3) 13:12;20:5;22:4 **BL**(1) 18:15 blue (1) 33:9 **Board** (84) 4:10,22,25;5:2,15; 6:10,16;8:21;9:1,8; 10:17,18,23;11:10,13, 13:12:22:13:10:14:18: 15:13;19:12,15;20:16; 22:8,9,15;25:3,6;26:7, 16;27:6,19,21;28:22;

34:1,14:36:2:38:3,11, 15.18:39:6:41:7.14: 45:11,21;46:3,25;47:1, 2.12.25:48:4.19:49:20. 20,25;51:8,14,16; 52:10,23,25;53:5;54:1, 13,22,25;55:2,6;56:2,8, 22,23;57:6;59:14;62:5, 16;63:9,21,22;65:8,9; 66:5 Board's (4) 20:20;22:18;56:5,6 body (2) 26:2:29:3 **BOEM (10)** 32:19;34:4;45:12; 47:8,19;55:25;56:10; 62:9;63:7;66:14 **BOEM's (3)** 32:8;34:16;55:16 border (1) 13:7 borne (2) 28:9;38:1 borrow (1) 29:6 Both (7) 10:8;13:18;30:10; 40:8;42:8;50:23;61:15 **Boulevard** (1) 17:25 **BPU** (11) 24:24:25:1,11,20; 27:25;34:21;36:4,10; 48:15:50:18:56:19 Brian (1) 54:9 Bridge (2) 29:13;30:11 bridges (7) 27:13,16;30:9;35:2; 42:13,16:61:10 briefly (8) 8:20;12:12;16:19; 40:9;42:3;43:17;46:18; 63:3 bring (1) 30:20 broadly (1) 25:21 build (1) 52:11 building (1) 60:13 built (1) 18:13 bulk (4) 9:14,22;21:14,21 burial (3) 31:13,24;32:1 business (1) 24:18

С cable (13) 10:14,15;11:2;13:1; 15:7;16:20,22;31:10, 23;32:25;33:4;44:17; 52:12 cables (7) 9:19;13:17;31:25; 32:1;48:9,9,10 call (2) 9:25;61:17 called (3) 21:5,11;48:3 calls (1) 61:19 came (3) 47:8:58:17:62:12 camera (1) 7:22 can (18) 8:3.11:14:25:21:6: 26:20:30:1:33:11: 34:13,15;38:17;41:5; 44:20;47:20;51:11; 52:6,8;56:18;62:3 capacity (1) 21:23 Cape (4) 10:7,11;28:3;64:23 capital (1) 22:11 care (1) 67:3 case (14) 15:5;22:11,13;24:2; 26:18,21,23;34:11; 37:15;38:8,21;55:3,6; 60:4 cases (1) 51:8 certain (5) 4:17;5:9;14:1;37:10; 60:12 certainly (2) 56:18;66:8 challenges (3) 33:12,15;62:1 challenging (1) 27:15 chance (1) 19:15 Chang (1) 6:3 change (1) 64:22 channels (1) 31:19 characteristics (2) 31:7;32:17 charge (1) 66:19

charged (2) 38:5.6 charges (1) 27:25 cheapest (1) 54:17 check (2) 8:10;18:25 Chivukula (6) 8:16:55:13:57:7; 58:11;59:15;60:2 Chivukula's (1) 59:18 chose (1) 41:19 chosen (1) 28:7circumstances (2) 52:5,7 cited (3) 26:14;31:20;32:10 citizenry (1) 30:15 City (98) 4:18,18;5:23,25;6:8, 16,21,25;10:24;11:8; 13:3,7;14:21;15:5,9, 11;16:3,6,13;17:11,16; 18:8,14,17,20;21:17; 23:6:24:12,18,22,23, 25:25:2,5,10:26:1; 27:15.20:28:2.3.20.24: 29:2,7,23:30:7,16,18; 33:20.24:34:10.14.25: 35:12;36:24;38:15,25; 40:9,11,21,23,24,24; 41:15:42:5:43:5.11; 45:9:46:12.16.22:47:3: 48:4,11,13,19;49:14; 53:18,19,20:54:1,2; 55:15;59:1,4,9,17; 60:23:61:21:62:3.19: 63:8,17;64:4,13;65:2, 2:66:22 City-Long (1) 29:12 City's (10) 25:13;30:16;32:10; 34:25;39:14;41:13; 43:12,15;62:5,11 claimed (1) 63:12 claims (2) 32:12;35:3 clams (3) 33:3,8.9 clarifying (1) 66:12 clear (9) 15:25:19:17:20:11; 21:7;22:21,25;30:23; 37:5;42:23 clearance (3)

June 24, 2022

27:13,18:30:10 clearances (1) 30:10 clearly (2) 23:2,20 close (3) 16:4;38:2;66:24 closing (2) 24:21;40:15 closure (1) 29:9 coast (1) 9:5 Code (1) 25:15 colleagues (2) 50:9;65:14 comfortable (1) 60:21 comment (2) 19:15:42:1 commentary (1) 48:16 comments (16) 6:10,12;20:6;21:3; 22:25;31:4;35:17;39:4; 43:18;50:10;53:12; 55:12;59:24;60:8;61:4; 62:25 commercial (1) 45:22 **Commission** (3) 27:8;59:17:64:17 **Commissioner** (20) 4:11:50:12,15,21,22, 25;51:9;55:13,21;57:7; 58:11,19:59:15,25; 60:2,10;61:5,8,13; 62:22 **Commissioners** (7) 4:25:7:5:8:15:24:4. 15:35:20:66:9 **Commissioner's (1)** 53:13 committed (1) 6:18 community (2) 33:19,24 company (5) 23:23;57:25;58:3; 60:16,17 Company's (1) 43:23 competitive (1) 51:19 competitively (1) 20:17 complaining (1) 47:18 complaints (1) 41:13 complete (2) 4:6;26:1

completed (2) 18:21:43:8 completely (3) 33:17:61:15:64:6 complied (1) 15:25 concerned (3) 51:14,16:52:25 concerning (3) 26:10,11:27:1 concerns (8) 9:3:20:9:23:19.21: 36:16;42:7;44:6;60:6 conclude (1) 24:5 Concluded (1) 67:4 conclusion (2) 34:18,19 concrete (1) 32:4 condemnation (1) 12:2 conditions (2) 31:15;33:12 conduct (1) 36:4 conducted (2) 17:12;48:2 conduit (1) 17:13 conference (1) 60:15 confirms (1) 26:23 confusion (1) 21:3conjunction (1) 13:18 connectivity (1) 31:19 consent (3) 15:2,9;34:25 consented (1) 15:11 consents (13) 4:16;5:10;7:11,20; 11:3,8;14:20;16:9; 19:10;25:14;28:23; 34:24;48:8 consequences (1) 30:20 consider (7) 25:11;33:23;55:17; 56:8;62:14,16;63:16 consideration (5) 33:18;54:7;65:18; 66:5,20 considered (2) 28:14:41:19 considering (1) 31:18 considers (2)

54:13.25 constituents (2) 26:3:33:21 **Constitution** (2) 26:9,15 constraint (1) 28:14 construct (1) 9:19 construct-ability (1) 42:25 constructed (12) 9:5;11:22;16:23; 17:19,20,21,22;18:10, 16;45:15,19,20 construction (17) 4:19;5:11;7:13;13:1; 14:25;17:18;18:21; 19:7;23:8;27:14;28:8, 10;29:8,11,12;30:12; 43:7 construed (1) 26:12 contemporaneous (1) 45:14 contested (2) 26:18,21 context (4) 8:23;19:12;45:5; 58:24 continue (1) 29:10 contrast (1) 29:14contribution (1) 30:2 conversely (1) 20:23 copy (1) 62:9 corporation (1) 25:25 corporations (1) 26:10 Corps (3) 29:6;34:6,17 corridor (1) 32:25 **cost** (35) 19:25;20:9,12,23,24; 21:1,15,19,25;22:9; 28:8.10.16.19.21:35:7: 37:13,14,18,23,25; 50:16,19,23,25;51:15, 16;52:11,13;53:1,18; 54:12,15,23;55:5 costs (14) 21:24;22:12;25:4; 28:7;29:18;37:19; 44:11,16:45:4:51:24; 53:3,25;54:6;55:7 Counsel (40) 6:2,22;7:1;20:6,9;

23:15,15,18:35:17; 36:12:37:3.20:38:1.14. 17:39:2,5:40:17,18: 41:22:43:21.22.25.25: 46:9;49:1;50:17;51:1; 53:12;57:8;60:1,16,19; 62:7,18,24;63:25; 64:20:65:7:66:22 Counsel's (7) 6:12:23:17:40:9: 43:18;44:6;56:7;60:17 counties (1) 26:11 County (5) 10:6,8,11;28:3;64:23 couple (5) 15:19;16:18;42:4; 49:4,8 coupled (1) 26:14 course (4) 9:16;10:10;47:10; 54:6 court (5) 4:4;54:22;62:12,13; 65:19 courts (1) 26:4 cover (3) 15:21:66:17.17 Cozen (1) 8:18 credible (1) 35:14 Creek (16) 13:6;18:1,5;29:17; 31:9,24;32:7,11,16,24; 33:2,5,13;35:11;47:11, 14 criteria (1) 61:17 criterion (1) 28:14 Crook (2) 17:25;29:16 Crooks (1) 13:6 cross (6) 13:5;18:3;27:12; 30:9;32:1;42:14 crosses (1) 17:25 crossing (4) 13:5;17:24;18:1; 31:10 curious (1) 57:14 customers (2) 9:15;22:17 D date (3)

5:7:45:23:66:7 day (2) 15:16,24 days (2) 55:25;62:10 deadline (1) 6:11 deal (1) 13:22 dealt (1) 31:12 decide (1) 25:24 decision (8) 25:5,8;31:20;34:15; 39:10;50:2;62:14,17 decision-making (1) 55:19 deemed (1) 35:11 deep (2) 17:5,7 defaced (1) 30:21 defer (1) 34:14 deficient (1) 35:9 delay (2) 62:14:63:17 delaying (1) 62:16 deliberation (1) 65:15 demolished (1) 61:15 **DEP** (9) 14:7,24;15:1,1,4,10, 12.14.16 depending (1) 20:6 depths (2) 31:13;32:1 describes (1) 16:20 designated (1) 32:14 desirability (1) 7:15 desirable (1) 42:20 detail (6) 8:22,24;13:22;15:20; 21:10;23:10 details (2) 58:21;59:1 deter (1) 23:22 determination (3) 4:23:5:9:8:5 determine (2) 34:8:55:8 determined (6)

June 24, 2022

10:4;20:19;22:18; 31:14:50:19:66:7 develop (1) 31:23 **Development** (1) $11:1\bar{2}$ different (13) 17:18:19:22:22:5: 38:19,22;42:18;43:9; 51:6:52:18,21:56:10; 58:2,7 difficult (2) 30:25;39:1 direct (6) 15:22;23:4,14;24:5; 42:8;43:23 directed (2) 21:14;50:21 directional (2) 17:3;18:5 directly (1) 47:22 disagrees (1) 55:4 discarding (1) 61:18 disclose (2) 25:3:28:6 discloses (1) 28:21 dis-concerning (1) 38:9 discovered (1) 63:13 discovery (15) 36:17,18,23;37:2; 43:23:57:17,19,23; 60:13,15,24;62:18; 64:17,24,25 discuss (1) 14:23 discussed (1) 12:12 discussing (1) 16:2 discussion (1) 50:16 discussions (6) 10:23,25;11:4;58:16, 22,25 dispense (1) 28:25 disposition (1) 26:19 disputed (1) 27:11 disqualified (1) 29:25 disregard (1) 26:2 disregards (1) 33:18 distance (2)

29:17:32:15 distinguish (1) 51:3 **District** (1) 27:7 disturbance (4) 29:19,21,23;30:15 disturbed (1) 30:17 diversion (5) 6:6;14:5,6,7;25:17 divert (1) 14:4 diverted (1) 14:14 **Division** (2) 6:22;27:9 Docket (3) 4:21;5:7;66:4 document (3) 56:17,24;66:18 documentary (1) 56:21 documents (1) 63:6 domain (1) 27:24 done (7) 16:11;23:6;46:1,1; 59:10:61:25:63:14 doubt (1) 26:20 down (2) 4:5:6:6 dozens (1) 56:12 Draft (9) 32:8,19;47:7,19; 55:23;56:11,16;62:9, 21 dragged (1) 64:23 dredging (1) 31:13 drilling (3) 17:3,4;18:5 duct (1) 17:13 due (1) 30:24 during (4) 29:8,10,12;37:11 duties (1) 27:1 duty (1) 65:11 Е earlier (8) 12:12;15:11;16:2,19;

early (1) 45:24 earn (1) 52:17 easement (12) 4:15;14:9,10;15:6; 18:2;19:4;25:12;36:3, 6.8.10:39:7 easements (25) 4:15:5:10:7:11.19; 12:25;13:2,4,9,11,13, 15,20;14:16;16:8,11, 13;19:4;23:10;28:22; 34:11,23;48:7;53:21; 54:3,5 easier (1) 35:23 eastern (1) 33:9 Economic (3) 11:12;30:24;61:22 economically (2) 28:18;61:22 edge (1) 32:15 Education (1) 27:6 effects (1) 30:19 efforts (1) 29:1 Egg (26) 27:12,17;29:3,4,22, 24,25;30:8,14,24;31:5, 21;32:12;33:15,17; 35:4,13;42:7,11,20,23; 47:4,15,15;53:23; 61:18 **EIS** (6) 34:5,6,7,16;47:19; 63:5 **EISENSTARK (21)** 8:9,14,17;38:10; 40:6;47:18;49:6,7; 51:9,10;54:19;55:4,18, 21;57:20,20;58:13,19; 63:1;66:18;67:1 elected (4) 25:23;33:20,23; 48:13 electric (9) 9:14;10:2;11:24; 13:1;16:22;18:17; 21:18,22;52:22 electricity (1) 9:16 Electric's (1) 18:15 eliminate (1) 31:21 eliminated (3) 29:21:30:24:31:5 else (8)

22:20;41:3,11;45:25; 47:6:55:7.12:62:4 elsewhere (1) 62:2 eminent (1) 27:24 emphasize (3) 16:22;20:4;39:3 enacted (2) 11:21:48:3 encumbered (1) 13:20 end (6) 7:6;15:16;18:7;24:9; 63:20,25 Energy (1) 6:6 enforceable (1) 34:21 engage (1) 58:15 Engineers (3) 29:6;34:7,17 England (1) 18:15 enough (3) 26:16;57:11,14 ensure (1) 7:22 enter (1) 21:16 entire (1) 17:11entirely (6) 20:25;40:14;41:4,24; 42:2;48:18 entity (1) 14:6 enunciated (1) 27:5 **Environment** (1) 32:8 environmental (24) 4:17;7:17;11:3; 19:10;23:9;25:7,14; 32:17,20;34:2,9,12; 42:25;45:11;46:4;47:7; 55:16,24;56:11,13,16; 62:1,9,21 equally (1) 29:16 equate (1) 29:9 equitable (1) 65:23 essentially (7) 10:4;12:15;14:19; 17:13;18:4;21:13,20 estuarine (1) 32:22 estuary (1) 32:21 et (2)

26:19:30:5 evaluated (1) 19:22 evaluation (4) 10:3;28:15;33:16; 64:21 even (8) 16:15:19:20:33:21, 23;54:7;60:15;64:2,3 event (1) 31:25 eventually (1) 22:10 everybody (2) 35:21;67:2 everyone (9) 4:2;8:11;9:2,10; 51:18;65:21,24;66:16, 25 evidence (14) 34:22;36:5;39:10; 40:20;41:23;42:10; 44:9;56:20,21;62:12, 15;63:5,23;64:6 evidently (2) 33:11;62:1 exactly (3) 8:25;23:5;64:1 examined (1) 9:24 excavated (1) 30:18 except (1) 7:19 excuse (1) 61:18 excuses (1) 28:5 exhibits (3) 12:19:23:5:41:19 existing (6) 9:14,22;10:2;17:14; 32:2;44:21 exists (1) 61:15 expansion (1) 46:22 expedience (1) 61:23 expedient (2) 28:18:61:22 experienced (1) 51:4 expert (2) 41:1;44:2 explain (2) 8:24;47:11 explained (2) 11:1;23:21 explaining (5) 23:5,6,7,8,10 explains (3) 11:1;21:9;31:4

June 24, 2022

explore (1) 50:18 export (2) 32:24:33:4 express (1) 41:25 extensive (4) 10:25:12:18:31:1; 42:10 extensively (1) 28:8 extent (1) 60:5 external (1) 31:16 extreme (1) 53:22 extremely (3) 39:1;60:14,18

\mathbf{F}

faced (1) 11:15 facilities (3) 21:12;22:15;43:10 facility (1) 17:21 fact (6) 4:3:27:11,18:36:18; 42:13:47:18 factor (5) 29:25;33:22;54:12, 16:55:9 factors (3) 27:5;31:18;54:24 facts (3) 41:23;47:21;48:5 factual (5) 35:1:39:14.15:41:10: 42:4 failed (1) 64:8 failure (1) 33:22 fair (6) 6:18;8:5;10:3;14:10; 65:13,15 fairly (1) 12:20 fairness (1) 65:2 fall (1) 13:2 famed (1) 43:12 familiar (1) 26:7 far (4) 11:1;16:8;37:13; 52:18 fatal (1) 35:12

54:20

17:24;49:16;51:18;

fatally (1) 35:8 favor (2) 26:12:55:9 February (3) 5:8,17;9:9 federal (4) 45:17;46:4;56:12,25 feel (2) 39:17:60:21 feels (1) 64:17 feet (4) 13:14;17:6;30:11; 38:4 fellow (1) 66:8 felt (1) 44:3 few (5) 18:25:24:1:44:22; 55:25;62:10 file (9) 9:8;22:10;23:13; 41:12,17;44:1;56:21; 59:7;63:11 filed (21) 4:13;5:8,25;6:2,4,7, 12;12:13;15:23;16:17; 21:4:23:3,3:24:25: 36:15:38:10:41:14; 46:23;56:4;58:5;63:7 filing (20) 8:19,23;9:3;11:9; 12:16:14:22:16:23; 20:3,11,22;22:16;23:7, 11,22;44:15,16;46:6; 52:19;56:14;57:24 filings (1) 47:23 final (4) 25:7:34:4:45:11; 64:16 finalized (2) 34:4;46:5 Finally (1) 45:7 **Find (6)** 28:1,22;34:22;36:11; 54:1;55:9 finding (3) 34:23;36:5;49:21 fine (1) 41:9 FIORDALISO (43) 4:1,9;8:10,12,15; 12:12;19:2;24:4,7,14, 16;35:16,20;39:20,22, 23;40:1,7;46:7,8,14,20; 48:25:50:3,6,14,20,24; 53:11,16;55:11;57:2; 59:16.20.23:61:3.6.7;

67:3 fire (2) 38:4.4 firm (1) 8:17 first (16) 6:13;9:4;12:24; 14:15:26:24:38:20; 40:4,8;45:22;46:1,11, 12;51:11;60:4;62:7; 65:3 Fisheries (1) 34:5 fishing (1) 31:17 fit (1) 11:11 five (3) 24:22;32:5,6 flushed (1) 60:24 focus (2) 57:1.6 focused (2) 35:25;48:18 follow (2) 63:9;65:11 followed (1) 6:25 following (1) 5:7 follows (1) 65:9 follow-up (2) 51:2:58:1 formal (8) 16:5,12;40:12;41:6; 59:3;66:1,2,6 formally (1) 16:15 formed (1) 26:10 formulate (1) 60:19 forth (3) 5:6;43:19;60:7 forward (2) 15:15;60:11 forward-thinking (1) 11:20 found (1) 34:20 Four (2) 32:23.25 fragile (1) 25:13 frankly (7) 20:5;36:25;39:15; 43:9;56:13;58:7;60:22 fraud (1) 32:4 Freehold (1) 27:6

front (5) 49:20:50:1:55:6: 60:20,25 full (1) 50:1 fully (3) 36:14;41:15;43:21 fund (4) 13:25;14:11,12;30:2 funding (1) 13:25 Further (1) 27:10 future (4) 45:1;51:24;60:7; 64:23 G garnered (1) 51:8 gas (3) 11:24;17:15;52:22 gathered (1) 11:10 gear (1) 31:17 generally (1) 14:2generated (1) 9:12 generation (2) 9:11:21:23 George (1) 24:19 Gillian (1) 24:18 given (3) 37:23:64:9:65:24 giving (1) 27:23 glad (2) 35:21,25 goal (1) 36:10 goes (3) 37:13;41:13;51:20 good (6) 4:8;24:7,14,16; 35:21;50:2 Gordon (1) 8:16 governing (2) 26:2;29:2 government (2) 25:16;26:11 government's (1) 46:4 grant (1) 24:24 granted (2) 10:21,22 grants (1)

4:22 great (27) 13:22;27:12,17;29:3, 4,22,24,25;30:8,14,23; 31:5,21;32:12;33:15, 17;35:4,13;42:7,11,19, 23;47:4,15,15;53:23; 61:18 **Green (10)** 4:15;6:5;13:20,20, 21,23,24;14:8,11,14 Greg (3) 51:10;55:18;58:13 Gregory (1) 8:17 grid (3) 10:2;18:18;44:21 grow-out (1) 33:3 guess (1) 60:1 guesswork (2) 51:25;52:1 Η habitat (3) 29:24;30:3;32:14 habitate (1) 30:3 half (1) 13:13 hand (3) 5:1;7:10;64:21 happened (1) 65:21 happens (2) 20:21;52:16 happy (2) 24:3:62:8 Harbor (26) 27:12.17:29:3.4.22. 24;30:1,8,14,24;31:5, 21;32:13;33:15,17; 35:4,13;42:8,11,20,23; 47:4,15,16;53:23; 61:19 Hard (3) 10:20;33:3,8 Hastily (2) 25:18:48:3 hazards (1) 31:16 Health (1) 27:7 hear (5) 8:11;18:22;43:8; 48:9:66:13 heard (1) 41:4 hearing (7) 6:9:26:19,24,25; 27:3;46:24;62:13

heavy (1) 29:16 held (1) 6:9 Hello (1) 35:20 help (1) 30:2 helpful (1) 60:18 Hey (1) 52:10 high (1) 30:10 highlight (2) 16:18;47:12 historic (7) 27:13,17;30:9;42:14, 17;61:10,11 hold (2) 38:3.7 Holden (4) 8:16;61:5,8;62:22 hope (2) 60:25;61:1 hoped (1) 7:25 hopefully (1) 15:15 horizontal (2) 17:2;18:5 Horn (3) 13:6:18:1:29:16 host (1) 42:24 hypothetical (1) 53:23 Ι idea (1) 17:7 identified (1) 53:25 identifies (1) 21:19 impact (19) 6:5;21:1;22:17;25:7; 32:8,20;34:2,9;35:2; 45:12;46:5;47:7;55:16, 24;56:11,16;62:10,21; 64:18 impacted (1) 33:19 impacting (1) 29:5 impacts (2) 34:13;43:5 impediments (1) 35:3 implement (1) 31:2 importance (1)

62:23;63:2;64:12;65:5;

25:17 32:21 17:21:16:44:20 issues (17) 35:19:39:21,24; important (9) interconnecting (1) 8:23:12:21:23:16: language (1) 43:20.20:44:8:46:11: 20:4;33:18:36:1; 37:22 31:20;36:25;41:1;44:3; 26:1549:3:50:4.5:54:9: large (2) 44:3;49:15,25;54:15; interconnection (13) 49:14,15,16;50:18; 57:10.16:60:10:67:2 9:25:10:5,9,16; 56:10;60:22;63:12,16, 27:4;44:25 list (1) 65:21,22 impossible (2) 21:16,18,21;28:15; 20:64:8 last (7) 14:23 37:19,23;44:11,16; 31:2;47:14 issuing (1) 16:5;22:22;40:16; listed (3) impracticable (1) 45:3 15:17 41:21;45:7;61:16;63:3 33:21:42:16:61:10 interested (2) late (1) 35:12 literally (2) J impression (1) 22:8:50:18 55:17 16:3:56:12 60:4 Interestingly (1) later (1) little (3) inaction (1) 10:19;13:12;22:4 36:24 Jason (1) 66:7 64:11 interests (2) 5:14 law (9) LLC (4) inappropriate (5) 6:16:19:6 Jay (1) 8:17;25:2;26:9,18, 4:14;5:8;7:12;8:19 40:15;41:5,25;42:2; interference (1) 24:18 23;27:20;35:6;46:3; load (1) 54:12 64:7 43:1 **JCP&L** (1) 9:15 interject (2) local (2) incerpt (1) 21:18 laws (4) 25:22;56:13;65:10, 41:22;63:19 25:16;26:11 Jersey (8) 48:13 include (1) 12 interjecting (1) 4:10;5:2;9:6;25:15; located (2) 22:11 63:19 26:8,15;44:21;46:3 learner (1) 9:16,17 including (3) interjection (1) Joe (1) 66:14 locating (1) 9:18;32:3;64:20 4:9 lease (2) 21:22 11:2 incomplete (1) interrupted (1) judicial (1) 33:1.6 location (3) 35:14 30:23 26:5 leases (1) 7:16;18:14;48:24 lodge (1) inconsistencies (1) into (24) juncture (1) 32:25 8:23;13:22;14:11; least (1) 40:12 35:10 35:6 inconsistency (1) 15:13;20:4;21:16,23; 22:15 long (2) June (4) 47:12 29:18;40:14;43:19; 6:11,11;10:19;31:3 leave (2) 45:8;66:16 increase (1) 45:21,21;51:20;57:1, jurisdiction (1) 22:24:43:16 longer (1) 37:19 12,14:58:21:59:1; 11:14 leeway (1) 32:16 indicated (2) 60:14:61:19.23:65:17: 48:4 look (3) 7:1:66:18 66:5.20 K legal (2) 54:22;55:2;56:18 inflation (1) inventory (1) 27:2:41:9 looking (2) 51:24 25:18 Kalwa (1) legislation (1) 54:13.25 looks (1) information (12) invertebrate (1) 11:20 5:14 5:19,22;8:4;37:10; 33:8 Kaplan's (1) legislature (4) 56:10 38:12,13,16;49:18; investment (1) 11:11,18;48:14; lot (11) 21:9 51:7;57:11,13;60:20 65:10 12:17;35:23;45:13; 52:17 kept (2) invite (4) less (2)49:7;51:19,20,22,23, infrastructure (3) 39:21.24 8:7:24:11:35:17: 52:17:53:25 22:7;32:2,2 25:52:1:60:22 kind (2)initial (4) 40:2 61:17,17 letter (4) low (3) involve (1) 5:17:7:3;10:21,22 kinds (1) 16:5,7,12;46:23 27:13,18:30:10 initiate (1) 52:7 58:9 liberally (1) lower (1) involved (2) 26:12 29:18 25:16 known (3) Inlet (7) 12:22;37:24 life (1) 13:6:17:2:37:1 lowest (1) 29:4,9,10,24;31:7, 19:25 involves (2) 52:4 knows (2) 27:3;56:12 9:10;22:9 light (1) 11;43:2 Μ install (1) island (3) 35:9 30:21,22;32:15 L 31:10 liked (3) installation (1) islands (1) 37:1,3;49:17 Madeline (1) 13:16 29:20 Lacey (2) likely (3) 5:14 installed (1) 26:7;29:18;45:1 maintain (1) issuance (2) 10:6;21:19 17:2 15:4:25:7 limited (6) 31:18 lack (3) instance (2) 30:15;38:22;64:17 7:10;21:6;44:19; makes (5) issue (26) 21:17;52:24 7:14,15;12:24;16:23; 52:5;56:20;62:17 10:14;20:6;35:23; land (7) 18:7;27:11,18;28:17; line (20) 39:1;48:6 instances (1) 9:16,20,21;10:15; 30:6;35:1;36:2,15; 13:5;17:4,5,7,11,12, making (5) 21:6 18:4;51:5;54:12 insurmountable (1) 37:7,16;38:3;39:2,3,6; 15,15;18:7,8:36:4,6,7, landfall (7) 25:4,8;27:13;47:6; 33:16 45:3,4,5,6,9;51:1;60:2; 9:20:10:14:22:2.3: 8,9;37:8,18,21;43:6; 64:4 interaction (1) 64:21 33:13:44:18:52:12 51:7 manner (1) 31:16 issued (6) landfill (1) lines (3) 42:1 many (5) 17:16:18:21:21:25 interconnect (7) 5:15,22;34:4;55:24; 33:5

9:13,21;10:2;18:12,

56:24;62:10

lands (1)

31:6,20;42:19,19;

LIPMAN (15)

56:10 mapped (1) 32:23 March (4) 5:20,20,22;6:1 Marine (2) 34:5;43:1 materials (1) 66:4 matter (15) 7:10;10:12;24:21,25; 25:1,5;27:10,19;34:15, 21;36:18;37:12,14; 46:24:66:3 Matthew (1) 21:9 mattress (2) 32:4,5 Maximilian (1) 6:3 May (16) 6:6,9;7:6;10:7,11; 20:4;24:4;25:25;28:3; 30:20;45:4;51:2;55:22; 56:24;58:22;64:23 Mayor (1) 24:18 McCROSSON (15) 24:13,17;40:13;41:8; 46:18,21;53:14,17; 59:19,22;61:9,13;63:4, 12:64:15 mean (8) 19:19,19,20;45:8; 51:12;54:16;56:2,9 means (2) 19:21:52:15 mechanism (3) 21:5,11,25 meeting (6) 4:3;5:2,4;37:16; 44:10:66:24 Meetings (1) 5:6 meets (3) 10:15;13:7;23:11 megawatt (1) 9:6 members (1) 11:9 mentioned (4) 16:1;17:24;19:2; 61:9 microphone (1) 7:24 might (1) 34:8 miles (3) 9:12;32:13,16 minimal (1) 43:6 minutes (2)

mitigated (2) 28:16;30:1	n
mitigation (1)	na
30:4 mobility (1)	na
31:15 modified (2)	N
20:20;27:24 moment (1)	na
48:7 moments (1)	ne
19:1 monetary (2)	ne
30:1,6 months (1)	ne
64:8 more (13)	
8:24;9:12;13:12; 30:25;31:1;42:1,12;	
49:18,19;52:25;60:1, 13;66:12	
morning (4) 4:8;24:14,16,20	
most (10) 15:20;17:12,17;	ne
28:18;33:5,18,19; 40:19;41:7;49:25	ne
motion (1) 41:7	ne
mouth (1) 23:17	ne
moved (1) 58:5	ne
much (14) 17:13,20;22:8;24:8;	
29:15,15;37:3;41:3; 42:12;43:19;46:7;	ne
52:14;54:23;66:24	ne
municipal (10) 11:7;12:3;14:19;	N
19:14;25:23,25;26:10; 51:5;52:24;54:12	
municipalities (1) 17:17	
municipality (1)	NT
65:3 municipality's (1)	N
15:13 mussels (1)	N
33:9 must (1)	N
15:2 myriad (1)	N
31:6 myself (1)	N
5:16	
Ν	N
name (2) 4:9;8:16	N
naming (1) 5:23	n
	i i

arrow (2) 57:3:66:19 arrower (1) 29:15 ational (4) 32:21,22;34:5;61:11 avigation (1) 29:10 avigational (1) 31:19 earby (1) 18:16 ecessarily (1) 54:17 ecessary (35) 4:19;5:11,23;7:12; 11:6,7;12:7;13:16; 19:6,16,19;21:20;28:4, 13,24;29:23;34:12; 35:1;36:3,7,7,11;37:9; 39:7;49:22;50:2;53:20, 22;54:3,6,14;55:1,10; 61:24:62:3 ecessitated (1) 11:8 ecessity (1) 19:18 eed (6) 8:4;23:5,9;24:2; 36:9:37:10 eeded (3) 4:16:11:1:16:8 eeds (6) 9:19;11:22;16:2,12; 36:5:49:21 egative (1) 7:18 either (3) 27:16;30:11;61:14 (ew (18) 4:10:5:2:9:6:14:14: 18:12;22:3;25:14;26:8, 15;38:16;44:21;46:2; 62:12;63:4,19,23;64:6; 65:3 **J**(1) 27:8**JAC (2)** 26:22;30:4 **JDEP** (2) 14:3,21 JDEP's (1) 30:2 **JSA (12)** 4:22;5:6;6:14;12:14; 25:19;26:3,14,18; 27:22;34:18,19;52:21 **MFS (1)** 34:16 one (1) 16:24 or (3) 27:17;38:15,17

normally (3) 25:35:3,12,13:36:3,19, 56:20;57:25;58:10 note (2) 7:25:44:7 noted (1) 7:5 notes (1) 18:25 notice (1) 5:4 novelty (1) 26:13 Number (9) 4:21;9:24;23:15,19; 32:5;36:25;44:3,19,25 0 off (3) object (1) 64:3 objection (3) 40:12;43:12,15 objections (2) 48:22;49:11 objects (1) 48:19 obligation (1) 65:11 obligations (2) 27:2;28:6 obstacle (1) 30:12 obstacles (1) 31:9 obtain (3) 4:14;25:12;37:11 obviously (4) 14:8;15:21;38:1; 59:5 occupy (1) 12:1occur (1) 33:1 **Ocean** (207) 4:14,18,20;5:8,12,20, 23,25;6:1,3,6,8,11,16, 21,21,24,25;7:11,16, 18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3,8, 13,17,18,19,24;10:5,6, 13,15,18,23,24;11:8; 12:7,19:13:3,7,19: 14:18,21;15:5,9,11,25; 16:3,6,10,12;17:11,16; 18:8,20;20:17,25;22:1, 13;23:1,6;24:12,18,21, 23,24,25;25:2,3,5,11, 19,24;26:1,16;27:11, 15,20,22;28:3,5,5,9,12, 17,20,20,23,24,25; 29:2,7,12,19,22;30:7,8, 16,18;31:4,8,23;32:2,7, 10,12;33:11,17,20,22, 24;34:1,10,14,24,25,

19.24:37:24:38:1.3.7. 15,24,24,25;39:14,15; 40:4,9,11,21,23,23; 41:13,15;42:5,6,8;43:5, 11,11,14;44:4,23,23; 45:9;46:6,12,16,22; 47:3,9,13,22,23;48:6, 11,12,13,15,19;49:9, 14:52:9:53:3,17,19,20, 25;54:1,2;55:15;58:14, 25;59:1,2,3,7,9,16; 60:23;61:20,21;62:2,5, 11,19;63:8,14,17,20; 64:4,13;65:2;66:21,22 O'Connor (1) 8:18 7:24;9:5;38:10 offer (2) 16:12,14 offered (1) 51:5 offering (1) 16:13 Office (4) 25:1;26:17;27:20; 35:5 officer (1) 5:17 officials (4) 25:24:33:20.24: 48:13 Offshore (23) 4:20;7:15;9:4,5,6,17; 11:12,17,23;12:4,9; 19:8;20:14;32:23,24; 33:4;37:5;39:5;43:15; 44:20;45:14;48:16; 51:17 often (2) 22:6;40:19 Once (3) 18:20;43:7;58:5 one (35) 8:2;9:18;10:6,9,11, 11;11:15;13:2;14:8; 19:24,25,25;20:1;21:5, 19;22:22;33:1;34:7; 43:3;44:13;45:7,9; 48:8,9,10,10;49:4,9; 52:7;54:24;58:7;60:1, 12;61:9;66:19 one-way (2) 21:2;53:8 ongoing (1) 63:5 only (11) 17:22;19:20;21:13; 23:12:37:7:44:23: 47:17;50:17;51:14; 54:16:66:15 onshore (7)

7:2;24:2

		1		June 24, 2022
10:13;11:16,22;	over (6)	particularly (2)	59:7;66:6	potential (1)
12:10;43:14;44:17;	10:19;13:19;25:13;	48:21;66:14	petitioner (5)	6:15
52:12	48:15;52:4;61:4	parties (12)	5:19;6:24;8:18;	power (6)
Open (3)	overall (1)	6:21,22;7:1,3,8;8:2;	23:14;48:23	9:14,22;21:21;25:24;
5:5;25:18;62:6	43:15	27:4;40:2;59:12;64:20;	Petitioner's (1)	27:24;48:12
opening (2)	overcome (2)	65:8;66:10	56:4	precedent (1)
19:3;57:3	31:9;48:23	parts (1)	petitions (2)	54:23
operation (4)	overhead (1)	17:5	19:13;60:7	preempt (2)
4:20;7:13;19:7;	16:24	party (3)	Phonetic (3)	14:19;25:21
45:23	override (4)	5:23;7:21;23:13	30:3;32:4;48:14	prefer (2)
opine (1)	12:3;14:19;19:14;	pass (1)	piece (1)	59:8,11
64:20	52:23	17:8	11:20	preferable (1)
opinion (3)	overruns (1)	passed (2)	pieces (1)	42:24
33:23;53:17;62:16	20:23	10:21;65:10	23:4	preferred (9)
opinions (1)	oversight (1)	passes (2)	Pilar (2)	28:7,12,16;29:14,17;
33:19	28:1	17:1,4	5:13;42:9	32:11;33:25;43:5;59:9
opportunity (19)	overstay (1)	path (1)	pipeline (1)	pre-file (1)
6:23;7:4;8:22;24:20;	22:24	28:7	51:6	14:23
36:14;38:12,18;39:16;	overwhelming (1)	Patterson (2)	PJM (8)	prepared (4)
43:21;44:1,4;58:4;	30:13	5:13;42:9	21:13,19;37:16,19;	41:3,11;47:6,8
59:21;63:10;64:9,13,	OWEDA (5)	pause (2)	44:10,16;45:3,5	present (7)
25;65:1,25	11:12,19;15:9;53:4;	16:21;18:24	place (4)	6:23;7:5;8:22;33:13;
oppose (1)	57:5	pay (4)	15:14;17:16,22;	48:5;62:9;65:25
63:22	own (3)	14:9,11;21:1;22:17	58:23	presentation (2)
opposed (3)	41:20;44:1;64:10	paying (1)	placement (3)	24:6;35:14
37:5,6;39:5	owner (3)	38:2	32:3,4,5	presentations (3)
opposing (1)	14:10;15:2,6	Peck's (2)	places (3)	7:7;24:9;50:8
23:18	Oyster (15)	13:6;29:16	42:17;44:20;61:11	presented (2)
options (3)	31:9,24;32:7,11,16,	pending (1)	planned (1)	40:21;62:8
32:3;33:5;34:1	18,24;33:2,5,10,13;	60:12	45:23	preserved (1)
Oral (9)	35:11;47:10,11,14	people (2)	play (1)	14:2
	55.11,17.10,11,11	people (=)		11.2
4.13.40.17 18.58.6	ovsters (1)	4.6.30.22		PRESIDENT (48)
4:13;40:17,18;58:6, 17:63:13 25:65:18 25	oysters (1)	4:6;30:22 perhaps (5)	63:18	PRESIDENT (48) 4:1 10:8:10 12 15:
17;63:13,25;65:18,25	oysters (1) 33:3	perhaps (5)	63:18 please (2)	4:1,10;8:10,12,15;
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12)	33:3	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15;	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13,
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7;		perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1)	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22,
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9;	33:3 P	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1)	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14,
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11	33:3 P Pages (2)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16)	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3,
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10)	33:3 P Pages (2) 32:9;66:16	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1)	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10;	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16;
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6;	33:3 P Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22;	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16,
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8;	33:3 P Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6)	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7;	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23;
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8	33:3 P Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16,
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8;	33:3 P Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9;	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7;	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5;
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2)	33:3 Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5)	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24	33:3 Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7)	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22;	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2)
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1)	33:3 Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17;	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25	33:3 Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12)	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3)
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3)	33:3 Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2)	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25	33:3 Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12)	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7)
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3)	P Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1)	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24	33:3 P Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22,	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7)
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24;	33:3 P Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1)	63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6;
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1) 7:25	 63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1)	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1) 7:25 personally (1)	 63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5)
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1) 63:9	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1) 54:10	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1) 7:25 personally (1) 66:12	<pre>63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 39:2,8,13;49:24;50:17;</pre>	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5) 23:7;25:4,8;46:24;
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1) 63:9 outlining (1)	P Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1) 54:10 participate (2)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1) 7:25 personally (1) 66:12 perspective (3)	<pre>63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 39:2,8,13;49:24;50:17; 60:19</pre>	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5) 23:7;25:4,8;46:24; 62:13
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1) 63:9 outlining (1) 16:7	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1) 54:10 participate (2) 41:16;43:22	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1) 7:25 personally (1) 66:12 perspective (3) 23:1,11;55:25	 63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 39:2,8,13;49:24;50:17; 60:19 positive (1) 	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5) 23:7;25:4,8;46:24; 62:13 pristine (1)
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1) 63:9 outlining (1) 16:7 outreach (1)	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1) 54:10 participate (2) 41:16;43:22 participated (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1) 7:25 personally (1) 66:12 perspective (3) 23:1,11;55:25 petition (24)	 63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 39:2,8,13;49:24;50:17; 60:19 positive (1) 7:17 	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5) 23:7;25:4,8;46:24; 62:13 pristine (1) 30:16
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1) 63:9 outlining (1) 16:7 outreach (1) 23:6	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1) 54:10 participate (2) 41:16;43:22 participated (1) 40:22	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1) 7:25 personally (1) 66:12 perspective (3) 23:1,11;55:25 petition (24) 4:13,23;5:9,12,16;	 63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 39:2,8,13;49:24;50:17; 60:19 positive (1) 7:17 possible (4) 	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5) 23:7;25:4,8;46:24; 62:13 pristine (1) 30:16 private (1)
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1) 63:9 outlining (1) 16:7 outreach (1) 23:6 outset (1)	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1) 54:10 participate (2) 41:16;43:22 participated (1) 40:22 participation (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 personal (1) 7:25 personally (1) 66:12 perspective (3) 23:1,11;55:25 petition (24) 4:13,23;5:9,12,16; 6:4,13,15;7:20;9:9;	 63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 39:2,8,13;49:24;50:17; 60:19 positive (1) 7:17 possible (4) 31:22;35:10;47:14; 	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5) 23:7;25:4,8;46:24; 62:13 pristine (1) 30:16 private (1) 25:25
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1) 63:9 outlining (1) 16:7 outreach (1) 23:6 outset (1) 57:2	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1) 54:10 participate (2) 41:16;43:22 participated (1) 40:22 participation (1) 66:23	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1) 7:25 personally (1) 66:12 perspective (3) 23:1,11;55:25 petition (24) 4:13,23;5:9,12,16; 6:4,13,15;7:20;9:9; 12:13;15:22;16:16;	 63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 39:2,8,13;49:24;50:17; 60:19 positive (1) 7:17 possible (4) 31:22;35:10;47:14; 65:23 	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5) 23:7;25:4,8;46:24; 62:13 pristine (1) 30:16 private (1) 25:25 privileges (1)
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1) 63:9 outlining (1) 16:7 outreach (1) 23:6 outset (1) 57:2 outside (1)	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1) 54:10 participate (2) 41:16;43:22 participated (1) 40:22 participation (1) 66:23 particular (1)	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personall (1) 7:25 personally (1) 66:12 perspective (3) 23:1,11;55:25 petition (24) 4:13,23;5:9,12,16; 6:4,13,15;7:20;9:9; 12:13;15:22;16:16; 23:3,7;24:24;25:9,12;	 63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 39:2,8,13;49:24;50:17; 60:19 positive (1) 7:17 possible (4) 31:22;35:10;47:14; 65:23 posted (1) 	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5) 23:7;25:4,8;46:24; 62:13 pristine (1) 30:16 private (1) 25:25 privileges (1) 27:2
17;63:13,25;65:18,25 Order (12) 5:15,19,22;8:5;14:7; 20:20;22:19;36:4;37:9; 45:19;46:5;47:11 OREC (10) 20:18,18;21:2,6; 50:19;51:13,21;52:4,8; 54:8 Orlando (2) 35:23,24 others (1) 51:11 others' (1) 22:25 otherwise (3) 14:20;46:3;47:24 out (9) 9:12,17;22:1;47:8, 20;49:8;57:19;60:24; 63:22 outline (1) 63:9 outlining (1) 16:7 outreach (1) 23:6 outset (1) 57:2	Pages (2) 32:9;66:16 paper (1) 12:17 paragraph (1) 26:13 parcel (1) 18:16 parcels (1) 13:19 Park (1) 32:16 parkland (1) 14:2 part (5) 32:21;42:22;45:16; 55:19;59:4 partially (1) 54:10 participate (2) 41:16;43:22 participated (1) 40:22 participation (1) 66:23	perhaps (5) 30:25;51:1,10;60:15; 62:17 peril (1) 41:20 period (1) 29:11 permit (6) 15:10,12,14;16:9; 19:10;25:14 permits (7) 4:17;14:21,24;15:17; 23:9;25:16;45:15 permitted (2) 45:20;57:19 permitting (4) 11:3;15:1,5;45:16 person (1) 8:1 personal (1) 7:25 personally (1) 66:12 perspective (3) 23:1,11;55:25 petition (24) 4:13,23;5:9,12,16; 6:4,13,15;7:20;9:9; 12:13;15:22;16:16;	 63:18 please (2) 7:22,23 POI (1) 10:1 point (16) 10:9,15;13:4;16:10; 18:3,18;20:1;22:21,22; 24:1,5,10;28:15;45:7; 49:8;64:16 points (5) 9:25;10:5;24:22; 46:21,23 Port (1) 29:13 portion (12) 9:21;11:16,22;12:10; 17:10;18:7;20:12,22, 24;22:2;37:17;52:12 portions (1) 18:19 position (9) 27:16;36:13;37:4; 39:2,8,13;49:24;50:17; 60:19 positive (1) 7:17 possible (4) 31:22;35:10;47:14; 65:23 	4:1,10;8:10,12,15; 12:11;19:2;24:3,7,13, 16;35:16,19;39:20,22, 23;40:1,6;46:7,8,13,14, 19,20;48:25;49:4;50:3, 6,14,20,24;53:11,16; 55:11,14;57:2;59:16, 20,23;61:3,5,7;62:23; 63:1;64:12,16;65:5; 67:3 presiding (2) 4:11;5:16 previously (2) 28:25;46:23 price (3) 52:8;53:7;54:8 prices (7) 20:18,19;21:2,6; 51:13,22;52:4 primary (3) 33:2;51:15;52:3 prior (5) 23:7;25:4,8;46:24; 62:13 pristine (1) 30:16 private (1) 25:25 privileges (1)

36:14:37:15.21; 38:14,17,23,23,25; 39:16:57:11.14 probed (1) 49:17 problem (2) 40:21;63:8 procedural (3) 5:18,24;57:22 procedure (3) 8:1;26:22;60:6 procedures (1) 63:9 proceed (1) 58:4 proceeding (18) 4:12;5:1;7:9;25:21; 40:16,22;41:16;47:3; 51:3,6;52:6;56:2,3,9; 58:2;63:17;64:5,10 proceedings (1) 56:19 process (32) 6:19;15:2,5;17:4; 36:23;37:11;38:19,20, 21;41:14;43:22;45:16, 17,21;48:1;55:20; 57:16,18;58:7;59:4; 60:3,14,25;63:5,10,21; 64:18,18,22,24;65:1,4 processed (1) 15:15 Program (2) 13:23.24 progressive (1) 11:19 Project (54) 4:21;5:12;7:13,16, 18;9:4,5,7,18,23,24; 10:1.8.25:11:6.17.23; 13:10;14:17,24;15:8, 18:16:5:19:8.22:20:2. 10,12,14,15,16,22,25; 21:15;22:5;23:18; 27:14;30:19;31:11,25; 34:3;37:25;44:18,24; 45:14,19,22;47:11; 51:17;52:5,14,15,16; 57:1 Projects (7) 12:4,9:22:7:37:6; 44:25:47:13:48:17 project's (1) 51:20 prolong (3) 63:2;64:5,10 promises (1) 61:1 promoting (1) 28:18 proper (1) 32:1 properly (3)

47:25;52:25;60:9 quite (7) properties (1) 20:5:36:25:39:14: 4:16 43:9:56:13:58:7:66:17 quote (1) property (18) 6:16;11:2,7;12:2; 26:914:1,2,9,15;15:2,6; 16:9;19:5,5;26:1;28:2; 29:1:48:8.20 proposal (1) raise (2) 59:3 45:10:64:7 proposals (2) raised (8) 20:9;23:15,18;44:2; 31:10:33:13 proposed (9) 49:16;55:15;60:2,23 6:5;19:23;20:18; raises (2) 32:7;33:4;34:9;35:11; 36:24;49:14 47:9;51:21 raising (2) propriety (1) 60:8;63:11 47:2 Rate (40) 6:2,12,22,25;20:6,8; provide (3) 22:10,12;23:14,15,17, 24:21;38:12;49:11 provided (6) 17;35:17;36:12;37:3, 5:5;13:25;38:13,16; 20;38:1,14,17;39:1,4; 42:10;57:13 40:9;43:17,21,22,25, provides (1) 25;44:6;46:9;49:1; 13:25 51:1;56:6;57:8;60:1, providing (1) 16,17,18;62:18;64:20; 6:1866:22 provisions (1) ratepayers (2) 57:5 21:1:38:5 prudent (2) rates (1) 34:14:65:12 22:14 Public (21) rather (1) 4:10,25;5:1,2,5;6:9; 27:47:9:11:24:12:1:17:9. reach (3) 23;18:10;19:13;20:13; 32:18;59:8,13 27:5,23;28:6;47:23; reached (1) 56:17,24:63:6 57:19 publicly (1) read (4) 56:17 41:2;42:21;63:24; purports (1) 66:17 25:21 reading (4) 40:14,25;41:10;47:5 purpose (1) 40:18 real (1) pursuant (3) 19:5 25:20;30:4;54:22 **Realistically** (1) pursued (1) 28:13 42:12 really (11) pursuing (2) 12:21;18:23;20:11; 29:3;48:19 22:20;36:13;39:12; put (4) 40:22;41:23;53:7;56:1; 8:23;23:16;52:13; 57:22 53:6 reason (6) 26:16;27:19;37:20; Q 46:2;55:5;57:12 reasonable (5) QO22020041 (1) 5:10;19:16,18,24; 54:21 4:21**Qualified (8)** reasonably (28) 4:20;9:3;11:17,23; 4:19;5:11;7:12;19:6, 19:7;20:14;39:17; 16;28:4,12,24;29:23; 51:17 34:11;35:1;36:3,6,7, quickly (2) 11;37:8;39:7;49:22; 45:23;49:3 50:2;53:19,22;54:3,6,

14:55:1,9:61:23:62:3 reasons (7) 30:25;31:6;32:10; 42:19.24.25:43:1 rebuttal (25) 6:7;7:4;12:18;15:23; 20:5,8;21:9;23:20; 24:2:36:15,17:38:9; 40:3,5;42:6,9,15;46:9, 17:49:2:57:24:58:5: 63:15;66:1,11 rebuttals (1) 50:8 received (2) 6:10:65:17 recent (3) 12:5,13;15:8 recently (2) 47:9,20 reconsideration (1) 22:19 record (19) 4:5;12:17;14:22; 21:8;34:23;35:8;39:10; 40:14,20;41:2;42:10, 22;49:19;50:1;56:3,8, 19,20;57:1 recorded (2) 4:3:66:4 recording (1) 4:4 recover (1) 53:3 recreation (1) 25:18 reduced (1) 29:17 reefs (1) 32:23 refer (4) 25:1:26:16:27:19: 44:8 reference (2) 44:9:47:7 referral (1) 27:21 referred (4) 16:6;35:5;44:9; 66:15 referring (1) 47:19 refusal (1) 49:11 regarding (3) 4:13;35:2;60:3 Regional (1) 27:7 register (3) 42:17;61:11,12 regulate (1) 22:14 regulated (3) 22:14;28:1;53:2

R

June 24, 2022 regulations (1) 25:23

reject (1) 32:10 relate (1) 7:19 related (1) 31:6 relations (1) 27:3 relevant (5) 28:11;33:22;53:18; 54:7:64:3 relief (3) 12:19;23:23;57:4 relies (1) 25:20 remains (1) 26:4 remarks (2) 19:3:40:10 remember (1) 54:15 remind (1) 7:8repeatedly (1) 57:10 replaced (1) 61:16 reply (1) 6:12 report (1) 66:15 reporter (2) 4:4;65:19 represent (1) 8:18 representatives (4) 6:20;10:24;65:7; 66:10 represents (1) 6:13 request (3) 5:21;6:13;8:2 requested (3) 5:18;19:4;57:4 requesting (1) 23:24 require (2) 14:25;25:3 required (8) 5:5;14:20,21;15:17; 18:2;26:24;34:3,22 requirement (2) 27:25;46:2 requirements (1) 16:1requires (2) 29:19;65:16 research (2) 32:22;33:1 reserve (2) 24:1:32:22

June 24, 2022

residence (1)	rock (2)
43:6	32:3,5
resolved (2)	Roosevelt (
37:1;61:2 respect (7)	17:25 route (46)
4:18;40:11;43:20;	15:7;16:2
47:1,10;49:7;50:16	17;28:7,1
respectively (2)	5,14,18,2
25:10;30:11	24,25;31:
respond (12)	32:11,13:
40:8;43:17;44:5; 45:8;49:9,11;53:15;	34:9;35:4 43:5,12,1
54:11;59:17;60:17;	5;53:23;5
63:3;64:13	55:1;61:1
responded (3)	routes (4)
16:15;20:7;43:24	25:4;28:2
response (9)	53:24
6:1,1,8;23:13;31:3; 34:16;56:5,6;62:5	rules (3) 25:22;65:
responses (1)	run (1)
49:10	21:25
responsibility (1)	
6:17	
rest (4)	P- (1)
15:7;17:12;18:11; 29:1	safe (1) 66:25
restoration (1)	same (2)
30:4	19:9;45:1
restricted (1)	satisfied (1)
4:16 Restriction (1)	23:2 Savastano
29:8	24:19
restrictions (2)	save (1)
13:21,21	24:8
result (3) 15:16;26:25;64:22	scallops (1) 33:9
resulted (1)	schedule (3
16:16	5:18,24;5
retaining (1)	scheme (1)
5:15	52:20
5:15 review (3)	52:20 School (1)
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8	52:20 School (1) 27:7
5:15 review (3)	52:20 School (1)
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1)	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4)
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15;
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5)	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8)
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17;	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5)	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8)
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10)	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2)
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10) 11:2,7;12:1,3;16:9;	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2) 25:15;26:
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10) 11:2,7;12:1,3;16:9; 26:1;27:1;28:2;29:1;	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2) 25:15;26; seek (3)
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10) 11:2,7;12:1,3;16:9;	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2) 25:15;26:
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10) 11:2,7;12:1,3;16:9; 26:1;27:1;28:2;29:1; 48:20 rights-of-way (1) 12:2	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2) 25:15;26: seek (3) 12:2;22:1 seeking (4) 5:9;12:20
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10) 11:2,7;12:1,3;16:9; 26:1;27:1;28:2;29:1; 48:20 rights-of-way (1) 12:2 risk (3)	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2) 25:15;26: seek (3) 12:2;22:1 seeking (4) 5:9;12:20 25:12
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10) 11:2,7;12:1,3;16:9; 26:1;27:1;28:2;29:1; 48:20 rights-of-way (1) 12:2 risk (3) 20:23;31:15,24	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2) 25:15;26: seek (3) 12:2;22:1 seeking (4) 5:9;12:20 25:12 seeks (4)
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10) 11:2,7;12:1,3;16:9; 26:1;27:1;28:2;29:1; 48:20 rights-of-way (1) 12:2 risk (3) 20:23;31:15,24 road (3)	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2) 25:15;26: seek (3) 12:2;22:1 seeking (4) 5:9;12:20 25:12
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10) 11:2,7;12:1,3;16:9; 26:1;27:1;28:2;29:1; 48:20 rights-of-way (1) 12:2 risk (3) 20:23;31:15,24 road (3) 17:9,23;18:10 robust (1)	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2) 25:15;26: seek (3) 12:2;22:1 seeking (4) 5:9;12:20 25:12 seeks (4) 12:16;14: 34:24 seems (1)
5:15 review (3) 19:1;34:15;51:8 reviewing (1) 65:16 revising (1) 6:4 right (5) 35:23;41:15,17; 49:24;50:24 right-of-way (4) 17:10,23;18:10;19:5 rights (10) 11:2,7;12:1,3;16:9; 26:1;27:1;28:2;29:1; 48:20 rights-of-way (1) 12:2 risk (3) 20:23;31:15,24 road (3) 17:9,23;18:10	52:20 School (1) 27:7 scrutiny (1) 26:6 seabed (4) 31:14,15; second (8) 13:3;14:1 18:2,24;1 Secondly (1 42:3 Section (2) 25:15;26: seek (3) 12:2;22:1 seeking (4) 5:9;12:20 25:12 seeks (4) 12:16;14: 34:24

	segment (1)
lt (1)	27:4 seizure (1)
2	28:2
6) 	selected (1)
6:20;27:12,14,	43:13
7,12,16,18;29:3,	self-serving (1)
8,22;30:1,9,14,	28:19
31:1,5,21,22;	sense (2)
13;33:15,17,25;	37:22,23
5:4;42:8,11,20;	sent (2)
2,14;44:18;47:4, 3;54:4,17,20,21;	16:5,12
	seq(2)
1:19 •)	26:19;30:5 seriously (1)
8:22;35:8;	6:17
0.22,33.0,	served (1)
	43:23
65:9,9	Service (1)
03.9,9	34:5
	set (10)
	5:6,17;14:14;51:13;
S	52:4;53:5,7;54:19;
6	57:17;63:22
	setting (2)
	54:8;60:7
	settlement (5)
5:18	58:16,22,25;59:3,6
(1)	sewer (1)
(1)	11:25
10 (1)	shall (1)
l0 (1)	26:11
	shallow (1)
	31:12
(1)	sharing (3)
(-)	21:5,11,24
(3)	shellfish (5)
4;57:23	29:24;30:3;32:14,25;
1)	33:3
	shore (1)
l)	9:13
	shoreline (1)
(1)	29:7
	Shore's (1)
4)	44:24
15;32:6,18	short (3)
8)	7:4;39:21,24
4:11,17;16:21;	Shortly (3)
4;19:9;26:25	10:22;62:13;63:13
v (1)	side (3)
	13:8;18:9;33:7
(2)	significant (1)
26:13	38:16
	significantly (2)
2:11;53:3	27:15;37:20
(4)	similar (3)
:20;13:19;	31:9;33:14;52:20
	simple (1)
14 6 00 00	12:20
14:6;28:23;	simply (5)
\ \	13:15;45:6,24;46:22;
)	63:18
	simultaneously (1)

46:1 sit (3) 11:5;42:21;59:11 site (3) 4:4;10:13;32:7 siting (2) 11:16;12:9 situation (2) 12:8;35:13 situations (1) 11:14 smell (1) 48:10 so-called (1) 42:7 soft (1) 33:8 solely (1) 29:7 solicitation (1) 53:6 solicitations (1) 51:19 solicitor (1) 40:24 Solomon (7) 8:16;50:12,15,22,25; 51:10;59:25 solution (1) 65:23 solutions (1) 32:6 someone (4) 41:3,11;47:6;50:21 sometimes (1) 16:6 somewhat (1) 38:22 somewhere (1) 62:4 soon (1) 28:3 sorry (3) 34:19;39:23;46:15 sought (3) 7:11,20;11:11 sound (1) 48:6 southern (2) 10:11;33:5 space (1) 25:18 spacers (1) 32:6 spanning (1) 27:17 speak (2) 18:25;45:8 speaking (2) 7:22,23 species (1) 33:8 specific (2)

27:4:57:4 specifically (2) 16:7;50:21 spoken (1) 50:23 stage (3) 40:15,16;41:21 standard (8) 19:1,3,9,17,18;23:2, 12;54:19 start (1) 8:20 started (1) 38:10 starting (1) 6:24 startling (1) 33:25 state (12) 14:11;17:17;25:22; 26:8;27:7;32:15;45:15, 16;46:3;48:14;56:25; 61:12 statement (25) 8:8;24:11,12;25:8; 32:9,20;40:13,25; 44:13;45:12;46:5,10, 17;47:5,8;48:17;55:16, 24;56:11,16;57:3; 62:10,21:63:3,24 statements (4) 34:2;35:18;40:3; 66:1 state's (1) 13:24 statute (5) 26:25;28:5;47:2; 48:3,18 statutory (6) 12:1;16:1;19:1;23:2, 12;52:19 stay (2) 45:2;66:25 stayed (1) 35:25 step (1) 15:13 still (3) 30:18;42:16;62:18 stop (1) 24:1 Street (3) 13:3;16:25;17:10 streets (1) 30:17 strictly (1) 30:5 strike (1) 41:7 strips (1) 25:23 strong (1) 42:1

				June 24, 2022
stuff (2)	surprising (1)	24;62:8;65:18,21;66:2,	type (7)	21:4,11,15,20
41:2,10	30:7	24,02.8,05.18,21,00.2, 2,3.23	12:8;38:21;51:7;	
				upon (2)
subject (2)	survive (1)	today's (2)	58:2,16;60:15,19	6:5;25:19
21:24;42:5	26:5	4:12;66:24	types (1)	Upper (7)
submission (1)	sworn (1)	told (1)	39:18	10:7,12,16;13:8;
51:21	41:17	37:14	typically (1)	18:11,13;27:6
submit (1)	system (9)	total (2)	58:15	Urbish (1)
48:3	9:14,22;21:4,11,14,	13:11,11		5:14
submitted (3)	14,21,23;32:22	touch (2)	U	urges (2)
5:20;20:18;66:4		15:19;42:4		24:25;27:21
Subsections (1)	Т	Township (8)	Ultimately (4)	use (4)
12:15		10:6,7,12,16;13:9;	10:3;34:20;42:12;	9:15;35:3;51:6;
substantiate (1)	talking (4)	18:11,13;21:19	52:17	54:12
62:20	10:10;21:12;22:16,	traditionally (1)	unable (2)	used (3)
substantiated (1)	23	51:4	11:6;37:11	10:8;18:6;58:8
43:4	Target (1)	traffic (1)	unacceptable (1)	useful (1)
substation (7)	31:13	43:1	34:10	60:14
18:12,15;22:3;32:11,	telecommunication (1)	translate (1)	unanswered (1)	using (2)
19;44:19;52:13	17:15	61:23	62:18	27:14;29:21
suffice (1)	temporary (1)	translates (1)	under (25)	usually (1)
13:23	29:11	29:18	6:5,14;7:20;10:15;	58:15
sufficient (3)	tested (1)	transmission (4)	12:13;17:1,4,9;26:18,	Utilities (9)
14:12;34:22;39:9	26:4	21:4,10,14;37:17	21,22;27:12;30:9;	4:11,25;5:3;11:24,
sufficiently (1)	testimony (39)	transparent (2)	42:14;46:2;47:2;48:2,	24,25,25;19:14;28:1
29:4	5:13;6:2,7;12:18,18;	6:18;65:13	18;52:7,19;54:12;57:4,	utility (16)
suggest (1)	14:23;15:23;20:7,8;	traveled (1)	4,18;66:4	17:14;20:13;22:5,6,
43:11	21:8,9;23:4,13,14,20;	29:16	underground (14)	7,10,13;27:23;28:6;
suggesting (1)	36:15,17;38:9;41:12,	traverse (1)	13:1,4,17;15:7;	52:18,19,23;53:2,2;
60:5	17,17,18;42:6,9,10,16,	29:15	16:20,24;17:3,14,19;	58:14,14
suggestion (3)	21,22;43:4,24;44:1;	traversed (1)	18:20;20:12;22:2;43:7,	utilizing (1)
45:10;56:15;63:23	56:4,21;57:24;58:5;	32:18	10	30:14
suggests (1)	63:11,16;65:17;66:11	traverses (1)	underline (1)	utter (1)
35:4	thanking (2)	33:6	7:14	30:15
sum (1)	8:21;38:11	treats (1)	underneath (2)	
40:20	Therefore (1)	27:22	18:3,4	V
summarizes (1)	54:5	Trenton (1)	underruns (1)	
47:9	thereto (1)	35:24	20:24	vacs (1)
Super (1)	34:16	tried (2)	understood (3)	17:13
27:8	thermal (1)	15:24;59:10	34:13;40:19,19	valid (1)
supercede (1)	31:19	triple (1)	unfair (2)	23:22
25:22	theses (1)	37:18	63:20,21	value (2)
supplemental (3)	48:10	true (2)	Unfortunately (3)	14:10;16:14
5:18,21;56:5	third (1)	44:12,14	11:5;36:12;59:12	various (3)
support (2)	27:3	try (2)	units (1)	14:5;35:7;65:8
34:23;62:11	though (1)	55:23;65:22	25:16	verbal (1)
supported (1) 41:24	54:15 thought (1)	TSUC (3)	unless (2)	66:13
	thought (1)	21:13,24;22:4	14:3;28:20	verbally (1)
supporting (1)	52:11	turbines (1)	unlike (2)	66:12
23:4	three (9)	22:1	11:24;52:18	Verified (1)
supports (1)	10:19,20;12:21;	turn (1)	un-muted (1)	23:3
33:7	14:13;16:4;20:19;23:3;	7:24	7:23	versus (1)
suppose (1)	27:5;45:20	turned (1)	un-rebutted (1)	27:7
38:6	tied (1)	48:14	23:12	vessel (1)
Supreme (1)	45:16	turns (1)	unusual (1)	31:17
54:22	times (1)	52:13	48:1	vessels (1)
sure (11)	14:13	twice (1)	up (11)	29:8
8:3;37:8;38:5;44:14;	Today (35)	52:14	17:8,9;18:8,11;	viable (3)
46:20;53:16;56:15,22;	4:12;5:1;6:20;7:5,14,	two (16)	22:19;40:20;44:11;	10:5;48:22;54:4
61:14;63:24;65:6	15;9:7;10:10;11:5,10,	10:4;12:21,25;13:9;	53:5;57:17;60:24;	vicinity (1)
surely (1)	15;21:8;36:2;37:16;	14:16;15:6;16:11;	62:12	33:2
31:1	38:14,16;39:1,6;40:17,	23:10;27:12;30:9;35:2;	updating (1)	video (1)
surface (1)				
Surface (1)	23;46:22:47:3:48:6:	42:13,16:47:13:57:27:	5:24	/:24
17:6	23;46:22;47:3;48:6; 49:14;59:5,11;60:23,	42:13,16;47:13;57:22; 61:10	5:24 upgrade (4)	7:24 view (1)

4:7	24;35:3;36:3,19,19;	26:22	
		10:4-6 (1)	
virtual (1)	37:5;38:1,4,7,25;39:5;		3
35:22	40:4;43:15;44:4,20,23,	5:6	
virtually (1)	23;45:14;47:23;48:6,	10-times (1)	3 (2)
8:3	15,16;49:9;51:17;52:9;	16:14	5:8;12:15
visible (1)	53:4,25;58:14,25;59:2,	11 (2)	
18:22	7;61:20;63:14,20;	6:6;26:13	3:14 (1)
	66:21		27:8
volts (1)		11:24 (1)	30 (1)
17:20	Wind's (15)	67:4	13:14
voluntary (1)	6:1;10:13;23:1;	1100 (1)	35th (3)
59:8	25:11;26:17;28:12;	9:6	13:3;16:25;17:10
	35:13;37:24;39:15;	11th (1)	
W	42:6,8;46:6;47:9,13,22	16:4	37 (1)
••			32:25
	wish (4)	14(1)	
wait (4)	40:3;49:1,15;50:10	32:9	4
25:6;45:11,25;46:4	within (9)	1400 (1)	
Waiting (1)	16:3;17:11,19,19,23;	66:16	4 (1)
34:12	18:20;22:3;26:1;32:13	15 (3)	
water (1)	without (2)	6:1;7:2;9:12	26:13
	29:5;34:25		40:55D19 (1)
11:25		15th (1)	52:22
waterline (1)	witness (6)	5:20	48:3 (1)
17:15	41:12,18,18,24;44:2;	16th (2)	34:18
way (10)	63:11	6:11;31:3	48:3-87 (1)
15:1;17:20;18:11;	word (2)	19 (1)	4:22
53:4,5,6,9;57:16;	37:25;38:7	6:9	
61:24;65:13	words (1)	1947 (1)	48:3-87.1 (2)
,			6:14;26:3
ways (2)	23:16	26:9	48:3-87.1f (5)
52:20,21	work (3)	1998 (1)	12:14;25:19;26:14;
website (1)	6:6;51:20;52:2	27:9	27:22;34:20
63:7	works (1)	1st (1)	486 (1)
welcome (1)	15:2	5:20	
	10.2	5.20	27:8
22.24	writing (2)		
22:24	writing (2)	2	
weren't (1)	16:8;41:5	2	5
weren't (1) 37:15	16:8;41:5 written (3)		
weren't (1)	16:8;41:5	2 (2)	5
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3	2 (2)	5 5.8 (2)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1)	2 (2) 12:15;44:23	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1)	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25;	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25;	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9)	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19;	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19;	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16;	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19;	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16;	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104)	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2)	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12,	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11,	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3,	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2)	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5,	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3,	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5, 18,23;11:12,17,23;	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24 0 0.647 (1)	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1) 5:22	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15 7:7-17.1 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5, 18,23;11:12,17,23; 12:4,7,9,19;13:19;	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1) 5:22 23 (1)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5, 18,23;11:12,17,23; 12:4,7,9,19;13:19; 14:18;15:25;16:10;	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24 0 0.647 (1) 13:12	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1) 5:22 23 (1) 5:17	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15 7:7-17.1 (1) 30:5
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5, 18,23;11:12,17,23; 12:4,7,9,19;13:19; 14:18;15:25;16:10; 19:8;20:14,17,25;	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24 0 0.647 (1)	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1) 5:17 27 (2)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15 7:7-17.1 (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5, 18,23;11:12,17,23; 12:4,7,9,19;13:19; 14:18;15:25;16:10; 19:8;20:14,17,25; 22:13;24:24;25:3,20,	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24 0 0.647 (1) 13:12 1	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1) 5:17 27 (2) 5:25;6:2	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15 7:7-17.1 (1) 30:5
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5, 18,23;11:12,17,23; 12:4,7,9,19;13:19; 14:18;15:25;16:10; 19:8;20:14,17,25; 22:13;24:24;25:3,20, 25;27:11,23;28:5,5,9,	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24 0 0.647 (1) 13:12	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1) 5:17 27 (2)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15 7:7-17.1 (1) 30:5 9
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5, 18,23;11:12,17,23; 12:4,7,9,19;13:19; 14:18;15:25;16:10; 19:8;20:14,17,25; 22:13;24:24;25:3,20,	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24 0 0.647 (1) 13:12 1	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1) 5:17 27 (2) 5:25;6:2	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15 7:7-17.1 (1) 30:5 9 90-day (1)
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5, 18,23;11:12,17,23; 12:4,7,9,19;13:19; 14:18;15:25;16:10; 19:8;20:14,17,25; 22:13;24:24;25:3,20, 25;27:11,23;28:5,5,9, 17,20,23,25;29:19;	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24 0 0.647 (1) 13:12 1 (7) 4:20;9:3,18,24;10:6,	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1) 5:17 27 (2) 5:25;6:2 29 (2) 6:3,7	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15 7:7-17.1 (1) 30:5 9
weren't (1) 37:15 west (1) 33:6 wetlands (3) 25:13;29:20;30:17 what's (4) 13:5;17:2;49:25; 54:14 whatsoever (1) 56:14 whole (1) 7:18 who's (2) 49:24,24 wide (4) 13:14,15;29:4,9 Wind (104) 4:14,20,21;5:8,12, 20;6:3,7,12,21,25;7:11, 16,18;8:7,8,19,25;9:3, 4,5,7,8,18,18,24;10:5, 18,23;11:12,17,23; 12:4,7,9,19;13:19; 14:18;15:25;16:10; 19:8;20:14,17,25; 22:13;24:24;25:3,20, 25;27:11,23;28:5,5,9,	16:8;41:5 written (3) 6:10;31:4;59:3 wrong (1) 49:24 Y year (2) 9:9;16:5 years (9) 10:19,20;16:4;20:19; 45:21;59:10;61:16; 63:6,8 Z zoning (2) 19:14;52:24 0 0.647 (1) 13:12 1 1 (7)	2 (2) 12:15;44:23 20 (1) 61:16 2002 (1) 29:13 2010 (1) 11:21 2019 (4) 10:20;20:20;22:19; 53:7 2021 (2) 11:11;12:5 2022 (2) 5:8;31:3 2024 (1) 45:24 2-13 (1) 32:9 22nd (1) 5:17 27 (2) 5:25;6:2 29 (2)	5 5.8 (2) 32:13,16 52:14f-1 (1) 26:19 55 (1) 30:11 6 60 (1) 17:6 65 (1) 30:11 7 7 (1) 26:13 7:36-26.8 (1) 25:15 7:7-17.1 (1) 30:5 9 90-day (1)