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PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Good morning. My name is Joe Fiordaliso, and I am the President of the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities.

I'm here with my colleagues, all of them, and we are anxious to hear these opening oral arguments. And the transparency of this particular event is vital. We want everyone to have the opportunity to contribute and so on.

Today we will have the oral argument regarding the Petition filed by Ocean Wind, LLC Requesting a Determination that Certain Easements and Consents Needed for Certain Environmental Permits in and with Respect to the County of Cape May are Reasonably Necessary for the Construction or Operation of the Ocean Wind Qualified Offshore Wind Project. Docket Number QO22050347.
N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(F) grants the

Board the authority to make a determination on this petition.

Since we have all four Commissioners of the Board present today, the proceeding is a public meeting of the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities. Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided as required by the Open Public Meetings Act set forth in N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, et seq.

Today we have the following on the docket in this matter: On May 20, 2022 Ocean Wind, LLC filed a petition with the Board on June 8, 2022.

The County filed a motion that the Board, requesting that the Board decline jurisdiction over the petition, and that the Board dismiss the petition without prejudice as ripe for disposition and as nonadjustable under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(F) and N.J.S.A. 20:3-1, et seq.

On June 20, 2022 Ocean Wind, LLC filed a reply brief in opposition to the County's June 8 motion. And on June 27, 2022 the County filed a reply to Ocean Wind, LLC's June 20, 2022 reply brief.

On June 29, 2022 the Board issued an order retaining the petition, directing that the County be included as a necessary party and designating me as the Presiding Officer.

As Presiding Officer, among other things, I am authorized to secure a just and expeditious determination on the issues regarding this petition.

On July 5, 2022 I issued an order setting the initial procedural schedule. On July

14, 2022 I issued an order modifying the initial procedural schedule. I issued the order to accommodate multiple government entities that requested certain deadlines be extended so that they could file motions to intervene.

On August 15, 2022 I issued an order that modified the procedural schedule for a second time. And that ruled on the motion to intervene that the government entities had filed.

City of Ocean City and Upper Township
were granted Intervenor status, while other
motives were granted participant status.
On August 22, 2022 the County filed a
motion seeking the Board's recusal from this matter and suspension of the procedural schedule. In the motion the County requested that this matter be transferred to the Office of

Administrative Law and reassigned to an
Administrative Law Judge.
Ocean Wind, LLC filed its reply on
August 22 , a reply to this August 22 motion, on September 1, 2022, and the County responded with its reply on September 9, 2022.

On September 27, 2022 I issued an
order on the matters to dismiss and recuse,
denying both. On September 28, 2022 the Board issued an order designating substitute public hearings officer for two public hearings that were held on September 29, 2022.

In addition, in oral arguments or oral comments received from members of the public during these two public hearings, public written comments were accepted up to and including October 12, 2022, in accordance with the procedural schedule.

The petition is one of the very first of its kind to request authorization under N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f), the Offshore Wind Economic Development Act, otherwise known as OWEDA. 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 and Intervenors in this matter. We have Ocean Wind, LLC; Cape May County, New Jersey; City of Ocean City, New Jersey; Upper Township, New Jersey; and the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel.

Each of these representatives will
have an opportunity to present their argument and
to provide rebuttal after all parties, Intervenors and Participants have spoken.

The nine Participant municipalities in this matter will also have an opportunity to present their short, and I underline short, arguments as well.

These nine Participants are as follows: Borough of Avalon; Township of Dennis; Township of Lower; Township of Middle; City of North Wildwood; City of Sea Isle City; Borough of Stone Harbor; City of Wildwood; and the Borough of Wildwood Crest.

The representatives speaking on behalf of these municipalities who are with us today will have the opportunity to present such arguments. As I already mentioned, the Commissioners are present today and may ask questions.

I want to remind the parties, the Intervenors and the Participants that arguments in this proceeding should be limited to the matter at hand. Specifically, whether the easements and consents that Ocean Wind, LLC seeks and that are needed for certain environmental permits in and with respect to the County of Cape May, are
reasonably necessary for the construction or operation of Ocean Wind 1 Qualified Offshore Wind Project.

Please refrain from discussing offshore wind generally, other issues regarding Ocean Wind 1 Qualified Offshore Wind Project or any other matters outside the scope of the matter at hand.

I would ask that when you are speaking, please be sure that your camera is on and that you are unmuted. And when you are not speaking, please turn both your camera and your microphone off.

The procedure today will be as
follows: First $I$ will ask each of the parties and Intervenors to place their appearances on the record and make their statement.

Second, I will ask each of the
Participants to place their appearances on the record and make their statements. Third, after all statements have been made, I will ask each party and Intervenor if they would like to make a rebuttal statement.

I will now ask the parties and
Intervenors to state their appearance and deliver
their statements. With that, I invite Ocean Wind, LLC to make its statement.

MR. EISENSTARK: Thank you, President
Fiordaliso. This is Gregory Eisenstark with the law firm Cozen O'Connor on behalf of the Petitioner, Ocean Wind, LLC.

Just as a matter of procedure,
President Fiordaliso, should I make my opening argument now, or are you going to take all of the other appearances first and then come back to me? PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: No, you can make your statement now, sir.

MR. EISENSTARK: Okay. Thank you, President Fiordaliso, and thank other members of the Board and Board Staff who are present here today for the opportunity to participate in this Oral Argument.

I'm going to start by summarizing the filing. I think as everyone who is here today knows, this petition in this matter involves Ocean Wind 1 , which will be the first qualified offshore wind project constructed off the coast of New Jersey. It's an 1100 megawatt project.

In order to get the power that will be generated by the wind farm out in the Atlantic

Ocean to shore where the load is, where the users are, where the power is needed, you need to bring the power ashore via cables, wires.

For the Ocean Wind 1 project there have been two interconnection points onshore that have been identified. One in Lacey Township in Ocean County, and one in Upper Township in Cape May County.

This matter, of course, concerns the onshore cable to the Upper Township point of interconnection, which will be at a new substation that will be constructed near the old BL England generating plant. That's an old fossil fuel-fired electric generation plant that is now out of service.

As President Fiordaliso alluded to a couple minutes ago, the statutory basis for this filing are the 2021 amendments to the Offshore Wind Economic Development Act, or OWEDA. That is N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(f), and then subparagraphs two and three.

Let me say also at the outset, Ocean Wind filed this petition only after extensive discussions and outreach with the county of Cape May, in hopes that we can reach accommodations,
reach agreements, to let the project move forward with the route to the point of interconnection in Upper Township without the need to file this petition.

The project began discussions with the County in 2019 shortly after it received the OREC award. There have been many discussions over that period of time between now and the time the petition is filed, but unfortunately no real progress was made to resolve it.

And for that reason, because time is moving forward, there are many, many commitments the project has, both commitments to the state, contractual commitments, deadlines, the project really had no choice but to file the petition asking the Board to step in here.

As I think most folks are aware, the issues in this filing are fairly limited. There are really only two issues.

One is that Ocean Wind is asking the Board to approve its acquisition of a temporary and a permanent easement over a parcel of land that is owned by the county.

The second issue is under the OWEDA amendments, we're asking the Board to essentially
preempt the County consents for certain New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection permits.

That's required because when a developer wants to construct something that requires environmental approvals on property that's owned by some other entity, in this case it's Cape May County, the property owner has to consent to the deed and the permits.

Again, the project has sought the consent of Cape May County, but Cape May has not been willing to give that consent.

Therefore, we've had to come to the
Board to ask the Board to essentially step into the County's role and say yes, it's okay, you may proceed with those DEP permit applications, and hopefully at the end of the day receive the necessary DEP permits.

With respect to the route, let me just briefly summarize the onshore portion of the route that's at issue here. And for those of you that are familiar with the proceeding that just concluded a little while ago regarding Ocean City, it is, of course, the same route we're talking about.

The preferred route that is described
in the petition would make landfall, come ashore, so to speak, at 35 th street and proceed west to Bay Avenue and then north on Bay Avenue to Roosevelt Boulevard.

And then it crosses what's referred to either as Crook Horn Creek or Peck's Bay at the Roosevelt Boulevard bridge.

It then will continue along Roosevelt Boulevard within public rights-of-way, turning north on State Route 9, and then proceed to the proposed substation property near BL England.

Again, the easements in question here are right at the point where the cable will cross the Roosevelt Boulevard bridge area at Crook Horn Creek.

And just before $I$ forget, I just want to make it clear that Ocean Wind has made an offer, which remains outstanding to the County, to acquire the easements. We made the offer back in the spring of this year. The offer's not been accepted, we haven't received a counterproposal.

That offer to acquire the easements remains outstanding and is still valid.

The other point I'd just like to make, just so it's clear, is that all portions of
the onshore cable that we're talking about here will be installed underground. We're not talking about overhead construction.

This construction will be underground construction, very similar to the types of underground construction that public utilities have used throughout New Jersey for many, many years, for decades.

It will be installed in one of two methods. Either the bulk of the construction along the public roadways will be installed in underground conduits, the same way that existing underground infrastructure is installed in many municipalities throughout the state. It will be no different.

In certain areas at the beach landing and at the bridge crossing, it will be installed using what's called horizontal directional drilling, which is a slightly different method, which this simply allows you to cross certain areas by basically drilling in a horizontal fashion to install the cable.

But again, I just want to emphasize the construction in these underground electric lines really are no different than the many other
underground electric lines that are installed and have operated for decades and decades throughout the State of New Jersey without issue.

A little bit more specifics, a few more specifics on the actual easements. As I said before, both of them, both the easements are on the exact same lot and block. It's Block 350.01, Lot 17.01.

This is property that is, as I said, on the northern side of the road at the crossing of the Crook Horn Creek.

The first easement that we've
identified would be a temporary easement that totals . 257 acres, so about a quarter-of-an-acre that would be used only during the construction portion of the project in that area.

It would be a temporary easement that
the project would need for 18 months from the start of construction. Once construction is completed and the line is in service, that temporary easement will no longer be needed.

The permanent easement is on the same lot and block, and that totals 0.357 acres. That easement will be approximately 30 feet wide and will be used for the underground cable.

Again, and just a little bit more detail -- and of course, all of the details are in our petition, our filing, our pre-filed testimony. And the DEP permits, as I said before, are primarily division of land use resource permits and related approvals that are required from the DEP, and the consent the Board needs to approve the project's ability to move forward with those permits in lieu of the County consent for them to be pursued.

I'm going to turn now briefly to the statutory standard of review. And President Fiordaliso already said it, so I won't beat a dead horse here. But the issue is, of course, whether the requested easements in this issue are reasonably necessary for the construction or operation of the qualified offshore wind project. And it's important to remember that, in fact, the same reasonably necessary standard applies to the preemption of the consents for the DEP permits. I think it's important to remember that reasonably necessary doesn't mean absolutely necessary.

It doesn't mean that the chosen, the preferred onshore route is the absolute best. It
doesn't mean even that it's the least expensive route. It only, reasonably necessary means what you would think it means when you read it from a common sense perspective.

It means that the solution of the project as proposed is a reasonable one that will achieve the desired result here, the interconnection of the offshore part of the project to the onshore electric grid.

In regard to the selection of the preferred route, our direct or rebuttal testimony goes into extensive detail about the siting process. It was a very iterative process where the project in a very high level identified many different potential points of interconnection.

Those, for a variety reasons that are discussed in the testimony, were narrowed down, and eventually determined that the two best ones for this project, given where the offshore lease area is located, given what the onshore, what the capacity of the existing onshore electric grid is at different locations, and narrowed it down to the two I mentioned earlier, Lacey Township and the point in Upper Township.

The route selection process was
thorough. After the points of interconnection were identified, it was another iterative, both qualitative and quantitative process, where Ocean Wind looked at many different potential routes to get from the ocean to Upper Township.

It looked at the impacts that this route would have on a variety of different stakeholders, of course on the residents, on the environmental impacts, impacts on marine issues with the different bodies of water that are in this area, impacts on historic resources.

Ease of construction, whether or not it's constructible. You can't pick a route and then find out that it's impossible to construct it, because there are engineering reasons why it can't be constructed.

So there were a whole host of different criteria that the project evaluated. And ultimately, in regard to the interconnection in Upper Township, the route that we've described in the filing and that involves these two particular easements, was determined to have the least cumulative impacts of any of the potential routes.

And that's why it was chosen. That's
why Ocean Wind is moving forward with this point of interconnection and this route.

Again, $I$ think we've heard, and I'll save some of this for my rebuttal testimony, but we've heard from various different parties about different issues that they've raised.

I think when the Board will review
Ocean Wind's testimony, its direct testimony, its rebuttal testimony, it's abundantly clear that the filing satisfies the statutory standard of reasonably necessary.

We've gone through everything, we've explained what the construction practices will be. We've explained -- one of the other statutory criteria that $I$ should mention here and is covered extensively in the testimony we had, the project is required to consult with the municipality, or in this case the County, prior to filing the petition.

We did that. There was extensive
outreach, as I said, from day one. Ocean Wind would have and still would strongly prefer to reach agreements with the County, so we would not need the Board to rule on this petition. Unfortunately time is moving forward,
as $I$ said before. And if those agreements could not be reached in a reasonable amount of time, so we simply at this time, to meet the deadlines in the Board's 2019 order and as far as starting construction, we need to move forward now, you know.

The other thing I'll just say here briefly, we've heard some of the other parties here have said, well, it's premature because the federal permitting process hasn't concluded yet. Well, that simply isn't correct. It's not premature for the Board to rule on these issues now.

Because first of all, the easement issues, we need easements in order to be able to finalize the route and to begin construction. We can't construct without the easements and we can't begin construction without the NJDEP permits.

Secondly, it's sort of the chicken and the egg argument. The federal permitting process requires consistency review, and the state permits are needed in order to comply with the federal permitting consistency review process.

So it simply isn't accurate that the project, or quite frankly now that the petition
has been filed, the Board can or should wait for the federal government to finalize their permitting review.

It's simply, both things have to
happen at the same time, so the project can move forward and finish the permitting stage of it, and actually begin the construction phase of the project.

At this point that covers what I'd like to say in my initial comments. And $I$ would reserve the right to respond in rebuttal to the statements of other parties as necessary. Thank you.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, sir.

Next I invite the County of Cape May to make its statement. And if its attorney would state its appearance and then make the statement, please?

MR. DONOHUE: Thank you.
President Fiordaliso, good morning.
Good morning to members of the Board. Good morning to Participants and Staff. Thank you.

Michael Donohue of the Law Offices of Blaney, Donohue \& Weinberg in Avalon on behalf of
the County of Cape May.
Initially $I$ want to indicate that the County, of course, incorporates all of its arguments, all of its paper submissions.

In the interest of the Board's time and judicial economy I'm not going to argue every single thing I've argued so far. It's of record. Our motions, our objections continue, etc.

Like I said, I don't want to belabor too many issues. But there are a number of things that should be touched on, there are a number of legal issues that need to be preserved in oral argument.

As Mr. Eisenstark said, we're here under the section of OWEDA 48:3-87.1(f), which essentially allows the offshore wind project to file a petition such as this with the BPU in order for the BPU to do a couple of things.

Mainly to stand in the shoes of elected officials. And that is the main reason or a main reason why the county has felt compelled to essentially, you know, object to the process.

The County feels strongly, or the officials in the County feel strongly that the voters should not be disenfranchised by a process
such as this, with all due respect to every member of the Board, where an unelected state authority steps into the shoes of elected officials and essentially sets them aside and begins to make decisions for them.

It's not unheard of, but this is a brand new process. One thing that $I$ think everybody agrees on is these are matters of first impression. It's a brand new statute, has not been subject to judicial scrutiny. There's no jurisprudential guidance on any aspect of it. But there are other similar processes.

We understand that, we've argued that as well. But these are matters of first impression. Mr. Eisenstark touched on it as did President Fiordaliso, the reasonably necessary standard. The County disagrees that that serves to utterly limit our discussion only to certain things, but we are going to try to stay within those parameters.

But the court has said that the analysis of the reasonably and necessary standard is to include consideration of all facts and circumstances, and a balancing of interests. That's in our papers, Borough of Glassboro v.

Grossman 457 New Jersey Super 416, a case from the Appellate Division 2019.

So in the assessing reasonably necessary analysis, the Board isn't compelled to simply look at, well, does the applicant, the petitioner, demonstrate, or form its own opinion that, hey, this is reasonably necessary because we looked at everything else and this is what we would like to do?

That's not the standard. The standard is to look at all of the facts and circumstances, engage in a balancing of interest to determine whether this particular route must be the one.

The County argues that the applicant petitioner should not be able to shift that burden to the County, that they should have to be able to establish conclusively that only this route is the one that will work, and is reasonably necessary for compelling substantial reasons, not just for the benefit of the project.

And balancing all of the interests here, as President Fiordaliso went through at the top of this proceeding, there are a number of parties here that are very interested. And there
is objections, which I'm sure you'll hear, I won't speak for any of them.

This is, as the County has argued, a quasi-judicial proceeding. I think any legal conclusion to the contrary is wrong. And all of those standards apply to this proceeding.

The County has made arguments of rightness and justiciability. In other words, are these matters really ready to be disposed of? And the County has argued that they are not. What we hear is time, time, time.

Time is certainly an important consideration, but should it really be the only consideration? Should the only consideration really be, hey, if we don't get this done right now, it may disrupt our timeline?

It's been this sort of a Catch 22 for the County and other parties, because the argument is made, well, we have an agreement with the BPU, we have to start delivering this power. So consequently all this has to happen now, time should control the outcome.

That doesn't appear to be a very reasonable argument.

In terms of the environmental reviews
that are to take place, as the Board is well aware Universal Energy Management is in the process of a draft and Environmental Impact Statement review. There's a historical resource analysis taking place.

The draft Environmental Impact
Statement is not scheduled to come to a sort of point of finality until April of 2023. And other processes, including DEP process, multiple processes, there's about a half-dozen or so looks like, applications for the DEP, will also be moving forward.

And here's really the problem as the County sees it in that regard, in terms of the question of time, and I'll put it this way:

Not to be flip about it, but we've all, I think everybody involved in this process, been involved in complex state and federal environmental permitting applications. Right?

Has anyone ever lived through that experience and not had those agencies change their project? I think the answer to that question is no. It is almost a fait accompli that those agencies are going to change what has been proposed.

And if those changes impact this preferred route, which they are likely to do for reasons I'll talk about in a moment, we're going to be back here again. I'll touch more on that in a moment.

What we look at in terms of this proceeding asks for two questions. The first is a question of whether the $B P U$ should put aside the elected officials of Cape May County when it comes to consent to the DEP applications.

Here's where we got hung up on that: The certification required to be signed by the County to submit to the DEP contains a provision that says, we have reviewed all of the documentation associated with all of these applications and we find it to be accurate -- I'm paraphrasing -- and complete. That's essentially what that the certification requires.

No County official was in a position to do that. And we were not provided with, although Ocean Wind's answer was, well, you never asked for it, but it should be clear that it's part of the process that you're asking for consent of this nature to provide all that documentation. And frankly, there's no one, I
certainly would not be competent to review that information, nor would any of the elected Officials. It would really require the County to retain some expert who could review all of that documentation and say it looks accurate, it looks complete.

That never happened, never given the opportunity really to do that. So in terms of signing the consent, the County is not being obstinate or trying to throw a monkey wrench in this whole process. There's no official who could sign it.

Because they did not make that representation on a certification, which is essentially swearing under oath to what's included and what the DEP wanted.

So the representation is accurate on its face that the County has not consented. But there's substantial important legal and factual reasons why that hasn't happened.

So at this point, Ocean Wind comes to the Board and says, we need you to step into the shoes of these five elected officials.

We just had an election a couple nights ago. Tens of thousands of residents of

Cape May County voted for who they want to represent them on the Board of County Commissioners who make these types of decisions. And Ocean Wind says, well, we're not getting anywhere with the County, so we need, respectfully again, unelected state authority to step in, and we argue disenfranchise those voters, the voter who trusted those five people to make these types of decisions.

The first question is on the consents. The consent is to allowing the environmental applications to move forward. I won't talk about any type of settlement type of discussion we had, because those are confidential and shouldn't be in this proceeding.

But there were some discussions outside of the context about, is there a way to offer our non-objection to the applications moving forward, so to speak. Didn't really seem to be a way to do that. There was consent in the form of BPU requires or nothing.

And that's unfortunate. Because I
think if there was a third way, that question may not be before the Board, but here we are.

The second part of the petition is
the taking. I think it's important to stress and understand, this is a condemnation proceeding, there's no other way to look at it. The Board is being asked to take property interest from the County. And if we have a condemnation proceeding, then we are in the context of eminent domain.

Now, again, the County believes that any conclusion that this is not a proceeding that impacts or implicates the law of eminent domain is just wrong. Now, it doesn't mean that every provision of the Eminent Domain Act applies.

What it does mean is that the due process that mirrors the due process procured in the provisions of Eminent Domain has to be afforded to the County.

There's, if you'll indulge me for one moment, the courts have said the legislature may not fight over arbitrate power of administrative agencies.

But as long as the discretion of administrative officers is hemmed in by standards sufficiently defending guiding its exercise and delegation of the eminent domain power can be constitutional.

It's obvious that a statute that
allows an administrative agency to exercise the right of condemnation also contemplates all necessary requirements to satisfy due process.

So in other words, all those things that are typical in an eminent domain proceeding should be part of this process. This goes back to what $I$ pointed out in the beginning about these being matters of first impression.

Every decision that the BPU makes in the context of this petition will be implying that. It would be establishing processes that will be utilized, in all likelihood, on a number of occasions, for perhaps this project, Ocean Wind 2, and other projects that are coming along.

So decisions that are made now are extraordinarily important in terms of determining how to mirror the due process provisions of the Eminent Domain Act and the law interpreting it. So certainly I'm not suggesting Ocean Wind's being dismissive of this process. But it is much more important in terms of this proceeding that $I$ think it has been afforded thus far, at least.

Part of that due process is that the property in question has to be subject to an
appraisal. That's sort of the sine qua non for any condemnation proceeding. The property has to be subject to an appraisal, the property itself. What happened here, the County was presented with an offer based on a appraisal of other property, not this property. And as we pointed out in the papers, that's not what the Eminent Domain Act calls for.

In fact, the Act calls for the County to have the ability to accompany the appraiser to the site, to then get the appraisal, along with a description of the methodology valuation used by the appraiser.

Now, interestingly, and we appreciate Ocean Wind finally doing this, an appraisal was conducted in the last couple of weeks. We got the report just a few days ago. But it's important to understand that that -- and again, if you'll indulge me --
N.J.S.A. 20:3-6 is part of the Eminent Domain Act. It encourages entities to try to resolve these issues before filing suit. And they're pre-action requirements. The appraisal is a big one.

The pre-action appraisal is a big one
because the courts are trying not to have to deal with these things, right, as I'm sure the BPU would prefer.

So that provision for a pre-action appraisal often allows the parties to engage in substantive discussions that avoid litigation. And it is strictly required before any condemnation action can be filed.

The court says the purpose is subject to strict instruction. If a condemnor may ignore statute and then later cure it during the proceedings, the whole purpose of having a pre-action appraisal will be completely frustrated.

Indeed, an order for a stay so the condemnor may then do what it should have done earlier, will encourage noncompliance.

In other words, it will encourage parties who seek a taking by eminent domain to simply ignore the pre-action requirement. And the courts go on to say that the remedy for that is dismissal without prejudice.

So what do we have here? We have undisputedly, beyond dispute, an action for a taking, a condemnation action filed without
satisfaction of that pre-action requirement for an appraisal beforehand.

The Eminent Domain Act, and
interestingly OWEDA in this section, then requiring a 90 -day period after the appraisal is supplied before a suit can be brought, before a petition can be filed, before a condemnation act can be filed.

And the purpose of that 90 -day period is to do what the Act wants to happen, what the courts want to happen, is to arm the condemnee with the methodology on valuation, with the appraisal, so that a realistic assessment can be made and some discussion can be had during that 90-day period.

That never happened. And the courts are clear that that cannot be cured mid-suit or mid-petition, because that would encourage people to not comply with that provision.

So the County argues that we now have the appraisal. But really that portion of this application should be dismissed without prejudice.

And once it is, then the 90 -day
period should start and parties can discuss
whether or not any of that methodology makes sense in terms of valuation, or if the offer is acceptable or could be negotiated.

And the County's argument in that regard stands, I think the law requires, I think that's where the court can come down.

In terms of the preferred route versus alternate routes, etc., I won't get down into minutia, the Board has all that, very competent staff, experienced in these things to review what has been submitted.

But as was argued in the Ocean City petition context, and has been argued somewhat in this petition context already, and as the county submitted in the pretrial testimony of its County engineer, in the opinion of the County, that analysis has not been sufficient.

Even the analysis of the preferred route is leaving out major components in terms of this balancing of interest. Right? There are nine, ten towns in Cape May County who have essentially filed some opposition to the process, some of them have a direct interest. Right?

Ocean City does, the County does.
That should be part of the balancing. Those folks
object to how this has been brought together to the analysis that has been presented or not presented. And that should be part of that balance. That should be a major consideration. In addition to that, our engineer identified the fact that the preferred route is going right through wetlands. Wetlands are a terrifying word in an environmental setting complex in our neck of the woods, and I'm sure in the experience of many of the Board members.

As soon as you say the word wetlands, you know you have to deal with a stack of environmental considerations before you can disturb one piece of cordgrass.

This route will go through wetlands.
And we're not sure how many areas of wetlands it will disturb. Because Roosevelt Boulevard itself, as our engineer argued, does not have a wide improved shoulder.

It has mostly grass shoulder that, in fact, is wetlands. It's a causeway right into a barrier island. So much of it runs essentially just right through wetlands.

So that roadway, that shoulder, also
abuts or is actually part of in some places the
wetlands. We don't know, there's been no analysis of what that impact will be from this route.

Also, the engineer pointed out that the Roosevelt Boulevard bridge over Crook Horn Creek, will have to be widened and perhaps replaced. There's a plan apparently to put bumpers on the north side where this route is proposed to go.

And no one has answered the question of how that will impact the route in the future, or the bridge, the ability to repair or replace the bridge. And that raises the question then, if that is going to happen during the 30-, 40-year life span of this project, what happens then?

Do we have to shut down the entire property, the entire operation, power generation operation in order to move these lines? Do we have to move the bridge to a different place that can cost millions and millions of dollars to taxpayers?

There's no consideration of those questions whatsoever in the presentation or the argument in favor of the proposed route. There are also alternate routes that weren't considered, as the engineer pointed out. And the Board can go
look at that detail in the testimony.
But there's a Parkway route that was described where the upland Parkway right-of-way could be potentially used. There's an abandoned railroad, which could be used.

And these abandoned railroad beds, I'm sure the Board sees in various places, and probably has even dealt with no doubt, are being utilized in this fashion very effectively. And the railroad bed is being upgraded to contain the facility underground very effectively on a route that makes sense.

And then improving the abandoned railroad beds to make it a bike path or a walking path or something of that nature, which would be fantastic for the community, and a great thing for a corporate resident.

So all of those things, in addition to all the other arguments we made, I think the Board needs to consider when talking about what's reasonably necessary and what the courts require in this balancing approach, and considering all the facts and circumstances.

Just indulge me for one second. What we have not seen really, other than what is
essentially just opinion, and not really analysis, not really a detailed breakdown analysis of all the other routes -- Egg Harbor Bay route, Parkway route, the railroad route -- I assume if that was available we would all have it.

It wasn't done. Essentially there appears to have been an assessment, this is the shortest route and the cheapest route, this is what we deem to be reasonably necessary. We don't want to burden the project with extra costs.

But we don't know, because no analysis has been presented in that regard, whether there would be extra costs for these other routes.

And in that balancing approach that the courts require when you deal with something that the question is reasonably necessary, money is only one factor. But we don't know. And that's part of the problem. We don't know because that analysis has not been presented.

So I'll just recap. The County resubmits all its arguments obviously. We think that these issues are not ripe yet, they're not complete. There's plenty of time. Time $I$ know is a factor.

But we are in the midst of a project that will impact us, $I$ say us, the State of New Jersey, perhaps the world, in a good way, we all hope so. But us here in Cape May County for 30 years, and we're talking about time.

The impacts to this will be great. And $I$ know this proceeding is not going to deal with questions of the impacts to fisheries and tourism and the view shed and those things. But for us that's all very serious, very important. And we think they should be considered.

What the County believes is going to happen, and it's unfortunate, is that the Board will act as it acts and the Board will make a decision.

If the Board makes the decision to approve this preferred route at this time, then we're all going to watch the environmental permit processes move forward and change the project and change what has to be done and where it can be done. And what happens then?

So let's, if you'll indulge me again, play this out very quickly. The Board grants the easements. Ocean Wind pursues its filing. We operate interestingly under the Eminent Domain Act
at that point, which is specifically incorporated into OWEDA by reference, to determine the value of the property which we can agree.

And an easement is recorded, a
permanent easement over this piece of land, before any of the environmental permitting is done. And the environmental permitting goes back and says, can't do it there, but it's got to move 200 feet to the north or south.

Then we're back here again. Because there won't be an easement for that portion of land. And I shouldn't say we're back here again, maybe we work it out. But if we don't, we're back here again and doing this all over again.

Whereas, if those processes are allowed to move forward we wouldn't have to do that. And this will be the final part, one of the final parts of the argument.

We have argued, and we don't seek this, we argue this alternatively, we argued for a dismissal without prejudice of the entire application.

But this Board can bifurcate these questions. In other words, split these things in half.

The Board can look at the DEP consent question and say, you know what, those applications need to move forward for the reasons Mr. Eisenstark said, so that all of the environmental permitting processes can move forward, and we're going to get into that.

But on the taking question we're going to hold that, because we don't know yet. It's not concretized, it's not certain yet for us to say that's definitely where you're going to go, that's definitely how you're going to do this. So we're going to step in and effectuate a taking of the County's property.

That question can be held until such time as those environmental permitting processes are complete. That would seem to make sense. Again, we argue this alternative. It seems to make a lot of sense.

The last thing I would say, because there has been some dismissal of the State Constitution, the Board is aware, it's in our submissions, that there is a provision of our State Constitution, Article 4, Section 7, Paragraph 11, requires that any law concerning municipal corporations or for local government or
concerning counties shall be liberally construed in their favor. That's in our State Constitution.

Ocean Wind seems to argue that the Constitution can be set aside because OWEDA says any laws that affect, this sort of trumps that. But the County's position is the State Constitution cannot be trumped in that manner.

And the County argues, the members of the Board in considering this must consider that constitutional provision and liberally construe OWEDA in favor of the County, not in favor of the petition.

So when there are questions of this nature, the Constitution should be given some respect in that regard.

I think that's all $I$ have at this moment. I appreciate it. I'm more than happy to take questions from the Board at the appropriate time. And we would reserve hopefully some time for rebuttal, if necessary. Thank you.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you very much, sir.

I now invite the City of Ocean City's attorney to state her appearance and make their
statement.
MS. MC CROSSON: Thank you, sir.
Good morning, President Fiordaliso, Commissioners, Board Staff. Thank you for the opportunity to present on behalf of Ocean City.

I was before the BPU in June in the first petition that involved Ocean City, and for purposes of this record, I'm going to reiterate arguments made in that proceeding, which is docketed as QO2202004.

Ocean City renews its argument that the New Jersey Administrative Code under Section 7:36-26.8 permits the local government, be it Ocean City or Cape May County, to initiate any and all application for the diversion of land on its recreation and open space inventory.

The 2021 amendment to N.J.S.A.'s 48:3-87.1, which appears to have been targeted at Ocean City, and designed specifically to benefit Ocean Wind and Orsted, denies Ocean City's power to decide whether Ocean Wind, a private entity, may take municipal or public property rights within Ocean City and Cape May County.

Whether this amendment will be upheld in the face of a legal challenge remains to be
seen. The City and now the County have cited to New Jersey Constitution Article 4, Section 7, Paragraph 11, any law concerning municipal corporations formed for local government or concerning counties shall be liberally construed in their favor.

Of course that argument applies in this case, as well as it did in the other. Ocean City urges this Board to refer Ocean Wind's petition to the Office of Administrative Law to contest the case under N.J.S.A. 52:14F-1, et seq., for hearing and disposition.

All three factors set forth in the case of Board of Education of the Upper Freehold Regional School District versus State Health Benefits Commission, 314 NJ Super 486, Appellate Division 1998, are present in this matter as they were in the prior case.

This hearing is required by statute. The hearing will result in adjudication concerning rights, duties, obligations, privileges, benefits or other relations, and the hearing involves specific parties, rather than a large segment of the public.

Additionally, discovery is required
in this matter. Ocean Wind is focused on its preferred route to cross Ocean City's beach, across the barrier island itself, and Ocean City's and Cape May County's wetlands.

They have dismissed the alternate routes, including the route through Great Egg Harbor Inlet. Ocean City, Cape May County and the public have a right to know why the alternate routes have been dismissed.

In the absence of factual support for its claims that the alternate routes have the challenges that Ocean Wind claims, the Board should consider the possibility that these reasons are pretextual, and that Ocean Wind is simply pursuing the easiest or least expensive route to its own benefit and to the detriment of the City, the County and the public.

The lack of discovery in this process may undermine its legitimacy in the eyes of the public. In some respects this process may be analogous to cases under the Eminent Domain Act, where no or extremely limited discovery is permitted.

However, considering whether discovery should be required, the Board should
treat this matter in the same way it treats other matters which come before them in the Municipal Land Use Law, where the same standard of reasonably necessary is applied.

As the City argued with respect to the first Ocean Wind petition, Ocean Wind has failed in its burden to establish that it's proposed route cutting a swath across the width of Ocean City and through Cape May County with a backhoe is reasonably necessary.

Ocean City requests that the BPU carefully consider the Great Egg Harbor route as an alternate route to the $B L$ England facility, and compel Ocean Wind to provide evidence as to why that alternate route is not being pursued.

Expert testimony is now required to poke holes in Ocean Wind's argument about the challenges which caused it to dismiss the Great Egg Harbor route. The two routes seem to be comparable, the route through Great Egg Harbor and the route through Barnegat Bay as an underwater route that presents challenges.

However, nothing that cannot be overcome, as they have overcome those challenges in the Oyster Creek project. The inlet is of
sufficient width to accommodate this route, as can be readily seen, without impacting the burrowing area in the Ocean City shore.

Restriction of other vessels during construction in this wide inlet does not equate to closure of the inlet, as Ocean Wind would have you believe. Navigation would continue during the temporary period of construction as it did when the Ocean City-Longport Bridge was constructed.

They talk about disturbance of shellfish habitat. Well, that can be addressed by monetary contributions to the NJDEP's dedicated fund for Shellfish Habitat Mitigation and Restoration, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:7-9.2. This is done on a regular basis.

And as noted before, Ocean Wind's claim that the two historic bridges which could be impacted by the Great Egg Harbor route is just simply inaccurate. The overwhelming benefit of the Great Egg Harbor route is the utter lack of disturbance to the citizenry of Ocean City, Cape May County, and the public in general.

The City's pristine beach and wetlands and the County wetlands would not be excavated or disturbed. The streets would not be
opened. Ocean City would still bear the aesthetic effects of this project, but that's not before this Board.

However, the Island and the County would not be defaced, and the activities of the people on the Island and the County would not be interrupted.

Without evidentiary support for its rejection of the Great Egg Harbor route and the other routes, how can this Board evaluate (inaudible)? If there's another route how can this be determined to be reasonably necessary?

The challenges cited by Ocean Wind appear to have been overcome in the Oyster Creek proposal. Could the strategies utilized to reach the Oyster Creek station be implemented in the Great Egg Harbor Inlet? If so, why is Ocean Wind insisting that the proposed route is reasonably necessary?

I agree with Mr. Eisenstark. The question before the Board is not whether the route through Ocean City is the easiest, fastest, least expensive. The Board is to determine whether (inaudible). But not reasonable, that's not the inquiry before you. It's reasonably necessary.

If there's more than one route, then going through Ocean City is not reasonably necessary. And Ocean Wind has not given any information about alternate routes to make a determination.

Until Ocean Wind explains why the Great Egg Harbor route was rejected, and explains how the obstacles upon which it bases its rejection of the Great Egg Harbor route and other routes are different than those that evidently it believes it can overcome in the Oyster Creek project, this Board cannot be certain that Ocean Wind is not arbitrarily abusing the power that the 2021 amendment granted to it.

The Board should not make a finding until the proposed route is demonstrated to be reasonably necessary. Ocean City concurs with and shared the arguments made on behalf of Cape May County.

The idea of bifurcating the Board's decision, allowing some of the permittees to go forward without granting the easements, is a good suggestion, one which we hope that the Board will take seriously.

The record before you is deficient.

Ocean City asks the Board to either bifurcate its decision, as Mr. Donohue suggested, or deny the petition. And the Board (inaudible). The City requests that the Board refer this petition to the Office of Administrative Law.

Thank you.
PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you very much for your comments.

I will now invite Upper Township's attorney to state their appearance and give their statement.

MR. MALEY: Good morning. Jim Maley on behalf of Upper Township. And Upper Township does not have an affirmative statement to make, we just reserve for any rebuttal.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Very good. Thank you, sir. I will now call upon Rate Counsel to state their appearance and to make their statement.

MR. LIPMAN: Good morning, President Fiordaliso and Commissioners. Brian Lipman of the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel. It's going to be hard to follow that last argument and be succinct, but I'll do my best.

The issue before the Board today, as
you know, is whether the requested easement is reasonably necessary for the construction or operation of the qualified wind project.

And it's important again to remember what's not in front of the Board today. Offshore wind is not in front of the Board. Where wind turbines will be placed is not in front of the Board. It's just this route, whether it is reasonably necessary.

Rate Counsel sees two problems with the Board making this decision at this time. First, it's the procedural posture in this case. Because of that the decision has essentially already been made.

In the Ocean City matter the Board found that the requested easements were reasonably necessary. In doing so they evaluated the exact same route that's in front of the Board now.

As we explained then, bifurcating these two requests leaves out anyone participating solely in this case. The Ocean City order came out the day before the public hearing in this matter, before written public comments were filed, and before obviously this oral argument.

The result was that many people,
members of the public, were confused at the public hearing for the matter, since the Ocean City order was issued that day before. They questioned why they were even attending a public hearing for things that they perceived to have already been decided.

Bifurcating the two matters confused the public, and it also made the overall procedural process of these matters more opaque. Moreover, as a result of deciding in favor of the Ocean City matter, it's virtually impossible for the Board to rule against the petition here.

To do so would likely have to
overturn the Ocean City order, an extremely unlikely outcome. Thereby, deciding the Ocean City before hearing from the parties here, the Board has essentially deprived the parties in this matter the ability of being heard.

The second problem we see is the record in this matter. We believe the record is fundamentally flawed. There's a petition before the Board.

The parties were not afforded the opportunity to ask for discovery regarding that petition. The parties were not afforded the
opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses supporting that petition.

Essentially the Board has before it a petition, and no party, including Board Staff, has had the opportunity to properly determine if it's accurate, credible or complete.

I would note that Mr. Eisenstark referred briefly to rebuttal testimony that was filed by Ocean Wind. There was no chance to ask anything, either informal or otherwise, on the rebuttal testimony.

And it's disingenuous for the Board to then state that no person had evidence opposing the petition. How could they? Due process serves two essential purposes. To ensure that every party has the opportunity to be truly heard, and to give the decider of fact the confidence that the evidence before it is viable.

Here neither has been accomplished, and simply due process has not been afforded. Ultimately the Board must determine that this easement is reasonably necessary.

This is a higher bar than a simple eminent domain case, which requires only necessity. Reasonable was added to the statute
and it must have meaning.
Reliance from the eminent domain statute is misplaced and has led to a process where the parties, the public, and frankly, the Board has been deprived of a full record upon which to base a decision.

Rate Counsel will not, because we cannot take a position on this petition. I am not happy with this conclusion. And frankly the Board should not be either.

The simple fact is that Rate Counsel does not have sufficient information to reach a reasonable decision. It is unclear to Rate Counsel how the Board does either. Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Director Lipman.

And thank everyone who has made a statement thus far.

At this time $I$ would like to invite the nine participants to place their appearances on the record. It's my understanding that Counsel may be representing a number of these municipalities.

So we're going to approach this, with your permission, a little bit differently, and ask
the attorneys to state their appearance and indicate the municipalities they are representing, if it's more than one.

So if you would start stating your appearance, please?

MR. BALDINI: I'm assuming you're
talking to me. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.
My name is Paul J. Baldini. I'm an attorney, I'm licensed in the State of New Jersey. And I do represent nine municipalities before this Board, as I have done.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: So you are representing all nine?

MR. BALDINI: Yes, sir, I am.
PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Okay. Very
good. The floor is yours, sir.
MR. BALDINI: Thank you, sir, I appreciate that. I also wish to thank the entire board of the BPU for listening to these comments.

I am here on behalf of nine Cape May County municipalities. These municipalities sought intervention status and were denied the opportunity to intervene.

So it is clear, I am here on behalf
of the City of Sea Isle, Dennis Township, Lower

Township, the Borough of Avalon, Middle Township, the Borough of Wildwood Crest, the Borough of Stone Harbor, the City of Wildwood, and the City of North Wildwood.

Collectively $I$ represent the overwhelming majority of residents who reside in Cape May County and will be affected by the decisions of the Board.

At the outset, the municipalities specifically reserve the right to challenge any and all approvals granted to Ocean Wind pursuant to this process.

The municipalities feel the Board does not have authority to move forward with this. The County has laid out numerous arguments, and I will not repeat those here before the Board.

But I do reserve all rights to these nine municipalities, including the right to appeal and challenge the decision to deny Intervenor status to these municipalities. By participating in these proceedings we are not waiving any rights.

Turning to consideration of Ocean Wind's petition seeking authority to obtain an easement over both Ocean City and County property,
there are a number of considerations. Some of the considerations are specific to each municipality, and some are general to all nine municipalities.

Under the statute N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1, one must keep in mind that this is a new statute, which has never before been used. As such, it is absolutely imperative that all municipalities and all stakeholders be involved in the process.

The rules being made by the BPU as the BPU goes through the process will, in the future, affect all nine municipalities, yet they have been effectively shut out of the process by the BPU.

Decisions to be made by the BPU are decisions that impact home rule and undermine the legitimacy of the process. Heretofore, these decisions were made by elected officials and the affected communities. They will now be made by the BPU.

I have been specifically immodest not to address the legitimate and important issues of residents of Cape May County, such as damage to fragile beaches, wetlands and other protected lands, impact on tourism, the fishing industry or environmental damage to birds and whales. So be
it.
But these towns go on record as calling out what is happening. The City of Sea Isle City is immediately adjacent to Ocean City and directly impacted by the easement sought.

If there is a way to deliver the energy to its final inland destination that does not run through the beaches of Ocean City or the County access roads to Ocean City, then such should be the preferred route.

The Great Egg Harbor route is a reasonable route. It avoids roads traveled by and on the residents of Sea Isle City.

Keep in mind that Sea Isle City send its children to Ocean City High School. The residents of Sea Isle City drive those streets every day. They will be directly impacted by the decisions made by the BPU.

The reasonable route of going through
Ocean City and along the County road may be reasonable to the BPU, but is not reasonable to the residents of the City of Sea Isle City.

Dennis Township being an inland community has concerns over the way the route is selected, with no financial disclosures by Ocean

Wind. Yet requests from the County and Ocean City have been ignored.

The rush to move forward with taking of land without the required Environmental Impact Statements is particularly troubling to Dennis Township.

Dennis is a rural community with large sections of environmentally protected and sensitive lands. To transverse these lands when there are other more viable routes available is disconcerting to the residents of Dennis Township.

Lower Township is a community in Cape May County that has both oceanfront beaches and Delaware Bay beaches. The cavalier approach to taking a land from Ocean City which is sensitive, which is sensitive land, is a huge concern to Lower Township.

As future wind development occurs in the Atlantic Ocean and Ocean Wind proceeds south, there will be arguments by Ocean Wind to not only traverse Lower Township's pristine beaches in the Atlantic Ocean, but for some residents its pristine beach along the Delaware Bay.

The process of the taking and the
impact upon environmentally sensitive land is extremely important to the Township of Lower Township, and directly affects its residents.

If the easement in taking is provided against Ocean City, then is Lower Township one of the next communities to suffer such a fate? If so, why aren't they at the table as stakeholders? The Borough of Avalon is immediately adjacent to the City of Sea Isle City, and also in the line to have Ocean Wind place windmills directly east of the community. This would be Phase 2.

Avalon is a vacation town with sight of the wind farm being detrimental to vacationers. Quite frankly, this goes without saying.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: If I may just interrupt you for a moment? We're addressing the transmission lines, not the location or the position of wind turbines.

MR. BALDINI: Thank you, sir. And I understand that you're now suppressing my right to be heard here today. I understand that, I accept it.

But understand that this City of, in
this case Avalon, will not stand by idly while their opportunity to be heard is transversed. So that we are clear, I reserve all rights relative to these communities to be heard. Thank you, sir. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: I am not suppressing anyone's right to state their opinions. I did at the beginning of this proceeding indicate that the arguments would be directed specifically to the transmission lines and their location.

MR. BALDINI: I remain with my
objection, sir. And so be it.
I'll turn to Middle Township, since
Avalon has been suppressed. Middle Township is an inland community similar to Dennis Township, with much protected pristine infrastructure.

Middle Township is also concerned about the process, and in an effort to utilize the process it involves all elected officials. One can hardly say that a reasonable road or a reasonable route is a route in which no elected officials have a say.

So from Middle Township's
perspective, the very process is tainted and fails to provide for appropriate input from affected
municipalities.
Middle Township also supports the idea of using the Great Egg Bay Harbor route and bypassing Ocean City and the County road. This is the reasonable route. Quite frankly, the majority of Cape May County residents understand that to be the reasonable route, even if Ocean Wind does not.

The Borough of Wildwood Crest is also a beach-front community, which faces the same problems that Ocean City faces, that Sea Isle faces and that Avalon faces.

The Borough is a small community which depends greatly -- I will stop after making this statement, Mr. Chairman -- depends greatly on tourism and influx of summer residents. The implications are clear.

So again, I will not go into the area you asked me not to go into. But I reserve the rights on behalf of the Borough of Wildwood Crest as well, as all nine municipalities.

The Borough of Stone Harbor is watching the process and recognizes the risks to residents and visitors of the Borough, as Stone Harbor views the process which is unfolding.

The Borough of Stone Harbor has no reason for the preferred route to go through pristine beach-front property and along the County road when there is an alternative route in Great Egg Harbor.

The BPU is requested by this municipality to take a closer look at what is a preferred route and what is a reasonably preferred route, and request that the Board take appropriate action to protect the beach-fronts and protect the County rights-of-way.

The City of Wildwood and the City of North Wildwood are oceanfront communities immediately adjacent to each other.

These communities face the same issues as the Borough of Wildwood Crest faces, and opposes the preferred route offered by Ocean Wind, and supports Ocean City in its efforts to move the preferred route to the Great Egg Harbor.

The communities implore the BPU to
listen to Ocean City and listen to the County and listen to the elected officials, so that the BPU can perform its function of allowing for a transparent and open process, at the same time ensuring that Ocean Wind is able to move forward
with its project in an environmentally sensitive and appropriate fashion.

I also note it is clear from the
record that not only the County of Cape May, but also Ocean City, have repeatedly reached out to Ocean Wind. I heard the comments of Ocean Wind that their offer remains open.

It is my suggestion that Ocean Wind should be more proactive. Sit down with the County, sit down with Ocean City, and find a way to resolve these outstanding issues.

The stakeholders want to speak to
Ocean Wind, Ocean Wind should be open and transparent in the way it deals with the municipalities and the County.

The municipalities are further
concerned that the proposed installation along the County road limits the County's ability to install additional drainage or other underground facilities due to proximity regulations.

As testified by the County engineer at length before the Board, this is a problematic process. Perhaps equally troubling is the fact that Ocean Wind has failed to address the impact of the need for elevated infrastructure in the
near future due to global warming.
So quite frankly, the point of that is that if these roads become inundated and it causes problems in raising that and protecting these municipalities, then using the Great Egg Harbor route would have been the reasonable route and would not be impacted by global warming or climate change or rising tides, as the beaches and as critical infrastructure leading in and out Ocean City will be impacted.

Finally, the record is devoid of any cost analysis as to the alternate routes considered by Ocean Wind. Although money is not the only factor, the boroughs and the towns are sensitive to the fact that financial considerations come into place for everything.

So if we find that the costs are not prohibitive but differential, then the reasonable route should be Great Egg Harbor, as requested by Ocean City, and not through its beaches and its County roads.

I thank you for listening to these
comments. And I hope you have a good day, sir. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: I appreciate your comments, sir. Thank you.

Now I will invite the parties and Intervenors to make any rebuttal statements, should they wish to do so. I will call on the parties and Intervenors in the same order as before.

Ocean Wind, you may proceed to make your rebuttal statement, if you have one.

MR. EISENSTARK: Yes. Thank you, President Fiordaliso. Gregory Eisenstark again on behalf of Ocean Wind. I do have a bit of rebuttal. I'll try to keep it short in the interest of time 'cause we've already been going for quite a while.

Let me respond first to some of the arguments that Counsel for the County made. The County's main objection seems to be to the statute itself that allows, gives the Board jurisdiction over this petition.

And again, the County repeated the phrase, stand in the shoes of elected officials, many, many times. The fact is under state law, all municipal authority derives from state legislature. So that's Number 1.

Secondly, it's clear in many, many different contexts, including a public utility
context, that the legislature may empower the BPU to supersede municipal or County approvals where the statewide interest in public utilities, or in this instance in offshore wind projects, is paramount to local interest.

In fact, that's the very reason that
the BPU has had jurisdiction to overrule municipal and county determinations with respect to local zoning and siting approvals, since literally the turn of the last century.

And it's the very reason why these
legislative amendments to OWEDA were necessary here, to essentially give the Board the power to override municipal objections or County objections, where the interests of the state and the citizens as a whole should be paramount. And I submit that that applies here.

The law is clear that the Board, that the legislature may empower the Board, or other state municipalities, to do just what it has empowered the BPU to do here.

Briefly, the County made an argument that it didn't, couldn't or wouldn't consent to the DEP permit applications because it didn't feel that it was competent to review the documents, and
didn't have the expertise or knowledge to sign the certification.

With all due respect, private
property owners, municipalities and counties sign those DEP certifications every week of the year. I'm sure the County has a county engineer, he filed testimony in this case.

Why they felt they couldn't ask for a copy of that, review them and get comfortable with them, is beyond me. But with all due respect, that's a bit of a weak argument.

Ocean Wind would be happy to share those documents with the County, would have been happy to share them if they asked for them, would have been happy to sit down with them and explain them if they needed assistance.

But that's a fairly standard part of the BPU permitting process, that municipalities and counties engage in all of the time.

Again, $I$ won't go into a lot of rebuttal to the County's argument about the applicability of the Eminent Domain Act for one primary reason, the county made those arguments in its earlier motion to dismiss.

We replied and responded to them in a
lengthy legal brief. And the Board has denied the County's motion and rejected all of those arguments.

That issue has already been decided in this case, and the Board simply decided here again at the end of the case, quite frankly, that the process that the OWEDA amendments lay out for the acquisition of easements by condemnation are clear.

The process starts with the BPU. Once the BPU, if the BPU approved, gives the authority for the offshore wind project to go forward, then there's a process that's set forth in the statute concerning the recording of the property interest, and then the determination of the appropriate compensation if the parties can agree to it.

There's no due process issue here. What the project has done and what the Board did in the Ocean City case, and what we're asking the Board to do in this case, complies with state law in all respects.

Finally, both the County and Ocean City made a number of comments suggesting that the route selection process was insufficient. Again,
you know, I'm not going to belabor the point, but there's extensive written testimony in the record of this proceeding.

Ocean Wind has filed direct and rebuttal testimony explaining the route selection process, explaining in detail the alternate routes that were considered and why those routes were ultimately not pursued, including the Great Egg Harbor route that a number of parties have spoken in favor here today.

So for the parties to come and argue that there's been no analysis of alternate routes is simply not true. And I'll just direct the Board to look at Ocean Wind's testimony in this case where that analysis is provided.

Finally, a brief response to comments that a few parties have made, the County and I believe the non-municipality Participants just made, that there may be future changes to road structures or to a bridge, or that the DEP or the federal government may change part of the project on review.

That's just speculation. There's no evidentiary basis in the record to sustain that. It's pure speculation of Counsel. A lot of things
may happen.
But we're here today, we need to move forward with the project. We've made a record before the Board on the easements that we're seeking and the consents that we're seeking.

And you know, who knows what's going to happen in the future, five, ten, 40 years from now? All of that is just speculation. And it's no basis for the Board to wait, none of that is any factual or evidential basis for the Board to bifurcate this proceeding and only give the permit consents but hold off on the easements.

We need to go forward now. That's the position Ocean Wind is taking. The record is complete. It's ripe for the Board to make a decision. And we encourage the Board to do so.

That's all $I$ have on rebuttal,
President Fiordaliso, and I thank you.
PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.
I now invite Cape May County to make its rebuttal statement, if they have one.

MR. DONOHUE: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it, and I appreciate the Board's time and attention, I really do.

First of all, the County joins in the
arguments made by Ocean City, by Rate Counsel and by the lead Counsel for the nine municipalities. We would reiterate all of the arguments we've submitted so far. We re-up here.

Not to belabor them, interesting that the argument is that the County is a creature of the state and therefore the elected officials don't matter. I'm not sure it's exactly what Mr. Eisenstark's saying, to be fair, but it's sort of how it came out.

That can't be a reasonable position to take. Elected officials do matter, the voters do matter. The fact that they entrust these elected officials with these types of decisions, that matters.

Ocean Wind argues that the body of law with regard to the Municipal Land Use Law and the authority of the Board in that context should overlay OWEDA context. Maybe that's a reasonable argument.

But that has not been tested in any court. There is nothing, there's no jurisprudence to tell us that applies, that that makes sense, that is how the law would be interpreted.

And as I indicated previously, and
certainly not telling members of the Board anything they don't already know, every decision here is a matter of first impression, will have a lasting impact on every municipality, every county, that might ultimately be affected by wind projects. Those are pretty heavy ambiguity issues and they shouldn't just be dismissed out of hand. In terms of signing the certification, just because so many people sign those without thinking, doesn't mean the County is compelled to sign without thinking.

And we appreciate the admission that Ocean Wind did not supply all of the underlying documentation that would have allowed the County to do their own analysis.

And again, Ocean Wind seeks to engage in burden shifting and put the burden on the County. That was their burden, not ours. Just as it's their burden to provide detailed and complete and specific requests, as the Board will see in our submissions or has seen already, requests that we got literally contained in letters the parenthetical phrase, if required, and a whole list of things that Ocean Wind said, well, we need your consent for this if required.

The burden shouldn't be on the County to determine what's required for the project, that should be on the project. The project should have to come and say precisely, specifically, this is exactly what we need and we need your consent. How can anyone consent to something when somebody says, hey, I need your consent to this, if it's required? Well, how do we know it's required? That's your job, not ours.

No one has argued that there's been no analysis of alternate routes. We've argued there has not been substantial and complete analysis. And most importantly, as Rate Counsel pointed out, there's not been any tested analysis, because we weren't afforded the opportunity for discovery and cross-examination.

So what's come before the Board is a one-sided argument. It is not contested. It has not been subjected to scrutiny. It has not been subject to cross-examination, none of that has happened in this proceeding.

As we have argued in our paper
submissions, all that is contrary to
administration procedures and procedures that are supposed to be employed in this type of petition
proceeding.
And it is not speculation in terms of wetlands and all these other environmental issues, it's not speculation. It's very informed, educated, reasonable inferences that are typical in this type of proceeding.

So with that, I thank the Board for your attention and your time this morning. And I yield back, Mr. President. Thank you.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you for your comments, sir.

I now invite the City of Ocean City to make its rebuttal statement, if they have one. MS. MC CROSSON: Thank you. Mr. Donohue has covered all the points that $I$ would make on behalf of Ocean City. Rather than repeat them, I'd like to adopt his arguments that he made in response or in rebuttal.

And also, Ocean City would also adopt the positions taken by Rate Counsel and Counsel for Participant municipalities which were made after our argument.

I have nothing further. Thank you. PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.

I now invite Upper Township to make a
rebuttal statement, if they have one.
MR. MALEY: Thank you. On behalf of the Township we don't have any comments. We're good. Thanks.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, sir. I now invite Rate Counsel to make any rebuttal statement, if they have one.

MR. LIPMAN: I'll be extremely
brief. I just want to point out that the arguments you've heard show that there's still factual disputes, that a proper hearing with proper ability to cross-examination, discovery, etc., would have resolved and provided a robust record from which the Board can make its ultimate determination.

Thank you.
PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, sir.

I want to thank everyone who has participated today. This is an important issue and one where transparency is extremely important.

I will now ask my colleagues if they have any questions or comments they wish to make at this time?

COMMISSIONER GORDON: President,

Commissioner Bob Gordon here. I just want to thank all of those who made their presentations today. And I assure you that the Board will be reviewing that information very carefully. Thank you.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.
Anyone else would like to make a statement or have any questions?

COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: President
Fiordaliso, I would like to assure all the participants and all the Intervenors and the parties that we have, we take all testimony, all of the voluminous information that's been provided to us in all of the situations, into consideration.

And should also note that many of us on the Board have been elected officials and have years of experience in Land Use Law, as well as what we have to take into consideration, what the legislature has deemed necessary for the utility Board. Thank you.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.
Anyone else?
MR. CHRISTODOULOU: Mr. President, if
I can have a few words?

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Sure.
MR. CHRISTODOULOU: Thank you. And thank you everyone, really, for the very informative information, not just from today's testimony but from the written testimony that are we are reviewing.

And I just want to assure everyone that the entire Board takes this matter very seriously. And as my colleagues have mentioned already, we will take every bit of information given to us to make the most informed and far reaching decisions that we can.

So thank you all very much. And please rest assured that we will do a very great job on everyone's behalf.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: President
Fiordaliso, $I$ also have some comments to make, and I also want to ask Counsel if they can clarify some other points with respect to the standard, the reasonableness standard they're suggesting.

One, that we consider Municipal Land Use applications over the Eminent Domain standard. Is that the argument that is being made? I guess this is Counsel for Cape May.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Counsel for
Cape May?
MR. DONOHUE: Yes, thank you.
Commissioner Solomon, if I understand your question, my argument is the Municipal Land Use sort of roadblock that sometimes get thrown up, that the Board has authority and has had for a very long time to sort of make decisions for the benefit of the broader community, right, instead of a narrow community.

The argument is that the body of law should apply here and be looked at by the Board. But this does not involve Municipal Land Use in any respect. It's a brand new statute, and whether or not that makes sense the Board will have to determine, and maybe ultimately a court.

Our argument in terms of the Eminent
Domain Act is that the law is clear that essentially the due process in this proceeding has to mirror the due process there.

It doesn't have to adopt the entire Eminent Domain Act, although I should note a portion of it is specifically incorporated by reference in OWEDA.

But that flavor, so to speak, of due
process isn't part of this proceeding. So if the taking is to be effectuated, the condemnee should be entitled to those rights that exist there.

As Rate Counsel pointed out, I think it was Rate Counsel, it's a limited process. It's a limited process in terms of discovery.

It's designed to hopefully have the parties confer beforehand, which is why we spend so much time talking about that appraisal requirement, a 90 -day period after that's provided to try and talk these things out. That due process was not afforded here.

So our argument is not necessarily that the bylaw of Municipal Land Use interfaces with BPU's obligations doesn't apply at all, we just don't know. We don't know that and I feel for the Board, because there's no jurisprudence to guide you.

Our argument is that because a taking is being effectuated, the law is clear that that due process protection, things that would typically be afforded, has to be afforded here. Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: Yes. So you're saying that there needs to be more broadly a look
at in terms of due process requirements under this proceeding, our proceeding?

MR. DONOHUE: Yes, yes. Yes,
Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: SO
additionally, things within the record, $I$ think it was Rate Counsel was suggesting, are missing from the record for us to consider because of the application that we've made with respect to due process?

MR. DONOHUE: I would say, not to
belabor it, but $I$ would echo what Rate Counsel argued, and we've argued this in our submissions, that that process of discovery and cross-examination is designed to create that robust record, that tested analysis, rather than a one-sided analysis.

So that the Board can look at that and say we are confident that we have a very robust record, that the opinions of the petitioner's experts have been tested, and subject to a real thorough analysis. The questions have been asked and the parties have been afforded the opportunity to cross-examine and ask those questions so that the record is complete.

And as Rate Counsel pointed out, an argument we join in and others joined in, that hasn't happened here. So yes, correct, absolutely, that would be part of the due process that we're talking about.

COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: That would go to, I think it was the last proceeding we had, though it hasn't been brought up much in this proceeding, in looking at the cost for an issue, the preferred route. Well, that's not determinative on which route is selected.

That is something you would say we are entitled to have provided to the Board for consideration and to probe as part of this proceeding. Is that what you're suggesting?

MR. DONOHUE: Yes. In fact, we, as the County, in response to the petition have the luxury of having Rate Counsel, right, that's involved in these proceedings, who's pointed that out with tremendous expertise and very well argued, that those analyses have not been presented either.

Cost is a factor, but it's not the controlling factor. Right? But we don't know, again, it's something we just don't know because
all the other potential routes have not been subject to that analysis.

There's been no presentation on those questions to say, the Egg Harbor route is great, hypothetically, but it's going to cost an extra $\$ 150$ million.

We don't know. Right? We don't know if it is demonstrably so much more expensive to go that route that it would not then be reasonable, right, under the reasonably necessary analysis.

So yes, that is an argument that was made consistently during the Ocean City proceeding by Rate Counsel and in this proceeding that we have joined.

COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: That's all I have at this time. Thank you. I didn't know if anybody else wanted to speak to the things that $I$ raised, but thank you.

PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you, Dianne. I think it's worth mentioning that, and I mentioned it at the beginning, the transparency is extremely important. And as Commissioner Holden mentioned, many of us or some of us have been elected officials. And we certainly understand from that perspective what local municipalities
encounter.
I think we have to keep in mind, and I'm sure those who have a legal background understand this, the only authority the Board of Public Utilities has is what is given to us by elected officials. And those elected officials comprise the legislature.

So I think that that's an important factor to certainly keep in mind. I think it's also important to keep in mind -- and I don't have any questions, I think all of the attorneys presented their cases well.

And we will, as one of my colleague mentioned thoroughly go through all of the information, written information we've gotten from stakeholders, information from our first gathering and certainly from these oral arguments, to come to what we believe is in the best determination for the communities of Cape May and for the entire State of New Jersey.

That's our charge. And we take this very, very seriously because it's a serious matter. We understand that. So if you leave with nothing else in mind, know that we take your comments and your oral arguments and all of the
other testimony we've received very seriously. And it's reviewed. And sometimes it takes us a while to come to a decision. All of you have been given the opportunity to present your oral arguments.

And now that the parties and
Intervenors have also been given the opportunity for rebuttal statements, I will conclude this meeting.

Please be advised that no formal action will be taken today on this matter. All arguments and rebuttal arguments made today and all recorded materials submitted under the docket will be taken into consideration.

The Board will take formal action on the petition at a later date. And certainly everyone will be apprised of that time frame once it is determined.

I want to thank my fellow
Commissioners. It is now, I have 10:58 a.m., and this meeting is closed.

Thank you very much. Have a
wonderful day, everyone.
(The hearing is adjourned.)
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| 57:16 | unelected (2) | 64:13 | 72:11 | Wind's (8) |
| trumped (1) | 26:2;32:6 | vacationers (1) | week (1) | 22:8;30:21;34:20; |
| 46:8 | unfolding (1) | 64:15 | 72:5 | 48:9;50:17;51:16; |
| trumps (1) | 66:25 | valid (1) | weeks (1) | 60:24;74:14 |
| 46:6 | unfortunate (2) | 16:23 | 35:16 | wires (1) |
| trusted (1) | 32:22;43:13 | valuation (3) | Weinberg (1) | 13:3 |
| 32:8 | unfortunately (2) | 35:12;37:12;38:2 | $24: 25$ | wish (3) |
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