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|  | 1 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. <br> The County filed a motion that the <br> Board, requesting that the Board decline <br> jurisdiction over the petition, and that the Board <br> dismiss the petition without prejudice as ripe for <br> disposition and as nonadjustable under N.J.S.A. <br> 48:3-87.1(F) and N.J.S.A. 20:3-1, et seq. <br> On June 20, 2022 Ocean Wind, LLC <br> filed a reply brief in opposition to the County's <br> June 8 motion. And on June 27, 2022 the County <br> filed a reply to Ocean Wind, LLC's June 20, 2022 <br> reply brief. <br> On June 29, 2022 the Board issued an <br> order retaining the petition, directing that the <br> County be included as a necessary party and <br> designating me as the Presiding Officer. <br> As Presiding Officer, among other <br> things, I am authorized to secure a just and <br> expeditious determination on the issues regarding <br> this petition. <br> On July 5, 2022 I issued an order <br> setting the initial procedural schedule. On July |
| PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Good morning. <br> My name is Joe Fiordaliso, and I am the President of the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities. <br> 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. <br> 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. <br> N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.1(F) grants the <br> Board the authority to make a determination on this petition. <br> Since we have all four Commissioners <br> of the Board present today, the proceeding is a public meeting of the New Jersey Board of Public <br> 23 Utilities. Adequate notice of this meeting has <br> 24 been provided as required by the Open Public <br> 25 Meetings Act set forth in N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, et seq. | 1 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. <br> 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. <br> City of Ocean City and Upper Township <br> were granted Intervenor status, while other <br> motives were granted participant status. <br> On August 22, 2022 the County filed a <br> motion seeking the Board's recusal from this <br> matter and suspension of the procedural schedule. <br> In the motion the County requested that this <br> matter be transferred to the Office of <br> Administrative Law and reassigned to an <br> Administrative Law Judge. <br> Ocean Wind, LLC filed its reply on <br> August 22, a reply to this August 22 motion, on <br> September 1, 2022, and the County responded with its reply on September 9, 2022. <br> On September 27, 2022 I issued an <br> order on the matters to dismiss and recuse, |

denying both. On September 28, 2022 the Board
issued an order designating substitute public
3 hearings officer for two public hearings that were
4 held on September 29, 2022.
5 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
10 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
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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

1 reasonably necessary for the construction or
2 operation of Ocean Wind 1 Qualified Offshore Wind
3 Project.
Please refrain from discussing
5 offshore wind generally, other issues regarding
6 Ocean Wind 1 Qualified Offshore Wind Project or
7 any other matters outside the scope of the matter
8 at hand.
9 I would ask that when you are
10 speaking, please be sure that your camera is on
11 and that you are unmuted. And when you are not
12 speaking, please turn both your camera and your
13 microphone off.
The procedure today will be as
15 follows: First I will ask each of the parties and
16 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
25 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
25 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.
4 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.
9 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,
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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
25 amendments, we're asking the Board to essentially

1 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
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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
25 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.
9 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
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underground electric lines that are installed and
have operated for decades and decades throughout the State of New Jersey without issue.
4
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.

1 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
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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

1 thorough. After the points of interconnection
were identified, it was another iterative, both
qualitative and quantitative process, where Ocean
4 Wind looked at many different potential routes to
5 get from the ocean to Upper Township.
6 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
10 with the different bodies of water that are in 11 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
15 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
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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,

1 as I said before. And if those agreements could
2 not be reached in a reasonable amount of time, so
3 we simply at this time, to meet the deadlines in
4 the Board's 2019 order and as far as starting
5 construction, we need to move forward now, you
6 know.
7 The other thing I'll just say here
8 briefly, we've heard some of the other parties
9 here have said, well, it's premature because the
10 federal permitting process hasn't concluded yet.
11 Well, that simply isn't correct. It's not
12 premature for the Board to rule on these issues
13 now.
Because first of all, the easement
15 issues, we need easements in order to be able to
16 finalize the route and to begin construction. We
17 can't construct without the easements and we can't
18 begin construction without the NJDEP permits.
19 Secondly, it's sort of the chicken
20 and the egg argument. The federal permitting
21 process requires consistency review, and the state
22 permits are needed in order to comply with the
23 federal permitting consistency review process.
24 So it simply isn't accurate that the
25 project, or quite frankly now that the petition
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1 has been filed, the Board can or should wait for
2 the federal government to finalize their
3 permitting review.
4 It's simply, both things have to
5 happen at the same time, so the project can move
6 forward and finish the permitting stage of it, and
7 actually begin the construction phase of the
8 project.
9 At this point that covers what I'd
10 like to say in my initial comments. And I would
1 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
25 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.
5 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.
9 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
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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
24 circumstances, and a balancing of interests.
25 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.
6 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.
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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

1 appraisal. That's sort of the sine qua non for
2 any condemnation proceeding. The property has to
3 be subject to an appraisal, the property itself.
4 What happened here, the County was
5 presented with an offer based on a appraisal of
6 other property, not this property. And as we
7 pointed out in the papers, that's not what the
8 Eminent Domain Act calls for.
9 In fact, the Act calls for the County
10 to have the ability to accompany the appraiser to
1 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

1 because the courts are trying not to have to deal
2 with these things, right, as I'm sure the BPU
3 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
0 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.
9 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
25 period should start and parties can discuss
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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.
25 That should be part of the balancing. Those folks

1 object to how this has been brought together to
2 the analysis that has been presented or not
3 presented. And that should be part of that
4 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
25 abuts or is actually part of in some places the
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1 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
10 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

1 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.
6 And these abandoned railroad beds,
7 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
10 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
25 we have not seen really, other than what is
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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.

1 But we are in the midst of a project
2 that will impact us, I say us, the State of New
3 Jersey, perhaps the world, in a good way, we all
4 hope so. But us here in Cape May County for 30
5 years, and we're talking about time.
6 The impacts to this will be great.
7 And I know this proceeding is not going to deal
8 with questions of the impacts to fisheries and
9 tourism and the view shed and those things. But
10 for us that's all very serious, very important.
11 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,
23 play this out very quickly. The Board grants the
24 easements. Ocean Wind pursues its filing. We
25 operate interestingly under the Eminent Domain Act
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1 at that point, which is specifically incorporated
2 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.

1 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.
7 But on the taking question we're
going to hold that, because we don't know yet.
9 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
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concerning counties shall be liberally construed
in their favor. That's in our State
Constitution.
4
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

1
2

1 seen. The City and now the County have cited to
2 New Jersey Constitution Article 4, Section 7,
3 Paragraph 11, any law concerning municipal
4 corporations formed for local government or
5 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
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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 BL 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

1 sufficient width to accommodate this route, as can
2 be readily seen, without impacting the burrowing
3 area in the Ocean City shore.
4 Restriction of other vessels during
5 construction in this wide inlet does not equate to
6 closure of the inlet, as Ocean Wind would have you
7 believe. Navigation would continue during the
8 temporary period of construction as it did when
9 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

1 opened. Ocean City would still bear the aesthetic
2 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.

1 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.
6 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.
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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.

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

1 you know, is whether the requested easement is
2 reasonably necessary for the construction or
3 operation of the qualified wind project.
4 And it's important again to remember
5 what's not in front of the Board today. Offshore
6 wind is not in front of the Board. Where wind
7 turbines will be placed is not in front of the
8 Board. It's just this route, whether it is
9 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,
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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.
3 Essentially the Board has before it a
petition, and no party, including Board Staff, has
5 had the opportunity to properly determine if it's
6 accurate, credible or complete.
7 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
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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
25 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
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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
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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

1 Wind. Yet requests from the County and Ocean City
2 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.
25 But understand that this City of, in

1 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
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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
23 watching the process and recognizes the risks to
24 residents and visitors of the Borough, as Stone
25 Harbor views the process which is unfolding.

1 The Borough of Stone Harbor has no 2 reason for the preferred route to go through 3 pristine beach-front property and along the County
4 road when there is an alternative route in Great
5 Egg Harbor.
6 The BPU is requested by this
7 municipality to take a closer look at what is a
8 preferred route and what is a reasonably preferred
9 route, and request that the Board take appropriate
10 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

1 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
25 your comments, sir. Thank you.
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1 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
25 different contexts, including a public utility

1 context, that the legislature may empower the BPU
2 to supersede municipal or County approvals where
3 the statewide interest in public utilities, or in
4 this instance in offshore wind projects, is
5 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
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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,
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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.
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1 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
25 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
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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 5 you.
6 PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Thank you.
Anyone else would like to make a statement or have any questions?
9 COMMISSIONER HOLDEN: President
10 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
25 I can have a few words?
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1 PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Sure.
2 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
18 Fiordaliso, I also have some comments to make, and
19 I also want to ask Counsel if they can clarify
20 some other points with respect to the standard,
21 the reasonableness standard they're suggesting.
One, that we consider Municipal Land
23 Use applications over the Eminent Domain
24 standard. Is that the argument that is being
25 made? I guess this is Counsel for Cape May.

## PRESIDENT FIORDALISO: Counsel for Cape May? <br> MR. DONOHUE: Yes, thank you. <br> 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. <br> 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. <br> Our argument in terms of the Eminent <br> Domain Act is that the law is clear that <br> essentially the due process in this proceeding has to mirror the due process there. <br> It doesn't have to adopt the entire <br> Eminent Domain Act, although I should note a portion of it is specifically incorporated by reference in OWEDA. <br> But that flavor, so to speak, of due

1 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
25 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.
5 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
10 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
15 cross-examination is designed to create that
16 robust record, that tested analysis, rather than a
17 one-sided analysis.
So that the Board can look at that
19 and say we are confident that we have a very
20 robust record, that the opinions of the
21 petitioner's experts have been tested, and subject
22 to a real thorough analysis. The questions have
23 been asked and the parties have been afforded the
24 opportunity to cross-examine and ask those
25 questions so that the record is complete.
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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

1 all the other potential routes have not been
2 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

Page 88
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
16 the petition at a later date. And certainly
17 everyone will be apprised of that time frame once
18 it is determined.
I want to thank my fellow
20 Commissioners. It is now, I have 10:58 a.m., and 21 this meeting is closed.
22 Thank you very much. Have a
23 wonderful day, everyone.
24 (The hearing is adjourned.)
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| 75:22;79:15;83:3;85:3, | 45:12 | engage (4) | eventually (1) | extremely (6) |
| 11;86:16 | effectuated (2) | 27:12;36:5;72:19; | 20:18 | 49:22;56:14;64:2; |
| doubt (1) | 84:2,20 | 77:16 | everybody (2) | 80:8,21;87:22 |
| 41:8 | effort (1) | engineer (7) | 26:8;29:17 | eyes (1) |
| down (8) | 65:18 | 38:16;39:5,18;40:3, | everyone (8) | 49:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20: 17,22 ; 38: 6,8 ; \\ & 40: 15 ; 68: 9,10 ; 72: 15 \end{aligned}$ | efforts (1) $67: 18$ | 25;68:21;72:6 engineering (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 7 ; 12: 19 ; 58: 17 \\ & 80: 19 ; 82: 3,7 ; 89: 17,23 \end{aligned}$ | F |
| draft (2) | egg (20) | 21:15 | everyone's (1) |  |
| 29:3,6 | 23:20;42:3;49:6; | England (3) | 82:15 | face (3) |
| drainage (1) | 50:12,19,20;51:18,20; | 13:12;16:11;50:13 | evidence (3) | 31:18;47:25;67:15 |
| 68:19 | 52:9,17;53:7,9;62:11; | ensure (1) | 50:14;57:13,18 | faces (5) |
| drilling (2) | 66:3;67:5,19;69:5,19; | 57:15 | evidential (1) | 66:10,11,12,12; |
| 17:19,21 | 74:8;87:4 | ensuring (1) | 75:10 | 67:16 |
| drive (1) | EISENSTARK (10) | 67:25 | evidentiary (2) | facilities (1) |
| 62:16 | 12:3,4,13;25:14; | entire (7) | 52:8;74:24 | 68:20 |
| due (21) | 26:15;45:4;52:20;57:7; | 40:15,16;44:21; | evidently (1) | facility (2) |
| $26: 1 ; 33: 12,13 ; 34: 3$ | 70:8,9 | 59:18;82:8;83:21; | 53:10 | 41:11;50:13 |
| 17,24;57:14,20;68:20; | Eisenstark's (1) | 88:19 | exact (2) | fact (12) |
| 69:1;72:3,10;73:18; | 76:9 | entities (3) | 18:7;55:17 | 19:19;35:9;39:6,21; |
| 83:19,20,25;84:11,21; | either (7) | 8:3,9;35:21 | exactly (2) | 57:17;58:11;68:23; |
| 85:1,9;86:4 | 16:6;17:10;54:1; | entitled (2) | 76:8;78:5 | 69:15;70:21;71:6; |
| during (8) | 57:10;58:10,14;86:22 | 84:3;86:13 | excavated (1) | 76:13;86:16 |
| 9:7;18:15;36:11; | elected (17) | entity (2) | 51:25 | factor (6) |
| 37:14;40:13;51:4,7; | 25:20;26:3;30:9; | 15:6;47:21 | exercise (2) | 42:18,25;69:14; |
| 87:12 | 31:2,23;61:17;65:19, | entrust (1) | 33:22;34:1 | 86:23,24;88:9 |
| duties (1) | 21;67:22;70:20;76:7, | 76:13 | exist (1) | factors (1) |
| 48:21 | 12,14;81:17;87:24; | Environmental (20) | 84:3 | 48:13 |
| E | $88: 6,6$ <br> election (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:12;10:24;15:2,5; } \\ & \text { 21:9;28:25;29:3,6,19; } \end{aligned}$ | existing (2) 17:12:20:21 | facts (3) <br> $26 \cdot 23 \cdot 27 \cdot 11 \cdot 41 \cdot 23$ |
|  | 31:24 | $32: 12 ; 39: 8,13 ; 43: 18$ | expeditious (1) | factual (4) |
| earlier (3) 20.23:36.17:72.24 | electric (5) | 44:6,7;45:5,15;61:25; | 7:22 | 31:19;49:10;75:10; |
| 20:23;36:17;72:24 | 13:14;17:24;18:1; | 63:4;79:3 | expensive (4) | 80:11 |
| Ease (1) | 20:9,21 | environmentally (3) | 20:1;49:15;52:23; | failed (2) |
| 21:12 | elevated (1) | 63:8;64:1;68:1 | 87:8 | 50:7;68:24 |
| easement (16) | 68:25 | equally (1) | experience (3) | fails (1) |
| 14:22;18:12,13,17, | else (5) | 68:23 | 29:21;39:10;81:18 | 65:24 |
| 21,22,24;23:14;44:4,5, | 27:8;81:7,23;87:17; | equate (1) | experienced (1) | fair (2) |
| 11;55:1;57:22;60:25; | 88:24 | 51:5 | 38:10 | 9:16;76:9 |
| 62:5;64:4 | eminent (19) | essential (1) | expert (2) | fairly (2) |
| Easements (17) | $33: 6,9,11,14,23 ; 34: 5$ | $57: 15$ | $31: 4 ; 50: 16$ | 14:18;72:17 |
| 6:11;10:22;16:12,19, | 18;35:8,21;36:19;37:3; | essentially (16) | expertise (2) | fait (1) |
| 22;18:5,6;19:15;21:22; | 43:25;49:21;57:24; | 14:25;15:13;25:16, | 72:1;86:20 | 29:23 |
| 23:15,17;43:24;53:22; | 58:2;72:22;82:23; | 22;26:4;30:17;31:15; | experts (1) | familiar (1) |
| 55:16;73:8;75:4,12 | 83:17,22 | 38:22;39:22;42:1,6; | 85:21 | 15:21 |


| fantastic (1) | 24:6 | 55:16 | GORDON (2) | 62:11;66:3,22,25;67:1, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 41:16 | FIORDALISO (38) | four (1) | 80:25;81:1 | 5,19;69:6,19;74:9;87:4 |
| far (6) | 6:1,2;12:4,8,11,14; | 6:20 | government (7) | hard (1) |
| 23:4;25:7;34:22; | 13:16;19:13;24:14,21; | fragile (1) | 8:3,9;24:2;45:25; | 54:23 |
| 58:18;76:4;82:11 | 26:16;27:23;46:22; | 61:23 | 47:13;48:4;74:21 | hardly (1) |
| farm (2) | 47:3;54:7,16,21;58:15; | frame (1) | granted (4) | 65:20 |
| 12:25;64:14 | 59:12,15;64:17;65:5; | 89:17 | 8:11,12;53:14;60:11 | Health (1) |
| fashion (3) | 69:24;70:9;75:18,19; | frankly (8) | granting (1) | 48:15 |
| 17:22;41:9;68:2 | 79:10,24;80:5,17;81:6, | 23:25;30:25;58:4,9; | 53:22 | hear (3) |
| fastest (1) | 10,22;82:1,16,18;83:1; | 64:15;66:5;69:2;73:6 | grants (2) | 6:5;28:1,11 |
| 52:22 | 87:19 | Freehold (1) | 6:17;43:23 | heard (10) |
| fate (1) | firm (1) | 48:14 | grass (1) | 22:3,5;23:8;56:18; |
| 64:6 | 12:5 | front (4) | 39:20 | 57:16;64:23;65:2,4; |
| favor (7) | first (18) | 55:5,6,7,18 | great (21) | 68:6;80:10 |
| 40:23;46:2,12,12; | 9:11;11:15;12:10,21; | frustrated (1) | 41:16;43:6;49:6; | hearing (10) |
| 48:6;56:10;74:10 | 18:12;23:14;26:8,14; | 36:14 | 50:12,18,20;51:18,20; | 48:12,19,20,22; |
| federal (6) | 30:7;32:10;34:8;47:7; | fuel-fired (1) | 52:9,17;53:7,9;62:11; | 55:22;56:2,4,16;80:11; |
| 23:10,20,23;24:2; | 50:6;55:12;70:14; | 13:13 | 66:3;67:4,19;69:5,19; | 89:24 |
| 29:18;74:21 | 75:25;77:3;88:16 | full (1) | 74:8;82:14;87:4 | hearings (3) |
| feel (4) | fisheries (1) | 58:5 | greatly (2) | 9:3,3,7 |
| 25:24;60:13;71:24; | 43:8 | function (1) | 66:14,15 | heavy (1) |
| 84:16 | fishing (1) | 67:23 | Gregory (2) | 77:6 |
| feels (1) | 61:24 | fund (1) | 12:4;70:9 | held (2) |
| 25:23 | five (3) | 51:13 | grid (2) | 9:4;45:14 |
| feet (2) | 31:23;32:8;75:7 | fundamentally (1) | 20:9,21 | hemmed (1) |
| 18:24;44:8 | flavor (1) | 56:21 | Grossman (1) | 33:21 |
| fellow (1) | 83:25 | further (2) | 27:1 | here's (2) |
| 89:19 | flawed (1) | 68:16;79:23 | guess (1) | 29:13;30:11 |
| felt (2) | 56:21 | future (6) | 82:25 | Heretofore (1) |
| 25:21;72:8 | flip (1) | 40:10;61:11;63:19; | guidance (1) | 61:16 |
| few (4) | 29:16 | 69:1;74:19;75:7 | 26:11 | hey (3) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 18: 4 ; 35: 17 ; 74: 17 \\ & 81: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { floor (1) } \\ 59: 16 \end{array}$ | G | $\begin{gathered} \text { guide (1) } \\ 84: 18 \end{gathered}$ | 27:7;28:15;78:7 <br> high (2) |
| fight (1) | focused (1) |  | guiding (1) | 20:14;62:15 |
| 33:18 | 49:1 | gathering (1) | 33:22 | higher (1) |
| file (4) | folks (2) | 88:16 |  | 57:23 |
| 8:5;14:3,15;25:17 | 14:17;38:25 | general (2) | H | historic (2) |
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| 13,20;13:23;14:9;24:1; | following (1) | 11:5 | 51:11,13 | 29:4 |
| 36:8,25;37:7,8;38:22; | 7:1 | generated (1) | half (1) | hold (2) |
| 55:23;57:9;72:7;74:4 | follows (2) | 12:25 | 44:25 | 45:8;75:12 |
| filing (9) | 10:8;11:15 | generating (1) | half-dozen (1) | HOLDEN (6) |
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| 35:22;43:24 | form (2) | 13:14;40:16 | 10:22;11:8;77:7 | holes (1) |
| final (3) | 27:6;32:20 | given (9) | happen (8) | 50:17 |
| 44:17,18;62:7 | formal (2) | 20:19,20;31:7;46:15; | 24:5;28:21;37:10,11; | home (1) |
| finality (1) | 89:10,15 | 53:3;82:11;88:5;89:4,7 | 40:13;43:13;75:1,7 | 61:15 |
| 29:8 | formed (1) | gives (2) | happened (6) | hope (3) |
| finalize (2) | 48:4 | 70:17;73:11 | 31:7,20;35:4;37:16; | 43:4;53:23;69:23 |
| 23:16;24:2 | forth (3) | Glassboro (1) | 78:21;86:3 | hopefully (3) |
| finally (4) | 6:25;48:13;73:13 | 26:25 | happening (1) | 15:16;46:20;84:7 |
| 35:15;69:11;73:23; | forward (21) | global (2) | 62:3 | hopes (1) |
| 74:16 | 14:1,12;19:8;22:1, | 69:1,7 | happens (2) | 13:25 |
| financial (2) | 25;23:5;24:6;29:12; | goes (5) | 40:14;43:21 | horizontal (2) |
| 62:25;69:15 | 32:12,19;43:19;44:16; | 20:12;34:6;44:7; | happy (5) | 17:18,21 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { huge (1) } \\ & 63: 17 \\ & \text { hung (1) } \\ & 30: 11 \\ & \text { hypothetically (1) } \\ & 87: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41: 13 \\ \text { inaccurate (1) } \\ 51: 19 \\ \text { inaudible (3) } \\ 52: 11,24 ; 54: 3 \\ \text { include (1) } \\ 26: 23 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { installation (1) } \\ & 68: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 86:19 } \\ \text { involves (4) } \end{gathered}$ | K |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { installed (6) } \\ 17: 2,9,11,13,17 ; 18: 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 20 ; 21: 21 ; 48: 22 \\ & 65: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | keep (6) |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { instance (1) } \\ 71: 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { island (4) } \\ & 39: 22 ; 49: 3 ; 52: 4,6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 5 ; 62: 14 ; 70: 11 ; \\ & 88: 2,9,10 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  | Isle (9) 10:10:59:25:62:4,13, | kind (1) |
|  | included (2) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 14,16,22 ; 64: 9 ; 66: 11 \\ & \text { issue (10) } \end{aligned}$ | 9:12 |
| idea (2) | $7: 18 ; 31: 15$ including (7) |  |  | knowledge (1) |
| $\begin{array}{r} 53: 20 ; 66: 3 \\ \text { identified (5) } \end{array}$ | 60:18;70:25;74:8 | insufficient (1) | $14: 24 ; 15: 20 ; 18: 3 ;$ <br> $19 \cdot 14,15 \cdot 54 \cdot 25 \cdot 73 \cdot 4$ | known (1) |
|  |  | 73:25interconnection (8) |  | $9: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13: 6 ; 18: 13 ; 20: 14 ; \\ & 21: 2 ; 39: 6 \end{aligned}$ | incorporated (2) $44: 1 ; 83: 23$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:14,15;54:25;73:4, } \\ & 18 ; 80: 20 ; 86: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |
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| ignore (2) | Indeed (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 5 ; 27: 12 ; 33: 4 \\ & 38: 20,23 ; 70: 12 ; 71: 3,5 \\ & 73: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { issues (17) } \\ & 7: 22 ; 11: 5 ; 14: 18,19 ; \end{aligned}$ | Lacey (2) |
| 36:10,20 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 36: 15 \\ \text { indicate (3) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| $\underset{63: 2}{\text { ignored (1) }}$ |  |  | $21: 9 ; 22: 6 ; 23: 12,15$ | 13:6;20:23 |
|  | 25:2;59:2;65:8 indicated (1) | interested (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:10,12;35:22;42:23; } \\ & \text { 61:21;67:16;68:11; } \end{aligned}$ | lack (2)49:18;51:20 |
| immediately (3) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { indicated (1) } \\ & 76: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 27:25 interesting (1) |  |  |
| immodest (1) | indulge (4) | $76: 5$ | 7,6; iterative (2) | laid (1) |
| 61:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 16 ; \\ & 43: 22 \end{aligned}$ | interestingly (3) | 20:13;21:2 | land (16) |
| Impact (12) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 14 ; 37: 4 ; 43: 25 \\ & \text { interests (3) } \end{aligned}$ |  | 14:22;19:5;44:5,12; |
| 29:3,6;30:1;40: | industry (1) |  |  | 64:1;76:17;81:18; 82:22;83:5,13;84:14 |
| 64:1;68:24;77 | inferences | $26: 24 ; 27: 22 ; 71: 15$ <br> interfaces (1) | Jersey (17) |  |
| impacted (5) | $79: 5$ influx | 84:14 | 6:3,22;9:21,21,22, | landfall (1) |
| 51:18;62:5,17;69:7, | flux (1) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { interpreted (1) } \\ 76: 24 \end{array}$ | 22;12:23;15:1;17:7; | 16:1 |
| $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ \text { impactin } \end{gathered}$ | 66:16 inform |  | 18:3;27:1;43:3;47:12; | $\underset{\text { landing (1) }}{\text { l }}$ |
| 51:2 | informa $57: 10$ | interpreting (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 2 ; 54: 22 ; 59: 10 ; \\ & 88: 20 \end{aligned}$ | lands (3) |
| impacts (8) | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 2 ; 53: 4 ; 58: 12 \\ & 81: 4,13 ; 82: 4,10 ; 88: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { interrupt (1) } \\ 64: 18 \end{gathered}$ | Jim (1) | 61:24;63:9,9 |
| 21:6,9,9,11,23;33:9; |  |  | 54:12 |  |
| 43:6,8 |  | interrupted (1) | job (2) | 48:23;63:8 |
| imperative | (15,16 | 52:7 | 78:9;82:1 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { last (5) } \\ 35: 16 ; 45: 19 ; 54: 23 ; \\ 71: 10 ; 86: 7 \end{array}$ |
| 61:7 | informative (1) | $\begin{array}{\|r} \text { intervene (3) } \\ 8: 5,8 ; 59: 23 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Joe (1) |  |
| implemented | 82:4 |  |  |  |
| 52:16 | 79:4.8 | Interv | join (1) | lasting (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { implicat } \\ 33: 9 \end{gathered}$ | 79:4;82:11 infrastructure (4) |  | joined | 77:4 |
| implications | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 13 ; 65: 16 ; 68: 25 ; \\ & 69: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Intervenors (9) } \\ & 9: 19 ; 10: 1,20 ; 11: 16, \\ & 25 ; 70: 2,4 ; 81: 11 ; 89: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 86:2;87:14 | later (2) $36: 11 ; 8$ |
| 66:17 implore (1) |  |  | joins (1) <br> 75:25 <br> Judge (1) | Law (22) |
| implore (1) | initial (3) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { intervention (1) } \\ & 59: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | $8: 18,19 ; 12: 5 ; 24: 24$ |
| 67:20 | Initially (1) |  | $8: 19$ | $33: 9 ; 34: 18 ; 38: 5 ; 45: 24$ |
| implying |  | into (15) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:3,10;50:3;54:5; } \\ & 70: 21 ; 71: 18 ; 73: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| important (17) | $25: 2$ initiate (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 13 ; 20: 12 ; 26: 3 ; \\ & 31: 22 ; 38: 9 ; 39: 21 ; 44: 2 ; \end{aligned}$ | judicial (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 17,17,24 ; 81: 18 \\ & 83: 11,18 ; 84: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 19:18,21;28:12 | 47:14 | $45: 6 ; 66: 18,19 ; 69: 16$$72: 20 ; 81: 14,19 ; 89: 14$ | 25:6;26:10 |  |
| 31:19;33:1;34:16,2 | inland (3) |  | 7:24,25 | laws (1) |
| 35:17;43:10;55:4; | 62:7,23;65:1 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { inundated (1) } \\ 69: 3 \end{array}$ | June (7) ${ }^{\text {7.3, }}$, | 46:6 |
| 61:21;64:2;80:20,21 | Inlet (5) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 3,11,13,13,14,16 ; \\ & 47: 6 \end{aligned}$ | lay (1)$73: 7$ |
| 87:22;88:8,10 | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 7 ; 50: 25 ; 51: 5,6 ; \\ & 52: 17 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| importantly (1) |  | invite (10) |  | lead (1)$76: 2$ |
| . 78:13 | input (1) |  |  |  |
| impossible (2) | 65:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 1 ; 24: 16 ; 46: 24 \\ & \text { 54:9;58:19;70:1;75:20; } \end{aligned}$ | jurisprudence (2) 76:22•84:17 | $76: 2$ leading (1) |
| 21:14;56:11 |  |  | $76: 22 ; 84: 17$ | $69: 9$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { impression (4) } \\ & 26: 9,15 ; 34: 8 ; 77: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $52: 25$ insisting (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 9 ; 58: 19 ; 70 \\ & 79: 12,25 ; 80: 6 \end{aligned}$ involve (1) | jurisprudential (1) | lease (1) |
| improved (1) | 52:18 | 83:13 | justiciability (1) | 20:19 |
| 39:19 |  |  | 28:8 | least (5) |
| improving (1) | 17:22;68:18 | 29:17,18;47:7;61:8; |  | $49: 15 ; 52: 22$ |


| leave (1) | 36:6 | 29:2 | mentioned (6) | 18:4,5;19:1;30:4; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88:23 | little (4) | manner (1) | 10:16;20:23;82:9; | 34:21;46:18;53:1;56:9; |
| leaves (1) | 15:22;18:4;19:1; | 46:8 | 87:21,23;88:14 | 59:3;63:10;68:9;84:25; |
| 55:20 | 58:25 | many (20) | mentioning (1) | 87:8 |
| leaving (1) | lived (1) | 14:7,12,12;17:7,7,13, | 87:20 | Moreover (1) |
| 38:19 | 29:20 | 25;20:14;21:4;25:10; | method (1) | 56:10 |
| led (1) | LLC (8) | 39:10,16;55:25;70:21, | 17:19 | morning (8) |
| 58:3 | 6:10;7:3,11;8:20; | 21,24,24;77:9;81:16; | methodology (3) | 6:1;24:21,22,23; |
| legal (6) | 9:20;10:23;12:2,6 | 87:23 | 35:12;37:12;38:1 | 47:3;54:12,20;79:8 |
| 25:12;28:4;31:19; | LLC's (1) | marine (1) | methods (1) | most (3) |
| 47:25;73:1;88:3 | 7:14 | 21:9 | 17:10 | 14:17;78:13;82:11 |
| legislative (1) | load (1) | materials (1) | Michael (1) | mostly (1) |
| 71:12 | 13:1 | 89:13 | 24:24 | 39:20 |
| legislature (6) | local (6) | matter (26) | microphone (1) | motion (8) |
| 33:17;70:23;71:1,19; | 45:25;47:13;48:4; | 7:2;8:15,17;9:19; | 11:13 | 7:5,13;8:8,14,16,21; |
| 81:20;88:7 | 71:5,8;87:25 | 10:4,21;11:7;12:7,20; | Middle (7) | 72:24;73:2 |
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